

Minutes

Meeting:	Bowdens Silver Project Community Consultative Committee - Meeting 1
Date:	Tuesday, 12 December 2017
Independent Chair:	Darryl Watkins
Location:	Mid-Western Regional Council, 86 Market Street, Mudgee
Time:	5.00 – 7.00 PM

Attendees	
Mr James Armitage (member)	Cr John O'Neill (Mid-Western Regional Council)
Mr Bradley Robert Bliss J.P. (Wellington Valley Wiradjuri Aboriginal Corporation)	Mr Keith Perrett (Silver Mines Ltd)
Mr Mick Boller (Lue Action Group)	Mr Anthony (Tony) McClure (Silver Mines Ltd)
Ms Sonia Christie (member)	Mr Jane Munro (Bowdens Silver Pty Limited)
Mr Tom Combes (member)	Mr Darryl Watkins (Independent Chair)
Ms Sally Dryburgh (member)	Mr Marc Snape (Minute Taker)
Mr John Lydiard (member)	

Subject	Actions
<p>1. Welcome & Introduction</p> <p>The Chair welcomed and thanked members for their attendance. Brad Bliss delivered Welcome to Country.</p> <p>The Chair acknowledged that some members had been on a previous Bowdens Silver Committee, while others were new members. Members were invited to introduce themselves and give brief introductions on their interest in the project and their background.</p>	<p>➤ No actions.</p>
<p>2. Apologies</p> <p>There were no apologies.</p>	<p>➤ No actions.</p>
<p>3. Pecuniary & Other Interests</p> <p>The Chair thanked members for submitting their pecuniary and non-pecuniary interest forms.</p> <p>The Chair declared to the Committee that he was appointed by the Department of Planning and Environment, and is remunerated by Silver Mines Limited.</p>	<p>➤ Chair to create and manage register of declared interests and conflicts.</p>



<p>4. CCC Guidelines and Code of Conduct</p> <p>The Chair briefly introduced the NSW Department of Planning & Environment’s Community Consultative Committee Guidelines, and explained that the Committee will be run as per these guidelines.</p> <p>The Chair also advised the Committee that he has received signed Code of Conduct forms from all Committee members.</p>	<p>➤ No actions.</p>
<p>5. Chair’s Expectations</p> <p>The Chair outlined his expectations of the Committee. All members will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Approach the CCC in a spirit of goodwill and cooperation.- Treat each other with trust, respect and mutual support.- Respect each other’s opinions.- Provide timely information.- Provide constructive discourse and cooperation.- Direct comments and questions through the Chair. <p>The proponent will be expected to provide quality and timely information to the Committee in response to requests from the members, and questions taken on notice.</p> <p>The meetings will not be run under formal meeting procedures (eg. There are no formal motions, movers, seconders etc), and any questions will be through the Chair.</p> <p>The Chair noted there would be a presentation from the proponent later in the meeting, to be followed by questions. Committee members were asked to raise their hands during the presentation and a list of names would be kept by the Chair. All members would have an opportunity to ask questions.</p> <p>Mick Boller noted that he has previously requested presentations from the proponent to be circulated prior to meeting, and asked if this was possible as part of this Committee.</p> <p>Tony McClure advised the presentation is intended to be presented at the meeting.</p> <p>The Chair acknowledged that it may be the case that the proponent needs to make changes to the presentation up to the day of meetings. The Chair will take this request on notice and advise the Committee once resolved.</p> <p>The Chair read through the CCC Guidelines to reiterate the purpose of the meetings. The meetings are to serve as a conduit of information from the proponent to the community, and to provide feedback from the community to the Committee.</p> <p>The Chair advised that no members are to speak to the media as a representative of the Committee other than the Chair. The Chair noted individuals can speak to media as a member of the community, however not as a member of the Committee.</p> <p>Tom Combes sought clarity on how confidentiality is interpreted.</p> <p>The Chair advised that it will be up to the individuals speaking to have that conversation regarding confidentiality. The Chair intends to establish a collaborative environment for the Committee.</p> <p>Mick Boller noted that as a representative of the Lue Action Group, he has previously prepared separate minutes for the group, and they are often quite different to the official minutes.</p>	<p>➤ Chair to advise Committee.</p>



<p>The Chair requested the opportunity to review any separate minutes of Committee meetings before they are sent to third parties outside the committee.</p>	<p>➤ Mick Boller to provide draft notes to Chair for review.</p>
<p>6. Project Introduction & Update</p> <p>7. Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) Status</p> <p>Tony McClure gave a presentation (see Appendix A) introducing the Bowdens Silver Project to the Committee members and the current status of the project and EIS.</p> <p>The Chair then commenced taking questions from members.</p> <p>Q1. Tom Combes sought clarification that the boundary of the project is 2.5 km to the north of Lue Village.</p> <p>A1. Tony McClure confirmed that this is correct.</p> <p>Q2. Tom Combes noted the project was described as a ‘long term project’, and sought clarification on what ‘long term’ means.</p> <p>A2. Tony McClure noted that the mine’s design is still not finalised, with previous iterations outlining 10 and 20 years of development. The mine’s development will be based on the reserve as an economic entity. This is very much a subset of the resource. There is certainly a possibility of increasing the resource, and the reserve within the current resource – this work is ongoing. In terms of longevity and long term opportunities for the mine, it could be ongoing long after we’re gone, probably more as an underground operation. Tony advised he is unable to outline a technical perspective, but from a geological view there’s likely to be expansion of depth. We are unlikely to know more on that for another 5 years or so. The feasibility will be undertaken for a short term project. Tom Combes clarified that the current forecast is 10-20 years with further possible works in the future. This was confirmed by the proponent.</p> <p>Q3. Brad Bliss asked in relation to the open cut mine itself, what would be the depth of the open cut and will the pit be filled or rehabilitated?</p> <p>A3. Tony McClure advised that the resource goes to a depth of approximately 300m, and the pit in the current mine design is approximately 150m deep. In response to filling the pit, this would not be the case as it is uneconomic to do so. In a coal mine that may be the case, however he is unaware of any precious metal operations doing so. With coal mines, over a very large span of area, you have back filling as they go, so from a mining operation perspective it’s a very different situation between coal and precious metal mines.</p> <p>Q4. Tom Combes noted that during the presentation it was mentioned that shareholders were mostly mum and dad investors, but he understands the last share raising was from United States of America?</p> <p>A4. Tony McClure advised that was not the case - there are currently no US based owners in the company that the company is aware of. The proponent has institutional investors, and retail shareholders. Larger shareholders are typically the institutional investors. As far as the company is aware it has 2 international shareholders out of the UK, 1 out of Switzerland, the rest are Australian institutions. 96% of shareholders are Australia or New Zealand based. In terms of volume, many of those are small shareholders. Tom sought clarification that the major shareholders are major fund companies. Tony McClure advised this is correct. There are half a dozen of Australia’s main shareholder organisations including Tribeca, Janus Henderson and others. Internationally, the largest is BlackRock based out of London.</p>	



Q5. Mick Boller asked a question regarding the EIS, and stated that he has not seen any mention of koalas in previous examples, and noted there had been a recent sighting of koalas on Bowdens property. Mick asked what steps had been taken regarding the koala sighting.

A5. Tony McClure advised that EnviroKey are undertaking the ecological assessment. There are various chapters in the EIS covering terrestrial and aquatic flora and fauna, and it is comprehensive. When it comes to specific animals, they will be considered as part of that assessment and this will include koalas. **Note:** *Bowdens Silver has subsequently advised that the recent koala sighting which was publicised in the media was not sighted on Bowdens Silver property.*

Q6. John Lydiard sought clarification that this Committee is only considering the Bowdens Silver Project development, and not discussing satellite pits?

A6. Tony McClure confirmed that is correct. If there's another discovery that leads to a potential mine development, that will be subject to a separate EIS. There is a Bowdens EIS, and anything outside of that is exploration and not subject to an EIS unless there is a potential mine development proposal.

Q7. John Lydiard stated a concern that EL5920 is a certain size, but that outside influences could make that project much bigger.

A7. Tony McClure confirmed that that is a possibility, but would be much later. Bowdens have other obligations on other exploration activities, and each of those have their own obligations. While that may not necessarily be in the form of another CCC, consultation takes place through the project website, mail outs, direct interactions with landholders etc. That consultation is as per the guidelines of the Department.

Q8. Tom Combes asked about the groundwater consultant and design of the project. Tom sought clarification around the frequency of the storm event that the water storage facility/tailing dam will be designed to withstand (1 in 10, 1 in 50, or 1 in 100 year storm).

A8. Tony McClure advised he would take the question on notice.

Q9. Tom Combes asked whether the groundwater model will be a "Class 3 Model" under national modelling guidelines.

A9. Tony McClure advised he would take the question on notice.

Q10. Tom Combes sought to clarify with the proponent that only local residents or landowners can join the Lue Fire Brigade. Some volunteers applied to the brigade, but due to the Lue Fire Brigade's constitution, they were referred to Mudgee Brigade. None of those referrals have progressed to become members of the Mudgee Brigade.

A10. Tony McClure advised he was happy to discuss this outside the committee forum. The personnel involved now understand the issue is in rules and regulations, but the site has several young guys willing to join. They now understand the constitution issues, but would like to find something more that we can do due to make use of the infrastructure Bowdens have onsite, including substantial water resources. Tom Combes advised the Rural Fire Brigade now works more as the mid-western regional group. It was agreed to discuss further outside of the Committee.

Q11. Brad Bliss asked about registered indigenous groups around Aboriginal sites and surveys. Noted he was involved in previous surveys with Uncle Larry. The Aboriginal community interest is not just around Aboriginal history and artefacts, but also around the EIS, groundwater etc. Would appreciate the indigenous communities be included in those areas

➤ Bowdens to respond.
Question on notice.

➤ Bowdens to respond.
Question on notice.

➤ Bowdens to discuss with
Tom Combes outside of
CCC.



as well.

A11. Tony McClure advised that Aboriginal and cultural heritage is also part of the EIS. Bowdens has a particular interest in history, and that is intrinsic to how we move forward with that and have been talking locally and will expand that further. There's a lot of history, both Aboriginal and European. There's a lot of information out there, but it's not well understood or well presented, and Bowdens would be delighted to help in that area as the project goes forward.

Q12. Sonia Christie noted in the presentation, a chart lists mine outputs for silver as per tonne, but for zinc and lead as a percentage. Sonia asked if it is possible to present all figures as a ratio of silver, zinc and lead.

A12. Tony McClure advised that it's technically incorrect and they are unable to do that. If you look at scientific standards applied to reporting grades in geology in mining, there's a specific convention, and we don't go outside of that. It can be misleading in a way, to 'what's the dominant metal'. For example, gold is a very precious metal. If you presented percentages of gold and copper in a mine, Gold would be small percentage, but it's still a gold mine. The proponent sits under a very tight regulatory body, and we cannot report outside of that. Tom Combes advised he had previously worked up a chart, and could do the same with the new numbers. The Chair requested that chart be forwarded to him, and will revisit the matter in the next meeting.

Keith Perrett advised the Committee that the proponent is a publicly listed company, and have rules and regulations in how they report. The Chair advised that he's reserving his right as Chair as to how this is progressed, but committed to considering it and will discuss in Meeting 2. Tony McClure reiterated that as an ASX listed company, they cannot report outside of the Joint Ore Reserves Committee (JORC) Code.

Q13. James Armitage sought clarification that the mine site's boundary is just a subset of EL5920?

A13. Tony McClure responded that this is correct, and that as the EIS process is completed, the boundary will be drawn just on operational site, not on the entire exploration site.

Q14. John Lydiard asked at what point the EIS is released to the public. When the EIS is submitted, is it submitted as one document and does it all go live at the same time? Does it go to PAC for review first?

A14. Tony McClure advised that the EIS goes public when it is lodged with the Department. The Planning Assessment Commission (PAC) review is a separate process, with various trigger points to go to PAC, such as objections to operation, if the proponent has made political donations etc. It is more a public process than a government process. There will be summary of each section, and comprehensive information with more detail for those who are interested.

Q15. Brad Bliss asked about previously identified Aboriginal sites. On the drive in to the homestead, there's rocks in the paddock to the right - has that been fenced off?

A15. Jane Munro advised that she believes it has been fenced off, but will take the question on notice to seek clarification. Keith Perrett advised that Bowdens had removed all livestock from that paddock as soon as they were alerted to the identification of artefacts, and that the entire paddock is now closed off to livestock.

- Tom Combes to forward chart to the Chair.
- The Chair will report back.

- Bowdens to respond. Question on notice.



8. CCC Members' requirements (DW)

The Chair opened discussions on what the Committee members may require to be effective. Think about matters that are important to you as Committee members and the community. The Chair wants to bring in technical experts to inform the Committee, but also want to seek feedback from members as to their priorities.

Sonia Christie suggested that future meeting dates for 2018 upfront would be great.

Sally Dryburgh noted that she is seeking truth and transparency from the Committee.

Tom Combes noted that if the presentation from Bowdens Silver could be circulated to Committee members before the meeting it would be appreciated. Tom also noted there are other members of the community who have asked to attend meetings as observers. In the past it has been a closed meeting.

The Chair advised he is fine with observers, but by consensus of the Committee. Upfront, we don't want disturbances, and if observers cause disruption they will be asked to leave and no longer allowed to attend as observers. They would have no right to speak.

Keith Perrett noted that as observers they wouldn't be restricted by the same Code of Conduct. This concern was also voiced by other members of the Committee.

The Chair advised he has selected this group as he believes they are a good team, and will respect confidentiality.

Councillor John O'Neill advised that the Council process is to allow observers during presentations, but they must leave during Q&As or confidential periods.

The Committee gave consensus to the principle of observers. A formal request must be made in writing to the Chair, which must be approved. An Observer's Code of Conduct will be signed by all observers before entering.

John Lydiard raised a concern that we should avoid just having quarterly meetings that is just a presentation with slightly updated numbers. He noted that not a lot can happen over a 12 month period with these projects unless something changes. He would like to hear from a water expert to discuss the impact on the Lue Valley. Keith Perrett advised that the proponent can't change the water. It's outlined very clearly in the EIS what companies have to cater for in this sort of development. John noted that any water that falls on the site can't leave the site. Would be good to learn what effect does that have downstream, because everything is downstream from the mine.

Keith Perrett noted he has no problems with experts addressing the Committee, but only if it's relevant and worthwhile for members. It's not about not wanting to provide the information, it's about having the right experts who can report with relevant information. Keith noted that the proponent is a publicly listed company.

Tony McClure advised that generally the proponent has a quarterly report, followed 2 weeks later by a community newsletter, and then a CCC meeting after that. That's more relevant in an exploratory phase. In operational phase, any substantial information has to be released the moment it's finalised, and the proponent can't hold information. Once the EIS is completed, Bowdens will also have a full information day with every



<p>one of the primary consultants present, to allow every member of the community to critically analyse the information. Bowdens previously had an information day with those experts primarily to explain the work they're doing, not the results they were finding.</p> <p>Mick Boller stated he was interested in how the Chair proposes to record dissenting views. Mick noted that in previous committees there were some dissenting views that were completely ignored in minutes. If there's a group of members who have a dissenting view, how will that be recorded?</p> <p>The Chair advised that minutes are taken of each meeting, and that the Chair is required under the guidelines to have a draft version circulated within one week of the meeting, and a final version circulated within two weeks of the meeting. Some leeway on this is required, especially over the forthcoming Christmas period. Mick sought clarification of dissenting views of the minutes, and whether that would be recorded as a dissenting view. The Chair advised that it won't be recorded as a specific criticism, but the minutes may note 'consensus not reached'.</p> <p>The Chair advised that his goal is to make this a workable forum - this isn't a decision making body, it's an advisory body, therefore no dissenting views will be recorded.</p> <p>Mick Boller remarked that one of the things that has driven him to be involved with the Committee, is to ensure people who live in the area are aware of how close they are to the project. Mick would like to ensure approximately 2-300 people who live within several kilometres of the pit and infrastructure layout are informed.</p> <p>Jane Munro commented that she would like to see more of a focus in the Committee on Bowdens and what we've done, and what we're going to do.</p> <p>James Armitage sought clarification on the Code of Conduct, which outlines "spreading the word" to the community as a requirement. The Chair advised that it's about speaking with authority about what you've heard in these meetings. The presentation and meeting minutes will be on the website, so the information is available. As pillars in your communities, you are perfectly within your rights to speak to the community about the project.</p> <p>James Armitage also agreed with the request for experts to speak to the Committee. James advised he has two big areas of interest: the genuine social impact – what are the genuine social impacts for the entire area that we can see; and the cultural and historical aspects. Tony McClure advised that the consultant undertaking the social impact assessment is going above and beyond what you would see in other mining operations.</p> <p>Brad Bliss advised he would like to undertake a site visit, and in terms of technical experts, would like to hear from hydrological, environmental, and archaeological (indigenous and non-indigenous) experts.</p> <p>The Chair agreed that a site visit would be helpful, and suggested the second meeting be held onsite, and that part of that meeting be a site visit, with the rest of the meeting completed in the facilities on site.</p>	<p>➤ Bowdens to respond. Question on notice.</p> <p>➤ Meeting 2 to be held on site.</p>
<p>9. Communication with Broader Community</p>	<p>➤ Deferred to Meeting 2.</p>



<p>10. Meeting Dates for 2018</p> <p>The Chair sought input on the next meeting dates. The Committee agreed with the following dates:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- 14 February 2018 – 5.00 - 7.00 pm Site visit and Q&A- 14 March 2018 – 5.00 - 7.00 pm Regular CCC meeting with technical experts (tbc)	<p>➤ Chair to liaise with Bowdens to organise technical expert presentations.</p>
<p>11. Agenda Items for Meeting 2</p> <p>Discussed as part of Item 10. Site visit and Q&A.</p>	<p>➤ Chair to advise.</p>
<p>12. CLOSE MEETING</p> <p>The Chair thanked Committee members for attending and their positive participation and contributions.</p> <p>Meeting closed 7.05 pm.</p>	