

McPhillamys Gold Project CCC Minutes

Title	McPhillamys Gold Project Community Consultative Committee (CCC) Meeting #20	
Meeting Date	28 November 2022 @ 6pm	
Venue	Attended both by ZOOM and in person at the Blayney Community Centre	
Chair	David Johnson (DJ)	Chairperson
Meeting Attendees	Jordan Butler (JB)	Community Representative
	Miles Hedge (MH)	Community Representative
	Peter Hildenbeutel (PH)	Community Representative
	Bruce Reynolds (BR)	Community Representative (Alternate for CS)
	Elizabeth Russ (ER)	Community Representative
	Robert (Bob) Russ (RR)	Community Representative (Alternate)
	Daniel Sutton (DS)	BHPG Representative
	Tom Williams (TW)	Community Representative
	Mark Dicker (MD)	GM, Blayney Council
	Heather Nicholls (HN)	Cabonne Shire Council (online)
	Graeme Hangar (RT)	Councillor, Bathurst Regional Council
	Stephen O'Donoghue*(SO)	Dept Planning & Env (Zoom)
	Kathryn Logan (KL)	Regis Resources
	Andrew Wannan (AW)	Regis Resources
	Wayne Taylor (WT)	Regis Resources
Apologies	Cyril Smith (CS) Paul Hancock (PH) Danielle Wallace (DW) Rachel Healy (RH)	ORWSA Representative Community Rep (Alternate) Regis Resources Regis Resources
Next Meeting	28 March 2023 @ 6.00pm Blayney Community Centre 91 Adelaide Street, Blayney NSW or Via ZOOM depending on COVID restrictions.	

MEETING WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS – David Johnson

Meeting opened at 6.08pm

Apologies tendered for meeting: Paul Hancock, Danielle Wallace, Rachel Healey

Introduction and Acknowledgement of Country by David Johnson

Declarations of pecuniary and non-pecuniary interests: Nil

BUSINESS ARISING FROM MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING (31 October 2022) – David Johnson

Actions:

A copy of October 2022, 3rd Amendment Report to be bound and posted to each CCC member.
Complete

Market release re sale of Glendower property to be provided to CCC

Included in last minutes

CORRESPONDENCE

- DPE review of CCC Guidelines in process
- Assessment Report sent to Independent Planning Commission, referral communicated to Chair, David Johnson
- Previous minutes circulated, no comments.

INDEPENDENT PLANNING COMMISSION - SITE VISIT

Did IPC see Kings Plains or only mine site? (MH)

Attendees saw drone footage of site, visited key points on site as well as Kings Plains over three hours.(AH)

Regis made the plan and took them where they want to see (BR)

The IPC had advance notice of the route and confirmed that it covered what they wanted to see. (AW)

Was anywhere left out? (DJ)

Absolutely, the process was independent but the route was influenced by Regis. I suggested 5 other areas for them to visit they visited none. (DS)

The volume of properties near the mine site was undersold. They didn't visit individual properties so the properties are being seen out of context. They didn't visit the intersection where the site entrance will be, the properties on Pounds Lane (even though toxic dust will blow in that direction), Vittoria State Forest, Guyong Rd and Vittoria Rd. All of those places would have added context and value. (DS)

The IPC did locality tours but we don't know where. (AW) This is normal. (DJ)

Visual aids can be included in submissions (DS)

There is no limit on visual aids that can be submitted showing Kings Plains properties so landowners can send videos as part of their submissions. People in Kings Plains are not satisfied with this because it doesn't show air and quietness. The proponent was benefited by the site visit (DS)

REGIS RESOURCES MCPHILLAMYS GOLD PROJECT UPDATE (PRESENTATION PUBLISHED ON WEBSITE)

Slide 7: Water modelling (answers to community questions)

Additional detail

Regis has a v-notch weir in the Belubula downstream from the mine site. Another one will be built on Trib A and another in the Belubula upstream of Trib A subject to approval. (AW)

How is monitoring done and can it be made available in real time? (MD)

Raw data is sent to ALS (a laboratory service with a specialisation in water testing). Real time monitoring information can be made available on a website dashboard.

Slide 8: Water licencing (answers to community questions)

Point of clarification: The regulator has told Regis what water licencing requirements are (not the other way around). (KL)

There are various licencing options available and additional licences will be required. Not all dams on site are required to be licenced – more information about this is available in the Regis responses to DPE Water. (AW)

Slide 9: Satellite projects (answers to community questions)

Point of clarification: If satellite projects were developed, would they go through a NSW Government approvals process, not a local government approval process. (KL)

What makes a development State Significant Development (SSD)? (DS)

There are triggers that push projects to different levels of the planning process. (MD)

The trigger for SSD mineral developments is >\$30M capital spend. For quarries it relates to the amount of material extracted. SSD can also be triggered by proximity to environmentally sensitive areas. (SO'D)

Where did the comment that Council could approve satellite developments come from? (ER)

I'm not sure but people have asked us about this. (KL)

If a satellite was developed in future and processing incorporated into the McPhillamys operation, would the extended mine life be covered under the current SSD application and possible approval? (DJ)

It would depend on the circumstances, for example, how long are modifications sought for. Tomingley Gold has surrendered their current approval and is seeking a new consent for the existing operation and a new pit. (SO'D)

Discovery Ridge is on the Regis resources list because there is an obligation to record resources. There is insufficient certainty to anticipate development, at the moment it's highly speculative. If it was developed it would be a whole new deal. (WT)

But a company could use their existing pit fleet and keep the cost of the project under \$30M. (DS)

No, the application must include the cost of fleet required for operations, infrastructure, crushing etc (SO'D)

Can the McPhillamys site process additional ore? Does the TSF have capacity to hold waste from additional processing? (DS)

Not under the current approval. If that were to happen the site would need a new waste rock emplacement for starters. It also depends where the crushing would happen. The TSF has freeboard conditions that allow for heavy rainfall conditions. (AW)

Has the site been designed with the intention that it has extra capacity? (DS)

No, projects have an obligation to justify capital investment value for the project under approval. (AW)

How much is a mining truck worth? (JB)

\$1.8M + for a modest sized truck and over several million for a large vehicle (200t+). So it's easy to spend over \$30M. (WT)

Does the current approval allow for processing of offsite ore? (DS)

No, only ore from McPhillamys. (SO'D)

Can you give us an updated idea of the capital cost? DS

No, capital cost is driven by an iterative process that factors in scheduling, planning and other things including building in the conditions of consent. (WT)

Capital cost is market sensitive and must be released to the market first. (KL)

Leaving a hole out there is not rehabilitation. (BR)

We have included a rehabilitation plan as part of the project. It will be assessed and approved by DPE, IPC and the Resources Regulator. (AW)

Rehabilitation may involve leaving a site looking different to what it did before mining. (DJ)

It is incorrect to say the koala offset is 8km from Blayney (DS)

Blayney was used as a reference point for the IPC. Regis has never said the Aziel offset is 8km from site.

Yes but it's nowhere near the mine site. (DS)

It is preferable to have offsets in the same bioregion and Aziel is in that region. Offsets need to be like for like. In this case the main class of offset required is PCT 1330, and the mine and Aziel match. Aziel provides 70% of the koala offsets required. (AW)

A lot of offsets are further away from the disturbance area than this. (DJ)

When Newcrest was approved a buffer area was put in around Cadia. This project doesn't seem to have one? (MH)

Do you mean physical zoning or land acquisitions by the company? (SO'D)

Cadia had to have a 2.5km buffer. (MH)

I had experience of the Cadia approval process from 1995 onwards and have no recollection of it. (AW)

GENERAL BUSINESS

Will the private briefings be publicised? (DS)

The IPC will provide Regis with questions asking for more information on how matters have been addressed. The questions may have come out of the site visit. Sending questions in advance allows the IPC to make their decision in a timely manner. (AW)

Private briefings are usually offered to proponents and Councils. Transcripts of private briefings are put up on the IPC website within a couple of days. We expect the IPC to send us (AW)

Discussion re Public Hearing and IPC process

The hearing will open with a briefing from DPE on the first day and a closing presentation on the last day. Public hearings may extend to a third day the following week. If new information comes to light IPC may provide opportunity for the public for additional comment. (SO'D)

DPE expects IPC to request an extension of 3-4 weeks over Christmas so an end February/March decision is realistic.

Comment to SO'D: The photo on the front of your report is of our place and Russes'. (MH)

If there is a positive determination, is there anything to stop RRL selling the McPhillamys Project?

There is no intention to sell the project because it is part of the company's growth strategy, bearing in mind that it would be a corporate decision. Regis could become an attractive takeover target. (WT)

The approval sits with the land not to company. (MD)

There are no fit and proper person tests within IPC or mining and environmental legislation. (SO'D)

Comment: Having been an IPC Commissioner, I have a high level of confidence that all submissions are considered fairly. I encourage the local community to make presentation and submissions (which are considered equally). (DJ)

Does IPC only consider current submissions or do they go back to EIS submissions? (ER)

They will look at the assessment on EIS submissions. (DJ)

They have all information available to them, and may go back to EIS submissions if it assists in making the determination. (SO'D)

So in our current submissions we should include material from original submission and new material. (ER)

Are the water diversions around TSF pumped or gravity? (DS)

- Both – Clean Water Facility 1A and 1B show diversions around the area.
- The EIS proposed to divert water (after closure) through a drop structure
- In the First Amendment Report this was changed to a meandering channel on a similar gradient to the Belubula
- Clean Water Facilities 1-5 are shown in the Second Amendment Report plans with blue lines indicating pipelines
- A stilling basin is designed to dissipate energy before water enters the river
- Pumps ensure small retention in water facilities which provides a better flow than a channel would

Regis has been approaching people re IPC submissions. (DS)

Please ring me. (KL)

There was a meeting about McPhillamys last Thursday. I have no idea what it was about? (JB)

It was a BHPG that was originally for members but was opened up to non-members. (DS)

Assuming the project is approved, will there be any change to the CCC? (DS)

Approval conditions require a CCC. (DJ)

It comes down to the new guidelines but I don't think they will change things that much. It's an opportunity for a refresh, sometimes the chair might change or new EOIs for positions are submitted. (SO'D)

If it is rejected, does the CCC meet again? (DS)

No. (SO'D)

Last week and the week before Regis advertised jobs in the paper. I was very angry. Regis is snubbing its nose at the IPC and the Kings Plains community. (ER)

I'm sorry the advertisements had that effect. The information in the ads has been run consistently over the last couple of years. The intention of the ads is to show the opportunities associated with the project if it is approved. (KL)

I would like an idea of the layout of the rooms in the hearings on the 8th and 9th? Is it like a court of law?

The Commissioners will be at the front of the room. There will be a place for people to stand and speak and a screen for presentations. There will be a list of speakers and who they represent. Individuals get five minutes and group speakers get 15 minutes. It is definitely not as formal as a court of law. The audience may not interject or interrupt – they will be asked to stop if they do. (DJ)

The IPC may ask questions or for clarification and their Counsel assisting may ask questions as well. This hearing will be a hybrid so some people may present online. (SO'D)

Martins Creek Quarry IPC public meeting is online at the IPC YouTube channel if anyone wants to watch it. (DS)

The room will be set up in the same way as it is for other large events in Blayney. (MD)

We were given three options when we registered – five, 10 or 15 minutes?
Time allocation is likely to depend on how many speakers register. (SOD)

Has Regis been advertising jobs? (DH)

No, not specific positions just statement of opportunities (as above). (KL)

What is the minimum distance or safety zone from houses that Regis may blast? MH

Within 500m of the pit rim which is well within the McPhillamys site and about 700m from the highway. The nearest property is over 1km from the blast zone. We are also limited to a small maximum instantaneous charge. (AW)

Will we be notified? ER

Not sure if we will notify every blast. Sites usually set a regular window of time and people know that blasting will happen between those hours. If that changes, we would notify people. (WT)

Wayne, can you give us your professional background please? (DS)

Laos, TriAusMin/Heron Resources (Woodlawn), Glencore (including Cobar), WMC, BHP Gold (Parkes) and South Africa.

I come from around the Millthorpe area. Have the water levels associated with recent flooding been noted? (PH)

Trib A flow was very high - outside range of v notch. The site pluviometers recorded lower falls than nearby areas.

We got a height level over a period of time but the level could not be converted to a flow volume.

The TSF will be built to tolerate a one in 10,000 year 72-hour flood event which has been indicated as potentially 350mm in 72 hours.

MEETING CLOSED

Meeting closed at approximately 7.54pm

	Action Items	Responsible	Due By
1	Book Blayney Community Centre for 27 March 2023	Kath Logan	Complete
2	Draft minutes to be provided to the Chairperson	Kath Logan	Complete
3	Draft minutes distributed to members by email (including alternates)	David Johnson	8 December 2022
4	Committee members provide comment on minutes to Chairperson	All committee members	15 December 2022
5	Minutes finalised & posted on the McPhillamys Website	David Johnson Rachel Healy	18 December 2022