



AUSCRIPT AUSTRALASIA PTY LIMITED

ACN 110 028 825

T: 1800 AUSCRIPT (1800 287 274)

E: clientservices@auscript.com.au

W: www.auscript.com.au

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

TRANSCRIPT IN CONFIDENCE

O/N H-949818

INDEPENDENT PLANNING COMMISSION

PUBLIC MEETING

RE: SUNRISE MOD 4

PANEL:

**ROSS CARTER
PROF ALICE CLARK
DR IAN LAVERING**

ASSISTING PANEL:

**DAVID KOPPERS
ALANA JELFS**

**DEPARTMENT OF
PLANNING AND
ENVIRONMENT**

**CLAY PRESHAW
ROSE-ANNE HAWKESWOOD**

LOCATION:

**IPC OFFICE
LEVEL 3, 201 ELIZABETH STREET
SYDNEY, NEW SOUTH WALES**

DATE:

11.08 AM, THURSDAY, 11 OCTOBER 2018

MR R. CARTER: All right. Good morning and welcome. Before we begin, I would like to acknowledge the traditional owners of the land on which we meet, the Gadigal People, and pay my respects to their elders past and present.

5 Welcome to the meeting today. Clean TeQ Holdings Limited, the applicant, is proposing to modify its development consent for the Sunrise Project, an approved nickel-cobalt, scandium mine near Fifield in the central west region of New South Wales. Key elements of the proposal include changes to the mineral processing facility and mine layout, an additional supply of limestone from third party suppliers,
10 and diversification of the mine's water supply to include surface water from the Lachlan River.

My name is Ross Carter. I am the chair of this Independent Planning Commission Panel. Joining me are my fellow commissioners, Professor Alice Clark and Dr Ian
15 Lavering. The other attendees of the meeting are from the Independent Planning Commission Secretariat, David Koppers and Alana Jelfs, and from the Department of Planning and Environment, Clay Preshaw and Rose-Anne Hawkeswood.

In the interests of openness and transparency and to ensure the full capture of
20 information, today's meeting is being recorded and a full transcript will be produced and made available on the commission's website. This meeting is one part of the commission's decision-making process; it is taking place at the preliminary state of this process and will form one of several sources of information upon which the commission will base its decision. It is important for the commissioners to ask
25 questions of attendees and to clarify issues whenever they or we consider it appropriate. If you're asked a question and are not in a position to answer, please feel free to 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. Thanks,
Clay.

30

MR C. PRESHAW: Okay. Thank you.

MR CARTER: An intro bit?

35 MR PRESHAW: Yeah, sure. So my name is Clay Preshaw, director of resource and energy assessments, and this is Rose-Anne Hawkeswood, senior environmental officer. I'm not sure how – did you want me to begin with a sort of outline of the modification?

40 MR CARTER: Yeah, that would be really useful - - -

MR PRESHAW: Yeah.

45 MR CARTER: - - - Clay, and I guess particularly the sort of the – the demarcation and modification of the plan.

MR PRESHAW: Sure. So I think it might be worthwhile just to outline what the project is and then outline what this modification is as opposed to previous modifications, and then maybe a little bit about the assessment process to date.

5 So I did bring a map. I'm sure you've seen it before, but it's just a map of the project and we don't really – there's all this stuff on the table here. You probably don't need to see it in any great level of detail. The main thing to say is that this project is – it does include multiple components that are geographically dispersed. So there's at least five, maybe six, components, depending on how you categorise it, but there's
10 the mine and the processing facility. There is now an accommodation camp that's somewhat separate to that. There's a limestone quarry. There's a rail siding. There's a borefield to the south and there's also pipelines in between. So somewhat unique, the project, in having those different aspects to the components of the project located in different areas, and it does, I think, cause some confusion at times when
15 we're talking about particular modifications that are only relevant to certain parts of the project.

So it has been modified five times now and, in broad terms, the first modification was about an increase in processing rate. The second modification was some
20 reconfiguration around the borefields. The third modification, which is in the latest tranche of modifications that have come in since the change of ownership, or around the time of the change of ownership, is the addition of scandium into the mix and the addition of having an initial production phase versus a full production phase, and that's – the concept at that point was that they would try and extract scandium early
25 on and then move later into nickel-cobalt.

Just to touch on the, I guess, the resource itself, which is relevant in terms of that modification. So scandium is this – you know, this metal that has a growing
30 demand, particularly in aeronautical engineering and some other uses as an alloy, and that's why that, when they came in for modification 3, that was the key kind of driver behind that. Around that time and since then, nickel-cobalt has also become – I guess, there's been an increase in demand, particularly in relation to the batteries and the growth of renewable energy. So, you know, perhaps – and this is really for the company to make its own commercial decisions about – but perhaps the nickel-
35 cobalt is now just as important or more important than the scandium was at that time.

So this is modification four, but it's a bit out of order. There were two other modifications: modification 5 and 6, which have since been approved before
40 modification 4. So modification 5 was just – was some minor changes to the hazard requirements in the conditions and modification 6 was – it was about relocating the workers' camp offsite and, as I say, modification 5 and 6 have both been approved. So modification 4 is the sort of outstanding one and, as we understand it, these last three and now this fourth – modification 4 – modifications are the parts of the project that will allow the project to actually commence in terms of developing the mine and
45 other aspects of the project. It is worth saying that there was physical commencement of the project. I think it was around 2006, but I'll have to double-check.

MS R. HAWKESWOOD: Yeah, 2006, I think.

MR PRESHAW: Yeah, with the development of some bores in the borefields. So, look, the project has been around for some time, obviously since 2001 when it was approved, and I guess with this modification it has drawn more attention than in previous modifications because perhaps there was a lack of understanding or awareness about it until now, and we've certainly seen a lot more interest with modification 4 as opposed to the previous ones, and you'll see from the timeline of the assessment process that it's taken us a bit longer, because we've been very comprehensive and we've done a lot of engagement with the community and with councils, and that would explain it, I think. But this modification application came in late last year and it's taken us till now to make a recommendation, and that really just reflects that we wanted to tick all the boxes and make sure that everything that had been assessed comprehensively and that the community and the councils were aware of what was going on and had all the opportunities that were possible to give us feedback on the process and on the project.

But it is important to say that, while there has been a lot of interest in this MOD, it is limited in its scope and so we are constrained, legally, to assess the modifications that are put to us as part of this application, so there has been a lot of submissions that have raised issues that we consider fall outside the scope of the modification and so we have, in our report to you, tried to clarify what parts of the modification are important for our assessment here and which parts are not – have already been assessed and approved as part of the original project or previous MODs.

So to turn – I know it's a long-winded way of sort of giving the background, but I do think it's important to sort of lay that context. So that this MOD, what's it about; it's really – the main driver behind it is that the company were looking to more selectively mine the resource to get the higher grade ore and, in simple terms, what that meant was – and I have – I just want to refer to my notes here – but there is a – the easiest way to think about it is that, by selectively mining the higher grade ore they actually require more sulphuric acid as part of their processing, which was – that's a component that was always required, but they're increasing that from 700,000 tonnes per annum to just over a million, and that means they need more sulphur; originally it was 260,000 tonnes and now it's 350,000 tonnes per annum. If you have more sulphuric acid, then you need more limestone to neutralise that, and so there's an increase from 790,000 to 990,000 tonnes of limestone and, really, what that means is you need – the company needs to have a bigger store – tailing storage facility, and that has then triggered some other reconfigurations on the mine site itself.

So that's the main component of this MOD. There are some other aspects that they've added in, and one of those is that there's going to be limited – a limited amount of blasting at the mine, which was not previously part of the project. There are some associated road transport changes and possibly the thing that has drawn some attention is that they – the company's also seeking to be able to extract water

directly from the Lachlan River, so surface water as opposed to the ground water that is already approved in the borefields.

5 So it is important – and I’m sure we’ll get to this – but it’s important to say that the main aspect of that water component is that they – what we’re assessing is their – the infrastructure that allows them to be able to extract the water and the amount of water and the way – the total volume that’s extracted, really, is a matter that’s governed under the Water Management Act and the relevant water sharing plans. While they have provided some details around what they expect the estimated
10 amount of water that could be extracted, again, that falls under the water licensing regime, and we may get to that later.

So, look, that’s the modification before us now, and that’s how I think it relates to the project as a whole and the previous modifications. I did just want to touch on the
15 assessment process. I did mention that it has taken some time, from late last year to, you know, late this year, and that’s because we got a lot more community interest on this modification, and also the councils were quite interested in this one also. There may have been an element of the – in previous modifications, people weren’t aware and didn’t make submissions. So what we’ve done in terms of our engagement is,
20 early in the process, we went out to the site, and we had a site visit, and we met with each of the councils individually, and we had long discussions with them.

We also held two community information sessions. This is not something that we normally would do for a modification of this, you know, scale and nature, but I think,
25 because of the time that had elapsed since the original project approval and the interest that had grown, we felt that that was an appropriate engagement tool that we could use. So we held one in Trundle, which is where a lot of people were concerned about traffic issues, in the main, although it also attracted people who would – who live in the Forbes area and out near the borefields, and then we held another
30 community information session in Fifield, which is obviously near the mine proposed – near the mine site and where some of the proposed changes on that site would be, and, in both instances, we did a presentation on the project and the mod similar to what I’m describing now, but then we just threw it open, and we – we basically just answered questions from the floor, which I think was a very productive
35 way of sort of engaging directly with the community, and, out of that, we, I guess, developed some relationships with key stakeholders in the community, and we’ve met with a number of those people and had teleconferences with them since.

They’ve asked various questions. So, out of that community information session and
40 the later engagement we had with some of these stakeholders, we’ve gone back to the company and asked for further information on a number of issues. So you’ll see in the package that we put up to you and what’s available on our website there is the normal kind of documentation you would get with an assessment process, being the environmental assessment or the EIS for a project, and the response to submissions,
45 but there’s also a series of letters from the applicant that are responses to questions that we’ve raised to try and clarify certain issues that were either raised by the community or residual things that we thought needed to be address.

5 So, you know, it is important to make the point that we have gone, I guess, above and beyond in terms of trying to respond to community concerns, and, late in the process what has been occurring is the councils have been in negotiations with the applicant about voluntary planning agreements. These had already been agreed as part of the
10 previous project and mods, but, you know, I guess there has been a renegotiation on the basis of this modification, and that has taken some time, given the fact that it's three LGAs that this project covers, and we essentially delayed the assessment while those finalised VPA negotiations occurred, and it's – so that we could have some clarity about what was going to be in those agreements before we put it up to the Commission for determination. Look, I think that's probably all I will say in terms of the mod and the process that we've undergone, and I'm happy then to sort of answer the more specific questions on particular issues and impacts.

15 MR CARTER: Okay. Alice you Ian, have you got any other issues around that?

DR I. LAVERING: No.

20 MR CARTER: All right. Thanks very much, Clay. So yeah. If we could sort of dive into some of the more specific elements - - -

MR PRESRAW: Sure.

25 MR CARTER: - - - that would be great. I think the exec summary of the assessments sort of really goes through the key ones that we're interested in as well. So yeah.

30 MR PRESRAW: Yeah. Okay. So just – I sort of respond to the points on the agenda here?

MR CARTER: Yeah.

35 MR PRESRAW: Okay. So, look, the first thing after that section on the proposed mod is the traffic, and certainly we consider this to be one of, if not the, key issue for the community, and that was – certainly came through in the community information session we had in Trundle. So one of the key concerns was that there would be an increase in traffic through Trundle as a result of the mod, and one of the ways that the community felt that that could be addressed was to include a bypass around the village of Trundle, and, look, our understanding from discussing it with people in
40 Trundle is that that wasn't, you know, consensus view, that there are certain people in the community who felt that that would be a good option, and there are some people, some other community members, including some of the businesses, who didn't think it would be a great option to have the bypass and, in fact, would prefer to have some of that traffic coming through the town itself.

45 So – but it was certainly something that came through in a number of submissions, and we asked their – the company to respond to that, and they did so formally, and I

think, in the responsive submissions, they provided some detail. It's on page 27 and also in their revised traffic assessment that their consultants did. The consideration in more detail is provided there. Look, essentially, our view was – is that the roads through Trundle are capable of carrying the proposed traffic volumes, and that's particularly because we did ask the company to consider ways in which they could reduce those traffic volumes.

So that was part of the process that we, I guess, drove through the assessment – was are there ways you can actually get the numbers down, and that's where the company then committed to using higher capacity heavy vehicles and also using shuttle buses for their employees, and, I mean, the – the resolve was that they did manage to bring the numbers down quite significantly from what was originally proposed, and, to go back to the concept of a bypass, we were comfortable, based on the advice from RMS, that the roads can handle the revised lowered traffic volumes and – if, you know, you were to try and move that traffic into some bypass roads, and we even looked at particular routes they could take.

Essentially, what you were doing would be to be moving traffic onto roads that are not equipped currently to handle that type of traffic and would require even more significant upgrades, and, on top of that, you would, in fact, be moving some of the potential impacts to other areas and – which would require further assessment, and you would be actually making other people who currently don't have any traffic impacts experience those types of impacts. So, given that the roads are capable of handling the traffic volumes that we're talking about and that the other possibilities would actually involve more significant upgrades, we didn't consider the bypass was the right approach.

The second thing you've got on the list there is just generally about road and intersection upgrades. So the – we went away, and we actually looked at all the different road and intersection upgrades that are required. The reality is the only one that has changed as a result of this modification is that they will need to do upgrades at the intersection of Henry Parkes Way and Middle Trundle Road. So this is just materials that are coming from Parkes up to the various components of the project. So that intersection didn't previously require upgrades, but there are a number of other intersection and roads that do need upgrades and will require maintenance. We have got a map here that shows basically where most of those things are occurring is between, you know, Trundle and the mine site.

So there are different sections of roads, and there's actually an LGA boundary in between, which does make it a bit more complicated, but almost of all the roads and intersections along these routes will require some level of either upgrades or maintenance – and/or maintenance, and so our conditions go into great detail about each sections of those roads, and the VPAs in some ways duplicate that because there will need to be some further agreement and negotiation about what the costs of upgrading and maintaining those roads are through the VPA process. I don't think it's – there's – given the scope of modification, the only thing that changed was, as I mentioned, the upgrade of Henry Parkes Way and Middle Trundle Road. I don't

know that we really need to go into any more detail about the other intersection and the road upgrades that were already required by the original project and subsequent modifications, but I'm happy to answer other questions if you have any on the traffic.

5 MR CARTER: Yeah. Thanks, Clay. I mean, some of the submissions from the community on the Trundle bypass and, well, the traffic impact issues sort of raise general amenity and safety issues, but there's some that also talk about some specific community events and usage - - -

10 MR PRESHAW: Yeah.

MR CARTER: - - - of that – you know, of the main street and their concerns about potential impacts on that. So can you just step us through that a little bit.

15 MR PRESHAW: Sure. Look, I think it's worth saying at the beginning that, look – that, through the process of this modification, I think we've come to a really good outcome in that the original approved project would have actually had more traffic movements than what is now proposed as part of this modification only after we've asked the company to consider using the higher capacity trucks and the shuttle buses.

20 So the – it is important to say that this modification results in less traffic than what's already approved, and so that's important because we think that that's a good outcome for the community of Trundle and the people who are concerned about being affected, but, on top of that, there are, as you mentioned, certain events that are quite important to the town of Trundle, in particular the ABBA Festival, which, I think, attracts many more people than actually live in the town. Thousands of people turn up for the festival, and it's actually, you know, factors above the number of people who already live there, and there's also the harvest season, where I think there's some events associated with that as well.

30 So in the conditions we have actually included – as part of the traffic management plan, we've required the company to consult with the relevant roads authority, which includes council – including Parkes Council, because it's with – Trundle is with in Parkes. That is the most relevant for those events. And then – additional condition we've included is that they need to consider how they would manage their traffic during those events in particular.

35 So our view is that – and that also includes, you know, consulting with the event organisers. So our view is that through the traffic management plan, they will need to speak to council, council will need to consider how can they – how can they ensure that those events are managed properly through traffic. Just let me turn to the actual conditions, so I get that correct. I think it's condition 45 of schedule 3. So we've said that they – the traffic management plan needs to consider measures to minimise disruption to community events and festivals in consultation with event
45 organisers and the traffic management plan also includes consultation with the relevant Rhodes authority.

5 So there are a number of ways that the applicant has discussed, in its responsive submissions and other documents, how it could try to minimise the impacts and, really, I think, from those documents, it would appear that there's way that they could sequence their traffic movements during those short-term periods to try and minimise the disturbance. Whether that's staggering trucks and vehicles to occur during the night time – I'm not exactly sure, but that's why we've included it as part of the requirements of the traffic management to be dealt with post-approval or post-determination.

10 MR CARTER: All right. Thanks, Clay. All right. So air quality was the next one.

MR PRESHAW: Yes. So air quality is certainly one of the other issues that was raised, particularly by the residents in and around Fifield. And so there was some concern about the particular processing method and whether the, you know, dispersion modelling that has been done is appropriate. The advice, you know, from the EPA, which is the expert agency on this, is that the data that they've collected and the modelling that they've done is appropriate and is consistent with the approved methods, so we've taken the advice of EPA on that. But I guess it's worth saying – and if you – there are more details that I could go into in terms of the impact assessment and how it was done but, in general terms, we accept the advice of the expert agency on that.

25 Despite that, the community was still concerned that, you know, when the final detailed design of the mine is completed, that these – that the air quality numbers may not be at the same – or are not reliable. So the EPA has agreed to doing what is referred to as a “verification study” or a “verification audit”, depending on where you look for it as part of the EPL process. So most of these issues, we consider would be dealt with through the environmental protection licence. There are conditions in our approval about – in our recommended conditions about the criteria that they would need to meet, but the majority of that stuff is dealt with through the EPL and the EPA has agreed that there could be an air-quality verification process that occurs before the commissioning of the processing plant.

35 So we've, essentially, duplicated the requirement that was – is likely to turn up in an EPL in the conditions to ensure that that is built into the process. The question, I think, that's – that you've put here, is how would this be operated in practice. The reality is that that verification process will occur through the EPL process and, really, what we've put in our recommended conditions in 24A of schedule 3 is just to ensure that that process occurs and to, you know, provide some assurance to the community that we – that that will occur as part of the process of the EPL process.

45 So there is a question, also, in this – in that part of the agenda around the real-time monitoring, and that is another aspect that, I guess, is largely in response to community concerns about potential air quality, impacts surrounding the mine and the processing facility. Again, that's something that we've added in on the advice of the EPA. So we've actually included, in the air quality management plan and condition 23(d) of schedule 3 that they include monitoring of sulphuric acid plant

stack emissions, including continuous monitoring concentrations. So there would be continuous stack emissions monitoring and it's likely that there would also be – and I might take your advice, Rose-Anne. Where have we included the receiver monitoring as well?

5

MS HAWKESWOOD: Just with our monitoring – includes monitoring.

MR PRESHAW: Right. So just above that – includes real-time monitoring. That – and that's – what the EPA has suggested could be done there is you actually would have TEOMs at a representative group of receivers at around the processing facility. So that's, I guess, in response to concerns from the community on an advice of the EPA.

10

MR CARTER: The spacing of those receivers monitoring that is determined by EPA?

15

MR PRESHAW: That's right. So that would be – that would be part of the EPL process

MR CARTER: Yes.

20

MR PRESHAW: And we would take advice from the EPA as to - - -

MR CARTER: An advice on it.

25

MR PRESHAW: - - - the most appropriate location.

MR CARTER: Yes.

MR PRESHAW: It is worth saying that that is, you know, not something that we ordinarily would require, but it's certainly something that we're doing in response to the community concerns, as opposed to any concern – any specific technical concern about the predicted – the predicted impacts because, as our assessor makes clear, we – the assessment that we've done would say that there's not likely to be exceedance of the relevant criteria. So it's over and above, again, what we would ordinarily require.

35

MR CARTER: Yes.

MR PRESHAW: But it is just to give the community that assurance.

40

MR CARTER: Okay. Alice, did you have anything

PROF A. CLARK: No.

45

MR CARTER: Okay. Water supply was the - - -

MR PRESHAW: Yep.

MR CARTER: - - - it featured quite a bit in submissions - - -

5 MR PRESHAW: Yeah.

MR CARTER: - - - as well.

10 MR PRESHAW: Yeah. So as I mentioned at the beginning, the borefields itself were approved – assessed and approved – as part of the original project and reassessed and approved as part of a subsequent modification. So we – while there were some concerns and some issues raised about that process that occurred under a previous assessment process, we are constrained to, you know, consider the aspect of the modification that relates to water, which is the proposed addition of surface water
15 extraction from the Lachlan River.

Having said that, it is worthwhile, as we have done in our report, to mention and to, I guess, highlight that since the original approval of the project there has been a
20 change in the water licence – the water management regime in the state, and so we have the Water Management Act and we have a set of water sharing plans that ultimately govern how people – how much – how people extract water from groundwater and surface water sources and how much they are able to do – how much they are able to extract.

25 So in broad terms, the – from the borefield, the company, we understand, has some 3154 entitlements to extract water from the groundwater and they're estimating that, from the surface water from the Lachlan River there would be approximately 350 megalitres per year and, as a result of this project, which includes the water treatment plant and substantial recycling of water on site, they could provide up to 1451
30 megalitres on site.

So basically what the company has put as part of this modification to clarify to the community and to others is that the total amount of water that they will need is the
35 1450 that they can produce through recycling and water treatment plus the water entitlements of 3154 plus 350 from the surface water. If they have all of that, that's sufficient water to operate at full capacity, full production, the project as a whole.

So that's just, I guess, background, but the relevant part of this modification is around the ability to extract water from the Lachlan River and, importantly, that was
40 something that the Department of Industry – the water part of the Department of Industry – actually suggested that the company have a diverse supply of water. So that part of the application, of this modification application, was in fact in response to the Department of Industry's recommendation to diversify their water supply.

45 MR CARTER: And just - - -

MR PRESHAW: Yeah.

MR CARTER: - - - earlier, Clay, you mentioned that the modification is about the surface water extraction infrastructure - - -

MR PRESHAW: Yes.

5

MR CARTER: - - - and the actual volume and entitlement issues are dealt with under the Water Management Act - - -

MR PRESHAW: That's right.

10

MR CARTER: - - - and the entitlement framework.

MR PRESHAW: That's right. So we do – and that's the key part that we assess. So, you know, the actual extraction infrastructure that's required to extract that water. We do, I guess, seek advice from the Department of Industry water as to whether there is water available to be licensed to the applicant, and the advice we have from the Department of Industry is that there is available water licensing there for the applicant or anyone else in the market, so that's really, once we were aware of that, then that's – the focus is really on the ability to, you know, the infrastructure that allows them to extract the water from the river. Did you – and I think that sort of answers the other points that are on the list there, but I'm happy to go into more detail, if necessary. I will take things on notice if necessary.

15

20

MR CARTER: Yeah, we might, unless you've got anything now, Ian or Alice, we might – we may come back on that. I guess - - -

25

MR PRESHAW: It does - - -

MR CARTER: - - - getting our head around how that operates is something - - -

30

MR PRESHAW: Yeah.

MR CARTER: - - - that we - - -

MR PRESHAW: And it could be something that, if you wanted more detail around how that regime works or, you know, how the water determinations for each year are made, I think those are the sorts of questions we may take from you and then go to the Department of Industry given it's their regulatory role and responsibility to handle those issues.

35

40

MR CARTER: Okay. Thanks, Clay. All right. I think that really goes as far as we can with water supply at the moment - - -

MR PRESHAW: Yes.

45

MR CARTER: - - - but we may take you up on that with some further questions with the - - -

MR PRESKAW: So there is just on that, if there's one thing I could just add: so there is a reference in the executive summary that the company has identified could be read, I guess, incorrectly. So we just wanted to make a clarification on that if we could – and we will provide this in writing to you as well. So it's in the executive
5 summary and it's under the Water Supply heading. So I think, generally, if you read that whole section in context, it's probably okay, but the company has identified the second sentence that says:

10 *Almost half (1451 megalitres per year) of the project's overall water demand (3135 megalitres per year) would be supplied by the water treatment plant.*

So that, in itself, outside of the context of the preceding and the sentence after, may not actually be entirely accurate. What it really should say is that “an equivalent of half of the project's overall external water demand” so 1451 megalitres is equivalent
15 to half of what the company would require to get from external sources.

MR CARTER: Yes.

MR PRESKAW: So again, if you read the next sentence, it's sort of implicit there
20 anyway, but I did – the company were, I guess, concerned that, if you took that all by itself, it may imply something else and I just wanted to make that clear.

MR CARTER: Okay. Thanks, Clay, and that – you're sending that through.

25 MR PRESKAW: I will send that through, and if you read the assessment section in the main body of the report, you will find that that's quite clear there as well. So the next - - -

MR CARTER: All right.

30 MR PRESKAW: Sorry, yes.

MR CARTER: No, I was going to say we've dealt a little with the main street event
35 usage.

MR PRESKAW: Yeah, that's what I was going to say, I think we've addressed that as part of the traffic questions, but if there's anything else.

MR CARTER: I think that's been covered.

40 MR PRESKAW: Yeah.

MR CARTER: So if you can move on to the noise assessment.

45 MR PRESKAW: Yes. So the noise assessment is an interesting part of the project that we needed – of the modification that we did need to assess, because there are now some very minor exceedences of the criteria and they are up to two decibels but

no more. So under, you know, existing – under the previous policy, under the new policy, you know, an exceedence of two decibels or less is considered to, you know, to be fairly perceptible to the average human, and so we didn't consider that that – and according to policy, that doesn't require any mitigation or acquisition criteria.

5

What we did look at, though, was is there anything more that the company can do to actually bring it down from those few exceedences? And so we interrogated that quite carefully and the reality is the company had done a lot of – had already incorporated a lot of mitigation strategies into the proposed modification as it is, and the advice that we've had from our acoustic expert and from the company's acoustic expert is that it does get progressively more difficult, as you're doing mitigation, to bring numbers – to bring predicted noise levels down, and so they – I think, initially, Rose-Anne, it was – there was a predicted exceedence of up to seven - - -

15 MS HAWKESWOOD: Yeah, that's right.

MR PRESHAW: - - - decibels, but through, you know, various mitigation strategies, they have brought it down to just the two, and we asked the question, well, you know, can you go further? What's required? And the reality is that it would, you know, in very broad terms – and I'm happy to provide further information if you need. I think it's in some of the documentation – but it would require, basically, you know concrete cladding on all the noise sources at the mine and the processing facility, which would incur, you know, extreme financial cost on the applicant for, really, to bring down a noise, a very minor noise exceedence that's not actually perceptible to the – to the average human, so we felt that that was unnecessary and not warranted in the circumstances and so that's why there are, in fact, some exceedences.

The other part of the advice that's relevant is that part of the reason that there are now predicted exceedences of up to two decibels is because of the additional data that they've gathered since the original approval and the original modification approvals, and basically better modelling methodologies that are available now as opposed to when it was originally done. So it's important to say that if we were to assess the predicted noise levels as a new project that they would still be something that is approvable anyway now, and I think that's an important point under policy, the existing policy, those numbers are not considered to be unacceptable levels.

MR CARTER: Okay. Ian, did you have anything?

40 DR LAVERING: No, thank you.

MR CARTER: Alice.

PROF CLARK: No, thanks.

45

MR PRESHAW: So there are two other - - -

MR CARTER: Yeah. Yeah.

MR PRESHAW: - - - clarifications I'd like to make, and one is in relation to the noise. So the first, I'll have to admit, is a mistake on behalf of the department. It's a
5 minor error that's been included, and that's on page 25 of the report, the first paragraph beneath the map - - -

MR CARTER: Yep.

10 MR PRESHAW: - - - and it talks about changes to noise impacts – predicted noise impacts at the quarry. Look, in short, that is just not the case. There are no noise changes at the quarry. That was just a mistake that crept into the conditions originally, the recommended conditions, and then back into the report. So that sentence essentially needs to be retracted, and the corresponding part of the table that
15 refers to those numbers, 37, need to be altered in the conditions of – the recommended conditions of consent, and so we're happy to provide that clarification to you.

MR CARTER: Great. That'd be good.
20

MR PRESHAW: Yeah. And, look, the only other clarification we would make – and, look, the company has gone through the – this report and conditions with a fine toothcomb – is that the traffic numbers across the whole project that we've put into our assessment are now, according to the company, not the most accurate numbers.
25 They are, in fact, the numbers that are available to us in the documentation that they've given to us, but, as I mentioned, through the process, we asked them to consider ways to reduce traffic volumes, and we were focused on through Trundle because that was where the community had focused its concerns, and so they did manage to do that, and so you will see on page 14 we've got a project – a table
30 showing the project-related traffic generation through Trundle, which shows, as I discussed earlier, that the modified project, with the additional mitigation measures, in fact, brings the numbers of traffic down than was originally approved.

It was our understanding – because that was – that came from the documents from
35 the applicant and from their traffic consultants. It was our understanding, if you refer to page 11 and 12, that the project-related traffic overall was still – had still increased, albeit in a very minor way, but, in fact, what the company is saying is, well, if you now apply the higher capacity trucks and the shuttle buses across the board, you will – what you find is the traffic volumes across the whole project
40 actually come down a small amount as well. So they've, in fact, given us revised versions of table 3 and table 4, which illustrate that the traffic volumes across the project are, overall, down. To me, that's – I mean, it's the department's view that the material part of the traffic assessment was really through Trundle, but, as a matter of clarification, I think it's worth, you know, now coming back to you with the revised
45 numbers across the rest of the project components.

MR CARTER: Okay. So you will do clarifications in writing, and that - - -

MR PRESHAW: Yes. We will. So all we have at the moment is a table which the company has sort of emailed to us. I would like to get that in a formal way that's come through their traffic consultants, so that we're comfortable that those numbers have, in fact, changed, and we'll forward them to you in the letter of clarification.

5 MR CARTER: Great. Thank you. And so that goes to the – in table 4 - - -

MR PRESHAW: Yes.

10 MR CARTER: - - - the totals will be different in the

MR PRESHAW: I think in – and I've got the email here. I can just sort of outline, but, in broad terms, the percentage change in table 4, the total at the moment is an increase of 2.4 per cent on the bottom right. In fact, that will, according to the company's later – latest figures – would be minus 10 per cent. So it'll go from a very minor increase to a slight decrease.

15 MR CARTER: Okay. Fantastic. All right. Well, look, thank you very much, Clay and Rose-Anne. David and Alana, did you have any - - -

20 MR D. KOPPERS: No.

MR CARTER: - - - issues or questions? Ian and Alice

25 PROF CLARK: No.

MR CARTER: Not at this stage?

DR LAVERING: No.

30 MR CARTER: Okay. Fantastic. All right. Well, thank you very much for that. We will look forward to those clarifications coming through, and we'll – well, the secretariat will put anything formally to you - - -

35 MR PRESHAW: Yes.

MR CARTER: - - - where we want to sort of ask further questions or get responses to - - -

40 MR PRESHAW: Okay.

MR CARTER: - - - but thank you very much.

MR PRESHAW: Okay. Thank you very much.

45 MR CARTER: So I will declare the meeting closed now.

RECORDING CONCLUDED

[11.52 am]