DLVRF rehabilitation options and scenarios —review of draft report

20/11/08

Present	Richard Aldous	Anne Bignell	Doug Sceney	John Mitas
	Bron Cuthbertson			

Summary of meeting and actions

Participants considered the comments made by the Technical Reference Group and made their own comments:

Comments on the DLVRF rehab options and scenarios report

- 1. Insufficiently complete to be considered a draft.
- 2. Some repetition, a lot of 'known' information in the document.
- 3. Very theoretical addresses rehabilitation options for new mines but doesn't suggest how to apply these new options to the existing mines
- 4. Typographical errors and sections missing these need to be addressed in a further draft to DPI.

Participants suggested several changes to improve the report along with the comments above.

Suggested changes to the report:

- 1. Inclusion of another chapter 'Applying rehabilitation framework to the Latrobe Valley today'
- 2. What do we do with the scenario we already have? Some of the suggested options are unworkable for today's mines.
- 3. Need to set out a methodology for dealing with the current mine structures ultimate outcome would be a process for DPI and the mine operators to come to an agreement on rehabilitation approach.
- 4. Include reference to the current DPI guidelines on rehabilitation this is what we have in place already, there needs to be continuity between this and what happens going forward.
- 5. Provide evidence for selection of options water unavailability, for example. Substantiate the proposed options.
- 6. Explain that this is a step in the process to getting to a new model for mine rehabilitation there are two types of mine at issue, existing mines and new mines. It will also inform what rehabilitation plans will look like 50-100 years in the future.

Actions

1. BC to relay comments back to report authors and ascertain a timeline for next draft