

**Report of the Duralie Coal Mine Community Consultative Committee  
Held Thursday 5 November 2009**

\* \* \* \* \*

**Present:** Cl J McWilliams, Cl K Hutchinson, Mr T Tersteeg, Ms H Gillard, Mr G Handford, Mr T Hutchings, Mr J Trotter.

**Visitor:** Mr M Plain, Mr B Tudor, Mr P Cribb, Mr T Dwyer  
**Apologies:** Mr D Lanham

**Presentation (Applications Under Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979) by Mr Tudor, Mr Dwyer and Mr Cribb:**

Mr Tudor stated that safety and the environment is the number one priority of Gloucester Coal and that the Company strived to be open with the community and to successfully co-exist with the community over the long term. He also stated that new management of the Company under Noble ownership had withdrawn the water discharge (from Duralie Mine) application and that this was an example of the new management philosophy. He said that new trucks (of which two have already arrived at site with additional trucks to follow) were tailor made and were as quiet as possible. He also said that the Company was proud of its contribution to the community and the prosperity it had brought to the Gloucester Basin.

Mr Dwyer and Mr Cribb addressed the Committee on applications under the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act, 1979 – see attachment.

Members of the Committee asked the following questions of the presenters:

- Mr Handford – was existing noise used in the DECCW study? Response – yes.
- Mr Handford – there had been dust and noise concerns related to the shuttle train in the past. Could DCPL manage these impacts? Response – DCPL can control activities of the train operator by direction. “GL” locomotives to replace current locomotives.
- Mr Tersteeg – there are proposed to be two final voids in the upper catchment of Coal Shaft Creek. Voids were previously to be of a spilling type. This had changed to a non-spilling arrangement. Response – agreement. Mr Tersteeg welcomed the final voids being positioned further north than was previously to be the case.
- Mr Tersteeg – Dr Ian Webster (CSIRO) had been commissioned by the Company to prepare a study on the final void (at time of Commission of Inquiry). Mr Tersteeg has been requesting the Company supply a copy of this report to him – without success. Could he receive it? Response – If this report (if exists) is not in the Environmental Impact Statement then it is not available.
- Mr Tersteeg – Company should put negative aspects of the proposal into the EA as well as positive aspects. Response – both negative and positive impacts will be dealt with in the study. Example of the socio-economic component study and greenhouse gas accounting given.
- Mr Tersteeg – worried about loss of people off local land, kids in local schools etc as a result of the Company purchasing private properties in the area. Response – Company purchased properties not subject to actual mining disturbance were typically re-tenanted or the seller remained as a tenant.

- Ms Gillard – with a shift in hierarchy would the current community relations policy enunciated by Mr Tudor likely to be adopted by the next CEO? Response – Mr Tudor said no guarantees could be given but that he and his management would be more open. Mr Tudor stated that all stakeholders would be well informed and that the Company would be a known and trusted member of the community. Mr Tudor also said that the new Board of Directors had a new view (to the previous Board) and came to their roles with no preconceived ideas.
- Clr Hutchinson – will there be any more extensions after this current one? Response – yes.
- Clr Hutchinson – will the Company be buying any more land? Response – in order to minimise the impacts of mining operations it was beneficial to provide buffer land to reduce negative impacts such as noise, visual upon persons living in the area.
- Mr Handford – there was a view in the community that the Company was “going to do this” – items/undertakings given in the EIS, for example – and that it was immoral to change this into the future (with a follow up application/approval). Mr Handford also said that the community should be told that the Company are likely to (or have) expectations to mine beyond boundaries shown in the Part 3A proposal.
- Clr Hutchinson – stated she personally felt that mining and farming could co-exist.
- Clr McWilliams thanked Messrs Tudor, Cribb and Dwyer for their presentation.
- Mr Tersteeg stated that he was a big critic of the Company but he congratulated the environmental management personnel.

**Confirmation of Minutes of Previous Meeting Held 6 August 2009:**

Minutes of the last meeting were accepted by the Committee.

**Business Arising from the Previous Minutes / General Business:**

Mr Tersteeg asked Mr Handford whether the “contributions had been sorted out.” Mr Handford advised that the matter would be resolved next year.

Mr Tersteeg suggested Mr Trotter write to Mr Lanham to provide him with information on “first flush”. Mr Trotter undertook to do this.

Clr McWilliams advised the Committee that Clr Hutchinson would be an alternative Chairperson (in the absence of Clr McWilliams). Council had authorised this arrangement. Clr Hutchinson would be a regular CCC meeting attendee in future.

Mr Handford stated that he had written to all current CCC community members inviting them to reapply for positions on the Committee. Advertisements had been placed in local papers (Gloucester Advocate and Dungog Chronicle) on 28<sup>th</sup> October and 4<sup>th</sup> November inviting interested persons to apply to join the Committee. Four or more community members could be on the Committee. The new Committee is expected to be in place for the May 2010 meeting.

Mr Tersteeg advised he was happy with the additional graphs which appeared in the September 2009 Biological Monitoring report and would like these graphs to be continued to be provided.

Mr Handford suggested that the Company have discussions with the EPA regarding noise monitoring at Ms Gillard's residence – Ms Gillard being the most frequent complainant. Ms Gillard also stated that she wanted the Company to monitor on her property.

The September 2009 Biological Monitoring report was acceptable to the Committee.

Mr Tersteeg raised comment by the Department of Planning (DoP) recommending a second spill pipe from the Main Water Dam to the mining pit. Mr Hutchings informed the Committee that any changes to the dam spillway would require Dams Safety Committee approval.

### **Report on Environmental Monitoring (Mr Trotter)**

(comments applicable to results tabled since last meeting)

Surface Water pH – all sites were largely within the neutral range, exhibiting natural fluctuations.

Surface Water Electrical Conductivity (EC) – all sites show an upward trend (particular accentuated with site SW2 Upstream). Such a trend was compatible with dryer weather experienced.

Surface Water Total Suspended Solids (TSS) – all sites returned relatively low readings with the exception of 22 June. June 22 monitoring was a “rain event” (receipt of at least 20mm of rain within 24 hours).

Dust Gauges – results for all sites (with the exception of site D5 in July) were less than the EPA limit. D5 July result was affected by the presence of algae.

Dust Gauges Annual Rolling Average – all sites have an annual rolling average less than the Environment Protection Authority (EPA) limit. State wide dust incident occurred late September.

High Volume (PM<sub>10</sub>) Air Sampling – all results for both sites under the EPA limit.

High Volume (PM<sub>10</sub>) Air Sampling Annual Rolling Average – for both monitoring sites, annual rolling averages exhibit an increasing trend but remain significantly less than the EPA limit. Prevailing weather considered to be a major factor in results.

Rainfall – the mine experienced a relatively dry winter with rain returning to historical norms in October.

Blasting – one blast exceeded the 120dBL overpressure limit at a monitoring location. This exceedance was reported to the EPA and DII (Department of Industry and Investment) and an investigation into this blast is in progress. A single complaint from the public followed this blast. In addition, there were 4 blasts which registered overpressure between 115 and 120 dBL at a monitored location. All elevated overpressure results were recorded at the “ex-Holmes Monitor” which is sited on Company owned land and which is unoccupied. The Company has made application to the EPA to relocate this monitoring point to a more suitable monitoring location. This more suitable location is one that will allow measurement of blasting impacts at a privately owned residence.

Complaints – ten complaints tabled.

**Mine Progress (Mr Hutchings)**

Report tabled.

**June 2009 Modification**

Modification approved by DoP (28 October 2009). Copy of consolidated Development Consent provided to Committee members.

**Irrigation Expansion Modification/River Discharge**

The application by the Company to irrigate mine water on the eastern side of Mammy Johnsons River as well as discharge mine water to the local river system had been withdrawn (refer presentation by Messrs Tudor, Cribb and Dwyer).

**Part 3A Application**

Refer presentation by Messrs Tudor, Cribb and Dwyer. Pamphlet providing information on the status of the Application provided to the Committee (with mail out prior to meeting).

**Next Meeting**

The next meeting of the Committee was scheduled for Thursday 4 February 2010 commencing at 10am.

The meeting closed at 1pm.

A site inspection preceded the meeting.