

## KANMANTOO-CALLINGTON COMMUNITY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE (KCCCC)

### KCCCC Secretariat

c/- Hillgrove Resources

phone: 8538 6800

email: [tamara.brown@hillgroveresources.com.au](mailto:tamara.brown@hillgroveresources.com.au)

### Chairperson

Karlene Maywald

Phone: 0412 445 865

Email: [karlene.maywald@gmail.com](mailto:karlene.maywald@gmail.com)

---

### Draft Notes to the Meeting

15 August 2019

Callington Memorial Hall

#### 1. Welcome and introductions

##### *In attendance*

Karlene Maywald (Chairperson)

Gary Duncan

Fiona Challan

Ed Thomas

Harry Seager

Carol Bailey

Mark Stewart

Lachlan Wallace

Welcome and introduction

##### *Apologies*

Ross Oke

Cathy Schneider

##### *Guests*

Adam Schutz (DEW), Peter Bond (Neutrog), Sarah Bellman (Hanson), Greg Tyczenko, Nathan Zeeman

##### *Gallery*

Approximately 7 people attended the meeting besides invited guests

#### 2. Confirmation of notes of previous KCCCC meeting of 19 June 2019

The draft notes to the last meeting of the committee held were accepted.

##### Actions completed from last minutes:

#### 3. Kanmantoo PEPR Revision (includes with PHES & No PHES)

#### 4. Mine Update – LW Presenting

- Current status – workforce reduction (260 to 70) processing stockpile (after 2020)
- Continuing rehab, hydro-seeding of IWL continues, areas of the IWL are not rehabilitating as successfully as we would like,
- Develop underground,
- developing pumped hydro with AGL

## 5. Future Projects

- Underground – designs based on ore bodies of open pit. Drilling is underway, existing road will become the decline. Mining to be complete before convert to pumped hydro. LW shares schedule for underground development
- Description of where decline will be in pit wall over half way down eastern wall. Time pressure to commence mining before pit flooding
- LW explains how pumped hydro works (video)
- Approval process, geo modelling and studies then funding
- Introduction of the community action list. The Intention is to update with concerns/actions raised as result of Underground development, reinstating the process used for changes to the operation previously with the KCCCC.

## 6. Industrial Park

- LW – reinforces community consultation process & master planning as contributing to concept of Industrial Park development as economic development is one of the 4 Pillars of the Master Plan
- LW – explains why Industrial Park is viable.
  - a. Services – water, power, land, transport route, DCMB agribusiness proposal, railway, warehousing, maintenance facilities etc....
- LW – requires industrial re-zone underway has council endorsement & State Government approval
- HGO funding the application – statement of intent to Minister Knowl

**Question** – FC – Highlights that a number of industrial opportunities have been identified by K4C. Has the K4C suggestions for use of industrial area been considered?

**Answer** - LW – This provides some excellent starting points, however it is difficult to advance meaningful decisions with potential users of the land until the rezone has been approved and the timing of cessation of operations at Kanmantoo certain. Effectively HGO would be seeking to sell the land and the buyer of the industrial park would determine future use.

**Question** – FC – What would the difference/restriction be between zones?

**Answer** - HS – explains that primary industry is limited to farming, whereas industrial zoning allows industrial business development.

**Question** -KM – if council were to purchase could have community use? GD- will K4C have input into re-zone plan?

**Answer** - Yes

### **ACTION**

LW – find out consultation details and provide to K4C. Public notices will occur.

## 7. Community Concerns

### **Dust**

- The site is still at risk to dust impact due to open areas.
- The underground itself is not expected to contribute materially as majority of activities occurring underground, the impact will be greatly reduced.
- The primary dust mitigation measures are;
  - a. Continued close out of completed areas with vegetation to reduce exposed surfaces which are main cause of dust lift.
  - b. Regular rotation of spigots on TSF, keeping the surface wet.
  - c. Water carts on haul roads and open areas.

- d. Maintain existing real time dust monitors which provide information to enable pre-emptive action through the established Trigger and Action Response Plan (TARP).

### **Noise**

- Blasting requirements remain within the Australian Standards but much smaller than what community are used to due to underground nature of development. The initial portal blasts may cause overpressure. This is raised as a precaution only as it is expected to be within Australian Standards as the pit is 350m deep which assists in reducing the noise.
- Potential impact identified for residents on certain nights during TSF lift construction. This is similar to the waste dumping that occurred on a daily basis during the open pit construction. It will be managed as before with operations changed / stopped when weather events identified that may contribute to noise propagation, particularly on night shift.
- It is not expected that there will be any other disturbance given underground nature. The site itself will still operate 24 hours per day and so there will be some limited surface noise but far lower than in open pit.

### **Vibration – Blasting**

- Video showing typical blast (underground development). Reduced risk of vibration due to smaller blasts, less explosives use and underground nature of development.
- In the open pit we would typically blast up to 8 holes of circa 200kg at once. This would result in ground vibrations of less than 3mm/s in Kanmantoo (Australian Standard is 5mm/s at residential and 10mm/s at residential based on human comfort). By contrast the underground holes are around 5kg in development and 350kg in production not expected to have any noticeable impact at the sensitive receptors (modelled ground vibrations 1km away are 0.15mm/s and 1.14mm/s for development and production blasts respectively).
- No Questions

### **Traffic**

- Scale of operation is much smaller, less personnel so less traffic movement. Continue to utilize private access road and encourage Neutrog to continue to use the road.
- No Questions

### **Light**

- TSF Construction risk – height of landform increases so lighting higher and may disturb nearby residents.
- No Questions

### **Visual Amenity**

- 8m higher than current approved height (11m higher than is now).
- LW – show photo montage from agreed points of the last 11 years of monitoring.
- Why higher landform – more tailings form underground development (3m). BUT opportunity to include the OTD material if pumped hydro development dam in that location. Opportunity to clean up legacy issue of OTD an environmental win for the state.

**Question** – What about the NAF stockpile next to the TSF?

**Answer** – Will still be used as capping material for TSF closure – as such it will be gone as part of site closure.

### Ground Water

- LW – 3D modelling to determine that the pit remains a groundwater sink if underground developed. Results show no water can travel off site. Water in the pit was acidic before HGO and will remain a pit acid lake after HGO.
- Modelling shows no impact on neighbours' bores from existing or underground development.

**Question** – Will we intercept more water as we go down?

**Answer** – Ground water will continue to travel through the rock at the very low flow rates that we observed in the open pit, however the underground will not intercept any large flow or basin of ground water.

**Question** – How high will water level in the pit be for pumped hydro?

**Answer** – This is dependent on AGL's final design, however the project concept when sold to AGL has around 90m in the base of the pit at all times which increased to approximately 140m from the base during peak storage (ie the water fluctuated between these levels as part of the Pumped Hydro operation). The depth of the pit is 350m so these levels are still very close to the bottom of the pit.

### Rehabilitation

- LW – Shows slides depicting progress (typical) revision of the NVMP
- Key changes – Payment into the Native Vegetation fund. The Native veg council to administer distribution of funds.
- Reinforce desire for projects as near as possible to impact site.
- Key Changes
  - SEB replaced with Native Veg & pasture species.
  - Convert processing area to industrial zone.
  - Remnant no longer enhanced.
- Opportunity to bring EPBC into the lease.
- LW explains difference between state & federal obligations of EPBC/SEB. Desire to move off site EPBC onto the remnant vegetation zone on ML.
- EPBC moved on site will ensure protection in perpetuity of the remnants.

**Question** – Have we thought of getting Native Veg Council payment in the Bremmer?

**Answer** – Adam Schutz will answer in presentation. Adam also explained how the multiplier effect is applied to native veg removal, off-set or pay in fund.

Offset can be provided by 3<sup>rd</sup> party or the proponent.

7 Key Requirements of the off-set

1. like for like or better
2. location – close to impact to maintain connectivity & habitat (IRBA associations)
3. improved protection maintained for long run (heritage)
4. management over and above existing obligations
5. protection in perpetuity with 10 year management plan
6. Longevity associated with significant size. Away from likely impact, pre-European condition.
7. SEB grants offering best return for investment seeking expressions of interest (can be targeted to area of impact). Consideration for condition of the vegetation to remove uncertainty.  
SEB credits can be sold to proponents who need (not very viable as not many credited sites in the market at the moment)

**Question** – Timeframe for holding funds to ask for applications?

**Answer** – Proposals historically have always come forward.

**Question** – How does the community apply for funding?

**Answer** – Adam - Information goes to key stakeholders and local papers and heritage association. Local landholders can approach DEW to put forward a plan.

**Question** – Is there support to determine if land is appropriate?

**Answer** – DEW can do that.

**Question** – Would the landholder be responsible

**Answer** – Yes, for delivery of the off-set. Need to cost in risk & insurance for things like drought. NVC will provide advice and assistance

- 3<sup>rd</sup> parties can be responsible if agreement with landholder to provide land only.
- HS – Original commitment from HGO with K4C/community was that the vegetation that was cleared for mining would be replaced here. For a payment into the NVC now will be a betrayal but could be achieved through a 3<sup>rd</sup> party provider, like Goolwa-Wellington LAP.
- Reveg being provided by HGO are meeting the community's expectation.
- Desire for HGO, DEW, NVC, K4C to work together to achieve the community acceptable outcome. LW explains the timing issue with business winding up how to deliver the outcome through other mechanics.

**Question** – Can DEW (Adam) be the middle man?

**Question** – LW – Could we put forward the application and quarantine the funds until accepted by Native Veg?

**Answer** – Adam – time limit would be up to 6 months.

**ACTION:** HGO to explore possibility for subcommittee involving Adam/HGO and K4C to determine outcome that suits all parties.

### **Employment Opportunities**

If mining proceeds, Hillgrove will engage an underground contractor to undertake the works

Any contractor will be required to follow Hillgrove's well established local hire policy (this has been the case with all other contractors since Hillgrove started).

Some skill sets will necessarily need to be brought in from outside of the area, particularly initially, however it is expected that most positions will be filled by local people that have experience in underground mining that are currently working in other mines (FIFO) or previously engaged in the Angas Zinc operation in Strathalbyn.

If mining proceeds, employment is expected to commence towards the end of 2019.

### **Benefit to Community of Underground Development**

If the underground goes ahead the benefits are far beyond Hillgrove Resources. The underground benefits other stakeholders including;

*Community;*

- Maintain employment, both directly and indirectly
- Multiplier effect; money into local economy increases overall economic activity (Hillgrove's activities contribute ~\$75m per year into the local economy)
- Community benefit through sponsorship, Master Plan, community forum

*Government (direct);*

- Royalties
- Taxes – personal and business

*Government (indirect);*

- Credibility to SA copper strategy
- Maintains IP in the State to enable future exploration. In particular the underground enables HGO to develop other nearby underground opportunities and continue near mine exploration to take advantage of existing infrastructure.

**Reginal Exploration**

What might be delivered long-term to the state by way of multiple mine development?

Underground mining provides the cash flow to continue to deliver this pipeline.

- Targets – Nugent, South Hub, Stella, North West, Porphyry IOCG in the South East

- **Next meeting and close**

- a. **Proposed date** 26<sup>th</sup> September 2019

Meeting closed 9:41pm