

# McPhillamys Gold Project CCC Minutes

Title	McPhillamys Gold Project Community Consultative Committee (CCC) Meeting #6	
Meeting Date	25 November 2019 @ 6pm	
Venue	Blayney Community Centre- 91 Adelaide Street, Blayney NSW	
Chair	<b>David Johnson</b>	Independent Chairperson
Meeting Attendees	<b>Miles Hedge</b> <b>Evan Leitch</b> <b>Elizabeth Russ</b> <b>Bob Russ</b> <b>Peter Hildenbeutel</b> <b>Jim Newman</b> <b>Tom Williams</b> <b>Daniel Sutton</b>	Community Representative Community Representative Community Representative Community Representative Community Representative Community Representative Community Representative Alternate BHPG Representative
	<b>Rebecca Ryan</b>	Blayney Council
	<b>Rod Smith</b> <b>Tony McPaul</b> <b>Andrew Wannan</b> <b>Chris Roach</b> <b>Sarah Taylor</b>	Regis Resources Regis Resources Regis Resources Regis Resources Alternate Regis Resources
	<b>Stacey McFawn</b>	Minutes
Apologies	Cyril Smith Bob Bourke Heather Nicholls	ORWSA Representative Mayor, Bathurst Council Cabonne Council

Next Meeting	24 <sup>th</sup> February 2020 @ 6.00pm Blayney Community Centre 91 Adelaide Street, Blayney NSW
--------------	--

### **MEETING WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS - David Johnson**

Meeting opened at 6:04pm.

Apologies for the meeting tendered for Bob Bourke and Heather Nicholls Introduction by David Johnson:

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

### **BUSINESS ARISING FROM MINTUES OF LAST MEETING – David Johnson**

- The minutes of the last meeting (of 23 September 2019) were approved by the Community Consultative Committee as being read and correct. • No previous notifications. **CORRESPONDENCE**
- No correspondence.

### **REGIS RESOURCES MCPHILLAMYS GOLD PROJECT UPDATE**

- PowerPoint presentation by Tony McPaul as follows (copy on McPhillamys website)
- EIS lodged the 15<sup>th</sup> July 2019.
- Still awaiting submissions from DPIE Water and NRAR (Natural Resources Access Regulator).
- Total of 669 submissions received to date.
- Open days were held on the 15 and 16<sup>th</sup> October.
- Meetings with near neighbours are continuing.
- Sponsorship/donations of local events such as the 50<sup>th</sup> National Working Kelpie Trials and Blayney Harness Racing.
- Water monitoring continuing.
- Aziel property (offset property)- Ecology survey completed. Koala scats found.
- Regulatory approvals process updated. (refer to PowerPoint presentation).
- There have been no further updates regarding the pipeline.

### **Questions arising from presentation**

- Evan Leitch asked if we were expecting a submission from the Department of Health?

*Answer: No, we are not expecting a submission from the Department of Health. Regis have commissioned a health impact assessment.*

- Miles Hedge questioned whether the IPC will be held locally or in Sydney?

*Answer: It will be more than likely be held here in Blayney.*

- Evan Leitch asked if Regis expect any problems having the responses answered by February 2020?

*Answer: It will be a challenge, so we do not know yet.*

- Evan Leitch questioned what the 12-18 months referred to.?

*Answer: Tony McPaul explained that this was the average time taken for approvals.*

- Miles Hedge stated that he had written to Paul Toole (Local Member) to ask why a second pipeline could not be installed to provide additional water to Blayney

- David Johnson asked if we had received any submissions in regards to the pipeline?

*Answer: Andrew Wannan stated that there were a number of submissions covering a variety of aspects*

- Daniel Sutton asked what is the purpose of examining the offset land- Aziel Property and do we use the same process on the mine site?

*Answer: Andrew Wannan explained the concept of biodiversity credits.*

- Daniel Sutton asked whether Regis looked for Koala scat at McPhillamys?

*Answer: Tony McPaul explained that there was no need as one koala had been identified there.*

- Evan Leitch questioned what does the Stewardship arrangement entail?

*Answer: Andrew Wannan explained that this was answered in one of the questions that Evan had provided to the meeting.*

- Peter Hildenbeutel had been asked by a member of the community a question regarding the glare back towards the Guyong road to the mine site?

*Answer: Andrew Wannan explained that the design will aim to soften the light through the use of LED lighting, etc, however it is likely though that there will be some night glow.*

### **Other Agenda Items**

No Other Agenda Items.

### **GENERAL BUSINESS**

No General Business

### **Additional Explanations Relating to Questions & Answers from the CCC Meeting:**

#### **Evan Leitch Questions 25/11/19**

- Evan Leitch- why the Noise Assessment PEER Review was not included in the EIS?  
*Answer: Peer reviews where completed would be included in the Response to Submissions (RTS) phase.*
- Daniel Sutton questioned should the conversations be happening now regarding the VLAMP (voluntary land acquisition and mitigation policy) if the PEER Review determines an extra 10 people?  
*Answer: Regis believes the noise report is robust and are proceeding with discussions with local residents.*
- Daniel Sutton asked if the VLAMP criteria changes, does the agreement change?  
*Answer: Regis does not anticipate it changing, however, if the criteria does change the agreements may require review. In addition to this, if additional property owners were determined to be within an affected area, then that would be taken into consideration accordingly.*

#### **Daniel Sutton Questions 25/11/19**

- Evan Leitch asked if we have purchased all of the Aziel property (offset property). *Answer: Yes, Regis has purchased all of the Aziel property.*
- Miles Hedge questioned how much natural occurring asbestos is there?  
*Answer: Rod Smith explained that normal procedures as carried out traditionally as best practice by exploration companies assessing if fibrous materials were present had not detected any naturally occurring fibrous material across the project site. However, Regis has since carried out more detailed assessments on some samples at microscopic levels and some fibrous material was detected in some samples. Whether this material is sufficient in quantity or of a nature that is detrimental to health is yet to be determined and further studies are underway. All of these results would form part of the RTS phase.*

#### **Other Business**

- Regis will be closing the office for the Christmas break from the 24<sup>th</sup> Dec – 2<sup>nd</sup> Jan.
- BHPG will be holding a general meeting on the 14th December.
- Rebecca Ryan reiterated the Blayney Council has ongoing support for all BHPG members.
- Rebecca Ryan to follow up on when the DPIE will come to chat to the community.

## **ACTIONS**

	<b>Action Items</b>	<b>Who</b>	<b>Due By</b>
1	Book Blayney Community Centre for the 25 <sup>th</sup> November 2019 @6pm	Stacey McFawn	26 <sup>th</sup> November 2019
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 13/12/19
5	Minutes finalised & posted on the McPhillamys Website	David Johnson Rod Smith	By 23/12/19
6	Questions and answers from the <u>May</u> CCC meeting to be added to the McPhillamys website.	Stacey McFawn	By 23/12/19

## **MEETING CLOSED**

Meeting closed at 7.05pm.

## **NEXT MEETING**

Monday 24<sup>th</sup> February 2020 at 6pm at the Blayney Community Centre, 91 Adelaide Street, Blayney NSW.

## **Attachment 1**

**Questions received by Evan Leitch for the**

**CCC meeting of 25-11-19**

**Questions from concerned community members submitted for answer at McPhillamys Gold Project Community Consultative Committee meeting on 25/11/2019. (Evan Leitch)**

1. In the Hansen Bailey SIA (EIS v. 8, SIA) it is reported that a HIA (Health Impact Assessment) is to be completed in parallel with the project approvals process (p.171, p. 196) and communicated to all PAA residents. Has this assessment been completed and if so when and how will it be communicated to residents? If not yet completed when will it be available and how will it be communicated to residents?

*A. Health Impact Assessment is being undertaken. It has not been completed yet. It is likely to form part of the response to submissions.*

2. The EPA has noted significant deficiencies in the assessment of air quality and noise as presented in the EIS. Will Regis expedite EPA – acceptable revisions of these reports so that, where necessary, sensitive receptors have their VLAMP status determined correctly?

*A. The Environment Protection Agency (EPA) have made comments relating to the EIS. Regis will respond to these and other comments made in other submissions as part of the response to submissions*

3. Will RRL make the ‘peer review’ for the EIS noise assessment available on the McPhillamys website?

*A. More information is required about which peer review is being referred to.*

4. Does RRL accept the figure of \$850 000 (or an average of \$12 3190 for 69 houses) as indicated in the EIS Economic Assessment as the cost of ‘varying degrees of visual mitigation’ of the effects of ‘adverse visual impacts’ arising from the MGP (EIS V.10, App DD p. 26)?

*A. Regis made an allowance of \$850,000 for visual mitigation (EIS V.10, APP DD p 28) the amount required per residence will vary greatly.*

5. Does RRL accept the average cost of noise mitigation at moderately impacted (3 to 5 dB exceedances) of \$12 000 as indicated in the Economic Assessment (EIS V 10, App DD p. 28) and In view of the substantial changes that may arise from revision of the noise assessment should this figure be regarded as a minimum?

(Note: It should not be assumed that the figures in questions 4 and 5 are acceptable to any resident adversely affected by the MGP).

*A. In the EIS V 10, App DD p.26 the amount mentioned is \$20,000. Note no amount has been discussed with any of the impacted residents. The focus has been on the effectiveness of the mitigation not the cost of the mitigation.*

6. (a) Will the condition recommended by Roads and Maritime, in their response to the EIS, that the site access from the Mid-Western Highway be constructed prior to any (other) construction works commence significantly extend the total length of the construction phase of the mine project? (b) will (a) and the additional recommendations in design of the intersection lead to a time extension of at least 9 months in total site construction time?

*A. As we are still working through the submissions, we are not in a position to answer this question at this stage.*

7. Will the SISD (Safe intersection sight distance) of 262 metres be satisfied by the EIS-indicated mine access intersection for west-bound traffic?

*A. The intersection has been designed to meet road standards. Page 23 Appendix Q of the EIS states that the proposed access satisfies minimum sight distances (SSID) requirements.*

**Questions received by Daniel Sutton for the  
CCC meeting dated 25/11/19**

Q. Is Regis aware that their tree guards are blowing around the state forest disturbing the fauna in the area, in particular the bees that use the area, noting that the population has considerably increased in the last 4 weeks as the considerable beekeeping business that leases it has increased the number of hives in the forest? What will Regis do to ensure their operations will not continue to impede those of existing businesses?

*A. Regis is aware that from time to time some of the tree guards blow off. Regis recovers and replace the missing tree guards where possible.*

Q. Has Regis made any further progress on the acquisition of offset land? What can the land be used for?

*A. Regis has purchased land which is proposed to assist with biodiversity offsets. The offset strategy may involve a range of outcomes to satisfy the relevant agencies. NSW Environment, Energy and Science provide information on the Biodiversity Offsets Scheme.*

Q. Will Regis make their procedures for naturally occurring asbestos available to the public? If so, when/where can it be accessed and if not, why not? Can you confirm that one already exists, and if so, when was it last revised?

*A. Regis has a procedure for naturally occurring asbestos that is applied to its exploration activities. The NSW government also provides general guidance on managing the risks associated with asbestos in NSW including naturally occurring asbestos and for the preparation of asbestos management plans for construction and operational activities. Regis will prepare a plan as required. Such plan will be prepared and adopted in consultation with relevant agencies prior to commencement of any construction associated with the project.*

Q. Does Regis intend to comply/adopt all suggestions from all Council and government authority submissions, regardless of what may be imposed by the DPIE/IPC in the final consent? Given Regis continues to claim they're a community focused business, we would expect that they adopt any and all recommendations/suggestions from the community representatives.

*A. The purpose of the response to submissions (RTS) is to consider the issues raised and determine responses and commitments. Regis will determine the appropriate response particularly where a range of suggestions may relate to a particular matter.*

Q. Why did the proponent not know proposed traffic volumes at the time of EIS submission? Given they detailed the level of equipment used and claim to know how many people they will employ, surely they would know, or have a reasonable estimate of traffic flow from the proposal? When do they expect to have this data?

*A. A reasonable estimate of traffic generated by the project was provided in Appendix Q of the EIS.*