



TRANSCRIPT OF MEETING

RE: BOWDENS SILVER MINE (SSD-5765)

COUNCIL MEETING

PANEL: TERRY BAILEY (Chair)
RICHARD PEARSON
DR BRONWYN EVANS AM

OFFICE OF THE IPC: KENDALL CLYDSDALE
TAHLIA HUTCHINSON

MID-WESTERN
REGIONAL COUNCIL: CR ALEX KARAVAS (Mayor)
DAVID NEEVES
ALINA AZAR
JULIAN GEDDES

LOCATION: ZOOM VIDEOCONFERENCE

DATE & TIME: 1:00PM – 2:00PM
MONDAY, 28th SEPTEMBER 2026

<THE MEETING COMMENCED

MR TERRY BAILEY: Good afternoon and welcome, everybody.

5 [Multiple people say good afternoon]

MR BAILEY: Just before we begin, I'll just make an opening statement and in doing that, I'd like to acknowledge that I'm speaking with you today from Huan land, and I acknowledge the traditional owners of all the lands from which we virtually meet
10 today, and pay my respects to Elders past and present.

Welcome to the meeting today to discuss the Bowdens Silver Mine, state significant development SSD-5765, currently before the Commission for determination. The consent granted to this application by the Commission in April 2023 was declared void
15 by the courts and a new public hearing and public submission period are being held by the Commission, and additional information from the Applicant and supplementary advice by the Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure has also been made available and is being considered.

20 The Applicant, Bowden Silver Mine Pty Ltd, is seeking approval to develop an open cut silver, lead and zinc mine approximately 2 kilometres north of the village of Lue in the Mid-Western Regional Council area. The mine would extract and process around 30 million tonnes of ore and up to 2 million tonnes per annum to produce an estimated 66.3 million ounces of silver, 130,000 tonnes of zinc, and 95,000 tonnes of lead.

25 My name is Terry Bailey and I'm the Chair of the Commission Panel. I'm joined by my fellow commissioners, Dr Bronwyn Evans and Richard Pearson. We're also joined by Kendall Clydsdale and Tahlia Hutchinson from the office of the Independent Planning Commission.

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

It's important for the commissioners to ask questions of attendees and to clarify issues whenever it's considered appropriate. And if you are asked a question and are not in a position to answer, you may take the question on notice. And following the meeting,
40 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.

45 I would request that all participants here today introduce themselves before speaking for the first time, and for all members to ensure that they don't speak over the top of each other, to allow accuracy of the transcription.

We'll now begin, and I just wanted to check if there were any councillors joining us today.

5 **MR DAVID NEWMAN:** Yes. G'day Terry, David Neeves is my name, I'm the General Manager with the Mid-Western Regional Council. And yes, we've got Councillor, our Mayor, Councillor Karavas in the room with us, so he's to my right. We've got Alina Azar, our Director of Planning – sorry, Director of Development, and Julian Geddes, our Director of Operations.

10 **MR BAILEY:** Thanks, David. Just very quickly, I would ask if Councillor could please declare any conflicts of interest if there are any on the matter.

CR ALEX KARAVAS: I have none.

15 **MR BAILEY:** Thank you. We might hand across – very happy for you to have provide any opening statement or context that you might like. We do have an agenda that we can follow, and some questions and queries that will flow from that, but I will hand across to begin with for any opening comments you'd like to make. Thank you.

20 **CR KARAVAS:** Thank you. Council has a suggested statement that we will make now. Thank you for the opportunity to meet with the Commission. Council's position has not changed. We recognise the significant economic and employment opportunities associated with the project, particularly for Kandos and Rylstone, and we acknowledge Bowdens Silver's longstanding engagement with Council and the community.

25 Sorry, do I continue?

MR BAILEY: Yes, all good.

30 **CR KARAVAS:** Sorry, thanks. Our role today is to make sure the renewed assessment of any conditions fully protect the local community and do not leave Council or future generations carrying project-related costs or risks. Our principal concern remains the long-term protection of water resources, including acid mine drainage, the tailings storage facility, drought resilience, and post-mining management. We are not the technical expert but the Department's [audio glitch 00:05:25]. Sorry, I'll continue. We are not the technical expert.

35 **MR BAILEY:** Sorry. We might just – thanks, Richard.

40 **CR KARAVAS:** Okay. We are not the technical expert, but the Department's own independent expert previously identified matters requiring further verification and design work. We want the Commission to be satisfied that those risks are not resolved through clear, independently verified and enforceable controls. The updated regional context now includes cumulative traffic and workforce impacts from renewable energy development, which makes up, sorry, which makes early separation of mine traffic from Lue more important, not less.

45 The supplementary social assessment now rates housing and services, amenity, and connection to land and culture as high significance matters. We support the proposed additions to the Social Impact Management Plan, but there needs to be measurable actions, clear timing, regular reporting, and direct Council involvement. Thank you.

MS ALINA AZAR: You're now on silent.

MR BAILEY: Sorry. Thank you for that statement. Any other comments from within the room or we might then move through to the agenda?

MS AZAR: We're fine.

MR NEEVES: We're happy to move on with the agenda.

MR BAILEY: Thanks, all. I might just invite commissioners and members of the Panel – we might start with a couple of areas that we note you've mentioned in that statement as well that we'd just like to come back to. And I might just start particularly with aspects that we've been reading, including where the project was at in its previous, in 2023, and where we're at now.

So, one of the areas that I wouldn't mind just getting that clarification on, the Panel would certainly like to get that clarification on, is that I might just start, just jump to the transport and traffic component that builds off some of the comments. And we note concerns that have been previously stepped through, and I might just hand across to Richard to do a couple of clarifications for us on Council's current position. Thank you.

MR RICHARD PEARSON: Yes, thanks, Terry. I did notice in your earlier submission that in particular Council wanted the Maloneys Road redirection to be resolved prior to any work on the mine itself. Is that a position that Council still holds, noting that the Department didn't agree with that, and it wasn't imposed in the development consent issued by the, or the voided development consent issued by the Planning Commission previously. Do you still hold to that view?

MR JULIAN GEDDES: Hi, Richard. It's Julian Geddes, Director of Operations, responding to that question. Look, that's the preference. We do note, as you've said, that it wasn't supported previously by conditions of consent. What was imposed instead were some traffic restrictions. So, the intent obviously of that request is to minimise the impact of traffic and transport through the village of Lue itself.

So, what we would request is, if that can't be supported, that we maintain the requirement through the conditions of consent that were previously put there of a limit of the heavy vehicles that are going through Lue. So, what's interesting to note as well though is the conditions of consent at the moment put a load limit of 32 heavy vehicles during the construction of Maloneys Road but seem to be somewhat silent on the requirement of heavy vehicles going through Lue for all other pre-mining construction related activities. Of course, there's an establishment period, Maloneys Road needs to be relocated prior to mining because the road ends up an internal road to the mine.

So, what we'd like considered is that that limit of heavy vehicles actually be imposed for all pre-mining related construction activities and site establishment so that we can minimise the impact on Lue, which is what the condition or what Council's desire was to achieve for the residents of Lue. And also to make sure that there's any conditions

that are imposed ensure that residents maintain access along Maloneys Road, because it does provide access to properties beyond the mine, whilst the establishment is occurring and prior to Maloneys Road being relocated.

5 **MR PEARSON:** Okay. So, just to clarify on that, were you not fully happy with the condition imposed previously on that matter, you wanted it to be more specific about heavy vehicle traffic through Lue?

10 **MR GEDDES:** Yes, that's correct. We've just noticed in the imposing of that condition that it was silent on any limit to the numbers of heavy vehicles that can travel through Lue for pre-mining related establishment.

15 **MR PEARSON:** Okay. Thank you. That was the main issue on traffic, Terry. But I did notice, I think the school had a view that there shouldn't be heavy vehicles during school operation hours through Lue. And again, I don't – that was not supported by the Department, I think, you know, again they were falling back on some level of restriction on heavy vehicle traffic. I guess that would remain Council's preference, not to have heavy vehicle traffic during school hours. But am I putting words in your mouth or is that a Council position as well as the Department of Education view?

20 **MR GEDDES:** Yes. Once again, Julian Geddes just responding. Richard, so that's to do with conflicts of heavy vehicle traffic movements particularly during pick-up and drop-off times. Obviously, the school operates during school hours so you wouldn't need, you wouldn't be able to limit traffic all day, otherwise it would become a fairly difficult task, but certainly during those school bus movements, where there might be any conflict with school buses.

25 **MR PEARSON:** Okay, thank you.

30 **MR BAILEY:** And I'd probably just note that it is open still to provide any views that you might have on that, for consideration, including what conditions that you think might be appropriate for us to give consideration to would look like.

35 **MR PEARSON:** Yes.

MR GEDDES: Thanks, Terry.

40 **MR BAILEY:** I'll just move around a little bit on the agenda. But we also wanted to touch on the water resources component. And again, going back to what you'd spoken to last time and we want to just see how satisfied you are. So, I might just hand across to Bronwyn.

45 **DR BRONWYN EVANS:** Thank you. Bronwyn Evans. I noticed in the submission you made in July 2020 at the time the proposal was for the water pipeline which has since changed, and I just would appreciate your view on the proposed water supply and the way it's being treated in the proposal now, and if you have any concerns or comments on that approach.

MR GEDDES: Hi, Bronwyn, thanks. Julian Geddes responding again. Look, Council's primary concern about water sustainability is that the development needs to be self-sustaining in terms of water. We would like to make sure that the application demonstrates quite strongly that their water sources are sustainable in the long term, that they don't impact the catchment of Lawson Creek, that their groundwater sources are certainly well established and won't impact surrounding bores, those types of issues.

So, one of the key things for Council is that Council doesn't have the capacity to supply the mine with water, and while that's not their proposal for them to draw on Council supply, it needs to be made pretty clear that we don't have that capacity particularly out of that Rylstone catchment. We also need to make it, or we'd like the Commission to consider quite seriously what does happen during extended drought periods that we have experienced before.

So, the submission talks somewhat to the Proponent winding down operations or adjusting operations where water becomes scarce, and we're interested particularly around what those triggers might be and what the Drought Management Plan might be that, you know, says when water gets to X level or becomes scarce in some regard, because when that happens it becomes scarce for us all, how are they planning to manage and what triggers are going to be put in place, whether it's via formal drought management planning or otherwise. So, in terms of the supply issue, that's the comment around that.

Moving on from that, there's other concerns particularly which might come on the agenda around quality and contamination – it was obviously one of the community's and Council's concerns in the previous submission as well. But did you have anymore – did you want to ask anything else about water security particularly?

DR EVANS: I think you've covered that really clearly, just flagging the importance of knowing what's going to happen during the extended drought periods, how will that be assessed, so what's the trigger and therefore the action. I think you've articulated that well, thank you.

MR GEDDES: Yes, thank you. I think it's important just to note, yes, that is one of the community's concerns as well and it's not just – it's the cumulative impact of a lot of large-scale development in our region at the moment, including renewable energy projects that are drawing on water supply from a range of sources, and water sustainability is critical for our valley.

DR EVANS: Thank you.

MR BAILEY: We might just, yes, we might just build on that a little, because the opening statement did touch on some concerns around mine management that you've started to talk to, and then post-mining management as well. And so, I wanted to offer the opportunity to perhaps go into a little bit more detail of the concerns that you might have on those.

MS AZAR: Sorry. Alina Azar speaking. So, I think particularly around the tailings storage facility, that's probably the one we hear the most concern from our community, during production and the opportunities for failure of that. So, obviously reading the material provided and the assessment by the Department, there's a level of a surety to the community through that, and I think through also the process of creating that as a fully operational dam facility gives us some comfort of that. But it's certainly, it's making sure that the right conditions and structures in place that is certainly maintained.

The health of the Lawsons Creek and other downstream systems is one thing we do hear continually from our community of concern. Without being the technical experts, we have to take the assessment of the Commission to validate that the procedures in place are relevant.

MR BAILEY: Thanks. I'm just checking, Bronwyn, Richard, if there are follow-up questions. And I'll come back to the post-mine management as well in just a moment to make sure that we're hearing your concerns on that. But just ...

MR PEARSON: Yes, I mean, just ... I notice, I think in the first round of submissions that water was the biggest issue that was raised by the community. So, are you saying it was largely around the risk of catastrophic failure and the potential water quality impacts of that – is that your kind of understanding about what the main concern is in the community regarding this project in terms of water impacts? Yes, can you just kind of confirm or expand on whether that is the key community concern.

MS AZAR: So, yes, catastrophic failure absolutely is a key one from concern, and if there's impact from the acid mine drainage. But the second one was drought and access to water. We're surrounded by farmers and the number one resource to farmers is water. So, the concerns of bores going dry because too much is being dragged out by this project, that neighbouring bores are impacted, is definitely a concern.

But I note conditions in the previous consent from B41 to B47 seem to talk through those issues and discuss the impacts on landowners' access to owners. So, they're probably the main areas that have been addressed through conditions at this point in time.

MR PEARSON: Thank you.

MR BAILEY: Thank you.

MR GEDDES: Richard, can I just add too, sorry, Julian Geddes here, just to add onto that as well. The flood mitigation is another thing that has come up recently in the community, so around that security of that tailing storage facility, the dam wall, dam management, flood mitigation, overflow capacity, all of those things are being raised quite strongly through community in their desire to make sure that the dam does not have an impact from a contamination point of view downstream, particularly in that Lawson Creek catchment. So, really important that those types of issues and measures are considered, particularly with the ongoing management of that dam.

MR BAILEY: Thanks, Julian. I might just touch, we're also curious to know, we've seen a lot of material in the submissions and a lot of discussion in the community sense around the human health impacts and health concerns. So, I just wanted to open up the opportunity to check in to see if there's anything that you wanted to add or expand on in relation to the human health concerns that are coming through.

MS AZAR: Yes. Thank you for the question. Absolutely remains a concern to members of the community. There is mixed understanding in the community about what the impacts are, the lead levels that exist currently versus what would newly exist in the community.

We worked closely with the Department previously on some of the conditions that were accepted, and particularly in terms of some of the monitoring activities. And the opportunity for community members to be quite involved in that very early stages as well. I think for us it's probably about making sure that those conditions remain, moving forward, that that was probably a key one for us regarding the health monitoring. The blood lead monitoring opportunities for community and the identification of various receptors. I know the school was identified in that.

So, for us it's about making sure those monitoring elements are in place. Without us being the technical experts about what dust levels are appropriate or not, and we're very clear – we take direction from NSW Health and EPA in regards to what are safe levels, but we do want to make sure that those monitoring measures are in place to ensure that they've got it right.

MR BAILEY: Thanks for that. I'm wondering, I think it's following on of whether you've got a clear understanding of what the monitoring arrangement might look like. And when I put it that way, it's the proposed, what was proposed as the monitoring arrangement.

MS AZAR: I'm just going to take it on notice. I'd have to go back to my notes in front of me, sorry, to advice. But it's certainly, I know we had a number of receptors that were identified. We had the blood test monitoring as well, some water monitoring in place. But in terms of the exact detail, I won't be able to find it right now.

MR GEDDES: I think, Terry – Julian Geddes here. One of the things we do know though is that the mine has acquired a number of properties, which is quite sensible. What we would be wanting to make sure though is that that doesn't mitigate or downgrade any of the monitoring obligations around the area just because the mines now own properties.

We want to make sure that any monitoring that's done is really comprehensive and robust right around that facility to help mitigate the community's concerns and also ensure independent monitoring and compliance, that's what's going to be really important in the future and build confidence, if the development is approved, in the community, that those concerns are being actively monitored into the future.

MR PEARSON: Thanks. Thanks for that, Julian. I think the other area we just wanted to touch across, and I'll hand across to Richard, was picking up a little bit, it flows

from your comments on the social economic impacts, but also the cost piece to Council and where you're at and your level of comfort with the Voluntary Planning Agreement that's in place.

5 **MS AZAR:** Yes. So, it's Alina speaking. I might just take that in two parts. So, the Social Impact Plan, we were happy to see the Department had acknowledged that things have moved on prior to or since the last conditions of consent. We are seeing significant cumulative impacts from construction workforces and unfortunately it, this project, it would appear the timings will seem to coincide with the absolute peak of the
10 renewable energy workforce. We're looking at 5,000 to 6,000 construction workers in our region around that '29/'30 period. So, this will be another 300 on top, which has a significant impact.

15 We have recommended amendments to the conditions that go a little bit further to than what the Department has recommended in regards to this. So, because we work very closely with the Department in regards to the renewable energy zone proponents, we've worked with them to tighten up conditions around local workforce and accommodation, and I'd like to see that brought across to this project. Particularly in regards to having a very clear accommodation strategy. It's noted at quite low level,
20 we need that to be very clear and upfront before construction.

We are currently struggling with tourism accommodation because of construction workers that are using it, and it is impacting our tourism industry. We are struggling with rental accommodation at the moment, with incredibly low rental vacancies. For
25 example, as of today, we would not be able to take this construction workforce in our town, we only have 60 houses available across the entire region at this point in time.

30 So, I'm very happy to forward, I guess, in correspondence of a recommended condition that we'd like to see included that just makes it a little bit clearer about the Proponent finding sufficient accommodation that is appropriate for the construction workforce that does not impact our tourism industry, doesn't take away housing for our key workers such as teachers and nurses and people like that. So, certainly a big impact and a big change, the social impact side.

35 The second –

MR BAILEY: We'd certainly welcome any material that you wanted to put in front of us to consider that and to look at that.

40 **MS AZAR:** That would be great. So, I will take a condition that has been put on other SSD proponents in the region so that it's consistent as well. So, I think that's a fair and reasonable approach.

MR BAILEY: Happy to receive that and look at it.

45 **MS AZAR:** Yes, that'd be great. From the VPA impact, just to, I guess, over discuss that. Firstly, obviously it was signed a number of years ago and agreed between Council and the Proponent. There is a change to the capital cost to the project that isn't currently reflected in the VPA. So, we will be engaging in conversations with

Bowdens. But further to that also they've made land acquisitions that are identified, so we need to review that VPA as it is.

In principle, the terms we were happy with. The way in which we've worked with Bowdens to ensure there's money to help cover the roads and the impacts on roads, but also then community as well. But certainly, we'll be talking to them about the change in the investment construction costs that have changed significantly since the signing of the agreement.

MR PEARSON: So, Alina, just on that, are you ... So, I think it's currently \$3 million community infrastructure funding under the VPA. What are you – can you quantify the difference that you're perhaps seeking in terms of capital value?

MS AZAR: Yes, I can. So, essentially, we were working off a 1% of the ICC, so the ICC was 246 million back then, it's now 455 million, so it's changed. But it means the community infrastructure in theory would move from \$3 million to \$5 million, is what we'd like to talk to them about. And existing road maintenance at this point in time would stay the same, however, we need to review the costs of road maintenance at this point in time versus a number of years ago as well. So, it's certainly where we're looking to talk to them further.

We haven't had these conversations earlier without knowing where this project was going to go, particularly after the last consent was voided. So, we've sort of sat on that for now.

MR PEARSON: Yes. So, the VPA, the previous or I guess the current VPA was executed with Council, but you are – is that correct – but you're seeking to renegotiate that with the Applicant, or you will be.

MS AZAR: We will attempt to renegotiate that, yes.

MR PEARSON: Okay. Thank you. Just on the accommodation side where ... Realistically, what are the options other than motels and short-stay accommodation? Are you saying that perhaps they should be looking at some purpose-built accommodation for their workforce for this project?

MS AZAR: That's correct. So, with all proponents for renewable projects now, they are required to build a camp or build their own structured accommodation. We cannot house the construction workers that are coming into the region. So, yes, we are in discussions with Bowdens for them to build a construction camp, not long-term workforce housing, but the construction workforce, we are. And it's certainly something that we would like.

I know at this point in time I can't write that as a condition, but I certainly hope that we can put something in there that protects the town and short-stay accommodation away from construction workers.

MR PEARSON: Okay, thanks for that clarification.

MR BAILEY: Thanks, thanks, Alina. I think I just want to check in with the other commissioners. We've covered many of the areas, I just want to check in to see if there's any other areas that they particularly wanted to cover today.

5 **DR EVANS:** Thanks, Terry, if I may. Bronwyn Evans here. I notice in the submission that you made earlier, you raised concerns about noise and air quality. In the noise area, you were – mostly it was around traffic but not exclusively. Are there any changes in the way you're thinking about, or your concerns about noise, has that changed at all?

10 **MR GEDDES:** Do you want to go?

15 **MS AZAR:** Sure. At this point in time, no, acknowledging the Proponent has purchased the two next closest properties, so of those impacted. And I do note in the conditions again currently, there's different noise levels allowed if it's a company owned or a proponent owned property versus not. So, no, we don't have a change in position at this point in time.

20 **DR EVANS:** Thanks, Alina. Thank you.

25 **MR PEARSON:** The only other one I'd pick up, Terry, is the agricultural impact of the project. Is Council's concern around that to do with the loss of that mining land to agriculture, or is it the downstream – and I'm using that word broadly – impacts of mining that is of concern in an agricultural sense?

30 **MS AZAR:** To be honest, both of those are at play at the moment. And again, because of the cumulative impacts of the renewable energy zone and the amount of agricultural land that is now going under solar or wind or transmission. From that, we are cognisant of risk of reduction in agricultural land, so that is something across the entire region that we are conscious of. However, in regards to our submissions previously, it has been much more focused on downstream impacts, either loss of water or contamination of water, and then the impacts on the agricultural sector in that respect.

35 I do believe there is also community concerns of dust and impacts on grapes and/or other agricultural pursuits. I believe that has been raised by community groups. As well as a concern that we need to be conscious of and ensure that there's relevant mitigating activities to protect those agricultural activities.

40 **MR PEARSON:** Thank you. Thanks, Alina.

MR BAILEY: Thanks, Alina. I did want to check to see if there's anything else that Council would like to make us aware of at this stage.

45 **MS AZAR:** I'm happy to go first. Just more though, and I'm more than happy to put this in a further information letter to you, in terms of the conditions that were proposed in the previous approval. As I mentioned, we are generally supportive of those conditions. There are a few though where Council isn't clearly identified as a stakeholder or noted to be notified or consulted. So, I'd like to ensure that is addressed a little bit more clearly, moving forward.

Again, we are going through so much state significant development at the moment with proponents, and every time a new project is approved or starts commencing, unless something is clearly articulated in the conditions, we find it very difficult to get appropriate information or be notified of appropriate activities. So, there's a number of conditions in the previous consent where I've just added words "to notify Council", it might be to notify the Planning Secretary, for example.

But the reason Council needs to be made aware of certain activities is for the community we are, in their eyes, the people to speak to about concerns, particularly with state significant development. Our community don't necessarily know to go to the Planning Secretary or to the Department about projects, they automatically come to Council. So, if we can just add ourselves on there as some party that needs to be notified of things, whether it's a lack of compliance, it's too many trucks, a change to construction hours, all those things in the current conditions that they have to notify the Planning Secretary, I would like it to be very clear they also need to notify Council. Because it can take up to hours to days of our time when we have to start investigating issues that are raised with us, that we may already be aware of.

And then, yes, the final condition I mentioned that I'll send through will be in regards to the accommodation and workforce. And one further is there seems to be no condition in regards to a Waste Management Plan. We believe that is very important, again, a lesson from the renewables, we do need a Waste Management Plan that we have been consulted and part of, to be done before construction commences as well, so we don't end up with our waste facilities full before we prepare for them to be.

That's it from me.

MR BAILEY: Thanks, Alina. I might just jump in there just at this stage just to do, sorry, the follow up that we talked a little earlier about, was the post-mine management, I think you raised in the opening statement. So, just to clarify any concerns that you might have on post-mine management.

MS AZAR: So, the key concerns that have been raised with us to date in post-mine management is the enforcement of rehabilitation. So, ensuring that there is clear clauses to enforce the rehabilitation, firstly. The second part of that also in post mining is the dam and how the dam will be treated once the mine closes, yes, the tailings dam. So, they were probably the two key issues that have been post mining addressed to us.

MR BAILEY: Thanks, Alina. Any other general statements that you wanted to pass through for consideration?

MR NEEVES: No, nothing, thanks.

MR BAILEY: Okay, thanks. I just wanted to thank, on behalf of the Panel, thank everyone for your time. And we welcome the comments that you've made and we'd certainly welcome your comments in writing on any of those additional matters that we've talked through.

As we mentioned earlier, the transcript from today will be published and made available. We'll also check through the transcript and write if there are questions on notice, so that it's clear on what they are and the follow-up timing for those to be covered off. And we'd deeply appreciate (a) your time but also appreciate that any of those written materials, if you can start to look at doing those sooner rather than later, that'd be valued by the Panel to inform our consideration.

And other than that, again, thank you very much for your time and input.

MR GEDDES: Thanks, Terry.

MR NEEVES: Thanks, Terry. And I understand – it's David here again – I understand that you'll be looking at doing a tour or someone from the IPC will be looking at doing a tour of the mine when you're out in Mudgee. And [cross-talk 00:38:26].

MR BAILEY: We will be doing a site inspection, a standard part of the program, that we will do a site inspection at about the same time or the day before the public hearing's conducted at Mudgee.

MR NEEVES: Yes. So, the Mayor and I are both unfamiliar with the site at this point, given that we're relatively new to our roles. So, we would like to accept the offer to participate in the tour if it's available.

MR BAILEY: We'll come back on that. There's probably two parts. We'll just have to look at how that day is planned out in the first instance, if it's possible we'll work to make it happen. If it's not possible between us, I think we'd certainly give the Applicant a heads up that they should be making the offer to you as well.

MR NEEVES: Okay. Wonderful, thank you.

DR EVANS: Thanks very much.

[Multiple people say thank you etc.]

MS AZAR: Thank you. Bye.

>THE MEETING CONCLUDED