



Community Liaison Group

MEETING MINUTES – MEETING ONE

Wednesday, 10 December 2008

Agenda Item	Action/discussion
Welcome and Introductions	Facilitator welcomed attendees Members introduced themselves and the organisation they represented Facilitator ran through CLG Member's Information Kit and meeting agenda.
Community Liaison Group Overview	Facilitator reviewed CLG Terms of Reference with CLG Members noting key points: <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ scope of the CLG, particularly that it applies to the Environmental Impact Assessment phase of the Project;▪ role of the CLG, including in relation to other consultation activities;▪ appointment of CLG members;▪ responsibilities of CLG members, SunWater and the Facilitator;▪ decision making process;▪ confidentiality; and▪ meeting administration and procedures. Questions and Comments <p>DIP representative asked what members think of the CLG process.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Members generally happy to be part of the process.▪ See that the CLG will be important in stopping misinformation about the Project in the community.▪ Members questioned whether there was enough local representation (i.e. Council, Agforce).▪ DIP asked that the possibility of local councillors being on the CLG be left open. <p>Questioned whether facilitator was considered "independent".</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Facilitator confirmed that responsibility is to ensure that CLG process and meetings were managed in a fair way.▪ DIP representative assured that Coordinator General will oversee the independence of the process. Actions: <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Update list of all CLG participants and circulate to members

Agenda Item	Action/discussion
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Review CLG membership for possible inclusion of other local representatives
Project Overview	<p>Sunwater representative presented overview of the Connors River Dam and Pipelines Project, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ location of dam; ▪ project background (i.e. recommendation of Central Queensland Regional Water Supply Strategy); ▪ concept storage and yield capacity; ▪ concept pipeline corridors under consideration; ▪ other infrastructure requirements; and ▪ project status and next steps. <p>Questions and Comments</p> <p>Have demand studies of mines been done?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ SunWater representative confirmed that preliminary demand assessments have been done. Demand assessments would continually be revised throughout the business case process. <p>Will the pipeline be buried?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ SunWater representative confirmed that the pipeline will be largely buried, but will need to come to the surface at some points along the pipeline. <p>Southern pipeline route might have more impact on future mining activities, as these activities move progressively southwards. Southern pipeline route will cross number of mine roads.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ SunWater representative confirmed that have tried to target property/ mining lease boundaries where possible to reduce impact on use of properties and mining leases. A number of mining representatives had been contacted during the formulation of the southern concept pipeline route. <p>The “wet area” (wide area of braided streams associated with Funnel Creek and liable to flooding in the wet season) on the southern pipeline route is the same on the northern route, but recognised that this is wider for the southern pipeline route.</p>

Agenda Item	Action/discussion
	<p>DIP asked what the width of the Queensland Rail (QR) Corridor was and whether the northern pipeline is to be located within this corridor.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ SunWater representative confirmed that in some instances, it is likely that the northern pipeline easement will be outside of the QR corridor, but would be located adjacent to the QR corridor. <p>Is there provision along the pipeline route to allocate water?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ SunWater representative confirmed that this would be considered in the business case that is being conducted separately for the Project. <p>Suggested that the closure of roads at the top of the dam will be important otherwise people will access the recreation area from all directions. A single access road to the recreation area is preferred to minimise traffic impacts on other roads, although this would depend on the needs of other landowners near the dam area.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ SKM representative confirmed that this would be considered in the traffic and transport section of the EIS that is being conducted for the Project. <p>What will the extent of the flood buffer zone be and will this be refined?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Sunwater representative confirmed that the flood buffer zone is based on the 100 year AEP flood event and that this would be refined with more contour data and flood modelling. <p>On the understanding that DNRW is currently buying land for the dam, what happens if the Project doesn't proceed?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ SunWater representative confirmed that DNRW is currently negotiating voluntary acquisition with property owners and that this is a risk the State Government is taking. ■ DIP representative mentioned that the DNRW generally includes 'buy back' clauses in property transaction contracts to ensure that no one is worse off. <p>Actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Send link of DNRW's acquisition policy to CLG members (http://www.nrw.qld.gov.au/property/resuming_land.html) ■ CLG Members requested a copy of SunWater's presentation
SDPWO Act Approvals Process	Coordinator General representative provided an overview of the EIS process under the State Development and Public Works Organisation Act 1971, including:

Agenda Item	Action/discussion
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ “significant project” status; ▪ EIS process and timing; ▪ role of the Coordinator General; and ▪ relationship of EIS process to the Commonwealth Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation (EPBC) Act 1999 assessment process. <p>Coordinator General representative distributed a fact sheet on the EIS process and how to make a submission on the draft Terms of Reference.</p> <p>Questions and Comments</p> <p>Ensuring that all stakeholders are getting a “fair go” is a concern and not sure if this happens. Important to balance views of wide range of stakeholders (i.e. some stakeholders have more “clout” than others).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ DIP representative suggested that water allocation relies on ‘highest and best use’ as per National Water Initiative. ▪ DIP representative confirmed that the Coordinator General is required to maintain balance and that there is time in the Project to consider all options and sustainable outcomes. <p>Over the years, the amount of farming land has decreased although production levels have been maintained due to efficiencies in farming. Farmers are taking more and more hits, with farming land being lost to mining and livestock numbers decreasing. Some farmers are struggling to keep afloat.</p> <p>Need to ensure the region maintains alternative industries and that business case is not built solely on coal industry.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ SunWater representative confirmed that they are commissioning an independent study on Agricultural Demand and would welcome submissions from any sector on water demand. This includes gaining input from AgForce if available. <p>Actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Coordinator General representative to distribute copy of draft ToR to CLG members when these are available (suggested late January 2009).
EIS Overview	SKM representative presented an overview of the EIS including:

Agenda Item	Action/discussion
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ EIS process and purpose; ■ Technical studies; ■ EIS structure; ■ Investigations undertaken to date; and ■ Community consultation. <p>Questions and Comments</p> <p>Will the EIS team be able to provide information on hydrology, etc?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ SKM representative confirmed that will be able to provide detailed information on EIS studies to CLG Members when this is available.
<p>Questions and Discussion</p>	<p>SunWater asked CLG Members what is the best way to disseminate information on the Project.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ ABC radio ■ Fitzroy Basin Association (FBA) has contacts for landholders in Connors Catchment and can email information on the Project to their contacts. <p>Does the dam allow any provisions for power generation? The dam could generate own power for pipeline by releasing water to pipeline through a hydropower plant (as currently done in Kunnunnarra). This would be “green and sustainable”.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ SunWater representative confirmed that this is not currently proposed but can follow this up and provide feedback at next meeting. <p>What is the AHD of the Dam?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Sunwater representative confirmed that the FSL is 168.4m AHD but that the final FSL was still being optimised. <p>Actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Facilitator to provide electronic version of Newsletter 1 to FBA to distribute to their contacts. ■ Sunwater representative to provide feedback on possibility of power generation at next meeting.
<p>Next Meeting</p>	<p>Next meeting scheduled for week commencing 16 February 2009 subject to availability of draft ToR.</p> <p>Facilitator indicated that next meeting will look at draft ToR and that future meetings will present findings and discuss outcomes of specific EIS technical</p>



Connors River Dam and Pipelines Project

Agenda Item	Action/discussion
	studies. Members asked to notify facilitator if any EIS studies they would like further information on.