

# Hillside Community Voice Minutes

4 May 2015

<b>Facilitator</b>	K Van Schaik
<b>HCV Attendees</b>	C Redding (Community Member), M Redding (Community Member), C Clift (Pine Point PA), J Sandercock (Ardrossan PA), I Haywood (Community Member), J Wundersitz (YPLOG), P Maguire (James Well/Rogues Point PA), J Buchanan (YP Tourism & RDA), T Stock (YPC), Peter Klopp (Ag Bureau, South Kilkerran), Klynton Wanganeen (Narungga Community), D Kluske (Local Trader), L Easter (Port Vincent), B Sleath (Pine Point PA), P Koulizos (Community Member), Stephen Lodge (Ag Bureau, Petersville), D Hosking (Community Member), E Dearlove (Rex Minerals)
<b>Apologies</b>	Shane Kennedy (Local Trader), Stewart Lodge (Ag Bureau, Petersville), L Kakoschke (Ag Bureau, South Kilkerran), M Young (Ag Bureau, Petersville)
<b>Guests</b>	Gavan Collery & Nic Marsh
<b>Minute taker</b>	K. Van Arend (Rex Minerals)

AGENDA ITEM	Notes	Action ASSIGNED TO/DATE DUE
<b>1. Welcome &amp; Introductions</b>	<p>Meeting opened at 6.32pm</p> <p>K. Van Schaik welcomed everyone to tonight's meeting including Gavan Collery the investment and media liaison person newly associated with Rex and also aligned with the appointment of their new CEO and Managing Director, Richard Laufmann.</p> <p><b>Record keeper for this meeting /recording</b> – Kylie Van Arend</p> <p><b>Apologies</b> – noted above</p> <p><b>Safety statement</b></p> <p>Reminder that as issues and key points are discussed at this meeting regardless of our personal views we respect and conduct ourselves professionally and not engage in personal attack. We are here to work on resolution and outcomes to maximise all the benefits and minimise all the risks.</p> <p><b>Confirmation of meeting notes:</b></p> <p><u>March minutes:</u> K Van Schaik thanked J Wundersitz for the comprehensive March minutes and notes. No amendments to be made.</p> <p><b>Moved</b> – Kate Van Schaik. <b>Seconded</b> - Len Easter.</p> <p><u>YPC website:</u> Minutes to be made available on the YPC website and through the community networks.</p>	
<b>2. Business/ actions from previous meeting</b>	<p><b>K Van Schaik to clarify the role of the HCV executive</b></p> <p>Executive appointed at last meeting which comprises of K Van Schaik, T Stock and J Sandercock. Executive to represent HCV in meetings with Rex etc To be available in the event the Facilitator/Leader is unavailable, accompany as second party with meetings with company/DSD if required and assist with drafting/checking some letters etc . Not designed to filter decisions and all final decisions to go out to the whole HCV.</p> <p><b>Request from HCV to Rex for administrative support and Leadership position – See Agenda item 4.</b></p> <p><b>Community Engagement Plan (CEP) and Department of State Development (DSD) CEP Guidelines</b></p> <p>Action from the previous meeting requesting feedback from the HCV on the CEP. C Redding provided extensive feedback. Suggested that a working group (WG) is formed to look at CEP document and other related documents.</p> <p><b>Moved</b> - K Van Schaik <b>Seconded</b> – P Koulizos.</p> <p><u>Membership of 'Communication' WG</u> – T Stock, K Van Schaik, C Redding, C Clift.</p>	

## Minutes

### Hillside Community Voice – 4 May 2015

AGENDA ITEM	Notes	Action ASSIGNED TO/DATE DUE
	<p><b>DSD guidelines for MLP and PEPR.</b></p> <p>The MLP and PEPR guidelines have been amended and were open for consultation to industry. J Wundersitz will circulate information about the guidelines to the HCV. J Wundersitz is concerned as DSD did not advise the HCV of the review, provide the HCV with a summary of direct impacts or given the HCV an opportunity for feedback. It was agreed for K Van Schaik to write to DSD for clarification of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• which set of PEPR guidelines apply to Hillside;</li> <li>• what stage is the guideline review up to;</li> </ul> <p>K Van Schaik will provide a summary of the changes and the implications for the Hillside PEPR.</p> <p><b>Response from DSD (Greg Marshall);</b></p> <p>A copy of the letter received from DSD has been provided to the HCV.</p> <p><u>Rainwater tank testing:</u></p> <p>K Van Schaik read out the relevant section of the response letter regarding rainwater tank testing. As tank testing was a specified lease condition, to avoid being in breach of the lease condition, Rex after consultation with the HCV executive group sent out the “Registration of Interest” letters. DSD stated that the HCV could not force the company into a breach of a condition. Now that Rex have met this condition there are no time frame constraints surrounding this rainwater tank testing program. The next step is for the WG to come up with a draft plan proposal for the testing program to be formally put forward to Rex.</p> <p>J Wundersitz to draft an email that can be sent out through the communication network providing a current update on this program, including that the initial letter was a “Registration of Interest” only and the details of the plan are still being worked out and will be redistributed when available. Kate reiterated that it was important for all communication networks to receive the same information.</p> <p>Rex confirmed that the individual property owners will receive a copy of their results.</p> <p><u>Extension of plans</u></p> <p>K Van Schaik read out the relevant section of the DSD response letter regarding the Community Engagement Plan (CEP); DSD requires the CEP to be resubmitted to DSD following further engagement with the community. The Social Management Plans are to be developed in consultation with relevant stakeholders and to be submitted by Rex by 16<sup>th</sup> September 2015.</p>	<p>J Wundersitz will circulate information about the DSD MLP/PEPR guidelines to the HCV</p> <p>K Van Schaik to draft a letter to DSD re clarification around guidelines and report back to HCV at June meeting.</p> <p>J Wundersitz to draft an email re clarification about the “Registration of Interest” rainwater tank testing letters sent by Rex &amp; provide to HCV members to send out to communication network.</p>
<p><b>3. Update from Rex</b></p>	<p><b>Appointment of CEO/MD;</b></p> <p><i>HCV meeting with new CEO/MD - See Minute #8</i></p> <p><b>Extended Feasibility Study (Hillside Project V2)</b></p> <p>The model with copper and gold only is still being worked on in the Extended Feasibility Study (EFS) with the results as per the Quarterly Report expected in the June 2015 quarter. The company has clearly advised that the reporting process and priority upon the release of results (through ASX) is DSD, landowners and HCV. It was reiterated that as a publicly listed company Rex must meet the listing rules and an ASX release will be sent out first upon release of the results.</p> <p>K Van Schaik stated that a public meeting will need to be organised quite quickly after the results are released to ensure the HCV is not responsible for communicating as a 3<sup>rd</sup> party. The proposed meeting will involve Rex and DSD.</p>	

# Minutes

## Hillside Community Voice – 4 May 2015

AGENDA ITEM	Notes	Action ASSIGNED TO/DATE DUE
<p><b>4. Administrative support and HCV Leadership position. Response from Rex</b></p>	<p><b>Administrative support – endorsed by Rex.</b>            K Van Schaik officially thanked and welcomed K Van Arend, advising that she will be taking the minutes, providing administration support for the HCV and oversee and manage the communication register.</p> <p><u>Format and process of minutes.</u>            The meetings will continue to be recorded. At the point of any key discussions K Van Schaik will provide a summary in a way that doesn't compromise the discussion and also captures the agreed actions. Members to advise of any further clarifications or points that they would specifically like minuted. K Van Schaik confirmed that a member of the HCV will still review the minutes prior to them being sent out and this should be shared each month amongst the HCV members. K Van Schaik to review this month's minutes.</p> <p><u>Administration of YPC website.</u>            It was agreed for K Van Schaik to liaise with K Van Arend.</p> <p><u>Communication Network: Forward contact details to Kylie as per HCV request.</u>            Communication network email addresses to be forwarded to K Van Arend to establish a distribution list. Members to continue to communicate to their communication networks while the master distribution list is being developed. It was agreed that the YPLOG members would be an exception with one email being sent to their responsible person to forward on. It was agreed for K Van Arend to administer the communication network distribution list and send any emails from her Rex email address as long as the subject matter was clear and there was no mention of Rex or visible logos.</p> <p><b>Paid HCV leadership position – Rex offer and in principle support - for discussion</b>            K Van Schaik compiled a submission which was sent to Rex on the 26<sup>th</sup> March 2015. A response was received from S Olsen which was circulated to the HCV by email on the 10<sup>th</sup> April 2015.</p> <p>There was a lengthy discussion where the consensus was the offer by Rex was totally unacceptable with the 2.5 days per month being "ludicrous". The idea that Rex misunderstood the HCV submission was not upheld by the HCV as the HCV collectively thought that K Van Schaik's submission was quite clear in its requests. The following comments support and expand on this (<i>J Wundersitz &amp; J Sandercock requested to be specifically minuted</i>):</p> <p>J Wundersitz stated that Rex's response was totally unacceptable. Rex have compounded two positions which were made very clear by the HCV that it was a facilitator's role with a very broad range of responsibilities. Rex are talking about providing a chairperson which would be to organise and run the meetings and essentially to get the minutes out etc. The other has somehow become a fulltime position with the council and it seems that Rex sees this in a very different light than what we saw the facilitator as being. So 2.5 days a month is absolutely ludicrous and doesn't indicate any serious commitment from Rex to this committee.</p> <p>J Sandercock has a similar view with the Rex's offer clearly demonstrating very little understanding of the role which was spelled out quite clearly in the HCV submission. He stated that "the offer of 2.5 days a month is almost offensive to those of us that have been involved for a very long time and put a lot of work in voluntarily. The company needs to get serious about the role they play in consulting the community and if they are not prepared to then I am no longer prepared to either. I would imagine there would be a number of other people sitting around the table with a similar view. We have put in a lot of time for what could be an absolute waste of time. If Rex is not able to get the funding then the project will not go ahead and some us have wasted more than three years. The company needs to take this seriously and make a serious contribution to this role".</p>	<p>K Van Schaik to review May HCV minutes prior to distribution.</p>

## Minutes

### Hillside Community Voice – 4 May 2015

AGENDA ITEM	Notes	Action ASSIGNED TO/DATE DUE
	<p>T Stock stated that Rex have missed the point. The HCV and the community is an integral part in Rex being able to progress the project forward. If the company is advising that they will appoint a facilitator to run some meeting until they receive the funding then they are not really serious about what the community thinks until the funding is there. This is really a slap in the face for the people around this room who have been investing their time voluntarily and trying to engage and inform the community. The Rex Board need to go back to the drawing board and revisit the situation because it isn't acceptable to say this group here hasn't really got a lot of punch until the funding is available. K Van Schaik has put in an enormous amount of time to date and to say that what she is doing is worth 2 days a month is quite an insult. Rex need to re think just how important this group is to the success of the project and at the end of the day if the community consultation falls through the floor how will that impact the project moving forward. Engaging the community and providing understanding is a vital part of their progress. They need to invest the time and money to be able to do this. It's disappointing that it has been almost a stroke of a pen to say "sorry we are not going to engage any decent time or money into this until the project is all go".</p> <p>It needs to be very transparent to the community that Rex are funding and sponsoring the position but they are not employed by Rex. It was agreed that K Van Schaik would draft a counter proposal with feedback and re-clarification to go back to the company which includes a basis of a <b>minimum</b> of a day a week initially subject to the work load. There was acknowledgement that there needs to be flexibility in the timeframe and the need to be reasonable.</p> <p>The draft proposal to be sent out to the members by the 12<sup>th</sup> May 2015 for feedback. A copy then to be provided to Richard and the Board with a view to discuss at the meeting on the 19<sup>th</sup> May 2015.</p>	<p>All HCV members to send through any specific questions for Richard to E Dearlove by 15<sup>th</sup> May</p> <p>K Van Schaik to draft a counter proposal by the 12<sup>th</sup> May 2015, for HCV feedback &amp; sent to Rex prior to the 19 May for discussion</p>
<p><b>5. Working groups structure and PEPR</b></p>	<p><b>Assigned work for each group - information, required work and resources to assist and extend group activities &amp; reporting processes for HCV</b></p> <p>E Dearlove gave a presentation and provided a handout developed in consultation with HCV Executive regarding the working groups which covered:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Background of the PEPR</li> <li>• Explanation of some of the PEPR wording used by DSD</li> <li>• The current working group structure (who is part of which working group – to be constantly updated)</li> <li>• HCV membership and their areas of interest</li> <li>• Feedback form for working groups to submit their recommendations</li> <li>• Initial work table individualised for each working group (provided by E Dearlove)</li> </ul> <p>E Dearlove is very conscious of not losing the work and information that the CCG had placed in the issues register and taking it forward along with new information in this new program. As a starting point E Dearlove provided to the following working groups an initial "work table" which included a list of questions developed from the government expectations/lease conditions and the CCG expectations (the issues register). These answers are required for the PEPR or to meet lease conditions but are by no means fully inclusive of everything or restrictive to the working group.</p>	

# Minutes

## Hillside Community Voice – 4 May 2015

AGENDA ITEM	Notes	Action ASSIGNED TO/DATE DUE
	<p>Topics for ‘Work Tables’ were for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Water Quality &amp; Marine Environment</u>; Rainwater Tank Testing Monitoring Requirements &amp; Reporting of Results</li> <li>• <u>Air Quality, Noise, Light &amp; Blasting</u>; Air Quality Monitoring Requirements &amp; Reporting of Results</li> <li>• <u>Transport</u>; Road Realignment &amp; Site Access/Exit</li> <li>• <u>Agriculture &amp; Farm Management</u>; Rex’s Land Use &amp; Potential Impacts to Adjacent Land Use</li> <li>• <u>Rehabilitation &amp; End Of Mine Life</u>; Mine Closure</li> <li>• <u>Accommodation &amp; Tourism</u>; Tourism Opportunities</li> </ul> <p>E Dearlove will provide these ‘Work Tables’ to each of the WG as they are formed. K Van Schaik reiterated that the ‘Work Tables’ are not designed to be a complicated process to capture every little nuance that the HCV might have but is the kick starter for each WG to go and begin their research. It was agreed by the HCV that this was a good approach.</p> <p>T Stock expressed concerned that even though Rex are saying that the community input and feedback is very important, Rex are not taking this seriously, as shown by the HCV Facilitator offer. If the HCV spends a large amount of time consulting with the community and providing the feedback of what the community want to see as part of this project what guarantees do the HCV have that the effort they put into this will be listened to by the company. Are they going to really work with the community as we are not currently seeing that? E Dearlove acknowledged the time that the CCG/HCV members put into this project as volunteers. The answers that the HCV provide to the questions in the ‘Work Tables’ are all negotiable i.e.; Where do you want environmental monitors? How do you want results reported to the community? These are things that Rex would be doing anyway but Rex want to know as a community how you want this to function.</p> <p>If the HCV recommended that Rex should meet a number well below the National Standard as set out in the lease conditions, then Rex would strive to meet this but would not commit to the recommendation by changing the lease condition. E Dearlove can’t give a guarantee that Rex will accept every recommendation put forward by the HCV but by using the ‘Work Tables’ which stipulate the required standards/lease conditions as a guidelines and the recommendations are reasonable there should be no reason for Rex not to take them on board.</p> <p>K Van Schaik stated that in the absence of any information from the HCV, if we do not put forward the communities’ wants, then we will end with up whatever Rex thinks the community wants. There are stipulations that have already been determined by DSD and their legislations and lease conditions. If the HCV don’t agree with the lease conditions the argument that the HCV are taking up is not with Rex it is with DSD and EPA about the Act and Standards. It is important to tell the people that actually make the decision. Rex has been told what standards it needs to meet and any reasonable company will say I’ll meet those standards. I’ll listen to what the community expectation is and if we put in more control measures which ultimately reduce the impact on the community we will do it, but we don’t have to. The government are the ones that set the standards. It is important that we also have a dialogue with DSD as a community because if we want to challenge some legislations we have to take this as a separate issue with DSD. The HCV need to be aware that any work in this area may not influence Hillside or the work that the HCV are doing. The HCV have a window of 12 months, with approx. 16 management plans. Each of these plans require the</p>	

## Minutes

### Hillside Community Voice – 4 May 2015

AGENDA ITEM	Notes	Action ASSIGNED TO/DATE DUE
	<p>community to provide input into 'how' Rex should do certain things. If the HCV miss this opportunity to provide the 'how' and spend too much time arguing with DSD and don't provide thoughts on the 'how' then they will get what the company decides.</p> <p>J Wundersitz stated that the 'Work Tables' are a nice logical way to deliver what Rex want to put into their PEPR to conform to the conditions. What is missing is the challenge to the conditions, we have never had the opportunity to do that. It is how we balance responding to Rex with the information they need for the PEPR as well as making it very clear to DSD that we will not accept some of these conditions. The work table is a tick box from Rex and the conditions as they currently stand not a challenge to those conditions. K Van Schaik disagreed in that the conditions are guiding what Rex needs to do at the moment. It is not going to dictate to the HCV what other questions we have around a particular topic. J Wundersitz stated that by going down this track (with the 'Work Tables') that the HCV are saying that part of us is helping Rex to meet the conditions and I think we lose our bargaining power in that, the alternative would be not answering the questions and saying no we don't accept that condition, that is not what the "community" want, the "communities" needs have never been listened to, our bottom line is the pit must be backfilled and we will not move from that position and for me that is an absolute.</p> <p>J Sandercock stated that he doesn't believe that the broader "community" has ever said that they want the pit backfilled. It hasn't been put to the "community" and there hasn't been the opportunity to explore what options there may be. The whole rehabilitation subject still needs to be looked at. The 'work tables' are only a prompt, it is purely a format in which to work. It is not prescriptive in the questions that you need to ask or answer but purely a mechanism to start the conversation of the WG. There is nothing prohibiting the rehabilitation working group going to the "community" and asking them what they expect. When meeting with E Dearlove and K Van Schaik regarding the WG structure, it was requested that Rex set out the required information from the community so that the HCV would have the opportunity for input into the PEPR.</p> <p>J Wundersitz expressed concern that air quality, light, noise, and blasting was in one WG as it was such a huge area. C Clift and P Maguire expressed their interest in a noise, light and blasting WG. It was agreed that the WG themselves would evaluate the workload and if the workload becomes too overwhelming they would put their hand up for help or split the groups. K Van Schaik reminded everyone that if anyone has any questions to ring E Dearlove.</p>	<p>C Clift and P Maguire to join the Air quality, light, noise, and blasting WG.</p>
<p><b>6. Any other business</b></p>	<p>S Lodge provided to the HCV a copy of the formal complaint from Roger Clift regarding his bore running dry at Sheoak Flat. It was agreed for K Van Schaik to send this complaint to DSD and to cc Rex Minerals.</p> <p>K Van Schaik asked all members to have a think about and canvas potential candidates for the facilitator role. K Van Schaik has agreed to continue in the role of HCV facilitator until the 31<sup>st</sup> August 2015 if required.</p> <p>There was a public notice in the Country Times regarding exploration licenses. E Dearlove will send out a response to this.</p>	<p>K Van Schaik to send groundwater complaint to DSD and CC Rex.</p> <p>E Dearlove to send response to HCV re exploration licence notice.</p>

# Minutes

## Hillside Community Voice – 4 May 2015

AGENDA ITEM	Notes	Action ASSIGNED TO/DATE DUE
<b>7. Confirm key actions and dates</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. J Wundersitz will circulate information about the DSD MLP/PEPR guidelines to the HCV.</li> <li>2. K Van Schaik to draft a letter to DSD re clarification around guidelines and report back to HCV at June meeting.</li> <li>3. J Wundersitz to draft an email re clarification about the “Registration of Interest” rainwater tank testing letters sent by Rex &amp; provide to HCV members to send out to communication network.</li> <li>4. K Van Schaik to review May HCV minutes prior to distribution.</li> <li>5. K Van Schaik to draft a counter proposal by the 12<sup>th</sup> May 2015, for HCV feedback &amp; sent to Rex prior to the 19 May for discussion.</li> <li>6. C Clift and P Maguire to join the Air quality, light, noise, and blasting WG.</li> <li>7. K Van Schaik to send groundwater complaint to DSD and CC Rex.</li> <li>8. E Dearlove to send response to HCV re exploration licence notice.</li> </ol> <p><b>Items for website</b> March’s minutes approved for the YPC website</p> <p><b>Information for communication network distribution</b> HCV members to forward the communication network emails to K Van Arend</p>	<p>By 22<sup>nd</sup> May By 22<sup>nd</sup> May</p> <p>By 1<sup>st</sup> June</p> <p>By 15<sup>th</sup> May By 15<sup>th</sup> May</p> <p>-</p> <p>By 1<sup>st</sup> June By 15<sup>th</sup> May</p>
<b>8. Meeting Close</b>	<p><b>Meeting with new CEO/MD</b> Meeting with Richard Laufmann new CEO/MD of Rex Minerals Note this is a meeting for HCV members ONLY. Discussion of leadership position and introduction. Discuss plans for community/public meeting with Richard.</p> <p>When: Tuesday 19th May 2015 Where: Ardrossan Bowling Club Time: 6.15pm for a 6.30pm start</p> <p>Tea and coffee will be provided</p> <p><i>Any specific questions for Richard to be sent through to E Dearlove by 15<sup>th</sup> May.</i></p> <p><b>Next meeting date</b> When: Monday 1<sup>st</sup> June 2015 Where: Ardrossan Bowling Club Time: 6.15pm for a 6.30pm start</p> <p><b>Items for agenda</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. K Van Schaik will provide a summary of the changes and the implications for the Hillside PEPR.</li> <li>2. Feedback from Richard Laufmann meeting on 19<sup>th</sup> May.</li> </ol>	