

BSPCCC Meeting 5

Meeting:	Bowdens Silver Project CCC - Meeting 5
Date:	Monday, 18 February 2019
Location:	Mid-Western Regional Council, 86 Market Street, Mudgee
Time:	5.00 – 7.00 PM
Independent Chair:	Darryl Watkins, KJA (DW)
Attendees:	Bradley Bliss J.P., Wellington Valley Wiradjuri Aboriginal Corporation (BB) Sonia Christie, Community Member (SC) Tom Combes, Community Member (TC) Sally Dryburgh, Community Member (SD) John Lydiard, Community Member (JL) Anthony (Tony) McClure, Silver Mines Ltd (TM) Jane Munro, Bowdens Silver (JM) Keith Perrett, Silver Mines Ltd (KP) Cr John O'Neill, Mid-Western Regional Council (JO) Marc Snape, KJA (MS)
Apologies:	James Armitage, Community Member (JA) Mick Boller, Lue Action Group (MB)

Actions

Action	Responsible
BB to provide details of guidelines in relation to Aboriginal Heritage reports to Bowdens.	Bradley Bliss
Bowdens to provide the committee with an updated landholders map.	Bowdens Silver
Bowdens to provide the committee with an updated infrastructure map.	Bowdens Silver
Bowdens to confirm the date of the information day.	Bowdens Silver
DW will liaise with CCC members to confirm the date of the next meeting.	KJA
DW committed to speaking to the NSW Department of Planning & Environment regarding a possible attendance at a future meeting.	KJA

Minutes

Minutes	Action
<p>Welcome (DW)</p> <p>The Chair welcomed members. BB gave Welcome to Country. The Chair reaffirmed the code of conduct.</p>	Note
<p>Apologies (DW)</p> <p>The Chair noted apologies from James Armitage and Mick Boller.</p>	Note
<p>Meeting 4 - Action Items (DW)</p> <p>The Action Items from Meeting 4 were reviewed by the Chair. All action items were completed and the Questions on Notice Register has been updated.</p>	Note
<p>Community Report and Feedback (TC)</p> <p>Tom Combes presented a Community Report to the committee. Tom circulated a Lue Action Group fact sheet (see Appendix A), and reported the key points of the fact sheet.</p>	Note
<p>Q&A and Discussion (ALL)</p> <p>SC asked a question about water use, particularly with the ongoing drought and the fish kills is highly relevant at the moment.</p> <p>DW commented that he understands many of the areas will be addressed in the EIS.</p> <p>TM advised that there will be an update on EIS timeframe under General Business.</p> <p>JO asked about the mine life, and whether it has always been 16 years?</p> <p>TC advised it has always been relatively short time frame.</p> <p>JO asked a question in relation to background lead standard measurement in people's system every day of the week would be as opposed to being close to the mine?</p> <p>TC advised that while he's not a lead expert, this more reflects a concern from the community due to the quantity of lead, and the proximity to people.</p> <p>TC advised that the information in the fact sheet was sourced from the feasibility study. While it is understood that these matters will be addressed in the EIS, unless the plan is going to change drastically from the EIS, community concerns won't be allayed.</p> <p><i>Note:</i> Bowdens Silver have clarified that only a summary of the Feasibility Study has been publicly released, and that the full Feasibility Study is an internal document to Bowdens Silver.</p> <p>JL commented that until the final design in the EIS is known, the CCC could be talking at different ends and debating, but it can all change.</p> <p>TM noted that they are undertaking a process to brief and engage the entire community, not necessarily just the CCC.</p> <p>JM noted that Bowdens have done a lot of work on the EIS. The current focusing is on getting specialist consultant studies finished, and preparing the text and figures that can be done, while waiting for those reports to be finalised. The basic framework of the document is done, but still working with the consultants.</p>	

The EIS is a cascading process. First the technical reports need to be done, which then forms the basis for other reports that follow. The technical reports are well advanced.

All of the technical consultants have done a baseline study of the environment. Data is in the process of being modelled, and Bowdens is expecting all of those technical reports to be completed in March. Once completed, they are then circulated to other consultants, who use their findings to complete further reports, including health, lead, aquatic ecology.

The existing health, lead and aquatic ecology reports will be prepared to draft stage in March-April, as will the agricultural impact statement

Soil and landscape capability and transport assessments are expected to be completed in March, but some updated soil stockpiling arrangements are still being finalised.

Completion of draft Aboriginal heritage report is reliant some land access arrangements that are still being finalised.

The visual impact consultant has been photographing from nearby residences in recent months to assess visual impact.

JM advised that Bowdens have had good responses from the community, with only two people who didn't want photos taken from their property.

All other assessments and reports have to be finalised before undertaking the Economic and Social Impact Assessment.

Prior to completing the Social Impact Assessment, there will be one-on-one consultations with affected landholders.

Bowdens is considering holding a community briefing day in April.

A peer review process will then follow, and is already underway in terms of existing environment and air quality reports.

Once the final reports become available, they will also go to peer review.

Groundwater report peer review has been ongoing for the last 18 months. The consultant has been involved in the process at all stages and making comments as required into that process.

The final review of the groundwater modelling and draft reports are planned to be completed March/April.

The surface water report peer review is due to be completed this month.

Health report peer review has not yet commenced, due to the staged process. That will commence once a draft health report is available for internal review, then peer review.

There are still some items where Bowdens is still finalising the design work – waste rock emplacement and also final capping and cover reports for waste rock and tailings storage facility. Bowdens is also working on detailed information to be provided to address the EPA's tailings dam policy, which has been recently developed subsequent to the issuing of the Bowdens Silver Project SEARS.

The current schedule is for a Draft Report to be available around May, and sometime after that the EIS will be submitted.

DW sought confirmation that the timeframe for the EIS submission is approximately mid-2019.

TM advised that it is hard to put a timeframe on the process, particularly due to the unknown timeframe of the peer review.

BB asked a question in relation to specialist consultant reports on Aboriginal heritage by Dr Matt Cupper. BB advised he had spoken to Dr Matt Cupper and

<p>raised concerns that Aboriginal groups have in relation to the draft report, and are seeking the opportunity to provide comment prior to the EIS.</p> <p>BB advised he has also spoken to the NSW Office of Environment and Heritage (OEH), and believes draft heritage reports are meant to be published as a draft, then given to local Aboriginal groups for comment.</p> <p>JM requested the details of the guidelines that BB was referring to. BB committed to providing details.</p> <p>JL asked what would be discussed in one-on-one specialist meetings with potentially impacted residents. Residents next door to the mine site likely have very little idea what to discuss with a consultant expert in response to detailed reports.</p> <p>JM advised that the specialist would likely explain what has been found, and then collect any and all feedback. The expert could provide some details, and then discuss mitigation measures, which is one of the main purposes.</p> <p>SC asked if there would be any compensation measures or buybacks discussed.</p> <p>KP advised that Bowdens has always taken the approach of dealing directly with the individual. If one person says they want to stay here, the company will work with them on mitigations. If not, then discussions continue.</p> <p>TC asked a question in relation to water plans, whether there is an update in relation to the proposed pipeline coming from Ulan and going through properties, and what type of water would be included.</p> <p>JM responded that Bowdens are proposing a pipeline between the mine site and one of the sites in Ulan. The proposal keeps changing as the route is refined and more information is gathered. All landholders have been written to that are affected by the proposed pipeline path. Currently Bowdens is only seeking land access for ecological and biodiversity surveys. If those pathways are confirmed, easements will be required but that is down the track.</p> <p>The pipeline path is about 60 kms, and there has been approximately 12 kms of ecological surveying done so far. Bowdens is proposing a buried pipeline, and the water would be water from a coal mine in the Ulan area. The water is already licensed, so doesn't need to be separately licenced. In terms of quality, it's not pristine, but quality wise could otherwise be used for stock water. We will be recycling a lot of water in our operation. It will be decanted from the tailings storage facility and reused in the mining operation.</p> <p>JM advised she would seek further information about the current licensing and use of the water. Details will be provided when they become available.</p> <p>TC stated that a number of people want to know their options. Are they able to say no to the pipeline on their land?</p> <p>JM confirmed they have the ability to do that.</p> <p>TM noted that the NSW Government could also go through arbitration.</p> <p>BB advised that he had spoken to heritage consultant Dr Matt Cupper and seen then pipeline route. BB stated that he believed that because the surveying had not been completed, that it could potentially delay thee heritage report for 3-4 months.</p> <p>JM advised that one of the things Bowdens have looked at is the topography and landscape of the route, and have planned the route to where it is unlikely to encounter heritage items.</p> <p>BB asked whether an Aboriginal person had been involved in the ecological surveys as Aboriginal heritage is not just sites, it's a holistic thing.</p> <p>JM advised she would pass no BB's feedback in relation to an Aboriginal consultant attending with the ecological survey to the consultant team.</p>	<p>Action (BB)</p>
--	--------------------

<p>DW asked whether it would be worthwhile having Rob Corkery attend a meeting to address some of the issues that this forum has raised.</p> <p>TM stated that this could be considered, but the alternative is the open day, which will be happening prior to the EIS.</p> <p>KP advised Bowdens can look at the information as it comes to light and then plan around that.</p> <p>TC stated a lot of the problem is the timeline uncertainty, as the project has been going on a long time.</p> <p>The committee agreed that the next meeting should be undertaken after the information day.</p> <p>TM advised that the second leg of the social impact assessment will be triggered based on the information provided through the Q&A process. The Social Impact Assessment is a well detailed process, with lots of one on one meetings and Q&A sessions. There will be further issues that come from the consultation with the community – issues such as river crossings and road upgrades, through that social process.</p> <p>JO stated it would be good to provide answers to questions that were prompted from this group at the information day in April.</p> <p>JM advised that the information day won't be going ahead until those reports are finalised.</p> <p>JL asked what questions the community could ask that hasn't already been asked, and what new information will be available at the information day.</p> <p>JM advised information on mitigation techniques, safety measures – essentially how Bowdens intends on avoiding all the concerns listed in the Lue Action Group's fact sheet.</p> <p>TM noted that it will be an iterative process, with Bowdens providing the findings, responding to questions, and continue the process to improve, prior to the EIS.</p> <p>JL noted that most of the local community aren't mining experts, and that more detailed information will need to be provided if the intention is to receive specific questions from the audience. The community needs to have more information, especially visually, so they can understand the project details.</p> <p>TM advised that the first open day was to introduce the key consultants just to explain what they will be doing, and to provide some guidelines on how it might shape up, detailed posters, information etc, and the process to get through the EIS. Those same consultants will now be coming back to explain their findings.</p> <p>DW asked if there is anything else that this group can do to provide the best interest of the community.</p> <p>TM advised that the Social impact process is a one-on-one process throughout the whole region – Mudgee, Lue, Kandos, Rylstone. It will be a statistical representation of the broader community.</p> <p>SC suggested listing the notification of the upcoming CCC meeting on the website, so that people are aware of the meeting.</p> <p>JM advised that she would investigate listing the upcoming dates for the CCC meeting on the website as a reminder for questions from the community.</p> <p>TM advised that Bowdens has an extensive Q&A register we have on the website.</p> <p>SC noted that Silver Mines Ltd had purchased the Stekhoven property that was purchase and asked what the thought process was for the purchase.</p> <p>TM advised that it was to do with the buffer zone, as Bowdens has an interest in expanding the buffer zone and that's all we can say.</p> <p>JL asked if an updated land ownership map could be provided to the committee.</p>	<p>Note</p>
--	-------------

<p>about being looked at through a rifle scope. If anyone wants to look at our operations please use binoculars, not a telescopic rifle lens.</p> <p>TC advised the committee he is well experienced with firearms, and that the gun was not loaded, was not pointed at anyone with any malice, and there was no danger to anyone.</p>	<p>Note</p>
<p>Close Meeting</p> <p>Meeting was closed at 7pm.</p>	

Appendix A

Lue Action Group Fact Sheet (Page 1)

BOWDENS MINE FACT SHEET



MINE LIFE:

- Expected mine life is 16 years.

LEAD*

- Lead is a cumulative toxicant that affects multiple body systems and is particularly harmful to young children.
- Lead in the body is distributed to the brain, liver, kidney and bones. It is stored in the teeth and bones, where it accumulates over time. Human exposure is usually assessed through the measurement of lead in blood.
- Lead in bone is released into blood during pregnancy and becomes a source of exposure to the developing fetus.
- The open cut mine is proposed approximately **2km from Lue Public School and the village of Lue, and within 30km of the township of Mudgee.**

WASTE ROCK

- The proposed mine is estimated to create 48 million tonnes of waste rock. 54% of this is potentially acid forming (PAF). **PAF rock contains sulfides, which when disturbed can create sulfuric acid.**
- Sulfuric acid is toxic to aquatic life, and acid drainage from sulphide bearing rock is recognised as a **major source of heavy metal pollution to groundwater and surface water ways.** Heavy metals from the orebody below ground released by sulfuric acid will contaminate groundwater (and thus surface water) decades after mining stops if left unmanaged.
- The face height of the waste rock embankment is expected to be between 50m – 90m high, located above the Lawson Creek water table. The Lawson Creek flows into the Cudgegong River at Mudgee. The Cudgegong River flows into Burrendong Dam.

WATER USE

- Processing approximately 2 million tonnes of ore feed per year and running an estimated 7,000 hours. Approximately 300 tonnes per hour of dry feed, while running will require 0.7 megalitres of water/hr.
- Daily plant water requirement is estimated to be approximately 17 megalitres per day.
- Bowdens plan to take some water from bores on site and from the pit.
- All aquifers appear to be connected and this extraction is likely to impact bores within 5 km and baseflow to waterways.
- Any water taken from proposed external sources is expected to not return.
- No water must leave site. Therefore all water used at the mine will be taken from the system. Nil will return.

Lue Action Group Fact Sheet (Page 2)

** Note: Bowdens Silver have clarified that only a summary of the Feasibility Study has been publicly released, and that the full Feasibility Study is an internal document to Bowdens Silver.*

TAILINGS DAM

- The Tailings Storage Facility will have a dam wall approximately 56 metres high and 0.9 km long. At the widest point, the tailings dam will be 1.6km wide. The total footprint area (approximately 140 hectares) WILL impact downstream flows.
- Contents of the dam include:
 - Lead (16,000 tonnes)
 - Zinc (22,900 tonnes)
 - Silver (382 tonnes)
- Dam will also contain chemicals and heavy metals used in processing, include cyanide, arsenic, cadmium, copper and xanthates (lethal to aquatic life).
- The tailings dam has no secondary wall in case of leakage or failure. The dam wall is not further than 1km from Lawsons Creek. Failure or leaking of the tailings dam would be catastrophic
- The tailings dam (and contents) will remain in situ forever. They cannot be moved once mining concludes. This will create a dangerous inter-generational legacy for Mudgee and surrounds.

FREIGHT

- Proposed to move product by truck. Concentrate to be shipped in 20t containers. LAg estimated a mass split calculation, this would result in 17 outgoing truck loads per week.
- Add contractor and employee movements.
- Traffic, safety and associated noise and dust impacts are a major concern.

TOURISM & AMENITY

- Lue, and the Lue Road, is a key tourist artery connecting Mudgee to Rylstone.
- The Mudgee tourism industry is an established, sustainable and valuable feature of the local and regional economy (visitor economy valued at ~\$160 million last year)
- This is an entirely greenfields area, which currently sustains thriving tourism and agricultural enterprise (two of the 'engine industries' identified in the NSW Government's 20 Year Economic Vision for NSW).
- The NSW Government's 20 Year Economic vision identifies the Central West as a growth centre, and water security as a major priority for the state. The location, water intensity and dangerous chemicals and heavy metals associated with this project are at odds with this vision.

BALANCE

- Mudgee has the balance right at the moment, but this mine, which presents a toxic, intergenerational risk to Mudgee and all downstream residents, does not fit with the broader strategic economic plan for the town or the region, or the state.

Sources:

**Health impacts of lead – World Health Organisation <http://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/lead-poisoning-and-health>*

**All calculations have been made using data presented in Silver Mines Limited Feasibility Study (dated 2 May 2018).*