

MT ARTHUR MINE COMPLEX

Community Consultative Committee Meeting – 16 December 2015



Attendance

Chairperson

Dr. Colin Gellatly Independent Chair MAC CCC

Company Representatives

Andrew Garratt	Senior Manager Corporate Affairs, NSW Energy Coal
Sarah Parton	Specialist Environment Execution
Nick Woodbyrne	Principal Mining Engineer
Nathan Donegan	Superintendent Mining Pit Services

Community Representatives

By Invitation

Scott Brooks Department of Planning & Environment (DPE)

Apologies

Jenni Hayes Community Representative

Alex MacDonald Community Representative

Di Gee Community Representative

Minutes

- 1. Welcome by Chairperson;** Col welcomed CCC Members. Apologies were advised and recorded.

- ## **2. Declaration of Pecuniary Interests;**

Ongoing Declaration: Col advised that both he and Sarah are engaged by BHP Billiton to provide the respective roles of independent Chairperson and preparation of the Meeting Minutes.

- ### **3. Approval of the previous Meeting's Minutes**

Col confirmed that the previous Meeting Minutes had been circulated, along with MAC's responses to questions tabled by John. Col advised that both of these documents are to be uploaded to MAC's website. John feels the time frame for Minutes acceptance at the following Meeting is too long and asked if the Minutes could go up on the Website after any feedback had been incorporated from the Draft for Members Review. John advised that there had been some difficulties in accessing the June 2015 Meeting Minutes on MAC's website.

ACTION 1: Andrew to test accessing the MAC CCC Minutes on the Website.

Andrew advised the process had been to distribute the Draft for Members Review at the time of putting out the next Meetings Agenda. Andrew explained that there had been a delay putting out the 15 September 2015 Draft Meeting Minutes, due to the company requiring time to provide responses to John's questions. Andrew is happy to distribute the Draft for CCC review and not wait for any secondary documentation in the future.

John advises people who are wishing to view the Meeting Minutes to go to the Library, however he has found that there are no Meeting Minutes there for 2014 and 2015. John thought the Minutes were sent to the Library after each Meeting.

ACTION 2: Andrew to contact Muswellbrook Library regarding displaying the MAC CCC Meeting Minutes and provide hard copies in the future if that would assist the Library to facilitate this.

The Minutes were accepted by the group and John advised that he would raise anything further in General Business.

4. Matters Arising

- ✓ Col confirmed all Action Items from the previous Meeting had been attended to.

5. Update from BHP Billiton

Presentation to be distributed with the Meeting Minutes.

OVERVIEW OF OPERATIONS

Presented by Nick Woodbyrne - Principal Mining Engineer

Nick advised that he will also present Quarter on Quarter Data in response to feedback from the previous meeting. Nick provided an overview of production in terms of overburden movement (Mbcm) and Coal Mined (Mt), for the periods September to November 2014, June to August 2015 and September to November 2015.

Nick is happy to provide additional detail that the CCC may like to see and had chosen this data as it shows truck movements in the pit, previously he had shown more detail on product which is more of a process.

 ***September to November 2014 & 2015 / Quarter on Quarter difference:-***

Overburden Movement –8%, Coal Mined –22%

 ***2014 & 2015 / Year on Year difference:-***

Overburden Movement –6%, Coal Mined -8%

John asked if the reduction in coal movement in September to November 2015 was a result of it being carted further? Nick responded that it was more related to equipment availability and utilisation, and that distance moved is not a primary contributor to production. In addition, there had been a lot of rain in that Quarter. Nick explained production was a bit down over the same period last year for similar reasons.

Nick noted that the previous period, June to August, included a production push leading to the end of the financial year, he advised there may be other certain lull periods in different Quarters i.e. December covers the Christmas / Boxing Day shutdown. ***John queried the Christmas shutdown period?*** Nick confirmed this shut is for a standard 48 hour period, from 6.30pm Christmas Eve to 6.30am the day after Boxing Day.

Environment - Period 1 September to 31 October 2015

Presented by Sarah Parton – Specialist Environment Execution

ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT

Sarah explained that it had been a busy time for reporting, with preparation of the following Reports:-

 ***Annual Environmental Management Report (AEMR)***

Annual Return

National Pollutant Inventory Report

National Greenhouse Emissions Report

 ***Site inspection on 9 October 2015 by the Department of Planning & Environment***

To close out actions arising from 2014's AEMR a site inspection was undertaken by the DPE and primarily focussed on areas affected by spontaneous combustion that had been recently capped and the hydrocarbon contaminated soil storage area. It was noted by the DPE that there were no large areas of spontaneous combustion remaining with the remaining areas either being difficult to access or new areas created by treatment of nearby areas. It was also agreed that a sump be constructed at the hydrocarbon contaminated soil storage area to capture water for analysis after rainfall.

Scott confirmed the Department had conducted two annual inspections, along with this more recent one on 9 October to cover off the issues from 2014, and provided the following update to the CCC.

➤ ***Spontaneous Combustion:-***

Scott advised that the Consent contains odour requirements, he has been to site on a number of occasions and feels the combustion issue is about 90% fixed. Scott acknowledged that often areas easier to access get fixed more quickly but also noted that it can be difficult to fix spontaneous combustion as it can pop out in a different location. There is an expectation by the DPE for this to be fixed within the next week or two, with the understanding that there is potential for some pop up.

➤ ***Waste and Hydrocarbon Management Audit:-***

Following the AEMR inspection, Scott requested that an Audit be conducted for hydrocarbons and the disposal of contaminated waste material. MAC agreed to do this Audit in response to some issues including management of oils on a concrete pad that not been completed. The audit was conducted in February 2015.

Scott advised the inspection had shown that the waste bins were good, there was satisfactory management of hydrocarbons in the workshop and he was happy with those areas.

Scott looked at the AEMR outcomes for 2015 and noted that there was some carryover such as the Visual Bund on Denman Road.

➤ ***Visual Bund on Denman Road***

Scott advised that the DPE had asked for this Bund on Denman Road to be looked at. Feedback from the DPE and Council was that it is too steep and covered in weeds. Scott said that the Mine is to flatten it out and vegetate the Bund, and that both he and Council had been clear on desired outcomes. Scott advised that when the bund is vegetated and trees planted, it is to be watered by Contractors.

Scott feels that MAC had lost some time regarding the Visual Bund, as some of the trees that had been sown had died. Scott has an expectation for the Visual Bund to look good, he does not want people driving past to see this as not being satisfactory. Scott stipulated that trees are not to be allowed to die off in this next round and asked the community to notify MAC if they see trees dying off. In addition, Scott felt that maintenance of graded banks to stop erosion had been a bit ordinary and believes it requires a more robust campaign and review.

Scott advised that one issue for DRE, that relates to a number of Mines, is how Mines monitor progress of vegetation so it gets to an end point i.e. what is the anticipated end result, what is the mine going to have and monitoring how it gets there, with the aim for landforms to be as good as they can be.

John felt the Visual Bund had taken a long time to get to the point it is at now. Scott explained that MAC had engaged a visual consultant to prepare a detailed design and implementation plan to provide an effective screen of the operations and improve the visual appearance. Scott agreed that planning took too long however it now has been started and confirmed that it will be done.

Nick further explained that this 50 meter corridor was a sensitive area and that MAC had to plan carefully as the Mine wanted to complete the key execution items correctly, being the; Vegetation Bund, Road properly constructed to avoid dust off site and Monitoring Pillars for Geotec Monitoring.

Scott confirmed in 2014 and 2015 there had been four talks to Mine OCE's and Mine Planners about Water Management, Blasting and Dust in particular, to make sure the Mines are doing all they can to manage these. These Meetings also provided the opportunity for the Mines to talk to DRE about the Regulators expectations and for these parties to have two way feedback.

➤ ***Incident of water crossing Denman Road***

John asked if the Department was happy with the water runoff onto the road, as he noted the water had previously sat there in an open divot for some time. John felt that work had started around that area, putting in dams or the like? The Department was notified and Scott noted that this was fixed straight away, he explained this became an incident as water went off site and that MAC had received an Infringement Notice.

➤ ***Spontaneous Combustion in June 2015***

Scott explained with regard to the spontaneous combustion in the wall, which may result in a bit of smoke, may not overly matter as long as a lid is kept on it and that a determination is made if it is in a sensitive or non sensitive area. ***John understood that MAC now had materials stored in readiness to attend to a spontaneous combustion and queried how is an areas sensitivity determined?*** Scott explained this is driven by a certain distance, that being 500 metres off the boundary and if it breaks within that area it gets fixed. Scott clarified that if it is more than 500 metres from boundary it does not get ignored, if access is good most likely it would be managed as soon as the company can attend to it. Some minor works may be done a little later, in this case in 2016.

ENVIRONMENTAL PERFORMANCE

John asked if the Environmental Performance data goes onto to MAC's website?

Andrew confirmed that this is the case.

➤ ***Environmental Incidents***

Nil

➤ ***Elevated Environmental Monitoring Results***

11 September, 5, 6 7, 9 & 20 October 2015

John queried the elevated results on 11 September? Sarah responded that on this day there had been races at the Racecourse and that another localised source had been identified.

Sarah advised there had been a number of air quality exceedences and investigations had indicated that a localised source had caused the monitor to go off. Over 5, 6 and 7 October there had been a regional dust event, with a series of days with bad weather. Sarah advised the OCE's are constantly checking weather conditions and if MAC get a high wind alarm operational changes are made and equipment may be pulled up.

John advised that he had contacted Bengalla asking for their monitoring data for this same period and was unable to get this information. John would like to compare results from one side of the Racecourse Road to the other.

In October 2014 John raised that MAC's Dust Monitor showed 148 and Bengalla's was 48, he was concerned about the difference of 100 in these two readings. John advised that MAC were to get a report on these variances and assumed that they did not get this report. John is concerned there can be a difference of hundreds between these monitors and is trying to get to the bottom of this.

➤ **Dust Monitor in Sheppard Avenue**

Scott advised there had been some go forward on that issue of dust, with the potential for dust to be coming from one of a number of places; from nearby Mines, the dirt road beside the Monitor and some potential movement of race horses.

Scott would like to see the road sealed or the monitor moved, he feels this will take that unknown away. If the road is sealed and the problem goes away, then it could be ascertained that the road was causing the issue. If the problem was to continue after the road had been sealed, then deeper investigations would be needed. Scott said it is not for one Mine to blame another and has requested that MAC look at sealing that road, however how this is progressed is the Mine's decision.

John feels the road should produce three to four times the volume of dust when comparing one side to the other. Scott noted that the Racecourse is right beside it and John acknowledged the potential issue when there is a Race day. If there is not a Race day or Function on and there is a difference in the hundreds in the monitoring results, John feels this is something the community is not happy about. Scott reiterated that he feels the dust is coming from vehicles using this road. John explained that he understands that most Trainers go around the back, not down that road, as the stables are located down the other end.

Col asked Scott to provide a report on DPE's recommendations regarding Sheppard Avenue in relation to sealing the road / moving the monitor. Scott advised that he is leaving the DPE and will put a note of this request in his handover notes.

Scott advised that there had been an offer to seal this road, however the Racecourse people and MAC were still in negotiations.

ONGOING ACTION: MAC CCC to keep Sheppard Avenue as an Agenda Item in relation to providing updates on progress of DPE's recommendations to; seal this road and/or potentially relocate the Dust Monitor.

COMMUNITY COMPLAINTS

It was noted that noise complaints had predominantly come from Muswellbrook residents and as a result of these MAC confirmed that all that could be done by the company was done, including additional Monitoring; twice weekly with resident and hand held. MAC explained they had not been operating at some of the times of complaint. John sometimes gets the really low level vibration, low frequency noise, and MAC confirmed a complaint had come from the new Estate near Iron Bark Road. John acknowledged this is one of the closer resident locations.

MAC had also investigated locations of lighting concerns on the fringe, and as a result lights had been either re-directed or turned off.

Andrew noted that the positive side of the complaints data was that lighting and dust were the smaller complaint component and that these had been a focal point for MAC.

IN THE COMMUNITY

- ✓ Successful launch of Reading Rocks.
- ✓ Mt Arthur Coal hosted a White Ribbon Day on site.
- ✓ End of year Stakeholder appreciation event held at Simpson Park.

6. Focus Topic 1 – Dams on site

Presentation by Nathan Donegan – Dams on Site

Andrew noted that MAC had chosen this focus topic in light of a tailings dam wall failure in Samarco. Andrew advised that BHP Billiton is committed to finding out what caused the collapse of the tailings dam at Samarco. Together with Vale, BHB have agreed to commission an external investigation into the collapse of the dam. It will be some time before this investigation concludes, but when it does, BHP will publicly release the findings. BHP will also share the results with other resource companies. BHP has brought forward their next review of all tailings dams in which the company has an interest.

MT ARTHUR COAL DAMS

Main Dam

John queried where MAC will get the water that they currently source from this dam when it is decommissioned during 2016? Nathan advised that this Dam used to be the main water supply to the Prep Plant, there is now an alternative source that holds 3 meters of water and is located closer to the Plant.

Environmental Dam

John asked where the spillway was located for this Dam? Nathan advised that water would travel through the left hand side over drop structures, he confirmed this spillway is designed to cater for a 1 in 100 year flood.

Tailings Storage Facility

7. Focus Topic 2 – Dust and Final Landform

Presentation by Nick Woodbyrne - Principal Mining Engineer

Key elements of presentation:

- Future state of final land form.
- Anticipated panorama from the Racecourse.
- Mine progress from now over the next two years.
- Stage builds.
- The Visual dump completion as at today is at 52%, June 2017 it is anticipated to be at 67%

How much will be filled in between the Visual Bund and Edderton Road? Nick anticipated this at RL360, not fully out to Denman Road and this work is about two thirds complete. For rehab purposes, MAC will still be on top of the Visual Bund.

John asked if the landform would be a Visual Bund then a flat area with nice green grass? MAC confirmed that is what they are seeking to achieve. The slope on the end will be at a 10 degree angle that MAC can rehab by placing top soil on this, then vegetating and planting trees. MAC starts with the end result in mind and builds dumps to create this final landform.

Col asked if there will be any immediate ground cover? Nick advised yes, there will be a couple of lifts with 20 metre lifts being the standard, then a dozer will come in and push this back to the 10 degree angle for top soiling and planting.

Nick advised that MAC are opening up an area of the Pit adjacent to Denman Road, so when heading towards Denman some activity will be seen in this broad area. Nick explained what is anticipated to be seen over the next few months. MAC are not going to make changes to the end wall i.e. Visual Bund, there is still about 55 metres of clearway and the Pit will develop inside of that. Nick can come back and update the CCC on progress there.

Col queried if the rehabilitation details could be found in the Mine Operations Plan (MOP) and Scott advised this Plan was approved by DRE in June. Some amendments had been received from MAC and there had been some talks between Donna and the DPE. Scott feels that these amendments may not be approved in light of response from Council and there would probably be a joint meeting with Council and DRE early in 2016.

8. Regulatory Update

Scott Brooks – NSW Government Planning & Environment (DPE)

Scott confirmed that he had outlined the outcomes of the AEMR inspections and had also wanted to attend today's meeting to see how they are operated with the new CCC. John felt the forum had improved dramatically, with the provision of good information from MAC and ample opportunity for questions and answers.

John advised Scott that he had found it beneficial to receive data for each of the Monitors; Water, Dust and Noise, as had been provided to the previous CCC. John feels the community doesn't have access to MAC's monitoring data and feels this is a bit of a loss to them. John feels that community also like to see data on dust and he tends to direct people to the Library.

Scott advised that all Mining Consents have the requirement for the Mines to keep their websites up to date with monitoring and Sarah confirmed that EPA data goes on line. John finds this data to be really unreadable and found it helpful when it was provided in graph form indicating; Annual Average, Day by Day, 24 Hour or Daily and High Velocity Air Sampler results.

Scott advised from a Consent perspective the monthly data to satisfy the EPL is there, how it is presented to the CCC is up to the group. Col confirmed that the reporting requested on Environmental Management & Performance and Community Complaints had been based on the majority at the time and the CCC had advised they did not want to receive too much information. John understands the CCC's decision and he had just wanted to make Scott aware that this data is no longer available to the community.

Scott advised that trends or numbers on a graph showing accelerated levels can actually be misleading If the monitor is reading the wrong thing i.e. dirt coming off a road. Scott noted that it presents a picture that may not be representative of the real picture and this is a problem with dust i.e. the Sheppard Avenue Monitor. Graphs at face value are easy to read, but Scott explained it is also easy for them to be misleading in the way data is represented.

John feels it comes back to community representatives and their ability to share information with the wider community. John is not seeking this data for the purpose of criticizing or raising concerns about the mine but to be also able to provide appropriate feedback about concerns and actions being undertaken by MAC in response to those.

Scott advised the Upper Hunter Air Quality Network (UHAQN) integrates all that data and that may be a useful data source for John.

9. General Business

John had noticed that a number of people stop to take photos of the Mine and Scott responded that it had been raised by Industry; if people want to look at a mine, how do they go about it. Scott advised that at a recent Upper Hunter Mining Dialogue Meeting, there had been discussion around Mine Tours and for Mines to increase available areas for people to see into them e.g. observation areas, to soften the need for people to stop in potentially unsafe locations as John had identified

Col thanked Scott for his attendance and input at today's meeting and Scott advised that he will no longer be working at the DRE after Friday 18 December 2015.

10. Date & Time of next Meeting

Mt Arthur Coal Boardroom
Thursday 10th March - 9:30am

ACTIONS ARISING FROM THIS MEETING

Action	Page Ref	Description	Who
1	1	Andrew to test accessing the MAC CCC Minutes on the Website.	Andrew ✓ Actioned
2	1	Andrew to contact Muswellbrook Library regarding displaying the MAC CCC Meeting Minutes and provide hard copies in the future if that would assist the Library to facilitate this.	Andrew ✓ Actioned

Long Term / Ongoing Actions

Description	Who
MAC CCC to keep Sheppard Avenue as an Agenda Item in relation to providing updates on progress of DPE's recommendations to; seal this road and/or potentially relocate the Dust Monitor.	Andrew
MAC to provide Environmental Management, Environmental Performance and Community Complaints one week prior to the next Meeting.	Donna and Deirdra

ADDENDUM 1

Mt Arthur Coal responses to questions tabled at the MAC CCC Meeting 16th September 2015.

QUESTION 1

A. What chemicals are put into the air with each blast at Mt Arthur Coal?

Refer Australian Explosives Industry And Safety Group Inc. Code of Practice. Code to be provided to CCC.

B. How far does each chemical travel?

There is no monitoring of specific chemicals, however Mt Arthur Coal has an approved Blast Monitoring Program that measures air blast overpressure and ground vibration in accordance with the Project Approval.

Mt Arthur Coal also has a Blast Fume Management Plan (an appendix to the Blast Management Plan) which details the methods used to minimise visible fume generated from blasting and reduce the potential of any fume leaving the Mt Arthur Coal site.

In addition Mt Arthur Coal has a comprehensive pre-blasting approval process that includes a review of specific factors required to initiate a blast and the use of a predictive fume model to show the expected path and dispersion of fume.

C. Who does the monitoring of these chemicals?

There is no monitoring of specific chemicals, however Mt Arthur Coal has an approved Blast Monitoring Program that measures air blast overpressure and ground vibration in accordance with the Project Approval.

Mt Arthur Coal also has a Blast Fume Management Plan (an appendix to the Blast Management Plan) which details the methods used to minimise visible fume generated from blasting and reduce the potential of any fume leaving the Mt Arthur Coal site.

In addition Mt Arthur Coal has a comprehensive pre-blasting approval process that includes a review of specific factors required to initiate a blast and the use of a predictive fume model to show the expected path and dispersion of fume.

D. Where can find information on a regular basis and previous data?

The Mt Arthur Coal website.

QUESTION 2

The wall along Denman Road I understand prevents water from entering and leaving the mine site.

A. What impact does it have on the water table along the river flats between the mine and the river?

Drawdown is limited within the alluvium to generally less than one metre, indicating that impacts in this area are minimal.

The modelled head for FY15 was extracted for all model slices from the consolidation project ground water model and compared to measured data in June 2015. The four bores in the alluvium showing negative values indicating the model may have slightly under predicted impacts in this area; however, future drawdown to the west of the bentonite wall within the alluvium is likely to be minimal.

Ground water monitoring adjacent to the barrier was undertaken during the reporting period utilising vibrating wire piezometer (VWP) data from VWP01, VWP02 and VWP03 (1 and 2) located between the Hunter River and the alluvial cut-off wall. Variable drawdown has been recorded by these VWP monitoring bores since monitoring commenced in September 2011, ranging from 23.3 m in the Edinglassie Seam to 40.2 m in the deeper Ramrod Creek Seam. A 30.8 m drawdown response has been recorded within the F4 Fault.

In contrast, nearby Hunter River Alluvial aquifer monitoring bores GW16 and GW21 have remained relatively static, with only a nominal decline in groundwater levels (up to 0.75 m) observed over the same period. This indicates the depressurisation observed in the underlying Permian coal seam does not appear to have propagated upwards into the Hunter River Alluvium in the vicinity of GW16 and GW21.

During the next reporting period the new bore GW42 will also be installed in this vicinity to provide additional monitoring of the alluvial cut-off wall in the future.

(Refer Mt Arthur Coal Annual Environmental Management Report FY 2015)

ADDENDUM 1

B. How have the salt content and water levels in the wells, on this land, been affected?

Note: Construction commenced in July 2013 and was completed in October 2013. GW16 and GW21 are alluvial bores.

Water levels and the water table are discussed in the answer above.

Average EC at GW16 was 3,391 µS/cm for the 12 months prior to commencement of installation of the alluvial wall (data from June 2012 to June 2013) and average EC was 2,724 µS/cm from October 2013 to June 2015, post installation.

EC at GW16 has been steadily decreasing since monitoring commenced at this bore in 2008, and these average results are in line with this steadily decreasing trend, with no anomalies present in the data around the time of or post installation.

Average EC at GW21 was 915.0 µS/cm for the 12 months prior to commencement of installation of the alluvial wall (data from June 2012 to June 2013) and average EC was 904.6 µS/cm from October 2013 to June 2015, post installation.

C. Where can I obtain relevant data prior to the wall being built, current data and future data?

The Mt Arthur Coal website under the heading 'Annual Environmental Management Report'. Also any exceedances of trigger values are provided to the CCC as part of the handout and discussed by exception. (Refer Mt Arthur Coal Annual Environmental Management Report FY 2015)

QUESTION 3

How many jobs have been lost from Mt Arthur Coal?

A. In the last two years?

Approximately 500

B. Types of jobs lost (i.e. production, administration, management, etc.)?

To clarify not all the jobs have been lost, some roles have been transferred to our Brisbane office as part of a two tier structure. The roles impacted have come from across the site and include areas such as Human Resources, Supply, Finance, Health, Safety, Environment, Maintenance, Production and Engineering.

C. What percentage of staff levels at Mt Arthur live permanently in Muswellbrook Shire?

75 percent.

QUESTION 4

Mt Arthur Coal has purchased a number of properties along the Hunter River.

A. How much of the water entitlements are controlled by Mt Arthur Coal?

As discussed in the Surface Water Assessment (as part of the Mod EA) HVEC presently holds 5,741 ML/a of Hunter River General Security Entitlement and 2,197 ML/a of Hunter River High Security Entitlement. The volume of water that can be extracted from the Hunter River by licence holders is limited by available water determinations which are announced by DPI Water on the 1 July each year. Where plans indicate that there would be sufficient water stored on site, water allocations from the Hunter River are offered to lease holders as temporary transfers.

B. How much excess water from Mt Arthur Coal has been discharged into the river in the last 12months?

Mt Arthur Coal has not discharged any water into the Hunter River in the last 12 months.

C. Is that water monitored downstream from the discharge point?

In accordance with the approved Surface Water Monitoring Program, Mt Arthur Coal monitor downstream of our discharge point on a monthly basis (even when we are not discharging).

ADDENDUM 1

D. Who does the monitoring?

Monitoring is undertaken by an independent contractor.

E. Where can I access the relevant data?

As noted in the approved Surface Water Monitoring Program, the downstream site is for internal use only and not reported.

F. Are properties downstream advised of the discharge?

Mt Arthur Coal discharges water through the Hunter River Salinity Trading Scheme (a licensing scheme for discharges of saline water in the Hunter River catchment above Singleton.) Mt Arthur Coal do not notify properties downstream however we would be more than happy to do this if asked (we haven't had any requests in the past).

More information see Appendix 3: Interim Monitoring Program. To be provided to CCC.

QUESTION 5

We have lived in Muswellbrook for just over three years and my children have developed asthma, yet they had no signs of asthma in Sydney. I have been told the Hunter is the asthma capital of NSW.

A. Do we really have high levels of asthma in this area? Where do I get this type of information?

See Upper Hunter Valley Particle Characterization Study and fact sheet to be provided to CCC and for more information goto <http://www.healthstats.nsw.gov.au/>

B. Are the mines responsible for looking at data affecting the health of the community?

Mt Arthur Coal has an approved Air Quality Management Plan and Monitoring Program to ensure that all reasonable and feasible avoidance and mitigation measures are employed so that particulate matter emissions generated by the site do not cause exceedances of impact assessment criteria specified in the Project Approval (schedule 3, condition 20).

C. In the Mine's "Conditions of Consent" is there any requirement to look at the health of the community and possible health i.e. incidence of asthma and cancer, etc?

No

D. Who is responsible?

NSW Department of Health