

FINAL MINUTES OF THE WALLARAH 2 REFERENCE GROUP
Held Wednesday 29th May 2013 at 11am
25 Bryant Drive TUGGERAH

MATTERS	DETAILS	ACTION	TIME LINE
PRESENT	Margaret MacDonald-Hill (MMH) Chairperson Kenny Barry (KB) Wallarah 2 Grahame Leshia (GL) Chittaway Bay Merv Church (MC) Jilliby Douglas Ford (DF) Toukley Suzanne Allport (SA) Kanwal Tony Kirk (TK) Australian Coal Alliance		
ALSO IN ATTENDANCE	Mandy Auston Wallarah 2 (Minute Taker) Peter Smith (PS) Wallarah 2 Insik Kim (IK) Wallarah 2 Ronan Kellaghan (RK) PAE Holmes Air Sciences		
APOLOGIES	Sean Gordon – Darkinjung LALC Daniel Farmer – NSW Business Chamber Narelle Caldwell		
WELCOME & APOLOGIES	MMH opened meeting at 11.05am MMH usual disclosure of interest		
CONFIRMATION OF PREVIOUS MINUTES	The minutes were confirmed with the following amendments: Addition at end of noise section; GL – mentioned noise from coal crusher and would it be possible to visit another facility to get an idea of noise. In General Business, discussion on website; add DF – including a link to the minutes of the previous Community Liaison Committee on Wallarah’s website. Minutes confirmed GL seconded SA		

<p>BUSINESS ARISING</p>	<p>KB - A link has been added this week on the Planning and Approvals page of Wallarah’s website to old EA and Planning documents. There is no link to old CLC meeting minutes as this is a new committee set up voluntarily by the company generally following the same guidelines but not set up by Planning. This is a whole new application process and we are getting toward the end of this new process. The last 12 months of information is more important.</p> <p>MMH – Council would have a record of old CLC minutes as they were involved for over a decade. Main concern of DF is what was and has changed. That is why the link has been put on the website.</p> <p>KB – The link was added as we only have limited room to hold full documentation on our website.</p> <p>MC – I think that’s what was said.</p> <p>MMH – We will copy link to CRG members on the Planning website.</p> <p>KB – In relation to MC suggestion to Mines Rescue simulator, would like to organise that about end August, possibly with some of our consultants also, to fill a small bus would be ideal.</p> <p>MC – Worthwhile as it puts into context the imagery in 3D.</p> <p>Correspondence MMH received suggestions and comments for agenda from DF regarding air quality, water quality & emissions, MC on emissions & GL on aquifers, water & crusher noise.</p>	<p>MMH</p> <p>KB</p>	<p>With minutes</p> <p>Next meeting</p>
<p>EIS UPDATE BY KB</p>	<p>KB - Runs through presentation. Submission receipts – Apparently some people when placing their electronic submissions are not receiving a receipt from the Planning website. Will follow up with Planning this week</p> <p>MC - Are you receiving copies of the submissions as they come in?</p> <p>KB – No, not expecting any until the end of the exhibition period.</p> <p>RE: Open days and attendees DF - Must have been disappointing to set up for that small amount of people. MC – It’s not unusual; Mandalong only had 8 at their session.</p> <p>RE: Link to planning website and submissions MC – Stated that one could submit in favour of the project.</p>		

<p>Monitoring Update by PS</p>	<p>RE: Community Grants MC – It’s good that 80% were successful KB – We have other opportunities for the 2 unsuccessful ones that didn’t fit the criteria.</p> <p>PS – Environmental Monitoring (handout) Current program in place has been going since 1999. The map is from the EIS. PS explained the types of monitoring stations and that most in action now are in the defined mining area.</p> <p>MC – Stated that most of this is in Volume 6 Appendix AA. PS - It is described in parts of the EIS yes. You will find a reference to each relevant study’s baseline information. We have regular information gathered that we keep and report on in different ways. We have a network of monitored bores in 14 locations, we have now developed our own borehole monitoring stations at Honeysuckle Park in the middle of the Jilliby Jilliby Creek floodplain and a couple at the Buttonderry site next to the tip. MC – You must be getting stuff from the tip (or waste management), seepage from there into your area? PS – They have many bores and report to EPA. For our own due diligence we have one on our side of the fence for background information, although we don’t have information from before, such as in the 1970s to compare to. DF - With all this monitoring, you know what is in the air. Have you been checking the bacteria counts? PS - In terms of the water we test for faecal coliforms – which is generally from sewerage etc... there are natural background levels also. DF – Bacteria is in the air we breathe, you need to know what the levels are. PS - There is a requirement on what we have to measure. We want to know the emissions of interest, eg dust, exhaust from mobile plant, mine ventilation, methane flaring, etc. The project does not include bacterial sampling of air. We undertake stringent requirements of the EPA. DF - You never get 100% flare off rates. PS - Basically natural waters are contaminated and need to be treated using chlorination and other methods. Mardi water plant uses standardised filtration with dosing. A sand media then finer, then coal (Anthracite) as the final filter. Six months ago they replaced the anthracite beds which is a big process. We record and track information through our environmental monitoring, this provides relative information as to activities nearby, fires, ploughing etc... We get an annual monitoring report. It’s about having a huge databank to see what we are dealing with and its changes over time. Council uses some of</p>		
---------------------------------------	---	--	--

	<p>our information that we supply them in their own community reports.</p> <p>KB - Would it be fair to say that the project's measurement of the background levels of chemical elements in ground and surface waters exhibits best practice?</p> <p>PS – Yes, typically with an operation like a mine, the EPA imposes conditions on the Licence holder to measure particular discharges, PH, electrical conductivity, dissolved salts and it's up to the company to gather further information. We want to be diligent and have management options ready. There is a suite of parameters which are regularly monitored.</p> <p>DF – The importance of it is, when I worked for the Dairy Corp they had a NATA registered laboratory. They could tell what the cows had eaten including pesticides also.</p> <p>PS – It depends what samples are taken in, the accreditation of the laboratory, in some cases duplicate samples are tested, the machines used in laboratory, if they're calibrated, it's all part of a chain of custody and accuracy. There is a "bible of water quality and associated guidelines", the ANZECC (Australian & New Zealand Environment & Conservation Council) guidelines, used as a basis for evaluating fresh and marine water quality. Over the long term there have been many exceedances in the existing waterways when compared against the guidelines as a result of day to day activities from the use of chemical fertilisers or organic materials from farms.</p> <p>MC - What is Kjeldahl?</p> <p>PS – Kjeldahl Nitrogen is a type of method used for testing for Nitrogen levels.</p> <p>PS – This ongoing testing will tell us if we are contributing to those matters. There is a 2012 annual monitoring report available here to look at regarding data back to 2006/07.</p> <p>MMH – Given what was said before about the Community Liaison Committee operating for 10 years and the baseline recording, would there be any other mines that have this amount of information?</p> <p>PS – No - this shows we have information way in excess of what we need for validation.</p> <p>DF - Probably over last 10-20 years community environmental awareness is at much greater levels. If you have information, you can protect your own backside and it is extremely important to us all and it's publicly available.</p> <p>PS - It's a public resource, we share our information with Council.</p> <p>DF - Information before, during and after.</p> <p>PS - We well exceed the ANZECC guidelines for data collection and assessment.</p> <p>MMH – Should the project be approved, monitoring regulations and requirements are changing all the time. There is ever increasing scrutiny and transparency. Monitoring for approved projects are now up on websites, for access by the community as part of this evolving process.</p> <p>KB – DF does that answer all your questions?</p>		
--	--	--	--

	<p>DF – Yes, only fumes, odours and smells now. Sometimes the experts can get snowed under by terminology. Need to use some comparison (referred to particle sizes).</p> <p>PS - There is other monitoring we do also that is part of the specialist studies done for the EIA, such as birds, critters, aquatic ecology, etc...</p> <p>MMH Conferred with group to confirm that the presentation covered the requirements of the CRG members in relation to monitoring and water issues. Thank you PS.</p> <p>RK – DF mentioned fumes. The project will develop a detailed strategy for methane flaring as a minimum. A desirable option would be beneficial use i.e. burning off in an engine.</p> <p>DF - What is ou/m³?</p> <p>RK – That is how much you have to dilute a parcel of air to get it down to no odour. It defines the odour units. It's done with a panel of people sniffing. Sounds like a bazaar concept. It's a NATA accredited method of analysis. Flares that are installed need to have over 90% methane destruction efficiency. There are limits set on flaring, no visible smoke, burning efficiencies and flame enclosed.</p> <p>DF - What triggered me to ask question was when I was travelling up in the Hunter Valley, and the odour issues I noticed around the tannery near Rutherford.</p> <p>RK – CSG is methane. Odours are destroyed in flares. We assess odours from tanneries the same way as we assess coffee roasters, regardless of how offensive or intensive. With a mine there is essentially a damp earthy odour, because methane in isolation is odourless.</p> <p>MC - Mandalong, in their assessment, say 4 odour units which is quite powerful. But it shows the area of the extremity of where that will be and it is farmland. 2 odour units are quite negligible.</p> <p>RK – The vast majority would not detect a 2 odour unit in a built up area. In rural areas 7 odour units are acceptable.</p> <p>DF – 370 cubic metres per second is a lot per day.</p> <p>KB – An important point to remember is that mine workers in an underground environment are breathing this air 24/7/365 so we must ensure it is safe. The air quality coming out of the mine is the same as being breathed underground. Machines underground only emit fumes from burnt hydrocarbons, and that is pretty minimal as equipment such as continuous miners, shuttle cars and longwalls are all electrically powered. Diesel machines are checked weekly and if they don't meet the criteria they're out. To get machinery certified for underground use is a big deal in itself.</p> <p>RK – Pollutants get dispersed quickly. Within 1 km that pollutant is 1000 times less than when it comes out. It's so low risk it's not even a consideration.</p>		
--	---	--	--

	<p>MC – There are particles that are quite innocuous and some that are carcinogenic. Is it carcinogenic?</p> <p>RK - All health professionals refer to PM2.5 as being the particles of health focus. What used to be assessed was total suspended particulates.</p> <p>MC – Does not tell you its toxicity.</p> <p>RK – PM 2.5 is generated from the combustion of fossil fuels etc. They are not a mechanically derived particle from the mining process. We assess the PM2.5, it's well below the guidelines. It's a small component of the overall dust.</p> <p>KB - Efficiency of machinery. The diesel used underground is different, very low sulphur. Geared to health and safety considerations, these machines run much cleaner operationally than those on the surface that use public roads etc, they have various components including exhaust scrubbers.</p> <p>PS – The number of vehicles involved that contribute is also very small compared to say nearby freeway traffic.</p> <p>MC – Wasn't thinking of extraction at all, I was concerned about the stockpile.</p> <p>KB - DF do you have any other questions?</p> <p>DF – Bacteria levels</p> <p>RK – In terms of bacteria, we don't decide what is assessed – the EPA tells us. We haven't collected any baseline data. It's not an issue for an underground mine. We have in the past done monitoring for indoor air, say an office environment where air conditioning systems are a potential growth media [for bacteria]. I personally don't think it's an issue with regards to the mine. The vent shaft is probably where you're coming from.</p> <p>DF - It's a concentrated area. You explained the dispersion.</p> <p>DF – A unit block in Sydney that I worked on, the bacteria levels were through the roof. Found it with help from the weather bureau, a local brewery was burning off at night. The testing showed high yeast levels.</p> <p>RK - Yeast is a living organism. In terms of burning off, the flaring proposed is 1000 degrees, there is nothing left.</p> <p>DF - Methane flame is invisible.</p> <p>RK – The flare is fully enclosed. There are off gasses from the flares, most significant one is nitrogen, existing already from power stations, levels are so low there will be a negligible change from background data. This project will not cause any noticeable changes from background data. This monitoring will continue on for the duration of the project.</p> <p>PS – The Boral tile factory with open cut clay quarry is between our site and residential areas, with gas fired ovens being a local flaring emissions source, they have been monitoring on a much bigger scale</p>		
--	---	--	--

	<p>according to their EPA licence.</p> <p>MMH – In the Hunter they monitor air emissions and make them publicly available. Is there a similar thing for the Central Coast?</p> <p>RK – It’s being funded at the moment.</p> <p>PS - One EPA monitoring station has recently been established at Wyong racecourse. Part of MAQS airshed monitoring system. They are putting some finer resolution monitoring around the place.</p> <p>KB – Queried before Ronan leaves, if everyone’s questions have been answered satisfactorily? DF, have all of your questions been answered satisfactorily?</p> <p>DF – Yes, at this point in time for the moment.</p>		
GENERAL BUSINESS	<p>MMH asked if TK had any questions?</p> <p>TK – Not at this stage</p> <p>MC – I apologise that I keep referring to Mandalong. In their EIS is a small section about bush fires and where their flares are and protection around flares. Dams for groundwater and extracted water also had a pump house and pumps to assist with bushfires and fire brigades could connect up. Depends on size of bucket for sky crane. I know you will have settlement tanks but maybe consider assistance to fill tankers etc. There is another section relating to erosion on steep slopes and rock rollout and crevices. They have stated commitments and remedial action for erosion on steep slopes. This occurs because of large extraction and greater slopes and caverns between. Regarding the rock rollout, they said they would re-grout to a sensible degree and fill fissures. Borehole reconstructions and repair on any property “water bores” make good.</p> <p>MMH – Referred to Statement of Commitments, which is standard practice.</p> <p>MC - They have talked to Greg Combet & Tony Burke about the work in the Mandalong South region and had a briefing. I don’t know if you’ve talked to those people. Hope you’ve talked to Tony and Karen McNamara.</p> <p>KB - The flaring and bush fires and potential impacts are covered off in EIS. Bearing in mind those requirements come into play once you have approval and require us to work closely with bush fire brigades and Council. Much finalisation of management plans for these items is generally done post approval. Mandalong is a different EA done by different people. The Mine Operations Dam at the Tooheys Rd site will collect stockpile runoff and water pumped from underground for treatment. As for provision for water in fire fighting, safety is number 1 the priority. You have to remember this will be a working mine and you can’t just have anyone come in to the site without paying close attention to the safety considerations. As for the helicopters like Elvis, I imagine it would be safer and more convenient to</p>		

	<p>collect water from the nearby lakes which are not hampered by operational obstructions.</p> <p>MC – Water was taken from Buttonderry tips dam when we had a fire close by.</p> <p>KB – A helipad is proposed at Buttonderry, which must be marked out and clearly defined, there are many requirements to ensure safety is considered as a priority when it comes to this type of operation. Very stringent code of practice need to be met to get helicopters to land at site. Not going to commit to anything that puts safety at risk. Appreciate MC comments. When you read someone else’s EIS, it can be very different. Different consultants may do and say things in different terms which in essence mean much the same thing.</p> <p>MC – Congratulations for a very fine document.</p> <p>KB – Thank you</p>		
NEXT MEETING	<p>MMH - Late Aug / early Sept so W2CP can share submission responses information with CRG.</p> <p>KB – Would anticipate a 12 week period for answering submissions given there have been many different sub-consultants involved. They may not be available and could alter the time to answer.</p> <p>Tentative Wednesday 4th September 2013 at 4pm</p>		
MEETING CLOSED	<p>MMH – Thanked CRG members for their attendance and dedication, which is much appreciated.</p> <p>IK – Thank you for your suggestions and your input.</p> <p>MMH - Thanked Kores for the BBQ lunch</p> <p>Meeting closed at 1.04pm</p>		