

# Agenda



Ground Floor, Suite 01, 20 Chandos Street  
St Leonards, NSW, 2065  
PO Box 21  
St Leonards, NSW, 1590

T +61 2 9493 9500

F +61 2 9493 9599

E [info@emmconsulting.com.au](mailto:info@emmconsulting.com.au)

[www.emmconsulting.com.au](http://www.emmconsulting.com.au)

---

<b>Time/date</b>	16:00–18:00pm, Tuesday 10 September 2019	
<b>Location</b>	Peak Gold Mine Offices	
<b>Invitees</b>	Garry West (GW), Independent chair of CCC Chris Bruce (CB), local resident for 30 years, operates small business associated with mining Julie Payne (JP), local resident and CSC Councillor (but present in capacity as local resident) Garry Ryman (GR), CSC Director, Planning and Environmental Services (as observer) Kay Stingemore (KS), curator of Cobar Heritage Centre and resident for 20 years Russell Grant (RG), local resident for 13 years	Jono Thompson (JT), Aurelia Metals Neal Valk (NV), PGM Sam Lloyd (SL), PGM Liam Richardson (LR), PGM Laura Barnes (LB), PGM Rob Morris (RM), EMM Andrew Dickinson (AD), EMM Andrea Kanaris (AK), EMM Ellie Evans (EE), EMM

---

## Notes

PGM – Peak Gold Mines

AM – Aurelia Metals

CCC – Community Consultative Committee

CSC – Cobar Shire Council

EIS – Environmental Impact Statement

REF – Review of Environmental Factors

The members of the CCC and EMM introduced themselves, and explained their respective backgrounds.

JT thanked the CCC for attending the EGM as the previous CCC meeting had only been held one month previously.

JT introduced the New Cobar Complex Expansion Project (NCCEP or ‘the project’) to the CCC using a variation of the presentation used for the meeting with DPIE and CSC, and explained that this meeting was part of the pre-scoping phase. JT explained the importance of consistent and well-managed messaging to communicate with the community the likelihood that the project would not create any additional jobs, and that would be an extension to the current New Cobar life of mine plans to 2035 rather than 2023, which is when activities are currently proposed to end. He also explained about the requirements for an SSD project, and other items in the project description, including location of infrastructure and use of existing plant and facilities for mining and processing.

RM explained the regulatory framework for an SSD application under SEPP and the EPBC Act, and that the new SSD approval would supersede the existing Council approvals for New Cobar. He explained the consultation process, what had been done so far, and that a key part of this stage of consultation is to listen to community concerns and questions, as well as disseminating project information.

AK responded to a question on consultation for those without access to a computer from KS and explained that although the questionnaire is online, there will be paper copies located at the local library and Council offices, and that there would be opportunities for people to be assisted in completing the online survey at the community information session to be held the following day.

RM continued to explain the next steps to be undertaken in the EIS and consultation process, including the application for SEARs and what they would be likely to include. He explained that SEARs would be applied for once outstanding design details had been clarified, including power and water constraints. He also explained each stage of the project where there would be opportunities for stakeholders to provide input, including scoping consultation (currently being undertaken), EIS consultation, and the opportunity to provide formal submissions once the EIS is placed on public display.

JT explained the need to clarify design uncertainties at this stage rather than further down the line to avoid the need for a modification. He explained that there was no additional electricity capacity at Peak, and that efficiencies would have to be identified.

RG asked about opportunities for solar power, and JT, RM and EE responded with examples of previous projects (Broken Hill, Nyngan) and the water requirements of solar farms for panel cleaning. JT explained that solar power generation would not be included as part of this project, but that AM would be open to considering it separately as an option for power supply if a suitable energy/solar partner wished to be involved.

JP and CB asked how waste rock would be managed; JT responded that it would stay underground at the New Cobar complex, and be used to fill existing underground stopes. He also explained that at this preliminary stage, there was no expected interaction (and a significant distance) between the historical Great Cobar workings and the proposed underground aspects of mining the Great Cobar deposit.

KS asked about activities on the Great Cobar site the previous day, JT explained about the delivery of the BAM air sampler and the site visit with EMM staff.

JP asked about the proposed water pipeline associated with the exploration drive dewatering, and whether that would change with the NCCEP. JT explained that the pipe would be constructed of black polyethylene, and that under the REF submitted for the exploration drive, an ecology assessment had already been undertaken. He explained that the pipeline would go south of the GC deposit, cross under Kidman Way and finish at the existing process water tank. He explained that the dewatering for the exploration drive would be at a rate of approximately 15L/s, and this would be likely to increase to a rate of 23L/s once the NCCEP was underway. The use of this water at Peak would reduce the use of Cobar's town water supplies by up to 400ML per year. He also explained that Peak's access licence for groundwater withdrawal is only for 620ML/year, so the 23L/s rate would be a maximum rate rather than an average or expected rate. JP and RG asked that the potential erosion impact of the pipe location should be considered.

JP and GR asked about traffic movements related to the project. JT explained that ore transport to Peak from New Cobar along Kidman Way would continue, but with a maximum average rate of 50 truck movements per day, an increase on the current rate of 25 truck movements per day. This increase has been specified to allow for flexibility in terms of breakdowns or processing issues. KS asked how the traffic assessment was carried out, and RM, GR and JT explained that it would be based on existing data (baseline) and proposed project details.

GW asked about the new guidelines for SIA. AK explained the process, the new guidelines and what is assessed.

KS asked if there were any plans to change the slag heaps associated with the historic Great Cobar Mine; JT stated that there were none.

KS asked if there would be further investigation into the location of the vent rises; JT stated that there would be.

KS asked if there would be information about joining the CCC at the community information session. AK stated that there wasn't any information about the CCC planned to be included in the information, however this would be considered. JT and AK determined that the attendance sheet for the information session would include a place where attendees could register their interest to join the CCC. AK also stated that under CCC guidelines, a website and email address would publicise details of the CCC and who to contact if someone wanted to join.

JP raised the issue of all age groups being able to access consultation materials, especially those without a computer or internet access. JT agreed that there was more work that could be done to make consultation more inclusive.

GW stated the importance of the CCC achieving diverse representation of the community makeup.

JT explained that there were still significant amounts of work [consultation and detailed project design] to be done, especially regarding air quality and lead. He stated that the high-volume air sampler, blast monitor and BAM should be fully installed within 4 weeks.

JT made a statement about the Pybar camp expansion not being related to the NCCEP, and reiterated the local employment rates of 66% for the Pybar (contracting) workforce and 94% for the Peak workforce, and that these had recently increased. He also explained that although Peak uses Pybar for some of its contracted workforce, other companies (including Downer) and contractors also use the camp. The difficulty of managing accommodation for the non-resident workforce was discussed, especially relating to motels wanting to have enough vacancies for travellers and tourists, but not being too empty that they have to close.

JT also explained that there was an application recently submitted to Council to update one of the MLAs to bring it in to compliance as it was currently non-compliant due to the presence of surface infrastructure. JT explained that it was not connected to the proposed development, or any other future development, and reinforced the need for careful messaging to reduce the likelihood of community misunderstanding of the need for the MLA update. He stated that the CCC would be updated as both the MLA update and the Pybar mining camp expansion progressed.

---

At approximately 17:10, PGM and Aurelia Metals employees (JT, NV, SL and LB) left the meeting.

---

AK and RM proceeded to explain the importance of stakeholder consultation in the EIS and the fact that all consultation needs to include community input, be undertaken by a social scientist, and that consultation details would be included in the scoping report submitted to DPIE to accompany the request for SEARs.

GW stated that it was good of JT to establish the CCC prior to any statutory requirement as it would help to formalise information flow, and address community concerns.

AK explained that if SIA and EIS engagement is done well, it can provide a service that is greater than the sum of its parts, strengthening the relationship between AM and the community, and also within disparate parts of the community itself. She also stated the benefits of trust and transparency, and the consultation opportunities and the CCC providing a 'safe' environment where people can speak candidly. She went on to say that much of the information from stakeholder engagement is anonymous, and quotes, if used, will not be identifiable.

RM explained the role of EMM in the EIS and stakeholder engagement process to communicate clearly, ethically and based on scientific fact. He also explained that EMM's work would be bound by the ethical guidelines of the company as well as the representative organisations (such as EIANZ etc) that individuals are members of.

JP asked how best to convey scientific information to a sceptical community regarding controversial issues such as air quality and lead. AK discussed risk and perception of risk, and how the scientific technical studies deal with actual risk, while the SIA also considers how the perception of risk(s) can affect a community and consequently its trust in scientific experts. Social impact assessment places importance on perceptions and acknowledges their existence and the impact they may have on social values. For the SIA process, DPIE insists on documenting perceptions as well as scientific facts.

JP and CP stated that the vent riser locations can be changed, but that it is up to AM, and acknowledged that moving the vent risers might make the project more expensive.

KS stated that local residents would like to have a public meeting about the project that isn't run by Peak/AM. She also stated that there are historic tunnels (thought to be related to the historic Great Cobar mine) under the town, and that there are community concerns regarding subsidence and sinkholes if blasting for the NCCEP disturbs or impacts the historic underground workings at Great Cobar. She stated that some areas of the town need regular maintenance due to subsidence and used the intersection of Lewis St and Harcourt St as an example. She also stated that there were stories regarding sinkholes appearing in parts of the town throughout Cobar's history, as well as the documented major collapse at the Elura (now Endeavor Mine) in 1996.

RM explained that the mining technique to be used at NCCEP would not typically cause subsidence, and that geotechnical specialists would be involved in the EIS who would assess the risk from subsidence.

KS requested more information on the mine plan, especially the geographic extent under both the town of Cobar (especially the heritage centre) and the historic mine workings. RM explained that more detail would come through during the exploration drive, and that the EIS will make use of mining options or scenarios to work out the likely extent of the project. CB also explained how stope mining (the method to be used for the NCCEP) is designed to minimise the risk of subsidence, as opposed to longwall coal mining which is designed to subside.

JP expressed concerns about the increase in blasting intensity. She explained that people in the town can already feel the blast vibrations at the New Cobar works, and that there would be concerns about the mining activities and associated blasting being located much closer to the town.

GW asked if vibration can be modelled, and if dilapidation reports would be required for potentially affected properties. RM stated that blasting would be modelled as part of the EIS, and that dilapidation reports would be undertaken if DPIE or another regulatory body requested it.

RM explained that the deeper the workings, the less vibration would be experienced. He also explained that the likely design of the mine will minimise the risk of subsidence and mine the low-risk areas first. He showed the members of the CCC a geotechnical model from another project to give an idea of the level of detail that would be undertaken for the geotechnical assessment for the EIS. He explained that members of different teams, such as hydrogeology and geotechnics would work together to ensure models generated for the project are accurate.

RM also explained that the study area for each technical study would be different, and dependent on the scope and extent of the expected impacts. He used examples of different study areas used for noise and air quality (relatively small, on a local scale) compared to social and economic (relatively large, on a regional scale).

JP stated that AM are trying hard to work well with the community and improve on the relatively poor relations with the community following the purchase of the mine and change in contract details. RM agreed and stated that AM are taking the approach of “do it once, and do it right”.

RG asked about the TSF and how it would fit in to the approvals process as it was not included in the SSD application, but would be used by the project to manage process wastes. RM explained that DPIE would not approve the NCCEP without an approval for the TSF expansion/management from Council. RG expressed concern that the TSF would not be fully rehabilitated if AM or Peak went out of business

GR asked how the works for the exploration drive would fit in to the EIS timeframes. RM explained that the EIS would assess the project cumulatively and holistically, and would include the details of the exploration drive.

No other items were raised, and the meeting closed at 18:15.