

Cover note to report on future rehabilitation options for the three Latrobe Valley coal mines.



Cover note to report summarising key changes from draft report to final report

On the 12th October 2015 Jacobs submitted a draft report to the Inquiry. On the 27th and 28th of October we participated in a technical workshop that provided substantive feedback on the draft report. Jacobs then undertook substantial revisions to the report and on the 16th November 2015 Jacobs submitted the final report to the Inquiry.

In the period between 12th October 2015 and 16th November 2015 Jacobs undertook many activities:

1. Prepared a cost estimation guidance note
2. Prepared for and conducted a background briefing for draft report on Thursday 15th October
3. An independent editorial review of the report by Carolyn Cameron. This review was completed on 19th October. This review recommended:
 - a. A full re-write of the then section 9 – Detailed Assessment of the Mine Rehabilitation Options. The section was overly repetitive. The references to standard risk controls should be made once and the focus of the section more of the rationale as to why the risks were rated as they were
 - b. A re-write of the Executive Summary and Conclusion
 - c. Minor edits to all other sections
4. Considered (received 5:00pm Friday 20th October) the findings of the URS report relating to future rehabilitation and closure costings. This report has provided additional material that we have used to inform our review of the draft report. A significant amount of work has been done on the cost estimates
5. Prepared for and attended a 1.5 day Technical Workshop. This included reviewing the letters received from the legal representatives, preparing powerpoint presentations and meeting with the Inquiry to discuss the format and approach to the Technical Workshop. At the workshop participants provided feedback on two key themes:
 - a. The size and magnitude of the costs for the each of the risk controls in comparison to the mine operator cost estimates and recent confidential cost estimates provided by URS
 - b. The need for greater site specific references in the document (understand the setting)

In considering the feedback and information received the table below summarises the important changes to the study's findings.

Table 1 – Summary of important changes to study findings

| Finding As Of 12 th October | Finding As Of 16 th November |
|---|--|
| The Partial Backfill Above the Water Table Landform option was assessed as a potentially viable landform. | The Partial Backfill Above the Water Table Landform has been assessed as a currently unviable landform option and has been removed from the section examining the potentially viable final landform/mine rehabilitation options. |

Cover note to report on future rehabilitation options for the three Latrobe Valley coal mines.



| Finding As Of 12 th October | Finding As Of 16 th November |
|---|---|
| <p>Cost estimates were provided for each individual risk control and the costs were independent across each control. Cost estimates included costs associated with progressive rehabilitation (short term costs).</p> | <p>Costs are provided cumulatively and any potential for there to be double up in costs (e.g. where a stability risk control addresses both stability and fire risk) have been removed.</p> <p>Costs are provided for short, medium and long term implementation actions and an assumption has been regarding extent of progressive rehabilitation.</p> <p>The quantum of costs presented in the report has changed significantly as a result of these changes to the underlying basis of presentation. The fundamental quantities have changed less than may appear.</p> |
| <p>Landform options were generally described with little cross reference to the current work plan for each mine</p> | <p>Additional referencing to the current work plan has been included in the conclusions sections to enable the reader to draw more readily the distinctions between the conclusions of the study and the current work plans</p> |
| <p>The description of the current physical context of each mine was brief and expected the reader to be able to find this information in other places</p> | <p>The report includes more fulsome descriptions of the physical setting of each mine, particularly in regard to the discussion of residual risks and the relative risks of the potentially viable landforms.</p> |
| <p>Appendices were brief, in part in shortened descriptions and included inadvertent references to different sites that led to confusion by readers as to the intended meaning</p> | <p>References and descriptions of sites have been made into more complete phrases and cross reference to inappropriate sites have been removed.</p> |