

Notes of Briefing from Council

Meeting note taken	by : Jorge Van Den Brande
Date: 03/07/2018	Time : 04:00 pm
Project: Mount Plea	sant Coal Mine – MOD 3 Extension of Mine Life
Meeting Place: Mus	wellbrook Shire Council offices.
Attendees:	
	rs: Alan Coutts (Chair); Peter Williams and Prof. Zada Lipman
Commission Secreta	riat: David Koppers (Team Leader) and Jorge Van Den Brande (Planning Officer)
Muswellbrook Shire	e Council
Martin Rush	Mayor
Fiona Plesman	Acting General Manager
Anthony Willis	Planning Lawyer
Sharon Pope Aleksandar Mitresky	Executive Manager, Planning, Environment and Regulatory Services
Aleksanuai Militesky	Folicy Officer
Department's assess	The purpose of the meeting was for Council to comment on the proposal and the sment report.
Department's assess The Council briefed t Proposed modifica	the Commission on the matters below:
Department's assess The Council briefed t Proposed modifica • The modifica proposed cha	the Commission on the matters below: tion tion should be assessed as a new development application due to the extent of the anges to the original project.
Department's assess The Council briefed t Proposed modificat • The modificat proposed chat • When the prop	the Commission on the matters below: tion tion should be assessed as a new development application due to the extent of the anges to the original project. oject was originally approved, the surrounding environment was significantly difference oday, and the development and impacts of more recently approved neighboring
Department's assess The Council briefed to Proposed modificat • The modificat proposed chat • When the pro- to what it is to mines was ur • Existing appr	the Commission on the matters below: tion tion should be assessed as a new development application due to the extent of the anges to the original project. bject was originally approved, the surrounding environment was significantly difference boday, and the development and impacts of more recently approved neighboring hknown. oval is not best practice.
Department's assess The Council briefed to Proposed modificat • The modificat proposed chat • When the pro- to what it is to mines was ur • Existing appr	the Commission on the matters below: tion tion should be assessed as a new development application due to the extent of the anges to the original project. bject was originally approved, the surrounding environment was significantly difference oday, and the development and impacts of more recently approved neighboring hknown.
Department's assess The Council briefed to Proposed modificat • The modificat proposed cha • When the pro- to what it is to mines was ur • Existing appr • Proponent pr	the Commission on the matters below: tion tion should be assessed as a new development application due to the extent of the anges to the original project. bject was originally approved, the surrounding environment was significantly difference boday, and the development and impacts of more recently approved neighboring hknown. oval is not best practice.
 Department's assess The Council briefed to the modification The modification proposed characterized to what it is to mines was un Existing appring the Proponent pring the Proponent pring the The Thomasterized to what it include Mountain the Mountain t	the Commission on the matters below: tion tion should be assessed as a new development application due to the extent of the anges to the original project. bject was originally approved, the surrounding environment was significantly differed oday, and the development and impacts of more recently approved neighboring hknown. oval is not best practice. oposing a new SSD application within two years. nomas Mitchell Drive and road affectation Mitchell Drive Contributions Study, May 2015, referred to in condition 41A, does n at Pleasant as a contributor and therefore would not impose an actual requirement
Department's assess The Council briefed to Proposed modificat • The modificat proposed chat • When the pro- to what it is to mines was ur • Existing appr • Proponent pr Contributions to Th • The Thomas include Moun on the projec • Contributions Mount Please	the Commission on the matters below: tion tion should be assessed as a new development application due to the extent of the anges to the original project. bject was originally approved, the surrounding environment was significantly differed oday, and the development and impacts of more recently approved neighboring hknown. oval is not best practice. oposing a new SSD application within two years. nomas Mitchell Drive and road affectation Mitchell Drive Contributions Study, May 2015, referred to in condition 41A, does n at Pleasant as a contributor and therefore would not impose an actual requirement
 Department's assess The Council briefed for the modification The modification proposed chara When the proposed chara The Thomas to The Thomas include Mount on the propection Contributions to The propection on the propection Contributions to The Thomas include Mount on the propection Contributions to The Thomas and the propection The Thomas and the propection The Department of the the the the the the the the the the	tion tion should be assessed as a new development application due to the extent of the anges to the original project. oject was originally approved, the surrounding environment was significantly different oday, and the development and impacts of more recently approved neighboring nknown. oval is not best practice. oposing a new SSD application within two years. Nomas Mitchell Drive and road affectation Mitchell Drive Contributions Study, May 2015, referred to in condition 41A, does n at Pleasant as a contributor and therefore would not impose an actual requirement t.



Microrelief

- Council acknowledges the proponent's willingness in improving the final landform with appropriate microrelief.
- Table 14 Rehabilitation Objectives of proposed condition 53 in the proposed consent is not consistent with what the Department has approved for other mining operations, in relation to final voids and mine site as a whole.
- Mount Pleasant's consent should be required to comply with the same standards as other mining operations, including final voids.
- IPC should delegate sign-off of rehabilitation requirements to itself and not the Department.
- Conditions should set minimum levels for final voids and amounts of microrelief.

Air quality

- Council is concerned that air quality in Muswellbrook is at the permitted health level and would worsen if this project is approved.
- Council argues that air quality averages do not reflect separation of day-time and night-time levels, and if future assessment was to assess these separately, it would show night time levels significantly above the permitted levels.
- Night-time operations are difficult to comply with due to inversion layers which compress the dust.
- Proponent should prepare a study now on 2x12hr exposure and exceedances.
- Mount Pleasant will have the most significant impact on Muswellbrook's air quality.
- Muswellbrook regularly exceeds PM2.5 standards, mostly due to woodfires, but power generation and mines contribute.

Documents: Council provided a copy of the Thomas Mitchel Drive Contributions Study, May 2015 and Table 14 Rehabilitation Objectives of the Mt Arthur's consent.

Outcomes/Agreed Actions: Council will provide a full submission on the matters discussed at the briefing within seven days of the public meeting.

Meeting closed at: 5:00 pm