

MR S. O'CONNOR: Good morning and welcome. Before we begin, I would like to acknowledge the traditional owners of the land on which we meet, the Wonnarua 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 Mount Owen Proprietary Limited, the applicant, is seeking to modify the existing development consent to mine an additional 1.97 million tonnes of run-of-mine coal within the existing approved mining life at the Glendell Open Cut Coal Mine located in the Singleton Local Government Area. My name is Steve O'Connor. I am the chair of this IPC panel. Joining me are my fellow Commissioners, Professor Zada

10 Lipman and Professor Chris Fell. Brad James – and I don't think Kym is here?

MR B. JAMES: No, Kym's not here.

MR O'CONNOR: Okay. Brad James from the Commission Secretary is also in

15 attendance. 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 the Commission's website. This meeting is just 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

20 upon which the Commission will base its decision. It is important for the Commissioners to ask questions of attendees and to clarify issues whenever we consider it appropriate.

If you're asked a question and are not in a position to answer, please feel free to take

25 the question on notice and provide additional information in writing which we will then put on our website. I request that all members here today introduce themselves before speaking for the first time, and for all members to ensure that they do not speak over the top of each other to ensure accuracy of the transcript. So we will begin. So as I said, my name is Steve O'Connor. I'm chair of the IPC panel.

30 MS Z. LIPMAN: My name is Zada Lipman and I'm a Commissioner.

MR C. FELL: Chris Fell. I'm a Commissioner.

35 MR JAMES: Brad James from the IPC Secretary.

MS M. CRAWFORD: Mary-Anne Crawford. I'm the manager of Development and Environmental Services for Singleton Council.

40 MR M. IHLEIN: Mark Ihlein, director, Planning and Infrastructure of Singleton Council.

MR J. LINNANE: Jason Linnane, general manager, Singleton Council.

45 MR O'CONNOR: Terrific. Thank you. We have an agenda. It's a pretty short agenda. We won't be keeping you long, unless you have got a lot to tell us. We're

basically here to listen. We haven't got a specific list of questions, but we did note that council did not make a submission at the time that the modification application was publicly notified, so we're really in the dark about whether – what council's views are, so we're very keen to hear from you guys this morning. I don't know
5 whether Jason is going to take the lead, or - - -

MR LINNANE: I will make a couple of introduction points.

10 MR O'CONNOR: Okay.

MR LINNANE: And then I will pass over to – to Mary-Anne and Mark, thanks, Steve. Again, on behalf of our organisation, we – we thank you for – for your time in coming to Singleton today. It's much appreciated and an opportunity for us to – to talk to – to the IPC and understand your perspectives and – in terms of the project,
15 and also the process, and it's also a great opportunity for us to provide a little bit more feedback, I suppose, and – and some commentary around our perspectives on the – on the application and the project. We – we will after today send in a formal statement for the Commission's consideration. We considered the idea of reading that today but we thought it might be more fluent and more appropriate to have the conversation rather than just read from the statement, so – but we will make that
20 available to the – the Commission subsequent to today's hearing. I probably won't say much more. I might just throw to Mary-Anne, I suppose, just to – to give some details around some of the – some of the issues and some of the matters that are at the forefront of our thinking, and some – some suggestions for consideration for the
25 Commission.

MS CRAWFORD: Thanks, Jason. And thank you, Commissioners, for your time today. We really appreciate the opportunity to be able to have a chat to you about this modification application. I guess we're – the first thing, I suppose, that we just
30 need to put out on the table is that this modification is a modification to buy time for the Glendell project while the larger project is being assessed, and that project is currently on exhibition. So council has invested a significant amount of time in reviewing the EIS for the larger project and we will be making a fairly fulsome submission in relation to that. We have also – it's also, I think, important to
35 acknowledge that we have had a number of briefings from the proponent on both this modification application originally and the larger Glendell project.

So we are aware, and one of the reasons why we didn't put in a submission is because we knew there was a bigger – bigger project that was going to come to the
40 forefront. But I think it is important to acknowledge that this is an application to enable continuity of mining with the presumption of approval, and it's also an application for the continuation of mining with the presumption of approval for the bigger project, and I think that's something that's very important for people to understand, particularly in the community, that there is an underlying presumption
45 within both applications. So we also, I guess, wanted to acknowledge that even though we didn't make a submission, there were a significant number of submissions

that were made that were in rejection to this modification application as well. I think that's important to note.

5 And, I suppose, going to the nature of what council's concerns are in relation to this particular modification application, we also note and acknowledge that there are a significant existing suite of conditions for the current – current project, and particularly related to the planning and rehabilitation – or planning for rehabilitation and mine closure aspects of the mine. And I suppose we also as part of that note that the Department's assessment report states that the modification would result in minor
10 changes to a conceptual land form, and that the applicant intends to investigate final land use options nearer to the closure of the whole Mount Owen complex, which is not until 2037.

15 But this project, this Glendell Mine and its – and its existing approval finishes in 2024, so it doesn't have approval to operate beyond that timeframe, and it's actually forecast, I think, to cease production in 2023. So detailed mine closure planning for this particular project at this point in time doesn't exist, and it should have commenced because it's within five years of not having an approval to be able to continue to operate. And I suppose from council's perspective, that's – that is the
20 underlying concern that we have, is that there is actually no detailed mine closure planning at the moment for this project, either in its current form, or if this was to be approved, in its modified form, and we see that as a major gap.

25 We have also had the opportunity to review at the back end of last year a revised mining operations plan for the whole complex. That was submitted to the Department of Planning and I think formed one of the appendices to the bigger project, not necessarily to the modification. I'm not aware of the extent to which the Commission or the Department have had a line of sight to that in relation to this modification application, but reading that and the mod together, it – it appears as
30 though the applicant is wanting to defer closure planning to a future time and to be undertaken as part of an as-yet-unapproved project. So we consider that to be a little bit presumptuous.

35 So we have got some suggested wording, I guess, around the conditions related to mine closure – we think they need to be tightened up – requiring the applicant to develop a detailed mine closure plan now as opposed to the conceptual one that they have put in their modification application, and I have got some detail that we can put to the Commission in writing as well. But it's really about – the crux of it is really about what are they going to do with this operation if they don't get approval, and
40 they – and they haven't contemplated that in either this modification application or their current approval requirements. So things like final land use options, feasibility assessment of the final land use options that might be available, ensuring that post-mining land use is suitable and doesn't result in a negative socioeconomic impact on the community.

45 I think whilst council acknowledges that yes, there's going to be a potential future for mining within our region, it's really important for certainty for the community that

operations are planning for their closure now, particularly those that are within the timeframes set by government. I guess some of the other points, I suppose, that we sort of have raised previously with previous IPCs and also with the Department is understanding the relationship between proposed final land uses and the final land form itself. So is it actually achievable? The integration of those future uses with other – other uses within the vicinity of the operation, and whether or not that would actually result in competing land uses I think is a really important consideration.

Whether any or all of the proposed final land use options that have been put forward in a conceptual sense will in fact be safe, stable, non-polluting and sustainable. So a lot of this information is put forward in these assessments as a conceptual kind of process, but there's not a lot of detail that underpins even just the basic requirements from the DRG around safety, stability and sustainability. And I suppose the – the key thing that council would really like to see is a timeframe and a timetable for investigating these land use options, and actually putting on the table what the – what the outcomes might look like through to a feasibility stage, so we're not left hanging for another 25 years, or we're landed with this thing that's just going to sit there in a care and maintenance phase whilst decisions are made around what its final land use will be.

There's some other commentary that we have got around final void management, and that's really important because the high wall stability is a critical issue for final void success, so understanding what contingencies might – might be in place if the void fails. What are they actually going to do? And there is a risk that that could happen. And then we have also got some comments, I suppose, around consideration of some of the climate change risks for a post-rehabilitation land form. We know through ATP New South Wales work that has been done in 2014 that there are issues associated with increasing temperatures, changing rainfall patterns, increased bush fire risk. All of those climate change consequences have an impact on success of rehabilitation. So the extent to which the applicant, I guess, has considered and put contingency processes in place to ensure that their rehabilitation will be successful into the long time. I think that summarises broadly what – what we would put in our submission.

MR IHLEIN: Yes. Yes. I think it does it very well, Mary-Anne. I guess just – just to add to it, Commissioners, this – this – I guess the kernel of this issue is about the community's expectations around what mining would look like when it's finished. Whilst we have certainly focused on ensuring that mining as it presently continues to operate is acceptable and minimises impact and amenity and all that sort of thing, one of the things that as a – as an organisation, as a council, we have – we have advocated is that there is a lack of thoughtfulness/planning around the end of the process, and really, really seeking to advocate that that thought process happen much earlier on in the process so that it's not left to the last minute, and that, you know, in a broader sense, hopefully, you know, government and other people will do broader planning around what mining lands will look like in the future. I know that's something that we have advocated with DPIE over a number of years in – in terms of strategic land use planning and some work that they have started but not yet finished

around what a strategic planning approach might look from a land use outcome point of view. So that – that’s kind of just gives you a broader sense of why we’re – we’re kind of feeling this is an issue that we want to – want to raise.

5 MR LINNANE: Yes. Yes. And I can only support Mary-Anne and – and Mark’s comments that final land use planning is something that’s very much at the forefront of – of our thinking, but not only our thinking, our community’s thinking. That’s something we always hear from the community. What does – what is – what’s the next use of that land look like? How do we – how are we going to get some
10 surety that from a social – from an environmental perspective that we’re going to be delivering outcomes through the future post – post the mining activity on that land? And that is Mary-Anne has been doing and – and we have been advocating on, again, to DPIE and – and other members of governance about trying to – to align the state’s approvals process and the conditions that are applied, and
15 trying to get in – in place a process – if nothing else, a process that helps us work with the applicants to align the conditions of consent that they land use planning strategies.

You would be aware that councils are – all councils are working on their local
20 strategic planning statements. That’s a really good mechanism, a really good vehicle for us to – to progress that. We acknowledge that it is – it is difficult – when you’re talking 20 years down the track, it’s difficult to – to perceive and see what that – what that looks like, but we think it’s a really good opportunity to building in the conditions the process to ensure there’s – there’s – there’s involvement of not only
25 council in the end but also the community and all the other stakeholders in the – in the work the mining company has to do. And Mary-Anne clearly articulated the fact that this – this current site will potentially cease operation in 2023, and we don’t have that clarity, sort of is an indication of why we’re concerned.

30 MR O’CONNOR: Okay. Thank you very much. I have got a couple of questions. Maybe, Mary-Anne, if I can start with you.

MS CRAWFORD: Sure.

35 MR O’CONNOR: Thanks for highlighting the fact that the revised mine operations plan was something that you had an opportunity to review last year. If – and we haven’t seen that document so that might be something we will – we will chase up as well. But it just occurred to me, if this mine ceases operation in – in 2023 or 2024, if they get this modification approved, and there’s no subsequent approvals, how does
40 that combined operation function if you take out one component of it? You know, so I think we – we probably need to look at that to – to understand.

MS CRAWFORD: I think that’s a really good question, and it’s certainly one that we have raised in our submission for the – the Glendell continued operations project.
45 There are extensive interactions between Glendell, Mount Owen - - -

MR O’CONNOR: Ravensworth.

MS CRAWFORD: Ravensworth, and even I think potentially Liddell as well.

MR O'CONNOR: Yes. Yes.

5 MS CRAWFORD: We don't understand those interactions. I would be – and I
come from 20 years of mining, and so I don't understand the interactions that are –
that exist and interplay between those operations. I think the applicant has missed an
opportunity to be able to explain those really clearly, and what the consequences of
10 one operation ceasing might be on others. I think though that's incumbent on them
to actually quantify that and – and provide that level of understanding back to the
community. From a purely approvals point of view, you know, if you read it as it
currently stands, they won't have development consent beyond if this modification
gains approval, which means that they are in a state of flux about what it is that
15 they're going to do, and if they don't get another extension to their operation, then
the questions that our community will be asking is really those questions that Jason
raised around, well, "What are you going to do with this? If you don't get an
approval for an extension – and you have really honestly left the run really late to be
able to give the community confidence in the mine closure planning process that
might exist".

20

MR O'CONNOR: And even that complexity of if this operation, Glendell, ceases, it
– what's its land use future, given you're right next door to an operating coal mine,
as opposed to eventually they will also cease and you will have a different scenario
to deal with.

25

MS CRAWFORD: Exactly.

MR IHLEIN: Yes, that's right.

30 MS CRAWFORD: And what are the different land use potential – what's the
different land use potential across the whole facility in a temporary sense while
you're waiting for the Mount Owen complex and Liddell complexes to finish, or in a
future sense when they do actually all come together? It's really unclear about how
all of that would interplay and where, you know, there's a number of different land
35 use options that – that have been proposed in a conceptual way. Where would they
take place on that facility, and are they actually suitable for the site anyway? That
level of detail hasn't been done to – to enable us or the community to form a view on
whether or not that's a land use that would be acceptable to the community.

40 MR O'CONNOR: Yes.

MS CRAWFORD: Yes.

45 MR O'CONNOR: And I think, Jason, you mentioned that local strategic planning
statement which council is developing.

MR LINNANE: Yes.

MR O'CONNOR: Can you tell us what stage that is at? Has it reached exhibition yet, or - - -

5 MS CRAWFORD: It will go to our March council meeting for exhibition, yes. So we're intending to conduct some targeted consultation in relation to that. We have a meeting next Monday with government agencies to talk about some of the aspects of the actions that are in there. One of the actions that we do have in our local strategic planning statement is really about this discussion that we're having around final rehabilitation outcomes and closure planning objectives, and – and I guess having a
10 consideration at a whole of local government level around what – what is achievable from a land use planning perspective, as opposed to a mining perspective.

MR O'CONNOR: Yes. Okay. Zada, do you have any – any questions?

15 MS LIPMAN: Not really. I mean, I was just interested in the – the acquisition aspects. I believe most of the properties in Camberwell have been either bought by the mine or are subject to acquisition rights, and there was a – a bit of concern in submissions about water tanks being polluted and wanting responsibility or some sort of condition about clearing the tanks. But it seems like most of those properties in
20 the area are subject to that condition from Mount Owen in any event. Do you have any further knowledge about problems in the vicinity of Camberwell, or - - -

MR IHLEIN: I mean, we are aware that it's a – a fairly impacted area from all sorts of mining operations and from the always comes up whenever there's a event,
25 Camberwell always comes up as the – almost the number 1 area that's profoundly impacted by that. So that – that's a – that's a fact. Your comment around the extent to which other operations have conditions over Camberwell I think is accurate, from – from – from our knowledge of – of – of previous consents, and certainly, the applicant has – has articulated that they in their findings in their EIS they don't even
30 have to appoint any additional properties, other than the ones that are currently so that – that's as we understand it.

MS LIPMAN: Right.

35 MS CRAWFORD: I think, if I may, Mark, it does – it does pose a question for the community though around confusion of who from an industry perspective is responsible for dealing with the acquisition and mitigation consequences as a result.

40 MR IHLEIN: Yes, that's true.

MS CRAWFORD: And I think that's a very valid question to seek further clarity on. I know it's confusing for us, so the extent to which one operation can confer an acquisition right onto another one because they have it as a condition of consent, and then absolve themselves of their responsibilities, I think creates confusion within the
45 community, and the impact is clearly felt. There's plenty of evidence to support that. Otherwise there wouldn't be acquisition rights imposed on conditions of consent. So from a community perspective, it is an issue for them. Yes. I think it's 85 per cent

of the property in Camberwell is owned by the – the mining industry, various companies, but they also tenant those properties as well, so people live there.

5 MR IHLEIN: Are still living there.

MS CRAWFORD: Yes.

10 MR O'CONNOR: So the population of – of Camberwell, it would – would it be 50/100 people, or - - -

MS CRAWFORD: We might need to take that on notice.

15 MR IHLEIN: Yes, on notice. I think it's – I think it's less than that. I think more – more around 20.

MR O'CONNOR: Okay. And there – I think from the information we have had from the there are only about half a dozen dwellings that aren't owned by companies.

20 MS CRAWFORD: Yes.

MR O'CONNOR: And they're – are they vacant or lived in, or – do we know?

25 MS CRAWFORD: Some are lived in. There is some vacant land that's privately owned in Camberwell as well.

MR O'CONNOR: Yes.

30 MS CRAWFORD: There's also some land that we own in Camberwell, but my understanding is the majority of properties that are able to be lived in in Camberwell either are – or tenanted by the mining industry.

MR O'CONNOR: Mine employees, I think. Yes.

35 MS CRAWFORD: Yes.

MR O'CONNOR: Yes.

40 MS CRAWFORD: Yes, I – yes.

MR O'CONNOR: Okay. Anything further, Zada?

45 MS LIPMAN: Just – it may not be an area of your – within your knowledge, but do you have any feedback on the Aboriginal cultural heritage sites within the mining area?

MS CRAWFORD: No.

MR IHLEIN: No.

MS LIPMAN: That's it.

5 MR FELL: Over to me? I would like to get back to the air quality question again.
We have got a situation where the EPA dropped the desirable limits 2016/2017, and
the proponents have done the sums, and they – they say some of the time we're going
to be over and, however, because we only contribute 19 per cent to the total of a
10 mining and away from where the people are, then that should all be okay. Have
you got any guidance for us on how we should handle that? The – one suggestion is
they have been asked to write a new air quality management protocol.

MS CRAWFORD: Yes, I – I understand from the Department's assessment report
15 that they are proposing to put a contemporary air quality greenhouse gas
management plan condition on the applicant.

MR FELL: Yes, correct.

MS CRAWFORD: I think one of the things perhaps that's really important for
20 consideration in that may be that – what contingencies are in place? So what
adaptive management framework exists around the air quality impacts that occur?
And whilst I acknowledge that from this assessment the additional impact may not be
that great from this particular project, I think it's probably fair to say that from a
community perspective they don't really care where the impact is coming from or
25 who's responsible for it.

MR FELL: That's right.

MS CRAWFORD: So there may be an opportunity to consider putting in some
30 form of an adaptive management response process within that condition that requires
them to go back and continually review their modelling outcomes to see whether or
not they are within those predicted limits, and what - - -

MR FELL: Well, even again – further than that, perhaps get down which
35 three and they currently work together, but also to extend the dialogue out to the
other mines that contribute to the 100 per cent.

MS CRAWFORD: Yes.

40 MR FELL: We will go to wood fire smoke. That's the second

MR LINNANE: And the – and the power stations.

MR FELL: Yes. But – well, what's your view on this? I mean, are we being
45 unreasonable when they're asking for five per cent of – eight/nine months extension
to ask them to do a lot more? Maybe that's for you people to suggest when the big
project is looked at.

MS CRAWFORD: Yes. I mean, it's certainly something that we have considered in our submission in relation to the extension – the continued operations project, looking at an adaptive management framework around particularly air quality impacts, and other – because one of the things that they say is, “Well, our existing
5 management controls adequately address the air quality issue, so therefore we don't need to do more”. My question is, well, how successful are those existing air quality controls? What evidentiary basis is there to support – other than modeling, like, actual evidentiary basis to support that those management controls are successful? And if they are, great. Report that through to the community. That's a good news
10 outcome for them. But if they're not successful, what contingencies are being put in place to mitigate that and bring it back into the level of compliance that's required?

MR FELL: Well, it's convex, because on the one hand they have done a model which they had carried forward from the earlier work.
15

MS CRAWFORD: Yes.

MR FELL: On the other hand, they do have readings.

20 MS CRAWFORD: Yes.

MR FELL: And I guess what you're saying is what's the like, and I believe it's indicated that it's not all that great. What do you do about that?

25 MS CRAWFORD: Yes.

MR FELL: Do you think it's feasible to – for the various mining companies to talk to each other, so that when the wind is blowing in a certain direction they take the
30 - - -

MS CRAWFORD: Well, in that particular part of the world, they are all effectively the one company.

MR LINNANE: It's one company. It's one company
35

MR IHLEIN: Except for Yancoal.

MR LINNANE: Yes, except for - - -

40 MS CRAWFORD: Yes.

MR FELL: Well, the Hunter Valley one, isn't there?

MS CRAWFORD: There's Hunter Valley Operations, which is Yancoal, and
45 there's Ashton Mine, which is also Yancoal.

MR FELL: And isn't Glencore the one - - -

MS CRAWFORD: And then Glencore is Mount Owen, Glendell, Liddell and Ravensworth.

MR FELL: Correct, yes. Yes.

5

MS CRAWFORD: So they're two people getting in a room and having a chat to each other.

MR LINNANE: So just – just on that, and more broadly on air quality, obviously it's an issue that has been in play for a long time in – in the Hunter Valley. It's – we have received a fair amount of publicity through the latter parts of – of last year for 2019. Earlier on in 2019, council did make a submission to review the air quality monitoring measurement that has been done through the – I think it's the We have also been really active in advocating on behalf of the community, suggesting that regardless of what activities are happening in – in our LGA, the people who reside here are entitled to high quality – a high quality environment.

15

MR FELL: Yes.

MR LINNANE: We have – we are a member of the Upper Hunter Air Quality Network, and council participates in that, as does the mining industry and other industries, and they have done some terrific work in – over the years in understanding the air quality issues and – and and the status of air quality in our region, and they have actually also been the catalyst for a whole range of improvements that industry have – have taken The – the Mining Dialogue – Upper Hunter Mining Dialogue commissioned last year some work on air quality, and we had those coming – that – that group coming to present to council I think in March February.

25

MR IHLEIN: Yes, that's correct. Yes.

30

MR LINNANE: One of the two, to talk about, well, what has that – what has that study found, what are the findings of that study, and – and what – what wisdom can we draw from that. I suppose and additional to that is council also had a presentation from representatives of the Doctors of the Environment in the latter parts of last year as well, raising the issue and – and putting forward their views on – on air quality and what needs to be done. So we're very much aware it's a – it's a concern still working through that, and we continue to advocate to – to government – to State Government as the regulatory authorities to – to help take the lead on the – this matter and – and work with us industry to put in place a framework to enable us to have success and enable the industry to continue and also enable the amenity of the – of the local people to not be compromised.

35

40

MR FELL: So with your permission, Chairman, just one other – noise is the other aspect that concerted effort would - - -

45

MR LINNANE: Yes.

MR FELL: Perhaps I believe on blasting there is talk between - - -

MR LINNANE: Yes.

5 MR FELL: So you have clarified that. Yes, that's helpful. Thanks.

MR LINNANE: Yes.

10 MS CRAWFORD: Yes.

MR IHLEIN: Sure.

MR O'CONNOR: Do you have any questions?

15 MR JAMES: Nothing from me, Steve.

MR O'CONNOR: Okay, Brad. Look, unless you have got any questions for us, we might - - -

20 MR LINNANE: Can I make one final comment.

MR O'CONNOR: Yes. Certainly.

25 MR LINNANE: I picked up on a – on a – on a comment that was made earlier in the fact that we hadn't made a submission on – on this project. Please don't take that as an indication of a lack of interest. Just to give you a bit of a highlight, it's a challenge that's not only faced by us but faced by most rural communities, or even communities that have industry and mining affectation and projects, and that at this point in time right now – and we're not a large organisation. We're a smaller one
30 we have been asked over the Christmas period to do submissions on a continuations project out at Glendell. I think that's around 6000 pages, the actual documentation.

MR O'CONNOR: Yes.

35 MR LINNANE: At the same time, not mining-related, but the – the plans for the bypass are put on exhibition. Again, we need to prepare ourselves, and that's potentially a \$700 million infrastructure project.

MR O'CONNOR: Yes.

40

MR LINNANE: So the level of detail is extensive. We had this one afoot, and we're also having an ongoing conversation with Glencore about on a Bulga site continued operations as well.

45 MS CRAWFORD: Yes.

MR LINNANE: So it wasn't that we – we weren't significant interested - - -

MR O'CONNOR: Things have to be prioritised. We understand.

MR LINNANE: It's just that we are really resource-constrained, and we would love to make this into an opportunity. If the Commission in their conversation with the
5 Department of Planning can – can see their way to have that conversation on our behalf, because timing and resource meaningful engagement of the council and the community, that really needs to be – really needs to be thought about.

MR O'CONNOR: Yes. Can I just ask about the recent bush fires. How was the air
10 quality here in the Upper Hunter during that – those events?

MR LINNANE: It varied, but very poor. Very poor for a long period of time. Yes, not only did we have the bush fires, we had the drought and the winds that come – come with that, so there has obviously been significant – and not only from – from
15 our LGA but from – dust is coming in from the other parts of the state. There are a number of around that as well, and then the ongoing industrial impacts.

MR O'CONNOR: But you would be in a unique position that you have got this air quality monitoring network.

20

MR LINNANE: Yes.

MR O'CONNOR: So you would be able to look back and see those results. I'm sure that would be very useful for – for various reviews and studies that are going to be undertaken.

25

MR LINNANE: Very useful. Yes.

MS CRAWFORD: Yes.

30

MR LINNANE: We very much looking forward to the work that's being done at the moment because there's a range of views with a range of data sets or interpretations of data sets.

MR O'CONNOR: Yes.

35

MR LINNANE: We will be advocating to the state to – to take the lead, but we're very keen to get our heads around it as well so we can have an informed contribution.

MR O'CONNOR: Okay. Well, thank you for your time this morning.

40

MS CRAWFORD: Thank you.

MR IHLEIN: Thank you.

45

MR O'CONNOR: We will be having a site tour this afternoon with the mining company.

MR LINNANE: Yes.

MR O'CONNOR: And then tomorrow there will be a public meeting, and you have been kind enough to make available the Civic Centre for us. Thank you very much.
5 And yes, once we have all that information, we will be in a position hopefully where we can make a determination of this modification application.

MR LINNANE: Yes. And we will send in a formal submission today.

10 MS CRAWFORD: Yes.

MR FELL: Thank you.

MR O'CONNOR: Yes. That would be terrific.
15

MR IHLEIN: Thank you.

MR FELL: Thank you.

20 MR O'CONNOR: Thank you.

MR LINNANE: Thank you very much, Mr Chair. Thank you, Commission Members.

25 MS CRAWFORD: Thank you.

MS LIPMAN: Thank you.

30 **MATTER ADJOURNED at 12.07 pm INDEFINITELY**