

**MT ARTHUR MINE COMPLEX**

**COMMUNITY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE**

**MEETING AGENDA**

**Wednesday 28<sup>th</sup> March 2012**

**Venue: Project Office**

Time	Item	Content	Person
3:00	1	Welcome and apologies	Chairperson
3:00	2	Housekeeping and safety	MAC
3:05	3	Meeting context	J.McNaughton
3:10	4	Summary of final draft document	S.Mitchell
3:30	5	Incorporation of feedback	S.Mitchell
4:10	6	Outline of next steps	MAC
4:20	7	Discussion	All
4:35	8	Meeting close	Chairperson

## MT ARTHUR COAL COMMUNITY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

### Minutes of Meeting (21)

- Location:** Mt Arthur Coal Projects Department Boardroom
- Date:** Wednesday 14 march 2012
- Present:** Martin Rush (MR) Chairperson, Jennifer Lecky (JL) Councillor, John Bancroft (JB) Resident, Craig Flemming (CF) Muswellbrook Shire Council, Bruce MacPherson (BM) Resident, Graham Guest (GG) Resident, Julie McNaughton (JM) Mt Arthur Coal, Rebecca Smith (RS) Mt Arthur Coal, Joanne Wilson (JW) Mt Arthur Coal.
- Apologies:** Eddie Constable (EC) Resident, Raymond Webb (RW) Resident, Michael White (MW) Mt Arthur Coal, Scott Mitchell (SM) Mt Arthur Coal, Donna McLaughlin (DM) Mt Arthur Coal, Shelley Masterson (ShM) Mt Arthur Coal.

---

#### Meeting Commenced: 3.05 pm

#### 1. WELCOME AND APOLOGIES

MR welcomed everyone to the Mt Arthur Coal Community Consultative Committee (CCC) Extraordinary Meeting for March 14 2012, and apologies were received.

#### 2. HOUSEKEEPING AND SAFETY

JM provided information on general housekeeping and safety at the Projects location at Mt Arthur Coal.

#### 3. MEETING FEEDBACK

MR - Confirmed the purpose of the CCC meeting and what they as a group were expected to get out of the discussion around the Biodiversity and Rehabilitation management Plan?

JM – Confirmed that this meeting is for a discussion about the Biodiversity and Rehabilitation Management Plan (Draft Format) only and that any other issues will be left until the next CCC meeting. Julie explained who the document will go to and how the contents/format will be.

BM – Wants a guide for a realistic timeline for each area of the rehabilitation strategy areas within the document or any other activity that may occur. Wants a section on timelines/timetable for strategy to be completed within document.

JM – The timeline is progressive and subject to change.

MR – Does not think it is unreasonable to expect a level of detail or a timetable of activity now.

CF – Questions the urgency.

MR – Thinks that things need to keep moving and detail provided by Mt Arthur Coal so that the community can be aware of what is happening. Wants a timeline so that everyone can be aware.

## MT ARTHUR COAL COMMUNITY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

John Bancroft arrives at the meeting at 3.15pm

JM – Mine Operations Plan (MOP) will be reviewed and then will be received by the CCC at a future date. Current end date is 2022, if this is to extend then there will be consultation with the community.

CF – Can you confirm this date?

BM – The Rehabilitation Plan would have to go past this date of 2022 to ensure that it is completed?

MR – Mt Arthur Coal's Project Approval includes a Rehabilitation Strategy/Plan to 2022.

JM – Document needs to be indicative and an active document to keep relevant to current timing.

MR – Wants certainty as to how this is going to look moving forward.

Graham Guest arrives at the meeting at 3.20pm

JM – mine has no approval beyond 2022, but unlikely to stop coal mining if extension is given to keep operations going at Mt Arthur Coal.

JB – Made reference to the Biodiversity and Rehabilitation Management Plan (Draft) Page 9, Section 1.7, Environmental Management System. Wanted to confirm if the EMS system had another 5 years after 2022?

MR – Rehabilitation established by 2022, and then is there a period after that to monitor the progress?

JB – How will this be monitored given the uncertain environmental factors that may occur over this period (for example droughts and floods)? Need period after life of mine for rehabilitation monitoring. Would this be 5 years or 10 years or how many years?

JM – Thinks the suggested 10 year period is reasonable.

JM – Reads out BHP Billiton Mt Arthur Coal's Mining Consent (Julie, please include reference if you feel it is required) to all at the meeting.

MR – Difference needs to be applied if the rehabilitation is not properly established. Martin refers to Section 5 of the report entitled Review and Implementation. In the last paragraph of this section wants wording changed from "major amendments" to "significant amendments".

BM – Has a concern that if the mine closed in 2022, under the present arrangement what sections of the rehabilitation strategy would be started and what would be completed. He Bruce feels that if

## **MT ARTHUR COAL COMMUNITY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE**

the mine does not completed the rehabilitation whilst it is mining it will never be completed and the community would be left with the mess.

MR – Always a danger and these conditions in this document won't protect you from that.

JB – Refers to Biodiversity and Rehabilitation Management Plan (Draft) Page 4, Section 1.1, Purpose. Wants clarification on recreational activities and access to land once it has been rehabilitated?

JM – Valid point but recreation is considered bush walking etc.

JB – Woodlands and primary production will not be an option as part of the overall rehabilitation strategy, or will there be grazing areas available for cattle etc?

JB – Page 5 of the Biodiversity and Rehabilitation Management Plan indicates that 30% of the rehabilitation strategy will be woodlands and 70% will be covered by pastures?

JM – No, the percentages will vary given opportunities. Some areas may be rehabilitated quicker than others due to environmental elements such as rain and dry periods.

MR – Wants definite measures on how that will be achieved.

JL – Would like to know what Mark Burns (consultant) responses were to the report.

JB – Reads out paragraph from the Environmental Impact Statement 2000. This section explained options for use of water within current rehabilitated areas. An example of this was aquaculture, but no studies had been conducted to see if this was possible as part of the current Biodiversity and Rehabilitation Plan.

BM – Commented that he would not like to see the water in the voids used for anything.

JM – commented that she was not aware of this water being used for aquaculture purposes.

BM – Overburden and walls of final voids (page 33 discusses overburden and interburden and the impact of soil structure in regards to adverse growing conditions). Bruce reads the entire paragraph out the meeting. How is this going to affect the quality of soils left behind for the rehabilitation process?

JM – Don't think that there has been any problems identified yet. This process is continually being monitored throughout all areas of the mine.

BM – How is the soil affected by the blasting of ridges and then this being used as overburden to fill in voids? How does this work.

## **MT ARTHUR COAL COMMUNITY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE**

JM – Julie explains by use of diagram. (general consensus in the meeting seem to accept and understand the basic process through this diagram and Julie's explanation).

MR – What do you propose as high risk parcels of land?

JM – This is an ongoing process to manage the land to try and avoid high risk areas through biodiversity and rehabilitation, is not perpetual.

MR – Final voids, what percentage of land will be categorised? That is what area of land won't be put back to any use due to risk? How much land is the community being asked to sterilise? Can a diagram or table be provided to show the areas the community will lose?

JL – Grazing on this land (voids), will it cause issues?

JM – Grazing in the areas that the Biodiversity and Rehabilitation Management Plan has highlighted as safe (not a high risk area) should have no effect to the rehab strategy. Areas shaded as final voids within the Plan.

JL – Jennifer did not have any questions to put towards the meeting as she was happy with the questions raised by Mark and will wait to have those concerns addressed.

JB – Asking questions in regards to voids in the North Pit and will this number increase?

JM – These voids have been minimised due to the Consolidation Project, there is now only one void in this area. Julie explains that what John was looking at was an old report based on information from 2000 and there have been changes since the report was written. The mine has the approval for four voids as part of the mines licence.

JB – If you started mining certain areas now, could you start to back fill these voids now to reduce the depth of these voids?

JM – Always aim for the final voids to be as small as possible given parameters to work within (Mine Plan).

JB – Wants the CCC to vote and put in the document the numbers of voids Mt Arthur Can have as part of the rehabilitation strategy.

MR – EIS (?) holds overall control within number of void parameters within MAC licence. Strategy document needs to reflect the current percentages or realistic numbers as Mt Arthur Coal is entitled to have four voids, the only thing we can request is the depth the final voids are.

JB – Wants this to be reflected in the document if the CCC don't agree with the proposal or planning as part of rehabilitation strategy in regards to void depth.

## **MT ARTHUR COAL COMMUNITY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE**

MR – Council Policy is that final voids must be improving so that Council can use these voids in the future. This process should take this into consideration.

JB – Requests that the voids are shallow.

MR – Reality of the matter is that they can have four voids, but as a committee we can affect how they are to be established (for example the depth).

JL – Told it would be ten years to fill a void on average. What is the amount of dirt that has to be moved in tonnes to complete this exercise?

CF – The question was the asked from Craig, what are the concerns over the voids, what is it that John, given that there will be voids, what is the best outcome you are looking for?

JB – Want to ensure that they have to make them (voids) as shallow as possible to get the most back from this land in terms of the community.

MR – Want best possible final voids so that water movement is in line with best practice.

BM – Seen the water in voids and would not like to use it on anything or anywhere.

MR – Thinks that voids will be a thing of the past in the future, especially for new mining operations, but Mt Arthur Coal are entitled to four as part of their operations. We just have to work with them to try and make sure they are as shallow as possible.

BM – What is the definition of depth?

MR – Depth is depth.

CF – It should be considered as the top of the void to the top of the rehabilitation area.

MOTION by MR – That acknowledging Mt Arthur Coal's consent to have four voids that the CCC object to the Biodiversity and Rehabilitation Management Plan in so far as the depth of the voids is concerned, but would consider future backfilling and invoid replacement for shallow voids. (MR may wish to reword).

Motion seconded by John Bancroft.

GG – Wants to know what Mark's comments were in the report.

JM – mark was not available to present.

JL – Would like to see the tracked changes on the report from Mark.

## MT ARTHUR COAL COMMUNITY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

MR – Will review the report (Biodiversity and rehabilitation Management Plan (Draft)) over the weekend and get back to the group with comments.

CF – Refers to page 31, Integrity of the slopes of the final void. Would like to look at this to confirm definition of the slopes etc.

MR – Wants to get the review of this document right, best practice, and use it s a blueprint for other mine in the Hunter Valley.

BM – Page 72, 5.1, Review, suggests that as a committee if we keep an eye on the bullet points then the CCC should not miss anything.

JM – explained that the document has a review process and timeline to be approved.

JB – Page 72, 5.1, Review, last point in question (Following updating of the Mine Operations Plan (MOP)). Cols the CCC have a copy of this updated document?

JM - There are confidential components of the report that will not be able to be viewed by the public due to commercial interests, but may be able to provide a copy for viewing.

JM – Suggests that John Bancroft send through his list of questions and she can answer them for him (meeting was winding up).

MR – Any other questions for this meeting. No.

#### 4. NEXT MEETING DATE

The next Mt Arthur Coal Community Consultative Committee meeting is proposed to be held in two weeks on 28 March 2012.

**Meeting Closed: 4.20pm**

ACTION ITEM NO.	ITEM	ACTIONED BY
1.	Provide a copy of the Mine Operations Plan to the CCC.	JM