

ABEL MINE COMMUNITY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE MEETING 1 February 2010

ABEL MINE – SMP Area 1 Pillar Extraction (Upper Donaldson Seam) SMP December 2009

P11 7 Mine Design

- Maximum vertical subsidence is predicted in the range of 870 to 1760 mm.
- Protection from subsidence impact is provided to items noted as Principal Residences (in SMP Area 1 the Boral asphalt Plant) and the Schedule 2 Viney Creek, by limiting mining to first workings only or the development of a Subsidence Control Zone (SCZ) to restrict subsidence in the area.
- Some surface cracking up to 260 mm wide is predicted.

Refer to consent conditions and Actions.

P14 8.8 First Workings Management Plan

- As a condition of the Project Approval a First Workings Management Plan will be required to be developed prior to first workings under both the Boral Asphalt Plant and/or Viney Creek.

Mandatory?

P14 8.9 Principal Residence Management Plan

- As a condition of the Project Approval a Principal Residence Management Plan is required to be developed prior to first workings under any principal residence.

Discretionary?

The only principal residence with the SMP application area is the Boral Asphalt Plant, which has been included in a SCZ and no first workings are planned in this area, negating the need for a Principal Residence management Plan at this time.

P18 8.10.3 Groundwater

- Weekly measurement of the volume of mine water pumped from the underground workings.
- Weekly measurement on site of the EC, TDS and pH of the mine water pumped from the underground workings.

Where is this water pumped to?

P21 Table 2 General Surface

- Target Date: baseline inspection and photographic monitoring for first panel to be completed prior to March 2010.

Status?

P21 Table 2 Fences/Roads

- Target Date: baseline inspection and photographic monitoring for first panel to be completed prior to March 2010.

Status?

P23 11 Reporting

- Results of subsidence surveys, monitoring, inspections and effectiveness of management strategies are to be reported in the four monthly Subsidence Management Status reports, part of the Subsidence Community Consultation process, and also the Annual Environmental Management Report.

Copies sent to CCC members?

P23 12 Review

The plan will be reviewed as necessary including:

- In the event that landholders and/or government agencies raise issues that necessitate review.

What criteria forms the basis of an "issue"? For example, a landholder is concerned that a surface crack <100 mm appears on their land.

**ABEL MINE – SMP Area 1 SMP December 2009 Attachment A
Public Safety Management Plan Area 1**

P4 4 Background

- No substantial adverse environmental effects due to subsidence are predicted for the surface above the application area.

Subjective assessment.

P7 7.4 Scope and Frequency of Inspections

- At the completion of mining in each panel a full surface inspection will be conducted and results included in a panel report.

Copies sent to CCC members as per previous – Section 11 Reporting?

P9 8 Actions and Remedial Measures

- Abel will install appropriate warning signage, positioned along access roads and property boundaries, prior to the commencement of pillar extraction, advising of the potential for subsidence impacts. The objective of the signage is to ensure users of the access roads and surrounding area are aware of potential hazards resulting from subsidence. Mine contact details shall be included to enable any damage to be reported.

Part of a standard Duty of Care.

P9 8.2 Remediation of Public Safety Issues

Does this general heading cover private landholder areas?

Following the completion of the above the Manager of Mining Engineering or his nominee shall:

Mandatory.

- Arrange for remediation works as detailed in Table 2. This will require consultation with the landholder, and possibly Industry and Investment NSW – Minerals and Energy, specialist consultants and appropriate stakeholders, as noted in current Management Plans and Programs, to prepare appropriate remediation plan relating to the particular item. Notification to the general public may form a part of the remediation plan.

P10 Table 2 triggers, Action and Management Responses – Public Safety

Subsidence Monitoring – Trigger: Subsidence results are not greater than 15% above predictions.

What establishes these “acceptable” limits? 15% is a large tolerance level (I would have anticipated 5-10%).

Surface cracking on roads / trails and general surface area –

Trigger: Surface cracking 10 – 100 mm or 10 – 260 mm if cover < 80 m.

Mitigation/Remediation: Repair if cracks exceed 100 mm by excavation and grading or fill by concrete or grout.

Please define grading – locals have had a bad experience with Telstra who defined grading as use of a D10 Caterpillar tracked Dozer!

Steep slopes damage or instability–

Please define steep slopes – several properties are located on a ridgeline.

Why are the result ranges different to “flatter” areas?

P13 9 Reporting

- Results of subsidence surveys, visual inspections and photographic monitoring are to be reported at each survey to the Principal Subsidence Engineer and landholder, also in the four monthly Subsidence Management Status reports and the Annual Environmental Management Report.

OK – CCC members also?

APPENDIX A – RISK ASSESSMENT RESULTS TABLE – NATURAL FEATURES AND SURFACE IMPROVEMENTS P14-19

Comment – Risk assessments are by their nature very subjective. The Risk Matrix alone is a variable that can bias the outcome, for example, listed below is a comparison for Personal Injury from one matrix compared with the Donaldson one:

Consequence	ABEL Matrix	Other Matrix
1	Multiple Fatalities	Fatality or Permanent Disability
2	Single Fatality	Major Injury
3	Serious/Disabling Injury	Average Lost Time Injury
4	Lost Time Injury	Medical Treatment
5	First Aid Treatment	First Aid Treatment

Similarly, the Likelihood or Probability may vary:

Probability	ABEL Matrix	Other Matrix
A	Will Occur	Common
B	Likely to occur	Has happened
C	Could occur	Could happen
D	Unlikely	Not likely
E	Practically impossible	Practically impossible

Therefore, some of the issues that have been rated by the Company and independent panel members may be different if landholders were included on the assessment evaluation team (Refer SMP Written Report Volume 2 Final Report August 2009 P10 4 Workshop Team).

ABEL MINE – SMP Area 1 SMP December 2009 Attachment B Subsidence Community Consultation Process – December 2009

P6 Table 1 Subsidence Community Consultation Process Requirements

Mechanisms for the community to monitor and comment on the implementation of the SMP in relation to the progress of the mining operation.

- Four monthly subsidence management status report
- Section 10 (General template presented in Appendix A)

P10 Reporting and Consultation Meetings

- The Community Consultation Process proposes to separate consultation meetings into Government Department, Interagency, relevant stakeholder meetings and the currently established Community Consultative Committee (CCC) meetings. However, this does not preclude the possibility of combined consultation meetings if necessary or the attendance of any one (or more) Government Departments at CCC meetings if requested.
- It is proposed to have one Community Consultation meeting for each panel following completion of the relevant extraction panel. These meetings will be supplemented with the Four Monthly Subsidence Management Report.

For the 2nd dot point above, is Community Consultation just that – all the residents or just the CCC members?

Note that landowners are not included as “Stakeholder” in Table 2 P11.

Comment – reference to the Written Report Volume 1, P116. This refers to a list of invitees to the 24/6/09 SMP stakeholders presentation and of concern is that there was no representation from Government departments or interagencies at the meeting. Is this a demonstration of limited resources or lack of interest?

**ABEL MINE – SMP Area 1 SMP December 2009 Attachment E
Abel Mine Water management Plan – March 2008**

This plan report has been published for some time and there is quite a bit of detail in it. Some aspects raise questions and I personally have not completed a thorough evaluation. Issues that are flagged at this time are as follows:

P B-7 B3.5 Abel Site Water Management

- In the later stages of mining some excess water may be stored within the underground workings.

What volume of excess water is anticipated and from what source?

P B-8 Table B 3.2 and 3.3 Estimated Water balance for the Abel/Donaldson Mine Areas

These Tables require some further explanation and consideration.

P B-11 B3.6 Off-site Water Transfers

The arrangements for water transfer between Abel and Bloomfield are:

- a) When the water level in Big Kahuna is above the target level (75% capacity initially), and Lake Foster is below its target operating level (50% capacity) water will be transferred from Big Kahuna to Lake Foster at 10 ML/day.

Big Kahuna is 400 ML capacity and Lake Foster is 50 ML capacity – does this mean that there is only 2½ days availability? Makeup from groundwater or Hunter Water?

P C-6 C2 Interaction with Bloomfield, Donaldson, Abel and Tasman Mines

Losses of water from the vicinity of the CHPP and stockpile include:

- Four dot-point descriptors

No allowance in calculations for evaporation and infiltration?

There is a lot of detail that is difficult to absorb/comment on from a committee member / landholder perspective!

ABEL MINE – Area 1 SMP Application Written Report December 2009 Volume 1

P115 13.1 Consultation During the Preparation of the SMP Application

Stakeholder's meeting

5 Field Visit SMP Area

Note: this visit was cancelled the afternoon prior to the meeting due to wet conditions of the inspection area. The field trip was then rescheduled on the day causing some attendees to miss out due to reorganizing their commitments. (Apology delivered from TS for any inconvenience). This detail should have been included in the Minutes.

ABEL MINE – Area 1 SMP Application Written Report December 2009 Volume 2 Appendix G

The following is simply a request for report / procedure summaries and copies if available:

P8 3.5 Assumptions and Limitations

- ACARP 2003 model used for subsidence predictions

P10 4 Workshop Team

- Comment previously made regarding make-up of the risk assessment team albeit compliant.

P14 6 Mineral Resources MDG 1014 Checklist

- Is the Mineral Resources MDG 1010 Risk Management Handbook available?

Appendix A Abel Mine Site Risk matrix

- Comment previously made regarding the subjectivity of risk assessment and matrices.



Alan Brown

29 January 2010