

Hillside Community Voice Minutes

13 July 2015

Facilitator	K Van Schaik
HCV Attendees	J Sandercock (Ardrossan PA), P Maguire (James Well/Rogues Point PA), J Buchanan (YP Tourism & RDA), P Klopp (Ag Bureau, South Kilkerran), D Kluske (Local Trader), B Sleath (Pine Point PA), Petersville), D Hosking (Community Member), E Dearlove (Rex Minerals), Stewart Lodge (Ag Bureau, Petersville), L Kakoschke (Ag Bureau, South Kilkerran), G Mattchoss (Black Point PA), L Easther (Port Vincent), C Clift (Pine Point PA),
Guests	Perry Woodward (Port Julia Progress Association)
Apologies	T Stock (YPC), P Koulizos (Community Member), Stephen Lodge (Ag Bureau), J Wundersitz (YPLOG), C Redding (Community Member), M Redding (Community Member), S Kennedy (Local Trader), M Young (Ag Bureau, Petersville), I Haywood (Community Member)
Minute taker	K Van Arend (Rex Minerals)

AGENDA ITEM	Notes	ASSIGNED TO/DATE DUE
1. Welcome & Introductions	<p>Meeting opened at 6.30 pm K. Van Schaik welcomed everyone to tonight's meeting</p> <p>Record keeper for this meeting /recording – K Van Arend Apologies – noted above Safety statement Reminder that as we will be debating a number of different topics this evening that we need to respect each other as members who represent all of our community with sometimes contrasting views. Even if discussion becomes heated we manage our behaviour with consideration for everyone in the room.</p> <p>Confirmation of meeting notes: <u>June minutes:</u> K Van Schaik thanked K Van Arend for collating the June minutes. No amendments to be made. Moved – J Sandercock Seconded – D Kluske <u>YPC website:</u> June minutes were endorsed for distribution and can now be made available on the YPC website and through the community networks.</p>	
2.	<p>Actions from Meeting May 4th 2015</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> J Wundersitz will circulate information about the DSD MLP/PEPR guidelines to the HCV. Request from HCV to Rex for Chair/Leadership position. Agenda item (to be discussed below). E Dearlove to confirm dates with R Laufmann. (to be discussed below) <p>Actions from Meeting June 1st 2015</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> K Van Schaik to send out minutes as a separate email to ensure that members see it. Sent by Kylie on behalf of Kate on Thurs 18th June 2015. E Dearlove to check the transport costs and tonnage and email to HCV. Sent by email Wed 3rd June 2015. Draft 'Hillside Community Voice Terms of Reference and Operational Guideline' (ToR) document collated and circulated to HCV members ("commitment table from Rex" not yet completed by Erica) Sent by email Thurs 25th June 2015. E Dearlove to forward a copy of the CEP to all HCV members. Sent by Kylie on Thurs 18th June 2015. 	<p>To be followed up at next meeting</p> <p>COMPLETE</p> <p>COMPLETE</p> <p>DRAFT COMPLETED</p> <p>COMPLETE</p>

Minutes

Hillside Community Voice – 13th July 2015

3. Update from Rex	<p>Steve Olsen Resignation</p> <p>E Dearlove confirmed that although S Olsen has resigned he will still have very much an active role in Rex going forward.</p> <p><i>Has the advisory board been wound up and why?</i></p> <p>E Dearlove confirmed that the advisory board that was put into place for the EFS has now been dissolved as the bulk of the EFS work (option studies) have been completed.</p> <p>K Van Schaik noted that the advisory board and Steve’s roles were to determine if it was going to be financially viable to take out the iron ore and to determine what volume and capacity will be mined in order to generate a return for potential investors. These are the broad based decisions on what the overall size of the project will be and the financial modelling. The finer details and information are what Rex is currently pulling together now to complete the EFS which is written for financial purposes.</p> <p>EFS Update</p> <p><i>If the EFS work has been completed why is there so little detail?</i></p> <p>E Dearlove acknowledged that the community needs further details including maps, plans where everything will be situated and what impacts there will be, etc. E Dearlove is waiting until it is known whether Rex need to submit a new MLP or can begin working on a PEPR document for the small scale start up before releasing these details. The issue is there are no guidelines for this “in between” period. Rex is currently in discussions with the government (DSS) regarding what information they require and how they would like that information presented.</p> <p><i>Where does the delay lie – with DSD or Rex?</i></p> <p>E Dearlove confirmed that Rex is awaiting information from the government and the government is also waiting on information from Rex.</p> <p>The HCV is very frustrated as this is the same response that they have been receiving for a number of months. Nothing is happening and they are none the wiser than they were six months ago. Noted by E Dearlove.</p> <p><i>At what point of time will Rex apply for a PEPR extension if they haven’t already?</i></p> <p>E Dearlove confirmed that the company has not requested an extension to the PEPR. The due date for the PEPR is currently the 16th September. If Rex are required to submit a new MLP then they won’t be required to submit a PEPR on this date. If Rex does need to complete a PEPR then they would need to request an extension. It all hinges on having a clear assessment of the information and a negotiated position between DSD and the company.</p> <p><i>Does Rex have a current mine plan footprint of how the mine will look?</i></p> <p>Summarised response from E Dearlove was that Rex have broad rough ideas on how the footprint will look but in terms of things like where all the soils and haul roads are going to go these details are yet to be finalised.</p> <p><i>What timeframe are we talking before we find something out, it’s been very frustrating going to the last two meetings with no information at all from Rex?</i></p> <p>E Dearlove advised that Rex currently do not have any time frames, as Rex want to ensure that they have good information before releasing timeframes.</p> <p><i>Will the EFS have all the environmental impacts included as per the MLP?</i></p> <p>The MLP is an approvals document and the feasibility studies are for a different audience – these are completely separate. The feasibility studies are for financial purposes, they don’t set out things like how Rex will meet the lease conditions.</p>	
---------------------------	--	--

Minutes

Hillside Community Voice – 13th July 2015

	<p><i>Do the HCV get a say in the mine plan?</i></p> <p>K Van Schaik stated that is one of the reasons for R Laufmann to come to the HCV meeting is to talk about what is actually involved in the plan and the HCV can have the opportunity to look at it. Have also asked the government to be present at this meeting to enable any questions about interpretation to be answered.</p> <p>Meeting with R Laufmann</p> <p>There was a group discussion regarding arranging a meeting with R Laufmann. The main concern for the meeting is that R Laufmann will not provide any new details and only present the same information from ASX releases. As stated previously this would be a complete waste of the HCV time. It was noted that it this is obviously not a priority for R Laufmann as a meeting has been requested a number of times over the last few months with no results.</p> <p>It was agreed by the members that there would be no point having a meeting unless Rex can provide more details. K Van Schaik to contact R Laufmann both by email and follow up with a phone call regarding a person to person meeting to provide some of the details of the plan on which the EFS decisions have been based and what the footprint looks like. The HCV expressed that they want to know what are the differences between the new plan and the old (MLP mine plan), are there any new issues/reduced level of impact? Rex needs to bring the required personnel to answer questions. The meeting to be at his earliest convenience but preferably before the 16th September. This will provide R Laufmann the opportunity to show the community how important it is to him.</p> <p>There was discussion around the HCV continuing to meet and do work when the exact plan is still unknown and the timeframes involved. There are a number of things that can be worked on and won't change e.g. HCV ToR, complaints register and other components of the Social Management Plans. There won't be any urgency and engagement with the working groups until such time as the plans are known for what they are to work on.</p> <p><i>Is investment one of the biggest parameters preventing the progress of the project? Is Rex delaying the project until funding is obtained?</i></p> <p>E Dearlove stated that funding is a huge hurdle for any development. Rex has been very upfront with seeking approvals and funding. Projects generally need approval before seeking finance as it is a risk for companies investing in a project that is not approved.</p>	<p>K Van Schaik to contact R Laufmann both by email and phone call regarding a person to person meeting</p>
<p>4. HCV Leadership position. Response from Rex</p>	<p>Feedback from HCV members re Rex's response to HCV Facilitator support.</p> <p>There was a discussion around employment for the new facilitator's position. K Van Schaik clarified that Rex from an industrial employment point of view would not be prepared to fund the position through the YP Council (YPC) as Rex would ultimately still have the industrial responsibility.</p> <p>It was stated by a number of HCV members that they, in their own businesses would not be prepared to employ someone with all the industrial responsibilities but have no control. The only way it would work through council was if it Rex provided a grant to YPC who would then go and employ someone and accept all the industrial responsibility. K Van Schaik advised the response received from YPC was they would be happy for someone to utilise their office space and pay them but ultimately they would not be responsible for the person or making the appointment.</p> <p>It was noted that ultimately Rex will be paying for the position so there is a concern that it will appear we are trying to hide who is paying for them which defeats the purpose of being open and transparent. It was confirmed by E Dearlove that the new Facilitator would be accountable to the HCV.</p>	

Minutes

Hillside Community Voice – 13th July 2015

	<p>K Van Schaik formally put to the table that based on Rex’s letter and the discussion this evening that they are happy to accept the appointment of the facilitator is under direct employment to Rex.</p> <p>Moved – K Van Schaik Seconded – D Kluske <u>Vote: For 9 Against 3</u></p> <p>A working group was established to work out the details surrounding the Job Description, terms of employment and the recruitment strategy. This group to begin working after the school holidays and provide a summary progress report at the next meeting. Working towards advertising the position before the 16th September 2015 with a view to appoint someone after this time.</p> <p>Working group: T Stock, L Kakoschke and E Dearlove J Sandercock to review documentation and provide advice as required</p> <p>HCV Leadership position nominations from HCV members.</p> <p>D Kluske put forward information about Bob Goreing with view that he might be a suitable candidate for the facilitator’s position. D Kluske spoke to members of the Kanmantoo committee for feedback on Bob which was very positive. They would be happy for members of the HCV to contact them. K Van Schaik talked about the option of talking to Alan Ferguson (former Senator) to see if he would be interested. It was noted that all members have to accept the nominated facilitator and be comfortable with that person.</p> <p>K Van Schaik asked the HCV members if they were happy for her to continue in the role of acting facilitator or would like to nominate for the role for the period of the next meeting onwards. K Van Schaik is prepared to stay in this role. It was moved for the sake of continuity that K Van Schaik remain in the role of facilitator until someone is appointed.</p> <p>Moved - J Sandercock Seconded - L Kakoschke</p>	<p>Summary to be provided at next meeting</p>
<p>5. Activity - Review of Rex’s Community Engagement Plan (CEP)</p>	<p>There have been two CEP plans submitted for approval. To meet the lease conditions the first draft was sent to DSD in December 2014. Feedback was then sought early this year. Comprehensive feedback was provided by Cathy Redding and more general information from the HCV. This feedback was attempted to be incorporated in the version that was submitted in May 2015 and approved in June 2015 after the last HCV meeting.</p> <p>There were concerns that the HCV were being asked to provide feedback on a document that has already been approved. E Dearlove explained that the CEP is a ‘live working’ document that will continue to be amended and updated. Rex did not want to release this on their website until the HCV had had the opportunity to review and provide feedback and any amendments made along with a decision by the HCV on how to circulate the CEP to the wider community.</p> <p>K Van Schaik shared that CEP feedback was received from J Wundersitz on behalf of YP Landowners group today Monday 13th July 2015. Table 1 and 4 were discussed as a whole group as this was the area where there were a number of questions raised also by HCV members. The remaining feedback will be included as part of the discussions about the CEP which will be continuing at the next meeting due to time constraints.</p> <p>K Van Schaik clarified that Rex’s intent behind Table 4 (of the CEP) is not to determine the level of interest/influence demonstrated by each of the different stakeholder members about their views towards the mine. Rather Table 4 is about the impact and primary influence on decisions that each stakeholder group has in regards to the implementation of Hillside. It was suggested that some of the language in Table 4 and broader CEP needs</p>	

Minutes

Hillside Community Voice – 13th July 2015

	<p>to be changed e.g. ‘the word interest’ to make it easier for the wider community to understand.</p> <p>The government guidelines for the CEP are still in draft form and are written very much in ‘government speak’ and not necessarily in ‘user friendly’ language. E Dearlove stated to the group that this is Rex’s best attempt to try and gauge what we should be doing and how we should be talking to the community. The purpose of the CEP is to set out who the stakeholders are, what are the engagement tools to obtain information from the stakeholder and how Rex are to seek feedback/input on Hillside. The HCV, as the community experts, have been asked to review the CEP to make sure that Rex get it right. It was agreed that the stakeholder list is acceptable but some of the descriptions need to be reworded. Table 4 needs further discussion as it was noted that each different stakeholder group would have greater influence and priority for engagement, subject to the nature of particular aspects of the project and would also vary with each of the different management plans that sit under the CEP. Suggestion from the HCV that with each milestone an action plan showing the objectives and the target stakeholders could be drawn up.</p>	
<p>6. Any other business</p>	<p>Update on the R Clift bore; DSD are working directly with the landowner, they are engaging an independent person to assess the bore. DSD have made a commitment to advise the HCV on the outcome, however this will be at the landowners discretion.</p>	
<p>7. Confirm key actions and dates</p>	<p>1. J Wundersitz will circulate information about the DSD MLP/PEPR guidelines to the HCV. 2. K Van Schaik to contact R Laufmann both by email and follow up with a phone call regarding a person to person meeting. The meeting to be at his earliest convenience but by no later than the 16th September 3. Facilitator working group to meeting and provide a summary report at the next meeting.</p> <p>Items for website June’s minutes approved for the YPC website by K Van Arend.</p> <p>Information for communication network distribution June’s minutes approved for distribution.</p>	<p>10th August 24th July 10th August</p>
<p>8. Meeting Close Meeting was closed at 9.06pm</p> <p>Next meeting date When: Monday 10th August 2015 Where: Ardrossan Bowling Club Time: 6.15pm for a 6.30pm start</p> <p>Items for agenda</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Continue work on the CEP <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key Stakeholders • Table 6 • Table 10 Action Plan 2. HCV Terms of Reference 3. Report from the Facilitator working group 		