



TRANSCRIPT OF MEETING

RE: DUBBO FIRING POWER STATION (SSD-28088034)

APPLICANT MEETING

PANEL: KEN KANOFSKI (CHAIR)
ANDREW MILLS
MICHAEL CHILCOTT

OFFICE OF THE IPC: BRAD JAMES (PRINCIPAL CASE
MANAGER)
OLIVER COPE (PLANNING OFFICER)

**APPLICANT
REPRESENTATIVES:** INDRAN PILLAY (SENIOR PROJECT
MANAGER, SQUADRON ENERGY)
KATE THOMSON (PROJECT OFFICER,
SQUADRON ENERGY)
JADE ROWARTH (LEGAL AND
COMMERCIAL MANAGER, ENERGY
TRANSITION SOLUTIONS)
TIM VESEY (DEVELOPMENT
MANAGER, ENERGY TRANSITION
SOLUTIONS)

LOCATION: ZOOM VIDEO CONFERENCE

DATE: 2:00PM – 3:00PM
TUESDAY, 16TH APRIL 2024

MEETING COMMENCED

MR KANOFSKI: And before we be - I've got a just form - I have a formal opening to the meeting. But before we start, I'd like to acknowledge that the traditional
5 owners of the various lands on which we're meeting. And I'm on Wangal country and pay my respects to Elders past, present and emerging. Welcome to the meeting today to discuss the Dubbo Firming Station - Firming Power Station case, currently before the Commission for determination. The applicant, Dubbo Firming Nominees
10 Proprietary Limited, proposes to construct and operate a power station, a hydrogen generation plant and ancillary infrastructure including gas and fuel storage and connections to the electricity and gas networks.

My name is Ken Kanofski. I'm the chair of this Commission panel, and I'm joined by my fellow Commissioners, Andrew Mills and Michael Chilcott. We're joined by
15 Oliver Cope and Brad James from the office of the Independent Planning Commission. In the interest of openness and transparency and to ensure full capture of information, today's meeting will be recorded, and a complete transcript will be produced and made available on the Commission's website. This meeting is one of the Commissions, is one part of the Commission's consideration of this matter, and
20 will offer one of several sources of information upon which the Commission will base its determination.

It is important for Commissioners to ask questions of attendees and to clarify issues whenever it is considered appropriate. If you asked a question and are not in a
25 position to answer, please feel free to take the question on our notice and provide additional information in writing, which we will then publish on our website. I request that all members here today introduce themselves before speaking for the first time, and for all members to ensure they don't speak over the top of each other to ensure the accuracy of the transcript.
30

So thank you and welcome. I think we've got a presentation. And first up thank you for the site visit yesterday. It was very helpful and very useful. So thank you for facilitating that for us up in Dubbo yesterday. And I think we've got a, you've got a presentation pack. We're probably, I think, probably the best angle of attack is for
35 you to walk through that, and we will ask questions along the way. And then we'll kind of wrap up at the end, as to see where we get to. So I'll hand over to you. Thank you.

MR PILLAY: Yeah, thanks Ken. I'll just share my presentation for you. I hope
40 everybody can see that one. Cool.

MR KANOFSKI: I can certainly see it.

MR PILLAY: Okay. All right. So as I said today, we're here to present the Dubbo
45 Firming Power Station through a state significant development application. But also Squadron Energy acknowledges the traditional custodians on whose lands we live and work.

We recognise and respect our continuing connection to land, waters and community. We pay respect to all Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples throughout Australia and to their Elders, past, present and emerging. Sorry just got a bit of a technical issue. That's the agenda for today's presentation and I'll just get stuck in straight away. Squadron Energy is a 100% Australian owned renewable energy company that develops and operates and owns renewable energy assets in Australia. We have 1.1 gigawatts of renewable energy in operation and under construction. And our portfolio of projects stretches across the eastern seaboard of Australia.

10 So today I'd just like to do a quick and brief project overview of the Dubbo Firming Power Station. Squadron Energy is part of the Tattarang Group of companies and is the 100% owner of Dubbo Firming Nominees. Dubbo Firming Nominees is the proponent for the state significant development application. Squadron Energy and our development partner Energy Transition Solutions have worked together to
15 prepare the state significant development application. And today from our project team, we have Tim Vesey, our Development Manager, Jade Rowarth, our Approvals and Contract Manager, Kate Thompson, our Project Officer, and myself, Indran Pillay, the Project Manager.

20 **MR MILLS:** Indran can I jump in before -

MR PILLAY: Yes. Sure -

25 **MR MILLS:** - you continue. The proponent is an entity with the name nominees in it which suggests it's potentially acting as a nominee for another entity.

MR PILLAY: Yes.

30 **MR MILLS:** Is that correct? Should be just that something. Maybe it's more for curiosity than anything else, but I guess, yeah. Who's actually going to be doing it? You know, from that point of view, I guess I'm asking.

MR PILLAY: Jade's probably really deep in the detail of our project structuring. So, Jade, do you want to?

35 **MS ROWARTH:** Yeah. Thanks, Indran. Jade Rowarth, as Indran introduced me. Legal and Commercial Manager at Energy Transition Solutions. No, the nominees, it's not a nominee company. It's a proprietary limited company that's acting in its capacity as that. But on behalf of the Dubbo Firming Nominees Trust. So there is a
40 trust behind it. It's 100% wholly owned subsidiary of Squadron Energy. As I understand it, they just use the nominees name in their entity names, but it's not doing this on behalf of anyone else other than its holding company, Squadron Energy.

45 **MR MILLS:** It's acting in a capacity as a trustee then?

MS ROWARTH: Yeah.

MR MILLS: Okay. And the -

MS ROWARTH: So it's a corporate trustee. Yeah.

5 **MR MILLS:** And the ownership of the trustee is within the Tattarang Group as well?

MS ROWARTH: It is. Yep. 100% owned also.

10 **MR MILLS:** Okay. Thank you. Thanks. Okay.

MR PILLAY: Squadron Energy proposes to develop Dubbo Firming Power Station, which will have a maximum capacity of 64 megawatts. The site is located at 28L Yarrandale Road, which is approximately four kilometres north of Dubbo's town
15 centre. The project will consist of onsite buried gas storage, gas compression and regulation facilities and up to 20 megawatts of hydrogen generation and the associated infrastructure. This project will operate as a firming plant in support of Squadron Energy's renewable energy portfolio. The project site has been selected due to its strategic location within the Central West Orana Renewable Energy Zone and
20 its proximity to supporting infrastructure. Namely gas transmission, high voltage electricity, high voltage electricity network and access to major roads and highways. For this part of the presentation I'll hand over to Jade. We'll talk a bit more in detail about the assessment report from the Department. Jade?

25 **MS ROWARTH:** Yeah, thanks, Indran. And thank you. And apologies I wasn't able to make the site visit yesterday. We've just got a few points or a few slides on some feedback on the recommended conditions and the assessment report that we would like to take the Commission through. The first of which is more a clarification per se and sort of just marries up with, in line with the statutory landowner consents that we
30 currently hold for the project.

So just for clarification perspective, we're seeking development consent under Division four of the EP&A Act for the construction and operation of the project on the main project site, which is the lot 13 DP 812799, and consent for the construction
35 and operation of the gas connection pipeline within the land parcel next door to it, which is lot 208 of DP 1276395. The EIS prepared for the project talks about the project in a more holistic perspective, and talks also about the installation of the electricity transmission line and that connection to the grid. No development consent is being sought for the installation of that transmission line, because those works will
40 be separately assessed under Part 5, Division 5.1 of the EP&A Act by Essential Energy in their capacity as a determining authority under that Division. So in line with advice that we've -

45 **MR CHILCOTT:** Jade, Can I ask you a question?

MS ROWARTH: Yeah

MR CHILCOTT: Sorry question just in relation to that. Sorry, it's Michael Chilcott. Jade, the application as you lodged it included I think the electricity connection may have included other things. And Tim was very good yesterday explaining that this project has been on a journey. At some point we actually need you formally, I think, to lodge an amendment to the application that actually confirms what the current consent is that's being sought.

So we have that formally there, and it can be dealt with by people like Brad and the Department to formally make sure that's all lined up in a statutory sense. And ultimately, as you would know from the EIS documentation, the things like the site layout map, the description we need that amended, I would imagine, so that we can include it within any further works. We do to make sure that should a consent be granted, it actually is for the works that are proposed.

MS ROWARTH: Yeah. Understood, Michael. And as Tim alluded to yesterday, it has been a journey on this project. Yeah. And Michael, I suppose that in part that's the reason we have suggested this proposed new condition in the recommended conditions. And that's in line with the advice that we've received just to clarify that point and clarify that the site layout, notwithstanding that it talks about the construction and operation of the electricity transmission line that will be separately assessed by Essential Energy under Part 5, Division 5.1.

And they have recommended - our advice as recommended that we seek to insert a proposed new condition that clarifies that position. And so the wording is on the screen there in endurance presentation. And the intention was to formally write to the IPC post this presentation just with the suggested amendments that we're discussing now.

MR KANOFSKI: Can I suggest, Jade, that we probably - just on this whole issue and getting clarity and thank you for that. I suggest we'll probably talk to the Department and to Commission officers and then and my suggestion if nobody else has an objection to this, is that we then will ask you to write to us in whatever form we think is required. Just - what I don't want to do is get you to write and then we'll go, oh, and then we get advice that says, oh no, that's not quite right. We need, you know, I don't want to create a kind of monster out of this.

MS ROWARTH: That's fine. Ken, if you write to us and say we need to do the following, which is amend the application we're proposing and the insertion of a new condition to clarify the position, and then that's fine. Yeah, whatever's easiest.

MR KANOFSKI: Now I can't see my fellow Commissioners on my screen at the moment, but Andrew and Michael are you happy with that? We'll get back to the applicant and just and seek the actual clarification (indistinct).

MR MILLS: Yeah, that's fine by me.

MR KANOFSKI: All right. Thanks, Jade.

MS ROWARTH: No, that's fine. That was the first point. Indran, we can go to the next slide. And I'll just defer to Indran just to give you a bit of background on the VPA and where we're at with Dubbo Regional Council.

5 **MR PILLAY:** Yeah, sure. Thanks. Jade. So we've been working with Dubbo Regional Council for a while now with regards to our planning agreement. We currently - we previously had a letter of offer to Dubbo Regional Council, which we through working with Council and further discussions, we've updated that offer. It's a letter of offer that reflects a lump sum payment of 0.5% of the CIV value.

10
15 In terms of our next steps, DRC have confirmed they're comfortable with the general framework of the offer. Our next steps are to prepare the general terms of the offer, which will then be tabled at the next ordinary council meeting for acceptance. The current conditions outline a VPA commercial terms, which currently doesn't align with our current offer that we're working with DRC and our proposed amendment is really just to clarify the payment details of that planning agreement in line with our current offer.

20 **MR CHILCOTT:** You know -

MR KANOFSKI: What's changed?

MR PILLAY: Sorry. Say again?

25 **MR KANOFSKI:** What's change? What's driving the change from 1.4 to 950?

MS ROWARTH: I think it was ease, wasn't it, Indran? Sorry. I'll let you go.

30 **MR PILLAY:** Yeah. So Council has a policy on their renewable energy benefit framework, where the proponent has the option to do 0.75% on an annual basis of the CIV value, or you have an option to do a 0.5% upfront. At the commencement of construction and working with Council, one of the things we were quite aware of is our internal capacity to administer that every year and as an ongoing payment. And also just in discussion with Council, they provided us with a couple of opportunities
35 of project specific opportunities to fund which we thought better aligned with the lump sum payment upfront at the start of construction.

40 **MR KANOFSKI:** Sorry, I can't see. I don't have the room on my screen. Any further questions from Andrew or Michael?

MR CHILCOTT: Indran, you said that this is going to Council, you understood, for their consideration and sign off at a future council meeting. We can check with Council as to the status of that. But do you have an idea of what the timing on that presentation to Council would be?

45 **MR PILLAY:** The next ordinary, I can't remember the specific date, but my understanding the next ordinary meeting is in May.

And the target is to table it at the next ordinary meeting. That's assuming that we can work quickly and get the general terms drafted and agreed.

5 **MR CHILCOTT:** Because currently the condition as it comes forward, assumes that Council are in agreement with the condition. And what I'm understanding is you're saying that any sort of progression of the consent, should it move that way from the IPC or to wait the outcome of the council meeting?

10 **MR PILLAY:** I think my suggestion would be - the proposed terms that we're looking for is to just basically align the payment details with the current offer. So the current offer, the commercial framework, has been generally accepted by Council. It's really the terms and conditions and around those payments which are we're currently working with.

15 **MR MILLS:** Okay. So just to clarify the former number of 1.425. Was you saying that's an incorrect number because it was based off 0.75 of the wrong number.

20 **MR PILLAY:** No, So the point 1.425 million was determined by the Department. And our understanding is that it's been calculated as 0.75% of the CIV value as per the EIS.

25 **MS ROWARTH:** It's a correct. It's a correct number. There's just two mechanisms - mechanisms under the Dubbo Regional Council regional energy benefit framework. You can either pay yeah 0.75% of the CIV. So over the life of the project you would pay. In this scenario, 1.425 million divided by 40 years for the project life. So they get a small payment annually, adjusted by CPI for the life of the project. Alternatively, the framework allows you to pay 0.5% upfront of the 190 million, which gets you to the 950,000.

30 And initially, I think Squadron's offer was the 0.75 over the life of the project. And then they realised internally, as Indran suggested, that from an administrative perspective and from discussions with Council who are keen to invest in projects, now that an upfront payment using the 0.5% of the project CIV value would be more amenable to the parties. And so that revised offer was put to Council and as I
35 understand it was accepted by the council executive. But it's subject to that just being confirmed at the council meeting that Indran's talking about in May.

MR KANOFSKI: So it's just applying a different part of the mechanism.

40 **MS ROWARTH:** Yeah and -

MR MILLS: The real comparison is 20 or whatever the number is. But you know, say \$28,000 a year.

45 **MR KANOFSKI:** Versus 950.

MR MILLS: Versus 950 upfront.

MS ROWARTH: Yeah.

MR MILLS: So that yeah, it just helps clarify.

5 **MS ROWARTH:** Yeah. And actually -

MR KANOFSKI: The wording on the slide is a bit -

10 **MS ROWARTH:** It's confusing. Yeah -

MR KANOFSKI: Confusing because I was going it's -

MS ROWARTH: 1.5 each year -

15 **MR KANOFSKI:** 1.425 per year. And I'm going well why would the Council take 950 instead of 1.45 this year.

20 **MS ROWARTH:** And actually we were initially discussing clarifying the - that language to make sure it represented that annual payment. And in the end, it was actually it's easier for everyone if we make an upfront 0.5% of CIV payment. And that's where the proposed amendment has come from.

25 **MR KANOFSKI:** Okay. Thank you. That might - that's clear to me now where that's happening. Andrew? Michael?

MR CHILCOTT: No. That's fine.

MR KANOFSKI: Okay, thanks.

30 **MS ROWARTH:** I think we can move to the next slide. Thanks, Indran. The next recommended condition of consent that we wanted to just talk about and seek again, some sort of clarificatory languages around the condition B4. The, there's - we've done obviously a significant amount of modelling in the air quality impact assessment, and it's based on two prospective turbines running on natural gas and

35 biofuel. And the modelling has been done on those two turbines because no decision has been made as yet by the proponent as to which turbine. And so that modelling shows that those turbines can comply with the clean air regulations. But it's based on generic data and not manufacturers performance guarantees.

40 And so we've spent a fair bit of time talking to the EPA and DPHI around the air quality modelling. And this amendment sort of has come out of the back of all of those conversations around once that decision on a turbine has been made and we have those manufacturers performance guarantees that we will do a further air quality impact assessment to confirm the modelling that rests in the EIS as it stands

45 today. And so we're seeking just some additional wording on the current condition B4 just to sort of reflect that.

That there'll be a revised air quality impact assessment for the final design and that will confirm the air emission performance of the power station that that's already in the air quality impact assessment in the back of the EIS. And so we're seeking that minor amendment to condition B4.

5

MR KANOFSKI: Is your concern in suggesting that minor amendment that is just to make sure the goalposts don't shift?

10 **MS ROWARTH:** That's correct Ken, because we've already shown that under both scenarios that we can comply and that we comply with the criteria set out in the Clean Air Regs. And we want to just confirm that we don't want the goalposts to change. Yep.

15 **MR MILLS:** Jade, am I correct in that you'd just be seeking to verify that the air performance criteria is within the limits set out in the EIS?

MS ROWARTH: Yep, That's correct.

20 **MR MILLS:** Sure.

MS ROWARTH: Yep.

25 **MR KANOFSKI:** Okay, I understand that now. Michael, Andrew, any questions on that?

MR MILLS: So confirming the air emission performance of the power station. Does it need extra words there to - is within the -

30 **MR CHILCOTT:** It remains within the compliance criteria required by the Clean Air Act or some such that provides it the standard that it's seeking to meet.

35 **MS ROWARTH:** Yeah, we don't want to be preparing an air quality impact assessment with - yeah, with different criteria, expectations and things when we have already established those. And really the next process is pick the turbine and can confirm the performance.

40 **MR KANOFSKI:** And we might just have to have a talk a lot about how we express that just to make sure (indistinct) but I understand. Well, I understand what you're trying to achieve.

45 **MS ROWARTH:** Yeah. I think that was that one. And then the next slide. The final one from me and you'll be sick of hearing me talk is around the noise. One of the proposed conditions in the conditions of a consent around operational noise. It's B21 that we're talking about. The noise impact assessment in the back of the EIS has categorised the receivers in question are R1 through to R6, and we've categorised using the NSW Noise Policy for Industry receivers R1 to R3 and R5 as being in the suburban category, and then R4 and R6 in the urban category.

We've done that because R4 and R6 are located on main highways. And so there is a heavy level of noise from the roads. And so that we've categorised it in those two suburban versus urban. The condition B21 has applied the suburban criteria for R4. And we are proposing an amendment to that condition to ensure that R4 is actually

5 correctly categorised in the urban category and not in the suburban category. And to that end, there is also the project noise trigger levels. In the noise impact assessment have been established in accordance with the principles and methodologies of the Noise Policy for Industry.

10 And they set out for the urban area. So R4 and R6 that days 57, evenings 48, night 43 and the sleep disturbance is 58. In the B21 condition criteria, you'll see there for R6 and we believe R4 should be in that category are the same or largely 40, 38, 38 and 52 which doesn't align with the project noise trigger levels in our noise impact assessment. R4 and R6, those levels have been done based on modelling that was

15 done at location 3, we call it in the noise impact assessment which happens to be R6. So on the side of the highway there, which gives us those higher criteria. And so we would we propose or request an amendment to that B21 to align with our noise impact assessment. And I think the tables in appendix 3 from the noise impact assessment, which sets out those criteria.

20 **MR KANOFSKI:** So your point here is that B21 doesn't correctly apply the Noise Policy for Industry.

MS ROWARTH: That's correct Ken, in our view.

25 **MR KANOFSKI:** Yeah, It doesn't. Yeah. That's - your contention is that it doesn't correctly apply and you're just - and, one is you're seeking a re-categorisation of R4. And then the second is -

30 **MS ROWARTH:** The levels in -

MR KANOFSKI: The levels were R4 and R6 have been incorrectly described in B21.

35 **MS ROWARTH:** That's correct.

MR CHILCOTT: Jade, that's because the background noise levels weren't appropriately read. Is that what you're suggesting?

40 **MS ROWARTH:** And no, they were read and they're higher than the - there's an assumed set of numbers in the Noise Policy for Industry, say, for when you model and you show that the background noise is actually higher than the usual set, and then that sets a different level of base numbers that you would use.

45 **MR CHILCOTT:** Yeah. You're saying that the noise assessment has been done and it shows a higher background noise level?

MS ROWARTH: Yeah. So the table appended to appendix 3 of this presentation is our - these are the project noise trigger levels that are in our noise impact assessment. That's been done for the project based on the modelling that we've done in that area. And I'll profess I'm not a noise expert, but that - it's a difference between our noise impact assessment and the criteria and the condition.

MR CHILCOTT: I understand, thanks.

MS ROWARTH: So that was - they were really the sort of the points that we wanted to raise in respect to the, the recommended conditions. I know there were a number of other dot points on the agenda, and we're happy to talk to those dot points or we're happy to take questions. We're in your hands, chair, as to how you would like to proceed.

MR KANOFSKI: Can I suggest maybe we go - I'll go to my fellow Commissioners to see whether they've got any questions. And once we've exhausted that, then we might just go through quickly through the other issues on the agenda to the extent we have time. So, Andrew, Michael, other questions across the board?

MR CHILCOTT: Just one. And this is following up a point that I think Andrew had raised in one of our meetings, which is the EIS, deals with the decommissioning of the plant at the end of life. There's no condition of consent that it specifically addresses or reflects those considerations and commitments as they're stated in the EIS. Do you have a view as to whether a condition might be put in there to reflect the commitments in the EIS so that they're to the fore in the - should any consent be granted?

MS ROWARTH: Think the EIS refers to the entry into a decommissioning plan. It's hard to crystal ball what the statutory requirements will be for that. But a condition in line with that the project will be decommissioned in accordance with the relevant statutory requirements of the day. I look to Indran, but something along those lines I don't think we would be adverse to.

MR CHILCOTT: Thank you. Ken, I have no other questions.

MR KANOFSKI: Okay. Andrew?

MR MILLS: No. Nothing from me.

MR KANOFSKI: No, I think I'm okay. So we might just go quickly, just quickly, do you want to talk to some of the other kind of key issues? I think we've talked a little bit to some of them.

MS ROWARTH: Yep. That's fine. We'll - Tim you're there. We'll throw to Tim. We'll kick off with hazards and risks.

MR VESEY: Yeah. No worries. Thanks, Jade. So, hazards and risks. So they've been touched on in chapter nine of the EIS, and we have supported the work via technical reports by the PHA, fire risk, a bushfire risk assessment as well, by fire risk consultants and the plume rise assessment by CASA. So we've ran a fair course on
5 that. And I suppose going to the Department's assessment, they were satisfied that the project could be designed to ensure no acceptable risk surrounding land users from fires, explosion or toxic exposure. So that's where through the EIS and the process, I suppose we feel we've ran that to ground. But if there's any other questions from the panel, we're open to address any concerns or issues that may be residual.

10 **MR KANOFSKI:** Any questions? I don't have any. Andrew? Michael?

MR CHILCOTT: I found Tim's explanations on site yesterday useful around the management of hydrogen in particular. Thank you.

15 **MR KANOFSKI:** Yeah. No, that was helpful. That was the only real question I had in the hazards area and that was dealt with yesterday. So thank you.

MR VESEY: No. No worries.

20 **MR MILLS:** Actually, I do have one.

MR VESEY: Yep.

25 **MR MILLS:** The storage pipeline that you've got on site now is going to be out and back, but now it's all being kept on site. Was that - just remind me, was that going to be buried or was that above ground?

MR VESEY: Sorry?

30 **MR MILLS:** The gas storage.

MR VESEY: Sorry -

35 **MS ROWARTH:** Underground gas storage.

MR VESEY: Sorry, I missed -

MR MILLS: Okay. Thank you.

40 **MS ROWARTH:** Yeah. Tim, the question was whether the gas storage was going to be underground or above ground?

MR VESEY: Yeah. Underground.

45 **MR MILLS:** Yeah. Thank you.

MR VESEY: All right. So if there's no further questions or talking points to that, the air quality which I think we have Jade touched on previously on that one as well. So obviously we have worked very hard around that. Noting that we are yet to select a vendor and have manufacturers guarantees, but we have demonstrated that compliance with the Clean Air Regs using the Approved Methods.

So that's where I think we've gone through that and just do seek that minor confirmation as we've discussed. And then from a greenhouse gas assessment point of view, that's where we've also undertaken the scope 1, 2 and 3 at the request of the Department, in accordance with the SEARs and again, that they were assessed and consistent with the NSW and Commonwealth policies and supporting a transition to renewable energy, I think was an assessment report, which we're comfortable and consistent with our messaging to.

MR KANOFSKI: Any questions on that? Andrew. Michael? Well. Okay. Shall we move on?

MR VESEY: Yep. No worries. So noise and vibration. I think we've gone through that one there as well. Again, we've gone through all the relevant assessments there including vibration which was touched on and that was looking at the distances from the furthest structures from our works, along with human receptors, which were well outside the area that we're looking at doing our works noise we've touched on previously on the operational noise limits, but again, that's been modelled throughout the whole process and addressed there. So unless there's any other questions from the Commissioners on noise and vibration.

MR CHILCOTT: No.

MR KANOFSKI: No, I don't think so. I think gas supply we talked about yesterday when we were on site.

MR VESEY: Yeah.

MR KANOFSKI: Anything further on that? Andrew? Michael?

MR CHILCOTT: No.

MR KANOFSKI: And the statutory matters we just talked about then. So we've dealt with that. Transport we talked about a little bit yesterday in terms of where things would be coming from. Is there anything you wanted to add on that, Tim?

MR VESEY: No, I think that's fine. And just going through the process to date, there was questions around just the workforce and traffic movements of use of shuttle buses to. So that was through Transport for NSW and their feedback. So that's where we've ran both scenarios now with shuttle bus use and individual car use, and neither affect level of service. Interruption from a workforce movement perspective as well.

And then also when we touched on based on transport routes out of Newcastle. So I don't think there's much else from there unless there's questions from the Commissioners as well.

5 **MR KANOFSKI:** You're only you're peaking, I think you said yesterday 150 -

MR VESEY: That's right.

10 **MR KANOFSKI:** - workers on site which would make, you know, a relatively modest percentage of all of the traffic movements. I thought in that area, given you've got, you know, big employers like the abattoir and the like.

15 **MR VESEY:** Yeah. Exactly right. So the level of service of the Golden Highway there and the base of Yarrandale Road, which is a main access from town as well, didn't affect the level of service. And we demonstrated that through the RFI and response to submissions there as well.

MR VESEY: Yeah. Okay.

20 **MR KANOFSKI:** The end. Anything else on that? Andrew. Michael?

MR CHILCOTT: Not for me.

25 **MR MILLS:** No, Thank you.

MR KANOFSKI: VPA, we've talked about. So visual impacts. So there was talk - so we talked about screening at the back of the site, which is not required, as I understand it hasn't been required. Is that correct? But you intend to produce. And then there was talk of some screening at the front, which you're not keen on from a traffic safety perspective. Is that correct?

35 **MR VESEY:** So where feasible, we'd be comfortable to look into it there Ken. So the tree screening and this was going through the process with the Department as well. Particularly around the RFI if the tree screening wasn't to take whether it would affect the outcomes of the LVIA which it was determined that there be negligible impact just based on the surrounding. And that's really demonstrating that the I suppose the tree screening we put in as an initial thing is good to do for the project and accommodate where required. It's come through and it works for the site and based on our site layout, and I note in our in the recommended conditions that the tree screening must be done as well. So we're comfortable with that and carrying that through as well.

MR KANOFSKI: Yeah. Okay. Anything further on that - Andrew? Michael?

45 **MR MILLS:** No, thanks.

MR CHILCOTT: No.

MR KANOFSKI: Accommodation and workforce, I think we talked about yesterday. Anything more that you wanted to add, Tim?

5 **MR VESEY:** No, not really. As we ran through, Squadron are currently bringing together that strategy as a commitment, a recommended condition there as well. So that we're comfortable with what was discussed and where we're at on that one Ken.

MR VESEY: Okay.

10 **MR KANOFSKI:** All right if there's anything else that my fellow Commissioners - before we close the meeting?

MR CHILCOTT: No. That's fine. You've been very responsive to the points I've raised. Thank you.

15 **MR KANOFSKI:** Look, thanks, unless there's anything else from you, Tim or Jade?

MR VESEY: I was just going to say. So, next steps can just on the back of this, we won't we'll hold off sending anything through. I think that was what we agreed.

20 **MR VESEY:** Yeah -

MR KANOFSKI: We'll get back to you via the Commission staff. Yeah. I just want to make sure we do it once and get it right. And that the Department's happy and that we're happy and we've got it all nailed down.

25 **MR VESEY:** Yeah. No worries.

MR KANOFSKI: Yeah. So we'll come back to you with the form. Yeah. And it may well be just doing exactly what you said. But let's just make sure on that before we - hold fire on that until we clarify.

MR VESEY: No, worries at all. And I also note that the submissions close at the end of this week. I think, the public submissions. On that, similar, you'll just consolidate any requests for further information or response to those submissions following that?

35 **MR KANOFSKI:** Yes.

MR VESEY: Yeah.

40 **MR KANOFSKI:** Yeah, that will do that. And yeah, if we need any further information, we'll request it in that way.

MR VESEY: Perfect. Noted.

45 **MR KANOFSKI:** Look, thank you very much for your time and for your answers. And as I said, and thank you again for yesterday. It's been very helpful.

MR VESEY: Indeed.

MS ROWARTH: Thanks for your time.

5 **MR VESEY:** Thanks Jade. Thanks, Commissioners.

MS ROWARTH: Thanks. Bye.

MEETING CONCLUDED