

FINAL MINUTES OF THE WALLARAH 2 REFERENCE GROUP
Held Thursday 31st October 2012 at 4pm
25 Bryant Drive TUGGERAH

MATTERS	DETAILS	ACTION	TIME LINE
<p>PRESENT</p> <p>ALSO IN ATTENDANCE</p>	<p>Margaret MacDonald-Hill (MMH) Chairperson Insik Kim (IK) Wallarah 2 Kerry Heywood (KH) Wallarah 2 Kenny Barry (KBa) Wallarah 2 Grahame Leshia (GL) Chittaway Bay Merv Church (MC) Jilliby Narelle Caldwell (NC) Blue Haven Douglas Ford (DF) Toukley Suzanne Allport (SA) Kanwal Ken Baker (KB) NSW Business Chamber</p> <p>Mandy Auston Wallarah 2 (Minute Taker) Bob Purser (BP) Wallarah 2</p>		
<p>APOLOGIES</p>	<p>Peter Fryar – Wyong Shire Council</p>		
<p>WELCOME</p> <p>DECLARATION OF INTEREST</p>	<p>MMH opened meeting at 4.02pm and welcomed Kenny Barry</p> <p>MMH declared she was engaged by Wallarah 2 as the independent chair of the Community Reference Group. She is also a member of the Mine Subsidence Board and a member of the Ministers' Arbitration Panel.</p>		
<p>CONFIRMATION OF PREVIOUS MINUTES</p>	<p>The minutes were confirmed with no amendments by DF and seconded by MC. MC commented on Tom Hole's presentation and the fact that he was trying to ascertain if there was additional building costs incurred when building in a mine subsidence area. Tom Hole replied there were none which appears to not be correct. MC pointed out there needs to be trust in information supplied so he can pass on the right information to others. KH's and MMH's interpretation was that Tom meant there were no additional cost incurred in constructing any building in a mine subsidence area that meets MSB standards. However there can be</p>		

	additional costs dependent on size and type of the building as some less expensive styles of buildings are not permitted under MSB guidelines. This was not clear in the presentation.		
BUSINESS ARISING	DF – Minutes are not up to date on website. KH – New website up within 4-5 days. DF – Not seen SG from Darkinjung at recent meetings. MMH will chase up. MMH - advised that update on the EIS and presentation on noise and dust are part of the meeting's agenda. She noted copies of the presentations of previous meetings had been sent to all members and she had also followed up with the Wyong Chamber of Commerce on a replacement representative.	MMH	Before next meeting
CORRESPONDENCE	In 17/10/12 - email resignation from Peter Murray Out 17/10/12 - email acknowledgement to Peter Murray 19/10/12 - email to Wyong Chamber of Commerce on replacement delegate		
NOISE & DUST PRESENTATION BY KENNY BARRY	KBa – Notes the Presentation on Air Quality & Noise are drafts only. He wanted to use the committee as a sounding board to determine if the presentation is appropriate level & pertinent. Issues Raised: <u>Dust</u> DF – Further terminology explanations required. NC – Further information on how monitoring and assessment locations were chosen/ required as would expect more monitoring near Bluehaven area. DF – Suggested community concern is you can control the results you want by putting monitoring stations in certain locations. MMH – This is not the case. When EIS is compiled it goes through an adequacy test by all Government agencies, experts in their respective fields. It has to meet a certain criteria. MC – Commented on a recent article in Telegraph re cancer in the Hunter Valley. People don't know the difference between open cut & underground. Would have thought points near and surrounding rail head and vent shaft is what we need to know. MMH – None of these monitoring locations are necessarily what will be used for monitoring when the project is in operation and community/agency input is included as part of the process. There is a much greater level of scrutiny than there ever was and it will continue to increase. KH – A reason receptors are located at distance from operating sites is to demonstrate that emissions don't extend in close proximity to population – this is what the monitors show. Modeling shows no dust		

	<p>in sensors close to Bluehaven.</p> <p>KB – Community would want to know more information. Narrabri example was used.</p> <p>MC – Re other particles, carcinogenic, relevant to a degree but not necessary to health impact. Content of particles not particularly size.</p> <p>NC – In reference to Herald article re Hunter Valley assumes the 24 hr period is averaged out. Figures could be high & low during the 24 hr period.</p> <p>KB – Didn't explain background enough.</p> <p>DF – Information required is values –v- levels before, during & after, number of stations and where.</p> <p>NC – Further detail on the numbers of stations and monitoring over the years should be provided.</p> <p>SA – And why the assessment locations were chosen.</p> <p>MC – Most people won't know what "x" ppm means this needs to be more clearly described.</p> <p>SA – Liked the hair reference. Need more of that kind of comparison so people can understand.</p> <p>NC – Agreed and referred to an article in Hunter Herald, which went into simple detail and explained the notion more succinctly.</p> <p>NC – Stated she can tell you what Bluehaven people will say. "Why is there only one receptor at Bluehaven?" This needs to be understood.</p> <p>DF – The report needs more comparison; size of dust particles for example like talc powder.</p> <p>SA – If people can't understand the information they will be concerned.</p> <p>MC – Most people are comparing the Hunter Valley and its numerous open cuts with here.</p> <p>MMH – Need to stress this is an underground mine.</p> <p>DF – Need to explain anticipated composition of coal dust.</p> <p>MC – WO had said to him "They won't meet that criteria and once they start you won't stop them".</p> <p>DF – What are the air changes required in mine for working conditions?</p> <p>KH – There are velocity requirements – large volumes of air must be continually moving.</p> <p>MC – To me there has to be a lot of coal dust appearing where the stock pile is, loading onto trucks etc. I can't see a lot of dust in other places but I can see methane coming out of vents. These are the images in my mind. They need a better explanation.</p> <p>KH /KBa – Agreed to take on board what has been said and we will refocus the presentation to make the whole process less technical and better explain the issues raised in this discussion. The current presentation and the reports from which it is taken are more appropriate for the agency experts and not the general community. It was agreed a revised presentation will be given at a later meeting.</p>		
--	---	--	--

	<p><u>Noise</u> All agreed sounds level comparison was very good imagery. Lawn mower would also be a good example. In the worst case modeling scenario (worst case means most adverse combination of weather conditions) predicts some construction noise from Buttonderry site has potential to exceed the Project Specific Noise Criteria at Amberwood Close by 4-9dB which is during the daytime only and minor. KB –Community want to know what noise level is going to be at midnight – the predictions are not clear. NC - What are the noise levels at the rail loop site expected to be? KBa – Project Specific Noise Criteria ranges from 40 – 57 dBA at assessment sites for Tooheys Road, inclusive of trains, loading and dozer operations on stockpile. Assessments show noise from the operations satisfy the PSNC levels at all locations. NC – I can hear trains in a westerly wind/direction. Trying to get a feel for noise level so I can explain to others. Frequency of trains will increase even though noise doesn't increase. SA – Any noises other than a slow hum? Loud bangs etc... Trains shunting? KH – Specific activities that generate noise will be minimised and/or restricted or during night time. DF - Suggested tape recording of general noises. GL – Regarding the crusher. Presume it is enclosed. Presume dust from the crusher is contained? KH – Yes plant locations are generally partially or totally enclosed and have noise/dust suppression systems. MC – Asked about the conveyor and coal loading system. KH - These systems will be controlled with water sprays. MC – Can hear trucks reversing alarms at Buttonderry tip at night in right weather conditions.</p> <p>KH / KBa – Agreed that the noise presentation although clearer than the dust presentation would be revised based on the comments provided and re-presented at a future meeting.</p>		
EIS UPDATE BY KERRY HEYWOOD	Final draft document went to planning 17-18 th October 2012. Now going through adequacy period. If agencies respond promptly, hope to be on exhibition in February. Public Notice appeared in today's CCEA paper.		
COMMUNITY TRUST GUIDELINES BY IK/KH	IK - Thank you for feedback. Explained about Community Foundation providing long term benefit to community. Would welcome comment & feedback from W2RG. KH - Explained current foundation proposal and that it was conceptual and Company is requesting feedback/comment from WRG. KBa – Elaborated on apprentice scheme and the interaction with TAFE.		

	<p>SA – It is a good concept.</p> <p>SA – The \$10k per apprentice would often make the difference needed for small business to employ an apprentice.</p> <p>SA – Recommend other bodies other than TAFE. School based training, non-academic kids getting out in the field could make the difference.</p> <p>KBa- There will be an (Australian Apprenticeship Centre (AAC) to be selected who assists with the Apprentice program.</p> <p>MC – How would you let people know these grants have been disbursed?</p> <p>KH – Community grant arrangements get it out there. Mentioned Poultry Club using our premises.</p> <p>GL – Could focus on community members with a disability, a major life improvement to someone.</p> <p>DF – Population/age demographics – possible mentoring; elderly giving knowledge to youth of the area.</p> <p>KH – There may be educational opportunities.</p> <p>KB – Concept is good.</p> <p>NC – Criteria needs to be quite stringent.</p> <p>MMH – Would there be a set application form as some people can write better submissions than others and possibly a worthwhile proposal may be overlooked as a result.</p> <p>MC – Recommended play equipment, bus shelter with 'donated by' signage.</p> <p>SA – Gave an example of a shelter that is required at local skate park to finish it off.</p> <p>MMH – Suggested it was good to have a mix of options and opportunities, gave a broader benefit back to the community.</p> <p>KH – The dollars will remain flexible but current concept seems a good balance of 5-10 grants of \$5-10k.</p> <p>KBa – If anyone on WRG is interested in participating in the process of sorting out the guidelines / criteria please let us know.</p>		
GENERAL BUSINESS	None		
NEXT MEETING	6 th February 2013 at 4pm		
MEETING CLOSED	6.00pm		