



TRANSCRIPT OF MEETING

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

DEPARTMENT MEETING

PANEL: NEAL MENZIES (CHAIR)
MICHAEL CHILCOTT

OFFICE OF THE IPC: BRAD JAMES
ISAAC CLAYTON

**DEPARTMENT OF
PLANNING, HOUSING
AND INFRASTRUCTURE:** IWAN DAVIES
MEGAN RAMSDALE
SAMANTHA WYNN

LOCATION: ZOOM VIDEOCONFERENCE

DATE: 10:00AM – 10:45AM
WEDNESDAY, 26th NOVEMBER 2025

<THE MEETING COMMENCED

MR MENZIES: And Megan. Welcome. Okay, guys, as usual, I have an introductory statement to read and then we'll get into a more open discussion about this one.

5

Okay. So, before we begin, I would like to acknowledge that I'm speaking to you from the land of the Jagera and Turrbal people here in the Brisbane River Valley. I acknowledge the traditional owners of the lands from which we're all meeting virtually today and pay my respects to Elders past and present.

10

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

15

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

20

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.

25

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.

30

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.

It's important for commissioners to ask questions of attendees and to clarify issues 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.

35

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

40

Okay, that's my formal statement. So, a free-for-all discussion. Did you have any presentation you wanted to make to introduce this one?

45

MR DAVIES: Yes, we do, thanks Neal. And in terms of introductions, I'm Iwan Davies, Director for Energy Assessments. I'll quickly pass over to Sam and Megan.

MS WYNN: Hi, I'm Samantha Wynn, Principal Planning Officer.

MS MEGAN RAMSDALE: Megan Ramsdale, Environmental Assessment Officer.

MR DAVIES: Thank you. Megan, do you mind sharing the slides please? Thanks. And whilst they are being shared, I'd also like to acknowledge the traditional custodians of the land on which we all join today's meeting. I'd like to pay my respects to their Elders past and present and extend that respect to any Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people here today.

I'll provide a brief overview of the key assessment issues, focused on those on the Commission's agenda, and in particular the key reasons for the Department's recommendation to the Commission to approve the project.

I'll run through the slides, but Neal, Michael and others, please feel free to jump in with any questions as I go. Can everyone see the slides?

MR MENZIES: No, no slides yet.

MR DAVIES: I'll get going anyway. So, before I dive into the assessment issues, it's important to provide some strategic context about the project in relation to its location and access to the electricity network. Noting that all coal-fired power plants in New South Wales are scheduled for closure in the next 15 to 20 years, the project would assist in supporting the transition away from traditional power generation and towards renewable energy generation by providing a firming capacity to smooth out peaks and troughs in renewable generation.

The Department considers that the project is consistent with the relevant national, state and local policy documents which identify the need to diversify the energy generation mix and reduce the carbon emissions intensity of the grid, while also providing energy security and reliability.

There are additional considerations from a regional context that the project site would benefit from. The existing Transgrid Albury to Hume 132 kilovolt transmission line traverses the eastern portion of the site. The site is in close proximity to the state road network, with the Riverina Highway located just 400 metres west from the site – oh, 400 metres from the site.

Biodiversity and heritage impacts are minimal. The site is located on land that is not mapped as Biophysical Strategic Agricultural Land (that is BSAL land) and entirely on land that has a land and soil capability of Class 6, which is defined as having very severe limitations. And there are no significant visual or noise impacts on residences.

The project would provide flow-on benefits to the local community, including up to 50 construction jobs and contributions to Council. There would be broader benefits to the state through an injection of approximately \$120 million in capital investment into the New South Wales economy.

Okay, so regarding community engagement and public submissions. The Department exhibited the EIS in November and December 2024 and received 76 unique public

submissions, consisting of 72 objections, 1 in support, and 3 comments. The most common matters raised in public objections were renewable scepticism and hazards, including fire safety and contamination. Two objections were received from individuals in Lake Hume Village. An additional four objections and three comments were received from within 100 kilometres of the site. The remaining 66 objections and 1 submission in support were from more than 100 kilometres of the site, 18 of which were interstate.

The Department considers there is a low level of local interest or concerns towards the project, and that there are relatively low levels of residual impacts associated with the proposal.

Throughout the assessment process, the Department sought advice from 17 government agencies in addition to Albury City Council and visited the site. Council objects to the project due to the project's proximity to the Murray River and the potential for environmental impact to the Murray River and subsequent impacts on water supply should an incident occur.

I'm now going to talk about what we found to be the key areas for assessment and the matters identified in the Commission's agenda. Regarding energy transition. The project aligns with the range of national and state policies which identify the need to diversify the energy generation mix and reduce the carbon emissions intensity of the grid, while providing energy security and reliability.

The project is in an area with access to the transmission network and on land battery storage is permissible, with development consent under the Transport and Infrastructure SEPP and section 4.383 of the EP&A Act. The project has a delivery capacity of 75 megawatts and a storage capacity of 150 megawatts, which would provide – 150 megawatt-hours, apologies – which would provide enough energy to supply about 29,600 homes during peak demand. Battery storage is consistent with the NSW Climate Change Policy Framework of achieving net zero emissions by 2050.

Next slide, please. Regarding land use compatibility. The site is located on land within the RU2 Rural Landscape within the Albury LEP. The proposed development is permissible by the SEPP and the EP&A Act. The project is consistent with local and regional plans, including the Albury LEP and the *Riverina Murray Regional Plan 2041*, which identifies the need to support well-located renewable energy industries and the consequent transition away from fossil fuels.

Regarding loss of agricultural land. The project covers approximately 1.92 hectares, all of which is mapped Class 6 low-quality land which has limited agricultural capabilities. The site is not used for agricultural purposes and is occupied by a house and its curtilage.

The project's development footprint accounts for a tiny fraction of mapped agricultural land in the Albury LGA. The site does not contain Biophysical Strategic Agricultural Land and the Department considers cumulative impacts on regional productivity would be negligible.

Neither the Council nor DPI Agriculture raised concerns that the project would compromise the long-term use for agricultural purposes. And importantly, the site is not currently used for agricultural production.

The Applicant prepared a land use conflict risk assessment (or LUCRA) as part of the EIS to assess the potential impacts of the project on land uses surrounding the site. The LUCRA concluded that potential impacts on surrounding land uses were manageable with the implementation of the proposed mitigation measure, including traffic management measures, weed management, rehabilitation and decommissioning plans, and noise and dust mitigation.

The Department notes that Transgrid's existing 132 kilovolt Albury to Hume transmission line traverses the site and the project is located in close proximity to the state road network.

There is a small section of Crown Land Reserve approximately 0.0053 hectares located within a portion of the land that facilitates access to the site. The existing licence held by the previous landowner for the use of the Crown Land transferred to Foresight to facilitate ongoing access to the site. Crown Lands advised it does not oppose continued use of this area for access in accordance with the terms of the licence.

This area is subject of an undetermined Aboriginal land claim under the Aboriginal Land Rights Act. In the instance the claim is granted, Foresight would consult with the claimant regarding ongoing site access provisions.

Based on the findings of the EIS, the project would not result in any unacceptable impacts on the local community or the environment. Overall, the Department considers that the project would be unlikely to generate any significant land use conflicts and would be compatible with existing and future land uses.

Next slide, please. Regarding hazards. The preliminary hazard analysis (or the PHA) found that subject to mitigation measures, including minimum separation distances between BESS containers and off-site sensitive receivers, the project risks did not exceed acceptable criteria, and propagation risks within the site were acceptable.

The Department is satisfied that the dangerous goods stored on site would be unlikely to exceed the threshold limits in the Department's Hazardous and Offensive Development Application Guidelines, applying SEPP 33, and the project is not potentially hazardous.

The project would comply with the International Commission on Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection Guidelines for electric, magnetic and electromagnetic fields. Subject to the implementation of a detailed Emergency Plan and Emergency Services Information Package, as required by the recommended conditions of consent, the Department considers that risks associated with the BESS would be minimal.

Regarding bushfire. The site is mapped as Class 3 medium risk bushfire-prone land under Council's Bushfire Prone Map. RFS advised the Bushfire Assessment Report adequately addressed their requirements of RFS' *Planning for Bushfire Protection 2019*.

5

The Department considers that fire hazards and risks, including bushfire risks, can be suitably controlled through the implementation of standard procedures and recommendations made by Fire and Rescue NSW and RFS, which include asset protection zones (or APZs), preparation of a fire safety study in consultation with Fire and Rescue NSW, development of a comprehensive Emergency Response Plan, development of an Emergency Services Information Package, and development of an Emergency Responders Induction Package. The RFS noted the recommended conditions provide for an appropriate suite of bushfire protection measures.

10

15

Next slide, please. Regarding contamination. Foresight conducted a preliminary site investigation (or a PSI) which included review of historical land uses, public records, and historical imagery, a site inspection identifying areas of environmental interest, and opportunistic asbestos sampling.

20

In one area of environmental interest, fragments of potential asbestos-containing material were observed on the ground surface. And based on the age of the existing residence, it's possible that the residence could contain asbestos-containing material. To manage the risk associated with exposure during construction and operational activities, Foresight has committed to preparing an Asbestos Management Plan in accordance with the relevant Safe Work NSW Codes of Practice.

25

Foresight concluded that the potential for widespread and/or significant contamination across the project area is low. Any risks would be managed as part of an unexpected finds protocol to guide responses to finds of contaminated, hazardous or unsuitable material during construction.

30

The Department considers that the proposed use of the land is not intensive and is low risk, noting the low number of people required to access the site during operation.

35

Next slide, please. Regarding contamination on water. Council noted that it objects to the project due to its proximity to the Murray River and the potential for environmental impact to the Murray River and any subsequent impacts on water supply should an incident occur.

40

The preliminary hazard analysis considered the applications of a thermal runaway event and concluded management would not involve dousing, would not produce fumes that could lead to toxic exposure off-site, and would not release particulates whereby fallout could credibly manifest in off-site deposition, leading to water quality issues.

45

As such, only rainwater would require management in the event it was to coincide with a thermal runaway event. The nearest waterway is an unnamed ephemeral drainage line located 250 metres to the north. And when flowing, it would flow into the Murray

River approximately 500 metres downstream. The project includes a northern detention basin to store runoff generated by rainfall over the BESS compound, and a southern detention basin to store runoff generated by rainfall over the switchyard, transformer and the control room.

Soil testing identified low or non-dispersive soils in the project area, and therefore soil erosion and sedimentation of downstream environments during construction is considered to be low risk. Indirect impacts due to mobilisation of sediments and pollutants would be managed through contamination, erosion and sediment controls detailed in a Construction Soil and Water Management Plan.

Preparation of a fire safety study would detail the requirements regarding storage and disposal of contaminated fire water associated with combating a fire on the site. The fire safety study would be submitted to Fire and Rescue NSW for review.

The Department has also recommended a condition requiring Foresight to ensure that the development does not cause any water pollution as defined under section 120 of the POEO Act. The Department consulted with Water NSW who did not raise any concerns regarding contamination.

The Department also conducted a detailed assessment of all other matters, and concluded that there would be no significant impacts.

Next slide, please.

MR MENZIES: Just before we move on, Iwan.

MR DAVIES: Yes.

MR MENZIES: The discussion that we had with the Council very much focused on their concern about the potential for contamination of the river. And if I put this in my words rather than theirs, I think they're concern was that if there was a fire, there may not be use of water to douse, but there may be use of other types of fire-fighting chemicals, which would then, through time, eventually make it into the river.

So, I think their concept is more related to experience from airports, military bases, etc., where there's been use of PFAS-type chemicals; pollution doesn't happen immediately but over time there's migration to the water course.

So, I think that's more the context of their current concern. I think the Applicant's responses with regard to they're not going to douse with water etc., there will be no gas or particulate emissions etc., I think the Council's understood those but still has this unresolved residual concern.

We've just spoken to the Applicant and stressed to them that this is an underlying concern of Council. They once again stressed to us that you don't douse with water. But it wasn't crystal clear in that discussion, they couldn't give a definitive answer that

there might not be other fire suppressant chemicals used, even within the Tesla modules that they intend to use.

5 So, Iwan, I just wanted to sort of put the construct of the Council where they're currently concerned, and whether the Department has any insights they could provide us around that.

10 **MR DAVIES:** No, that's great. Thank you, Neal. Look, we had detailed discussions with Council and the Director of Planning at Council during the assessment process, and hence why we ... I mean, we'd have undertaken the detailed assessment anyway, but clearly we've gone into a lot of detail in our assessment, and we are comfortable with what at least is proposed in the EIS. That either the Applicant has committed to the relevant mitigation measures, including those detention basins or the like, and in the recommended conditions with the fire safety study and some management plans.

15 It sounds that perhaps, I'm unsure what Council, if what Council has raised to you this morning or in your meeting with them is different to what they advised in their advice to the Department, if it is perhaps, I would recommend that in the first instance, that is for the Applicant to confirm or provide a response to Council's latest comments should
20 that be different to what has been advised in their comments on the EIS.

25 **MR MENZIES:** Yes, Iwan. We've asked the Applicant to just give us clarity on whether there is suppressant chemicals used within the battery pack etc. And to be fair to the Council's concern, if we were considering this as a battery system that was 20 kilometres away from the river rather than 500 metres, the level of concern around this one would be quite different. So, I think it's just that, you know, their perception of this is so close to the river, we need extra assurance that it won't be a problem for the river or for their own local drinking water. So, yes, that context.

30 **MR DAVIES:** Absolutely. And I don't disagree with Council's concern. I suppose all I can advise is what the Department has assessed, but I fully appreciate your comments, Neal, and I absolutely full appreciate Council's comments and noting the proximity to the river.

35 **MR MENZIES:** Okay.

40 **MR DAVIES:** Thanks, Neal. And, sorry, just finally, regarding a summary. So, electricity generating works on the site are permissible with consent in accordance with the Transport and Infrastructure SEPP. The overall agricultural productivity of the region would not be significantly reduced, noting the site is not currently used for agricultural production. The site would connect directly to the Albury to Hume 132 kilovolt transmission line that traverses the site and has access to the road network.

45 The project has been designed to largely avoid site constraints, including nearby non-associated receivers, agricultural land, water courses, remnants of native vegetation, and Aboriginal heritage sites, while maintaining its ability to utilise the existing electricity infrastructure and road network.

5 The project would assist the transition of the electricity sector from coal and gas-fired power stations to low emissions sources and is consistent with New South Wales policy. It would provide 75 megawatts and 150 megawatt-hours of energy storage to dispatch energy to the grid when energy generation from renewable energy resources is limited, which is enough to power about 29,600 homes in peak demand.

10 The Department considers that the project achieves an appropriate balance between maximising the energy security and reliability and minimising the potential impacts on surrounding land users and the environment. Through job creation and capital investment and a planning agreement with Council, the project would also stimulate economic investment in renewable energy and provide flow-on benefits to the local community.

15 On balance, the Department considers that the project is in the public interest and is approvable, subject to the recommended conditions. I'm happy to take any further questions, Neal and Michael.

MR MENZIES: Thanks, Iwan, that was great. Michael, questions?

20 **MR MICHAEL CHILCOTT:** Yes. Look, as Neal mentioned, Iwan, I think the matters that Council have raised are matters that are ones we are keen to just understand, coming to this afresh, and to understand the Department's assessment of the risks, given the proximity of this particular facility to the Murray, which is obviously an important catchment given its use for drinking water in the area as well as
25 downstream values that are there.

30 So, I just wondered, given the nature of its location, the selection of this particular site, can you just give us any insights into how the Department's assessment has responded to that particular circumstance, that would appear perhaps different to other battery facilities that may be in locations not so proximate to such a major water catchment.

MR DAVIES: Yes, thank you –

35 **MR CHILCOTT:** Given those risks that we talked about.

MR DAVIES: Thank you, Michael. And again, reiterate that the Department absolutely appreciates Council's comments on the matter and the significance of the Murray River.

40 I suppose I've set out in some of my speaking notes regarding the Department's assessment at a high level, and there's additional information within our Assessment Report and in the recommended conditions. Now, on this particular project and noting there's an approved project, I suppose, on the dam or adjacent to the dam that would have to be relinquished prior to the construction of this battery, we've considered the
45 site as an alternative site to the approved project.

With this, we consulted closely, we have an expert hazards team within the Department that generally works on industrial projects, but those that are formally

hazardous facilities. And some of those can be adjacent to or nearby other water courses, whether that's in and around Sydney or elsewhere in the state.

5 So, we work closely with that team to understand if there are any significant or any concerns really regarding the potential impacts, and ultimately the conclusion is no, with the management measures that the Applicant has committed to and with our recommended conditions, we are comfortable as a department. But we would be more than happy should additional information come to light from Council's presentation to you this morning or from any further information that the Applicant puts forward, to
10 consider those matters further.

I don't have anything else to add at this stage. And perhaps await that additional information from the Applicant, unless Sam or Megan, you wanted to add anything there. But I think really our position would be that – I'm unsure exactly what Council
15 has advised this morning and what the Applicant is going to put forward, and we'd be happy to assess or provide input on that to the Commission.

MR CHILCOTT: I think we're just trying to make sure we've got our head fully around the matters here. It's obviously a significant matter of public interest first, and therefore it weighs on us to inquire into it, just to be satisfied in relation to these
20 matters.

Just noting from, I think that the Applicant's presentation, they noted that they've taken the determination how to manage water on the site and impacts on the Murray Darling to a sort of preliminary level, but it's not a final design. And I think they indicated that there were constraints to do with the engagement of contractors that would lead to a final design, and they're relying on the condition that requires them to develop and provide to the Department a Fire Management Plan to the satisfaction of the Secretary.
25

I'm just wondering whether in doing so, that it's a requirement for a plan but it doesn't – the condition doesn't go to particular outcomes that might be appropriate and be secured by such a plan. Did the Department give any thought along the way to how it constructed that condition and whether there's any benefit in trying to secure some agreement about what some of the outcomes of that plan might be.
30
35

MR DAVIES: Yes, thank you. And I'm just opening – I'm scrolling to the condition itself now. So, I think the relevant conditions would clearly be the fire safety study but it being a post-approval matter, but also that storage and handling of dangerous goods, I appreciate that's not about tackling any potential incident on site. But also, the operating conditions at B33 and B34 and B35, the Emergency Plan. If you just give me a minute to look at the fire safety study.
40

MR CHILCOTT: They did talk about the systems for the capture of – what they referred to, was it first flush they talked about?
45

MR MENZIES: First flush, yes.

5 **MR CHILCOTT:** Notwithstanding that they propose not to use any water, my question was what was the first flush they were referring to, and there they were talking about, well, in the event of a fire in circumstances where it's raining, how would these things be addressed, was what they were envisaging being defined more precisely post-approval.

MR DAVIES: Yes, okay, thanks.

10 **MR CHILCOTT:** So, my question is, how are these things being addressed in the Department's assessment? I'm just trying to understand that. And whether there's any, given the particular circumstances of this facility, whether there are any implications for – whether any particular outcomes would be considered or not, to just mitigate those risks. And given all the particular concerns expressed by the community and the Council.

15 **MR DAVIES:** Thank you. So, first of all, the fire safety study needs to be prepared both in consultation and – consultation with Fire and Rescue NSW, but also confirmation that it meets Fire and Rescue NSW's requirements. And there's also an approval, there's approval required by the Planning Secretary. So, the Applicant could not commence construction until both Fire and Rescue NSW and the Planning Secretary have approved the fire safety study. Whether we can add some detail into the fire safety study in particular regarding this project and perhaps reference to potential downstream impacts ... I'm just scrolling through a couple of the other conditions such as soil and water.

25 **MR CHILCOTT:** I raise it as a question, not as a direction, but it is – it just strikes us, I think, that the circumstance in which this facility is being placed, is unusual and not necessarily standard. And so, to require a sort of standard response in a condition that meets the standard requirements, you know, in one sense I understand why you might go down that way. I'm just wondering whether the particular circumstances of this might benefit from some refinement. And it's a question.

30 **MR DAVIES:** Yes, no, good, thank you. Well, I suppose, as I initially advised, the Department is comfortable with the current set of conditions. We consider that we have the appropriate parameters in place, whether that's referenced to the POEO Act. The conditions, both the operating conditions and the management plan, all post-approval document conditions that we do have in the existing development consent.

35 We work very closely with Fire and Rescue NSW and RFS in developing our conditions. And ultimately, they are all-encompassing, so not only ... I don't consider it a standard condition ultimately. Yes, it may be reflected in other batteries, but ultimately a lot of assessment and consultation with the Emergency Services has been undertaken in developing these conditions, and the conditions themselves refer to particular technical guidelines, including RFS' and the Department's.

40
45 So, I do consider, or the Department considers these are stringent conditions. We've required, and as we do with all of the batteries, but that's not to say it's standard, these are very stringent conditions for batteries regardless of location. Perhaps we can look

to see if there's some particular reference needed, but ultimately even if that reference is included, the requirements, as far as I see it, are included within the conditions themselves.

5 But more than happy to hear from what the Applicant's final or response to the Commission is, and we'd be happy to consider whether we just pull some things into the conditions to ensure that it's absolutely clear that there cannot be any impacts on the Murray River, which, again, I'd consider the conditions already capture. But perhaps to ensure that is pulled out and highlighted, perhaps we can make some
10 references within the conditions set.

MR CHILCOTT: Yes, and we're awaiting further feedback from the Applicant in relation to the questions. When put to them at the time, they weren't able to immediately provide the advice on, for example, within the battery containment
15 systems, whether there are particular fire suppression mechanisms that involve particular chemicals, for example. So, we're looking forward to that information. No doubt we can supply it through to you and you can assess whether that has any implications for the set of conditions you're recommending.

20 **MR DAVIES:** Perfect, thank you. And what we do in that instance if there are changes, we'd consult with Fire and Rescue NSW in particular. We could also consult with RFS and Water NSW as well. Yes.

MR CHILCOTT: Thank you.

25 **MR MENZIES:** Iwan, I think that our concern is in the sort of water environment space rather than the fire space. If they're using suppressant chemicals to put out the fire, I'm sure they work very well, but then water are the knock-on consequences. Let's not spend a lot more time on this one, because until we get feedback from the
30 company, it's completely speculative. But yes, I think we've flagged well enough the Council is exercised by this matter and hence we're chasing it.

This morning when we spoke to the Applicant, they included a couple of recommended – changes to recommended conditions of consent. And this is a question
35 without notice, Iwan, so if it's not one that's easily answered, we might have to come back to you on it. But the operational noise limit, they're suggesting a change to noise limits defined in the Noise Policy for Industry, which they say represents an appropriate benchmark.

40 Is what has been done here standard for other batteries that have been installed across the state?

MR DAVIES: So, our noise conditions across the state vary, depending on the local circumstances and the type of receiver, and what that receiver is defined as in both the
45 ICNG but also the Noise Policy for Industry.

So, there is not many batteries, or any SSD really, may have some standard figures that are pulled from the Noise Policy for Industry. But it must be looked at a project-by-

project basis, and we consider that the conditions we have put forward are in line with the Noise Policy for Industry and what the Applicant has ultimately assessed for this project. So, we have ensured that the noise that, or the limits that they have, or their assessment, has been appropriate captured in the conditions. I think they raised a similar question late in the process with us, but ultimately this is what they've assessed and this is what we consider is appropriate in line with the Noise Policy for Industry.

MR MENZIES: Yes, thank you, Iwan. So, the numbers that are in table 3 are ones that have been developed specifically for this site, as appropriate for this site.

MR DAVIES: That's correct.

MR MENZIES: Thank you. Michael, any other questions from you?

MR CHILCOTT: No, that's been very helpful. Thank you very much.

MR MENZIES: Yes, no other questions from me either. So, Iwan, Sam, Megan, thanks for spending your time this morning.

MR CHILCOTT: Thanks for your work on this.

MR MENZIES: It's been certainly a helpful discussion, and yes, I think this is a relatively straight forward one except for the proximity to the river issue; that's given us some additional things to think about.

MR DAVIES: Absolutely, yes. Yes, thanks for your time, Neal and Michael, and as I said, the Commission.

MR MENZIES: Thanks, guys. Bye for now.

MR DAVIES: Okay. Thank you. Cheers, Neal.

MS WYNN: Thank you.

>THE MEETING CONCLUDED