

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• KCCG advised that they were keen to talk to Proponent and interested in being involved in the development of the project and the draft EIS.</li> <li>• KCCG were concerned about the lack of consultation in the past</li> <li>• ST advised that they had agreed to assist the KCCG to understand the EIS process and interpret the technical reports that were provided by the proponent. This did not include value judgements on any specific technical project matter.</li> <li>• KB confirmed that proponents should be informing the Kingaroy community about the impacts and how they are going to mitigate those impacts. KB reiterated that the CG has stated that he would like to see a good robust social assessment process.</li> <li>• The RPI Act was discussed and KCCG raised concerns that the proponent may not be talking to the Department that administers this act.</li> <li>• KB confirmed that they had agreed to keep the proponent informed of the concerns raised by the KCCG in the future.</li> <li>• KB confirmed that he had received the Consultation and Engagement Plan and had both positive and negative feedback about the plan. KB agreed to provide more comprehensive written feedback on the plan soon.</li> <li>• KB was concerned that the plan did not have any specific strategies or timeframes on how the Proponent was going to address community concerns or to engage with the community to alleviate those concerns. KB also highlighted the need to engage with the broader community including the KCCG.</li> <li>• KB advised that the outcomes of previous engagement should be included and those outcomes should inform the development of strategies to afford community members the opportunity to engage with the proponent.</li> <li>• KB advised that KCCG had submitted a 128 page submission on the draft ToR setting out their issues and concerns about the project and that the proponent needs to deal with those issues through their consultation, collaboration and engagement processes.</li> <li>• JE advised that they were not prepared to empower KCCG over other community groups and that they would all be treated the same.</li> <li>• OCG agrees that the KCCG should be treated consistently with all other community members or groups. In particular, each community member or group should be afforded the opportunity to engage with the proponent.</li> </ul>	<p>ACTION: OCG to provide feedback on C&amp;E Plan</p>
4.	<p><b>TAG Meetings</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PB discussed the Technical Advisory Group meetings (TAG). TAG's to be set up to assist the proponent and</li> </ul>	<p>ACTION: Proponent to advise OCG which departments/issues required to</p>

	<p>relevant agencies to meet and understand the technical concerns of the project e.g. DEHP, DAFF, Social and Economic issues – DET. OCG would coordinate the TAG meetings.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>KB advised that the introduction of the Social Impact Assessment Cross Agency Reference group will be implemented following the introduction of the Strong and Sustainable Resource Communities Bill in April/May. The South Burnett Coal Project will therefore be subject to this reference group as part of the Review and Assessment of the EIS.</li> </ul>	<p>be resolved/informed to ensure the EIS meets the TOR.</p> <p>ACTION: OCG To keep proponent up to date on progress of the development of the SIACAR Group implementation.</p>
5.	<p><b>IESC request for advice</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>PB discussed the Independent Expert Scientific Committee (IESC) a commonwealth government initiative set up to assess the impacts of coal seam gas large coal mines on Australia's water resources.</li> <li>The committee meets 10 times a year and there is a lead in time of 6 weeks for every meeting, therefore a report to the Committee will need to be prepared six weeks before the next committee meeting.</li> <li>PB stated that OCG would set up a meeting with the commonwealth as required.</li> </ul>	<p>ACTION: Proponent to advise if meeting is required.</p>
6.	<p><b>Other Issues</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ST offered to organise a meeting with the Commonwealth Department for the Environment and Energy to clarify the EPBC requirements for the project. Liz McMillan would be the contact and is based in Brisbane.</li> <li>Agenda item for next meeting – Discuss Consultation and Engagement Plan.</li> <li>PB advised that a State Development Area (SDA) had been set up for the Bundaberg region.</li> <li>Proponent advised that Capex for the project could change significant from what was originally advised. This is in line with ASX. ST advised that formal advice would be required for any change in CAPEX (or other publically available information on the project to ensure consistency).</li> </ul>	<p>ACTION: Proponent to advise of timing for EPBC meeting.</p> <p>ACTION: OCG to advise Proponent of the contact details for the SDA Bundaberg region</p>

Meeting Closed	12:15pm
Next meeting	TBC

The distribution of this document, in whole or part, to individuals or entities for purposes other than internal departmental purposes, is prohibited. Any unauthorised distribution of this document may be a breach of copyright and/or a contravention of the department's Code of Conduct.