

MINUTES

Clean TeQ Sunrise

Community Consultative Committee



	Community Consultative Committee	Meeting Date: Commenced:	27 August 2018 1:20pm
Independent Chairperson:	Lisa Andrews (LA)		
Member Attendees:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Laurie Hutchison, Wiradjuri Condobolin Corporation (LH) • Cr John Medcalf, Mayor, Lachlan Shire Council (JM) • Cr Mark Hall, Lachlan Shire Council (MH) • Cr Alan Ward, Parkes Shire Council (AW) • Steve Loane, Forbes Shire Council (SL) • Dennis Brady, Condobolin Chamber of Commerce (DR) • Des Ward, Community Representative (DW) • Narelle Sunderland, Community Representative (NS) • John Lagerlow, Community Representative (JL) • Helen Quade – Alternate Community Representative and Alternate Trundle Community Consultative Committee delegate (HQ) • James Fisher, Clean TeQ NSW Manager (JF) • Justine Fisher, Clean TeQ GM Government, External Relations & Community (JuF) • Tim Kindred, Clean TeQ Project and Start Up Director (TK) 		
Invited Guests:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mike Young, A/Executive Director Resource Assessment & Business Systems, Department of Planning and Environment (MY) <i>[left at 3:55pm]</i> • Clay Preshaw, Director Resources and Energy Assessment, Department of Planning and Environment (CP) <i>[left at 3:55pm]</i> • Gary Whytcross, Regional Director South and West NSW EPA (GW) • Dr Sandie Jones, Manager of Operations Central West, NSW EPA (SJ) • Peter Cribb, Principal, Resource Strategies (PC) • Lucas Burns, Senior Environmental Manager, Resource Strategies (LB) • Bronwyn Flynn, Clean TeQ Environmental Superintendent (BF) • Ben Stockdale, Clean TeQ, Chief Financial Officer (BS) 		
Observers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nana Peters, Concerned Borefields Residents Alliance (CoBRA) • Lisa Schiff, Acting Director Planning & Environment, Lachlan Shire Council • Josh Loxley, Regional Operations Officer, EPA 		
Venue:	Committee room, Lachlan Shire Council Administration building, Condobolin		
Minute takers:	Karen Worthington, Clean TeQ Community Relations Officer (KW) Alexandra Burke, Clean TeQ Community Relations Specialist (AB)		
Close:	4:35pm		

1. Welcome & Introductions

Independent Chairperson, Lisa Andrews welcomed all members and guests to the Community Consultative Committee (CCC) meeting. LA declared that she is an Independent Chairperson, appointed by the Secretary of the Department of Planning and Environment and engaged by Clean TeQ to chair this CCC meeting. For the benefit of all present, each attendee provided a brief introduction and stated their position on the CCC.

2. Apologies

Apologies were received from Sam Riggall, Clean TeQ's CEO, Deputy Mayor Barbara Newton (Parkes Shire Council), Mayor Ken Keith (Parkes Shire Council), Cr Steve Karaitiana (Forbes Shire Council), Geoff Rice (Parkes Chamber of Commerce) and John Hanrahan (Approvals Lead).

3. Declarations of Interest

LA confirmed that an amended declaration of pecuniary and non-pecuniary interests had been received from HQ.

4. Business Arising from previous minutes

LA confirmed that the minutes from the May meeting were finalised and a copy emailed to members on 29 June 2018. Responses to two questions taken on notice, regarding water supply and the 2006 bore test data, were incorporated into Addendum 1 of the May meeting minutes prior to finalisation. Two further questions taken on notice, regarding TSF height and noise limits at Currajong Park were addressed during the Clean TeQ presentation – details can be viewed on slide 28 of Clean TeQ's presentation. The TSF height question was also addressed by way of written correspondence to DW, prior to the CCC.

5. Correspondence Report

- 20/6/18 – Email to members with the draft minutes from the 30/5/18 meeting
- 25/6/18 – Email from Clean TeQ with two ASX announcements on the Definitive Feasibility Study
- 26/6/18 – Email from DW with comments on the minutes
- 29/6/18 - Email to members with the finalised minutes
- 31/7/18 – Email from JuF advising that the construction water transportation proposal as per MOD4 has been removed from MOD4 and advising of some staff changes
- 6/8/18 – Email from Clean TeQ with the August Sunrise e-News
- 13/8/18 – Email to members with the Meeting Notice for this meeting and advising of the attendance of Mike Young, Clay Preshaw, Gary Whytcross & Sandie Jones and requesting that questions be provided by COB 20/8/18 for response by DPE & EPA representatives at the CCC
- 16/8/18 – Email from Nana Peters, Concerned Borefields Residents Alliance, requesting attendance at the meeting
- 19/8/18 – Email from HQ submitting questions, these were forwarded on to the Department, EPA & Clean TeQ
- 20/8/18 – Email to CCC members asking if they have any objections to Mrs. Peters' (CoBRA) attendance. (Responses received.)
- 20/8/18 – Email from John Lagerlow with the list of questions on behalf of the Trundle Community Consultative Committee. These questions were forwarded through to the Department, EPA & Clean TeQ.
- 23/8/18 – Email received with Clean TeQ's latest newsletter
- 23/8/18 – Email to Mrs. Peters, granting observer status for this meeting
- 23/8/18 – Email to all members providing them with the agenda, which included attendees, correspondence report and questions that were submitted for the CCC meeting.

6. Department of Planning and Environment (Mike Young and Clay Preshaw)

A range of questions were asked during the following reports and presentations. Q&A is recorded below each relevant presentation.

Mike Young (Department of Planning and Environment)

MY on behalf of the Department of Planning and Environment (DPE) provided an introduction and overview of the DPE's position on the broader planning process and the considerations taken for their assessment of Clean TeQ's Modification 4. MY provided the following information:

- An overview of how DPE has conducted the assessment of the Project since 2001. He acknowledged that it has been a long time since 2001 and noted some people had concerns which have been acknowledged and considered by the DPE.
- Stepped CCC attendees through the Project approvals to date – Development Consent and 5 Modifications plus the one (Modification 4) under consideration.
- Explained that in terms of the Development Consent, the Project was approved by the Minister in 2001 and that the Development Consent remains valid. MY went on to explain that the types of changes being contemplated within Modification 4 are certainly within the bounds of s75W of the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Act*. The proposed Project changes do not require a new State Significant Development approval.
- Provided details on the approvals process for the mining industry and noted that some other mining operations currently operate under approvals from the 80s and 90s.
- Explained that the contemporisation of the Project Development Consent is consistent with how DPE regulates mines across NSW and that the Project would be regulated in a similar way as a very large coal mine, despite being a different type of operation and coal mines generally having a greater disturbance area.
- Explained that the DPE now applies conditions to approvals with an “outcomes focus” and that the expectation is that mines will operate within the conditions set.
- Explained that mines in NSW operate under various legislative frameworks, including;
 - Development Consent issued under the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Act*
 - Environmental Protection Licence (EPL) issued under the *Protection of the Environment Operations Act* by the EPA, and
 - Mining Lease, issued under the *Mining Act* by the DRG.
- In addition, MY explained that mining companies, just like other water users, are required to obtain relevant water licence/s under the *Water Management Act*. MY provided some background and context around current water sharing plans and the government’s position with regards to management of water as a resource.
- In terms of Modification 4, MY explained that the DPE and the IPC are legally constrained to only assess the aspects of the Project that are being changed (within MOD4).
- He explained that engagement and consultation with various agencies such as the EPA, Crown Lands, RMS, OEH, DI-Water and local councils has been a serious process and that the rigor has been as it were for a fresh application. He explained that the DPE is aware that some community members have concerns relating to air quality, water, monitoring, dust, traffic, noise and blasting and the implications on both water and agriculture in the region; and that the DPE has looked at all these concerns and sought expert advice from key agencies. In addition, MY explained that the DPE was aware that the VPA with Forbes, Parkes and Lachlan Councils was close to being finalised and that it was a generous VPA.
- Outlined the role of the DPE’s compliance division and explained that within the regulatory bodies, significant non-compliance fines and prosecutions have all increased. Furthermore, MY explained that the company would be required to undertake monitoring and that relevant monitoring reporting must be made available on the company’s website.
- MY explained that while the role of the CCC is an important one, the CCC cannot play a regulatory role. He said the DPE had received positive feedback from the Chair about the work the Clean TeQ Sunrise CCC has been doing and that it’s vital that the CCC continue to be used as a forum for community discussion, information exchange and transparency. MY also informed the CCC that members can make reasonable requests for information if they feel there is a need for additional studies. All requests need to be made through the Chair. MY indicated that the DPE can assist in determining if a CCC request is reasonable.
- MY noted that the DPE is expecting to finalise their assessment report (and are close to doing so) by the end of the current week and that this will then be submitted to the IPC within a few weeks. A decision from the IPC is expected before the end of the calendar year.

Q&A relating to the DPE report

HQ spoke: Thanked MY for attending and acknowledged the time extended to her for phone calls and meetings with DPE staff since lodgement of Modification 4. HQ expressed she’d like to address some points on behalf of members of the near neighbours’ community.

- HQ confirmed that she and other members of the near neighbours’ community are not opposed to the Project though they are looking for a basis for which they can fully support the Project.

- HQ said she is seeking consent conditions to be imposed on the project that provide security and comfort for everyone.
- HQ said they were not looking to raise things from the past, but said they are seeking to have the air quality issues raised in Modification 4 objections addressed.
- HQ expressed concerns with the DPE's removal of Condition 11 of the Development Consent during the Modification 3 approval process and said that if there was such a level of confidence that the clause would not be triggered, then the clause should be reinstated to provide a level of comfort to those living close to the project.
- HQ expressed that while the regulators might be aware of their concerns the members of the near neighbours' community didn't feel that anything was being done to address them.
- HQ raised concerns regarding the ramifications for non-compliance, suggesting that the fines imposed on mining companies are like a slap on the hand with a wet lettuce leaf.
- In closing HQ said that the near neighbours are not looking to stall the project, they can see the benefits of the development proceeding, but that these benefits should not be at the expense of anyone's peace of mind.

MY responded: thanking HQ for raising the concerns. MY informed HQ that the DPE hasn't finished its assessment of Modification 4.

DW asked: When Modification 3 was lodged why wasn't the original CCC called together? The original CCC was put into recess not disbanded.

MY answered: Under the provisions of the legislation there wasn't a requirement to consult with the original CCC. MY informed the CCC that the DPE had consulted with key agencies and the local councils in accordance with relevant legislation.

DW responded: Key elements of the Development Consent were changed during the Modification 3 approval process, such as removal of the land acquisition condition and several management plans, with no community consultation.

MY responded: There are still a substantial number of key management plans within the current Development Consent. Whilst the community has objected to not being consulted, the consent provides very similar conditions in how the Project is regulated.

SL commented: For the minutes, Forbes Shire Council (FSC) is fully supportive of the project and excited for its development, even though it is not the host council. SL stated he was pleased to hear MY talk about the company undertaking additional groundwater modelling, as this is the key issue for people in the borefield area. SL informed the CCC that Forbes Shire Council is waiting for information on the water pipeline (route, depth and engineering) and that Council is very close to finalising the VPA.

SL asked: Has the DPE arrived on a decision about consultation and contemporisation?

MY responded: Whilst there are a few mines out there that have 'old-school' approvals, there are fewer and fewer. For this kind of updating of modifications, there are no triggers for community consultation where there are changes to approval conditions.

SL asked: What is the tenure of the CCC?

MY responded: For the life of mine.

HQ asked: To what extent do the IPC determinations typically vary from the recommendations made by the DPE?

MY responded: There have been instances where the IPC has refused to issue consent. MY was not aware of any instances where the DPE has recommended refusal and the IPC has approved an application. The IPC is its own authority and may disagree with recommendations put forward by DPE. In terms of Condition 11 the IPC may determine that it should be reinstated, although the current approach accords with the current guidelines. Though the IPC, being the consent authority, is not able to take away the current Development Consent or vary it in relation to matters not relevant to MOD 4.

CP commented: From his experience with the PAC (now IPC) they have always looked very closely at conditions and usually made changes to the DPE recommendations.

DW asked: If the CCC is established for the life of mine, why wasn't the original CCC recalled?

MY responded: The DPE issued guidelines for CCCs (November 2016, Community Consultative Committee Guidelines). A condition of the Project's Development Consent (current) was that a CCC was established.

JL asked: Did the DPE consider addressing the questions provided relating to Trundle Traffic Issues?

MY responded: If they are specific questions he would need to take them on notice as he hadn't seen the list of questions. MY gave a commitment that he would provide a response.

LA confirmed: The questions JL referred to were sent to all members and the DPE with other community questions.

Following further discussion regarding the questions provided by JL it was determined that the questions related to the proposed draft modified consent conditions issued by DPE to relevant state agencies and LGA's. This document had not been circulated to the CCC and had been provided to JL by an anonymous party. It was felt that given other members had not had the benefit of viewing the document and it was recommended that these questions be directed to the IPC.

7. Environment Protection Agency (Gary Whytcross and Dr. Sandie Jones)

Gary Whytcross and Dr Sandie Jones

GW and SJ provided an introduction and explanation of the EPA's role in relation to licensing, monitoring, regulation and enforcement. This included the following information and explanations:

- The EPA is responsible for regulating air emissions, noise and water quality.
- The EPA's approach is to have limits and monitoring placed at the source.
- An EPL cannot be issued without Development Consent approval as the approved conditions are reflected within the EPL.
- The EPA can advise that it has required the company to install an onsite meteorological station.
- All modelling shows the proposed process can meet the set standards comfortably, though the EPA will be undertaking a verification process and will require monitoring onsite.
- The EPA has suggested to DPE and the company that two continuous particulate matter monitors are established and can confirm this is in the draft EPL conditions.
- The EPL is about the operation of the facility, with limits set. The company is required to operate the facility to meet the EPL limits and conditions.
- The process in relation to non-compliance includes the ability for a pollution reduction program to be put in place on the licence to correct non-compliances.
- An EPL is a requirement prior to construction though the licence would be need to be modified prior to operations commencing.

In addition to the above information, SJ provided a short presentation that included information on the following subjects;

- Operating conditions
- Example conditions – dust and noise
- Meteorological and water monitoring
- Air verification report
- Community question – real time monitoring
 - Continuous particulate matter monitoring at two sites – TEOM (construction & operations)
 - Continuous meteorology monitoring (construction & operations)
 - Continuous air emission monitoring – sulfuric acid plant stack and two power generation facilities (operations only)

A discussion took place around night-time noise measurement parameters. PC explained that noise criteria should be based on the noise modelling levels and in accordance with the Voluntary Land Acquisition and Mitigation Policy. SJ is to provide an email to LA explaining the increase in noise levels at Currajong Park

ACTION: SJ to provide an email to LA explaining the increase in noise.

[Q&A from EPA report](#)

HQ asked: Why is the measurement frequency regarding noise monitoring blank (slide 8, Example Conditions - Noise, point 11 & 12 of the EPA presentation)?

SJ responded: Because Clean TeQ will not be required to undertake real-time monitoring, they must demonstrate that they are compliant.

MY commented: The DPE expects Clean TeQ to undertake attended noise monitoring on a regular basis. Clean TeQ will need to demonstrate compliance on an ongoing basis at locations stipulated by the DPE.

SL asked: Will the pumps at the borefield be diesel or electric? As diesel pumps are likely to generate noise.

JF responded: The pumps will be electric in operations, however, will initially operate diesel pumps during construction. It is important to remember that there is onsite water storage during construction and therefore the diesel pumps will not need to operate continuously.

DW asked: Why not have real-time monitoring?

SJ responded: Noise monitoring is very complicated as there are various influences that can impact on the monitoring, such as frogs, local traffic, birds etc.

JL asked: Are the EPL noise limits only applicable to the mine site?

GW responded: We regulate the mine site that the EPL applies to. The relevant Council regulates noise on roads.

MY commented: The DPE is still required to assess road noise through the approval process.

DW asked: Where will the monitoring data be available?

SJ responded: The company is required to keep all monitoring data.

TK commented: Relevant monitoring data would be reported in compliance reports as required on a regular basis.

MY commented: We would expect the CCC to be a forum to receive relevant monitoring information.

LA confirmed: A commitment to provide relevant monitoring data to the CCC had already been provided by the company.

DW asked: Why has the TSF been designed with a spill way to spill up to 800ML in a wet year?

GW responded: The EPA will take advice from the Dams Safety Committee and DI – Water as the experts.

SJ commented: The Dam Safety Committee will play a role in the design of the TSF.

DW commented: The BOM's modelling for a 100-year event is 32mm per hour and that using data from the Murrumbogey Met station is not a reliable method to indicate heavy rainfall in the operations area.

MY commented: The DPE will be relying on the DI - Water to look at the information that has been provided.

8. Late Question from Trundle Consultative Committee

Have any changes been made recently to the designation of the Bogan Way to allow the use of the road by B-triples and if so, does this mean the main street of Trundle cannot be closed for community events?

JF responded: Clean TeQ have obtained the relevant heavy vehicle permit for use of AB-Triples through the National Heavy Vehicle Regulator (NHVR).

It was explained that road closures for special events are the responsibility of the local Council, RMS and the Police and that representatives from each sit on a Traffic Management Committee.

TK commented: Clean TeQ would not impact on community events seeking road closures and that operational changes can be made to accommodate these events.

9. Clean TeQ Reports (Tim Kindred, Justine Fisher, Bronwyn Flynn and Peter Cribb)

Tim Kindred, Clean TeQ Project and Start-up Director

TK provided the CCC with a presentation on the Definitive Feasibility Study (DFS) completed in June, commenting that the completion of the DFS was an important milestone for Clean TeQ Sunrise.

- The DFS models the first 25 years of production, with sufficient ore reserves to extend beyond 40 years
- Results confirm the Project's global importance as a sustainable, long-life, low-cost source of high purity cobalt and nickel sulphates for the battery revolution
- Clean TeQ Sunrise is forecast to produce high quality nickel sulphate and cobalt sulphate products in sufficient quantities to manufacture around 500,000 electric vehicles per annum
- The Project delivery model will be determined in Q3 2018 with a final investment decision targeted for early 2019
- Completion of the DFS provides the platform to enable the acceleration of product offtake agreements and project financing

JuF provided the CCC with an overview on Community and Social Benefits slide presented in TK's report, this included;

- The DFS found Clean TeQ Sunrise has the potential to provide tremendous economic and social benefits to the local communities of Lachlan, Forbes, Parkes & surrounding areas.
 - In addition to employment opportunities, taxes and royalties, these benefits will come in the form of council rates, upgrades to local infrastructure, community enhancement contributions and other local community initiatives. Statistics provided included;
 - Peak Construction Workforce: 1000 people
 - Employee Salaries and Wages: A\$1.9 Billion (including staff and contractors)
 - Steady State Operations Workforce: 300 people (excluding mining contractors and ancillary services)
 - State Royalties and Payroll Tax: A\$630 million over life of mine
 - Corporate Tax: A\$2.2 Billion over life of mine

In addition, TK provided an indicative project timeline, explaining;

- Plan to commence construction of the water pipeline and construction camp late 2018
- Moving into FEED (front-end engineering and design)
- Continue to secure funding and offtake agreements

[Q&A relating to TK report](#)

SL asked: Where does the product go? Can any of it be sold in Australia or is it all exported?

BS responded: Mainly centred around areas with electric vehicle manufacturing, unfortunately there is no related manufacturing in Australia, though we have had discussions with the Commonwealth Government to try and invigorate possible downstream opportunities in Australia.

JL asked: How many people will be onsite during steady state operations?

TK responded: This is a point that is under some consideration. TK explained that during peak construction the workforce is expected to be around 1000. During operations, 200 of the approximate 300 strong operational workforce would be based onsite, on various shift rotations, meaning that not all 200 people will be onsite at the same time.

Justine Fisher Clean TeQ General Manager Govt. External Relations and Community

JuF provided the CCC with an overview on Community Engagement over June, July and August, this included;

- Community and stakeholder engagement activities
 - 1:1 meetings
 - Community drop-in sessions
 - Shop fronts
 - Supporting local events and fundraising efforts
 - Community Information Sessions
 - Federal MP and near neighbour site visits
- Means of keeping people informed
 - Advertising locally
 - eNews
 - Community newsletter
 - Social media
 - Meetings, presentations & shopfronts
 - Information stands at local Ag shows
- Quarterly Stakeholder Engagement Summary

Bronwyn Flynn, Clean TeQ's Environmental Superintendent and Peter Cribb, Resource Strategies Principal

BF and PC provided the CCC with an update and Modification 4 and Environmental Management, this included;

Modification 4

- Removal of construction water transport from Modification 4
- Finalising VPA with local Councils
- DPE preparing assessment report and draft Development Consent conditions
- Independent Planning Commission process

Environmental Management

- Groundwater works program – 2018 Bore census (borefield and mine site)
 - The purpose of the bore census
 - Summary of field investigations and use
 - Landholder reports being prepared
 - Preparation of the Groundwater Management Plan
- Groundwater monitoring (borefield and mine site)
- Groundwater model (borefield and mine site)
- Road Transport – Trundle
 - Project traffic generation - revised to reduce the number of vehicle movements
 - Road network - The Bogan Way, approved and adequate capacity for project heavy vehicle
 - Pedestrian Access Review – no significant deterioration to safety and no road upgrades required. Kerb and threshold treatments to be implemented.
 - Road Noise – assessment predicted no exceedances
- Site access
 - ML 1770 boundary will be fenced for safety & security, with no public access available
 - Public access to Dam 22 will cease once the ML is fenced – Clean TeQ will undertake community consultation regarding recreational and emergency water supply options

- Rail Siding Access
 - Confirmed access will be via The Bogan Way and Scotsons Lane
 - Intersection upgrades are required
- The McGrane Way (MR354)
 - Modification 4 includes the proposed use of the McGrane Way

May CCC Action Items

- Tailing Storage Facility
 - Maximum design elevation is 314 m AHD
 - Height will be between 10 and 35 m above ground level
- Currajong Park noise criteria
 - Noise criteria in the development consent and will also be in the EPL (table showing limits on slide 28)

Q&A relating to BF and PC report

DW commented: The bore census letter sent by the company stated a yield test would be completed. To do this you have to do a pump test and measure the recovery.

PC responded: Ground water levels is the priority measurement. If a drawdown is occurring while pumping, we can monitor that via the water level. Clean TeQ will be monitoring water levels.

SL asked: [Directed to the DPE] Is the bore census a reflection of what you asked the company to do?

MY responded: No, as we haven't yet asked the company to do anything.

PC commented: We are preparing the Groundwater Management Plan; the contemporary information collected during the bore census will be used to inform the groundwater model and the groundwater model will inform the Groundwater Management Plan. During operations, we will manage the borefields in a way to reduce impacts to other users in the area.

SL commented: From the outset the community have been concerned with the dated modelling and are seeking comfort through a new groundwater model. I thought there was going to be a new model.

PC responded: The 2018 bore census has recorded up to date water levels. This data will be used in the preparation of the groundwater model in consultation with DI-Water. In addition, there is a network of Government monitoring bores near the borefields with data dating back to 1970, the company has data from the 2005 census and moving forward has loggers in its monitoring bores (at the borefield and mine site). All this data is available to update the groundwater model. All relevant monitoring data that is obtained will be reported annually through the Annual Review, as well as to the CCC.

DW asked: If the DPE had instructed the DI-Water in Dubbo not to meet with him?

CP responded: No, this wasn't the case.

MY responded: If you wish to meet with Tim Baker (DI-Water) please put a request through the Chair and the CCC can facilitate this discussion.

MY commented: That he felt it would benefit the CCC to invite either DI-Water or DRG to attend a CCC meeting.

ACTION: LA to extend an invitation to DI-Water and/or DRG to attend a CCC meeting.

DW asked: How many of the groundwater monitoring bores will be left once the mine (pits) are developed?

PC answered: They will be left in place until disturbed by the mining operations. The groundwater monitoring bores on the extremities of the mine site will be left in place.

HQ asked: If the ML area could be changed to accommodate public access to Dam 22?

BS responded: All areas within the ML are required and areas would not be removed. Noting that the Dam 22 area has always been included in the Mining Lease Application area and was not added as part of Modification 3.

PC commented: The watercourse would not be blocked. Water will flow through the site via a water diversion system and continue to flow north.

DW asked: Following mine closure what happens to the diversion / drainage structures?

PC responded: The diversion structures will be designed in accordance with the Development Consent requirements and Clean TeQ will not be able to relinquish the Mining Lease until it is able to demonstrate that the diversion structure is safe, stable and non-polluting.

10. Community concerns

A list of questions from CCC representatives were received prior to the meeting. These questions have been addressed through the various reports and presentations.

11. General Business

DW asked: John Hanrahan was going to provide the details of the pump tests completed in 2006 of the borefield. This question was taken on notice.

JM commented: He appreciates the attendance of the guest presenters today and hopes that everyone has taken something away from the information provided, commenting that with the IPC coming up it is important to get community concerns resolved now.

12. Next meeting

Next meeting confirmed for Monday 3rd December 2018

ACTION ITEMS

ITEM	ISSUE	RESPONSIBILITY
1	SJ to provide email to LA on increased noise limits	SJ
2	LA invite DI-Water to attend CCC meeting	LA
3	LA invite DRG to attend CCC meeting	LA