

**KANMANTOO-CALLINGTON COMMUNITY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE (KCCCC)**  
**Master Planning Working Party meeting and site tour**

**DRAFT NOTES**

5.00pm – 7.30pm  
Thursday 23<sup>rd</sup> February 2017  
at Kanmantoo Copper Mine

**In attendance**

Fiona Challen  
Garry Duncan  
Carol Bailey  
Harry Seager  
Bev Robertson  
Ed Thomas  
Catherine Davis (Environmental Manager)  
Adam Crossing (Mine Manager)  
Bob Goreing

**Apologies**

Kathy Schneider Roberts  
Alistair Walsh  
Lachlan Wallace

Purpose of the meeting and site tour

**Meeting**

1. Update of the status of the mine closure and completion plan
2. Begin to develop a list of potential opportunities for additional community benefit from retaining existing physical infrastructure after mine closure
3. Discuss possible actions to address these opportunities in the mine closure and completion plan, particularly where they may require significant lead time
4. Update the progress of initiatives to involve University students in the project

**Site tour**

- Look at examples of possible vantage points (lookout) and other access infrastructure opportunities
- Look at examples of opportunities to link up mining history / heritage tourism, the rehabilitation / native vegetation programs and recreational aspects of the site
- Look at existing infrastructure and opportunities for retention for future benefit

**Meeting**

Lachlan was an apology to the meeting and site tour. Lachlan had provided a written report which was tabled by Bob.

**1. Update of the status of the mine closure and completion plan**

Catherine said that the mine closure and completion plan (MCCP) had been in place since 2010 under obligations through the original mine plan (program for environment protection and rehabilitation (PEPR)) and maintained in the 2014 PEPR update.

Progress against the MCCC was regularly reported at KCCCC meetings.

Catherine said that the mining regulator was aware of the community's interest in the MCCC under its master planning process and amendments to the MCCC were possible.

### **2. Begin to develop a list of potential opportunities for additional community benefit from retaining existing physical infrastructure**

Bob said that the purpose of this discussion was to begin to develop an inventory of existing infrastructure that may be retained for community benefit after mining is complete.

Lachlan's report identified the following infrastructure that he felt may represent opportunities:

1. maintenance sheds (processing area, heavy equipment workshop)
2. 2 x wash down pads
3. offices
4. access tracks
5. electricity sub-station
6. 2-3 dams

These sites were included in the site tour that followed this meeting.

Catherine explained that some infrastructure that had a role in the rehabilitation or maintenance of the site would remain in place for some time after mine closure. She gave the example of the return water dam that will capture underground drainage from the tailings facility until this reaches equilibrium.

### **3. Discuss possible actions that may be required to address these opportunities in the mine closure and completion plan, particularly where they may require significant lead time**

Catherine said that key issues for consideration in the retention of infrastructure included:

1. current and future ownership of both the infrastructure and the land on which it is located
2. future responsibility for maintenance and upkeep
3. caveats to future development like Land Management Plans or Environmental Heritage Agreements
4. the status of land use under the Mining Act and how this may impact on future land use like an industrial hub
5. the relinquishment process, its time line and potential for early relinquishment of particular areas for defined land use
6. the transition process from mining tenements to land zoned under the Development Act

The example of the private access road was raised where private landowners and the local Council each had an interest and any discussion on its possible retention must begin with these stakeholders.

Other issues that were discussed included the financial arrangements that may be in place to link the sale and removal of infrastructure to the funding of the on-going maintenance of the site.

## Master Planning Working Party meeting and site tour

---

It was agreed that an important stakeholder to engage as early as possible would be Mt Barker District Council.

**Action:** Make a presentation on the master planning process to Council as soon as there is more advanced material available through the research projects. Ensure that Council officers are aware of the project and invite their participation.

### 4. Update the progress of initiatives to involve University students in the master planning project

#### Playford Trust

The meeting clarified the aims of the Playford Trust project and particularly the key outcome of developing a set of GIS information and maps of the mining lease and nearby area, comprising mining history and heritage, environment, infrastructure and other layers.

Lachlan's report said that there was one applicant for the Playford Trust scholarship that had been received by the University of SA and passed on to Lachlan for consideration by Hillgrove.

Lachlan said in his report that he felt the applicant was a good candidate for the scholarship. Before proceeding, Lachlan invited the KCCCC Master Planning Working Party to consider the application with a view to supporting this decision as he felt that the KCCCC was likely to be a key contact for working with the scholarship holder.

**Action:** Interested Working Party members to consider the application in response to Lachlan's invitation and confirm with Bob via text or e mail.

#### Mine closure research project

Lachlan reported that he had had discussions with the Future Industries Institute (a collaboration of Uni SA and University College London (UCL)) about the potential for students enrolled in their MSc in Global Management of Natural Resources to undertake individual research projects on the topic of Management of Mine Closure. Examples he suggested included research projects aimed at:

1. establishing a mining history tourism precinct around the mine and surrounding historic mining district
2. environmental regeneration
3. creating a recreation park utilising the unique physical features of the mine site
4. further industry which takes advantage of the water, power and transport infrastructure

The meeting felt that this was a good opportunity to build on the GIS framework and drill down to particular initiatives under the headings suggested.

**Action:** Lachlan to follow up with the UniSA with a view to developing these research projects

### Site tour

Catherine and Adam hosted the site tour which supported the items discussed in the meeting.

The site tour included a viewing of:

1. possible vantage points (lookouts) and their potential access from the road network
2. possible walking / riding trails and features that the trails may link up such as remnant native vegetation, rehabilitated landforms, similar features compared across the generations of mining (eg old and new tailings facilities)
3. the existing processing and maintenance area of the mine site including:
  - maintenance sheds and other buildings
  - wash down areas, particularly the large facility adjacent the maintenance shed
  - electricity sub-station
  - water retention facilities

### The tour finished at 7.30pm

PS: Bob mentioned that DSD was looking to put together some examples / case studies of leading practice in community engagement relating to resources industry and other projects and wanted to send a film crew to the next KCCCC meeting as background. The KCCCC members present had no objections to the film crew attending the meeting.