



Note that minutes are paraphrased to an extent and may not exactly match actual statements. These minutes were ratified by email following distribution in early 2017.

Project	Gloucester Coal Seam Gas Project	From	Michael Ulph
Subject	Community Consultative Committee	Tel	4910 7788
Venue/Date/Time	Thursday 15 December 2016 Bucketts Way Neighbourhood Group 10.00am – 12.00pm	Job No	21/17714
Copies to	All attendees		
Attendees	Jerry Germon [JG] – Community Representative Rod Williams [RW] – Community Representative Nicky Coombes [NC] – The Gloucester Project Karyn Looby [KL] – AGL Community Relations Manager Andrew Adorini [AA] – AGL Operations Superintendent Anna Kaliska [AK] – Mid Coast Water Clr Katheryn Smith [KS] – Mid Coast Council Clr Tony McKenzie [TM]– Dungog Shire Council Ed Robinson [ER] – Lower Waukivory Residents Group Ray Dawes [RD] – Barrington Gloucester Stroud Preservation Alliance Michael Ulph [MU] – GHD (Chair) Alexandra Parker – GHD (Minutes)	Apologies	Clr Karen Hutchinson [KH] – Mid Coast Council
	Observers / Presenters None	Others not present	Paul Minett – Dungog Shire Council Lee McElroy – Port Stephens Council Lisa Schiff – Mid Coast Council Les Seddon [LS] – Port Stephens Council Tony Summers [TS] Stuart Redman [SR]– Gloucester Business Chamber

Notes	Action
Michael Ulph (Chair)	
<i>Welcome and Acknowledgement of Country</i>	
<i>Apologies: Karen Hutchinson</i>	
<i>Meeting commenced at 10:07 am</i>	



Notes	Action
-------	--------

MU: I will call to accept the last minutes from 15 September 2016 as a true and correct record.

Moved: Jerry Germon and seconded: Rod Williams

Meeting agenda

- Welcome, Apologies, Introduction
- Acceptance of last minutes and matters from the previous meeting
- Project update (Andrew Adorini)
- Morning tea break
- Community Engagement update (Karyn Looby)
- General business
- Next meeting & close of formal proceedings
- Lunch

Action items from the last meeting

Action Item: Colin to see if plugged well locations can be included as a mandatory part of land titles?

MU: Colin took over from Evelina who moved on to another job. Basically there is no mechanism through which plugged well location are added to land titles. That is what I got from Colin.

KL: I think Colin has also left that role.

KS: Is this in the CCC's capacity to write to request that entailed to the powers above, to include that?

ER: Do we write to the local council, our council, stating that there is a problem here with 30 odd wells that have disappeared?

AA: They are still on public record.

ER: Yeah, but if they are not going to appear on the Land Title, are the searches going to be done to discover where they are? Probably not.

MU: The Land Title is not just limited to one local council but are more related to a State issue.

KS: I think it's more of a State issue more than our backyard. It's for a better practice down the track. Is that deemed there is a reasonable thing to request they are added to land titles. I don't think it's too absurd.



Notes	Action
-------	--------

TM: You would have to go back to the Land Title office.

ER: I think it is but at the moment we getting the Land Titles office are not going to do anything about it and maybe we need to come in from the local government view point and write to the Land offices and say 'why aren't you doing this?'

MU: Colin White doesn't work for the Land Titles office. But we could approach the Land Titles office. You are suggesting that potentially we should go through council first than get the council to contact them?

ER: Well I think we need to push a little bit harder on the fact that there are 30 odd wells out there that are going to disappear.

KS: I don't think we should limit ourselves to one mechanism. So I am happy to write to the Lands Titles office to be considered at the next review as well as we can put back through Mid-Coast Council and that could get bit more traction maybe through the Mine Related Councils as well as a couple of the ROCs and those type of things.

ER: I wonder if Council need to write to the Lands Title Office saying there is a problem.

KS: They can, but I am just saying let's not limit ourselves to just that way.

AA: Don't limit it to coal seam gas wells, there's coal holes, septic tanks and landfills. There are probably 30,000 coal bores that are around. They are the ones I would be concerned about.

RW: Probably the easiest way to capture that would be to ensure the agency you are targeting has probably flagged that any areas that have been subject to a PEL or mining lease at any point in time. The information is there; it is just trying to link it back.

AA: It goes back to the gold mine holes.

KS: Just because that's the way it was done does not mean that's the way it should be done in the future. [Are] gold mine shafts all documented?
What is the proper term?

AA: Petroleum [Exploration Licence].

ER: We know that the early exploration of coal all that time ago originally was kept 1000 - 1500 odd. They were never documented at all. The last big exploration which was left 4-5 years ago, were 3000 odd holes. They were actually pinpointed by sat nav. Admittedly, those coal holes only went down to maximum of 240-260 metres.

AA: Some a little deeper, we found a lot of the older ones that were drilled 15-20 years ago and we cemented them up ourselves.

ER: Those were never documented.

AA: They were, because we found them. The documentations there, it's just not put into the public domain.



Notes	Action
-------	--------

KS: Lilian Brady is the [Deputy] Chair of Mine Related Councils. Can we write to her to put it on the agenda as well?

TM: Can we also put them on the charter of the mine subsidence board because they keep records?

KS: Lets action.

MU: Would you like to volunteer to write to those entities?

AA: It's wider than this it's a state issue.

MU: It's been highlighted here as a potential concern so perhaps we can provide some value.

JG: We need to write as an organisation and Kathryn needs to write as an individual.

KS: I can follow it up.

JG: There are two different issues.

MU: Shall I draft a letter for circulation, to go to the Land Title office and we would copy that into Council.

KS: Council, Mine Related Council, we can put the State member on it as well. Anyone else want to jump in?

JG: Department of Planning as a resource and the Department of Resources and Energy.

KS: We are just being proactive. I'm quite happy to action that. Does anyone dispute that it should be on the land titles, for all things not just coal seam gas?

no objection

ER: Maybe the coal exploration holes are not quite as significant as the coal seam gas wells.

AA: I think that is completely wrong. Maybe you haven't been paying attention or you just simply don't understand what I have been trying to tell you for the past 18 months. The coal seam gas wells are sealed, plugged and done to a standard. Whereas the coal holes aren't, the opal holes aren't. These are inert now, there is absolutely nothing. They are better than before we came here.

MU: The reason this came up was, the idea of a concrete plug that a farmer could hit when digging a hole, a dam etc. Whereas with the other holes, they are not plugged and there is no concrete but there are risks of falling down one or having an animal falling down one. There are two different levels and perceptions of what the risks are around it.

Action: Michael Ulph to write to Subsidence Advisory, Association of Mining Related Councils, NSW Land Titles Office and NSW Department of Resources and Energy concerning this issue.

Draft to CCC for review in the first instance.



Notes	Action
-------	--------

AA: They are 1.5 metres [below ground level] generally in this area, there is not that much top soil.

KS: That can be disputed. We are not making that determination we're just bringing it up as an issue. I'm sure that will get debated at a high level now.

AA: To keep in mind, one thing to keep in mind, if there is another CCC meeting, AGL people are gone on the 25th January. If there are actions coming out of this meeting.

MU: That is irrelevant to these issues. These are not actions for AGL, they are actions for the regulator and Land Titles Office to get together and work out how they put that onto any title in NSW.

AA: Just making sure that when we write these letters we are not trying to come back to an action.

KS: That's why we address the whole issue because it's not targeted at AGL, it's targeted at the processes.

MU: It's about the process. I think we have an action out of that. Anyone dispute that we should be going forward on that basis?

Action Item: Andrew to provide rehab progress photographs for inclusion in the Meeting Minutes.

Completed

Action Item: Michael to confirm site visit on Wednesday 19 October 10 am.

This occurred

Action Item: AGL to organise transport from AGL office to site.

This occurred

Action Item: Invite local paper to last CCC meeting when confirmed.

I have invited the local paper to this meeting. They will arrive at 11 am to take a photo.

Project Update – Presented by Andrew Adorini

AA: There are no more coal seam gas wells. Surface rehab are completed for Waukivory Pilot, civils are completed for Waukivory Pilot. We have done surface rehab for all the Stratford pilot wells. The civil contractor equipment is now at Craven 6. We haven't started there, and Wards River will be the last surface rehab. Surface rehab is coming along really well. The grass has grown.

The EPA has visited a couple of times. We haven't started beneficial reuse of the water as yet. We had a meeting with the EPA yesterday which seemed very promising. We are currently moving all the sediment out of Tiedman's Dam, an operation by Enviro Pacific.



Notes	Action
-------	--------

RW: Where is that heading?

AA: It's going down to Newcastle.

NC: Have you been granted approval by the EPA to irrigate the remaining water?

AA: Not as yet. But that was mentioned in our meeting with the EPA yesterday and that's where we going but we have to change our EPL. There is an EPL variation and as part of that there are whole lot of other conditions that were to do with the Waukivory pilot and other things that don't actually exist anymore, monitoring gas emissions from the flares – which don't exist. So we had to change our licence and then remove about 15 conditions and adding a condition for irrigation to stay. We haven't got that in writing yet, until we have that in writing from the EPA I can't say we have approval.

JG: When will you finish?

AA: I will finish on 25 January. We will probably have Craven 6 completed by Christmas. We have started at Wards River. So there will just be to finalise the surface rehab at Wards River, the seeding and the natural terrain returned. At Tiedmans, pretty much all equipment is gone. My stuff will be complete by the 25 January and there will just be some civils left and irrigation will continue for a month maybe.

RW: You don't know exactly till you get approval?

AA: Yes. All the conditions with the irrigation will be conducted by landholders. We won't be doing it. After that point will be the 6 months. The water level that's in the dam meet ANZECC guidelines. As the EPA said if it wasn't AGL and it wasn't Gloucester it would be [fine]. It's beneficial.

KS: When all that is complete, when you've met all the conditions of the criteria from all the agencies, how long until you get the bond back?

AA: The bond is on the individual wells and the individual parcels. On each thing they would have a bond, so if Stratford 3 got signed off today, DRE would come in and say yep that's rehabbed, everything is good and we'd get that bond back. We've got individual bonds, there are multiple bonds. It's generally a rule of thumb 6 – 12 months. Once they can see the rehab is complete.

AK: What is the volume of the water in Tiedman's Damn to be irrigated?

AA: It's 30 meg [mega-litres].

NC: Can you explain how in April 2015 the EPA put a stop to the irrigation trial due to heavy metals and salts within the soils?

AA: No. We stopped irrigation.

NC: There is a statement from the EPA that they had been part of that as well. You have called it successful and they have said no, they weren't happy.



Notes

Action

AA: That's different to the information I have and the discussion we had with the EPA yesterday.

NC: If there are heavy metals and salts within the water, and the water is being quite diluted by the rain and then you condition it to balance the PH, how does that remove the heavy metals and salts that were originally in the water anyway?

AA: You have seen our water quality analysis. The heavy metals and salts compared to the ANZECC guidelines, are at a factor of a thousand below the limits. There is going to be metals and salts in everything. Do you remove heavy metals and salts when you condition water or dilute it? No. Heavy metals and salts are in everything, it is the quantity compared to the volumes. You add more water, you are not removing it, but our water meets the guidelines.

With that irrigation trial, it was ceased because it was a trial to see whether it was a viable option to dispose of the water if the project went ahead. It wasn't going to be a viable option because of the rigmarole around the monitoring. It was cheaper option for us to put an RO [reverse osmosis] plant in. That's why we stopped, this is not going to be an ongoing prospect so we stopped the irrigation trial. Unfortunately, when we ceased the irrigation trial we also ceased that licence to irrigate. Which is why we ended up with that water sitting there, we couldn't do anything with because we took our licence away to do anything with that water because we were going to send it to the CPF (Central Processing Facility) and that never went ahead.

ER: There are 30 mega-litres of water left. You are saying that AGL is not going to irrigate, the landholders are going to irrigate it, who owns the block?

AA: AGL owns the block, the landholder is the Bignell's that lease it at the moment. And has been since before I was here, before we came around and before Lucas came around. You can't say that they don't have a vested interest in that land.

ER: I am more concerned about the irrigation licence actually belongs to AGL because you own that land.

AA: The water that is there isn't [associated with] the water licence from the river, its run off, from catch dams, in a turkey's nest [dam]. I don't know how to answer that.

ER: To me that would appear to be industrial water under your licence etc. It is not called irrigation water it is industrial water.

AA: Under our licence it is licenced for irrigation stock use and beneficial reuse. And the licence is getting renewed and that will never be the same title. Remember that the water is run off water and rain water, with the only thing that it could to tie back to any coal seam gas water - which is good water anyhow - is that we have one mega-litre left of the blended water that we were irrigating with two years ago. That's one meg we've had, it rained and the rain water run off added another fourteen mega-litres.

ER: So you are still just waiting for the approval to come through from the EPA to irrigate this water.



Notes	Action
<p>AA: Correct. We won't just be irrigating, it will be used for stock drinking as well and its beneficial reuse as per the Produced Water Management Plan. Which was presented a couple of times.</p>	
<p>RW: It is essentially surface water, it is not stream water, it is not ground water.</p>	
<p>AA: Some of water in that east dam, which was the original irrigation water there'd be about 3 mega-litres of original river water. People are begging for this water, it meets ANZECC guidelines.</p>	
<p>RW: It's a pity. I have a house in the bush, you could have dumped that and I wouldn't have cared what was in it. So what is going to be the likely use of that water?</p>	
<p>AA: Normally we would use some to stock up dams on the property, but the bulk would be for irrigation.</p>	
<p>JG: Can you set up for cattle drinking spots.</p>	
<p>AA: He is bringing cattle down from the hills at the moment but it is not good timing.</p>	
<p>RW: It's pretty dry.</p>	
<p>AK: What sort of conditions would you expect EPA to put on the licence? Volume or concentration, or other things?</p>	
<p>AA: I'm speculating but what I would assume is they would say a maximum of one mega-litre a day, zero run off and then they will come and test the soils after and the water meets ANZECC guidelines. That's what I would say, zero run off, one meg a day in irrigation.</p>	
<p>AK: And the area?</p>	
<p>AA: It's the 1 B area which is in the public domain which is not the area where we were irrigating with the big irrigator, which is unfortunate. We are not using the big irrigator. We are using the travelling helicopter irrigator and probably get another one. One meg a day is not a lot.</p>	
<p>RD: What happens when it rains heavily next week?</p>	
<p>AA: Don't irrigate.</p>	
<p>MU: If you have a dam with water in it and it's capturing water from the run off and you have a rainfall event that tops that up, do you have to keep going in perpetuity until you empty the dams?</p>	
<p>AA: They are turkey's nest dams. The rain water runoff is not in those dams. We would pump off the original irrigation we had catch dams that would pump that water off the original irrigation.</p>	
<p>MU: OK so it's not an issue? Once it's gone it's gone.</p>	



Notes	Action
-------	--------

AA: Yes. that's all. That irrigation run off was because we hadn't irrigated for 2.5 years. It's been off the licence for about 4 months so basically it doesn't exist anymore.

NC: So sludge is going to the Newcastle tip?

AA: The sediment? Yes. It's getting treated by Enviro Pacific. Going to a Newcastle tip. They went into the dam, it rained, we drained the dams and it was dry on the bottom. It rained then moisten up the sediment again, the had an inert polymer that just sucks it in again and it turns into a claggy mess and we also added sawdust to it. Excavated it out of the dam, loaded it into a standby area, put it into trucks and sent it to the tip.

NC: So that's gone is it?

AA: No. it's in the process. That should be gone, it is weather dependant. It's a Newcastle tip, might be on Kooragang. Remember Enviro Pacific this is their core business, it's what they do. They find this quite funny that they are going to this extreme because there is nothing wrong with it, but they use standard processes.

RW: Realistically the timeframe to put that land back to the market is a long way off in reality?

AA: It all depends. For instance, Stratford 7 is up on the hill so on the eastern side past Merridong, it had bad soil, so it is not coming back as well. And could we go there and cover in manure? Yes, but then we will have a square of a really nice bit of land. We will try to return it as is and that can take a bit longer it could take up to a year. That is still part of our licence. I'd talk to Toni.

NC: When is it proposed that land will be up for sale?

AA: As soon as we get our licence back. Which could be a year.

Community engagement update – Presented by Karyn Looby

KL: In regard to the Community Engagement update, it is the Community Legacy Fund with a community panel. Jerry sits on the panel so Jerry will provide an update on that.

JG: We have had our first round of funding which created fifty-one jobs. Most of the applicants were local people. There was one company from Sydney called Woven Image which makes acoustic covers for walls and setting up office space. Four jobs were created with the day-care centre and the others were with Level Tech, Drifter, and Jason Collins.

The second round of funding was opened at the end of October. The applicants have been approved to go forward. The third round will open in January. To date we have spent less than 1 million dollars. Creating fifty-one jobs with less than 1 million dollars is a very good outcome.

KL: When will the jobs start?



Notes	Action
<p>JG: Jason Collins has already put on at least four people. He runs his own logging company and commercial timber. He converted some part time people into full time positions and hired some new people.</p>	
<p>Level Tech has started putting on people, they import parts from Germany and distribute, they are an ongoing distributor and make a lot of parts particularly for mining. They are putting on storeman to ensure their product goes out regularly and they have good documentation.</p>	
<p>KS: They've got new machinery too.</p>	
<p>JG: Drifter are currently asking for apprentices. All starting to put things in place. Drifter makes camping trailers. They are serving into America now.</p>	
<p>KL: Level Tech has an international reach too, and is putting on new apprentices.</p>	
<p>JG: Woven Images are looking at moving in the new year. They are in the process of having a power extension put in the building they bought, because they need a lot more power. They deal in partitions for offices and that sort of thing. They sell internationally as well.</p>	
<p>TM: The fifty-one jobs, how long are these guaranteed for?</p>	
<p>JG: They will continue on at Drifter, their aim is to grow in the next few years from 60 to 90.</p>	
<p>TM: What about the other companies?</p>	
<p>JG: Level Tech is looking to increase their numbers. The preschool will maintain, as they have the required number of students next year to maintain that. Woven Image, there is a chance they will move another part of their business to Gloucester as well, depending on how the first part goes. They find it is just as easy to get parts here as in Sydney or Newcastle.</p>	
<p>KS: In the presentation it showed they have a very successful and established business in Sydney, they are looking for relocation without the Sydney overheads.</p>	
<p>RW: Interesting things between the applicants, besides the preschool, four of the applicant's export to some degree.</p>	
<p>NC: Do you not think Advance Gloucester's involvement in the Legacy Fund actually politicises these funds?</p>	
<p>RW: How do you justify that?</p>	
<p>NC: Because Advance Gloucester are seen as a pro-mining lobby group.</p>	
<p>KL: You are talking about when the group presented at Advance Gloucester. That was an initiative of the Business Chamber and Advance Gloucester. I understood the Business Chamber and Advance Gloucester invited through the panel for that to happen, it was not just Advance Gloucester.</p>	



Notes	Action
-------	--------

NC: I see that Business Chamber was involved in that, I think as a balance within the community and to restore some faith in the Chamber and keep them as a neutral group. Perhaps it would be best if the next round is presented by the Business Chamber alone.

RW: That's your opinion but Advance Gloucester approached the Chamber and they agreed to it.

NC: I will approach Stuart about it. I am sure you see Groundswell Gloucester as political in same way we see Advance Gloucester as political.

JG: Advance Gloucester's charter is to promote business and growth for Gloucester.

NC: But that's the role of the Business Chamber, they have been doing that for 89 years, so why not let the Chamber perform its role.

JG: Most of Advance Gloucester are in the farming community rather than industrial type businesses.

NC: You have stated yourself Mr Williams in your first interview about Advance Gloucester that you understand that you don't represent the whole community. Whereas the Business Chamber tries to represent the whole community and the community actually holds them accountable.

RW: I don't think you can say one group can represent the entire community.

NC: We don't hold you accountable for what you do.

RW: The main reason we started was out of frustration that the town was being pulled apart and nothing was happening. We were very conscious that regardless if AGL went ahead or regardless if they didn't. We said early on, just in case things don't pan out, a major project exiting a community, which wasn't invited to in the first place, coal mine, gas whatever. Potentially, if they were to exit, the same thing happened in Dungog.

The exit can be more detrimental to the town than if it had gone ahead. We talked a long time ago that if it does fall over be conscious that we need to ensure we benefit. At the end of the day AGL have been here 10 years, we wanted to ensure the community could get something out of it and jobs were the number one priority. We didn't care what the jobs were, we wanted to stimulate jobs outside of that business that turned us upside down and inside out. That is how the legacy fund came. We weren't the only ones to help make it happen luckily AGL were very open minded and conducive to having the chat. I remember the morning I got the call to say they were pulling out and had put 2 million dollars on the table and the rest is history.

NC: Why not leave it to the Business Chamber to promote that?

RW: What's the difference?

NC: So it can be seen as being neutral. Do you want political gain is that what it is?



Notes	Action
<p>TM: I have never seen a neutral Business Chamber in my life. We have just been told they have put out fifty-one jobs for less than 1 million. Why change it? It is working?</p>	
<p>NC: It is working.</p>	
<p>TM: You want to pull them out of it. The Chamber could have stood up but they didn't. If they are too lazy to get up and this organisation did so be it.</p>	
<p>RW: A point of difference between us and the Chamber is that we are a regional group, we are not just tied to Gloucester, but also Great Lakes, and Dungog, we are regional, that is a point of difference. If we potentially had more interest, there is nothing to stop the Chamber doing that.</p>	
<p>KS: If Gloucester hadn't amalgamated we would have asked for a presentation to happen at the Chamber to us. Do you want a presentation at one of the Groundswell meetings, is that issue?</p>	
<p>NC: I see Advance Gloucester as a lobby group. I see that it taints a good thing that AGL are doing for our community. It would be the same if Groundswell got up and said we are doing this with AGL aren't we great, you would be upset.</p>	
<p>AA: Why hasn't Groundswell got up and said that?</p>	
<p>NC: It is best that the Legacy Fund be not politically motivated. This comes down to the event. Why can't the Business Chamber lay claim to that to restore some of their image? Why are you taking it upon yourself to write that article?</p>	
<p>TM: Does Business Chamber want to write that article?</p>	
<p>KL: They may need some support to help them with their promotion and marketing material. They are always looking for new members so maybe that's the angle.</p>	
<p>RW: Everyone is doing a good thing.</p>	
<p>NC: I think it is amazing what the Legacy Fund is doing.</p>	
<p>MU: I will just mention, that on Rods comment about it being regional. It is called Advance Gloucester, so this is an emphasis on Gloucester.</p>	
<p>I take the point that back in the day Advance Gloucester was seen as an opponent to Groundswell Gloucester. They want development in Gloucester and they don't care where it comes from and Groundswell was anti-extractive industry.</p>	
<p>ER: We were for sustainable development, which excludes a little extractive industry.</p>	
<p>RD: It is hard when you see Advance Gloucester was AGL's preferred cheer squad.</p>	
<p>KL: Advance Gloucester was never AGL's preferred cheer squad.</p>	
<p>RD: There was a very strong wedge and a member of the CCC was behind that wedge.</p>	



Notes	Action
<p>During the project, the CCC were not invited to the project area. With discussions with what was actually happening and what AGL or Haliburton was actually monitoring.</p>	
<p>Haliburton engaged a company called Pinnacle Frac Hite. Pinnacle Frac Hite to quantify micro-seismic activity in that area. The Gloucester basin is extremely complex, a lot of horizontal stresses, a lot of fracturing, a lot of compartmentalisation. They are the issues that I would have liked to discuss with geophysicists during the project.</p>	
<p>What I would have liked to have had is some feedback about what AGL were actually doing. We had a bus load of people going in and they weren't really technically able to understand what was happening or ask questions.</p>	
<p>MU: You are saying it could have been better and more inclusive?</p>	
<p>RD: I know exactly what they were trying to do. One of the pathways, for example, with faults, they showed that the micro faults were relatively benign. However, compartmentalisation was a really big issue for this project to succeed financially and I suspect that is what finally brought it down.</p>	
<p>It would have been interesting to talk to the geophysicist about issues like that and that would help my understanding and that goes back to people who are very frightened and concerned about possible migration during vertical fracking. There were vertical cracks as well as horizontal cracks. As a result of that there was also cracking and movement along the area between the overburden and the coal seam. That then leads a pathway towards the surface. Some of the coal seam actually recharged from the river.</p>	
<p>It is a very complex problem. It would have been nice at that stage and that would have taken a little bit of the heat off, but I gathered that that was AGL's attitude. My comments don't reflect on you *Ray gestured to Andrew* so I apologise if it was taken that way but there were elements within AGL. I saw a busload of people going in who really didn't want to scrutinise the project in any way. I agree with some of Nicky's comments that it would be best if Business Chamber were responsible for it, but I agree with Tony that they probably won't do anything.</p>	
<p>MU: There is a few different points there. I'd say that with any CCC situation if the community members come from and represent the wider community, there is a likelihood that a level of scientific understanding wouldn't really be there, to look at some of the stuff that you have. You have been in a unique position in some respects across CCC's across large projects.</p>	
<p>RD: There are some smart people in the community. This basin is so damn complex.</p>	
<p>MU: Going forward, in terms of how consultation is done and CCC's are run in trying to improve the engagement process for AGL and others, would you suggest that people who are technically minded or technically interested have an opportunity to delve further into the science?</p>	



Notes	Action
<p>RD: I understand confidentiality. I am very disappointed that AGL didn't trust me to talk to their doctors. I am hoping Andrew will take this back.</p>	
<p>RW: The new guidelines for CCC's would possibly open that up.</p>	
<p>RD: It's a real problem across CCC's. They don't like people like me [interested in the science].</p>	
<p>ER: I don't think new guidelines have been ratified yet. They don't apply.</p>	
<p>RW: No, but there are opportunities.</p>	
<p>MU: It is an interesting profession, if you like, to consider how to interact between a project and a community. It has only been around for about 10 years or so that idea of engaging with the community and sharing in that open transparent way.</p>	
<p>ER: Hasn't Stratford CCC been going since day dot?</p>	
<p>RW: This has been pretty much voluntary. The proponent has not been obliged to have us.</p>	
<p>MU: That is correct. Lucas started up the CCC 8 years ago and did it on a voluntary basis, so it wasn't captured under those guidelines.</p>	
<p>JG: Can I make a comment to that. I don't know if Nicky was having a go at me because I am on the Legacy Committee but the Legacy Committee is made up of the community reps, James Hooke, Stuart Redman the president of the Chamber, and myself. As far as I am concerned I am representing the whole community and I believe James would think the same way and so would Stuart.</p>	
<p>NC: You are down as representing Advance Gloucester.</p>	
<p>JG: No, I am not.</p>	
<p>NC: I looked at it yesterday and you are written down as Advance Gloucester. The other thing with the Business Chamber, I have always found the Business Chamber approachable and respectful. I have high respect for Stuart Redman, I think he is a really great guy. If I ever have an issue I am comfortable enough to ring him up and relay that issue and he is respectful to my option. I'd just like to see the Legacy Fund with no politics at all and perhaps you can help Business Chamber promote that in a more productive way.</p>	
<p>JG: So you are saying that I am not trustworthy or approachable?</p>	
<p>NC: I am not saying that. Groundswell Gloucester, like Advance Gloucester has a stigma to it within the community, the Legacy Fund is a really good thing that is happening in our community and I think it should be kept as neutral as possible.</p>	
<p>JG: I am not there representing Advance Gloucester.</p>	
<p>NC: You need to have that changed on the internet.</p>	



Notes

Action

JG: If you had seen the letters I provided for me to go on that committee, there are a lot of other organisations in Gloucester that support me other than Advance Gloucester, they just happen to be one of them.

MU: Ok, thank you both. Is there anything else in relation to the community engagement report?

General Business

MU: I think it has been really good that we have had robust discussion. I am pleased that we have been able to maintain a level of professionalism. Thank you everyone.

ER: My question is what are we doing with this meeting going forward?

MU: The vibe was that the project is pretty much complete and that AGL have left town in terms of this project.

AA: My last day is the 25th January.

ER: Who is left after you leave?

AA: It is uncertain to know who is left. Toni Laurie could stay around but she is yet to accept an extension but that is her decision.

MU: What is the unfinished businesses post 2016?

AA: Just waiting for the sign off from the department. There is no oil and gas operation anymore. When DRE came in and inspected that was the end.

TM: Once they sign off that is it?

AA: Once they sign off we can relinquish the PEL. Once we relinquish the PEL we can sell off the land.

TM: Once they sign off, that could be forwarded to us and that is it?

AA: Simplistically all the Department has to do now is come, look at the properties. I'll do a comparison to the Hunter, we were there, there are still blocks in the Hunter that haven't quite germinated to the point where we have said that is good enough to inspect so we have a land and approvals manager in Camden who travels there once every six months, he has a look and says 'yeah, that's good enough'. There will be zero AGL work here if Toni doesn't stay. If Toni does stay, she will not be in the office she will be working from home on the farm.

RD: There is an ongoing problem with what is going to happen with the licence. I'd like to see the CCC and AGL suggest to the Government that it be quarantined and no further licences issued over the valley for gas. Mainly to protect the companies, as you would have someone silly enough to buy it.



Notes	Action
-------	--------

MU: That is probably out of our scope I think, to be honest.

RD: Can we recommend it as a group? If it were backed up by a recommendation by AGL? That would go a great way to healing some of the problems that have been created.

AA: I personally couldn't recommend that morally or from an environmental point of view. You are going to have coal mines. Those coal mines will be accessing the same coal seams. Those coal seams are producing gas, that gas is just going straight into the atmosphere. If you say you can't use that gas for beneficial use you are being very detrimental to the environment. You have to think big picture.

NC: There is a mine in Bulga isn't there?

AA: All underground coal mines either flare or produce energy for themselves. At the moment and if you mandate something like that you are never going to be able to do anything with that gas.

At Camden, once we go out the coal mines will go forward. They are 100% self-sufficient but anything north of that, we could send out the gas and put into houses but they are not allowed to because they are a ML, which is a mining lease.

You look at Bulga and Xstrata, one side of the road they are flaring gas, those wells where they are flaring gas are being vertically drilled and fracked. The same company is drilling for them as they were for us. They are on one side of the road next to a vineyard, we are on the other side of the road and have to be 2km away from the vineyard. We are using exactly the same technology and methods. They can't put it into a pipeline and send it to houses. We are looking to be importing gas into the State via LNG because of this stupidity.

NC: So with the mines in Bulga that are using that gas, they can't put it into the pipelines because they don't have a Production Licence?

AA: Yes, because they have a Mining Licence. It is an extractive industry. The bi-product of the mining is gas production; they can use that gas to generate energy [on site only] but they can't sell the actual gas because they don't have a petroleum licence. At the moment there is problems with the overlapping of those licences.

RD: I understand. I was looking at as one small step in trying to quarantine this Valley. A lot of people think this Avon Flat is rubbish country but in the scientific community consensus on present changes in our climate, it is predicted that the Gloucester region will be essentially quarantined by and large to a lot of the adverse effects. My suggestion was just one small step.

AA: I think you have missed the boat trying to stop the coal mines. As soon as that coal price started to come up two months ago, it's a lost battle. But I'd be careful. I personally would not agree with that. CSG is not an extractive industry it is not a detrimental industry to the environment, and once you go through the science I think you will come to the same conclusion. But AGL is a different company now, we are a retailer, we just buy and sell.



Notes	Action
<p>ER: We will agree to disagree. I just need to be assured that everything is signed off, whether that is done electronically or whether we have another meeting even six months down the track, to say it is finished so we can be assured there is no loose ends.</p>	
<p>KL: It is fine either way, we can provide information. There is still going to be a community engagement person for our CSG assets and projects. But we can keep you up to date and can always continue to do that, electronically.</p>	
<p>ER: I assume when the Exploration Licence goes back to the state, it is done.</p>	
<p>KL: The other piece of work that has to be completed 30 days after giving back the PEL is a Community Consultation report. So there is still work to be delivered on, still work to do, and we can continue to share that.</p>	
<p>TM: I think if you get it electronically and it is verified, I think if we finish off electronically, perhaps a lot of people can get back to their core lifestyles, doing something else. I am of the opinion that once it is done, we shut the door, we don't keep dragging it up. If the groups are satisfied that AGL will put out copies of everything that is not commercial in confidence, then that is that.</p>	
<p>MU: As a formality with these minutes, we would need the minutes verified by the group that they are true and correct. Handing the PEL back could be this time next year. Would everyone be ok if we do not meet again face to face and got through the process to get the minutes online, and I as the chair would let you know final details, which may be on an ad hoc basis.</p>	
<p>AK: It would be good to know when the irrigation is finished. EPA licence we can see online and all the reports are public but only after a year.</p>	
<p>TM: That report can be sent electronically?</p>	
<p>MU: Yes.</p>	
<p>ER: We need to make sure we are not spending our life searching through Department documents trying to find all these things. What we need is when it is finished and signed off, done, get the milestones of the process sent to us.</p>	
<p>MU: On that then, are we able to get a list of the various items and milestones and I will distribute to the CCC and if anything is missing that you would like to know then bounce back to me. We will get that in a formal shape. Is that doable?</p>	
<p>KS: In a table format, with the list, date and relevant links to documentation.</p>	
<p>KL: Yes.</p>	
<p>ER: I think the irrigation trial, the PEL, maybe when the properties come out for sale etc. There is a lot of people that are very interested in the property sale. I understand they are all coming up for sale at once, as a bulk lot, which seems surprising to me.</p>	<p>Action: AGL to facilitate development of a table of items that are required to be finalised prior to formal 'closure' of the Gloucester Gas Project, such as the handing back of the PEL, finalisation of the irrigation, remediation of land, and sign off by all relevant authorities. Also when the AGL owned properties come up for sale. Michael Ulph to distribute the table to the CCC and then communicate when each item is finalised.</p>



Notes	Action
<p>TM: We questioned Hunter Water on that, whether they would do a bulk lot and flood the market or do a gradual sell off, I think they went to gradual.</p>	
<p>ER: I'd have thought you'd make more money over a gradual period.</p>	
<p>TM: We talked Hunter Water into doing that so as not to flood the market.</p>	
<p>AA: I don't think AGL is concerned about the money.</p>	
<p>ER: There is only four properties down there?</p>	
<p>AA: There is the CPF [Central Processing Facility], Tiedmans, Avondale, Merridong and Pontilands there are five.</p>	
<p>KS: Any chance of using the proceeds from the sale to top up the Legacy Fund?</p>	
<p>NC: Any chance that Nigel [Bean] would consider a micro-grid system for Gloucester?</p>	
<p>KL: Email through the request.</p>	
<p>AA: That would be a good request for a Legacy Fund. If you don't put the applications in you won't get the money.</p>	
<p>MU: Can we confirm that there will be no more formal meetings and electronic signoff and 'accounting' of the final documentation. Is everyone OK with that?</p>	
<p><i>*no objection*</i></p>	
<p>RD: Just in reference to a document I would like to ease my confusion about what is a flaw, what is a recommendation and what is a challenge. Professor Pels, for example, said there were flaws, so did Doctor Evans in private conversations. SKM made twenty-four flaws, recommendations or challenges and this is the whole reason for that project. I know I have been harping at it but I would like to see a document addressing every one of them, and some of them have been addressed by this document. If I had that earlier on. I will table this document. it is very technical but the data is summarised in terms of fracking.</p>	
<p>AA: It is a report on the micro-seismic from Waukivory 13.</p>	
<p><i>*tabled report, appended to the minutes*</i></p>	
<p>AA: I am pretty sure that document was previously presented on at the CCC.</p>	
<p>RD: I think if we have a separate document that addresses those to show that all the issues were addressed.</p>	
<p>KL: We wouldn't get approval to close if we didn't address that.</p>	
<p>MU: So the recommendations, some of them were things that the independent peer reviewer said you should do, some were implemented, some maybe not, is that what</p>	



Notes	Action
<p>you are saying. Is there a case where, because the project didn't proceed, that some of those things are not relevant, because they were reliant on a project that proceeded? Is that correct?</p>	
<p>RD: I think you might be right.</p>	
<p>AA: Would you like to go through them now?</p>	
<p>RD: Things like 'the conceptual model should account for major structural changes related to the faults'. Evans discussed the need to have your bores very close together for monitoring so you could discount things unrelated to the fracking process.</p>	
<p>To my mind, the way the project was set up it was designed to fail. To me the monitoring was too far away. I'd like to have evidence to be able to discuss that.</p>	
<p>MU: The monitoring was set up to monitor groundwater during the project. The project didn't go ahead. So is that irrelevant if you are not doing the project?</p>	
<p>AA: The water bores at Buckets Way, they are nowhere near Waukivory. That water monitoring was for the whole project and the project didn't go ahead.</p>	
<p>AK: Waukivory Pilot was supposed to address some of these. The Waukivory was set up specially to address and check on the fractures, it was completed, but after it was completed there was a decision that it was not going ahead. I'm not sure that AGL have to do the analysis if they are not progressing.</p>	
<p>RD: It is predominantly for selfish reasons, for my own interest. I would like to know more and it might help me understand.</p>	
<p>MU: I will note it as a request from you to AGL. But that's probably all we can do, it is up to AGL.</p>	
<p>TM: Are you happy with dot point answers?</p>	
<p>AA: I'd say to send it through to Craig Middleton, but he has changed positions. Send it through to the general information page and they will chase it up.</p>	
<p>RW: How many do you think are outstanding of the 24?</p>	
<p>RD: I don't know. The compartmentalisation, the mobility along the fault planes, it's very unlikely. There is probability of fluids along some of the fault planes.</p>	
<p>AA: We were struggling to get the water back. There wasn't mobility of water.</p>	
<p>RD: There was only 9, there is disagreement between various people. Could fracture 19 times maybe. Pels is of the opinion of 15. If you are fracturing that large number of closely spaced seams and you are getting degrees of vertical fracturing, then it's going to increase the probability.</p>	
<p>AA: That report shows the strength of the coal is factors different to what was expected. As we predicted we weren't getting vertical integration. I can't see AGL for</p>	



Notes	Action
-------	--------

your general interest, doing another report. We can provide everything we have and it is probably all online anyway but I don't think we will do a paper.

RD: I am not looking for a technical paper, just a bit more information about what was done and maybe what couldn't be done.

MU: If you want to send it through, I will share it with Karyn and we will see how AGL responds.

**Ray expressed appreciation to Andrew, Roy, James from AGL for open and transparent way they presented AGL operations and findings during their involvement in the CCC*.*

KS: What is happening at Tomago with the gas storage facility?

AA: It is still going. During summer months it sucks in gas, fills up the thermos, and in the winter months it dumps it out. As we experienced last year, and it is going to get worse this year and the next, this is where AGL makes the money because there is not enough gas coming into the state. Gas companies have contracts with hospitals, businesses etc, they have to supply that gas, when they can't get the molecules of gas out we have a big thermos full of gas and we send that on.

KS: I wasn't sure of the viability of it without this project.

Around the room thanks from committee members to AGL and each other, thanks from the CCC to Michael for his time and efforts as CCC Chair, thanks from Karyn on behalf of AGL to the CCC for ongoing involvement and interest in the project.

Merry Christmas and best wishes to all CCC members.

Next meeting

It was mutually agreed by the CCC that this, being the 46th CCC meeting, held on the 15 December 2016 would be the final formal CCC meeting. Any future correspondence will be managed electronically by the Chair.

Meeting closed at 12:12 pm

Michael Ulph

GHD – Stakeholder Engagement



ACTION ITEMS	
Action	Responsibility
Michael to draft and circulate letter to CCC members, letter addressed to Subsidence Advisory, Association of Mining Related Councils, NSW Land Titles Office and NSW Department of Resources and Energy, on behalf of the CCC, tabling the issue of plugged and abandoned wells on title searches. Letter to be CC'd to Mid-Coast Council Interim GM. Kathryn Smith to draft similar letter as an individual.	Michael Ulph Kathryn Smith
AGL to facilitate development of a table of items that are required to be finalised prior to formal 'closure' of the Gloucester Gas Project, such as the handing back of the PEL, finalisation of the irrigation, remediation of land, and sign off by all relevant authorities. Also when the AGL owned properties come up for sale. Michael Ulph to distribute the table to the CCC and then communicate when each item is finalised.	AGL Michael Ulph
Thursday 15 December 2016 will be the last formal CCC meeting. CCC to be kept informed of all project milestones electronically through the Chair.	AGL Michael Ulph