

From: [Rod Doyle](#)
To: [Casey Joshua](#)
Cc: [Lindsey Blecher](#)
Subject: IPC - Geological Data Summary
Date: Wednesday, 21 July 2021 5:16:33 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[image002.png](#)
[image003.png](#)
[image004.png](#)

Casey,

Thank you for your email, I would like to retract the pdf summary geological document and request that a review be undertaken to assess whether the report could be considered by the IPC Panel and not be published due to the special circumstances as listed below.

1. Firstly, I have no issue with the IPC asking to talk to whoever they may. I was surprised that there wasn't a request to speak with Hume Coal's Mining expert's to get balance, but I accept that is the Panel's prerogative.
2. From the transcript (9/07/2021) provided Prof. Galvin made a comment when asked, does Hume have sufficient geological information. The question asked Page 16 Line 6'so what you're saying Jim, is that there's a **dearth of data** that would enable them to come up with a conceptual mine plan and the response comes back, '**... there is a lack of detailed data.**'
3. I don't believe Prof Galvin has any real concept of the nature and scope of geological information Hume has collected over many years. In my opinion, Prof Galvin misspoke and should have said something like, 'I haven't seen all their data so I don't really know'. But he didn't. I think his comment may have coloured the panels view in an unintended way and I wanted to provide the Panel with a snapshot of information in that report that had been put together some years ago to demonstrate that Hume has undertaken considerable exploration. The report provided contains considerable data which cost many millions of dollars to collect, model, interpret and eventually report on. The data is an significant asset in its own right.
4. Because this statement comes from a well-qualified person (Prof Galvin) I thought it may be given inappropriate weighting. Prof Galvin, gave a personal view and was based on his limited exposure to a limited snapshot of Hume's geological information. It isn't like he's examined our entire data base and concluded, 'hey its unsatisfactory'. In fact, if my memory serves me well, when he first made this comment (sometime ago) he corrected himself at that time and said its not usual that geological data is provided at this time in the process.
5. What is also important is to recognise that Hume was never asked to provide any geological information in the SEARS. So it wasn't provided in the EIS, RTS or the reply to the IPC report. (To the best of my knowledge nobody has ever actually asked to see it.) However I did present the information to officers of DPIE Water and DPIE in a meeting on the 30/07/2019.
6. Yet the IPC are asking a government mining expert about it, rather than the Proponent, who really doesn't know what we have – he is making a conclusion based on what he has seen. And I think his response was inappropriate.
7. Bizarrely enough, every year Hume has to complete an annual report for government. All relevant details of exploration are provided to the NSW government. So the government does actually have all of Hume's data which they keep confidential.
8. Perhaps even more bizarre is that our opposition groups seem to have a better idea of

how diligent we have been in our exploration than the DPIE and Prof Galvin. However, they (the opposition) clearly misuse information in any way they can to paint a false picture. Which I tried to demonstrate a couple of examples to the IPC in my presentation. This is the main reason we don't want the data put on public display – it would be misused.

9. The data provided in the pdf file highlights summary information from every drill hole Hume has drilled and includes coal quality data which is commercially sensitive and there is also significant commentary of geological structures.
10. For this reason, I do not wish the data to be made public, because it is confidential, it is sensitive and because some parties will definitely try and use the data against Hume.
11. Further, I am uncertain if Hume will be given any further opportunity to talk to the IPC and correct any misapprehensions that they may have about the Project. (And I would be grateful to hear anything regarding that potentiality.)
12. Given Hume has spent in excess of \$200 Million and 10 years to get this far along the path, and literally had less than a few hours to put their case to a NEW panel. I would like to redress any potential misapprehension that the Panel may have regarding Hume's 'geological data'. This possibly also has something to do with me being the site geologist and an ex-mentor of mine telling me I haven't done my homework.
13. At this time, as are many, I am currently working from home (in Wollongong). I do not have the facilities to undertake redacting portions of the data and represent it.
14. The purpose of providing the data is not to change the Panel's view about the Project, but to potentially correct one example of an error from one of their discussions with one of the governments experts.
15. I ask for your forbearance and your consideration.

Thank you,

Rod Doyle

Project Manager – Hume Coal Project

Hume Coal Pty Limited

Mobile [REDACTED]

Location Post Office Corner, 3/30 Old Hume Highway, Berrima 2577

www.humecoal.com.au



This e-mail is for its intended recipient only. If this e-mail has been sent to you in error, or contains privileged or confidential information, or the contact details of other persons, then you must not copy or distribute this information and you must delete the e-mail and notify the sender. Any views expressed in this communication are those of the individual sender, except where the sender specifically states them to be the views of Hume Coal Pty Limited. Except as required at law, Hume Coal Pty Limited does not represent, warrant and/or guarantee that the integrity of this communication has been maintained nor that the communication is free of errors, virus, interception or interference.