



**AUSCRIPT AUSTRALASIA PTY LIMITED**

ACN 110 028 825

**T:** 1800 AUSCRIPT (1800 287 274)

**E:** [clientservices@auscript.com.au](mailto:clientservices@auscript.com.au)

**W:** [www.auscript.com.au](http://www.auscript.com.au)

**TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS**

---

TRANSCRIPT IN CONFIDENCE

---

O/N H-959217

**INDEPENDENT PLANNING COMMISSION**

**MEETING WITH MUSWELLBROOK SHIRE COUNCIL**

**RE: BYLONG COAL PROJECT**

**PANEL:** **GORDON KIRKBY**  
**WENDY LEWIN**  
**STEVE O'CONNOR**

**ASSISTING PANEL:** **DAVID WAY**

**MUSWELLBROOK**  
**SHIRE COUNCIL:** **FIONA PLESMAN**  
**JOSHUA BROWN**  
**ANTHONY WILLIS**

**LOCATION:** **IPC OFFICES**  
**201 ELIZABETH STREET**  
**SYDNEY, NEW SOUTH WALES**

**DATE:** **2.05 PM, MONDAY, 12 NOVEMBER 2018**

MR KIRKBY: Okay. Good afternoon and welcome. Before we begin, I would like to acknowledge the traditional owners on the land on which we meet and pay my respects to their Elders, past and present. Welcome to the meeting today. KEPCO Bylong Australia Pty Ltd, the applicant, is proposing to develop the Bylong coal project, an open cut and underground thermal coal mine near Mudgee, New South Wales, in the Mid-Western Regional Council area.

My name is Gordon Kirkby. I am the chair of this IPC panel. Joining me are Wendy Lewin, Steve O'Connor. Other attendees of the meeting are David Way from the IPC secretariat, Fiona Plesman, Joshua Brown and Anthony Willis from Muswellbrook Shire Council. In the interests of openness and transparency and to ensure the full capture of information, today's meeting is being recorded, and a full transcript will be produced and made available on the Commission's website.

The meeting is one part of the Commission's decision-making process that's taking place at the preliminary stage of this process and will form one of several sources of information upon which the Commission will base its decision. It's important for the commissioners to ask questions of attendees and clarify issues whenever we consider it appropriate. If you're asked a question and not in a position to answer, please feel free to just take the question on notice and provide any additional information in writing, which we will then put up on our website. We will now begin. I'd just like to thank you for making the time available to come to Sydney rather than meet last week, so thank you very much for that. That's sort of helped us out significantly. We have – firstly, actually, I might just get everybody to identify themselves just so the transcript – when they come back to it later, they know what voice matches. So if we could just - - -

MR WILLIS: Anthony Willis, corporate lawyer for Muswellbrook Shire Council.

MS PLESMAN: Fiona Plesman, general manager.

MR BROWN: Joshua Brown, manager of integrated planning risk and governance at Muswellbrook Shire Council.

MR O'CONNOR: Steve O'Connor, commissioner.

MR KIRKBY: Gordon Kirby, chair.

MS LEWIN: Wendy Lewin, commissioner.

MR WAY: David Way, senior planning officer.

MR KIRKBY: Okay. Thanks. Just to help us later on. So we sort of have a bit of an agenda here, which you have in front of you. I guess we may just start with obviously we've received Council's submission and are aware you have concerns regarding I guess principally the traffic and I guess their estimation of where the

mine workforce and deliveries and things are coming from, the impact that may have on the Muswellbrook and your road network, so maybe if you could just take us through your concerns .....

5 MS PLESMAN: Well, how we'd like to present our case, I'll just do a bit of an overview of Council's concerns, and then I'm going to hand over to Anthony, who will take you through our submission. We have a submission here in writing - - -

MR KIRKBY: Yes.

10

MS PLESMAN: - - - that's ready to hand over. And Anthony will take you through the detail of our submission. But in general, as an overview, council is concerned. The principal of its concern focuses on the road, Bylong Valley Way, which is a road fit for a rural area carrying general rural primary agricultural traffic, and not at all fit for any heavy loads or frequent use of commuter traffic would be our view.

15

We – Muswellbrook Shire Council is a council that is very experienced in working with and living with mining communities. In our one shire we have eight large mines, thermal coal mines, open cut thermal coal mines, and two power stations, and I think we work very reasonably and compatibly with the mining community. So we're not novices to working with mines. We're very familiar with living with and working with mine workers and all the various support industries that support a large, complex open cut thermal coal mine, so we're very aware – we actually – Muswellbrook houses a large number of the industrial industries and services that support mining. So we're very aware of what is required to support a large open cut mine.

20

25

Our concerns are that while KEPCO has stated a focus that the mining community will be drawn from the Mudgee area, in reality, miners will go where the jobs are, and that's fine, and the services that are required to support a mine will be drawn from wherever they can be drawn from when it's needed. So our concerns that the Bylong Valley Way is completely insufficient to deal with supporting even a relatively small element of that mine, should that transpire to be the case in the future, and we are also familiar as a council with responsibility for road networks in dealing with the consequences of accidents and incidents that relate to busy mine-related road traffic, having had to deal with, on a number of occasions, fatalities that occur in the area when we're dealing with mine traffic. Mine vehicles are extremely large – I don't know whether you've ever seen them, but they are very, very large, and it is – if you live in the area, as we do, you regularly draw to one side numerous times a day while you allow mining vehicles to pass. That's just part of life in a mining area. And we wish to draw our – your attention to and have on record our concern for any fatalities or incidents that may in the future occur in the Bylong Valley Way. I'll now hand over to Anthony.

30

35

40

45 MR WILLIS: Thank you.

MR KIRKBY: Thank you.

MR WILLIS: I have copies of Council's written submissions for each of you and I will take you through those in the order that they are set out in the written submissions. So the first issue that's of particular concern to council is the residential demographics and movements which have been asserted by the proponent and upon which the department's report is based on and are before the commissioners for consideration. Council is still of the firm view that should this project be approved, the majority of the mine's workforce is likely to reside in the Hunter, instead of the Mid-Western Regional Council area. That's indicated by the habits of existing mine workers who typically would board – would board in close proximity to the mine and then travel by the Golden Highway and Bylong Valley Way to their permanent residence.

In the Department of Planning's assessment report, it's asserted that KEPCO's report concludes that only five to seven per cent of the workforce would reside and commute from the local area from Bylong Valley Way. We say that the workforce will predominantly be sourced from the existing workforce in the Hunter Valley and mine support services as well. If we are correct on that basis, that would fundamentally change the key assumptions on which the traffic and the social impact assessments prepared for – in respect of this project and relied on by the department and on that – on that basis, council submits that the project should be refused consent. I'm just quoting from the final assessment report here, on page 79 it states that:

*It is also clear that KEPCO and MWRC –*  
Being a reference to Mid-Western Regional Council –

*...are committed to utilising existing accommodation, mining services and the existing employment pool from MRWC.*

Council's not quite sure how that assertion is made to justify the reliability of their traffic assessment or the likely traffic impact on Bylong Valley Way. And, frankly, the concerns of the council in relation to this road have to be answered or met by the proponent with more than hopes and good intentions. Even if KEPCO's assertions are correct with respect to the workforce likely to actually use the Bylong Valley Way, any percentage, regardless of how small it is, still represents an intolerable risk to human life and safety. Without significant road safety upgrades to the Bylong Valley Way, in our submission, the commission could not approve the project in its current form. The second issue I would like to raise is road and workforce safety and, again on page 79 of the department's final assessment report, it's stated – and I quote:

*For workforce safety reasons, KEPCO is targeting its workforce to reside within a one hour drive from the project identified as the local area.*

The council can find nowhere where that target is embodied in an enforceable undertaking, a condition of consent or otherwise. And we say that the safe – road

safety and the safety of the workforce and road users has to be predicated on more than targets alone, especially in circumstances where there is absolutely nothing in the department's recommended conditions of consent that would bind them to meet, let alone attempt to achieve, any of those targets. As Fiona mentioned briefly before,  
5 council's not convinced the Bylong Valley Way is in any form at the moment sufficiently safe for use by mining traffic, especially any of that which we anticipate would stem from the project during its major phases and operation.

10 One needs to remember that it will be the project's workforce, suppliers and mining support services that are likely to use Bylong Valley Way. That leads us to our – one of our main submissions, which is, should the commissioner be minded to grant approval to the project, Bylong Valley Way would require significant upgrades and maintenance in order to render it safe for traffic that use or are otherwise associated with the project during its entire life cycle. In condition 49 of schedule 4 of the  
15 department's recommended conditions of consent, we say it does not reflect the final assessment report in that KEPCO's most recent offer to council in respect of road safety upgrade funding – and you can find that at appendix E9-1 of the final assessment report – the amount of \$267,700 that appears in the recommended conditions of consent was intended to be and offered by KEPCO as subject to CPI.

20 And in our – we have annexed to the written submissions a number of proposed conditions of consent or modifications to the departments in which we set out a proposed amendment on that basis. Council also says that the payment anticipated in condition 52 of the recommended conditions is inadequate to address the ongoing  
25 use of the Bylong Valley Way over the life of the project. It'll clearly have a significant impact on council's road infrastructure and would require a far greater contribution, were the project to proceed.

30 MR KIRKBY: Have you done any preliminary calculations on what that might be?

MS PLESMAN: We've done some studies. Josh, do you want to address that?

MR BROWN: Look, there's – we haven't come to any conclusions as yet but we are – we have undertaken some traffic assessments. I think that the – the – the  
35 Planning Assessment Commission that reviewed the project was provided with a submission that was prepared on our behalf - - -

MR .....: Okay.

40 MR BROWN: - - - which we're happy to provide you a copy with.

MR KIRKBY: We should have – was that the Cardno?

45 MR O'CONNOR: Was that the Cardno submissions?

MR KIRKBY: Was that the Cardno – okay.

MS PLESMAN: Yes.

MR BROWN: Yes, yes, yes.

5 MR O'CONNOR: Yes, yes.

MR KIRKBY: Yes, we have that, yes. So that's the most recent.

10 MR BROWN: Yes, yes. I understand that we're looking at it again but, yes, that's correct.

MR KIRKBY: Okay. Sorry.

15 MR WILLIS: No, that's fine. Staying with condition 52, we submit that the proponent should be required to not only rehabilitate or make good any development-related damage identified in the post-dilapidation survey which is anticipated in that condition but to contribute to the ongoing maintenance and upkeep of Bylong Valley Way and we further submit that is consistent with the obligations of the proponent in respect of road contributions to Mid-Western Regional Council as set out in the department's recommended condition 52. We have also set out, should the commission be minded to grant the project consent, amendments in the attached minute to condition 52 to ensure that what we say is a – is a mis-description in condition 52 which simply invites KEPCO to prepare a post-dilapidation survey that does not identify any development-related damage without consequence.

25 We've identified that issue and we have proposed in the attached minute a slightly redrafted condition 52 to address that. The third major concern of council is the movements of heavy vehicles along Bylong Valley Way and we say it's inevitable that heavy vehicles will use Bylong Valley Way to travel to and from the mine, and that is particularly clear in light of our previous submissions on the likely sources of the project's workforce and support services. Condition 51, we say, will merely be honoured with a breach. There is no particular way in which the condition is enforceable in a way that would prevent heavy vehicles from using Bylong Valley Way in any event.

35 We say that condition 51 is unenforceable in its current terms and that the commission is the only authority empowered to decide whether the project is granted approval and, if so, the conditions on which it may be. We further say that any heavy vehicle movements along Bylong Valley Way have the potential to result in fatalities and, in our written submissions, council's taken you to an example in which a man was killed on Wybong Road, which is a road towards Mangoola. Now, in that case the Mangoola project approval had a similar condition which prohibited heavy vehicle movements along that particular road.

45 Wybong is a fairly similar road in terms of configuration to Bylong Valley Way. Mr Patton was driving away from the mine and he happened upon a heavy vehicle driving towards the mine on Bylong Road in circumstances where it was – the

project approval said that a heavy vehicle couldn't use that road for the purposes of or associated with Mangoola Mine. In that collision, Mr Patton was killed, and I won't go into the detail, but it was quite brutal, and in council's view, the risk of a similar event occurring on Bylong Valley Way is not insignificant, is a material risk that similar fatalities, and I say that in plural because we say there will be more than one if this project is granted approval.

There's a material risk that these – those events will repeat themselves. And we say that unless the Commission is comfortably satisfied that no heavy vehicle movements would occur along Bylong Valley Way and condition 51 in its current form or redrafted is effective to ensure that this won't occur at any stage for the entire life of the project – if you cannot be satisfied of that, we say you must refuse the application.

There are two other – two other key points that arise from condition 51. One is it won't bind third parties. It will bind the proponent. It certainly won't bind a truck driver in a heavy vehicle who decides to drive along Bylong Valley Way. And therein lies the difficulty of enforcing any such condition.

The second point is the Commission needs to independently consider these issues and not simply follow what the proponent has – or the Department of Planning has said in its various documents before the Commission. You simply can't delegate away consideration of those key issues to another person or another body. We say you need to actively turn your mind to these issues before any making or decision on this project.

If ultimately the Commission is minded to grant consent to the application, we submit that at the very least the proponent should be required to monitor the Bylong Valley Way and to maintain and report on heavy vehicle movements on Bylong Valley Way for the life of the project. And we have proposed a condition in that regard in the attached minute.

Finally, there's some – a selection of other conditions that Council submits should be amended if the Commission is minded to grant consent to the project. Condition 52(a) relates to security – so that's our draft in the proposed minute – relates to security to secure KEPCOs performance of their obligations in respect of Bylong Valley Way.

Condition 53 we say needs to include the words "annual" and "independent" to ensure that the monitoring program is actually robust and impartial as opposed to being solely controlled by the proponent, in circumstances where naturally their own interest is to ensure that the report is favourable to them. And finally, condition 53(a), which is a requirement for the applicant to ensure that any journey management plans be reviewed regularly. Those are council's key submissions.

MR KIRKBY: I just have a couple of questions. Do you – has there been any surveys of any field – like, obviously you've got your current workforce living in

Muswellbrook, Denman ..... how – what sort of distances are they travelling in terms of I guess the more commutes to - - -

5 MS PLESMAN: So as part of our economic – we have a new economic  
development and innovation – very small – department, but wonderful staff member  
who's now been with us a couple of years, Melanie – not quite two years. Part of  
that has been the process to gather a lot more information and data, statistics, about  
our current workforce, where they travel from and where they come from. There's  
10 been an assumption in Muswellbrook for quite some time that our workforce is – and  
the mines assert that is largely local. What we've discovered, that of our 3000 plus  
mine workers, almost 2000 of them travel into Muswellbrook from other places. So  
I can provide that data. I haven't got it with me today - - -

15 MR KIRKBY: No, no, that's fine. Yeah, you can - - -

MS PLESMAN: - - - but I can forward that to you, if that's of interest to you,  
because it's just data that we've sourced – Josh will get onto that now, but data that  
we've sourced ourselves through an economist who has been working with us –  
partly working with Council and also the Hunter Research Foundation. So that's  
20 been of – it's something we suspected, but to have that confirmed has been of big  
interest to us, because we're working very hard to maintain a very active local towns,  
so it's been quite eye-opening to see that in fact more than 50 per cent of our mining  
workforce comes in from south along the Hunter Expressway. Quite a few of them  
are from further north, and some from – well, as we would have expected, the  
25 Denman and surrounding area. So people will travel for their jobs, and that's what  
we've discovered, and they will use whatever access and roadways they have to their  
– to get where they need to go. So.

30 MR BROWN: I must just note that in relation to the assumption made by the  
proponents where they say that they were looking at distances within one hour of the  
mine site, I just – I doubt that Denman - - -

MR KIRKBY: Denman is within one hour. Yes.

35 MR BROWN: - - - is within that one hour period. And with planned – well, with  
plans for the development and growth in Denman, there's – there'd certainly be  
opportunities to provide accommodation.

40 MS PLESMAN: I would say that that's – we have a number of – council has  
received a number of development applications for subdivisions in the Denman area  
- - -

MR KIRKBY: Yes.

45 MS PLESMAN: - - - and there is some pressure on us to open up land for  
residential development in the Sandy Hollow area. So Sandy Hollow is also very  
close to the Bylong Valley Way, and as Council is working to improve water

services in the Sandy Hollow area, should we manage to achieve that over the next few years, which is certainly what we're hoping to do, we should imagine that there would be a further interest in buying very reasonably priced blocks of land in the Sandy Hollow area and supporting that, you know, home and lifestyle by working if  
5 there was such a thing as a mine along the Bylong Valley Way. So it seems perfectly reasonable to us that that would be a scenario – well, we could imagine that scenario, just as we could – we would like to prevent a death like the death that Anthony referred to of Mr Patterson.

10 MR O'CONNOR: Yeah. Can I just summarise what I think your position is just so you can confirm I do understand it correctly. So what you're saying to us is that the EIS has incorrectly identified the traffic flows likely to be coming along Bylong Way, they're likely to be much larger than the – I think it's five to seven per cent that  
15 you've quoted that they're saying will come from that easterly direction and, on that basis, you believe the DA should be refused. But, even if it were only five to seven percent, you still think the DA should be refused because that's an intolerable burden for that road in its current standard to accommodate and there could be fatalities or significant damage, etcetera, so under both scenarios, you believe the DA should be refused; is that correct?

20 MR WILLIS: Yes, that's correct. We say that the proponent's assumptions on traffic flows generally are incorrect and, if so, that fundamentally changes the assessments which the department's report and recommended conditions are based and also the material on which you would be basing your decision, among other  
25 things. Even if it – even if those assumptions were correct, it would still represent an intolerable risk, in our submission, to road user and workforce safety.

MR O'CONNOR: So I understand that. So moving on then to the second point – just to make sure I understand this correctly – if the commission were inclined to  
30 approve the project, then you're suggesting that certain conditions should be attached which are different to those recommended by the Department of Planning and Environment.

MR WILLIS: That's broadly correct but, in our submission, we have suggested  
35 certain amendments to the conditions.

MR O'CONNOR: Yes.

MR WILLIS: So not in – in every circumstance, we haven't proposed new  
40 conditions, we've simply submitted that certain of the recommended conditions be amended to either correctly reflect the true position or to resolve an ambiguity or some other issue that, in council's submission, is present in the terms as drafted at the moment.

45 MR O'CONNOR: Right. Am I – am I correct in understanding if the commission were – or saw fit to approve the project, that the condition relating to contributions that might have to be made for road improvements of Bylong Valley Way, you

would like to see the offer made by KEPCO subject to CPI And GST adjustments factored in as a requirement.

MR WILLIS: We would like to see the condition amended fundamentally at 2.6.  
5 We would fundamentally like to see the condition amended to reflect KEPCO's offer. So if you refer to the – KEPCO's most recent offer, which is an appendix to the FA, they did offer that amount index at CPI but that isn't set out - - -

MR KIRKBY: It's not reflected in the condition.  
10

MR WILLIS: - - - or made clear in the – in the department's recommended conditions.

MR O'CONNOR: Sure. And, likewise, you would also like to see a bond that  
15 relates to guaranteeing future maintenance of the road. So it's not just a matter of doing some upgrades to the road for the life of the project, there's going to be a requirement for maintenance and you would like to see a bond that guarantees that maintenance gets done but it's a – it's an amount of \$40,000; how did you calculate that or derive that number?

MR WILLIS: From memory, we came to that number based on – there was some  
20 calculations done based on general – or council's expected expenditure for one or two years if KEPCO didn't follow through with its obligations under the condition. So the point of the bank guarantee was to secure performance of those obligations.

MR KIRKBY: So there's two amounts; there's the amount that they've agreed to  
25 pay indexed that does the safety upgrade and then this, I guess, is a bond, really, around the dilapidation surveys, if - - -

MR WILLIS: Yeah, that's right.  
30

MR KIRKBY: - - - there's damage, you have an amount of money in security if, for  
whatever reason, they don't pay the required amount to fix it up, there's a pool of money.  
35

MR WILLIS: Yeah, that's right. The bond was to go to – the bond is more going to  
the – the result of the post-dilapidation survey - - -

MR KIRKBY: Yep, yep.  
40

MR WILLIS: - - - whereas the 267 amount generally set out under our submission 2  
is to do with road safety upgrades.

MR O'CONNOR: Yep.  
45

MS PLESMAN: We base that on our current and some historical experience in maintaining the roads in our area so our engineers are quite experienced at looking at what the effects of certain use will be so we have a precedence.

5 MS LEWIN: That's included in your past reports or submissions?

MS PLESMAN: I'm not sure.

MS LEWIN: The engineers' assessments?

10

MS PLESMAN: Has it - - -

MR BROWN: I make take that on notice.

15 MS PLESMAN: Could we take that on notice.

MR KIRKBY: Yeah. Interesting whether this - - -

MS PLESMAN: Yeah.

20

MS LEWIN: That – that would be good.

MS PLESMAN: Yeah.

25 MR KIRKBY: - - - you applied it to other mines within Muswellbrook and there's a footing, like, say - - -

MS PLESMAN: We - - -

30 MR KIRKBY: - - - Mangoola or – yeah.

MS PLESMAN: We do.

MR KIRKBY: You do. Okay.

35

MS LEWIN: Yes, and the physical conditions in .....

MS PLESMAN: That's right.

40 MS LEWIN: Yes.

MS PLESMAN: So we have a fairly good - - -

MS LEWIN: We - - -

45

MS PLESMAN: - - - understanding and agreement with the mines on our areas and I regularly meet with them and we discuss the – how the road strategies are operating, as does our engineer so - - -

5 MS LEWIN: Okay. Good.

MR O'CONNOR: There's been submissions put to us that if the project's approved, there should be a requirement – which is not in the conditions at the moment – that says that there should be buses provided to transport workers to and from the site, obviously, to dramatically reduce the amount of individual car movements occurring on the roads in the area. Would you be arguing for something similar, say, from Denman to the project, if the project were approved?

MS PLESMAN: Look, I think we would want to take that on notice.

MR WILLIS: Yeah, I think we'd want to make - - -

MS PLESMAN: And - - -

20 MR WILLIS: - - - a separate submission on that.

MS PLESMAN: Yeah, that – yes. We would – we would consider that.

MR O'CONNOR: Okay. We would appreciate if you do give some that thought.

MR KIRKBY: Yeah. And I guess whether there are other mines - - -

MS PLESMAN: There are other mines.

30 MR KIRKBY: - - - within your LGA that to operate like that, that do provide - - -

MS PLESMAN: We have – we have a new mine that is currently doing that: Mount Pleasant run by Mack Energy.

35 MR KIRKBY: Yep.

MS PLESMAN: They've only just – they're just moving to extraction, in December they'll move to 24 hours so the workforce is increasing and we noticed that most of our hotels have no accommodation as many of the workers are coming in from outside and they are bussing them out to the mine – mine site.

MR KIRKBY: So that funding that they're talking about is prior to construction so it would have covered the construction phase as well because there's – that dynamic's likely to be different as well in terms of - - -

45 MS PLESMAN: Well - - -

MR KIRKBY: - - - I could see quite a bit of potential construction traffic coming up from .....

5 MS PLESMAN: It is quite different. So we've just finished - - -

MR KIRKBY: Yeah.

10 MS PLESMAN: - - - well, only part of the construction phase of Mount Pleasant so the traffic changes as the workforce changes.

MR KIRKBY: Do you have any - - -

MR O'CONNOR: Thank you. No, that's good.

15 MR KIRKBY: Does council have any other concerns outside, I guess, this issue?

MS PLESMAN: That's our primary issue.

20 MR KIRKBY: That's the primary one, yes. Okay. And you've gone on – normally ask where you're confused on the conditions but you've made that very clear so we'll take that on board so that would be great, if you could follow up with some of that information, take it on notice.

25 MS PLESMAN: Yep, yep. So, as I understand it, if we could just summarise what - - -

MR KIRKBY: Yeah, sure.

30 MS PLESMAN: - - - we've either taken on notice or you're expecting, we'll forward our employment statistics in relation to the mining – mine worker population, we will also forward through any other examples we have in relation to road strategy that we have. Have we already submitted our western – the western road strategy?

35 MR BROWN: I'm not sure. We've – the mine-affected road strategy, which is probably more relevant and up-to-date, I'm not sure whether we have that; we could make that available. That's what I suspect the document's come from but I just need to check that.

40 MR KIRKBY: Is that the one that's been – all the mines in Muswellbrook - - -

MR BROWN: Yeah.

45 MR KIRKBY: - - - I think I was involved in - - -

MR BROWN: Yeah. So that – that – that - - -

MR KIRKBY: - - - which mine and I remember there was a discussion around some work that had been done. I think the department was involved in; is that that one?

MR BROWN: Yeah, yeah.

5

MR KIRKBY: Okay.

MS PLESMAN: Yeah.

10 MR BROWN: The department sponsored that project, yep.

MR KIRKBY: Yes, yep.

15 MS PLESMAN: And that, also, having a look at that strategy, you wanted to find out how we came to the figure of 40,000 for the bank guarantee.

MR KIRKBY: Yeah.

20 MS PLESMAN: And then we'll comment on would council support the use of buses to transport workers; was that all?

MR KIRKBY: And whether, yeah, you have any precedents of that being used in the mines in your area.

25 MR BROWN: Yep.

MR KIRKBY: So, yeah, if you've got some examples and whether they're – you think they're successful, that would help. Okay.

30 MS PLESMAN: Yeah.

35 MR KIRKBY: That's fine. Well, once again, thanks very much for coming in, this has been valuable and we'll look forward to that information. We've, obviously – we've now had a public meeting and we're still going through, I guess, everything that was raised there and we'll consider all this additional information so we're a little bit off yet making any decision, we've got a lot to absorb - - -

MS PLESMAN: Yes, I imagine that's the case.

40 MR KIRKBY: - - - and deliberate on, yes.

MS PLESMAN: I guess, a demonstration of our level of concern is our willingness to be here today. We do see matters of concern.

45 MR KIRKBY: Okay.

MR O'CONNOR: We certainly appreciate – that helped us out last week.

MR KIRKBY: Thank you. Thanks.

MS PLESMAN: Yes.

5 MR KIRKBY: Yep. Great, thanks.

**MEETING CONCLUDED**

**[2.45 pm]**