

McPhillamys Gold Project CCC Minutes

Title	McPhillamys Gold Project Community Consultative Committee (CCC) Meeting #7	
Meeting Date	24 February 2020 @ 6pm	
Venue	Blayney Community Centre- 91 Adelaide Street, Blayney NSW	
Chair	David Johnson	Independent Chairperson
Meeting		
Attendees	<p>Evan Leitch Community Representative Elizabeth Russ Community Representative Bob Russ Community Representative Alternate Peter Hildenbeutel Community Representative Tom Williams Community Representative Alternate Daniel Sutton BHPG Representative Cyril Smith ORWSA Representative</p> <p>Rebecca Ryan Blayney Council Heather Nicholls Cabonne Council</p> <p>Rod Smith Regis Resources Tony McPaul Regis Resources Andrew Wannan Regis Resources Frank Botica Regis Resources- Observer Sarah Taylor Regis Resources- Observer</p> <p>Stacey McFawn Minutes</p>	
Apologies	Jim Newman Bob Bourke Miles Hedge Chris Roach	Community Representative Mayor, Bathurst Council Community Representative Regis Resources Alternate
Next Meeting	1 st June 2020 @ 6.00pm Blayney Community Centre 91 Adelaide Street, Blayney NSW	

MEETING WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS - David Johnson

Meeting opened at 6:03pm.

Apologies for the meeting tendered for Bob Bourke, Miles Hedge, Jim Newman and Chris Roach.

Introduction by David Johnson:

- No declaration of pecuniary and non-pecuniary interests to declare.

BUSINESS ARISING FROM MINUTES OF LAST MEETING – David Johnson

- The minutes of the last meeting (of 25th November 2019) were approved by the Community Consultative Committee as being read and correct.
- No previous notifications.
- Rebecca Ryan: Steven O'Donoghue (DPIE) has advised he could not attend this meeting. Phillipa Duncan is currently on maternity leave. Steven will try to attend the next CCC meeting.

CORRESPONDENCE

- No correspondence.

REGIS RESOURCES MCPHILLAMYS GOLD PROJECT UPDATE

- PowerPoint presentation by Tony McPaul as follows (copy on McPhillamys website)
- 671 submissions received in total – final ones received in January 2020
- Regis are currently preparing Response to Submissions – anticipated to be lodged with DPIE mid-year. An Amendment Report would be lodged at the same time to reflect updates/changes to the project plan arising from submissions feedback and project fine tuning.
- Various community and stakeholder meetings and engagements.
- Community Information Sheet #10 is scheduled for distribution in March.
- McPhillamys project activities include the V-notch weir which is located on the Regis owned property.
- Air quality monitoring is continuing on and around the site.
- Regis is currently working with LLS to help control the rabbit population.
- Native tree propagation and planting is continuing.
- Biodiversity surveys on the proposed offset property 'Azil' have been completed and more are to be undertaken.
- Regis working with FOOD Week and Orange 360 to promote local events.
- Project referral to Independent Planning Commission yet to be announced by DPIE.

Questions arising from presentation

- Evan Leitch - Are submissions to DPIE received after the close date still accepted?
Answer - Submissions received by the DPIE after the closing date are not counted in the official figures but we believe will be considered by DPIE.
- Daniel Sutton - Is there a specific month the Response to Submissions will be completed.
Answer - Middle of year (June/July).
- Rebecca Ryan - What is the success rate for the native planting tree line?
Answer – Survival rate ranges between 10% and. 60%, in different parts of the tree line. Factors including drought and interference from native animals have affected the success rate. These will be replanted.
- Cyril Smith- Did you have a watering program for the native trees?
Answer-Yes Watering was carried out by Regis and Skillset.
- Evan Leitch- Further question regarding the EIS submissions closing date and submissions being accepted after this date.
Answer- Advice to be sought by Regis from Steven O'Donoghue (DPIE) on this question.

Other Agenda Items

No Other Agenda Items.

GENERAL BUSINESS

No General Business

Other Business

- It was agreed that committee members should aim to lodge questions with Regis at least one week prior to future meetings to enable time for the questions and answers to be circulated to all committee members prior to the meeting. This way, only further questions and discussions arising from the answers provided will be required at the meeting.
- Tony McPaul advised that over the coming months Regis would commence some operational readiness such as engaging with potential mining contractors and pre-ordering machinery and equipment which require long lead times and/or bookings with manufacturers for non 'off the shelf' items. These activities involve a financial risk to Regis as they can incur expenses prior to a decision on whether the project is approved. But it is important to undertake some preparatory work in order to avoid lengthy delays in the event of an approval being given.
- Request for CC Committee group photo to be included in an article in the next Regis newsletter to promote the Committee and its work to the local community. This was agreed by the meeting and photo taken after close.

ACTIONS

	Action Items	Who	Due By
1	Book Blayney Community Centre for the 1 st June 2020 @6pm	Stacey McFawn	25 th February 2020
2	Draft minutes to be provided to the Chairperson.	Stacey McFawn	Within one week
3	Draft minutes distributed to members by email Including the alternate representatives	David Johnson	Within one week
4	Committee members provide comment on minutes to Chairperson	All committee members	By 27 th March 2020
5	Minutes finalised & posted on the McPhillamys Website	David Johnson Rod Smith	By 1 st May 2020
6	Questions and answers from the <u>February</u> CCC meeting to be added to the McPhillamys website.	Stacey McFawn	By 1 st May 2020

MEETING CLOSED

Meeting closed at 7.30pm.

NEXT MEETING

Monday 1st June 2020 at 6pm at the Blayney Community Centre, 91 Adelaide Street, Blayney NSW.

Note : This date yet to be confirmed and may need to be changed (or form of meeting altered) due to continuing coronavirus restrictions.

Attachment 1

Questions for Community Consultative Committee Meeting of 24 February 2020 tended by Evan Leitch

1. Further to my question 9 from 25-09-2019 regarding peer reviews of EIS technical studies. It is stated In Volume 1B page 739 of the EIS that peer reviews ‘in the areas of the TSF design, groundwater modelling, surface water management and the assessment of noise management’ were undertaken.

With respect to groundwater modelling an appropriately detailed independent review was undertaken that appears to have been completely reported in EIS Volume 5, Appendix H of Appendix K (Appendix H only internally paginated).

Evidently there has been some interchange between the author and a presumably independent specialist during the finalising of the 'surface water management 'EIS report (Volume 4, Appendix J) but the 5-sentence letter included in the Appendix (attachment D) does not qualify as a peer review.

Further, although Regis has involved a risk management facilitator to guide discussion of the risks involved in the TSF (see EIS volume 3 A, Appendix E) it is clear from paragraph 8 on page 30 that Appendix E does not qualify in any way as a 'peer review'. I could find no indication of the presence of a peer review in the EIS volume 2A Appendix D Table of contents, nor during several albeit incomplete examinations of the Appendix. A 'within house' reviewer is indicated on the title page of the Appendix and the "conditions etc" of the Appendix as indicated on the following page (i) indicate that again comments made by the reviewer do not qualify as a 'peer review' of the TSF.

I could find no review or reference to a peer review in the 'noise and vibration impact' part of the EIS (Volume 6, Appendix L) nor elsewhere except in volume 1B as mentioned above.

The following questions arise:

1a Is RRL (or LFB Resources) in possession of 'peer reviews' as indicated in EIS Volume 1? 1b Why was only that for 'groundwater' included in the EIS?

1c Will RRL release the peer review on 'noise management' it reports, in EIS volume 1 to have obtained?

1d Will RRL release the other peer reviews that it or its consultants have obtained on the studies making up the EIS?

*Regis and EMM sought reviews from other specialists to provide additional confidence that the assessments submitted with the EIS were appropriate. The groundwater peer review was included in the EIS as it was a specific requirement of the Department of Industry - Water (EARs.) In relation to noise Regis will further address noise impacts through the Submissions Report and in ongoing communications with relevant agencies.
Regis will release information relevant to its reports in its Submissions Report.*

2. In its December 19 quarterly report RRL reports that "Regis is working with the community and Transgrid to identify the optimum route and placement of infrastructure" to allow electricity to be connected to the McPhillamys Project.

Will RRL now inform the community of the proposed route, or alternative routes, for the power supply?

The powerline project will be a separate Development Application to the McPhillamys Development Application. Planning for the powerline has been progressing with some landowners and electricity infrastructure providers. Regis will provide information on the powerline in its Submissions Report or sooner if possible.

3. Discovery Ridge is likely a “very significant additional value proposition for the McPhillamys Project” and leads to a “change in scope for the (McPhillamys) DFS” (RRL September 2019 quarterly report).

Will it be necessary to have an EIS for Discovery Ridge (and perhaps Bald Hill) accepted before the DFS is completed?

The relevant section from the September quarterly report in full says, “Discovery Ridge continues to shape up as a very significant additional proposition for the McPhillamys Project and work is currently underway on a maiden reserve estimate.” As we have stated all along the EIS and DA are for McPhillamys only.

4. Noise and air quality rank in the top five concerns of those objectors resident close to the McPhillamys Gold Project. The assessment of these parameters as reported in the EIS have been severely criticised by the NSW EPA.

In view of their importance in determining land acquisition and mitigation under the VLAMP criteria does RRL plan to have its consultants carry out additional (i) field investigations, (ii) data collection and (iii) modelling, to remedy the multiple shortcomings identified by the EPA and present a more credible assessment of the increase in noise and decline in air quality should mining proceed?

Issues raised by the NSW EPA have been discussed with both DPIE and EPA. Regis and its consultants are providing further information that demonstrates that the assessment methods are robust and appropriate. Further sensitivity analysis has been undertaken which confirms results for the noise assessment and as such the VLAMP criteria remains effectively unchanged. Information will be provided in the Submissions Report.

5. Although the NSW VLAMP Policy places much emphasis in noise and air quality changes in assessing mitigation measures in reaction to changes brought about by mining developments the policy document also includes references to social and environmental impacts.

What is RRL's policy towards approaches from neighbours for mitigation for decrease in visual amenity and night light pollution?

Regis is engaging with affected residents on ways that visual impacts can be managed.

6. **How would the early years development timetable changes should access to the mine site be restricted to the Mid-Western Highway?**

Regis is communicating with relevant roads authorities to consider the options for construction access pending the new access. Regis expects that appropriate solutions can be determined with the agencies. The outcomes will be reported in the Submissions Report.

7. **In at least two Government Department responses to the EIS it is indicated that once any earthworks commence on the land surface that will ultimately be included in the pit miningshould be considered underway. If this proves to be the case will this advance the time that the change from construction to minings is defined for purposes including how noise is treated for VLAMP mitigation?**

The EPA submission discusses construction phases and then suggests separating it into different activities. This is not supported by precedents or common practice. It is usual that consideration is given in phases allowing for construction then operations when product is actually produced following commissioning. It would be appropriate that construction was deemed to be occurring while at least the plant is being built. In other comparable projects, construction was deemed to occur until after commissioning. Regis will outline its position on this matter in the Submissions Report.

Questions tabled at CCC meeting to Regis on 24.02.2020 from Daniel Sutton as community rep.

1. **Is Regis carrying out ongoing maintenance and proactive care for the 4000+ trees they've planted? Are many of them still alive given the current climate? Will Regis be planting more to replace the ones that have died? When will this be carried out and will they have a proactive plan for management and care this time?**

Despite hand watering, a number of the trees planted this year have died due to the drought and the impact of native animals. Replacement trees will be grown from seeds collected locally and they will be planted at the appropriate time.

- 2. Can Regis confirm what further modeling will be carried out on the back of the submissions made in response to their EIS? Can we get an estimate of when these are expected to be completed and subsequently, when the RTS is expected to be completed?**

Further modeling will occur as required. The RTS is currently expected to be submitted around the middle of the year.

- 3. Expanding on the above, if particular modeling isn't going to be carried out, can we get an update from Regis about how their consultations with governing bodies are going in relation to issues they raised in their submissions to the EIS? In particular around the criticisms and dismissal of the modeling around Noise, Air Quality, TSF and the RMS disallowing the use of Dungeon Rd and demanding the Mid-Western Hwy intersection be constructed first?**

Discussions have taken place and they will continue to take place between the relevant parties with the final position included in the RTS.

- 4. Has there been any further progression on the VPA and its inclusions? Can we please get another explanation of this process as I've had a few folk queries about the publicity and consultation process around it?**

VPA negotiations are expected to commence shortly.