

s22

From: s22
Sent: Tuesday, 22 May 2018 3:23 PM
To: s47F
Subject: Alpha North Coal Mine Project, Galilee Basin, Queensland (EPBC 2018/8189) [SEC=UNCLASSIFIED]
Attachments: 2018-8189 Referral Decision-letter to proponent.pdf; 2018-8189 Referral-Decision notice.pdf

Good Morning Mr Harris,

Please find attached a letter from the Delegate of the Minister for the Environment and Energy advising of their decision about the proposed Alpha North Coal Mine Project, Galilee Basin, Queensland (EPBC 2018/8189).

A copy of the document recording this decision is also attached. This document will be published on the Department's website.

Cheers

s22

Assessments and Governance
Environment Standards Division | Department of the Environment and Energy
GPO Box 787 Canberra ACT 2601

s22





EPBC Ref: 2018/8189

Mr Nui Harris
Managing Director
Waratah Coal Pty Ltd
GPO Box 1538
BRISBANE QLD 4001

Dear Mr Harris

Decision on referral
Alpha North Coal Mine Project, Galilee Basin, Queensland

Thank you for submitting a referral under the *Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999* (EPBC Act). This is to advise you of my decision about the referral of the proposed action to construct and operate a coal mine, and associated infrastructure, in the Galilee Basin in Queensland.

As a delegate of the Minister for the Environment and Energy, I have decided under section 75 of the EPBC Act that the proposed action is a controlled action and, as such, it requires assessment and a decision about whether approval for it should be given under the EPBC Act. A copy of the document recording this decision is enclosed.

The information that I have considered indicates that the proposed action is likely to have a significant impact on the following matters protected by the EPBC Act:

- Listed threatened species and communities (sections 18 & 18A)
- Listed migratory species (sections 20 & 20A)
- A water resource, in relation to coal seam gas development and large coal mining development (sections 24D & 24E)
- World Heritage property (sections 12 & 15A)
- National Heritage place (sections 15B & 15C)
- Great Barrier Reef Marine Park (sections 24B & 24C)

A decision has not been made on the assessment approach for the proposed action. The Queensland Department of Environment and Science has not made a decision on whether the proposed action will be assessed through an environmental impact statement (EIS) under the *Environmental Protection Act 1994* (Qld) (EP Act). If the proposed action is to be assessed by EIS under the EP Act, it may be assessed under the Bilateral Agreement between the Queensland and Commonwealth governments.

Under section 89(2) of the EPBC Act, as delegate of the Minister, I am requesting your advice regarding the method of assessment of the proposed action by Queensland. I will make a decision on the assessment approach once this information is provided.

Please note, under subsection 520(4A) of the EPBC Act and the *Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Regulations 2000* your assessment is subject to cost recovery. A fee schedule will be provided to you once the decision on the assessment approach has been determined. Further details on cost recovery are available on the Department's website at: www.environment.gov.au/epbc/cost-recovery.

Each assessment approach requires different levels of information and involves different steps. All levels of assessment include a public consultation phase, in which any third parties can comment on the proposed action. Indigenous communities may also need to be consulted during the assessment process. For more information on how and when indigenous engagement should occur during environmental assessments, please refer to the indigenous engagement guidelines at www.environment.gov.au/epbc/publications/engage-early.

Details on the assessment process for the proposed action and the responsibilities of the proponent are set out in the enclosed fact sheet. Further information is available from the Department's website at www.environment.gov.au/topics/environment-protection/environment-assessments.

I have also written to the following parties to advise them of this decision:

Queensland Government	s47F	Queensland Department of Environment and Science
Other relevant authority/authorities		The Hon David Littleproud MP, Minister for Agriculture and Water Resources Senator the Hon Matthew Canavan, Minister for Resources and Northern Australia

Please also note that once a proposal to take an action has been referred under the EPBC Act, it is an offence under section 74AA to take the action while the decision making process is on-going (unless that action is specifically excluded from the referral or other exemptions apply). Persons convicted of an offence under this provision of the EPBC Act may be liable for a penalty of up to 500 penalty units. The EPBC Act is available on line at: www.environment.gov.au/epbc/about/index.html.

The Department has published an *Environmental Impact Assessment Client Service Charter* (the Charter) which outlines the Department's commitments when undertaking environmental impact assessments under the EPBC Act. A copy of the Charter can be found at: www.environment.gov.au/epbc/publications/index.html.

If you have any questions about the referral process or this decision, please contact s22
s22 by email to s22 / .au or telephone
s22 and quote the EPBC reference number shown at the beginning of this
letter.

Yours sincerely



James Barker
Assistant Secretary
Assessments and Governance Branch

21 May 2018

s22

From: s22
Sent: Friday, 31 August 2018 1:53 PM
To: s47F
Cc: s47F s22
Subject: FOR INFORMATION: Assessment Approach for Alpha North Project (2018/8189)
[SEC=UNCLASSIFIED]
Attachments: 2018-8189 Assessment-Assessment Approach-Att D-Fee schedule-Proponent.pdf;
2018-8189 Assessment-Assessment Approach-Letter-Proponent-Signed.pdf

Dear Mr Harris

Please find a letter advising that the Alpha North Coal Mine Project (EPBC 2018/8189) is to be assessed under the bilateral agreement between the Commonwealth Government and the State of Queensland.

Further, as the proposed action is subject to cost recovery, please find attached a copy of the fee schedule for the assessment. An invoice for Stage 1 will be provided shortly.

Kind regards

s22

Assessments and Governance Branch
Department of the Environment and Energy

s22



EPBC Ref: 2018/8189

Mr Nui Harris
Managing Director
Waratah Coal Pty Ltd
GPO Box 1538
BRISBANE QLD 4001

Dear Mr Harris

**Notification of assessment approach
Alpha North Coal Mine Project, Galilee Basin, Queensland**

I am writing to you in relation to your proposal to construct and operate a coal mine, and associated infrastructure, in the Galilee Basin in Queensland. On 21 May 2018, I decided the proposed action is a controlled action and it requires assessment and a decision about whether approval for it should be given under the *Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999* (EPBC Act).

At the time, a decision on the assessment approach for the project was not made, pending advice as to the method of assessment of the project by the Queensland government. On 27 July 2018, the Queensland Department of Environment and Science (DES) advised the Department that the project is to be assessed by an environmental impact assessment process under Chapter 3 of the Queensland *Environmental Protection Act 1994*.

I am now able to advise you that the proposed action is to be assessed by state assessment under a bilateral agreement between the Commonwealth Government and the State of Queensland.

Please note, under subsection 520(4A) of the EPBC Act and the *Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Regulations 2000*, your assessment is subject to cost recovery. Please find attached a copy of the fee schedule for your proposal. Fees will be payable prior to each stage of the assessment proceeding. An invoice for Stage 1 is attached and must be paid prior to the Department reviewing the draft Terms of Reference.

If you disagree with the fee schedule provided, you may apply under section 514Y of the EPBC Act for reconsideration of the method used to work out the fee. The application for reconsideration must be made within 30 business days of the date of this letter and can only be made once in respect of a fee. Further details regarding cost recovery can be found on the Department's website at www.environment.gov.au/epbc/cost-recovery.

If you have any questions about the assessment process, please contact the project manager, s22 [redacted] by email s22 [redacted] .au, or telephone s22 [redacted] and quote the EPBC reference number shown at the beginning of this letter.

Yours sincerely



James Barker
Assistant Secretary
Assessments and Governance Branch

30 August 2018



Australian Government

Department of the Environment and Energy

FOI 190506
Document 2b

EPBC Act Cost Recovery - Fee Schedule

EPBC No: 2018/8189

Date of Fee Schedule: Aug. 29, 2018

Project title: Alpha North Coal Mine Project, Galilee Basin, Queensland

Assessment method: Bilateral Agreement / Accredited Assessment Process

Fee Schedule

STAGE FEES	Base fee	PART A Complexity costs (A-L, P)	PART B Complexity costs (MNO)	Total
Stage 1	\$3,961	\$34,471	\$0	\$38,432
Stage 2	\$3,655	\$54,580	\$0	\$58,235
Stage 3	\$2,175	\$57,453	\$82,604	\$142,232
Stage 4	\$8,355	\$140,760	\$82,604	\$231,719
TOTAL PROJECT COST	\$18,146	\$287,266	\$165,209	\$470,621

Notes:

- For assessments by environmental impact statement - If standard guidelines are used under Section 101A(2)(a) of the EPBC Act, the Stage 1 fee will not be applicable.
- For assessments by public environmental report - If standard guidelines are used under Section 96B of the EPBC Act, the Stage 1 fee will not be applicable.
- If no further information is requested under section 95A of the EPBC Act, the Stage 1 and 2 fees will not be applicable.
- The Department advises applicants of the maximum liability for Part B complexity fees at the time of the assessment approach decision, based on the information provided in the referral documentation. Applicants have the opportunity to reduce the Part B complexity fees during the assessment process by improving the quality of information provided to the Department during Stage 2 of the assessment. These Part B complexity fees are confirmed when all the assessment documentation is provided in Stage 2, and are not payable until Stages 3 and 4 of the assessment.

Fee Breakdown

		COMPLEXITY FEE
CONTROLLING PROVISIONS		
	A Listed threatened species and ecological communities	Very High \$48,931
	B Listed migratory species	Very High \$48,931
	C Wetlands of international importance	None \$0
	D Environment of the Commonwealth marine area	None \$0
	E World heritage properties	Very High \$48,931
	F National heritage places	Very High \$48,931
	G Nuclear actions	None \$0
Part A Fees	H Great Barrier Reef Marine Park	Very High \$24,465
	Reduced fee as Great Barrier Reef is also being assessed under World and/or National Heritage	
	I Water Resources	Very High \$48,931
	J Commonwealth Land/Commonwealth Agency/Commonwealth Heritage Places Overseas	None \$0
NUMBER OF PROJECT COMPONENTS		
	K Number of project components	Moderate \$18,146
COORDINATION WITH OTHER LEGISLATION		
	L Coordination with other legislation	Low \$0
ADEQUACY OF INFORMATION AND CLARITY OF PROJECT SCOPE		
Part B Fees:	M Site surveys/Knowledge of environment	High \$34,949
	N Management measures (including mitigation and offsets)	Very High \$95,311
	O Project scope	High \$34,949
EXCEPTIONAL CIRCUMSTANCES		
Exceptional circumstances	P Exceptional circumstances	False \$0
TOTAL COMPLEXITY FEES		\$452,475
BASE FEE		\$18,146
TOTAL FEE		\$470,621

Potential fees for contingent and post-approval activities (if required)

The Department will notify you if a contingent activity fee is applicable due to an additional statutory step being required under the *Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999*.

Post-approval fees

Evaluation of new Action Management Plan (per management plan) (\$2,690)

Contingent Fees

Request additional information for referral or assessment approach decision (\$1,701)

Variation to the proposed action (\$1,353)

Reconsideration of the controlled action or assessment approach decision at the applicant's request (\$6,577)

Request additional information for approval decision (assessment on referral information, preliminary documentation or bilateral/accredited assessment) (\$1,701)

Request additional information for approval decision (assessment by environmental impact statement or public environment report) (\$7,476)

Variation of conditions (\$2,690)

Variation of an action management plan under conditions of approval (\$2,690)

Administrative variation of an action management plan under conditions of approval (\$710)

Transfer of approval to new approval holder (\$1,967)

Extension to approval expiry date (\$2,690)

s22

From: s22
Sent: Friday, 7 September 2018 4:52 PM
To: s47F
Cc: s47F s22 s47F
Subject: INVOICE: Stage 1 invoice for the Alpha North Project (2018/8189)
[SEC=UNCLASSIFIED]
Attachments: 2018-8189 Assessment-Cost Recovery-Stage 1-Invoice.pdf

Dear Mr Harris

Please find attached the Stage 1 fee invoice for the Alpha North Coal Mine Project (EPBC 2018/8189) for payment.

Once the Stage 1 fee is paid, the Department will review the draft Terms of Reference for the EIS when it is provided by the Queensland Department of Environment and Science as per the bilateral agreement.

Kind regards

s22

Assessments and Governance Branch
Department of the Environment and Energy

s22



Australian Government
Department of the Environment and Energy

Tax Invoice

Page: 1 of 1

Invoice Date : 07 September 2018
 Invoice No. : 18031919
 Your Account No. : 52634
 Our ABN : 34190894983
 Date Printed : 07 September 2018

Waratah Coal Pty Ltd
 GPO Box 1538
 BRISBANE QLD 4001

For enquiries please contact: Accounts on (02) 6274 2930,
 or via email: accountshelpdesk@environment.gov.au

Item Description	Qty	Unit	Unit Price	Line Total
Stage 1 Fee EPBC 2018/8189	1	EA	\$0.00	\$38,432.00
Total Out of Scope Supplies				\$38,432.00

Total Amount Owning: \$38,432.00

***** Total Amount Owning Includes GST of: \$0.00**

Attn: Nui Harris
 Stage 1 Fee
 EPBC 2018/8189
 Project Name: Alpha North Coal Mine Project, Galilee Basin Qld

PAYMENT ADVICE

TOTAL AMOUNT \$38,432.00

PAYMENT DUE WITHIN 30 DAYS

Waratah Coal Pty Ltd

Invoice Date : 07 September 2018
 Invoice No : 18031919
 Company Code : 0120
 Account No. : 52634

Credit Card Visit www.environment.gov.au/payments to make a secure credit card payment
 A surcharge fee applies to credit card payments

BPAY Biller Code: 980318
 Ref: 05263400180319192

Telephone & Internet Banking – BPAY®
 Contact your bank or financial institution to make this payment from your cheque, savings, debit or transaction account.
 More info: www.bpay.com.au

Direct Deposit Payment details: BSB: 092009
 Account: 115859
 Reference: 18031919

Cheque Forward this payment advice and cheque to:
The Collector of Public Monies
 Department of the Environment and Energy
 GPO Box 787
 Canberra ACT 2601
 AUSTRALIA



Mr Nui Harris
Managing Director
Fairway Coal Pty Ltd and Central Queensland Coal Pty Ltd
Level 17, 240 Queen Street
BRISBANE QLD 4000

Dear Mr Harris

**Change of designated proponent
Styx Coal Project, central Queensland (EPBC 2016/7851)**

I am writing in response to your request of 10 July 2018, requesting a change in proponent for the proposed action to construct and operate an open cut coal mine on Mining Lease 80187, train load out facility and associated infrastructure approximately 130 km north-west of Rockhampton in central Queensland, referred under the *Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999* (EPBC Act).

The proposed action was deemed a controlled action on 3 February 2017 and, at that time, Fairway Coal Pty Ltd was designated as the proponent of the action. I note, in accordance with section 156F of the EPBC Act, your confirmation that Fairway Coal Pty Ltd (the first person) is no longer proposing to take the action or be responsible for the advancement of the environmental assessment and that, Central Queensland Coal Pty Ltd (the second person), proposes to take the action instead.

The effect of the change, as per section 156F of the EPBC Act, is as follows:

- the provisions of Chapter 4 of the EPBC Act that applied to the first person in relation to the action cease to apply to that person and start to apply to the second person;
- the second person is taken to be named in the referral of the proposal as the person proposing to take the action;
- the second person is taken to have done anything the first person did in relation to the action; and
- anything done in relation to the first person in relation to the action is taken to have been done in relation to the second person.

In addition, in accordance with section 78(5) of the EPBC Act, I have revoked the designation of Fairway Coal Pty Ltd as proponent of the proposed action and designated Central Queensland Coal Pty Ltd as proponent of the action. The notice of this decision, along with the request of change in person proposing to take the action, will be published on the Department's website.

If you have any questions about this decision, please contact s22 [redacted] by email to s22 [redacted] or by telephone s22 [redacted] and quote the EPBC reference number shown at the beginning of this letter.

Yours sincerely



James Barker
Assistant Secretary
Assessments and Governance Branch

17 July 2018

s22

From: s22
Sent: Wednesday, 29 August 2018 3:36 PM
To: s47F
Cc: s22; s47F; s47F
s47F IESC Secretariat
Subject: RE: Meeting with DotEE and OWS [SEC=UNCLASSIFIED]

Hi s47F

The best dates for us and the IESC Secretariat is the week of 12 November 2018. I understand you wished a meeting in October, however November will be the best time in regards to availability of all relevant people, particularly the IESC Secretariat.

Please let me know the suitability of that date and I can begin organising the meetings.

Kind regards

s22

Assessments and Governance Branch
Department of the Environment and Energy

s22

From: s47F
Sent: Friday, 24 August 2018 1:22 PM
To: s22
Cc: s22; s47F; s47F
IESC Secretariat
Subject: RE: Meeting with DotEE and OWS [SEC=UNCLASSIFIED]

Hi s22

Understood re availability. If you can give me a couple of dates we can make one work.

Yes, we would like to postpone both meetings – IESC comments and DotEE comments.

Cheers

s47F

Kind Regards,

s47F | s 47F CDM Smith
s47F | cdmsmith.com

From: s22
Sent: Friday, 24 August 2018 1:03 PM
To: s47F; s47F
Cc: s22
s47F s47F

s22

Subject: RE: Meeting with DotEE and OWS [SEC=UNCLASSIFIED]

Hi s47F

Thank you for letting me know. I will liaise with the IESC Secretariat for a suitable date. However, please note there are two IESC meetings in October and one in early November. Further, the section will have a few staff unavailable in October, including s22 which will have a bearing on workloads.

I will get back to you next week with potential dates.

Also, can you please confirm that you also wish to postpone the GBRWHA discussion with s22 and myself.

Kind regards

s22

Assessments and Governance Branch
Department of the Environment and Energy

s22

From: s47F s47F

Sent: Friday, 24 August 2018 9:53 AM

To: s22

Cc: s22

s47F

Subject: Meeting with DotEE and OWS

Hi s22

CQC would like to postpone the meeting planned for 5 Sep 18 to discuss the IESC and DotEE comments about the CQC Coal Mine Project.

CQC would like to confirm new dates in October for the meetings. Could you please let me know dates in October between 8 – 31 October that are suitable for DotEE and OWS. We will then come back to you with dates to lock in.

Apologies for any inconvenience postponing the meeting may cause.

Cheers

s47F

Kind Regards,

s47F s47F | CDM Smith
s47F | cdmsmith.com

From: s22

Sent: Wednesday, 15 August 2018 11:13 AM

To: s47F . s47F

Cc: s22

s47F

Subject: RE: Comment 32.28 [SEC=UNCLASSIFIED]

Hi s47F

Those dates and time are suitable for us and representatives of the IESC Secretariat. I will book a room and send a calendar invite out to everyone.

Can you please provide an agenda and any relevant documents for the discussions at least a week prior to the meetings so that we can adequately prepare, particularly in relation to the outcomes you desire from the meeting with the IESC Secretariat.

Kind regards

s22

Assessments and Governance Branch
Department of the Environment and Energy

s22

From s47F . s47F

Sent: Monday, 13 August 2018 4:44 PM

To: s22

Cc: s22

s47F

Subject: RE: Comment 32.28 [SEC=UNCLASSIFIED]

Hi s22

Thank for getting back to me.

Can we please lock in 5 Sep 18 for the meetings.

Can we meet say 9.30 – 11.30 to discuss the non-IESC matters which are essentially an update on what we talked about in Brisbane. Keen to get a better understanding of what an offset could look like if there is ultimately a view that there is potential for significant residual impact to the GBRWHA.

We would like to meet with the OWS team from say 1.30 – 4.30. We note you are suggesting two hours and we appreciate how busy everyone is. We do; however, have quite a bit to talk through and we do not think two hours will allow sufficient time to adequately talk through our questions. We have our lead for surface water and groundwater coming to the meeting and as such it would be very much appreciated if the extra time could be made available.

Can you please discuss and come back to me if that date is ok and the timings of the meetings are ok.

Thanks

s47F

Kind Regards,

s47F | s 47F | CDM Smith
s47F | cdmsmith.com

From: s22
Sent: Friday, 10 August 2018 12:12 PM
To: s47F . s47F
Cc: s22
s22 s47F

Subject: RE: Comment 32.28 [SEC=UNCLASSIFIED]

Hi s47F

s22 and I are happy to have a follow up meeting with you to discuss Central Queensland Coal's response to the Department's comments on the draft EIS.

Further, relevant officers from the IESC Secretariat (Office of Water Science) can attend a meeting to clarify the IESC advice, however they are unavailable the week of 28 August due to the August IESC meeting. In regards to a meeting with IESC members, they are not available that week and it is not standard practice to have them involved in a project-specific discussion of this nature.

As such, I propose two meetings in Canberra on a day during the week of 3 September (not the Monday) as s22 will be in Canberra that week. One meeting with s22 and I to discuss EPBC matters and a second meeting with relevant officers from OWS to discuss the IESC advice. s47F will also be invited to telephone into one or both meetings. I further propose that both meetings be no more than 2 hours due to staff availability.

Can you please let me know the suitability of dates and times.

Kind regards

s22
Assessments and Governance Branch
Department of the Environment and Energy

s22

From: s47F . s47F
Sent: Tuesday, 7 August 2018 3:00 PM
To: s47F
Cc: s47F s22
Subject: RE: Comment 32.28

Hi s47F

As discussed we would like to have a follow up meeting with s22 and s22 at DotEE to discuss our progress in responding to their comments. We would also like have a meeting with the authors of the IESC response (Department of Water Science and relevant IESC members if available).

We assume that these meetings would be best done in Canberra given the majority of people are located there.

We would hope to have the meetings the week commencing 27 August 2018 as the CQC team and our surface water and groundwater leads are all available that week.

For the meeting with s22 and s22 it is a follow-up on the same issues we discussed in our previous meeting. We would like to spend a good period of time talking through the perceived significant risk of residual harm to the OUV of the GBRWHA and how this translates to the formulation of an offset package. Our position is that through our updated assessment we do not consider there to be a risk of significant residual impact to the OUV of the GBRWHA. Notwithstanding, we would like to better understand how to establish appropriate offsets should there be an alternate view of significant risk still being present. This meeting would not be to discuss IESC comments.

For the meeting with the IESC response authors we would like to discuss the following key themes, of which there will be specific questions arising out of the comments:

- Groundwater model build and confidence in the model;
- Spatial and temporal adequacy of the data (i.e. bore locations and recurring theme of 24 months' worth of data);
- Preparation of Management Plans, prior to EA to post EA – noting prior to EA approval is not the usual practice in QLD; and
- Third party review – can IESC advise a key focus list to ensure the third party reviewer addresses residual concern.

I propose to send through a more specific agenda for the IESC response meeting closer to the date.

I would hope we could allow 2-3 hours to discuss the EPBC matters with s22 and s22 For the IESC meeting we would like to block out a full day, noting it is not likely to take that long.

As a suggestion, we propose:

- 1.30 to 4.30 28 August for the meeting with s22 and s22
- 9 - 12 and 1.30 – 4.30 29 August for the IESC comments meeting.

Could you please let me know suitability of dates and times.

Cheers

s47F

s 47F

| CDM Smith

| cdmsmith.com

s47F

s22

From: s22
Sent: Wednesday, 1 August 2018 10:23 AM
To: 's47F'; s47F
Cc: s47F; s22; s47F
Subject: RE: Squatter Pigeon [SEC=UNCLASSIFIED]

Hi s47F

Thank you for your email and I note the conclusion that the project is unlikely to have a residual significant impact on the Squatter Pigeon.

In reviewing the AEIS, there is sufficient discussion on the Squatter Pigeon to allow the Department to inform a recommendation to the delegate on whether or not to approve the project.

Regards

s22

Assessments and Governance Branch
Department of the Environment and Energy

s22

From: s47F; s47F
Sent: Wednesday, 1 August 2018 10:23 AM
To: s22; s47F
Cc: s47F; s22; s47F
Subject: RE: Squatter Pigeon [SEC=UNCLASSIFIED]
Importance: High

Hi s22

Thanks for the additional information. I think we have now done all of that but it will be a useful prompt to review what we have said.

The issue we sought clarification at the meeting, and I believed that it was agreed to be provided, was how is it that DotEE consider that the action will result in a significant impact. We have followed the Matters of National Environmental Significance Significant impact guidelines 1.1 Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999 (the Guideline), when we have undertaken the assessment and addressed each of the following points:

An action is likely to have a significant impact on a vulnerable species if there is a real chance or possibility that it will:

1. lead to a long-term decrease in the size of an important population of a species
2. reduce the area of occupancy of an important population
3. fragment an existing important population into two or more populations
4. adversely affect habitat critical to the survival of a species
5. disrupt the breeding cycle of an important population
6. modify, destroy, remove or isolate or decrease the availability or quality of habitat to the extent that the species is likely to decline
7. result in invasive species that are harmful to a vulnerable species becoming established in the vulnerable species' habitat
8. introduce disease that may cause the species to decline, or

9. interfere substantially with the recovery of the species.

In regard to important populations of Squatter Pigeon these are defined at (see http://www.environment.gov.au/cgi-bin/sprat/public/publicspecies.pl?taxon_id=64440):

The southern boundary of the known distribution of the Squatter Pigeon (southern) is contracting northwards. Therefore, all of the relatively small, isolated and sparsely distributed sub-populations occurring south of the Carnarvon Ranges in Central Queensland are considered to be important sub-populations of the subspecies (Squatter Pigeon Workshop 2011). This includes, but is not limited to (Squatter Pigeon Workshop 2011):

- populations occurring in the Condamine River catchment and Darling Downs of southern Queensland
- the populations known to occur in the Warwick-Inglewood-Texas region of southern Queensland, and
- any populations potentially occurring in northern NSW.

Given this, it is our understanding that criteria 1-3 and 5 do not apply in this case as the Project area is not within an important population defined for Squatter Pigeon in the DotEE Species Profile and Threats Database. We understand that this is the key database to use when considering MNES and undertaking the Significant Impact Assessment test. Can you please confirm if this interpretation is correct.

Given the above, it would be very useful if you could advise specifically which of the remaining criteria taken from the Guideline you consider triggers the likelihood of a significant impact outcome. We can then provide more focused information in response to the concerns regarding residual significant impact.

We look forward to your response.

Cheers

s47F

[Redacted]

s 47F

| CDM Smith

| cdmsmith.com

s47F

From s22

Sent: Wednesday, 1 August 2018 9:28 AM

To: s47F s47F

Cc: s47F s22

Subject: RE: Squatter Pigeon [SEC=UNCLASSIFIED]

Hi s47F

As discussed with s47F the approach specified in the draft EIS comments (dated December 2017) and amended EIS (dated June 2018) is applicable.

I note your main point regarding the offset of non-remnant vegetation for the Squatter Pigeon. The impact assessment process below should help inform your discussion on how the project will/will not have a residual significant impact on non-remnant vegetation which forms Squatter Pigeon habitat.

Impact Assessment considerations

SPRAT clearly describes two preferred types of habitat:

1. foraging and breeding habitat; and
2. dispersal habitat.

Further, SPRAT notes that breeding habitat requires water within one kilometre of a water source, whilst foraging and dispersal habitat requires water within three kilometres of a water source.

The Department requires the following in the amended EIS:

1. definitions for breeding, foraging and dispersal habitats, including the importance of each habitat to the species (derived from SPRAT and relevant associated documents);
2. discussion on if/how the various remnant, regrowth and non-remnant vegetation on the project site (i.e. identified from vegetation assessments/surveys) forms potential breed, foraging and dispersal habitat using the definitions identified at point 1;
3. quantification (in ha) and map (with project footprint overlay) of breeding, foraging and dispersal habitat on the project site; and
4. quantification (in ha) of the amount of breeding, foraging and dispersal habitat to be impacted by the project (direct and indirect impacts).

Using the information requested above, an impact assessment must be undertaken to conclude if there is likely to be a residual significant impact on breeding, foraging and/or dispersal habitat for the species. This conclusion may identify that the project will result in a residual significant impact on all or some preferred habitat. Any residual significant impact (i.e. unavoidable impacts that cannot be mitigated) must be quantified in hectares and an offset proposed to compensate for residual significant impacts. If you are of the view that non-remnant vegetation on the project site does not form suitable foraging or dispersal habitat for the species, sufficient information is required to support this conclusion.

Regards

s22

Assessments and Governance Branch
Department of the Environment and Energy

s22

From: s47F | s47F
Sent: Monday, 30 July 2018 10:06 AM
To: s47F
Subject: RE: Squatter Pigeon

Hi s47F

I understand they had a chat but we were waiting for s22 to come back with an email advising outcome of DotEE's internal consideration of the points we raised.

Cheers

s47F

s 47F | CDM Smith
s47F | cdmsmith.com

From: s47F
Sent: Monday, 30 July 2018 10:04 AM
To: s47F | s47F
Subject: RE: Squatter Pigeon

s47F I spoke to s22 the other day and he mentioned that he had a chat with s47F some time ago. Check in with s47F that the issue is now ok.

Cheers, s47F



s47F
Principal Environmental Assessment Officer
Impact Assessment and Operational Support
Regulatory Capability & Customer Service Branch
Department of Environment and Science

s47F
Level 9, 400 George St, Brisbane QLD 4000
GPO Box 2454, Brisbane QLD 4001

From: s47F s47F
Sent: Monday, 30 July 2018 10:02 AM
To: s47F
Subject: Squatter Pigeon

Hi s47F

Just seeing if you have received anything back from DotEE re Squatter Pigeon and requirement to offset non-remnant veg?

Cheers

s47F

Kind Regards,

s47F | s 47F | CDM Smith

s 47F

s47F cdmsmith.com



The information in this email together with any attachments is intended only for the person or entity to which it is addressed and may contain confidential and/or privileged material. There is no waiver of any confidentiality/privilege by your inadvertent receipt of this material.

Any form of review, disclosure, modification, distribution and/or publication of this email message is prohibited, unless as a necessary part of Departmental business.

If you have received this message in error, you are asked to inform the sender as quickly as possible and delete this message and any copies of this message from your computer and/or your computer system network.

s22

From: s47F
Sent: Tuesday, 13 November 2018 10:57 AM
To: s22 s47F
Cc: s47F
Subject: AGENDA: CQC Meetings - 15 November [SEC=UNCLASSIFIED]

Categories: CQC (Styx)

Hi s22

For Thursday PM meeting with the IESC team we will run through a PowerPoint presentation covering the following key themes which have all been updated since receiving the later round of IESC comments:

Groundwater

- Updates to the groundwater model build (including numerical model confidence level, worst case scenario modelling, spatial and temporal data availability for conceptualization and calibration, modelling);
- Receptor identification and assessment of effects (including saltwater / freshwater interface, PAF materials, drawdown, GDEs); and
- Management and mitigation.

Surface water

- Flood modelling outputs and updates;
- Project's water management system (including wet weather preparedness resiliency and capacity, sediment control mechanisms (permanent and temporary); and
- Project site wide water balance.

We can cover off other matters if we have time; however, I suspect we wont have much time spare after discussing the above.

Could you please arrange for a Projector. Just checking if you have USB capability on your computers or if we need to bring our laptop with the presentation.

Cheers

s47F

From: s22
Sent: Wednesday, 7 November 2018 11:23 AM
To: s47F
Subject: AGENDA: CQC Meetings - 15 November [SEC=UNCLASSIFIED]

Hi s47F

Noting the two meetings regarding the Central Queensland Coal Project are scheduled for next Thursday, please advise if you propose to have an agenda or presentation for the day. I can circulate to the attendees prior to the meetings, set up a projector (if required), print hard copies, etc.

Kind regards

s22

Assessments and Governance Branch
Department of the Environment and Energy

s22

15/11/18

Central Queensland Coal → GBRWHA

* Extracting coal from N → S

* Mine up to 500m from the road

- smaller waste pit dumps
- geotech holes within first 6 months
- acceptable from blasting
- will not go near 500m zone until 10 years
 - might mine closer to road
 - could move the Bruce Hwy
- still a viable option.

* Environmental outcomes

- Dam 5 removed (close to listed wetland)
- no impact to natural drainage
 - flows will flow north into Tooloombah Creek
- smaller waste rock stockpile 1A
- smaller waste rock stockpile 2
 - change in mine schedule → waste rock put into pit much quicker
- no direct impact to MWES
 - TELs avoided

- better management of sediment/erosion
- reduce impact on Koala habitat
- Brigalow TEC regrowth

* No mining in the 500m buffer zone in the first 10 years

- agreement with TMR to do geotechnical assessments in parallel to mining.
- Blast characteristics and depth
- Blast Management Plan
- no closure of the Bruce Hwy
- will see if DCI has same lithology and structure → desire to use same Blast Management Plan

* 28 new bores → used for determining hydraulic parameters
→ revised drawdown contours.

→ no material change in depth to groundwater at end of mining (~1m)
- Tooloombah Creek.

- * Two changes to environmental clause
 - Dam 2A (in line with waste rock dump 2 shrinkage)
 - Dam 2D (close to Deep Creek - to minimise dust issues in creek)
 - permanent sediment and erosion control structures
 - non-permanent structures during construction and will be rehabilitated

- * Move of overland conveyor out of Deep Creek → still goes under the road
 - discuss with TMR about culvert
 - does not need it until about year 8
 - closure of half of Bruce Hwy to avoid full closure.

Groundwater Effects

- * Requested an update of RE mapping by DES → some is potential koala habitat
- * OMP → use of ground-truthed vegetation
- * DES → use mapped RES.

* Additional surveys of impact + offset areas to inform a draft OMP

- habitat assessments

- use of calculators

- use of Mander property as the offset area → outside of impact

 - outside of drawdown

 - non-remnant which will be improved

* No significant impact on the GBLWHA

- if there is, what are the options for offset requirements?

* Expectation of no impacts on the CBR as a result of the project

- Reef 2050 Plan → no impact
→ net benefit

- look at Carrichael Coal Mine and \$400k to Reef Trust → why?

- Department would not accept an impact on the CBR.

- no offsetting of future impact → it will be a compliance issue.

* Worst case scenario:

- dieback of riparian vegetation (< 100 ha)
- increase erosion

* Land use management → leaf moisture
→ link to soil moisture

- put more water down the system if necessary (supplementary)
- seep bands

* Deep Creek = minimal GW

* Tooloombah Creek = some GW interaction (pools)

- use of environmental chemistry
- stable isotopes
- radon

* Conservation Advice → SP (population)

* Draft SSMP → will review and comment
→ use of MP Guidelines

* Broad Sound → fleshing out species
→ touched on bird surveys

* Standalone social + economic assessment

* Offsets + justifications

- what is happening now and historical context

- justifications into calculator

- grazing, weed + pest mgmt

- active revegetation

- fire management.

} State
legislation

- what are you doing to have additional gain?

- SMART principle.

- objectives and performance criteria

* IESC Advice → OWS discussion.

* Talked to S47F → ex IESC (?)

* Model is Class 1 → elements of Class 2 and Class 3 models
→ no existing pit to understand dewatering

* Still don't know where the saltwater/ freshwater interface is → based on bores, it will be close to the coast

* Tooloombah Creek → surface / GW interaction

* Deep Creek → less SW/GW interaction.

* Tidal limit of Styx River = main & coals
- beds in creeks = Type 2 = near confluence
GDEs = same at confluence
(tidal surge limit)

* Styx coal moisture = 4% to

= less permeable and acts as an aquitard.

* Don't need to do modelling as per IESC
for impacts on SW/GW interface

* Forest red gum woodlands are slightly
dependent of GW (water table $< 10\text{m}$)

- are likely to adapt to gradual GW
drawdown.

- maintenance of surface water regime
is critically important (flooding)

- no surface water will be taken from
Tobourah Creek and Deep Creek

- no Dam 5 = prohibits overland flow
into Tobourah Creek

- water diversion of 'clean water' into
Deep Creek (not mine produced water)

* No significant change in GW quality
from leachate \rightarrow will have to be monitored.

\rightarrow hazard material storages?

- qualitative analysis.

\rightarrow PAFF (20cm in 60m lithology)

\rightarrow consider and demonstrate analysis
for all hazards (potential)

* GDEs → Mitigation and Management

- maintain SW regime pre-mine
- supplement GW pools (~3600 ML/20 years)
 - Fresh water
 - Treated water
- post-closure management to manage long-term impacts to pools
 - Water Management Plans

* Model peer-review is in progress

- unlikely to occur prior to the submission of the revised SEIS.

* Consider running a 20yr below average rainfall parameter modelling - worst case

- demonstrate not an issue scenario

* Surface Water

* Mine water from waste stock pile 1B is treated back to MIA for reuse.

- WRSP2 → Dam 1

* Mine water on Deep Creek goes into Dams 1, 2 and 3.

* First priority is to take water from environment dams for processing (decanting)

* Second priority is to take water from Dam 1

* Third "back up" is to transfer water into pit.

* Pre wet season → take sediment out to maximise water storage.

* Manage water quality in the environment dams (sediment), transfer water to Dam 1 or Dam 2 to dilute.

* AddSim model for both historic wet and dry periods.

* Mineral Council Australia water accounting framework. → addresses IESC

* Surface water flow gauging → role

- draft EA

- start in post approval

* Sodic and dispersive soils

- backfill quicker and minimisation of stockpile life
- reducing stocking and revegetation activities

* Water release points decreased from 11 to 5.

- dewatered
- wet season + high flows in Deep Creek
- approved triggers
 - will deal with in post approval

* Burds → selective in avoiding use of sodic soils

- potential to use treatment to reduce potential sodic soil
 - doesn't always work

→ engineer to source appropriate material to use

- potential to use unconsolidated material under sodic soil layer