

# Notice

Mining

## **Notice of decision to proceed with Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)**

*This notice is issued by the chief executive pursuant to subsection 49(5) of the Environmental Protection Act 1994 to advise that the chief executive has decided that the submitted Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) is to proceed to public notification and the receipt of submissions.*

Mr Michael Gray  
Springsure Creek Coal Pty Ltd  
GPO Box 5227  
BRISBANE QLD 4001

Our reference: CBD/111013

### **Re: Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the proposed Springsure Creek Coal Mine Project**

The above-mentioned EIS, initially received by this office on 30 November 2012 and subsequently amended and resubmitted on 15 January 2013, has been considered by the chief executive and a decision made to allow the EIS to proceed to the public notification stage of the EIS process.

To facilitate the public notification process you are required to prepare and publish a notice about the EIS (an EIS Notice) in accordance with sections 51 and 52 of the *Environmental Protection Act 1994* (EP Act). A copy of the EIS Notice in the approved form is attached. Within 20 business days of receiving this Notice (issued under section 49 of the EP Act) you must give a copy of the EIS Notice to each affected person for the project and each interested person, after which you must publish the EIS Notice at least once in a Saturday edition of *The Courier-Mail* and *The Australian*, as well as in regional newspapers of your choice.

The 30-day submission period, during which submissions on the EIS may be made to the chief executive, starts on the first business day after the last day the EIS Notice is published by newspaper.

Within 10 business days after the EIS Notice being published, the proponent must give the chief executive a statutory declaration declaring:

- a) whether or not the proponent has complied with the notice requirements under sections 51 and 52; and
- b) the name and address of each person to whom the EIS Notice was given under section 51.

A copy of the (published) EIS Notice must be attached to the declaration.

A proforma for the statutory declaration is enclosed. Once completed, the statutory declaration and attached EIS Notice must be submitted to the chief executive at the following address:

The Chief Executive  
Attention: EIS Coordinator, Springsure Creek Coal Mine Project  
Department of Environment and Heritage Protection  
Level 9, 400 George Street, BRISBANE QLD 4000  
GPO Box 2454, BRISBANE QLD 4001

Should you have any queries in relation to this notice, please contact Dr Monika Rhodes, Principal Environmental Officer, on telephone 07 3330 6293.

**Approved by**

[Redacted Signature Box]

sch4p4(6) Personal  
[Redacted Signature]

Signature

[Redacted Date Box]

01/02/2013

Date

Lindsay Delzoppo  
Director, Statewide Environmental Assessments  
Delegate of the Administering Authority  
*Environmental Protection Act 1994*

**Enquiries:**  
Statewide Environmental Assessments Unit  
Department of Environment and Heritage  
Protection  
Ph. **07 3330 6293**  
Fax. 07 3330 5754

RTI DL Release

# Statutory declaration

Mining

## Statutory declaration for public notice requirements of Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)

A statutory declaration is a written statement of facts that is sworn or declared under the Oaths Act 1867. This statutory declaration should be completed and forwarded to the chief executive in accordance with Section 53 of the Environmental Protection Act 1994. You must attach a copy of the 'Public Notice of Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)', required under sections 51 & 52 of the Environmental Protection Act 1994, to this statutory declaration.

**OATHS ACT 1867**

QUEENSLAND

TO WIT

**Re: Public notice of Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the project****Described as:**

Springsure Creek Coal Mine

**On land described as:**

MLA 70486

I

Rachel Gibson

Insert the name of the person making this declaration

of

Level 4, 260 Queen Street, Brisbane

Insert the street address of the person making this declaration

in the State of Queensland do solemnly and sincerely declare that in regard to the above mentioned EIS, the proponent:

Springsure Creek Coal Pty Ltd

Proponent company name

**Statutory declaration for public notice requirements of Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)**

Has (please tick only one of the following):

fully complied with the public notice requirements of sections 51 and 52 of the *Environmental Protection Act 1994*.

OR

not fully complied with the public notification requirements of sections 51 and 52 of the *Environmental Protection Act 1994* and the details of non compliance are as follows:

RTI/DL Release

The EIS notice was published in the following media:

|    |                                     |                         |
|----|-------------------------------------|-------------------------|
| 1. | 'The Australian' and 'Courier Mail' | 9 February 2013         |
| 2. | 'Central Queensland News'           | 13 February 2013        |
|    | Insert publication name             | Insert publication date |

And the EIS notice has been given to the following persons

|    |  |
|----|--|
| 1. | Please refer to Table 1 and Table 2 attached |
| 2. |  |
| 3. |  |

Insert name, address and dates

And I make this solemn declaration conscientiously believing the same to be true, and by virtue of the provisions of the *Oaths Act 1867*.

**Statutory declaration**

**Statutory declaration for public notice requirements of Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)**

Taken and declared before me, at

Level 4, 260 Queen Street, Brisbane

Insert location

this

14<sup>th</sup>

day of

February

in the year

2013

Insert day (e.g. 18th)

Insert month

Insert year

sch4p4(6) Personal information  
Personal information

Signed

(Person making this declaration)

sch4p4(6) Personal information  
Personal informa

Signed ✓

(Delete whichever are not applicable — ~~Justice of the Peace / Commissioner for Declarations / Solicitor / Barrister~~)

TESS LYE

Printed name and registration number (if applicable)

RTI DL Release

**Springsure Creek Coal Mine Project – Review of the amended EIS (SEIS) and proponent’s response to submissions**

***Key issue identified: Inconsistent information on water management and assessment***

The key issues identified relate to water management and assessment proposed by the proponent. In particular the water management on site and the discharge practices are inconsistent in the amended EIS and EM Plan. While in some areas the EIS proposed a non-release scenario, in other areas the EIS proposed uncontrolled discharges (outlined as Condition D15 in the EM Plan). Of importance here would be that mine dewatering water (from groundwater inflows) would be stored in dams with a potential for uncontrolled discharge or vertical infiltration of contaminants from dams to water table aquifer.

***Recommendation:***

EHP recommends that the inconsistencies on water management on site and discharge practices would be addressed in the EIS and EM Plan.

***Issue identified: Insufficient information on water parameters and WQOs for receiving waterways***

As part of the EIS review, the Department of Science, Information, Technology, Innovation and the Arts (DSITIA) and EHP have recommended that the proponent conducts further water quality assessments for receiving waterways. Water quality data and parameters should be analysed as outlined in the DNRM, Guideline Model Water Conditions for Coal Mines in the Fitzroy Basin.

Since then, the proponent collected additional surface water quality data has been collected at four locations (February 2013). While an extended suite of water quality parameters have been analysed for the February 2013 survey, the proponent does not provide a clear list of what these additional parameters consisted of.

This is important as sampling program will form the basis of the Projects Water Quality Sampling Program. Data from this sampling program will also be used to develop site specific trigger values for the project.

Furthermore, the water quality objectives (WQOs) have not been specified in full.

For a comprehensive review refer to Table 1.

***Recommendation:***

EHP recommends the following:

- that a list of additional water quality parameters collected in February 2013 survey should be presented
- that a list of WQOs outlined in the amended EIS should be updated to include all WQOs
- that water conditions proposed should reflect Fitzroy Model Water conditions and their requirements
- that where any new data should be incorporated with data already collected and compared for comparative analysis; i.e. the EM Plan should reflect sufficient data to meet conditions and if not, should otherwise be justified.
- Revise the water chapter and EM Plan to show compliance with acceptable water conditions.

**Issue identified: LAmax exceeds criteria**

The noise modelling proposed in the amended EIS shows LAmax criteria is exceeded for sensitive receptors NL4, NL5, NL6 and NL7. No mitigation measures have been proposed.

The EIS and the EM Plan did not contain information how acceptable levels of noise can be achieved. In particular, the following issues will need to be addressed:

1. What are the noise sources that are causing the high values of LAmax?
2. What is the timeline of those sound sources and how long will they be running for in comparison with the mine life?
3. What are the proposed mitigation measures to address exceedances in LAmax?
  - a. When will they be put in place?
  - b. What sound reduction is anticipated?

**Recommendation:**

Revise the noise chapter and EM Plan to show compliance with acceptable noise levels. Address the questions outlined above and present mitigation measures and their effectiveness.

**Issue identified: Subsidence modelling outside MLA**

The modelling of subsidence shows impacts outside of the MLA.

**Recommendation:**

Reconsider the subsidence model based on the existing MLA and any potential environmental impacts associated with changes in hydrology.

**Table 1.** Specific comments in regards to water assessment (\*Timing requirements inserted by EHP)

Advice provided to EHP by Water Assessment & Systems, Environmental Monitoring and Assessment, Science Delivery, the Department of Science, Information Technology, Innovation and the Arts

| Topic                     | Recommendation / Suggestion  | Response  | Comments   | Recommendations  | Timing*   |
|---------------------------|--|---|--|--|---|
| Chapter 8 – Surface Water | <p><b>Recommendation:</b> It is recommended that baseline water quality assessments continue and be amended according to the issues identified above.</p> <p><b>[Issue: Section 8.4 and subsection relating to the Water Quality Assessment]</b><br/> <i>A preliminary baseline water quality assessment was undertaken for the Springsure Creek Coal Mine Investigation area, over two sampling events (with a total of 12 data points both upstream and downstream collected so far). From the mapping presented in Figure 8-5, it does not appear that a water quality and quantity monitoring site has been placed at a location downstream of the proposed mine dams. It is necessary to include a site downstream of the major source of contaminants to receiving waters, in the flowing section of the waterways. It will also be necessary to design monitoring for Dam 2 and Dam 4 which are listed as being downstream of the mine discharges in other sections of the EIS.</i></p> | <p>This submission was discussed between DSITIA, EHP and SCC on 1 May 2013 (as per minutes circulated between attendees). Additional surface water quality data has been collected at four locations (February 2013) and include the Springsure Creek Inflow to Den-Lo Park Dam, Upstream from the Project area on Springsure Creek, Upstream from the Project area on Station Creek and Upstream of the Project area on Unnamed Creek 4. Water quality data and parameters measured at these sites during this period include an extended suite of tested and measured parameters as outlined in the DNRM, Guideline Model Water Conditions for Coal Mines in the Fitzroy Basin. This additional data is presented in Chapter 8 of the EIS. Sampling at these sites is ongoing and data will be used to develop specific water Quality trigger</p> | <p>The proponent response has largely fulfilled the recommendation made by WAS, however there is some issue with the details, including:</p> <p><b>C1.</b> The proponent should better incorporate any new data collected. For instance two of the four sites sampled in February coincide with sites already sampled in summer. How do these sampling events for the same site compare in water quality?</p> <p><b>C2.</b> There are no surface water survey site descriptions for the new sites that have not been sampled before, namely (a) Springsure Creek Inflow to Den-Lo Park Dam and (b) Upstream of the Project area on Unnamed Creek 4.</p> <p>[NB February survey sites:<br/>         – Springsure Creek Inflow to Den-Lo Park Dam (<b>new site</b>);<br/>         – Upstream from the Project area on Springsure</p> | <p><b>R1.</b> Where any new data are collected it should be incorporated with data already collected, for example sites samples in February, 2013 have been sampled previously in summer and this data should be compared.</p> <p><b>R2.</b> A description should be included in Section 8.4.3.1 (Site Conditions) of any new sites.</p> | <p>Prior to SEIS approval and represented in EM Plan.</p> |

16/07/2013

3

| Topic | Recommendation / Suggestion   | Response  | Comments  | Recommendations   | Timing*   |
|-------|---|---|---|---|---|
|       | <p>Section 8.4.3.2 lists the indicators measured as part of the baseline water quality assessment for the Springsure project. This list is not comprehensive and should include all indicators listed in Tables 2 and 3 of the "Model water conditions for coal mines in the Fitzroy basin".</p> <p>Section 8.4.4.2 Electrical Conductivity discusses the results obtained so far for EC. The conclusions made are not based on sufficient data or thorough investigation of the relationship between flow and EC for the relevant creeks. Far more data collected over a longer period of time and representative of various seasons and conditions will be required if the proponents wish to establish locally relevant water quality objectives for EC. Graphing EC vs. recorded stream flow at the time of sampling would be useful to inform this process.]</p> | <p>values for the Project. This sampling program will be extended to include additional sites (potentially including locations used in initial sampling program) as necessary, and will form the basis of the Projects Water Quality Sampling Program. Data from this sampling program will also be used to develop site specific trigger values for the Project.</p> <p>No discharges are proposed as part of the Project except during major flood events, in which case contaminants will be diluted within receiving waters.</p> <p>As noted above, additional surface water quality data has been collected at four locations (February 2013) and include the Springsure Creek Inflow to Den-Lo Park Dam, Upstream from the Project area on Springsure Creek, Upstream from the Project area on Station Creek and Upstream of the Project area on Unnamed Creek 4. Water quality data and parameters measured at these sites during this period include an extended suite of tested and measured</p> | <p>Creek (<b>site 5</b>);</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Upstream from the Project area on Station Creek (<b>site 2</b>) and,</li> <li>- Upstream of the Project area on Unnamed Creek 4 (<b>new site</b>.)]</li> </ul> <p><b>C3.</b> While an extended suite of water quality parameters have been analysed for the February, 2013 survey (4 sites) the proponent does not provide a clear list of what these additional parameters are in Chapter 8.</p> <p><b>C4.</b> Some water quality objectives are missing from Table 8-8 (pp8-32 – 8-33; Chapter 8; SEIS).</p> | <p><b>R3.</b> Include a list of additional water quality parameters included in the February, 2013 survey in Section 8.4.3.2 (Water Quality and Sediment Sampling Method).</p> <p><b>R4.</b> Update Table 8-8 (pp8-32 – 8-33; Chapter 8; SEIS) to include all WQOs)</p> | <p>Prior to SEIS approval and represented in EM Plan.</p> |

16/07/2013

4

| Topic | Recommendation / Suggestion | Response   | Comments  | Recommendations   | Timing*   |
|-------|-----------------------------|--|---|---|---|
|       |                             | <p>parameters as outlined in the DNRM, Guideline Model Water Conditions for Coal Mines in the Fitzroy Basin.</p> <p>(As discussed at meeting, the DNRM Guidelines were not released at the time of preparing the draft EIS, hence they were not referenced at that time.) Chapter 8 of the EIS has been updated accordingly.</p>   |   |   |   |
|       |                             | <p>As noted above, additional surface water quality data has been collected at four locations (February 2013). Sampling at these sites is ongoing and data will be used to develop specific water Quality trigger values for the Project. This sampling program will be extended to include additional sites (potentially including locations used in initial sampling program) as necessary, and will form the basis of the Projects Water Quality Sampling Program. Data from this sampling program will also be used to develop site specific trigger values for the Project. Surface water monitoring criteria are thus to be announced as per Chapter 18 – EM Plan.</p> | <p><b>C5.</b> The reference to the information on surface water monitoring criteria in Chapter 18 is not specific enough.</p> | <p><b>R5.</b> The proponent should outline the specifics of the surface monitoring program and criteria in Chapter 18 as stated - <i>“surface water monitoring criteria are thus to be announced as per Chapter 18”</i></p> | <p>Prior to SEIS approval and represented in EM Plan.</p> |

16/07/2013

5

| Topic | Recommendation / Suggestion   | Response  | Comments  | Recommendations  | Timing*   |
|-------|---|---|---|--|---|
|       | <p><b>Recommendation:</b> It is recommended that potential impacts to aquatic ecosystem from reduced stream flow volumes are adequately assessment [sic] and presented in the SEIS.</p> <p><b>[Issue: Section 8.5.6 Stream Flows</b></p> <p><i>The median predicted decrease in stream flow is predicted to be up to 42% for local waterways. Very little consideration has been given to the potential impacts this may have on aquatic ecosystems downstream, including wetlands or semi-permanent or permanent pools in the receiving waters.]</i></p> | <p>Information in relation to the aquatic ecosystems from reduced stream flows within and downstream of the Project area has been assessed in Chapter 12 - Ecology. This chapter identifies that it is not anticipated that the project will result in significant impacts to aquatic values.</p> | <p>The proponent does discuss the subsidence as potentially reducing connectivity and impacting stream flow within and downstream of the project area (including a wetland protection area) with potential impacts to aquatic flora and fauna (Table 12-19). The risk level is considered medium (Table 12-19). Subsidence management measures are also outlined (Section 12.7.10) and these should decrease the risk of impacts from the predicted decrease in flow in Springsure Creek if carried out appropriately.</p> <p>The proponent has committed to ongoing monitoring of streams and wetlands downstream for subsidence related impacts (Section 12.7.11) throughout the construction; operational phases and decommissioning phases of the mine.</p> | <p>No further recommendations.</p>   |   |
|       | <p><b>Recommendation:</b> It is strongly recommended that a clear and consistent proposal is submitted in the SEIS. It is impossible for the administering authority to assess the proposal when conflicting statements are observed throughout</p>   | <p>The mine site water management strategy identified a water deficit, or shortage of water, for proposed operations. Water will therefore be piped to the site from a secured allocation.</p>  | <p><b>C6.</b> There is still inconsistent information in the SEIS regarding whether there will be a controlled discharge from dams. For example, the proponent has not updated point 3 under the heading of</p>   | <p><b>R6.</b> Clarification is required on the inconsistencies stated throughout the SEIS and EM Plan regarding water management practices and whether the mine will be practicing and conditioned for</p> | <p>Prior to SEIS approval and represented in EM Plan.</p> |

16/07/2013

6

| Topic | Recommendation / Suggestion  | Response  | Comments   | Recommendations  | Timing* |
|-------|--|---|--|--|---------|
|       | <p>the documents. How exactly will water management be undertaken on-site? All sections of the EIS need to be updated to ensure that a consistent message is presented throughout, in the text, tables and diagrams.</p> <p><b>[Issue: Chapter 8 Surface Water</b></p> <p><b>Table 8-13</b></p> <p><i>Potential impacts to surface water, clearly states that a no controlled release policy will be in place during the operation of the mine. Again under section 8.6.1 Cumulative Impacts the proponent states</i></p> <p><i>“However, this Project will not be undertaking controlled releases and may only discharge water during extreme high flow or dangerous events”</i></p> <p><i>In other section of the EIS the proponents mention that a strategy to undertake controlled discharges is incorporated in the water management (e.g. Section 18.5.4.9 Control Strategies). Inconsistencies of this nature are repeatedly observed throughout the EIS. The proposal needs to be clarified, and</i></p> | <p>This plus rain water collected on site and groundwater removed from the mine working area will be recycled for operational uses. Using 86 years of historical rainfall data in a water balance model, dams have been sized to have no discharge during the 86 years of historical rainfall records to reduce the need for any potential uncontrolled discharges from the site. There are no proposed piped (controlled) releases from dams to the receiving environment. The "Manual for Assessing Hazard Categories and Hydraulic Performance of Dams" (DERM 2012) was used as a basis of design document. All mine water infrastructure will comply with release limits and conditions contained in any Environmental Authority issued by DEHP. A Water Management Plan will be required to be prepared and approved as a condition of any Environmental Authority. This Plan will detail measures for: use and movement of water for operations, water quality and quantity monitoring, and</p> | <p><i>“Mobilisation of contaminants”</i> [p18-99; Chapter 17; SEIS]. If there will be not controlled discharges from dams then this point should be removed from the text.</p> | <p>controlled or uncontrolled releases. Point 3 under the heading of <i>“Mobilisation of contaminants”</i> [p18-99; Chapter 18; SEIS] references controlled discharges from dams. Under the next heading <i>Mine Water Management System</i>, it states a mine water management system has been developed based on no controlled discharges.</p> <p>The SEIS must clearly identify the proponents intention when and if the following scenarios will occur –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Controlled releases</li> <li>- Uncontrolled releases</li> </ul> <p>Both scenarios must also include appropriate assessment and monitoring to satisfy the Fitzroy Model water conditions.</p> |         |

| Topic | Recommendation / Suggestion   | Response   | Comments   | Recommendations                    | Timing* |
|-------|---|--|--|------------------------------------|---------|
|       | <p><i>consistently presented throughout the EIS. It is impossible to assess the environmental risks posed by the proposal if there has been no decision as to how the water management will be undertaken.]</i></p>   | <p>stormwater management, etc.</p>   |  |                                    |         |
|       | <p><b>Recommendation:</b> It is strongly recommended that a clear and consistent proposal is submitted in the SEIS. It is impossible for the administering authority to assess the proposal when conflicting statements are continually encountered.</p> <p><b>[Issue: Chapter 8</b></p> <p><i>During the information session presented on 12th April, the proponents mentioned that;</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>No coal processing is proposed within the mining lease area; hence no tailings will be generated within the mining lease area (which is the subject of the current EIS process).</i></li> <li>• <i>During construction, overburden is proposed to be re-used for the construction of roads and dams, where possible.</i></li> </ul> | <p>Reference to a coal processing plant has been removed from the final EIS as this is not required.</p> <p>Overburden from the construction of a cut and cover and the drift will be recycled to provide construction material onsite.</p> <p>No overburden will be stored on site in a waste rock or tailings storage facility.</p> <p>As discussed during meeting, Table 8-13 and Table 8-14 present impacts and their mitigation during different stages of the Project i.e. construction phase versus operations phase.</p> | <p>The response provides sufficient information to understand that overburden will not be stockpiled on site, yet there will be coal stockpiled during the mine operation. Erosion and stormwater runoff from the coal stockpile is listed as a potential cause of impacts to surface water (sedimentation and contamination) during the operation phase of the project.</p> | <p>No further recommendations.</p> |         |

| Topic                             | Recommendation / Suggestion  | Response  | Comments  | Recommendations   | Timing*   |
|-----------------------------------|--|---|---|---|---|
|                                   | <p>• <i>During operation, 100% of mined material will be exported from the site; hence, no overburden stockpiles will be required on the surface within the MLA.</i></p> <p><i>In contrast to this Table 8-13 mentions that “Erosion and sedimentation during the operation phases is most likely to occur from stormwater runoff from the coal stockpile, MIA and ongoing minor earthworks...” Additionally Table 8-14 specifically identifies an environmental dam which is planned to receive run-off from the coal stockpile. What is the actual proposal?]</i></p>          |   |   |   |   |
| General Water Management Strategy | <p><b>Recommendation:</b> It is better to manage discharges in a controlled fashion rather than identifying that uncontrolled discharges will occur but should hopefully not impact on downstream environmental values. Discharging controlled volumes of water to minimum flow triggers in the receiving waters represents a better environmental management strategy as a level of dilution and flushing is then assured. Of course, rainfall event/s can be so extreme as to cause uncontrolled discharge but in terms of managing water on-site where discharge has been</p> | <p>Please refer to response above regarding water management. The proposal does not include any controlled discharges. The dams located on drainage lines are those that already exist in the Project area as used by landholders primarily for agricultural uses. Existing water practices within the Project area have been clarified within Chapter 8.</p> | <p><b>C7.</b> The proponent has added information that there will be not controlled discharge of mine wastewater to surface water and that uncontrolled release will be rare and restricted to high rainfall events. The proponent needs to ensure that all references to controlled discharge in the SEIS are removed.</p> | <p><b>R7.</b> EHP requires that the inconsistencies on water management on site and discharge practices would be addressed – as per R6 above.</p> | <p>Prior to SEIS approval and represented in EM Plan.</p> |

16/07/2013

9

| Topic | Recommendation / Suggestion   | Response | Comments | Recommendations | Timing* |
|-------|---|----------|----------|-----------------|---------|
|       | <p>identified as being required, then this should be managed in a controlled fashion.</p> <p><b>[Issue: General Water Management Strategy]</b></p> <p><i>There are major concerns regarding the plans for on-site water management for the Springsure Creek Coal Project. The repeated claim that discharges will only be of an uncontrolled nature presents a number of significant problems.</i></p> <p><i>The presented intent of the water management on site is to control excess water using uncontrolled discharges (which are modelled to be quite rare). However, the proponent admits that quite a high uncertainty remains in relation to the volumes of groundwater which will be encountered during this long wall mining operation, which may mean the models are not representative. This mean that when the one single dam designated to contain mine-affected water from the underground operations is approaching capacity, continued pumping of mine-affected water from underground operations (estimated 1.5-3.7 ML/DAY, and</i></p> |          |          |                 |         |

RTI DL Release



| Topic | Recommendation / Suggestion   | Response | Comments | Recommendations | Timing* |
|-------|---|----------|----------|-----------------|---------|
|       | <p><i>potentially more) to the surface may cause a discharge. By definition this would not be considered an “uncontrolled” discharge, since on-site pumping would be causing this discharge. However, we question whether the proponents will cease underground mining operations to avoid a discharge under these circumstances (and wait until space becomes available to store more mine-affected water in the mine water dam). Given that the sizing of the mine water dam has been based on several layers of modelling (and the associated assumptions and limitations) we have concerns regarding this strategy.</i></p> <p><i>The mine water dam could be gradually filling up over a particular wet season (with high rainfall). This may be due to water falling directly over the mine dam footprint itself (and surrounding catchment, is this planned as a Turkey’s Nest Dam?) but also due to the fact that when high rainfall is experienced on the surface, the levels of groundwater will also be expected to increase in the underground operation. As the level of water in the mine water dams approaches the spillway level, it may in fact be a relatively small rainfall event, or series of small</i></p> |          |          |                 |         |

RTI DL Release

16/07/2013

11



| Topic   | Recommendation / Suggestion  | Response                             | Comments   | Recommendations  | Timing*   |
|---|--|--------------------------------------|--|--|---|
|   | <p><i>rainfall events that trigger uncontrolled discharge/s. The assumption made by the proponent that significant dilution with receiving waters will occur during an uncontrolled discharge is not necessarily the case.</i></p> <p><i>Is the mine water dam a dam without any outside catchment? At the information session it was mentioned that certain dams were located on drainage lines, which dams?]</i></p>   |                                      |  |  |   |
| <p>EIS and Environmental Management Plan (Chapter 18)</p> | <p><b>Recommendation:</b> It is recommended the proponent clearly map all wetlands identified through Queensland wetland mapping both on-site and downstream. Identify potential impacts from anticipated water quality and quantity changes for each of these identified wetlands.</p> <p><b>[Issue: Section 12 Environmental Management Plan</b></p> <p><i>Figure 18-11 in the Draft EM Plan maps five wetlands identified through Queensland wetland mapping (which are also farm dams). From our mapping the lower reaches of Springsure Creek are</i></p> | <p>This figure has been updated.</p> | <p><b>C8.</b> Figure 18-11 in Chapter 18 of the EIS is now Figure 18-12 in Chapter 18 of the SEIS. Figure does not appear to show any new information when compared to Figure 18-11. The proponent should indicate (what information has been added) how the figure has been updated apart from the numbering.</p> | <p><b>R8.</b> The proponent should say what has been updated in Figure 18-12 (Chapter 18) of the SEIS.</p> | <p>Prior to SEIS approval and represented in EM Plan.</p> |

16/07/2013

12



| Topic | Recommendation / Suggestion  | Response   | Comments  | Recommendations  | Timing*   |
|-------|--|--|---|--|---|
|       | <p><i>mapped as Riverine RE (Regional Ecosystems) and there are additional wetlands relevant to the site. The proponents also mention a "wetland protection area 2.4 km to the east of the Project area along Springsure Ck". This is not currently mapped in the EIS. Downstream wetlands are also important to identify and consider given the changes to flows anticipated due to subsidence.]</i></p>  |  |   |  |   |
|       | <p><b>Recommendation:</b> It is recommended that the proponent specifically outline the mitigation measures for each and/or all types of mine-affected waters in Section 12.8.8.</p> <p><b>[Issue: Section 12.8 Mitigation Measures</b></p> <p><i>The proponents state in Section 12.8 Mitigation Measures 12.8.8 Accidental Release of Pollutants that "the redirection of all infrastructure area runoff to environmental dams" will occur, however this should be altered to read "the redirection of all mine affected run-off and mine affected waters are made to appropriately managed dams". No mention is</i></p> | <p>This section has been reworded to clarify the meaning. Groundwater mitigation measures and inflows are addressed in Chapter 9 - Groundwater and Chapter 18 - EM Plan.</p> | <p>Wording in dot point 5; p12-106; Section 12.7.8 (formerly 12.8.8) of Chapter 12 has been changed to "<i>The redirection of all mine affected runoff and mine affected waters are made to appropriately managed dams which have been designed to be above the 1:1000 year ARI level</i>"</p> <p>It is also apparent from the EMP (Chapter 18) of the SEIS that mine dewatering water (from groundwater inflows) will be stored in dams with a potential for uncontrolled discharge or vertical infiltration of contaminants from dams to water table aquifer.</p> | <p><b>R9.</b> Review the performance criteria for ground and surface water impacts and ensure all environmental protection commitments are measurable and auditable.</p> | <p>Prior to SEIS approval and represented in EM Plan.</p> |

16/07/2013

13

| Topic | Recommendation / Suggestion  | Response  | Comments   | Recommendations  | Timing*   |
|-------|--|---|--|--|---|
|       | <p><i>made in this section of the mitigation measures and destination for groundwater inflows (one of the major concerns in terms of water quality and volumes).]</i></p>  |   | <p><b>C9.</b> Not all of the performance criteria associated with potential groundwater impacts from groundwater inflow and disposal/removal (e.g. in italics below) are measurable and should be reconsidered.<br/> <i>“all valid groundwater complaints from down gradient users will be taken seriously and investigated in accordance with Project investigation procedures”</i></p> <p>Without measureable performance criteria it will be difficult to assess impacts and / or efficacy of mitigation and management measures.</p> |  |   |
|       | <p><b>Recommendation:</b> Scientific justification of the above statement is required and should be presented in Chapter 8 –Surface Water (and appropriate appendices) and Section 12.8. The proponents should prepare and present an assessment of the anticipated water quality of all the various types of mine waters.</p> <p><b>[Issue: Section 12.8 Mitigation</b></p> | <p>As noted above, a baseline water quality monitoring program is being prepared at present. This will be implemented and data gathered prior to construction. The findings of this additional monitoring will determine specific trigger values. Sizing of dams will ensure that any uncontrolled discharges resulted in highly diluted water being released that will not</p> | <p><b>C10.</b> The proponent not only need to ensure that they have a good characterisation of water in the receiving environment but will also need to characterise the quality of mine affected water that may be discharged and under what conditions (if there is natural stream discharge at the time of mine affected water release then potential contaminants will be diluted to some extent)</p>  | <p><b>R10.</b> More information would be required on the quality of mine affected water that may be released and under what scenarios or conditions this water would be released in order for the proponent to justify the statement <i>“The discharge of wastewater and stormwater will be similar to water quality of receiving waters and in accordance with the water quality objectives for the Comet</i></p> | <p>Prior to SEIS approval and represented in EM Plan.</p> |

16/07/2013

14

| Topic | Recommendation / Suggestion   | Response  | Comments   | Recommendations  | Timing*   |
|-------|---|---|--|--|---|
|       | <p><b>Measures</b></p> <p><i>The proponents state in Section 12.8 Mitigation Measures 12.8.8 Accidental Release of Pollutants that “The discharge of wastewater and stormwater will be similar to water quality of receiving waters and in accordance with the water quality objectives for the Comet River sub-basin” however we have found no evidence in the EIS that an assessment of the anticipated water quality onsite has been undertaken. Without presentation of this estimated water quality it is unclear how this statement can be scientifically justified.]</i></p> | <p>impact the system. This has been discussed in Chapter 8 - Surface Water.</p>   | <p>to the environment before they can understand the potential impacts of mine affected water release (controlled or uncontrolled) to the receiving environment.</p>   | <p><i>River sub-basin”</i></p>   |   |
|       | <p><b>Recommendation:</b> It is recommended that the proponents update Section 18.5.4.6 Potential Impacts on Environmental Values (Surface Water) and other relevant sections of the EIS to include impacts listed under “groundwater” but which actually pertain to “surface waters”. The proponents should also detail the potential impact to downstream environmental values in further detail, i.e. list the contaminants of greatest concern and assess potential impacts to identified EVs downstream outside of the mixing zone (quantitatively), from</p>                  | <p>Section 18.5.4.9 Control Strategies for the management of surface water impacts has been updated to include monitoring of downstream discharges. Monitoring will account for all existing uses and values of water and adopt a risk based approach to management as appropriate. As discussed at meeting, the Arcturus Coal Mine project is on hold and thus cumulative impacts for this project need not be assessed as part of this EIS.</p> | <p>The proponent has added more detail on potential impacts to surface and groundwater EVs, and proposed control strategies to Sections 18.5.4.6 and 18.5.4.9 of the SEIS, respectively. Included in Section 18.5.4.9 of the SEIS is some broad information on the monitoring program to be implemented to;</p> <p>(a) “supplement the water management strategy to confirm that any potential uncontrolled discharges (overflows from the</p> | <p><b>R11.</b> Where possible measure local stream flow data rather than estimating it.<br/> <b>R12.</b> Provide greater detail within a Mine Affected Water Monitoring Plan or incorporate this information into the Water Quality Monitoring Plan.</p> | <p>Prior to SEIS approval and represented in EM Plan.</p> |

16/07/2013

15

| Topic | Recommendation / Suggestion   | Response | Comments   | Recommendations | Timing* |
|-------|---|----------|--|-----------------|---------|
|       | <p>alterations to both water quality and quantity including for aquatic ecosystems e.g. farm dam wetlands, semi-permanent or permanent waterholes, Riverine regional ecosystems etc., irrigation and stock watering. Cumulative impact's also needed to be assessed. This is required under the EIS ToR and has not been adequately addressed in the EIS.</p> <p><b>[Issue: Environmental Management Plan : Section 18.5.4.6 Potential Impacts on Environmental Values (page 18-84)</b></p> <p><i>The potential impacts to surface waters identified by the proponents during the operational phase are listed as:</i></p> <p><i>“ Altered catchment conditions and subsidence on the hydrology of waterways and drainage lines; and Stormwater runoff, erosion and contaminants from the CHP and MIA areas.”</i></p> <p><i>Yet in the groundwater section (page 18-85) a more descriptive assessment of potential impacts to</i></p> |          | <p><i>Environmental Dams) do not adversely impact on downstream water quality”, and</i></p> <p><i>(b) “serve as a continual improvement mechanism for the ongoing management of stormwater including operational calibration of the water balance model”</i></p> <p><b>C11.</b> According to sub-point 3 p18-101; Chapter 18; SEIS (“<i>Relevant water quality parameters, including physico-chemical and estimation of local stream flow;</i>”) local stream flow data will be estimated rather than measured.</p> <p><b>C12.</b> Very limited detail is provided in Section 18.5.4.9 (EM Plan section of the SEIS) on the intended monitoring of mine affected water in storages. This information is integral in determining the potential impacts should mine affected water be released. This information would also be used to set release limits and / or trigger values should the</p> |                 |         |

16/07/2013

16

| Topic | Recommendation / Suggestion   | Response | Comments   | Recommendations | Timing* |
|-------|---|----------|--|-----------------|---------|
|       | <p><i>surface waters is presented.</i></p> <p><i>“Mine dewatering water will be stored in a dewatering dam on the eastern side of the MIA. Due to the quality (“poor”) of mine water, potential impacts to above ground ecosystems could results from uncontrolled discharge into the surrounding waterways...”</i></p> <p><i>In general however, the descriptions and assessment presented in this section of the EIS is not considered adequate. The ToR clearly require;</i></p> <p><i>“ Describe any cumulative impacts on environmental values caused by the project, in isolation and in combination with the proposed Arcturus Coal Mine and other known existing or planned development or sources of contamination.”</i></p> <p><i>and</i></p> <p><i>“ Impact on environmental values: describe quantitatively the likely impact of the project on the identified environmental values of the area. The cumulative impacts of the project must be considered over time or in combination with other (all) impacts in the dimensions of scale, intensity, duration or</i></p> |          | <p>mine affected water ever be released to surface waters.</p> |                 |         |

RTI DL Release

| Topic | Recommendation / Suggestion   | Response | Comments | Recommendations | Timing* |
|-------|---|----------|----------|-----------------|---------|
|       | <p><i>frequency of the impacts. In particular, address any requirements and recommendations of relevant state planning policies, environmental protection policies, national environmental protection measures and integrated catchment management plans.”</i></p> <p><i>and</i></p> <p><i>“Cumulative impacts on the environmental values of land (including agricultural land), air and water and cumulative impacts on public health and the health of terrestrial and aquatic ecosystems must be discussed in the relevant sections. This assessment may include air and watersheds affected by the project and other proposals, such as the Arcturus Coal Mine, competing for use of the local air and water sheds.”</i></p> <p><i>and</i></p> <p><i>“Where impacts from the project will not be felt in isolation to other sources of impact, it is recommended that the proponent develop consultative arrangements with the Arcturus Coal Project and other industries in the project’s area to undertake cooperative monitoring and/or management of</i></p> |          |          |                 |         |

RTI DL Release

| Topic | Recommendation / Suggestion  | Response  | Comments   | Recommendations   | Timing*   |
|-------|--|---|--|---|---|
|       | <p><i>environmental parameters. Describe such arrangements in the EIS”]</i></p>  |   |  |   |   |
|       | <p><b>Recommendation:</b> It is recommended that a much greater emphasis is placed on site-specific assessment in regards to potential impacts and environmental protection objectives for surface waters.</p> <p><b>[Issue: Environmental Management Plan : Section 18.5.4.7 Environmental Protection Objectives (page 18-85)]</b></p> <p><i>The environmental protection objectives listed for water resources are scarce and apart from protecting agricultural use the only objective listed is as follows:</i></p> <p><i>“Maintain chemical, physical and biological properties of existing water resources within acceptable parameters”</i></p> <p><i>There is no consideration of protecting water flow as a protection objective, and there is a wide leeway in how “acceptable parameters” could be interpreted.</i></p> | <p>As noted above, a baseline water quality monitoring program is being prepared at present. This will be implemented and data gathered prior to construction. The findings of this additional monitoring will determine specific trigger values appropriate to the context of the Project.</p> | <p><b>C13.</b> The proponent has not fully addressed the recommendation. There is a combination of information that is used in the site specific assessment of potential impacts and to quantitatively assess the efficacy of impact mitigation and management measures. Initially, environmental values and objectives to protect or enhance these values should be identified. WAS wish to reiterate that while the baseline water quality monitoring information is important the Scheduled environmental values and water quality objectives for the region (attached) should also be considered in impact assessment.</p> | <p><b>R13.</b> Scheduled environmental values and water quality objectives for the region (attached) where the project occurs are as important as baseline monitoring data and should also be considered in impact assessment. EVs and the objectives used to protect or enhance these values should be detailed in the EIS and EM Plan. There are Scheduled EVs for surface and groundwater flow and Scheduled WQOs for flow objectives in high ecological value waters. Regional surface and groundwater flow objectives should also be taken into account (Queensland Government, 2011).</p> | <p>Prior to SEIS approval and represented in EM Plan.</p> |

| Topic | Recommendation / Suggestion   | Response   | Comments  | Recommendations                    | Timing* |
|-------|---|--|---|------------------------------------|---------|
|       | <p><i>It would appear that very little time and consideration has been given to identify, and clearly assess that site-specific environmental values and environmental protection objectives for surface waters both on-site and downstream of the proposed site. This is a major concern in regards to this EIS. How can the objective be to maintain existing properties for surface waters when an inadequate assessment of local surface waters has been undertaken? If information is not currently available then the EPO's should include to an objective to comprehensively assess the local surface waterways and aquatic ecosystems and detail the spatial location of all relevant EVs (mapping).]</i></p> |  |   |                                    |         |
|       | <p><b>Recommendation:</b> It is recommended that the proponent makes the suggested alteration listed above.</p> <p><b>[Issue: Environmental Management Plan: Section 18.5.4.8 Performance Criteria (page 18-85)]</b></p>  | <p>Section 18.5.4.8 has been amended as recommended.</p> | <p>The proponent has fulfilled the recommendations made by WAS.</p> | <p>No further recommendations.</p> |         |

16/07/2013

20

| Topic | Recommendation / Suggestion   | Response | Comments | Recommendations | Timing* |
|-------|---|----------|----------|-----------------|---------|
|       | <p><i>The proponent lists the following Performance Criteria for surface waters:</i></p> <p><i>“ Compliance with the regulatory conditions outlined by the Project’s Environmental Activity (EA);</i></p> <p><i>Monitoring to be undertaken in accordance with outlined control strategies;</i></p> <p><i>Develop monitoring criteria including trigger values using site specific data ;</i></p> <p><i>....</i></p> <p><i>Quantity of groundwater complaints from down gradient users”</i></p> <p><i>The terminology is incorrect for EA, as this should read “Environmental Authority” rather than “Environmental Activity”. Given that the main Performance Criteria is based on compliance with the EA, the EA will need to be designed in such a way to protect the receiving waters and associated environmental values environment. As it stands the current proposed EA does not achieve these aims.</i></p> <p><i>It is not a performance criteria to “<u>develop</u> a monitoring program and trigger values” rather, it would be a</i></p> |          |          |                 |         |

RTI DL Release

16/07/2013

21

| Topic | Recommendation / Suggestion  | Response   | Comments   | Recommendations   | Timing*   |
|-------|--|--|--|---|---|
|       | <p><i>performance criteria to “adequately monitor and <u>maintain</u> water quality within receiving waters in order to meet the Water Quality Objectives (WQOs) for identified environmental values”.</i></p> <p><i>It is unclear how a “quantity of complaints” is an adequate environmental performance criteria. By this criteria in the current EIS, if a small number of complaints are received regarding the projects impact on down-gradient groundwater users, then the site is “performing” adequately. We would suggest that any and all complaints should be considered seriously.]</i></p> |  |  |   |   |
|       | <p><b>Recommendation:</b> It is recommended that the proponent clarify the water management strategies as there is a general lack of consistency throughout the EIS and Appendices. Follow the advice above to undertake the planning of a controlled discharge</p> <p><b>[Issue: Environmental Management Plan: Section 18.5.4.9 Control Strategies (page 18-87)]</b></p> <p><i>For the first time, the proponents</i></p>  | <p>As confirmed during meeting, the Project is not proposing any controlled discharges. As such, no draft EA conditions are proposed to manage this. Conditions to manage the event of an uncontrolled release are proposed at Condition D15, which includes quality objectives for monitoring and reporting requirements.</p> | <p><b>C14.</b> It is not usual to condition for an uncontrolled release, especially if the release will be rare or unlikely to occur at all during the lifetime of the project. In instances where an uncontrolled release is foreseeable the proponent may apply for a Temporary Emissions Licence (TEL). The information collected to characterise baseline surface water quality and the quality of mine affected water in storage dams monitoring would be useful in this application. There</p> | <p><b>R14.</b> In relation to condition (D15) - EHP requires that the inconsistencies on water management on site and discharge practices would be addressed – as per R6 above.</p> | <p>Prior to SEIS approval and represented in EM Plan.</p> |

16/07/2013

22

| Topic | Recommendation / Suggestion   | Response | Comments   | Recommendations | Timing* |
|-------|---|----------|--|-----------------|---------|
|       | <p><i>mention anything about a controlled discharge. In all or most other sections of the EIS the proponents only refer to “uncontrolled” discharges.</i></p> <p><i>“Controlled discharges from dams (i.e. actively controlled discharges) will only be undertaken in the event water quality parameters are in accordance with the relevant guidelines”</i></p> <p><i>While we are not against the proposal of controlled discharges if designed in such a way that WQOs are adequately protected (i.e. with dilution specifically designed), this should not be the first and only mention of this water management option. There does not appear to be any EA conditions relating to controlled discharges, if controlled discharges are to be considered further then further information and site-specific assessment will need to be incorporated in Chapter 8 – Surface Water, Site Water Management Plans and Site Water Balance, and detailed conditions proposed in the EA water conditions (refer to Model Conditions for Coal Mine in the Fitzroy for more guidance on this). The Technical guideline “Wastewater release to Queensland waters” (2012) should</i></p> |          | <p>would also be some monitoring requirements under the TEL.</p> |                 |         |

RTI DL Release

16/07/2013

23

| Topic | Recommendation / Suggestion  | Response   | Comments  | Recommendations   | Timing* |
|-------|--|--|---|---|---------|
|       | <p><i>also be followed.]</i></p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> It is recommended that this statement is removed from the Mine Water Management System section of Section 18.5.4.9 Control Strategies. The mine water management should clearly aim to keep “clean” or “raw” water separate from “dirty” or mine affected waters. This should be updated in Section 18.5.4.9 and any other relevant sections of the EIS.</p> <p><b>[Issue: Issue: Environmental Management Plan : Section 18.5.4.9 Control Strategies (page 18-87)</b></p> <p><i>The proponents [sic]</i></p> <p><i>“Raw water will also be used to top up the mine dewatering dam to ensure there is enough water for underground mine use and stockpile sprays”</i></p> <p><i>This statement does not align with the stated aim to separate “clean” and “mine-affected water” on-site, where separation of these water types represents best-practice management. It is not best-practice</i></p> | <p>All water within the MIA is classes as ‘dirty’ or “mine affected” water. Clean water is either that from outside the site that will be diverted around the mine site, or bought into the site. Bandanna Energy has purchased an allocation of 1,000 mega litres of water per year from Sunwater’s Nogoa–McKenzie Water Supply Scheme for use at the mine site. Water from this scheme will be piped to the site. The purchase will ensure the mine is self-sufficient and does not draw upon existing local water supplies and or aquifers. In the event that the dam does not contain sufficient quantities of water to undertake underground mining activities, water from the pipeline will be utilised as a supplement.</p> | <p>The proponent has provided sufficient information on this issue.</p> | <p>WAS have no further recommendations on this issue.</p> |         |

| Topic | Recommendation / Suggestion  | Response  | Comments  | Recommendations   | Timing* |
|-------|--|---|---|---|---------|
|       | <p><i>to combine clean or raw water with contaminated waters (impacted by mining activities), as this in-effect increases the volumes of contaminated water onsite.]</i></p>   |   |   |   |         |
|       | <p><b>Recommendation:</b> It is recommended that the proponent state that the baseline water assessment and interpretation of water quality data will follow the appropriate guidelines including the DERM Monitoring and Sampling Manual, Queensland Water Quality Guidelines (QWQG, 2009), ANZECC guidelines, Model water conditions for coal mines in the Fitzroy Basin etc. As a minimum, but not limited to including;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Measure for those all indicators listed in Tables 2 and 3 the Model water conditions for coal mines in the Fitzroy Basin (including both field filtered (dissolved) metals and totals metals).</li> <li>• When deriving local WQOs make sure included data is only collected from true reference sites (as per the definition in Section 4.4.3 of the QWQGs (2009)). It is not adequate to use data collected from locations downstream of discharging</li> </ul> | <p>A detailed monitoring plan is currently being developed. Please refer to Chapter 18, Section 18.5.4.10</p> | <p>The proponent has provided sufficient information on this issue.</p> | <p>WAS have no further recommendations on this issue.</p> |         |

16/07/2013

25

| Topic | Recommendation / Suggestion   | Response | Comments | Recommendations | Timing* |
|-------|---|----------|----------|-----------------|---------|
|       | <p>mines.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Include a measure or estimate of local stream flow at the time of each sampling event. The relationship between flow vs. EC should be investigated at local reference sites.</li> <li>• A minimum of 10 data points, but preferably 24 data points should be used and collected over a minimum of 12-18 months, and be representative of all seasons;</li> <li>• All data used to determine locally-derived trigger values should be presented in electronic format for review by DEHP or DSITIA</li> </ul> <p>IMPORTANT NOTE: Reference to these documents, and the minimum requirements listed above should also be added to other relevant sections of the EIS which refer to future plans to undertake water and aquatic ecosystem health monitoring and WQO derivation</p> <p><b>[Issue: Section Environmental Management Plan: Section 18.5.4.9 Control Strategies (page</b></p> |          |          |                 |         |

RTI DL Release



| Topic | Recommendation / Suggestion   | Response   | Comments  | Recommendations   | Timing*  |
|-------|---|--|---|---|--|
|       | <p><b>18-88)</b></p> <p><i>The proponents commit to developing a Water Management Plan (Water MP) under the Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP), and as part of this program they plan to develop:</i></p> <p><i>“Criteria will be developed with trigger values set at the 20<sup>th</sup> and 80<sup>th</sup> percentiles identified through baseline investigations which will be further undertaken prior to construction”</i></p> <p><i>No clear plans are presented in regards to how these “baseline investigations” will be undertaken. There is no presentation of the monitoring program design, indicators to be measures, QA/QC, etc. There is also no reference to the appropriate guideline documents.]</i></p> |  |   |   |  |
|       | <p><b>Recommendation:</b> The issues listed should be addressed in the relevant sections of the EIS</p> <p><b>[Issue: Section 18.5.4.10 Monitoring Surface Water</b></p>  | <p>Condition D21 provides for the monitoring of water storage quality.</p> | <p><b>C15.</b> Proposed Condition (D21) provides no information on the frequency of monitoring mine affected water in storage dams. Stock should not have access to dams containing hazardous waste. Condition (D21) [<i>“(D21) In the event the water quality within any dam</i></p> | <p><b>R15.</b> Remove Condition (D21) from the Proposed Environmental Authority Conditions: Schedule D – Water (Section 18.5.4.12; EM Plan; SEIS).</p> <p><b>R16.</b> Mine affected water in storage dams should be monitored. A condition to</p> | <p>Prior to SEIS approval and represented in EM Plan.</p> <p>Refer to guidelines-EM99 Model mining conditions.</p> |

| Topic | Recommendation / Suggestion   | Response | Comments  | Recommendations   | Timing*   |
|-------|---|----------|---|---|---|
|       | <p><i>Commitments are made to monitor at the Environmental Dams (EDs) and the proposed ongoing sampling locations (refer section 18.5.4.12 - EA) for both water quality and flow (subsidence impacts). There should also be ongoing monitoring of water quality in the mine-affected water dam also.</i></p> <p><i>There is repeated reference to “water quality levels which exceed the WQOs set out in the EA and Water MP, upstream (control) values will be compared to the water quality within and downstream of the Project area to determine if the exceedence is likely to be Project area specific”. There is no mention however of the sampling frequency or how this comparison will be undertaken. Strictly speaking it should be the median of test site data which is compared to the WQO. If weekly sampling is undertaken, a rolling median could for example be calculated and used for interpretation purposes.]</i></p> |          | <p><i>containing hazardous waste does not comply with the contaminant limits defined in Table 18-30, measures will be implemented to minimise access by stock to the dam.”]</i> should be removed from the Proposed Environmental Authority Conditions: Schedule D – Water (Section 18.5.4.12; EM Plan; SEIS). Stock should not have access to dams containing hazardous waste.</p> <p><b>C16.</b> It is still important to monitor the quality of mine affected water in storage dams because this information can be used to (a) assess potential impacts to ground and surface waters (diffuse and point source emissions/release); (b) set release limits should mine affected water be released to surface waters, and (c) test the efficacy of mitigation and management measures to avoid and / or reduce impacts.</p> | <p>monitor mine affected water in storages and / or a commitment to monitor mine affected water in the EM Plan should be sufficient. A detailed plan on how this monitoring will be carried out should be included within a Mine Affected Water Monitoring Plan or incorporate this information into the Water Quality Monitoring Plan.</p> | <p>EM634 Structures which are dams or levees constructed as part of ERAs.</p> |

| Topic | Recommendation / Suggestion  | Response  | Comments   | Recommendations   | Timing* |
|-------|--|---|--|---|---------|
|       | <p><b>Recommendation:</b> It is recommended that proposed EA Condition D3 is altered and does not allow for the uncontrolled environmental discharge of mine affected water to receiving waters. Just because a creek is unnamed and is located in full or in part on the mine lease area does not mean that it should be considered part of the on-site water infrastructure (nor for on-site farm dam wetlands). The QWQGs clearly state that all waterways including highly ephemeral waterways are assigned a level of protection. We do support however the assertion that receiving waters monitoring is undertaken (as outlined in the second half of proposed EA Condition D3).</p> <p>Throughout the EIS, very limited information is presented regarding the locations of discharge points, relative to the receiving waterways, farm dam wetlands, riverine regional ecosystems etc. No modelling or assessment of the impacts of mine discharges on these waterways is presented. Given that discharge locations appear to upstream of farm dams, and discharge waters are likely to be trapped within these farm dam wetlands, a comprehensive understanding of the likely dilutions,</p> | <p>Farm dams and creeks will not be used to provide or store water as part of the Project. Any uncontrolled discharges during flood events to existing waterways from these dams will be via a spillway and in accordance with quality criteria presented in condition D15. There is no need to amend condition D3.</p> | <p>WAS are satisfied with the information supplied here.</p> | <p>WAS have no further recommendations on this issue.</p> |         |

RTI DL Release

16/07/2013

29

| Topic | Recommendation / Suggestion  | Response | Comments | Recommendations | Timing* |
|-------|--|----------|----------|-----------------|---------|
|       | <p>mixing zones and wetland specific issues should be presented in the SEIS. If mine-affected discharges occur with high Electrical Conductivity (EC) into a poorly mixed receiving environment (farm dams) it is highly likely that stratification of waters will occur with higher concentration EC water falling to the bottom layers of the water column, and potentially adversely affecting biota within the benthic zone. Insufficient attention has been placed on these and similar issues. It is strongly recommended that thorough consideration, assessment and/or modelling is undertaken and presented in the relevant sections of the EIS</p> <p><b>[Issue: Section 18.5.4.12 Proposed Environmental Authority Conditions: Schedule D- Water Surface Water</b></p> <p><i>The proponents propose the following conditions;</i></p> <p><i>“Condition (D3) Waters within unnamed creek 1 has the potential to be affected by storm water contaminated by the mining activities and therefore must be</i></p> |          |          |                 |         |

RTI DL Release

| Topic | Recommendation / Suggestion  | Response   | Comments   | Recommendations   | Timing*   |
|-------|--|--|--|---|---|
|       | <p><i>monitored at the locations and frequencies defined in the Table 18-24”</i></p> <p><i>Contaminated stormwater should not be allowed to run-off freely into receiving waterways and needs to be contained for treatment and/or for controlled discharges.</i></p> <p><i>Unnamed Creek 1 is stated to flow into Farm Dam 2 (Den Lo Park). Discharges to Unnamed Creek 1 are complicated by the downstream Farm Dam. What are the EV's of this dam? Aquatic ecosystems, irrigation, stock watering? The proponent has not presented any information in regards to how the EV's of this dam will be protected from mining impacts. Mine-affected water which is proposed to be discharged into dams is a far more complicated discharge scenario. No modelling or assessment of mixing zones has been presented in the EIS]</i></p> |  |  |   |   |
|       | <p><b>Recommendation:</b> It is strongly recommended that the proponent obtain and consider the “Model water conditions for coal mines in the Fitzroy basin”. Deviations to these conditions are able to be proposed by the proponent however this needs to be adequately justified</p>  | <p>Schedule D has been updated considering the Model water conditions for coal mines in the Fitzroy basin. New conditions have been presented and existing conditions updated.</p> | <p><b>C17.</b> Given release of mine affected water to surface waters will be rare or highly unlikely then a controlled release of mine affected water condition will not be required in the EA.</p> <p><b>C18.</b> Condition (D21) is</p> | <p><b>R17.</b> In relation to the proposed condition (D15) - EHP requires that the inconsistencies on water management on site and discharge practices would be addressed – as per R6 above..</p> <p><b>R18.</b> Remove Condition</p> | <p>Prior to SEIS approval and represented in EM Plan.</p> <p>Refer to guidelines - EM99 Model</p> |

16/07/2013

31

| Topic | Recommendation / Suggestion   | Response | Comments   | Recommendations  | Timing*                  |
|-------|---|----------|--|--|--------------------------|
|       | <p>on a scientific basis. We could not locate any scientific justification for the proposed conditions regarding waters. Significant revision is required for the proposed EA.</p> <p><b>[Issue: Section 18.5.4.12 Proposed Environmental Authority Conditions: Schedule D- Water Surface Water</b></p> <p><i>This mine is located in the Fitzroy Basin and yet the proponents do not refer to the "Model water conditions for coal mines in the Fitzroy basin".]</i></p> |          | <p>poorly written and needs to be reviewed or removed.</p> <p><b>C19.</b> The Water Quality Monitoring Plan (WQMP), which is described in brief in the EM Plan section of the SEIS (pp18-19), shows that the proponent intends to conduct receiving environment monitoring throughout the life of the project. A requirement to conduct a receiving environment monitoring program (REMP) is usually also conditioned in the EA, especially where there is a potential for release of mine affected water to surface waters.</p> <p><b>C20.</b> The WQMP / REMP is only described in brief in the EM Plan section of the SEIS.</p> | <p>(D21) from the Proposed Environmental Authority Conditions: Schedule D – Water (Section 18.5.4.12; EM Plan; SEIS). A condition to monitor mine affected water in storages and / or a commitment to monitor mine affected water in the EM Plan should be sufficient, along with a detailed plan on how this monitoring will be carried out (a Mine Affected Water Monitoring Plan).</p> <p><b>R19.</b> We recommend adding a requirement to conduct a REMP in the EA. Conditions for monitoring of the receiving environment as per Model Mining Conditions (<a href="http://www.ehp.qld.gov.au/land/mining/pdf/model-mining-conditions-em944.pdf">http://www.ehp.qld.gov.au/land/mining/pdf/model-mining-conditions-em944.pdf</a>).</p> <p><b>R20.</b> The full details of the environmental monitoring to be carried out under the WQMP / REMP would need to be reviewed to ensure that the program is well designed enough to (a) to assess the potential impact of any release of mine affected water on EVs; (b) to test the accuracy of an environmental impact statement and whether management and mitigation measures are effective and (c) to set and / or</p> | <p>mining conditions</p> |

16/07/2013

32

| Topic | Recommendation / Suggestion | Response | Comments | Recommendations  | Timing* |
|-------|-----------------------------|----------|----------|--|---------|
|       |                             |          |          | amend release limits and trigger levels for specific water quality parameters and related conditions within an approval) |         |

RTI DL Release

## References

DERM (2011) *Environmental Protection (Water) Policy 2009 Comet River Sub-basin Environmental Values and Water Quality Objectives Basin No. 130 (part), including all waters of the Comet River Sub-basin September 2011*, Department of Environment and Resource Management, Brisbane:

[http://www.ehp.qld.gov.au/water/policy/pdf/plans/fitzroy\\_comet\\_river\\_wqo\\_290911](http://www.ehp.qld.gov.au/water/policy/pdf/plans/fitzroy_comet_river_wqo_290911)

Queensland Government (2011) *Water Resource (Fitzroy Basin) Plan 2011*, Queensland Government, Brisbane:

<http://www.legislation.qld.gov.au/LEGISLTN/CURRENT/W/WaterReFBP11.pdf>

## Attachments



Adobe Acrobat  
Document



Adobe Acrobat  
Document

## Disclaimer:

*Any opinions, advice or comments provided in this memo (i.e. the work request 'response') or associated attachments or emails should not be used as part of legal proceedings or expert statements. Please advise the Water Assessment and Systems (WAS) Group immediately if the response to this work request could be used in relation to legal proceedings.*

*WAS work request responses are typically based largely on the information and data provided by other parties. Although the information and data provided will be cross-checked and verified wherever possible, WAS cannot be held liable for interpretations based on incorrect, inaccurate, incomplete or otherwise invalid information or data, nor for any subsequent decisions or actions made by any individuals or organisations that were based on misinformed responses.*

RTI DL Release

# Notice

## *Environmental Protection Act 1994*

### **Amendment of an original environmental impact statement (EIS)**

*This notice is to be used pursuant to section 66(3) of the Environmental Protection Act 1994 by the proponent to notify the chief executive<sup>1</sup> of an amendment or replacement to an environmental impact statement (EIS) which has already been submitted.*

To: Department of Environment and Heritage Protection  
GPO Box 2454  
Brisbane QLD 4001

Attention: Monika Rhodes

#### **Notice of amendment of an original EIS**

**1. Proponents details**

Date: 21 June 2013

Proponents name(s): Springsure Creek Coal Pty Ltd (SCC)

Contact address details:

Level 4, 260 Queen Street, Brisbane, QLD

Email: MichaelGray@bandannaenergy.com.au

**2. Original EIS details**

Project name: Springsure Creek Coal Project

Original EIS prepared by: SCC

Original EIS dated: 14 February 2013

Nature of the project: Mining of black coal

Location details: MLA 70486

**3. Changed EIS details**

It is advised that the following information amends the original EIS.

Springsure Creek Coal Project Final EIS June 2013 (as attached).

**4. Payment of fees**

It is acknowledged that where a fee is prescribed under a Regulation for the submission of this notice, it must accompany this notice. The current fee being lodged, as prescribed under Schedule 10 of the Environmental Protection Regulation 2009, is \$0.00.

<sup>1</sup> The Director General of the Department of Environment and Heritage Protection is the chief executive under the *Environmental Protection Act 1994*.

**NOTE:** You may pay your fee via cheque, money order or credit card.

Select the payment method below:

- Payment by cheque or money order made payable to the Department of Environment and Heritage Protection (attached).
- Please contact me (the applicant) for credit card payment:

Phone number: \_\_\_\_\_

sch4p4(6) Personal informati  
sch4p4(6) Fee

21 June 2013

Signature

Date

|   |
|---|
| YOUR NAME<br>Michael Gray                     |
| YOUR POSITION<br>Managing Director            |
| COMPANY NAME<br>Springsure Creek Coal Pty Ltd |

RTI DL Release

# Notice

## *Environmental Protection Act 1994*

### **Amendment of an original environmental impact statement (EIS)**

*This notice is to be used pursuant to section 66(3) of the Environmental Protection Act 1994 by the proponent to notify the chief executive<sup>1</sup> of an amendment or replacement to an environmental impact statement (EIS) which has already been submitted.*

To: Department of Environment and Heritage Protection  
GPO Box 2454  
Brisbane QLD 4001

Attention: Monika Rhodes

#### **Notice of amendment of an original EIS**

**1. Proponents details**

Date: 13 August 2013

Proponents name(s): Springsure Creek Coal Pty Ltd (SCC)

Contact address details:

Level 4, 260 Queen Street, Brisbane, QLD

Email: MichaelGray@bandannaenergy.com.au

**2. Original EIS details**

Project name: Springsure Creek Coal Project

Original EIS prepared by: SCC

Original EIS dated: 14 February 2013

Nature of the project: Mining of black coal

Location details: MLA 70486

**3. Changed EIS details**

It is advised that the following information amends the original EIS.

Springsure Creek Coal Project Addendum to EIS August 2013 (as attached).

**4. Payment of fees**

It is acknowledged that where a fee is prescribed under a Regulation for the submission of this notice, it must accompany this notice. The current fee being lodged, as prescribed under Schedule 10 of the Environmental Protection Regulation 2009, is \$0.00.

<sup>1</sup> The Director General of the Department of Environment and Heritage Protection is the chief executive under the *Environmental Protection Act 1994*.

**NOTE:** You may pay your fee via cheque, money order or credit card.

Select the payment method below:

- Payment by cheque or money order made payable to the Department of Environment and Heritage Protection (attached).
- Please contact me (the applicant) for credit card payment:

Phone number: \_\_\_\_\_

sch4p4(6) Person  
sch4p4(6)

13 August 2013

sch4p4(6)  
Signature

Date

|   |
|---|
| YOUR NAME<br>Michael Gray                     |
| YOUR POSITION<br>Managing Director            |
| COMPANY NAME<br>Springsure Creek Coal Pty Ltd |

RTI DL Release

## Phillips Erin

---

**From:** Rhodes Monika  
**Sent:** Friday, 1 February 2013 12:57 PM  
**To:** Rachel Gibson (Bandanna); Pete Jones  
**Cc:** Rowland Philip; Loveday Chris; Nielsen Tenille  
**Subject:** Notice of decision to proceed with EIS under s 49(5) of the EP Act  
**Attachments:** sd-mi-no-s53-compliance-public-notification-eis\_2013.doc; EIS\_Notice\_s49 decision for EIS to proceed\_Springsure Creek\_20130201.pdf; Public Notice\_Springsure Creek\_20130130\_CCI approved.doc

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

Dear Rachel

Please find attached the electronic copy of notice of decision to proceed with EIS under s 49(5) of the EP Act, a copy of the approved text of the EIS notice, and a proforma of the statutory declaration form which will need to be given to the chief executive within 10 business days after the EIS notice is published.

The signed notice and the proforma for the stat dec will be sent by mail today.

Within 20 business days of receiving this Notice (issued under section 49 of the EP Act) you must give a copy of the EIS Notice to each affected person for the project and each interested person, **after which you must publish** the EIS Notice.

Kind regards

Dr Monika Rhodes  
Principal Environmental Officer  
Statewide Environmental Assessments  
**Telephone** 07 3330 6293 **Facsimile** 3330 5875  
**Email:** [monika.rhodes@ehp.qld.gov.au](mailto:monika.rhodes@ehp.qld.gov.au)  
[www.ehp.qld.gov.au](http://www.ehp.qld.gov.au)

Department of Environment and Heritage Protection  
Level 9, 400 George Street, Brisbane Q 4000  
GPO Box 2454, Brisbane Q 4001

# Statutory declaration

Mining

## Statutory declaration for public notice requirements of environmental impact statement (EIS)

A statutory declaration is a written statement of facts that is sworn or declared under the Oaths Act 1867. This statutory declaration should be completed and forwarded to the chief executive in accordance with Section 53 of the Environmental Protection Act 1994. You must attach a copy of the 'Public Notice of environmental impact statement (EIS)', required under sections 51 & 52 of the Environmental Protection Act 1994, to this statutory declaration.

### OATHS ACT 1867

QUEENSLAND

TO WIT

Re: Public notice of environmental impact statement (EIS) for the project

Described as:

On land described as:

I

Insert the name of the person making this declaration

of

Insert the street address of the person making this declaration

in the State of Queensland do solemnly and sincerely declare that in regard to the above mentioned EIS, the proponent:

Proponent company name

**Statutory declaration**

**Statutory declaration for public notice requirements of environmental impact statement (EIS)**

---

Has (please tick only one of the following):

fully complied with the public notice requirements of sections 51 and 52 of the *Environmental Protection Act 1994*.

OR

not fully complied with the public notification requirements of sections 51 and 52 of the *Environmental Protection Act 1994* and the details of non compliance are as follows:

The EIS notice was published in the following media:

|    |  |
|----|--|
| 1. |  |
| 2. |  |

Insert publication name

|  |
|--|
|  |
|  |

Insert publication date

And the EIS notice has been given to the following persons

|    |  |
|----|--|
| 1. |  |
| 2. |  |
| 3. |  |

Insert name, address and dates

And I make this solemn declaration conscientiously believing the same to be true, and by virtue of the provisions of the *Oaths Act 1867*.



**Statutory declaration**

**Statutory declaration for public notice requirements of environmental impact statement (EIS)**

---

Taken and declared before me, at

Insert location

this

Insert day (e.g. 18th)

day of

Insert month

in the year

Insert year

Signed

(Person making this declaration)

Signed

(Delete whichever are not applicable — Justice of the Peace /  
Commissioner for Declarations / Solicitor / Barrister)

Printed name and registration number (if applicable)

RTI DL Release



# Notice

Mining

## **Notice of decision to proceed with Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)**

*This notice is issued by the chief executive pursuant to subsection 49(5) of the Environmental Protection Act 1994 to advise that the chief executive has decided that the submitted Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) is to proceed to public notification and the receipt of submissions.*

Mr Michael Gray  
Springsure Creek Coal Pty Ltd  
GPO Box 5227  
BRISBANE QLD 4001

Our reference: CBD/111013

### **Re: Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the proposed Springsure Creek Coal Mine Project**

The above-mentioned EIS, initially received by this office on 30 November 2012 and subsequently amended and resubmitted on 15 January 2013, has been considered by the chief executive and a decision made to allow the EIS to proceed to the public notification stage of the EIS process.

To facilitate the public notification process you are required to prepare and publish a notice about the EIS (an EIS Notice) in accordance with sections 51 and 52 of the *Environmental Protection Act 1994* (EP Act). A copy of the EIS Notice in the approved form is attached. Within 20 business days of receiving this Notice (issued under section 49 of the EP Act) you must give a copy of the EIS Notice to each affected person for the project and each interested person, after which you must publish the EIS Notice at least once in a Saturday edition of *The Courier-Mail* and *The Australian*, as well as in regional newspapers of your choice.

The 30-day submission period, during which submissions on the EIS may be made to the chief executive, starts on the first business day after the last day the EIS Notice is published by newspaper.

Within 10 business days after the EIS Notice being published, the proponent must give the chief executive a statutory declaration declaring:

- a) whether or not the proponent has complied with the notice requirements under sections 51 and 52; and
- b) the name and address of each person to whom the EIS Notice was given under section 51.

A copy of the (published) EIS Notice must be attached to the declaration.

A proforma for the statutory declaration is enclosed. Once completed, the statutory declaration and attached EIS Notice must be submitted to the chief executive at the following address:

The Chief Executive  
Attention: EIS Coordinator, Springsure Creek Coal Mine Project  
Department of Environment and Heritage Protection  
Level 9, 400 George Street, BRISBANE QLD 4000  
GPO Box 2454, BRISBANE QLD 4001

Should you have any queries in relation to this notice, please contact Dr Monika Rhodes, Principal Environmental Officer, on telephone 07 3330 6293.

**Approved by**

sch4p4(6) Person  
sch4p4(6)

Signature

01/02/2013

Date

Lindsay Delzoppo  
Director, Statewide Environmental Assessments  
Delegate of the Administering Authority  
*Environmental Protection Act 1994*

**Enquiries:**  
Statewide Environmental Assessments Unit  
Department of Environment and Heritage  
Protection  
Ph. **07 3330 6293**  
Fax. 07 3330 5754

RTI DL Release

## Public Notice

*Environmental Protection Act 1994 – Sections 51 and 52*

### **Notice of Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) Proposed Springsure Creek Coal Mine Project**

Springsure Creek Coal Pty Ltd (SCC), a wholly-owned subsidiary of Bandanna Energy Limited, has prepared an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) as part of their proposal to develop an underground coal mine near Springsure in Central Queensland, located approximately 47km south-east of Emerald. The proposed mine would be located on a new Mining Lease (ML 70486) encompassing 10,736ha.

The project would involve longwall mining to produce up to 11 million tonnes of thermal coal a year. The project is anticipated to operate on the principle that all coal would be exported without the need for beneficiation. The mine would be operational for approximately 40 years.

A peak workforce of approximately 350 people would be employed during construction, 585 during operation and 40 during decommissioning. Some of the workforce would be accommodated within a 300 bed dedicated village and would commute daily by private bus to the mine site. Access to the site from Emerald would be via the Gregory Highway, Glenorina Road, Wyntoon Road and Kilmore Road.

Coal would be transported to a proposed rail loading facility at Triumph Creek, approximately 40km to the east of the mine. From there, coal would then be transported via existing rail networks to the Wiggins Island Coal Export Terminal (WICET) at the Port of Gladstone.

Separate approval processes would be sought for both the transport and infrastructure corridor connecting the mine and the train load out facility (to be located at Triumph Creek), and the workforce accommodation village. The EIS described in this notice addresses the mine component of the project only.

#### **Environmental Protection Act 1994 (Queensland)**

On 2 December 2010, SCC made an application to the Department of Environment and Heritage Protection under section 70 and 71 of the *Environmental Protection Act 1994* for approval to voluntarily prepare an EIS for the project. The application was approved on 17 December 2010.

The EIS does not address any requirements under the Commonwealth's *Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999*.

**A copy of the EIS** can be inspected at:

- Department of Environment and Heritage Protection  
Floor 3, 400 George Street  
BRISBANE QLD 4000
- Emerald Public Library  
44 Borilla Street  
EMERALD QLD 4720
- Department of Environment and Heritage Protection  
99 Hospital Road  
EMERALD QLD 4720
- Springsure Library  
Eclipse Street  
SPRINGSURE QLD 4722

Electronic copies of the EIS are available online via the project website [www.springsurecreekproject.com.au](http://www.springsurecreekproject.com.au). The EIS can be provided on request by telephoning 1800 230 064 or contacting [enquires@springsurecreekproject.com.au](mailto:enquires@springsurecreekproject.com.au). Please note that a reasonable charge may be applied for the reproduction of copies of the EIS. Further information on the project can be obtained from SCC using the company's contact details above.

Written submissions in relation to the EIS are invited from any person within the submission period. The submission period commences on **Thursday 14 February 2013** and ends on **Wednesday 27 March 2013**. Submissions should be addressed to:

The Chief Executive  
Department of Environment and Heritage Protection  
Attention: The EIS Coordinator (Springsure Creek Coal Mine Project)  
GPO Box 2454, BRISBANE QLD 4001  
Level 9, 400 George Street, Brisbane QLD 4000

or emailed to: [eis@ehp.qld.gov.au](mailto:eis@ehp.qld.gov.au).

**A properly made submission is one that:**

- is written
- is signed by or for each person ('signatory') who has made a submission
- states the name and address of each signatory
- is made to the chief executive
- is received on or before the last day of the submission period.

For further information regarding the EIS process for this proposal, contact the EIS Coordinator on QGOV (13 74 68) or email [eis@ehp.qld.gov.au](mailto:eis@ehp.qld.gov.au).

RTI DL Release

## Phillips Erin

---

**From:** Rowland Philip  
**Sent:** Friday, 19 July 2013 4:17 PM  
**To:** michaelgray@bandannaenergy.com.au  
**Cc:** Pete Jones; stuartclark@bandannaenergy.com.au; Rhodes Monika; Curley Peter  
**Subject:** Springsure Coal Project EIS - information request.  
**Attachments:** s555 & s62 notice 19072013.pdf; review-and-appeal-court-em1866.pdf; SEIS\_DAFF comments\_Springsure\_20130710.pdf.pdf; SEIS\_DNRM comments\_Springsure\_20130712.pdf; SEIS\_EHP attachment to comments\_Comet\_plan\_20130710.pdf.pdf; SEIS\_EHP attachment to comments\_Fitzroy\_Comet\_river\_wqo\_20130710.pdf.pdf; SEIS\_EHP comments\_Review of SEIS\_key issues\_Springsure\_20130716.pdf

Michael

Please find attached an information request and extension of decision notice. The notice is in response to the advice EHP has received from advisory bodies on Springsure Creek Coal's response to submissions and amended EIS.

A printed copy has been forwarded to your registered office.

Please contact Monika Rhodes (3330 6293) or myself if you have any queries.

I look forward to receiving the information.

Regards

**Philip Rowland**

Manager, Statewide Environmental Assessments

Statewide Environmental Assessments  
Environmental Regulatory Practice  
Environmental Performance & Coordination Branch  
Department of Environment and Heritage Protection

Email: [philip.rowland@ehp.qld.gov.au](mailto:philip.rowland@ehp.qld.gov.au)  
Phone: 07 3330 5602  
FAX: 07 3330 5875

## Section 555 and Section 62 — *Environmental Protection Act 1994*

### Extension of decision on whether EIS may proceed and request for information

*This notice is issued by the chief executive pursuant to sections 555, 62 and 56A of the Environmental Protection Act 1994 (EP Act) to advise of an extension of the decision on whether the submitted EIS can proceed under division 4 of Chapter 3, Part 1 of the EP Act and to request information to assist with making the decision.*

Mr Michael Gray  
Springsure Creek Coal Pty Ltd  
GPO Box 5227  
BRISBANE QLD 4001

Our reference: CBD/111013

**RE: Decision under section 56A of the *Environmental Protection Act 1994* for the proposed Springsure Creek Coal Mine Project, environmental impact statement process (EIS)**

I have considered the amended EIS and your company's response to submissions (the SEIS), received by this office on 21 June 2013, and have determined that additional information is required before a decision can be made on whether the EIS may proceed under section 56A (s56A) of the *Environmental Protection Act 1994* (EP Act).

Under section 62 of the EP Act, EHP requests Springsure Creek Coal Pty Ltd to provide EHP with information on the following matters:

- Biosecurity, fisheries, land use, productivity loss and cost issues identified by the Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry's advice to EHP dated 10 July 2013. (Attached)
- Provide site specific subsidence modelling within the boundaries of the mining tenure including any potential changes in hydrology, water management issues, stygofauna and strategic cropping land issues identified by the Department of Natural Resources and Management's advice to EHP dated 12 July 2013. (Attached)
- Address inconsistencies in water management and water quality objectives, surface water, noise and subsidence modelling issues identified by EHP's advice to the proponent dated 16 July 2013. (Attached)

The proponent should address all issues outlined in the advice given by the abovementioned state agencies and EHP.

Under section 62 of the EP Act, the period for provision of the information is 40 business days from the date of this notice.

To allow for Springsure Creek Coal Pty Ltd to provide this information and to allow EHP to adequately review the information provided, under section 555 EP Act I extend the decision period for section 56A of the EP Act to 20 business days after receipt of the requested information.

Extension of decision on whether EIS may proceed and request for information

You may apply to the administering authority for a review of this decision within 10 business days after receiving this notice. You may also appeal against this decision to the Planning and Environment Court.

Information outlining the review and appeal processes under the *Environmental Protection Act 1994* is included with this notice. This information is intended as a guide only. You may have other legal rights and obligations.

Should you have any queries in relation to this notice, please contact Dr Monika Rhodes of the Department of Environment and Heritage Protection on telephone (07) 3330 6293.

sch4p4(6) Personal information  
sch4p4(6) Personal information

Signature

19 July 2013

Date

Philip Rowland  
A/Director, Statewide Environmental Assessments  
Delegate of the chief executive  
*Environmental Protection Act 1994*

**Enquiries:**  
Monika Rhodes  
Statewide Environmental Assessments  
Ph: (07) 3330 6293  
Fax: (07) 3330 5875

Enclosed: Information required under section 62 of the *Environmental Protection Act 1994*:

1. Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry advice to EHP dated 10 July 2013
2. Department of Natural Resources and Management advice to EHP dated 12 July 2013
3. Department of Environment and Heritage Protection advice to the proponent dated 16 July 2013.
4. Review and Appeal Process EP Act. (EM1866)