



New South Wales Government
Independent Planning Commission

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

RE: GLENDELL CONTINUED OPERATIONS PROJECT (SSD-9349)
AND MOUNT OWEN CONTINUED OPERATIONS MOD 4 PROJECT
(SSD-5850-MOD-4)

PUBLIC HEARING DAY 1

COMMISSION PANEL: DIANNE LEESON (Chair)
 PROFESSOR SNOW BARLOW
 ADRIAN PILTON

COUNSEL ASSISTING RICHARD BEASLEY, SC
THE COMMISSION:

LOCATION: VIA VIDEO CONFERENCE

DATE: 8.30AM, FRIDAY, 18 MARCH 2022

TRANSCRIBED AND RECORDED BY APT TRANSCRIPTIONS

PUBLIC HEARING DAY 1 SCHEDULE

Presentation	Page No.
OPENING STATEMENT.....	3
CLAY PRESHAW & STEVE O'DONOGHUE, DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENT	6
XAVIER WAGNER & SHANE SCOTT, GLENCORE.....	21
JASON LINNANE, SINGLETON COUNCIL.....	32
DAVID WHITSON, LAKE MACQUARIE RESIDENT	34
DAVID SHOEBRIDGE, MLC, GREENS NSW.....	36
NIKO LEKA, NEWCASTLE RESIDENT	41
STEWART EWEN, BROKE VILLAGE SQUARE TRUST	42
JENNY MARSHALL, FORMER OWNER, RAVENSWORTH HOMESTEAD	43
JAN DAVIS, HUNTER ENVIRONMENTAL LOBBY	45
MARG McLEAN, HUNTER VALLEY RESIDENT.....	48
GEOFFREY SHARROCK.....	50
JODY DERRICK, BROKE FORDWICH TOURISM ASSOCIATION.....	53
SIMON ROCK, WESTRAC NSW	55
ROBERT McLAUGHLIN	57
STUART BONDS, GLENCORE EMPLOYEE	58
NAOMI HOGAN, AUSTRALASIAN CENTRE FOR CORPORATE RESPONSIBILITY	60
LYN MACBAIN, SINGLETON SHIRE HISTORIAN	63
DR BOB VICKERS, SINGLETON GP.....	68
ROBERT MONTEATH, CHEAPER ELECTRICITY PARTY	74
DR BOB VICKERS, SINGLETON GP.....	77
GEOFFREY STEVENSON, SINGLETON RESIDENT	78
CRAIG SHAW	80
ANGELA MICHAELIS	81
NIC CLYDE.....	83
ROD CAMPBELL, AUSTRALIA INSTITUTE	86
PADRAIC GIBSON, JUMBUNNA INSTITUTE, UTS	91
SIOBHAIN O'LEARY, AUSTRALIAN PARENTS FOR CLIMATE ACTION	94
MALCOLM HOWARD, PROPERTY OWNER, BROKE NSW	97
GRAHAM CHEETHAM, MIDDLE FALBROOK RESIDENT.....	99
CLOSING STATEMENT	101

MS LEESON: Good morning and welcome to Day 1 of the Independent Planning Commission's Electronic Public Hearing into the State Significant Development Application for Glendell Continued Operations SSD-9349 and Mount Owen Continued Operations Mod 4 SSD-5850-Mod 4 Projects. Before we begin, I would like to acknowledge the traditional owners and custodians of the land on which we variously meet, and to the Wonnarua people as the traditional custodians of the land on which the project is located. I would like to pay my respects to their Elders, past, present and emerging, and to the Elders from the other communities who may be participating today. I am Dianne Leeson. I'm the Chair of the Commission Panel.
10 Joining me are my fellow Commissioners Professor Snow Barlow and Adrian Pilton. We also have Richard Beasley, Senior Counsel, as Senior Counsel Assisting the Commission at this public hearing.

The Glendell Mine forms part of the Mount Owen Complex located in the Hunter Coal Fields in the Singleton Local Government Area. The application seeks approval to extend the life of the existing operations by establishing a new mining area to the north of the current Glendell pit to extract an additional 135 million tonnes of run-of-mine coal over 21 years. The coal would continue to be processed at the existing Mount Owen coal-handling and preparation plant facilities before being transported
20 via rail in accordance with the Mount Owen consent SSD-5850. The project involves an associated modification to the Mount Owen consent to integrate with the proposed extension.

While the project would continue to rely on existing rail infrastructure, the Mount Owen coal-handling preparation plant, rail loop and existing Glendell mining fleet, it would require the development of a new mine infrastructure area, along with construction of new heavy and light vehicle access roads. In addition, the project would involve the realignment of a section of Hebden Road, diversion of Yorks Creek and relocation of the historic Ravensworth Homestead.
30

The Commission is the consent authority for this State Significant Development application because more than 50 or more public objections were received. I note the Department of Planning and Environment in its assessment report has recommended the application is approvable subject to conditions.

The Minister for Planning has directed the Commission to hold the public hearing into the application. He has asked that the Commission make its determination within 12 weeks of receiving the final whole-of-government assessment report from the department. In line with the regulations introduced in response to the ongoing
40 COVID-19 pandemic, we have moved this public hearing online with registered

speakers provided the opportunity to present to the panel via videoconference and telephone.

In the interest of openness and transparency we are livestreaming proceedings on the Commission's website. A full transcript of the two-day hearing will also be published on the Commission's website in the next few days.

10 To provide some context of the Commission and its role in this determination, the Commission was established by the NSW Government on the 1st of March, 2018 as a standalone statutory body operating separately to the department and independently of the minister's direction and control. The Commission plays an important role in strengthening transparency and independence in the decision-making process for major development and land-use planning in New South Wales.

20 The Commission is the minister's delegate as consent authority for this State Significant Development application. This public hearing forms one part of the Commission's process. We have also undertaken a virtual site inspection, met with the department, the applicant, Singleton Council, the Broke Village Square Trust, the Plains Clan of the Wonnarua People, and the Wonnarua Nation Aboriginal Corporation. Transcripts of these meetings have been published on our website.

A physical locality tour and site inspection are also planned, and the site inspection notes will be published on our website when available.

After the public hearing we may convene with relevant stakeholders if clarification or additional information is required on matters raised. In terms of the next steps, following the public hearing we will endeavour to determine the development application as soon as possible, noting that there may be a delay if we find that additional information is needed.

30 Written submissions on this matter will be accepted by the Commission up to 5.00pm Australian Eastern Daylight Time on Monday the 28th of March, 2022. You can make a submission using the Have Your Say portal on our website or by email or post.

40 The purpose of this hearing is to invite interested individuals and groups to make any submission they consider appropriate. However, the Commission is particularly assisted by submissions that are responsive to the department's assessment report and recommended conditions of consent. All submissions made to the department during exhibition of the environmental impact statement have been made available to the Commission. As such, today's speakers are encouraged to avoid repeating or restating submissions they've previously made on this application.

There are certain matters that by law the Commission is not permitted to take into account in making its determination. Submissions on such matters cannot be considered by this panel. These matters include the reputation of the applicant and any past planning law breaches by the applicant.

10 Before we get underway, I would like to outline how today's public hearing will run. We will first hear from the department on the findings of its whole-of-government assessment of the application before the Commission. We will then hear from the applicant second. We will then proceed to hear from other registered speakers. While we endeavour to stick to our published schedule, this will be dependent on registered speakers being ready to present at their allocated time. Senior Counsel Assisting Richard Beasley will introduce each speaker when it's their turn to present to the panel. Everyone has been advised in advance how long they have to speak. A bell will sound when a speaker has one minute remaining. A second bell will sound when a speaker's time has expired. To ensure everyone receives their fair share of time, we will enforce time keeping rules. I reserve the right as chair to allow additional time as required to hear new information.

20 If you have a copy of your presentation or additional material to support your presentation, it would be appreciated if you would provide a copy to the Commission. My fellow Commissioners and I may ask questions regarding your submission as might Mr Beasley. However, the public hearing is primarily a listening experience for the panel so we can hear what you have to say.

If you are asked a question and not in a position to answer it today, you are welcome to respond in writing by 5.00pm Australian Eastern Daylight Time on Monday the 22nd of March, 2022. Please note that any information given to us may be made public.

30 The Commission's privacy statement governs our approach to managing your information, which you can view on our website. Thank you. It is now time to call our first speaker.

<CLAY PRESHAW & STEVE O'DONOGHUE, DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENT

40 MR BEASLEY: Thank you. The first speakers are both from the Department of Planning and Environment. We've got Clay Preshaw, who is the Executive Director of Energy and Resource Assessments, and Steve O'Donoghue, who is the Director Energy and Resource Assessments. Are you there, Mr Preshaw and Mr O'Donoghue?

MR PRESHAW: Yes.

MR O'DONOGHUE: Yes, Mr Beasley.

MR BEASLEY: Please go ahead.

MR PRESHAW: Thanks, Mr Beasley, and thanks, Chair. I'd like to start by thanking the Commission for giving us the opportunity to present the project openly and in this type of setting. I'd also like to recognise that the assessment of a large-scale coalmining project actually involves a lot of people, most of whom are not present here today. As the executive director I am really just the final sign-off and was mostly involved at the key points of the assessment process although, given the complexity of this issues with this project, I must say that I have been probably more hands-on with this project than a typical project. And as Mr Beasley said, I'm here with my colleague Steve O'Donoghue, who will provide further details on the key assessment issues and our evaluation of the project, and in particular the key reasons for the department's recommendations to the Commission that the project is approvable subject to strict conditions.

I'll also just say now from the outset that we don't intend to outline the project components in any detail as this is all well documented in the substantial documentation available on our website. Also for the purposes of this presentation when Steve or I say "the project", we are referring to the Glendell Continued Operations Project.

Firstly, just some comments on our assessment report just to highlight to the Commission and everyone, as we did in another recent project before the Commission, the fundamental difficulty of the task of preparing a report like this. And it's important to say that a report is not meant to be a full compilation of all the information and data that has been presented to us throughout the assessment process. All of that information is available publicly and can be accessed, if necessary. Our assessment report is instead a distillation of all of this material and is designed to give the decision-maker, in this case the Commission, sufficient information to make a determination, and I will say that we are confident that our report does provide a good summary of our views about the project. We also believe that this public hearing process can be really important in fleshing out key issues relating to the project from a communities perspective.

Now, just a few comments about our approach to this report. We did something of a different approach perhaps to those in years gone past. The most important thing is

that we've tried really hard with this report to be very open and transparent about the issues that concerned us the most. So, where possible, we have tried to avoid overly technical language or excessive details which I believe can sometimes hide the real issues of concern or at least make them hard to understand and find. So what does that mean to this project? Well, it should be obvious from our assessment report that we really have grappled with what we see as extremely difficult issues, the types of issues that have forced us to seek additional information and a range of expert advice from different places.

- 10 So while environment impact assessment documents might sometimes come across as unequivocal or seem to present findings with absolute certainty and with conclusions that, you know, appear totally definitive, I'm sure that you will see from our assessment report that this project, it presents issues that contain elements of uncertainty and ambiguity. We believe that this is not something that we should shy away from as it really is the same for most of the State Significant projects that we deal with where there are competing land uses, and they often involve issues that reasonable people might disagree about and, in fact, that task, that difficult task of weighing up the pros and cons of a project and balancing up the competing views and perspectives and also taking into account the public interest more broadly, that's
- 20 ultimately the statutory task that we are required to do under the Act.

It is, of course, an extremely difficult task when the consequences of either an approval or a refusal would undoubtedly be significant. But importantly, in the context of this technical complexity and the significance of any consequences, we are confident that we've provided an extensive amount of expert advice and evidence to support the conclusions that we have ultimately come to.

- So coming to some high-level comments about how that applies with this project. So the project is located within a mining and industrial precinct. There are a total of 13
- 30 coalmines located within 15 kilometres of the project area. It will continue to rely on existing processing plant and transport infrastructure at the Mount Owen mine. On top of that, looking at the strategic context broadly, the project area is located approximately one kilometre from Camberwell Village; however, the vast majority of residents in Camberwell are either mine-owned or currently already have acquisition rights under various mining consents. And importantly, the project area itself has been extensively cleared and grazed since the late 1820s.

- Now, having said all that, the project still would have impacts that require careful consideration. A couple of obvious aspects of this project are, firstly, while the
- 40 existing processing and transport infrastructure at Mount Owen continued to be used, there is additional infrastructure facilities as proposed including a road realignment

and a creek diversion and, secondly, the project would require the relocation of the Ravensworth Homestead, which is listed under the Singleton LEP as being of local significance and I've also recommended for listing on the State Heritage Register and, of course, the vast majority of community objections regarding the project raise concerns about air quality impacts and impacts on climate change from greenhouse gas emissions.

10 So given all that, we found that the three key issues for the assessment are, firstly, heritage, secondly, air quality and, thirdly, greenhouse gas emissions. Now, at this point in the meeting I'll step away for the most part and let Steve work through a brief summary of the key assessment process today and the key findings in relation to those three issues. So over to you, Steve.

MR O'DONOGHUE: Thanks, Clay. Good morning, Chair Commissioners and Mr Beasley. As said before, my name's Steve O'Donoghue, Director of Resource Assessments with the Department of Planning and Environment. As Clay sort of introduced I'd like to provide a short summary of the assessment process to date, set out some more of the strategic context in the project that Clay has referred to, followed by an outline of the key assessment issues, findings and recommendations that the
20 department made in its assessment report to the Commission.

First, a brief outline of the assessment process to date. In addition to the current public hearing process, the project has been through an extensive assessment process already. This included an extended public exhibition period from December 2019 until February 2020 where we received a total of 340 public submissions on the project, 324 from members of the public and 16 from special interest groups, including around 205 or around 60 per cent of submissions in support of the project and 125 or around 37 per cent objecting, with the remainder providing comment. The supporting
30 submissions largely noted the positive socioeconomic benefits and ongoing employment opportunities both at the mine and for industry supporting mining in the region. Key concerns raised in the objecting submissions were about impacts of mining in the broader Hunter region with a particular focus on cumulative impacts on air quality and the effects of greenhouse gas emissions from coalmining and also any use of coal on climate change.

Glencore provided its submissions report in response to these submissions and agency advice in two parts. In May 2020 it provided a part A of a submissions report which addressed the issues on the EIS apart from heritage-related matters, which needed further expert input at that time. Part B of the submissions report was submitted in
40 August 2020 and provided a response to the heritage-related matters which were a key issue of concern raised in the submissions. The supplementary heritage information

included the expended statement of significance, additional engineering and investigations on the relocation options and additional parties' views on the relocation of the homestead. Further investigation into the potential for the project area to have been the site of conflict or site of a particular massacre during the 1820s period.

10 The department also received advice from NSW Government authorities and also Singleton Council throughout the assessment. This included advice from the department's water group, biodiversity conservation science group, along with advice from the Environmental Protection Authority, Heritage NSW and Heritage Council, Resources Regulator, Mining Exploration and Geoscience, and Transport for NSW being some of the key agencies who have been involved in the project in the all-of-government assessment.

20 In addition to the expertise provided by these government agencies, the department also engaged a number of experts in key assessment areas to provide advice, and largely it centred around the project's heritage impacts and this included advice from mine planning experts MineCraft, focusing on reasonable and physical mine plans for the project, economic expert from the Centre for International Economics to review the economic evaluation and financial viability aspects of alternative mine plans.

20 MR BEASLEY: Mr O'Donoghue, can I just interrupt you there just to ask you a couple of questions about the matters you just raised. First of all, I'll come back to MineCraft, but firstly on the independent assessment of the economic benefits that the department requested from CIE, obviously – and I don't want to go through the detail with either of you and both of you feel free to answer my questions, but I don't want to go through the detail with you but obviously there's a considerable difference of opinion between Ernst & Young's assessment for Glencore and the CIE report in terms of the opinion about the net economic benefits for New South Wales. I don't want to ask you about the drafting of the guidelines, which clearly different experts
30 have taken different views, particularly, I think, in relation to how you assess the cost of greenhouse gas emissions. But what I wanted to ask you was this. In your assessment report, this is at about paragraph 537, 538, you've expressed the view, well, look, there's the Ernst & Young report, there's the CIE report, and one's probably best-case scenario and one's probably worst-case scenario. You recall that part of your report?

MR O'DONOGHUE: Yes, Mr Beasley, yeah, yeah.

40 MR BEASLEY: What I wanted to ask you is this. In terms of the panel's assessment, do you agree that where there's this big difference of opinion between Ernst & Young and CIE about tax, payroll tax, net economic benefit for workers, and also how you

cost GHG emissions, it's unlikely to be a rational approach that you take the 1.1 billion of Ernst & Young and the 150 million of CIE and just add them together and divide them by two. These are – do you agree with me they're fundamentally different methodologies and have fundamentally different views about how economic benefits are properly assessed here? Do you agree with that?

MR O'DONOGHUE: I agree, Mr Beasley, and I guess the way we've looked at it is, you know, particularly with the costing of greenhouse gas emissions in particular, but also supplier benefits and, and employee benefits. With, with these economic
10 assessments, and this is not the only project this happens on, there is a range of views about the sensitivity of, of the, in, in feeding into the cost-benefit analysis and in particular to determine the net benefits. So it's, it's not, it's not unusual, but I guess for this project there is quite, probably, probably to the extent there's quite an extreme sort of sensitivity range when you look at the different methodologies.

MR BEASLEY: Yeah, well, look, it's up to a billion dollars. My question, ultimate question is really this, that probably in terms of rational decision-making, the panel might take the view, well, look, they could take the view we accept Ernst & Young or they could take the view we accept CIE. I don't want to ask you to pick a winner, but
20 my question for both of you is this. If you assume – and this is an assumption and I'm not asserting CIE's right or Ernst & Young is wrong or vice versa – but if you assumed that CIE was right and the net economic benefits from this project are about 150 million or perhaps less, rather than the 1.1 billion from Ernst & Young, would it still be the department's view that, on balance, the project's approvable and in the public interest, bearing in mind the impact, the other impacts.

MR O'DONOGHUE: I guess I can say to that that the CBA, like, it's just one, one of the planks or tools to, to weigh up the benefits and costs of a project. You know, when you, when you evaluate it, it's, it's an important element in, in the, in the overall
30 assessment of the project, but it's not the only one.

MR BEASLEY: No, no, and I'm not suggesting it is, but in terms of how the panel approaches weighing the impacts, environmental and otherwise, of this project, it would obviously make a difference if the economic benefits are 1.1 billion as distinct from 150 million or less. All I'm asking you is would your view be different if the \$150 million figure was the correct figure, if you thought that.

MR O'DONOGHUE: I guess in our, in our report we're saying that there's still a, either way there is still a significant net benefit for the project.
40

MR BEASLEY: Right.

MR O'DONOGHUE: Looking at that sensitive view range. So the, the, our conclusion will still be that the, the project's approval.

MR BEASLEY: All right. All right. And again, for both of you, and, look, this might be more a question for the Glencore people, but one of the reports that's been provided to the Commissioners is the review that was done of the mine plan, with mine plan options. You'll recall that report because it's got a lot of redactions to it. I assume those redactions were made at the request of Glencore, with them telling the
10 department that's, we think that's commercial-in-confidence information.

MR PRESHAW: That's correct, Mr Beasley, yeah, and I've committed to the Commission this week that we would get back to, to the Commission on whether any of that information might be made available as part of the decision-making process.

MR O'DONOGHUE: Yeah, I think, I think it's going to be – look, I certainly don't want to put it as high as it's impossible for the panel to assess or determine this project with the redactions, but it would obviously be much more helpful to the Commissioners if that material wasn't redacted. I'll ask Glencore this, but was
20 anything said to you about why this, you know, why mining planning schedules are so commercially sensitive or - - -

MR PRESHAW: Yeah, I think, I think it'd be best to ask Glencore about the - - -

MR BEASLEY: All right, we'll do that. We'll do that.

MR PRESHAW: - - - the ins and outs of what, what's considered commercial-in-confidence and the reasons for each of those things.

30 MR BEASLEY: All right, thanks. If you could follow that up, though, I think the Commissioners would appreciate it.

MR O'DONOGHUE: Yeah, we will and we have, as I say, we've committed to the Commission. We'll get a response back today about where that's landed.

MR BEASLEY: All right. All right, sorry, I have interrupted your flow, Mr O'Donoghue. Please go ahead.

40 MR O'DONOGHUE: That's all right, Mr Beasley. That's fine. Look, I'll jump to just some of the strategic context aspects that Clay had flagged. It's important to provide some strategic context about the project, particularly in relation to the existing

land use and likely land use surrounding the site. As Clay indicated, the Glendell Mine is located in the centre of a mining and industrial precinct within the Hunter Valley. In addition to the three mines making up the Mount Owen Mining Complex, incorporating the Glendell, existing Glendell Mine, Mount Owen and Ravensworth mines, there are several other coalmines operating nearby, including Liddell Open Cut to the north-west, Hunter Valley Operations to the west, Ashton Coal Mine at the south, and Integra Underground and Rix's Creek operations to the south-east. The Bayswater and Liddell power stations are located to the west of the Mount Owen Complex along with associated transmission infrastructure, key road and road
10 infrastructure. Other industrial land uses in the locality include two quarries to the north along Hebden, Hebden Road. Glencore also owns several other nearby mines, which enables them to achieve several efficiencies, including shared use of coal-handling preparation processing capacities and infrastructure assets, train maintenance and refuelling areas and load-out, water management and tailings infrastructure, and also opportunity to coordinate mine closure and rehab strategies across, across the mining, the mines in the area.

Despite the influence of these industrial activities, the land surrounding Glendell also supports a range of primary industries including the Ravensworth State Forest, there's
20 regenerated vegetation from the new forest area, and also diversity offsets associated with the Mount Owen Mine, as well as rural-residential and agricultural activities in the vicinity. The Glendell Mine, as indicated, is immediately east of the New England Highway and the main northern rail line, and it provides road access to the Glendell Mine via Hebden Road. And giving it's an existing operating brownfield mine, continue to rely on existing infrastructure as far as practicable, including the coal-handling prep plant and rail load-out facilities at Mount Owen, so there's some synergies there with the Mount Owen Complex. ROM coal from the Glendell mine, or run-of-mine coal, would continue to be processed at the adjacent Mount Owen Mine before being transported by the existing rail networks to Port of Newcastle for
30 export. If approved, the project would commence at a time when production at Glencore's other mining operations would be ceasing or reducing production rates, and the project would provide replacement coal to maintain long-term production levels from the complex as a whole.

Along with Camberwell Village to the south of the Glendell Mine, a range of agricultural enterprises and rural-residential holdings also exist within the locality. The amenity impacts on sensitive receivers around the mine site was a key consideration in the department's assessment, particularly in relation to noise blast and air quality impacts. Just from a strategic context as well, and flagged in submissions
40 on the project and representations, just acknowledging the Aboriginal and historic heritage of the area was also a key consideration to the department's assessment. The

area has a complex history dating back to European settlement from the early 1820s, which included interactions and conflict between local Aboriginal people and the early settlers in the area. The Ravensworth Estate itself was one of the first land grants in the Hunter Valley and contains a homestead complex and other archaeological resources that date back to the early days of European settlement in the 1820s and 1830s. Some of the Aboriginal stakeholders involved in the project to date, including the Plains Clan of the Wonnarua People, suggest or provide advice that the Ravensworth Estate is highly significant for its association with frontier conflict between European and Aboriginal people, including a reported massacre associated with the state itself and it is an important consideration in the assessment of the project, which I'll discuss in detail shortly pending available time.

Probably just from a strategic context as well, it is important to note that the NSW Government's 2020 Strategic Statement on Coal Exploration and Mining in New South Wales recognises the value of continued coal production of the state, including the potential for coal production to deliver significant economic benefits to regional communities. To support the intention of the statement, the NSW Government has identified a portion of the state's coal regions where mining is not supported and is prohibited and areas considered for proactive release coal exploration.

The project is not located in any of these no-go areas but would be located in an area where coal exploration mining titles already exist and as I said earlier, an extension to existing mining operations. As outlined, the proposed mining area is suitably located and that is within an existing mining precinct well supported by existing industrial facilities, infrastructure and transport corridors.

I'll just go into a summary of the key assessment issues flagged earlier by Clay, namely, heritage, air quality and greenhouse gas emissions. However, the department has undertaken a comprehensive assessment on other environmental matters including water resources, biodiversity, noise, traffic, social impacts and benefits which are comprehensively documented in our assessment report. Firstly, in relation to heritage there are two aspects in regard to impacts on heritage, impacts on the Ravensworth Homestead, in particular, and impacts on Aboriginal cultural heritage, not just archaeological aspects such as artefacts but more broadly the cultural landscape including intangible aspects along with the history of early frontier conflict associated with the Ravensworth Estate area but more broadly in the Hunter region.

Firstly, just on the Ravensworth Estate. There is agreement from all parties and experts involved in the assessment that the Ravensworth Homestead has elements that are of state significance under the New South Wales heritage criteria such that the homestead has been nominated for listing on the New South Wales State Heritage

Register. A key issue, therefore, is that the project includes the proposed relocation of the homestead, which is located in the centre of the open-cut pit extension to one of two locations. One of the relocation options is to the Ravensworth Farm which is proposed as an intact move approximately 1.7 kilometres from the existing location within the boundary of the original Ravensworth Estate landholdings.

10 A further option investigated in detail is relocation to Broke Village which would require dismantling and a rebuild and move to the publicly-owned McNamara Park in Broke. These two options were shortlisted following extensive community
10 engagement and options analysis throughout the assessment process including the establishment of the Ravensworth Homestead Advisory Committee. 11 options were investigated along with two relocation methods. That is an intact move as proposed for relocation to the Ravensworth Farm or dismantle and rebuild as proposed to Broke.

20 There were differing community views on the two shortlisted options and have varied pending stakeholder groups that were surveyed by the proponent, with the wider community members within the Singleton Local Government Area and Aboriginal groups favouring the Broke Village option and near neighbours generally favouring the Ravensworth Farm option. Following our view of all the information, the
20 department considered that the intact relocation to the Ravensworth Farm would act to mitigate the largest concern, which is loss of heritage values associated with the homestead and its surrounds. Although the Broke option would result in additional social benefits for the local community, this option would not act as effectively to mitigate many aspects of the homestead's heritage values.

30 Further, there are a number of planning and environmental constraints for the Broke site that would need to be resolved, including rezoning, to allow the proposed use. The site is also located within a hundred-year flood zone and it would require flood mitigation works along with biodiversity and heritage issues to be considered as part
30 of any future planning application. To ensure the retention of as much heritage as possible, we have recommended as part of our recommended conditions to the Commission detailed relocation criteria to be developed in consultation with Singleton Council, Heritage NSW and the local community as part of the recommended Ravensworth Homestead Relocation Plan.

40 This relocation plan is embedded with a comprehensive Historic Management Plan also recommended by the department to manage non-Aboriginal heritage cultural items on the site. We do note though in our report, and we acknowledge that the Heritage Council does not support the relocation of the Ravensworth Homestead as it
40 considers this would result in irreversible loss of the identified high and exceptional significance and values of the homestead. Given this and also the views of some in

the Aboriginal stakeholders in the community for avoidance of the impacts on the homestead as well, the department has assured that all project alternatives were properly evaluated, including those which would avoid the need to relocate the homestead, and that has been a detailed consideration of economic, social, environmental costs and benefits associated with the relocation or retention of the homestead in its current position. And, Mr Beasley, I guess one of the information there is the redacted document which you sort of referred to earlier and that's something that, as Clay said, would be, you know, speaking to the company about, about making the information available.

10

MR BEASLEY: Well, look, I mean, again it's a matter for Glencore. It's not as – I'll say as helpful for the Commissioners in its current state that it would be in an unredacted form. Of course, Glencore has the option to remove the redaction but ask the Commissioners to still not make the document publicly available in an unredacted form but I think that requires the Commissioners to be satisfied that's appropriate so that would require some form of submission from Glencore but I think it's better from them then asking you.

20

MR O'DONOGHUE: Just stepping through, I guess, in terms of the elements of our evaluation model we went through and sort of flagged earlier but we did commission MineCraft as an independent expert to review the numerous alternative mine designs including three, in particular, which would avoid the homestead. That included underground mining incorporating a hundred metre stand-off from the homestead and also incorporating a 500 metre stand-off from the homestead. So MineCraft provided advice on all those options, particularly in potential impacts on the homestead with proximity to the hundred-metre stand-off, in particular.

30

The underground mining, MineCraft looked at the detail in that and due to geology and geotechnical risks particularly related to the Camberwell anticline, which runs through the centre of the mine, and associated faulting and a significant reduction in ROM coal and also high capital cost needed for underground mining, the advice was that underground mining is not feasible. On the back of the mine plan review, the department requested further information from Glencore as to why a 500-metre stand-off option was not pursued. Glencore advised given the low internal rate of return, Glencore would not progress that option along with the underground hundred-metre stand-off options.

40

Based on this information, we engaged CIE, which we discussed earlier, advise them whether this was a reasonable and justifiable position. CIE confirmed that the 500 metre standoff option is not said to be financially viable given the low rate of return in their advice back to us. So based on the MineCraft review and the additional

commercial-in-confidence information provided by Glencore, as well as the review by the department's independent economics expert, the department accepts that the options to retain the Ravensworth Homestead in situ would essentially render the project unviable and it would mean it would not proceed in any form. As such, the department then sought advice from an expert in the field of heritage architecture, Mr Hector Abrahams, to provide advice on what, if any, heritage value has been retained should the relocation be approved. Mr Abrahams' review confirmed that the relocation would preserve many aspects of the homestead's heritage values and the intact move to Ravensworth Farm was a most superior option from a heritage perspective, not necessarily considering the social benefits of the move to Broke.

I'll just give some further context in relation to Aboriginal heritage associated with the Ravensworth Estate in particular. As mentioned earlier, the Ravensworth Estate is part of the traditional lands of the Wonnarua people and holds cultural significance as a result of recorded reports and interactions and conflicts with colonists or settlers in the locality largely during the 1820s periods, when European settlement in the Hunter Valley was first occurring. As outlined in our report, there is, there is contention between Aboriginal parties as to the significance of the Ravensworth Homestead site and more broadly the estate area, the Plains Clan of the Wonnarua People advising that the estate may have been the site of or the staging post for massacre of Aboriginal people, while other, other parties state that it's not aware of a massacre and specifically at the Ravensworth Estate. 32 Registered Aboriginal Parties were involved in the consultation on the project, with Heritage NSW satisfied that the assessment and consultation with the Aboriginal community was undertaken in accordance with relevant Aboriginal heritage assessment and consultation guidelines.

Just in regard to the massacre occurring at the current homestead site, there is extensive evidence provided throughout the assessment process that the location of the massacre is well outside the estate and project area. Importantly, the current Ravensworth Homestead was constructed around 1832, whereas the period of most of the conflict between Aboriginal people and early settlers in the area was around mid-1820s with the massacre occurring in 1826, well before the construction of the existing homestead. This was thoroughly considered by Heritage NSW, who ultimately modified the name of the site card in its Aboriginal site register from "the Ravensworth Massacre" to "the Upper Hunter Massacre" in the acknowledgement of the available evidence that the massacre site is located outside the project area. This, which is supported by numerous surveys, salvage and excavations in the area. They have not identified any burials or human remains on the, on the project site.

So overall, in relation to heritage impacts, particularly on the Ravensworth Estate, the department weighed up the significant socioeconomic benefits of the project against

the potential impacts of relocating the homestead, noting that aspects of its heritage values would be retained through relocation process.

I'll just move on to the next sort of key issue raised in submissions, which is air quality. Particularly punitive impacts of air quality from other projects in the area. The predicted air emissions associated with the project, based on the predictions, would remain similar to those for the existing mine for most receivers. However, the dust levels would reduce over time at residences as mining moves to the north, further away from the villages of Camberwell and Middle Falbrook, which are located to the south and south-east of the mine respectively. With the implementation of proposed mitigation measures, the worst-case dust emissions from the project are predicted to meet applicable criteria for larger dust particles, which are total suspended particulates and dust deposition at all privately owned receivers. However, cumulative annual average PM10 and PM2.5, which are the finer particulates, are predicted to exceed ambient air criteria set by the EPA, which are based on Commonwealth environment protection measures, and that, that would exceed at 13 privately owned receivers on 10 properties during, during some of the operational scenarios modelled over the life of the project. It's important to note, it was flagged by Clay earlier, that all of these receivers have acquisitional rights under existing development consents across a number of mines as a result of cumulative impacts. The assessment determined that the project would contribute between 5 and 30 per cent of this annual cumulative criteria of these receivers, with most of that contribution in the early years of the project before the mining progresses further away from the villages of Camberwell and Middle Falbrook.

In accordance with the department's voluntary land acquisition mitigation policy, the affected receivers would be entitled to acquisition and/or mitigation rights, again noting that all these receivers are already afforded acquisition rights due to dust impacts from existing operations. So we, we've recommended conditions of affording acquisition rights to these residents, so retaining, retaining that in the, in the conditions. They identify additional acquisition and mitigation rights across all development consents and a hierarchy process for which mine would be responsible for acquisition, if, if a landowner chose to, chose to seek voluntary acquisition, and also subject to whether they are still operating. The, the assessment also indicated that the project would comply with the project alone, so just, just incremental 24-hour PM10 and 2.5 finer dust concentrations, except that one industrial facility operated by Daracon. However, again from cumulative impact point of view, the 24-hour or the shorter-term criteria are likely to be exceeded, exceed the EPA ambient air quality criteria of privately owned receivers. For most of these receivers it would only be a small increase in additional days from a result of the project. And again, the receivers identified from the shorter-term impacts had acquisition rights already under the

annual average acquisition trigger. Following advice from the EPA, it was also confirmed that the assessment modelling did not include benefits from Glencore's proactive and reactive dust management system, and it also included all approved and proposed mining operation of the area, running at maximum production as well. So, so in that sense the assessment was, was highly conservative. Just in terms of recommendations, monitoring management for air quality impacts, in order to mitigate potential impacts and manage it and monitor, Glencore is planning to expand its existing air quality mitigation measures, which are currently managed already under its approved air quality and greenhouse gas management plan. So there's a whole
10 range of best practice and proactive and reactive controls that already form part of that, which would be, which would be continued if the mine were approved.

MR BEASLEY: Mr O'Donoghue, sorry to interrupt, just so we don't lose track of time too much for the sake of other speakers, I know at least Professor Barlow has a question, so I might interrupt you now so that Professor Barlow can ask you a question, and perhaps the other Commissioners if they want to as well.

MR O'DONOGHUE: That's fine, Mr Beasley, yeah.

20 MR BEASLEY: Professor Barlow?

PROF. BARLOW: Thank you. Thank you, Counsel. Look, Commissioner Barlow here. Mr O'Donoghue, sorry to take you back to the economic analysis, but the question I have is in relation to the two reports, one from, commissioned by the applicant from Ernst & Young, and the other from the Centre for International Economics commissioned by yourselves, are you satisfied that both those analyses have adequately addressed the guidelines set by the NSW Treasury for economic analysis.

30 MR O'DONOGHUE: Well, probably the guideline, the guideline of relevance is the, is the economic benefit guideline that the department released in 2017, rather than the Treasury guidelines per se. So the assessment was, the requirements I guess under the, under the SEARs for the project, but also as, is against the 2017 economic guidelines and the technical notes associated with that, rather than the Treasury guidelines. So that, since that, that's generally related to public infrastructure projects. This was the economic guidelines for mining and petroleum industries was targeted more for private sector.

40 MS LEESON: If I can pick up there then, Steve. Is the department satisfied that both of the economic analyses are consistent with the department's guideline of 2017?

MR O'DONOGHUE: In general, yes, and they're both, they're both referring to the guidelines, but they are, again, there's a, there's a different interpretation on aspects of that or how the analysis is done. But particularly around that, that element of apportionment of, you know, greenhouse gas emissions for scope 1 and scope 2 but also the supply, the supply benefits and employer benefits, different approaches, I guess, or justifications for those elements. So, in general, yes, followed the guidelines, but there, there was just different, I guess, different justifications that both economists, experts in their own right, have put forward.

10 MR BEASLEY: In other words, they've addressed the subject matter that they're required to in accordance with the guidelines but they each, particularly in relation to the cost of greenhouse gas emissions, have interpreted the guidelines in different ways.

MR O'DONOGHUE: I think that's correct. I mean, there's a, there's a whole range of sensitivity around there about apportionment but also carbon pricing.

MR BEASLEY: Yeah.

20 MR O'DONOGHUE: Also this, you know, when you, there's quite, there is quite a difference of view on the supplier benefits and the employee benefits as well, you know, with, depending on the conservativeness of the, the approach or analysis of it, there's actually quite different views.

MR BEASLEY: I think the panel's also expressed a view about cost of GHG and also how you properly assess worker benefits I think in Mangoola, where – a different panel, of course, that has their own view, but I think in relation to the greenhouse gas, there's, in the guidelines, without getting into the weeds too much about this, it says, in general, the total net environmental et cetera costs will be attributable to New South Wales and the proponent should include the net environmental costs in the New South
30 Wales CBA unless there are cases where these costs are not entirely attributable to the New South Wales community. And I think Ernst & Young's view is, well, for greenhouse gas emissions it's not entirely attributable to the New South Wales community, and CIE have a different interpretation of the guidelines.

MR O'DONOGHUE: There's probably, yeah, I mean, there's, in looking at it, and we sort of highlighted in our report, there's probably three different interpretations. One, one is, you know, global, you know, New South Wales population to global, you know, GDE, or to Australia, or, or it's all attributed to New South Wales.

40 MR BEASLEY: And I've asked this question before, but you yourselves haven't settled on what you think is the appropriate approach, is that right?

MR O'DONOGHUE: We're looking at it more from a, like a sensitivity approach in terms of – and that's how we've, we've addressed it in our report in looking at if you did apportionate it through different ways, how does that affect the, the net benefits.

MR BEASLEY: Sure. Yes, Commissioner Pilton has a question.

10 MR PILTON: Yes, just going on to the homestead. Everyone, all parties seem to agree that the building is worthy of state heritage listing, but the Heritage Council stated that if it's relocated, it sort of loses its meaning and therefore it's unlikely to meet the criteria for state heritage listing. Does the department have a view on that?

MR O'DONOGHUE: Not specifically on whether it would retain, retain its listing, I mean, that's, that's probably more of an expert, expert view from the Heritage Council and, and the heritage consultants in that. I, I guess we, we engaged Hector Abrahams, you know, to provide I guess advice on the relocation options and, and commentary on, on what heritage values would be retained. I guess we came to the view that if, if it, if it stays on the Ravensworth Estate area, where the, where, which is potentially lifted up intact, with a similar setting to the current location in terms of views, aspects and, and incorporation of the garden, even though it, it would definitely, it would 20 definitely lose heritage significance compared to what is now in that relocation process, but some aspects of the heritage would be retained. But I, I can't really advise whether it would still retain a, a state heritage listing. That's, that's really a call for the, for the Heritage Council.

MR PILTON: Okay. And can I ask you a question about if it's moved to the other side on the Ravensworth property, there's an animation which appears to show a method which looks to work to move the whole house. Is the department aware of any other building of that sort of size in the state that's been successfully moved? 30

MR O'DONOGHUE: Look, I'm not aware, I, the, the, my understanding is the, the, this equipment would need to come from overseas, so I can, we can get back to you on that one and provide the advice on that but I'm, I'm not aware of any similar sort of move in New South Wales anyway.

MR PILTON: Thank you.

MS LEESON: I think we're a bit short for time.

MR BEASLEY: I think that's all we've got time for. Of course if there's any further questions, we can deal with that later. But thank you both, then, for your presentations.

MR O'DONOGHUE: No, thanks, thanks for the opportunity, Mr Beasley, Chair and Commissioners.

MS LEESON: Thank you.

10 <XAVIER WAGNER & SHANE SCOTT, GLENCORE

MR BEASLEY: Our next speakers are both from Glencore. Xavier Wagner, who is the General Manager of Glencore, and Shane Scott, who is the Project Manager for the Glendell Continued Operations Project. Are you there, gentlemen? You might be on mute, sir.

MR WAGNER: Good morning. Can you hear us now?

MR BEASLEY: Yes, we can hear you now, thank you. Go ahead.

20

MR WAGNER: Thank you. Thank you very much for the opportunity to present this morning. I'm Xavier Wagner, General Manager at Glencore. I'm joined today by Shane Scott, who's Project Manager for the Continuation Project. And this morning we are here to talk to you about the Glendell Continued Operations Project.

MR BEASLEY: All right. You're sharing your screen with us and we can see it.

MR WAGNER: Hopefully that's showing now.

30 MR BEASLEY: Yep, we can see it. We can see the slide with the gentlemen in the high-vis amongst the trees.

MR WAGNER: Thank you. Before we start, we'd like to acknowledge the traditional owners of the land upon which we sit today, the Awabakal people, and also the Wonnarua people within which the project is located, and recognise their Elders past, present and emerging. We'd also like to thank all stakeholders, local landholders for their time and input into the environmental impact statement. We'd like to start with an overview of our Mount Owen Complex, within which the Glendell Mine is situated. The Greater Ravensworth area has a long history of mining, dating back to
40 the 1880s. Mining at the Mount Owen Complex, which is within that Greater Ravensworth area, began in the late 1960s with Swamp Creek Mine and today

comprises three active operations, Mount Owen, Ravensworth East and Glendell Mines. Coal mined from each of the three mines is processed at the Mount Owen washery and then loaded onto trains and railed to the Port of Newcastle for sale to export markets. Coal produced by the complex is of a high quality due to its inherent properties, being high in energy and low in ash content. As such, it is highly sought after in both steelmaking and coal-fired power stations. Glendell Mine will cease mining at the end of this year, mining at Ravensworth East will cease in 2023, and we also note that Glencore's neighbouring Liddell Open Cut Mine will also reach the end of its mine life in 2023. In 2021, our Mount Owen Complex employed 820 people,
10 300 of whom were employed at Glendell Mine. We spent more than \$360 million on goods and services with some 527 different suppliers and paid \$69 million in royalties to the state. Our Glendell workforce is predominately local, 72 per cent of whom live in Singleton, Maitland, Cessnock and Muswellbrook, and this workforce will predominantly spend their money in communities within which they live.

Our zone complex has a voluntary planning agreement with Singleton Council in excess of \$1 million and has undertaken substantial upgrades to local infrastructure that has markedly improved safety and traffic flow for all users along Hebden Road. These works which represent an additional investment of more than \$10 million
20 include a rail overbridge over the main northern rail line and also a dual line bridge over Bowmans Creek. These works have addressed longstanding issues within the local community.

We are a responsible miner who takes its commitments to managing its impact seriously. We operate under a well-established environment management system which is subjected to frequent audits, both internally and externally. It's worth noting that as part of a global multinational organisation our systems are vigorously tested, benchmarked and calibrated. These internal policy standards and procedures then set an expectation for, and drives performance that goes above and beyond regulated
30 compliance.

The diagram on the right represents the overarching structure of the system but in reality it's also supplemented by a variety of processes, registers, procedures, forms and other tools to give effect to those plans through trained and highly qualified staff. We have an extensive monitoring network surrounding the complex that allows us to monitor and modify our operations in order to minimise impacts on our neighbours. The coloured dots on the diagram on the right demonstrates the extent of this real time dust and noise monitoring network, both within our operations and also across
40 neighbouring properties. It gives us the means to not only monitor but also to modify our operations in response to issues as they emerge.

Mount Owen complex is connected to the Glencore Regional Water Management System. This system represents an investment of more than \$60 million and 130 kilometres of pipelines which allows us to share water with other Glencore mining operations within the greater Ravensworth area. It has increased our capacity to reuse and recycle water. In 2021 this meant that less than 3 per cent of the water used across five mining operations was taken from the Hunter river system specifically allowing Mount Owen to use far less than its licensed water allocation.

10 Our rehabilitation is not only best practice, it is industry-leading. Our work in rebuilding the Ravensworth State Forest has been recognised internationally and has also been used as the model for published guidelines on re-establishing native vegetation on disturbed land. We are serious about managing cultural heritage holding biannual meetings with the local Aboriginal community. Many of the artefacts that have been collected from our mining areas now have a permanent keeping place on Wollombi Brook. Mount Owen was a major contributor to the Minimbah Teaching and Keeping Place. We're very proud to have worked with the community to establish a managed ruin of the Ravensworth Public School following an arson attack in 2019.

20 Mount Owen is part of Glencore's Community Investment Program which, as to date, invested more than \$100 million with community groups and events. Our complex has longstanding partnerships with more than 20 community organisations. We undertake regular engagement with stakeholders through consultative committees, newsletters and circulars. Our employees regularly volunteer their time on community projects. In short, we are invested in our community and do everything we can to make a meaningful and positive contribution. I'll now hand over to Shane to tell us more about the project itself.

30 MR SCOTT: Thanks, Xavier. I'm Shane Scott, Project - - -

MR BEASLEY: Sir, you've gone mute again. I'm not sure if you can hear me, we can still see your screen but we can't hear you. He's no doubt talking away.

MR SCOTT: Apologies, Commissioners, can you hear us now?

MR BEASLEY: Yes, you're back now, thanks, go ahead.

40 MR SCOTT: Okay. Look, I'm Shane Scott, the Project Manager for the Glendell Continued Operations Project and I will be presenting on the project. The Glendell Continued Operations Project seeks approval to continue open-cut mining north of the existing Glendell Mine. With reference to the figure on the screen a proposed mining

footprint shown as the orange-shaded area on the figure is surrounded on all sides by current and historical mining operations. The area has been previously cleared through past agricultural practices with the majority of vegetation being grassland and regrowth. There is substantial buffer distance between a project and private residences and as mining moves northwards it will move away from the village Camberwell which lies to the south.

10 The project will provide access to approximately 135 million tonnes of coal and extend the life of Glendell Mine by around 20 years. It will also provide employment opportunities for up to 690 personnel, provide a net benefit to the Hunter region of almost \$450 million, which we note was the cost of the recently opened Maitland Hospital, and provide a net benefit of over \$1.1 billion to New South Wales including over \$280 million in royalties. Ravensworth Homestead shown as the yellow square on the figure is situated within the proposed mining footprint and needs to be relocated for the project to proceed.

20 So why does Ravensworth Homestead need to be relocated? Well, the project requires access to the full resource and the relocation of Ravensworth Homestead in order for the project to be viable. We have assessed alternate mine plan options that leave the homestead in place as shown by the figure on the screen and these have been found not to be viable and subsequently would not be pursued by Glencore. We've maintained the homestead since the late 1990s so we recognise the homestead's heritage significance and committed to sensitively moving the homestead in order to conserve it. We believe the opportunity to provide the homestead with a new life along with the associated socioeconomic benefits of the mine are greater than any benefit of the homestead staying in place.

30 We also note the Department of Planning and Environment sought independent advice from experts in the fields of mine design and economics. These experts also concluded that mine options that leave the homestead in place are not viable alternatives. The Department of Planning and Environment also considers that no reasonable alternative mine plan designs are available. We recognise the homestead's heritage significance from the outset and this informed our approach to the relocation of Ravensworth Homestead.

40 As you can see from the flowchart on the screen it has been a detailed and comprehensive approach which we believe sets a new benchmark. Because of the significance of the homestead, we established a community-based advisory committee to assist in identifying and assessing relocation options. This committee included a former owner of the homestead, local landholders and members of the Singleton business and heritage community and was facilitated by an independent Chair. We

spent time engaging with members of the Aboriginal community, local landholders, heritage stakeholders and the advisory committee to understand their key values in relation to the homestead.

We engaged the best heritage consultants to investigate and assess the homestead which informed the relocation philosophy. We considered 11 relocation options that included a public call for ideas and submissions. We engaged specialist moving engineers and heritage contractors, people with national and international experience to assess the feasibility of moving the buildings using different methodologies, and we
10 have reviewed and assessed all relocation sites. This work resulted in two alternate relocation options which have been put forward in the environmental impact statement and which we believe represent first class mitigation. The Ravensworth Farm option places an emphasis on retaining significant heritage features through moving the buildings intact to an adjoining site within the original Ravensworth Estate. The Broke Village option is a proposal by members of the Broke Fordwich Community that places an emphasis on siting the buildings in a public accessible location through dismantling and rebuilding the complex in Broke to form a village square.

The mitigation proposal also includes full archaeological investigation and recording
20 and salvage of select trees and plants for working into the relocation proposal. We note that the Department of Planning and Environment's independent peer reviewer agrees with our assessment that the Ravensworth Farm option results in lesser heritage impact than the Broke Village option but we also note that the Broke Village option has far greater public benefit through ongoing engagement and use.

We recognise the cultural sensitivities in relation to the historic events that took place within and around Ravensworth Estate during early settlement. The 1820s was a time that saw documented conflict between Aboriginal people and early settlers. A number of these events occurred within and around Ravensworth Estate. We engaged a noted
30 historian to research and investigate primary and secondary sources in relation to this early conflict with a summary of this research reproduced as the timeline on the screen. These events were tragic. The incidents that took place within and around Ravensworth Estate were also occurring elsewhere throughout the Hunter Valley. Extensive archaeological investigations completed across the project area have found no evidence of conflict. The massacre event that occurred in September 1826, which has been referenced by other parties, happened well beyond Ravensworth Estate. The reprisal party involved in this event travelled for three days and 20 miles from Alcorn's Hut, which was situated next to Glennies Creek, approximately nine kilometres to the south-east of the Ravensworth Homestead. Alcorn's Hut is not
40 located on Ravensworth Estate or lands now owned by Glencore. Finally, we also

note that Ravensworth Homestead was constructed around 1832, that is six years after the massacre event.

In short Ravensworth Homestead did not exist at the time of this massacre or the main period of conflict. It also needs to be noted that Heritage NSW acknowledges that the massacre site is outside the project area and there is no evidence that the current Ravensworth Homestead is specifically the site of early conflict. This is documented in Department of Planning and Environment's assessment report.

10 We have a strong focus on respecting and managing cultural heritage. During development of the cultural heritage assessment report for the project we engaged with 32 Aboriginal parties providing multiple ways in which they could provide input through meetings, workshops, fieldwork and reports. We note that the New South Wales Office of Environment and Heritage considered our consultation over a three-year period an example of best-practice consultation. We also recognise that there are differences of opinion within the Aboriginal community in relation to Ravensworth Estate.

20 In regard to greenhouse gas we take our responsibilities to developing the state's coal resources seriously and are contributing to the transition to a low carbon economy. Glencore plans to reduce total emissions by 50 per cent by 2035 with an ambition of achieving net zero emissions by 2050. This includes scope 1, scope 2 and scope 3 emissions. Glencore's global strategy is to be a leader in enabling decarbonisation by meeting the growing demand for green metals, responsibly depleting our global coal assets, investing in emission abatement technologies and through offsetting. We are already implementing a managed decline of our global business. In the next three to five years our Liddell, Newlands and Integra Mines in Australia will close.

30 The Glendell Continued Operations Project has been factored into Glencore's decarbonisation pathway and the production cap announced in 2019. Coal is still needed to meet global energy demands in the near to medium term. We will continue to identify, assess and develop coal projects against investment criteria and our climate change goals. Our pipeline of coal projects and mine life extensions have been factored into our company climate change commitments.

40 In conclusion, the Glendell Continued Operations Project seeks to continue open cut mining to the north of the existing Glendell Mine and will provide significant socioeconomic benefits. Our project will create and maintain large numbers of local jobs, continue to support hundreds of local businesses through on-going spend and provide approximately 20 years of additional royalties for essential services and infrastructure. We are proposing first class mitigation in relation to Ravensworth

Homestead and this is something that I am particular proud of that includes full archaeological investigation and recording and relocation of the Ravensworth Homestead buildings.

The Mount Owen Complex, which includes Glendell Mine, has an established and proven management and monitoring system that will enable us to meet the proposed conditions for the project, continue to maintain compliance across all areas of operation and with it, our license to operate. The project has undergone a rigorous environmental assessment process which was assessed and deemed approvable by the
10 Department of Planning and Environment subject to stringent conditions. We thank you for the opportunity to present today.

MR BEASLEY: Thank you. This is a question for both of you. Before the Commissioners are a number of hypothetical mine plan options including the preferred mine plan, and some of those hypothetical options involve mine plans that wouldn't impact the homestead, but as I understand it, it said that those other mine plan options are not economically viable for Glencore. To test that, the department obtained a report from MineCraft analysing the various mine plan options to see whether they were economically viable et cetera and what the benefits would be to New South
20 Wales from these various options. Quite a lot of opinions expressed in this report but quite a lot of data is redacted, the department tells us at the request of Glencore. Just a couple of things for both of you, as the report stands in its redacted form it's not of as much assistance to the Commissioners as it would be without the redactions, that's point one. Point two, we understand that the reason for the redactions is it's said that the material redacted is commercial-in-confidence to Glencore. I just wanted to ask you, the fact that I don't understand why some of this material is commercial-in-confidence doesn't mean it's not confidential but I'm just wondering why things like coal production schedules and operating costs and capital costs, all of which are redacted, are commercial-in-confidence to Glencore. Are you able to assist with that?
30

MR SCOTT: Mr Beasley, we can certainly understand the panel's concern in regards to the level of redaction. It is certainly, I guess, to protect commercially sensitive information so that's the reason why there is the extent of the redaction within that report.

MR BEASLEY: So do you say that if this material was published it would somehow harm Glencore?

MR SCOTT: This would probably be something I'd need to take further advice on,
40 Mr Beasley. I mean, I'm not at liberty to divulge any of the company's - - -

MR BEASLEY: I'm not asking you to divulge anything, I'm just asking you whether, I mean, usually a claim for commercial-in-confidence is based on something being secret, and also that if it was revealed that it would harm the entity that owns the information. As I said, the fact that I don't understand what would be secret or harmful about some of the material or data redacted, doesn't mean it's not, but it would require some further explanation, I think. If you don't feel comfortable addressing this question, though, that's fine. But can I suggest this, that these are the options, as I see them, for Glencore. One is you leave the report as redacted and the Commissioners get what they can from it, but it's not as useful to them without the redactions. The other is someone makes a decision at your end, okay, you can have the report unredacted and it can be published that way. I think a third one is that you can to the Commissioners, well, we'll give you an unredacted copy of this report, but we don't want you to publish the redacted bits. But that would require the Commissioners to be satisfied of two things. One, that the information truly is confidential, and, two, it's in the public interest for them to consider it but not publish it. So if you could take that on board and make a decision obviously relatively quickly, or someone in your organisation could make a decision relatively quickly, I think the Commissioners would appreciate it so that they know what it is that they're going to be able to rely on in terms of this report.

20

MR SCOTT: Understand.

MR BEASLEY: All right. Thank you for that. I think also Professor Barlow has a question as well.

PROF. BARLOW: Thank you, Counsel. Commissioner Barlow here. To both of you, you make the point in your introduction to a project that the coal that you're looking to mine is high quality coal and very sought after, and I presume this is thermal coal. Could you help me with information of what is, what are the greenhouse gas emissions per unit of energy delivered by this coal of coals of various qualities? So do you get greater energy per tonne of CO₂ emitted by burning high-quality coal, or as opposed to low-quality coal? And are the figures available on this?

30

MR SCOTT: Commissioner Barlow, I think we would need to take that particular question on notice. It sounds like it's an extremely technical question, which neither Xavier or I are in a position to answer, I'm sorry. So I respectfully request that we be able to take that question on notice.

40

PROF. BARLOW: Sure, Shane, yes, it is a technical question.

MR BEASLEY: Commissioner Leeson also has a question, gentlemen.

MS LEESON: Thank you. Can I take you to the scope 1 emissions, scope 1 and 2 emissions, where you've estimated that there'll be an additional 253,000 tonnes of CO₂ equivalent per year coming out of the mine. I assume that's because of the increased mine run from 4 million tonnes a year to 6 million tonnes a year. I think there's a peak of 10 million in a couple of, in a 2023, 2033-34 if I'm not mistaken, but generally about 6 million tonnes a year. So I'm assuming that that 253,000 extra tonnes a year is based on the additional output of the mine. If, assuming it's the same, you have a baseline, assuming it's the same baseline that is taken forward, how do you intend to, or do you have any proposals to offset the additional emissions against the baseline or are you anticipating a higher baseline to be established for the mine, should it be approved?

MR SCOTT: Commissioner Leeson, look, terribly sorry, this is another technical question and it's a very valid question. Maybe if I just touch briefly on the tonnes of CO₂ estimate per year. Certainly the number that's recorded in the impact assessment would be an average tonnes of CO₂ per year, so taking the total estimate emissions and then dividing that over the life of the mine. However, yeah, I'm, I'm unable, I'm sorry, to answer your question in terms of the restating of any baseline in accordance with the NGERs legislation. So I'm sorry, I'd need to also take that particular question on notice and come back to you with a fulsome response in that regard.

MS LEESON: Thank you. That would be appreciated. My second question, we discussed in our stakeholder meeting the other week around pre-drainage and you explained to us that was not a feasible outcome and you also advised us that sealing exposed seams at the end of the day, at the end of mining was not feasible either. We touched on issues of technologies available, and I think you were going to follow up on that, from recollection. But what I really want is a clarification of whether the assessed fugitive emissions that you've provided us in the EIS includes post-mining emissions. You described, I think, that you believe it's a low-gas mine, that the emissions in fullness of time post-mining would be very low, and therefore you didn't think that ceiling was necessary. But can you confirm for us, either now or later, whether those fugitive emissions include post-mining?

MR SCOTT: Certainly, Commissioner Leeson, we can also take that question on notice and confirm that. I don't believe that the fugitive emission estimates would allow for any post-mining potential leakage from the seams, but I would certainly go away and, and seek to clarify that.

MS LEESON: And I have one last question, which takes us back to the mine plan options if we can, and MineCraft made some suggestions in their report around

possibly alternative layouts around the mine infrastructure area being located to the south and which would avoid a Hebden Road realignment. Is there a diagrammatic representation of that, do you know, and how has Glencore considered that in their process? It said, for example, that it would avoid having to close Hebden Road for mine blasting purposes because you would be connected directly to the New England Highway. Is there a diagrammatic explanation of that?

10 MR SCOTT: Yeah, look, our Mine Planning Options Report, which is appendix 1 of the environmental impact statement, includes all of the different options that we considered in terms of the relocation of Hebden Road, as well as the alternate options that we considered for placement of the mine infrastructure area. So that includes a detailed analysis and justification around why the mine infrastructure area and Hebden Road, or the proposed relocation of Hebden Road, are where they, where they're proposed to be relocated. We also provide, provided a further response in our response to MineCraft's peer review in relation to their comment around placing the mine infrastructure area to the south. So there's a number of considerations down there, and it's explained in great detail within our response to MineCraft's report. But in short, placing it to the south would have implications for the final landform and the drainability of the final landform. It would also be located in, in a flood plain area
20 quite close to Bowmans Creek. And also too, from an operation point of view, given that the mining operation is moving northwards, it would be moving further away from any MIA located in that southern portion. So there'd be some, I guess, inefficiencies that would be impacted as a result of that.

MS LEESON: Thank you. Thank you.

MR PILTON: Can I just ask a quick question about the moving of the homestead to the Ravensworth Farm site. Is it planned that all of the buildings would be moved as whole buildings, as it were, or is it just the homestead?

30 MR SCOTT: Commissioner Pilton, no, the intention is to move the entire complex of buildings and to recreate what's currently there in its current site at the Ravensworth Farm site, with the intention of, you know, achieving verisimilitude for that particular location, with a similar outlook and setting. The actual grade or the land profile that the buildings would be placed on at Ravensworth Farm would be identical and similar to their current grade, with, with again the intention of replicating what's there at the moment.

40 MR PILTON: Thank you. I'll just ask a quick question that I asked, also asked the department. Are you aware of any other buildings of that size that have been moved whole? Successfully, that is.

MR SCOTT: So this, the intact move methodology was used to move the Hornsby Signal Box. It was only a small building that was moved. But certainly in Australia, not to my knowledge has buildings of this size been moved in this technology. However, buildings much larger scale and size have been moved using this technology throughout North America.

MR PILTON: Is it possible that you could point us in the direction of some of those buildings?

10

MR SCOTT: Yeah, absolutely, Commissioner Pilton. Yeah, look, we've provided extensive information to the department in relation to this, showing previous examples of similar buildings that have been moved of similar size. So, yeah, more than happy to extract that information and provide that to you.

MR PILTON: Thank you.

MR BEASLEY: I think there's actually a proposal to move quite a large heritage building for the new Powerhouse Museum at Parramatta in Sydney, in case you want to look at that as well, but I think that's proposed for that development. I hope that hasn't confused you. All right. Does anyone have any further questions?

20

MR PILTON: No, thank you.

MR BEASLEY: All right, look, thank you both for your presentation and we note that you'll get back to those, get back to the Commissioners about the matters they asked to be followed up.

MR SCOTT: Thank you, Mr Beasley. Thank you, Commissioners. Thank you for your time.

30

MS LEESON: Thank you, thank you.

MR BEASLEY: All right, we're going to have, the Commissioners are going to have a break until the next presenter, until 10.20.

SHORT ADJOURNMENT

[10.01am]

40

<JASON LINNANE, SINGLETON COUNCIL

MR BEASLEY: All right, recommencing the public hearing into the Glendell Continued Operations Project. The next speaker is Jason Linnane from Singleton Council. Are you there, Mr Linnane?

MR LINNANE: Yes, I am.

MR BEASLEY: We can hear you, so go ahead, sir.

10

MR LINNANE: Thank you very much. I'd like to begin by paying my respects to the Elders past and present of the Wonnarua people and acknowledge their custodianship of the land on which we're meeting today. I'd also pay my respects to all the Aboriginal people from other nations that are here today and live in Wonnarua country. Thank you, Commissioners, for giving me the opportunity to speak on behalf of our organisation. At this meeting on the 15th of March of 2022, which was this Tuesday, council considered the following matters for a motion in respect to the relocation of Ravensworth House. Singleton Council recommends that the Ravensworth Homestead be relocated to McNamara Park at Broke as part of the
20 Glendell Mine extension approval, and that the General Manager of Singleton Local Government Area prepare and deliver to the Independent Planning Commission a verbal and written submission supporting the proposal to relocate the Ravensworth Homestead to McNamara Park and Broke. In considering the motion it was successfully resolved that Singleton Council recommends that the Ravensworth Homestead and outbuildings – and I emphasise outbuildings being added – be relocated to McNamara Park and Broke as part of the Glendell Mine extension approval, and the General Manager of the Singleton Local Government Area prepare and deliver to the Independent Planning Commission a verbal and written submission supporting a proposal to relocate the Ravensworth Homestead and outbuildings to
30 McNamara Park and Broke. I am advised that Glencore submitted a concept and design for the relocation of Ravensworth Homestead to McNamara Park and Broke as part of the submission for the extension of the Glendell Coal Mine. During preparation of the submission, I am advised that considerable stakeholder engagement was carried out in relation to the proposed relocation.

30

40

An alternative proposal to relocate the homestead within the Glendell mining lease area was also submitted. It is council's view that the NSW Planning Department, in its recommendations for approval of the extension of the Glendell Coal Mine, have overlooked the social and economic benefits for relocating the Ravensworth Homestead to Broke, and have consequently recommended the homestead be relocated a short distance from the existing and future mining operations. This

recommendation appears to have been made purely on the basis of minimising heritage impact and avoiding secondary approval requirements for the site at Broke. It is contended that the relocation of the homestead within the mining lease area does not provide any social or economic benefit to the local community, and council is concerned that an opportunity to create potentially benefit to the community will be lost. At the council meeting, 15th of March, 2022, speakers representing the proposed management trust, Broke Fordwich Tourism Association and the Broke Residents Association spoke in support of the motion. In respect to the relocation of Ravensworth House to Broke, council has previously raised a range of issues which included but may not be limited to potential native title, potential New South Wales
10 Aboriginal Land Rights Act claims, planner management requirements and local community engagement requirements, Crown land status and their support, zoning and flooding, DA process, and long-term management and maintenance responsibilities and the funding of such. I must be clear that none of the above-mentioned issues means that council opposes the proposal. However, they need to be acknowledged, carefully considered and resourced to enable the process of relocation to occur in an appropriate manner and timeline.

Further to the above, the IPC met with council staff and councils on the 8th of March, 2022 to discuss the project. At these meetings, reference was made to the prior
20 submissions on the project, which were endorsed by council at the meetings of 16 March, 2020 and 19th of April, 2021. I have nothing further to add to these submissions or the conversation with the IPC held on 8th of March, 2022. Thank you very much.

MR BEASLEY: All right, thank you, sir, for that. Our next speaker if she's available – all right, the next speaker is not online. We might have to take a short break because neither of the next two speakers are online yet, so the Commission will take a break until we're able to get them back, but probably we'll call it five minutes. Thank you.
30

SHORT ADJOURNMENT

[10.25am]

<DAVID WHITSON, LAKE MACQUARIE RESIDENT

MR BEASLEY: Mr Whitson, can you hear me?

MR WHITSON: Good morning. How you going?

40 MR BEASLEY: Yes, we can hear you, we're good. Go ahead, sir.

MR WHITSON: Thank you, Commissioners, for the opportunity to speak. I'm grateful for this chance to speak to you on this important hearing. I live in the city of Lake Macquarie and I wish to acknowledge the traditional owners of the land on which I live and I wish to pay my respects to Elders past, present and emerging, and just as an aside, if there is anyone from Glencore in Switzerland watching, Heidi says no. I won't comment on the Swiss movies anymore, I promise.

10 I will be speaking against the proposed extension of this coalmine. I premise my arguments on the negative social impacts of this project. I will contend that this project extension takes us one step closer to civil disruption and societal collapse. An old magical teacher of mine once explained to me, one way to hold an audience is with a piece of rope so I've got the piece of rope here.

MR BEASLEY: You're going to have to tender that, sir, later.

MR WHITSON: It appears to me that things seem to be going on a magical, almost mystical kerb, but as I'm happy to explain there's a concern that the whole system might collapse. That might be an image that you hold with you as I go on. In order to
20 lessen and delay the impacts of such a collapse we need to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and this means no new coal and no extensions to existing coal projects. The public interest more broadly is not served as this project pushes us closer to societal collapse.

If I can just preface my remarks with the following statement. I called for a just transition so that those currently working in the coalmining industry can be given alternative employment or retraining so that no one is left behind. A transition with dignity into new fields of employment is what's needed here for coal industry workers but I might add that my late father worked most of his life, over 30 years, as an
30 electrician in an underground coalmine and he happened to be for most of those years the shop steward or the union delegate for that Lake Macquarie coalmine. So you could say my childhood and my youth were all involved in the coalmining issues of the late sixties and seventies.

The issues I'm about to discuss are certainly troubling so I might – seeing we're on a general wide broadcast thing I just might mention that if you do find these issues troubling, possibly Lifeline on 131114 is a safe place to talk about these issues if you need to. So in December 2020 hundreds of academics from 30 different countries wrote a letter titled Warning on Climate and the Risk of Societal Collapse. Professor
40 Will Steffens from the Australian National University in Canberra was one of those signatories to the letter and he's a good one to follow up, Will Steffen if you want to

dig down into this area. These academics stated that they consider societal collapse a credible scenario this century. Let me just repeat that. These academics stated that they consider societal collapse a credible scenario this century. They added, “We need to discuss this threat of societal collapse so that we might reduce this likelihood, its speed, its severity and harm to the most vulnerable in society.” So you can see where some of these social impacts start coming in. We face a changing climate, it’s more extreme weather events or unprecedented weather events, as we’re now naming them, due to heatwaves, droughts, floods and storms. Adding more greenhouse gases into the atmosphere by allowing the extension of this coalmine will not help the situation and will lead to negative, lead to increasing negative outcomes for society.

At a time of climate and ecological emergency such as we find ourselves in, it is no time to approve the extension of a coalmine, rather it is time to keep this coal in the ground and rapidly decarbonise the world. It seems to me that we’re in a fork, at a fork in the road. Today we’re at a critical juncture. The Greeks had the word “chronos” for time, and I think I’ve been given 10 or 15 minutes to speak today, but they also used the word “kairos”, meaning a significant time, an impactful time, a most important time, a kairos moment. And I see ourselves in such a kairos moment at the moment. The earth is rapidly warming 1.2 degrees above pre-industrial levels. It seems to me we’ve locked in temperature rises of over 1.5 degrees and we are currently on track to reach the devastating level of 2.7 degrees Celsius by the end of the century. That’s one of the estimates from the UN framework convention on climate change. Frankly, earth system scientists are starting to freak out. While climate change is often framed as an environmental problem, and it certainly is a serious environmental problem, it also creates some huge sociological concerns, some huge problems for our society. With these worsening impacts of climate change, the prospect of civil disruption and societal collapse loom large. Such a collapse would have an uncontrollable downturn in society. Social concerns would include downturns in life expectancy, downturns in food production, water insecurity, loss of infrastructure, loss of housing, loss of businesses. Weighing up the social benefits of this coal extension project versus the negative impacts of the onset of societal collapse messes with my head. It’s no comparison. We must do what we can to reduce carbon emissions and, at the end of the day, no amount of public relations spin is going to help us as we spiral into societal collapse.

However, what will help us is if the extension of this coalmine is rejected. If you do happen to approve this coalmine, I seriously wouldn’t be surprised if this is the last coalmine project or extension ever approved in New South Wales. You saw a bit of magical stuff before. I just want to make a brief aside about magical thinking around planning issues. It seems to me a fair deal of magical thinking to think that we can burn more and more coal on a finite planet. We just can’t. Magical thinking that we

can have infinite growth on a finite planet. We just can't. We're in earth overshoot. We're currently using about 1.7 or 1.8's worth of the earth's resources each year. Magical thinking, in my opinion, is part of the, and they're doing the best work in the system that's possible in this all-of-government assessment, fails to factor in the cost of civil disruption and societal collapse. Arguably we might say that we're also at a social tipping point regarding the coal industry. There is a widespread concern from many sectors in society, shareholder unease about coal projects, divestments, groups divesting from fossil fuel industries, surveys and opinion polls expressing greater concern over climate change. We might mention the student climate movement. I've
10 been involved in huge protests in both Sydney and Newcastle here. Next Friday, the 25th of March, I expect once again thousands of the youth of New South Wales will be on the streets expressing their dismay and concern and, quite frankly, depression. I don't know how to put a human cost on that, to hear teenager and young person, speech after speech, telling me that they fear for their future. Today I stand in solidarity with them and express my desire for them to grow up in a safer climate. In conclusion, I reiterate my concern about the Glendell Continued Operation Project. It will increase greenhouse gas emissions in a time when we need to do all that we can to reduce greenhouse gas emissions as we face the very real prospect of civil disruption and societal collapse. I might just briefly mention again that Lifeline phone number 1-
20 3-1-1-1-4. I thank the Commissioners for their time in hearing my concerns this morning. Thank you.

<DAVID SHOEBRIDGE, MLC, GREENS NSW

MR BEASLEY: Thank you, sir. Next speaker is David Shoebridge MP, who's a member of the Legislative Council of New South Wales. Mr Shoebridge, are you there?

30 MR SHOEBRIDGE: I am, Commissioner.

MR BEASLEY: Go ahead, sir.

MR SHOEBRIDGE: First of all, thanks very much for the opportunity to speak to you today on this critical project. I'll firstly indicate I'm coming to you from Gadigal Land, from parliament here in, in Sydney, but I express particularly strong sentiments and support for the Wonnarua people, the Wonnarua Plain Clans people, on whom this appalling devastating project is proposed to be forced. Can I first of all indicate there should be sufficient material before the Commission to reject this project given the scale of the impact it will have upon our global climate. The proposal is for an
40 extension to allow some 135 million tonnes of coal to be extracted, inevitably exported, by and large exported, and then burnt. That would contribute some 337

million tonnes of greenhouse gases. That would be a globally significant attack on the climate at a time when we've already seen, very, very dramatically, the impacts of climate-driven extreme weather in this state. That should end this inquiry and that should lead to a rejection of the application of itself. But I particularly wanted to draw the Commission's attention to the way in which this matter has been processed through the New South Wales bureaucracy and the evidence of strong regulatory capture, but also the evidence of strong resistance from important parts of the bureaucracy, particularly the Heritage Council, who continue to strongly reject this project because of its impact upon colonial and particularly First Nations heritage.

10

Can I start with some of the regulatory capture. All of this is evidenced from documents that we've obtained in parliament that show – and all of these documents I will provide to the Commission, evidencing what I put to you today. Early on in the assessment of this project, the Ravensworth Homestead and the surrounding landscape, which has strong evidence of frontier violence and resistance, was, was a significant issue. But from the very beginning, it became clear that the Department of Planning was doing all it could to get rid of that problem. And in that regard I note that we have communication from a Mr Whitelock, a senior resource analyst inside the Department of Planning and Industry, from the 10th of December, where he says as follows, and I read, “As per usual, Glencore were very prepared for our REA site visit yesterday. 100-plus page preso and an excellent site inspection. A long day but very worthwhile. We even had a good look around the historic Ravensworth Homestead, which was most relevant, as it will probably be the biggest stumbling block in getting this very important project removed. Glencore have many options for it. Interesting to see how that issue plays out with OEHS Planning Service and the IPC.” There was no effort to seriously assess the need to retain Ravensworth. It was a stumbling block that, from the moment it was raised, the NSW Government bureaucracy was trying to get out of the way.

20

30

We can then go forward to the role of the Heritage Council. In February 2020 the letter from Heritage NSW as delegate of the Heritage Council went back and made it clear that the environmental impact statement had not adequately addressed the SEARs. The Heritage Council has been deeply concerned from the outset about the inadequate addressing of particularly the heritage – colonial and Aboriginal heritage aspects of this project. In March 2020 a briefing from Heritage NSW – so the department in this case, not the council – went to the Special Minister of State, Minister for Public Service and Minister for Heritage, and it was co-signed by Pauline McKenzie, the Executive Director of Heritage New South Wales, and Kate Foy, the Deputy Secretary of Community Engagement, and it noted, and I'll read from it, this is the department itself. “Ravensworth is an exceptionally intact cultural landscape that tells the story of shared Aboriginal and European heritage in the Hunter Valley

40

including early conflict, the development of pastoralism and the convict labour system. A proposed State Significant Development aims to extend an existing adjacent opencut coalmine approval into the cultural landscape site.” And it then reads, “In conclusion, the Wonnarua landscape centred on a series of creeks comprises tangible and intangible values. While 19th century rural land-use practices such as vegetation clearance, cultivation and grazing had some impact on the Aboriginal archaeological record, the landscape, its resource and much Aboriginal archaeology remains. The site is noted to have the strongest documentary evidence of any conflict site across the Hunter Valley. This demonstrates how fiercely the Wonnarua defended and valued the landscape involving several violent episodes including the event known as the Ravensworth Massacre.”

That, of course, was co-signed, as I said, by the Executive Director of Heritage New South Wales and the Deputy Secretary of Community Engagement as recently as March of 2020. In September 2020 the Heritage Council again commented on the response to submissions and again said how inadequate the response had been to the SEARs relating to heritage, colonial and Aboriginal. On the 9th of December, 2020 the Heritage Council was requested to revisit the matter and it did not change its position. Indeed, on the 9th of December, 2020 the Heritage Council said, and I’ll just read from the conclusion. “In conclusion, the Heritage Council strongly supports Ravensworth Homestead being retained in its current original, highly significant location with a curtilage around its equally significant cultural landscape and does not agree with the rationale contained within the RTS that would allow for its removal and loss of significance. The Heritage Council reiterates that a precautionary principle should be adopted with respect to the potential loss of Aboriginal cultural heritage.”

In May 2021, though, Glencore not satisfied with Heritage Council’s position made representations to the minister’s office, those representations were met up with meeting requests and those meeting requests were eventually granted, and Glencore continued repeatedly to brief the minister’s office and seek to change the position of Heritage NSW and Heritage Council. On the 14th of September, 2021 a letter from DPI to Heritage NSW stated, “While Heritage NSW accept there’s evidence of conflict between Aboriginal people and the European settlers on several properties along the Hunter Valley, Hunter River, Bowmans Creek and Falbrook, Glennies Creek inside and outside the project area, there is no material evidence that would show that the current Ravensworth Homestead is specifically the site of such conflicts.”

A 180 degree U-turn from Heritage NSW after being schmoozed repeatedly and repeatedly subject of submissions from Glencore but importantly, the Heritage Council was then – sorry, following which Heritage NSW and Planning and particularly in this case DPIE sought to have a direct meeting with the Heritage

Council and they had that meeting and a direct presentation on the 6th of October, 2021 and the purpose of that meeting was for NSW Planning, at the behest of Glencore, consistent with their initial position from the very outset that they wanted to get rid of the stumbling block which was the Ravensworth Homestead and surrounding landscape, they sought a one-on-one meeting with their heritage consultant to try and persuade the Heritage Council to change its position.

10 And I asked the head of the Heritage Council – the Chair of the Heritage Council about this in budget estimates as recently as the 1st of March, and I put to him they were trying to persuade you of the benefits of relocation, they were trying to persuade you that the contested massacre site could not be on the Ravensworth property, they were actively trying to persuade you on these matters, weren't they? And Mr Howarth, to his enormous credit, responded absolutely truthfully. He said the short answer is yes. And I said, "Can you recall another occasion where any government agency has ever come" – and he interjected and said, "No, I cannot" – and then I said, "To try and persuade you in that way?" And he said, "Well, Transport for NSW is often trying to persuade us around things so it's not unusual for a government agency to debate with the council around heritage significance." And I said, "But once you had adopted a position?" And he said – and I said, "But once you had adopted a position, in this case 20 you had affirmed it twice. Have you ever had Planning or another government agency come and try to effectively persuade you out of it like this?" And Mr Howarth said, "No."

Commissioners, what we have here is the grossest case of regulatory capture. DPIE from the outset were a proponent and an advocate for Glencore. They did everything they can, and they continue to do everything they can to minimise the heritage impact of this appalling project, to ignore the genuine heritage issues relating to Ravensworth and to minimise, and grossly improperly minimise the extent of the evidence of frontier conflict on this site and the impact that allowing this project to proceed will 30 have upon the Wonnarua people and Wonnarua heritage.

I then note, and I'll provide these documents as well, that in October DPC Media briefed the minister's office about – following a media enquiry and they said this. "The Burra Charter advocates a precautionary principle for conservation. The Heritage Council considers Ravensworth Homestead and the wider cultural landscape in which it sits, including Aboriginal cultural heritage, significant for its aesthetic, historical, scientific and social values. The council supports Ravensworth Homestead being retained in its current location with a curtilage around its equally significantly multi-value landscape."

40

Commissioners, this is a project that should've never got to first base. This is a project and an assessment process and you can read it in the report from Planning that shows that the Department of Planning and the planning officials here have become advocates for the proponent. They have not fairly assessed the impact on the colonial and Aboriginal heritage and I urge you for climate and for heritage and for the protection of the Wonnarua people to reject this project.

MR BEASLEY: Thank you. Can I just ask you a couple of quick questions? Do I understand your submission first of all that your submission is the project should be
10 refused by the Commissioners on the grounds of greenhouse gas emissions alone - - -

MR SHOEBRIDGE: Indeed.

MR BEASLEY: - - - and that separately, even if you put that aside, it should be refused on the heritage issues you've raised alone as well?

MR SHOEBRIDGE: Indeed.

MR BEASLEY: Yes. And do I understand – your greenhouse gas submission I
20 assume, and tell me if I'm wrong, is based on, at least in part, the submission that even though this project, if you looked at its emissions on an Australia-wide or global basis, it may represent a small proportion of either Australian emissions or global emissions, but in order to tackle climate change it's necessary to take a large number of local actions which include not approving more coalmines or coalmine extensions?

MR SHOEBRIDGE: Yes, indeed. I mean, this project itself will have an adverse impact and aggravate climate change and it's a globally significant project with – I think I did the basic calculation of 2.5 tonnes of CO₂ for every tonne of coal burnt and that's some 337 million tonnes of CO₂. I think that in itself is significant but it also
30 should be seen as if we want to address the wicked problem of climate change we need to take multiple actions across all parts of society to address carbon emissions going forward and I'd say it on both grounds in that regard.

Can I say on the heritage grounds the Heritage Council made – and I haven't had time to deal with it but I will provide the documents – on the 2nd of November – in November the – sorry, on the 3rd of November Glencore wrote back to DPIE and rejected all of the options that the Heritage Council put for protecting Ravensworth and the surrounding curtilage. So one of the options for the Commission is to make a condition protecting Ravensworth and then say maybe five, six or one-kilometre
40 radius around Ravensworth. Glencore have made it very clear that this for them is an all-or-nothing project. They reject any such conditions, they say that amounts to

refusal because they say, well, it would be uneconomic to remove the coal. Effectively Glencore has said if Ravensworth and the surrounds are to be protected then this project should be rejected.

MR BEASLEY: Yes. All right. Thank you, sir, I think there's no further questions so thank you for your presentation.

MR SHOEBRIDGE: Thanks very much.

10 <NIKO LEKA, NEWCASTLE RESIDENT

MR BEASLEY: Next speaker is Niko Leka. I hope I've pronounced that correctly. If I haven't, I apologise. Are you there?

MR LEKA: Hi, yeah, good morning, Commissioner, and thanks very much for the opportunity to speak. My name's pronounced Niko Leka as you said. So of course sovereignty was never ceded by the Aboriginal people and always was and always will be Aboriginal land, but what we're looking at here with Ravensworth and its surrounds is an unresolved crime scene. Now, it's not my area but I'm just a citizen in
20 Newcastle, but I did get in touch with Mr Dunne, Mark Dunne, who wrote a book, it was his PhD, looking into what happened into that area. And he says that the massacre did not occur at that particular site, it was 20 kilometres away, but he does say that the Ravensworth and Bowman Estates were like the centre of violence in the Hunter, and there's even a deployment of mounted police around Bowmans Estate, a number of incidents.

So what we're talking about murders, abductions, a number of crimes. Smaller crimes in terms of not a massacre but still crimes nonetheless. At one point the way that the law stood on those days was that Aboriginal people were not regarded as British
30 subjects because there had been no treaty signed with the king and therefore, if British officers happen to murder and Aboriginal person, it wasn't really possible to have a proper trial because, again, referring to Mr Dunne's book, it was impossible to bring Aboriginal people to trial as defendants because the trial would require a jury of seven military or naval officers, which would mean a jury half of British subjects and half of Aboriginal people.

Okay, so, I accept that there were crimes that occurred there. Now according to another expert in the area, Professor Lyndall Ryan, she says that of the Hunter, the Hunter Region has a very low representation of frontier massacres sites in comparison
40 to the settled districts in Tasmania, which opened up to the same private settlers in exactly the same historical period, that is the 1820s. So statistically it's quite possible

that given time, further evidence may be unearthed, we may find out more in time. But the fact remains it's an unresolved crime scene and therefore it should not be touched on or not substantially altered as far as possible on that basis alone.

So, I've got a question here. There is significant variation in the modelling of the financial benefits ranging from \$150 million to I think it was over \$1 billion. And so at what point in that sort of financial modelling is it unviable to leave Ravensworth there, not the estate, the lands itself as well, the whole, the whole lot, to leave it alone, to leave it there? At what point and in what way do they actually sort of work out
10 whether it is viable or not viable? And going a little bit further onto that, I won't take much longer, it raises another question. If the answer is no, then what is the plan for Glencore to walk away? What plan will they have to actually leave the site and to actually cease their operation – what is their plan for walking away? Is it a responsible plan, would it be acceptable to the community? Should they be required to provide such a plan as part of this assessment process? That's all I've got to say. Thank you.

<STEWART EWEN, BROKE VILLAGE SQUARE TRUST

MR BEASLEY: Thank you, sir. Our next speaker is Stewart Ewen, who's from the
20 Broke Village Square Trust. Are you there sir?

MR EWEN: I am. Am I coming through clearly?

MR BEASLEY: Yes, we can hear you. Go ahead, please.

MR EWEN: Right. Firstly, thanks again, Commissioners, for the opportunity. I am not going to repeat the various issues we've had the opportunity of passing on to the Commission earlier in the week with our meeting. However, I'd like to bring you up to speed just on a couple of matters that have occurred since then.
30

Firstly, when we met I did mention that the Morrison Lee impact statement or study was well underway. That's now been completed. A copy of their report has been forwarded to you. I do refer you to the executive summary in the front of the report that adequately looks at the economic situation as far as moving the, or the impact of moving the Ravensworth Homestead to Broke and the positive issues that will emerge from that.

The second issue I just wanted to raise with you is that Singleton Council dealt with this issue earlier in the week. On Tuesday evening, there was a motion put before
40 council that council were to support the concept of relocating the homestead to Broke. This was debated at quite some length and it was a very positive and intensive

discussion looking at all the elements because both the Ravensworth area and the Broke area fall within the Singleton Shire. At the end of the day there was a vote on the matter and it was voted on unanimously that council would support the relocation of the homestead to Broke. That was obviously been passed onto you as well.

10 Look the only other comment I'd like to make, and I have the greatest respect for some of the speakers in regard to their generalisation on the heritage issues, but as an ex-Heritage Council member I do believe there's been some very unusual statements and probably some of the people haven't been briefed as well as they might have been in regard to how heritage has to deal with these issues. I think Keith Cottier, who was one of my compatriots on the Heritage Council and was one of the chairmen of the Historic Homes, has given written evidence to support the relocation.

Equally, in terms of the Indigenous groups again, I think there's been an element of miscommunication there. We have lodged with the Commission letters of support that the homestead should not be considered significant to the Indigenous groups and that they would have no concerns about it being relocated to Broke.

20 The economic impact of moving such a facility to Broke is so great, and as I mentioned before, what the Department of Planning, when they met onsite, they, you know, considered that the economic and social impact benefits that would flow from such a project vastly outweighed any other issues or heritage issues that emerged.

So, look, I'm going to leave it at that. If there are any questions I would be delighted to answer it, but I think we've given you as much information as we can at this point.

**<JENNY MARSHALL, FORMER OWNER OF RAVENSWORTH
HOMESTEAD**

30 MR BEASLEY: Thank you, sir. Next speaker is Jenny Marshall. Are you there, Ms Marshall? I think you might be on mute - - -

MS MARSHALL: Can you hear me now?

MR BEASLEY: We can hear you now. Go ahead please.

40 MS MARSHALL: Good, thank you, thank you. Good morning everybody. I, my name is Jenny Marshall and my husband Geoff and I are the last owners of Ravensworth. We sold to Glencore in 1998. Geoff passed away in February of this year so I am speaking for him as well.

We all know the history of Ravensworth I'm sure dating back to 1832 when the old kitchen, as we called it, was built. The homestead was a wonderful home and many happy time with friends and family were enjoyed during many, many years. Geoff has lived all his life, mostly all of his life except for 12 years when we were over at Ravensworth Farm, and he and I moved back to the homestead to live in 1983 after his mother died.

10 We were under the impression there would never be mining under the homestead. Geoff's father, Campbell Marshall, acquired the land with the homestead in the 1920s under the Soldiers Settlement Scheme. His father and grandfather also owned some land across Bowmans Creek towards the railway line.

20 As a result of the sale to Glencore, Geoff and I were invited to be on the advisory committee together with some local residents of Singleton and surrounds to look at and assess what options were available to relocate the homestead. We spent many hours back at Ravensworth discovering aspects of the complex along with some interesting sites: a dog's grave, the underground brick storage for grain on the hill, a grave thought to be the one of James Bowman, the site of the vegetable garden down by the creek, the outside four-seater toilet, the shearing shed, and the remains of the convict quarters.

30 One day, the heritage people came to have a look at the homestead with the advisory committee. There was a suggestion that there could have been a western wing of the house. After some time, the archaeologists came back and showed members her discoveries. As the members peered into the freshly dug hole at some foundations, the archaeologists excitedly pointed out to the probably footing of the western wing. A quiet voice, which was Geoff, of course, said, "That's not old. I put that there when I was doing extensions to the bathroom." Glencore has spent considerable time and money assessing the possibilities of moving the buildings to another site to preserve the history.

40 Please don't tell me that it will lose its history. It already has. How many four-seater dunnies are left in New South Wales and who has actually seen one? In my opinion, the best location would be to move the buildings to Broke, where it would be seen by the public, is close to the wine-growing areas of the Hunter Valley and is in a rural setting. The buildings could be used for multiple purposes and would be a great tourist attraction and able to support itself in monetary terms, and it is in the Shire of Singleton. We must preserve historical buildings as so many have already been destroyed by mining and a lot of them just decay and die. The other site suggested was on the property down by Bowmans Creek. It does not have any attraction – well, to me anyhow – as it would be off the beaten track, and people do not really want to

go and see a building surrounded by coal holes and overburden. And who would want to live there? And it would have, as it would have eventually be left to fall down. That's demolition by neglect, maybe. Ravensworth deserves a second life.

Another point I would like to make, and this is a controversial one, if the decision is made not to move the buildings, surely the beautiful stone building material could be reused in other locations in the area or even elsewhere. Thank you for the opportunity to speak on the behalf of Ravensworth Homestead and the complex, and to honour all the previous owners who have contributed to the historic icon it is today. May it live
10 on. Thank you for the opportunity to speak.

<JAN DAVIS, HUNTER ENVIRONMENTAL LOBBY

MR BEASLEY: Thank you very much. Next speaker is Jan Davis from Hunter Environmental Lobby. Are you there, Ms Davis?

MS DAVIS: Yes, I am, thank you.

MR BEASLEY: We can hear you, so go ahead.
20

MS DAVIS: Great. Okay, I take this opportunity today to tell you I'm Jan Davis and I'm President of Hunter Environment Lobby, which is an organisation that's been going for over 30 years. I'd like to take this opportunity too to acknowledge the sovereignty and the culture of the Wonnarua people, who have sovereignty over the area that I live in East Maitland, as well as the area that this proponent is asking to mine more coal. So a little bit of history about Hunter Environment Lobby. Hunter Environment Lobby, or HEL, H-E-L, so it's a regional community-based environmental organisation and we've been active for well over 30 years on the issues of environmental degradation, species and habitat loss, climate change and social
30 disruption, including health impacts. HEL has particular interest in biodiversity and water management issues in the Hunter region, and has held positions on the Hunter River Management Committee, the Hunter and Paterson Environmental Water Advisory Group, the Upper Hunter Air Quality Monitoring Network Advisory Committee and the Paterson Environmental Water Advisory Board.

Our latest concern around coal expansions in the Hunter is that Glencore is applying for an extension to its Mount Owen coalmine called the Glendell Continued Operations Project. Our historic concerns. They're seeking to mine an additional 135 million tonnes of coal over 21 years, which will create 226.9 million tonnes of
40 greenhouse gas emissions and cause irreparable loss of heritage value of a colonial estate said to be the location of the massacre of Wonnarua people in the 1820s. In our

December 28 submission on this expansion, we noted that the air quality assessment failed to apply the new NEPM standards, as well as failing to apply the EPA 2017 guidelines of assessing air quality. That impacted on the health of Hunter people who already suffer severe impacts of mining and coal-fired power generation, and I myself with asthma. We also noted that the air quality assessment failed to identify community ambient air quality at Camberwell and surrounding districts. In the five years prior to the 2018, the area had critical levels of air pollution impacting on human health if measured under the new national standards. We know these impacts have only increased.

10

HEL has been protesting to this department for over 15 years about the allowance of final voids in the coal industry. This project leaves a final void and lowers the class of agricultural land in the final landform from class 4 or 5 down to class 8. This lowers the land value and productivity for future users. It has always been our policy to push for no final voids. If the project cannot afford to backfill them, it is not a viable project.

20

Further impacts of the proposal. To make way for the mine expansion, Glencore is proposing to relocate the historic Ravensworth Homestead and dig up the archaeological landscape of the Ravensworth Estate on Wonnarua country which was the site of frontier violence that we've heard so much about. The Heritage Council has warned the Department of Planning this would have irreversible and catastrophic impacts on heritage that is of state significance. The Heritage Council advised the department it opposed Glencore's proposal to relocate the Ravensworth Homestead and advised them not to ignore the objections of the Plains Clan of the Wonnarua People, who say their ancestors were massacred in the area in the 1820s.

30

For its original greenhouse report, Glencore's assessment admitted that the mine's development was consistent with the IPCC's high-emission A2 scenario, which is projected to result in warming by approximately 3.4 degrees by 2100, which would be, which would cause catastrophic levels of global warming. The IEA's Roadmap for Net Zero by 2050 modelled global energy use consistent with achieving that target, and found that beyond projects already committed as of 2021, there are no new oil and gas fields approved for development in our pathway and no new coalmines or mine extensions are required. That is, there is sufficient coalmining operations already approved globally to supply coal to the limit of what the atmosphere can afford if we are to achieve the net zero by 2050, which New South Wales shares. We find the government support of projects like this unbelievable when taken with climate change disasters like the recent fires a couple of years ago, and the floods that have affected so many people and cost our community so much, and many of us have relatives/friends who are still suffering and are homeless.

40

This project is not consistent with New South Wales climate policy, the principle of intergenerational equity, nor the public interest, as it clearly assumes the failure to meet the Paris Agreement temperature goals and worsening climate change impacts for New South Wales. Our message to the Independent Planning Commission in the strongest terms is that we object to this project. HEL supports the Wonnarua Plains Clan, and that if you approve this mine extension, you'll be condemning the people of New South Wales to the intensifying impacts of climate change for generations to come.

10

And if I've got a couple of minutes, I'll just precis that HEL has a huge history with Mount Owen. It was one of the first projects that we actually got together over all those years ago, 30 years ago in Singleton, that we came together and got to learn of what was going to happen if the Ravensworth State Forests were to be removed to form the first Mount Owen Mine. And actually, in the original investigation, our recommendations were put into conditions of consent. So Hunter Environment Lobby has an ongoing and continuing alignment with this project. And also the, we've been presenting to you, Commissioners, and to your predecessors for over 30 years and we've been talking about the predictions of climate change, what will happen. And to see them happen here in front of us and to our relatives and our friends is pretty tragic, but we've been telling you for so long. And Glencore is a Swiss company. Swiss glaciers cannot take any more rises in temperatures, so it's going to come back to bite this company's country as well. And so with those, with those words I'd like to finish and ask you, thanking us for the opportunity for us to give you our thoughts and not the other way around. Thank you very much.

20

MR BEASLEY: Thank you.

MS LEESON: Thank you. I just have one quick question if I can. You mentioned Mount Owen project had been involved in so many years ago, and your submissions to that included comments around conditions that were then adopted and taken onboard.

30

MS DAVIS: Yep.

MS LEESON: I'd be interested if you've had an opportunity to look at the draft or the recommended conditions of consent that the department's provided us, and if you have any comments on those, or if you don't right at the moment, I'll just remind you now that you do have, you know, the Commission is assisted by any comments in those regards, so - - -

40

MS DAVIS: Yeah, lovely. I'll, I'll, I'll enlarge my submission and get back to you in my written submission and lodge it online. So thanks very much for that comment.

MS LEESON: Thank you.

<MARG McLEAN, HUNTER VALLEY RESIDENT

MR BEASLEY: Thank you. Next speaker is Marg McLean. Are you there, Ms McLean?

10

MS McLEAN: Yes, I am.

MR BEASLEY: Go ahead. We can hear you.

MS McLEAN: Very good. Thank you very much. So good morning, Commissioners, thank you for the opportunity to provide my perspective on the implications of approval for the Mount Owen Complex continuing to operate for another 22 years. 30 years ago, I, like Jan, was – I engaged in the process of consideration of the creation of the Mount Owen Mine. This entailed the destruction of half of the Ravensworth State Forest. I advocated then for the country to be protected from clearing, giving primacy to its high conservation value as habitat for biodiversity, being the largest remnant of the original valley floor forest of 450 hectares. Now I need to say that if we take heed of the consequences of our decisions, the consideration of the application is not primarily a land-use decision. The bottom line in the public interest must be the consideration of implications for climate change and the more frequent extreme weather events it precipitates. The refusal of this continuing operation application is appropriate from several points of view in many dimensions. We cannot continue with business as usual. It is time to admit our mistakes, acknowledge the past and make preparation as best, and adaptation, as best as we can.

20

30

The recognition and respect for the heritage value of the Ravensworth Homestead means that it must be left where it stands. The meaning of the Ravensworth Massacre, that the European occupation of Hunter Valley was violent, is diluted if it's divorced from its context. It's also appropriate to refuse this continued operations application because it would result in the destruction of over 100 hectares of a critically endangered ecological community. This should not be blithely glanced over. The fact is that a critically endangered ecological community is considered to be facing an extremely high risk of becoming extinct in Australia in the immediate future. These vegetation communities have been cleared to near extinction. The overclearing, also the overclearing of vegetation contributes to the impact of our extreme weather events.

40

It appears both from the articles in the current edition of The Coalface newspaper and the Department of Planning's assessment report that the main argument for approval is that the mooted benefit to the economy would be greater than the social/environmental costs. I appreciate the cost-benefit analysis is presumably the primary framework that the IPC considers it must use also. I can't argue with that. But I beseech you to consider the full gamut of costs and to be able to incorporate the costs of loss that don't easily lend themselves to monetary evaluation. For me, this is including the heritage value of Ravensworth Homestead left in situ and biodiversity value of protection of the remnant vegetation and standing trees with hollows in this fragmented, overcleared landscape of the Hunter Valley floor.

I appreciate that it is not the job now of the IPC to recommend changes to the law or even the accepted process. Specifically, the use of biodiversity assessments method to describe the impact of an activity on the plants and the animals and their habitat. But regardless, I consider it important to the Commissioners' consideration of Hunter Valley biodiversity for me to point out the limitations of this way. If you only rely on the department's BDAR report without due consideration on the cumulative impact over time and space, then you'll be misled. I've been concerned about the protection of the biodiversity of the Hunter region for over 30 years. I've been a community representative on several committees, including for the Glennies Creek catchment, and was involved in the north-east, from the Hunter River to the Queensland border, comprehensive regional assessment process. This process sought to identify and protect enough adequate habitat for enough breeding females of threatened species to enable local populations to survive. The outcome from that process was effectively that it was clear that there is a biodiversity crisis. That at the turn of the 21st century, it's been 20 years that I'm talking, and I appreciate I must be nearly out of time, but what I'm trying to say is that it's akin to climate change that we haven't – there's been no regional biodiversity assessment conservation done since this time. This is akin to climate change denial and failing to respect our heritage. If you don't look at it, then you can pretend it isn't happening. I'm talking about the biodiversity assessments method. It obfuscates the situation more than anything. The approach is in the name but not the spirit of ecologically sustainable development. It's recognising significant impact needs to be mitigated if it can't be avoided. The concept of being able to compensate for the destruction of habitat by mining and development leads to the concept of offsetting becoming codified and formalised through biobanking, biodiversity offsets, but it doesn't really do the trick. I will be putting in a more written - - -

40 MR BEASLEY: submission.

MS McLEAN: - - - of the material, yes, submission, of the material that is substantiating what I'm sorry that I've run out of time to, to share with the department, with the Commissioners, but it's there, it's the concept of critically endangered is really, it leads to the absurdity to consider that you can allegedly offset a critically endangered ecological community. By definition, by actuality, the impact of destroying an area supporting critically endangered ecological communities, and it's not the only one obviously in the Hunter Valley, the impact is that it's even more endangered. There is less of it. This impact cannot be offset. The whole concept of offsetting, as just, means that we don't really look at the situation, and that's what I'm
10 saying at the moment. I caught a bit of what David Whitson was saying, is it is a critical time. It is a time for not business as usual. We are able to actually start to try to turn things around. Thank you for your time.

MR BEASLEY: Thank you. Thank you, Ms McLean and please send in your written submission for the Commissioners.

MS McLEAN: I will. I'm sorry I wasn't more coherent.

<GEOFFREY SHARROCK

20 MR BEASLEY: No, that was fine. Thank you very much. Next speaker is Geoffrey Sharrock. First of all, Mr Sharrock, are you there and can you hear - - -

MR SHARROCK: Yes. Yes, and can you hear me?

MR BEASLEY: We can. Just before you commence, I've been asked to just note for any people listening that Mr Sharrock is a former member of this Commission from 2018 and 2020, and perhaps as a matter of obviousness, that fact, of course, is not relevant to the panel's consideration. Thank you, sir. Go ahead.
30

MR SHARROCK: Well, thanks very much. Look, I have a PowerPoint presentation, so I, if you would let me in to, to show that, I'd appreciate it. So - - -

MR BEASLEY: Someone else is going to have to do that - - -

MR SHARROCK: I have it on my screen, but I think you'd - - -

MR BEASLEY: Could - - -

40 MR SHARROCK: Yeah, I have it on my screen but I can't tell whether you can see it. But - - -

MR BEASLEY: You can't share it?

MR SHARROCK: Yeah, so do you have it yet?

MR BEASLEY: You, you're going to have to share your screen with us.

MR SHARROCK: I've pressed it. I've pressed it.

10 MR BEASLEY: All right. Well, beyond that, unfortunately my area of expertise is not in screen sharing. I'll see if someone here can pass on - - -

MR SHARROCK: Okay, well, look, I'll start because time's going.

MR BEASLEY: If you've got documentation you can, of course, send it in later.

MR SHARROCK: Well, the PowerPoint presentation is very important because it's got some photos of some important houses. Thanks very much, I'll commence.

20 So as you're aware, Commissioners, the Department of Planning has recommended that Ravensworth Homestead be moved to a site called Ravensworth Farm and not to Broke. Now, I believe this recommendation is wrong, in my opinion, and it's wrong for the following reasons.

There are only 19 homesteads in the Hunter Valley regarded as very significant and as far as I'm aware there's none in the public domain. So the Hunter Valley was one of the first areas of European settlement outside of Sydney, and in the early 19th century there were many land grants, broad acre grants, 3,000 to 5,00 acres and there are still a number of many such sandstone – I'll try entering again – such sandstone buildings
30 around in the Hunter Valley. Arrowfield, which Professor Barlow's been to, Struan, Balmoral, Edinglassie, Plashett – all of those places are – I'll just share screen again – all of those places are owned by organisations, either coalmining companies or horse studs, but none are in the public domain.

One sandstone house which was at Broke was broken up and sent away, that was Gregory Blaxland's house. So, I'll see if I can – I'll continue. So, my next screen was going to show Wambo Homestead. Now Wambo Homestead is on a mine lease, and what happened to Wambo Homestead should not happen again. In the 1990s there was a plan to move that homestead into Singleton and the Heritage Office opposed
40 that because the curtilage of that building is very important and so they didn't – would

not allow it to be moved. So, as a result it's now stands on a Wambo mine site surrounded by mining - - -

MR BEASLEY: We can now see your screen, sir, just so you know, oh no, hang on.

MR SHARROCK: Okay, okay, I can't see it.

MR BEASLEY: I'm not sure it's what you want us to see though, it's a message about screen sharing so, anyway – you continue.

10

MR SHARROCK: Anyway, look I'll continue on because time's going and I don't want to take up too much time. I'll speak about Wambo Homestead. The photo I wish to show you is a photo of the homestead at the moment and there are columns missing, there are temporary downpipes to take water away from the building, there are concrete braces holding the foundation in place. So it's in a very, very sorry state and it can be visited by nobody.

20

Now my next slide was to talk about the North of England open air museum in Beamish, between Durham and Newcastle. It's a 300-acre site that had farms and a coalmine there, and many, many buildings have been moved there since the 1970s, and the person who founded it, a Dr Atkinson, said that he admits that a building that's in its original location is best for its history, but rather than lose a building, it's better to move it. So there are many, many buildings there. There was a school I was going to show you, a stone building with stone walls, 1891 building, it was moved from a place called Sunderland, south of Durham. The Lloyds Bank in Durham, excuse me, the Lloyds Bank in Beamish, it comes from Newcastle. The hotel there comes from south of Durham. So many, many buildings have been moved successfully and now Beamish gets 700,000 visitors a year and it is genuine, a critic once said it's a bit like Disneyland, but it's not like Disneyland because Disneyland is recreated buildings.

30

These are the real buildings moved.

I wanted to come to local example. A local example is Richmond Villa and I have a photo of Richmond Villa in its original site, which is beside Parliament House in Macquarie Street. In 1977-78 that was moved to allow a new building to be built behind and around New South Wales Parliament House. It was moved to Kent Street in Sydney and it remains there today. In 2012 it received heritage listing. So you can translocate a building, you can rebuild it and you can get heritage listing. So moving a place and keeping its heritage listing is possible.

40

So, in summary, I've taken up my time, in summary I'd say what is the best outcome for Ravensworth Homestead? The best outcome is not to put it at Ravensworth Farm

where it won't be visited by anybody, where a plan of management has to be developed and where we don't know what its future will be, it will probably be mouldering away. Whereas, if it's moved to Broke there's already a plan of management, more people will see it and there are so few, I think there's none, there's so few homesteads from this sandstone era, 1830s, 1860s in existence that we should take the opportunity to not lose another such house. Thanks.

MR BEASLEY: Thank you very much.

10 MR SHARROCK: No presentation?

MR BEASLEY: You can mail it in.

MR SHARROCK: Okay, sorry about that.

MR BEASLEY: No worries, thank you. Next speaker is Jody Derrick, are you there Ms Derrick? I think we can see you.

<JODY DERRICK, BROKE FORDWICH TOURISM ASSOCIATION

20

MS DERRICK: Yes, can you hear me now?

MR BEASLEY: We can, go ahead, please.

MS DERRICK: Commissioners. Hello, my name is Jody Derrick. I represent the Broke Fordwich Tourism Association and I'm a local resident.

I have grown up and lived in Broke since I was 5, so over 40 years. My father worked in the nearby mine. My husband and I are both involved in mining via our transport
30 business and our tourism accommodation business and my work in the local cellar door.

The village of Broke has changed significantly. In my early years, I would say that most residents were involved in the mining industry. However, I feel that there has been a significant swing towards involvement in tourism. My feeling is that mining will contract in our area over time. However, Broke Fordwich will always be a tourism area.

I am involved in many events in our area, the Broke Village Fair, Little Bit of Italy,
40 and Smoke in Broke. And, yes, Glencore, our local mine, is very supportive of these

events and local projects. I feel that the impact of the mine, the increase traffic, noise, dust, and road closures while they're blasting, to our village are not - - -

MR BEASLEY: Sorry to interrupt you, just be careful about, I think, not moving too far from your microphone.

MS DERRICK: Oh okay. Is that better, can you hear me?

MR BEASLEY: It's better at the moment, we'll see how we go.

10

MS DERRICK: Our village is not fairly compensated. Ravensworth House would be significant compensation that would live on for generations to come. Broke has more than 10 beautiful cellar doors, well known restaurants, and an art gallery and a sculpture walk yet it lacks a town centre. We have a service station which is often the first thing tourists come across. The staff at the service station do not have a tourism background and cannot, in most cases, help guests to our area. Ravensworth House will provide a town centre and could be used for a tourism information hub and an area where locals can meet for coffee and catch-ups. These are both non-existent for Broke now.

20

If anyone has witnessed how the now closed coffee cart brought locals together, I'm sure that you will agree that Broke needs this meeting point socially and economically. The tourist hub will also create an important transport link between Sydney, Newcastle, Pokolbin, Cessnock, Wollombi, Broke and Singleton and an extra reason to come via Broke and increase visitors to our LGA. Tourism is an important sector to our area. Increasing visitation will help overcome our reliance on income from fossil fuel industries in the future.

30

From a heritage point of view, the artist impression and my visit to the site show a stunning main building with beautiful outbuildings. It will certainly make an impact and encourage people to call in. The building can be used to enhance the existing events in the McNamara Park and McTaggart Park, like the Broke Village Fair and the Broke Village Markets and Smoke in Broke. It will also improve the facilities on the park for the many campers who visit. If the building is moved on the Glendell site for offices once the mine closes the building will be left in the middle of nowhere and serve no purpose. In Broke the heritage building will live on forever and be well used.

40

From an Indigenous point of view, Mt Yengo and Baiame Cave are significant to the Aboriginals of New South Wales like Uluru and the Aboriginals of Central Australia. Broke Fordwich and the close by Wollombi Valley have important stories to tell about the Indigenous heritage. Ravensworth House could accommodate an Indigenous

Heritage Centre so the story could be told. It could also employ some local Indigenous and become a tourist destination. The building could also be rented for a tourist information centre and provide a service and generate income from rent and events.

To summarise, I support the extension of the Glendell Mine Site. I feel that existing mines should be able to continue mining rather than opening new mines. Mining will contract over time and be replaced with more renewable energy sources. However, we still need mining to support our energy needs while we transition.

10

Ravensthorpe House on the extension site is of heritage interest for me. I would like to see that it is cared for by moving to the Broke Village where its heritage and beauty will live on and benefit many for years to come. Thank you.

MR BEASLEY: Thank you very much, and I think that you're going to be asked to but if you could send in your speaking notes for any bits we just missed with the microphone issues. Thank you very much.

MS DERRICK: Thank you.

20

<SIMON ROCK, WESTRAC NSW

MR BEASLEY: Next speaker is Simon Rock from WesTrac NSW. Are you there Mr Rock?

MR ROCK: Yes, I am. Thank you very much for the opportunity to - - -

MR BEASLEY: We can hear you and we can see you, and the coal mine behind you.

30

MR ROCK: Sorry about that. Thank you. Good morning, Commissioner. I'd just like to comment, I'm commenting today on behalf of WesTrac. We have submitted a written submission on our support for this proposal and the jobs and ongoing work it will generate in the area. I'd also like to just make comment on my experience of over 30 years living and working in the local region there, including roles as past president of the Chamber of Commerce, and the impact that the mining brings to the town, the prosperity, the jobs, the income, the opportunities it provides people in the town. It's been wonderful over the years, and this development will ensure that Singleton and Muswellbrook and surrounding smaller villages have that ongoing income and maintain their businesses into the future.

40

I'd also just like to point out and remind people of the less tangible benefits that the mining industry has brought to the surrounding area. We look around Singleton, as past treasurer and president of the P&C, at the primary and high school level, the mining industry has always stepped up when we've requested support for learning resources and raffle ticket prizes, whatever we've needed, the mining industry has always been very helpful to support all those sort of things, as well as the sporting clubs. In addition, the other ones that I've been involved in Singleton were the youth centre and tutorial, volunteer tutorial sessions, which Glencore in particular supported and encouraged their people to come along and help tutor young high school students that were struggling to keep up to speed and achieve their goals. And some of those students who initially didn't think they weren't smart enough to finish high school ended up going to university and are now working in the industry as engineers, which is a wonderful achievement for a company to, to sponsor.

In addition, WesTrac supports the transition to a low-carbon future, and as part of that transition, we need to ensure that the coal that is being burnt over the next 20 or 30 years is the best coal we can burn, the lowest-emission coal, and the coal coming out of the Hunter Valley is that sort of coal. So while we have to burn it, let's make sure we burn good coal and not less quality coal that's coming out of some other markets, and that way we can reduce our impact on the environment in this interim transition period.

MR BEASLEY: Thank you, sir. I'm just going to check whether the next speaker, who's meant to be Robert McLaughlin, is online. Are you there, Mr McLaughlin? All right, perhaps he might come back later on. But that was the last speaker before the lunch break, so we're going to take the break now and resume at 12.50.

LUNCHEON ADJOURNMENT

[11.44am]

30

<ROBERT McLAUGHLIN

MR BEASLEY: All right, resuming the public hearing into the Glendell Continued Operations Project. Our next speaker is Robert McLaughlin. Mr McLaughlin, are you there?

MR McLAUGHLIN: I am.

MR BEASLEY: We can hear you, sir. Go ahead, sir.

40

MR McLAUGHLIN: Thank you, Commissioners. Thanks for having the opportunity to address you today. I strongly object to the Glendell Continuation Project and I support the Wonnarua Plains Clan in their efforts to have the project denied. Glencore is proposing to relocate the historic Ravensworth Homestead and dig up the archaeological landscape of the Ravensworth Estate on Wonnarua country, land taken from the First Nations people through violence in the mid-1820s. The question is now have we become a more just nation in 2022? The Heritage Council has warned the Department of Planning this would have irreversible and catastrophic impacts on heritage that is of state significance. The Heritage Council advised the department it is opposed to Glencore's proposal to relocate the Ravensworth Homestead and advised them not to ignore the objections of the Plains Clan of the Wonnarua People.

Climate change is here now. Most people know that. Most reasonable people accept that. Glencore's original greenhouse report admitted, admitted that the mine's development was consistent with the IPCC's high-emissions A2 scenario, which is projected to result in warming by approximately 3.4 degrees by 2100, which would be catastrophic levels of global warming. The International Energy Agency Roadmap for Net Zero by 2050's modelled global energy use consistent with achieving that target and found that beyond projects already permitted as of 2021, there are no new oil and gas fields approved for development in our pathway, this is quoting them, and no new coalmines or mine extensions required. There are sufficient coalmining operations already approved globally to supply coal to the limit of what the atmosphere can afford and if we are to achieve that net zero by 2050 goal. The cumulative scientific evidence is unequivocal. Climate change is a threat to human wellbeing and planetary health. Any further delay in concerted global action on adaption and mitigation will miss a brief and rapidly closing window of opportunity to secure a liveable and sustainable future for all of us, or for all.

The IPCC also reports that climate change has adversely affected both physical and the mental health of people around the world. Mental health is stressed by the trauma caused by extreme weather events and the associated loss of livelihoods and culture, and by concerns about the future stability of human society in a hotter world. For both losses and damages and limits to adaption, 1.5 degrees C is a critical level of warming. Exceeding 1.5 degrees C means that we will experience greater levels of losses and damages, with some of them being irreversible. It also means that there will be additional people and ecosystems that will reach the limits of adaption. The IPCC working group to report concludes that time is short for securing a liveable and sustainable future by transitioning away from fossil fuels. This project is not consistent with New South Wales climate change policy, the principle of intergenerational equity, nor in the public interest, as it clearly assumes failing to meet

the Paris Agreement temperature goals and worsening climate change impacts for New South Wales. If this mine extension is approved, you will be condemning the people of New South Wales to intensifying impacts of climate change for generations to come. I'm imploring you today, Commissioners, refuse this mine expand.

<STUART BONDS, GLENCORE EMPLOYEE

MR BEASLEY: Thank you, sir, for that. Our next speaker is Stuart Bonds. Mr Bonds, are you there?

10

MR BONDS: I am, guys, can you hear me?

MR BEASLEY: We can now. Thank you, go ahead.

20

MR BONDS: Okay, great. So, hello, everyone. My name is Stuart Bonds and I'm a coalminer currently working at Glendell and I have been employed by Glencore for the last eight years. I need to stress that these comments are my own and they're not made on behalf of the company. As luck would have it, I would be the last person to have lived at the Ravensworth Homestead and called it my home. I lived in a small wooden house which is part of the Ravensworth Homestead complex in 2007 for about 12 months, which was owned by Xstrata at the time and managed by Colinta Holdings. It was the first place that I moved to when I moved away from my childhood home, so if anyone alive has a connection to the land and that place, it's me. We couldn't live in the homestead itself because it was in such poor condition at the time and it was deemed unsafe. In the entire time I lived at the homestead complex, the only people I seen at the homestead itself were the workers that were employed by the mine, trying to keep the old house standing. If this building had such great cultural significance, then why did absolutely nobody visit it the entire time I was there? If this property was not purchased by a mine, it would be just another house that was rotting in a paddock that no one cared about. I believe that the astronomical costs of moving these buildings is a complete waste of money, and the money could definitely be better spent on something else in the community, like a hospital upgrade. But this is the times that we live in.

30

40

We're also going to hear stories about this being prime grazing land. I've walked on every single square metre of that place before it was originally mined by Glendell, and it's anything but. I now live on a small cattle farm outside of Singleton, and I've lived there for 12 years, so I know a little bit about farming. I used to walk on the same land that Glendell sits on now before it was mined, with a rifle and my dog. We used to walk through the trees and the scrub, hunting wild pigs, dogs and foxes. I can tell you with great certainty that this is poor quality land. The illusion that we're going to lose

more prime agricultural land to this mine is a myth. The entire area would not support a single family's income with the cattle that you could run on the property. Instead, the mine is going to support hundreds of people for decades and provide much-needed electricity to millions of people.

The arguments and roadblocks put up against this mine's expansion are for one reason and one reason only, to muddy the water around the real issue that people have, which is climate change. If it's my understanding, this is an Independent Planning Committee, not an Independent Planning Committee of Climate Change. If I am
10 correct, the committee is to assess the project's impact on the local community and make sure there is no corruption in the approval process. We should not be turning this into a climate change debate, but again this is the times we live in. And even on those grounds, the mine should go ahead. The Hunter Valley produces some of the finest quality coal in the world with the highest-quality 6,000-kilocalorie coal anywhere on earth. That means that per tonne of Hunter coal, we generate more power than if you get the coal from anywhere else. We are told the climate is a global issue, so under the premise of minimising damage to the planet, wouldn't it be better for the planet if we burn the highest-quality coal that we could get? It also makes
20 sense to have the mines in countries that are under the watchful eye of strict government agencies and regulators, such as yourself.

The other thing we hear is about stranded assets. I note that we are having this conversation in the midst of a global energy crisis. This crisis is only going to get worse as time goes on. Price is a function of demand, and right now coal is at record highs and there's never been a better time to be mining coal, and the government windfall from these projects is going to be a lot, never going to be higher. How can someone predict with such certainty that these assets will be stranded when the prices are at record highs?

30 Now here's a little bit of history. In 1797, 10 years after the First Fleet landed in Sydney, Captain John Shortland chased from convicts from Sydney Harbour to the Hunter on a stolen boat. In his diary, he noted that he found a very fine coal river. Subsequently, the seat of Shortland was named after him. A convict settlement was set up and it was first named Coal River, then Kingstown, then renamed Newcastle after England's famous coal port, Newcastle. Hunter coal was the very first export for New South Wales, and Newcastle has grown into the largest coal port anywhere on earth. It allows countries to generate more electricity for more people than any other single place on earth. It also brings great wealth to our region. And that's why I think
40 on these grounds the extension should go ahead. Thank you very much, Commissioners.

<NAOMI HOGAN, AUSTRALASIAN CENTRE FOR CORPORATE RESPONSIBILITY

MR BEASLEY: Thank you, sir. Next speaker is Naomi Hogan, who I believe is from the Australasian Centre for Corporate Responsibility. Are you there, Ms Hogan?

MS HOGAN: I am. Thank you, Commissioners.

MR BEASLEY: We can hear you, so go ahead.

10

MS HOGAN: Great. Thank you. I would like to start by acknowledging country. I'm joining from Awabakal country here today in Newcastle, and I also want to acknowledge the Wonnarua people on which this project is being debated and respect their advocacy and fight in this project struggle. ACCR is a research and shareholder advocacy organisation focused on engaging with listed companies and their investors, and that is the topic of my presentation today with regard to Glencore, and I'm going to share my screen and present a PowerPoint presentation, if I may. Is that slide coming up okay, Commissioners?

20 MR BEASLEY: Yeah, we can see that, yep.

MS HOGAN: Lovely, thank you. I'd like to start with the context of the work that we do, which is regard to the challenge of climate change, and acknowledge the IPCC report that came out just a few weeks ago, noting that any further delay in concerted anticipatory global action on adaptation and mitigation will miss a brief and rapidly closing window of opportunity to secure a liveable and sustainable future for all, and that underpins the presentation today. I note that recently there was an agreement endorsed by nearly 200 nations at last year's COP26 Climate Summit in Glasgow, including, for the first time, a pledge to begin curtailing coal from the energy mix.

30 Indeed, UN Secretary-General António Guterres described coal as a deadly addiction and urged all governments, private companies and local authorities to cancel all global coal projects in the pipeline, while COP26 president Alok Sharma called on world leaders to consign coal to history.

In terms of context of Glencore, and I note that there has been some conversation today already about the economics of moving things and of doing things differently. In the very recently released 2021 annual report, I note that earnings before taxes for Glencore were up at \$21.3 billion, up from 11.6 in 2020, their net debt down to \$6 billion from 15.8, their funds from operations in 2021 were 17.1 billion, up from 8.3
40 billion in 2020, and the net income attributable to equity holders was around 5 billion, up from 1.9.

I also note that Glencore is the largest coal producer in Australia. This graph gives a comparison with some of the other coal producers we see here in Australia, and also note that the vast majority of the mine, coalmines that they are producing from are thermal coalmines.

I note that Glencore has made commitments around coal, noting that they want to hold onto the asset and ensure that they can be part of the solution to bringing down those emissions, and that they have committed to managing the decline of their fossil fuel portfolio, stating that they are in line with the goals of the Paris Agreement. I note that here in Australia and for this particular project it has been noted in the greenhouse gas report that they have indicated that it will continue to develop a pipeline of coal projects assessed against market conditions and project economics.

I note that they as a company, or Glencore as a company is committed to transition metals – copper, cobalt, zinc, nickel – and have made emissions reduction targets, which I note there on the screen. I also note that the vast majority of Glencore’s emissions are from coal. As we can see here, a huge proportion of the scope 1 emissions and a very sizeable chunk of the scope 3 emissions for the company is in coal. And you can see here the coal production line in orange, which demonstrates that the emissions of the overall company are very much aligned to the production rates, and I’ve, the 2022 figures there are based on the projection that Glencore have given where they see themselves having about a 17 per cent increase in coal production in 2022.

This is the pipeline of coal projects here in Australia that Glencore are committed to and have put forward since they made the announcement in 2019 to cap production. Glendell is there in yellow at 10 megatons per annum, and taken together, all of this new capacity is around 130 megatons, or as an equity share, around 105. And certainly there are concerns that if all of these projects are developed, it is not in line with their stated decline in the coal portfolio.

In order to better understand that over time, we mapped out the production values currently in blue there of the mines that are operating, and in orange the mines for which they are currently seeking approval, including the Glendell Continued Operations there. We are concerned that the coal decline is not being managed as the company has stated internationally, and that in fact emissions from these coal production activities are set to be high for quite some time. Wandoan is there in grey as it has been approved but is uncertain at this stage.

40

Certainly we have concerns about the cumulative impacts of all of these mines that Glencore is producing and note that in the assessment documents for this mine, it is brought up that it is just one project, that is true, but this is just one project of many that need to be considered by the company as a whole. I also note that their climate plan talks up the closing of Integra, Liddell and Newlands, which you can see clearly here on the graph, which does not cause a significant decline in their emissions due to the extensions and new mines that Glencore is seeking approval for.

10 Glencore also likes to talk about the ways in which their targets are aligned with IEA and IPCC. There is some concern that the emissions reductions need to be taken for, in considering the strong emissions from coal in their portfolio, around 85 per cent of their emissions are from coal. If you were to take a coal decline projection as mapped by the IEA, you'd see that by 2035, which is the yellow line there, you would see a large decline in coal production, far less than a 50 per cent decline that is the emissions goal of Glencore, and that red line is just indicative of what a 50 per cent decline might look like. Certainly if we go back to the map of Glencore's forward projections for their projects, by 2035 we're still seeing a large, huge number there for coal production from Australia if these coalmines are approved and go ahead.

20 This is a graph from last year's submission by NSW Minerals Council, simply bringing home the point that we continue to export huge amounts of coal from New South Wales, and that has not declined yet. And also with regard to the emissions from this particular project, we can see the vast majority are the scope 3 emissions, but we also have concerns that the scope 1 emissions may be underreported due to emissions factors not matching coalmines in their actual emissions. We note that the IEA Global Methane Tracker report from 2022 noted that methane emissions from the energy sector are about 70 per cent higher than the sum of estimates submitted by national governments. And I also note an Australian Conservation Foundation report looking at Glencore's Ravensworth Underground Mine, which was leaking more than
30 a million tonnes of CO₂ or the equivalent to 33,000 cars on the road every year, and it, according to that ACF report, Glencore has ceased trying to capture or flare that methane, and it is now venting directly into the atmosphere. Certainly we have concerns based on Glencore's Hail Creek Coal Mine, which was found in an academic paper by the Netherlands Institute for Space Research and their methane satellites. So there is a concern that the figures being used for the assessment process may be an underestimation of scope 1 emissions.

To close, Glencore also has plans around carbon capture and storage, which they like to talk about in terms of the emissions reductions, but when you look at even if their
40 CTSCo Project in Queensland was successful, it would be a tiny proportion of that coal power station's emissions, and indeed Glencore's overall emissions. We are not

seeing Glencore spend money on climate solutions compared to their peers in this area, and we are seeing them with a huge footprint in terms of their lobbying, and have been found by InfluenceMap, who provide information for many companies and also for the Climate Action 100, ranked Glencore as the eighth most obstructive company blocking climate policy action globally, and certainly their contributions to the Minerals Council, the NSW Minerals Council and the Queensland Resources Council are part of that concern, and we see the ongoing advocacy for approving new thermal coalmines, we see their industry associations negatively impacting on climate policy here in Australia, we see using the pandemic and trying to avoid scope 3 emissions.

10 I'll finish there. Thank you.

<LYN MACBAIN, SINGLETON SHIRE HISTORIAN

MR BEASLEY: Thank you very much for that. Next speaker is Lyn MacBain. Ms MacBain, are you there?

MS MACBAIN: Yes, I am, Commissioner.

MR BEASLEY: We can hear you, so go ahead.

20

MS MACBAIN: Okay, good afternoon, Commissioners. My name is Lyn MacBain. I hold qualifications in local family and applied history. Singleton is my husband's generational home and my home for the past 33 years, 43 years. I work voluntarily to help preserve Singleton Shire's history. However, I also wear other hats, so I want to make it quite clear I'm expressing my views only. Whilst I note in my written submission my concerns in regard to many other aspects of this development, today I wish to talk about Ravensworth Homestead and the proposed removal of this complete colonial complex, which has both Aboriginal and European history intertwined. I've had the privilege to have had two incredible mentors in my life, the late Mrs Dorothy Clayworth, a renowned local historian in Singleton District and beyond, and the late

30 Mrs Barbara Foot, Wonnarua Elder. Both were dedicated in seeking and speaking truth, correcting mistakes, raising awareness and teaching history and heritage to all. Both gave me an appreciation of our Singleton Shire's rich heritage and opportunities for knowledge and learning from two different sides of the coin. After nearly 30 years or more of researching, I am still learning about Ravensworth, its people, and its near 200-year European history, along with its longer association with the Wonnarua.

Firstly, though, I want to comment on part of the process. I was the first person to be asked by Glencore to go on their community committee. Once I saw the terms of

40 reference, I refused. Its sole purpose was to remove Ravensworth, not find other solutions (not transcribable) tender a copy of this with my written submission. Sadly,

over the years I've seen the divide-and-conquer strategy put in place by companies, and it is no different in this case. There is little (not transcribable) about the process that has gone before us. How does a person like my 84-year-old friend Miriam, who wants to see her ancestor left in peace in his unmarked grave on Ravensworth, cope with the process? And even today the process is onerous and denies a hearing to those who do not have the technology to participate. Companies have the means to permeate media with the company line. They have an even closer ear to the government and its agencies. They know the system and know how to make it work for them. The staff are engaged to (not transcribable) company's voice. It is very
10 intimidating to walk into a public meeting surrounded by a barrage of high-vis shirts. Facts are denied and supported, distorted. Voices from others are brought in and promoted as an expert opinion when they are not. I've seen the promotion of an Aboriginal community who are willing to say their history is untrue over traditional custodians who have law and proof. Comparisons are made to other properties as examples of mining companies' neglect to supporting moving Ravensworth. Having been on a committee to protect the property in question, Wamba Homestead at the time, from damage during a period of underground mining to the footprint of the homestead complex, I have listened to many a promoted untruth. And I say this, if
20 this was the case, where are the government authorities charged to protect these properties? Are they non-existent? No, they're not.

I believe Ravensworth is uniquely significant in areas of Aboriginal, colonial, convict, immigration and agricultural heritage. If a proposal went forth to remove Elizabeth Farm, there would be absolute uproar. Ravensworth is no less significant. The homestead is said to be designed by the same colonial architect, John Burge, was built by colonial surgeon Dr James Bowman (not transcribable) the daughter of John and Elizabeth Macarthur. When James and Mary married, they received 2,000 merino sheep as a dowery, and the properties intertwined were a catalyst for the sheep industry that saw our nation grow. From a European heritage perspective, some of the
30 other Ravensworth people have played a major part in influencing colonial, state and nation. The Ravensworth heritage goes beyond the shores. Like Sir Baker Creed Russell, son of our first legislative member, Captain William Russell, the second owner of Ravensworth. Baker rose to be one of the highest-ranking colonels in the British Army and is credited with teaching Sir Baden-Powell the bush skills that forged the Scouting movement that influenced the world, bush skills Baker learnt growing up on Ravensworth, and no doubt aided by the Wonnarua people's knowledge.

Ravensworth offers insights into the contestation between traditional dwellers and
40 early colonisation, the contestation between master and convict, the contestation between land, agriculture and industry. Ravensworth tells the inspirational

intergenerational story of both Aboriginal and European peoples connected to this place. It provides a unique opportunity for acknowledgement of the past, healing, education and appreciation of both the Aboriginal and European history. I don't think there are many who would visit Ravensworth without being inspired by its landscape, sense of place, purpose and endurance. You just have to stand there and take it in. Its presence is a constant reminder that we have built a nation on the shoulders of so many, and the part the Hunter Valley has played in our evolution and of a people who were acknowledged as having the oldest culture in the world. I've watched the Plains Clan of the Wonnarua People try and tell their story only to be stifled and
10 misrepresented. History good or bad should be told. The old adage that history is written by winners is so true. Ravensworth has grim and sad times. We cannot turn back time. We cannot recommence the past. But what we can do is acknowledge it even when it makes us cringe and feel uncomfortable.

Moving Ravensworth to Broke is against Burra Charter principles. Its history and heritage has nothing to do with Broke, and it is only the homestead they wish to move. However, the outbuildings are just as valuable. Any proposal to move it must include all. Our community has a right to see its heritage protected and retained for future
20 generations. If this is supported, then you add to the demise of other heritage properties sitting on mine sites, as this can only be seen as a precedent. Xstrata, the previous owner, made a commitment to protect Ravensworth. It spent a considerable amount of money to do that, and that must have happened after Mr Bond had left. People could visit it. However, present company Glencore have allowed cattle to access the area. I believe they've neglected its maintenance and they refuse entry. People say, "Oh, it's just going to be a ruin, the company will neglect it, and on Tuesday night I heard they would bulldoze it if they didn't get their own way." Again the fear factor rises. I do not believe that would happen. I would hope the company would have more integrity than that. I believe the company would find an alternative way to get the coal without damage to Ravensworth, much like United and Peabody
30 did at Wambo.

The past calls for acknowledgement. Lessons are learnt by experience and Ravensworth in situ is a story and an experience for our future. It is a living museum. We are moving towards a new sustainable era in Singleton Shire's history as mining declines. Singleton must find another way. It must take advantage of what we have to offset that decline, and what we have is a rich, diverse Aboriginal and European culture, incredible environmental and built heritage that will help sustain us as we move forward in the future, and help give jobs to our next generations. Ravensworth is a physical representation of both Aboriginal and European heritage. Save it, protect
40 it in situ, as we, our community, has already lost so much valuable heritage to mining industry. Thank you.

MR BEASLEY: Thank you very much.

MS LEESON: Can I just – oh, sorry, Snow.

PROF. BARLOW: Richard - - -

MR BEASLEY: ...couple of questions.

10 MS LEESON: I have one quick question if I can. You mentioned, Ms MacBain, an unmarked grave on the Ravensworth site early in your presentation. Do you have information as to where the location of that is?

MS MACBAIN: No. That's the sad thing. The, given that it's an unmarked grave, all Aunt Miriam knows that her great-great-uncle is buried there. As, and that's, that come from information, I often get information that people know that their families are buried out in properties, and certainly Ravensworth has its fair share of unmarked graves.

20 MS LEESON: But they've not so far been able to be identified - - -

MS MACBAIN: No, no, no.

MS LEESON: - - - 'cause they are unmarked? Is that the – yeah.

MS MACBAIN: No. That's the problem. It's a huge problem.

MS LEESON: Okay. Thank you very much. Thank you.

30 MS MACBAIN: Thank you.

PROF. BARLOW: Richard, I have a question.

MR BEASLEY: Go ahead, Commissioner Barlow.

PROF. BARLOW: Okay, thank you, Counsel. Ms MacBain, we've heard you mention both Ravensworth very passionately but also Wambo.

MS MACBAIN: Yes.

40

PROF. BARLOW: How many other historic homesteads are there in the Singleton area and are any of them accessible to the public?

MS MACBAIN: One of the problems – well, I think the study probably about four or five years ago identified Singleton had the highest proportion of heritage properties in the Hunter Valley. As far as you've got, you know, there's so many of them. So many of them are under mining, on mine sites. Some mines have people living in them and some mines have just let them sit there as a ruin. The, the issue is the accessibility and the, I suppose, a mining company making it allowable for people to visit. That's the problem. A lot of mining companies don't want people visiting because it takes extra resources. It also has an issue in regards to safety. All those sort of things need to be compliant before a mining company would access, let people access properties. The sad thing is we used to be able to. Now as mining companies and certainly giants like Glencore have taken over mine properties through acquisition and things like that, that is greatly reduced. I sat on the Singleton Heritage Advisory Committee. I had access to Ravensworth consistently while Xstrata had the mine, and certainly, as I said, after Mr Bond had left Ravensworth property, they did that up. And there was no issue. But sadly, that same committee was able to access it once and no photos were allowed to be taken, strict instructions on where we could go, what we could see, things like this. So mining companies do have an opportunity to engage community in these if they wish. Sadly, a lot of them don't.

PROF. BARLOW: And do you think, if I might just ask, what you have been able to see, if these are, and some may be listed heritage-wise and some may not, the ones that are listed heritage-wise, are the owners – the company in this case – fulfilling their responsibility to maintain them?

MS MACBAIN: Some will go as far as they actually have to, and that's – I think have treated our heritage properties in the same vein as destruction by neglect, and others have put their money where their mouth is and seen the value of leaving something behind for our community.

PROF. BARLOW: Thank you.

MR BEASLEY: Thank you very much.

MS MACBAIN: Thank you.

<DR BOB VICKERS, SINGLETON GP

40

MR BEASLEY: Next speaker is Dr Bob Vickers. Dr Vickers, are you there?

DR VICKERS: Yep. Yep.

MR BEASLEY: Please go - - -

DR VICKERS: I've just got a presentation to share my screen as well, if that's all right.

MR BEASLEY: Yes, go ahead.

10

DR VICKERS: I'll just bring that one up.

MR BEASLEY: Yep, we can see that.

DR VICKERS: Okay, can you – and is that in slide mode, you can see the slides?

MR BEASLEY: Yeah, Health Impacts of Glendell Expansion.

20 DR VICKERS: Fantastic. So, look, I'd just first like to acknowledge that I'm speaking from Wonnarua and pay my respects to their Elders past and present, acknowledge that sovereignty was never ceded, it always was, always will be Aboriginal land. I'm a local resident in Singleton. I was born here. I spent majority of my childhood and professional career in the Singleton LGA and I work locally as a GP at the local Aboriginal community-controlled health centre, and have a special interest in air pollution and public health.

30 The, I've done this presentation many times, so I'm hoping that the panel is already aware, but I just wanted to re-cover the main issues. So, look, air pollution, it's been associated with multiple dangers to human health. The particulates enter the lungs, particularly PM10. PM2.5 is then small enough to enter the bloodstream and causes significant downstream impacts in terms of heart disease, lung cancer, asthma, increased rates of respiratory infections. There is neonatal and, and maternal mortality issues with infants born to women exposed to high levels of air pollution. They're more likely to be admitted to a NICU. It causes low-birth-weight babies, type 2 diabetes, and there's also significant cognitive changes in terms of increases in violent crime.

40 Very relevant right now in that Omicron variant replicates in conductive airways. I know people talk about COVID and Omicron being mild now. That is completely false. The evidence has shown that it just changes how it replicates. Instead of lower lung cells, which mainly causes lung disease in adults, very quickly, it replicates - - -

MR BEASLEY: Dr Vickers, are you intending to move from the first slide?

DR VICKERS: Oh, it hasn't moved along?

MR BEASLEY: No, we're still on title page.

DR VICKERS: Okay, I might just quickly come out of that view, then, and - - -

10 MR BEASLEY: Okay, we're now on air pollution.

DR VICKERS: Okay, did that switch back and forth when I did that?

MR BEASLEY: Well, it switched to the slide that's air pollution.

DR VICKERS: Yeah, cool. Okay. If I do that, does that switch to the next one? Oh, it's paused my screen sharing. That's why. Hang on. Resume share.

20 MR BEASLEY: I'm being told you need to go to presentation mode, whether that means anything.

DR VICKERS: Yes, I've got multiple screens, that's all. So have you got the updated air quality targets there now?

MR BEASLEY: We do, yes.

DR VICKERS: Okay. No worries. So I'll just have to quickly change that over. Fantastic. All right. Look, the – let me go back up one, sorry. So, yeah, look, Omicron replicates in the conductive airways, which is the trachea, the bronchioles
30 (not transcribable) cause significant disease burden for children in asthma and croup, and it is now starting to cause increase in childhood fatalities. So in the US, they're seeing a gradual increase in childhood fatalities every month, and actually every week as they see the BA.2 variant rise, which is what we're being told is our next wave in Australia and will be our next wave. One-third of the deaths since the pandemic have begun in the US have been since January. So Omicron is, is particularly high risk for children with asthma and croup, and unfortunately the Hunter Valley, as a result of our PM10 pollution, 90 per cent of which comes from open-cut coalmining, and the EPA has confirmed this data, it's unacceptably well above the national rate. So open-cut coalmining is going to add an additional risk factor for Hunter Valley children in terms
40 of COVID mortality, and with the absence of public health measures like mask-wearing, schools are still returning, we don't have any isolations, and if anything

they're reducing isolation requirements, this is a big issue. And this is something that I did actually warn about in previous presentations, funnily enough.

World Health Organization has recently updated their targets. They've actually become more strict in terms of the criteria for PM2.5 and PM10. I acknowledge that the NEPM targets and the New South Wales and Australian targets haven't been revised yet. Having said that, I think it's highly unlikely that they won't be across the life of this mine. So when we assess the project as to whether it's going to meet the current criteria for air pollution targets for PM10 and PM2.5, that's not a fair
10 assessment of whether this would be an appropriate health burden for our local population based on the best science available and international recommendations of best standards for air pollution. There's no known safe level of air pollution. That's the other argument as well. We should be striving for the lowest possible, not just to fall under a decided target. This is the data for the last couple of years. So business-as-usual approaches in the Hunter Valley, all of these mines' air pollution plans have led to a gradual worsening up to 2019, and then despite having two La Niña summers and increased precipitation, we still actually fall above the recommended annual levels based on the new WHO targets.

20 So the project doesn't account for exceedances in areas outside of its immediate area. An acquisition right is essentially a death sentence for someone living in those residences. And the cumulative health impacts of mining activity in our region, it's never been fairly assessed during any of these IPC assessments or NSW Department of Planning assessments. All we look at is individual mines. No one has done a cumulative health impact study as a result of these applications. And we continue to request it, and it doesn't get done.

I know people are saying that climate change is a minor issue in this, but it's not. The proponent has claimed that the project's unlikely to affect the objectives of the New
30 South Wales climate change policy framework. We clearly have already seen today that they don't have a steady reduction in greenhouse gas emissions by 2050. And reality, after the extreme weather events that we've just been seeing, I also find it highly unlikely that those targets won't also be revised, like the WHO targets. I think it's very unlikely that in 2049 we'll be patting ourselves on the back saying, yes, good job, we've got one more year left and we've met our targets.

Significant health impacts from recent floods still haven't subsided. We are seeing vector-borne illnesses. I actually spoke about vector-borne illness in the Wambo presentation as a health complication of climate change. So we're now having New
40 South Wales Murray Valley encephalitis, Japanese encephalitis, brucellosis, and these are all directly linked to land-use conflict, land clearing by open-cut mining, livestock

become vectors with wildlife, the increase global sea temperatures brings monsoonal and mosquito-borne vectors further south. These are not illnesses that we have any kind of vaccination against. And so the mortality rate for Japanese encephalitis is about 1 to 2 per cent, and there's not enough vaccine to protect people who need it.

The mental health impact of repetitive extreme weather events is significant. We have the term solastalgia, which is basically grief of losing the environment. And it's not only Glencore who's responsible, but this whole approval process is, is a precipitating and perpetuating factor for the entire spectrum of the eco-anxiety and eco-grief disorders. Every single approval that is given by the NSW Department of Planning, the Planning Minister, Environment Minister, IPC, leads to a significant mental health impact for everyone watching around the world that is calling for urgent emissions reductions. This is never included in the impact of these assessments, whether the approval, not just the proponents' mental health impact but the approval process's mental health impact is significant.

The emissions target is an aspirational goal. I think it's highly unlikely that this project will not meet future aspirational targets and it's very naïve to think that they would. And as already mentioned, we, we should be having no new thermal coal projects to have any chance of meeting science-based projects, science-based targets.

The economic report is also substandard from the proponent. They didn't include any of the health costs associated with health pollution, which is a significant burden, not just in mortality but quality adjusted life years. They didn't include any health costs associated with climate change, any of the things that I've mentioned. Every year there's 2,616 deaths from, excess mortality from air pollution just in Australia alone, and it's estimated to be 4.2 million excess deaths globally. Children that miss school, that miss education have quality-adjusted life years in terms of economic potential and time away from work. The, the ignorance of these health economic costs is, is negligent in terms of the Department of Planning's due process to assessing the economic impacts of this project. There's also the transition risks and this project is undermining the economic impacts of a, beneficial impacts of a transition, a properly planned transition. We've got recruitment programs locally that work via labour hire companies that take young people, particularly young Indigenous people, in this town and provide them with jobs in the coalmines that are unsecure. They close their mines for two weeks to boost the thermal price of coal. They have no loyalty to their employees. Without a diversified economy, those who can't work in the thermal coalmining industry face those indirect impacts. We've got some of the highest rental prices for units and lowest value of units, and Muswellbrook has some of the highest rents in the state despite having the lowest house – it's a two-tiered system and it is unfair and it is unsustainable.

The most galling part of this assessment, though, this is unrelated to health impacts, I just need to personally point this out, that the Department of Planning had an alternative plan that would leave the Ravensworth Homestead in place and have theoretical economic benefit to the state, but they went against it because of the theoretical risk to Glencore. Their mission is to serve the people of New South Wales, not Glencore. It is absolutely insulting and disgusting that the risk of investment to Glencore outweighed potential economic benefit to the state. This is going to cause further generational hurt.

10

Look, my last slide, sorry, is this one. I have some recommendations that I would strongly urge you to consider based on this information before this project is approved. We need a - - -

MR BEASLEY: Just before you get to that slide, Dr Vickers, 'cause I can see on it item 2 is a cumulative impact study, which you mentioned earlier in your - - -

DR VICKERS: Yep.

20 MR BEASLEY: - - - presentation. I was just wondering, what I thought I heard you say was we have requested an air quality cumulative assessment for particulate matter, I assume in the Hunter region.

DR VICKERS: Yep.

MR BEASLEY: I was just wondering when you say "we", who "we" is.

30 DR VICKERS: So the Environmental Defenders Office, the Doctors for the Environment Australia, and Lock the Gate. In recent years have, with the support, actually, of councillors from Singleton Council, done multiple presentations to the EPA and made submissions with power station approvals - - -

MR BEASLEY: Who are you requesting, is it, you mentioned the EPA, have you - - -

DR VICKERS: So the EPA would be the ones that would take the lead from that. What they would usually do is they would usually approach researchers from universities which have been the ones that usually do the particle characterisation studies. The reason they're not done is they cost money. They cost money and they should be done for the benefit of health.

40

MR BEASLEY: Sorry, well, that was my last question. What reasons are you given that it hasn't been done?

DR VICKERS: They're expensive. They're expensive, they're time-consuming and it involves multiple departments. So NSW Health would need to be involved as well. Department of Planning, Department of Environment.

MR BEASLEY: Sorry, is that your assumption as to why it's not done or is that the actual reasons you've been given, that it - - -

10

DR VICKERS: Well, I'm a, a member on the Upper Hunter Air Quality Advisory Committee.

MR BEASLEY: Right.

DR VICKERS: This has been raised by Singleton Councillor Danny Thompson and myself, and Catherine Chicken, a vet from Scone. And the, it should be actually minuted in those meetings. The response given was that these would be expensive and that they would have to look into whether the cost was of any additional value in terms of those studies, particle characterisation study or a cumulative impact study.

20

MR BEASLEY: I see. And that, that response was from officers from the EPA?

DR VICKERS: That was from officers from the EPA. So I would hope that those would be minuted, but I can probably confirm that that was verbally said by Councillor Danny Thompson on Singleton Council or any of the other members of the Hunter Air Quality Advisory Committee.

MR BEASLEY: All right. Yep. Thank you for that. Commissioner Barlow has a question, so go ahead.

30

PROF. BARLOW: Thank you, Counsel. Dr Vickers, you showed us the Hunter, the air quality network results for Singleton, Camberwell and Muswellbrook.

DR VICKERS: Yep.

PROF. BARLOW: Just to give us, who are not experts in community health, how do those figures compare with other places around New South Wales? Are they the worst in New South Wales or – where do they sit?

40

DR VICKERS: Depends on the particulates. So there's some really concerning things about our local monitors. If you – I'll bring up the graph again because it's actually a really good thing to show. Screen share again.

MR BEASLEY: Oh, okay, I'm not sure if you can hear me, Dr Vickers, but you've frozen on our screen. If we can't get you back, and assuming you can hear me, I'm not talking to myself, you could mail in a short paragraph answer to Commissioner Barlow's question and your slide presentation. It looks as though we've lost Dr Vickers, have we, entirely? Yep, all right. So we might move on to our next speaker, and while an attempt is made to contact Dr Vickers again. And the next speaker is Robert Monteath from the Cheaper Electricity Party. Are you there, Mr Monteath?

<ROBERT MONTEATH, CHEAPER ELECTRICITY PARTY

MR MONTEATH: Yes, I am.

MR BEASLEY: We can hear you, so go ahead, sir.

MR MONTEATH: I'll just share my screen. Thank you for the opportunity of addressing the panel. Get this organised. Yeah. What are some of the arguments for not approving this extension to the Glendell Mine? Goal of reaching net zero emissions by 2050 and claims that carbon dioxide emissions from powerplants lead to extinction of flora and fauna, human deaths, rising temperatures and increase in natural disasters. So to respond to these claims I'll be referring to expertise, research and knowledge from the following people or organisations. Dr Moore, who is the co-founder of Greenpeace, CSIRO, ANU, NASA, International Energy Agency, Intergovernment Panel on Climate Change, National Electricity Market Data, Federal Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources, Monash University, the Bureau of Meteorology.

So the goal to reach net zero emissions by 2050 – what is the current global contribution of wind and solar for all energy in the world consumption, be it electricity, transport, heating, manufacturing and how's it been improving or what's happened in the last 30 years? And is Australia and the world tracking towards net zero emissions? The Australian Government believes we are and they do say and I should – sorry, I'll just get my pointer going – that we are, Australia is making good progress in reduction of emissions. According to data from the International Energy Agency, we're not really doing that well. This is a graph for the last 30 years over the consumption of all energy in Australia and the dark green line is wind and solar, which in 1990 was 0.5%, it is now 3% of overall energy generation. Europe, which is supposedly leading the world in renewable generation of electricity, has gone from

zero to 3% over that period and they're looking at, they're the yellow band there. And then looking at the world's energy consumption, which is again the yellow band for wind and solar, it is 2%. So we're looking a long way off for achieving net zero emissions by 2050.

And it's worth noting that the percentage consumption of coal in that 30-year period has not changed. So the world still needs coal for the foreseeable future, and Australian coal is the cleanest in the world as mentioned by at least one previous speaker. The CSIRO claims that Australia's coal is five times cleaner than the rest of the world's and it has one of the highest energy ratios compared to other coal in the world.

So, it looks like net zero emissions goal by 2050 could be unachievable. So if people in the world – including Australians – they want luxury, the luxury of using electricity 24 hours a day, seven days a week, then we need to keep mining coal for the next few decades at least.

Many say the carbon dioxide emissions from coal powered plants are going to destroy the planet by causing mass extinction of flora and fauna, significant loss of human life, increase to global temperatures and increase in natural disasters. So as to the claim that carbon dioxide emissions cause extinction of flora and fauna. On his series Green Planet, Dr David Attenborough said that human existence depends heavily on plentiful and healthy global plant life. Since 1990 the amount of CO₂ in the atmosphere has increased from 360 to 410 parts per million. According to research done by the CSIRO and ANU, it's revealed that between 1982 and 2010 there was 11 per cent increase in the amount of foliage in the world's arid regions as a result of the increase in carbon dioxide in the atmosphere. Also, NASA's satellite data has shown the amount of plant and tree leaf cover around the globe has increased by 20 million square kilometres, which is 13 per cent of the world's land mass, from 1982 to 2015 as a result of increase in the CO₂ in the atmosphere.

There's claims that human deaths there's a rise in human deaths because of rising temperatures. Last year there was a Monash study carried out that proved that more deaths occur from cold weather than hot weather. And this study shows that 4.6 million deaths were due to cold weather and only a tenth of that of 480,000 deaths were due to hot weather.

Is carbon dioxide the only cause of rising temperatures – what about the sun? This graph shows the sun's activity being solar flares and sun spots over the last 1,000 years and it's worth noting that between 1650 and 1750 there is a period of one of the lowest activities of the sun in the last 1,000 years and during that time the earth

suffered from a mini or a little ice age. There's written history to show that in the 1700s the Thames River would freeze over each winter as well as other European rivers and Baltic Sea. So if low sun activity causes the earth to cool then you would imagine that high sun activity would cause the earth to warm. It's noted that since 1900 the sun's activity has been increasing and it's close to its highest point – or it is at its highest point in 1,000 years and that dare I use the world hockey graph, which is showing from late 1800s through to 1900s, is, has a correlation with the world's average temperatures that were declining until about 1900 and then started increasing since then. So there is a correlation between the sun's activity and earth's
10 temperatures.

The IPCC published a report in August of last year and it was a bit surprising but they claimed in comparison there is no negligible long-term influence from solar activity – so it is surprising that this report has dismissed the effect and influence that the sun has on earth's temperatures.

Dr Patrick Moore, who as I say, was a co-founder of Greenpeace, claims that in earth's history there hasn't been a direct correlation between CO₂ increase and decrease and similar increase or decrease in atmospheric temperatures. The purple line is CO₂
20 concentrations and the blue line is surface temperatures. So, for the last half a million plus years or so, the CO₂ levels were flatlining where temperature was going up and down – no direct correlation.

And then does climate change affect the number of or increase the number of natural disasters? And I note and others have noted the recent flooding in Brisbane and the north-east coast of New South Wales. But it's interesting to look back in history. Here's from the Bureau of Meteorology, here's the flood gauge at Brisbane Port Office, where in the 1800s, over a 65-year period, there were eight major floods, and since 1900 up until now, 120 years, there have been four major floods. Here's the
30 2022 flood, which is a major flood but just a major flood. Just to put things in perspective, the first coal-fired power station in the world was built in 1882 and the first car was built in 1886. So, it's hard to imagine how human emissions of CO₂ caused the flooding back in the 19th century. There doesn't appear to be a correlation between climate change and disasters.

Similar, looking at the American bushfires, again the 19th century there were millions of hectares that were burnt out and I just want to make a comparison between the 1871 fire that said this fire created its own wind system and turned into a tornado, which was very similar to what happened in our 2019 fires. So before and after so called
40 climate change, we suffer from violent and destructive changes on earth.

Where does the Glendell coal go to? Most of it goes to Asia and I need to quicken this up. There's 600 coal-fired plants being built in Asia currently and Australia is supplying the coal to those power plants. In the last 10 years there's been a three-fold increase in imports of coal into Asia, which is mostly coming from Australia, and that means that – yes – the coal industry is still in high demand in Australia.

Sorry, I've run out of time so unfortunately I can't complete my presentation.

MR BEASLEY: You can send your written material in.

10

MR MONTEATH: I will, I will.

MR BEASLEY: Thank you. I think we've been able to get Dr Vickers back.

<DR BOB VICKERS, SINGLETON GP

DR VICKERS: Yes, sorry, about that. I had a power outage. I've got battery again but it disconnected everything.

20 MR BEASLEY: You were going to a slide to answer Commissioner Barlow's questions.

DR VICKERS: So, the question was the differences between monitoring stations in the Camberwell, Muswellbrook and Singleton region and other regions in the state and therefore the impact on mining on our results versus elsewhere. I mean you can see from this graph here the big glaring thing is in the PM10 particulate levels. Those three ones that I've chosen deliberately are Muswellbrook, the Singleton and the Camberwell station. A lot of the proponent's arguments and mining companies – not just the proponent, all the companies say it – they say, oh, it's the drought or it's bushfire smoke, something else is the cause of the pollution and it's not just us. If that was the case, the droughts in New South Wales are not centred around Camberwell. There is no other explanation that is scientifically plausible why Camberwell has - - -

30

MR BEASLEY: We've lost him again. We've lost you again Dr Vickers so might have to go onto the next speaker this time and if you can hear me you can - - -

DR VICKERS: - - - quality station is right next to the horse racing - - -

MR BEASLEY: You dropped out again for a fair while then Dr Vickers. What we might do is, if you could, to address question is maybe put a note into the Commissioners in writing.

40

DR VICKERS: Yes, absolutely, I can break down the sources of pollution and just show that it's, our area is consistently higher than every other area in the state across multiple pollutions. I haven't put there sulphur or nitrogen dioxide, they are also significant higher in Muswellbrook and Singleton compared to any other region.

MR BEASLEY: Okay, all right. Well, look, thank you for your assistance today.

DR VICKERS: Not a problem.

10

<GEOFFREY STEVENSON, SINGLETON RESIDENT

MR BEASLEY: The next speaker we have is Geoffrey Stevenson. Mr Stevenson, can you hear me? Sir, you might be on mute.

MR STEVENSON: Can you hear me now?

MR BEASLEY: All good, go head.

20 MR STEVENSON: Excellent. Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen and Commissioners of the Independent Planning Commission. My name is Geoffrey Stevenson and I'm speaking today in support of the proposed Glendell Mining Continuation application.

I'm a resident of Singleton, I live here with my wife and two children about 14 kilometres away from the proposed mining application. I've lived here for over 10 years, where I moved to work in the coalmining industry as a maintenance engineer. Working in coal has given me and my family a financially stable life and an economic future.

30

With generous income from my full-time employment has allowed us to purchase our first family home. The income from my wife's work has also enabled us to purchase a residential investment property here in Singleton. This property provides quality accommodation to a local family with three children.

My wife works as a self-employed domestic cleaner here in Singleton and in the surrounding area. Some of this cleaning work is done in the homes of coalmine workers. Some of this cleaning work is done, also done on rural residential properties that happen to be owned by some local coalmining companies. Although my wife
40 doesn't work directly in coalmining, the coalmining industry benefits her

economically just as it benefits other residents in the area who earn a good income without having any kind of tertiary education.

Only 10.5 per cent of the Hunter Valley population outside Newcastle hold a bachelor's degree or higher. That's less than half the level of the rest of the country or the state. I hope that one day coalmining will provide a career opportunity to my children when they eventually finish high school.

10 The coal from this mining project will not be used domestically as far as I understand – it will be exported to existing foreign users of coal. So approving this project, it's not likely to increase global coal usage, it will simply displace coal that would otherwise be mined by unstable totalitarian countries like Russia or countries with minimal environmental regard such as Indonesia. Denying approval to this project application will send some employment opportunities overseas as a result. I believe it will create a domino effect in the area as mining companies will view Hunter Valley as a risky place to invest and to do business. A cut in capital expenditure locally will result in a decline in some local employment opportunities, property values to a degree and to some of the taxes paid to the State and Federal Governments.

20 The local mines around here pay 35 per cent of Singleton Council's rates bill. So they effectively act as a subsidy to the rates that local residents like myself have to pay.

I do concede that it is unfortunate the mining continuation project will extend into the area of the Ravensworth Homestead, so on the question of relocating the homestead to the town of Broke – I do support this proposal. Glencore have committed to pay for the cost of this relocation. I'd suggest as a condition of the project's approval that the homestead should be turned into a tourist attraction. The public should be given access to the building free of charge. If it is relocated to a location other than Broke, I believe it should remain within the Singleton Local Government Area, and I believe
30 that Glencore should be required to deposit funds into a trust fund to maintain the relocated homestead for the next 100 years.

I'd like to thank the Planning Commission for listening to my submission today.

<CRAIG SHAW

MR BEASLEY: Thank you, sir. Next speaker we have is Craig Shaw. Mr Shaw.

MR SHAW: Good afternoon, Counsel. Good afternoon, Commissioners.
40

MR BEASLEY: Go ahead, we can hear you.

MR SHAW: Thank you. Thank you for the opportunity to present today. I'll note that I'm coming to you from Wiradjuri country in the Central West of New South Wales and also would like to acknowledge the lands of the Clan of the Wonnarua People about whose history and heritage we are talking today. Excuse me if I put my glasses on occasionally because I am a little bit blind and while I printed out my notes in extra-large font, I can't always read them but I'm aware of the flare, so I'll just appear as best I can.

10 I'll keep it as short as I can. I just want to keep – make a few simple points. Five minutes isn't long but Abraham Lincoln in his famous four score and ten, four score and seven years Gettysburg speech did it in about two and a half with 270 words and had a major impact so, here's hoping.

Briefly about me, I'm a statistician then become market researcher and qualitative. Lived in Bylong and have been involved in campaigns relating to mining there for a period of time and I was a born and bred Newcastle boy. I also have a connection with Ravensworth property and homestead given I took a fairly nasty fall from a horse there in the mid-80s and have a slight limp that reminds me of it fairly regularly.

20

What I won't be talking about today is issues around climate change and about greenhouse gas emissions et cetera. Not because they're not important, indeed, I feel that they are so important that they should be grounds enough for the project to be refused and others will speak in more detail and more eloquently than I in relation to them.

Instead, before I do say that, however, it should be enough to say that those reasons alone should be enough to scotch the project, should be enough to scotch the project and what we should be about now in terms of coal is following the advice from
30 various world bodies and others about no new coal and no extensions and instead mopping up spare capacity that already exists in the system and taking more earnestly the task of transition to a lower carbon economy.

I want to focus instead on the interrelated issues of heritage and environment, ecosystems and so on and preserving what remains. Now, from a Western point of view in terms of heritage and property, it's about I own things and it's about things not places, painting fairly broadly. From an Aboriginal perspective it's obviously completely the opposite – it's about landscape and country and it's about me belonging to country than the other way around.

40

The issue at stake here in terms of the cultural landscape is that the landscape itself is the life and history of the Aboriginal people involved, it's like a three dimensional book – it only makes sense intact and in place. And it's something to which Aboriginal people relate profoundly. It's not just about the massacre, there's a lot of points been made about the massacre and where it was located or where it wasn't located but it's deeper than that, the history runs back much further and it's about connection to land as much if not more than anything else.

10 Those focusing on the homestead miss the point entirely. Mark Latham, speaking in the Upper House calling it a rat infested hole more or less, showed that he wasn't really aware of what the issues were and it's not just about bricks and mortar. Indeed, you could even make an argument that the homestead wasn't the point and it could be moved but would still be left with the question of the importance of the cultural landscape otherwise with a building missing – it's the bigger picture.

20 The point now is that you've got lived history and you've got remnant ecological communities – Glencore will seek to downplay the importance of what's left, you know, we've heard presentations to say that it's a mining precinct, blah, blah, blah, lots of stuff has been debated. Instead, really what that does is emphasise the importance of what remains.

We are at a tipping point now I feel where various things are weighed up against each other and traditionally coal and the benefits of the state have won but it's time for that tipping point to change and for this – for the precinct as it is to be left intact, the plains country that remains to be left intact and the process of reconciliation and re-evaluation and maintenance of precious critically endangered ecological communities is gotten on with and taken serious.

<ANGELA MICHAELIS

30

MR BEASLEY: Thank you very much for that sir. Our next speaker is Angela Michaelis. Are you there?

MS MICHAELIS: I am. Thank you very much for the opportunity to speak. I acknowledge that I'm on the lands of the Gadigal people of the Eora Nation and I pay my respects to their Elders past, present and emerging.

40 I wish to speak against the proposal on two grounds. One is a lack of respect for Indigenous heritage in regard to the proposed location of the Ravensworth Homestead and the second is my concern about commitment to continued greenhouse gas emissions if this extension is approved.

10 Firstly, concerning Indigenous heritage – I have no specialist knowledge. I am born in Australia to a European immigrant family but the destruction recently of the Juukan Gorge rock shelters has reminded us that elimination of Aboriginal sites by mining is permanent. I understand that the proposal to relocate the Ravensworth Homestead might go some way towards persuading concerns about European heritage, but as the previous speaker said is that to ignore the connections of the Aboriginal people to this site is just to misunderstand the relationship of Aboriginal people to country. I care deeply about the land and how much more if my ancestors had had 40,000 years of connection and then if they had been, in so many cases, displaced by, by force. The possibility that the Ravensworth Estate is an Aboriginal massacre site makes it a faulty proposition that relocation can compensate for digging the land up in a way that can never be restored.

20 The Heritage Council wrote to the Department of Planning saying that this would have irreversible and catastrophic impacts on heritage that is of state significance. And as a city based whitefella, I wish to add my voice to that of the Plains Clan of the Wonnarua People and to the Heritage Council and to ask for the land to be left undisturbed.

My second concern is about the greenhouse gas emissions from an extension to the coalmine. Obviously, I'm very concerned about that, I believe it's driving us towards catastrophic climate change. Although New South Wales and Australia have both agreed that we must reach net zero emissions by 2050. Each time we decide to extend the life of a coalmine we agree to omit more carbon dioxide and more methane both in the mining phase and significantly at the point where it is burnt.

30 The proposal at Glendell is to keep the coalmine going until 2044, but last year the International Energy Agency told us that to stay below the 1.5 degree Celsius limit for global warming, which Australia has an international commitment to attempt, we have to stop any new coal, oil or gas projects. At our current rate of emissions we have very few years left to put that brakes on before we reach 1.5 degrees, and at the current rate of emissions we have maybe a 50 per cent chance that we won't exceed the 2 degree point by the middle of the century, 2053. Yet, as long as we approve new coal mines and expansions we are pushing up, not down.

40 At present Australia has reached about 1.3 degree Celsius above pre-industrial levels and we are seeing the results of global warming. Ordinary New South Wales towns like Lismore may be becoming uninhabitable. We have summer heat in parts of Western Sydney, where I have lived for many years, of over 50 degrees. Our agriculture is threatened first by droughts, then by floods, so the price of fresh food is

rising. That contributes to greater inequalities in our society. And that is only in New South Wales.

If we continue to turn our backs on the real greenhouse gas impacts of the New South Wales addiction to coal royalties, we are assuming it is someone else's job to bring down dangerous emissions.

10 I realise that the Commission is trying to balance what's in the best interest of the community but I'd ask you to consider not just the immediate future but the obligations of the past to our Aboriginal people and to the future, to the young generations. We are trying to safeguard their rights to live on a healthier plant – a much healthier plant that we are currently on track to deliver. So while it would be awkward to say to a multinational miner that they can't go on exploiting coal because the world is overspending its carbon budget, I'm nevertheless going to ask the Commission to do that anyway out of a duty of care for generations to come. Thank you very much.

20 MR BEASLEY: Thank you for that. The Commission will now take a break until 2.30.

SHORT ADJOURNMENT

[2.07pm]

<NIC CLYDE

MR BEASLEY: Nic Clyde. Mr Clyde, are you there?

MR CLYDE: I am, thank you, Mr Beasley.

30 MR BEASLEY: Go ahead, sir. We can hear you.

MR CLYDE: Thank you very much. I'm just going to share my screen. Can you see that?

MR BEASLEY: We can see Cape Grim Greenhouse Gas Data.

40 MR CLYDE: Indeed. Thank you very much. Okay. I'll get started. Commissioners, my name is Nick Clyde. I'm joining you today from Gadigal land here in Sydney. I want to talk briefly today about climate and heritage, starting with climate.

As you can see from the screenshot of CSIRO's webpage here, CO₂ concentrations continue to rise. To stabilise global temperature at any level, that CO₂ curve you're looking at needs to flatten. Until that happens, our planet will continue to heat up.

Since the Paris Agreement came into force, Commissioners, your organisation, and indeed your fellow Commissioners, have approved 3.2 billion tonnes of new emissions. Another 1.8 billion tonnes of new emissions are pending, including the greenhouse gas emissions from this project.

- 10 Professor Barlow, a panel you chaired approved the last major new coal project in New South Wales named Gawler last April. When your panel approved that mine you described your decision to approve more greenhouse gas emissions as "permissible in the context of the current climate change policy framework". While sadly in New South Wales that may be true, it is also true that this decision was and remains entirely consistent with behaviour globally that will result in severe heating of the earth.

- 20 But a different course of action is also permissible in the context of the current climate change policy framework of New South Wales. To quote Rana Koroglu from the Environmental Defenders Office, "The IPC's decision to refuse the Bylong Coal Mine was sound. It was based on the evidence and the science, including evidence about the problematical greenhouse gas emissions. The decision was tested to its limits, and in every appeal, the IPC decision has been upheld."

On greenhouse gas alone, Commissioner, this mine should be refused consent.

- 30 As an aside, Commissioners, please carefully review our so-called reasonable and feasible measures promised by DPE to mitigate scope 1 and 2 emissions for this mine. They won't. The regulatory system in New South Wales is comprehensively failing to reduce coal mine emissions. Clean energy regulator data and coalmine annual review information proves that reasonable and feasible measures are failing to drive meaningful emissions reduction.

Commissioners, this is essentially a hoax on the people of New South Wales, statements otherwise. Exhibit A, for this mine, reasonable and feasible measures are in place, are already in place at the current Glendell Mine, and what do we see, emissions intensity per ton of coal mine there has gotten worse, year on year for the last three years in a row.

- 40 I've only got five minutes, Commissioners, so turning now to heritage – the Ravensworth Homestead in reconciliation for Wonnarua people. I want to show you in a moment a promotional flyer that I made a couple of days ago that imagines that

your panel refuses consent for this mine, that the Minister for Heritage then follows government advice and protects Ravensworth.

Commissioners, by the NSW Government's own reckoning, Ravensworth is rare and exceptionally intact, meets all seven of the criteria for listing on the State Heritage Register, tells the story of Aboriginal and European heritage, and has the strongest documentary evidence of any conflict site across the Hunter Valley.

10 This is why I reckon it's in the public interest to protect this place and turn it into a Wonnarua Centre of Reconciliation. As the Australian Museum's Unsettled exhibition noticed last year, or noted, rather, Australian's foundation story is more than the voyage of James Cook or the arrival of the First Fleet. It is a story about the seizure of land from First Nations People, denial of Indigenous sovereignty, devastating frontier wars and separation from families and homelands.

20 In future, I'd like to be able to take my kids to this place, reimagined as the Wonnarua Centre of Reconciliation at Ravensworth Homestead, to meet Wonnarua people, to learn about and celebrate their culture, their survival and the terrible history of dispossession in the Hunter Valley. Commissioners, a pilgrimage to a giant hole in the ground filled with salty water in a dangerously warmed climate would not be the same.

Commissioners, in summary, please refuse consent for the mine. It's the right thing to do for the climate, and it may just catalyse the establishment of a museum, a centre in this place that helps heal our relationship with First Nations people and encourages us all to grapple with the truth of our own colonial history. Such a place would also have significance as a location protected by an IPC panel of three, who recognised and acted on an opportunity to leave a positive legacy for the people of New South Wales.

30 And, Commissioners, I'll just leave you with the alternative that, frankly, I think is a bit too sad to contemplate. Thank you for hearing me out.

MR BEASLEY: Thank you, sir.

MS LEESON: Nick, if I may, can you take us back to one of your earlier slides where you talked about the last three years' emissions, or three years year-on-year emissions from the existing mine?

40 MR CLYDE: Yes, I can. Yes, this slide here.

MS LEESON: You're not sharing it at the moment.

MR CLYDE: Oh, sorry.

MS LEESON: What it was demonstrating – what you were demonstrating, I think, was year-on-year emissions. Is that correlated in any way to increased production year on year? Is there a correlation there, do you know?

MR CLYDE: Well, look, let's see, I've got the production figures there, so you can see the emissions intensity in – can you see it now on your screen?

10

MS LEESON: I can now, thank you.

MR CLYDE: Yes. So, you know - - -

MS LEESON: No, no, that's answered my question. Thank you very much. Sorry I didn't – now that you've showed it again, I'm fine. Thank you.

MR CLYDE: And that's data derived from the annual reviews for Glendell.

20 MS LEESON: Thank you.

<ROD CAMPBELL, AUSTRALIA INSTITUTE

MR BEASLEY: Thank you. Our next speaker is Rod Campbell from the Australia Institute. Mr Campbell, can you hear me?

MR CAMPBELL: I can, thank you, and I hope you can hear me.

MR BEASLEY: We can. Go ahead, sir.

30

MR CAMPBELL: And I've got - I've also got some slides I can share, which hopefully you can see now. Thank you, Commission. My name is Rod Campbell. I'm the Research Director with the Australia Institute. I'm an economist by background and I've made submissions on many of these – many coal projects in New South Wales and appeared at many of these hearings.

In regards to this project, I'd just like to take you to the relevant sections of the department's assessment report regarding economics, and I'd just like to quote the three key paragraphs there. The department writes that, "Glencore's economic assessment included a cost-benefit analysis which included consideration of all

40

environmental externalities, which calculates that the project would have a net benefit of \$1.1 billion to the New South Wales economy.”

Firstly, I'd contest whether or not that paragraph is actually true. I think the consideration of several externalities is so cursory as to really not to have been, not to have taken place at all, but, anyway, the department is looking at Glencore's, the department is putting considerable weight on Glencore's economic assessment there.

10 The department then notes that their independent economic expert disagreed with aspects of Glencore's assessment, including the values attributed to the coal price, company and payroll tax, worker and supplier benefits and greenhouse gas emissions. “While still representing a net benefit, the independent experts' analysis indicates that the project is more likely to deliver a net benefit of around 151 million.”

The department goes on, in their final paragraph on economics, “The department recognises that the assessment prepared by Glencore and the independent review undertaken by CIE are likely to represent the two extremes when it comes to the realised benefit to New South Wales, i.e. they are the best and worst-case scenarios.”

20 I find it extraordinary that the department would be so intellectually incurious that they wouldn't want to interrogate the Glencore assessment a little more, and that they don't place a little bit more weight on the independent assessment that they themselves review. I think to just say they're going to split the difference and it's all positive and it's all good is, you know, a very poor approach, to say the least.

MR BEASLEY: You probably missed it, Mr Campbell, but earlier today when the department officers were giving evidence, I asked them about that part of the assessment report, and I think they agreed with me, it's – the proper approach wouldn't be to add 151 to 1.1 billion and divide by two, and that's the answer. I think
30 they, they ultimately accepted there's different methodologies used by Ernst & Young and CIE, and one might be favoured over the other, one might be right, rather than the other.

MR CAMPBELL: Great. Well, we'll go into that in a little bit more detail right now, and of course in my written submission. I mean, you can see here that the CIE's high estimate is less than a third of EY's low estimate. So, you know, we're not talking experts with sort of vaguely crossing Venn diagrams here. We're talking orders of magnitude different. And I would contest that the CIE's range is indeed a worst-case scenario. There's a number of reasons why I think the CIE's range is in fact optimistic
40 in favour of the project.

Those reasons are, they discuss potential for periods in care and maintenance, heritage, climate impacts and biodiversity assumptions, and I'll talk about them very briefly here.

10 So the CIE write that "Coal price forecasts at the lower end of the range they're talking about would place greater pressure on mine profitability and could result in mines halting production, either temporarily or permanently. The benefit estimates below do not account for this." As anyone who's looked at mining in Australia knows, mines do go in and out of care and maintenance, and that does reduce the benefits of them, and I think to not consider that means that, contributes to their range being optimistic.

20 Furthermore, I realise that heritage is a very big issue in relation to this project. The CIE write, "Glencore proposes to relocate the homestead to a new site for its reuse as a mitigation measure. The costs of these options are included in the capital costs, the project, and no further consideration is made." So they're effectively assuming that this mitigation measure is going, this relocation is going to work perfectly, and that's going to be fine with everybody, it's not going to impose any further costs on the relevant members of the community. I'm not fully au fait with the heritage values here, but from what I understand it seems like a very optimistic assumption.

Regarding climate and biodiversity, CIE are going off a carbon price, it's quite a long section and I'll go into it in more detail in a written submission, but they're looking at a European price of 54 euros. When I looked at it the other day, that price has actually risen to 67 euros, and the futures prices are all substantially higher.

30 On biodiversity offsets, CIE write – this is CIE, not Glencore's economists – they assume that offset purchases fully mitigate any biodiversity impacts and there are no additional unmitigated impacts that need to be incorporated into the CBA. Having looked at a lot of biodiversity and climate offset programs in Australia, I think that the idea that they work perfectly and impose no additional costs is again extremely optimistic.

I'll put some more detail into that a written submission, but I also just wanted to provide context around who we're talking about here. The CIE and EY's economist, Steven Brown – you know, this is not their first dance. Both appeared in the Rocky Hill case, and let's have a look at how that worked for EY's economist, Mr Brown.

40 Regarding benefits to suppliers, Chief Judge Preston found that Mr Brown's figure was inflated, unreliable and unproven. His inputs and methodology are uncertain and

not able to be tested or verified. A number of inputs seem plainly wrong. The judge accepted and adopted the critical analysis of the CIE.

10 And in summing up, Chief Judge Preston found that the economic benefits of the Rocky Hill project, assessed by Mr Brown in his CBA are uncertain, and in any event substantially overstated. The direct benefits of the project are likely to be much lower than he claimed, because less royalties and less income tax will be paid. The total indirect benefits will be orders of magnitude less than those claimed by Mr Brown, and again, his perhaps no indirect benefits, nowhere near the inflated values assigned by Mr Brown.

So in conclusion – I’m not sure if I’ve stopped sharing - - -

MR BEASLEY: We’re back looking at you now.

20 MR CAMPBELL: Fabulous. So in conclusion, the department has failed to actually conduct any sort of due diligence or any assessment of these two heavily conflicting reports. The Glencore report is written by an economist with a long track record of inflating his clients’ analysis, and he is using substantially the same methods in this analysis as he did for Rocky Hill, which copped such treatment in that judgment.

The CIE is a much more credible economic assessment outfit, but even their assessment clearly rests on some very optimistic assumptions, and I think the likely range for net present values of the project is likely to be considerably lower than even the CIE estimate, and I would argue would be more likely to be negative, and in which case the project should be refused.

30 MR BEASLEY: Can I just ask you, Mr Campbell, in terms of the – not trying to give you more homework, but in terms of the written submission you’re going to make, will you address the Glendell’s – it’s a report by Umwelt but it’s a response to the CIE report. Are you familiar with the one I’m mentioning?

MR CAMPBELL: I think I am, because I think they in fact quote me and I think they – is that what you’re referring to? I think they quote my 2015 submission to - - -

MR BEASLEY: I mean, in a – yes.

40 MR CAMPBELL: - - - to the process that set up the current guidelines for cost benefit analysis - - -

MR BEASLEY: I think that’s right, yes.

MR CAMPBELL: - - - of mines in New South Wales. Yes, I'll absolutely address that, because I've been taken out of context, and I'm quite upset about it.

MR BEASLEY: All right. Well, feel free to say what you want to say about that. I did notice that in Mangoola, the panel in that case did accept much of your submissions, so you can at least take some heart from that.

MR CAMPBELL: Thank you.

10

MR BEASLEY: All right. Is there any - - -

PROF. BARLOW: I have a question.

MR BEASLEY: Commissioner Barlow has a question for you.

PROF. BARLOW: Mr Campbell, you've mentioned in the acceptance or lack of critical analysis of both the methodology used by EY and the Centre for International Economics. Do you agree that, you know, you're an economist, which I'm not, but in those methodologies, a lot hangs on their assumptions and how credible those assumptions you, that are made that actually set up the analysis. There's, is that what you would say as an economist about those, the cost-benefit analysis?

20

MR CAMPBELL: Absolutely, and I think that's why it's really important that economists are clear about what their assumptions are, and there's enormous potential for important assumptions to be concealed and the results of that - and therefore the results to be, to be altered, and, you know, I think in essence the economics consulting industry basically trades off its ability to conceal the true costs and benefits of projects in a way that enables them to paint their clients' interests as in line with the public interest, when so often I would argue the opposite is the case.

30

MR BEASLEY: Thank you. Just - you're right. The Umwelt response to the CIE report does, it does footnote your analysis of the guidelines. I've just picked that up. You must have done a paper called Draft Guidelines for Economic Assessment of Mining and Coal-seam Gas Proposals submission. It must have been a submission regarding the guidelines. Is that what you were referring to?

MR CAMPBELL: Yes, that's right - - -

40 MR BEASLEY: Yes.

MR CAMPBELL: - - - and it was about touching on Commissioner's Barlow point about what assumptions should be made regarding greenhouse gas commissions and the scope of assessment, and, you know, I think you can mount a logical argument that – to only include a small fraction of the costs of climate change in a cost-benefit analysis that focuses exclusively on New South Wales, but I think it's fundamentally misleading to not really emphasise to decision-makers that just outside the New South Wales border, a huge cost is incurred by other people, and that that is, should be relevant to decision-makers. So I'd be happy to expand on that in my submission.

10 <PADRAIC GIBSON, JUMBUNNA INSTITUTE, UTS

MR BEASLEY: All right. Thank you very much. Thank you for that, Mr Campbell. Our next speaker is Paddy Gibson from the Jumbunna Institute for Indigenous Education and Research from the UTS. I hope I've pronounced that correctly. If I haven't, I do apologise.

MR GIBSON: Yes, no, that's fine. Yes, it's the Jumbunna Institute here at UTS. Thanks very much for the opportunity to speak with you today and to contribute.

20 We are objecting to this project here at the Jumbunna Institute, and there's two grounds on which I'd like to speak to you about that today. The first is the issue of climate justice and the second is the issue of Indigenous heritage, and in both areas, it's the issues around Aboriginal rights that are at the centre of why we're making this objection.

On the issue of climate justice, firstly, I know you've already heard, you know, quite extensively, you know, even some of the presentations recently from Nick and others about the dangers posed by the emissions from fossil fuels that will come from this project and the contribution that it will make to the climate crisis.

30

We would just like to reiterate and ensure that it's considered in this process the profound impact that climate change is actually having on Indigenous communities here in Australia, who are really bearing the biggest, causing the most hurt to Indigenous communities, a group of people who benefit the least from the extraction of fossil fuels, extraction of fossil fuels which has desecrated sacred lands from, you know, since the mining started on this continent, and generated a lot of wealth for a lot of people while Aboriginal people remain, you know, amongst some of the oppressed and poorest people within OECD countries.

40 And the climate crisis is posing particular changes to communities that I work that we're very, very concerned about. I work with a lot of communities in Central

Australia who, when El Niño was in place two or three years ago, were living through summers that they had never experienced before, months in a row over 40 degrees. A lot of these areas are becoming almost unliveable, and people are very, very scared about the future that they're going to be able to have, whether they're even going to be able to live on their homelands going forward. They've struggled so long against being dispossessed, and now, you know, they couldn't go out. Some of my friends and contacts around Alice Springs and Tennant Creek couldn't go out and actually practise the ceremony over the summer that they would usually practise because of the extreme heat and weather events that are happening. So that's a real concern.

10

We can even see with the floods currently in the Northern Rivers region, it's Indigenous communities who historically have been herded into some of the most vulnerable areas. There's a history in New South Wales of the Aborigines Welfare Board actually building reserve communities on flood plains, and we're seeing the devastating consequences of that now. Places like Cabbage Tree Island, we're really concerned whether it's going to be possible for people to return to Cabbage Tree Island after the recent floods, and they certainly aren't going to be returning any time soon given the terrible state of the accommodation that's actually there.

20 So we just do ask that when the Commission considers the question of climate change, you please do consider the very particular, terrible impacts that are happening right now for Aboriginal communities that have benefited the least from the fossil fuel industry.

The second thing that we, submission that we'd be making is on heritage grounds this project should be opposed. You know, we've heard from others, you know, about some of the details of the particular Aboriginal heritage value actually of this site, but my PhD was in histories of frontier warfare, and I know how important actually having opportunities to not only discuss the history of the violence that was
30 perpetrated to disposed Aboriginal people is, but to be able to maintain the integrity of the cultural landscapes in which this violence actually took place, to allow people in the contemporary generations to fully actually engage with and experience and try to understand the depth of the violence that lies at the root of their settlements that we actually now have in Australia, including in areas such as the Hunter Valley, where there was such terrible violence that was used to actually establish these homesteads in the first instance.

So here in Sydney, I'm actually supporting some local Gadigal people to be organising tours on the water around the harbour areas, where there were violent conflicts taking
40 place, where they can actually tell some of the history of their own interactions with these natural landscapes, but also of the violence that people have suffered, and take

people and show people, and allow people to connect with the country, but also in that process, allow people to connect with the realities of the violence that was perpetrated in order to separate them from that country, and put those lands and resources in the hands of people who have not managed them well since, and the ecological crisis that we're all living through now, I think is evidence of the, you know, of what's happened since those management rights have been taken away from traditional people.

10 So we don't have any, you know, sort of direct relationship with engagement with the Wonnarua Plains claim, who are, you know, at the moment I know are making very strong representations about the importance of the cultural landscape around the Ravensworth Homestead and the importance of maintaining that, both for their own rights and their own cultural integrity, but also in terms of being able to allow the broader community to actually connect with and understand the realities of that violence throughout history.

20 But I do know and can testify to the importance of the integrity of a cultural landscape for being able to properly live and experience and communicate those experiences and that history. And all Aboriginal peoples that I work with who are currently struggling to defend their lands from encroachment by the fossil fuel industry, this is a very big issue right across Australia, that Aboriginal people essentially have no rights to try – well, they don't have anywhere rights to veto, except in some places such as the Northern Territory, and the land rights regime up there, virtually nowhere do people have rights to actually veto or stop or control questions like major destructive projects such as a coalmine that might be threatened on their lands. They don't have the rights to actually control that development. The lands have been taken from them.

30 But it's very, very important in terms of them establishing a legitimacy in the broader community and an understanding in the broader community about the injustice that is involved in dispossession, and trying to build a position that allows them to have more influence in the contemporary world, on their country, and, you know, on the development and what's going to be happening on their country. Being able to understand the gravity of frontier violence that was bound up in dispossession is central to that, is central for actually promoting their position and building their strength and building their power in able to be actually able to influence in a positive way how we're going to live together on these lands and how we're going to make plans together on these lands going forward.

40 So it's on that basis that we would, you know, very strongly oppose this project. If there are Aboriginal people for whom this is a crucial cultural landscape, who can see the importance of actually being able to pass on stories, not just to their own people, but to the broader community about the significance of that history, you know, this is

something that's helped heal wounds of the past, and this is something that can help build power and a shared future, where Aboriginal people can hold their rightful place in actually being able to have some decision-making power on what happens on their lands going forward.

10 So both on the climate issue, where Aboriginal people are suffering badly, and on the issue of cultural heritage, where there is very weak protections, you know, we think it would be a tragedy to see this project go ahead, destroy that cultural landscape, you know, and contribute to the climate crisis, with everything we know about the risk that this is going to pose going forward. Thank you.

<SIOBHAIN O'LEARY, AUSTRALIAN PARENTS FOR CLIMATE ACTION

MR BEASLEY: Thank you very much, sir. Next speaker is Siobhain O'Leary from Australian Parents for Climate Action. Are you there, Ms O'Leary?

20 MS O'LEARY: Yes, thank you, and good afternoon. I am here representing Australian Parents for Climate Action, a group of 16,000 members and growing, parents, grandparents, carers, aunts, uncles, anyone who's welcome, including over 5,500 members in New South Wales. We are a nonpartisan organisation of individuals and we're focused on and dedicated to mitigating climate change and its impacts, primarily to ensure a safe and prosperous future for our children. On behalf of every member of Australian Parents for Climate Action, and more specifically on behalf of our children and all future generations, we object to this project.

30 I was actually speaking at a hearing before the Commission exactly a month ago, but that time was for the proposed extension of the Narrabri underground coal mine. A lot can change in a month in some respects, and in other respects nothing can change at all.

As with that project, our main reason for objecting to this one should be clear, but for clarify, we object on the grounds of harmful climate change and the greenhouse gas emissions that would arise from this coal-mining extension.

40 It is well-established science, acknowledged by this Commission, by government agencies, at all levels of government in Australia, and it remains uncontested in the Federal Court of Australia the burning of fossil fuels from projects like this is causing the climate to change at an historically unprecedented rate, and it will and is causing harm to people now and to our children into the future.

It is destabilising our life support systems and is having massive negative ramifications on ecosystems, human health, communities, wellbeing, economies, livelihoods and lifestyles. As I said, I was here a month ago with these same words, and a lot can happen in a month, especially when you're living through a climate crisis.

10 In late February, the IPCC Working Group 2 released the latest report, Climate Change 2022 - Impacts, Adaptation and Vulnerability. It arrived the same day as Brisbane and Northern New South Wales experienced catastrophic flooding. The report was described as a dire warning about the consequences of inaction, and as an atlas of human suffering. It outlined how human-induced climate change is causing dangerous and widespread disruption in nature, and affecting the lives of billions of people around the world. It showed that climate change is a grave and mounting threat to our wellbeing and a healthy planet.

20 People in Brisbane and Northern New South Wales, too many towns, cities and families, no longer have to imagine the threats and impacts, the lack of adaptation, the vulnerabilities outlined in the IPCC report. They have had to live it in traumatising technicolour. Like people in Brazil, Japan, China, Germany, Bangladesh and many places before them who have experienced terrible, unprecedented floods over the last few years, like towns who have lived through unprecedented fires from across Australia to Canada and North America.

Some towns hit hard by fires, like those in New South Wales, where rainforests that burned which has never burnt before, were then hit by floods, which ultimately experiencing the compounding impacts of these disasters as devastating landslides.

30 The latest IPCC report is on the back of the 2021 IPCC report on the scientific basis of climate change, which was declared a code red for humanity, outlining the immediate urgency of reducing global greenhouse gas emissions on a massive scale.

It is also on the back of the 2021 International Energy Agency report Net Zero by 2050: A Roadmap for Global Energy Sector. It was clear when it said that "Beyond projects already committed as of 2021, there are no new oil and gas fields approved for development in our pathway, and no new coalmines or mine extensions are required. It is clear to the IEA and the IPCC that there can be no new or expanded fossil fuel projects globally beyond 2021, or we miss hitting the Paris climate agreement target of 1.5 degrees of warming."

40 There is a lot at stake if we miss hitting the 1.5-degree target. Costly mitigation and draw-down measures from technology that does not even exist yet, increased food and

water insecurity, infrastructure loss and damage, ecosystem collapse, the potential for mass human migration on scales never seen before and worsening societal and global conflicts. And with every additional emission we make limiting warming to safer levels harder, which is placing impossible burdens on future generations.

Already families here and globally are experiencing water and food crises. Drought, famine, natural disasters and food insecurity are complex issues, but all are undoubtedly exacerbated by climate change and will only worsen.

- 10 Intergenerational justice requires us to take responsibility to leave future generations a clean and healthy atmosphere, and a living world in which they can survive and thrive. But in the face of government failures to act on climate change, mitigation and adaptation at anything like the scale required, anxiety levels in young people are increasing, and the capacity for our young people to emotionally invest in their future is being affected. Sadly, they now have very strong visuals to show them what their future will be if we fail to act sufficiently.

- 20 This is not a future we want for our children, nor is it one we simply imagine, but one that has been modelled and predicted with ever-increasing certainty, and sadly also shown. There is nothing in life that climate change will not make harder. It is already making it hard to live in certain parts of New South Wales.

When we teach our children, we use stories to help them grasp important concepts, like coping with loss or fairness. All through human history, adults have learnt through stories too and our history has been passed between generations through story. I'd like to read this story to you by the celebrated children's author Pamela Allen, as an allegory for the situation we find ourselves now in. It's called Who Sank the Boat?

- 30 "Beside the sea on Mr Pepper's place, there lived a cow, a donkey, a sheep, a pig and a tiny little mouse. They were good friends, and one warm, sunny morning for no particular reason they decided to go for a row in the bay. Do you know who sank the boat? Was it the cow who almost fell in when she tilted the boat and made such a din? No, it wasn't the cow who almost fell in. Do you know who sank the boat? Was it the donkey who balanced her weight, who yelled, 'I'll get in at the bow before it's too late'? No, it wasn't the donkey who balanced her weight. Do you know who sank the boat?

- 40 "Was it the pig, as fat as butter, who stepped in at the side and caused a great flutter? No, it wasn't the pig as fat as butter. Do you know who sank the boat? Was it the sheep who knew where to sit to level the boat so that she could knit? No, it wasn't the sheep who knew where to sit. Do you know who sank the boat?

“Was it the little mouse, the last to get in, who was lightest of all? Could it be him? You do know who sank the boat.”

Our children understand it and we understand it and we are sure that the Commission understands it. The atmosphere does not care where the emissions come from, the details of the scope 1, scope 2, scope 3 emissions from this and every other project that comes before the Commission. The boat is already full.

- 10 The science of climate change, its cause and impacts is irrefutable and it is uncontested by Australian governments. That was reiterated just this week in the Sharma v Environment Minister appeal judgment.

- The IPC is charged with considering as a whole the impact of new mines and extensions. This is your statutory duty. The Commission as an agent of the NSW Government is responsible for determining whether to approve the extraction of coal, and responsible for considering the public interest implications of such extraction. We contend that you owe a duty to all people of New South Wales not to approve the
20 Glendell Coal Mine extension, a decision which would be consistent with the maintenance of the environment of New South Wales. We believe your duty is to address the associate climate risks, regardless of any limitations related to scope 3 emissions. Please don't fail us in performing your duty. Thank you.

MR BEASLEY: Thank you. Next speaker is Malcolm Howard. Mr Howard, are you there?

MR HOWARD: Yes, I am here.

- MR BEASLEY: Go ahead, sir.
30

<MALCOLM HOWARD, PROPERTY OWNER, BROKE NSW

- MR HOWARD: Right, O.K., thank you. Thank you for allowing me to just give a short presentation at today's Commission hearing. I speak to you today as a property owner in Broke, and someone who is very interested in Broke's growth and future. Just for your, for background, I live in Sydney, but we own a rural property in Broke, which my wife and I bought about four years ago, which has a house which we rent out on the short-term holiday accommodation market, and we also have a small
40 vineyard and sell the grapes to a local producer in the area, and we eventually plan to retire and live permanently in Broke.

When we bought our property four to five years ago, there were various reasons we decided on Broke. Obviously from a geographic perspective, it's a very scenic and pretty area due to the surrounding mountain ranges and the views and the vineyards in the area. As you may be aware, it's sort of considered the quiet side of the Hunter – it's much quieter and not as busy as other areas in the Hunter, such as Pokolbin. It also has some very good wineries and cellar doors in the area, and it has a really nice community village type atmosphere and feel about it, something which, you know, I don't think you get in some of the larger areas like Pokolbin, but, you know, this is one aspect I think would be significantly improved and enhanced with the BBS
10 project. And also, it's an area that, you know, from a landowner and investor point of view, you know, it has very good prospects for capital growth from a real estate perspective.

However, Broke does have, you know, some negatives in areas for improvement. It lacks a real proper focal point and area, a set of buildings both for the community and tourists to visit and use and meet at. You know, obviously other areas in the Hunter like Pokolbin, Lovedale, Wollombi have those sorts of areas and sort of centres of attraction. Apart from the cellar doors, there's really one retail outlet in Broke, which is the garage and convenience store, which, if you've ever been there, it really is quite
20 overpriced in terms of the small quantity of goods that it sells.

Apart from Margan Restaurant, which is obviously a very good high-end special occasion type restaurant, and, you know, there's only one or two other wineries that sometimes do lunch on the weekends, there's no real sort of proper café, casual, family-type restaurant in the area, both servicing, you know, that can service both locals and tourists. And apart from the cellar doors and one vineyard which has a small shop, there's no buildings, centres, shops that, you know, tourists and locals can visit.

30 I think the Broke Village Square Project and the relocation of the Ravensworth Homestead will address these areas of improvement and provide considerable benefits. You know, it will provide a proper focal point, a set of buildings for both the community and tourists to visit and use. It will provide, you know, one or more retail outlets, which, again, will be of great benefit for locals and tourists. It will provide one or more sort of eating areas, cafes, restaurants, which will be of great benefit.

Most importantly, though, it will be a really good site for the relocation of a Ravensworth Homestead. Instead of this historic building just being moved to some other part of Glencore's mine site, being used as an office, if it's moved to Broke, it
40 will really provide, you know, a proper use and get some really good benefits both

from locals and tourists, where it can be used, you know, as a centre of attraction, a building of cultural and historical significance.

In summary, you know, I strongly support this project and relocation of the homestead, and I thank the Committee for listening to me today.

<GRAHAM CHEETHAM, MIDDLE FALBROOK RESIDENT

10 MR BEASLEY: Thank you, sir. Next and final speaker for the day is Graham Cheetham. Are you there, Mr Cheetham?

MR CHEETHAM: Yes, I'm here. Can you hear me?

MR BEASLEY: We can. Go ahead, sir.

20 MR CHEETHAM: Good afternoon, members of the Independent Planning Commission. As you would know, my name is Graham Cheetham. Our family has owned and farmed this property at Middle Falbrook for over 69 years, 66 of which I have lived here.

Firstly, I'd like to say it is – I was a member of the Ravensworth House Advisory Committee. As you know, after many months of meetings, consultation with community and other interest groups, two recommendations were made for the relocation of the homestead.

30 It soon became apparent that the community wanted it to stay in the Singleton Shire. My personal view was that it be available for public use, had to be financially sustainable, remain in the Singleton area, and remain in a similar layout as at present. I feel the movement of the Ravensworth Farm in the long term cannot meet these requirements. I fully support the relocation to Broke, where the homestead will meet all the requirements of the community, and be a public place for all to visit and enjoy.

I have been to England and visited similar buildings that have been moved and look just as they were before being moved.

40 The second issue I have is one of concerning the mine extension itself is that Middle Falbrook is a small community located to the east of the Glendell project. Much of our area has already been purchased by Glencore and Bloomfield companies. The few of us that remain are the most directly impacted of any residents adjacent to the Glendell project. Air quality is my biggest concern, as we live, work and drink the water from our house roofs.

There is enough of a ridgeline along Glennies Creek Road between Glendell operations and Middle Falbrook. In the past, the planners and mine personnel claimed that this ridgeline stops most of the dust from reaching us at Middle Falbrook. This to me is admitting that the dust reaches this point. We are less than two kilometres from this ridgeline. When the mine lifts the outer pit dumps by up to 60 metres, the dumps will be much higher than the natural ridgeline along Glennies Creek Road.

10 So if the ridgeline stops the dust when it leaves the current dumps at a height of RL140, then the dust will blow across that ridgeline when leaving at a level of 200. All these predictions are made from modelling.

I have drawn some diagrams based on fact and experience. When the west wind blows past my sheds, the leaves all end up in the sheds, as per the diagram. The first diagram here shows – if I can get it on the camera right – when the westerly wind blows, the wind blows through past the sheds, but there's an eddy forms, sucking the dust and the leaves into these sheds.

20 Water running down a creek does the exact same thing. If there is a cutting in the bank or the stream of the creek, the water does the exact same thing. The water running down, an eddy forms, and the water and debris circle into that cutting.

Now, if I draw the topography of the landform from Glendell to Middle Falbrook, the exact same thing happens to the dust as the leaves and water in the creek. It will create an eddy, dropping the dust onto us during windy weather. Now, I'm not very good at lining these pictures up, but anyhow, we'll have another go. So here we have – it's not drawn to scale – we have the Glendell outer pit dump, we have the westerly wind blowing across. Across the Glennies Creek ridgeline, over the Middle Falbrook, and the same thing happens – we get an eddy with the dust falling onto us at Middle
30 Falbrook.

Another interesting point is, why now our car windscreens become dirty overnight? They're parked outside. No wind, just the dirt dropping from the air with the dew. We are currently painting the interior of our house, and this is a photo of the grey dirt off the inside walls. Yes, they've been dusted with a feather duster over time, my wife dusts, but this was cleaned with a steam cleaner, and this is the impact of the dirt accumulated inside our house on the walls. So you can just imagine what the outside is like and the roofs and the water that we drink.

I'm not against coalmining. It is a valuable resource that is needed. But we, as residents neighbouring coalmines, should be protected by government agencies, allowing us to sell and move away from the dirt and the dust if we wish to do so.

Unfortunately most of our neighbours that have sold to Glencore, it has been a long and stressful experience for them. This should not occur and should be condemned and stopped by government agencies.

10 Finally, I would like to reiterate my support for the relocation of the Ravensworth Homestead to Broke, where all the community will enjoy it. Thank you.

MR BEASLEY: Thank you, sir.

MS LEESON: Thank you. That brings us to the end of day 1 of this public hearing. Thank you to everyone who presented today for your thoughtful presentations. A transcript of today's proceedings will be made available on our website in the next few days.

20 Just a reminder that the Commission will accept written submissions on the Glendell Continued Operations and Mount Owen Continued Operations Mod 4 projects up until 5pm Australian Eastern Daylight Time on Monday the 28th of March, 2022. It's particularly helpful to us if you can comment on your submissions at this stage, on the Department's assessment report and the draft recommended conditions. You can submit your comments using the Have Your Say portal on our website or by email or post.

We'll adjourn until 8.30am, Monday the 21st of March, 2022 for day 2 proceedings, and again thank you very much.

30

ADJOURNED UNTIL MONDAY 21 MARCH, 2022

[3.19pm]