



South Galilee Coal Project Community Reference Group Meeting Minutes

13 December 2010

Date: Monday 13 December, 2010

Location: Alpha Town Hall, Alpha

Meeting Commenced: 18:45

Meeting Concluded: 20:30

Attendees:

Mark Bouffler	AMCI
Colleen Fish	MET Serve
Sherri Taylor	Landholder
Lee Clews	Landholder
Beryl Dyer	Barcaldine Regional Council
Judy Acutt	Alpha Merchandise
Warren Gleeson	Landholder
Brett Harwood	DIP

Apologies: Aloma Everingham, Les and Kayleen Leishman, Brant Bettridge

Next Meeting: Monday February 21st (tentative)

Agenda Items:

1. Groundwater assessment methods for mining impacts
2. Final Terms of Reference review

Chairperson Name: Colleen Fish (MET Serve)

Notes from Meeting:

Item No.	Discussion / Issue Raised	Response	Action	Responsibility
Meeting Administration				
1	Introduction of Brett Harwood from DIP.	Brett Harwood – Department of Infrastructure and Planning (DIP) was introduced and explained his co-ordination and approval role for the SGCP EIS process.	Brett indicated he could not attend all meetings, but would try to attend some future meetings to keep abreast of the CRG process. CF to ensure Brett is invited to future meetings and receives a copy of minutes from meetings.	BH CF
2	Business arising from Previous Minutes.	Beryl Dyer confirmed she had passed along Sunwater information to the BRC who were aware of the situation but were of the understanding they were not required to make a separate application for water.	Nil	NA
3	Business arising from Previous Minutes.	All other actions from the previous meeting were ongoing or would be covered by the current meeting agenda.	Nil	NA
4	CRG Charter Review.	Minor amendments to the CRG Charter were made in response to DIP – Social Impact Assessment Unit comments. Amendments were highlighted, discussed and agreed.	Vote was held at the meeting and all attending agreed to accept the minor changes to the Charter. CF to send out final Charter to CRG members.	All CF

Item No.	Discussion / Issue Raised	Response	Action	Responsibility
Agenda Items / Presentations				
5	CF presented an update of the current SGCP activity and status.	Nil	Nil	NA
6	<p>CF presented information (with handouts) on the Groundwater Assessment Process that would be undertaken for the SGCP and the range of information that would be presented in the EIS.</p> <p>NB: all information provided was schematic/generalised at this time. Actual data for the SGCP will not be available until detailed mine plans and subsequent modelling work has been completed.</p>	<p>1. CRG members stressed the importance of groundwater supply for the town and the surrounding land holders.</p> <p>2. CRG members requested time for review of information prior to meeting.</p> <p>General comment that the figures provided, although schematic, helped visualise the groundwater issues.</p>	<p>1. Noted.</p> <p>2. Get presentation information out prior to meeting so CRG members have a chance to review and be prepared with questions for the meeting.</p>	<p>1. AMCI/CF</p> <p>2. CF</p>
7	Notification that Final Terms of Reference were now available for the SGCP and where to access them from.	Copies of the Final TOR were available on disc, but members preferred accessing them online instead.	CRG members to access Final TOR online, at DIP or SGCP website, as required.	All

Item No.	Discussion / Issue Raised	Response	Action	Responsibility
General Business /Discussion				
8	Warren Gleason asked about how the mining proponents in the Galilee Basin were working together to assess and manage relevant cumulative impacts?	<p>Mark Bouffler replied that AMCI had continued to seek a cooperative approach to relevant Galilee Basin issues.</p> <p>A meeting had been held with Adani and Hancock had now agreed to a meeting request, indicating some movement towards a cooperative approach.</p>	<p>AMCI to continue advocating and seeking a cooperative approach for relevant Galilee Basin issues.</p> <p>AMCI to provide update of any relevant, non-confidential information regarding the progress of a cooperative approach from these meetings.</p>	<p>Ongoing.</p> <p>AMCI</p>
9	Beryl Dyer mentioned that a recent study on Fly In / Fly Out impacts had been released.	<p>General discussion was that there were both positive and negative potential impacts from FIFO.</p> <p>Positive:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Controlled / limited population growth ("not another Emerald") - Access to workforce - Upgraded airport and regular services to Brisbane <p>Negative:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Money not being spent in the local area - Population figures not recognised in census from which Council facilities were assessed 	<p>Beryl Dyer to provide details of report, if available.</p> <p>CF to also search for report details and provide to CRG if available.</p>	<p>BD</p> <p>CF</p>

Item No.	Discussion / Issue Raised	Response	Action	Responsibility
10	The issue of the numerous proposed railway routes was raised.	General discussion was that nobody was happy with the number of proposed railway routes and there was confusion in the community regarding what was happening ie why have so many different routes out for public comment? Would there be many railway lines with different corridors, many lines within one corridor, one line within one corridor and which route was going to be accepted?	Brett Harwood could not provide a definitive answer, but his understanding at this stage was that only one route would be approved, even if potentially more than one railway line could be built. BH and/or AMCI to provide details of railway line decisions as they became available.	BH / AMCI
11	The SGCP rail spur corridor was discussed and how it would link into whichever railway line was finally approved. MB was asked why 'Anderson's' and properties north of the SGCP had not been consulted with yet.	Mark replied that until the SGCP rail spur/corridor route had been finalised – which could not be done until Government approved a railway route, for the SGCP rail spur to link in to – that AMCI could not be sure what properties would actually be impacted. AMCI did not want to raise concerns for property owners if they were not actually going to be impacted.	Mark would contact relevant landholders to the north of the SGCP and commence engagement processes.	MB
12	Alan Tilser (on behalf of another proponent) and a land/property valuer had been contacting local property owners.	A number of CRG members were aware of this but were not sure what this was about.	Nil	NA

Item No.	Discussion / Issue Raised	Response	Action	Responsibility
Next Meeting				
13	<p>Next meeting tentatively planned for February.</p> <p>Agenda items to include:</p> <p>Surface Water Assessment information (similar to level of information for Groundwater)</p> <p>Invite DIP Social Impact Assessment Unit and talk about Social Impact Management Plans (SIMPs) and cumulative impact assessment.</p>	<p>Meeting to be held after school holidays and not on the Bullarama night.</p>	<p>CF to check dates and confirm final meeting date early in the new year.</p> <p>Send out proposed meeting date, agenda and meeting information.</p>	<p>CF</p> <p>CF</p>