

South Galilee Coal Project Community Reference Group Meeting Notes

Date: 20 June 2011

Location: Uniting Church Hall, Milton Street, Alpha

Meeting Commenced: 6.30pm

Meeting Concluded: 8.30pm

Chairperson Name: Brett Harwood (BH) MET Serve

Attendees: Mark Bouffler (MB) AMCI
Beryl Dyer (BD) Barcaldine Regional Council
Aloma Everingham (AE) Landholder
Sherri Taylor (ST) Landholder
Sonia Booth (SB) DEEDI
Lyn Hopewell (LH) DEEDI
Jim Kelly (JK) Alpha Police
Sue Rogers (SR) MET Serve

Apologies: Judy Acutt, Lee Clews, Les and Kayleen Leishman, Alex Misson

Agenda Items: Recap from previous meeting
Project Update
- Environmental Approval Process
- Proposed Infrastructure Corridor
- Baseline Studies
Other projects update

Next Meeting: TBA, late September/October 2011

Item No.	Discussion / Issue Raised	Response	Action	Responsibility
1	Introductions MB introduced visitors and explained changes SGCP team.	Changes include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> BH joined MET Serve replacing previous PM, Colleen Fish SB now PM role at CG's office SR joined MET Serve in Community Consultation role. 		
2	Role of the CRG and opportunity to include other project proponents. MB asked CRG members to consider their current role and the possibility of inviting other Galilee Basin project proponents to attend future meetings. This would mean the existing SGCP CRG would be expanded to have appropriate local representatives for other Galilee Basin projects and would be helpful when considering cumulative impacts. BD suggested that if all projects had the same CRG, there are cooperation and information sharing opportunities.	SR confirmed she had already contacted local police and hospital and was looking for a recommendation from the Alpha School. LH advised that all proponents have to prepare a SIA and SIMP and that if the other proponents established their own CRGs, that this could place demands on the community of Alpha, resulting in 'consultation fatigue'. Key stakeholders, including the Alpha community are to indicate their preference to the best approach to community consultation. ST suggested that people from the local kindergarten should be considered.	It was agreed that if Waratah and Hancock approach AMCI to attend CRG meetings, they should be invited to attend.	AMCI / MET Serve to refine list of additional local people to attend CRG meetings and update CRG members if new project proponents join the CRG.
Recap from previous meeting on 2 March 2011				
3	BH provided an overview of the previous meeting - surface water impact assessment and SIA/SIMP requirements.	BD advised there were two new state government planning documents available that could be useful for the SIA studies.	SR to follow up with LH to ensure these documents are considered as part of the SIA/SIMP.	AMCI / MET Serve
Project Update – Infrastructure corridor				

Item No.	Discussion / Issue Raised	Response	Action	Responsibility
4	BH reviewed content of presentation.	<p>MB:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> explained that following a suggestion from AE, the landowners that were likely to be impacted by the corridor were contacted and possible impacts explained advised that the current plan is for the SGCP to connect with the proposed Waratah rail line proposal, and that SunWater and Powerlink infrastructure would be included in the one corridor advised that AMCI plans to construct its rail spur connection under the Capricorn Highway and over the existing QR rail line. 	AMCI and MET Serve to inform CRG members of any changes in the corridor alignment and location of cross over points.	AMCI / MET Serve
5	ST advised that Telstra is working in the area, laying new fibre optic cables.	MB advised that all existing service infrastructure within the corridor will need to be identified and possibly relocated.	AMCI and MET Serve to consider other infrastructure and services in mine planning.	AMCI / MET Serve
6	AE asked why the rail corridor isn't a straight line connection.	<p>MB explained that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> AMCI's preference was to stick to property boundaries and avoid environmentally sensitive areas if Waratah doesn't proceed with its project, their EIS studies will be utilised as assessment tools to connect to other Galilee Basin project rail proposals to the north. 	AMCI and MET Serve to inform CRG members of any changes in the corridor alignment and connection points.	AMCI / MET Serve

Item No.	Discussion / Issue Raised	Response	Action	Responsibility
7	BD advised that the council and community preference was for one rail corridor from the Galilee Basin to the Abbot Point coal terminal.	MB confirmed this was AMCI's preference, and advised that public meetings regarding multi-corridors are planned and the Queensland Government would be attending.	AMCI, MET Serve and SB to inform CRG members of any further developments regarding rail corridor alignments and proposals.	AMCI / MET Serve / CG Office
Baseline studies - groundwater and surface water				
8	BH provided information about groundwater and surface water studies and confirmed that baseline field studies were underway.	MB also confirmed that the surface water monitoring points installed in August 2010 were up to 12 metres under water during the floods. BH advised that this monitoring was useful when comparing existing water quality to the operational environment.	AMCI and MET Serve to inform CRG members of any future baseline studies.	AMCI / MET Serve
9	BD advised that it had been reported to her that the pipes from the groundwater bores were exposed and was a potential hazard for landowners.	MB confirmed that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the white pvc pipes were about five inches in diameter, had a conical insert that covered the opening and were located in a cleared area that would make the pipes more visible due to the floods and restricted access drill sites have not yet been rehabilitated but will be in the next few weeks. 	AMCI to investigate potential drilling hazards.	AMCI
Baseline studies - geochemistry				
10	BH advised that these studies helped to identify potential acid forming soils and were used to develop waste management plans for the mine site.	MB confirmed that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> waste management was part of the EIS and the mine development plan would take into account the location of stock piles and dumps, 	AMCI and MET Serve to inform CRG members of any future baseline studies.	AMCI / MET Serve

Item No.	Discussion / Issue Raised	Response	Action	Responsibility
	BD asked if waste management was part of the EIS.	<p>and any run off from the exposed material</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • geotechnical information was used to determine a suitable angle for the mine dumps' batter slopes • the mine development plan would be prepared for a 35 year mine life even though AMCI expected there is sufficient coal resource to continue mining for many years beyond the current mine plan. 		
11	JK advised that he and BD had recently taken a tour of Ensham Mine and the batter slopes were 10:1.	MB advised that the grade of the slope depended on the geotechnical characteristics of the waste material.		
Baseline studies - soils, air quality, noise & vibration, visual amenity				
12	<p>BH confirmed that photographs had been taken in late May for the visual amenity study.</p> <p>JK asked how close the proposed mine site would be to town, and likely impact of vibration and noise.</p>	MB advised that the processing plant was about 15 km from Alpha, and the pit another 3 kms – about the same distance as Sapling Creek.	MET Serve to provide update of noise and vibration modelling.	MET Serve
13	ST asked about the status of a proposed residential development near the airport, but not part of the SGCP.	BD advised that the planning application would need to be assessed by council and meet approvals requirements and confirmed that the development wasn't part of the SGCP.	AMCI and MET Serve to review potential development plans during the EIS process.	AMCI / MET Serve
Baseline Studies, terrestrial flora & fauna, freshwater aquatic ecology				
14	BH provided an update on the studies being undertaken, as per the handout.	AE asked if landowners would receive a copy of the flora and fauna studies,	MB confirmed that landowners would be advised of any significant species	AMCI / MET Serve

Item No.	Discussion / Issue Raised	Response	Action	Responsibility
		<p>especially any identified protected species on their properties.</p> <p>BH confirmed that further aquatic ecology studies were being undertaken - including studies for stygofauna and troglifauna.</p> <p>BD advised that local knowledge was predicting a wet summer again - a cold winter equals a wet summer.</p>	<p>located as part of the EIS process. BH confirmed that this information would be in the EIS which will be made available to CRG members.</p>	
Baseline Studies, indigenous and non-indigenous cultural heritage				
15	<p>MB:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> advised that AMCI was managing the development of the Cultural Heritage Management Plan and this work was well advanced confirmed that once the plan was signed, the Right to Negotiate process would commence and a cultural heritage clearance exercise undertaken. This would involve 4 or 5 people, including archaeologists, and was planned to begin in the next couple of months confirmed that the non-indigenous study would provide a picture of Alpha as it is today. 	<p>MB confirmed that if Native Title had not been extinguished on a property, then compensation was required.</p>	<p>AMCI and MET Serve to advise affected landholders when indigenous cultural heritage field work would be undertaken.</p>	<p>AMCI / MET Serve</p>
Baseline Studies, social				
16	<p>BH confirmed that as part of the EIS, a</p>	<p>LH confirmed that the SGCP had</p>	<p>AMCI and MET Serve to continue to</p>	<p>AMCI / MET Serve</p>

Item No.	Discussion / Issue Raised	Response	Action	Responsibility
	community engagement report, a Social Impact Assessment and a Social Impact Management Plan needed to be developed.	implemented a range of important community engagement activities and the CRG was one of these.	develop community engagement report, a Social Impact Assessment and a Social Impact Management Plan	
17	<p>ST confirmed that our participation at the Alpha Show had been a good opportunity to share information and capture feedback.</p> <p>ST confirmed that the best way to get the survey to CRG members was by email as most people are time poor but are on the internet as part of their daily activities. She also advised that people read information on the notice in the post office, bakery and butcher shops.</p>	SR reiterated the need for people to complete the survey and for CRG members to encourage other local people to provide this feedback.	SR agreed to send the pdf version of the survey to CRG members so it could be forwarded to their networks.	MET Serve
Other Projects Update				
18	MB provided a snapshot of the other projects planned for the Galilee Basin.	BD advised that the Alpha Coal Project were planning a public event to celebrate the first truck load of coal from that Project's bulk sample initiative.	AMCI / MET Serve to provide further updates of other Galilee Basin projects at future meetings, based on information that is available to the public.	AMCI / MET Serve
Next meeting				
19	BH suggested that the next meeting be in late September or October 2011.	<p>ST advised that October could be an issue due to mustering time for some landowners.</p> <p>BD advised that there was a family wedding planned around this time.</p>	SR to send a table of optional dates for late September/October so members can choose a preferred date for the next meeting and request topics.	MET Serve