



## **TRANSCRIPT OF MEETING**

**RE: HUME NORTH BATTERY ENERGY STORAGE SYSTEM  
(SSD-61842974)**

### **COUNCIL MEETING**

**PANEL:** NEAL MENZIES (CHAIR)  
MICHAEL CHILCOTT

**OFFICE OF THE IPC:** BRAD JAMES  
ISAAC CLAYTON

**ALBURY CITY COUNCIL:** DAVID CHRISTY  
NATALIE WELLS  
CHRIS MURPHY

**LOCATION:** ZOOM VIDEOCONFERENCE

**DATE:** 12:30PM – 1:15PM  
TUESDAY, 25<sup>th</sup> NOVEMBER 2025

**<THE MEETING COMMENCED**

**[Audio gap until 00:00:40]**

- 5       **MR NEAL MENZIES:** Hello, David. Hello, David, can you hear me?
- MS NATALIE WELLS:** I can hear, but I don't think – David, can you – can you guys hear us? We don't normally use Zoom, so ... Yes, all good.
- 10       **MR BRAD JAMES:** Hi David, Brad here from the Office from the IPC. It sounds like there might be ...
- MR DAVID CHRISTY:** Sure. I can hear now.
- 15       **MR JAMES:** Okay, great.
- MR CHRISTY:** I just had to change my settings. It was going to my speaker, so I just had to change it to the headphones.
- 20       **MR MENZIES:** Okay. Excellent, David. Yes, sorry that we're using a different technology. It's rather a treat, isn't it, there's so many options. But we've got you at this point.
- MR CHRISTY:** Yes. No problems.
- 25       **MR MENZIES:** So, I'm Neal Menzies, I'm the Panel Chair, and Michael Chilcott is the other panel member for this one. Guys, the formal process for us is I've got to read out an opening statement. Having done that, we'll have a much more informal discussion. So, let me just go through our formal statement ...
- 30       **MS WELLS:** Just before you go through that. We are still waiting on Chris Murphy to join us, our Water Engineer. If that's important for him to hear us, he's just trying to find a location where he can undertake this meeting, because we had a change of – we had technology issues in the office and had to change plans ...
- 35       **MR MENZIES:** Okay.
- MS WELL:** ... so, he is doing that.
- 40       **MR MENZIES:** We're happy to wait, Natalie.
- MS WELLS:** Okay.
- 45       **MR MENZIES:** It's not that that the opening statement is that important, but we don't want to be sort of paused halfway through waiting for the rest of your team.

**MS WELLS:** Waiting, yes, perhaps he will be only a few minutes, if you wanted to talk casually, just so we have all members here. We – I'll send him a message and just see how far off he is.

5 **MR MENZIES:** Okay. I'm Brisbane based, so we've been doing the comparative weather thing. You guys are far enough south that you're probably not sweltering as we are in Brisbane, but ...

10 **MR CHRISTY:** And I guess we need to say good morning to you.

**MR MENZIES:** David, you are absolutely correct, yes, yes, and ...

15 **MR CHRISTY:** How are your curtains – have they faded, have your curtains faded, has the milk curdled?

**MR MENZIES:** The blank stares, the cows get upset, you know ...

20 **MR CHRISTY:** I lived in WA for a few years. They had three or four referendums to change to daylight savings that were defeated every time.

**MR MENZIES:** Yes. The same in Queensland. Remarkable. Though normally I get from my New South Wales colleagues that at the moment we are 10 years and one hour behind New South Wales rather than just 10 years.

25 **MR CHRISTY:** Yes. It used to be a joke about my mates living in New Zealand – two hours ahead and 20 years behind.

**MR MENZIES:** Yes.

30 **MS WELLS:** We have Chris with us now, thank you so much everyone for your patience.

**MR CHRISTY:** So, no more ginger jokes. Chris.

35 **MR MENZIES:** All right. Let's kick off. So, before we begin, I'd like to acknowledge that I'm speaking to you from the land of the Jagera and Turrbal peoples here in the Brisbane River Valley. I acknowledge the traditional owners of all the lands from which we are meeting virtually today and pay my respects to their Elders past and present.

40 Welcome to the meeting today to discuss the Hume North Battery Energy Storage System, it's a state significant development application (SSD-61842974), which is currently before the Commission for determination.

45 The Applicant, Infrastructure Capital Services Pty Ltd, proposes to develop the Hume North Battery Energy Storage System 75 megawatt, 150 megawatt-hour battery and associated grid connection infrastructure near Lake Hume Village, approximately 10 kilometres east of Albury in the Albury local government area.

My name is Neal Menzies. I'm Chair of this Commission Panel, and I'm joined by my fellow commissioner, Michael Chilcott. We're also joined by Brad James and Isaac Clayton from the Office of the Independent Planning Commission.

5

In the interests of openness and transparency and to ensure the full capture of information, today's meeting is being recorded, and a complete transcript will be produced and made available on the Commission's website.

10

This meeting is one part of the Commission's consideration of this matter and will form one of several sources of information on which the Commission will base its determination.

15

It is important for the commissioners to ask questions of attendees and to clarify issues whenever it's possible – whenever it's considered appropriate. If you're asked a question and are not in a position to answer, please feel free to take the question on notice and provide any additional information in writing, which we will then put up on our website.

20

I request that all participants here today introduce themselves before speaking for the first time, and for all members to ensure that they do not speak over the top of each other, to ensure accuracy of the transcript.

25

Okay. That's the end of my formal introduction, now we can move to, as it were, a more informal style of presentation. David, did the Council have any sort of presentation you wanted to make, or we have a discussion?

30

**MR CHRISTY:** David Christy, Service Leader City Development. I think I followed that instruction.

**MR MENZIES:** Thank you, David.

35

**MR CHRISTY:** Albury City. No, no, we weren't overly, I guess, concerned with presenting, we're happy – this is our first IPC matter as well. So, we a hundred per cent weren't certain of the protocols, but yes, we put up what our issues were down in submissions and so we're happy enough to talk through those as you require any queries or questions.

40

Obviously, we know you've got the report from the Department of Planning on it, and their recommendation, so I guess we're taking this as an opportunity if you had any questions about any queries we would raise. But then we're happy enough to leave it to the IPC to do their deliberations.

45

**MR MENZIES:** Okay. So, David, thanks, that's great. Yes, we, Michael and I certainly are ploughing through all the material, and one of the first things that we'd start with is the Council's submission, so we're well aware of the concerns that you put into that. One of the difficulties for us though is the timing shifts of you put in your submission, an applicant then has a think about that and there's an ongoing discussion.

5 So, we really wanted to make sure in talking to you this morning that we understood what the Council's viewpoint now. How many of the things that the Applicant has done, or responses that they've given, how that's shifted your thinking. If you were writing to us now, whether you would be writing something different.

**MR CHRISTY:** Yes, yes.

10 **MR MENZIES:** Okay. And so, look, I guess the biggest thing – there were various things in your submission that I could see the Applicant responded to and has made changes to deliberately address them. The one that I thought might still be a cause for concern for you and obviously is the risk of a fire, risk of contamination from that site reaching the river. And so, if we could have a bit of a discussion on that particular topic, I think that would be, if not a great starting point, certainly one of the bigger issues that we'll have to think through.

15 **MR CHRISTY:** Yes, yes, and more than happy with that, Neal. From our end, just on, I guess, on summary of what you said before. Yes, obviously we did our first submission – I think it was early September, I'll just check my date here for the submission next to me – and raised a number of issues, some of them concerns, some of them just clarity or further information. And then a number of those did appear to be addressed through that further information that was provided, I think, in some time in October or so in response to a number of those issues.

20 **MR CHRISTY:** So, yes, we have put onto the Department that we generally didn't have overall objections based on those technical issues. We still had an overarching concern/objection – and we did use the word "objection", so I'll be clear around that language (the Department asked us to be clear of that) – we did have an overarching objection on the basis of that concern about its proximity to the Murray River and obviously it's upstream of our water intakes as a city. So, just that concern around the fact of the impact of us.

25 **MR CHRISTY:** One, not so much in some ways if there's a fire on the site or as such, it's more the response to that and how it may be contained. Because obviously we're not suggesting that a fire on the site will necessarily cause water contamination, but some of your fire suppressant materials etc. used, and measures, may obviously then have that issue about leading to off-site contamination.

30 **MR CHRISTY:** Being clear, it's not that we have an issue with battery storage itself. I'm sure there'll be some people who you'll have submissions from who had concerns with the whole concept of battery storage. Ours was purely the location of this battery storage, as opposed to battery storage itself.

35 **MR CHRISTY:** And for the elephant in the room, we will note obviously, happy enough to note, I'm sure it'll be brought up at some stage, that there had been a previous application pretty much across, in fact you could argue possibly slightly closer to the river. I guess, at that particular point we hadn't, to be honest, dived into the extents of information that was available. So, in some ways it may have been a concern then, we just didn't, that

5 didn't elucidate it as clearly. So, it wasn't that our position's changed. I guess it's like anything else, as we go through and we take greater notice of some issues and concerns, so I just wanted to explain that discrepancy between not raising it, it feels like three or four years ago, when the previous one came up. I guess, if we're in the same area of understanding and everyone's understanding of things like PFAS and the like do change, then we probably would have raised it back then. So, that's probably just a broad, general comment.

10 We did raise some issues around visual impact and like, but I think most of those have been fairly satisfied. There was that issue around the Noise Report and some sensitive land users nearby, which I believe they'll also addressed from a technical point of view, may not addressed to the community members' satisfaction, but that's a separate issue. But yes, probably our main issue is regards to potential impact on the Murray River and then obviously our downstream water supply, as well as the general  
15 environmental impact, but specifically our downstream water intakes.

Anything further on that from your end, Chris?

20 **MR CHRIS MURPHY:** Thanks, David. Yes, Chris Murphy from Albury City, Senior Engineer in the Water and Wastewater Team. Yes, that's a really good summary, David. I don't think – I think everything you said is relevant. You mentioned there was an issue with the proximity of the site, potentially more so than the technology. So, yes, just reiterating that, and that's been our concern.

25 And I suppose our concern with their response to that is that it was just sort of accepted that a hazard assessment had been completed and deemed fine. But it's kind of, for us, we don't really understand who completed that assessment and who essentially is signing off on it, who's taking that risk in giving this the sort of, the okay, or the fact the risk is at an okay level. So, that's – for me personally, that's probably where the  
30 biggest sticking point is.

35 There's other information that you've probably seen, recent emails around in-principles supply, sorry, in-principle agreement to supply water and wastewater. However, that's kind of – that's a minor issue, that was more around ... We just didn't have the information around the volumes and the methodology to provide that servicing, and that's just a typical requirement we ask of any development application. But I feel like they're sort of fairly minor relative to what David's already discussed, that can be sort of worked through at later stages as long as the Applicant understands that it's subject to more detailed application information. But in just sort of tying off  
40 what we'd normally require.

So, yes, I think that's it for me.

45 **MR MENZIES:** Okay, that was – that's really useful. Because that's, I guess, the sense that Michael and I had, that there were a whole lot of things that had been worked through and that you were comfortable with. And David, your point about the earlier approval and the Council and the community in general, I think, learning more and more about the technologies involved here. That also makes a lot of sense to us.

Of course, each individual application is dealt with independently on its merits, but it helps us to understand where the Council's coming from, that there's no inconsistency here, it's simply as you learn more, you have more reason to ask questions and for clarification. So, that was really useful.

Michael, do you have –

**MS WELLS:** Neal, can I –

**MR MENZIES:** Sorry.

**MS WELLS:** Oh, could I make one more comment? Just only to just correct the record, that the first RFI was sent on the 13th of December 2024 and the second one, the 3rd of September 2025. And the issues raised in the 3rd of September 2025, that only include drinking water quality risk, is the issue that we're retaining as outstanding.

**MR MENZIES:** Yes.

**MS WELL:** State Department officers sought to ask us again in further correspondence were we satisfied by the updated preliminary hazards analysis prepared by Planager dated the 5th of May. And we maintain that are not able to be satisfied with that document on the basis that we do not have the resources to review and comment on such a high-level technical assessment.

So, we stand with those comments, that we would recommend any determining authority seek a peer review of that work and be confident that they can be satisfied that documentation is in fact able to achieve the mitigation measures that are stipulated in it. So, that remains, and we've continued to repeat that to the Department in writing and in emails after this correspondence was issued.

**MR MENZIES:** Yes. Thanks, Natalie. Once again, a useful clarification for us. It's really important that we do understand where the Council stands, and I think we're getting there. Michael?

**MR MICHAEL CHILCOTT:** Yes, just sticking on the risks associated with drinking water supply associated with fire and fire response. To the extent that you've been able to turn your mind to the application and the risks as they're presented within the risk assessment, and you've mentioned that its proximity to the water supply that drives things, that number one is the location and your capacity to assess the mitigation measures.

Have you made recommendations or do you have any thoughts in relation to mitigation measures that might be at least discussed with the Applicant and Planning in relation to either the location or mitigation approaches?

**MR CHRISTY:** I'm happy enough to jump in for a moment there, and I think this is a little bit what Nat was saying, we'll also admit our technical, lack of technical knowledge in that area. Like, a lot it's – we're planner, Chris is the Water Engineer etc., but there are lots of people out there that are far more qualified in those spaces.

**MR CHILCOTT:** No, I accept that.

**MR CHRISTY:** Yes.

**MR CHILCOTT:** It's just to the extent you've been able to turn your mind to it.

**MR CHRISTY:** Turn our mind to it, I guess ...

**MR CHILCOTT:** I totally acknowledge what you said earlier.

**MR CHRISTY:** Certainly. I guess in some ways we were taking a little bit of that consideration of whether it be called a risk-based approach, whether you call it a precautionary principle, whether you call it the EPPC of avoid and then minimise before you mitigate. In summary, we'll go in at that suitability that, almost when planning, you ask yourself about suitability to site first of all. And then you talk about measures past that point to try to deal with some of those potential risks and issues.

And I guess we were trying to be honest there, try to throw the question further up higher about whether it was suitable with those considerations, rather than trying to mitigate around some issues. I understand why they're at the site too, because of proximity to the grid and the electricity supply, so I can fully understand they haven't just randomly picked the site out of nowhere. But I guess from our end, we're still stuck at that point of really the suitability of the site in the first place.

Those technical components, I admit, we would leave that to the experts to throw, which is why Nat said, we wanted an abundance of caution about making certain the number of people look at this with the required technical expertise, rather than just one or two or what a like. But it was all on that basis of just having those concerns around the suitability of the site with its location, not so much the qualities of the site or its road frontage. But that was probably it, if that's answered your question without diving into specifics.

**MR CHILCOTT:** No, that's helpful. Because, if I understand what you're saying, is that from your perspective the site selection is driven by factors to do with proximity to the grid, road access for both construction and maintenance and so forth. And that you're not in a position to sort of really assess the mitigation of risks, given that site selection. But your concerns go back to the initial site selection itself.

Have you, again, you know the area, have you, in your discussions internally at any point turned your mind to, well, if it weren't here, a better site for a thing like this might be da-da-da, and whether that's being considered within the options of assessment in the EIS.



**MR CHRISTY:** Yes. Probably from our end, I guess, it's in some ways, again, understanding what are the parameters and what are those points. So, if it's 4 kilometres away from its generation source, what's that mean for a whole variety of reasons? And it's always a [unintelligible 00:21:42] when you try to balance up some of these potentially competing components, and we do this with planning, obviously, on a regular basis.

But I guess in some ways, without having all detailed understanding of all those nuances and all those key factors that say if you're within 1 kilometre of source you get 72% efficiency, once you get to 3 kilometres of the source you get the 55% efficiency. I'm sure there'll be a whole heap of other factors, that we might start to say, well, these would reduce the risk, but they may not even be suitable because they can't even get access to the grid of the efficiency just doesn't return. So, we understand there's a whole lot of inputs that go into the equation.

So, no, we haven't dived through, from our end, to try to say, "Oh, this site might be better," because, I guess, we don't have – I'm happy to say it – we don't have that full detailed understanding of what makes a site suitable in the first place, in terms of its need to proximity to the grid, to where the generation source is, what it needs to be from a bushfire perspective, flooding perspective – a whole variety of things which might rule out 70% of the LGA or rule in 70/75% of the LGA.

**MR CHILCOTT:** No, that's helpful, David. And I guess we can turn our mind to it when we have a meeting with the Department and the Applicant, to just get them to take us through site selection as a matter to help ...

**MR CHRISTY:** Yes.

**MR CHILCOTT:** ... address questions concerning the origin of the potential matters that arise from this particular site. Thank you.

**MR CHRISTY:** And Chris, I note you've turned on your mic, did you want to add?

**MR MURPHY:** Oh, oops, I just forgot to turn it off from the last time. Yes, I don't have much more to add, but perhaps ... To try to answer your questions, in terms of what we've thought about. I don't want to get too specific and make it seem like we've done more than we have here, because we're just ...

I suppose for me what's lacking is, like David's alluded to, the lack of our understanding of the hazard or the risk assessment that's gone into the decision to place it here or to state that this particular development is suitable at this location. So, for me it's things like the fire suppression and chemical discharge or chemical release in some form.

And although we've been reassured many times that they're self-contained units and that sort of thing will be contained on site, it's sort of understanding rather than to just have that sort of statement, it's understanding what is the risk. How is it contained on site? What if it's raining at the time? Where does the stormwater discharge go; is it

going to a basin, what happens if that's accidentally released? What are the provisions to stop that sort of thing happening?

For us and for me in particular, we're just trying to protect our water source. And it's, yes, it's a very real risk that if something gets into the river at that location, it will almost certainly be drawn into our water supply.

**MR CHILCOTT:** Okay. Thank you.

**MR CHRISTY:** Just for an example, when the manganese levels change in the weir, now we're talking here about water quality, not health impacts – I'll be clear about that for Chris.

**MR MURPHY:** Yes.

**MR CHRISTY:** But for example when the manganese levels change in the weir just due to natural fluctuations, we've got brown water through a lot of our area. So, that's something that we're not in charge of, yes, it's not about the health and quality of the water, because they're not exceeding any WHO standards or anything. But those impacts can be just a small change but have a substantial impact, and that's just the quality of the water in terms of its visual appearance as opposed to anything that may go in from a chemical contamination perspective and what that may mean.

Either what would we need to do to be able to treat it, and like Chris said, even if it can be retained on site, how long does it need to be retained for, what happens in those lower 80 mils in 40-minute events if that's when it occurs? And a whole lot of those other stuff, rather than your old rules of thumb which take into account most occasions but not all occasions.

**MR CHILCOTT:** Thank you.

**MS WELLS:** So, just to add, yes, on that updated preliminary hazards analysis. If you were to independently assess or look for the kinds of mitigation measures that might seek to improve this, you would be looking at significant site bunding and/or ongoing plans of management that indicate that this is managed suitably.

Not wanting to give you guidance towards that, because as we all said, we don't have the qualifications and experience to give that guidance, but you should be seeing those things coming out loud and clear in any sort of application that was suggesting that this would be managed well and sufficiently. And we cannot see that, and that is being reiterated by the fact that its position, Murray Darling Basin, our regional area and others, it's the head of the river feeding into the whole region of the Murray Darling, so it could be impacts not only for Albury City but others downstream.

**MR CHILCOTT:** Thank you.

**MR MENZIES:** Well, I certainly kicked the conversation off with the right topic, didn't I?

**MS WELLS:** Yes. You did.

**MR MENZIES:** And look, that's been a really useful conversation for Michael and I, because we can see in the responses that it was the issue of concern, but the clarity we now have is really useful.

Michael and I get the opportunity to see the site, we're down there next Monday and Tuesday. Until you see the site, you can't, you know it's really hard looking at whatever, Google Earth or maps, it doesn't quite convey all the information. But from what we can see on the maps and Google Earth, this is a location that's got the sewage treatment plant and the trout farm etc. around it, so I'm assuming that the Council is pretty happy with the location in the sense of impact on the surrounds. That's not a big issue for you, now that things like the screenings are improved, and setbacks, and noise assessments. So, David, just that broader placement of this facility.

**MR CHRISTY:** Yes, yes, it's more that potential with that off-site impact more than its design on site as such. As I said, and this is only from a Council perspective, I do understand that there's immediate neighbours that have got more immediate impacts.

**MR MENZIES:** Yes.

**MR CHRISTY:** But we obviously look at it more contextually in that broader component. So, yes, that would be correct.

**MR MENZIES:** Right. Michael, any other things that you wanted to pursue in particular?

**MR CHILCOTT:** Yes, just a couple. The status of the VPA. I think you raised it as a concern or at least you mentioned in your proposed conditions something to do with – how did you express it – community benefits da-da-da, and the Department notes that the Applicant is favourably inclined towards a planning agreement with a number that's in the report, their Assessment Report. What is your perspective in relation to, and what is the status of, your discussions and documentation with the Applicant?

**MR CHRISTY:** So, there have been some to-ing and fro-ing, and there was just some clarity around whether it was a VFA or a VPA and a few other things, but that all got sorted. There was a letter, which I think is actually attached with all the report stuff, late October where they formally entered to go into – or offered to enter into a VPA, I think it was 350 and 100, I think they were the figures for the breakup.

I guess we had responded back to the Department saying we've talked about internally at an officer level, we don't have – we are happy enough to provide some in-principle support. Our Voluntary Planning Agreement Policy, and this is again that little unusual about who owns an application – if it had been the DA coming into us for determination, then we would advertise the VPA as per our policy. And it can also only be adopted at a council meeting.

So, our response back to the Department had been no in-principle issues, but that we hadn't, obviously because it only just come in and hadn't a chance to report it to a council meeting and get it out for public consultation or to then get it adopted at a council meeting, as what we normally do for a VPA for us. And so that's why we'd said no issues but that was something that would need to happen. But when it comes to a DA, that can be a condition of consent that they need to satisfy, that they've ...

**MR CHILCOTT:** I'm not sure we've got how to impose a condition in relation to a VPA.

**MR CHRISTY:** And that's what we weren't certain about. All I know is that under –

**MR CHILCOTT:** And so, that's why I'm interested just in the status of it.

**MR CHRISTY:** Yes.

**MR CHILCOTT:** And interested in [cross-talk 00:31:29].

**MR CHRISTY:** I don't have a VPA.

**MR CHILCOTT:** If you have any information you want to share with us on process and timing, that at least we should be knowledgeable about, that would be helpful.

**MR CHRISTY:** Yes, yes. So, I definitely – I don't have a VPA, we have a letter of intent to enter into a VPA, which is allowable under the Act.

**MR CHILCOTT:** Yes, absolutely, yes.

**MR CHRISTY:** Yes, applicants can either enter into one or have a letter of intent, and then it becomes a condition of consent and then they satisfy that like they would satisfy any other condition of consent. So, like I said, we've said that from our end, from an officer perspective, that we were happy to support that, but under our delegations and under our policy, a VPA can only be entered into by councillors through a resolution at a council meeting.

And so, at this stage, I don't have an actual VPA, I've just got a letter of intent to enter into one. With what would constitute in the letter of intent, fully understand that, but there's a whole legal format that we know VPAs need to fill out, and so that's what we would normally do. And we haven't entered into that process yet because our understanding was it was only a letter of intent, not an actual VPA offer, because we don't have a VPA offer in front of us, as in a technical VPA ready to exhibit.

**MR CHILCOTT:** No, thank you for that additional advice.

**MR MENZIES:** One of the other things that we often talk to councillors about and is a concern, is accommodating workforce for projects like this, particularly in the REZ's where the councils may have three or four things with hundreds of additional people that they've got to accommodate. That hasn't been anything that's come in what the

Council's being talking about. I'm assuming that Albury has capacity to accommodate the number of workers, that this is not a concern to you?

5 **MR CHRISTY:** I guess it's like anything else, everywhere has got a housing crisis, so to speak. We're like most the state, at about 0.8% to 1.0% vacancy rates. But through from that, it's not unusual. We don't have a substantial – we're not having large substantial construction workforces that a few other places are having, like Cobar and all those places with different mines. Obviously, at the moment, there's even stuff like Inland Rail did a bit of a consideration, that's going through at the moment for some of 10 their workforce components.

But also from recollection, it wasn't a substantial construction workforce that we're dealing with here. We're not a three or four-hundred construction worker camp like some of the mine sites etc. So, like anything else, they may have some challenges with 15 finding suitable accommodation for their workers. But in the scheme of things, it wasn't a substantial issue.

**MR MENZIES:** Okay. Yes. David, I'm just ticking off some of the things that ...

20 **MR CHRISTY:** No, no, I understand.

**MR MENZIES:** ... particularly come up and, you know ... If I didn't ask now, then it gets missed. I think we've, from Michael and my perspective – Michael, you're okay with where we are?

25 **MR CHILCOTT:** Yes, just finally. One of the points you raised in your submission in September was to do with the design of exclusion materials and potential impacts on wildlife. I think you noted there were sugar glider populations in the area. Where does Council sit currently in relation to updated information provided by the Applicant?

30 **MS WELLS:** Yes, I'll answer that, David.

**MR CHILCOTT:** Thanks, Natalie.

35 **MS WELLS:** Yes, we did receive updated information particularly addressing the outdoor security lighting and the barbed-wire fence perimeters, particularly for squirrel gliders. We did address that, including a condition of consent for the Australian Standard of National Light Pollution Guidelines for Wildlife would be favourable, because it means that here isn't security lighting being introduced into that space 40 where there are – well, that particular species of squirrel gliders which move through a woodland habitat.

They've addressed a number of concerns in a BDAR – and I would have to keep, we'll take this on notice, with my final advice given to, I think, Megan at the time, I went 45 through all the draft standard conditions and then sent her an email back giving her confirmation of where we stood on that draft conditions of consent.

There were some matters that she didn't wish to include. Some of those were our conditions around – Chris, help me out here – the trade waste approval, for water, and then some of the other minor matters, I can, yes, take it on notice and just formalise what exactly that last piece of correspondence was that speaks to those final conditions that she didn't see were reasonable. We discussed them internally as being reasonable, particularly the trade waste issue.

Because we are the water authority and in other locations you might have Sydney Water managing those approvals. For Council, that's a key matter because if they start perhaps putting contaminants into the network, we're able to then deal with our own enforcement matters, rather than relying on a protracted process of going through higher bureaucracy where they said, "No, we'll handle it, it's state significant, we'll handle it." Well, we need more assurance than that, that we can take our own action, I think, in those sort of significant matters.

Chris, did you want to add on? Yes. Oh ...

**MR CHILCOTT:** You're still on mute, Chris.

**MS WELLS:** I think it came on and then off. There you are.

**MR MURPHY:** No, I think you've nailed it, yes. So, from me, yes, I'm just particularly interested in the water and sewer aspects. Yes, the trade waste condition was something we'd like to see. Despite reassurances that sewer is not being connected as part of this proposal, from our point of view, it's the fact that it could potentially be connected at some point in future means we would like to have that assurance that a trade waste condition if, down the track sewer is connected, would be required to be complied with.

**MR CHILCOTT:** All right. No, that's helpful. Thank you. And Brad can follow up with you in relation to those conditions matters.

**MS WELLS:** Those final emails.

**MR CHILCOTT:** Yes.

**MS WELLS:** I'm happy to do that, yes.

**MR CHRISTY:** Yes – and just add in that point. Like, for example, for barbed wire, we have a preference for it not to be installed, a bit like that old avoid bit. Where it can't be avoided, if there's a national security measure or whatever that says you have to have barbed wire, then we have some things. But we have a preference for it not to be installed in the first place, because you're just managing a risk you're introducing.

**MR CHILCOTT:** All right, thank you. Thanks, Neal, that was my questions.

**MR MENZIES:** Okay. Anything else that the Council would like to put in front of us?

**MR CHRISTY:** No, mine's just more of a quick little process. I did give a little disclaimer at the start; we haven't really done any IPC matters before. So, we're just curious, we know you guys are down and there's stuff where you'll listen to the community. We're just more a little bit curious of the process, especially in case I get asked by my councillors. You're considering the report now, you're understanding submissions from ourselves and obviously have that opportunity for community members as well.

And what's your rough progress, especially with consideration that we're right on top of Christmas. Did you have an indicative timeframe that you thought you might be, just so I can – if my councillors say, say, oh yes, they won't look at it until after Christmas, don't bother me before then, or no, they want to rush a decision – well, not rush, they want to make a quick decision in the next week or two, they'll make it before Christmas. Just more out of curiosity.

**MR MENZIES:** I think Brad's going to jump in and give a ...

**MR CHRISTY:** Only if needed, Neal.

**MR JAMES:** Yes, based on our KPIs, David, we're looking at a potential determination this side of Christmas.

**MR CHRISTY:** Yes.

**MR JAMES:** But if there's a need for further information, it may get pushed out to after that Christmas period, but yes.

**MR CHRISTY:** Yes. And does that get notified then in the paper? As submitters, we get written correspondence?

**MR JAMES:** Yes.

**MR CHRISTY:** It's those little practicalities.

**MR JAMES:** Yes, sure. Once a determination is made, the documents are available on our website and it will – the Commission will notify all interested and affected parties, including the Applicant, Council, anyone who's made a submission to the Department during exhibition, and anyone who's expressed an interest through our process. So, they're all be notified that a decision is available on our website at that point.

**MR CHRISTY:** No problems, yes. We've had one or two challenges just with finding out a little bit where stuff was put up to the portal, and then we found out about it by happenstance. So, if there's just a request, a bit like sometimes happens, if we got – everyone's got our emails, if there's a chance just to let us know stuff's up. Because sometimes the portal and our system don't always seem to integrate a hundred per cent, so we've found out, like a couple of times where Megan called and said, "Have you had a look at the stuff yet?" "Ah, what stuff?" So, just that quick little query, if that's possible, or a request.

**MR JAMES:** Yes. Neal, Michael, if you're happy, if there's anything important that comes to us throughout our process, that you'd like Council to comment on, I'm happy to reach out to David and the team and make them aware of that.

**MR CHILCOTT:** If I'm hearing David, it sort of ... You've expressed some, or given some information about KPIs in relation to certain timelines but also there was a qualifier in there, I'm hearing from David that if there's an update of any significance in relation to that, Council might be interested in just getting an update.

**MR CHRISTY:** Yes, for sure, just to keep the councillors informed. They'll have members of the community asking them.

**MR MENZIES:** Okay. And David, we're always open to additional submissions.

**MR CHRISTY:** Yes.

**MR MENZIES:** If Council hears something that you think would be useful for us to know about or to know your viewpoints on, I always stress to the public when we're talking to them, if there's something that could make this project better, even if you don't want it approved but we may approve it, if there's something that we can do that makes it better, please tell us about that. So, I stress that ... If there's a particular condition that you think would help, please send us your ideas.

**MR CHRISTY:** Yes.

**MR MENZIES:** It doesn't mean that we'll necessarily adopt it as you send it to us, but it certainly assures that we're aware of what you're thinking and what you believe would make the project better.

**MS WELLS:** Can I make a comment on that, just to reiterate, Neal, on the drinking water risk. That we very much raised that independent assessment thing clear, and then mitigation measures that can include things like bunding and that bunding of sites can be very critical in eliminating significant risks off-site. So, just clarifying that that should be very front and centre and clear that whatever review you're doing of that paperwork can be certain that nothing is escaping, essentially, that site into our drinking water supply.

**MR MENZIES:** Yes. Natalie, you've been very clear and it's been –

**MS WELLS:** Great.

**MR MENZIES:** Believe me, I got it.

**MS WELLS:** I just want to clarify an administrative matter. In getting this final email that I sent to the Department to you, who is the best person to forward that email to?

**MR JAMES:** Natalie, I am the best person there.



**MS WELLS:** All right.

**MR JAMES:** I might send a follow-up email after this meeting just so you have my details and ...

**MS WELLS:** That'd be great.

**MR JAMES:** ... you can go from there.

**MS WELLS:** Yes. Otherwise, I'm not sure how I would find that information. Thank you.

**MR MENZIES:** Yes, communications through to Brad and he'll make sure that it gets to Michael and I, and what is considered by the whole of the team who are working on this. Yes.

**MR CHILCOTT:** Great.

**MR MENZIES:** Okay. Thank you very much for the time you spent with us, that was a really useful discussion, both in the sense of the things that we learned from you, but also various things that we could cross off as non-issues, that also helped us. And thank you very much for the time you spent with us.

**MR CHRISTY:** No problems, guys.

**MS WELLS:** Thank you.

**MR MURPHY:** Thank you very much.

**MR CHRISTY:** Have a good afternoon.

**MS WELLS:** Enjoy your trip to Albury.

**MR CHRISTY:** I can say afternoon now.

**MS WELLS:** Bye, everyone.

**MR MENZIES:** See you, guys.

**>THE MEETING CONCLUDED**