

Community Consultative Committee

Meeting Held: 9 November 2018 from 2:00pm

Venue: Boggabri Golf Club

1.0 Welcome

David welcomed everyone to the Joint CCC.

2.0 Present and Apologies

Present: Cameron Staines (CS) – Narrabri Councillor
Carolyn Nancarrow (CN) – Maules Creek CCC
Catherine Collyer (CC) – Community Representative
Colleen Fuller (CF) – Community Representative
Cr Robert Kneale (RK) – Narrabri Shire Council
Darren Swain (DS) – External Relations Superintendent, MCCM
David Ross (DR) – Independent Chair
Debbie Corlet (DC) – Independent Secretary
Daniel Martin (DM) – Boggabri Coal
Geoff Eather (GE) – Boggabri Coal CCC
John Hamson (JHa) – Tarrawonga CCC
Julie Heiler (JH) – Tarrawonga CCC
Kerri Clarke (KC) – Maules Creek & Boggabri CCC
Libby Laird (LL) – Maules Creek & Boggabri CCC
Mitchum Neave (MN) – Boggabri Coal CCC
Ray Balks (RB) – Boggabri Coal
Richard Gillham (RGi) – Boggabri Coal CCC
Robyn Grover (RG) – CCC Alternate
Roz Druce (RD) – Boggabri CCC
Sarah Torrance (ST) – Boggabri Coal
Scott Mitchell (SM) – Maules Creek Mine
Sebastien Moreno (SB) – Tarrawonga Coal
Steve Eather (SE) – Maules Creek CCC

Apologies: Andrew Johns (AJ) – Gunnedah Shire
David Moses (DM)
Jack Warnock (JW)
Nigel Wood (NW) – WHC
Peter Forbes (PF) – Boggabri Coal
Rebecca Ryan (RR) – Tarrawonga CCC
Simmone Moodie (SM)

Guests: Lindsay Fulloon (LF) - EPA, Rebecca Scrivener (RS) – EPA, Steve O’Donoghue (SOD) – DP&E

3.0 Declaration of Pecuniary or Non-Pecuniary Interests

SE – Has a son who works for Boggabri Coal.

RG – Has a daughter at Maules Creek and a grandson at Boggabri Coal.

JH, RD, RGI & RG - Have properties that fall into the ‘Zone of Affectation’ for acquisition.

GE – Has a son working for Boggabri Coal.

DR gets paid for chairing these meetings as does DC for typing the minutes.

4.0 Acceptance of Previous Minutes

May Joint CCC meeting – accepted by all.

5.0 Business Arising from Previous Minutes

DR – The 3 mines were to identify if fume analysis kit technology exists.

SM – We don't believe so. Not off the shelf anyway.

DR – CCC members unanimously approved that the Air Quality Fact Sheet concept proposed previously by the EPA is useful.

LL – I've sent RS and Heidi an email previously asking questions like "how do you escalate a situation where there is a breach that ends in a fine. What are the steps involved"? I get a lot of questions and I can't tell people how it works. I have asked DPE Compliance and EPA for a one-page sheet on Regulatory escalation processes.

RS – To provide feedback on compliance.

DR – Had discussed with LF to get ARTC or relevant EPA staff to attend and present on ARTC operations at this meeting. We have been unsuccessful.

LF – Just recently had some progress. ARTC are willing to attend a future meeting. We'll try and get them in the room for the next CCC meeting in May 2019. Who is coming, what are their special knowledge areas? What is the topic you've asked them to discuss at the next meeting? Management of emissions of coal trains – noise idling locomotives maybe?

MN – would like information on what areas and how far along the line (where) readings are taken

DR – DR and LF to organise for ARTC to attend May 2019 meeting. Action on David to send an email to CCC representatives (within 3 weeks) to seek out information they would like ARTC to cover in their presentation when they come.

Action re: Anna discussion with Julie and Richard about plantings along boundaries didn't happen.

DR – Action relating to "Mines to identify if water models factor in climate variability" to remain open.

DR – Action 11 relating to "BTM water model assume a variation of rainfall with the possibility of drought etc? No climate variability simulated that they applied a steady average range – severe drought that can last for years. How is WHC going to respond – model did not include this?"

DM – climate variability over 100 years. Action to remain open – mines to respond within 4 weeks.

6.0 Company Updates on Strategies

DM - BTM Water Strategy has numerous stakeholders to consult with – final comments from stakeholders have come in, so we'll look at those comments and provide feedback to the government.

SOD – Date due 19 Dec 2018 asking for more details in the strategy (due back to DPE)?

LL – Is there a chance it will not be approved?

SOD – No, not really.

DM – We'll (three mines) get together in the next week.

LL – (to SOD) Have you read the communities response? Does the Dept read our comments before they send it to the company, how does this work?

SOD – Assessments - Post Approvals reviews documents Not necessarily me. It's up the mine to consider these comments and proposed response.

Review of Namoi Air Quality Data – Presentation by Rebecca Scrivener, EPA

DR – Mentioned that Rebecca and others gave a presentation at a recent Namoi Region Air Quality Advisory Committee meeting that I thought you may be interested in. Colleen, Cath, Peter, Mitchum and Kirsten Gollogly are also on that committee.

What are we talking about today?

1. Monitoring site locations within the Namoi / Gunnedah basin.
2. Background to why and how ambient monitoring is carried out and how it is interpreted.
3. Review of data collected between July 2015 until May 2017.
4. Review of data collected between May 2017 and July 2018.
5. Regional dust events.

Where are the monitoring sites?

Three monitors established by OEH being at Narrabri, Gunnedah and Tamworth. Four monitors established by industry being at: Maules Creek; Wilgai; Breeza; and Werris Creek.

What is the purpose of ambient monitoring?

Ambient monitoring is used to collect data on general air quality within an airshed or air catchment. Data is used to help inform decisions and activities carried out in an airshed. Ambient monitoring is not used to determine industry compliance with project approvals, development consents or environment protection licenses. Used to inform decision and activities e.g. inform legislation, policy decision. Data can be used as a trigger to focus on increasing air quality problems. Community can access data.

What is meant by 'criteria' and 'goals'

Air quality criteria for PM10 and PM2.5.

Pollutant	Averaging period	Max concentration	Allowable exceedances
Particles as PM10	1 day Annual	50µg/m ³ 25 µg/m ³	Nil
Particles as PM2.5	1 day Annual	25 µg/m ³ 8µg/m ³	Nil

What does the criteria mean for me?

The Air Quality Index

AQI Category and Values	Air Pollution Level	Recommended Action
Very Good 0-33	0-33% of national standard	Enjoy activities
Good 34-66	34-66% of national standard	Enjoy activities
Fair 67-99	67-99% of national standard	People unusually sensitive to air pollution, plan strenuous activities when air quality is better
Poor 100-149	100-149% of national standard	Air Pollution Health Alert Sensitive groups: cut back or reschedule strenuous outdoor activities
Very poor 150-200	150-200% of national standard	Air Pollution Health Alert Sensitive groups: avoid strenuous outdoor activities Everyone: cut back or reschedule strenuous outdoor activities
Hazardous 200+	≥ 200% of national standard	Air Pollution Health Alert Sensitive groups: avoid all outdoor physical activity Everyone: significantly cut back on outdoor physical activities

If PM₁₀ is up to 17ug m³ air quality is considered good; >50ug m³ leads to NSW health alert to stay inside and shut doors for those prone to asthma etc; >150ug m³ = hazardous for all and stay indoors.

RS – discussed:

-) PM₁₀ – 24-Hour Data Trends – July 2015 to December 2016.
-) PM₁₀ – 24-Hour Data Trends – December 2016 to May 2017.
-) PM_{2.5} – 24-Hour Data Trends – July 2015 to December 2016.
-) PM_{2.5} – 24-Hour Data Trends – December 2016 to May 2017.
-) Regional Dust Events + Regional Dust Storm – 6/7 November 2018.

Rebecca drew members attention to PM_{2.5} which have a higher health risk as you can't see these smaller particles and it can get into the respiratory system and deeper into the lungs. NEPM takes those into consideration. The presentation then discussed PM₁₀ particles.

Spikes were recorded in the monitoring at Tamworth and Werris Creek in May 2016 due to a regional dust storm, Breeza in May 2016 due to a fire near that site and at the Maules Creek monitor in January. Looked into the weather conditions at that time – westerly winds – suggested source dust carrying it east. Maules Creek occurs to the south of that monitor – source of the dust was a natural occurrence and not associated with Maules Creek mine.

From 2016 to May 2017 – generally very good. Feb 17 criteria level just tipped. Related to bush fire events. PM_{2.5} – July 2015 to December 2017 – spike at Breeza monitor due to a fire near the monitor.

Spike in Feb – bush fire. March through to May – air quality considered to be good all the time.

A Regional Dust Events Slide was presented. 15 Apr 2018 – dust recorded in Tamworth, Narrabri, Gunnedah came from the Bass Straight area – not just a regional issue but a broad scale.

N.B. Dust data: 1 hour average but 1-2 hours old when available on website, 24 hour average presented. Need to be aware of the hourly period of dust in the air shed.

Photo of Gunnedah and what I believe what people saw in this area today. Result of a low trough – turbulent and picked up. Behind the turbulence is the slow speed dust behind it.

RS noted that for the Namoi Region Air Quality Committee, EPA prepare seasonal air quality newsletters. Lots of detailed information about the region. We are getting the newsletter published and we'll provide the website link.

Members of the Joint CCC who are also members of the Air Quality Committee complimented the presentation given at the last committee meeting.

The committee then discussed the presentation.

SOD – (in reference to a discussion at his table) Presentation was great – the air quality is good with a few spikes. See the influence of the topography – north western direction – terrain and towards the town.

DS – It was a good presentation. Dust from South Australia – very high levels and not good range. So, why wouldn't we get health alerts?

RS - NSW Health has alerts that you can sign up for. OEHL website can get alerts – separate monitoring network PM10 and PM2.5 and regional dust monitoring network.

RS to send DR the link for Dust Watch.

KC – How far back is the data available?

LF – Only from July 2015, the raw data to the reports. Can download from the website which was up to May 2017 – now have raw data live in minutes available to public. Tamworth site was established in 2010.

6.0 Other Business

CC – As most would know now, Caz has resigned from all CCC's. I would like to thank her on behalf of the Joint CCC for all her participation and input into these meetings. Thank you.

JH – Read a note that she wanted the Joint CCC to be aware of.

The shareholder had asked about why the EPL risk category of Maules Creek mine had been escalated, a serious risk classification that only two other mines share.

Paul Flynn, the WHC CEO, had noted that WHC would challenge that as the two matters on which that classification turned on were largely administrative matters not actually risk in terms of environmental outcomes. He believed that the motivation for an audit requested by the EPA was to deal with a nearby "serial complainant who had no basis other than a commercial one. We do see that it is certainly not reflective of the way the site has been operating. Both the noise and dust audits that have been done found that Maules Creek is generally in accordance with best practice."

JH was offended by Paul Flynn's comments, which she believed undermine the integrity, the intent and the essential spirit and potential success of the CCCs role. They have eroded the trust of the community and questions the way the EPA handles our complaints and concerns.

JH - Like it or not, the mining industry is now established in our valley and we as a community need to establish and maintain a good working relationship with all three mines. The CCCs offer a better understanding for both sides of the issues facing mining and our community. If all parties are honest, willing to listen and have the ability to compromise, most of the time objectives will be met with the mainly positive outcomes. But if Paul Flynn's comments reflect the sentiments and attitude of Whitehaven or mining in general, we are all wasting our time.

We are fortunate to have a Chair who wants to make a difference and sincerely cares about achieving a positive outcome for our community, but he can't do it alone, this is our opportunity as a group. It is our choice, we can be part of the solution or part of the problem.

RK – My question relates to Biodiversity offsets – how they are determined and by whom. Planted trees on river flats in area.

SOD – Offsets are worked out with old mines and new mines as they all evolved. The offsets for these mines' pre-dates offset ratio basis. Outcome of policy at the time was about offset and clearing.

RK – Problems on river flats as planted trees will influence future floods and flood water onto property.

SOD – Issue of planting there and to get it back to woodland. Planting more intensive with success woodland.

CS – Have you done flood monitoring – if not, you should.

SOD – No requirement to do flood monitoring.

CC – Please don't tell me you are planting trees now. They won't survive.

JH – Mines and farmers agree (to SOD). Why is the government doing this? Poor Dan is having to plant trees. Water is very scarce as we all know, and he has to keep them all alive.

DM – Guys, I ordered and bought 180,000 trees 12 months ago. Nature plants trees all the time and they don't all survive. Me, I may not keep these all alive. I only have to keep one per HA alive to be compliant. Hundreds are planted but we would be lucky if 60 survived.

RG – Geoff and I don't think you get the whole idea of a flood. Key hole – its wider and becomes narrower We have no control of what is coming in the top and now you've put a plug in it.

JH – I agree with Richard. We don't need all these trees – we need productive farmland – national parks don't want it. Is this land coming back to the farmers – which supports our community and post mining. Continue to plant trees – we want to protect our future – we are willing to have a percentage of trees, but the rest needs to be productive.

KC – Not all feel the same way, as we have to consider the environment.

SOD – There is the flexibility of the Management Plan – it's up to the judgement of the mines to plant them. Happy to discuss the flood issue at CCC.

CC – There is flexibility? What is the period of flexibility – 12 months of drought or longer.

SOD – Judgment call by the mines on when is the best time to plant – window of when to delay.

DM – Number of plants on the river flats – we know they aren't going to survive. We need to measure benchmark. I must organise saplings year in advance – 600 odd hectares – gamble I take not knowing if the drought will continue or not – not going to let everything die and it stresses me.

MN – When a mine comes to town and gets a mining lease, the biodiversity offsets should be held to that approval but if they want something to change – they just change things.

SOD – Changes in corridor don't need a modification to do that.

MN – Should be locked away permanently and not make changes. If you are taking the corridor you have 300 metres past the point – two mines working against each other.

SOD – It's up to the mines to work that out.

MN – You approve this though?

SOD – How they are managing that joint corridor. The offsets have been there since the beginning – additional conditions. They aren't going to change. Higher value or transfer to the National Park.

KC – There is an environmental side to this as well.

RD – Issues and deals around national parks not wanting some of the offsets – what is the real deal. All about the mapping.

SOD – Verification done by the Commonwealth. Went through a process and OEH signed off.

RD – When did they do that?

SOD – About 18 months ago.

RD – The MCCM Northern offsets. The whole Project approval hinged on those Offsets and their approval.

RD – Can we see some verification.

SM – It's on the Maules Creek website.

SOD – Still in the negotiations.

RD – Security for them. It doesn't take that long.

SOD – Takes a long time.

SM – Tony provided a response around the timing and why the extension was granted.

RD – Will you need another extension?

SM – To advise on whether another extension will be required.

RD – Tree planting – talk to the locals and where all the floods were and do before all the planting progressed. Richard, Geoff – could have told you because of the floods. You do need to go back to the local community and gain their local knowledge. Train line across the flood lines.

LL – I am requesting that David forward all modification notifications to all CCC members as modifications create cumulative impacts and it is imperative to email CCC reps, so we can circulate to community members for comment. For example, Modification 6 extending the "temporary" use of trucks on the road due to an increase in tonnage from Tarrawonga and Rocglen from 2.5 tonnes to 4 tonnes without an overpass. They've had this temporary change via a Mod for 2 years. It was circulated to Community CCC a week after the last CCC – Tarrawonga CCC – can we change the rules – so the wider community is in the loop and may want to comment.

People would like to comment on modifications – council should be interested – 1 truck every 45 seconds – at Blue Vale – turning right off Kamilaroi Highway and off. I'm asking David to circulate modifications to the CCC, so we can tell the community.

SM – Modifications started in September and Tarrawonga included the community.

LL – (to SOD) – is the DPE going to take any regulatory action for the months when the mining company did not have approval for the 4.5 MTPA hauled by trucks on this route and this was not covered by the Mod 6 extension application?

JH – We addressed this issue (in Tarrawonga CCC) yesterday – overpass – Tarrawonga changing with their production – tonnage on the road. 45 seconds is a blink – it is more like 15 to 20 minutes.

LL – There is a gap – Mod 6 is an application to extend coal haulage by road. Would you please send around to the CCC members – Vickery Mine will add a lot of extra traffic – need to read the data and crunch the numbers – until you look at it – the data you won't understand the cumulative impact.

KC – Good idea as we are here as a Joint CCC as a cumulative impact. All the mines to notified when plans are due – calendar could be produced – notifying of modifications and plans for CCC feedback.

MN – Next Joint CCC – I would like all the mines to table water levels for all your bores – so we can see the differences between them and who is sharing water. Highs and lows etc.

DR – To forward information to Joint CCC members when modifications are on exhibition (ongoing).

SOD – Purpose of the CCC is to keep the members informed. Modifications – there are different sorts under the statutory requirements – some go on display.

RG – Question to Seb at Boggabri Coal – the road / gravel roads – good job on cracking on the traffic coming out.

CS – VPA money – Council got the last bit of it a couple of months – we've done a risk assessment on the roads. Action: Plan to let you know – Cameron to pass it on.

DR – As Caz has resigned – if anyone would like to join the Environmental Trust please get in contact with David.

Next meeting May 2019

Meeting closed 4:30pm

Action List

Page No	Action No	Action to be completed	Action Owner
2	1	RS to provide feedback on compliance and Fact Sheets.	Rebecca Scrivener
2	2	DR and LF to organise for ARTC to attend May 2019 meeting. Questions from Community – 1 month prior to May meeting.	Lindsay Fulloon / David Ross
2	3	Mines to identify if water models factor in climate variability” to remain open.	BTM Mines
4	5	Send DR the link for Dust Watch.	Rebecca / David
6	7	Advise on whether another extension will be required.	Scott Mitchell
7	8	Forward information to Joint CCC members when modifications are on exhibition (ongoing).	David Ross
	10	Look into VPA money for roads	Cameron Staines