

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

MEETING NO.38

Held in the RGP Conference Room, Menangle on 21 November 2013 at 5.30pm

MINUTES

Member / Guest	Attendance Type
Mrs Margaret MacDonald-Hill (MM) Chair	Present
Mr Brad Staggs (BS)	Apology
Mrs Diane Gordon (DG)	Apology
Mr Fred Anderson (FA)	Present
Ms Jacqui Kirkby (JK)	Apology
Ms Nea Makowski (attending on behalf of JK) (NM)	Present
Mr Michael Hingley (MH)	Apology
Mr Peter Bloem (PB)	Apology
Mr Simon Hennings (SH)	Apology
Mr Troy Platten (TP)	Apology
Mr Paul Reynolds (PR)	Apology
Cr Lara Symkowiak (LS)	Apology
Mr Aaron Clifton (AC)	Present
Ms Jenny O'Brien (JO)	Present
Mr Adam Lollback (AL)	Present
Ms Sara Olivier (SO)	Present
Mr Andrew Spooner (AS)	Present
Mr David Henry (DH)	Present
Mr Geoff Green (GG)	Apology
Ms Nicole Magurren	Apology
Ms Jackie Wright (JW)	Present
Ms Therese Manning (TM)	Present

Meeting Opened at: 5.30pm

ITEM	ACTION
<p>1.0 Welcome</p> <p>MM - Welcome and introduction of presenter Jackie Wright – EnRisk and observer Therese Manning - EnRisk</p> <p>MM also welcomed Nea Makowski who was attending on behalf of Jacqui Kirkby.</p> <p>Declaration made by MM - MM - Advised that she is engaged by AGL as an independent chair, approved by the Director General of Planning and Infrastructure. She is also a member of the Mine Subsidence Board and the Minister's Arbitration Panel.</p>	
2.0 Apologies	

As above.	
<p>3.0 Confirmation of Previous Minutes</p> <p>MM indicated some minor corrections had been received by JK and PB for meeting #37 minutes. These corrections largely included clarifications to statements they had made during the meeting.</p> <p>No further corrections were made by members.</p> <p>Moved: Andrew Spooner Seconded: David Henry</p>	
<p>4.0 Invited Speakers</p> <p>Jackie Wright, Environmental Risk Sciences Pty Ltd (EnRiskS)</p> <p>Presentation on Environmental Health Impact Assessment – Camden North Expansion Project</p> <p>AC – Introduced JW and TM. Explained that the Environmental Health Impact Assessment (EHIA) was carried out following a commitment AGL made in late January 2013. This commitment was made following comments received from the community about concerns of potential health impacts from the proposed Camden North Expansion Project.</p> <p>AGL met with NSW Health and Department of Planning and Infrastructure and committed to undertaking the EHIA despite the project being suspended. AGL thought the EHIA was still an important process to complete to meet the expectations of NSW Health and the community.</p> <p>Key government agencies including NSW Health have been consulted with prior to the release of the EHIA and JW and TM have shared the findings of the report with Camden, Campbelltown and Wollondilly Shire Councils. AC confirmed the report is now available on the project website.</p> <p>MM – Confirmed a copy of the presentation would also be made available to members.</p> <p>DH – Did you discuss the outcomes of the HIA with the Chief Scientist?</p> <p>JW - Yes the Chief Scientist’s office was briefed on the outcomes and they were involved in the process.</p> <p>NM – Will pass on the information to JK. NM asked what the definition of low and acceptable risk was and how it was determined?</p> <p>JW- The definition of acceptable risk is what a community can accept without undue concern. The NSW Health determines this. Acceptable risk is defined when policy is developed, For example in the drinking water guidelines, air guidelines and recreational water guidelines. These</p>	<p>JO to send EHIA presentation to CCC members</p>

guidelines were adopted in the EHIA to determine the level of risk and to demonstrate if the project fell below these levels.

MM – Asked JW to clarify if these guidelines were also based on national and international guidelines and standards.

JW – Confirmed that NSW guidelines are consistent with national guidelines and some international guidelines eg. From the WHO, EPA.

NM - Asked if most of the information used to complete the assessment was gathered from the Environmental Assessment (EA)?

JW – Confirmed the bulk of data was taken from the specialist study reports in the EA. Some additional data collection and studies were undertaken including studies on fugitive emissions. During the EHIA analysis was undertaken down to a very low level to know if there were any detects. In particular, no detections of benzene or were found.

FA – Would you expect the same fugitive emission results from the existing project?

JW - Yes a very similar composition of emissions would be expected.

AS – Have NSW Health endorsed the document?

AC – No NSW Health haven't publicly endorsed it. They have been very cooperative throughout the development of the document and have provided a lot of resources. Ideally, it would be great to have a statement on the front page of the report signed by Minister for Health.

AL – AGL have gone back to NSW Health on three occasions and each time they have provided questions and comments. Following each of these meetings AGL has gone back to address these.

AS – Have NSW Health provided comment on the final version?

AC – No not yet.

JO –Where changes or further work were suggested by NSW Health, these matters and changes have been made.

MM – Commented that it is unlikely that government will endorse the report. This report will form another study and provide information that will go in the melting pot for the community and government to consider.

AS – Understood AGL worked closely with Wayne Smith, was he happy with the report? Has he stated that concerns have been covered?

JO – Have not been advised at this stage

AS – Agrees that NSW Health endorsement would provide confidence to community.

AS – Understood that the information contained within the report and the findings are not transferrable to any other CSG project. Asked whether this was because EnRiskS was only commissioned to look at the Northern Expansion? Council is looking at another issue in Menangle Park and wondered if the information was transferable to similar operations and places of similar geology?

JW – Explained that within this existing Camden Gas Project area most of the results are transferable because of similar geology. The reason the report states that the results are only relevant to the Camden Northern Expansion project is the risk someone tries to transfer the results to other operations in other areas such as QLD or the Hunter where there is different geology. The results are transferable within existing operational areas in Camden.

FA – If powers at the top were in disagreement with this report would it have been issued?

JW – If representatives from NSW Health, Planning and other government departments were concerned or identified gaps in information, then this report would not have been released until these gaps or concerns were addressed. Feedback received to date has been positive from representatives of government agencies and questions asked has enabled EnRiskS to clarify information or find additional information to provide further explanation.

AC –AGL made it known publicly that this report was being prepared and would be reported on. If benzene was found that could have had a health impact AGL would have had to release the report regardless of findings.

JO – AGL made a commitment to the community to share the results and findings of the EHIA and the fugitive emissions report. JO explained her job and the role of the CCC is to share information and to be open and transparent. JO explained this was the only way to develop trust and credibility with community.

FA – Commented about moral responsibility for people at the top of organisations to disagree with the publishing of findings of this type of report - not only in relation to emotional issues but also in regards to the substance of the science.

MM – There is often debate between experts and technical report findings. This provides for a dynamic process. A report such as this stands in the public and can be commented on. This process should bring confidence as it drives best practice. Others may read the information, conduct their own research, put papers out publicly for discussion.

AC – AGL have been cautious about the release of report to ensure the community understand that the Camden Northern Expansion Project is still suspended.

<p>JO – Explained that the Northern Expansion project is suspended. AGL made public commitments to conduct a health impact assessment. Aware there may be some members of the community who may perceive the EHIA as a way for the project to push ahead. AGL briefed the local papers about the report via phone and media releases and reiterated that the project remains on hold however the story depicted was that AGL won't rule out the project. The messages about the EHIA have been unclear in the media. AGL are trying to deliver on promises made to the community and be transparent.</p> <p>NM – Is there community confusion that the Northern Expansion Project is going ahead?</p> <p>JO – There are some sections of the community who are concerned about this. This can't be said for all sections of the community though.</p> <p>AL – AGL committed to doing the EHIA and that is why AGL pushed ahead with it.</p> <p>JO – AGL cannot go ahead with the Northern Expansion Project because of the current exclusion zones.</p> <p>AL – AGL needs to formalise intentions now the SEPP is released.</p>	
<p>5.0 Correspondence</p> <p>In 14/10/13 letter from Wollondilly Council advising Council Committee representation 2013/14.</p> <p>22/10/13 email from JO with link to AEMR</p> <p>28/10/13 email from JO with link to Environmental Health Impact Assessment - Camden Northern Expansion</p> <p>Out None</p>	
<p>6.0 AGL Update - Chair confirmed -most matters in Business Arising were included in updates.</p> <p>AL - PowerPoint presentation containing recent policy developments</p> <p>AL provided an overview of recent policy developments and DOPI exhibition of maps outlining CSG exclusion zones, locations of Strategic Agricultural Land and Critical Industry Clusters.</p> <p>More mapping had to be formalised. 8 November submission period closed.</p> <p>New policy is in place now just the mapping has to be finalised.</p>	

<p>AL – Addressed query JK raised from last meeting regarding the percentage breakdown of wells on public and private land and the percentage breakdown of pipeline infrastructure on public and private land. Public and government land has been considered the same category.</p> <p>There are 144 wells in total – 89 wells are on private land and 55 wells are on government land (including Sugar Loaf field, Gundungurra Reserve and Elizabeth Macarthur Agricultural Institute). This equates to approximately 62% of wells located on private properties and 38% of wells located on government land.</p> <p>Gathering line infrastructure is largely contained within the property boundaries of the wells however it does briefly cross into public roads in certain locations into the road easements. There is a therefore a similar breakdown for the gathering line infrastructure however slightly higher proportion of infrastructure on government property because of crossings along the road easements. Breakdown of gathering line infrastructure is 60% on private property and 40% on government land.</p> <p>NM - Will pass on to JK.</p> <p>FA – Is there any difference in the depth or type of pipe between the gas delivered for domestic use and for the gas gathering line infrastructure for this operation?</p> <p>AC – There are different Australian Standards for domestic gas supply and for the gas gathering lines. Expects differences because the gas is at different pressures in the pipes. AGL’s pipeline is under a lower pressure than the supply of gas for domestic and industrial use. The depth of AGL’s gas gathering lines is at a minimum of 75cm below ground level.</p> <p>FA – When the gathering pipeline crosses private land does it only impact the land that the well is located on or can it go across other neighbouring properties?</p> <p>AC – Access agreements can be developed for gathering lines not just wells. AGL has some flexibility with where the pipeline can be positioned. If a landowner doesn’t want the gas gathering line across their property, alternate locations can be investigated.</p> <p>AL – Some landowners only have pipelines eg. Council land has some pipelines linking different parts of the gas field but doesn’t have a well.</p> <p>FA- Is there a government regulation that requires you to put the pipeline in the road easement?</p> <p>AL – No, it is a matter of finding the best routes.</p> <p>AC – Telstra and other communications will commonly take the shortest and easiest path. Sometimes it is easy to put this infrastructure into the road easement but it is not always the case.</p>	<p>NM to confirm with JK that her query has been answered.</p> <p>AC to confirm pipe depths and sizes of domestic gas pipelines.</p> <p>JO to send email about percentage breakdown of wells and gathering line</p>
--	---

<p>JO – Explained information about the percentage breakdown of wells and pipeline infrastructure will be documented and sent in an email to the CCC.</p> <p>AC – Powerpoint presentation on Well Summary , HSE and Field Investigations AC - provided overview of well summary, field operations including new water monitoring bores to be drilled at Glenlee/Menangle Park in January 2014 and HSE.</p> <p>JO sent out a link to the annual environmental report. This is an important document for AGL not just completed as a requirement for Planning and OCSG. It is an important resource for AGL and covers all non-compliances, air emissions exceedances, consultation work, CCC meetings and actions, information on recycling, Aboriginal Heritage, audits, visits from government agencies etc. This link is now on the website.</p> <p>The corrective actions register to be updated in December 2013.</p> <p>AS left meeting at 6.35pm.</p> <p>Results for quarterly air emissions testing in September came back today so they will go up on website shortly.</p> <p>JO – Powerpoint presentation on recent community activities.</p> <p>JO – Provided overview of a noise complaint received, the community open day on July 18, 2013 and other community events.</p> <p>JO introduced the “YourSay AGL” website. One stop shop to find out about all AGL operations and a portal to find out general information about CSG. Trying to provide information to community. Community can register and ask questions. This site is updated nearly daily. A weekly blog will also be published. Trying to engage with community in different ways. The YourSay site has been live for about 2 months. 120 people have registered and there have already been about 10,000 visits to the site.</p> <p>AC – Responded to a question raised by JK in the previous meeting about the names of groundwater wells. In particular why some wells are referred to as Raby when they are not located in this area. The groundwater monitoring bores are located in Denham Court which has been called Raby Field.</p> <p>Raby Monitoring Bore (RMB) 01-4 are within Raby Field however to ease confusion they will be referred to as RMB in Denham Court Field moving forward. The wells cannot be renamed at this stage because a lot of data has been collected and is assigned to these names.</p> <p>Any future wells will be named more appropriately. For production wells and monitoring wells the names can’t be changed because they are</p>	<p>infrastructure on public and private land.</p> <p>AC to upload September quarterly air emissions monitoring results.</p>
---	---

<p>already on record.</p> <p>An action for AGL was to review existing maps on the project website. AGL has now updated the maps with clearer labels - produced, plugged and abandoned, suspended. Maps should be uploaded onto the website within the next 24 hours.</p> <p>JO – To send a link to the CCC to the updated maps.</p>	<p>JO to send link to updated maps.</p>
<p>7.0 Business arising</p> <p>NM – JK raised an issue with page 6 of the previous minutes which possibly has been answered in presentations..</p> <p>NM - To confirm if information presented tonight addresses JK’s query.</p> <p>AC – Addressed TP suggestion from previous meeting to seek a report on repair works conducted on the cracked engine mount. Contractor will be providing letter to keep on file to provide date and scope of repair works. Expect to receive within next week and will be kept on internal file.</p> <p>AC – Didn’t receive any direct emails from JK regarding the activity in Mt Annan. JK to forward email to AC if follow up is required.</p>	<p>NM to follow up with JK</p>
<p>8.0 General Business</p> <p>DH – Asked about the status of the fugitive emissions report.</p> <p>AC – This report is still being reviewed. It is a big job with a lot of data. AGL have reviewed, Pacific Environment have made changes which should come back this week. Once received it will go to CSIRO for their review.</p> <p>Have formed a small internal committee to take main report and consolidate it into a summary report that is user friendly. The full report will be made available on the website as well but for those who want a quick summary there will be a shorter version. It is unlikely that this will be ready before Christmas.</p> <p>JO – The public consultation group will be brought back before the public release of the report and before going to government as per commitments made.</p>	
<p>9.0 Next meeting date</p> <p>MM – Proposed March 20 2014 but an extraordinary meeting can be held earlier if needed.</p> <p>JO- Will continue to provide CCC updates.</p>	

MM - Thanked committee for efforts and thanked NM for attending. Thanked AC, AL and JO for all the information provided. Merry Christmas and happy new year.	
--	--

JO - On behalf of AGL wanted to thank the committee for their time and efforts over the last year.	
--	--

Meeting Closed at: 6.55pm

Acronym Index

CCC	Community Consultative Committee
EHIA	Environmental Health Impact Assessment
SEPP	State Environmental Planning Policy
OCSG	Office of Coal Seam Gas
DP&I	Department of Planning and Infrastructure
HSE	Health, Safety and Environment
WHO	World Health Organisation