

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

MEETING NO.36

Held in the RPGP Conference Room, Menangle on 27 June 2013 at 5.30pm

MINUTES

Member / Guest	Attendance Type
Mrs Margaret MacDonald-Hill (MM) Chair	Present
Mr Brad Staggs (BS)	Apologies
Mrs Diane Gordon (DG)	Apologies
Mr Fred Anderson (FA)	Apologies
Ms Jacqui Kirkby (JK)	Present
Mr Michael Hingley (MH)	Present
Mr Peter Bloem (PB)	Present
Mr Simon Hennings (SH)	Present
Mr Troy Platten (TP)	Present
Mr Paul Reynolds (PR)	Apologies
Cr Lou Amato (LA)	Apologies
Cr Lara Symkowiak (LS)	Apologies
Ms N Magurren	Present (Arrived 6.30pm)
Mr Aaron Clifton (AC)	Present
Ms Jenny O'Brien (JO)	Present
Mr Adam Lollback (AL)	Present
Mr Mike Moraza (MZ)	Present (via video con)
Ms Michala Lander (ML)	Present
Mr Andrew Spooner (AS)	Present
Ms Lisa Andrews	Observer

Meeting Opened at:5:30 pm

ITEM	ACTION
<p>1.0 Welcome</p> <p>Welcome and Introductions by Chair – MM.</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. She is also a Member of the Mine Subsidence Board and the Minister's Arbitration Panel.</p>	
<p>2.0 Apologies</p> <p>As above.</p>	
<p>3.0 Confirmation of Previous Minutes</p> <p>Corrections</p> <p>Pg 3 – after MZ the following comment from AS should be inserted <i>"We first need to obtain a more detailed understanding of the regulatory</i></p>	

<p><i>action by the EPA including the monetary value of the enforceable action prior to the Committee considering proposals. It is also unlikely that agreement will be reached between the three councils.</i>”</p> <p>Pg 3 – Insert after PB, JK objected to EU as an appropriate regulated response and queried why the EPA was not prosecuting AGL for its breach.</p> <p>Pg 3 – JK agreed with the Chair that the selection of the proposals was not the role of the CCC.</p> <p>Pg 7 – comments attributed from PB not correct. Name not to be attributed. Use the words ‘committee’ in place of name attribution.</p> <p>Pg 7 – JK corrected the attributed comment. It should state <i>“the issue is that there is no evidence to substantiate the claims made by AGL at Camden. Any accountability has to be through the science and not the perceptions.”</i>Reference should be made to Gavin Mudd at Monash Uni</p> <p>Moved: Jacqui Kirkby Seconded:Andrew Spooner</p>	
<p>4.0 Business Arising</p> <p>JK – Clarification on status of both production and exploration wells</p> <p>Map issued on 17 April 2013 did not include the exploration wells. JK queried whether pipelines should be included. A breakdown of the public vs private land was also requested.</p> <p>AL – confirmed that pipelines on the same land as the wells.</p> <p>JK – requested an email confirming this to clarify that this would include the pipelines.</p> <p>PB – update on Enforceable Undertaking. EPA has received a proposal from AGL regarding the final EU to address the conduct that EPA were concerned about. EPA yet to provide a response. No agreement has been made on the EU and any agreement would have to be approved by the Chief Regulator.</p> <p>AS – AGL to verify that MP25 recently flooded</p> <p>AC – confirmed that MP 25well did flood this week due to recent high rainfall. The location of the well is subject to flooding during periods of high rainfall. There is no evidence of damage to the well. Camden project staff were present throughout the day to monitor the well site. There was an officer from the EPA present today to view the well site. Following previous floods when land was rehabilitated the water tanks were moved to higher ground to reduce the impact of flood. The well has been rehabilitated to fit in with the surrounding landform.</p>	<p>AL to issue an email clarifying that pipelines located on the same land as the wells.</p>

<p>TP - Queried the aesthetic of raised tanks</p> <p>AC – Photos of raised tanks can be provided. The objective is to minimise the number and size of tanks on site. The majority are 10,000 litres and green or grey in colour to blend in with surrounding environment. There is a fleet of 15 mobile tanks which each have capacity of 75,000 litres. Tanks at the MP 25 site are raised on an earth pad, not on stilts.</p> <p>PB – Queried the status on Tree Planting.</p> <p>AC –Tree planting has been postponed due to inclement weather.</p> <p>MM – Question raised by BS in previous meeting about Flood response team.</p> <p>AC – copy of Flood Management Procedure was issued to BS.</p> <p>JK – Requested that Flood Management Procedure be issued to CCC.</p> <p>AC – A copy will be distributed once personal phone numbers have been removed.</p> <p>MM – email address of JL distributed in last minutes.</p>	<p>JO to provide a photo of a typical agricultural tank at a well site</p> <p>AC to issue Flood Management Procedure to CCC.</p>
<p>5.0 Correspondence</p> <p><u>OUT</u> None</p> <p><u>IN</u></p> <p>In - all members email 25/3/13 - AGL - EPA March media release and contact details for Jock Laurie emails 4 & 5/4/13 - AGL on EU email 17/4/13 - AGL - status of production wells & private/public land, Camden Open Day & Wollondilly forum email 23/4/13 - AGL update on air & water monitoring programs email 6/6/13 - AGL media statement on air monitoring at Camden email 24/6/13 - AGL advising of Camden Open day for 18/7/13</p>	
<p>6.0 AGL Update</p> <p><u>AL – Recent Developments</u> AL gave a powerpoint presentation on recent developments in relation to land and approvals and a well summary.</p> <p>Review of legislation waiting for release of Mining SEPP.</p> <p>JK – any ETA on when Mining SEPP will be released?</p>	

MM – contacted DPI was told it is imminent but has been delayed. All dates suggested have passed.

AL – EPBC amendment for new water trigger. This is now required for any CSG developments.

Water monitoring

JK – Why are there four monitors at Denham Court? Where is the extra one located and what role do these monitoring bores play in stage 2 now that Stage 3 is not going ahead?

AL – Located at the back of the site, they are installed at varying depths in the Hawksbury Sandstone which includes a shallow monitor. Installed to reflect the shallow water in regards to the Cumberland Plain.

JK – The four monitors at Harness Racing, are they for Stage 2? And when were they installed? Are they all in a similar location?

AL – Confirmed they are at Menangle Park 25. Installed 2 weeks ago.

JK – Has any data been collected?

JO – No data as yet, however as part of the consultation for the continuous emissions monitoring and expanded ground water monitoring program we will bring the group back to share the results..

JO – Community update

JO gave a powerpoint presentation containing the Community Update.

Energy for life program

TP – Mental health is a significant issue in the community. Will AGL do anything about mental health in the area?

JO – AGL is currently investigating social issues in the community, there are lots of areas in the community where we could contribute.

AC – Operations and HSE Update

AC gave a powerpoint presentation containing the Operations and HSE Update.

JK – Queried which were the exploration wells?

AC– 3 wells that were drilled in Badgerys Creek, Cecil Park and Elderslie. They fall outside of the Camden North project.

TB – Queried how often suspended wells are monitored.

AC- The AGL Production team monitors suspended wells every month to measure well pressure. If they reveal a build up of pressure then further investigations are undertaken. Sometimes as a result suspended wells are brought back into production.

TP – Queried if wells could get suspended as a result of pressure from the community.

AC – There has been no community pressure to suspend a well.

JK – Queried if refracking is required to bring a well back into production.

AC – Refracking is not required. It would be a case of removing blockages and clearing out the well. They could be dewatered.

AC - HSE Update

AC – Revised Environment Protection License issued by EPA in May and this is on Camden Microsite. www.agk.com.au/camden. Site has a lot of information including quarterly ground water monitoring. New license condition required quarterly ground water monitoring at designated wells (8 additional monitoring points) these report will be put on website.

AC - Fugitive emissions monitoring – now commenced program across 25 locations for 3 months, currently in week 8, the report once completed will be given to CSIRO for review. The results will be shared with the CCC and the consultation group that has been formed.

AC - 2011-2012 Annual Environment Performance Report has been uploaded onto microsite. Independent Environmental Audit to be released in July. There has been a slight delay due to information obtained from Sydney Gas. This afternoon received confirmation from the auditor that a draft report will be provided in next 24 hours.

JK - Queried if the Environment Audit Report is for 2012?

AC – Confirmed that it is a 2 year audit report 2010 – 2012, the next 2 year period would be 2012 - 2014.

Field Operations

AC – Results for Quarterly air monitoring reports for March 2013 have been uploaded to the AGL Website www.agl.com.au.

Continuous Emissions Monitoring

AC - New CEM equipment was commissioned in March and is now functional. February and March CEMs reports were delayed due to the complexities in analysing data. Also in March there was a swap over period from the former CEMs unit to the new Ecotech unit. This caused reports to be delayed. They have now been uploaded.

JK–Expressed concern that the quarterly and monthly CEM weren't on the website. As at June the only data went back to January. Under the new legislation AGL should have all data uploaded.

AC – Monitoring was undertaken in March but data was not received from the consultants until May. The reports were uploaded within 14 days of being obtained. For February and March AGL did not meet requirements of the Act. The April report was uploaded the day after AGL received the data.

JK – Queried when monitoring was undertaken.

AC – Monitoring was undertaken in March but data was not received from the consultants until June. The April report was uploaded the day after AGL received the data. For February and March AGL did not meet requirements of the Act.

JK – Queried why AGL had not put up the monthly report?

AC – Confirmed that monthly monitoring is contained in the one report.

TP– Queried why AGL did not meet the February and March time requirements.

AC – Clarified that in March two datasets had to be aligned and this took time and resources. The February report also had to be aligned. An issue with the CEMS units especially with Compressors 2 and 3 is that the data is raw and there are approximately 40,000 data points for each Compressor. For the data to be useful it has to be analysed and processed.

TP – Queried why AGL can't provide the raw data on their website. Stated that this would enable AGL to adhere to the legislation and only a couple of people would understand it.

JK – Stated that AGL is obligated to make the data meaningful.

AC – Confirmed that AGL converts thousands of data points into a two page summary. The EPA has contacted AGL on the matter of overdue reporting. AGL has now developed a number of internal procedures to ensure that the monitoring issue does not happen again.

TP– Queried why raw data is not issued before it is interpreted.

AC –AGL have considered the option of providing raw data, particularly if there is a delay in obtaining the report.

MM – Queried PB as to why there is a 14 day difference in reporting requirements between the mining and gas industries.

PB – Confirmed that the issue is in relation to obtaining data. The results of quarterly monitoring takes time to analyse and is reliant on an external consultant. The EPA has attempted to find a balance between timely access to information and appropriate validation of data.

JK – Queried why the legislation provides AGL with some leeway

<p>because third party consultants are utilised, technically absolving them of responsibility for meeting the time requirements.</p> <p>PB – EPA directed the company to show cause. Confirmed that six proposals were discussed and one has been put forward and this was not up for discussion as it is subject to approval from the Chief Environmental Regulator. Stated that it is important to recognise that the EU is not just about community benefit but about addressing poor conduct.</p> <p>TP – Confirmed whether the excuse was that the third party consultant did not provide data for two months and why did this occur.</p> <p>AC – the consultants are a new company which is local to the region. They did communicate with AGL that the reports had been held up as they developed their analysis process.</p> <p>TP – Suggested that this information be made available on the website to keep the public informed.</p>	
<p>7.0 General Business</p> <p>Enforceable Undertaking</p> <p>TP – Queried AGL’s proposal to the EPA with regards to the EU.</p> <p>PB– Confirmed that six proposals were discussed and one has been proposed. The issue is not open for general discussion as it is subject to approval from the Chief Environmental Regulator. Stated that it is important to recognise that the EU is not just about community benefit but about penalising the conduct associated with it.</p> <p>Health Impact Assessment</p> <p>AS – Queried if AGL are progressing with Stage 3 in terms of Health Impact Assessment (HIA), or are is this pending the release of the SEPP.</p> <p>AL – The HIA has been discussed with NSW Health. The document is currently being worked on. Regardless of whether Stage Three continues, AGL believes the HIA to be an important study.</p> <p>MZ – HIA has been done by an external consultant, it was tabled with the Department of Health 3 months ago and AGL discussed it with them three weeks ago to obtain their feedback. AGL considers the Department to be providing a peer review of the document. It is planned for the report to be made available on the public domain.</p> <p>AL – The HIA was initially raised as a submission and there is no formal process of response.</p> <p>JK – Queried if the HIA is a baseline assessment and why if it is for the Northern Expansion is it still necessary. Also questioned what NSW</p>	

<p>Health would consider to be acceptable, particularly when according to JK, Gavin Mudd from Monash University has stated that AGL has not been collecting data.</p> <p>MZ – Confirmed that the Department of Health is undertaking a peer review and stated that Gavin Mudd is just one opinion.</p> <p>AS – Queried what the timeframe is for the report.</p> <p>AL - A final report from consultant is anticipated in the next 1 -2 weeks. This will then be resubmitted to NSW Health.</p> <p>AS - Campbelltown Council currently assessing a rezoning application in Menangle Park. The HIA would help with the assessment of the proposal.</p> <p>MZ – In reference to SMH Article on 18 January 2013 by Ben Cubby, who stated that a full CSG health check was essential. There is the perception that projects like Camden North create health risks. The question however is not in regards to baseline data, the question is do projects pose health risks in terms of emissions, noise and other health risks. Therefore it is the pathways for exposure that should be assessed. The HIA report being undertaken by AGL will be peer reviewed by NSW Health. The purpose of the report is to demonstrate to the community what the health risks are. It is relevant because AGL will build on these health assessments to address the concerns of the community. The work done for Camden North will be replicated for other studies. It is not a baseline assessment.</p>	
<p>8.0 Next Meeting Date</p> <p>26 September 2013.</p>	

Meeting Closed at: 6:45pm

Acronym Index

- AEPR Annual Environmental Performance Report
- CCC Community Consultative Committee
- PAC Planning Assessment Commission
- SRLUP Strategic Regional Land Use Policy
- EU Enforceable Undertaking
- HIA Health Impact Assessment
- SEPP State Environmental Planning Policy
- SMH Sydney Morning Herald