

MEETING MINUTES

Subject **ANGLO AMERICAN (DRAYTON MANAGEMENT) PTY LIMITED
COMMUNITY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE (CCC)**

Date 16/09/2015

Time 15:30 (AEST)

Present **Mt Arthur Coal Boardroom (following JCCC meeting)**
James Benson (JB) – Drayton Ray Butchard (RB) – Councillor (Chair)
Peter Forbes (PF) – Drayton Jennifer Lecky (JL) – Councillor
Cameron Eckersley (CE) – Drayton Peter Horder (PH) – Resident
Brooke York (BY) – Drayton Gerrit De Boer (GDB) – Resident
Matt Frodsham (MF) – Drayton

Apologies

David O'Rourke (DO'R) – Drayton
MSC Environmental Officer – yet to be appointed

1. Welcome Attendees / Apologies

Meeting opened by Chairperson *Ray Butchard* at 15:30, all attendees welcomed.

Apologies made for *David O'Rourke* (Drayton).

Muswellbrook Shire Council Environmental Officer was also absent. *Ray Butchard* informed the Community Consultative Committee that the Environmental Officer position at Muswellbrook Shire Council is still yet to be filled.

Motion to move the welcome and apologies (moved (*Jennifer Lecky*), seconded (*Peter Horder*), motion carried).

2. Acceptance of and Actions from Previous Minutes

Actions from the previous Community Consultative Committee meeting were:

- *Ray Butchard* to provide Drayton with an update on the Muswellbrook Shire Council Environmental Officer position vacancy (advise when position has been filled).
- *Peter Forbes* to correspond with Muswellbrook Shire Council to call for more nominations for Drayton Community Consultative Committee membership.

Both previous actions completed with updates provided.

Ray Butchard provided an update that the council does not currently have an appointee for the Environmental Officer role, It was also raised that the Muswellbrook Shire Council General Manager was not of the opinion that having the Environmental Officer attend the Community Consultative Committee meetings was a valid use of their time. All members of the Community Consultative Community strongly oppose that view.

Gerrit de Boer raised a point he felt very strongly about; that if the Environmental Officer would not attend, he requested that an explanation from the Muswellbrook Shire Council General

Manager should be given detailing where the funding (from the mines towards) an Environmental Officer within Muswellbrook Shire Council was being spent. The Community Consultative Community were all of the opinion that have an independent Environmental Officer was of great benefit as they could provide insight from other Community Consultative Committees and potentially an alternative view from 'outside' of the mining sector.

Peter Forbes was asked to resend his email to Muswellbrook Shire Council (requesting an acknowledgement of receipt) and further discussion over the matter of the valued attendance of the Muswellbrook Shire Council Environmental Officer at the Community Consultative Committee forum.

Acceptance of previous minutes (moved (*Jennifer Lecky*), seconded (*Peter Horder*), motion carried)).

3. Declaration of Pecuniary Interests

Declared pecuniary interest included;

6/8/14: *Ray Butchard*: Ray's son works for Pacific National who is the rail provider for Drayton.

6/8/14: *Peter Horder*: Peter lives within the voluntary acquisition zone of Drayton mine.

16/09/15: Nil further pecuniary interests declared.

4. Report on Drayton's Environmental Performance

James Benson presented a report on Drayton's environmental performance for the period since the last Community Consultative Committee meeting.

A map of Drayton's monitoring locations was displayed.

4.1 Enquiries and Complaints

There were 7 complaints made since the previous Community Consultative Committee meeting from May 2015 to August 2015.

Five complaints were in relation to blast vibration, one was in relation to alleged spontaneous combustion odour and the other relating to noise. The complaints were received either directly via phone or the Environmental Complaint Hotline.

The first complaint was in relation to a North Pit ROM blast on the 19/5/15. The blast was investigated and found to be within compliance limits. The complainant also mentioned several blasts from the previous week, but these were checked and found to not be Drayton blasts. The complainant asked to be rung before every blast moving forward, rather than just for the North Pit shots.

The second complaint was in relation to the same blast as the first complaint as well as a blast on the 20/9/15. The Environment Coordinator called the complainant to discuss the results of the first blast (which were compliant) as well as confirm that the blast on the 20/5/15 was not a Drayton blast. The Environmental Coordinator contacted Mt Arthur to confirm the second blast

was from that mine and provided the complainants details so that Mt Arthur could contact the complainant directly.

The third complaint was from a repeat complainant, who alleged that she could smell a spontaneous combustion odour at her residence in Scone and that Drayton was the source. As has been the case in the past, the weather conditions at the time of the complaint were reviewed and did not support the claims.

The fourth complaint was in relation to a North Pit ROM shot fired on 23/6/15. The complainant stated the blast had resulted in vibration and noise at their residence. The Environmental Graduate verbally committed to investigate the blast results and have the Environmental Coordinator call the complainant back to discuss the results, but the complainant stated it would not be necessary.

The fifth complaint was received through the Environmental Complaints Hotline and was forwarded to the Environmental Coordinator. It related to what was described as a 'roaring noise' between ~5AM-8AM on the morning of 3/7/15. The Environmental Coordinator attended the complainant's residence at ~8:30AM by which time the noise had subsided. The Environmental Coordinator and the complainant discussed the possible sources of the noise and the complainant said it sounded like the washery plant. The Environmental Coordinator confirmed that a train was being loaded from ~2AM-5:30AM on the day in question, after loading the washery was not operating. The complainant mentioned the noise was usually worse from Friday to Sunday.

The sixth complaint was in relation to a North Pit shot fired on 3/7/15. The complainant stated the blast had resulted in vibration and noise at their residence at two times that day. The Environmental Graduate confirmed that Drayton had only fired one shot that day and discussed the blast results which were within compliance limits. The complainant requested a Drayton representative attend the residence to inspect alleged cracking as a result of blasting activities. A visit was scheduled however had to be postponed as the complainant was unwell.

The final complaint was in relation to a North Pit shot fired on 18/8/15. The complainant stated the blast had resulted in vibration and noise at their residence. The Environmental Coordinator left a phone message on the complainant's machine and attended the complainant's residence with the Environmental Officer on 19/8/15. Concerns were raised by the complainants regarding the impact of Drayton's blasting on their house. Examples of cracking were shown and concerns were raised about the number of kangaroos coming from Drayton owned land. Complainants mentioned their intention to complain to the Mine Subsidence Board and plan to write a letter to Drayton asking for a building inspection on their house.

A general discussion was had between the Community Consultative Committee members regarding the blasting compliance limits. The point was raised as to whether Drayton knew what caused some blasts to elicit complaints from near neighbours and comments were made by *James Benson* about the impact of weather conditions (cooler months usually get more blast complaints). *Peter Forbes* also discussed how the blasts were designed to mitigate blast noise and vibration concerns. *Gerrit de Boer* asked *James Benson* if he could explain why some blasts are felt but others are not, to which the response was primarily the impacts of weather and the blast designs and sizes.

As for the issues of kangaroos, *Peter Horder* mentioned that he has seen the majority of kangaroos coming across to his and neighbouring properties from the Electricity Commission owned land rather than Drayton. *James Benson* provided an update on the kangaroo culls that have been undertaken by Drayton this year.

4.2 Rainfall History

The period of April to August was wetter than average with 357.8mm falling during the period compared to a mean of 219.8mm. April's rainfall was the wettest on record at Drayton with 171.0mm falling during two East Coast Low events, while below average rainfall fell in June and July.

4.3 Blasting

There were no blasts that exceeded the airblast overpressure limit of 120dB(L) during this reporting period.

Further discussion was had around the specific North Pit blasts that resulted in the five blasting complaints. The actual results were identified on the graphs. All blasts were well within limits.

4.4 Air Quality

The HVAS (high volume air sampler) and TEOM (tapered element oscillating microbalance) results were discussed. For the reporting period, Drayton recorded levels below the annual mean limit for *Total Suspended Particles* (HVAS), however there was one exceedance for the TEOM against compliance limits. Furthermore, there was an approximately two month gap in the HVAS results when a fuse burnt out and required replacing which took some time in getting appropriate parts ordered. In the interim, continuous TEOM data from a nearby monitoring station was used to continue to monitor the dust levels.

On the 6th May, the TEOM recorded a daily result of 56.94µg/m³ which was above Drayton's limit of 50µg/m³. *James Benson* discussed the findings of the investigation:

- Investigations from the Department of Planning & Environment indicated that the cause of the high TEOM readings on May 6th were the result of a regional dust event.
- The wind direction on the day was predominantly from the NW. With the mine located to the SW of the monitoring location, source of the higher dust levels was unlikely to have been from Drayton.
- Reviews of all of the Upper Hunter Air Quality Monitoring Network (UHAQMN) indicated that all monitoring locations recorded exceedances.

Although Drayton was not the source of the elevated dust on the 6th May, the Department of Planning & Environment requested early in 2015 that all exceedances (whether a result of mining activities or not) were to be reported to the department. Drayton has continued to do this.

Comparisons were made with the UHAQMN results for the reporting period and the results monitored by Drayton were generally less, but correlated with the UHAQMN results.

Due to the gap in the HVAS data for the last 4 months, it was difficult to determine any trends, however the 12 month rolling average remains well under the annual mean limit.

4.5 Attended Noise Monitoring

Independent Attended Noise Monitoring results were displayed for the past four months. Drayton's acoustic consultant completes evening and night monitoring on a monthly basis. Daytime monitoring is completed quarterly. Monitoring results showed compliance with noise criteria at each location.

The point was raised that the noise limits shown for the Drayton Community Consultative Committee were different to those discussed at the earlier Joint Community Consultative Committee. *James Benson* explained that this was due to a different set of consent conditions being used. *Ray Butchard* asked about the causes of significantly different results seen between June and July at some monitoring locations, which *James Benson* explained that the weather conditions were the key causal factor. *Peter Forbes* added that Drayton has been looking closely at the forecast weather conditions for 'noise enhancing' or 'noise suppression' conditions to determine the level to which operations need to be altered to ensure that mining noise is suitably managed.

4.6 Water Storage

Water storage levels and capacity for the period were viewed, and Drayton is currently at approximately two-thirds capacity. Drayton's water management system is a closed system. Drayton does not discharge water and the only water brought to site is potable water.

Cameron Eckersley discussed the sharp decrease in storage volume between May and June which was the results of bathymetric survey work conducted in May and finalised in June. The bathymetric survey used sonar to map the deposited tailings in the ES Void on top of which free water is stored. Such bathymetric survey work gives Drayton an opportunity to 'sanity check' the assumptions and calculations used in water balance calculations and helps to improve our understanding of the storage inventories.

4.7 Waste Management

Waste recycling and disposal figures for the past four months were viewed.

Waste generated for the past three months was slightly lower than the previous period, with only oil filters increasing. It was also mentioned that some waste streams are managed on an 'as needs' basis rather than a 'scheduled' basis to maximise cost-efficiencies.

5. Reports and Submissions

No reports were submitted to the regulators since the previous Community Consultative Committee.

6. Drayton South Update

Matt Frodsham provided an update on the Drayton South project. The *Planning and Assessment Commission* public hearing was held in Denman over the 10th and 11th of September. It was understandably a long couple of days with the first day running until approximately 7pm in the evening before finishing up around lunch time on the second day. *Matt* reported that although the *PAC* is due to have their summary report available by October 26th, it was acknowledged that this was a very optimistic timeframe.

Jennifer Lecky asked about the representation on the day and *Matt Frodsham* stated that overall there was good representation for the project, particularly from the local business community. *Matt* informed the Community Consultative Committee that the Drayton South project team has and will continue to provide information and assistance to the *PAC* to ensure

that any information required to make the most informed decision is available to the *PAC* panel members.

7. General Business

James Benson asked the committee members if they would like a tour of the mine site (rehabilitation areas) as part of the next Community Consultative Committee meeting. All parties were interested in touring the site.

Gerrit de Boer requested that the meeting minutes keep the use of abbreviations and acronyms to the bare essentials.

8. Next Meeting

James Benson provided a status update for the next Community Consultative Committee to be held with Drayton in November however the dates are yet to be confirmed. Drayton will communicate dates when they are available.

9. Actions from Meeting

Ray Butchard to provide Drayton with an update on the Muswellbrook Shire Council Environmental Officer position vacancy (to advise when position has been filled).

Peter Forbes to correspond with Muswellbrook Shire Council outlining disappointment with lack of response to previous correspondence and ask that it be rectified (and provide and acknowledgement of receipt).

Peter Forbes to correspond with Muswellbrook Shire Council to call for more nominations for Drayton Community Consultative Committee membership.

Brooke York to provided dates of next Community Consultative Committee meeting which will be held at Drayton.

Cameron Eckersley to ensure that the use of abbreviations in the minutes is kept to the absolute essentials only.

10. Meeting Close

The meeting was closed at 16:30hrs.