

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

MEETING NO.37

Held in the RGP Conference Room, Menangle on 26 September 2013 at 5.30pm

MINUTES

Member / Guest	Attendance Type
Mrs Margaret MacDonald-Hill (MM) Chair	Present
Mr Brad Staggs (BS)	Present
Mrs Diane Gordon (DG)	Apology
Mr Fred Anderson (FA)	Apology
Ms Jacqui Kirkby (JK)	Present
Mr Michael Hingley (MH)	Apology
Mr Peter Bloem (PB)	Present
Mr Simon Hennings (SH)	Apology
Mr Troy Platten (TP)	Present
Mr Paul Reynolds (PR)	Apology
Cr Lou Amato (LA)	Apology
Cr Lara Symkowiak (LS)	Present
Mr Aaron Clifton (AC)	Present
Ms Jenny O'Brien (JO)	Present
Mr Adam Lollback (AL)	Apology
Ms Sara Olivier (SO)	Present
Mr Andrew Spooner (AS)	Present
Dr Wendy McLean (WM)	Present
Ms Denise Corish (DC)	Present
Ms Suzanne Westgate (SW)	Present
Ms Nicola Fry (NF)	Present
Mr David Henry (DH)	Present
Mr Geoff Green (GG)	Present
Ms Nicole Magurren	Apology

Meeting Opened at:

ITEM	ACTION
<p>1.0 Welcome</p> <p>Welcome and Introductions by Chair – MM</p> <p>Introduced presenters Dr Wendy McLean from Parsons Brinkerhoff, Denise Corish from Treo Environment and Nicola Fry from AGL.</p> <p>Also introduced Suzanne Westgate, Land and Approvals Manager from AGL who was attending in place of Adam Lollback.</p> <p>MM - Advised that she is engaged by AGL as an independent chair, approved by the Director General of Planning and Infrastructure. She is</p>	

<p>also a member of the Mine Subsidence Board and the Minister’s Arbitration Panel.</p>	
<p>2.0 Apologies As above.</p>	
<p>3.0 Confirmation of Previous Minutes</p> <p>Corrections to meeting #36 minutes</p> <p>Pg 2 - Update question from AS to read <i>AGL to verify that M25 recently flooded.</i></p> <p>Pg 6 – Correct first comment by AC. <i>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.</i></p> <p>Pg 1 – Update the member guest list with MM’s observer Lisa Andrews.</p> <p>Pg 2 – Update the corrections from JK by removing “in relation to the discussion about the pros and cons of EU” and “in relation to the proposal being tabled as part of the EU”</p> <p>JK provided MM with typed up changes to meeting #35 minutes.</p> <p>Pg 4 – Under heading Water Monitoring first comment from JK should read: <i>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?</i></p> <p>Pg 6 – Update second question from JK to read: <i>Queried why AGL had not put up the monthly report?</i></p> <p>Pg 7 – Update JK comment to also include: <i>Queried if the HIA report was for the Northern Expansion and why this is still necessary?</i></p> <p>Pg 7 – Update PB comment to read: <i>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.</i></p> <p>Pg 1 – Insert initials after Andrew Spooner.</p> <p>Moved: Troy Platten Seconded: Andrew Spooner</p>	
<p>4.00 Invited Speakers (Agenda reordered to allow guest presenters to go first)</p>	

Presentation by Denise Corish on the Independent Environmental Audit of the Camden Gas Project 2010-2012

Denise Corish is a Director of Treo Environment, a registered Environmental Lead Auditor with RABQSA, approved as an independent auditor by the Director-General.

Questions:

JK – Will the CCC members receive copies of the presentations?

MM – Confirmed they would and presentation will also be uploaded onto the website.

JK – Would like to know which authority is going to ensure compliance and what will be the penalty for non conformance?

AC - AGL pursued this audit and even though AGL scored 92% conformance there is room for improvement. AGL has gone through the report thoroughly and has formed a compliance team internally. This team has been tasked with overseeing site conditions and all Upstream Gas projects. They undertake a weekly review of compliance and have reviewed all non-conformance from the past 2 years to prevent future non compliances. There are new systems in place and there have been real improvements through more frequent meetings with EPA, OCSG and DPI.

JK? What is Office of CSG?

SW – It is an office within the Department of Trade and Investment. Consents for CSG developments are complex and fall under Part 3A and Part 4. Recommendations have been made to consolidate the conditions so the requirements are clearer. This would assist with audits and compliance. It is a complex regime with contradictions between conditions of consent and the license which makes the audit process very challenging.

PB - Had AGL considered consolidating the many consents as they exist under various approvals?

SW – From an operators point of view, we agree. Would like the overlap between the consents and license to be removed however recognise this is a big task which may take years.

PB – Commented that a very large number of conditions were audited and appreciated it was a very complex task. The majority of breaches were administrative according to the auditor.

JK – The government made a number of changes to simplify matters for the community. Is the EPA the lead regulator? Non-compliance looks like they relate to conditions of consent. Does the EPA monitor this?

PB – Consent conditions are administered by the Department of Planning.

<p>JK – Which authority is going to monitor compliance and issue penalties?</p> <p>PB – Compliance obligations fall under both the licence and the conditions of consent. The EPA monitors and ensures compliance with conditions of the EPL. The Department of Planning is responsible for non-conformance with the development approval.</p> <p>JK – Should someone from the Department of Planning be attending these meetings?</p> <p>MM – It is not common for agencies to attend, pointed out Howard Reed from DP&I had attended recently.</p> <p>JK – How does the Director General of Planning receive information and make an assessment of actions being taken?</p> <p>AC – AGL has reported back to Department of Planning on actions being taken in response to the audit recommendations.</p> <p>DH - Will AGL report back on how they are actioning recommendations from the audit?</p> <p>JO – The website will be updated every 3 months and at the next meeting AC will present back to CCC on corrective actions taken.</p> <p>TP – Questioned how Denise was engaged by AGL.</p> <p>AC- AGL asked Treo to undertake audit and Denise’s CV was sent to the Director General.</p> <p>TP – Asked if Denise was local?</p> <p>DC – Explained was local to Sydney.</p>	
<p>Presentation by Nicola Fry, AGL</p> <p>NF gave a powerpoint presentation of groundwater in the Camden area and an update on the groundwater monitoring program.</p> <p>NF – Responded to the query about where and why there was an additional groundwater monitoring bore installed in the Northern Expansion area. Explained that AGL installed an additional monitoring bore on a Denham Court property with Cumberland Plain Woodland- the property now has a total of four monitoring bores. This monitoring bore has been placed outside of the CSG activity so it is good to monitor activity between this type of vegetation and the groundwater.</p> <p>AGL continues to collect monitoring data from the Denham Court monitoring bores- outside the Camden Gas Project- because it provides good background data. The data from the monitoring bores will be uploaded onto the project website quarterly.</p>	

<p>Questions:</p> <p>JK – Why are the wells referred to as Raby / Denham Court when they are not located in Raby? It is confusing to the community.</p> <p>NF – They have historically been called this.</p> <p>AC – Will look into changing the name however it is possible it cannot be changed because the names are attached to the monitoring licence.</p> <p>JK - Why is it useful background data?</p> <p>NF - Groundwater varies across the area. Looking for trends and to better understand the natural variations. It is useful to have this data across a broad geographical area.</p> <p>JK – How long would it take to detect an impact from gas production downstream?</p> <p>NF – The monitoring bores are not monitoring for pollution events but rather looking at long term trends. The monitoring bores are collecting baseline spatial data ie. comparison between a geographic area but are being conducted at the same time as the CSG operations within the Camden Gas Project .</p> <p>JK- Where do the flow paths of the aquifers end up?</p> <p>NF – The Sydney basin is a basin shape. The outcrop of the Hawkesbury Sandstone aquifer is south of Camden Gas Project, it is a lot deeper at the centre of Sydney and outcrops again to the north. The water in the aquifer flows to the middle of the basin and then likely flows out to Sydney Harbour.</p> <p>JK – Is the baseline data being collected by the monitoring wells impacted by the exploration that has already been undertaken in the area?</p> <p>NF – No. The type of exploration that has been carried out in proximity to the monitoring wells would not impact on the data being collected.</p> <p>NF - Explained that through routine monitoring, AGL found water from a few gas wells had lower salinity than expected. Engaged Parsons Brinkerhoff to investigate the lower salinity and provide reasons why this was happening. AGL took a proactive approach to these investigations. It was not a requirement to undertake this investigation. NF introduced Dr Wendy McLean.</p>	<p>AC: Look into the ability of changing the names of existing wells</p>
<p>Presentation from Dr Wendy McLean, Water quality investigation</p> <p>Dr Wendy McLean carried out work whilst working for Parsons Brinkerhoff however now works for EMM.</p> <p>Wendy has a PhD in hydrochemistry and hydrogeology, is a Member of the International Association of Hydrogeologists, a Registered</p>	

<p>Professional Geoscientist, is an Australian Research Council Fellow and has nearly ten years' experience in the coal seam gas industry.</p> <p>Powerpoint presentation provided an overview of the research methodology and findings into why some water samples taken from a few gas wells had low salinity. Research identified that dilution was the cause of these results.</p> <p>Questions:</p> <p>JK – Will the data be peer reviewed?</p> <p>NF - All the data has been uploaded onto the website and could be peer reviewed. The report was also shared with the EPA, NSW Office of Water, Office of Coal Seam Gas and the NSW Department of Planning.</p> <p>Members - Asked Wendy which government department she previously worked for?</p> <p>WM - Previously worked for DLWC which is now called the Office of Water.</p> <p>TP – Asked for a copy of the presentation.</p> <p>JO – Indicated all presentations would be provided and uploaded onto the website.</p>	
<p>Meeting reverted to normal business agenda</p> <p>4.0 Business Arising</p> <p>JK – Referred back to the data about the location of production wells on the ABC was wrong. Said the AGL Northern Expansion map was clear however the map for other stages of the project were confusing. The maps are unclear about whether the wells labelled as plugged or abandoned are suspended from production permanently or have the potential to be brought back into production. Need to be able to distinguish between suspended, plugged and abandoned. The label for production wells are also unclear. Are they being drilled or are they in production? These should also be differentiated on the map.</p> <p>JO – Clarified that there are no wells currently being drilled.</p> <p>SW – AGL will look into the labelling of the wells and their status. In particular the labelling of production, exploration, plugged and abandoned and suspended wells.</p> <p>JK – Asked for the percentage breakdown of wells on public versus private land and the percentage breakdown of pipeline infrastructure on public versus private land. Would like a separate breakdown of this infrastructure.</p> <p>JO – Explained a recent email sent to the CCC provided information</p>	<p>AGL to send link to Office of CSG website and interactive map.</p> <p>AGL will review the existing map</p>

<p>about the pipeline infrastructure breakdown.</p> <p>JK – Only the breakdown of well locations have been given. Have not received the breakdown of pipeline infrastructure on public and private land.</p> <p>MM – Suggested perhaps the information request before has been interpreted differently.</p> <p>AC – The intent of recent information distributed to the CCC was to respond to this request however AGL will review and action.</p>	<p>AC to review information provided to date and provide further detail where possible.</p>
<p>5.0 Correspondence</p> <p><u>OUT</u> Nil</p> <p><u>IN</u> email 13/7/13 from AGL with link to NSW Chief Scientist & Engineer review email 9/8/13 from AGL on EU & link email 10/9/13 from AGL on IEA AGL Corrective Actions Register & links email 11/9/13 from AGL on Water Quality Investigation Report & link email 13/9/13 from AGL on continuous monitoring exceedance & links email 17/9/13 from AGL on Open Day email 19/9/13 from AGL on well sites and link to website</p>	
<p>6.0 AGL Update</p> <p>SW introduced herself as Head of Land and Approvals at AGL. Took over the role in April this year and was previously in the legal team at AGL.</p> <p>Provided an overview of recent policy developments including the EPBC Amendment Bill. A new water trigger has been introduced. Federal assessment and approval is required for coal seam gas and large coal mining developments.</p> <p>JK – Asked what classifies as ‘significant’ to trigger a project to have to be referred to the Commonwealth Government for approval?</p> <p>SW – the term ‘significant’ is broadly defined. There are two components that would be considered as a significant impact – a change to hydrogeology including to the water level or to water quality.</p> <p>JK – Who decides if an impact is made?</p> <p>SW – A preliminary assessment is carried by the proponent and if there is any doubt about the impact then proponents refer the project to the Federal Government.</p>	

SW – Provided an update on the Enforceable Undertaking

JK – Raised concerns that AGL will be perceived as a good corporate sponsor.

SW – This breach is being taken extremely seriously by the board and there is nothing about this process that will portray AGL as a good corporate sponsor. There will be no AGL branding and UWS has been upfront about AGL’s involvement with the three local governments involved in the project. AGL will step away from the project.

JK – Wanted to state on the record that she considered \$150,000 to be trivial compared to what penalties could have been received if the matter had gone through the courts.

PB – The EPA made the decision that an EU was an appropriate course of action. The \$150,000 is not a fine but a significant amount committed toward an environmental project. It is commensurate in dollar terms with fines imposed by the courts for significant environmental offences. The EPA has a strong prosecution record and details can be found in the Annual Report. The EU steps out all poor conduct and places it clearly on the public record. If another incident were to occur then consideration would be given to prosecution however in this particular case and situation an EU was considered the best outcome for the community and the environment.

JK – Will send a letter to the EPA. Has an issue with a number of things including the media release distributed by the EPA that incorrectly claimed that the EU had been developed in consultation with the AGL CCC.

PB – Advised JK should send a letter to the Chief Environmental Regulator.

AS – Stated that it had been agreed that it was not part of the CCC’s role to get involved in the EU. From Campbelltown Council’s point of view the EPA should have prosecuted AGL. Questioned whether there would be an independent auditing process for how money is being spent?

PB – This is not outlined in the EU but a project plan sits behind the EU which outlines how the money will be spent.

AS – Questions who goes back to confirm how the money is spent.

PB – The EU requires AGL to submit documentation to the EPA about how they have complied with the EU.

JO – In addition, UWS is taking this project seriously. It has gone through their ethics committee and a steering committee has been set up. The steering committee will meet quarterly to provide an update and this will be reported back to the EPA.

Status of wells, HSE Update and Field Operations

AC gave powerpoint presentation containing an overview of the status of the wells, HSE and field operations.

BS – Was the weekly review of wells at the request of the EPA?

PB -Reviewing the wells is part of the EPA’s role. EPA is currently undertaking a well inspection program in regard to fugitive methane. AGL has its own leak detection and repair system. EPA is reviewing wells for its own purposes and the inspection program is being done over and above licence requirements. Information from both AGL and EPA programs will inform future licence requirements.

TP – Is the EPA auditing AGL because they have done something wrong?

PB - AGL has announced an enhanced monitoring program. The EPA have new responsibilities now have their own methane monitors.

MM – Commented the government is responding to public interest.

PB – There is public interest in fugitive methane. Leak monitoring is a licence not a consent requirement that is monitored by AGL however the public are still sceptical. The EPA is doing its own monitoring which is a new area for the EPA.

AC- Outlined a NOx exceedance was recorded on Compressor 1 in August and the details of the exceedance are included in the August 2013 CEMS report. It was caused by a cracked engine mount.

TP – Asked who fixed the cracked engine mount and whether they provided a report?

AC – Explained a subcontractor fixed it the engine mount and that no report was provided. The engine mount was 9 years old and it is not an uncommon problem. AC will follow up for a summary report from the subcontractor.

Community update

JO - Provided a powerpoint presentation on recent community open days, AGL volunteering and the Campbelltown show. Upcoming events were also discussed.

MM –Were the people who attended the open day local people?

JO - Explained it was a real mixture – of industry, community and Gloucester residents. JO asked CCC members to distribute the invite to the Camden Community Open Day on October 12 to their respective stakeholders.

AC to request report from Contractor who repaired the cracked weld

<p>JK – Queried whether there has been any AGL activity including truck movements in the Mt Annan area?</p> <p>AC – Didn’t believe so but asked JK to resend her email so he could confirm.</p> <p>AC –In July, four officers from the EPA and OCSG undertook an unannounced audit of the project. The audit was carried out on 17 and 19 July against the license conditions and against the project operations in general. The audit report is still being finalised by the EPA team. It will be made available once it has been received.</p> <p>PB – The audit was carried out by the compliance audit section of the EPA which is an independent section of the EPA.</p>	
<p>8.0 Next Meeting Date 21 November 2013</p>	

Meeting Closed at: 7.35pm

Acronym Index

AEPR	Annual Environmental Performance Report
CCC	Community Consultative Committee
PAC	Planning Assessment Commission
SRLUP	Strategic Regional Land Use Policy
EPL	Environment Protection Licence
EU	Enforceable Undertaking
HIA	Health Impact Assessment
SEPP	State Environmental Planning Policy
SMH	Sydney Morning Herald
OCSG	Office of Coal Seam Gas
DP&I	Department of Planning and Infrastructure
DWLC	former Department of Water and Land Commission
HSE	Health, Safety and Environment
UWS	University of Western Sydney
CEMS	Continuous Emissions Monitoring System