

Meeting Minutes

Narrabri Gas Project (NGP)
Community Consultative Committee (CCC)

DATE / TIME

Tuesday 19th March
9:30am

LOCATION

Narrabri Shopfront Conference Room
125 Maitland Street, Narrabri

CHAIR

Garry West

MINUTE TAKER

Lyn Firth

ATTENDEES

- Stuart Murray (People of the Plains)
- Lisa Smith (Chamber of Commerce) (Alternate)
- Todd Dunn (Santos)
- Janelle Twyman (Santos)
- Carlee Miller (Santos)
- Cr Cathy Redding (Narrabri Shire Council)
- David Scilley (NSW Farmers)
- Jocellyn Cameron (Community representative)
- Abby McClure (Santos)

APOLOGIES

- Ken Flower (Community representative)
- Lyn Trindall (Narrabri LALC)
- Russell Stewart (Chamber of Commerce)

Discussions

NO.	DISCUSSIONS
1. Welcome	The Chair welcomed all to the meeting and acknowledged Gomeri country on which the meeting was held as well as Elders past, present and future and all Aboriginal persons present.
Declaration of Interest	The Chair asked if there were any new declarations of conflict of interest. None declared.
2. Minutes of Previous Meeting	<p>The minutes of the previous meeting were circulated, finalised and posted. Comment was received from Stuart Murray – he opposes the adoption of the minutes as circulated believing them not to be an accurate representation of the previous meeting. Stuart Murray has submitted correspondence to the Chair – see below, Copies were provided to to all members present. Stuart Murray was invited to summarise his comments to the members.</p> <p>In summary, he is concerned about the accuracy of the minutes as they didn't address in detail his points regarding the draft Terms of Reference.</p> <p>Other members indicated they felt that the previous minutes were an accurate reflection of the meeting.</p> <p>The Chair reminded the members that actions and decisions of the committee would always be based on a majority opinion. Stuart Murray indicated he believed the department should be requested to conduct a review of the committees performance as provided in the CCC Guidelines. The Chair agreed to inform the department of this request.</p>
1. Action from Previous Meeting	Questions with regard to carbon capture will be addressed in this meeting, and a copy of the Independent Audit and response documents will be circulated at the conclusion of the meeting. Other matters (3-5) have been dealt with.
2. Correspondence	<p>Email to Chair (dated 6.12.23) concerning discussion about the Terms of Reference at CCC meeting held 5.12.23.</p> <p>Letter to Chair (dated 21.12.23) comments and changes requested to the draft CCC minutes 5.12.23.</p> <p>Email to Chair (dated 18.3.24) requesting a proxy vote against any motion to accept the minutes of the December 2023 CCC meeting with reasons.</p> <p>Comments from People of the Plains with regard to minutes taken at CCC meetings. (Attached to the these minutes)</p>

<p>3. Santos Update</p>	<p>Question – How much carbon will actually be captured by Santos’ Direct Air Capture project?</p> <p>Refer to the slide in the presentation for full details.</p> <p>In 2021, Santos partnered with the CSIRO to conduct a field demonstration of Direct Air Capture (DAC) units utilising Carbon Assist technology. Commissioning of the first 0.25 tonne per day unit was completed in Q3 2023, with delivery to Moomba and the initial field trials commenced in Q4 2023. The next phase of the project will involve scaling the DAC technology to one tonne per day.</p> <p>Santos Corporate Update (Todd Dunn)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Refer to Santos presentation <p>Narrabri Gas Project Development Update (Janelle Twyman)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Phase 1 activity continues to progress. • 5 shallow bores completed between February and October 2023 • 2 deep reservoir monitoring bores and 4 core holes proposed for this year. • Santos will make a final investment decision once all the approvals are received supporting the development including the supporting pipelines. • Micro-siting remains ongoing for Phase 2. • Annual Review to be submitted to DPHI at the end of March and will be available on NGP website • Santos is currently planning for other activities which are required prior to the commencement of Phase 2, including revision of existing management plans and new management plans. <p>Independent Environment Audit (Janelle Twyman)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Independent Environment Audit was required within one year of commencement and was completed in November 2023. • This was a massive undertaking covering the period from 30 September 2020 to 15 September 2023. • It included site inspections, interviews with project personal and the review of Santos records, documents, and data. • The audit found 131 compliant findings, 2 minor administrative non compliances (since rectified), 77 not triggered findings and 89 observations. • The two administrative non-compliance issues were:

- All permits are required to be on the NGP website, and the water access licenses weren't. They have now been added.
- The auditors didn't consider that the waste management plan addressed all the requirements under the SSD. The waste management plan has been updated to provide more clarity.
- Documents were submitted to DPHI on 13 November 2023, and it was accepted on 30 January 2024.
- The report and the Santos response can be found on the NGP website and will be distributed to all CCC members at the conclusion of the meeting.

Phase 1 Activity and Management Plans (Janelle Twyman)

- Management plans continue to be revised and updated in response to the ongoing changes occurring in the project.
- The management plans for Phase 2 & 3 of the project are currently being worked on and engagement will progress through 2024.
- Management plans and DPHI approvals are available on the NGP website.

Garry West explained that the Department of Planning and Environment (DPE) has had a name change to Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure (DPHI).

Q. Cathy Redding - Are the Management Plans for Phase 2 & 3 different to Phase 1?

A. Janelle Twyman – Yes, they are different because Phase 2 & 3 involve different development and operations scope. The basis of the plans is much the same, but they are updated for different activities.

Todd Dunn advised that CCC is consulted on 3 plans: 1) Noise 2) Social Impact 3) Field Development Plan.

National Native Title Tribunal (Todd Dunn)

- The original decision relating to the granting of Petroleum Production Lease Applications for the Narrabri Gas Project was handed down in December 2022.
- This was appealed by the Gomeroi people, and the appeal was heard in August 2023.
- The decision by the Full Federal Court was handed down in March 2024 allowing the appeal against the granting of the Petroleum Production Lease to proceed.

- The Court has determined the National Native Title Tribunal erred in law by declining to consider evidence on climate impacts and the public interest that was put forward by the Gomeroi people.
- The Court did not make any findings in relation to Santos' conduct.
- Santos have at all times negotiated with the Gomeroi people in good faith.
- The Court's orders regarding next steps are yet to be made.
- Santos have advised that the final investment decision is subject to receiving all required approvals to support development including the supporting pipelines.

Q. Cathy Redding - Do you have an indicative timeline for when you expect the approvals to be granted?

A. Todd Dunn - We are working towards the second half of 2025.

Hunter Gas Pipeline (HGP) update (Todd Dunn)

- The gas from the NGP is committed to the domestic market. The gas will be taken to the market via the HGP which was given Critical State Significant Infrastructure (CSSI) status by the NSW Government.
- Design is in accordance with the latest version of the Australian Standard - Pipelines Gas and Liquid Petroleum (AS 2885).
- Santos is expecting to commence construction of the 833-kilometre HGP in the second half of 2025.
- The approvals are driven by land access negotiations and what is required under the Pipelines Act.
- The design has not changed. Feedback from surveys and landowners has meant that some of the detail, such as depth of the pipeline, has changed.
- Staging request was approved by DPHI and Stage1 was commenced in Q4 2023 with works supporting construction such as laydown areas.
- Santos are entering into agreements to build further construction sites along the route (laydown yards, machinery storage, workshops, offices, camp sites etc).
- Landowner and community engagement (along the route) continues. Over 180 sites have been surveyed to date.
- Deed of Option Easement Agreement process is underway.

Q. Stuart Murray - Are you able to comment on when the pipeline to the QLD gas fields are planned?

A. Todd Dunn - We are currently not focussing on this part of the project. The route for that part of the project has approval and there is more information about the project on the website.

Narrabri Lateral Pipeline update (NLP) (Todd Dunn)

- This connects the approved NGP gas processing facility at Leewood to the HGP east of Baan Baa. It also has CSSI status.
- Landowner and community engagement continues with survey activities where voluntary agreement has been reached.
- The EPBC referral to the Commonwealth Government has been delayed due to the Pilliga bushfire – the impact of the fires needs to be reviewed – expected to be submitted Q2 2024.
- The NLP EIS is being prepared based on the SEARs and will be placed on public exhibition for submissions by the DPHI.

Exploration & Other Activity (Janelle Twyman)

- PEL 1 – Kahlua pilot activity (workover of existing wells) – wells now online
- PEL1 – Scouting for future minimum tenure commitments.
- PEL 238/PAL2 – Operations workovers and monitoring bore completions.
- PEL 238 /PAL2 – Tintfield Pilot workovers & pond upgrade works
- Brawboy 2 (PEL 456) – P&A complete with rehabilitation to be progressed through 2024.

Santos in the Community (Abby McClure)

During 2023:

- Santos has invested approximately \$10 million into the Narrabri/Gunnedah Shire regions.
- Santos has hosted 20 community info sessions and partnered with over 50 community groups or organisations.
- Santos personnel attended 54 events or initiatives

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Festival of Rugby employed 40 local contractors and injected approximately \$800,000 into the community. About 3500 attended the football over the weekend. <p>Duck Creek Pilliga Bushfire (Todd Dunn)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • About 130,000 hectares of the Pilliga Forest was affected. • Santos has a comprehensive bushfire management plan approved by the former DPE, and this was shown to be effective. • No impact on Santos operational infrastructure, but some auxiliary infrastructure was damaged, such as fences and signage. • Clean up is in progress. Santos were not allowed back into the forest until the end of February. <p>Q. David Scilly - Were the temperatures during the fire monitored by Santos? It would be useful information for the local fire crews.</p> <p>A. Todd Dunn - There is some meteorological equipment at Leewood, but in the field, there is no temperature monitoring equipment as such.</p> <p>Q. Jocelyn Cameron - Is there any precedence where bushfire sites have been rehabilitated? What is Santos' responsibility now for its rehabilitation sites.</p> <p>A. Todd Dunn - The sites that Santos are responsible for were nearing full rehabilitation, but the fire did go through some of them. To an extent, they will rehabilitate naturally. We will continue to work with Forestry but we will be responsible for these sites for the foreseeable future.</p> <p>Q. Jocelyn Cameron – How many sites is Santos responsible for?</p> <p>A. Todd Dunn - I am not sure of the exact number.</p>
<p>4. Advisory Group Updates</p>	<p>Meeting of the advisory groups will take place over the next 2 days.</p>
<p>5. Member updates</p>	<p>Still looking for a new member for the Greenhouse Gas Emission advisory group. No other member updates.</p>

6. General Business	Stuart Murray submitted written questions for Santos via the Chair.
---------------------	---

Actions

NO.	ACTIONS	ACTION BY	DUE DATE
1	Advice to DPHI with P4P concerns about CCC.	Garry West as Chairperson of the CCC	ASAP

Next meeting

18 June 2024 – to be confirmed.

Meeting closed

10.35am



Attachment 1

Denise Murray <denisemurray47@gmail.com>

CCC meeting 5/12/2023 Terms of Reference discussion

2 messages

Denise Murray <denisemurray47@gmail.com>

Wed, Dec 6, 2023 at 11:28 AM

To: Garry West <garry.west@gbwconsulting.com.au>

To Garry

To the best of my knowledge, People for the Plains was the only CCC member that proposed alterations to the draft Terms of Reference giving our reasons. Amongst the reasons we argued that the minutes must accurately summarise the matters discussed at the meeting which is a requirement described in the draft Terms of Reference. We know from experience the minutes for our CCC often fail this objective. Our suggested alterations would have also brought more integrity to the CCC process.

Yet most of our suggestions were rejected by the other CCC members and supported by you.

To argue that most of our suggested alterations to the Terms of Reference, were for example '*not needed*' is in my opinion to condone the current shortcomings we described in our submission.

I request that when you are writing the minutes for this CCC meeting you give your reasons as to why most of People for the Plains suggested alterations to the draft Terms of Reference were unacceptable, therefore inferring the draft version was superior to People for the Plains edited version.

Our community network will be interested in why our version was too complicated, not needed, seeks to confuse, and not beneficial as argued at the meeting.by those that opposed our suggested changes.

Stuart Murray

People for the Pains CCC Member

ATTACHMENT 2

To Garry West Comments and changes requested to the draft CCC minutes 5/12/2023 to be read in conjunction with my edits to your draft minutes 21st December 2023

Comment No 1

To the best of my knowledge P4P was the only member of the CCC that provided written feedback on the draft ToR giving our reasons.

So, you were correct saying that discussion around the Terms of Reference centred on the document submitted by People for the Plains(P4P).

Your next comment is incorrect as it infers that the feedback from P4P would '*limit the scope of the CCC*'.

P4P argue that the opposite is true for the comments we made under section, Purpose and Scope would complement the advisory and consultative role of the Committee which is the purpose, as described in the ToR template.

According to your draft minutes the majority of the Committee feel that the P4P feedback '*needed to be kept short with simple language*' which does not answer the email I sent you after the meeting requesting reasons why the P4P feedback on the draft ToR were, for example : '*not needed, not acceptable, not relevant, not beneficial, too confusing, too complicated, and would make the meetings too long*'.

These reasons give me the impression that the P4P suggested changes to the ToR template would be an unreasonable burden on the committee, as the P4P suggested alterations would expand the Terms of Reference. I cannot see how the P4P suggested alterations would if they were allowed, '*limit the scope of the committee*' as you claim. The truth is the reasons given by the committee (listed above), for rejecting P4P.s changes **would** '*limit the scope of the committee*' as you claim in the draft minutes. P4P did not want to limit the scope of the committee.

According to the Committee members some of the wording P4P used under the section Purpose and Scope was not acceptable, but could be substituted with other words that were acceptable to the committee, without changing the meaning of our suggested edits.

I request that when you revise the Terms of Reference document you make these changes.

In your minutes your description of the CCC as an, '*advisory group*' is in agreement with ToR template yet this word is not used in the dot points describing the scope of the committee.

The word *advice* could be used in two places to replace P4P alterations that were not acceptable to the committee.

Please make these changes when you revise the ToR template. If you need a reminder of what was said when discussing the Purpose and Scope section, I would be happy to help.

Comment No 2

It is true that the committee agreed the words that '*The Santos NGP CCC Chairperson is the author of the minutes for each committee meeting*'. were acceptable.

The reasons described by you as to why the Committee agreed to the P4P request to **distinguish between the 'note-taker' and the 'author'** of the minutes is not the truth.

For this reason I have crossed out your comments and request they be replaced with what was said.

'Stuart was asked to explain why P4P wanted this change. He explained that he was acutely aware of the awkward position the note-taker found herself in because of the Chairperson being choosy about what he included or ignored in producing his version of the minutes. Stuart explained that he needed to assure her that P4P had confidence in the accuracy of her note-taking and gave examples of the Chairperson's manipulation of the minutes.'

ATTACHMENT 2

Comment No 3

P4P made suggestions that would improve the accuracy of the minutes, an essential requirement according to the Terms of Reference. Our suggestions focused on the need for the meeting proceedings to be recorded and made available to the members. If this request had been acceptable to the committee, disputes about the accuracy of the minutes would largely be eliminated.

P4P have frequently requested alterations to the draft minutes and made requests for information to be recorded in the minutes however these have largely been ignored.

This is despite the fact that on page four of the ToR template under the section Meeting Minutes it states that: 'any opposing views of members on a matter to be (recorded on request)

Up until our 5/12/2023 CCC meeting the recording of the meeting proceedings were acceptable to the committee members. However, access to these recordings was restricted to the Note-taker and the Chairman who was the author of the minutes.

The following is an opposing view made by P4P about the decision to not record CCC meetings giving our reasons. Please record the following in your minutes for the 5/12/2023 meeting.

At the meeting you the Chairperson announced these meeting and future meetings will not be recorded.

P4P had an **opposing** view that the meeting proceedings be recorded and made available to committee members. This would be useful if the accuracy of the draft minutes is questioned by a committee member, which would make possible the requirement emphasised in the ToR template that the

'minutes **must accurately** summarise the matters that were discussed at the meeting, including.

| any community feedback expressed, and enquiries made

| any opposing views of members on a matter (recorded on request)'

Stuart Murray

P4P delegate to the NGPCCC

ATTACHMENT 3

To Garry West, Chair Narrabri Gas Project CCC
From: Stuart Murray People for the Plains CCC delegate
Subject: Meeting minutes 5th December 2023

18/3/2024

Dear Garry

I would like to register a proxy vote (at the CCC meeting proposed for 19th March 2024) against any motion to accept the minutes of the December 2023 CCC meeting.

My reasons are that sections of the minutes do not accurately summarise the matters discussed at the meeting.

To recap

Point 1.

On the 6/12/2023 the day after the CCC meeting and before the draft minutes were circulated, I sent you an email requesting that you give your reasons as to why most People for the Plains suggested alterations to the draft terms of reference were unacceptable. At the meeting I expressed my concerns verbally that the reasons given were pedantic, and as it turned out I assumed correctly that for this reason they would not appear in the draft minutes. In this email, referring to the (Purpose and Scope section of the draft Terms of Reference) I listed some of the reasons why the Committee rejected People for the Plains suggested alterations that could be included in the draft minutes.

These were: - *too complicated*
not needed.
seeks to confuse
not beneficial

Your draft minutes ignored my request instead gave an **opinion** (rather than the facts) that implied that People for the Plains input into the draft Terms of Reference (*would limit the scope of the CCC*).

Nothing could be further from the truth and even logic says People for the Plains would have no interest in (*limiting the scope of the CCC*)

On the 21/12/2023 on receipt of the draft minutes, I sent you an edited version together with supporting comments. This email listed the other reasons used by the CCC committee to reject People for the Plains suggested changes to the draft Terms of Reference.

These were:- *would make the meetings too long*
only accept our feedback not input
not acceptable
not relevant
need to keep the Terms of Reference simple,

You ignored these two requests for changes to be made to the minutes and persisted with your **false opinion** that People for the Plains suggestions (*would limit the scope of the CCC*).

Point 2

Meeting Minutes section of the draft Terms of Reference.

Refers to People for the plains request for the Draft Terms of Reference be changed,

From “*the Chairperson (or identified note-taker) will take minutes for each meeting*”

To “*The Santos NGP CCC Chairperson is the author of the minutes for each committee meeting*”

ATTACHMENT 3

Garry asked me to explain why People for the Plains wanted this change. My reply was.

“That I was acutely aware of the awkward position the note-taker found herself in as a result of the Chairperson being choosy about what he included or ignored in producing his version of the minutes. I needed to assure her that People for the Plains had confidence in the job she was doing” and then gave examples of the Chairpersons manipulation of the minutes.

For this reason, People for the Plains requested alteration to the draft Terms of Reference, was approved by the CCC committee. Even though Garry asked me to provide reasons for our requested change to the draft Terms of Reference, and they were accepted by the CCC committee the reason I provided did not appear in the minutes.

I therefore edited the draft minutes and referred Garry to comment No 2 in the attached email that repeated the reasons why we needed to distinguish between the **note-taker and the author of the minutes**, and asked they be included in the final version of the minutes.

You ignore this request.

Point 3

Refers to People for the Plains submission to the draft Terms of Reference regarding the need to have the CCC meetings recorded and made available to the members.

Our reasons were set out in our submission to the draft Terms of reference, plus the accompanying document of support prior to the meeting. This was followed up with letter to Garry, 21st December 2023 together with edits to the draft minutes. These were sent before the final minutes were circulated and argued that this would enable the CCC meeting minutes to meet the requirements of the terms of reference, that is

“the minutes must accurately summarise the matters discussed at the meeting”

We also argued that if the recording of the minutes were available to members then disputes about the accuracy of the minutes would largely be eliminated.

At the December 5th 2023 CCC meeting there was no argument made to suggest that People for the Plains request to have the meetings recorded and made available to members would negatively impact the requirements that the minutes must accurately summarise the matters discussed at the meeting.

Instead I was referred to the dispute resolution section of the CCC Guidelines that would provide a *“comprehensive guideline”*, as to how disputes should be resolved. It did not mention anything about recording of minutes let alone say that they would not be useful in the event of a dispute that needed to be resolved.

At this CCC meeting the Chair (Garry) attempted to move further away from the need to record minutes when he announced that *“This CCC meeting and future CCC meetings will not be recorded”*.

We brought this to your attention in our amended version of the draft minutes and the accompanying letter in support.

In the final version of the minutes Garry conceded that.

ATTACHMENT 3

“The Chairperson had advised that as a general practice recording of CCC minutes would not occur in future, however, provision for recording in certain circumstances should remain in the terms of reference”.

The final version of the Terms of Reference concerning the recording of the meeting remained unchanged, meaning our request for meeting minutes to be recorded was rejected without any reason being given.

In conclusion.

So as to comply with the requirement in the Terms of Reference that states.

*“minutes must **accurately summarise** the matters that were discussed at the meeting, including.*

Any community feedback expressed, and enquires made

Any opposing views of members on a matter (recorded on request)”

I request these four documents be included as attachments to the final minutes of the proposed 19th March 2024 CCC meeting.

Stuart Murray
People for the Plains
Delegate to the NGPCCC

Comments in Response to the Terms of Reference Feedback from People for the Plains

People for the Plains has provided a member of the Santos NGP CCC for the length of its existence, except when we withdrew our delegate at the end of the previous CCC in protest because of shortcomings of the process at the time.

When the current CCC was established, we were assured the process would meet our expectations. Unfortunately this has not been the case.

People for the Plains understands that the purpose of the CCC is to provide a forum for open and honest two-way discussion between Santos and the community. We participate in this process in good faith, but we continue to be disappointed by it.

As per the Terms of Reference, section on Meeting Minutes, the template states,

'The minutes must accurately summarise the matters discussed at the meeting'.

Please see our proposed amendments to the draft TOR, focusing on these core issues:

1. That the recordings of the CCC meetings be made publicly available as an important part of the public record. These recordings could be held in the cloud with links along with the CCC minutes (as done by other organisations). Public availability of these recordings would reduce (or remove entirely) instances of misrepresentation of what was discussed at the meeting.
2. Alternatively as a bare minimum (or as well), the recordings of the minutes should be made available to committee members when/if the accuracy of the draft minutes is questioned by a committee member. This should eliminate most discrepancies.
3. Committee members should have access to a mediation dispute resolution process using an independent mediator. This would allow disputes over the accuracy of the minutes or other issues to be resolved satisfactorily.
4. That there is more opportunity for CCC members to have their expertise utilised to improve the project, thus improving the likelihood of gaining social licence.

Comment One

It is important that a distinction be made between the note taker and the Chairperson's roles.

Comment Two

With the current operation of the CCC there is the opportunity for the minutes to not be accurate and requests for changes to the minutes or requests for important or relevant information to be included can be ignored.

Comment Three

This issue was a failing of the prior CCC and led to People for the Plains withdrawing its delegate at the time. This problem continues to exist with the current CCC. On a number of occasions People for the Plains has requested changes to the draft minutes and for information to be included in the minutes, to better reflect the meeting, yet these have largely been ignored and there is no satisfactory dispute resolution process.

Comment Four

In order for the CCC to function more effectively, we request these changes to the Terms of Reference.

Comment Five

People for the Plains request that the recordings of the minutes be made available to the committee when there is a dispute over the accuracy of the minutes.

Requests by People for the Plains that the recordings be made available to us have been denied previously. Transparency and integrity of the CCC process would be significantly improved if the recordings of the minutes were made available publicly.

Comment Six

We would like to see that this applies also to the Chairperson, as previously the People for the Plains CCC delegate has been refused permission by the Chairperson to raise concerns and give reasons for these concerns.

Comment Seven

There is now vast amounts of scientific research available that demonstrates very clearly that good quality engagement (through processes such as CCCs) includes the ability for stakeholders to have a say in actual decisions, to influence plans and outcomes. Best practice genuine community engagement is not about the proponent informing the community of how things will go, they are an opportunity to learn from the experience of community members in how to improve the project, improve management and mitigation methods and how to have a better outcome for the community and the environment. This is how social licence can be achieved and these standards should reflect these opportunities for best practice. Please see the Social Impact Assessment Guideline developed by the Department of Planning

[https://www.planningportal.nsw.gov.au/sites/default/files/documents/2023/GD1944%20SIA%20Guideline NEW%20VI 14 02 23.pdf](https://www.planningportal.nsw.gov.au/sites/default/files/documents/2023/GD1944%20SIA%20Guideline%20NEW%20VI%2014%2002%2023.pdf)

4.4 Refining the project

The steps of identifying and analysing likely social impacts may prompt refinement of the project design and exploration of alternatives that would improve social outcomes. Testing and refining the project design in response to social impacts is likely to be iterative. If project refinement has occurred after consideration of social impacts, describe any changes to the project design in the scoping report (if required) and the SIA report that is part of the EIS.