



Dargues Reef

Community Consultative Committee

Minutes of Thirtieth Meeting

The DRCCC held its 30th meeting on 17 December 2018 at the Majors Creek Hall.

Meeting

Attendance: Brian Elton Chairperson, Rebecca Bigg, David Lever, Matt Darwon, Belinda Royds, Peter Cormick, Kathleen Waddell (Alternate Member for Bill Waterhouse), Karis Sanderson (Observer), Pete Harrison (QPRC), Len Sharp (Gold Mine), Paul Rouse (Dargues Gold Mine), Mick South (Dargues Gold Mine), James Dornan (Dargues Gold Mine – Subject Matter Expert), Shannon Green (Dargues Gold Mine - Observer), Hannah Bubb (Elton Consulting – minutes), Marjorie Lemin (Observer), Randall Lemin (Observer), Geoff Wolford (Observer) and Sophie Lee (Observer).

Not present: Bill Waterhouse, Richard Roberts, Brett Corven (ESC).

Apologies were received from: Bill Waterhouse, Richard Roberts, Brett Corven (ESC).

A site visit was held before the meeting in order to view the proposed Spring Creek crossing relocation from Modification 4.

Pecuniary and other interests

In keeping with the *Community Consultative Committee Guidelines – State Significant Projects* (Department of Planning and Environment, 2016) all members are asked to declare any pecuniary or other interests. No changes were reported by members present.

Minutes

The minutes of the CCC meetings are available to the public at the Braidwood office of the Queanbeyan-Palerang Regional Council and via the Company's website (www.divminerals.com.au).

Matters arising

Len Sharp raised a clarification of the September meeting minutes. With regard to unattended noise monitoring of traffic there would be no concentrate trucking at night.

Peter Cormick sought further information regarding a question responded to via the minutes of the September meeting (Attachment 4). Peter queried how waivers on management plans come about and who determines whether any of the requirements set out at Condition 2 of Schedule 5 of the Project Approval, are unnecessary.

It was clarified that there are broad requirements for all management plans and a waiver depends on whether any standard aspect is relevant to the specific management plan (e.g. baseline data). The Chair added that the Secretary may waive certain provisions of a management plan.

Peter Cormick asked whether the CCC would be consulted on changes if there was to be a waiver.

James Dornan responded that this is captured in a management plan review. James added that the company has previously agreed to send all management plans for consultation with the CCC, noting that any changes to management plans are marked up to ensure that changes can be tracked. Final determination is made by the Secretary of the Department of Planning and Environment (DPE).

The company introduced the new General Manager of the Dargues Gold Mine, Shannon Green.

The Chair raised that the company would confirm which representatives of the Dargues Gold Mine would act as CCC members in 2019.

Correspondence

The Chair stated correspondence had been received via Matt Darwon, Peter Cormick and Kathleen Waddell. Correspondence is provided in Attachment 1.

Peter Cormick stated that he had contacted the DPE requesting an extension to the exhibition period of modification 4.

The Chair shared correspondence from DPE regarding the request, stating that the 14 day exhibition period is as per the minimum statutory timeframe and is commensurate with the nature and complexity of the modification and would remain unchanged. The correspondence continued, stating that the Department would accept any additional information submitted to the Department over the Christmas/New Year period. The Chair undertook to confirm submissions received up to Monday 7 January would be considered by DPE.

Presentation: Modification 4

Matt Darwon stated that having visited the site, he could see the modification is a better solution than the previously approved location. Matt added that there would be less of an impact from noise but there would be similar environmental issues and that he was satisfied with it.

Belinda Royds stated that it would have been beneficial for the community and CCC to be provided with a plain language description of the Modification.

David Lever agreed, adding that it was not made clear whether the proposed change in location was due to new information becoming available to the company since Modification 3, or the result of reassessment of the existing information..

James Dornan stated that it was not the company's intention to have exhibition so close the Christmas. James provided a timeline of the process, noting that the company had met with DPE in October to discuss the project layout. At this time DPE had believed public exhibition would not be required, however, the Dargues Gold Mine was subsequently advised that the modification would be placed on public exhibition.

James added that the company's intention was to consult with the CCC whether or not public exhibition was required. James added that legal advice was sought with regards to how the project would be modified as the Dargues Gold Mine is now State Significant Development (SSD) and falls under s5.56 of the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979*. It was stated that the time taken to put the modification on exhibition was impacted by the need to obtain legal advice, and the consequent requirement for DPE to transition the project to SSD as well as the preparation of the SoEE.

Matt Darwon stated that it would have been good for the company to forewarn the community, as the community worried about another modification and found the documentation hard to read.

James Dornan responded that the Company is required to consult DPE first and DPE dictates how the process goes. James added that the company would have liked to share information with the CCC at the September meeting however the process did not allow enough time.

Paul Rouse added the company was in a difficult position as DPE had stated the change would not go on public exhibition. Paul stated that the company is aware of the reaction to modifications and they seek to do it carefully. Paul added that through progress on site there may be further changes if required.

Rebecca Bigg added that the previous modifications were from different companies and this should be promoted by the CCC.

The Chair summarised that the CCC would like the company to flag when they are talking about certain issues with DPE. The company agreed that this was reasonable.

Matt Darwon raised that there was a reaction in the community about the timing of the exhibition. Peter Cormick added that the Company should be aware of the perception in the community about a modification. Belinda Royds stated that the modification is a positive one. Peter added that he supported the modification.

Len Sharp stated that CCC members have good relationships in the community and they can let their networks know to contact the mine.

Matt Darwon stated that many people aren't invested in understanding about what is happening and some others are hesitant to contact or look for more information. Len added that he receives a lot of correspondence from the same small number of people.

It was clarified that Modification 4 includes the reinstatement of previously approved road to access the TSF, Spring Creek crossing relocation and administrative activities such as including additional land.

In response to a question from Matt Darwon, James Dornan stated that he does not see any consequences down the track as a result of the Modification.

Paul Rouse recognised that the process of modification is difficult and can cause angst within the community. Paul added that the CCC would still have been informed without the modification, noting that the company had to go through the process.

Karis Sanderson asked, will the mining footprint extend beyond existing boundaries?

James Dornan responded no, as the project approval always included this lot. James added that the only thing that has changed is ownership of the lot and that it was only included as it has access to water and a water license.

James Dornan clarified the structure of the company, stating that Dargues Gold Mine is the company name and what the community will see. Len Sharp added that there will be changes to website.

Matters which community representatives wish to raise with Diversified Minerals

Noise

Matt Darwon had sent correspondence regarding onsite noise to the CCC.

Matt explained that he had been discussing noise with DGM staff, noting that many changes had been made to the fan to reduce noise. Matt stated that the issues are ongoing as operation is almost 7 days a week and he can hear noise at his property particularly early in the morning. Matt stated that residents can hear the mine every morning and requested that the use of equipment and fan be restricted to after 8am.

Belinda Royds queried whether 24 hour noise monitoring was considered for Matt's property. Len Sharp responded that the company is waiting on a noise logger which will be used. Len added the noise monitoring will be particularly targeted for early in the morning and between 6-8pm as this is when the area is very still and most complaints are received. It will be trialed for 1 month depending on the data obtained.

The CCC discussed noise monitoring including suitable locations given the influence of traffic and bird sounds, methodology for monitoring noise and options for reducing noise onsite.

Len Sharp stated that the noise logger would be located approximately 1,200m from the box cut in the same location as blast monitor 1 to determine whether good data is available as the location has less interference from birds and frogs.

Mick South stated that that the company is looking at options to reduce the noise of the vent fan, including geofabric to wrap the bag and moving hay bales. Shannon Green added that the company will talk to the fan manufacturer to understand if there have been any advancements.

It was raised that updates should be available to the community on the website about the noise mitigation options.

Rebecca Bigg stated that the community want to see more engagement by the company via promotion of website and the community access phone number, as well as a newsletter to promote the company and help people to find information and access to resources.

Paul Rouse added that the company is hoping to have another public meeting or information session by the end of January.

Matt Darwon added that he would be comfortable speaking at a community meeting to share information.

It was stated that minutes from the September CCC meeting had been published on the website.

In response to a question from Peter Cormick, Paul Rouse stated that he hoped to have project finance settled by the end of the week.

Karis Sanderson asked, has the company sorted out where the concentrate is going?

Paul Rouse responded that this is part of finalising the finance, adding that the mine is 12 months away from any concentrate being produced.

Pete Harrison stated that the company should look at mitigating noise by looking at treatment to box cut walls and reducing impact of hard services such as the shape of the walls.

Consultation with CCC

Peter Cormick stated that the CCC is a requirement of the State Government, as the mine is a major project, adding that he believes that the company is not as engaging or forthcoming with the community members as it could be as expected. Peter read an excerpt from the March 2017 CCC meeting minutes regarding consultation on the draft Water Management Plan, to illustrate his contention.

Peter Cormick raised [that] the CCC would like the opportunity to comment on draft plans. This was supported by Tom Wells. The CCC community members accepted that while there are no legal requirements to involve the CCC in the drafting of management plans it would be better if this could be done, while not compromising the project timeframes.

Bill added the role of the CCC in reviewing draft plans was a source of tension at the beginning of the CCC. It was added that the CCC wants to be involved and have an input for information available.

The CCC asked to be consulted regarding draft management plans where it does not compromise the project timetable. This was taken on notice. Subsequent to the meeting, the Chair was advised that the Company will make the Water Management Plan available for two weeks following the finalisation of the draft.

Peter stated that but for asking, the CCC wouldn't have been consulted on the Water Management Plan and that while it is not a legal requirement for the company to do so, such an attitude, of seeking to rely on legalities to exclude consultation, is at odds with the spirit, if not the requirements, of the CCC guidelines. Peter added that as part of the Project Approval the CCC is required to be established and conducted in accordance with the CCC guidelines. He emphasized the need for the CCC and the community to be consulted on management plans and possible changes, stating that the company should involve the CCC to the full extent possible.

James Dornan responded that as previously stated the company will consult with the CCC on management plans. James added that this was agreed to for all management plans following consultation with CCC on the Water Management Plan. James stated there can be timing issues for consultation on draft management plans and the company will allow a reasonable time for the CCC to review.

The Chair sought an appropriate time for consultation as a general protocol for the CCC to provide comment. The Chair added there will always be cases with time constraints which will be considered by exception.

Peter Cormick added that the guidelines require the proponent to consult the CCC before lodging anything with DPE.

The Chair proposed that no less than 10 working days should be made available by the company for non-complex matters, and longer according to the complexity of the subject matter, when consulting with the CCC on proposed changes to the Project Approval. The company agreed to this.

James Dornan noted that this timeframe is already in place, for example Modification 3 went through 6-9 weeks of consultation prior to notification whereas Modification 4 is shorter. James noted a preference for no longer than 4 weeks depending on the nature of the issue.

Paul Rouse asked, what is the nature of the issues the CCC would like to get involved in?

Peter Cormick responded, "All matters related to the environment" e.g. water. David Lever added employment policies.

Rebecca Bigg added that management plans are reviewed annually and for the CCC to be involved in reviewing many documents would be a fruitless task without the appropriate technical data or educational background. Rebecca suggested that the company notify the CCC of any modification to plans stating what is changing and why, as well as whether it comes up against any approval conditions or changes to acts and regulations regarding operating conditions.

James Dornan stated that management plans will be updated following Modification 4, particularly the Water Management Plan. James added that a tracked changes version will be sent to agencies first for review and then to the CCC for comment, with the final version submitted to DPE.

The Chair noted the role of the CCC is to: review and comment on development of the mine, environmental issues and compliance as well as look for community benefit.

In response to a question, Mick South noted that out of 24 staff members onsite, there are 4 staff who weren't living locally 12 months ago who now are, in addition to an engineer who commutes from Sydney.

Climate risk and water licenses

Correspondence from Kathleen Waddell had been received around climate risk and water licenses. It was agreed that matters were to be discussed at the next CCC meeting.

Kathleen explained that her questions concerned assessing and addressing physical, transition and business risks for the operation of the mine as well as whether or not taking these risks were into consideration at the mine.

Kathleen raised that she had received questions via Upper Deua Catchment Landcare Group in relation to mine's water licenses and possible restrictions around licenses. She added that with a changing climate, groundwater restrictions do not seem to be considered in the assessment of licenses and added that the

water licenses are quite large and that there is concern about how the mine will use its access during drought.

In response to a question from Belinda Royds, the company undertook to provide relevant studies and management plans to the CCC prior to the next CCC meeting. The Chair added that a top line assessment should be provided to the CCC.

Matt Darwon asked, will there be an open day in future?

This was taken on notice.

Rebecca Bigg advised that the Braidwood Community Association is raising funds to upgrade the kids playground and queried the funding available through the mine and Council. Rebecca undertook to contact Len regarding the matter.

Belinda Royds proposed that a question log was going to be used to track questions from the CCC. This was supported by the committee.

Pete Harrison raised that around 3 years ago Council had discussed with the mine the possibility of the mine running a mining or gold education centre to showcase the mine.

Matters which Diversified Minerals wishes to raise with the community representatives

None raised.

Other business

James Dornan raised that the company considers that anything made available to the CCC is available to be made public, adding that anything in confidence will be marked and identified as so.

The Chair stated that Tom Wells had resigned as a member of the CCC. The Chair thanked Tom for his contribution. The Chair noted that currently there is a spare membership, with the possibility of including an alternate member as a full community member. The Chair undertook to speak to Alternate Members outside of the meeting.

The process for finalising and publishing minutes was confirmed. Minutes are finalised and published between meetings in line with the requirements of the CCC guidelines.

Next Meeting

The Chair noted that Bill Waterhouse had raised that the timing of meeting prevents participation. The Chair sought a preferred meeting time from the CCC. The Chair added that CCCs are usually held after business hours, noting that he is available at any time to hold the meeting.

The CCC discussed possible meeting times, factoring in work commitments, site visits and the risks of being on the road at night. It was agreed that 4.30pm works in summer time and 2.30pm in the winter with a site visit by exception.

The Chair provided the below dates as tentative days and times for a future meeting.

- Tuesday, 19 March 2019, 4:30pm (possibly with site visit)
- Tuesday 18 June 2019, 2.30pm

The Chair will negotiate the dates and times for the balance of the year between meetings, and will endeavor to give at least 10 working days' notice if any additional meetings are to be held.

These minutes are endorsed by



Brian Elton

Independent Chairperson

Dargues Reef Community Consultative Committee

Attachment 1: Correspondence

Matt Darwon

Majors Creek NSW 2622

16th December 2018

machineshed@bigpond.com

Statement to The Dargues Mine CCC concerning issues related to “Noise” and questions regarding the installation of a 24hr noise monitoring station, and a possible community meeting regarding noise issues.

I, Matt Darwon, reside at Majors Creek with my wife, Sophie Lee. We have been living at this location since 2006 and have owned the property since 2004. I apologise for the late submission of this document to the Chair of the CCC, it is an extremely busy time of the year for my business and my family.

The underlying purpose of this submission to the CCC is a follow up after my last submission just on 3 months ago.

Since that time I have kept daily notes (when I have been in Majors Creek). As everyone would be aware we have had many days running into weeks of strong winds over the last three months and over the last few weeks, periods of intense rain. Of course, during those times the impact upon our property by noise generated at the mine site is significantly masked to the point where there exists little or no impact at all at some times.

Further, in recent weeks, the increased rainfall has brought with it a regeneration of the frog population on our property and I’m sure across the rest of the township. Of Majors Creek. This frog sounds also have a masking effect on noise generated by the mining operations.

Over the last few months, except for times noted above, the day to day goings on at the mine site, have continuously been a part of our life on our property because we can hear machinery. That said though, we are prepared for, and accepting of, a certain level of noise and impact, because we understand that:

- a) at some point the fans (possibly in the next 6 months), will be located underground,
- b) there is an expected life of the mine and that eventually this industry will leave this town behind and move on, and,
- c) employees of the Company, such as Mick and Len are listening to our concerns and doing their best to address the impact where possible.

This is not to say we are ready and willing for the next level of operations and possible impacts when the processing facility is operational. On the contrary, it's really honing our ability to decipher what noise is actually emanating from the subject site, what the cause of the noise is, and what is machinery from another neighbouring site, or roadworks etc.

I have had quite a few discussions with Len over the last 3 months, and once again I thank him for his attentive and professional level of response. It's a comfort knowing that he is there and ready to help us when the impact becomes too much. Quite often we have together been able to pinpoint the cause of noise and Len has made changes to reduce the level of impact. Slowing down a transfer pump to half speed significantly reduced the level of noise transmission (to probably half or thereabouts). Turning off one of the fans, again, significant benefits for the community at certain times when the noise is travelling across the Majors Creek village. I have even recently sent Len a message where I said, "Len, can you hear that fan at your place?" and his response is "Yes, I'm going to give the guys a call".

My wife and I recently submitted an application to construct a dual occupancy on a 14 acre property located closer to the subject site than our house. This property almost touches the 2km buffer zones from the underground workings and the box cut. Recently we have been spending more time on this property and have found that the noise impacts are significantly higher than at our residence some 500m further south. This will be taken into consideration when we build these small, off-grid, solar-passive houses.

What I would like to put to the Company at this point in time is a question that has already been asked by, I think, the Chair of the CCC. I feel I actually need to ask this question directly and in writing. Would the Company consider installing a 24hr noise monitoring station at a property that is agreed upon by members of the CCC and the Company?

I do understand there is a significant cost associated with an installation of this type and as the only real alternative is that the installation be funded by a member/s of the community, I feel its not inappropriate to ask if the Company would do this.

My feeling is that at certain times, namely, very early in the morning and at any time when background noise levels are low, the level of impact upon the community can be unacceptable (from the communities point of view that is). Again, I understand the importance of strict compliance with the figures deemed acceptable, and the regulations controlling noise in the approvals, but mention again, that mere compliance does not necessarily equate to great neighbourly relationships.

All this said, many discussions have been had between myself and people of Majors Creek about issues relating to noise emanating from the site. I feel that the people in the community who now have their ears “tuned” to the site are more aware of how sound is travelling in and around the village. I have been doing my best to make people aware of what the Company has been doing to control noise emanating from the site, however, I would like to put forward a suggestion to the Company that a public meeting could possibly be held to inform village residents of progress on this issue so far, and what is to be expected over the coming 6 months as the Company ramps up for processing.

Again, thanks to Len and Mick for their attention and connection with myself, Sophie and other residents here in Majors Creek on this very important matter.

Matt Darwon

Matt Darwon

Majors Creek NSW 2622

16th December 2018

machinshed@bigpond.com

Statement to The Dargues Mine CCC concerning Modification 4

Firstly, I apologise for the late submission of my documents to the CCC, this is an extremely busy time for my business and I have not been able to get to this before now. I hope to have 4 or 5 minutes to present this document to the CCC tomorrow afternoon.

Whilst I understand that the Company is completely within its rights to submit any modification at any time it chooses, let me say that the choice to submit a modification, no matter how small, right at beginning of the xmas period is in my opinion a poorly considered decision.

This does absolutely nothing to help with bringing the community and the company together and I have no doubt that the decision to submit a mod at this time only serves to damage relationships, that we, on the ground here in Majors Creek are trying to strengthen.

Of course, if the idea was indeed to drive a wedge between the company and the public, then I think once again, success. Having practiced as an architect that worked almost exclusively for developers in my first 10 years after leaving university I know all too well the reasons for lodgment at this time, and no amount of excuses or “now’s as good a time as any” and “its only a little one”, sort of discussions can easily repair damage done.

I think whoever thought to disregard the impact this would have on the community at large, and made a decision lodge this application at this time, has shown a disregard for the community and the how this leads to loss of social license.

How easily this could have been averted if the CCC had been informed and the modification and its timing been discussed in this forum, with honesty and openness prior to lodgement. I cannot stress enough how this omission in the

process damages relationships here and how it makes people in the community feel sceptical, wary, and simply upset.

If the company can see the error here, then I suggest it should make a submission within the next 24 hours to the Department of Planning and Environment as the Proponent, asking to extend the period for submissions until Friday the 18th of January, due to feedback and response from the CCC.

Enough of that point. Following on from this, is discussion of the modification particulars. I am directly concerned with the impact upon the community as I have always been, and something I think needs to be discussed at this point are the potential impacts from truck noise and truck lights associated with vehicle movements as they traverse the proposed new crossing, and the road on each side of the creek crossing thereto. Obviously we have a crossing already approved, but lodgement of a modification to this approval, that I understand will result in a crossing position higher in elevation than that approved, raises the questions of impact once again.

I do not have the benefit of understanding the “real life”, “lay of the land”, differences from that previously approved, and proposed locations but I take it tomorrows site inspection will hopefully answer these questions.

I feel it is now imperative the Company start testing, on an inclusive basis, with the CCC, impacts of potential future truck movement noise around the site and also the potential negative impacts upon the community from truck lights at night.

I believe this needs to be addressed immediately. I don't know how this could be done, in order to get definitive answers on these issues that hopefully would lead to a preemptive approach to heading off negative impacts upon the existing amenity of neighbouring residents, but I'm sure there are experts who do know, and by that I suggest that no one person or company are qualified unless they have spent many many hours on site here at Majors Creek. Perhaps a truck idling, moving, (lights on) in a variety of locations identified as possible “bad spots” on a still night might be one idea. I'm sure members of the CCC who live here would gladly be available for such a test or testing.

My aim before I leave this CCC meeting is to be 100% convinced there will be no increase in impacts upon amenity for the Majors Creek community as a result of this modification 4. If I am not convinced, I will be asking the Company to make a submission to the Department of Planning and Environment to extend the submission period and to facilitate the coming together of the Company and the Community so that the neighbouring residents of Majors Creek can be shown how the approval of this modification will not be to their detriment.

Matt Darwon

From: [Peter Cormick](#)
To: [Brian Elton](#)
Cc: [Hannah Bubb](#); [David Lever](#); [Richard Roberts](#); [Brett Corven](#); [Karis Sanderson](#); [Kathleen Waddell](#)
Subject: Tomorrow's CCC meeting
Date: Sunday, 16 December 2018 7:08:38 PM

Hi Brian,

I trust all is well with you.

The purpose of this email is to alert you to items - one or two that you may or may not be aware of - that will be brought up tomorrow, so that you are hopefully better placed to deal with them - by having the opportunity to give consideration to them, and to the challenge of time allocation for the various items, beforehand.

I am acutely aware of the very tight time constraints that you work to when you and Hannah make the long trek from Sydney, and back. Given that the meeting will very likely not commence until about 3.30 pm - after the site visit - and that the Mod 4 presentation will take a fair slab of time, there will be relatively little time left for other matters, before you need to head back. In my view, meetings would ideally run from late morning, through a working lunch and then into the afternoon, until all matters have been properly dealt with. After all, meetings occur only 4 times a year. Because of my awareness of your own time constraints, I usually hold back from opening up a subject matter which I feel needs airing and closer attention. And I am but one member. And of course, your time is money to the company. So they certainly don't want meetings to be any longer than they presently are.

Mod 4 - exhibition period

I expect that I will not be the only CCC member who has the view that the 2-week public exhibition period for Mod 4 is both poorly timed and inadequate in its length. As we all know, public exhibition of documents at the end of a year, abutting the Christmas holiday period, is not a good look. It is a time when we are all busy with other things; a time when what might otherwise receive attention, is put to one side; a timing that will raise suspicions about just how genuine a proponent is in hearing back from the community.

I have received a number of complaints from within my local community about the way in which Mod 4 has been placed on exhibition. Overwhelmingly, the complainants want the exhibition period to be extended by at least another 2 weeks. I will therefore be putting that proposition to the meeting: to have the exhibition period extended to at least 2 January - that would make the period 4 weeks in total.

I don't know what rationale is applied by the Department, or what other influences might be at play, in deciding on the length of an exhibition period, though I do understand that the timing is a matter determined by when the application is made by the proponent. On late Friday (14 Dec), I emailed the nominated planning officer (on the Dept's Major Projects web page), a Mandana Mazaheri, and asked him the following questions:

Could you please let me know:

1. Just how the Department advertised the Mod 4 exhibition: which newspapers and radio stations (if any) were provided with the public notification? Braidwood Times? The Bay Post?, etc
2. By what means was it decided, and by whom, to provide just 2 weeks for the public exhibition period?; and
3. How should a request for an extension to the period (to say another 2 weeks) be

made, and to whom?

You may already know the answers to these questions but it is the answer to question 3 that is most important. So, if you don't presently know the answer to this question, you may have an opportunity to get it before the commencement of the meeting, so that we will hopefully know one way or the other whether an extension is possible, before we leave the meeting. After all, the current exhibition period is due to finish just 2 days after the meeting, on Wednesday 19 December.

Kathleen Waddell's email of 10 December 2018

Kathleen's email contains enough material for a conference, or two. The time available at a CCC meeting cannot possibly do it justice. In my view, the matters she has raised on the impacts of climate variability and climate risk modelling - as well as those related issues raised by the Upper Deua Catchment Landcare Group in its 15/10/2018 letter to her, and the response by the company - *must* be addressed, somehow, by the CCC and the company. As is clear to all, the question of the impact of the project on the availability and quality of groundwater (and, of course, the intimately related surface water), is of fundamental importance. I suggest that an extraordinary meeting of the CCC be arranged for sometime in the new year, at which this subject matter, of the impact of climate variability on water availability is addressed. And I suggest that there would be a need for at least one independent expert in the field to be there to present to the committee and take questions: possibly one of the authors of the CSIRO publication, [*Climate change impact on groundwater resources in Australia*](#), would fit the bill.

Agenda Item 4. Matters arising from the minutes of the last meeting

I will be addressing the response given by the company to my questions concerning the waiving of certain Management Plan requirements, imposed by the Project Approval, as allowed by the Project Approval itself. As I mentioned in my response to the draft minutes, I am not satisfied with the company's response and will, at the very least, be seeking clarification.

Agenda Item 7. Consultation with the CCC

This item, which, in the context of the Mod 4 consultation process, I asked to be included on the agenda, will certainly take up more than a few minutes. I can't imagine that I will be the only committee member to express views on this vitally important subject.

Agenda Item 9. Other business

I want to address the matter of the availability of meeting minutes to the community. As a reminder, the CCC guidelines require the minutes to be finalised and available to the community within 4 weeks after a meeting. The current practice is that minutes are not finalised until they are confirmed, or otherwise, at the subsequent CCC meeting, being 3 months after the meeting to which they relate. In addition, the latest CCC minutes available on the DM website are those of the March 2018 meeting. I have taken the liberty to speak with Len (Sharp) about this and he has explained that he has had ongoing 'software/technical problems' in uploading beyond March. I regard Len as a good and honest person and don't doubt his explanation. He is very aware of the need to have this problem rectified asap and so I see no need to make a thing of it at the meeting. But I do believe that we need to sort out the issue of finalisation of the minutes, so that the relevant CCC Guidelines are being adhered to.

I apologise for the timing of this rather lengthy email, Brian, but my circumstances have not allowed it to be otherwise.

I look forward to seeing you and Hannah, tomorrow.

Best wishes,

Peter

PS1. It has just occurred to me, if I recall correctly, that there is also the issue that Bill Waterhouse wants to discuss: the timing of the meetings. I do recall that at one time Bill wanted meetings to start at 4.30 pm, and that happened for a while. It may be that he wants that starting time reinstated. If that is so I can say now that I strongly object to such a late start. As I have said, above, in my view, if we are to do our job properly, there needs to be a morning start!

PS2. You will see that I have copied in a selection of committee members and alternate members, with whom I communicate on occasions, outside meetings. In this way, the benefits of the opportunity for consideration of the issues I have raised here, by these members, prior to the meeting, will hopefully be realised at the meeting itself.

This email has been scanned by the Symantec Email Security.cloud service.
For more information please visit <http://www.symanteccloud.com>

26/11/2018

Kathleen Wadell
DCCC Member
C/O Elton Consulting

By Email – EMAIL ADDRESS

Dear Kathleen,

Re: Dargues Gold Mine – Questions from Upper Deua Catchment Landcare Group (UDCLG)

Please see below responses to the questions forwarded to the DRCCC from the UDCLG. (Letter dated 15/11/2018 from Penny Hayman).

Currently most water licence holders have a notice to cease to pump has the mine?

The Mine has not had a notice to cease to pump.

a. Copy of the Mine's Water Licences,

The Mine holds four (4) Water Access Licences (WAL) which are detailed in Table 1 below and are available for download from the Project's website (<http://www.divminerals.com.au/dargues-gold-mine/operational-documents/licenses/>). These licences were transferred from the *Water Act 1912* to the *Water Act 2000* during 2018 and both licence numbers are provided for completeness.

Table 1 Water Licences

Location	Licence Number	Water Access Licence	Extraction allowance
	(Water Act 1912)	(Water Act 2000)	
Dargues Gold Mine	10BL6050106	WAL39281	320 mega litres
Snobs	10BL6050107	WAL39282	39 mega litres
Stewart and Merton's	10BL6050108	WAL39287	16 mega litres
United Miners	10BL6050109	WAL39292	24 mega litres
Total			399 mega litres

b. Data of the 2017-18 extraction levels,

Extraction data is available in Table 8 of the *Dargues Gold Mine – Annual Review 2017-2018*, which can be downloaded from the Project’s website (<http://www.divminerals.com.au/dargues-gold-mine/environment/reporting/annual-environmental-management-report/>) and is reproduced below.

Table 8 Water Abstracted During the Reporting Period

Water Licence	Source details	Entitlement	Active pumping	Total
WAL39281	Extraction of groundwater from Dargues Gold mine	320	0	0
WAL39282	Extraction of groundwater from Snobs Workings	39M	0	0
WAL39287	Extraction of groundwater from Stewart and Merton’s workings	16M	0	0
WAL39292	Extraction of groundwater from United miners workings	24M	0	0

c. Data from the 2017-18 return flow levels,

As no water was abstracted from groundwater sources and no impact to groundwater levels was detected at the Project Site, no compensatory flow was undertaken or was required.

d. Date of the commencement of extraction processes.

Groundwater abstraction commenced in the 2018 – 2019 reporting period from the Dargues Gold Mine (WAL39281) as a result of the requirement to remove water from the development face of the underground decline. No abstraction occurred from the other listed WAL’s.

e. Are the held water licences consolidated or singular?

The WAL’s are all part of the same Water Source, namely the Lachlan Fold Belt Coast Groundwater Source, but relate to different works.

Kind regards,



Len Sharp

HSEC Superintendent – Dargues Gold Mine

Dargues Gold Mine Information Line

Phone: 1800 732 002

Email: DGM.Community@divminerals.com.au