COMMUNITY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE
AGL – CAMDEN GAS PROJECT

MEETING NO.28

Held in the RPGP Conference Room, Menangle on 10 March 2011 at 5.35pm

MINUTES

ATTENDANCE

Mrs Margaret MacDonald-Hill (MM)	Chair
Mr Michael Hingley (MH)	Campbelltown City Council
Mr David Henry (DH)	Campbelltown City Council
Mrs Diane Gordon (DG)	Community Member – Camden
Mr Simon Hennings (SH) *(late arrival 5.50pm)*	Community Member - Wollondilly
Ms Jacqui Kirkby (JK)	Community Member – Camden North
Mr Aaron Clifton (AC)	AGL Upstream Investments Pty Limited
Mr Adam Lollback (AL)	AGL Upstream Investments Pty Limited
Ms Naomi Rowe (NR)	AGL Upstream Investments Pty Limited
Miss Wendy Thompson (WT)	AGL Upstream Investments Pty Limited

APOLOGIES

Mr Jai Rowell (JR)	Campbelltown City Council

ABSENT

Mr Paul Hourigan (PH)	Landcom Development Director
Cr Michael Banasik (MB)	Wollondilly Shire Council

Meeting Opened at 5.30pm

ITEM	DISCUSSION	ACTION/ CLOSE OUT	DATE BY
1.0	**Introduction**		
28-1.1	Welcome by the Chair – MM.		
28-1.2	Margaret advised committee members that she is engaged by AGL as an independent chair. Margaret declared to committee members that she is also a member of the Mine Subsidence Board and the Ministers Arbitration panel.		
28-1.3	MM asked members if JK is to be formally nominated as a committee member. JK advised the committee she is opposed to Stage 3 development. No objections. Moved by committee.	MM to write to the DoP.	
28-1.4	JK advised that she did not receive a copy of the previous minutes. WT to send copy to JK.	AL to give WT JK's contact details	
2.0	**Apologies – As Above**		
3.0	**Last Meeting Minutes**		
28-3.1	MM – Corrections to previous minutes:		

	*"Exploring for gas will be harder and we are living in the information age."*MM advised that the reference here was that there is a whole lot of information on websites today which may not be factual. *"The Mining Act has changed."* MM advised that the statement should read that drilling is not permitted within 200m without prior approval from the landholder. Moved by DH, seconded DG.		
4.0	**Business Arising**		
28-4.1	MH – *(Refer previous minutes 27-6.7, Slide 12)* Section 75J of the Sartor approval. AC – When you refer back to the environmental assessment with regards to fraccing, it describes and talks about water and sand as a slurry. This makes up a fair portion of the slurry used. It is not until we drill a well that we can build a frac programme, tender to the frac companies, review the geology and get a programme together which include details of any chemicals to be used. Our conditions are such that we aren't required to give DII further information on chemicals used. MH – Are the landowners involved in that? AC – We brief them on the fracture stimulation activities being undertaken but we don't discuss finer details of the fracture stimulation activities such as what chemicals are being used. We haven't been required to provide that level of information to date. JK – Sand and water doesn't mean sand and water. What is the level below that? AC – We can't say exactly what chemicals, if any, are going to be used to fracture stimulate a well as we don't know until we assess the geology following drilling. JK – Are there any instances where you have only used sand and water? NR – In Hunter we used sand, water and salt. JK – What type of salt? NR – Sodium chloride (table salt). AC –We have only fracture stimulated vertical wells. The SIS wells are designed so we don't have to fracture stimulate as an essential completion. JK – When you say essential you mean you can. AC – If drilling of SIS wells alone is not enough to recover the gas, then fraccing is an option to recover the gas. The information Mike provided at the last meeting provided this information. JK – I didn't get the minutes. When we had a meeting with John Ross he explained that the geology was consistent within the Sydney Basin and the reason why AGL hadn't done hydrological study, but what you are saying is you don't know until you drill. NR – Aaron isn't a geologist, his position is an Environmental Manager. AC – I don't want to speculate on what John said, but what I am saying is the quality of the coal can vary throughout the project area. MM – What they are saying is that it depends on the coal measures, whether there are fractures or faults. The Government has a fair idea, but until physically drilled it may not be what was expected. DH – Went to a 3 day conference purely on hydraulic fraccing and it shows how complicated it is. SH – It is like digging holes, you could dig a hole here and find something completely different to what you find over here, but until you drill you		
28-4.2			

	don't know. NR – Wells are like fingerprints, every one will be different. DG – There are lots of question marks. You can have a hypothetical, but each area will require a different treatment, but AGL has some idea of what they are dealing with. I take that from the information provided at the last meeting. There will always be variables and until they drill to explore the coal seam you can't determine anything.		
28-4.3	AC – A few members have left the committee and we need to fill positions. AGL knows of a Menangle resident who would be representative of the people from that area. He is involved in the local fire brigade and has shown an interest in seeing the minutes and attending a meeting initially as a guest. JK – Who are you proposing they replace? MM – David Hunt from Wollondilly area. JK – What about someone from Rivers SOS. AC – This resident has previously been on BHP CCC, but I am not sure if he is a member of Rivers SOS. MM – Do they have an environmental interest. What is their name? AC- Maurice Blackwood, and I believe he does have an environmental interest. MM – Mozzie B was previously from Rivers SOS. Yes, I recall his name and he does have an environmental interest. Invite him along to the next meeting. David Funnell, a long term representative of the committee has also resigned. His replacement Fred Anderson has been appointed but is yet to be confirmed. DH – Is there no more concern from these areas? What is being done now is far more superior that what they were doing. Camden and Wollondilly have no issues hence little commitment. It is about educating and addressing the issues. MH – The actual frac process was never understood, hence why there are now reservations. DG – AGL is constantly working on how to do things better. In 5 years it has become less invasive on the communities. There have been incredible changes, and the whole process of harvesting gas is light years ahead. SH – The new drilling process with horizontal wells has given new access to the area . MM – I have a file *(hand gestured large)* this thick on concerns from Wollondilly at the earlier meetings. MH – Is there any information covering chemicals? MM – There were other issues then.		
28-4.3	JK – I have complaints from landowners who say their water is very salty. Was there not a benchmark study done? They are talking about doing one for Stage 3, a water and environmental benchmark. Someone I know said the water has become very salty. AC – We had one claim from an adjoining landowner approximately 2-4 years ago where the creek we were working adjacent to was claimed to be impacted by our operations. We spoke to the EPA who walked the creek taking samples and provided the results, confirming that the salinity was not a result of our operations MM – I will try to locate the report on the hydrology of the area for the next meeting.	MM to bring paperwork to	

	JK – How do you monitor it? SH – Water can change just with rain. AC – We don't monitor all ground water levels, we monitor the main beneficial use aquifiers which are approximately 120m underground . SH – What about surface monitoring? NR – We don't touch surface water. AC – We have exclusion zones of 20-40m from creeks, so if there was a spill no ground water would be affected as the spill would be contained before entering a surface water body. JK – It's not just ground water, surface water should also be monitored. SH – I don't know how you would contaminate it, and AGL are under a duty to disclose if they spill anything anyway.	next meeting	
5.0	**Correspondence**		
28-5.1 28-5.2	*Correspondence In* Nil *Correspondence Out* Nil		
6.0	**Reports on AGL's operations and future plans**		
28-6.1 28-6.2 28-6.3	**HSE Field Compliance and Operations - AC** <u>Civil Earthworks</u> Rehabilitation works continued at ED01, EM34, MP05A, SF20 and EM26. MP12/23 gas gathering line construction works continue. <u>Drilling</u> Drilling continues at MP03 surface location. MP01, 02, 03 and 09 wells have been drilled. We are currently drilling MP10 well and are expected to be completed in approx 4 weeks. Continuous noise monitoring has been undertaken by external consultants during the drilling of MP01 and MP02 wells and all results have been confirmed compliant with the DoP noise limits. <u>Rosalind Park Gas Plant</u> Quarterly noise monitoring has been undertaken for RPGP operations with all results compliant. A continuous noise logger and weather station has been removed from the adjoining Mt Gilead property. This logger could have been removed a few years ago. While it was not mandatory to keep the logger AGL wanted to ensure we were meeting all our obligations. Quarterly air emissions monitoring has been undertaken, but the results have not yet been received. The 2009-2010 Annual Returns have been submitted to the DECCW.		

	RPGP continues to operate without significant operational issues or community complaints. Additional fire brigade familiarization tours have been held.		
28-6.4	<u>General Field Operations</u> Cultural Heritage Test pit excavations have been undertaken at Menangle Park. An area of Aboriginal archaeological sensitivity was identified. AGL consulted with representatives from the registered Aboriginal stakeholder groups. AGL agreed to undertake the test excavation program to determine the site contents, boundaries and its cultural significance prior to commencing construction of the gas gathering line. AGL engaged a heritage specialist to complete the program with the registered Aboriginal stakeholder groups. Work involved hand digging fifteen 50cm x 50cm test pits within the immediate vicinity of the proposed gas gathering line route. Each layer (spit) of soil was sieved and all artefacts were collected, bagged and clearly labelled. During the dig twelve Aboriginal artefacts were identified from the test pits. All artefacts were analysed to determine raw material type, artefact type and manufacturing techniques. Analysis of the artefacts provides information on the types of cultural activities undertaken on the land in the past. MM – What sort were found? AC – Chips and flakes that may have formed when making stone tools. All chips and flakes are analysed and recorded. JK- In our dealings with local Aboriginal groups they get very upset if something is removed and they say you should leave them where you find them. Are you not finding this? AC – It could be possible that your dealings have been with a different aboriginal group as the general aboriginal group boundaries change around the Denham Court area. We always use the approach to avoid any sensitive area, as we understand the reasons why it is a sensitive area. In any case we work with the aboriginal groups and come to an agreement. Late last year over at Spring Farm by the hill a few artefacts were found and they said they didn't want us trenching there, so we under bored so as not to touch the area. Biosis are paid by AGL, but were chosen following close consultation with the aboriginal groups who had good experiences with Biosis during works on BHP sites. JK – When dealing with RTA truckstop, when we got papers from the Government the Aboriginal groups were very upset. AC – There have been a lot of changes in state legislation since then to ensure that aboriginal stakeholders are consulted..		
28-6.5	<u>Community Complaints</u> On 23 February, an adjoining landowner to the MP03 site contacted AGL to complain about the dust and recent noise levels at night.		

	AGL's investigation discovered the dust was generated whilst the dust suppression water cart was offsite. The water cart has worked continuously onsite to prevent dust and tighter controls are now in place to minimise offsite time. Drill rig noise levels have been reduced through further mitigation.		
	Community and Government - AL		
28-6.6	<u>Camden Gas Project Menangle Park</u> Menangle Park Gathering Line Modification map was shown and the route link changed plans. The proposal was to change the gathering line route and this has been lodged for approval as it was outside the 25m assessment corridor. Approved Modifications are: 1. Menangle Park Mod 1 (MP 06 0291 Mod 1) 2. DA 282-6-2003i MOD 12 – RPGP 3. DA 9-1-2005 MOD 3 – EMAI Landscaping Showed map of the proposed MP33 location		
28-6.7	<u>Camden Gas Project Northern Expansion</u> The EA Process is currently at the Submissions Received stage. During the exhibition period, submissions regarding the proposed Project were accepted by DoP from online, email, fax and post sources. Submissions have been received from Local and State Government authorities, community groups and developers and individual land owners. Submissions were numbered as received and provided to the Proponent in accordance with section 75H of the EP&A Act. Several submissions were also accepted after the submissions period. JK – The Serbian Church put in a late submission because they were not aware you were putting 6 wells there, and they said no. They were shocked to find you put it in and they cannot go ahead with their plans if you go ahead with the wells proposed. Has this been accepted for a response? AL – I believe it has been. We have actually been to the property with the permission of the Church and have had one of their members come to our office to speak about locations. JK – When you went to consult you did not disclose that you wanted to put wells on the land? AL – We had an introductory meeting with Randin Illick who came to our office as a representative of the church. We also gained permission for access, undertook an inspection and had discussions with him in regards to the location. JK – They said no they didn't want it so you came up with a deal for compensation. AL – We came up with proposed locations. JK- They put in a submission saying they can't do their plans if you do this. They are making it clear they don't want you there. They are not		

	giving you permission. AL – We have been in discussions with them, and will be continuing our negotiations. JK – They said they did not understand. AL – We have had discussions with them for 18 months, and all I can say is they didn't say no we couldn't have discussions and review proposed locations. JK – You took it as a yes. AL – They have given me permission to visit the property to do the environmental assessment. If they have an issue with the wells, we can discuss with them. JK – You offered compensation of $15,000. AL – We have never ever made any offer. SH – Landowner information is personal dealings. MM – This is not a discussion we should have here as this is confidential information between landholders and the company. JK – Well it's a no deal as far as they are concerned. AL – The keys issues raised in the EA Submission are: • Environmental assessment process • Licensing and other approvals associated with the project • Ecological impacts of the project • Ground water and Surface water management • Existing and Future Land use • Heritage considerations SH- These are similar issues as were previously raised in Camden. MM – Were many submissions raised? AL – 18 in total. There are a lot of issues that are covered in the environmental assessment. We will review each submission and reply forming the submissions report. DH – Do you know when that is likely to be? MH – Will it go back to the DoP and filter through? DH – It all goes on the website. AL – The responses will, Yes.		
7.0	**Guest Speaker**		
28-7.1	**Naomi Rowe** <u>Energy for Life</u> Recorded an apology on behalf of Melissa Kwan who was unable to present today. I would like to take the opportunity to talk about AGL's Energy for Life programme which is one of AGL's Corporate Responsibility Volunteering programmes. Employee's of AGL have nominated 10 charity partners that they would like to support through volunteering and donations. Employee's personal choice to have donations taken from their pay each month and donated to these charity partners. AGL matches the employee contributions $1 for $1 up to a capped amount each year. The key one I want to provide you information on today is the Warmth in		

	Winter programme. AGL funds the winter energy bills for crisis accommodation services in NSW, Victoria, ACT, SA and Queensland who home the homeless and assist those requiring crisis accommodation. This frees up valuable funds for those charities, which can be redirected to other essential services. This is an annual programme and applications are received in May, with hand delivery of cheques by our employees in August/September. We also provide high level energy audits and installation of energy efficient measures which can assist in reducing energy spend during the summer months, and increasing energy efficiency overall. In the local area we work we wanted to be able to give you an idea of what we are doing. This year at the Camden Show we are even sponsoring the Beef and Cattle section. In the local area here we will be expanding out and we have also had discussions to volunteer at the local respite centre, and have been in contact with the local youth groups to discuss longer term mentoring and skilled mentoring for youth employment opportunities. This area is quite high for youth unemployment and we are opening the door to seek your input, involvement or suggestions. MM – So you are taking suggestions? NR – We know people are time poor, but we are more than just sponsorship. There are AGL employee's who live and work in the area who are demonstrating their commitment. This programme has been going on for years, we have just never been able to tell you at CCC. The guys working in Camden office are enthusiastic about being part of this. JK – Who are the giving partners? NR – Showed the slide with the 10 charity partners. SH – I remember years ago you did the playground at the local preschool. NR – Currently in Gloucester we are working on a youth development programme and what they need most is a marquee for sporting days and events, so we are getting that for them.		
8.0	**General Business**		
28-8.1 General	DH – You previously mentioned that you are planning Exploration drilling. Can you let me know where this is up to? AL – Yes, as previously mentioned we are planning some exploration drilling. Once we have finalised the REF, I will be sending it out to councils for review. JK – The language used today "is moving into". Is that an assumption that at the next meeting you will be in? NR – Not at all – we aren't making assumptions. JK – Can't you draw enough gas from the wells you already have? NR – The wells have an expiration, they are constantly rolling over.		

	AL – We are getting gas in the area, we also need to move to new areas to get additional gas resources. MH – 15-21 years for the PEL, looking at this map. *(Referenced wall map showing PEL's).* MM – There are certain things to be done in 6 years, or AGL relinquish a portion of the PEL. AL – There is a work program that needs to be completed for each PEL. 25% relinquishment at renewal of the PEL. SH – There is no conflict, there is coal and AGL can get the gas out. JK – No conflicts! There is a lot more involved, and these discussions don't address those. I have been to a health conference talking about the direct impacts on health. MM – Government's Coal and gas strategy is taking on board what people's thoughts on mining are, social, environmental and health as well as economic. Hopefully, the new Government will take these issues on board in developing future strategies. There were a lot of concerns on gas exploration 12 years ago. It caused an uproar then. SH – I founded the GAG (Gas Action Group) to stop Sydney Gas. Now I don't have any concerns. Time has demonstrated what these guys are doing and I am comfortable with it. DG – Gas is better for us. There are wonderful job opportunities being created. There are other resources which are not clean and not liked. This is something that is natural, harvested by AGL without disruption to communities. There are no health issues. I look 10 years back now and wonder what all the fuss was. The economics of gas are very good for NSW. JK – I am not looking for opinions, I want facts. DH – We're going to ask for more information then would have been asked before. JK – AGL needs to look for other renewables which are good for NSW. There are problems with the decision making process at a State level. MM – It is a democratic process who you vote for. There is some mistrust in that process. SH – Legislation says what activities can and can't be undertaken. We changed how close to houses they can drill. Legislation can be changed. DG – AGL shows what they are doing and have a very high regard for the area. They are making a conscious effort to get along in the community. AL – A lot of people who work here live in the community. JK – Let the community make the decision which is Council.		
9.0	**Next Meeting**		
	Thursday 16 June 2011		
	Meeting Closed 7.36pm		

Note:

- Item numbering in column one shows the meeting number first then the section number to allow for the actions to be tracked for close out.