

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

**MEETING NO.39**

Held in the RPGP Conference Room, Menangle on 7 May 2014 at 5.30pm

**MINUTES**

<b>Member / Guest</b>	<b>Attendance Type</b>
Mrs Margaret MacDonald-Hill (MM) <b>Chair</b>	Present
Mr Brad Staggs (BS)	Apology
Mrs Diane Gordon (DG)	Present
Mr Fred Anderson (FA)	Present
Ms Jacqui Kirkby (JK)	Present
Mr Peter Bloem (PB)	Present
Mr Simon Hennings (SH)	Present
Mr Troy Platten (TP)	Present
Mr Paul Reynolds (PR)	Present
Cr Lara Symkowiak (LS)	Absent
Mr Aaron Clifton (AC)	Present
Ms Jenny O'Brien (JO)	Present
Mr Andrew Spooner (AS)	Present
Ms Suzanne Westgate (SW)	Present
Mr David Henry (DH)	Present
Justine Firth (JF)	Present
Mr Allen Rodwell (AR)	Present
Nicole Magurren	Apology

**Meeting Opened at: 17:30**

<b>ITEM</b>	<b>ACTION</b>
<p><b>1.0 Welcome</b> Welcome and Introductions by Chair – MM</p> <p>MM - Advised that she is engaged by AGL as an independent chair, approved by the Director General of Planning and Environment. She is also a member of the Mine Subsidence Board and the Minister's Arbitration Panel.</p>	
<p><b>2.0 Apologies</b> As above.</p>	
<p><b>4.0 Presentation by Justine Firth, Pacific Environment Limited</b></p> <p>JF - Provided an overview of the monitoring program, methodology used and results from investigations (Refer to presentation).</p>	
<p><b>Questions</b></p>	

<p>JK – Queried the quoting of average levels over 100 years. Overseas universities have been quoting average levels over 20 years. Can you explain why you are only using the 100 year averages?</p> <p>JF – Question taken on notice</p> <p>JK – Stated that the Scenic Hills Association did not participate in the process to select the testing sites as did not believe the method used to select the sites constituted good science. This was put into a submission to the NSW Chief Scientist.</p> <p>JK - Queried if comments made by the CSIRO on the study will be available to the community?</p> <p>JF – We looked at the comments provided by the CSIRO and addressed concerns that were raised.</p> <p>AC – CSIRO were not engaged to approve the study methodology – they were only asked to review the methodology and findings.</p> <p>TP – Noted that the sites that displayed the highest levels of methane were taken out, did you take out the sites with the lowest as well?</p> <p>JF – For part of the analysis, we only took out sites we believed were influenced by other sources of methane such as the landfill. We did this in order to ensure that the results were not skewed by external factors.</p> <p>PR –If you wanted to make the study results look better you would have left the externally influenced site in the study for analysis. The study has done the community a favour by taking out sources that would skew results.</p> <p>TP – Is there any issues putting the report on the website?</p> <p>JF – It is already on the website and we have worked with AGL to develop a summary document so that the community can better understand the results. If there are any questions about any of the results, all of the data is available for people to review.</p> <p>JK – Advised her understanding from the February meeting was that the CSIRO did not want to be associated with the study. You should be careful in referencing the CSIRO. In an ideal world you would not have a single machine undertaking measurements. You need to be very careful with conclusions so as not to mislead the community</p> <p>AC – We have been very precise with the details that have been communicated to the community. We have provided fact sheets, reports and updates with the details. The CSIRO did review the methodology and findings of the Report.</p> <p>JK – The vast majority of people would not understand the report. The onus is on AGL and the Government to ensure that the community is not being misled about the study results.</p>	<p>JF to follow up</p>
--	------------------------

<p>SW – AGL has produced the information in at least 5 different ways to make it accessible for everyone.</p> <p>JO- as part of the community consultation that was conducted it was requested by the community to produce a community version of the Report and that was completed.</p> <p>SH – Queried what the report showed is that whatever the source of the methane, it just sits within the average band – Macarthur is average, even with gas wells?</p> <p>JF – Yes that is correct.</p> <p>MM thanked JF for her presentation and confirmed her presentation would be distributed with the minutes.</p>	
<p><b><u>Declarations of Interest</u></b></p> <p>MM – referred to recent media where she had been mentioned in relation to this and other projects. She clarified some inaccurate information that was published:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- I am not an AGL Representative on any Federal Committee as reported in the Financial Review</li> <li>- I have never been involved in an arbitration where I have a conflict of interest or have been a member of a consultative committee.</li> </ul> <p>MM – Asked if she had the confidence of the group to continue on as Independent Chair?</p> <p>JK – Stated that the position held by the Scenic Hills Association is that the word independent means that you should not be engaged and paid by the proponent. The issue is that the Chair is engaged by and paid by the proponent.</p> <p>AS – Asked the Chair if the process of her appointment was outside of her control?</p> <p>MM – Confirmed it rests with the Government.</p> <p>Other members of the group individually expressed their support for the Chair in her current capacity, commenting positively on her performance to date.</p> <p>There was discussion around how the position of the Chair should be funded, if AGL did not pay.</p> <p>JK – Commented that she does not think that the CCC is very effective, and believes that the minutes are not always a thorough representation of the meeting. Also questioned whether the appointment of the Chair is even a question that should be put to the CCC. Then went on to say that</p>	

<p>her group has an issue with the way that consultants are viewed as being independent, and that this is not personal to the Chair.</p> <p>MM responded that it is a matter for the CCC and reiterated her offer to stand down if the committee did not support her chairmanship.</p> <p>TP – Asked the Chair if she has any shares in AGL?</p> <p>MM – Replied that she does not have any shares in AGL.</p>	
<p><b>3.0 Confirmation of Previous Minutes</b></p> <p><b>Corrections to meeting #38 minutes</b></p> <p>JK – Advised that the person who represented the Scenic Hills Association at the last meeting had made some amendments to the published minutes based on her notes of the meeting.</p> <p>MM - asked the Committee if anyone else had any issues with the minutes. No issues from those present.</p> <p>MM Advised there was no problem with the notes for the benefit of JK who was an apology but the Committee had previously agreed to the format of the minutes, they are not verbatim. JK could keep them for her own records.</p> <p>JK - said she would advise her representative but warned of the impression that this would create.</p> <p><b>Moved: Andrew Spooner</b> <b>Seconded: David Henry</b></p>	
<p><b>4.0 Business Arising</b></p> <p>JK – Stated that the Scenic Hills Association will be providing a response to an AGL Environmental Health Impact Assessment. She noted that the group endorses a submission made by Sister Kramer of the Carmelite Nuns, who is also a member of the Association. She asked that it be noted that they are disappointed that none of the comments raised in their submissions have been addressed in the EHIA.</p> <p>AC – Responded by explaining that the scope of EHIA was prepared when submissions were being made and at no point does it indicate that submissions would be taken into account when developing the scope. He also noted that community feedback has been taken on board, evident in the significant change in scope for the project.</p> <p>There was discussion amongst the group about the amount of time being taken up discussing issues that are only relevant to some small groups, with other members of the CCC not knowing the background on what is being discussed. It was suggested that any localised issues are tabled to the group in a written submission and then make a decision if this is the</p>	

<p>forum in which they should be discussed. It was also suggested that if these issues are not appropriate for this forum, then they should be addressed with AGL directly. It was reiterated that the CCC is a clear and transparent process; however the forum should be used to discuss issues that impact on the wider community as opposed to certain pockets.</p> <p>JK - Noted that the issues she had been raising (e.g. the EHIA) were for the whole of the Northern Expansion, which is Stage 3 of the Camden Gas Project. The EHIA had been presented at the previous meeting.</p>	
<p><b>5.0 Correspondence</b></p> <p>In</p> <p>19/12/13 email from JO update on minor breaches</p> <p>5/2/14 email from JO AGL Fugitive Emissions Monitoring Program findings</p>	
<p><b>6.0 AGL Update</b></p> <p><b><u>Land and Approvals</u></b></p> <p>SW - Updated the group that the Camden North Expansion Project is still suspended.</p> <p><b>Questions</b></p> <p>PB – Questioned if there is any move to tidy up or consolidate the various consent conditions placed on the project?</p> <p>SW – There are various conditions on the project that are not consistent, however, it is very difficult to even apply to modify consents because of 2km buffer zone put in place. We are working with the Department of Planning to streamline the consents.</p> <p>SH –Is there any timeframe for how long the suspension will be in place?</p> <p>SW - No, there is no timeframe.</p> <p>SH - Would it not be beneficial for the company to review if the project should be cancelled?</p> <p>SW – Noted that there are a range of views on this subject, however the AGL stance is that the project is suspended and not cancelled.</p> <p><b><u>Status of wells, HSE Update and Field Operations</u></b></p> <p>AC- Provided a PowerPoint presentation that gave an update on the status of wells, HSE &amp; field operations. He indicated that Jenny McMahon is the new Head of Environment for Upstream Gas projects and that AGL will introduce her to the group at a future meeting</p> <p><b>Questions</b></p>	

<p>AS – Noted that non compliances were listed in the 2012-13 Annual Returns submitted to the EPA. Have these non-compliances been reported to group?</p> <p>AC - Yes. This is a summary of everything that has occurred during the 2012-13 period. The non-compliances have been related to NOx levels exceeding licence limits and failing to publish monitoring data.</p> <p>AS: Is it possible to list the outcomes of independent audits that have been undertaken and report back on the progress on addressing actions from the audit?</p> <p>AC: A corrective actions register is maintained on the AGL website. Will take on notice for next meeting to report back to the group on the progress of addressing actions from the audit.</p> <p>FA – Is AGL given notice of when EPA site inspections will be undertaken?</p> <p>PB – A time is arranged between AGL &amp; EPA for inspections; however there are also separate independent audits that are undertaken without notice.</p> <p>SH – What are the options for community donations as part of EU for breaches?</p> <p>PB – AGL is currently looking at the provision of additional monitoring systems. AGL has also committed \$150,000 for the Love Your Lagoons Project with UWS.</p> <p>JO – Elaborated that the UWS project is well underway, with larger participation by students and the community than expected.</p> <p>JK - questioned AGL's ongoing role in this project.</p> <p>JO explained that AGL has not had any branding or the company name involved in the project and that schools understand why the money has been given to the schools. She explained that there is a steering committee to ensure that UWS is spending the funds the way they said they would. The project is due for completion in December 2014.</p> <p>SH – What is happening with the noise barriers around the well on the back road to Picton, next to the Horse stud?</p> <p>AC - Explained that the well was never commissioned and that the noise barriers are in place to minimise noise from the pump operating on the well.</p> <p>JK - Has there been any fracture stimulation on wells recently?</p> <p>AC – There has not been any since 2009.</p> <p><b><u>Community update</u></b></p> <p>JO - Provided a PowerPoint presentation on recent community open days, AGL volunteering and work with local organisations. Upcoming</p>	<p>AC – Report back to the group on the progress of addressing actions from audits at next meeting.</p>
--	---

events and the potential for upcoming training opportunities were also discussed.	
<p><b>7.0 General Business</b></p> <p>PR – Mentioned that he had received positive feedback from within the community about the AGL Open Days.</p> <p>JO - Outlined that AGL ask for and receive a lot of positive feedback and are continually making changes to improve the open day.</p> <p>AC – Gave a very short presentation on the size and material of the gas gathering lines being used by AGL, in response to an action from an earlier meeting.</p> <p>MM – Mentioned that if the committee wants to meet less frequently due to the current suspension in works, than this can be put to the Department.</p> <p>Group – Agreed that meetings should continue as normal.</p>	
<p><b>8.0 Next Meeting Date</b> 30 July 2014</p>	

**Meeting Closed at: 7.27pm**

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