
MINUTES: SANTOS COMMUNITY COMMITTEE – UPPER HUNTER

Tuesday 5 February, 2013

Barry Rose Room, Upper Hunter Shire Council office.

Attendance: Sean Constable, Peter Bishop, David Ross (Chair), Cate McMahon, Emma Ridley, Sam Constance, Michael Johnsen, Paula Stevenson, Graham Brown, Sam Crafter, Steve Guihot, Peter Miller

Apology: Wayne Bedggood, Kathy Burns

Discussion

Action/By Whom

1. Welcome

The Chair opened the meeting at 6.18pm.

REF still not ready; DR invites SC to offer explanation to group.

SC: As we've talked about before, we have put a position where we would like to do more work on the water space and we're still in discussion with Dart about that. They are continuing to work on the REF, which is not ready for review. There's a link between wanting to undertake the water study and then we're not going to progress the REF until then. Those discussions are ongoing and that's why REF has not progressed to stage of being ready to talk through it. Nothing more to it than that. The context is that the discussion and the negotiation is between us at the moment.

DR: So you're not even in a position to have an early conversation with committee members on the REF at this stage?

SC: Dart don't think it is, they're not ready to do that. If we can get it between now and next month we can bring it in and talk about it. It doesn't entirely sit with us at the moment.

DR: Later, we will talk about dates for meeting this year and whether the REF is coming or not will provide some context as to the frequency of when we should meet.

SG: Regarding the scoping of the work for the REF is there input required from this committee?

SC: There's a range of things we need to submit and we plan to do that when we present to the committee. We'll then take on board any feedback and any other work that needs to be done and then take it to the government.

DR: Further to SG's question. Are Dart aware that there's an expectation that they'll take that info on board from our September meeting?

SC: Yes, definitely.

2. Water Study sub-committee summary – Peter Bishop

Peter Bishop provides an overview (summary attached) of subcommittee meeting with Glen Toogood from Santos in relation to Santos water study PEL456.

Subcommittee members include Peter Bishop, Don Eather and Steve Guihot (absent for meeting). DR also attended meeting.

DR: to forward PB summary to CCC.

SG: Is this water study a requirement of the REF?

SC: Not of the REF, but if it got to part 4, it is.

PB: Had a couple of points I am a bit concerned about. As Professor Willgoose pointed out: there's not much drilling data. It's going to be interesting to see how accurate it is, there are plenty of old drilling companies around here like Nutt's at

Merriwa who've been drilling for 80 years who probably have some of sort of data, but probably not drilling down that deep and the data to be fed into the model would be questionable. I also have concerns that the study is only concentrated around where the activity is going to happen (20 kms or something), I would like to see that expanded over PEL.

DR: I understood that differently, that CH2M Hill will have a couple of different methods to collect data. Whoever's involved in water study will have to come to agreement on the geographic scope of the area. Use three sentinel wells on areas of high activity but also shallow monitoring wells, as well as historical data to build up a picture of the whole PEL. Is that correct, Sam?

SC: Glenn is the water expert, I have an understanding of it, but you'd need to ask more questions of Glenn.

PB: He did say they need to be around areas of high water use: Bunnan, the olive farm on Willow Tree Road and then in township of Merriwa itself because it derives all water from that aquifer and they'd be keen to see what going on. That's pretty close to the 20km area, Don mentioned 'what about Wybong, and that downstream catchment?'. I think there should be more to make information more accurate.

PB: Need to have someone independent monitoring it all. There are other ways of taking info out of existing bores, but that machinery also does look for coal and gas. GT was happy for us to ask for an independent person to come along and watch the drilling. We need to be influential on who oversees the study that doesn't have a past relationship with the company. And that's where GT said is where he wanted to go to next: appoint this person.

DR: Scope of works is still to be discussed, we don't want to get into nitty gritty of

scope of work here tonight; are you happy having the three members representing on water committee? Maybe other key water users from around the region may need to be involved later.

PS: I think there's some ambiguity, says exploration process, but say going to prepare where predict areas of high activity, only when going into production, so where is there going to be high CSG activity in PEL 456?

PB: I can presume it's going to be in the Bunnan Brawboy area.

PS: You didn't mention Brawboy, all the activity has been there.

PB: The way I understand, that's where the water usage is to occur.

PS: Or high CSG activity

PB: They're not going to set them up in Mudgee at bottom of PEL

DR: No, I don't think it is putting the wells in areas of high CSG activity; it's putting the wells in areas of high water usage.

SC: If you take a step back, look at next round of activity, there's a constant theme of not enough water data. Let's try and get some before we do any more work. Can be less precise in knowing with less holes. We don't have any data yet about whether gas would flow and my understanding is that's actually as important is to go where water usage is because that's where potential impact would be, but we do have to get some balance. But I think the good idea of a subcommittee, with access to Glenn is important. Questions from this group can go back to Glenn, and I'm more than happy to take them back, but as this moves along, I don't have the water expertise to answer all the questions.

SG: I couldn't get to the meeting, but I suggested to David that we needed independent help in scoping water study. Can we get some assistance so we know what we're trying to find out independently? Suggested Gary Willgoose, but also suggested to David that an independent is needed to review the scope and the results. We've got water contacts, I've got some outside of what we're doing, they're more aligned with coal industry as opposed to environment people, but I'm happy to submit those names. Very important that we get independent advice on scope.

SC: Don't have any problems with that, but I don't have open chequebook to do water study.

MJ: Perhaps as a template idea, the base point, could be the final scope of the study that the original Broke people used, it's different but it could be a starting point in what to look for.

PB: Little vague on the term 'scope' what's involved with this: the area?

SG: The area, what looking for in terms of depth, pumping. Rather than just saying look mate just go out and check olives and the town water, which on surface sound good, but suggested Gary because when he came in here he said things like the recharge for this area came from here. But also said it might be 20 years before we feel the effects. Putting a monitoring well in here, might show something in 20 years, but it's not going to show anything now.

DR: The scope is about the what, when and how. Are you comfortable for the three to represent the committee if we try to get independent scope and peer review.

ER: (Collective agreement) I'm happy because I understand the questions that Steve and Pete are putting forward. The precautionary principle must be considered in the interpretation of the data or any recommendations that come out of the results.

The constraints of model must also be considered.

SG: Would it help if we brought back a draft scope?

DR: Would you be comfortable with Steve's suggestion?

Sean: That's what a subcommittee does.

DR: Is everyone comfortable if we'll draft a scope for discussion at next meeting.

SG: Can I ask, Gary Willgoose, he's a local, would anyone object if we asked him to help develop the draft scope?

ER: It's a draft and then could get another expert to review it.

PS: Make it clear to Willgoose that he's just employed to assist with the draft, checks and balances, and that he'll be working through us rather than Santos.

ER: I think we should take Michael's suggestion on the Broke parameters, I don't know the fellow (Willgoose), if he is the starting point or should he be, or he could be

PS: I am accused of being negative all the time, but we're sitting here talking about a water study on the presumption that a gas company will be drilling into our land when the Liberal Government said it would never ever allow it. We've had Chris Hartcher standing up in Parliament saying it's such a dangerous industry and now they're going for it because it's a resource we have to use. They talk about all these things to protect the catchment, then they march through, invade the land and drill in the catchment.

PB: I agree. It's an awkward situation. We're assisting a company construct a water study to find out what's going on, to help them progress through the process of

Water subcommittee to prepare draft scope for study for presentation at next meeting.

exploration and go for production, but if we don't know anything what information have we got to argue?

MJ: Not necessarily something for tonight, but I think it should be on the agenda that the committee needs to have a discussion about what constitutes 'independent'? Because if you take the Broke water study, Willgoose was picked by the committee as an appropriate 'independent' person. He didn't say what people wanted to hear and so all of a sudden he's not 'independent'. We need this CCC to have agreement on what is independent. If you expect Santos to pay for independent work, if you don't like it, you then say that 'Santos' paid for it. What happens if govt pays for it? It'll be more cooperative.

ER: I would like to support what PS and PB said. I think that is the difficulty of CCC's position – we're creating positive relationships with the community when perhaps it's not even wanted here.

3. HVRF representative
Clare Hogue
presentation on
different survey
options

SG: Ideally Michael the state govt has a plan of 'the companies pay and the govt appoints'. It's the ideal, rather than the company appoints or the committee appoints.

MJ: Just need a consensus on who it is.

PS: I think we're living under some sort of delusion if we think the water study will offer any legal protection to landholders because the damage may not be evident for 20 years or it may be immediate. People might say 'my bore's gone dry' and Santos might say your neighbours are pumping too much. To think we can challenge it is completely delusional.

ER: So effectively the committee is assisting and then, going down that same path, are we then are responsible for it and do we have ownership of it and then do we

condone the outcomes? We're all participating.

DR: That's all probably a wider discussion and debate for another occasion. We will come back with a scope and then have a discussion about what's acceptable and what's not.

ER: By being a member of the CCC, how does that position sit with us? Are we aligned with Santos?

DR: We can talk about the draft scope and have the wider debate at next meeting.

DR: We had discussions at last meeting about the methodology used to get the HVRF survey results. From memory, about 300 people were surveyed, a number of which weren't within the Upper Hunter. Can you describe the methodology used and whether it's a representative survey?

CH: The survey is run through three separate areas, Hunter, Central Coast and Upper Hunter - Muswellbrook, Singleton and UH LGA. We do a sample of 300 from those 3 LGAs and the geographical regions are chosen for our reasons. We use the data for economic indicators and environmental attitude indicators and we do presentations in various areas on data that comes from that. It offers a cost effective way of getting a bit of data. You can buy into the survey to get a question and report rather than commission a stand alone survey. Geographic area is determined by us, if people would like to get data from that area, they're welcome to come on board.

DR: In the case of this committee which is interested in 'where to from here', whether we maintain the same set of question in future or whether we modify them ,and can we tailor who is asked those questions?

CH: Yes, if you want to it would be separate to the LGA.

SG: I noticed in stats on back of report that 23.2% of respondents came from Upper Hunter, is it possible to give results purely to that 23.2%?

CH: No, the sample size is way too small to say it would be a representative sample.

ER: Already established that can't increase the omnibus survey. We can't increase the Upper Hunter sample size?

CH: We could, we have done in the past. Wyong Shire wanted just Wyong Shire and we charge for every interview above the 300. Generally reflect the population proportionally. We conduct 35 interviews in Upper Hunter if you wanted to take that up to 300, it'd be an extra charge per interview.

SG: You said 200 interviews were done all together which was statistically relevant, why?

CH: It is fair and robust, more numbers, more power you get, fewer people the less inferences you can make. Is Logical. 10 people out of 10,000 is meaningless.

DR: So, the larger the number of people the greater the confidence you can have in the results.

CH: The appendix shows that 300 is relatively precise you can tell that 95% of the people interviewed will be in that range. Generally recommend sample size of about 300. This is based on population survey, other stuff very different. You can have a focus group of 10 people and it's very different.

SG: You took a sample size of 300 over 50,000 for the region, same sample size for two quite different populations. What confidence levels should we have in these

surveys?

CH: It's just a general look in level of confidence is with a sample. If have a population of 50 you can't have a survey of 300. 300 is reasonable with a population of 14,000. If people want to commission us to do something, we can discuss what's available. We can have other discussions, target areas or the populations that are there, but doesn't describe the survey.

SG: I think it's a great baseline, but would like to see better indication of whether what we're feeling as a CCC is reflective of the broader community or whether we're out of touch.

CH: It's worthwhile looking at precisely what you wanted to find out and who you want to find out from, Then work from there out : who you want to include, exclude, the most important thing is to get research questions right. Omnibus is great for general snapshots, but not necessarily that the sample getting really targeted and precise information.

DR: Some of the results are quite interesting for each of the individual areas, it provides us with much already. With the first two questions, one is about awareness where results showed a large number of people weren't aware of CSG, and then also the next question, a lot of people are concerned about CSG. Are there any linkages, does that mean that those who have concerns are those that are aware of what it entails?

CH: No it's not evident that the more you're aware the more you're concerned. Pre-test post-test methodology is good for that, if you're running awareness you can ask people before the campaign and afterwards. Can't make inference that more they're aware the more they're concerned. It's unknowable, can't ask people information

about things that haven't happened. Difficult to prove a negative, how do you prove that I haven't read a book?

PB: I think that it's a really important point, finding out how aware people are of the activity, and how concerned they are, it would make it much more useful.

CH: Only ask those that have identified as being very aware, then ask them how concerned they are. Keeping in mind that's going to be a smaller subset, less than a third of sample were quite aware, when you're only asking those people it's a smaller sample.

GB: If you did the survey again, would you ask the same people?

CHL: No, they're taken off the list for 2 years. They're randomly surveyed,

GB: On the cost of this, and Santos paying for it, once we go over a certain level we pay for each person?

CH: Recommend against open ended responses in an omnibus survey but in stand alone survey you can be much more targeted and can pick your geographic area.

DR: If stick to focus on CSG remaining part of omnibus survey, could you tweak questions, but current size would remain the same?

CH: Yes, but about \$15 per additional interview, so you're looking at about an extra \$3k . We'll be conducting the next survey in June.

SC: The point is to workout whether we want more targeted info, if we want to stick to more narrow questions, the costs wouldn't be enormously dissimilar.

SG: A standalone survey makes sense to me.

Sean: I think a targeted one would be a lot more beneficial for our information.

ER: Just to recap on what is the outcome we're after here? WB wanted to understand what awareness of CSG and concerns are around it. Is this still our objective? By doing this we're looking to ascertain a depth of understanding, what we've got now - would Santos go away and act on it? Start a marketing campaign?

SC: We'd be looking at how does it shape what we do as a committee, are there other issues we should be investigating? Should we be holding water forums if that's an overwhelming issue? As a committee we have some information to drive our work.

DR: From memory this survey idea came about when we were working through an old REF. There were approximately five issues raised relevant to REF and also to CSG generally, a: water, flora and fauna, community consultation, and a social license for Santos, I think that one of the reasons that drove us to where we are now was the idea that the CCC was set to be the be all and end all of getting information out to wider community. But is that effective in creating awareness?

PB: It seems from the other questions, I remember them just comparing to coal, it's not really relevant. It did show that 96% are concerned and we need to delve into that. What are you concerned about - with saline water into streams and other issues that have popped up?

PS: Then what do you do with that information?

SG: Excellent point, if the awareness is there of environmental impacts, economic benefits, it then remains to be seen whether Santos take it and run with it or whether community takes it and runs with it.

ER: It could be of benefit to Santos, to run with the 'facts', or so the community can

show their levels of concern.

DR: So the information could be valuable for all. People want to see if we can change questions and would you be happy to have key issues focussing on awareness and concerns and get Clare to help develop questions? (Collective agreement)

SC: We need to have a session with the committee to thrash out the issues, and then let them (HVRF) design the questions.

SG: Are we only interested in people who are aware of CSG or are we also interested in those not aware and is the survey designed so that those who have no idea can contribute?

ER: What if we do a specific survey. Find the community has no awareness, we do another survey six months later and then it comes back and says we're very aware and we're not concerned? Agree the precautionary principle should be applied there. How are we going to interpret it, how do we balance it with technical data?

PS: That's why WB brought up in first place, we're just sitting in an enclave, how is the info getting out there? That's why we've done it.

SG: Should we not ask the questions because we're afraid of the answers?

PS: Do Santos really care if they have a social licence or not? Santos don't care even if they're told they're not wanted and that there are negative impacts.

SG: Who would you rather have sitting in here?

PS: I don't think anything I say or do has any impact on any CSG company. The Government just does what it wants anyway.

4. Review of previous minutes

CM: We're working in your community and we want to do the right thing.

ER: if survey keeps coming back saying we don't want it, the only thing survey delivers is for council to say we don't want you. I just feel this helps Santos achieve what they want to achieve. We're between a rock and a hard place with this.

SC: It's very difficult for us to work in that space, when there are very definite views about our industry. We are in a constant straining point of disagreement and polarity but we have to understand that in the Bunnan example that we're not going to stop engaging with people and we've established this CCC. We advertised for nominations for people who are across the issue and to look at the way we do it, we've now got the water study because we have a better understanding of community sentiment. I think from PS perspective, unless we say we're not going to continue we'll never find a way to meet. We didn't have to do a CCC at this point in time, we may get asked to by the Government, but the reason we're here is to work through these issues to see if we can make it work. Our genuine intent is questioned every five minutes, but it is genuinely why we're here. I take your point, we're talking about our work, and we get benefit from it.

ER: At end of day the Government sees the CCC required, box ticked, this is part of consultation. We're never going to resolve it.

SC: It's a way of shaping a project, we look at concerns, give confidence in those areas. So not just a process of ticking a box.

Sean: If we take PS point, which says it's inevitable that government says 'there's a resource there and we're going to extract it', I'd prefer to shape it and have some impact on it.

5. General business

ER: We're in a better position to influence if it goes ahead.

PS: That's just a hope, there's no evidence that we've influenced any outcome or direction. I've not received anything here that couldn't have found on the internet. Have there been other access agreements signed in Bunnan, other than Bates?

SC: Signed? I don't think so. We're talking with people.

PS: Someone told me today that there is.

PS: Has there been an access agreement for pilot well at Brawboys?

SC: It's ongoing, it's not necessarily at former Brawboy site.

SG: I defer to you (PS) on a lot of things because you're at the coal face. Been through this before with coal mines, water is a big issue in this area, unless Santos can prove no impact on water. So, the study is a good thing.

PS: I'm not disparaging water study it's the only thing positive thing out of this committee.

SC: And there's no way we would've had it without this CCC.

PS: I take that.

GB: I agree with PS. I think it's basically a waste of time because it is Santos. But I also understand because of problems in other gas areas, they want to head any problems off at pass. They definitely don't want similar problems other CSG companies have. There have been surveys elsewhere. 99% Mullaley, 100% Bellata, against it. Talking about survey, I don't mind seeing results but don't think it's going to be the only one, a starting point., This is a waste of time to a certain extent if we want to influence

Government. If we show government results they're not going to stop. We will influence Santos by these surveys.

ER: I am still interested to find out what is required for gas to be economically viable here.

SC: In terms of Santos' areas of interest, Pilliga would be first area developed, once we have more data, I don't have a problem bringing to Upper Hunter potential for coal. We've done 7 holes across whole area to understand geology, need to do more pilot holes to see if gas flows, Narrabri we know, Gunnedah, less so. Upper Hunter 7 holes need to keep building up knowledge, we don't have the detailed understanding of what's in the region. There is a real prospect that gas might be too tight or too deep, we don't know enough yet. Obviously our intention is to find out, flow well, intention is for it yet, have much more certainty around Narrabri and Gunnedah, have much less certainty here. Doing about 20 odd bores looking at doing three but in context of where we are, it's all relative. We don't have all that clarity yet.

ER: So if it's not viable here where do you go next?

SC: Our other areas.

ER: What are the factors that would make it economically viable for you?

SC: Gas price,,gas markets, there are so many variables, and those things based around our industry are very cost intensive up front. Off shore drilling – you might spend \$50million drilling and get nothing out of it. Not as simple as saying hit this much money or we don't do it. We can source someone externally if you'd like, who can give you a briefing on the gas market: how it plays out – if it's of interest, or we can do it from our perspective.

SG: Eastern Star had plans in place to bring gas through this area, my understanding is that they have thrown them out.

SC: We have thrown out and we're working out where we need to go.

SG: Can we see where it was? To see what the intention was, is that available?

SC: ESG tried to get to Newcastle, also Narrabri and central ranges.

PS: Queensland Hunter pipeline goes along the highway, that's a proposed pipeline.

GB: In relation to the pipeline going to Pilliga, if there's a decision to go ahead, will Santos apply or will ESG?

SC: Santos, and ESG are one and same, need to go through process to apply, talk to people.

PS: You say same you're the same entity, but I notice on the website that ESG still listed as of a week ago that seeking approval through Narrabri?

SC: It's some legacy stuff, nothing more than paperwork stuff. There's no way of hiding from that.

PS: I was just surprised to see their name.

DR: Previous minutes confirmed? (Agreement from those present)

PS: I'm on the Arts Upper Hunter Board and they subsidise travel and wondering if Santos would reimburse? I think if you're travelling more than 100kms it's something like 74 cents per kilometre.

SC: More than happy to do that. Just need to work out best mechanism to process.

Santos to provide a map of old proposed pipelines to next CCC meeting

CM: to bring EOFY year forms to next meeting.

SG: The concept of ambient gas levels that came up in the Darling Downs, is that being considered around here? Is there a plan for a methane baseline study?

SC: We're looking at doing something in areas where we have more activity, but we can do it here.

SG: I'd like to suggest that with respect to pecuniary interest, a call for some sort of register for this committee is required so we're all squeaky clean. If there are certain things here we need to disclose....

MJ: Council can probably provide guidelines to CCC so we can understand standard guidelines, would also suggest understanding what constitutes independence. Should come to some sort of arrangement what action we should take if a declared or 'undeclared' interest appears. Should automatically completely exclude yourself.

Sean: to supply relevant council documents related to 'independence'. Register of interest to be collated.

PS: Declare if hold any Santos shares.

PS: I read council minutes, I see that Dartbrook CCC minutes are in there.

MJ: Because there's a Councillor on their committee,

GB: I think Muswellbrook Council runs the Dartbrook CCC.

MJ: There's a statutory rule, any committee that includes a councillor must supply the minutes for inclusion in the Council minutes. Dartbrook CCC minutes have to be put in there.

SG: If there are a couple of recommendations that may be of interest, are they highlighted?

MJ: Only ones that are highlighted from a council business perspective. Section 355

committees states: where a committee makes a recommendation that needs to be considered or ratified by council.

SG: What if made a recommendation that council should do something?

MJ: If there's a specific recommendation about council we would highlight it.

SC: We would have to write a letter notifying them.

CM: Provided an update of work in the Pillig & invites any interested members of the UH CCC to tour the site.

GB: Have you done the extensions to that – Wilga Park?

SC: 16 mega watt, but aren't firing gas yet into the power station. Obviously we've been shut down for 13 months now, but once we get water management facilities in place and get gas flowing again go capacity for 40 megawatts, it is now at 16.

GB: Who's taking the power

SC: It's going into the grid.

GB: Who's getting paid.

SC: Santos. 8 different pilots that produce gas, we flare, we capture the gas and put it to use and that's what they've done. We've inherited that, whether we use it or not.

DR: PS asked the question via email whether emails to me need to be shared with the wider group. The feedback from CCC members has been that when the need seems right, the email will be shared as requested by individual members.

Discussion around dates for CCC meetings for 2013, following dates are proposed for

Tuesday nights:

March 26

May 28

June 25

July 30

August 27

CM: There are still issues that PB raised that would be of value to discuss getting the landholder in the Surat basin to speak to the CCC of their experiences, getting a land valuer in.

Sean: And the survey, when will we do that?

PM: I have some questions for Santos in relation to employment. You invest a lot of money – how much in Narrabri and Gunnedah regions? How many employees in Narrabri and Gunnedah, how much is invested in the community. I'm asking this so I have an understanding of what might happen down here if it all goes ahead. How much is paid in wages? How much has been invested in Upper Hunter?

PM also indicated he would like to take up CM's offer of visiting the other sites.

MJ: When talked about money being invested in community, can we look at community grant sponsorships as opposed to local business and services.

ER: Investment beyond commercial.

Meeting closed at 8.34pm.

DR: To invite CH to March 26 meeting for a briefing on what the CCC hopes to achieve from the next survey Santos to provide response on investment in Narrabri and Gunnedah regions

DRAFT

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 2012	Ongoing
27.	WB to ask HTBA for a representative for the CCC	25 th September	Ongoing

		2012	
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	Complete
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 2012	Completed

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	24 th July 2012	Completed

	properties with CSG activities		
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	Completed
52.	CM to investigate if a CSG specific survey can be conducted and costings for this.	10 December 2012	Completed
53.	Glenn Toogood presentation to be forwarded to CCC members	10 December 2012	Completed
54.	DR to gauge CCC members interest in forming subcommittee to provide feedback for Santos groundwater study	10 December 2012	Completed
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	Ongoing
56.	DR to forward PB's summary of water sub committee meeting notes to	5 February 2013	

CCC.

-
- | | | |
|------------|--|-----------------|
| 57. | Water subcommittee to prepare draft scope for study for presentation at next meeting. | 5 February 2013 |
| 58. | Santos to supply picture of the proposed ESG locations | 5 February 2013 |
| 59. | Santos to bring EOFY year forms for travel reimbursement to next meeting | 5 February 2013 |
| 60. | Relevant council documents related to 'independence'. Register of interest to be collated | 5 February 2013 |
| 61. | DR to invite Upper Hunter Research Foundation to March 26 meeting for a briefing on what the CCC hopes to achieve from the next survey | 5 February 2013 |
-
-

SANTOS COMMUNITY COMMITTEE

UPPER HUNTER

February 2013 Meeting

The Community Committee met on Tuesday 5th February for its first meeting of the year. The Committee is made up of local business owners, landholders, community leaders and representatives from Upper Hunter Shire Council and the thoroughbred breeders industry.

The **instigation of a regional groundwater study** was further discussed. Since Santos announced that they would commence a water study in December, three community members on the CCC have been working with staff from Santos and the CCC Chair on the study's scope. The meetings of the water study group will continue to take place between CCC meetings.

CCC members have agreed to seek guidance from independent experts on the scope of the investigations with things like location and depth of bores and who from the community should be involved to be taken into consideration.

The study will be conducted and funded by Santos. There was strong consensus from committee members on the need for this water study to be a priority. This study will now give everyone some baseline data to work from in determining where, when or if it is even appropriate for CSG activity in particular areas.

While committee members will contribute to the development of the scope for the study, it doesn't necessarily suggest that they agree with the proposed activities. Rather, they want to ensure that the study provides the most objective data possible.

The survey conducted on behalf of the Upper Hunter Santos Community Committee (UH-SCC) in December by Hunter Valley Research Foundation was also discussed further. A member of HVRF was invited to discuss the methodology behind the survey and answer any questions.

The CCC agreed that there was value in undertaking a survey specific to CSG, which focussed questions more on awareness and concern of CSG and the linkages between these two issues.

Santos has indicated a willingness to look into a CSG-specific survey further with the CCC.

The next meeting of the CCC will be held on Tuesday 26th March, 2013.

For further information please contact David Ross on 0402 060 649.