

Bloomfield Colliery Community Consultative Committee

(incorporating the Mine Closure & Rehabilitation Workshop (Part 2))

Location: Bloomfield Colliery

Time: 10.00 am

Date: 01 August 2022

ATTENDEES	
Name	Organisation
Lisa Andrews (LA)	Independent Chairperson
Janet Murray (JMY)	Community Representative
Dennis Thurlow (DT)*	Community Representative
Hamish Mackinnon (HM)* Marc Hope (MH)*	Cessnock City Council
Greg Lamb (GL)	Bloomfield Colliery
Brad Donoghoe (BD)	Bloomfield Colliery
Steve Vickers (SV)	Bloomfield Colliery
Damien Butler (DB)	Bloomfield Colliery
Geoff Moore (GM)	Bloomfield Colliery

Apologies	
Jack Dwyer (JD)	Community Representative
Kristy Cousins (KC)	Maitland City Council

**Participated via video-conferencing.*

Item	Issue	Action
1	Welcome & Introductions	
	The Chair opened the CCC at 10:11am apologising for the delay, due to technical difficulties. LA advised that Hamish McKinnon & Marc Hope from Cessnock City Council and Dennis Thurlow were participating via video-conferencing. LA introduced all members in the meeting room.	
2	Apologies – Jack Dwyer & Maitland Shire Council delegate	
3	Declarations	
	LA declared that she is an Independent Chairperson appointed by the Secretary of the Department of Planning and Environment and engaged by Bloomfield to chair this CCC/Workshop. No changes to members' declarations.	

4	<p>Business Arising</p> <p>The minutes from the CCC held 28/3/22 were finalised on 12/4/22. There were three action items from that meeting:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>ITEM</th> <th>ACTION</th> <th>RESPONSIBILITY</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">1</td> <td>Send link to AR & IEA <i>(Complete – sent 4/4/22)</i></td> <td style="text-align: center;">GL/LA</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">2</td> <td>Send Mine Closure/Rehabilitation Presentation to CCC members <i>(Complete – sent 4/4/22)</i></td> <td style="text-align: center;">SV/LA</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">3</td> <td>Schedule RMP Extra-Ordinary CCC/Workshop for late May <i>(Complete – workshop held 27/5/22)</i></td> <td style="text-align: center;">LA/CCC</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>There were also four action items from the Extra-Ordinary CCC & Workshop held on 27/5/22:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>ITEM</th> <th>ACTION</th> <th>RESPONSIBILITY</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">1</td> <td>Send Mine Closure/Rehabilitation Presentation to CCC members <i>(Complete – sent 14/4/22)</i></td> <td style="text-align: center;">SV/LA</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">2</td> <td>Provide pre-clearing information to DT <i>(Complete)</i></td> <td style="text-align: center;">GL/LA</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">3</td> <td>Provide Flora and Fauna Management Plan to DT <i>(Complete)</i></td> <td style="text-align: center;">GL/LA</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">4</td> <td>Provide topography to JM <i>(Complete – sent with the draft minutes on 9/6/22)</i></td> <td style="text-align: center;">SV/LA</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Business Arising from the previous minutes:</p> <p>DT noted that he found the spatial data difficult to navigate. JM noted that in 1966 the land was tree covered and would provide a copy of an image to DT.</p> <p>DT noted his previous request for the provision of pre-clearing information. DT stated the requirement to have the Landscape Management Plan and the Rehabilitation Management Plan completed within six months of the approval. GL advised that the Landscape Management Plan and the Rehabilitation Management Plan that were required as part of the</p>	ITEM	ACTION	RESPONSIBILITY	1	Send link to AR & IEA <i>(Complete – sent 4/4/22)</i>	GL/LA	2	Send Mine Closure/Rehabilitation Presentation to CCC members <i>(Complete – sent 4/4/22)</i>	SV/LA	3	Schedule RMP Extra-Ordinary CCC/Workshop for late May <i>(Complete – workshop held 27/5/22)</i>	LA/CCC	ITEM	ACTION	RESPONSIBILITY	1	Send Mine Closure/Rehabilitation Presentation to CCC members <i>(Complete – sent 14/4/22)</i>	SV/LA	2	Provide pre-clearing information to DT <i>(Complete)</i>	GL/LA	3	Provide Flora and Fauna Management Plan to DT <i>(Complete)</i>	GL/LA	4	Provide topography to JM <i>(Complete – sent with the draft minutes on 9/6/22)</i>	SV/LA	<p>Action: GL to provide DT with link to the Landscape Management Plan and the Rehabilitation Management Plan.</p>
ITEM	ACTION	RESPONSIBILITY																											
1	Send link to AR & IEA <i>(Complete – sent 4/4/22)</i>	GL/LA																											
2	Send Mine Closure/Rehabilitation Presentation to CCC members <i>(Complete – sent 4/4/22)</i>	SV/LA																											
3	Schedule RMP Extra-Ordinary CCC/Workshop for late May <i>(Complete – workshop held 27/5/22)</i>	LA/CCC																											
ITEM	ACTION	RESPONSIBILITY																											
1	Send Mine Closure/Rehabilitation Presentation to CCC members <i>(Complete – sent 14/4/22)</i>	SV/LA																											
2	Provide pre-clearing information to DT <i>(Complete)</i>	GL/LA																											
3	Provide Flora and Fauna Management Plan to DT <i>(Complete)</i>	GL/LA																											
4	Provide topography to JM <i>(Complete – sent with the draft minutes on 9/6/22)</i>	SV/LA																											

<p>approval conditions are on the company website. DT would like a copy of the original previous plan. GL to provide link.</p> <p>DT noted the previous presentation provided on 27 May 2022, specifically page 8 and the references to final land use. DT asked about the Stony Pinch Consortium and references to Donaldson that had changed to Yancoal. It was confirmed that Yancoal had purchased Donaldson.</p> <p>DT questioned references in previous approvals documentation regarding future land usage. DT said he believes references to the future use of the rail loop over the entire site are misleading; the Bloomfield Mine Closure Community Newsletter No. 1, April 2022 also says “generally pasture.....that leverages the existing infrastructure including the rail loop”. DT said he believes it is ‘mischievous’ that documentation had referenced future land use and he believes this was used as justification for the approval of grass lands over the entire site.</p> <p>DT enquired if the CCC were considered a stakeholder group in terms of the consultation process for the mine closure. LA confirmed that the CCC members are stakeholders.</p> <p>JM noted previous conversations with the former mine manager that it would take 100 years to do anything on the site because of the need for the soil to compact. JM said Donaldson had done a good job on rehabilitation by returning it to native vegetation.</p> <p>DT said he was concerned that everything in the final land use was about pasture. DT’s opinion is that the Stony Pinch Consortium has no interest in agriculture and that they just want to sell the land off for development. DT said that in his opinion any references to agricultural land are ‘dishonest’. Further stating that the owners - Stony Pinch Group, don’t just want agriculture, they want the whole mine site from John Renshaw Drive to East Maitland for future development, referencing EA Mod 4 (page 39 – potential structure plan).</p> <p>Bloomfield stated that the future of the land would be decided by others and would have to be approved by the state government.</p>	<p><u>LINK:</u> https://www.bloomfieldmine.com/sustainability/environmental-management/bloomfield-assessments/management-plans-and-strategies</p>
---	--

<p>GM advised that Bloomfield does not own the majority of the land and wasn't sure whether the Stony Pinch Group still existed. DT referred to EA (MOD 4), where it stated that <i>Bloomfield had formed a consortium, The Stony Pinch Group, which consisted of the major land owners in the area, Bloomfield, Ashtonfields and Yancoal, to develop the large combined landholdings of the member companies post mining. Further, that a legal agreement between the landowners ensures that individual landowner interests in the site are replaced by a single, shared interest in all land use and development outcomes.</i></p> <p>GM advised of the approved consent and that grazing land is the approved final land use. GM said that the future use of the land was not the mine's jurisdiction and noted the approved final land use. GM said that any future land use other than grazing needs to go through a future consent process and that this is completely separate to the closure obligations that the mine needs to meet.</p> <p>DT said he believed the Stony Pinch Consortium influenced the mine's past approvals and was used as justification to allow the final land use to be grazing.</p> <p>JM asked about the approval of the RMP and GM noted that the objectives and criteria had to be approved by the Regulator. SV noted the approvals of the previous consent and GM advised that the mine has been rehabilitating to those requirements.</p> <p>DT said he believes the mine is just doing what the landowner wants. GM said that in terms of the mine closure the approved final land use is grazing. He said what happens once the lease is relinquished is up to others.</p> <p>DT enquired why Bloomfield would need to have a forest analogue when they were not rehabilitating any forests. GL advised that the NSW Resource Regulator required this and Bloomfield were meeting its conditions of approval.</p> <p>DT requested to see the forest analogue site referred to in a previous presentation. GL agreed to take DT to this site.</p>	<p>Action: GL to provide DT with tour of analogue forest site.</p>
---	---

	<p>DT asked why the regulatory requirements for rehabilitation Appendix 2 of Bloomfields RMP on pages 87-89 ignored most of the objectives at the expense of the re-establishment of the native eco-system, commenting that they had cherry picked what they wanted. Bloomfield advised that it was because it was using pasture.</p> <p>Bloomfield stated that the rehabilitation objectives were recently added to the consent and are general to all mines and are applicable to the final landform and land use which is predominantly grazing.</p> <p>DT asked if the mine is clearing more trees to create grassland and GL confirmed that the mine was not, with the exception of the disturbance shown on plans required for mining.</p>	
<p>5</p>	<p>Correspondence (as was sent on 12/7/22 with 2 additional items)</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 14/4/22 – Email to members with the draft minutes for review, the links to the AR & IEA as well as the Mine Closure/Rehabilitation Presentation. • 12/4/22 – Email to members with the finalised minutes (and presentation) • 13/4/22 – Email to members with the Meeting Notice & Agenda for the Mine Closure & Rehabilitation Workshop on 20/5/22. • 9/6/22 – Email to members with draft minutes from workshop for review. • 21/6/22 – Email to members with the finalised minutes from the workshop. • 12/7/22 – Email to members with Meeting Notice & Agenda for this CCC. • 22/7/22 – Email to members with the Rehabilitation Management Plan for review at the CCC & Workshop on 1/8/22. • 28/7/22 -Email to members with a reminder for this meeting. 	
<p>6</p>	<p>Bloomfield Rehabilitation Management Plan - Rehabilitation Objectives and Completion Criteria</p>	
	<p>SV went through consented final land use and the updated mining plan land use. SV noted the ongoing studies. SV said there will be some iterative changes. JM asked about the streamline requirements and SV explained those. SV went through plans for remainder of the mining life. He noted the new disturbance area and the offset property. DT asked about green areas and if it was going back to grazing. SV confirmed it was. JM asked about previous topography maps and how Bloomfield are</p>	<p>Action: SV to overlay topography maps with consideration of water.</p>

<p>considering water. JM asked about overlaying that with current topography and SV agreed to do that.</p> <p>DT asked about spotted gum areas that are proposed to be removed. DT said he was under the impression some of the forest area was going to be cut down. BD said that was covered in the consent and that there were offset areas.</p> <p>JM asked for vegetation along the lines of the streams to try and stop erosion. JM said she believed this should be 20m of trees either side was best practice. JM also commented on the southern boundary for people who were looking at the mine that if there was a buffer on the southern boundary there would have been better outcomes for noise, visual amenity and dust. JM said whatever ends up on that side there should be decent buffer on the southern wall so that those living in the rural lifestyle cannot see any future developments in the area.</p> <p>SV invited feedback on the RMP by Friday 26 August 2022.</p> <p>SV gave an overview of the Completion Criteria for the final void, as a worked example for the CCC to provide feedback on the remainder at a later stage. DT stated that he has concerns about the final void last time it was said that it was going to be 10m deep, now it's going to be 70m deep and if it does overflow some of this would go to Louth Park and Wallis Creek, which would include saline water.</p> <p>SV noted the void was shaped to 18 degrees and described water volumes and levels. DT and JM asked about what happens if it overflows and the risk of flooding. SV said it is designed not to overflow. JM noted that the wording 'high risk' could be removed and SV said this could be more specific to say 'landforms have been constructed in accordance with geotechnical design'.</p> <p>Water Management in the Completion Criteria was covered and JM asked what happens if the void overtops. SV noted it was consented to be a groundwater sink and the purpose of the modelling being completed was to reduce that risk. DT asked when it floods where the water will go and SV explained the design of the void.</p>	<p>Action: Feedback on RMP from CCC members by 26/8/22.</p>
---	--

	<p>Used tyres in the final void was discussed and GL confirmed these cannot be recycled and are only truck tyres from the mine, nowhere else.</p> <p>DT asked for a copy of the presentation.</p> <p>It was agreed that any community feedback on the Rehabilitation Management plan that is on the Bloomfield website:</p> <p>(https://www.bloomcoll.com.au/sustainability/environmental-management/bloomfield-assessments/mining-lease) should be channeled through the CCC.</p> <p>JM noted the previous construction of flat waste dumps and asked that the final landform not be flat but rather be undulating and fit into the final landform.</p>	<p>Action: SV to provide copy of the presentation. Included with minutes</p>
7	General Business	
	JM asked what hours the mine was working. BD confirmed the mine was working night shift. JM noted she could hear the operation when she was outside.	
8	Next Meeting	
	The next meeting will be Monday 17 October 2022 at 10am and will incorporate an update on the RMP.	
9	Meeting Close:	
	<i>The meeting closed at 12:02pm with LA thanking all for their attendance and contribution.</i>	

ACTION ITEMS:

ITEM	ACTION	RESPONSIBILITY
1	GL to provide DT with link to the Landscape Management Plan and the Rehabilitation Management Plan.	GL
2	GL to provide DT with tour of analogue forest site.	GL
3	SV to overlay topography maps with consideration of water.	SV
4	SV to provide copy of the presentation.	SV
5	Feedback on RMP from CCC members by 26/8/22.	CCC

Acronyms referred to in minutes:

CCC	Community Consultative Committee
RMP	Rehabilitation Management Plan