

Bloomfield Colliery Community Consultative Committee

Location: Bloomfield Colliery

Time: 10.00 am

Date: 17 October 2022

ATTENDEES	
Name	Organisation
Lisa Andrews (LA)	Independent Chairperson
Janet Murray (JM)	Community Representative
Dennis Thurlow (DT)	Community Representative
Greg Lamb (GL)	Bloomfield Colliery
Brad Donoghoe (BD)	Bloomfield Colliery
Steve Vickers (SV)	Bloomfield Colliery
Damien Butler (DB)	Bloomfield Colliery

Apologies	
Jack Dwyer (JD)	Community Representative
Kristy Cousins (KC)	Maitland City Council
Richard Forbes (RF)	Cessnock City Council
Geoff Moore (GM)	Bloomfield Colliery

Item	Issue	Action
1	Welcome & Introductions	
	The Chair opened the CCC meeting at 10:03am and	
	welcomed members to the meeting.	
2	Apologies – Jack Dwyer, Maitland City Council, Cessnock City Council. LA noted JD was continuing to correspond on CCC matters and JM noted that it would be valuable to have a community representative from the Ashtonfield side of the operations.	LA advised that she would like to recruit additional membership for the CCC, both community representatives and stakeholder group delegates. Members to reach out to networks.
3	Declarations	
	LA advised that she is the approved Independent Chairperson on this CCC and engaged by Bloomfield. LA noted that there had been no changes to members' declarations and pecuniary interests.	



4	Busines	ss Arising		GROUP
	The minutes from the CCC held 01/08/22 were distributed 05/08/22 and finalised 23/08/22. LA noted the additions made to the minutes following			WE CARE. WE DELIVER.
			d 23/08/22. LA	
			ninutes following	
	the revi	ew process. The four acti-	ons from the	
	previou	s meeting were noted:		
	ITEM	ACTION	RESPONSIBILITY	
	1	GL to provide DT with	GL	
		link to the Landscape		
		Management Plan and		
		the Rehabilitation		
		Management Plan.		
		(Complete)		
	2	GL to provide DT with	GL	Action: GL to provide DT and IM with
		tour of analogue forest		Action: GL to provide DT and JM with
		site. (Incomplete*)	GI.	tour of analogue forest site, older
	3	SV to overlay	SV	rehabilitated areas of the site and the
		topography maps with consideration of water.		biodiversity offset area.
		(Action replaced with flow tables)		
	4	SV to provide copy of	SV/LA	Action: SV to provide water flow table
	-	the presentation.	SVER	with minutes.
		(Complete)		
	the tour GL sugrehabilithis tour and if he arrange On activities would 1	ion two, GL noted the difference of the analogue site due to gested the tour also encortated areas of the site. JM r. DT asked about the bio e could visit that area too this for both DT and JM. on three, SV noted he had asideration of water in tallike to see that.	to the wet weather. mpass a visit to older asked to also attend diversity offset area and GL agreed to topography maps ble form. DT said he	
5	Corres	pondence as sent 10/10/2		
	•	5/8/22 – Email to members for review, the links to the Management Plan as well a Closure/Rehabilitation Pres 23/8/22 - Email to member minutes. 26/8/22 – Email to member RMP deadline for feedback 5/9/22 – Email from JM wi	Landscape as the Mine sentation. s with the finalised as reminding of the the comments on the	
		on 7/9/22.	era with the Mastine	
	•	10/10/22 - Email to member Notice & Agenda for this n	rs with the Meeting neeting	



	• 14/10/22 – Email to members with reminder for	GROUP
	this meeting. LA thanked JM for providing the community response from 2008 to "Part 3A Environmental"	WE CARE. WE DELIVER.
	Assessment for Bloomfield Colliery: Completion of Mining and Rehabilitation (Project Application No. 07_0087)".	
6	Bloomfield Rehabilitation Management Plan - Rehabilitation Objectives and Completion Criteria – Feedback and Bloomfield response.	
	At the previous CCC meeting, feedback on RMP from CCC members had been requested by 26/08/22. JM had provided a detailed response and SV had collected the feedback against the relevant Rehabilitation Objectives and Completion Criteria along with the Bloomfield response to each piece of feedback. It was agreed this document would be marked as draft and provided with the meeting minutes.	Action: Provide feedback and response draft excel tracker with minutes.
	SV noted specific feedback had been received from JM only and that no other stakeholders had provided feedback to date.	
	SV went through each feedback area and provided Bloomfield's response.	
	On feedback item 2, JM noted the consent requirements were from 2008. JM noted her role on the Daracon CCC and the discussions regarding benches and screening. JM noted that benches visible to the public highlighted what has been lost and encouraged Bloomfield to do more on these areas.	
	On feedback items 3 and 4, DT asked if the rail loop was part of the current consent and how effective it could be for future commercial use. SV confirmed it was not part of the current consent however that it was included within the RMP. JM questioned how stable rehabilitated land would be and BD mentioned the University studies that were underway to provide more clarity, but that timeframes remained unclear. JM noted her frustration with references to the area becoming a freight hub and questioned why rehabilitation would occur in a certain way knowing that the area can't be used in this way.	
	On feedback items 5, 6, 7 and 8, JT asked if water flow was vastly different prior to mining. SV went through before and after surface water figures. JM asked where the flood risk was and SV provided the	



areas at risk downstream. DT asked if the highway had ever been cut. DT stated his concern with Wallis Creek and the culverts that go under the roads. DT believes this needs to be sorted out beforehand and reinforced his concern with the road being cut. SV noted the liaison with Council and the potential future requirements for works in these areas. DT noted the catchment area for Wallis Creek would nearly double. SV noted the one in five year flood areas. DT again noted his concern about the area of the road being cut. SV noted the studies and the work required with Council to address that. BD noted the future timings for tailing dam works.

JM asked if Bloomfield needs to leave a deeper void so it doesn't overtop. SV noted the need to divert more catchment away rather than having a deeper void. DT asked about the depth of the void. SV commented it would be approximately 18 metres above sea level. SV clarified the depth would be approximately 70 metres. DT asked about length and width of the void and SV agreed to provide this. JM said it would be useful to have that overlaid on a map to scale. DT asked for a comparison of the size such as a football stadium. DT asked about what happens if the void does overflow and if there will be a spillway. SV said it was designed to not overflow but would follow the drainage flow. DT asked about burying tires. SV noted the approval to bury tyres at depth. SV said they wouldn't be simply sitting on the bottom of the void. JM asked about the possibility of not having a final void. SV noted the approval to have a final void. SV noted the options being explored.

Feedback items 9, 10 and 11 were covered. JM noted areas that are having record rainfalls and that the past doesn't tell the entire story. SV noted the studies highlighted that the groundwater risks improve.

Feedback items 11 and 12 were discussed. DT asked about areas of the void where there could be grass or shrubs. SV noted the plan for grasses on the steeper slopes. GL said stability was the priority. DT asked about spotted gum and iron bark forests and the list of vegetation native to certain areas. GL noted the species list provided in the RMP. DT asked if trees will be planted over pasture. GL said the areas would be seeded.

WE CARE. WE DELIVER.

Action: Provide dimensions of final void. Refer to figure 5.1 and 5.2 of the RMP for scaled final landform



	Feedback item 13 was discussed. JM noted the view	V GA	
	from her neighbour's house is a mound and that she	WE CARE. WE DE	IIVED
	is not impressed by it. SV noted the area had already	WE CARE. WE DE	LIVER
	been mostly rehabilitated to a rural setting. JM said		
	they don't want to look at whatever comes next. JM		
	asked whether other understory plants could be		
	seeded. JM stated that she believes that what is there		
	now looks like a waste dump covered in grass. SV		
	said work could be done to make the area look more		
	natural.		
7	General Business		
	There was no general business.		
8	Next Meeting		
	It was agreed to carry over the same schedule for		
	2023: 20 March, 19 June and 16 October. It was		
	agreed to commence at 10:00am.		
9	Meeting Close:		
	The meeting closed at 11:23am with LA		
	thanking all for their attendance and		
	contribution		

ACTION ITEMS:

ITEM	ACTION	RESPONSIBILITY
1	GL to provide DT and JM with tour of analogue forest site, older	GL
	rehabilitated areas of the site and the biodiversity offset area.	
2	SV to provide water flow table with minutes.	SV
3	Provide feedback and response draft excel tracker with minutes.	SV
4	Provide dimensions of final void.	SV

Acronyms referred to in minutes:

CCC	Community Consultative Committee
RMP	Rehabilitation Management Plan