

DISCUSSION QUESTIONS & ANSWERS PROVIDED BY ROB CORKERY, RW CORKERY & CO PTY LTD

1.1 Are the proposed policy principles for application to new State significant mining projects appropriate?

Partly - The comments provided in Items 1 to 3 in Table 1 need to be considered.

1.2 Are the proposed policy principles for application to all State significant mining projects appropriate?

No. It needs to be recognised that planning for existing state significant mining projects is invariably well advanced and retrofitting a number of the principles would be inappropriate. Reliance should be placed upon ensuring the MOPs and Closure Plan have sufficient detail to achieve an appropriate standard of rehabilitation.

1.3 Are there other policy principles that should be included? What are they?

More reliance should be placed upon RCEs and realistic security bonds that have already been demonstrated to focus miners upon rehabilitation costs.

2.1 Is the policy framework for determining the acceptability of final voids appropriate?

No. See Item iv) in the attached document. Much more research needs to be undertaken by DPE / DRG on case histories relating to metalliferous mines, e.g. Peak Hill, Cadia and Cobar.

2.2 A number of final landform options could be considered in a policy framework for the assessment of final voids. What are the benefits and costs of:

- **Requiring final voids to be beneficially re-used?**
- **Requiring backfilling of final voids in areas where the environmental and social costs would otherwise be too high?**

2.3 Should other final landform options be considered in a policy framework for the assessment of final voids? What are the benefits and costs?

The Policy framework needs to recognise the variability of mine locations, local environments, mineralogy, etc. Please encourage miners to consider only feasible alternatives rather than responding to impractical options for their particular resource.

3.1 What is the most effective way of improving consideration of rehabilitation and closure in the early stages of mine planning?

See tracked comments in Guideline response. Introducing potential options for rehabilitation and mine closure could be presented indicatively in a scoping report prior to seeking SEARs.

3.2 Are there any other changes in the early stages of mine planning required? What are they?

It would be useful for miners to acknowledge early in their planning process, that they are committed to the payment of the security deposit based on the RCE calculations prior to and during the life of the proposed mine.

4.1 What aspects of rehabilitation are appropriate to include as 'binding rehabilitation outcomes' (particularly for progressive rehabilitation)?

See tracked comments in Guideline response.

5.1 Are the proposals to improve regulatory processes once a mine has been approved appropriate?

Definitely not. Both DPE and DRG need to resolve how to only prepare a single document for one of the authorities to manage. Whilst the guideline acknowledges that a single document addressing DPE's conditional requirements and DRG's MOP requirements can be prepared, there are still the conflicts arising from the expectations of both agencies.

5.2 Are any other changes at the assessment phase required? What are they?

It would be preferable that the Landscape and Rehabilitation Plan is no longer required for mining operations, and instead, only a comprehensive MOP. It remains RWC's preference to re-introduce requirements for MOPs to include a greater quantity of detail regarding mining operations and not just focus on rehabilitation. In our experience, more accurate rehabilitation planning is achieved when there is greater emphasis placed upon documenting the staged mining sequence.