

Appendix E
Community Consultation Report



Cloncurry Copper Project

Community Consultation Summary Report

Prepared for:
Exco Resources Limited

September 2009



Document History and Status

Issue	Rev.	Issued To	Qty	Date	Reviewed	Approved
1	Draft	Exco Resources Ltd	1	08/09/09	P Jackson	A Pearce

Project Manager:	Andrew Pearce
Name of Client :	Exco Resources Limited
Name of Project:	Cloncurry Copper Project
Title of Document:	Community Consultation Summary Report
Document Version:	Draft

This controlled document is the property of AustralAsian Resource Consultants Pty Ltd and all rights are reserved in respect of it. This document may not be reproduced or disclosed in any manner whatsoever, in whole or in part, without the prior written consent of AustralAsian Resource Consultants Pty Ltd. AustralAsian Resource Consultants Pty Ltd expressly disclaims any responsibility for or liability arising from the use of this document by any third party.

Opinions and judgments expressed herein, which are based on our understanding and interpretation of current regulatory standards, should not be construed as legal opinions. Information obtained from interviews and contained in the documentation has been assumed to be correct and complete. AustralAsian Resource Consultants Pty Ltd does not accept any liability for misrepresentation of information or for items not visible, accessible, nor able to be inspected at the sites at the time of the site visits.



TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.0	INTRODUCTION	1
1.1	AIMS OF THE COMMUNITY CONSULTATION PROGRAM.....	1
1.2	SCOPE OF THE COMMUNITY CONSULTATION SUMMARY REPORT	1
2.0	METHODOLOGY	2
2.1	COMMUNITY CONSULTATION PROGRAM	3
2.2	INTERESTED AND AFFECTED PERSONS	3
2.2.1	Interested Persons	3
2.2.2	Affected Persons	4
2.3	KEY CONSULTATION AREAS	5
3.0	CONSULTATION OUTCOMES	6
3.1	IDENTIFIED STAKEHOLDERS	6
3.2	PUBLIC COMMENT ON DRAFT TOR	10
3.2.1	Government Departments and Advisory Bodies Comments	10
3.2.1.1	Community Consultation.....	11
3.2.1.2	Health and Safety	11
3.2.1.3	Social Impacts	11
3.2.1.4	Hazard and Risk	11
3.2.1.5	Transport	12
3.2.1.6	Groundwater	12
3.2.1.7	DERM	12
3.2.2	Community Groups and Landholder Comments.....	13
3.2.2.1	Water Resources	13
3.2.2.2	Transport	13
3.2.2.3	Air and Noise and Vibration	14
3.2.2.4	Infrastructure.....	14
3.2.2.5	General Comment	14
3.3	COMMUNITY CONSULTATION REGISTER	14
3.4	ONGOING COMMUNITY CONSULTATION	24
4.0	REFERENCES	25

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1	Interested Persons.....	6
Table 2	Affected Persons.	7
Table 3	Community Consultation Register.	15



LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

AARC	AustralAsian Resource Consultants Pty Ltd
AL Act	Aboriginal Land Act 1991
ATSIP	Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Partnerships (Mt. Isa)
DEEDI	Department of Employment, Economic Development and Innovation
DERM	Department of Environment and Resource Management
DIP	Department of Infrastructure and Planning
DOGIT	Deed of Grant InTrust
DTMR	Department of Transport and Main Roads
EHM	Ernest Henry Mine
EIS	Environmental Impact Statement
EM Plan	Environmental Management Plan
EP Act	Environmental Protection Act 1994
IAS	Initial Advice Statement
IRTM	Interactive Resource and Tenures Mapping
NC Act	Nature Conservation Act 1992
SIA	Social Impact Assessment
TOR	Terms of Reference
TSIL Act	Torres Strait Islander Land Act 1991

1.0 INTRODUCTION

This report provides a summary of the Community Consultation Program that was conducted during the period November 2007 to June 2009. The report provides a description of the consultation approach employed, together with the current outputs of the consultation process. This document constitutes an appendix to the Environmental Impact Statement for the Cloncurry Copper Project.

1.1 AIMS OF THE COMMUNITY CONSULTATION PROGRAM

The aims of the Community Consultation Program are as follows:

- Provide stakeholders with information on the Project, the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) process and the role of consultation / public comment in that process;
- Identify key concerns, community values and interests of stakeholders and advisory bodies with reference to impacts that the Project may have upon the environment;
- Work with stakeholders to develop control strategies for key concerns;
- Mitigate potential adverse effects of the Project, thereby providing confidence that the Project will be delivered in an environmentally responsible manner;
- Evaluate community acceptance of the Project;
- Capitalise on any positive opportunities that are identified during the Community Consultation Program.

1.2 SCOPE OF THE COMMUNITY CONSULTATION SUMMARY REPORT

The scope of the Community Consultation Summary Report is to describe the Community Consultation Program. The requirements of the Community Consultation Summary Report in the final Terms of Reference for the include:

- The nature and extent of the community consultation program is to be described and a summary of the results incorporated into the EIS;
- The summary Consultation Report should describe how 'interested' and 'affected persons', and any 'affected parties' were identified;
- The Consultation Report should summarise the results of the community consultation program, providing a summary of the groups and individuals consulted, the issues raised, and the means by which the issues were addressed;



2.0 METHODOLOGY

During preparation of the EIS a community consultation process was undertaken to allow the local community the opportunity to:

- Become fully informed of the Project status and the likely impacts of any development prior to approval;
- Express any concerns regarding current or planned Project activities and their environmental impacts;
- Discuss, review, and contribute to the formulation of the strategies proposed for the Project for mitigation of any potential adverse impacts that may arise.

The community consultation program adopted the following consultation methods as required by the *Environmental Protection Act 1994* (EP Act) and suggested in *Guideline 7 – Issue Identification and Community Consultation* (DERM 2005):

- Advertising the draft TOR in local and state media for the duration of the draft TOR comment period;
- Facilitating a public comment period for the draft TOR;
- Inviting comments and providing responses from the proponent;
- Mailing information direct to residents;
- Organising meetings and surveys with interested and affected persons;
- Presentations to gatherings of stakeholders and other interested groups;
- Landholder Agreements;
- Submission and advertising of the draft EIS;
- Facilitating a public comment period for the draft EIS;
- Managing responses to comments on the draft EIS and incorporation of these comments into the final EIS.

All correspondence with interested and affected persons was recorded in a Community Consultation Register detailed in Table 3 of this report.

Guideline 7 – Issue Identification and Community Consultation (DERM 2005) outlines how and why community consultation should be undertaken for mining activities. This report follows the recommendations set out in the guideline document where applicable.

This report has also drawn on information sourced from the Best Practice in Environmental Management Mining series, Community Consultation and Involvement (Commonwealth of Australia 1995). This booklet details principals and examples of what is considered “best practice” in community consultation in Australia.

2.1 COMMUNITY CONSULTATION PROGRAM

Below is the statement of planned community consultation with the interested and affected persons from section 1.5 of the TOR.

An appropriate public consultation program is essential to the impact statement. This section should outline the methodology that will be adopted to identify and mitigate socio-economic impacts of the project. Information about the consultation that has already taken place and the results of such consultation should be provided.

The submission of a list of affected persons and interested persons as well as a statement of how the proponent proposes to consult with those persons is a statutory requirement of the EIS process in the Environmental Protection Act 1994. Similar requirements, though non-statutory, are usually applied to EIS processes under other State legislation.

The community consultation program should be conducted in a manner consistent with the intent of the Guideline 7 Mining: Issue Identification and Community Consultation. The community consultation program should provide information to Interested and Affected Persons regarding the processes of the Project, environmental information, and how community feedback has / can be incorporated into the Project. Moreover, how on-going consultation and participation can occur through the assessment process and later operational phases should also be outlined.

Information collected from the community consultation program will be incorporated into Section 4.9 Social Impact. All participants in community consultation will be informed of this prior to commencement of consultation. The public consultation program should identify broad issues of concern to local community and interest groups and should continue from project planning through commissioning, project operation and final decommissioning.

2.2 INTERESTED AND AFFECTED PERSONS

2.2.1 Interested Persons

Section 41(3)(b) of the EP Act provides the following definition for interested persons –

Example of persons who may be proposed as an interested person—

an unincorporated community or environmental body with a financial or non-financial interest in the local government area that the operational land is in.

Ecoaccess Guideline 12 – *The EIS Process for Non-standard Mining Projects* states the following for interested persons:

*“At the beginning of the EIS process, the proponent may nominate those persons with an interest in the project (**interested persons**). Interested persons may include a local community progress association, a local/state/national environmental action group, or affected land users other than land holders.”*

Interested persons of the Project in the Cloncurry region have been identified by using local community directories, discussions with Cloncurry Shire Council and through other individuals, government bodies and organisations.

2.2.2 Affected Persons

Section 38 of the EP Act provides the following definition for affected persons –

1. A person is an **affected person** for a project if the person is—
 - (a) a person mentioned in subsection (2) for the operational land or any land joining it; or
 - (b) any of the following under the Native Title Act 1993 (Cth) for the operational land or for an area that includes any of the land—
 - (i) a registered native title body corporate;
 - (ii) a registered native title claimant;
 - (iii) a representative Aboriginal/Torres Strait Islander body; or
 - (c) a relevant local government for the operational land.
2. For subsection (1)(a), the persons are as follows—
 - (a) for freehold land—a registered proprietor;
 - (b) for land that is held from the State for an estate or interest less than fee simple and for which the interest is recorded in a register mentioned in the Land Act 1994 (Land Act), section 276—a person recorded in the register as the registered holder of the interest;
 - (c) for land subject to a mining claim, mineral development licence or mining lease—a holder of, or an applicant for, the tenement;
 - (d) for land subject to an authority to prospect or a lease or licence under the Petroleum Act 1923—
 - (ii) a holder of the authority; or
 - (iii) a lessee under the lease; or
 - (iv) a licensee under the licence;
 - (e) for land under the Land Act or the Nature Conservation Act 1992 (NC Act) for which there are trustees—a trustee of the land;
 - (f) for Aboriginal land under the Aboriginal Land Act 1991 (AL Act) that is taken to be a reserve because of section 87(2) or 87(4)(b) of that Act—a grantee of the land;
 - (g) for DOGIT land under the AL Act or the Torres Strait Islander Land Act 1991 (TSIL Act)—a trustee for the land;
 - (h) for land held under a lease under the Local Government (Aboriginal Lands) Act 1978, section 3 – a relevant local government;
 - (i) for Torres Strait Islander land under the TSIL Act that is taken to be a reserve because of section 84(2) or 84(4)(b) of that Act—a grantee of the land;
 - (j) for land under a lease from the State under the Aborigines and Torres Strait Islanders (Land Holding) Act 1985 that has been excised from land granted in trust for Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander purposes under the Land Act—a trustee of the land;
 - (k) for land that is any of the following, the State—
 - (i) unallocated State land;
 - (ii) a reserve under the Land Act for which there is no trustee;

- (iii) *a national park, national park (Aboriginal land), national park (scientific), national park (Torres Strait Islander land), national park (recovery) or forest reserve under the NC Act;*
 - (iv) *a conservation park under the NC Act for which there are no trustees;*
 - (v) *a State forest or timber reserve under the Forestry Act 1959;*
 - (vi) *a State controlled road under the Transport Infrastructure Act 1994;*
 - (vii) *a fish habitat area under the Fisheries Act 1994.*
- (l) *another person prescribed under a regulation.*

Affected persons were identified via the following information sources:

- Lot and Plan search via Interactive Resource and Tenures Mapping (IRTM) (Department of Employment, Economic Development and Innovation 2009 (DEEDI)) for contact details of other lease holders;
- Property Details Reports from the Department of Environment and Resource Management (DERM);
- Environmentally Sensitive Areas map request through DERM;
- Contacting the local council in the Local Government Area the Project is located in;
- Native Title Search via IRTM.

2.3 KEY CONSULTATION AREAS

The main avenues of communication which constitute the consultation register can be summarised as follows:

- **Formal EIS Process:** Outline, review and negotiations regarding the outcomes and objectives of the EIS through the process of drafting the TOR. This process involved considerable communication between the Proponent and the DERM to settle on the scope of the project and finalise the TOR;
- **Public Comment Period:** Public Comment period for the draft TOR involving advertisements in local and State media and information regarding the project sent to interested and affected persons. The results of this comment period are summarised in Table 3;
- **Landholder Meetings:** Meetings and correspondence to discuss the potential disturbance to the underlying properties, nuisance to landholders caused by project activities and potential environmental and social impacts caused by the Project that may affect the landholders;
- **Advisory Body Meetings:** Meetings with DERM, the Department of Communities, DIP and DEEDI, to discuss various aspects of the Project to ensure all relevant areas of communities consultation (where possible), were assessed by Exco;
- **Indigenous Cultural Heritage Meetings:** Meetings and correspondence with relevant cultural heritage parties about the development of a Cultural Heritage Management Plan and the various field work and assessments that have been undertaken throughout the Projects development. Also, negotiations with Mitakoodi Juhnjar Aboriginal Corporation with regards to Mitakoodi QC96/101 Native Title claims.

3.0 CONSULTATION OUTCOMES

The community consultation program began with the identification of stakeholders as detailed in Section 2.2. Initial community consultation was predominantly undertaken through the public notification process which involved advertisement of the Draft TOR and the public comment period. The results of the public comment period are described in Section 3.2 below. Following this public notification period, ongoing community consultation was conducted in the form of letters, emails and meetings with interested and affected people, and relevant advisory bodies. The results of this communication process are described in Section 3.3. Ongoing community consultation is to occur throughout the life of the Project and the process of mine decommissioning is referred to in Section 3.4.

3.1 IDENTIFIED STAKEHOLDERS

The interested persons identified during the community consultation process may include, but are not limited to, the groups listed in Table 1 below.

Table 1 Interested Persons.

Name of Interested Person or Organisation	Relationship to Project
Southern Gulf Catchments	Community-based natural-resource management group of the southern gulf catchments which includes the Project catchment area.
Ergon Energy	Power distributor for the Project.
CS Energy	Power supplier for the Project
Department of Environment and Resource Management (DERM) – Cloncurry Regional Office	Administers leases and natural resource planning
Department of Infrastructure and Planning (DIP)	Department responsible for infrastructure and regional development.
Department of Employment, Economic Development and Innovation (DEEDI) – Queensland Mines and Energy (QME)	Department responsible for mining approvals and tenures and energy development, as well as tourism and region development.
Department of Employment, Economic Development and Innovation – Tourism, Regional Development and Industry	Department responsible for tourism and region development.
Cloncurry Justice Association	Administers community strategies in Cloncurry



Name of Interested Person or Organisation	Relationship to Project
Department of Communities: Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Partnerships (Mt. Isa) (ATSIP)	Administers agreements and partnerships
Department of Communities: Community Capacity and Service Quality	Liaison with local Indigenous groups
Department of Transport and Main Roads (DTMR) North West District	Department responsible for roads, future roads and upgrades in the North West Region.
Queensland Transport	Department responsible for management of Queensland's transport system.
Sunwater	Possible supplier of water for the Project

The affected persons identified during the community consultation process may include, but are not limited to, the groups listed in **Error! Reference source not found.** below.

Table 2 Affected Persons.

Name of Affected Person or Organisation	Relationship to Project
PROPOSED MOUNT MARGARET AND MONAKOFF PROJECT AREAS	
Stanbroke Pastoral Company Pty Ltd	Holder of Lot 80 on SP112345
Andrew William Jesse; Samuel Donald James Daniels; Gabrielle Kennedy; and Others	Holder of Lot 2 on BD177 Holder of 2463 on PH760
Tennant Limited, by agreement 100% of the rights, title and interest is to be transferred to Exco Resources Limited	Holder of Lot 15 on BD15
Mitakoodi People	Native Title Claimants over the Project area. Claim Number: QC96/101.
Queensland South Native Title Services	Aboriginal Representative group for the Mitakoodi People.
Exco Resources (Queensland) Pty Ltd, a 100% subsidiary of Exco Resources Limited	Holder of EPM 7085

Name of Affected Person or Organisation	Relationship to Project
Eliza Creek Mines Ltd, a 100% subsidiary of Exco Resources Limited	Holder of EPM 8609 and ML 90157
Tennant Limited -,by agreement, 100% of the rights, title and interest is to be transferred to Exco Resources Limited	Holder of ML 7122
Cloncurry Shire Council	Local government in jurisdiction over the Project area
PROPOSED POWERLINE EXTENSION AND HAUL ROAD TO EHM	
Stanbroke Pastoral Company Pty Ltd	Holder of Lot 80 on SP112345 And easement ACP911419
Eliza Creek Mines Ltd, a 100% subsidiary of Exco Resources Limited	Holder of EPM 8609 ML 90157
Equinox Resources Limited	Holder of EPM 15004
Mount Isa Mines Limited	Holder of EPM 8648
Ernest Henry Mining Pty Ltd	Holder of ML 90107, ML 90116, ML 90085 and Holder of Lot 100 on SP108163
PROPOSED WATER PIPELINE AND WATER STORAGE	
Stanbroke Pastoral Company Pty Ltd	Holder of Lot 80 on SP112345 And easement ACP911419
Ernest Henry Mining Pty Ltd	Holder of Lot 100 on SP108163,ML 90058 and ML 90100
Eliza Creek Mines Ltd, a 100% subsidiary of Exco Resources Limited	Holder of EPM 8609
Equinox Resources Limited	Holder of EPM 15004
Mount Isa Mines Limited	Holder of EPM 8648
MOUNT MARGARET MAIN ACCESS ROAD	
Stanbroke Pastoral Company Pty Ltd	Holder of Lot 80 on SP112345

Name of Affected Person or Organisation	Relationship to Project
Ernest Henry Mining Pty Ltd	Holder of Lot 100 on SP108163
Equinox Resources Limited	Holder of EPM 15004
Eliza Creek Mines Ltd, a 100% subsidiary of Exco Resources Limited	Holder of EPM 8609
Mount Isa Mines Limited	Holder of EPM 8648
MONAKOFF EXISTING TRACK UPGRADE	
Helen Margaret Monize	Holder of Lot 4105 on Ph2186 Holder of Lot 2482 on PH2047
Andrew William Jesse; Samuel Donald James Daniels; Gabrielle Kennedy; and Others	Holder of Lot 2 on BD177 Holder of 2463 on PH760
BHP Billiton Minerals Pty Ltd	Holder of EPM1 1675
Exco Resources (Queensland) Pty Ltd, a 100% subsidiary of Exco Resources Limited	Holder of EPM 7085
Tennant Limited, by agreement 100% of the rights, title and interest is to be transferred to Exco Resources Limited	Holder of ML 7122
PROPOSED HAUL ROAD LINKING MOUNT MARGARET AND MONAKOFF	
Stanbroke Pastoral Company Pty Ltd	Holder of Lot 80 on SP112345
Andrew William Jesse; Samuel Donald James Daniels; Gabrielle Kennedy; and Others	Holder of Lot 2 on BD177 Holder of 2463 on PH760 Holder of Lot 1 on BD103
Tennant Limited, by agreement 100% of the rights, title and interest is to be transferred to Exco Resources Limited	Holder of Lot 15 on BD15
Teck Cominco Australia Pty Ltd	Holder of EPM 16631
Equinox Resources Limited	Holder of EPM 15004

Name of Affected Person or Organisation	Relationship to Project
Eliza Creek Mines Ltd, a 100% subsidiary of Exco Resources Limited	Holder of EPM 8609
Exco Resources (Queensland) Pty Ltd, a 100% subsidiary of Exco Resources Limited	Holder of EPM 7051 and EPM 7085
ACCOMMODATION CAMP	
Stanbroke Pastoral Company Pty Ltd	Holder of Lot 80 on SP112345
Ernest Henry Mining Pty Ltd	Holder of Lot 101 on SP135875 and Lot D CP911422
Eliza Creek Mines Ltd, a 100% subsidiary of Exco Resources Limited	Holder of EPM 8609
Teck Cominco Australia Pty Ltd	Holder of EPM 16631

3.2 PUBLIC COMMENT ON DRAFT TOR

A TOR Notice was advertised in the Mount Isa North-West Star and the Brisbane Courier Mail on the 9th and 11th of August 2008. The Notice stated details of the Project and invited written comments on the Draft TOR from any person during the comment period (11th August to 23rd September, 2008). Exco sent copies of the Notice to all Interested and Affected Persons at the start of the comment period. Copies of the Draft TOR could be obtained from several locations, as stated in the TOR Notice.

The DERM sent copies of the TOR Notice, Draft TOR, and the Initial Advice Statement to all parties identified as advisory bodies at the commencement of the Comment Period. The advisory bodies were also invited to comment on the Draft TOR.

In total, 12 separate submissions were received from advisory bodies, stakeholders and affected and interested Persons. Following closure of the comments period the Draft TOR comments were provided to Exco by the DERM. Exco prepared a written summary of the comments, responses to the comments, and amended the draft TOR as a result of the comments received. Responses to stakeholder comments were provided to the stakeholders and in many cases discussed with stakeholders during follow-up meetings or discussions.

3.2.1 Government Departments and Advisory Bodies Comments

Government departments and advisory bodies that were requested to make comments on the Draft TOR included Cloncurry Shire Council, Department of Communities, Queensland Health, Department of Infrastructure and Planning – Northern Region Planning Group, Department of Infrastructure and Planning – Significant Projects, Department of Community Safety – Strategic Policy and Executive Services, Department of Transport and Main Roads, Department of Employment, Economic Development and Innovation, Department of Environment and Resource Management and the Queensland Police Service.



Of these bodies, the Cloncurry Shire Council, the two divisions of the Department of Infrastructure and Planning, the Department of Employment, Economic Development and Innovation (formerly the Department of Mines and Energy), and the Queensland Police Service had comments of “no change required to the TOR”.

3.2.1.1 Community Consultation

Comments produced by the Department of Communities focussed on the community consultation program. In particular, they requested that the community consultation program and Social Impact Assessment (SIA) be more clearly defined (especially in regards to Aboriginal Traditional Owners), with an emphasis of undertaking these in a manner consistent with the *EcoAccess Guideline 7 Mining: Issue identification and Community Consultation*.

3.2.1.2 Health and Safety

Queensland Health commented on the potential for the tailings and stormwater dams to allow for mosquitoes to breed, and asked how this was going to be considered during the EIS. This issue is covered adequately in the appropriate sections of the TOR, and as such, no changes were made to the TOR.

Queensland Health commented on the need for the testing and treatment regime for bore water to be documented and that reference should be made to the *Australian Drinking Water Guidelines* for potable water. These comments were incorporated into the TOR in Section 3.5.3.

Further comments by Queensland Health included the consideration of access to health care and emergency services, and food safety. However, these issues are outside of the scope of works for the EIS, and no changes were made to the TOR in response to these comments.

3.2.1.3 Social Impacts

Comments provided by the Department of Communities (formerly the Department of Housing) concerned the workforce, in particular the size of the workforce over different stages of operation, what percentage of the workforce would be sourced and housed locally, the opportunity for local training and apprenticeships, transport methods to and from the Project site, and associated impacts for these aspects. The TOR adequately covered aspects related to workforce numbers, training and apprenticeships, accommodation, the potential for local recruitment, and social impacts. Changes to the TOR were made to address the comments regarding employee source communities, and method of transportation of employees to and from site.

The Department of Community Safety (formerly the Department of Emergency Services) commented that the proponent should undertake an assessment of the impacts of the Project on delivery of fire, ambulance, and counter disaster services, in consultation with relevant State authorities, and that any issues identified should be incorporated into the Environmental Management Plan (EM Plan). This is covered under Section 4.9.1, and no changes were made to the TOR.

3.2.1.4 Hazard and Risk

The Department of Community Safety commented that identification of hazardous materials associated with the Project should be included, and that the Project should be assessed against the Dangerous Goods Safety Management Act 2001 and the Australian Dangerous Goods Code, however as this is a legislative requirement, and already covered under Section 4.12.2 of the TOR, the comments were not incorporated into the TOR.



The Department of Community Safety also commented that an investigation into the impacts of flooding, bushfire, and landslip should be incorporated into the EIS, and that any mitigation strategies incorporated into the EM Plan as a result of these investigations should meet the specified outcomes of the State Planning Policy 1/03. The TOR was amended to reflect the incorporation of the State Planning Policy.

Further, the Department of Emergency Services requested that a hazard and risk assessment be included in the EIS. However, Section 4.12.2 of the TOR adequately covers the assessment of risks, and as such no changes were made to the TOR.

3.2.1.5 Transport

The Department of Community Safety commented that the impacts of traffic and transport safety should be investigated. This is covered adequately under Section 4.2.2.9 of the TOR, and therefore no changes were made.

The Department of Transport and Main Roads (formerly the Department of Main Roads) comments referred to detailing new or alterations to road infrastructure as a result of the Project (public roads, realignments, upgrades, bridges, etc), detailing of any proposed future infrastructure provisions identified by the Queensland Government related to the Project, details of spill management plans, provision of a road impact assessment and detailing of associated mitigation measures in a road use management plan.

The appropriate changes were made to the TOR to reflect these comments, however, details of future proposed infrastructure provisions identified by the Queensland Government are not within the scope of the EIS, and as such this was not included into the TOR. In addition, the road use management plan is not believed to be required for inclusion in the EIS, as it is not related to the environmental values or impacts of the Project.

3.2.1.6 Groundwater

The Department of Transport and Main Roads requested that the EIS describe the impact of the Project's water use on commercial and private users. Section 4.4.2 covers the impact assessment of both groundwater and surface water, and the extent to which any impact will occur. No changes were made in the TOR as a result.

3.2.1.7 DERM

The DERM (formerly the Queensland Environmental Protection Agency(QEPA)) made numerous comments on the Draft TOR. These comments were wide ranging and predominantly pertained to the scope and depth of reporting of the EIS. The issues raised fell into various categories, which are summarised in the dot points below. In the majority of cases, the TOR was amended to change terminology, or add further description and depth to the studies.

- EM Plan
- Resource Base and Life of Mine
- Description of the Project
- Project Justification
- Environmental Values



- Impacts and Mitigation Measures
- Surface Water
- Air
- Erosion and Stability
- Cultural Heritage
- Land Disturbance
- Terrestrial Flora
- Rehabilitation and Decommissioning
- Tailings
- Waste Management
- Accommodation
- Sewage
- Stormwater Drainage
- Groundwater
- Water Supply and Storage

3.2.2 Community Groups and Landholder Comments

Xstrata Copper's Ernest Henry Mine (EHM) made several comments, as summarised below:

3.2.2.1 Water Resources

EHM requested that the currently approved EHM impacts on long-term groundwater drawdown be utilised during groundwater modelling, that land holders with potentially affected ground water bores be added to the list of Affected and / or Interested Persons, and that the sustainable long-term use of Lake Julius as a water source for the proposed Project be assessed, taking into consideration the currently approved allocations of EHM and Mount Isa Mines. It was believed that the TOR adequately covered these aspects, and no changes were made to the TOR.

3.2.2.2 Transport

EHM expressed concern that the proposal did not specify the proposed concentrate haulage routes, and the need for the cumulative impacts of increased traffic movements on Zingari Road and through Cloncurry (if applicable) to be assessed. As the haulage route options were fully described in the Initial Advice Statement, and Sections 3.5.1 and 4.2.2.9 require a complete and comprehensive assessment of traffic movements on all affected roads, no changes to the TOR were found to be necessary.

3.2.2.3 Air and Noise and Vibration

EHM expressed concern that as no air quality modelling or noise / vibration assessment is proposed for the Mount Margaret operations, potential air quality and noise / vibration impacts at the existing EHM village would not be assessed. They proposed that a noise assessment of the cumulative impacts of the proposed Project at the EHM village be required, with acceptable day-time noise levels to be the same as per the night-time levels, thereby accounting for night-shift workers at the EHM village. However, as Sections 3.1.1, 4.5 and 4.6 require a complete and comprehensive assessment of baseline levels, and monitoring, of air, noise and vibration, and discussions between EHM and the proponent have led to an agreement being made that EHM's air, noise and vibration data will be used in the modelling / assessment stages for the Project, it is believed that all cumulative impacts will be considered in the EIS, and no changes were necessary to the TOR.

3.2.2.4 Infrastructure

EHM questioned the assumptions of Exco utilising infrastructure currently used by and / or owned by EHM, such as the electricity transmission line, the Lake Julius Pipeline, and Zingari Road. Exco accepts that an open dialog between them and EHM is essential for future collaborations and in the event of shared facilities. No changes were necessary to the TOR.

3.2.2.5 General Comment

EHM expressed concern that the TOR does not specify that the EIS would assess the cumulative impacts of the Project together with the currently approved environmental impacts of EHM. It is believed that these concerns have been adequately addressed above, and no changes were made to the TOR.

3.3 COMMUNITY CONSULTATION REGISTER

The aim of the Consultation Register is to demonstrate to the DERM and advisory bodies that the consultation process was effective and that feedback from consultation influenced the final Project design. The Consultation Register, which identifies the methods of communication, issues discussed, and ways in which the issues were addressed is presented in Table 3 below.

Table 3 Community Consultation Register.

Date	Method of Communication	Brief Description of Consultation	Stakeholder Name	Relationship to the Project	Issues Discussed and Actions Taken	Further Actions Required
November 2007	Presentation	Pre-Design Conference	Department of Environment and Resource Management (DERM)	Department responsible for assessing the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) and Environmental Approvals	- A presentation was given to DERM to introduce the Project and gauge early opinions and advice on the Project and the approval process to be taken.	
17/04/2008	Face to face meeting	Project Briefing	Helen Monize	Landholder – Fisher Creek Station	- General briefing on Exco activities and Cloncurry Copper Project	
			Bruce McLarty Phillip Lefanu	Exco		
17/04/2008	Face to face meeting	Project Briefing	Jack Morris + 1	Stanbroke Pastoral (Fort Constantine)	- Briefing Stanbroke on the Cloncurry Copper Project	
			Bruce McLarty Phillip Lefanu	Exco		
18/04/2008	Face to face meeting	Project Briefing	Pearl Connelly Christine Parter Donna Parter Gordon Connelly	Mitakoodi	- Project Update	
			Bruce McLarty Phillip Lefanu	Exco		
7/05/2008	Face to face meeting	Indigenous consultation	Pearl Connelly	Mitakoodi	- Provision of Community Benefits	
			Bruce McLarty	Exco		

Date	Method of Communication	Brief Description of Consultation	Stakeholder Name	Relationship to the Project	Issues Discussed and Actions Taken	Further Actions Required
11/6/2008	Face to face meeting	Project Briefing	Louise Karle	DERM – Mt Isa	- Project briefing	
			Bruce McLarty	Exco Resources		
			Andrew Pearce	AARC		
12/06/2008	Face to face meeting	Project Briefing	Andrew Daniels and Craig Turnour	Cloncurry Shire	- Briefing Cloncurry Shire on the project's status	
			Michael Anderson Bruce McLarty	Exco		
07/07/2008	Documents and Letters	Document Submission – Initial Advice Statement, Application to Prepare a Voluntary EIS, and Draft TOR to the DERM for assessment	DERM	Department responsible for assessing the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) and Environmental Approvals	- A letter from AARC, and an Initial Advice Statement (IAS), was sent to DERM to support Exco's application to prepare a voluntary EIS.	
09/08/2008	Newspaper Advertisement	Public Notice of Draft TOR for the EIS advertised in the Brisbane Courier Mail and the Mount Isa North-West Star	General Public	Persons or parties that may be affected by the development of the Project.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Public Notice advertised a brief description, and the Lot and Plans that the Project is proposed to be located on. The Notice stated that the Draft TOR and the IAS had been prepared for the Project and where copies of these documents could be obtained. - The Notice provided contact details for further information on the Project and invited public comment on the Draft TOR during the comment period, which commenced on the 11th of August 2008 and closed on the 23rd of September 2008. 	



Date	Method of Communication	Brief Description of Consultation	Stakeholder Name	Relationship to the Project	Issues Discussed and Actions Taken	Further Actions Required
14/08/2008	Documents and Letters	Letter from Exco, the Draft TOR Notice, IAS, and Draft TOR were sent to all identified Affected and Interested Persons	All Affected and Interested persons as described in the Initial Advice Statement	Persons or parties that may be affected by the development of the Project.	- A letter from Exco, the Draft TOR Notice, IAS, and Draft TOR were sent to all identified Affected and Interested Persons	
16/09/2008	Face to face meeting	Project Briefing	Rachel Harcock Brian Burkett	Department of Communities	- Briefing Department of Communities on Cloncurry Copper Project	
			Bruce McLarty	Exco		
17/09/2008	Face to face Meeting	Project Briefing	Helen Monize	Landholder – Fisher Creek Station	- Update on project Status	
			Bruce Mc Larty Phillip Lefanu	Exco		
07/10/2008	Documents	DERM provided Exco and AARC with copies of comments from public comment period on Draft TOR	DERM, Advisory Bodies, and general public	Departments responsible for assessing the EIS and negotiating a suitable Terms of Reference (TOR) and general public that may be affected by the development of the project.	- A total of 12 submissions were received on the Draft TOR by the DERM. Of these submissions, all but one were government Advisory Bodies. The other was from Ernest Henry Mines (EHM).	
12/11/2008	Documents	AARC sent document responding to the Draft TOR comments and proposed changes to the DERM as requested	DERM	Departments responsible for assessing the EIS and negotiating a suitable Terms of Reference (TOR)	- Changes made to draft TOR as required	



Date	Method of Communication	Brief Description of Consultation	Stakeholder Name	Relationship to the Project	Issues Discussed and Actions Taken	Further Actions Required
15/12/2008	Letter and Document	Received Final TOR document from DERM	DERM	Departments responsible for assessing the EIS and negotiating a suitable Terms of Reference (TOR)	- A letter and the Final TOR were received from DERM. The letter stated that the EIS had two years from the date of the Final TOR to be completed and submitted to DERM as a draft.	
20/12/2008	Newspaper Advertisement	Public Notice of Final TOR for the Cloncurry Copper Project advertised in the Courier Mail and North Western Papers	General Public	Persons or parties that may be affected by the development of the Project.	- Public notice stated that in accordance with Section 46 of the EP Act, the DERM has finalized the TOR for the EIS for the Project. The Public Notice also stated that the final TOR is available on the DERM's website or by contacting the EIS coordinator.	
09/02/2009	Letter	Letter sent to Advisory bodies identified in the Social Impact Section of the Final TOR, and relevant landholders, to gauge expressions of interest for participation in community consultation regarding the social impact of the Project.	Department of Infrastructure and Planning (DIP), Department of Employment, Economic Development and Innovation (DEEDI), Department of Communities, Queensland Health, Department of Education and Training, Cloncurry Shire Council, and Landholders	Departments that can offer advice on the social capacity and infrastructure in the region of the Project, and people that may be affected by social impact of the project.	- Letter offered opportunities to participate in consultation on the social impact of the Project.	
13/03/2009	Face to face meeting	Indigenous consultation	Pearl Connelly Christine Parter	Mitakoodi	- Review of Native Title and Work Clearance Reports	
			Rodd Boston	Exco		

Date	Method of Communication	Brief Description of Consultation	Stakeholder Name	Relationship to the Project	Issues Discussed and Actions Taken	Further Actions Required
16/03/2009	Face to face meeting	Social Impact Assessment requirements for EIS Groundwater approvals	Dean Ellwood Phil Dash Freya Walton Kate Gubesh Graham Locke	DIP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - DIP provided the 'Sustainable Resource Communities Policy' - Discussed that Social Impact Assessment was to be undertaken according to the Policy - Discussed that the Policy was draft at this stage and AARC questioned the need for compliance with the Policy given it is out for comment - DIP seek a Social Management Plan from the SIA - Previous SIAs format no longer acceptable - DIP perceive that groundwater will be an issue with landholders - Discussion of groundwater extraction and approval pathways for a non-State Significant project - Contact NRW for all options for water extraction approval for non-State Significant projects 	
			Bill Dixon Steven Tarte Stuart Cameron	DERM		
			Bill Hastie	DEEDI		
			Geoff Laing Bruce McLarty Michael Anderson	Exco		
			Andrew Pearce	AARC		
16/03/2009	Face to face meeting	Groundwater	Bill Legg	DERM	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - DERM was asked to comment of findings of groundwater report by AGE but not yet completed review. DERM suggested that AGE groundwater report be externally peer reviewed and Exco agreed to this. - Discussion of approvals for extraction of GAB during dewatering pit - Interaction is required between DIP and NRW to licence extraction of GAB water - NRW suggested the DIP should be able to declare the project regionally significant - NRW concerned about effects continuing for 20-25 years beyond life of mine until pit water levels stabilise 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - DIP, DERM, and Exco to resolve in additional meetings
			Errol Briese Andrew Durrick Duncan Irvine	AGE		
			Geoff Laing Bruce McLarty Michael Anderson Mike Dunbar	Exco		
			Andrew Pearce	AARC		



Date	Method of Communication	Brief Description of Consultation	Stakeholder Name	Relationship to the Project	Issues Discussed and Actions Taken	Further Actions Required
17/03/2009	Face to face meeting	Project Briefing	Tony McCormack John O'Kane	Stanbroke Pastoral Company – Fort Constantine	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - SPC expressed interest in groundwater drawdown especially the permanent drawdown of the aquifer by the pit - BMcL (Exco) offered that Exco would be happy to allow SPC access to land on the ML that will not be disturbed by mining - SPC would like to see copies of the baseline studies that are part of the EIS 	
			Geoff Laing Michael Anderson Bruce McLarty	Exco		
17/03/2009	Face to face meeting	Community impacts that need to be considered in SIA	Nikki Row	Department of Communities – Mt Isa	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - DC questioned Exco's thoughts on local recruitment. BMcL (Exco) indicated that project would take as many appropriately qualified local people as possible - DC highlighted training requirement of indigenous employment - BMcL (Exco) indicated that project would modestly employ indigenous persons - DC indicated that rising housing costs lead to homelessness, domestic violence and crime - BMcL (Exco) indicated that impacts on housing will depend on balance between FIFO/residents – present scenario has employees at camp and management in town - DC asked about health/medical services onsite. - GL (Exco) indicated that project would have a combination of onsite nurses and government health service. One trained nurse would be located on site and additional services would rely on government. - DC questioned community contribution – cited Xstrata as an example - MA (Exco) indicated that community contribution will be made including children's rugby tours and swimming carnivals. These are already being done. 	
			Geoff Laing Bruce McLarty Michael Anderson	Exco		
			Andrew Pearce	AARC		



Date	Method of Communication	Brief Description of Consultation	Stakeholder Name	Relationship to the Project	Issues Discussed and Actions Taken	Further Actions Required
17/03/2009	Face to face meeting	Indigenous consultation	Christine Parter Pearl Connelly	Mitakoodi	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Letter provided to Ms Connelly by Exco detailing the intended development of a Cultural Heritage Management Plan for the Project. Letter included a brief project description and provided Exco's contact details. Letter also gave notice of that if any Aboriginal party wished to take part in the development of the CHMP, written notice would be required by 17th April 2009. - Regular project status updates provided to Mitakoodi people - Provide Mitakoodi people with copy of Flora and Fauna report for review 	
			Michael Anderson Geoff Laing Bruce McLarty	Exco		
18/03/2009	Face to face meeting	Council issues including employment, transport and maintenance	Andrew Daniels Craig Turner	Cloncurry Shire Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - AD sought that Exco approach QANTAS to get flights to Cloncurry (2 per week). Council is approaching QANTAS and would like support. - AD indicated that he hopes employees could be found locally. - AD questioned mining company employee salaries - BMcL (Exco) outlined that Exco must be competitive in salaries offered - BMcL raised the issue of grading the Council road at Fisher Ck. - AD said he will only do graziers roads twice a year and it is up to the exploration companies to fix the roads for the grazier. - Agreed that compensation agreements would be required for contributions to road maintenance 	
			Geoff Laing Bruce McLarty Michael Anderson	Exco		
			Andrew Pearce	AARC		
18/03/2009	Face to face meeting	Landholder issues including dust	Andrew Daniels	Landholder (Ilkley, Drybrough, Mapperley Park)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - AD raised a minor concern about the dust from road between Monakoff and Mt Margaret 	
			Geoff Laing Bruce McLarty Michael Anderson	Exco		



Date	Method of Communication	Brief Description of Consultation	Stakeholder Name	Relationship to the Project	Issues Discussed and Actions Taken	Further Actions Required
			Andrew Pearce	AARC		
18/03/2009	Face to face meeting	Ernest Henry	Jules Blunt Clay Taylor Community Affairs person from EHM.	Ernest Henry Mine	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - EHM are provided regular updates - An update of progress of EIS was provided to EHM - EHM raised doubts about the findings of the groundwater report that indicated that the resource is compartmentalised 	
			Geoff Laing Michael Anderson Bruce McLarty	Exco		
18/03/2009	Letter	Aboriginal Cultural Heritage	Pearl Connelly	Mitakoodi and Mayi Peoples Pty Ltd.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Letter in response to the written notice to the Mitakoodi Peoples, informing that Mitakoodi and Mayi Peoples Pty Ltd is the registered Aboriginal cultural heritage body for the Project area 	All correspondence for the Cultural Heritage Management Plan is to go to Ms Connelly
18/03/2009	Face to face meeting	Project Briefing	Helen Monize	Landholder – Fisher Creek Station	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Update on Project 	
			Geoff Laing Michael Anderson Bruce McLarty	Exco		
7/04/2009	Face to face meeting	Follow up relating to social impact assessment procedures	Freya Walton Kate Gubesh	Department of Infrastructure and Planning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Social Impact Methodology 	
25/04/2009	Face to face meeting	Road Impact	Dev Ghosh	Department of Transport and Main Roads (DTMR)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A meeting was held in the Cloncurry office of the DTMR outlining the scope of the road impact assessment and the likely transport routes to be used by Exco. 	Mr Dev Ghosh requested that a letter be sent to the District Director Mr Peter Trim formally outlining the project scope and detailing the data requested. The letter, project outline and proposal for the requirements of the RIA

Date	Method of Communication	Brief Description of Consultation	Stakeholder Name	Relationship to the Project	Issues Discussed and Actions Taken	Further Actions Required
			Rodger Bonney	AARC		was sent to the DTMR on the 3rd May and a reply containing the requested data was received on the 7th May 2009.
25/04/2009	Face to face meeting	Road Impact	Ted Herson	Ernest Henry Mining	- A meeting was held to discuss the scope of Exco's road impact assessment. Data on Ernest Henry's existing traffic route and number of truck and trips per day was requested.	
25/04/2009	Face to face meeting	Road Impact	Ernst Woodfield	International Energy services / Kiernans Transport (Rail head being considered for transport of concentrate)	- A meeting was held to discuss the scope of Exco's road impact assessment. Data on traffic generated by Ernest Henry and traffic generated by quarry materials such as concrete being trucked was requested.	
25/04/2009	Face to face meeting	Road Impact	Tom Arnold	Cloncurry Shire Council	- A meeting was held in Cloncurry outlining the scope of the road impact assessment and the likely transport routes to be used by Exco. An information request was made to procure information on traffic movements on some of the proposed routes controlled by the council.	It was requested that a formal data request letter be sent to the council.
			Rodger Bonney	AARC		
26/04/2009	Face to face meeting	Road Impact	Owen Laffite	Department of Transport and Main Roads	- A meeting was held in Cloncurry outlining the scope of the road impact assessment and the likely transport routes to be used by Exco. The most appropriate heavy vehicle route was discussed.	
			Rodger Bonney	AARC		
05/06/2009	Letter	Information Request	Landholders – Daniels, Helen Monize, and Stanbroke Pastoral Company.	Landholders underlying the Project boundaries	- Letter from Exco requesting information on the numbers of employees on pastoral properties for inclusion in the Social Impact Assessment and EIS.	



3.4 ONGOING COMMUNITY CONSULTATION

After the close of the draft EIS submission period, public comments will be forwarded to Exco by DERM. Exco in collaboration with AARC will formulate a written summary of the comments, responses to the comments, and amend the EIS as a result of the comments received. Responses to the submission comments will be provided to and discussed with the stakeholders during follow up meetings and / or discussions.

The consultation process will be more intensive during the feasibility and impact assessment phase, however, it is important to maintain consultation with the local community after the commencement of mining. This approach to community consultation is in accordance with the QEPA *Guideline 7 – Issue Identification and Community Consultation*.

Exco will continue ongoing consultation with stakeholders at key stages of the project life where there is any significant progress or change in Project activities.

Exco will use the following methods to maintain contact with the local community throughout the life of the Project:

- Creating a contact telephone number for inquiries and complaints;
- Communicating with stakeholders throughout the life of the project via site visits, mine open days, regular meetings of the community discussion group and newsletters;
- Annual sustainability reporting undertaken by independent consultants to gauge the mine's reputation amongst the community and community satisfaction with consultation methods;
- Consulting with the community closer to the closure and decommissioning of the mine concerning requirements for mine closure, potential land uses and post mining monitoring;
- Feedback from the consultation process will continue to be entered into the consultation register. Issues raised through EIS submissions will be addressed by amending the EIS and / or Project plans required and / or through consultation;
- After the EIS has been approved and the Project is commissioned, feedback from the consultation will be undertaken as outlined above. The relevant Project team member will review the feedback that has been entered into the consultation register for action and implementation of appropriate mitigation strategies where required. This process will ensure that mitigation strategies are developed for the potential adverse environmental and socio-economic impacts that have been identified through consultation.

In particular, close consultation will be maintained with the landholder located within the southern MLA, because this landholder will be significantly affected during various stages of mine development. Information regarding the progress of mine sequencing, should always be provided to this land holder.

Ongoing monitoring of the local environment is likely to be a requirement in the EA conditions for the Project. Results of regular monitoring events should be made available to interested and affected persons when requested.



4.0 REFERENCES

Commonwealth of Australia (1995). *Best Practice in Environmental Management Mining Series, Community Consultation and Involvement*.

Department of Employment, Economic Development and Innovation (2009) *Interactive Resource and Tenures Mapping (IRTM)*.

National Health and Medical Research Council / Natural Resource Management Ministerial Council (2004). *Australian Drinking Water Guidelines*.

DERM (2005). *Guideline 7 – Issue Identification and Community Consultation*. Ecoaccess, Brisbane.

DERM (2003). *Guideline 12 – The EIS Process for Non-standard Mining Projects*. Ecoaccess. Brisbane.