

**COMMUNITY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE  
AGL – CAMDEN GAS PROJECT**

**MEETING NO.30**

Held in the RPPG Conference Room, Menangle on 29 September 2011 at 5.30pm

**MINUTES**

<b>Member / Guest</b>	<b>Attendance Type</b>
Mrs Margaret MacDonald-Hill (MM) <b>Chair</b>	Present
Mr David Henry (DH)	Present
Mrs Diane Gordon (DG)	Present
Cr Fred Anderson (FA)	Present
Mr Jeff Lawrence (JL)	Present
Ms Jacqui Kirkby (JK)	Present
Mr Michael Banasik (MB)	Absent
Mr Michael Hingley (MH)	Present
Mr Simon Hennings (SH)	Present
Mr Aaron Clifton (AC)	Present
Mr Adam Lollback (AL)	Present
Mr John Ross (JR)	Present
Miss Wendy Thompson (WT)	Present

**Meeting Opened at: 5.35pm**

<b>ITEM</b>	<b>ACTION</b>
<p><b>1.0 Welcome</b></p> <p>Welcomed by Chair – MM.</p> <p>Welcomed John Ross, Manager Hydrogeology, AGL to meeting.</p> <p>Margaret advised committee members that she is engaged by AGL as an independent chair, approved by the Director of General Planning and Infrastructure.</p> <p>Margaret declared to committee members that she is also a member of the Mine Subsidence Board and the Minister’s Arbitration panel.</p>	
<p><b>2.0 Apologies</b></p> <p>Nil</p>	
<p><b>3.0 Confirmation of Previous Minutes</b></p> <p>JK – Raised concern over the minutes and sought clarification on what changes are made and by whom.</p> <p>MM – Confirmed that minutes are provided to MM for review prior to being distributed.</p> <p>AC – AGL advised that minutes are reviewed for accuracy.</p> <p>JK – Concern that the minutes are on the website for public information and with comments removed, they lose their context. Believes there is an</p>	

<p>interpretation given to the minutes beneficial to AGL.  JK gave two examples from the previous minutes where she believed words had been omitted from the discussion on the contents of the Sugarloaf 3 foam incident. Her concern is that AGL has changed their story, which is an important aspect to the community. She requested confirmation if methane was present.  AC – Confirmed that we cannot confirm if methane was present</p> <p>AC – Asked the committee what is the requirement for the minutes, what are the committee’s expectations?  MM – Advised they are a record of general points of discussion and decisions made, not a transcript.  JK – Advised that the guidelines state if the committee agrees, the meeting can be recorded, and requested future meetings be recorded as a backup, with the tapes made available on request, or if anyone had any objections to the meetings being recorded by herself.  SH – Queried the possibility of meeting minutes being taped. General consensus was no.  FA – Cited his concern on the meetings being recorded as it may only appear as an issue if the minutes are denied, or it appears to be construed.  JK – Advised her view of the importance of having accurate minutes.  MM – Queried the committee members if they had any concerns on the standard of minutes or process of confirmation.  Members confirmed no issues.  DG – Advised that minutes are not meant to be verbatim. The opportunity is available to amend as required.  JK – Requested her concerns be noted and her preference for the meetings to be recorded.</p> <p>The Committee agreed that the process will be for the minutes to be distributed, and any major amendment, on their own comments only, be submitted to WT for referral to MM for review. All minor amendments, if any, will be dealt with at the next meeting.</p> <p>Current minutes not confirmed to be held over to next meeting pending proposed amendments from JK.</p> <p><b>Moved:</b> Nil  <b>Seconded:</b> Nil</p>	
<p><b>4.0 Business Arising</b></p> <p>JK – 6.3 Copy of URS Soil Sampling report was to be distributed. Report has not been received.  AC – Confirmed that an email was sent to all committee members on 10 August 2011 regarding the findings of the SL03 wellsite sampling undertaken, and the results were available on the website noted in that correspondence.  Reference for committee to view the report was provided by AC, where URS report can be viewed.  JL – Requested a copy of the report to be sent.</p>	<p>AL to send copy of URS report to JL on CD</p>

<p>JK – Requested further information relating to the water study. Referred to DoPI guidelines stating to be provided within 28 days. Requested on 16/6, received on 10/8. Had suggested monitoring not proceed until new regulations in place. Waited 2 months for information, then AGL advised that it was going ahead.</p> <p>AL – Advised he had spoken to JK regarding this and provided requested information.</p> <p>JK – Requested confirmation and source of the information provided.</p> <p>DH – Queried if MM had sought DoPI clarification. (Ref 6.4 previous minutes)</p> <p>MM – confirmed and tabled letter to DoPI , no response received as yet.</p> <p>AC – Referred to the DoPI guidelines and suggested it would be of benefit for all members to review the guidelines as a group.</p> <p>MM – JK has been approved by DoPI as committee member and that new members were being sought.</p> <p>AL advised looking at having two new members. An advertisement seeking interest will be in the local community newspapers and on the website. Agreed on 4 week period for applications.</p> <p>JK – Queried the area of applicants, or if there are any concerns of land owners being members.</p> <p>MM – Advised it is preferred that all applicants need to have the ability to represent the concerns and interest of the broader community and not be a single or personal interest.</p> <p>AC – Advised that AGL do have a preference for an environmental background to be included.</p> <p>SH – Suggested that applicants being sought should have diversity of skills and broad spectrum understanding.</p> <p>JK – Queried when the advertising would commence.</p> <p>AL – Confirmed the intention is to be completed this week, and submitted to the next newspaper.</p> <p>DG – Suggested that potential land holders may not be ideal. Suggest it be those who are currently involved in current project areas.</p> <p>MM – Item 6.4 – letter to DoPI seeking confirmation on compliance activities.</p> <p>Page 8 – Moratorium on fracking extended to 31 December 2011</p> <p>JK – Understood that this was applied to new projects</p> <p>AL – Understanding that it is relating to fracking across all projects in NSW</p> <p>AGL has not undertaken fracking processes during the moratorium period.</p> <p>JK – Requested confirmation if it applies to all existing projects, or new ones.</p>	<p>AL to find source and communication to confirm</p> <p>MM to see if DoP could attend</p> <p>AL/AC to seek and provide confirmation</p>
<p><b>5.0 Correspondence</b></p> <p><b><u>IN</u></b></p> <p>10/8 – Email from AL on SL03 incident with attachment from Peter Bloem OEH</p> <p>2/9 – Email from Mike Moraza, Group General Manager, Upstream Gas</p>	

<p>on TV program 15/9 – Email from DoPI forwarding letter of approval of JK as a committee member</p> <p><b>OUT</b> 29/6 – Letter to David Kitto seeking confirmation on compliance and activities (Item 6 of previous minutes) 15/9 – Email to JK forwarding DoPI approval confirming appointment as committee member</p>	
<p><b>6.0 Reports</b></p> <p><b>6.1 JR provided a presentation to the committee on Groundwater Investigations for the Camden Gas Project</b> ➤ See presentation slides</p> <p>JK – Suggested distributing the slides in full size, or placing them on the website for members to download themselves.</p> <p>JL – Queried regarding the results, what bearing does it have on AGL’s submissions report? AL – Phase 1 report confirmed that it will be part of the submission. Additional information from new studies to be included if available</p> <p>JK – Noted that in Phase 1 report that there could be major faults that transmit water and queried how do AGL know that there are not? Baseline data collected in 2001 by Sydney Gas cannot be used for the Northern Expansion area because the consultants made it specific for the Cawdor area. JR – Advised that mapping and geological data collated indicates there are no major faults. JK – Queried if this data is from the Northern Expansion area AL – Suggested presentation be provided by AGL Geologists at the next meeting. JK – Seeking what does exist for the area of the Northern Expansion. Consultants made it specific for the area, and were unable to verify the data. Suggested in the interests, when making claim would like the information on what supports that claim. JR – Mapping indicates that the major structural features are to the west (Nepean Fault etc), and there are no known major faults within the northern expansion area. The concept is correct that if there are major faults, there is a possibility of groundwater connectivity.</p> <p>JK – Questioned if AGL had licences for the water bores being put in. She had been given information they did not. JR – Confirmed AGL does have licences for the three well monitoring bore installations at Denham Court. Camden field is licensed. Do not hold bore licences for Camden Northern extension. JK – Queried why AGL are continuing to go ahead with this in the area on the assumption that approval will be granted. JR – Advised need to gain an understanding of the local hydrogeology as a baseline. AGL is doing this to provide the information to regulators and communities to define the water characteristics for the area.</p>	

<p>JK – Advised that the community holds concerns that there was not a hydrological study undertaken for the public exhibition period. Secondly noted, the understanding is not getting a hydrological study. Questioned if the information gathered will provide a go/ or no/go position. Queried if there is an expectation of an adaptive management strategy, if there are indications of damage.</p> <p>JR – Advised the information is to provide a baseline for all parties, and is not a critical go/no go investigation. Advised changes could happen to the underlying groundwater from multiple activities eg salinisation due to urbanisation.</p> <p>JK – Concerned the area is being used as guinea pig. Queried if wells not done correctly can this create fault zones, or could it happen during the fracturing process?</p> <p>JR – No</p> <p>JK – Queried Stage 2 groundwater monitoring program</p> <p>JR – Advised there are plans to do extra monitoring in the existing area but unable to go back in time to get baseline.</p> <p>JK – Advised informed that at any stage impacts of dewatering can be monitored. Technology around to determine any aquifer interference.</p> <p>JR – Advised is not aware of technology. Would like to seek the information regarding the technology available.</p> <p>JK – Report in Upper House Enquiry website May Lou Pott’s submission on the Camden Gas Project</p> <p>SH – Thanked JR for comprehensive information in his presentation.</p> <p>DH – Regarding site at Denham Court Road, questioned surface disturbance requirements.</p> <p>JR – Flat area, no excavation requirements.</p> <p>JK – Varoville House well site not mentioned in the report. Questioned what happened to that well.</p> <p>AC – Confirmation that an exploration well was drilled but is not sure why it is not noted in the report.</p> <p>JK – Seeking confirmation as to what occurred with that well. Liked to know what happened to it, what the results were.</p> <p><b>6.2 AC – Operations and HSE Update</b></p> <p>➤ See presentation slides</p> <p>Slide 6 – Reference: URS audit on PELs</p> <p>JL – Queried if the audit report is supplied to DTIRIS</p> <p>AC – Advise the expectation is that a draft audit report would be provided to AGL to confirm accuracy, then submitted to DTIRIS as a final version. Audits also being taken in Gloucester &amp; Hunter location</p> <p>MM requested that powerpoint presentations at the meetings be distributed to all members at the commencement of the meeting.</p>	<p>JK to provide copy of report to JR</p> <p>AC to seek information and review, and where possible provide approved information to JK</p> <p>WT to prepare presentation materials for distribution at the meetings</p>
---	--

<p><b>6.3 AL – Community and Government Update</b></p> <p><b>ADAM – Presentation</b>  ➤ See presentation slides</p> <p>JK – In relation to Mike Moraza’s advertorial, statement was made AGL does not drill within 20m of the house. The news items referred to wells being built within 20m of them. Is this correct?  AL – Correct.  JK – Advised that this is misleading. Factually correct, contextually misleading.  AL – Suggests that is a matter of opinion.</p>	
<p><b>7.0 General Business</b></p> <p>AC – Sponsored Camden show earlier in the year, and Campbelltown show recently. AC attended and advised that AGL got a lot of good information from it. AC asked the committee members to suggest any other opportunities that AGL can be involved in within the community to let AL and AC know.</p> <p>MM – Advised she had received a request from a member of the AGL Hunter CCC, to meet with Camden Committee during a proposed visit on November 8. Queried interest and availability of Camden members. Not sure of itinerary as yet.</p> <p>JK – Requested the Camden committee visit the site to where water monitoring is being undertaken.  MM – agreed this could be arranged if there is interest from other members.  JR – Suggest the visitation occur during the actual water sampling process and monitoring period in November.  AL – Advised that permission will need to be gained from the landowners prior to approving the site visit.</p>	<p>MM to circulate further information</p>
<p><b>8.0 Next Meeting Date</b></p> <p>16 February 2012</p>	

**Meeting Closed at: 8.04pm**