

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

MEETING NO.41

Held in the RPGP Conference Room, Menangle on 24 September 2014 at 5.30pm

MINUTES

Member / Guest	Attendance Type
Mrs Margaret MacDonald-Hill (MM) Chair	Present
Mr Brad Staggs (BS)	Apology
Mrs Diane Gordon (DG)	Apology
Mr Fred Anderson (FA)	Apology
Ms Jacqui Kirkby (JK)	Present
Mr Andrew Spooner (AS)	Present
Mr Peter Bloem (PB)	Present
Mr Simon Hennings (SH)	Apology
Mr Troy Platten (TP)	Apology
Mr Paul Reynolds (PR)	Present
Mr Aaron Clifton (AC)	Present
Ms Jenny O'Brien (JO)	Present
Ms Anna Cosgrave (ACos)	Present
Ms Jenny MacMahon (JM)	Present
Ms Lara Symkowiak (LS)	Apology
Ms Nicole Magurran (NM)	Apology
Mr Mike Moraza (MMz)	Present
Ms Suzanne Westgate (SW)	Present

Meeting Opened at: 5:35pm

ITEM	ACTION
<p>1. Welcome Welcome and Introductions by Chair – MM.</p>	
<p>2. Apologies As above.</p>	
<p>3. Declarations of Interest MMH made usual disclosure.</p>	
<p>4. Confirmation of Previous Minutes The amended May 7 Minutes were moved without any changes: Moved - JK Seconded – PR The July 30 2014 Minutes were moved with minor amendments: 1. JK - EPA compliance audit – the words “enforceable undertaking” should be capitalised “Enforceable Undertaking”. 2. Apologies – AS is listed as an apology twice. Moved - PR Seconded - AC</p>	

5. Business Arising

JK- Carmelite Nuns wrote to AGL, requesting a written response to their questions about the Environmental Health Impact Assessment (EHIA) for the Proposed Northern Expansion. A response was received but not in the requested format (a written response).

AGL offered to meet with the Carmelite Nuns and have one of their technical consultants present to answer any questions. JK said that this offer will be accepted if there are outstanding issues, following AGL's written response.

MMz - AGL has responded to the submission but the number of questions raised is extensive. Many of the issues raised in the submission have been covered as part of the EHIA preparation.

MMz believes that the best way for AGL to respond is have experts who wrote the EHIA to have an open discussion with the Carmelite nuns.

JK – suggests that MMz go through the questions and say where the information is available; provide a reference to where issues have been answered in the documentation. The Carmelites are educated ladies who are frustrated with the response from AGL.

MMz- Meeting with people is the best option as other issues become obvious. AGL would encourage a meeting, where the nuns will have access to experts.

JK- Asked if AGL is prepared to provide a written response or not? They put a lot of time into their submission.

MM- Suggested MMz ring and speak to Sister Jocelyn.

JK- Hard to reach her on the phone. Encourage email contact over phone contact.

MMz – AGL is prepared to deal with this issue, but there are inefficiencies in sending long letters back and forth. AGL seeks to better address Sister Jocelyn's concerns.

JK – Reiterated ringing Sister Jocelyn is not appropriate. A written response is preferred. AGL should respond to the Carmelites how they requested.

MMz- Thanked JK for her comments. Would still like to call Sister Jocelyn.

Development Consents

JK was after most recent developments consents.
AC advised 2010 consent is the current version as shown on,
Department of Planning & Environment website.

EPA Compliance Audit

PB – There has been a tenfold increase in penalty infringement notices. EPA has compliance policy = steps out how make regulatory decisions. Corporations \$1500 to \$15,000
Individuals \$750 to \$7,500, council fines aren't as high.
Compliance policy is still within the framework. These are the toughest on-the-spot penalty infringement notices in Australia.

Additional Council representative

MM – Brad Staggs advised additional Council representative is being finalised through Wollondilly Council.

JOB to send out link to most recent version

<p>6. Correspondence In Email 1 Sept 2014 from AGL on Spring Farm incident Out nil</p>	
<p>7. AGL Update</p> <p>Land and Approvals Presentation delivered by SW. Copies of the presentation were made available. JK– Is there a consolidated list of consents available? SW- No – there is no place containing all consents for Camden. The Office of Coal Seam Gas (OCG) has a list of different documents. JK – these documents don’t follow any kind of order SW- 10 different consents because project is developed in stages. Under the current law, it can’t be consolidated. The law doesn’t allow for this.</p> <p>Operations Health, Safety, Environment. Presentation delivered by AC. Copies of the presentation were made available. JK – Are people alerted about well workovers ahead of time? AC- Yes, because of conditions of consent, this work requires 14 days’ notification. AGL does letter box drops to the surrounding landowners. This information provides an estimated time/date of when the work will be done, and a contact number. JK – does this go up on the website? Would be a good idea. AC – no, it doesn’t. JO – yes, agreed. PR - Council would also appreciate this information.</p> <p>Community Presentation delivered by JO. Copies of the presentation were made available. JK – Questioned how were figures calculated? JO – This was completed by looking at vendor data, employment data and community investment data. The figures were broken down into three areas; Australia, NSW and local. This information was audited by Deloitte’s and was prepared for AGL’s Annual Sustainability Report. JK- Where can we look at this? Interested in the methodology. JO – The Sustainability Report will be released by the end of the year however the detailed analysis will not as there is sensitive information in that. Once the methodology was established it was audited by Deloitte’s JK – Is \$5.2million only vendor data? JO – It also includes community investment and employment data. This is an important story to tell the community of how AGL contributes to the local community. I will share the Sustainability Report to the CCC when it becomes available.</p>	<p>JO to share AGL’s Annual Sustainability Report when released</p>
<p>MMz – Presentation on Spring Farm incident MMz presented on the circumstances of the Spring Farm 05 pressure safety valve well incident, including the response, regulatory environment, investigations, improvements and actions.</p>	

AGL treats all incidents very seriously, especially an event like the Spring Farm incident, which is a well located close to residential areas. AGL is disappointed about the misinformation that was distributed from different outlets. The misinformation encouraged fear and confusion about safety and what actually occurred.

Overview of incident and AGL’s response and actions

- The incident occurred on Sunday evening, 31 August 2014 at Spring Farm.
- Spring Farm 05 is the well of interest.
- Locations are where Landcom requested wells to be placed, away from residential areas, and will be separated from residences by a future road that will connect Liz Kernohan Drive and the M5.
- The wells in question had all been shut down for a couple of days. The incident occurred in the process of bringing the wells back on-line.
- Pressure safety valve had released. The device is designed to release in over-pressure events.
- This process makes a “gushing sound” when the gas is released up into the atmosphere. The vent is approximately 2-3 metres above the ground.
- The pressure safety valve operated as it was designed to do (release gas in high-pressure event)
- Fire and Rescue NSW, Jemena and AGL attended the site and fire crews’ inspections showed no detectable gas levels on monitoring equipment, or any need to evacuate residents.
- The equipment is able to deal with higher pressures and is over engineered as the natural gas comes up in a low pressure environment
- Based on AGL’s interview with Fire and Rescue NSW, the event took place from approximately 7:05pm (which is when the ‘000’ operator call was received by Fire and Rescue NSW) to 8:50pm. The pressure safety valve on the SF05 gas/water separator was intermittently open during the event for an estimated duration of 53 minutes
- AGL’s Engineers don’t think this was venting continuously for 53 minutes. However have calculated the quantity of gas being released based on 53 minutes worth of flow. Engineers calculated 283 m³ of gas was released in this time. (About the size of the meeting room – or a little bit bigger).
- Brigade Hazmat team set up hydrocarbon detectors to detect present hydrocarbon and/or methane. They were unable to detect these gases. This was the same for Jemena and AGL’s investigations.

JK- was calculation based on basis that it vented for the whole 53 minutes? Conservative number?

MMz- Correct, the 53 minutes. This is a rare incident. In last 10-15 years, it has happened only 3-5 times. This event typically happens when well is brought online or shut down.

<p>JK – Was there a problem with the compressor that you couldn't receive the gas?</p> <p>MMz – No, we shut down the compressor to resolve the issue.</p> <p>PR – If one goes down, are wells turned off?</p> <p>MMz – if AGL wants to shut down compressor, shut down commensurate valves.</p> <p>PR – If well shut down, is it less pressure?</p> <p>MMz –Correct, if wells are shut down the pressure in the gas gathering line and the Gas Plant is reduced. This happens very quickly.</p> <p>JK – If the pressure valve did not release, what would have happened?</p> <p>MMz – nothing would happen except for a build-up of pressure. The equipment is built for very high pressure. It is rated to ~Class 600 (2000/3000 pounds per square metre).</p> <p>Worst case is that there would be a build-up of pressure but AGL confident that the equipment can handle this.</p> <p>Nothing would have exploded/ruptured, no excessive release of gas. There are plenty of safety precautions. There would be no catastrophic failure.</p> <p>AC – The control room would have picked it up if the pressure continued to build.</p> <p>JK- What would you have done if the gas continued to build up?</p> <p>MMz – We would release it downstream. A flow into the gas gathering system.</p> <p>JK – Did this incident occur at the five-well location?</p> <p>AC- At four wells, known as Spring Farm 20. One well out of a cluster of four wells.</p> <p>Spring Farm 6 was never drilled. It was licensed to be a five well cluster, but this was never built.</p> <p>JK – You weren't bringing these on for the first time?</p> <p>MMz – no, these wells were brought online in 2011 and were drilled in 2010.</p> <p>JK- Is there a greater risk of problems when you have a cluster of wells?</p> <p>MMz – No. There is no danger to other wells in close proximity to Spring Farm 05. Each well is unique and confined.</p> <p>PR– Is there a pressure device?</p> <p>MMz – Yes, AGL uses check valves – these are designed to stop backflow.</p> <p>PR– So it is better to control the valves downstream – so that gas goes to the plant, rather than venting?</p> <p>MMz – It is not in AGL's interest to vent (or lose gas). If operator knew of this problem, the operator would have opened the valve slowly – a managed control and flow of gas to the Gas Plant.</p> <p>JK – to PB: Were any EPA licences breached in this incident?</p> <p>PB – The EPA is looking to ensure it was operated in a proper and efficient manner. Even though AGL says risks from incidence is low, EPA will investigate. It is yet to be determined, but EPA will take an appropriate response.</p> <p>The EPA is committed to see what is best for the community.</p> <p>EPA site visit on the Monday (following the incident) revealed that the well was operating properly. AGL and residents have been interviewed. Learnings not just related to Spring Farm. Important to understand what happened here and what is in the best interests to get the best outcome.</p>	
--	--

JK – Is there going to be a different regime for wells located close to residences those that are not?

MMz – No, there is not. AGL is looking to have best practice wells. AGL wants to go above and beyond to ensure there is appropriate containment around wells, and visual amenity is considered (plantings around well) AGL looking at further plantings.

MM – Will the learnings from this incident be shared with the industry?

MMz – Yes

JK – Are horizontal wells running under any houses in the area?

MMz – Yes

JK – SMH had a report, interviewing residents. One resident reported ‘regular tremors’. Could this be related to well?

MMz – no, it is unrelated. Misinformation is promoting fear in the community. It is unrelated.

The people of Spring Farm are being contacted by groups who are driving a fear that activities are creating subsidence, health problems, odour issues (but natural gas is completely odourless).

AGL want to engage with community around these issues by sharing facts about the industry.

PR to **JK** – used to live off Campbelltown Road, trucks would cause vibrations in home, even though the property was removed from the road. It is difficult to pinpoint where the vibrations are coming from.

JK– Cautioned AGL; when scientific reports come out that they are not mis-quoted. Claims that AGL puts spin on the reports.

JO– AGL provides open and proactive responses to issues and questions. AGL doesn’t have control of how things are reflected in the story (by media). Some reporters don’t give context, which creates difficulty.

MMz- Do you (**JK**) have any suggestions about how AGL can engage with Spring Farm?

JK – you can’t. You can’t change how people will feel about this.

MMz- Are you saying we shouldn’t try?

JK – I think you should try. Even with best practice, there are problems.

MM – Has anyone told the residents about the road?

PR – Council always receives calls about this. Encourage people to read planning boxes.

JK – People don’t check this.

PR – It is hard to consult with a community that isn’t there.

MM – appreciate the way that this was presented in a non-technical way.

JK – Suggestion to EPA. Should also take role in communicating with people after this event. The community has more confidence in EPA (over AGL).

PR – people are calling Council to see if there are problems with their property being near a well.

MMz – would a targeted letter box drop help?

PR – worthwhile doing something.

JO to **PR** – There are more residences all the time. Are there increases in enquiries of people who already live there or will live there?

PR – once precincts released for sale, there is a spike in calls/enquiries.

<p>JO – Takes questions from current and prospective residents. Some say there will be a sound wall at the back of the property.</p> <p>PR – acoustic reports are done. There will be noise walls.</p> <p>JO – when Landcom were negotiating where the wells would go, they chose locations because of the road, and once the wells are plugged and abandoned, these areas will be used as car parks (for reserve and park + ride). This will be a very busy road.</p> <p>PB – Do people know this?</p> <p>PR – The information is publicly available</p> <p>PB – Has the relationship with Jack Scully tip been considered?</p> <p>PR – Yes.</p> <p>JO –An AGL team member has bought land with intention to build and there are many different clauses including odour, salinity and subsidence.</p> <p>JK – rumour Cornish group or other development, knowledge that CSG is in area is affecting house prices.</p> <p>PR/JO – haven’t heard this – Council encourages people to read Chief Scientist’s report.</p>	
<p>7. General Business</p> <p>JK – A landowner wanted to know what is happening with AGL’s access agreements? The NSW enquiry said that they should be open. Are we going to find out how people are compensated?</p> <p>MMz – Was the landowner happy/sad/indifferent?</p> <p>JK – They felt that they have a weak negotiating position.</p> <p>MMz – AGL can provide costs for legal advice</p> <p>SW - As of 2013, AGL has uploaded to their webpage a landowner portal with information about land and access agreements and production agreements. AGL voluntarily took into account draft Land Access Code. AGL have put this in their Precedent Production Agreement. Agreement costs are not made public because people want it to be private. AGL has revised compensation requirements to better reflect what is fair.</p> <p>PR – Does the amount of compensation vary?</p> <p>SW – AGL considers many things including the value of the land and project context, area of land, how AGL will use the access road, look at productivity of land (highly productive, mid range). It can range from \$3000+ per annum.</p> <p>JK – Have you taken into account that around Camden, it will one day be residential and will impact negatively on the property in the future?</p> <p>SW - AGL can’t put wells on residential zoned land. AGL can’t take into account future land use.</p> <p>Agreements hold for the life of the PPL (~mid 2020)</p> <p>JO – the life of the well is ~15 years. For this project we are well into the life.</p> <p>JK – need to know that AGL is being fair to landowners – because there is high value for development in this area.</p>	
<p>8. Next meeting date</p> <p>Will include Christmas dinner: JO we to organise. Thursday, 4 December 2014.</p>	<p>JO to send invitation around</p>

Meeting Closed at: 7.40pm.

Acronym Index

CCC	Community Consultative Committee
EHIA	Environmental Health Impact Assessment
EPA	Environment Protection Authority
EPL	Environment Protection Licence
EU	Enforceable Undertaking
HSE	Health, Safety and Environment
PEMS	Predictive Emissions Monitoring System
RPGP	Rosalind Park Gas Plant
SEPP	State Environmental Planning Policy
DP&E	Department of Planning and Environment