



TRANSCRIPT OF MEETING

**RE: PORT KEMBLA OUTER HARBOUR – MODIFICATION 5
RECONFIGURATION OF RECLAMATION AREA (MP08_0249-Mod-5)**

DEPARTMENT MEETING

PANEL: RICHARD PEARSON (Chair)
SHELLEY PENN AM

OFFICE OF THE IPC: JANE ANDERSON
CALLUM FIRTH

**DEPARTMENT OF
PLANNING, HOUSING
& INFRASTRUCTURE:** DANIEL GORGIOSKI
LISA MITCHELL
GLENN SNOW

LOCATION: ZOOM VIDEOCONFERENCE

DATE: 3:00PM – 3:40PM
MONDAY, 1st JUNE 2026

<THE MEETING COMMENCED

5 **MR RICHARD PEARSON:** Before we begin, I would like to acknowledge that I am speaking to you from Gadigal land, and I acknowledge the Traditional Owners of all the lands from which we virtually meet today and pay my respects to their Elders: past and present.

10 Welcome to the meeting today to discuss Modification 5 of the Port Kembla Outer Harbour Reconfiguration application (MP08_0249-Mod-5) currently before the Commission for determination.

15 The Applicant, Port Kembla Operations Pty Ltd as trustee for Port Kembla Unit Trust, proposes to modify the approval for the Port Kembla Outer Harbour which involves dredging and reclamation of land and developing additional portside and landside facilities. The project is located in the Wollongong Local Government Area.

20 My name is Richard Pearson; I am the Chair of this Commission Panel. I am joined by my fellow Commissioner, Shelley Penn. We are also joined by Jane Anderson and Callum Firth from the Office of the Independent Planning Commission.

25 In the interest 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 The meeting is one part of the Commission's consideration of this matter and will form one of several sources of information upon which the Commission will base its determination. We have issued an agenda for today's meeting, which will form the basis of discussions.

35 It is important for commissioners to ask questions of attendees and clarify issues whenever appropriate. If you are asked a question and not in a position to answer, you may take the question on notice. Following the meeting, the Commission will advise you in writing of any questions taken on notice that the Panel considers requires a formal response. Any subsequent response or information provided to the Commission will then be published on our website.

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

45 So, thanks for that, we will begin the meeting, and I have, we have re-circulated an agenda. Perhaps – I've introduced the IPC personnel, maybe if the Department could introduce yourselves and then I believe you've got a presentation that you're going to run through with an overview of the application. Over to you, Glenn and team.

MR GLENN SNOW: Thanks, Richard. My name is Glenn Snow. I'm the Director of Transport and Water Assessments at the Department of Planning, Housing &

Infrastructure. With me today from the Department is Lisa Mitchell and Daniel Gorgioski, who were involved with the assessment of the Modification.

5 We could probably start with the slides. Do you want us to present or are you presenting – what's the normal formality? I'm happy to present.

10 **MR PEARSON:** No, well, we're expecting you would run through your presentation. Our preference is to ask questions as we go rather than ... But we cover a lot of the items on the agenda as we go through your presentation, so is that – are you going to do that, Glenn or Lisa or Dan?

MR SNOW: Yes, I'll do that. I'm just trying to find ...

15 **MR DANIEL GORGIOSKI:** I can do that – I can open that up now.

MR SNOW: Thanks, Dan.

MR PEARSON: Thank you. Okay, we can see that. Thank you.

20 **MR SNOW:** Great. Dan, go to the next slide please. So, a quick acknowledgement of country. So, I'd like to acknowledge the traditional custodians of the lands, skies and water across New South Wales and pay respect to Elders past and present. We honour Aboriginal peoples' ongoing connections to country, community, culture and knowledge, and we commit to working in partnership to support self-determination. I
25 also acknowledge and pay my respects to our Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people/colleagues joining us today.

30 So, Richard, as you're aware, the site location is primarily in the Outer Harbour in the Port of Newcastle and in the Illawarra area.

35 So, next slide please, Dan. So, just a quick run through of the approved concept layout. As you can see there, it was originally two fingers going into the Outer Harbour. There was a concept approval and a Stage 1 approval as well. The concept comprises three stages and was primarily proposed in relation for multi-purpose and container terminal berth in the long term. It also includes construction of some supporting infrastructure, including road and rail and other infrastructure associated with drainage.

40 Stage 1 was approved at the same time as the concept. It was split into three substages, with most of the dredging and reclamation occurring those that Stage 1. Construction operation was also included with some road and rail infrastructure upgrades and related infrastructure.

45 The next slide, please. Key issues from the original assessment which I was actually involved in, was the development of a train path to service the container terminal particularly, which required significant upgrade to local and regional rail and train networks. So, there were a number of conditions put in place to address those issues moving to the future, including some limits in relation to construction and operational vehicles.

There were potential impacts on endangered species, including the green and golden bell frog, and also impacts to aquatic ecology in relation to dredging and potential mobilisation of contaminants. Next one, please.

5 **MR PEARSON:** Glenn, can I just ask a question on that slide?

MR SNOW: Yes.

10 **MR PEARSON:** Can we just go to that. Just in relation to that rail transport issue which I think it's the Applicant said that they had to transport 90% of any containers by rail under the consent. Is that under this consent, that that requirement exists?

15 **MR SNOW:** Yes. So, the concept plan includes limits on the amount of truck movements. So, if they ever wanted to go beyond that level of truck movements, they'd have to find an alternate mode, which is rail. But at the moment, the rail pathways are limited on the Illawarra line/Southern line, would require some level of infrastructure upgrade, whether that be on the existing line or potentially the Maldon–Dombarton line, which has been in planning for many years.

20 **MR PEARSON:** Yes. So, there's been no particular progress on planning for infrastructure upgrade, even though, you know, I'm not talking about actually doing any rail or road upgrades, but is the progress ... I just don't want to end up in a situation where we approve something that's undeliverable.

25 **MR SNOW:** Yes, so I'm not aware of any planning at this point in time, but in the past there – you know, the Maldon–Dombarton line has resurfaced in discussions. I'm not aware of its status at the moment. But look, we had very sane concerns when we first considered the concept plan and that's why we sort of constructed a process that as they moved through the stages, if they got to a point that it would trigger a lot of
30 thought and action in relation to alternate transport modes.

MR PEARSON: Yes, okay, thanks, Glenn.

MR SNOW: Yes. So – sorry.

35 **MS SHELLEY PENN:** Sorry, apologies, Glenn.

MR SNOW: That's all right.

40 **MS PENN:** Can I just ask a quick question, sorry, back there on that slide around key issues, just around the green and golden bell frog, I think maybe you did go on to say but I ... The lack of a BDAR for that, is that – I guess I just wanted to understand if that's an issue. I know there's a management proposal, I've got various bits of paper here, trying to work out where's what. That was the only one that seemed to not be
45 closed off in a way.

MR SNOW: Yes, so, and maybe Lisa or Dan can fill in my knowledge gaps here. But in the original approval, the green and golden bell frog was identified as potentially impacted. My understanding is that the Modification doesn't change that.

MS PENN: Yes.

MR SNOW: But my understanding also with the Modification, they requested the deletion of the requirements around the frog. And so, but there's two things. One, they couldn't properly give us the information to sort of progress that Modification, but also any modification now that has an impact on biodiversity values, regardless of that's a positive or negative one, requires a BDAR as well.

MS PENN: Yes.

MR SNOW: So, they didn't furnish a BDAR with this Modification, so we could never consider that change anyway.

MS PENN: Right. But then, I guess, materially for us, the situation hasn't changed from the concept approval anyway.

MR SNOW: Yes, that's –

MS PENN: In terms of this is a Mod. Yes, okay.

MR SNOW: And that's why we decided not to support their request to change the conditions in this respect.

MS PENN: Yes, great, okay, thank you.

MR SNOW: So, the Modification in front of us is, my understanding is primarily driven by passage of time and the need to facilitate a changed type of product coming into the port, which in the first instance is related to renewable energy componentry and also offshore wind farms. But, so, you know, they've changed the footprint of the terminal. But also the key change here is also that Stage 1 no longer includes operation, so they're putting operation of any reclaimed land into future stages.

Thanks, Dan. So, look, I'll go through this really quickly. The concept and Stage 1, as we've talked to already, established some conditions in relation to moving forward but also provided conditions in relation to environmental envelope of the site, any operation of the port, that's something we'd like to do with all the projects to give flexibility to the port user, so that they can operate within that environmental framework.

One of the reasons for the reconfiguration is to increase flexibility and the accommodation of larger general goods. Conditions that managed operational impacts have been moved into the future stages or been maintained in the concept. Generally, we think the existing conditions, except for a few minor ones, are enough to manage the change. And we've just talked about the green and golden bell frog before.

Yes, next one.

MR PEARSON: And what does the Rail Master Plan do?

MR SNOW: It really puts –

MR PEARSON: Taking it back to our earlier conversation.

MR SNOW: Look, what it doesn't do is force ... It's a sort of, it's a stop-gap measure in combined with the limits that are set up, you know, the truck limits to encourage the Proponent to work with government and rail providers to explore alternate road options. It doesn't force them to build it, but if they, you know, if those rail options don't proceed, then the full potential of the port, I suppose, can't be realised.

MR PEARSON: And that's because there are limits on road traffic in the consent?

MR SNOW: That's correct, yes, yes.

MR PEARSON: I mean, they could always, I suppose, come back and seek an amendment to that condition in the future. You know, they can come back and say, "We've tried for rail, it didn't work, and now we want to send more by road." Is that a scenario that you've – have they –

MR SNOW: They haven't come to us with that scenario, but it is a scenario. The SSI approval pathway is very flexible in that respect. But if that did occur, that would be subject to fairly extensive engagement with the transport providers and the community in relation to the impacts of that, yes.

MR PEARSON: Yes, okay, thank you.

MR SNOW: We've just got a slide here showing the changes in the footprint. So, as mentioned before, it sort of was like two fingers, now it's a more solid looking facility to the west of the Outer Harbour. Some minor changes in relation to impacts on the Emplacement Cell and some of the supporting road links there. But there's not a huge amount of changes there.

Next slide, thanks. So, the project was exhibited for 14 days. We got no community submissions. Council had no comments on the Modification. The EPA were satisfied. There were some concerns raised by the Department of Climate Change, Environment and Water in relation to a number of issues, construction issues and the end, I suppose the end design in relation to climate change. Fisheries had no major issues. And Transport for NSW did raise some issues during the exhibition, but they were resolved with further discussions post exhibition. And Port of Authority also raised a couple of minor issues there in relation to maritime traffic, and we noted that this stage doesn't include operation but in future stages the Harbour Master would be involved in that.

MR PEARSON: Thank you.

MR SNOW: So, yes, these issues align with the matters you identified in the agenda. So, do you want me to keep going through these now or ...?

MR PEARSON: Yes, that'd be good, thank you.

MR SNOW: Yes. So, one of the things we did in relation to the approval was contemporise it as much as possible without over-complicating the assessment. So, we picked up some contemporary auditing example and processes in the new approval.
5 And look, this is something we do in many of our concept approvals and older SSIs. And to be fair, this project was one of our first concepts under Part 3A, so we've learnt a lot over time and we've sort of tried to refine that concept approval to make it more workable.

10 Dredging reclamation, traffic impacts are comparable to the approved project. Additional fill sources is unknown, but that is generally consistent with most major sort of fill projects and examples I put there is Western Sydney Airport and Penrith Lakes where the fill for those projects come from another source, another approved source and somewhat market driven.

15 We do not need to change the conditions in managing dredging and reclamation. We did think about that, but when we were working with the other regulatory agencies they were happy for us to leave those alone, because they're currently working quite well. As part of that contemporisation, we also updated some limits in relation to water
20 quality.

MR PEARSON: Yes. One of the things, Glenn, that we've been struggling a bit with here is how much of the dredge material will become fill material, you know, for the rehabilitate – not rehabilitation, but reclamation.

25 **MR SNOW:** Reclamation, yes.

MR PEARSON: How much they need to import. And we did raise this with the Applicant and they weren't particularly specific. They said they, you know, relied on
30 them having to see what comes out of the water in terms of usability. Have you got any comments on this? You know, are we looking at the majority of dredge material being used on site or, you know, this is one area we're kind of keen to get a bit more certainty about.

35 **MR SNOW:** Yes, my understanding is the dredge material is to be used mainly on site. But look, I don't know, Lisa, Dan, are you able to ...?

MS LISA MITCHELL: Yes, look, my understanding is that most of it will be used on site. It will be as either part of the Emplacement Cell or the new landform. It's not a
40 change of use. There is contaminated material in there which was identified in the original assessment. But there's no plan that we are aware of to take material off site.

MR PEARSON: Take it, sorry, on site, did you say, Lisa?

45 **MS MITCHELL:** There's no plan to take it off site.

MS PENN: Wow. That's quite significant. We were assuming there'd be some and, I mean, we probably asked that question, didn't we? Now, I'm just trying to work out exactly what we ... We were trying to understand volumes, as Richard has just

described, but that's good if they can reuse it all. But we kind of assumed there might be some that would have to go –

5 **MS MITCHELL:** We can take that on notice and check that, if that's helpful? But we're not aware of plans to take off site.

10 **MR PEARSON:** We'll look at whether you need to come back on that, Lisa, because it's a question we are following up with the Applicant who I would assume are in the best position to know on that. Would there not be some contaminated elements that would have to be disposed of off-site, or is it pretty much the same in terms of contamination profile?

15 **MS MITCHELL:** Look, the contamination profile is consistent with what was assessed in the original project. And that was mostly being captured within the Emplacement Cell. There's no – I don't believe there's no sort of change of land use that would require them to take anything significant off site.

MS PENN: Okay, yes.

20 **MR PEARSON:** Thank you.

25 **MR SNOW:** And just some background as well with the contamination. So, when they did the Inner Harbour, they used the Outer Harbour, so there was emplacement cells put into the harbour in relation to the Inner Harbour dredging. So, if I recall correctly, some of that was emplaced material from the Inner Harbour was going to be impacted by the original approval as well and would be put into a new Emplacement Cell as part of this project. So, yes, look, it's probably a good question to ask and, look, if the – yes, to ask the Proponent, yes.

30 **MR PEARSON:** Yes, okay, I think that's what we're proposing to do. So, we'll come back to you if we need anything more on that.

35 **MR SNOW:** Yes. So, Dan, next slide please. We were just talking about contamination there. So, yes, so we believe the existing conditions are, based on what Lisa just said as well, that the contamination impact is pretty much comparable to what was originally approved.

40 In relation to aquatic habitat, again, the impacts are very much consistent with what was approved. And I do note that the Proponent has committed to implement a – I'm not going to get this name wrong, but a Syngnathiformes Management Plan, so, yes.

MR PEARSON: No one's got that right yet, Glenn, so we totally ...

45 **MS PENN:** Syngnathiformes or something. The only thing – can I just ask about that. I noted that management plan commitment as well, which is good, and I noted the aquatic habitat management conditions adjustment to the project approval. But, I mean, I was curious about it – maybe those management plans and the programs are enough because they do seem to rely in their Assessment Report that the Applicant's Modification Report, sorry, on data that's 15 years old as though it's contemporary,

they do kind of do that quite a lot, although they acknowledge that the EPBC listing is now present where it wasn't before. But, I guess, there isn't much more we can do than what you've proposed and what they have committed to in their report. Is that right? Are you confused?

5

MS MITCHELL: Look, my understanding is that the expectation is that the sediments are not particularly – what's the right word – they're not really what the seahorse looks for when they're dredging, and that anything present in the water column would likely move away because of the noise sources during the dredging.

10

They have proposed to have somebody there to look out for the seahorse and try and move them on. I mean, I don't know how easy or practical that is, but beyond that ...

MS PENN: Yes, there's not much ... It seemed to be, that that's what the management plan proposed, which seems to be the critical document. Because my understanding is they are not mobile, as opposed to other fish, for example, who are more mobile and can get out, but that these would require – they'd so some dive down and have a look and see what's there and try to move them, basically.

20 **MS MITCHELL:** Yes.

MS PENN: So, yes, I think it's addressed, it's a bit bleak reading ... Yes.

25 **MR GORGIOSKI:** Sorry, Dan here. Can I also add, I think the Assessment Report, that the steps that are undertaken is they also indicated that it's all potential habitat, and I don't know if they did find actual seahorses there. So, this is just a precautionary measure in case they find one. But Fisheries, we went to Fisheries as well, and they were satisfied with what was presented and with the data that was presented, so.

30 **MS PENN:** Yes, thanks, yes.

MR GORGIOSKI: We also used their advice.

35 **MS PENN:** Yes.

MR PEARSON: Okay. Thank you.

40 **MR SNOW:** Next one, Dan. Oh, we've talked about the BDAR and green and golden bell frog, so I'll jump to the heritage. So, with the change in the footprint, there is no longer an impact to heritage items on the site, so we've removed those conditions accordingly.

45 Traffic and transport will be maintain the limits in relation to both the construction and operational matters. And as we also mentioned earlier, the maritime movements will be considered in future stages. So, yes, we've had no changes in the conditions there.

Next one. Noise and vibration, again, we don't believe there's really a noticeable change in impact, so we've left those conditions pretty much as is. We've provided some clarity –

MR PEARSON: Sorry, Glenn, is the dredge impact going to be noticeable at residences which I notice are like 500 metres away. But, you know, it'll be quite a noisy environment at 3 o'clock in the morning, allowing for the fact that it's a 24/7 industrial area. But do we – and I suppose what I'm getting to, is there any fail safe if residents to report that they're being disturbed by 24/7 operation of dredging? Is there a wind-back mechanism in the conditions?

MR SNOW: I don't think there's a wind-back mechanism. But look, they've been able to operate 24/7 to date and we've had no concerns.

MR PEARSON: With dredging?

MR SNOW: Yes, we need clarity on that. But yes, look, that's something to look into, if necessary. Look, and I suppose one of the things down there, and you would have seen in the – we've got zero community submissions, we rarely get any community submissions down in Port Kembla.

MR PEARSON: Yes.

MR SNOW: I think it reflects the, as you said, Richard, it is already a large port which operates 24/7 with many industries supporting that.

MS PENN: Sorry, Glenn, did you say that they have been operating 24/7 recently?

MR SNOW: Yes, they actually dredge 24/7 existing and we just provided clarity around that.

MS PENN: Okay, thank you.

MR SNOW: Lisa, did you want to add to that or ...?

MS MITCHELL: No, I don't think there's anything to add.

MR GORGIOSKI: Yes, they did reclamation of land previously for the western side of the site, for the Cement Australia site. So, they would have to do the dredging component there and reclamation of land. So, we weren't aware of any issues as a result of that initial reclamation of land process at this point in time.

MR PEARSON: Okay, thank you.

MR SNOW: Hydrodynamics. This is probably one of our, as the assessing officers, we wanted to get a good assessment of, because of the change of the footprint of the port. But that identified fairly limited changes, with a slight increase at the northern breakwater, but all manageable, so yes.

MR PEARSON: Did you commission some advice on that, Glenn, or was that just in review and agency comment?

MR SNOW: Yes, and look, we made that a key issue in the SEARs we issued as well.

MR PEARSON: Okay.

5 **MR SNOW:** But look, I suppose to be frank, you know, it's their port, if they don't get it right, you know, they're going to have to fix any damage caused by hydrodynamic changes, yes. But look, yes, but look, as the report suggests, the impact is similar to what was already approved, but we do also have requirements about ensuring that reasonable wave generation is minimised in the harbour, so.

10

MR PEARSON: Mm-hm.

MR SNOW: Next slide.

15

MS MITCHELL: That's it.

MR SNOW: That's it, yes.

20

MR PEARSON: Yes, I think that did cover the issues on our agenda. Shelley or Jane or Callum, did you have any further questions on the – if we went back to the agenda, on the key matters on our agenda, which were the things the Department ran through in its presentation?

25

MS PENN: Not on those matters, no.

MR PEARSON: Jane and Callum?

MS JANE ANDERSON: Nothing from me, Commissioner.

30

MR CALLUM FIRTH: No thanks, Richard.

35

MR PEARSON: Thank you. Thank you. And nor do I. So, that brings us to conditions of consent, recommended conditions of consent. We've had a preliminary look at these, and I think Shelley's got some specific questions, but we may have some other thoughts as we move through the determination of the project. Shelley, did you want to – is there anything you want to raise?

MS PENN: Yes, thanks.

40

MR PEARSON: Was there anything the Department wanted to say in terms of the conditions that are recommended?

45

MS MITCHELL: Maybe the only thing to say is that we – Glenn touched on the fact that we have taken out the operational conditions as they no longer relate, it's purely a construction project. For the project, there are some sort of operational related conditions that remain in the concept, and the contemporisation, but we have tried to keep it as light a touch as we could, so not to overly engineer or re-engineer the approval anymore than we felt we needed to, so.

MR PEARSON: That makes sense, yes. Shelley, did you have your specific questions?

5 **MS PENN:** Yes, I've just got a handful of just tiny little clarifications, just to partly make sure I'm understanding things. Can I just – it's probably easier to just run through them, if it's all right. So, on the project there's B13 which is stormwater, and you've added the word "implemented", which is a good – I think that's a slight adjustment to what was the wording before. I just wondered, that's about the plan for stormwater being prepared by a qualified practising civil engineer, Richard, just for
10 your reference.

MR PEARSON: Yes, thank you.

15 **MS PENN:** And I just wondered whether just a minor clarification would be to "implemented as specified" or something like that, it's partly a grammatical thing, it's so tiny, but it's kind of obvious. I'm a bit of a pedant with language, but I felt like there should be a comma and it should say "and implemented as specified" or something like that. I am understanding it correctly, aren't I, that's the intent, it's really just – yes, no worries. We'll talk about that later and whether we'll bother you with
20 that is another question.

MR SNOW: Sure.

25 **MS PENN:** The other one, I think there's a couple that we sorted out, I have sorted out by cross-checking, so that was fine. There was a minor – oh, look, just on C14, which is under traffic and transport, "The primary access route for construction vehicles via Flinders Street and Old Port Road and along Arawata Drive," which I saw was just an update on the what's now extent. It talks about "Construction access to the site via the Five Islands Road and Darcy Road to be minimised to the greatest extent practicable."
30 And it's just that question you probably usually get, sometimes from us, about whether it's too vague and whether it's, how that's enforceable. I just thought I'd ask for your comment on it, really.

35 **MR SNOW:** Look, it's probably a condition that has limited value now.

MS PENN: Okay.

40 **MR SNOW:** One, for the reason you said. But also as industry has changed in the area, the local road capacity is actually quite significant, you know, the local road capacity was built, and that those roads were built to accommodate BHP and other previous industry that generated a lot of traffic. So, the road network in the surrounding area does have quite a lot of capacity, so yes, it is a ...

45 **MS PENN:** It's a non-issue?

MR SNOW: It's a non-issue now, yes, it's sort of evolved, yes.

MS PENN: Okay. Thanks for that. Okay, we can – that’s helpful. Then, the last one on the project, the recommended approval was – no, I think we answered that, we just talked about that before, seahorses, sorry, and their friends.

5 Oh, just on the concept there are a couple of edits obviously. On 2.4 which talks about future projects and further requirements, this was around just clarity, because operation is not part of the current proposal in Stage 1, is it? So, 2.4 says, “The construction and operation of Stage 2 and 3.” Again, it’s probably just a pedantic thing. I wondered if that reads as ambiguous, i.e. implying that operation in Stage 1 could occur, where in
10 fact it’s not the case, and whether ...

I wanted to make sure I’m absolutely clear about that, that that’s not part of the current application or approval and whether the wording of that should be/could be slightly clearer, that’s all. To be clear that, for example, construction Stage 2 and 3 and
15 operation of the – it’s just a minor thing.

MR SNOW: Yes, you’re right. The Stage 1 does not include operation.

MS PENN: Yes.

20 **MR SNOW:** And I think we actually put in a condition, it’s not explicit to that, but it does talk about maintaining – is that correct?

MS MITCHELL: Yes.

25 **MS PENN:** Okay.

MR SNOW: About maintaining the reclaimed land until the next stages.

30 **MS PENN:** Oh yes, I read that as well. Yes, yes, that made sense. The only other one was on 2.7 which is road traffic volume limits. Again, I just got slightly confused with references to Stage 1. There’s a little note underneath Table 1 which has got the total road traffic volumes, and the note just basically explains what the table is referring to. And in the note, it says, “However, the volumes in truck movements for the ‘Bulk’,
35 ‘General’ and ‘Container’ values do not include cargoes and traffic associated with the Stage 1 Cement Australia Grinding Mill project.” So, I was just getting confused, because this is Stage 1 of the concept, but that was Stage 1 of the – that was a different Stage 1 ...

40 **MR SNOW:** Well, no, look, that’s already been built. Look, it’s probably something we missed, we could probably fix the wording too.

MS PENN: It was just a tiny clarification – yes, good. I just wanted to make sure I understand that properly. That was all. They were just tiny things, as I said, so that’s
45 helpful. Thank you.

MR PEARSON: Thank you, Shelley and Department. And as I say, we may have some further condition questions or comments. Sometimes we have meetings just about conditions with the Department, but I’m not particularly sure that’s going to be

needed on this occasion. But I just want to reserve the right that we might come back with something further prior to determination, but we can deal with that in whatever format we think is most efficient.

5 **MR SNOW:** Yes.

MR PEARSON: Is there anything else, Callum or Jane, that you want to raise in relation to conditions?

10 **MR FIRTH:** No.

MS ANDERSON: Not from me, Commissioner.

15 **MR PEARSON:** Okay, thank you. So, the only other thing on the agenda is the old any other matters. Any other matters, Shelley or team?

MS PENN: Not from me. Thank you.

20 **MR FIRTH:** Nothing from me.

MR PEARSON: Not from me. Department?

MR SNOW: No.

25 **MR PEARSON:** Okay. Well, thanks, that was very useful. I think we've got submissions closing later this week – am I right, Jane?

MS ANDERSON: Yes, on Thursday.

30 **MR PEARSON:** Yes, okay. Well, I don't think we've received any at this point in time. But we'll wait and see if we get any submissions – if we do, we may need to talk to you about them, but we'll see if we receive anything.

35 We met with the Applicant. We offered to meet with the Council, the Council declined that, I think they gave us a comment, I think they thanked us for offering to meet but didn't feel any need to. So, we'll continue forward now.

40 That was a useful presentation, thank you, and if we need anything further on the dredging volumes issue, we'll come back to you – hopefully we can get an answer from the Applicant on that we'll just steam forward with our determination of the application. Thank you. If there's nothing further, I'll conclude the meeting.

MS MITCHELL: Thanks very much.

45 [Multiple people say thank you/goodbye]

>THE MEETING CONCLUDED