

Latrobe Valley
Regional
**REHABILITATION
STRATEGY OVERVIEW**

Consultation Report



Published and prepared by
Department of Jobs, Precincts and Regions
1 Spring Street Melbourne, Victoria 3000
Telephone (03) 9208 3799

May 2020

© Copyright State Government of Victoria 2019
This publication is copyright. No part may be
reproduced by any process except in accordance
with provisions of the *Copyright Act 1968*.

Authorised by the Victorian Government, Melbourne.

Designed by DJPR Design Studio

ISBN 978-1-76090-203-2 (Print)
ISBN 978-1-76090-204-9 (Online)

Disclaimer

This publication may be of assistance to you
but the State of Victoria and its employees do
not guarantee that the publication is without
flaw of any kind or is wholly appropriate for your
particular purposes and therefore disclaims all
liability for any error, loss or other consequence
which may arise from you relying on any
information in this publication.

Accessibility

This publication is published in PDF
and Word formats on djpr.vic.gov.au

Contents

Introduction	2
Consultation process	3
Other engagement activities	3
Presentation of this report	4
Survey design and summary of responses	4
Information about respondents	4
Responses	4
What is your level of knowledge regarding mine rehabilitation in the Latrobe Valley?	4
What is important to you when you think about mine rehabilitation in the Latrobe Valley?	5
What do you feel are the most important things Government can do as part of the planning, rehabilitation, and post-rehabilitation stages of the Latrobe Valley coal mines?	5
What do you feel are the most important things the coal mine operators can do as part of the planning, rehabilitation, and post-rehabilitation stages of the Latrobe Valley coal mines?	7
What do you feel are the most important things community and stakeholders can contribute as part of the planning, rehabilitation, and post-rehabilitation stages of the Latrobe Valley coal mines?	8
How would you like to be engaged in the rehabilitation process for the Latrobe Valley brown coal mines?	8
Overall, do the principles outlined in Section 4 of the LVRRS Overview meet your expectations?	9
Are there any changes you would suggest to the proposed principles outlined in Section 4 of the LVRRS Overview? If so, please provide a short explanation as to why you have suggested these changes?	9
Are there any specific elements of the LVRRS Overview that were not clear, or need further information?	9
Do you have any further comments on the LVRRS Overview?	10
Next steps	10
Appendix One: LVRRS Overview online consultation questions	11
References	12

1. Introduction

The Latrobe Valley's three brown coal mines – Hazelwood, Yallourn and Loy Yang – have fuelled most of Victoria's electricity generation since 1924. Hazelwood closed in 2017 and Yallourn and Loy Yang are planned to close by 2032 and 2048 respectively. Each of the Latrobe Valley brown coal mine operators are required to develop a plan to rehabilitate their mine sites in order to achieve a safe, stable and sustainable landscape once mining activity ceases.

A reopened Inquiry into a coal fire that burned for 45 days at Hazelwood in 2014 found that using water to create 'pit lakes' in the areas where coal has been mined is likely to be the most viable way to achieve safe and stable rehabilitation of the mines. However, the Inquiry recognised that significant knowledge gaps existed in relation to the feasibility of this rehabilitation option.

These investigations – geotechnical, water and land use planning studies – have been undertaken as part of the Victorian Government's preparation of the Latrobe Valley Regional Rehabilitation Strategy (LVRRS).

The studies, which were carried out by technical specialists from 2017 to 2019, considered the regional benefits and risks associated with stabilising the mine pits (or voids) by creating full or partial pit lakes. These studies will inform the final Strategy which will provide information on the:

- regional risks that need to be considered and addressed in rehabilitation plans;
- feasibility of using water if required for safe, stable and sustainable rehabilitation; and
- possible future land uses for the rehabilitated sites in a regional context.

The final Strategy will be prepared by 30 June 2020.

2. Latrobe Valley Regional Rehabilitation Strategy Overview consultation process

In late 2019, the Victorian Government published the *Latrobe Valley Regional Rehabilitation Strategy Overview* (the Overview or LVRRS Overview). The Overview presented a set of draft principles, objectives, roles and responsibilities as the basis of the final strategy. The Overview was a snapshot of thinking at the time that will be superseded by the Strategy, which is due to be prepared by 30 June 2020.

The Overview was made available for public consultation and feedback between 20 November 2019 and 17 January 2020.

The consultation provided an opportunity for the Project Team to:

- a) hear from and understand what's important to the local community and key stakeholders when it comes to mine rehabilitation in the Latrobe Valley; and

- b) gain feedback on the draft LVRRS principles, objectives, roles and responsibilities.

Feedback was obtained through an online engagement process run through the Victorian Government's dedicated online community and stakeholder engagement platform Engage Victoria (engage.vic.gov.au). Here, participants were asked a series of 10 questions relating to mine rehabilitation in the Latrobe Valley and the Overview. A copy of these questions is provided as **Appendix One** of this report.

In addition, a number of stakeholders chose to provide longer submissions or submissions that provided general feedback in response to the LVRRS Overview.

All submitters were asked to provide their consent to publish their submissions. Where consent was provided, these submissions have been made available electronically on the dedicated LVRRS Overview page on Engage Victoria (<https://engage.vic.gov.au/latrobe-valley-regional-rehabilitation-strategy>). This report is also available on the same page.

Representatives from the Project Team also met individually with key stakeholders to walk them through the Overview. The Project Team has worked in close consultation with the mine operators, water corporations, Latrobe City Council and a number of other key stakeholders in preparing the LVRRS to date and was keen to seek their feedback on the Overview.

3. Other concurrent engagement activities

Other engagement processes relevant to the LVRRS that were either occurring or complete at the time of feedback being sought on the Overview included:

- A series of six focus groups which were undertaken in Moe, Morwell, Traralgon, Churchill and Sale in December 2019. The purpose of these focus groups was to understand the views of the broader Latrobe Valley community (including those downstream of the Latrobe River) regarding mine rehabilitation, particularly about some of the principles contained within the LVRRS Overview. Participants in these focus groups were randomly selected by a market research agency.
- The LVRRS Project Team has hosted several community open days and events over the life of the Project, promoted via email distributions, newspaper advertising, media interviews and social media.
- Targeted stakeholder engagement was undertaken to inform the development of a position on water access for mine rehabilitation. The LVRRS is tasked with looking at the feasibility of water as a rehabilitation option; including water availability for mine rehabilitation under various climate predictions and the policy and legislative measures that may be required to enable this. The Department of Environment, Land, Water and Planning (DELWP) led a targeted engagement program to seek feedback on this issue.
- In October and November 2019, DELWP also undertook consultation on the draft *Latrobe Valley Preliminary Land Use Vision*. The Preliminary Land Use Vision identifies the types of land uses that the rehabilitated brown coal mines might be able to support across four key themes. The Vision was open for feedback through Engage Victoria between October and November 2019 (<https://engage.vic.gov.au/latrobe-preliminary-land-use-vision>). More than 70 submissions were received, and the feedback utilised to inform the final LVRRS.

4. Presentation of this report

This report presents the feedback received on the LVRRS Overview. It outlines each of the questions that were asked of respondents on Engage Victoria during the

consultation period (provided in **Appendix One** of this report) and provides a summary of the feedback provided for each.

The longer submissions that provided general feedback are also summarised in this report, under the most relevant questions.

5. Survey design and summary of submissions

The survey seeking feedback on the LVRRS Overview contained two multiple choice questions and eight open questions.

The survey also contained four questions that sought information about the stakeholder group, postcode, age and gender of respondents. The survey is included as **Appendix One**.

A total of 31 submissions were received in response to the LVRRS Overview.

21 of these submissions provided direct responses to the questions asked on the Engage Victoria webpage.

10 of these submissions were longer submissions, which provided general feedback on the Overview.

Information about respondents

Of the 21 submissions which directly responded to the questions on Engage Victoria, 16 respondents provided postcode details; 12 of those were from postcodes within Latrobe City, two within the

Baw Baw Shire municipality and one within the Wellington Shire municipality. Four were from outside of Latrobe City.

15 respondents provided age group demographics, with 70% of those respondents aged over 55.

13 respondents provided their stakeholder group, with more than half of those identifying as community representatives. Other stakeholder groups respondents identified with included local government, farming, business operators and mine staff.

6. Responses

The information below provides a summary of the feedback received as part of the consultation on the LVRRS Overview.

What is your level of knowledge regarding mine rehabilitation in the Latrobe Valley?

This question used a Likert scale and asked respondents to nominate themselves as being either unfamiliar with, having some knowledge of or having a strong knowledge of mine rehabilitation in the Latrobe Valley. It provides useful information about the respondent's level of knowledge on the issue. 17 respondents answered this question; 10 described themselves as having some knowledge of mine rehabilitation, five said they have a strong technical understanding, while one respondent said they were unfamiliar with mine rehabilitation in the Latrobe Valley and another one selected the 'other' option.

What is important to you when you think about mine rehabilitation in the Latrobe Valley?

This question was designed to help provide an understanding of the issues that are of most importance to stakeholders when it comes to mine rehabilitation in the Latrobe Valley.

One of the key themes to come through several of the submissions was the desire for the rehabilitated mine voids to offer some amenity value to not only the region, but the state of Victoria more broadly. Nine respondents noted the range of economic development opportunities that the rehabilitated mine voids might be able to support and the responses indicate a desire to see these realised.

As Environment Victoria stated in its response:

"the rehabilitated sites need to leave the Latrobe Valley with a positive legacy from coal mining and should create a positive amenity for the community that contributes to the future social and economic integrity of the region".

The mine licensees and power station operators note that it's

important that expectations are managed regarding the delivery of amenity value. The mine licensees recognise in their submissions that they have a legislative obligation to deliver a safe and stable final landform, not necessarily one that offers amenity value. ENGIE has acknowledged that it intends to rehabilitate its Hazelwood site to a state that can support future recreational uses; however, is not necessarily responsible for funding these. Loy Yang B Power Station has cautioned against creating expectations that the mine licensees will fund rehabilitation activities beyond a state that is safe, stable and sustainable.

Respondents to the LVRRS Overview were also keen to ensure that the rehabilitation of the region's three brown coal mines does not come at a cost, specifically, that there is not an environmental impact as a result of whatever rehabilitated landform is ultimately chosen. In particular, the importance of the region's river system and its significance

to regional ecological resilience and the Ramsar-listed Gippsland Lakes was noted. More than a third of respondents expressed concerns about the impacts on water availability for other uses if water is supplied to the mines to undertake rehabilitation activities, while others questioned whether or not the pit lake option was really 'sustainable' given that it will require further water each year to account for evaporative loss.

The origins of the LVRRS can be traced back to the Hazelwood Mine Fire and the government response to the Inquiry that followed. Respondents noted the need to ensure that fire risk was appropriately managed. Capping of exposed coal to mitigate fire risk was specifically mentioned as well.

Responses noted the high-value of the region's coal resource and its potential to support future low emissions projects to produce alternative products including hydrogen and synthetic fuels. One submitter described a desire to not see the coal resource quarantined while another said that it is important that "there will still be access to the coal resource if in the future other uses are found for brown coal"². Similar sentiments are expressed in Latrobe City Council's submission, which notes that "mine rehabilitation should be undertaken in a manner that does not preclude future opportunities to utilise what is a globally significant resource"³.

What do you feel are the most important things Government can do as part of the planning, rehabilitation, and post-rehabilitation stages of the Latrobe Valley coal mines?

A number of the key themes to emerge as important to respondents as part of the previous question again emerged here. This time however, participants expressed a general view that government had some role in either protecting (in the case of water resources and environmental values) or preserving (in the case of the coal resource and its ability to support future low emissions coal projects) what they had identified as important, or assessing risks and alternative options (in the case of the pit lake and alternative rehabilitation options).

In responses to this question, two words appear regularly throughout the submissions – clarity and transparency.

Transparency

Much of the feedback on this point relates to government decision-making regarding mine rehabilitation and the need to ensure this is understood by stakeholders, particularly the Latrobe Valley community. In addition, the need for government to ensure that the community is engaged regarding mine rehabilitation issues was also highlighted. The LVRRS Overview notes that the role of government in supporting the achievement of the LVRRS' objectives (among others) is to provide "guidance on community engagement required to support the rehabilitation and closure process"⁴. Latrobe City Council suggests in its submission that more than guidance is needed and that an opportunity for public feedback and submissions on rehabilitation plans should be formalised through a legislated process such as an Environmental Effects Statement. What is clear, is that there is an expectation for open and transparent community engagement regarding mine rehabilitation.

Clarity

The mine licensees and power station operators expressed a need for clarity of process, decision-making pathways and evidence to be provided by the mine operators. In meetings with departmental representatives regarding the Overview, the mine operators recounted instances of 'shifting goalposts' on other issues, where a lack of clarity led to confusion and uncertainty regarding what was expected from them. The mine operators are keen to see government provide clarity around the evidence base that would be required to satisfy a number of new requirements proposed in the LVRRS Overview, particularly an analysis of rehabilitation options that don't use water as well as how they essential for mine rehabilitation.

The need for clarity emerged again regarding the definitions of some of the key terms related to

mine rehabilitation. In providing feedback on the most important things government can do as part of the mine rehabilitation process, one respondent noted government ought to:

"be more prescriptive about what will and will not constitute a sustainable outcome. This will benefit all stakeholders, including the [mine] operators as this will remove ambiguity and investment of developing options that have no chance of meeting sustainability criteria"⁵.

Other rehabilitation options

Another theme to consistently emerge was the need for assessment of rehabilitation options other than the pit lake. One Latrobe Valley community member described one of the most important things government can do is:

"encourage and facilitate the development [of] a range of potential options rather than being, as is currently apparent, locked into a single option that is dependent on a number of as yet untested assumptions"⁶.

Similar sentiments were expressed in other submissions, with a number of respondents keen to see the benefits and risks associated with rehabilitation options other than the pit lake assessed and this information openly shared with community.

Managing environmental risks

The need for government to appropriately assess and manage any environmental risks, particularly to waterways, security of water resources and overall ecological health were also noted. Responses that included this ranged from general in nature, for example "consider long-term climate projections in setting parameters for rehabilitation, including water availability"⁷ to quite specific. The West Gippsland Catchment Management Authority provided several suggestions in terms of how this could occur in practice, including an ecological risk assessment of specific waterways and consideration of increasing the size of the current environmental entitlement in the Blue Rock reservoir⁸.

Engagement with Traditional Owners

The submissions also highlighted the need for engagement with Traditional Owners. The submissions note this should be guided by the principles of self-determination. While the Gunaikurnai Land and Waters Aboriginal Corporation acknowledges the work of government in establishing the Mine Land Rehabilitation Authority, it notes government has an ongoing role in ensuring healing of country through mine rehabilitation. It also notes the need for government to understand the concept of connected Country, particularly regarding the region's wetlands, rivers and lakes.

Opportunity cost

Latrobe City Council notes that government ought to undertake an "economic assessment of water resources available within the Latrobe River Catchment, including opportunity costs if expanded irrigation opportunities are not realised"⁹. The Victorian Farmers Federation's submission also provides several suggestions on this front including that DELWP consider the true value of water, and its increased value in the future when considering rehabilitation options for the mines, while another submitter acknowledges that government "should not hand over fully subsidised water as a cheap option to the private owners [mine licensees]"¹⁰.

Working in partnership

Submissions noted the need for the government to work in partnership with the mine operators, the community and other key stakeholders to deliver the best possible rehabilitation outcome for the region. The mine licensees among others noted that government has a large role to play in mine rehabilitation, particularly given that it was responsible for mining and power generation in the Latrobe Valley prior to privatisation in the early 90s. According to ENGIE, the operator of the now-closed Hazelwood Mine:

"Government's role in mine rehabilitation should not be limited to setting legislation, regulation,

*policy and guidance [as the principles suggest], but also to providing coordinated, multi-agency support to mine operators, in the knowledge that historical decisions made by government had a direct bearing on the current challenges confronting them"*¹¹

The mine licensees note that a level of flexibility, for both themselves and government is needed regarding fill times. The operators note that there are potential benefits that can be delivered from shorter fill times, including increased stability and potential earlier public access to the sites (and the associated community benefit).

Shared vision

The need for a shared vision regarding the ultimate mine rehabilitation outcome was also identified and a number of respondents saw government as having a role in coordinating this. EnergyAustralia, operator of Yallourn, noted "only the Government can explore what other State-building opportunities may exist for these pits...Only Government can bring all three mine operators to the table, overcoming different closure time horizons and competitive priorities, to define the lowest total cost response to rehabilitation. A coordinated approach is a public good and should be treated as such."¹²

What do you feel are the most important things the coal mine operators can do as part of the planning, rehabilitation, and post-rehabilitation stages of the Latrobe Valley coal mines?

Openness and transparency again came through in responses to this question with respondents keen to see the mine licensees be clear about their intentions for the rehabilitation of the mine sites.

Land rehabilitation/land use

Another theme to come through the submissions was the need for the operators to fund their rehabilitation activities and commit to seeing these through to completion. For some respondents there seems to be a level of cynicism that the mine licensees will see their rehabilitation plans through to fruition with one

submitter commenting that "when the money they have set aside runs out they are gone"¹³.

Several respondents expressed a desire to see the mine licensees deliver rehabilitated sites that offer amenity value to the local community, while according to Latrobe City Council the pursuit of amenity should not impede urban development opportunities nor should rehabilitation inhibit future access to the coal resource. Irrigators that draw water from the Latrobe River suggested giving consideration to other rehabilitation options or finding an "alternative use for the resource (i.e. a coal-to-hydrogen project, removing the need for rehabilitation)"¹⁴. While further mining might delay final rehabilitation of the mines, rehabilitation would ultimately still be required.

Water for rehabilitation

The LVRRS Overview proposes the roles of mine operators in realising the objectives of the LVRRS, such as undertaking a broad options analysis, as well as demonstrating the essential need for water to achieve rehabilitation objectives¹⁵. Regarding this point, EnergyAustralia notes that the Overview makes some "unreasonable demands" and "places a heavy burden of proof on the mine operators"¹⁶, specifically citing the two aforementioned points as examples of this. ENGIE's view is that its technical studies in recent years demonstrate water is essential to achieve its rehabilitation plan while the Loy Yang B Power Station believes that mine operators "should not have to re-justify the use of water as the default option"¹⁷ and that mine operators should have equitable access to water (beyond their existing entitlements) for mine rehabilitation via an open and transparent user pays market. Irrigators that draw water from the Latrobe River similarly suggested that "the value of water needs to be indexed, and the mines need to pay a commercial rate"¹⁸. Southern Rural Water's "preferred position is that current entitlements should take precedence over filling mine voids [and that] as a minimum there should be no disadvantage to current entitlement holders."¹⁹

What do you feel are the most important things community and stakeholders can contribute as part of the planning, rehabilitation, and post-rehabilitation stages of the Latrobe Valley coal mines?

This question was posed to help understand community expectations regarding its role in the mine rehabilitation process.

Community Engagement

The submissions reveal a clear desire and expectation from the community that it will be actively engaged in mine rehabilitation. Responses ranged from general assertions about open and transparent engagement with the community on issues related to mine rehabilitation, to quite specific suggestions such as providing opportunities for public comment and feedback on rehabilitation plans. According to Environment Victoria, Latrobe Valley residents should be given a “major say” as to whether mine rehabilitation plans are acceptable, suggesting the mine operators be “required to amend their plans on the basis on this feedback”²⁰. There is however, a recognition that not necessarily all expectations will be able to be met, with one respondent noting that “compromise will be necessary to enable progress”²¹.

Timing and frequency of engagement with the local community was also a key theme to emerge from this question. There is a desire for engagement to occur on an ongoing basis, including during the development of rehabilitation ideas and plans while mines may still be operating all the way through to the implementation and completion of these. The submissions reveal an appetite for genuine engagement, throughout the mining cycle, rather than tokenistic engagement when the mines have ceased operating and are required to engage to obtain relevant approvals of their rehabilitation plans.

Access to clear technical and other related information

Provision and access to information was raised in several of the submissions noting that community ought to have “access to good information backed up by

robust science”²². There is a clear appetite to see the evidence that has underpinned preparation of proposals and decision-making regarding mine rehabilitation in the Latrobe Valley made publicly available.

How would you like to be engaged in the rehabilitation process for the Latrobe Valley brown coal mines?

While responses to the previous question reveal an appetite for the local community to be actively engaged in the mine rehabilitation process, respondents articulated different preferences for how they wish to be engaged. This includes access to the sites and progress reports²², phone calls²³, participation in working groups^{24/25}, attending community events²⁶ and developing citizen science programs²⁷.

Overall, do the principles outlined in Section 4 of the LVRRS Overview meet your expectations?

This question provided an important litmus test on whether the principles underpinning the final LVRRS meet community expectations.

Respondents to this question were required to select one of five options ranging on a scale from strong agreement to strong disagreement. A total of 16 respondents provided an answer to this question. Five respondents agreed that the principles outlined in the Overview met their expectations, while one strongly agreed. Three respondents disagreed with this statement and one strongly disagreed. Six respondents neither agreed nor disagreed.

Are there any changes you would suggest to the proposed principles outlined in Section 4 of the LVRRS Overview? If so, please provide a short explanation as to why you have suggested these changes.

This question helped to identify potential improvements to the principles underpinning the final LVRRS.

Responses to this question varied, with some choosing to provide

high-level statements while others provided specific feedback on particular principles.

One respondent noted that the principles provide a “contextual starting point, but need to be genuinely honoured and stringently adhered to in order to have any real meaning”²⁸. Another, who identified as a farmer from the Latrobe Valley expressed concern that the Overview appears to present the pit lake rehabilitation option as the preferred rehabilitation option, and that the pit lake should instead be identified as the solution of last resort²⁹.

Environment Victoria has suggested that the principles relating to the protection of the region’s waterways be amended to specifically include reference to the Ramsar listed Gippsland Lakes. It was also suggested that a timeline be provided for the public release of technical reports and that biophysical feasibility statements be developed for other rehabilitation options. Another submitter fully endorses the mine rehabilitation concept presented by the Great Latrobe Park, which proposes repurposing the mines as “forests, wetlands [and] parks linked by pathways that encourage creative utilisation of the vast space”³⁰.

The Gunaikurnai Land and Waters Aboriginal Corporation provided specific suggestions for changes to the LVRRS principles. A number of these focussed on ensuring the cultural values (particularly those related to water) were understood and considered in the decision-making process as well as ensuring that mine operators and government work collaboratively with Traditional Owners regarding mine rehabilitation issues.

One local community member suggested that the principles ought to be updated to reflect government as having an ownership role in the outcome, given that it contributed to the challenges now being experienced as part of the State Electricity Commission of Victoria. Another noted that the principle that refers to minimising the costs to the community and government should be reframed to consider “value for money...for residents over the long-term”³¹.

Several stakeholder groups and organisations that have been actively engaged in preparation of the LVRRS to date provided a number of suggestions on the principles. The West Gippsland Catchment Management Authority has provided some suggested additional considerations that could be added to existing principles (for example, consideration of economic, environmental and social sustainability as part of an assessment of long-term benefits to community), as well as proposed new principles (including flexibility of water supply arrangements to be able to adapt to climate uncertainty and that the cost of water for mine rehabilitation should reflect that mine rehabilitation is not an essential service compared with power generation).

Latrobe City Council provided commentary and suggested variations for each principle. This can be found in full in Council's submission uploaded online. In summary, it's seeking that the LVRRS adopt precautionary principles to cater to a changing climate, that current, long-term advantages of the Latrobe Valley are not compromised as part of mine rehabilitation, that current and future mine rehabilitation plans be subject to an Environmental Effects Statement and that further consideration and assessment of other non-water rehabilitation options be undertaken. Mine operators should be required to submit Environmental Effects Statements for their mine rehabilitation work plans, this should be mandatory - particularly if rehabilitation requires river diversions.³²

For the licensees and power station operators, there is a view that some of the principles impose unreasonable demands or are unclear in their intent and application. In particular, the mine licensees and power station operators have expressed concern over how the principles that require them to demonstrate the essential need for water for mine rehabilitation and the consideration of other, non-water rehabilitation options will be

implemented and how they would satisfy these requirements. The mine licensees have expressed a view that they have largely already undertaken and acquitted these actions in previous years.

EnergyAustralia's submission echoes a sentiment that is shared by the mine licensees regarding clarity. It notes that the "Regional Water Study and Geotechnical Study synopses revealed competing aspects of the Government's technical projects, particularly in relation to water as central to mine stability but constrained by scarcity."³³ As with the other mine licensees, EnergyAustralia request that this discrepancy is resolved to give more clarity to rehabilitation planning.

Are there any specific elements of the LVRRS Overview that were not clear, or need further information?

This question helped identify any areas of the Strategy that may be challenging to grasp as well as help in tailoring the final Strategy and supporting communications to address these.

Again, responses to this ranged from quite specific points and questions to more general uncertainty regarding elements of, or the LVRRS Overview overall.

Uncertainty regarding terminology and definitions resurfaced here, this time in relation to relinquishment, and the standards which the final rehabilitated landform will be required to meet for the operator to be able to relinquish the site. The term 'community' was another that was identified as ambiguous in its meaning, with a suggestion that it must include all potentially impacted communities, not just those immediately surrounding the mines. There was also some uncertainty expressed about how community views and sentiment towards mine rehabilitation would be measured and tracked.

Another uncertainty to emerge through the submissions related to the various assessments required to support the preparation and delivery of mine

rehabilitation plans and how these will be undertaken. Two examples provided included how the economic and environmental sustainability of rehabilitation plans will be assessed and determined³⁴ and how the economic value of water will be determined³⁵.

Environment Victoria raised several uncertainties and questions ranging from whether there would be a requirement for the mine operators to fully line the mines to manage fire risk, how an appropriate separation distance between pit lakes and townships will be achieved and the consequences for the mine operators in the event they do not adhere to the principles prescribed within the LVRRS.

Do you have any further comments on the LVRRS Overview?

This question provided respondents with a final opportunity to raise any issues regarding the LVRRS Overview that they may not have done in any of the previous questions.

The limited number of respondents to this question raised a desire for the final rehabilitation outcome to "not be subjugated to commercial expedience at the cost of future benefit and amenity"³⁶. One respondent noted that the objectives are likely to cause significant disagreement amongst the range of stakeholders relevant to this issue. Another submitter noted the need for the LVRRS to be binding as well as expressing a desire to understand how it may change or respond to a significant shift in circumstances (i.e. social licence/public sentiment, water availability, etc.).

The West Gippsland Catchment Management Authority provided several suggestions in response to this question, noting the opportunity to achieve non-flow improvements in the Latrobe River and the scope for increased investment to improve river and wetland health.

7. Next steps

The LVRRS Project Team will carefully consider each of the submissions received as part of this process. The team acknowledges that a large amount of work has gone into many of these and will look to address the feedback received as appropriate in the final LVRRS.

Appendix One: Latrobe Valley Regional Rehabilitation Strategy Overview online survey

The following survey was available on Engage Victoria from 20 November 2019 to 17 January 2020.

1. What is your level of knowledge of mine rehabilitation in general

- Am unfamiliar
- Have some understanding
- Have strong technical understanding
- Other (please specify)

2. What is important to you when you think about the rehabilitation of the Latrobe Valley coal mines?

3. What do you feel are the most important things Government can do as part of the planning, rehabilitation, and post-rehabilitation stages of the Latrobe Valley coal mines?

4. What do you feel are the most important things the coal mine operators can do as part of the planning, rehabilitation, and post-rehabilitation stages of the Latrobe Valley coal mines?

5. What do you feel are the most important things community and stakeholders can contribute as part of the planning, rehabilitation, and post-rehabilitation stages of the Latrobe Valley coal mines?

6. How would you like to be engaged in the rehabilitation process for the Latrobe Valley brown coal mines?

7. Overall, do the principles outlined in Section 4 of the LVRRS Overview meet your expectations (considering the important issues you identified above)?

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

8. Are there any changes you would suggest to the proposed principles outlined in Section 4 of the LVRRS Overview? If so, please provide a short explanation as to why you have suggested these changes.

9. Are there any specific elements of the LVRRS Overview that were not clear, or need further information to be provided in the LVRRS?

Appendix One: Latrobe Valley Regional Rehabilitation Strategy Overview online survey *(continued)*

10. Do you have any further comments on the LVRRS Overview?

Demographics

Stakeholder group

Community member

Farmer

Local government

Business owner

Mine staff

Other (please specify)

Postcode

Age Group

29 or younger

30-34

35-39

40-43

50-54

55-59

60-64

65-69

70-74

75-79

80-84

85 and over

Gender

Male

Female

Other identity

11. Please provide your email address if you would like to be added to the Latrobe Valley Regional Rehabilitation Strategy mailing list and/or like a copy of the consultation report (optional).

12. Do you consent to the LVRRS Project Team publishing your submission on this page?

Required

In the interests of transparency and information sharing, the LVRRS Project Team wishes to upload submissions received on this page. Any personal details will be removed before this occurs.

Yes

No

References

1. Environment Victoria, pg. 1, "Engage.vic.gov.au," <https://engage.vic.gov.au/latrobe-valley-regional-rehabilitation-strategy>, accessed 7 February 2020, https://s3.ap-southeast-2.amazonaws.com/hdp.au.prod.app.vic-engage.files/9215/7949/5713/Environment_Victoria_response_to_LVRRS_Overview.pdf.
2. Submission 6, pg. 1, "Engage.vic.gov.au," <https://engage.vic.gov.au/latrobe-valley-regional-rehabilitation-strategy>, accessed 7 February 2020, https://s3.ap-southeast-2.amazonaws.com/hdp.au.prod.app.vic-engage.files/8015/7947/4594/Submission_6.pdf.
3. Latrobe City Council, Submission to LVRRS Overview, pg. 22, "Engage.vic.gov.au," <https://engage.vic.gov.au/latrobe-valley-regional-rehabilitation-strategy>, accessed 7 February 2020, https://s3.ap-southeast-2.amazonaws.com/hdp.au.prod.app.vic-engage.files/6815/7923/4900/Latrobe_City_Council_response_to_LVRRS_Overview.pdf.
4. Department of Jobs, Precincts and Regions and Department of Environment, Land, Water and Planning, Latrobe Valley Regional Rehabilitation Strategy Overview, pg. 11, "Engage.vic.gov.au," <https://engage.vic.gov.au/latrobe-valley-regional-rehabilitation-strategy>, accessed 7 February 2020, https://s3.ap-southeast-2.amazonaws.com/hdp.au.prod.app.vic-engage.files/4715/7421/7074/LVRRS_Overview.pdf.
5. Submission 8, pg. 1, "Engage.vic.gov.au," <https://engage.vic.gov.au/latrobe-valley-regional-rehabilitation-strategy>, accessed 7 February 2020, https://s3.ap-southeast-2.amazonaws.com/hdp.au.prod.app.vic-engage.files/7415/7947/4625/Submission_8.pdf.
6. Submission 3, pg. 2, "Engage.vic.gov.au," <https://engage.vic.gov.au/latrobe-valley-regional-rehabilitation-strategy>, accessed 7 February 2020, https://s3.ap-southeast-2.amazonaws.com/hdp.au.prod.app.vic-engage.files/1615/7654/8202/LVRRS_Overview_-_Submission_3.pdf.
7. Submission 12, pg. 1, "Engage.vic.gov.au," <https://engage.vic.gov.au/latrobe-valley-regional-rehabilitation-strategy>, accessed 7 February 2020, https://s3.ap-southeast-2.amazonaws.com/hdp.au.prod.app.vic-engage.files/1915/7957/5447/Submission_12.pdf.
8. West Gippsland Catchment Management Authority Submission to the LVRRS Overview, pg. 1, "Engage.vic.gov.au," <https://engage.vic.gov.au/latrobe-valley-regional-rehabilitation-strategy>, accessed 7 February 2020, https://s3.ap-southeast-2.amazonaws.com/hdp.au.prod.app.vic-engage.files/6515/7949/5788/WGCMCA_response_to_LVRRS_Overview.pdf.
9. Latrobe City Council, Submission to LVRRS Overview, pg. 26, "Engage.vic.gov.au," <https://engage.vic.gov.au/latrobe-valley-regional-rehabilitation-strategy>, accessed 7 February 2020, https://s3.ap-southeast-2.amazonaws.com/hdp.au.prod.app.vic-engage.files/6815/7923/4900/Latrobe_City_Council_response_to_LVRRS_Overview.pdf.
10. Submission 13, pg. 9, "Engage.vic.gov.au," <https://engage.vic.gov.au/latrobe-valley-regional-rehabilitation-strategy>, accessed 11 February 2020, https://s3.ap-southeast-2.amazonaws.com/hdp.au.prod.app.vic-engage.files/6215/8139/7684/Submission_13.pdf.
11. ENGIE submission to the LVRRS Overview, pg. 7, "Engage.vic.gov.au," <https://engage.vic.gov.au/latrobe-valley-regional-rehabilitation-strategy>, accessed 7 February 2020, https://s3.ap-southeast-2.amazonaws.com/hdp.au.prod.app.vic-engage.files/8915/7966/4227/ENGIE_response_to_LVRRS_Overview.pdf.
12. EnergyAustralia submission to the LVRRS Overview, pg. 3, "Engage.vic.gov.au," <https://engage.vic.gov.au/latrobe-valley-regional-rehabilitation-strategy>, accessed 7 February 2020, https://s3.ap-southeast-2.amazonaws.com/hdp.au.prod.app.vic-engage.files/2515/7742/2918/EnergyAustralia_response_to_LVRRS_Overview.pdf.
13. Unpublished submission.
14. Section 51 Licence Holders response to the LVRRS Overview, pg. 1, "Engage.vic.gov.au," <https://engage.vic.gov.au/latrobe-valley-regional-rehabilitation-strategy>, accessed 24 February 2020, https://s3.ap-southeast-2.amazonaws.com/hdp.au.prod.app.vic-engage.files/7915/8252/2128/Section_51_Licence_holder_response_to_the_LVRRS_Overview.pdf.
15. Department of Jobs, Precincts and Regions and Department of Environment, Land, Water and Planning, Latrobe Valley Regional Rehabilitation Strategy Overview, pg. 11, "Engage.vic.gov.au," <https://engage.vic.gov.au/latrobe-valley-regional-rehabilitation-strategy>, accessed 7 February 2020, https://s3.ap-southeast-2.amazonaws.com/hdp.au.prod.app.vic-engage.files/4715/7421/7074/LVRRS_Overview.pdf.
16. EnergyAustralia submission to the LVRRS Overview, pg. 3, "Engage.vic.gov.au," <https://engage.vic.gov.au/latrobe-valley-regional-rehabilitation-strategy>, accessed 7 February 2020, https://s3.ap-southeast-2.amazonaws.com/hdp.au.prod.app.vic-engage.files/2515/7742/2918/EnergyAustralia_response_to_LVRRS_Overview.pdf.
17. Loy Yang B Power Station response to the LVRRS Overview, pg. 13, "Engage.vic.gov.au," <https://engage.vic.gov.au/latrobe-valley-regional-rehabilitation-strategy>, accessed 7 February 2020, https://s3.ap-southeast-2.amazonaws.com/hdp.au.prod.app.vic-engage.files/3815/7949/4354/Loy_Yang_B_Power_Station_response_to_LVRRS_Overview.pdf.
18. Section 51 Licence holder response to the LVRRS Overview, pg. 1, "Engage.vic.gov.au," <https://engage.vic.gov.au/latrobe-valley-regional-rehabilitation-strategy>, accessed 7 February 2020, https://s3.ap-southeast-2.amazonaws.com/hdp.au.prod.app.vic-engage.files/6815/7923/4900/Latrobe_City_Council_response_to_LVRRS_Overview.pdf.

- vic.gov.au/latrobe-valley-regional-rehabilitation-strategy, accessed 24 February 2020, https://s3.ap-southeast-2.amazonaws.com/hdp.au.prod.app.vic-engage.files/7915/8252/2128/Section_51_Licence_holder_response_to_the_LVRRS_Overview.pdf.
19. Southern Rural Water response to the LVRRS Overview, pg. 1, "Engage.vic.gov.au," <https://engage.vic.gov.au/latrobe-valley-regional-rehabilitation-strategy>, accessed 6 April 2020, https://s3.ap-southeast-2.amazonaws.com/hdp.au.prod.app.vic-engage.files/3715/8579/5488/Southern_Rural_Water_response_to_LVRRS.pdf.
 20. Environment Victoria response to LVRRS Overview, pg. 2, "Engage.vic.gov.au," <https://engage.vic.gov.au/latrobe-valley-regional-rehabilitation-strategy>, accessed 7 February 2020, https://s3.ap-southeast-2.amazonaws.com/hdp.au.prod.app.vic-engage.files/9215/7949/5713/Environment_Victoria_response_to_LVRRS_Overview.pdf.
 21. Submission 6, pg. 1, "Engage.vic.gov.au," <https://engage.vic.gov.au/latrobe-valley-regional-rehabilitation-strategy>, accessed 7 February 2020, https://s3.ap-southeast-2.amazonaws.com/hdp.au.prod.app.vic-engage.files/8015/7947/4594/Submission_6.pdf.
 22. Submission 5, pg. 1, "Engage.vic.gov.au," <https://engage.vic.gov.au/latrobe-valley-regional-rehabilitation-strategy>, accessed 7 February 2020, https://s3.ap-southeast-2.amazonaws.com/hdp.au.prod.app.vic-engage.files/4415/7947/4536/Submission_5.pdf.
 23. Submission 2, pg. 1, "Engage.vic.gov.au," <https://engage.vic.gov.au/latrobe-valley-regional-rehabilitation-strategy>, accessed 7 February 2020, https://s3.ap-southeast-2.amazonaws.com/hdp.au.prod.app.vic-engage.files/9315/8016/7819/Submission_2.pdf.
 24. Committee for Gippsland response to the LVRRS Overview, pg. 2, "Engage.vic.gov.au," <https://engage.vic.gov.au/latrobe-valley-regional-rehabilitation-strategy>, accessed 7 February 2020, https://s3.ap-southeast-2.amazonaws.com/hdp.au.prod.app.vic-engage.files/8915/7923/7170/Committee_for_Gippsland_response_to_LVRRS_Overview.pdf.
 25. Submission 12, pg. 2, "Engage.vic.gov.au," <https://engage.vic.gov.au/latrobe-valley-regional-rehabilitation-strategy>, accessed 7 February 2020, https://s3.ap-southeast-2.amazonaws.com/hdp.au.prod.app.vic-engage.files/1915/7957/5447/Submission_12.pdf.
 26. Submission 6, pg. 1, "Engage.vic.gov.au," <https://engage.vic.gov.au/latrobe-valley-regional-rehabilitation-strategy>, accessed 7 February 2020, https://s3.ap-southeast-2.amazonaws.com/hdp.au.prod.app.vic-engage.files/8015/7947/4594/Submission_6.pdf.
 27. Submission 12, pg. 2, "Engage.vic.gov.au," <https://engage.vic.gov.au/latrobe-valley-regional-rehabilitation-strategy>, accessed 7 February 2020, https://s3.ap-southeast-2.amazonaws.com/hdp.au.prod.app.vic-engage.files/1915/7957/5447/Submission_12.pdf.
 28. Submission 3, pg. 1, "Engage.vic.gov.au," <https://engage.vic.gov.au/latrobe-valley-regional-rehabilitation-strategy>, accessed 7 February 2020, https://s3.ap-southeast-2.amazonaws.com/hdp.au.prod.app.vic-engage.files/1615/7654/8202/LVRRS_Overview_-_Submission_3.pdf.
 29. Submission 8, pg. 2, "Engage.vic.gov.au," <https://engage.vic.gov.au/latrobe-valley-regional-rehabilitation-strategy>, accessed 7 February 2020, https://s3.ap-southeast-2.amazonaws.com/hdp.au.prod.app.vic-engage.files/7415/7947/4625/Submission_8.pdf.
 30. "Great Latrobe Park." <https://glp.org.au/>, accessed 7 February 2020.
 31. Unpublished submission.
 32. Environment Victoria response to LVRRS Overview, pg. 2, "Engage.vic.gov.au," <https://engage.vic.gov.au/latrobe-valley-regional-rehabilitation-strategy>, accessed 17 April 2020, https://s3.ap-southeast-2.amazonaws.com/hdp.au.prod.app.vic-engage.files/9215/7949/5713/Environment_Victoria_response_to_LVRRS_Overview.pdf.
 33. EnergyAustralia submission to the LVRRS Overview, pg. 6, "Engage.vic.gov.au," <https://engage.vic.gov.au/latrobe-valley-regional-rehabilitationstrategy>, accessed 7 February 2020, https://s3.ap-southeast-2.amazonaws.com/hdp.au.prod.app.vic-engage.files/2515/7742/2918/EnergyAustralia_response_to_LVRRS_Overview.pdf.
 34. Submission 8, pg. 2, "Engage.vic.gov.au," <https://engage.vic.gov.au/latrobe-valley-regional-rehabilitation-strategy>, accessed 7 February 2020, https://s3.ap-southeast-2.amazonaws.com/hdp.au.prod.app.vic-engage.files/7415/7947/4625/Submission_8.pdf.
 35. Victorian Farmers Federation response to the LVRRS Overview, pg. 6, "Engage.vic.gov.au," <https://engage.vic.gov.au/latrobe-valley-regional-rehabilitation-strategy>, accessed 7 February 2020, https://s3.ap-southeast-2.amazonaws.com/hdp.au.prod.app.vic-engage.files/2015/7957/1413/Victorian_Farmers_Federation_response_to_LVRRS_Overview.pdf.
 36. Submission 3, pg. 2, "Engage.vic.gov.au," <https://engage.vic.gov.au/latrobe-valley-regional-rehabilitation-strategy>, accessed 7 February 2020, https://s3.ap-southeast-2.amazonaws.com/hdp.au.prod.app.vic-engage.files/1615/7654/8202/LVRRS_Overview_-_Submission_3.pdf.

Contact us

Please visit earthresources.vic.gov.au/projects/lvrrs to learn more about the Latrobe Valley Regional Rehabilitation Strategy or you can contact the project team at lvrrs@ecodev.vic.gov.au

