
MINUTES: SANTOS COMMUNITY COMMITTEE – UPPER HUNTER
Monday 10 December, 2012
Barry Rose Room, Upper Hunter Shire Council office.

Attendance: Sean Constable, Peter Bishop, Kathy Burns, David Ross (Chair), Cate McMahon, Glenn Toogood, Emma Ridley, Ann Stewart

Apology: Wayne Bedggood, Steve Guihot, Paula Stevenson, Sam Crafter, Peter Miller, Graham Brown



Discussion

Action/By Whom

1. Welcome

The Chair opened the meeting at 6.20pm.

Paula Stevenson and Graham Brown not attending as have indicated a concern about the effectiveness of the committee and the genuine nature of the consultation process, particularly given Sam Crafter’s absence.

Cate McMahon clarified the reasons behind Sam’s absence: two days after 10 December had been agreed upon as date for next meeting, Santos board organised to be in Gunnedah. As manager of community relations Sam was required to be there and is very apologetic for his absence. Ann Stewart attending in his place at tonight’s meeting.

Introduction of Emma Ridley who works for Darley and who will be representing HTBA on the UH –SCC, replacing Wayne Bedggood in that role.

2. Review of Previous Minutes

Minutes confirmed to be ok.

3. Presentation of HVRF survey results:

CM: Results from the survey came in late this afternoon. A summary of key figures include:

CM: to ask about the feasibility of HVRF undertaking a survey specific to CSG

Awareness of CSG

25% very aware; 25% moderately aware; 25% somewhat aware

(18-34 year olds had low levels of awareness, 49-65 year olds had high levels of awareness)

Levels of concern:

10% not concerned; 46% moderately concerned; 43% very concerned

Other key points:

35% thought CSG came from existing open cut mines

36% though CSG was a better alternative to coal

60% believe CSG activity intersects aquifers

28% believe CSG activity causes seismic activity

31% believe CSG is better for the environment

SC: I think what I took from that is there is still a lot of education that needs to

happen.

AS: My outstanding recollection is that a lot more people need education. That's the glaring fact from this.

DR: Paula raised at last meeting that she felt that there's a lack of awareness in community about CSG and it sounds like the results support that.

CM: to send copy of survey results to everyone.

SC: The younger the person, the less knowledge and less concern because they don't really give a crap. The older they get, they care about the community a bit more. Something I found was that awareness was fairly spread but even people who say that they're very aware may not actually know much about the industry. You don't know what you don't know, so I take this with a grain of salt.

AS: There just isn't a deep understanding, and education is what you need to do.

DR: Cate can you remind me if the broader survey takes place every 6 months?

SC: Yes, they do one each six months and you can add in questions.

DR: Thankyou for what was a short turnaround. The last meeting was 5 days before questions had to be finalised, thanks to those who provided input in such a short time frame. You may see that there's also an appendix with all the questions, I'd be interested to hear your thoughts on whether this so far has been a good exercise and maybe at next meeting we can hear thoughts on how it can be improved, if necessary.

CM: Can find that out for you

AS: I think it's been a good starting point and every six months we can see whether we're getting message out or not, the survey should be a good reflection of this.

PB: Just gauging the level of concern is pretty high, so it's evident that although people aren't educated on the process, the perception of it is that they're concerned.

That tells me that their mind is already set, and that they're pretty disgruntled about the idea of it.

ER: In terms of survey area, I'd like to understand the methodology for that?

CM: This was inserted into part of the broader HVRF survey

ER: Might be interesting to understand their methodology. Isn't it bigger than just those three regions? If you look at Muswellbrook residents they might be more educated than Scone.

PB: Can you direct your focus a little bit more?

SC: There is an opportunity to get one done specifically to the UHLGA, but it would cost more money,

PB: What did this survey cost?

CM: Will check and come back to you – wasn't cheap, a couple of thousand.

DR: How would everyone feel, if you're given time to absorb this information and then get Cate to provide information on how much this one cost, how much a specific one would cost and the breakdown of sampling.

CM: They can cost up to \$30,000.

DR: So we need to decide whether a survey specific to CSG be taken every six months, whether we retain as is, tweak it. Is everyone comfortable with that?

ER: Can I just clarify the objective – Wayne felt there was a lack of community awareness?

DR: Wayne started the discussion and a number of members completely agreed.

PB: I think we should publish the survey results in the Advocate, pick out the stats that are more relevant.

ER: Is it going to be a public document, what is Santos' plan with it?

DR: We probably just need a bit more info and with a few more people present we can make a more informed decision

AS: It's a good document for Santos to see what position we're in.

ER: This is now public, Pete's raised that it should be public sooner rather later, what is your media plan with it? You wouldn't want it going out without some sort of plan around it.

AS: It's a strategy for us, it's not a PR thing for us.

DR: As part of our monthly meetings we put out a media release, is everyone happy if I get Polly to pull together a media release with contributions from PB, ER and SC?

General agreement to this.

CM: APEL 456 update.

There was a concern that there's not enough water data, so we've decided to do more water monitoring in the area. We were looking at doing a REF for a site around Scone but until we get the water study established, we've put the REF off.

AS: Would like to add in with regards to the REF, it will now become standard practice for us to conduct a water study as part of the process.

CM: In regards to a community event in the New Year here in Scone: we had an Open Day last month in Gunnedah and Narrabri, with information on everything - engineering water, community etc; It went from 11am – 6pm so people could come after work. We'd like to do one here, any suggestions as to when would be good.

General discussion suggests late February or March might be best.

ER: This water monitoring plan, ground water study, is commencing and therefore the REF has been delayed. Is it impacting the REF? Is this groundwater study something to do with exploration requirements?

GT: There is currently no requirement to do it, Some people say it's good practice for any exploration or appraisal activity.

PB: The Namoi study done, co funded by Santos and the government, cost \$5million, then there was an AGL study at Broke, we asked questions of Gary Wilgoose, 'what's the story with our area?'. He said they didn't know and hypothesised on what he thought. But basically there's no data and the process we'd have to go through to get a proper water study would take years. Santos have pre-empted that by saying we'll do our one. I question how thorough that would be.

ER: How much are Santos spending?

GT: It is uncertain but these studies are in the ballpark of \$2-5 million.

ER: So it's a Santos initiative based on this committee's request. The NSW Govt have not asked you to do it, but would you need it for your gateway process?

AS: No. To explore and appraise you're under Part 5 so you're not going the gateway process. Santos does them to support the Part 5. You can later on use it as part of

4. Glenn Toogood presentation on Scone CCC Groundwater Study

gateway, but we use it before even get to that state.

Glenn is the hydrologist energy team leader for Santos, he's trained as a geologist specialising in ground water systems with 12-13 years experience, mainly in Victoria. He described what the groundwater study would need to consider (see Appendix).

DR: So this sounds like "how long is this piece of string": do you have to go off and design the study to begin with?

GT: Yes.

DR: This news is only new to me, so you need to do a model?

GT: You always have to do a model. There's talk about the strategic land use plan called the aquifer landuse policy. With an aquifer, if we decide to put a pilot well down, we get asked 'what's the effect on the water quality over here', and that's hard to do without models. It's not the ideal way to build, but the csg aquifer interference policy has taken it to another level when understanding the science of ground water systems before you even start. It's not the best model, but any extra info is required.

CM: To supply copy of Glenn's presentation for distribution

DR: When do you plan on starting this study?

GT: We have it pencilled in for as early as January. It's important to find the right consultants and to find what the community groups want to see out of a model and what the community has in relation to groundwater and it all depends on skill set and availability. There are probably only about six groundwater specialists in Australia that Santos would consider to be experts in that field. Gary Wilgoose is one of those.

ER: Can you explain why you're doing a model now to address to the aquifer interference policy when current practice for mining and gas is to collect as you go

along?

GT: An exploration doesn't take water out, it's looking for availability of coal, not there to take water out. So appraisal activity would start to understand the volume of water we need to take out, so if we start modelling this area and put 300 holes in this area, the first question I'll be asked is 'how much water is there?'. I'd say 'no idea' and every basin would be different. But until you go to every location you don't get a feel for the amount of water. You can move 20-30 metres and can have a huge difference, starts to develop stress factor of the model. When we say 'we have no data', we do know what goes into the system, from rainfall, we know how much irrigators are taking out and we have Office of Water data, but don't know how much water will come out, one extraction every year, gives an idea and then you multiply that.

ER: So you're not doing a pilot extraction?

GT: No

GT: We're going to assume that it's best to err on the side of caution - over exaggerate the volume of water. We know from an impact perspective what it's likely going to be, when returned the model impact will be done again.

GT: A core hole drill is not really done with water, you use it to help with data, it's a pretty crappy way to judge water. Just own isolate bore give us a snapshot of what's happening every 30 seconds. Importantly if monitoring shows pressure differentials in this coal seam, we can say we're not doing any activity. Say where we are doing mining, we know it's 'background noise'. They've turned pumps off, and it has changed pressure of that. Important to get that baseline data upfront. Will be looking at installing 3 aquifer bores, to understand what it looks like today.

PB: How many and how deep will you go?

GT: We'll have shallow ones and deep, aquifer monitoring bores. We'll be gauging what's happening in those locations comparing to other areas close to coal mines and their water extractions.

PB mentioned a local bore that is at 330 metres, would you put one there?

GT: Depends where it is

PB: West of Turill by about 40kms.

GT: Depending on location might go below Huskissons formation, would consult with this group before provide rationale of why locations were picked, cost \$200-300k each. Be 4/5 wires sticking out of core holes.

PB: Who is going to own the data on this?

GT: We will as the licensee, but we don't plan on hiding it.

PB: The committee needs to see all the raw data

GT: There is the water portal. There's ways we can provide links to the community to look every 30 seconds, and you can see in summertime when there's heavy irrigation you can see how it drops off.

PB: Do you do ultra shallow monitoring bores, like 30 metres?

GT: As part of existing bore s there are the shallow bores.

PB: But won't have live data.

GT: If there's concerns about what's happening in particular areas we can do that.

Pump bores and water drops, device gets logged up.

PB: I think there'd be a need for that.

GT: The water board has some of those already and we'll be drawing on those.

PB: Is this an assumption, this diagram, the fault line doesn't go through into the other layers of rock?

GT: Probably a historic fault, the other material wasn't there 400-500 million years ago when material started building up. The fault would've been there. Will probably propagate somewhere at the surface

PB: I did read about hydrology when you extract coal seam pressures over a million years old and start pressuring there is the potential for seismic activity in these particular faults. How are you going to investigate how far that fault does go, and the risks?

GT: Faults actually introduce change, the way methane gas is developed, you know the gas is pretty crappy, high CO2 levels, intrusion into biological process. You wouldn't want to target it anyway.

PB: Is that what they found at Turill hole?

GT: Yes

AS: Could Santos please explain only core holes, won't have real data. If you put down an aquifer monitoring bore, how long is it there for, do you monitor for whole life of project?

GT: The intent of aquifer monitoring bore is to be there for the duration of the

project, they are built to last for hundreds of years. Therein lies a question as to where to locate these, on farmers' land, crown land, who's going to manage them and what agreements are in place.

AS: Santos has been working on how we should approach this with landholders, how to come up with that concept.

CM: We are looking at doing same water bores as in Queensland.

ER: Monitoring the holes - it might be wise looking beyond the life of the gas project. We don't know what seismic activity might happen later. Have you produced a map, have you decided where it's going in terms of consultations, what are you looking to negotiate with landholders?

AS: After whole concept came up we've looked at compensation arrangements, we have a team working out how to best access monitoring bores, minimum 30 years, how to compensate someone, how would we leave this , only in talking stage, then we can go out to people and discuss.

ER: The Access arrangement will be specific to the activity not general?

AS: Yes

PB: You have to submit for each different type of activity?

AS: Explore, appraise, and then a different activity and then another one if going to produce out of that person's well.

AS: A pilot can be: explore, appraise, aquifer monitoring bore and then a pilot that has been tested and produce and that becomes a separate access arrangement.

PB: Is it different to old access arrangement?

AS: Yes , that's Santos' approach

ER: The new land access code is that Santos or Govt?

AS: Govt.

ER: So you're taking that initiative, if you gain access to a farm that's for one specific reason, it's not a general access arrangement?

AS: It has to be very specific to the activity that has occurred.

CM: You can't say you're doing a core hole and then jump to a pilot.

PB: An explore and appraise agreement encompassed two different activities, but it's the same agreement to a pilot well appraisal?

AS: You can't enter into access agreements without specific activity, you want to drill a core hole, access track, fencing, road, have to explain what's happening for that activity under the law. The petroleum divisions you got an REF you've got to do xyz, audited against the agreement specific to the agreement, have to change access to suit next activity.

DR: How as a committee do we go about providing feedback to Glenn? Rather than going to 12 of you – as we did with the input for HVRF - do we constrain it to a subset of the committee?

SC: We've got a few people missing.

DR: Propose that next committee meeting be held Tues 5 February and during that meeting I'll provide proposed dates for rest of year. Like to have input from

committee before then.

KB: Will REF be available by then?

CM: Depends on water study.

GT: As the model starts to develop and we build data of particular areas, a basin study, hydrological study defined by input and outputs of a particular area, and that'll be ok from REF perspective, only company in NSW putting in water studies.

DR: REF not ready for the next meeting?

GT: Would expect it to be 5-8 months after model starts.

KB: We've sat here for 12 months, and now going to sit around for another 8.

GT: We need the access to do raw info, so we can continue to build the model.

ER: You don't need physical access to provide enough data to go into the REF, so the REF may actually be ready within 8 months?

AS: I think we're being very realistic in considering how regulators would look at something without water monitoring in it. There's been a big shift as to how they approve REF, would take full advantage of powers, would ideally do it that way because they'd request the info anyway. Would get you approval faster.

KB: That's not what we were told 2 months ago, and now this to going to drag out even longer.

AS: Dart have done all the work they need to do on the REF, we've provided comment and they're at the stage where they are ready. It hasn't considered water, it's done

DR: Email members to determine which 4 would like to be on subcommittee to provide feedback on which consultants they'd like involved in the groundwater study. With a view to commencing talks in February.

noise.

DR: If the REF is held back to May/June, if a lot of it has been done and waiting to process it, it would make sense for us to look at it earlier.

AS: The studies have been done and we've signed off on them, and I'd suppose they're in the process of preparing it.

DR: is it possible to have a look at it now then?

KB: Gives us 8 months to look at it. That's why the committee doesn't turn up, we can't just come here and talk.

CM: Santos to consult with Dart to see if they can supply the UH-SCC with a copy of REF in the next quarter.

SC: Three monitoring sites, it's a fairly small number across a large area.

GT: NSW Water Office interested in their own sites so there'll be others. There's no requirements to put bores, we're just doing it,

SC: Are AGL doing it?

GT: We think its good information to have.

KB: Graham very against Garry Wilgoose, he'll have an issue.

GT: I'll put some names together,

DR: With the committee to choose.

CM: I know there's not much activity happening in the area and we keep talking about REF we will try and get Dart for the committee. We're actually up in PEL 238 and can show you our rehab sites in Piliga, an operating arm with cores, show power stations, cooler sites, get a bit more of an understanding of how it operates.

KB: I think the people on the committee are too strong in their beliefs, everyone is so upset, attacks are being made on people. We need to feel like we're achieving something. Not just having a talk fest. I asked for all this info to learn but I feel now that it's time to step up to the mark. Research is an excellent thing, but we need to have that REF to look at.

AS: We can look at other things. Farm management plan, when work commences, we've actually done a farm management plan with that person now, we can look at that.

KB: But I think we're up to the REF. We need to see that before the (farm management) plan.

AS: Could go through the parts.

DR: General business

ER: You've touched on the infrastructure at Pilliga; do you have a map of this region and Santos' proposed idea of where you would like the infrastructure on a map overlay.

AS: We have to explore first

ER: You would have an idea of best wish for what you'd like to happen.

AS: In this basin we don't have proven resources yet, we haven't done enough work yet.

ER: How much gas is needed to make it economically viable in this region?

AS: Have to have explored the area to have found evidence that there is a large area

3. General business

of gas, that it's a commercially produceable reservoir of gas.

ER: What is that in economic data? What would make it viable?

CM: We'd have to go to an internationally accredited organisation to get figures for you.

ER: If you don't find or prove resources aren't there, where will you go to connect from Gunnedah down?

CM: Don't know again, only hearsay, we have to explore.

ER: If we look at the big picture, there are only a few paths you can go, you could say this is probably the best option based on geotechnical stuff you already have available. One is economic viability, if can't do it which way are you going to go, because you're already investing and establishing pipelines.

CM: We don't have a pipeline yet

ER: Are you going east?

CM: There are already existing pipelines.

PB: Eastern Star Gas at Coolah, when Santos bought out Eastern Star they had a big field day, it's been a debacle. They've got a good gas line.

DR: Is it possible for Santos to provide a map with different options?

CM: There's not even a map, we've been asked that question before.

AS: Santos knocked it on the head, didn't feel the route economically viable, don't believe there is a pipeline route.

PB: I think it was shelved. Cost to build a 'train' is billions of dollars.

AS: Two trains are something like \$750 billion.

ER: I find it difficult to believe that you wouldn't have a few options of where else you'd go.

AS: We've got a project team pulled together, and that's their whole job to determine what we should do in NSW. Eastern Star Gas had such a team,

Santos to present at a later date on options once developed by Project Team

DR: When they come up with something, need them to present: ongoing.

PB: There's a grey area with this aquifer interference policy, would be good if supply summary of interpretation of how that policy is affecting the REF submissions and to what impact and relevance the water study will have in that whole picture. In relation to that and the gateway process.

Dr to prepare summary of aquifer interference policy and relationship with gateway process

ER: Have a look at the HTBA submission in relation to that.

SC: The date on the water study Santos do, if you're going into agreements, I think that agreements should become available.

AS: Santos is committed to water portal in NSW.

CM: Pilliga update : independent consultants came in, conducted an analysis of the site, put a plan into place, put contractors in to rehabilitate the Pilliga.

DR: I saw the site with Narrabri CCC in mid November. It was interesting for CCC to see the damage that had been done and the scale of the rehab. I got a sense that Santos was very appreciative of the input given by the CCC.

DR: (To CM) With Narrabri and Gunnedah (Open Days), I'll get you to raise that again

at our February meeting and PB you can follow up on your Queensland stuff.

DR: Land valuations update – trying to find people to talk to. Spoken to Margaret McDonald Hill and AGL. Their CCC, had undertaken a study, been trying to get a copy, they have to get approval, but it's not publicly available.

ER: Wayne should have a copy as he's a member of that CCC.

DR: Margaret put me in touch with Robert Dupont, who could conduct a study. Charlie Blomfield, the MD Agriculture Management company, been consulting to CSG issue for past 5 years, he said a number of studies have been undertaken, and the view from his experience on those that have been released: half say it's a positive and half say it's a negative. Herrod Todd White and John Burn Property Company were others that were also mentioned.

ER: Are there any overseas studies?

DR: Robert Dupont said he's aware of some in the US. But I've not looked into those yet.

ER: Maccallum Inglis have offices at Camden and Scone, they might be of use.

DR: Dupont has also done similar studies on windfarms.

DR: February 5 next meeting; while the water study may have commenced, we have agreed to ask that AS get REF presented as quickly as possible and possibly get farm management plan. REF as priority.

ER: Copy of the PEL and all the conditions,

AS: You can have it, but not sure can have the commercial in confidence part of it.

Meeting closed: 8.20pm.

Attachment 1. Issues prioritised by the Committee Members and progress made

	Issue Prioritised	Progress Made
1.	Understanding the impacts of the coal seam gas industry drilling and fracture stimulation techniques on water	Well integrity presentation – Feb 2012
2.	Identifying the need for independent peer reviews of water monitoring	
3.	Better communication with the community	Commenced at September meeting
4.	Providing timelines for proposed activities, including Santos activities, commercial in confidence matters and regulatory changes	
5.	Providing better education on the process and impacts of coal seam gas	Commenced at October meeting
6.	An understanding of the cost of the industry to the community and how this may be recovered	Discussed at February meeting
7.	Establishing baseline data of local aquifers	
8.	The need for independent specialists such as hydrologists and geologists to provide information	
9.	Understanding how value can be added to the community through this process	Commenced at October meeting

Attachment 2. Actions raised by Committee Members that are not complete

	Action Raised	Date Raised	Progress Made
1.	Committee to ensure that all communication is distributed through DR rather than through any other individual(s)	29 th November 2011	Ongoing
2.	Alternates to be briefed by their colleagues before attending any meetings, as required	29 th November 2011	Ongoing
3.	Santos to present on legislative approvals process at a future meeting	29 th November 2011	
4.	SC to table an REF at a future meeting	29 th November 2011	
5.	SC to present at a later date on the Eastern Star Gas pipeline projects once the business plan has been completed	29 th November 2011	
6.	DR to provide Committee Members with copies of future media releases	29 th November 2011	Ongoing
7.	Santos to report back to the Committee on the findings of the investigation in to spill	24 th January 2012	Ongoing
8.	Santos to report back on whether a prosecution is to go ahead	24 th January 2012	Ongoing
9.	Minutes to be provided to members within one to two days and members then to have five days in which to provide comments back to the Chair	24 th January 2012	Ongoing
10.	Santos to present on well integrity at next meeting	24 th January 2012	Ongoing
11.	DR to ensure there is another presentation on the impacts of CSG on water management	28 th February 2012	Ongoing

12.	DR to ensure there is a presentation on fracture stimulation in future presentations	28 th February 2012	
13.	Pilliga issue to remain on the agenda for March meeting	28 th February 2012	Ongoing
14.	Santos to provide before and after photos of the Brawboy 2 site at the next meeting.	27 th March 2012	Ongoing
15.	Next water management presentation to respond to the issue of geological flaws and cracks	27 th March 2012	
16.	Santos to provide updates on progress of organising future joint forums	27 th March 2012	
17.	Produce written update on work schedule in PEL 456	27 th March 2012	Ongoing
18.	Sam and Steve to discuss property values and potential impacts on neighbours	28 th August 2012	Ongoing
19.	PB and PS to discuss organising a cattle property tour wSith Santos	27 th March 2012	Ongoing
20.	Santos to talk to Frank Krstic and the EDO to identify what they could offer to the SCC or local solicitors	22 nd May 2012	Ongoing
21.	SC to identify Santos sites in the audit	22 nd May 2012	Ongoing
22.	Santos to contact the Knights and provide them with appropriate details (when there is a date for seismic)	22 nd May 2012	Ongoing
23.	PS and SC to discuss obtaining water quality data from landowners	22 nd May 2012	Ongoing
24.	Chair to approach Canberra Uni for a water specialist after input from GB	24 th July 2012	Ongoing
25.	Review and evaluation of whether input has been acted on to be discussed at November meeting	25 th September 2012	
26.	Santos to approach Hunter Valley Research Association	25 th September	Ongoing

		2012	
27.	WB to ask HTBA for a representative for the CCC	25 th September 2012	Ongoing
28.	CM to identify if copies were mailed out to GB	23 rd October 2012	Complete
29.	CM: to ask if HVRF can supply their questions to SCC-UH prior to survey.	23 rd October 2012	Complete
30.	CM: to ask about the feasibility of HVRF undertaking a survey specific to CSG	23 rd October 2012	
31.	DR to investigate seeking presenters with positive and negative experiences of having CSG on their land	23 rd October 2012	Ongoing
32.	SC to obtain non-commercial in confidence information on Santos' strategic views for Upper Hunter	23 rd October 2012	Complete
33.	PB to contact farmer about his experience in Surat Basin	23 rd October 2012	
34.	SC to identify with Tony Pickard just what data he is referring to. SC to then report back to committee on this	23 rd October 2012	Ongoing

Attachment 3. Actions raised by Committee Members that have been completed

	Action Raised	Date Raised	Progress Made
1.	SC to provide DR with copy of presentation to go out with minutes	29 th November 2011	Completed
2.	SC to provide information on crops grown (at site in presentation) and the details of the water content of the treated water	29 th November 2011	Completed
3.	DR to contact Committee members to determine the date for the next meeting.	29 th November 2011	Completed
4.	DR to forward Kathy a copy of the previous minutes	24 th January 2012	Completed
5.	CM to source information on costs of running a desalination plant	24 th January 2012	Completed
6.	CM to report back on Santos' policy on community investment	24 th January 2012	Completed
7.	CM to report back on progress on joint water forum	24 th January 2012	Completed
8.	DR to contact Committee members to determine the date for the next meeting	24 th January 2012	Completed
9.	SC to resolve Santos mail out database	28 th February 2012	Completed
10.	SC to provide DR with possible government contacts for presentation	28 th February 2012	Completed
11.	DR to discuss list of government contacts with PS	28 th February 2012	Completed
12.	DR to invite government regulator to present at next meeting	28 th February 2012	Completed
13.	SC to respond to Foreign Correspondent story at March meeting	28 th February	Completed

		2012	
14.	Electronic copy of Santos report on the Pilliga to be forwarded to the Committee	28 th February 2012	Completed
15.	Hard copy of Santos report on the Pilliga to be sent to Don Eather	28 th February 2012	Completed
16.	SC to identify the date for licence renewal	28 th February 2012	Completed
17.	Santos to present on well abandonment at March meeting	28 th February 2012	Completed
18.	DR to invite WB, MJ and PB to present their views on the land use forums at the next meeting	27 th March 2012	Completed
19.	DR to talk to Julie Moloney about landowner rights	27 th March 2012	Completed
20.	DR to talk to Julie Moloney about responding to road sales in April meeting	27 th March 2012	Completed
21.	DR to ensure that staging of works to be a set agenda item	27 th March 2012	Completed
22.	MJ to provide DR with background information on enquiry for DR to forward to committee	24 th April 2012	Completed
23.	Santos to invite water specialist to present at next meeting	29 th November 2011	Completed
24.	Liz to forward Committee Charter to Michael J for Council	28 th August 2012	Completed
25.	Santos to consider appointing an independent consultant to assist landholders with what information is available to them during negotiation	24 th April 2012	Completed
26.	Liz to also email Steve Guihot a copy of the Update	24 th April 2012	Completed
27.	Santos to provide CCC with copy of its submission	24 th April 2012	Completed

28.	SC to find out who approached Santos for rodeo sponsorship	22 nd May 2012	Completed
29.	SC to identify the sponsorship contribution Santos has made locally	22 nd May 2012	Completed
30.	Santos to consider how to communicate landholder negotiations to general public while maintaining the privacy of individuals	22 nd May 2012	Completed
31.	Santos or DR to contact John Ross, Gavin Mud or Phillip Pells to present on local hydrogeology	22 nd May 2012	Completed
32.	Mark to discuss with Santos compensation for neighbours under the new compensation package	24 th July 2012	Completed
33.	Mark to get the conversion rates of roads to drill pad areas.	24 th July 2012	Completed
34.	Mark to ensure obligations to make good are included in compensation promotional materials	24 th July 2012	Completed
35.	CM to investigate if Santos is aware of these companies.	24 th July 2012	Completed
36.	MJ and WB to call their insurance companies re: action 38	24 th July 2012	Completed
37.	CM to find out when a storage pond becomes an evaporation pond.	24 th July 2012	Completed
38.	CM to find out where the storage pond will be located in Bunnan.	24 th July 2012	Completed
39.	CM to find out the names of the seams being targeted in the Bunnan area.	24 th July 2012	Completed
40.	CM to review newsletter mailing list and name of the newsletter	24 th July 2012	Completed
41.	Santos to go to government to ask for accurate mapping of the region to be undertaken by government.	24 th July 2012	Completed
42.	Chair to write to AGL Community Committee Chair offering support on behalf of the Santos Committee	24 th July 2012	Completed
43.	DE and GB to forward names to the Chair for independent water specialists within one week of July meeting.	24 th July 2012	Completed

44.	GB to provide names of insurance companies who do not insure properties with CSG activities	24 th July 2012	Completed
45.	AS to send ESG2 Environmental Assessment guidelines to David to distribute	25 th September 2012	Completed
46.	AS to send ESG2 Environmental Assessment guidelines to David to distribute.	26 September 2012	Completed
47.	Discussion on where the CCC is heading to be held in November meeting	26 September	Completed
48.	DR to contact government and Margaret McDonald-Hill to discuss sending meeting minutes to government.	26 September 2012	Completed
49.	Hardcopies of Ann's presentation to be provided with the minutes	26 September 2012	Completed
50.	DR to provide CCC with ASX link from Dart website	10 December 2012	
51.	DR to issue HVRF survey results to CCC members	10 December 2012	
52.	CM to investigate if a CSG specific survey can be conducted and costings for this.	10 December 2012	
53.	Glenn Toogood presentation to be forwarded to CCC members	10 December 2012	
54.	DR to gauge CCC members interest in forming subcommittee to provide feedback for Santos groundwater study	10 December 2012	
55.	Santos to consult with Dart to see if they can supply the UH-SCC with a copy of REF in the next quarter.	10 December 2012	

