

# McPhillamys Gold Project CCC Minutes

Title	McPhillamys Gold Project Community Consultative Committee (CCC) Meeting #10																																					
Meeting Date	2 November 2020 @ 6pm																																					
Venue	Blayney Community Centre- 91 Adelaide St, Blayney (in person) GoToMeeting (by video conference)																																					
Chair	<b>David Johnson</b>	Independent Chairperson*																																				
Meeting Attendees	<table style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 30%;"><b>Evan Leitch</b></td> <td>Community Representative*</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Elizabeth Russ</b></td> <td>Community Representative*</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Tom Williams</b></td> <td>Community Representative Alternate *</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Bob Russ</b></td> <td>Community Representative Alternate*</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Daniel Sutton</b></td> <td>BHPG Representative *</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Miles Hedge</b></td> <td>Community Representative *</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Cyril Smith</b></td> <td>ORWSA Representative*</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2">-----</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Rebecca Ryan</b></td> <td>Blayney Council*</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Heather Nicholls</b></td> <td>Cabonne Council*</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2">-----</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Rod Smith</b></td> <td>Regis Resources#</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Sarah Taylor</b></td> <td>Regis Resources Observer#</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Andrew Wannan</b></td> <td>Regis Resources*</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Chris Roach</b></td> <td>Regis Resources Alternate*</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Danielle Wallace</b></td> <td>Regis Resources Observer*</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2">-----</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Stacey McFawn</b></td> <td>Minutes*</td> </tr> </table>		<b>Evan Leitch</b>	Community Representative*	<b>Elizabeth Russ</b>	Community Representative*	<b>Tom Williams</b>	Community Representative Alternate *	<b>Bob Russ</b>	Community Representative Alternate*	<b>Daniel Sutton</b>	BHPG Representative *	<b>Miles Hedge</b>	Community Representative *	<b>Cyril Smith</b>	ORWSA Representative*	-----		<b>Rebecca Ryan</b>	Blayney Council*	<b>Heather Nicholls</b>	Cabonne Council*	-----		<b>Rod Smith</b>	Regis Resources#	<b>Sarah Taylor</b>	Regis Resources Observer#	<b>Andrew Wannan</b>	Regis Resources*	<b>Chris Roach</b>	Regis Resources Alternate*	<b>Danielle Wallace</b>	Regis Resources Observer*	-----		<b>Stacey McFawn</b>	Minutes*
<b>Evan Leitch</b>	Community Representative*																																					
<b>Elizabeth Russ</b>	Community Representative*																																					
<b>Tom Williams</b>	Community Representative Alternate *																																					
<b>Bob Russ</b>	Community Representative Alternate*																																					
<b>Daniel Sutton</b>	BHPG Representative *																																					
<b>Miles Hedge</b>	Community Representative *																																					
<b>Cyril Smith</b>	ORWSA Representative*																																					
-----																																						
<b>Rebecca Ryan</b>	Blayney Council*																																					
<b>Heather Nicholls</b>	Cabonne Council*																																					
-----																																						
<b>Rod Smith</b>	Regis Resources#																																					
<b>Sarah Taylor</b>	Regis Resources Observer#																																					
<b>Andrew Wannan</b>	Regis Resources*																																					
<b>Chris Roach</b>	Regis Resources Alternate*																																					
<b>Danielle Wallace</b>	Regis Resources Observer*																																					
-----																																						
<b>Stacey McFawn</b>	Minutes*																																					
Apologies	Bob Bourke Peter Hildenbeutel Tony McPaul	Mayor, Bathurst Council Community Representative Regis Resources																																				
Next Meeting	1 February 2021 @ 6.00pm (to be confirmed) Blayney Community Centre 91 Adelaide Street, Blayney NSW																																					

\* Attended meeting at Blayney Community Centre- 91 Adelaide St, Blayney.

# Attended meeting via video on GoToMeeting

## **MEETING WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS - David Johnson**

Meeting opened at 6:03pm

Apologies for the meeting tendered for Tony McPaul, Bob Bourke and Peter Hildenbeutel.

Introduction by David Johnson:

- No declaration of pecuniary and non-pecuniary interests to declare;
- Elizabeth Russ declared water testing had occurred on her property;
- Danielle Wallace (Regis Environmental Superintendent) to present to the CCC committee in Tony McPaul's absence.

## **BUSINESS ARISING FROM MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING (3 August) – David Johnson**

- The minutes of the last meeting on 3 August 2020 were approved by the Community Consultative Committee as being read and correct;
- No previous notifications.

## **CORRESPONDENCE**

- No correspondence.

## **REGIS RESOURCES MCPHILLAMYS GOLD PROJECT UPDATE**

- PowerPoint presentation by Danielle Wallace with 'Shared Screen' for GoToMeeting attendees (copy on McPhillamys website). The key points from the presentation were:
  - Meetings with neighbours to provide updates on progress, with ongoing discussions on mitigation/negotiated agreements;
  - Land care and skillset seed collection;
  - Contribution to the Blayney High School for the upgrading of the hothouse;
  - Aboriginal Cultural Heritage (ACH) consultation advertising in progress;
  - Community Information Sheet #12 was distributed in October. Community Information Sheet #13 is scheduled for distribution in December.
  - Continuing community updates in the Blayney Chronicle.
  - Stage plans from the Amendment Report delivered to near neighbours with follow up meetings in progress.
  - McPhillamys project activities such as weed control, fencing, visual screening and monitoring are all still progressing.
  - Regis are continuing a program of mineral exploration in the Central West of NSW.

- Regis are currently advertising for a project detailed design civil engineer to join the team.
- Regis have engaged an ordnance consultant to assess the findings of a relict mortar tail (military feature) on the McPhillamys site.
- The Amendment Report and Submissions Report was lodged with the NSW Government on the 4<sup>th</sup> September 2020. The DPIE (Department of Planning Industry and Environment) are currently assessing the project.

## QUESTIONS ARISING FROM REGIS PRESENTATION

Elizabeth Russ

Q. How are Regis utilising the explanation videos and how would people view them?

A. They would be available on the McPhillamys website.

Elizabeth Russ

Note: Informed the meeting that she knows someone who might know about the mortar tail including the activities that occurred around that time, circa 1950/1960's.

Daniel Sutton

Q. Asked if any of the NSW Government Agency responses would extend Regis' response deadline?

A. No delays are foreseen at this stage.

## BLAYNEY SHIRE COUNCIL (COUNCIL) VOLUNTARY PLANNING AGREEMENT (VPA) EXPLANATION

Rebecca Ryan (General Manager Blayney Shire Council) provided a detailed explanation of what the VPA is, how it is developed, other VPA's that Council are party to (Cadia Mine and Flyers Creek Wind Farm), and, the key points of the proposed VPA were discussed:

- In mid-2020 Council and Regis recommenced discussions regarding the establishment of a Voluntary Planning Agreement (VPA) under subdivision 2 (s7.4) of the EP&A Act (formally s93F) and the NSW DPIE Planning Agreements Practice Note (April 2020).
- A draft VPA has now been prepared which Council will consider at the meeting on 16 November 2020. The VPA and Explanatory Note will then be on public exhibition for 28 days, inviting comment prior to formal execution and noting on Council's Planning Agreement Register at [www.blayney.nsw.gov.au/development/voluntary-planning-agreements](http://www.blayney.nsw.gov.au/development/voluntary-planning-agreements)
- Council has reaffirmed its position that any Planning Agreement should be executed between two partners only; being LFB Resources NL (Regis) and Blayney Shire Council. The Blayney local government area will be affected by 100% of the impact for the life of the operation and post mine closure and dilution of the proposed VPA would not be supported by Blayney Shire Council.
- The VPA comprises a monetary contribution, being 1% of the estimated total capital cost of the project paid over 15 years. Payments are proposed as follows;
  - an initial sum of \$1 million; and

- annual payments of \$212,222 (subject to CPI or 2% adjustment whichever is the greater after the first annual payment).
- In addition, Regis have agreed to pay 1% per additional capital expended above the original capital cost of the Project, that is associated with any future development requiring modification subject to a Planning Agreement.
- The VPA is effected when Development Consent granted, subject to;
  1. The exhaustion or expiry of any appeal or legal proceedings (if any commenced); and
  2. The Board of Regis giving final approval for the capital expenditure required for project.
- Each year, Blayney Shire Council will determine how the monetary contributions are allocated and will identify projects in the annual Operational Plan and 4-year Delivery Program. Funding will be allocated to a specific project (or projects) that improve social, sporting/recreation, environmental, economic and public amenity which are consistent with the strategies of the Blayney Shire Community Strategic Plan.
- An allocation may also be provided towards increasing Council's existing Financial Assistance Program (FAP) and a representative from Regis will be invited to be a member of Council's Financial Assistance Committee. Eligible community groups will then be provided the opportunity to access financial support via the FAP for their projects in July and January each year.
- Council will be required to acknowledge Regis and the purpose to which the contributions under the VPA are applied, in its Annual Report.

#### **QUESTIONS ARISING FROM THE VPA EXPLANATION**

Daniel Sutton

Q. Will the VPA be on the Blayney Shire Council website?

A. Rebecca Ryan explained that it would be publicly available on the Council website, when endorsed by Council for public exhibition, and then following public comment and when executed, in the same way that the Cadia Mine and Flyers Creek Planning Agreements are.

Miles Hedge

Q. Could Rebecca please explain further how the funding might be used for the Financial Assistance Committee (FAC)?

A. Rebecca Ryan explained that Council has the discretion to allocate funding to the FAC from the monetary contributions.

David Johnson

Q. Is the VPA similar to the Cadia Mine and Flyers Creek VPA's?

A. Rebecca Ryan explained that it was very similar, the principles are the same and is flexible in that Council will determine where the funds were used, for projects in line with the Community Strategic Plan and advertised in the annual Operational Plan.

Elizabeth Russ

Q. Is the VPA separate from the community rates?

- A. Rebecca Ryan explained that they were. Regis currently pays farming rates at McPhillamys as it is not an operational mine site. If the project is approved, then Council would apply the Mining Rates applicable to property.

#### Additional Discussion

Rebecca Ryan informed the meeting that she discussed with Stephen O'Donoghue from the Department of Planning, Industry and Environment the potential venue for the Independent Planning Commission (IPC) public hearing and proposed that the public hearing be held at the Blayney Community Centre.

Rod Smith confirmed that Regis would support the use of the Blayney Community Centre.

The members of the CCC also supported this proposal.

David Johnson indicated that the selection of the venue was normally decided by the IPC Chair

Rebecca Ryan recommended that the CCC write a letter to the IPC supporting this decision.

Elizabeth Russ moved that the CCC Chair write a letter as per Rebecca Ryan's recommendation, once the matter has been forwarded to the IPC for determination. Cyril Smith seconded the motion. The motion was carried by the committee.

## OTHER AGENDA ITEMS

### ADDITIONAL EXPLANATIONS RELATING TO QUESTIONS SUBMITTED PRIOR TO MEETING

#### Evan Leitch – Questions Submitted

Q.1 Evan Leitch requested additional explanation.

A. Andrew Wannan explained that the locations are determined by the noise consultants to satisfy the relevant noise policies and how the background noise assumptions influence the noise operating limits that are then set.

Q.2 Elizabeth Russ asked for clarification around which receivers were located in which noise catchment and where this information is documented.

A. Danielle Wallace indicated that a list of the receivers and a description of the relevant noise catchments could be found in Section 3 of the Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment as part of the Amendment Report.

Q.3 Daniel Sutton asked what 'RL' meant?

A. It was explained that it referred to the height above sea level in metres, and refers to the AHD, which is the Australian Height Datum.

Note: Elizabeth Russ requested that all acronyms have their full description stated at least on one occasion in the questions and answers. It was agreed by all that this should occur. Rod Smith suggested that if the CCC agreed, then Regis would correct the questions and answers to show the full description of acronyms. The committee agreed.

Q.4 Evan Leitch asked if the term 'bank' in 'bank cubic metres' could be explained.

A. It was explained that this means the volume of the material in its natural state in the ground, prior to excavation.

### **Daniel Sutton – Questions Submitted**

- Q.5 Daniel Sutton asked exactly what disciplinary action would be imposed if people exceeded the speed limit?
- A. Rod Smith explained that the company disciplinary policy would apply, and depending on the severity of the indiscretion, discipline would normally include a first warning through to final warning approach.
- Q.6 Daniel Sutton asked if the topography of the area was taken into account when determining runoff from different parts of the catchment?
- A. Rod Smith explained that the runoff coefficients (or factors) do vary depending on the area being assessed, but was unsure of what scale this applies to, that is, does it vary locally, or regionally. Rod Smith committed to finding out how the runoff coefficients are determined within the project area and providing an answer to the committee.
- Q.7 Daniel Sutton asked for further detail on the cost of refilling the void?
- A. Rod Smith explained that detailed pricing is not sought for the refilling of the void, as previous experience has demonstrated that the cost to refill the void will far exceed the Net Present Value (NPV), or profit (taking into account the time value of money). That said, the average cost to move material is still applied to the volume of waste that is mined as a check calculation, and in the case of McPhillamys, as is the case in most mines where the valuable material is present in a vertical shape, the cost would be a multiple of the NPV, or time valued profit, making it uneconomical. In addition to the economic issue at McPhillamys, the environmental and community impacts would extend for a further ten or so years.
- Q.8 Daniel Sutton asked if a direct survey of the Kings Plains residents had been completed?
- A. Andrew Wannan said it had not, rather that relevant demographic data had been used however the SIA in the EIS had acknowledged health concerns from residents during consultation.
- Q.9 Daniel Sutton asked if the job numbers quoted in the answer to his question were direct or indirect numbers?
- A. Rod Smith explained that the numbers quoted were the direct jobs required to operate the mine site. They did not include indirect jobs outside of the site, for example, shop keepers, child care personnel, etc.

### **GENERAL BUSINESS**

- No General Business.

### **OTHER BUSINESS**

- David Johnson to advise the DPIE that Jim Newman has resigned from the CCC and that Tom Williams (currently an Alternate Member) has been appointed as a full Community Representative.

## **ACTIONS**

	<b>Action Items</b>	<b>Who</b>	<b>Due By</b>
1	Book Blayney Community Centre for the 1 February 2021 @6pm	Stacey McFawn	4 Nov 2020
2	Draft minutes to be provided to the Chairperson.	Stacey McFawn	9 Nov 2020
3	Draft minutes distributed to members by email Including the alternate representatives	David Johnson	23 Nov 2020
4	Committee members provide comment on minutes to Chairperson	All committee members	7 Dec 2020
5	Minutes finalised & posted on the McPhillamys Website	David Johnson Tony McPaul / Rod Smith	11 Dec 2020
6	Questions and answers from the <u>Nov</u> CCC meeting to be added to the McPhillamys website.	Stacey McFawn	11 Dec 2020

## **MEETING CLOSED**

Meeting closed at 7.22pm

## **NEXT MEETING**

To be confirmed - Monday 1 February 2021 at 6pm at the Blayney Community Centre, 91 Adelaide Street, Blayney NSW.

## ATTACHMENT 1

### EVAN LEITCH – QUESTIONS SUBMITTED VIA EMAIL ON 27 OCTOBER 2020

Questions for Community Consultative Committee (CCC) for CCC meeting dated 2nd November 2020.

1. According to the noise assessment sensitive receivers grouped as the 'Walkom catchment' are not influenced by road noise from the Mid-Western Highway. How was this established? It is certainly not shared by all those included in that catchment.

The noise catchments have been determined by the noise specialists based on site surveys, existing noise levels, review of aerial photographs and other project information. The Walkom Road catchment is defined in the assessment as those receivers in the Kings Plains locale that are not influenced by road traffic noise from the Mid-Western Highway. This is reflected in the higher background noise level determined for the evening period for the "Kings Plains" catchment.

2. The sculpturing of the rehabilitated surface of the Waste Rock Emplacement (WRE) is difficult to understand. Its form in some representations is of a stepped terrace structure topped by a plateau, while in others it is shown as having a smoother, gently undulating gradient. Further it is apparently to have 'micro relief features' on a 10-metre scale. Neither the terraced structure, mesa form nor the 'micro relief structures' are a part of the present landscape it will replace. Just what is the appearance that is intended?

Regis is committed to adopting leading practices in the planning, construction, operation, closure and rehabilitation of the project. The key rehabilitation objective of the project is to restore the land as much as possible to its pre-mining land use at the end of its operational life; that is, primary an agricultural land use comprising grazing on pastures whilst improving the biodiversity values of the area by re-establishing endemic open woodland communities on the waste rock emplacement as part of the rehabilitation program.

The waste rock emplacement design uses erosion and landform modelling to develop stable slope gradients and drainage patterns that avoid structural drainage features. Further, microrelief has been incorporated into the final landform design to facilitate a natural looking landform as much as practicable. These microrelief features will be up to 1,075 mRL<sup>1</sup> in places across the top of the landform. The final landform in the amended project is indicated in Figure 2.4 together with a comparison of the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). Progressive rehabilitation is shown on stage plans which show the change from benches ("terraces") to more natural slopes over time.

*Note 1: RL stands for Reduced Level. In this case, the 1,075 mRL is based on the Australian Height Datum (AHD), which is the national vertical datum for Australia, and is relative to the mean sea level for the period 1966-1968. In lay terms, 1,075 mRL is approximately 1,075 vertical metres above sea level.*



3. In the amended report it is indicated that the height of the WRE is to be increased. As this will further obscure the view of Mount Canoblas from the south and southeast. Why is this increase necessary? Is it to allow for an increase in the amount of waste rock to be accommodated?

The WRE will be constructed to achieve a final height across the landform of approximately 1,065 mRL<sup>1</sup>, as proposed in the EIS; with microrelief features up to 1,075 mRL in places across the top of the landform.

As part of the Amended Project, a small decrease has been made to the total volume of waste rock emplacement anticipated to be produced, from a total of 87.8 million bank<sup>2</sup> cubic metres (Mbcm) described in the EIS, compared to 84.5 Mbcm for the amended project (noting some of this material will be used in the construction of embankments, such as for the Tailings Storage Facility (TSF) and Water Management facilities (WMFs)). Despite this, there is no change to the height of the final landform of the waste rock emplacement proposed as part of the Amended Project.

*Note 2: a 'bank' cubic metre is a cubic metre of material in its natural state in the ground.*

4. The final form of the slopes of the WRE to the east, west and south are apparently too steep to allow grazing and instead are to be developed as a 'grassy woodland' and will only be subject to 'crash grazing' at most. How will the latter affect the survival of immature trees it is hoped to establish?

The grade of the slopes of the WRE are consistent with other hills and slopes in the general vicinity, however the land and soil capability assessment system accounts for slope and soil characteristics to determine suitability of rural land. The system is explained at: <https://www.environment.nsw.gov.au/-/media/OEH/Corporate-Site/Documents/Land-and-soil/land-soil-capability-assessment-scheme-120394.pdf>.

The system suggests that LSC 6 may be used for low intensity uses and needs to be managed. Crash grazing is one of several measures promoted in NSW for managing bushland and wildlife habitat as indicated in the following link: <https://www.environment.nsw.gov.au/-/media/OEH/Corporate-Site/Documents/Animals-and-plants/Conservation-management-notes/natural-regeration-conservation-management-notes-110659.pdf>

A number of management measures will be applied for the site rehabilitation and closure plan which will be subject to the approval of government agencies.

5. Has consideration been given to mitigating the fire hazard presented by the grass growth on the rehabilitated WRE if little grazing is feasible?

A bushfire hazard assessment was completed for the project by a suitably qualified bushfire assessor and ecologist, and was prepared in consideration of the NSW Rural Fires Act 1977 and the relevant guidance documents from the Rural Fire Service (RFS). A bushfire management plan (BFMP) will be prepared and implemented for construction, operation and decommissioning. Fire management will be an integral part of land management during and after mine operations.

6. Rumours abound concerning changes post-dating the information in the submissions and amendment reports. Is there any currency to those that (a) suggest that the electricity supply will be derived from the high voltage line running between Bathurst and Blayney, (b) that Ponds Lane is to be closed or its course is to be changed, and (c) that it may not be possible for traffic from some southern properties east of the new mine entrance to turn directly right on to the Mid-Western Highway towards Bathurst on exiting driveways.
- a) Appendix X of the Amendment Report outlines the proposed electricity supply coming from the TransGrid 132kV (kilovolt) line 948, that runs between Bathurst and Orange approximately 10km north of the project area;
  - b) It has been suggested that the intersection of the project may be safer than the existing Ponds Lane intersection, and because Fleetwood Lane is nearby, that the intersection may serve as an alternate access. Regis would be prepared to discuss this with Council and residents if it is considered to have merit, but at this stage, it is not part of the project;
  - c) The new access does not change the rights of access to the Mid Western Highway for any non-Regis properties.

## ATTACHMENT 2

### DANIEL SUTTON – QUESTIONS SUBMITTED VIA EMAIL ON 27 OCTOBER 2020

Questions for Community Consultative Committee (CCC) raised by community members to Daniel Sutton for CCC meeting dated 2nd November 2020.

Within Regis' response to submissions summary:

1. Section 5.4.2v states there is a health assessment report at appendix F of 'this report'. Appendix F of responses is the response to Department of Planning, Industry and Environment (DPIE) hazards and appendix F of the amendments is the Agricultural Impact Assessment, neither of which reference health. Should this refer to Appendix E of the submission responses instead, or is there another health assessment appendix?

The Health Impact Assessment is found in Appendix E.

2. At 5.2.2 it notes there will be chemical suppressants used to aid in dust control. What are the chemical suppressants to be used and how are they administered?

The reference to chemical suppressants is consistent with the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). There are many forms of commercial dust suppressions available that are widely used in mining operations. The appropriate product will be chosen based on the specific conditions at McPhillamys, including climate and truck movements. Regis commits to the selection of a product that is both environmentally friendly for human and ecological impacts and achieves the required particulate matter emission reduction.

3. At 5.2.2 it's noted that sign posted internal speed limit will be used to minimize dust. How will this be enforced? With disciplinary/financial penalty action to the driver?

Speed limits are enforced in all mines for environmental and safety purposes. Employees will be advised at site inductions of all site rules and company protocols if the rules are not adhered to.

4. 5.1.1iv) states Tailings Storage Facility (TSF) seepage is half a meter per year. Community understanding is the tailings seepage is in liquid form so can this be represented in volume? We assume the half a meter refers to half a meter of the surface area of the TSF, is this correct?

This is not correct. The reference to 50m seepage over 100 years is the "worst case" modelled seepage rate of horizontal movement, taking into account determined permeability rates. Volumes are expressed in s6.2.1 in Appendix H of the Amendment Report. This was also indicated schematically in Figure 9.31 in the water section of the EIS.

5. 5.1.2ii) Refers to a 'small reduction' in surface water flow but does not quantify the amount. How many Litres/second will the reduction of surface water be?

This section also states the impact on surface water will be short, temporary and once stock piles are complete and rehabilitation has been completed, then the influence on the surface water flow will be reduced. Given Regis is permanently changing the landform that dictates the volume and direction of surface water flow, how is it that these impacts will be short term and will be reduced?

Section 5.1.2 ii of the Submissions Report mentions a "minor change" in streamflow during operations.

In the long-term, following rehabilitation, the disturbed catchment area will significantly reduce and be 0.46% less than the current catchment area draining to Carcoar Dam. This level of change is not expected to be noticeable and the change will be within the natural variability of current flows. The annual volumes under different rainfall conditions are reproduced in Table 25 on page 94 in Appendix G to the Amendment Report.

General:

6. Regis claims that it's uneconomical to refill the void after operations, can you please confirm how much do they expect the cost of refilling the void to be?

Consistent with the EIS, a grazing land use is proposed over most of the rehabilitated mine development project area, with woodland proposed over the waste rock emplacement area and the final void remaining a void. Backfilling of the void is not a viable option and hence is not considered further as part of this project.

7. Were any surveys of Regis' neighbours conducted by your health impact assessor?

Although no detailed surveys were undertaken as part of the Health Impact Assessment, the assessment has been undertaken in accordance with relevant guidelines, policies and approved methods as described in Section 1.4 of the Health Impact Assessment. Notwithstanding, health issues of the surrounding population were considered as part of the Social Impact Assessment prepared for the EIS.

8. The health assessment states that Regis' consultants concluded that the local area is consistent with the entire Western NSW Local Health District (LHD), does Regis believe this accurately reflects their neighbours and those that will be impacted?

Section 3 of the Health Impact Assessment indicates that "data available for the larger LHD are expected to be also representative of the smaller population considered in this [assessment.]" The Health Impact Assessment also recognises that "areas surrounding the site may be more vulnerable to health-related impacts associated with the project, where compared with the general population of NSW". Health issues of the surrounding population were also considered as part of the Social Impact Assessment prepared for the EIS.

9. Can Regis explain their formula for determining the 'average' number of jobs they're claiming will be created, in particular the 480 during construction, the 120 for the construction of the pipeline and the 260 during operations?

The average number of jobs is determined by dividing the number of full time equivalent positions by the time that the respective phase operates for within the project.

Questions for DPIE:

10. Will the DPIE reports and consultant reviews/reports be made public?

The DPIE assessment report will be made publicly available on the Major Projects website.