

ENSHAM RESIDUAL VOID STUDY
COMMUNITY REFERENCE GROUP
MEETING MINUTES

STANDING ITEMS

FORMALITIES

Date	Thursday 7 th December 2017
Meeting Opened	10.15am
Venue	Ensham Gatehouse – Duckponds Road Emerald

ATTENDEES

Position	Name
Independent Chair	Emma McCullagh
Minute Taker	Meghan Swift
Members	Hamish Millar Geoff Kavanagh Councillor Alan McIndoe Councillor Hamish Millar Nigel Burnett Nathan Johnson
Guests	Daryl Conway Proxy for Peter McTaggart
Ensham Representatives	Paul Green (PG) Dave Myers (DM) Paul Martinkus (PM) Dan Yates (DY) Neil Dale (ND)

APOLOGIES

Position	Name
Near Neighbour	Carl Morowitz

CHRRUP	Claire Rodgers
Near Neighbour	Justin Fontanta
SunWater	Peter McTaggart Proxy – Daryl Conway (joined meeting after tour)

SITE TOUR

The Chair welcomed and thanked everyone for their attendance expressing that today’s meeting is essentially about the tour of Ensham viewing the voids and for all members to ask questions and express any concerns.

Introductions were made to Paul Martinkus and Dan Yates.

DM presented digital images of Ensham explaining where the tour would be taking place today and images of the 2008 flood event. Everyone gathered around the map of Ensham to give an overview of the tour. R24, Highwall C Pit, R4 – see entry points to UG, R81 – current rehab being complete.

PG suggested to refer to the locations as pits rather than ramps to save confusion.

Question	Do you have any photographs of the 2010 flood event?
Response	DM – We will get some for you
Question	Can we take photographs while on the tour?
Response	PG – Yes; however, avoid taking photos of logos
Question	Is there any mining operations in these pits?
Response	PG – There is only 1 dragline operating in F pit. No mining activities south of the river.
Question	Are there any species that were here before that aren’t being grown as part of the rehab?
Response	ND explained that there is a mix of native and exotic grasses. PG – Don’t think there are any species that were here that aren’t a part of the rehab, however, will have to confirm this.

Stop at B Pit:

Everyone exited the bus to view the void at B Pit. It was mentioned that the river is located approx. 8 metres from our current location.

Question	Where would the Probable Maximum Flood (PMF) level be for this location?
Response	DY – The PMF requires reinstate the flood plain all the way back to A Pit, and back fill everything to that level
Question	Does the PMF require it to be build higher than it was to allow for the ground to settle?
Response	DY – That will all be included in the tech work. In principle, would have to mound backfill to allow the ground to settle.
Question	Is the PMF a moving target?
Response	DY – Guidelines of the PMF tend to change around a bit. PG – Over time the PMF has changed, it has changed since Ensham started.

DY discussed the three different options in respective with this current pit.

Option 1:

Create a land form where you see the levee now. Move dirt around to create a land mass so no water can get in to the pit. If the land is rehabilitated to a size and magnitude monitoring will not be required as a levee does.

Question	Do you have sufficient data as to what effects this would have?
Response	DY – All of this data is being gathered as part of the study.

Option 2:

Utilising the pit to harvest water during a flood event that can then be used for recreation or downstream, irrigation. DY expressed that it is not to redirect the river, though to take water during a flood event. If the flood plain is reinstated, downstream will get the full effect of the flood. By inducing the flow, it can potentially help the flow downstream.

GK mentioned that the water would have to be regulated and at an environmental level before being released. 2/3 of the water stored in spoil, as spoil settles the quality changes.

DY discussed that it would have to be included in current licenses, regulations etc.

PG stated that Ensham doesn't have acid issues, that the water at Ensham is saltier than normal water. PG continued to encourage everyone to ask questions and to let everyone know their thoughts.

Question	Will all the voids be managed differently?
Response	Yes. How we manage one void will be different to how we manage the other voids. By March 2019 all documentation will be submitted to the EHP for all voids.
Question	Will this be the first complete agreement that Ensham has had?
Response	DY – Yes, since approx. 2006
Question	Could the area be used for energy?
Response	Not to criteria, take back to grazing land, not commercial use
Question	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Where does the ground water/leech water intersect? Salt load will tail off if the salt is coming in through the ground water. Would backfill stop this?
Response	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> ND – The ground water is coming from the actual formation. Majority of the water in the pit is ground water from the coal seam, this it ceased mining in 2015. If the ground water continues to fill the pit it will get to a certain level so it equalizes and stops running in. DY – No, backfill will act like a sponge. It doesn't function the same as dirt that hasn't been disturbed.

Stop at D Pit:

Everyone viewed the voids. Discussion was made as to whether these pits could be filled with water. DY explained that any void rehabilitation in this pit will be conducted when underground mining ceases. This will be displayed at the next stop to view the access to the underground mine. It was discussed that the criteria could change by then. DY mentioned that completion criteria presented to the EHP in March 19 would include this area.

Question	Is this pit currently being de-watered?
Response	PG – Yes, this area needs to be kept dry due to underground operations.

Stop at C Pit (UG Portals & Conveyor System):

DY explained that this is the bottom of C pit, with an additional amount as the ground was slightly built up in this area. This explains why no water will be going into this pit for a period of time.

Stop at E Pit:

This is to show everyone an example of the rehabilitation of E pit. This area is out of the flood plan. It has been reshaped, top soiled and seeded.

DM discussed that this area is 60 hectares as a part of the 100 hectares of rehabilitation that is required to be met by the end of 2017.

PM explained that as this area is not on the flood plain the void is not required to be filled. This area is to be complete as safe, stable and non-polluting to the environment.

Bus tour ended at the Gatehouse, continued with formal meeting. Daryl Conway joined meeting.

DECLARATION OF INTERESTS

Chair reminded members to complete their declarations of interest.

CONFIRMATION OF PREVIOUS MINUTES

MOTION THAT: The minutes from previous meeting held on the 4th of October be accepted

MOVED: Geoff Kavanagh

SECONDED: Nigel Burnett

VOTE: Unanimous

BUSINESS ARISING FROM PREVIOUS MINUTES

Business from previous minutes are carried over to the communication section.

GENERAL BUSINESS

1. ALTERNATE RESIDUAL VOID USES

The chair discussed that at the previous meeting three options were given for the voids. A survey was sent to everyone to give the opportunity to provide other alternative uses for the residual voids. As per the [presentation](#) feedback was gained and discussed. DY explained that this is a brain dump exercise as everyone looks at things from a different angle.

AM shared; what is the long term benefit that can be gained? The retention of water is a big thing. Look at harvesting water. Someone would have to build licences. Instead of three-day release, look at having a one day release? The opportunities are there, however, is it viable? The three bigger options have been provided. We need to think of what can be done off the back of that. Recreational activities such as a dedicated 4x4 drive park is quite large with tourists. During off peak, the area could be used by armed services (national & international) looking for real life experience. Or something like Dubbo Zoo.

NJ suggested using the land as a solar/ hydroplant mix. It would use extra funds to set up, then instead of selling the land off as a whole in the ground, sell it as an asset. There is a lot of investment put into the shaping of the land for grazing. There may be opportunity in some areas to use as private refuge for threatened wildlife. The space could be used as a conservation refuge.

AM questioned that the option of land fill would have risks with the river being so close. This will probably be better environmentally suited elsewhere.

There was discussion about this option being removed; however the group suggested that it should be included in the considerations and explained as to why this option was not reported. The group felt that landfill would not be an option for residual void on or in close proximity to the floodplain.

DY explained that there will be a whole government response regarding this study. These include; DEHP – regulatory for environment agreement, DERM – Water bodies and treasury. DERM will be involved with the study process regarding flood mitigation and water allocation. DY was open for these groups to be invited to these meetings.

It was discussed that these groups would be looking at this wider than a regional issue. The group agreed that as the study progressed, and more information was delivered then an invite to relevant people could be issued and a presentation on the wider approach to voids could be considered. At this stage it is outside the scope of this group. All in agreeance.

Question	Who would take control of that area, it's surface and risks?
Response	Ensham own all the land, except for Yongala pits. Post mining Ensham will still own the mine.
Question	Is there scope for you to explore multi use for some options?
Response	DY – Yes, doors are not closed on anything. These are the base things that we need to close in this project. Each of the 3 options are the preferred out of 14 that were assessed. Each can have different post land usage with them, or multiple.
Question	What stage will the underground pits be completed?
Response	DY to come back with response as to when underground mining will possibly cease in these pits?
Question	Is there a starting date for construction?

Response	DY – Start date of construction depends on life of the life of the mine. At this stage it's 10-12 years for areas not utilised for mining. Access areas will be at the end of life of mine. There is more information to come as the study continues.
Question	Are there water testing results for pollutants and the potential irrigation usage?
Response	ND handed out information on contaminants within the water across site. There was concern over what level the water was tested at it was stated that there would be minimal difference when the water is tested at different levels. DY Water quality will be a consideration in the reports for each of the options. Details will be provided in the reports ACTION: ND to share water report electronically
Question	Is the water mixed when it is released?
Response	ND – If water is released above trigger level, the water has to be tested downstream to ensure it is still under the trigger level.

2. TERMS OF REFERENCE (TOR) DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL HERITAGE AND PROTECTION

The Chair asked if anyone had any questions in relation to the Terms of Reference. There was no response in relation to this.

DY mentioned that some of what we do around the structure of the charter is that we want to be able to engage with the community. When final reports are issued, we would like feedback. These reports will be issued to EM for distribution, if anyone would like more information or would like to discuss the reports further, send your request through to EM.

3. STUDIES UPDATE

[Presentation by PM](#). This included what studies have been done so far, classifying them into themes including historical reports, studies and documentation related to residual voids. PM stated that the report that has been distributed to EM includes a page for any questions to be written and we will try to include those as much as possible.

PM discussed how the report was written, explaining the triple line access criteria graphs and what the process what to filter all options on the voids. Examples were provided as to how the options were marked. It was mentioned that the Surface water modelling will be updated and will be compared to the current model. This decision was made to ensure the correct data is submitted.

Question	Does financial assurance reflect on the analysis results?
Response	DY - Cost of rehabilitation is far in excess, could we hand back the asset? Yes, however it's not an option for Idemitsu. PM explained that the options ranged from backfilling the whole mine through to leaving it and closing up.
Question	Is the analysis done internally or externally? It appears that the 14-3 was more of an internal process? Does this group have a look or research base set up to make decisions?
Response	DY – all reports are distributed and peer reviewed. We will have to develop the triple bottom line assessment and process. Ensham still to determine participants in final options analysis. We will gain feedback and discuss with CRG in regards to this.

4. SET MEETING DATES

The Chair stated the meeting dates will line up with when reports will be delivered, meetings are at a reasonable time period after to allow for feedback and consultation.

DY next proposed mate is by March, 26th 2018. There will be a number of reports back by then, so reports can be distributed prior to the next meeting.

The Chair mentioned that she would communicate proposed meeting dates, and that the next meeting can be in Emerald with the options of Skype available.

DY stated that the report will be delivered with a summary, presentation and the full report. Any confidential items are to be marked 'CONFIDENTIAL'.

5. COMMUNICATION POINTS

The Chair stated that there are CRG members attending that will need to provide feedback to their organisations.

Question	Will there be 'dumbed down' versions of the technical drawings and information provided to communicate to the CRG and others?
Response	Yes

MEETING CLOSED

Time: 2.48pm

Next Meeting Date: 26th March 2017

SUMMARY OF ACTION ITEMS FROM 7TH DECEMBER 2017

Item No.	Action Detail	Person Responsible	Due Date
1	Do you have any photographs of the 2010 flood event?	DM	
2	Are there any species that were here before that aren't being grown as part of the rehab?	ND	
3	What stage will the underground pits be completed?	DY	
4	ACTION: ND to share water report electronically	ND	