
MINUTES OF THE ASHTON COAL PROJECT
COMMUNITY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE
TUESDAY 17 JUNE 2008
11:00PM - ASHTON COAL PROJECT SITE OFFICE

ATTENDEES:

Brian Thomas	(BT)	Singleton Council (Chairman)
Fred Harvison	(FH)	Singleton Council
Paul Ashford	(PA)	Community Representative
John McInerney	(JM)	Community Representative
Tracey Clarke	(TC)	Community Representative
Peter Barton	(PB)	Company Rep (General Manager)
Lisa Richards	(LR)	Company Rep (Environment & Community Relations Mgr)
Brian Wesley	(BW)	Company Rep (Underground Mine Manager)
Shane Pegg	(SP)	Company Rep (Underground Tech Services Manager)
Peter Dundon	(PD)	Hydrogeologist and Groundwater Specialist
Peter Horn	(PH)	Maunsell (SMP Project Manager)
Amanda Kerr	(AK)	Maunsell (SMP Project Manager)
Adam Spargo	(AS)	Minute Taker (Environmental Coordinator)

1. OPENING OF THE MEETING BY THE CHAIRPERSON

The Chairman opened the meeting at 11.10pm.

2. APOLOGIES

Apologies were received from Greg Summerhayes (Department of Primary Industries), Thelma DeJong (Community Representative), Deidre Olofsson (Community Representative) and Cr Fred Harvison (Singleton Council). FH arrived later during the meeting.

Tracey Clarke attended on behalf of Thelma DeJong

3. DECLARATION OF PECUNIARY INTEREST BY COMMUNITY REPRESENTATIVES

Nil declared.

4. MINUTES FROM PREVIOUS MEETING

Minutes from the meeting held on 11 March 2008 were accepted as a true and accurate record:

Moved: John McInerney

Seconded: Paul Ashford

5. BUSINESS ARISING FROM PREVIOUS MINUTES

Nil

6. REPORTS AND OVERVIEW OF ACTIVITIES

6.1 OPERATIONS OVERVIEW

PB provided an overview of the operations to date, covering the Open Cut and Underground Operations and the CHPP. PB also described the consolidation of the Mine Lease.

PB indicated that Ashton is still looking at the feasibility of the SEOC. Indicated that this is behind schedule.

JM discussed the success of the OGM and the evident benefit to the rehabilitation. BT asked about using the OGM as a top dressing, PB indicated that due to the plastics content the material needs to be raked into the surface.

PB indicated that DoP had proposed to conduct a cumulative impact study on noise and dust in Camberwell Village.

6.2 ENVIRONMENTAL

There was discussion by the Community Representative that last Thursday's blast was very big causing a lot of Overpressure. LR indicated the blast results. Two shots were fired on Thursday 12 June 2008. The blast results at the village blast monitor were 2mm/s vibration and 115dBL overpressure for the first shot fired at 10:41am and 3mm/s vibration and 108dBL overpressure for the second shot fired at 10:45am. BT asked if the blast commented on by CCC members last Thursday was included in the blast statistics. LR indicated that this was the case. JM indicated that it was the loudest blast he had heard in a number of years. It was shown that all criteria for the blast were within criteria for Ashton Coal.

Ashton has now separated complaints received through Ashton Coal's complaints line and complaints received through the DECC. FH asked how Ashton Coal determines the difference between a complaint and an enquiry. LR indicated that enquiries are complaints that are received from residents with agreements with Ashton Coal formed under the development consent.

PA presented a bag of dust and that he had collected from the roof of his house. He asked why there was a lot of dust on his roof when the dust gauge was showing low levels of deposited dust. It was indicated that the month of May, may have had high levels of deposited dust and that Ashton would supply PA with the May dust results when they were available.

6.3 SUBSIDENCE MANAGEMENT PLAN PRESENTATION

BW, SP, PD, PH, AK joined the meeting at this point. SP gave a presentation on the SMP process and underground mine plan.

BT asked how the long wall would be reduced to the mini walls. SP indicated that the longwall would be reduced in width once the miniwall section was reached. A second gate road would be driven to provide the desired width of the miniwall.

BT asked if the modeling had been based upon the results of 1 seam or 4 seams. SP indicated that the model had been calibrated on 2 panels in the Pikes Gully Seam and would be further validated using monitoring from longwall panels 3 and 4.

BT asked how the helium testing worked and is this reliable. SP indicated that the helium testing forms a part of an ACARP study and involves injecting helium gas into the goaf and testing at the surface to see if it rises through. The information provided from the test indicates that there is some form of impermeable barrier between the surface and the UG. PD indicated that the helium test, groundwater monitoring and subsidence modeling combine together to suggest that there is some form of barrier between the mine and the surface and self-healing of cracking. The width of the miniwalls is then based on a conservative figure that does not assume self healing will continue to occur and therefore any subsidence may be lower than indicated in the predictions.

BT enquired if it is identified that the lower seams could cause cracking through to the surface would there be a reassessment and the mine stopped. SP indicated that we would assess each seam following the SMP processes which is required by the Development Consent.

BT asked if DPI have their experts involved in the process. BW indicated that Gang Lee has been involved throughout the process along with DWE's Fergus Hancock.

JM indicated that he thought that staggering the longwalls, as discussed in a previous meeting, seems like it would greatly help to prevent cracking.

PA asked if we would be looking at the impacts that Glendell's creek diversion would have on the project. LR indicated that it would not impact greatly on our system however DWE have been looking into monitoring and investigating the Glendell project.

JM asked what the open day would include. PD indicated that the open day would aim to show people what the process involves and answer anyone's questions regarding the process.

6.4 ACTION ITEMS FROM PREVIOUS MEETING

SECTION 94 – LIST OF PRIORITISED WORKS

PB indicated that LR and BT should speak with the relevant people at council following the meeting and identify the plan to begin the project. The committee would then discuss the outcome at the following meeting.

INVERSION STATISTICS

LR indicated that 52% of nights have an inversion greater than 3^o/100m of varying lengths in time.

7. GENERAL BUISNESS**NOISE FROM ASHTON COAL CHPP**

JM had indicated that he has been able to hear a lot more noise from the CHPP, particularly the loader. PB indicated that we were looking into replacing the 994 loader due to noise levels. LR indicated that 3rd gear reverse had been removed from all dozers. LR indicated that the southern bund wall had been completed and was designed to reduce noise from dumping operations on Camberwell Village.

8. DATE FOR NEXT MEETING

30 September 2008

9. SITE INSPECTION OF THE OPERATIONS

A site inspection was undertaken at 10:00am. PA, JM, LR and AS were present. The inspection was focused on the rehabilitation works to date and the OGM trial.

MEETING CLOSED AT 1:30PM

ACTION ITEMS

ITEM	RESPONSIBILITY
Supply Paul Ashford with the deposited dust results for May at Site 2.	AS
Meet with Singleton Council regarding section 94 works.	LR, BT