

The feedback I have received on the revised Guidelines from members of the Committees I am involved with is positive. Most people are supportive of the concept with the clarity and additional layers of transparency and accountability they now provide. Overall comments have been they are a big improvement on the 2007 version. I have not received any negative comments and every committee member was encouraged to put in a submission if they had specific comments.

One member is very supportive of the review of draft management plans now included in the **"Purpose of the Committee"** (Page 3, Point 4) and the opportunity to provide suggestions for improvement. This has been raised at meetings from time to time. I support this opportunity for comment, particularly where community representatives are near neighbours or representative of the surrounding local community, where impacts are most likely. My only comment is a proviso to avoid the potential to delay a mine's statutory obligations as far as lodgement of documents to Government agencies within the required time, given the Committee's meeting schedule and capacity to respond within a specified time frame as a committee, or response by individual members.

In the same section, (Page 2, Point 2) another member queries the use of the word "optional"

"development assessment --- including scoping of issues for assessment and commenting on assessment documentation (optional);"

His interpretation and suggestion is included in his separate submission to the Department.

"Establishment of the Committee" (Page 3) where a committee could be established at different stages of the project, is this a duplication/crossover with Division of Resources and Energy committees established during exploration?

Dissolution of the committee should be unanimous or a majority decision of the committee.

Nomination of **"Independent Chairperson"** (Page 3) the following comment has been provided:

"The Company nominating 2 options for Independent Chair. Maybe there needs to be a panel of suitable people to choose from? I would like to think companies would do the right thing, but can't assume this. Maybe nominee needs to do a letter stating why they are interested and addressing the criteria? It is obviously vital to get an independent chair, as they then recommend the community members!"

What format does the report to the Department (Page 4) by the independent chairperson take; written or verbal?

Selection of **"community representatives"** (Page 4-5) the following comments have been received:

"There needs to be transparency around the recommendations for community members – perhaps a list of successful and unsuccessful applicants back in the

papers where the positions were advertised? The community will soon decide whether the best applicants are being chosen.

Advertising in the "local press" does not necessarily cover everyone who might be interested. It should be advertised in a regional as well as a local paper (eg Newcastle Herald), or even community-based papers in some smaller areas".

One more suggestion received:

At times, I have been the only community representative on the xxxx CCC. Advertising doesn't seem to work - perhaps companies need to be compelled to letterbox drop affected areas to flush out more representatives? Or donate money eg \$10 000/month to local community projects until someone is found, to give them the incentive to find someone!

The appointment of the Committee, including community representatives and the Chair, should be for a set term ie 3 years, with provision for review where all positions are declared vacant and current members can reapply. This keeps the dynamics of the committee refreshed and focused and avoids domination and single interests.

On Page 5, what is the Department's definition of "a representative of recognised environmental organisation"?

On Page 6, "**company representatives**" the following comments have been received:

"There needs to be an operational representative of the company present at meetings who has sufficient authority to make decisions to overcome issues causing complaints. I believe Environmental Officers are unlikely to have this authority.

If there is an issue, the person with the authority to make operational changes to overcome it is there and can give an undertaking on the spot to do something (and often does).

it is the operational people who understand what is causing the impact on the surrounding community eg what is making the noise/dust/light spill etc – it is vital to have their input".

This is a very valid point, it is far better to have answers to questions when raised, wherever possible, then to hold over to the next meeting. The attendance of the Mine Manager in addition to the Environmental Officer in most cases addresses this issue.

On Page 6, "**alternate representatives**", the following comments have been received:

I believe community representatives should nominate their own alternate representative and this can then be okayed by the committee and the Department, as happened with me. I nominated my neighbour who experiences the same/similar impacts as me. I still advise locals the meeting is on and ask for any issues. My neighbour raises these and after the meeting, tells me what went on. We both

receive the minutes and I circulate as normal to my email list. If the Department nominated someone I didn't know, there would not be the same exchange of information and the local community would not necessarily be kept informed.

I concur, this has worked well. An alternate is just that, someone who can attend when the regular member is unable to do so. For continuity, the alternate should be a person approved by the Department, not a range of different people.

The establishment of a regional committee in lieu of a local committee was not supported because of the focus of the committee becoming too broad and concerns of local residents potentially being diminished or overlooked. This was consistent even where the same company was operating at multiple sites within a region and not necessarily because of different operators.

On Page 6, the meeting agenda is out of sequence; Confirmation of Minutes precedes Business Arising.

On Page 7, "**Minutes of meetings**" the following comment has been made:

"It would be good to have something in there about minutes of the meeting being sufficiently expansive to allow other members of the community to understand what has been discussed! Often, they can be a bit sketchy and community representatives then have to almost write a cover letter to explain what went on".

Most companies now do PowerPoint presentations as part of the meeting. In a lot of cases they are included with the minutes and provide greater context. These presentations are very effective when handed out to the committee at the beginning of each meeting, enabling representatives to make their own notes. Some companies send out a pre-meeting information package (updates, monitoring results, complaints etc) prior to the meeting, in addition to PowerPoint presentations.

Page 8 "**Committee training**" Whose responsibility is this? Some generic induction would be ideal, perhaps a future project for NSW Mining.

Page 8 "**Committee funding and remuneration**" Where expenses are paid, apart from a declaration in the minutes, a simple statement on the Company's website page relating to the Community Consultative Committee to that effect is also effective.

On the Independent Chairperson nomination form (Page 10), it states the position is voluntary, a sitting fee is paid. I am not aware of any instances where it is not.

Page 8 "**Responsibilities of the Company**" What is the mechanism for provision of this documentation? Available on Company website, printed copy or memory stick, upon request? Many people are not interested in the voluminous documents but prefer a concise version.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Margaret MacDonald-Hill