



AUSCRIPT AUSTRALASIA PTY LIMITED

ACN 110 028 825

T: 1800 AUSCRIPT (1800 287 274)

E: clientservices@auscript.com.au

W: www.auscript.com.au

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

TRANSCRIPT IN CONFIDENCE

O/N H-1021578

INDEPENDENT PLANNING COMMISSION

MEETING WITH APPLICANT

RE: ORANGE GROVE SOLAR FARM

PANEL: **CHRIS WILSON**
ANNELISE TUOR
ANDREW HUTTON

ASSISTING PANEL: **DENNIS LEE**
BRAD JAMES

PROponents: **JASON GIBSON**
BRETT THOMAS
JOHN ZAMMIT

LOCATION: **IPC OFFICES**
LEVEL 3, 201 ELIZABETH STREET
SYDNEY, NEW SOUTH WALES

DATE: **9.36 AM, FRIDAY, 3 MAY 2019**

MR C. WILSON: Good morning and welcome. Before we begin, I would like to acknowledge the traditional owners of the land on which we meet, the Gadigal People. I would also like to pay my respects to their elders, past and present, and to the elders from other communities who may be here today. Welcome to the meeting
5 today. Orange Grove Sun Farm Proprietary Limited, the applicant, is seeking approval for development of a new 110 megawatt solar farm, approximately 12 kilometres northeast of Gunnedah Local Government area.

10 My name is Chris Wilson. I'm the chair of this IPC panel. Joining me are my fellow commissioners, Annelise Tuor and Andrew Hutton. The other attendees of the meeting are Brad James and Dennis Lee from the Commission Secretariat. In the interests of openness and transparency and to ensure the full capture of information, today's meeting is being recorded and a full transcript will be produced and made available on our website.

15 This meeting is one part of the commission's decision-making process. It is taking place at the preliminary stage of this process and will form one of several sources of information upon which the commission will base its decision. It is important for the commissioners to ask questions of attendees and to clarify issues whenever they
20 consider it appropriate. If you are 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 will then be put on our website.

25 I request that all members 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. I think for the public record if we could just introduce ourselves. Yes.

30 MR J. GIBSON: My name is Jason Gibson. I work for Overland Sun Farming. I'm a senior development manager.

MR B. THOMAS: My name is Brett Thomas. I'm the managing director and CEO of Overland Sun Farming.

35 MR J. ZAMMIT: And John Zammit, I'm a senior development manager at Overland Sun Farming.

MR A. HUTTON: Andrew Hutton, a part of the commission's panel.

40 MR WILSON: Chris Wilson, Commissioner.

MS A. TUOR: Annelise Tuor, for the panel.

45 MR B. JAMES: Brad James, from the Secretariat.

MR D. LEE: Dennis Lee, from the Secretariat.

MR WILSON: Thank you. I guess now we will throw out to you, just to give us a brief overview or an overview of what you think is appropriate for – of the project.

MR GIBSON: Of course.

5

MR THOMAS: Yes. Thank you. Thank you very much. And thanks for the opportunity to present to the commission and for considering the project. A little bit of background about Overland, just so that you understand, I guess, where we're coming from and our background. And then specifically we will go into the presentation on the project. So Overland Sun Farming is an Australian owned and operated renewable energy development company that specialises in the development of lifestyle solar power projects. The people in the business have been working in the Australian renewal industry developing renewable projects since the mid-2000s and have developed both large-scale wind and now large-scale solar projects.

The list of projects up there represents projects that are either in a very advanced stage or in fact are built or under construction. So just to give you some background on our experience and the breadth of the work we do, we've completed two projects in Queensland with Hughenden being constructed and Middlemount under construction. Our projects in New South Wales, being Hay, Orange Grove, Hillston and Lindendale, Lindendale is currently under construction and the others are either about to commence construction or obviously going through the planning process with yourselves. And in Victoria we've completed the development of all of those four projects, Karadoc, Wemen, Yatpool and Glenrowan. And Karadoc and Wemen solar farms have been built and Yatpool solar farm is currently in build, with Glenrowan moving towards construction by the end of this year.

The reason that I think that that's relevant background is so that we can give you an understanding of our experience not just in the development and planning of projects, but of actually getting projects through the full cycle to financing build, own and operate, so that we have a broader understanding of the requirements of planning as they take a project into the operation or construction phase and the completion of management plans and the implementation of management plans around the planning consent conditions. So I might, with that introduction – will you just ask questions as you wish to?

MR WILSON: Yes. I think that's appropriate, if you're okay with that. Yes.

MR THOMAS: Okay. Yes.

MR HUTTON: Can I ask one question now?

MR THOMAS: Sure.

45

MR HUTTON: Why the eastern states?

MR THOMAS: The west is a long way away.

MR HUTTON: Yes. Yes. No. No. I presumed it was something like that.

5 MR THOMAS: And South Australia has some good projects in it. We've just tended to focus on the eastern states because of the overall grid resource energy market mechanisms.

10 MR HUTTON: And you operating all of the farms that you've brought up through commission?

MR THOMAS: No, we're not. No. We develop the projects through and then we bring our investment partners in, who build them out. The operating ones at the moment are Wemen, Karadoc is in operation and Hughenden is in operation. So
15 we're not operating them. Obviously, we have an interface role in that, but we're not on site.

MR HUTTON: Sure. Yes.

20 MR THOMAS: Okay. I will hand over to Jason, then, to go through the specifics of the project.

MR GIBSON: And I see a bunch of maps on the table, so if there's anything that's redundant in here – we just weren't sure what level of information you folks would
25 already have. So the project we're here to discuss today is the Orange Grove Sun Farm. The project is generally located 12 kilometres east of Gunnedah in the Gunnedah Shire Local Council. The project area is – sorry, the project site that we have an agreement for is 817 hectares in size. The project site area is relatively flat, sloping east to west in the south-west corner. Specifically for the site, our
30 development footprint out of the 817 hectares is consuming 248 hectares in size. That's the hashed mark that's currently up there on the screen on the right-hand side.

The blue line that traverses across is the TransGrid 132 KV line that we're looking to interconnect with. And the red hashed mark in the bottom left-hand corner is the
35 Gunnedah terminal substation that ultimately our power will be going into. The land is generally zoned as RU1 and its use in this area is typically for grazing and for cropping. The predominant feature is the Namoi River, which flows across about two kilometres south of our development river. And that's the curving line across the bottom of the screen.

40

MR HUTTON: I understand the study site is made up of two separate properties.

MR GIBSON: Yes.

45 MR HUTTON: Can you just walk us through that?

MR GIBSON: Yes. So the properties are – sorry if the animation is going to get a little messy here. So we have two landowners involved in this project right now. There's the southern land owner, which is the chunk of the land that is south of the transmission line and the majority of the square block. That is one land owner.

5

MR HUTTON: Okay.

MR THOMAS: Excuse me. Is there a laser or something we can use as a pointer?

10 MR GIBSON: Here. If you guys don't – if the mic is going to pick me up, I can stand up closer.

MR HUTTON: So that's the development footprint, yes.

15 MR GIBSON: Yes.

MS TUOR: Maybe you should go back to the - - -

MR HUTTON: Can we go back to the - - -

20

MS TUOR: 800 site.

MR HUTTON: - - - site.

25 MR THOMAS: I can point to the place and you talk.

MR HUTTON: Yes. Okay.

30 MR WILSON: Yes. So that's the – okay. So you don't have one for – that's the full - - -

MS TUOR: No.

35 MR WILSON: No. That's just – again, that's the footprint, is it?

MR GIBSON: So the maps that you have in front of you here right now - - -

MR WILSON: They have it on it?

40 MR GIBSON: - - - the purple outline – and it's on some other maps that are going to come up. So the purple outline on the image that you have right here is the land that we have access to. That's land inside our contract. And that is the site.

MR WILSON: For the transcript, that's figure number 2, project layout.

45

MR GIBSON: Yes.

MR THOMAS: So on that figure number 2, you should see – and just to answer your question – landowner 1 holding that land.

MR WILSON: Yes.

5

MR THOMAS: And landowner 2 holding that land.

MR WILSON: Okay. Thank you.

10 MR HUTTON: I've got you. Okay.

MR WILSON: Yes. Yes.

MR HUTTON: Sorry. Please continue

15

MR GIBSON: Yes.

MS TUOR: And that one is 2.

20 MR THOMAS: That's right.

MR GIBSON: Just some general reasons why we've chosen this particular portion of the land and area as the site. The site location generally to develop a project is going to require minimal vegetation removal. There's minimum biodiversity impact. We have immediate access to the electrical grid, with the TransGrid 132 KV running directly through our site. The location of the project has a generally high solar yield. We felt that the project has a minimum visual impact in the local area. There's minimal heritage impact, from our assessments. We have good access to major transportation routes. And the landowners that we have agreements with, it's compatible with their land use and future planning for their farming activities.

25

30

MR THOMAS: Just can I add just one point to that, particularly whilst you have those maps in front of you: you will see as we go through the presentation that we've sought to optimise the project from the point of view of the community, environmental, etcetera. One of the things that we did seek to avoid was to absolutely minimise the amount of biodiversity impact. And a lot of this land down here particularly, when we did the initial studies on it, had a high biodiversity value, because it can't been grazed for a long time, so there were native grasses, so we avoided all of this land here on the basis of minimising biodiversity impact.

35

40

MR WILSON: Yes.

MR GIBSON: That's the darker green portion – that's the map there.

45 MS TUOR: So that's the logic of actually not moving it away from R1.

MR THOMAS: That's right.

MS TUOR: Because if you did that to get your yield, you would have to push it into
- - -

5 MR THOMAS: Yes. Native grasses, yes. Yes. That's correct. And simply to the
south for the same reason, that you're moving the significant vegetation.

MS TUOR: So which is the south there, which one of those is – the PCT one or do
you know what – I find it hard to read the key.

10 MR GIBSON: Yes. I will come back with an answer on that one.

MS TUOR: Yes. Yes.

15 MR GIBSON: The biodiversity assessment does cover that, but I can't tell you off
the top of my head which

MS TUOR: And I don't know if we're meant to be asking questions now, but just
on that, if these are the areas that are farmed – grazed – at the moment, does the –
20 putting the solar panels on those mean that the grazing then goes into these – is
displaced, essentially – into these other areas of biodiversity?

MR THOMAS: No, because the landowners have broader landholdings. So this is
not their only land in the general region, and they will continue to do their grazing on
25 other land areas.

MR WILSON: So they will continue to graze under normal circumstances, without
over - - -

30 MR THOMAS: Yes.

MR WILSON: Overgrazing.

MR THOMAS: That's correct, yes.

35 MR WILSON: Yes.

MR GIBSON: They have landholdings adjacent to what's in the contract. This is
just some general photos of the site. To our understanding, we have a site visit, or
40 site tour, booked at about the beginning of June.

MR WILSON: Yes.

MR GIBSON: So we'll definitely see more, but this is generally the characteristics
of the development footprint, both for the paddocks that are being looked at, used –
45 have historically been used for cropping, more specifically stock

MR HUTTON: It's all typically dry-land cropping; there's no irrigation cropping?

MR GIBSON: There – there is some historical irrigation on the southern portion of the project area, but it hasn't been used by that landowner in many, many years. But there is some drainage around that site.

5 MR HUTTON: Okay. Which is under the footprint of the panels?

MR GIBSON: The panels will be contained in that area.

MR HUTTON: Yes, okay.

10

MR GIBSON: Yes.

MR HUTTON: Yes. Thank you.

15 MR GIBSON: Yes. Just to give you a general context, so this is the project timeline, or how the project has kind of proceeded. We started to – Overland started looking at the Orange Grove Sun Farm back in early 2016, where we started doing some desktop studies. Mid-2016 we had gone out and started engaging with
20 landowners to have discussions about land use. We ultimately had signed up some land under contract, so that we knew that we had some land to work with. So we started progressing, in early 2017, with some field studies. Mid-2017, based on the field studies, we went out and made a second round of landowner engagement.

We further developed the project and, in November 2017, we submitted our SEARs
25 request. December 2017 our SEARs response was received. In response to those, we did some site studies to further refine the project. And in May of 2018 we submitted our EIS to DP&E. In July 2018 we received our response to the EIS, and then, from July until November 2018, we did a bunch of revisions to the project, based on the public response and the response of local government agencies. In
30 November 2018 we submitted our RtS to the EIS, and then, in April 2019, DP&E issued the development consent recommendation to IPC. And now we're in May, meeting with you.

35 MR THOMAS: Can I just make one point, just going back to the question earlier, for your clarity. The Overland group owns the Orange Grove Sun Farm Proprietary Limited entity. So the structure of our projects is that each project sits within a purpose vehicle itself, and the reason for that is that that vehicle then holds all the contracts and rights and obligations, etcetera. So the Overland group owns Overland Sun Farm – Orange Grove Sun Farm Proprietary Limited, and therefore Overland
40 Sun Farming, as our development name, which is part of the same group, completes all the development work. So we're not a – I'm only saying that to clarify – we're not a third-party developer for a project owned by somebody else; it's a project owned through the Overland group and developed by the Overland group.

45 MR HUTTON: Just before you moved to this next slide - - -

MR GIBSON: Yes, yes, of course.

MR HUTTON: - - - and looking at that timeline - - -

MR GIBSON: Yes.

5 MR HUTTON: - - - can you explain, through that timeline, where you did engagement with community other than the landowners? Was there any points where you had engagement with the community, and could you point out where that fits in the timeframe?

10 MR GIBSON: We do have - - -

MR THOMAS: We have a - - -

MR GIBSON: We have - - -

15

MR HUTTON: A slide? Okay.

MR GIBSON: Yes – we have a consultation timeline and log - - -

20 MR HUTTON: Okay.

MR GIBSON: - - - that we can provide.

MR HUTTON: That'd be great.

25

MR GIBSON: Yes, we'll find - - -

MR HUTTON: Thank you.

30 MR GIBSON: Yes.

MR HUTTON: And the SEARs required you to undertake community consultation and address the issues raised - - -

35 MR GIBSON: Yes.

MR HUTTON: - - - in the EIS – yes. I haven't - - -

MR GIBSON: Yes.

40

MR HUTTON: Sorry; I haven't read the EIS yet.

MR GIBSON: Yes, the – I believe, in the EIS, there is – it's either in the EIS or the RtS that there is part of that consultation log.

45

MR HUTTON: Okay.

MR GIBSON: It is in there, and it - - -

MR HUTTON: Thank you. Right.

5 MR GIBSON: - - - explains the community contact efforts with local neighbours,
all the meetings that we had – telephone calls; emails. So our EIS was publicly
exhibited by DP&E. Public exhibition started on 6 June 2018 and ran until 5 July
2018. The total submissions received were 86. We had nine comments from
10 government agencies, including Gunnedah Shire Council, who supported the project.

At public exhibition, we had 76 comments received: 66 objected to the project; 10
supported; one passed general comment. Of those sixty – of the 76, 53 of those
submissions were from the community members residing more than 50 kilometres
from the project area. And we had one special interest group, which is the Namoi
15 Pistol Club – they passed some comments around the project as well.

The comments that were received – DP&E identified two major topics out of the
comments: there was flooding and land use. And the other topics that were brought
to our attention was amenity, biodiversity, water and soil, and consultation efforts.
20 This is a table that shows the breakdown of where the comments were received. This
is from the DP&E report, which I think you have in your – in front of you.

MR THOMAS: Just – sorry – just to go back to that – that presentation – so that –
can you go back?
25

MR GIBSON: Yes.

MR WILSON: Can you leave a copy of this with us?

30 MR THOMAS: Yes.

MR WILSON: Thank you.

MR THOMAS: Yes, for sure. Yes.
35

MR GIBSON: So – I have copies for you - - -

MR HUTTON: We'd like it electronically, if you wouldn't mind, too - - -

40 MR GIBSON: I – I will provide electronic - - -

MR THOMAS: Yes.

MR WILSON: Thank you.

45 MR GIBSON: Sorry if I - - -

MR HUTTON: No, that's all right.

MR GIBSON: I apologise. I printed - - -

5 MR HUTTON: Thank you.

MR GIBSON: I printed copies out for each of you.

MR WILSON: I think we've only got - - -

10 MR GIBSON: There's only - - -

MR WILSON: - - - four, Dennis, so if you can - - -

15 MR GIBSON: Yes.

MR WILSON: - - - perhaps share with Brad, that would be great. Thank you.

MR GIBSON: Sorry. I apologise about that. I think we're about five slides up.

20 MR THOMAS: So that – this is from the – as Jason said – from the DPE assessment report, just giving the breakdown of overall public submissions, so both those that were an objection and those that were support. And we felt that that was very important, to look at the distribution of those around the less than five, less than
25 10 kilometres from the project, and those that are greater than 10, and particularly greater than 50, kilometres from the project. So that – you know, people that were greater than 50 kilometres, or in fact were interstate, such as Queensland, or Western Australia, or Tasmania – submissions – would more than likely not have participated in the local community assessment program.

30 The comments that are received are slightly – the location of the comments received are slightly redacted from DP&E, so the numbers that are up on the screen on this map right now kind of depict the general area of where the – where all comments were received. And then, more locally, this is the submissions that are within
35 approximately 12 kilometres of our project area, with Gunnedah on the western side, and then our project area kind of in the centre.

So, based on the public comments, and the government agency comments, that were supplied to us during that timeframe on the – that you saw on our timeline, we made
40 a series of revisions to the project, to try to resolve and accommodate some of the issues that were brought up. The layout that's on the left-hand side – this is 2008 – that is the layout that is submitted with – that was submitted with the EIS.

45 MR THOMAS: The original EIS submission.

MR GIBSON: Yes. Yes. Between the 2018 EIS and then the DP&E approved layout, that's when the public consultation had occurred, and that's when we

received the comments. We've subsequently made the revisions to the development footprint in between those two pictures. So the 2019 DP&E approved layout, that is, the layout that DP&E had reviewed and developed the report they have in front of you around. And then, on – further on the right-hand side, that is indicative of the layout – our PV layout – of the project. So that's where we're – in that layout pattern, that's where we're proposing panels, inverters, and roads, and our substation.

MR THOMAS: The only thing that layout on the right-hand side doesn't show is that the connection line – the existing 132 kilovolt line goes through that gap between the northern and - - -

MR WILSON: Yes.

MR THOMAS: - - - southern part.

MR WILSON: So the - - -

MR THOMAS: And the substation is located on site, with general laydown and operational maintenance facilities. So another key criteria of selecting this site was, we didn't need – it was selected so that we had a short connection line, which is not only, you know, economic from the point of view of project development, but it also means we're not running a line through vegetation, through other properties, you know, whatever visual impact might be associated with constructing a line. So we've got a couple of hundred metres to connect from the substation to the line.

MR WILSON: The size between the two – the original and your revised – in terms of hectares – is it - - -

MR GIBSON: Yes – yes, so the project has decreased in size.

MR WILSON: Okay.

MR GIBSON: I got it – I think it's in two slides from now – it shows that. We've gone down by approximately five hectares in area – in total consumed area, in the development footprint. So the next series of slides is just going to highlight the revisions between

MR WILSON: Sure.

MR GIBSON: - - - the EIS and the RtS layouts.

MR WILSON: Excellent. Thank you.

MR GIBSON: So one of the major revisions that was – sorry – one of the topics that was brought up was the first-order stream, or the potential first-order stream. That was laid out within the development footprint, in the original one. There were some concerns about that breakout channel being activated in a one in 100 year

flood. We performed an additional assessment, specifically of the breakout channel, as we were requested. And based on the findings of those, we elected to remove all infrastructure out of the first-order stream, just to avoid any potential impacts if that channel did occur to become a breakout in the future.

5

MR HUTTON: So the direction of flow of that breakout is from - - -

MR GIBSON: It's - - -

10 MR HUTTON: - - - bottom right to top left?

MR GIBSON: Yes.

MR THOMAS: That's correct.

15

MR GIBSON: Yes, south-east to north-west.

MR THOMAS: It's actually – just to mention – it's – that's actually going uphill.

20 MR HUTTON: Yes.

MR THOMAS: And also those contours you're seeing there are 100-millimetre contours.

25 MR HUTTON: Yes.

MR THOMAS: So when you saw the photo of the site before – it is a very flat site. And that swale that shows there, with the 100-millimetre falls, is not an easy swale to see; there's no obvious, you know, waterway through the site, or anything like that. But we were very conscious understanding the regional concerns around flooding, and we selected this site to be out of any flood plain impact, but we wanted to ensure that there was no impact of the project on even possible one in 100 year breakouts in low channel – low depression areas like that.

30

35 MR GIBSON: Now, this is getting back to your question. So the revised development footprint decreases the total area required by five hectares. The project area on the north side of Orange Grove Road has been decreased by approximately 41 hectares in size, and the area on the south side of Orange Grove Road has subsequently been increased by 36 hectares.

40

When we've done the realignment of the development footprint, it's enabled us to retain a – retain approximately 18 additional trees in and around the project. So on the north side, we've – you can see by the graph – there's been a number of trees that have been retained; those aren't required to be removed or displaced any longer.

45 And on the south side, there are three, possibly four, trees that may have to get removed.

MR THOMAS: And also, what retaining those trees on the north-eastern side does is, it maintains the existing vegetation screening from the residence – one? Two? Two?

5 MR ZAMMIT: Two, yes.

MR THOMAS: Which is across, who are – and Jason will come to this in a minute – but are some 1.3 kilometres away. It maintains those existing vegetation, so it had a dual benefit.

10

MR HUTTON: I'm assuming that the gap between the two zones is driven by the setback from the transmission lines.

MR THOMAS: That's right.

15

MR HUTTON: Yes.

MR THOMAS: Yes.

20 MR GIBSON: Yes, there's a pretty wide easement.

MR THOMAS: Sixty-metre easement or something.

MR HUTTON: Okay.

25

MR THOMAS: Yes. And then it's not – it's not practical, then, to put in a 10-metre row of panels next to the road, between the easement and the road, so - - -

MR HUTTON: Yes, I understand that.

30

MR GIBSON: In the original development footprint, for the EIS submission, the vegetation integrity score was less than 15, under the new Bayer methodology. Because we're now removing less vegetation, it's decreased even further, but it still falls under that classification of sub-15. The next series of maps all – there is a number of – sorry – slides that pertain to the three receptors that you see on the screen, so R1, R2 and the Namoi Pistol Club. So we just wanted you to have a general understanding of where those receptors currently sit.

35

R1 is on the western side of the site, located about 200 metres away from the revised development footprint. R2 is located to the north-east side, approximately 1.3 kilometres from the revised development footprint. And the Namoi Pistol Club is further way up and just kind of behind a little bit of a knoll, set into the hill at 1.8 kilometres. The Namoi Pistol Club – and I don't know if it shows up on some of the maps, they actually have two locations. They have the 900 metre range, which is flagged, and then further to the east they have – yes, they have their smaller pistol range as well.

45

MR HUTTON: I understand R5 is a project resident.

MR GIBSON: Yes. Sorry. Yes. R5 is a project-related So this is R1, located on the – receptor R1, located on the western side of the development footprint.

5 Under the old development footprint from the receptor to the possible nearest point of project-related infrastructure, the distance was approximately 150 metres. With the revised development footprint, we have included a 50 metre setback from the property line, so that now it increases the distance between receptor R1 and the nearest point of development-related infrastructure to approximately 200 metres.
10 This is a photo from the southwest corner, right against Orange Grove Road, looking north towards – or up that western property line of the development property. The house R1 is located on the left-hand side with the label. In this area that you currently see right now, this will be generally where the 50 metre setback is going to occur. And then we've also proposed some vegetative screening to run - - -

15

MR WILSON: And that's the access road for R1?

MR GIBSON: That is the driveway for R1. Yes. We will also be including some vegetative screening, which is on the next slide in this area as well. So in that 50
20 metre gap we have proposed to include vegetative screen down the entire length of that spacing. So all the views from R1 and the project infrastructure should be obscured. Specifically for R1 as well, in the consultation that we've performed with them, there were some concerns that were brought up about the impact of having project-related infrastructure in close proximity to their fence line. I think there were
25 some concerns about their cattle or grazing efforts being impacted by having infrastructure that close.

So we've also implemented a 20 metre setback from every other property that's in common with her land. So hopefully that's far enough back. Moving to R2, under
30 the old development footprint, their house was located about 750 metres to the north east of the project. Under the revised development footprint, we have increased that distance to 1.3 kilometres to the nearest point of our infrastructure. That's at that tip that's there. If you go up to the northwest corner, it's obviously much further away, but we've tried to setback. And as Brett talked about in the past, with us revising the
35 development footprint, those 18 additional trees have now been left kind of in between the two.

This is a photo from part of our consultation efforts that we had with R2. This is taken from their veranda, outside their house, looking towards the development
40 footprint. This picture is used in the VIA, where it shows a visual sim of the old development footprint and this view specifically. There was a couple of trees that were in the centre that were removed, because they would have been cut down under the previous plan. Those trees have now been retained, because of the realignment of the development.

45

MR THOMAS: So those trees in the far distant that you can see are part of the trees that are retained within that area.

MR GIBSON: Yes.

MR THOMAS: And the solar farm is well behind those.

5 MR WILSON: Can I just ask a question on that.

MR GIBSON: Yes.

10 MR WILSON: That white line doesn't represent the height of it?

MR GIBSON: No. The panels individual and in the VIA under the old development footprint, if you look really closely on the picture, but there is – you can see there is a blue line that does appear. It's about a millimetre tall.

15 MR WILSON: But it must be under the tree line. It must be well under the tree line.

MR THOMAS: It is well under the tree line.

20 MR GIBSON: Yes.

MR ZAMMIT: They are visualised at three metres high.

25 MR WILSON: Okay.

MR HUTTON: I was going to ask, actually, for the site inspection, do we have, like, a structure that shows – like, just some timber structure that shows the height of the panels, so we can see it in the paddock?

30 MR THOMAS: Yes.

MR HUTTON: Do you understand what I mean? So - - -

35 MR THOMAS: Do you mean to physically put a timber - - -

MR HUTTON: Like a - - -

MR THOMAS: A mock-up?

40 MR HUTTON: Yes. Two poles and a crossbeam to show the height - - -

MR GIBSON: Of what the panel might be.

45 MR HUTTON: - - - and perhaps the width of the poles on the panel itself.

MR GIBSON: Okay.

MR HUTTON: Just to assist us with understanding scale.

MS TUOR: Just as a reference point, so when we're looking at the site we can go "okay".

5

MR HUTTON: If that's possible.

MR GIBSON: Yes.

10 MS TUOR: Because the two of us were on the Gunnedah project and I think we used a tractor in that one.

MR GIBSON: Yes, a tractor.

15 MR HUTTON: Yes, or a shed, but it would be nice to actually have something as a reference.

MR GIBSON: Yes. Yes. And do you want that one extent of the property lines or do you want it kind of at the centre? Like, where would you like that positioned?

20

MR HUTTON: What's convenient with the landowner is fine.

MR GIBSON: I mean, we've - - -

25 MR HUTTON: And accessible for the site expansion.

MR GIBSON: Okay. And is the idea for you to see it from a distance or is it the idea to see it up close?

30 MR HUTTON: Both.

MR GIBSON: Both. Yes.

35 MS TUOR: And I suppose the main thing is, in terms of the visual impact from R1, I suppose.

MR HUTTON: Yes. So maybe if we could have it on that side.

40 MR GIBSON: That side, yes. Okay. I just want to make sure I'm putting it in the proper spot for you.

MR THOMAS: We should have the vegetation screening as well.

MS TUOR: Yes.

45

MR HUTTON: Yes. I understand that, yes.

MR GIBSON: Okay.

MR HUTTON: Sorry.

5 MR GIBSON: No. No. No.

MR HUTTON: Just while I thought about it.

10 MR GIBSON: So under the old development footprint – sorry, let me go back. Similar to the consultation efforts with R1, where the landowner has concerns about their cattle grazing next to the solar-related infrastructure, under the revised development footprint the nearest point of infrastructure to their property line in total is 260 metres away.

15 MR HUTTON: To the north there, is that a paper road easement?

MR GIBSON: Yes. So the 20 metre white strip that comes down and then goes to the east and then it actually goes about a kilometre over and it comes down again. So it does like a Z in the ground.

20

MR HUTTON: Yes. Yes.

MR GIBSON: That is on a paper road and it goes up over the top of the hill ridge.

25 MR HUTTON: Right.

MR GIBSON: The landowner farms up to and in that area.

30 MR HUTTON: Yes.

MR GIBSON: Yes.

MR HUTTON: They utilise that.

35 MR GIBSON: Yes.

MR HUTTON: Cattle can get to the fence line, I guess.

40 MR GIBSON: Yes. This is the Namoi Pistol Club's 900 metre range. In the comments that were received, there was some concerns that they would be able to see the solar farm from the firing range. Under the old development footprint, they were about 1.2 kilometres away. Under the revised development footprint, the nearest point of infrastructure is going to be 1.8 kilometres away. We met on site with the Namoi Pistol Club and I believe was there as well. We talked about the
45 revised development footprint, specifically with the 900 metre range. The photo on the bottom left is from the firing line looking in the direction that the members of the club would be shooting.

MR THOMAS: Which is the blue line right - - -

MR HUTTON: Yes. Kind of to the left.

5 MR THOMAS: Yes.

MR GIBSON: Yes. And the solar farm, when you're looking down the – or looking down the firing range, is to your left. And a majority of the firing – or a majority of the solar farm is obscured by a hill. You might be able to see the smaller corner of it off in the distance, but with the revised footprint, I believe we believe
10 we've alleviated the concerns in our discussions that we had on site.

MR THOMAS: a full 90 degrees away from the visual line that they're firing.

15 MR GIBSON: Yes.

MR HUTTON: And the Namoi Pistol Club is on private land?

MR THOMAS: Yes.
20

MR GIBSON: The Namoi Pistol Club, both the pistol range and the 900 metre range is on land that's owned by R2.

MR HUTTON: Okay.
25

MR GIBSON: So I know that it's really bright green on my screen. The R2 that's kind of in the centre, just underneath the word "firing", but that's R2s residence between the two firing ranges.

30 MR HUTTON: Yes. Yes. Yes. Is that the office or it's not. There's a separate office, separate administration for the firing - - -

MR GIBSON: I don't know if they actually have an office building. I think they just have a firing line that's two posts and a table for the 900 metre range and the
35 pistol range on the far side is - - -

MR WILSON: Well, we will have a look.

MR GIBSON: Yes. There's more substantial like they've got some popper blades and they do cowboy action shooting there. In addition to the revisions that we
40 made, we wanted to ensure that the choices that we were making in the revised development footprint were correct. So we elected to commission a glint and glare analysis by a glint and glare specialist, Snowy Mountain Engineering.

45 MS TUOR: How does one become a glint and glare specialist?

MR GIBSON: They're the experts on it.

MR THOMAS: It's amazing how detailed the work is that they do, actually.

MR WILSON: When the statement is considered nil, it's a - - -

5 MR GIBSON: Yes. So in our RtS, which you'll have access to there, there is the SMEC glint and glare analysis. This is just the figure from it. I was trying to find something to show you guys. Each of the red points, or red dots on that map, are points that a glint and glare analysis was measured from for the area that's in the blue.

10 MR THOMAS: Was modelled.

MR GIBSON: Was modelled.

15 MR HUTTON: And these are tracking panels?

MR GIBSON: Yes.

MR THOMAS: Yes.

20 MR HUTTON: So it took into consideration different times of day - - -

MR GIBSON: Yes.

25 MR HUTTON: - - - and the tracking profile?

MR GIBSON: Yes, the SMEC study takes the worst case scenario of the project.

MR HUTTON: Yes.

30 MR GIBSON: So they do consider the type of panel; the type of coating that's on the panel, whether it's anti-glare or not - - -

MR HUTTON: Yes.

35 MR GIBSON: - - - and it takes into consideration whether it's a tracking or fixed-axis system.

MR HUTTON: Yes.

40 MR GIBSON: It does not take into consideration any of the local vegetation, or vegetative screening or buildings. So it's a worst case scenario: in every instance, they consider it a - - -

45 MR THOMAS: Or elevation.

MR GIBSON: Yes. Yes.

MR THOMAS: It considers a flat plane.

MR GIBSON: Yes, it's a - - -

5 MS TUOR: But it presumably takes into consideration the actual structure?

MR GIBSON: The structure of the solar panels?

10 MR THOMAS: The height of the - - -

MS TUOR: Yes.

MR GIBSON: The height of the solar panels, yes.

15 MS TUOR: Yes, so - - -

MR GIBSON: Yes.

20 MS TUOR: Because, as I understand it, the solar panels themselves are designed to absorb heat, whereas - - -

MR THOMAS: That's correct.

25 MS TUOR: - - - potentially, the actual steel structure that - - -

MR GIBSON: Yes.

MS TUOR: - - - could be what you're getting - - -

30 MR GIBSON: Yes.

MS TUOR: - - - the reflection from.

35 MR GIBSON: Yes. Yes. There was also some comments about the amenity of the project. One of them that came up was around dust created by the construction aspects of the solar farm. So we've made a commitment to – under our traffic impact assessment – sorry; our traffic management plan – to incorporate a dust management protocol for the entire unsealed portion of Orange Grove Road, from where the bitumen ends, which is where the word “area” is, all the way to our two access points
40 at Orange Grove Road.

MR WILSON: Effectively watering it, yes?

45 MR GIBSON: I don't know what solution will be – what solution may be used, if it's going to be a polymer-based solution or water, but one of them - - -

MR WILSON: Surface

MR GIBSON: - - - would be used, yes.

MR THOMAS: Yes, some of them are now polymer-based, which lasts a lot longer.

5 MR GIBSON: Also we've made the commitment to ensure that the two scar trees
that were – sorry; two potential scar trees – that were brought up during our cultural
heritage assessments have been established – have been left outside the development
footprint; they will not be impacted. The two isolated artefacts, which are stone
flakes, which are located in the development footprint, also have been addressed
10 inside our ADHC.

MR HUTTON: So you'll leave those in place, where they sit?

15 MR GIBSON: The stone flakes?

MR HUTTON: Yes.

MR GIBSON: I - - -

20 MR ZAMMIT: No, there's permission for total disturbance.

MR HUTTON: Okay. So they will be – yes.

25 MR ZAMMIT: They'll be removed.

MR GIBSON: Gunnedah Shire Council brought up, on their report – sorry; their
comments – about upgrading Old Blue Vale Road, specifically at the intersections
where Old Blue Vale Road comes into contact with Kelvin Road and Blue Vale
Road. They wanted that widened to a proper two-lane road – I believe it's seven
30 metres, I think – and then 100 metres long. They've also asked for the commitment
to remove the loose gravel at the intersection of Old Blue Vale Road and Kelvin
Road.

35 The road has already been upgraded by Council in that area. The commitment still
resides on us to ensure that it is constructed and maintained to those standards. I've
highlighted the area where the gravel does seem to populate at the intersection of
Kelvin Road and Old Blue Vale Road. We have a requirement to remove that and
keep it clean, and we have to do a dilapidation report prior to the commencement and
construction, which will take into consideration the upgrades to Blue Vale Road that
40 already exist – or Old Blue Vale Road; sorry – that already exist.

MR HUTTON: When were those upgrades finished, do you know?

45 MR GIBSON: Don't quote me on it, but I was up there – these photos were taken
about six – six, seven weeks ago.

MR HUTTON: Okay.

MR GIBSON: They were – I would say, three quarters of Old Blue Vale Road had been widened to a proper two lanes all the way down – like, fully finished.

MR HUTTON: Yes.

5

MR GIBSON: There were the last three quarters of a kilometre was still in the process of being finalised.

MR HUTTON: Yes.

10

MR GIBSON: I think they were just topping it.

MR HUTTON: Yes.

15

MR GIBSON: So it's relatively new. We met with Council and had some discussions with them. They wanted to upgrade it to what they wanted before anything started with us. And I think, other than that, we just wanted to make sure that we're here to answer any questions, and talk through anything that you folks may want to know about.

20

MR HUTTON: So is that an example of what it would look like?

MR GIBSON: That one is - - -

25

MR THOMAS: That's Wemen, isn't it?

MR GIBSON: That's Wemen.

30

MR ZAMMIT: That's our Wemen project in Victoria.

MR THOMAS: That's our Wemen project, in Victoria. That's correct.

35

MR GIBSON: That one's not fully complete. That one's still – that's a picture under construction.

MR HUTTON: Yes.

40

MR THOMAS: I mean, every project has a different – potentially – different row spacing - - -

MR HUTTON: Yes.

MR THOMAS: - - - between them - - -

45

MR HUTTON: Yes.

MR THOMAS: - - - and then overall access arrangements. But yes. Yes.

MR WILSON: What type of land is it there, in terms of - - -

MR ZAMMIT: That was - - -

5 MR WILSON: - - - agricultural capacity or capability, sorry?

MR THOMAS: Rural farming land.

MR WILSON: Yes.

10

MR THOMAS: It was used for general cropping – wheat cropping, from memory – as well.

15 MR ZAMMIT: And the non-productive portion of it – you can see the orchard surrounding it – that part, I think, specifically couldn't be used, because of the soil type or something. And that's why it was attractive for the landowner to have the solar farm there, as well.

20 MR WILSON: Thank you. Just in terms of the landscaping down the east – sorry – the western side of the proposal - - -

MR THOMAS: Yes.

25 MR WILSON: - - - I understand your water balance during operations – your water requirements are about three megalitres; is that right? Per annum.

MR GIBSON: I believe that's what we were – yes.

30 MR WILSON: You have sufficient – I understand you've got bore – you got sufficient water to ensure that - - -

MR GIBSON: Yes.

35 MR WILSON: - - - this can be achieved?

MR GIBSON: Yes.

MR THOMAS: Yes.

40 MR WILSON: Okay. Yes.

MS TUOR: So, just in terms of the screening, the proposal now is on both sides of Orange Grove Road as well.

45 MR GIBSON: Yes.

MS TUOR: So the visual impact of the proposal from the road – that was considered in your assessment, and was – there wasn't any need for screening along the road?

5 MR GIBSON: No, that's correct.

MR THOMAS: That's correct.

MS TUOR: So it will be visible from the road, and that's considered acceptable.

10 MR GIBSON: Yes.

MS TUOR: And if we were to consider that there should be screening, I don't think there would need to be on the southern side, because you've got that separation of distance – 60 metres or whatever – but on the northern side, is it feasible to get – is that setback 20 metres from the boundary there? No?

15 MR GIBSON: No.

MS TUOR: It's only from the adjoining private boundaries, is it?

20 MR THOMAS: Yes, that's right, because that's our – apart from the road, that's our landowner's land, to the south.

MS TUOR: So if there were to be a screening on here, it would mean that you'd lose some of your panels, because you'd have to get - - -

25 MR THOMAS: Yes, that's right. Yes.

MS TUOR: Yes.

30 MR THOMAS: And also from a – I mean, the houses to the east.

MR GIBSON: West. Aren't they?

35 MR THOMAS: No, going this way. I'm talking – if you're talking about – being the traffic going - - -

MR GIBSON: Yes, yes.

40 MR THOMAS: This is a minor - - -

MR GIBSON: Yes.

MR THOMAS: A minor road, going to a very limited number of houses.

45 MR GIBSON: Yes, there are - - -

MR WILSON: So – yes, what’s the – well, we’ll obviously look at that.

MR THOMAS: Yes, of course.

5 MR WILSON: What are the number of vehicles using this road?

MR GIBSON: I can get you the specific number. It’s - - -

10 MR THOMAS: It’d be in the - - -

MR GIBSON: - - - in our traffic - - -

MR THOMAS: Bear with me – I think, in the transport - - -

15 MR GIBSON: - - - impact assessment.

MR WILSON: We can look at that, I guess. Offhand, just generally, do you - - -

20 MR GIBSON: I don’t. I can’t remember what it was. It was – I can’t remember exactly.

MR ZAMMIT: I can have a look. I can look here and get back to you.

25 MR GIBSON: Yes, John. Thanks.

MS TUOR: But if we go to the visual impact assessment, it will be, “Yes, you can see it, but because of the usage of the road, it’s not considered to be an issue.”

30 MR THOMAS: Yes.

MS TUOR: Is that - - -

MR THOMAS: That’s correct.

35 MS TUOR: Okay. And then – so at the moment you’re not subdividing the project area off from the actual mother lots; it’s – it will all just be the two different property owners and all the - - -

40 MR GIBSON: Yes.

MS TUOR: - - - boundaries that exist, and the only subdivision is this - - -

MR GIBSON: That’s correct. Yes, the only subdivision is really to get to the substation.

45 MS TUOR: So all your vegetation screening and APZs will all be within the actual lot.

MR GIBSON: Yes.

MR THOMAS: Yes.

5 MR GIBSON: Yes. That was something that Gunnedah Shire Council was – was backing, was us not providing any further subdivision, but basing it on

MR THOMAS: And the subdivision of the substation relates to the contractual obligations around electrical grid infrastructure remaining in operation.

10

MS TUOR: And the drop-down fence that was required as part of the Gunnedah proposal: because you're out of the flood plain, that's not considered to be necessary, although there is a condition about just ensuring that fencing doesn't interfere with flooding.

15

MR GIBSON: That's correct.

MR THOMAS: That's correct.

20 MS TUOR: And in relation to the conditions, have you looked at those? Have you got any - - -

MR THOMAS: Yes.

25 MR GIBSON: Yes.

MS TUOR: - - - comments on them, or - - -

MR THOMAS: No, we're happy with the conditions. We've discussed those.

30

MS TUOR: So the condition about the battery: that's something that – you've got an area that's located for future battery, but - - -

MR GIBSON: Yes.

35

MR THOMAS: We'd have to deal with as modification.

MS TUOR: Modification, yes.

40 MR THOMAS: Yes.

MS TUOR: And then, in relation to your contractual agreement, the obligation to decommission the site: is that explicit in your contractual - - -

45 MR THOMAS: Yes, it is.

MS TUOR: - - - agreement with the farmers? So - - -

MR THOMAS: Yes, it is, and it's a full decommissioning of all materials.

MS TUOR: Including the subsurface materials?

5 MR THOMAS: Yes, including subsurface materials.

MR ZAMMIT: Including subsurface, above- and underground - - -

MR THOMAS: Yes.

10

MR ZAMMIT: - - - as part of the land being the BSAL land - - -

MR THOMAS: Yes.

15 MR ZAMMIT: - - - bio-strategic - - -

MR THOMAS: So it's a contractual obligation under the agreements with the owners.

20 MS TUOR: Okay. And in terms of dilapidation or – not dilapidation, rate of decommissioning and rehabilitation, is it your intention that you prepare a plan early on in the piece that articulates how you're going to go about doing that?

25 MR ZAMMIT: I believe there's a condition in the consent – I think it's condition 28 – that we do have to prepare a decommissioning plan and complete that within 10 months of the end of life of the project, of the full - - -

30 MS TUOR: I think that was a condition that was in the Gunnedah one, but at the moment the current wording of this one just says, you know, that you've just got to do it, but you don't have to do a plan to show how you're going to do it. Yes. So at the moment the wording of 28 is just that within 18 months of the cessation of operations – and the cessation of operation is 12 months after – it has to be not used for 12 months.

35 So it's, basically, within 30 months – the applicant must rehabilitate the site to the satisfaction of the secretary and comply with those objectives, whereas I think the condition that went into Gunnedah was about actually preparing a plan. I can't remember. I think it was within three years and the actual start of the operation and – so that's presumably something that the commission will consider imposing as a
40 condition. Is that something that you would have any concerns about?

MR THOMAS: No.

45 MS TUOR: And then in a sort of – maybe in a broader policy sense, there is the power under the EPA Act now, section 4.17(4)(b), which we understand is a power that would enable bonds to be placed on these sorts of infrastructure projects, these and wind farms, etcetera, etcetera. So do you have any – which would be put in

place to ensure that, you know, if you sell it and someone else buys it and 30 years from now it ceases use, if someone goes away for 12 months and then after that 12 months there's no one left to clear up the site, so do you have any comments on that?

5 MR THOMAS: We will perhaps take that on notice. We haven't had a requirement or seen a need to put bonds into other projects. And all of our landowners have been satisfied with that and ultimately it has been returned to their land. But we're happy to take that on notice.

10 MS TUOR: And just off the cuff, do you have a sort of philosophical position almost as to whether bond for these sorts of facilities is, you know, something that in terms of the public good is needed or is just, you know, the market will take care - - -

15 MR THOMAS: I think at a conceptual level there's a lot of pure value still in the infrastructure in the project. So I think – I've always said it would be very difficult to contemplate that an owner of a project would physically walk away. I guess they can go into insolvency. That's always a possible risk. But there's significant value in the material on the site, so to contemplate that that material would just be left there without someone realising the value of the materials that are there - - -

20 MR HUTTON: So are you talking about reuse value or recycle - - -

MR THOMAS: Either reuse or recycle value.

25 MR HUTTON: Yes.

MR THOMAS: You know, there's an awful lot of steel in the ground; there's an awful lot of cabling in the ground.

30 MR ZAMMIT: Typically, panels have a warrant lifespan of 25 years. And they're guaranteed for 80 per cent degradation rate at 25 years, so there's still warranty that they will produce 80 per cent of the output after 25 years.

35 MR HUTTON: Yes.

MR ZAMMIT: So there may be a point in time when it comes to repurpose the site with new panels or - - -

40 MR HUTTON: Yes. Which is why the upgrade – proposal for the upgrade condition is useful for you as a – or for an operator to - - -

MR THOMAS: Extend the period.

45 MR HUTTON: - - - I guess respond to life, but also respond to technology.

MR THOMAS: Yes.

MR ZAMMIT: Yes. Market economics in 25 years time could be quite different.

MR HUTTON: Yes. Well, the technology might be very different in 25 years time too.

5

MR THOMAS: Yes.

MR HUTTON: Through your experience – and I appreciate you only operate in Australia, but no doubt you've seen or been aware of overseas projects, etcetera. Are you aware of the – or can you talk us through the process of decommissioning, how you would see a decommissioning of the site?

10

MR THOMAS: Well, as you say, we haven't seen a decommissioning here, because the industry is relatively young at this scale.

15

MR HUTTON: Yes.

MR THOMAS: And I haven't seen personally decommissioning in other parts of the world either, because similarly large-scale solar even in Europe is still - - -

20

MR HUTTON: Still relatively new.

MR THOMAS: - - - within the 25 year cycle.

25

MR HUTTON: Yes.

MR THOMAS: Happy to come back to you with some approach to decommissioning, if that would help, in terms of the way decommissioning would be carried out.

30

MR HUTTON: Yes. I think that would be useful, just for us to understand the process, I guess. We can see the construction process; it would be good to see the deconstruction process and how you might see that. And I, if possible, would be interested in understanding some of the resources that might be in that decommissioned material, so metal, those sorts of things, would be useful.

35

MR THOMAS: Okay. Yes. Sure.

MR HUTTON: In my mind, I'm thinking construction – to deconstruct would be the same levels of equipment, same levels of trucks. You're effectively taking everything off the site that you took onto the site. Is that a reasonable assumption, in your mind, or - - -

40

MR THOMAS: Yes. I think in general, yes.

45

MR HUTTON: Yes.

MR THOMAS: I mean, you've got to take the panels off and you've got to pull the piles out and - - -

MR HUTTON: Yes, lifts it on, lifts it off, takes it off site.

5

MR THOMAS: Yes. And you've got to pull the trenching up. In general I think - - -

MR HUTTON: I just wanted to make sure I had that assumption correct.

10

MR THOMAS: Yes. I think in general that's probably correct.

MR HUTTON: Yes. Okay. Thank you.

15

MR WILSON: So on that basis – based on that assumption, it would take approximately nine months to decommission the site, if you were pulling it apart and removing the infrastructure completely.

20

MR THOMAS: No. I would not expect it would. It would take less – it would take far less to decommission.

MR HUTTON: You would bowl it over.

25

MR THOMAS: Yes. In the construction work, there's obviously a lot of control systems being putting in place and electrical systems and connections being put in place and it takes time to get the accuracy and make them work and commission them. I mean, the commissioning process is an important part of that time as well.

30

MR WILSON: And returning the soil and the land to its former capability, is that something that would happen quite quickly?

35

MR THOMAS: Well, the current capability is – and you will see when you go out – is that the land is grazed with some stubble cropping. You know, we would remove the material and the land would be re-tilled. Top soil is not removed. So we would expect that it would be returned pretty quickly.

MR WILSON: Okay.

40

MR HUTTON: I don't have any further questions, other than thank you for your presentation. It was informative. Thank you.

45

MR WILSON: There was one question. It's probably immaterial but on traffic – you had a high number of heavy vehicle movements during operation and I was just – I think it was two per day or something or four movements a day, two heavy – I was just a bit – at a peak level in – during operation, yes.

MR THOMAS: During operation.

MR ZAMMIT: During operations.

MR THOMAS: Which would allow for transformer - - -

5 MR ZAMMIT: Yes. It's usually an allowance for maintenance of equipment replacement. Yes. But it most likely won't be utilised.

MR WILSON: Yes. Okay.

10 MR THOMAS: It's not ongoing. It's - - -

MR HUTTON: So you might have a maintenance campaign that's changing out four transformers that means, you know, those - - -

15 MR THOMAS: Exactly. Yes.

MR HUTTON: Okay.

20 MR THOMAS: The main thing is whether there's a change out on major heavy equipment, which is the transformer.

MR HUTTON: Yes. Okay.

25 MS TUOR: So it's not something to transport every day.

MR THOMAS: No. No. No. It's - - -

MS TUOR: It's just that you want to have that option, if you need it.

30 MR THOMAS: No. No. No. It's the maximum allowance.

MR HUTTON: Yes.

35 MS TUOR: Yes. Okay.

MR HUTTON: That makes - - -

MS TUOR: That makes sense.

40 MR WILSON: Do have any more questions?

MS TUOR: No. I think that was it. Thank you very much for coming.

45 MR GIBSON: Thank you.

MR ZAMMIT: Thank you.

MR THOMAS: Thank you for listening to us.

MS TUOR: And so you will get back to us – do you know how long it will take you to get back to us on those – that additional information?

5

MR THOMAS: I would expect within the next seven to 10 days.

MR WILSON: And you will be able to provide electronic copies?

10 MR GIBSON: Yes. Yes. So it will be a little bit larger – are you okay if I provide it to you in a PDF format?

MR JAMES: Yes.

15 MR GIBSON: Just I need to break – some of the slides are – like when they were doing the transitions, they're – it's kind of two slides over the top of each other.

MR JAMES: Okay. Yes. A PDF would be fantastic.

20 MR GIBSON: So I will just separate it. Yes.

MR THOMAS: And I believe we have a site visit scheduled for 2 June.

MR GIBSON: 3rd.

25

MR JAMES: Yes. Yes. It's Monday, so it's the 3rd. Yes.

MR GIBSON: The 3rd, yes.

30 MR JAMES: So we've allocated two hours. And I might have a chat to Jason before you go about logistics.

MR GIBSON: Perfect. Yes.

35 MR THOMAS: Okay. And the format of that - - -

MR JAMES: The format – yes, we can have a chat about format, but essentially we can probably nominate a few aspects on the site we might visit and if you could guys could put forward an itinerary. Yes, we can have a chat about it.

40

MR GIBSON: Yes. Happy to do that.

MR THOMAS: So you will give us – I'm just thinking of us preparing, to make sure that you're getting the maximum out of the site.

45

MR JAMES: Yes.

MR HUTTON: Yes. We will certainly come back to you with our thoughts on what we would like to see.

MR THOMAS: Okay.

5

MR HUTTON: And, yes, we will talk about that before the day, so that everyone is very clear.

MR THOMAS: Right.

10

MR HUTTON: Access is provided, safety is considered, those sorts of things, so
- - -

MR THOMAS: And if you need maps or things – I know you've got information
15 that we've submitted, so there's no additional maps, but if you need bigger ones
blown up or A1s or whatever, happy to do that.

MR HUTTON: Yes. Yes. All that stuff, we will certainly have a conversation with
you before - - -

20

MR THOMAS: Okay. Okay. Great. Good. Thank you.

MS TUOR: Thank you.

25 MR HUTTON: Great. Thanks very much.

MR GIBSON: Appreciate it.

30 **RECORDING CONCLUDED**

[12.01 pm]