

TFI, Thursday 12 April 2018, Newcastle



Engaging communities in planning for closure and post-mining land uses with a utility goal

Dr Jo-Anne Everingham Sustainable Minerals Institute The University of Queensland



What will the legacy be...?









2

Safe, stable and non-polluting in future?









Or denuded hills and an orange river? (Mt Lyell copper)











Enduring value?! At least doing no harm?



Samarco tailings dam collapse, Brazil (Nov 2015)

Current guidelines also require:

 An agreed beneficial land use post-mining

Consultation with stakeholders











What are land users' views about potential utility of sites?



Waihi gold mine, New Zealand – abutting the town

Rehabilitation and closure planning considers...









Do companies have the systems, capacity and resources to recognise and manage the risks?

	Slightly Harmful	Harmful	Extremely Harmful
Highly	Insignificant	Low	Medium
Unlikely	Risk	Risk	Risk
Unlikely	Low	Medium	High
	Risk	Risk	Risk
Likely	Medium	High	Extreme
	Risk	Risk	Risk







Do government regulations provide protection?

- Financial assurance?
- Mine closure plan requirement?
- Monitoring?
- Synoptic plans?
- Stakeholder input?







Stakeholder engagement in planning post-mining in CQ

- 2 year ACARP project
- Central Queensland University Prof John Rolfe, Prof Susan Kinnear and Dr Delwar Akbar plus UQ-CSRM
- Core was 4 workshops with 39 stakeholders throughout 2017
 - 1. Identify relevant issues general and regional
 - 2. Undertake individual planning of a hypothetical site
 - 3. Technical info and group planning at site level
 - 4. Confirmation that final plan met stakeholder approval and preferences for options for stakeholder input who, when and how?
 - Hypothetical site gave concrete focus imagery/ map







KM

Key Findings – land utility

Considerations relevant to transferring mining land to grazing:

- Risk is an issue who bears residual risk and financial liability?
- Due diligence and 'science' re water, soils, engineering (e.g. dams) etc.
- Monitoring and management responsibilities for contaminated areas
- Water resources
- Access throughout the property (/ ex-mining lease)

Similarity of views with regard to post-mining land uses

- grazing the most suitable use in CQ
- anticipate 'patchwork' uses with some productive and some not
- post-mining land can have ecological, social and economic functions
- native vegetation adds value as part of a grazing property
- planning and engagement should be early

Key findings – engagement process

Benefits of stakeholder engagement processes

- E.g. more diversity of knowledge and values; transparency; more flexible; improved negotiation and decision processes
- Alignment of different models of stakeholder engagement with purposes
 - Decision tree flowchart.
 - Eight questions to indicate appropriate type of stakeholder engagement for complex, uncertain and ambiguous planning
 - Spectrum: inform; consult; involve; collaborate or empower
- Strengths of workshop-based process and concrete example demonstrated
 - Enhancing mutual understanding;
 - Facilitating consensus and compromise



SMICSRM Centre for Social Responsibility in Mining



Models for mining affected communities having a say

- Who? (e.g. civil society, councils, government, 'experts', landholders)
- Why? (i.e. purpose, scope and focus of a panel's deliberations)
- When? (i.e. timing of stakeholder involvement)
- **How**? (i.e. resourcing, structuring and operation of panel + IAP2)

...to engage with mining affected communities.

- And **what** are the advantages and disadvantages of five models?
 - Community reference group
 - Special interest group (e.g. water/ pit)
 - Community consultative committee
 - Expert reference panel
 - Taskforce









THANK YOU



