



Legal Notice: Please note that this document is only a reflection of the comments, questions and conversations that occurred during the meeting. All comments captured have been paraphrased.

Project	Gloucester Gas Project	From	Michael Ulph
Subject	Community Consultative Committee	Tel	4941 2841
Venue/Date/Time	Thursday 18 th August 2011 Gloucester Country Club, 10am – 2pm	Job No	21/17714
Copies to	All attendees		
Attendees	Ian Shaw – AGL Lands Officer Rod Williams – Community Representative Marney Johnson – The Gloucester Project Anna Kaliska – Mid Coast Water David Mitchell – Avon Valley Landcare Toni Laurie – AGL Operations Glen Wilcox – Gloucester Shire Council Tim Hickman – Community representative Terry Kavanagh – Dungog representative Naomi Rowe – AGL Community Relations Manager Mark Bonisch – AGL – Operations Manager Michael Ulph – GHD (Facilitator) Lilen Pautasso – GHD (Assistant Facilitator)	Apologies	Sally Whitelaw Cr Paul Hogan Peter Ainsworth Cr Richard Webb Garry Smith

Topic	Action
1. Michael Ulph <i>Welcome and Acknowledgement of Country</i>	
2. Meeting agenda Acknowledgement, apologies/introductions, last minutes – feedback/acceptance, project update, consultation strategy – feedback/input, general business, next steps and conclusion.	
3. Minutes Topic: Minute format and feedback.	Further legal advice to be sought by AGL.
Issues raised: <ul style="list-style-type: none">Legally binding document can become a major issue	Minutes will contain a statement at the



-
- Minutes should be recognised as a paraphrased document, not a 'word-for-word' document
 - Legal advice is to provide a statement at the top of the document that clearly outlines that all minutes taken are representations of the conversation and have been paraphrased.
 - Risks involved with the current transparent document.
 - Names attributed to comments are an issue – could be used against individuals and/or groups
 - Omission of names could cause a lack of transparency and context
 - Individuals could request their name to be used alongside a particular comment.

beginning to outline all conversations are reflections and have been paraphrased.

Outcome:

- Minutes will contain a statement at the beginning to outline all conversations are reflections and have been paraphrased.
- AGL and GHD representatives to be identified
- Committee members to be anonymous unless they request their names to be used upon reflection of the draft minutes.

4. Project Update

Toni Laurie explained the current status of the project which includes exploration works including seismic testing. To date AGL has sent out letters to stakeholders who will be directly affected by that work. First contact has also been made and landowner access agreements are being sought as required. The intention of the work is to build on geological knowledge of the area and an estimated timeframe for the work will be around October/November.

AGL to prepare a response to CCC question regarding control measures proposed for groundwater with high salinity. This should include a number of options for managing the water.

CCC: How many properties do you estimate are involved in the seismic testing?

Toni: up to 75 properties are directly affected by these tests.

CCC: Will you be using aerial or cable testing to undertake this seismic work?

Toni: Just cable. It does not differ from previous seismic work done in the area. It will involve only 2D testing.

CCC: why are you using both methods of testing?

Mark: We only use cables and an energy source such as an Envirovibe in 2D seismic surveys. Aerial work is carried out for magnetic surveys which are testing the earths magnetic fingerprint and only receives the information from the ground. There is nothing transmitted from the aircraft for this process.

CCC: How are you going to guarantee that the cables don't get caught up last time?



Toni: We have been looking at how this incident happened last time in order to avoid it occurring again.

Ian: The cables will be the responsibility of the sub-contractor selected following the tender process. In order to ensure this doesn't happen again the new contract will contain a specific clause regarding the situation that occurred.

CCC: Why won't you be using the 3D all the time?

Ian: we are not using just one method because we find that by using both of them; together they provide a better reading and therefore a better understanding of the area.

Naomi: just coming back to the aerial/cable question. What are your feelings or concerns about the aerial or cable testing? Have you received some community feedback about the testing?

CCC: the feedback I've received strongly suggests that what the community really want to know is who is working in the area. In the past numerous helicopters have flown across Gloucester and that did cause significant confusion and therefore concern about what was happening. There needs to be a better understanding of who is operating what and there needs to be something put up to better inform the community of what work is occurring, like a sign or noticeboard. The issue was 'who are they'? All these things are impacting on people at the moment so there needs to be communication with not just landholders but with the wider community. All the different extraction companies need to work together to create more clarity and provide a better picture of what's going on.

Naomi: so you feel that there needs to be better communication with the wider community?

CCC: Yes. And people have to know because it will be a concern. Maybe noticeboards, signs and advertisements in the local paper would be a good idea.

Naomi: Yes. And we have outlined in the Stakeholder Engagement Plan (as you will see) the different methods for informing the community. Advertising will be one of those methods.

CCC: Contact needs to be made with CCC members too. I feel we are still behind the 8-ball and perhaps not able to take action before decisions are made. I received a letter in the mail explaining work proposed on my property but, even though I've missed a few meetings, I had no idea this was going to occur! The point of this committee is to be on the front foot. Ian did try and mitigate this issue by ringing landowners, but it's a phone call and it's easy to forget what happened in previous meetings or conversations.

CCC: I think we need to use the local media a lot more. I think AGL need to develop more of a presence in the local media.



Naomi advised that this will be addressed in the SEP.

Michael asked for further comments to be sought on the project status.

Toni outlined to the CCC that there has been some approval for drilling to occur on some wells, but no actual fracking due to the moratorium currently in place.

CCC: can you explain a bit more about the seismic testing?

Map of proposed FY12 work program was demonstrated to the CCC, followed by some questions regarding testing areas and locations.

CCC: before going into stage 2 will you be doing 3D seismic testing?

Toni: there is the potential for more 3D seismic testing to be undertaken as part of future works, but that's not being planned. To make one point clear, the lines that mark the seismic testing do not go through Gloucester.

CCC: why are you doing more investigative work?

Naomi: we do have an obligation to the government to continue further investigative works and we need to comply with those requirements.

Mark: Just so the CCC is aware some of those works will also involve gathering irrigation approvals to run irrigation trials. From here to October we will start to install a lateral moving irrigator and water lines.

CCC: what will the purpose of the irrigator testing be?

Toni: It will be investigative work to test water uptake. The benefit of the particular irrigator we are using is that it can be closely controlled. By doing these trials we can develop a better idea of impacts of the salt.

Mark: explained the process of using particular soil combinations to see what vegetation has the best uptake of the water to work out how the water removed can be used.

CCC: Mentioned a new technology as shown on the ABC's New Inventors Program that could be beneficial to the investigative work proposed.

AGL noted the information.

CCC: will there be approvals sought for building a new dam?

Mark: as noted in the REF there is capacity for an approval to be



sought for a dam as part of their water trials. Mark went into detail on the purpose of trying to obtain this approval.

CCC: have you given up on the reed beds?

Toni: no not at all. There are different options out there and we will consider them all.

CCC: The reed bed option could be a good option if the water doesn't have such a high salinity, but what solutions are you looking at if the salinity levels are too high?

Blending with other water

CCC: what would happen if, in the worst case scenario that didn't work?

Mark: in that particular scenario we would attempt to take as much of the salt out of the water – Reverse osmosis would be the most likely scenario.

CCC: I understand your response but I want to look at the worst case scenario. What if the salinity cannot be controlled and there is a significant natural event in the area?

Naomi: I presume that you are referring to a similar situation that occurred in the Queensland floods. I don't think we are prepared to give you an answer that will be satisfactory at the moment, but can we find out an appropriate response to your question and get back to you?

CCC: Yes, that's fine. All I want to know is what AGL's response will be in the worst case situation. We need to know all the information before things happen. Long term, we need to know what will happen if the high salinity in the water is going to have an adverse affect in the area in case there is a significant natural event such as flooding.

Meeting break occurred at 11:55am

Meeting reconvened at 12pm

5. Stakeholder Engagement Plan

Naomi: during the previous meeting there was a great deal of conversation regarding the ways forward for consulting with the community and to gather comments and feedback in the development of the stakeholder engagement plan. I've printed some copies of the resultant draft plan and will ask you questions after you've had a quick read of it. You will notice that there are some gaps where I will be

AGL to further investigate the ministerial role of the CCC.

AGL to address issues raised regarding the stakeholder table and clarification of the



looking to gather everyone's feedback on the draft document. Please acknowledge that it is a draft document and that I am looking for feedback to ensure the issues raised in the previous meeting have been captured. Please note that there will be no mention about other phases of the project other than the prior to detailed design phase. As the project progresses, the plan will be updated to reflect current issues for the particular stage of the project. After reading it, I will be gathering feedback.

issues.

AGL to update the table with topics raised in the meeting including project updates on a quarterly basis and advertisements in the local media.

CCC: can we show this document as a draft?

Naomi: you can, but we would like to change it and provide it to you in an electronic format once we have received your feedback today.

AGL to clarify the terms of reference including the meaning of the term 'exclusive' etc.

CCC were given time to read the document.

Naomi: All external information produced by AGL has to be approved, so I want to make it known now that AGL would like to ask the CCC to be the first round of approval. We will put this up front now and then will make a final decision at the end.

AGL to provide further information on who the arbitrary regulator will be for high-level complaints.

Naomi went through the content of the introduction.

Naomi: the level of detail mentioned in the introduction is suited to the current stage but alludes to the fact that there will be further work done on the project. As raised in the previous meeting a community forum was recommended by the CCC, but I don't believe that this would be the most appropriate format as it could lead towards discussion on topics that are not relevant to the stakeholder engagement plan. Is the committee happy with that decision?

CCC: would you allow the community to get involved?

Naomi: Yes, certainly. What AGL would like to do next is work with particular focus groups that would be invited to express their opinions on the SEP. This is really important for AGL to honour our commitment and engage effectively with the community.

CCC: You have to be careful with the selection process, I think. People might have an issue if there is a selection criterion for this and they might feel excluded from sharing their opinions.

CCC: I think it would be worth having a broad demographic captured in the focus groups. Can AGL do that?

Naomi: Yes, and that's our intention too. But we need to make sure that the focus is on the stakeholder engagement plan and that means



selecting those people that would likely be impacted by the proposal.

CCC: Why are you having an independent facilitator?

Naomi: the independent facilitator is really important when trying to garner suitable information from focus groups and meetings. Basically how it works is the facilitator is given an understanding of the area and any key issues or facts surrounding the project and would then run a focus group or workshop based on that information. AGL want to use a facilitator so that they can be independent from the activities and conversations that might occur.

Naomi ran through the engagement principals, the community consultation objectives, the requirements for a stakeholder engagement management plan and consultation approach. Naomi called for feedback on these objectives.

CCC: can we give you feedback if we think of anything further?

Naomi: we will try and get through as much feedback now. But yes, please let me know if you think of anything later.

Naomi addressed the stakeholder list which was developed through the workshop that was held at the last CCC meeting. Naomi asked the CCC whether they believe it is an accurate reflection of the discussions held during the previous meeting.

CCC: with the local government can we add the Taree Local Council?

Naomi: yes, we can include them but the ones that we are looking at are particularly targeted for the purposes of the project. We will identify them as being a stakeholder but need to make it clear that it is not an area that we will be working and digging in.

CCC: and Hunter Water too, due to the water catchment areas?

Naomi: yes. OK I will acknowledge them as a stakeholder.

CCC: can we use another word instead of 'captured'?

Naomi: Yes. I can change that.

Naomi asked for further comments on the stakeholder list.



CCC: where you have water management can you please include water/soil management where appropriate?

Naomi: Yes. I can add this.

CCC: the areas of interest should include environmental/water/soil management. I think they are of significant interest and have to be mentioned somewhere, they're absent from this list.

CCC: will the areas of interest also include compensation agreements?

Naomi: yes – most likely.

CCC: It seems to be appropriate to make the 'other affected stakeholders' section clearer. I think it's probably a little bit unclear what an 'other stakeholder' is.

Naomi: Yes, OK. Just so you know, where we have other affected stakeholders, we will add a comment that says that this exists in conjunction with other management plans.

CCC: I think there needs to be a statement that outlines how stakeholders are interested in future developments as well, not just what's happening now. Can that be in there too?

Naomi: Yes, I can find the best way to include that in the engagement plan.

CCC: As was mentioned before, there really needs to be more clarification of the other stakeholders.

Naomi: would it make sense to include the other management plans to make sense of who the other stakeholders are?

CCC: Yes, I think that would help, but even so there need to be some comments or something made in the table here.

Ian: I think that's very important to include because it has been a recurring concern as to who is affected by different things.

Naomi moved on to stakeholder consultation activities and explained the processes that are currently in place to consult effectively with the community which reflects the comments made at the previous CCC meeting. Naomi also explained the purpose



of ‘consultation manager’ and the possibility of the Department of Planning auditing these activities.

CCC: is there going to be a ministerial appointed committee?

Naomi: the jury is still out on that. At the moment it's not part out our conditions of approval and we would need to seek approval for amendments to these conditions. So, at the present stage we are still unsure but we do understand that the CCC wanted some sort of protection. It is a matter that is still being considered. What we do want to put up front is our commitment to this CCC. This will be an action for me to pursue, I'm sorry that I can't provide an answer to the CCC now, but hopefully I will have a good answer at the next meeting.

Naomi explained the details of the stakeholder activities for this project and the purpose of these activities.

Michael: There's one thing I've picked up on in the time I've spent reading it. In the section discussing the different parts of the project, drilling and pipeline construction - as you're discussing two different things you need to make sure they are split and there is clarification. At the moment it's confusing.

Naomi: Great spotting, yes I will change that, definitely.

CCC: I have an issue when you use words such as ‘avoidance’ it does imply possibility. Do you know what I mean?

Naomi: Yes, I do. But it's necessary to have that word because it does imply that while in some cases there may be flexibility, in others there aren't. It all needs to be clarified and agreed to by the landowner. All the conditions are noted on the property access agreement and signed by the landowner. Maybe I can clarify it a bit further, but it is necessary.

Various members of the CCC raised the concern that work could be conducted without approval.

Naomi: Nothing will occur on a property without approval from the landowner. We have access agreements that, by law, all members of the project team must adhere to. If a landowner does not want something to occur on their property then it doesn't happen.

Naomi moved on to the stakeholder activities and explained that they are a step-by-step process of the activities being undertaken for the project.

CCC: Just coming back to what you said about the possible situation if a landowner says ‘no’ to work on their property. What happens if the landowners say no but you need the access?

Naomi: there are legal capacities for companies to acquire access, but AGL has never done that and we don't want to pursue that. We want to make sure that there has been enough consultation before ever having



to go down that path. In the end no-one wins if that process is sought.

CCC: but what if the entire community doesn't want it, what do you do?

Naomi: we would want to know all of that before we made any investments on the land. Consultation is imperative.

The CCC went on to raise concern over the current situations occurring around the country with the lack of consultation, with fear the same thing could happen in Gloucester if the community says no.

Naomi: explained that consultation is an imperative part of AGL's objectives for all of their projects and that consultation is occurring right now so there's no concern over that situation.

Mark: emphasised the importance of consultation and that respect and constant dialogue with landowners would help to ensure that this doesn't occur.

Naomi continued discussions regarding stakeholder activities.

CCC: regarding the construction section. I believe this is pretty light on in terms of whether there will be things such as an REF, traffic management plan etc. There are a lot of things missing.

Naomi: I can make this clearer and break it up into steps. If we divide those up we can provide more information about what is occurring with the different affected landowners.

Ian: and, as mentioned at the start, divide the pipeline principals so that there is clarification.

Naomi: Yes, exactly. I've actioned this.

CCC: Just in regards to the information on the construction camp and how stakeholders will be consulted – how will it be addressed in here?

Naomi: the construction camp wasn't raised at the previous meeting so I didn't address that. So I think it's probably best to address that as a separate but similar table.

CCC: and I think it should address issues such as waste, traffic etc. Similar to the ones raised in the previous table.

Naomi agreed to address these issues.

CCC: What about the issue of a waste disposal site? I know it will be handled but I just don't see where or when it will happen.

Naomi: actioned the questions raised and agreed to add them into the SEP.

Naomi explained the communication methods including the notification methods.



CCC: 5 days is not enough notification. What if someone is away?

Naomi: we can't provide more than this because of changing project schedules. The community will be informed of what's occurring in newsletters and then a personalised letter will go out after that.

Michael explained that for any work occurring outside of hours the standard requirement is between 5 and 15 days, but no more than that to keep it timely.

CCC: I think that if you rang me as a landowner and gave me a month's notice and then called me with 5 days notice that would be better.

Naomi: Yes, and that would occur. The 5 day notification would only be specific to the work occurring on your property. For anything unusual such as night work, communication would be different. Of course the newsletter would be released on a quarterly basis so that everyone is aware of where the project is up to.

CCC: That's OK. So long as there's a quarterly notice advising the community of what's going on.

Naomi explained the communication methods further and the feedback received (not including the previous CCC meeting).

CCC: I think a noticeboard would be effective for the community where, in their own time they can take the time to read it. People read noticeboards a lot more than you think.

Mark: do you feel that, with lots of noticeboards however you would be bombarded with information?

CCC: No, I think the more the better. I just think that AGL needs to get on the front foot and let people know what is going to happen. We don't want news to come as a history such as 'this is what we've done' we want to know what is planned. Because the project is so huge I believe that, even if there is no work occurring in one area, the community want to know what's going on. The feedback I've received has demonstrated an interest in knowing what's going on in other areas not just their specific area.

Naomi: Yes, but I wouldn't want to send construction updates to everyone just because of the costs and time it takes to undertake this, and confusion it may cause. It's something we would let people know about but it would be more specifically addressed to the areas affected.

Ian: further to this, maybe what we can have is column in the local papers that advises people of what's going on for those that don't have an awareness of what's going on.

CCC: That's a good idea, I'm happy with an update on where the project is on a quarterly basis.

Naomi moved on with the SEP contents.



CCC: In regards to the issue raised in the previous meeting about 'policing'. I don't believe any member of the CCC has the ability to police the meeting and mention where breaching has occurred. I don't think that that job should be the responsibility of anyone on the CCC.

Naomi: Yes, and that's what we wanted to put forward to the CCC today. Would you be satisfied with the CCC being a body that we regularly report to regarding any issues, rather than having someone 'police' the meeting?

Michael: to observe that AGL is complying with its different requirements.

CCC: Yes, but only when there is something that is obvious and issues have been raised by the community that are appropriate to bring up and discuss with the CCC. I don't believe that there should be a 'policing' role.

Naomi brought up the use of the term 'exclusive' on request from the CCC.

Mark: what the term means is that the members of the CCC can make a decision on who can become a member of the committee so that not just anyone can join and influence the agenda or the topics discussed.

CCC: That's a good idea and I think it's important so that members can be recommended by the CCC too.

Naomi: would you like us to include the standard government guidelines so that there is clarification of the terms of reference?

CCC were not sure about this, have allowed for Naomi to decide.

CCC: Can we have members from the community, by invitation, to witness the meeting?

Naomi: Yes, I think this was brought up in previous meetings and it would be good to have people in here that are currently not being represented.

CCC: Yes that would be great. Can we get students involved too, to sit in a meeting and learn how decisions are made?

Naomi: I think it's a great point, but maybe what we can do is try to involve the groups that are missing – groups that may be influenced more by the project. This will give us the opportunity to allow for better engagement and give us a better perception of who needs to be involved.

CCC: I'm keen to get students involved because it is for their future.

Naomi: but there are implications there with the responsibilities put on a 17 year old.

CCC: for me it's just a way for them to be included in the process.

Naomi: Yes and what we can do is try and focus communication



activities to reflect a broader demographic, rather than have them come in and sit through a 3 hour meeting.

CCC: just to finish up, can we change the line '15 persons' and make it up to 30?

Naomi: we can come back to that and add in there a line that is more representative of what's going on.

Naomi ran through the complaints management section of the SEP. What we need to include is that there needs to be an arbitrary regulator to manage complaints that escalate.

CCC agreed that AGL would seek the right regulator to discuss with the CCC at the next meeting.

CCC: signage is needed alongside where the work is being undertaken. Can you make sure that this is considered?

Naomi explained that this is part of the communication activities and that all communication material contains the same contact information in case anyone seeks further information on project schedules.

CCC: once the changes have been made will the SEP come back to the CCC meeting?

Naomi: no we don't want to wait that long. What we will do is to incorporate these changes and then run a focus group to further develop the SEP. However, that said, you can still provide your comments and send them to me.

CCC: what's your timeframe for these focus groups?

Naomi: don't have one yet, but I will like to have one done within a month. It all depends on availability.

Ian raised the approval process for the SEP.

Naomi explained that ideally AGL would like the CCC to approve the document following consultation.

6. General Business

Naomi clarified the draft SEP would be presented at the next meeting following focus group discussions.

Michael also added that a geotechnical engineer would be present at the next meeting.

CCC: if something new or unexpected comes up can an earlier meeting be called?

Naomi: yes, if something significant comes up we can do that.

CCC: my general thoughts are that there was a lot of pressure and



22 Tate Street
Gloucester, NSW, 2422
Australia
Tel: - +61 2 6558 1166
Fax: - +61 2 6558 1066

responsibility put on CCC members at the previous two meetings to get the information out there. I think it's time for AGL to start implementing what's outlined in the SEP.

Naomi noted this comment.

CCC: is there any scope to get someone high up to speak at community information meetings? Because I know there's significant interest there.

Naomi: Yes, and I can look into that further for you.

10. Next meeting

CCC nominated Thursday 13th October as the next CCC meeting.
To be confirmed.

Michael Ulph

GHD – Stakeholder Engagement