



Appendix B

Submissions Register





| Submitter                        | Issue Details   | Submitter Recommendations / Suggested Mitigation   | Relevant EIS<br>Section | Cross<br>Reference to<br>Supplementary<br>Report |
|----------------------------------|---|--|-------------------------|--|
| Dpt of Transport & Main<br>Roads | The TI Act is not administered by other institutions as stated in the paragraph under the Transport Infrastructure Act.   | It should be amended to "The TI Act is administered by Department of Transport and Main Roads."  | 1.10.1.2                | 21.1, Appendix C                                 |
| Dpt of Transport & Main<br>Roads | No reference to the pipeline crossing the Norwich Park branch of rail infrastructure.   | Include a clear statement that pipeline crosses the Norwich Park branch of rail infrastructure.  | 2.2.2                   | 2.2.2  |
| Dpt of Transport & Main<br>Roads | The EIS does not provide detailed mapping or information relating to where the rail corridor is encroached upon.  | This section of the EIS should clearly identify if the pipeline crosses the rail line and impact.  | 2.2.2                   | 2.2.2  |
| Dpt of Transport & Main<br>Roads | Road related issues appear to be addressed however, rail<br>interests are not adequately addressed. Rail interests should be<br>addressed in this section to ensure the integrity of the rail corridor<br>is maintained.    | An additional heading under 2.5.3- Associated infrastructure should be included. The additional sub section should address rail and rail corridor related requirements.  | 2.5.3                   | 2.2.2  |
| Dpt of Transport & Main<br>Roads | The first paragraph in 7.1.3.5 -Land tenure does not make reference to rail corridor land. Rail corridor land should be reflected in this section.  | Amend paragraph one of 7.1.3.5 - Land Tenure by inserting "rail corridor<br>" in the first sentence, after "reserve" and in the second sentence after<br>"road reserves" The inclusion of the term 'rail corridor' adequately<br>reflects rail interest.   | 7.1.3.5                 | Appendix C                                       |
| Dpt of Transport & Main<br>Roads | When construction access to the rail corridor is required, an approval from QR Limited is required in the form of a Wayleave agreement. Rail approval requirements are not explicitly stated in this section of the report. | This section of the report should be amended to reflect the requirement<br>of Wayleave agreements during the construction phase. The following<br>wording should be included at the end of the first paragraph of this<br>section: "when construction access to the rail corridor is required, an<br>approval from QR limited is required in the form of a Wayleave<br>agreement." | 21.1                    | 21.1, Appendix C                                 |
| Dpt of Transport & Main<br>Roads | In the description section of the Area 6 segment, no reference is made to the pipeline encroaching on railway corridor or crossing the rail corridor.   | Area 6 segment should include reference to where the rail corridor is<br>encroached upon to ensure the pipeline route description adequately<br>reflects DTMR's interests.   | Table 21-4              | 2.2.2  |
| Dpt of Transport & Main<br>Roads | The last sentence of this section states that "Railway corridor crossing will be at one location - that of the Millennium rail loop to the south west of Coppabella, in Area 6.   | The last sentence in section 21.4.1.1 - Access and Routes should be amended by inserting:" railway corridor crossing will be at one location - that of the Norwich Park Branch to the south west of Coppabella, in Area 6."  | 21.4.1.1                | 21.3.2.1, Appendix<br>C                          |
| Dpt of Transport & Main<br>Roads | The first sentence incorrectly state that "Crossing of an existing corridor will be at one location - that of the Millennium rail loop to the south west of Coppabella, in Area 6".   | In this sentence Millennium rail loop should be replaced by Norwich Park branch.   | 21.4.1.6                | 2.2.2  |
| Dpt of Transport & Main<br>Roads | Proponent has not fully outlined the nature and extent of project traffic impact (construction and operational phases) and ameliorative measures to be required.  | Further detailed road impact assessment (RIA) should be undertaken<br>and finalised in accordance with the relevant guidelines of DTMR and<br>submitted for approval by the Regional Director, Mackay/Whitsunday at  | 21.4.1.3; 21.4.1.4      | 21.3.2   |





| Submitter                        | Issue Details  | Submitter Recommendations / Suggested Mitigation  | Relevant EIS<br>Section | Cross<br>Reference to<br>Supplementary<br>Report |
|----------------------------------|--|---|-------------------------|--|
|                                  |  | least three months prior to the planned commencement of construction.   |                         |  |
| Dpt of Transport & Main<br>Roads | The project traffic will increase road safety risks and affect road infrastructure.  | Proponent should obtain all the relevant approvals and permits from DTMR and local govt before commencing the construction. Develop a traffic management plan (TMP) for the proposed construction and get approval from both Isaac Regional Council and DTMR.   | Figure 21-1             | 21.3   |
| Dpt of Transport & Main<br>Roads | Paragraph 2 foreshadows upgrade of the Marlborough - Sarina<br>Road/ Connors River Collaroy road intersection. However, no<br>assessment has been undertaken to determine the appropriate<br>standard of intersection required at the intersection.  | In consultation with the regional DTMR office, the proponent should<br>assess and describe requirements for the upgrade of the Marlborough -<br>Sarina Road/Connors River Collaroy Road intersection to cater for<br>project traffic.   | 21.4.1.1                | 21.3.2.1   |
| Dpt of Transport & Main<br>Roads | The EIS has identified that the traffic generated by this proposal<br>will access the dam and some temporary accommodation<br>facilities provided for the project via the intersection of<br>Marlborough-Sarina Road/ Connors River Collaroy Road.<br>Additional site along state-controlled roads have been identified<br>as also requiring access to temporary accommodation facilities to<br>facilitate construction of the pipeline. | The proponent should consult with DTMR regional office and seek<br>approval for any proposed temporary and permanent access from State<br>controlled roads to ensure road safety and transport efficiency. Prior to<br>commencement of construction on site, the proponent should undertake<br>any intersection/ access upgrade required as identified in the RIA for<br>any new accesses and the existing intersection of the Sarina<br>Marlborough Road/ Connors River Collaroy Road. Any construction<br>works within the road reserve should be undertaken by a contractor pre-<br>qualified by the department to a level nominated by the department.<br>requirement for the design and construction of works within the road<br>reserve can be provided to the proponent prior to detailed design of<br>such works. | 21.4.1.1                | 21.3.2   |
| CFMEU                            | There are number of towns under water stress who can not grow<br>because of the strain on their water supply. EIS fails to<br>adequately address the ongoing ability of localities within the<br>affected region to maintain their water supply.   | Water should be available to the towns in the region.   | 14.1.6.1; 1.3           | 1.1, 24.2  |
| CFMEU                            | Water being supplied to industry would not be priced for residential use.  | The price of water to towns should be reasonable  | 24.3                    | 1.1, 24.2  |
| QCC, CCC                         | The Connors river flow regimes remain close to their natural state<br>and continues provide high, medium and low flow fresh water<br>pulses that maintaining the health of downstream ecologies. EIS<br>fails to adequately address to minimise and mitigate changes to<br>flow regimes that will occur should the dam proceed.  | Nil   | 14.2.2.2                | 14.4   |
| QCC, CCC                         | Water can undergo a range of chemical and thermal changes  | Nil   | 16.2.1.2                | 16.2.2   |





| Submitter | Issue Details   | Submitter Recommendations / Suggested Mitigation | Relevant EIS<br>Section | Cross<br>Reference to<br>Supplementary<br>Report |
|-----------|---|--|-------------------------|--|
|           | when held in storage for prolonged period, and effect downstream<br>ecologies when released. Due to the storage capacity and the<br>likely reduction of inflows quality of stored water is likely to be<br>significant. Proposed measures to minimise the impacts caused<br>by poor water quality is not adequately addressed.  |  |                         |  |
| QCC, CCC  | The project will inundate many terrestrial and aquatic habitats<br>which have significant biodiversity values due to the intact<br>connectivity of the areas ecological communities. This would<br>isolate populations of species living up and downstream by cutting<br>migratory pathways. No detailed measures to effectively mitigate<br>the local and regional impacts of habitat fragmentation.   | Nil  | 13.2.1; 11              | 11.2.1   |
| QCC, CCC  | Fish and other species migration throughout the Connors river will<br>be substantially impeded by the dam wall and fails to adequately<br>address the impacts to aquatic species.   | Nil  | 13.1.3.3                | 13.6   |
| QCC, CCC  | The 2003 Nathan dam case was primarily concerned about<br>whether all likely impacts to the Great Barrier Reef from the third<br>party use of water supplied from the dam should be duly<br>considered. As the intended purpose of the proposed project is to<br>support coal mining, urban development and agriculture<br>throughout central QLD, it is 'inescapable' that direct, indirect, and<br>cumulative impacts to matters protected under the EPBC Act will<br>result as a consequence of third party use of water from the<br>proposed project, which therefore is within the contemplation of<br>the project proponent. Despite the legal precedent of Nathan dam<br>case, EIS fails to address the issues identified in the case that<br>must be considered in such projects as the proposed dam project. | Nil  | 27.2.3.1                | 1.2, 27.5  |
| QCC, CCC  | Climate change is projected to cause impacts that will significantly reduce inflows to dams to increased intense rainfall events that are likely to cause safety concerns to in stream storages from more frequent over topping events. EIS fail to adequately address the multitude of significant issues that arise when considering the broad implications and impacts of climate change on the proposed project.  | Nil  | 3.3.2                   | No response<br>required                          |
| QCC, CCC  | Scope 1 emissions (ie. the resulting emissions from decaying  | Nil  | 18.2                    | 18   |





| Submitter | Issue Details  | Submitter Recommendations / Suggested Mitigation                          | Relevant EIS<br>Section | Cross<br>Reference to<br>Supplementary<br>Report                           |
|-----------|--|---|-------------------------|--|
|           | vegetation following initial inundation and the ongoing release of<br>GHG equivalent emission from the decay of vegetation that is<br>carried into the storage by inflows over the life of the proposed<br>project) have not been adequately calculated. IS failed to<br>adequately calculate the amount of GHG and fails to provide<br>measures to mitigate or minimise the volume. |   |                         |  |
| QCC, CCC  | No details on the criteria utilised to assess the feasibility of potential alternatives particularly in terms of a comparative analysis of the ecological footprint and GHG profiles of feasible alternatives.   | Nil   | 1.6                     | 1.3  |
| QCC, CCC  | Following the recent introduction of new government regulations,<br>CSG producers are required to treat CSG associated water to a<br>condition suitable for beneficial reuse. Potential alternative of<br>CSG water was not adequately assessed.   | CSG associated water as a potential alternative must be fully considered. | 1.6.3                   | 1.3  |
| QCC, CCC  | The life expectancy of coal mines does not justify the project.  | Nil   | 1.3                     | 1.3  |
| QCC, CCC  | All level of governments are committed to applying and meeting<br>the objectives of the national strategy for Ecological Sustainable<br>Development which requires to apply ESD principles within their<br>jurisdiction. EIS fails to describe how the project meets ESD<br>objectives over the life of the project.   | Nil   | 14.2 ; 25.4             | Adequate<br>information<br>provided within<br>Section 1.10.2 of<br>the EIS |
| QCC, CCC  | Increased mosquito breeding impacts to public health has not addressed.  | Nil   | 13.2.1.1; 16.2.1        | Adequate<br>information<br>provided within<br>Section 13.2 of the<br>EIS   |
| QCC, CCC  | GDEs are under increased risk from the excessive take and<br>disturbance of groundwater resources throughout QLD. No site<br>specific investigations have been undertaken to identify existing<br>GDE and potential impacts to GDEs were not addressed.  | Nil   | 15.2                    | 15.1   |
| QCC, CCC  | Another of our major concerns is how the EIS proposed to offset<br>the loss environmental values within the project area. All too often<br>an EIS will state that "management of wholly purchased<br>properties for environmental purposes will provide a greater area   | Nil   |                         | 27.4   |





| Submitter                       | Issue Details  | Submitter Recommendations / Suggested Mitigation  | Relevant EIS<br>Section    | Cross<br>Reference to<br>Supplementary<br>Report |
|---------------------------------|--|---|----------------------------|--|
|                                 | of secure habitat than that lost as a result of the project and<br>effectively offsets project related impacts. This statement ignores<br>the fact that such properties are purchased to provide offsets,<br>which invariably places a much greater risk of endangered<br>species becoming extinct through a combination of increased<br>food competition, migration disturbances and interruption to<br>breeding.   |   |                            |  |
| DIP, Central Region<br>Planning | The EIS primarily focuses on providing water for existing and<br>proposed coal mines and future water requirements for urban<br>development within existing towns were not clearly addressed.  | If the dam is intended to supply water for existing townships another section should be included to discuss about the need and ability.   | 1.3                        | 24.2   |
| Private                         | The dam should be larger   |   | General                    | 1.3.1  |
| Dpt of Community Safety         | The establishment of construction camps  | An evacuation and access map of these camp be provided, along with a possible landing site identified for the rescue helicopter if required.  | 1.5.21; 2.5.9.4;<br>26.6.2 | 24.5   |
| Dpt of Community Safety         | The construction workforce will include 570 workers over the 20 months construction period.  | Qld Ambulance Service (QAS) would need to be provided with the contact numbers for key officers of the project during the construction phase.   | 1.5.22; 2.5.9; 26.6        | 24.5   |
| Dpt of Community Safety         | Construction of proposed workers camps   | DCS recommends the proponent adhere to the SPP 1/03<br>Guideline/Appendix 5A, Advice regarding: for non-residential<br>development and development involving temporary or moveable<br>residential structures (e.g. caravan parks and camping grounds);<br>Hazardous Materials; Essential services infrastructure (e.g. on-site<br>electricity, gas, water supply, sewage and telecommunications). | 2.5.9.4                    | 2.4, 26.1  |
| Dpt of Community Safety         | According to the definition of a floodplain in SPP 1/03, land<br>adjacent to a dam is considered as part of the floodplain. Last<br>sentence of the first paragraph of section 14.1.5.3 (Design<br>flooding -pg 14-24 )states, 'The 1 in 100 AEP flood level is also<br>used to determine the location of infrastructure and for land<br>acquisition purposes'. It is unclear what land acquisition purposes<br>means. Does it indicate the proponent will be acquiring all land in<br>the dam vicinity susceptible to a 1 in 100 AEP as this will be the<br>projected dam capacity? | DCS request clarification of this point.  | 3.2.2; 14.1.5.3            | 14.1   |
| Dpt of Community Safety         | It would be expected that the increase in road traffic may impact<br>on the delivery of ambulance operations from the ambulance  | In the event of a major emergency incident, local ambulance resources would be activated in accordance with local disaster management   | 21.3.1.1                   | 21.2.1, 26.1                                     |





| Submitter               | Issue Details   | Submitter Recommendations / Suggested Mitigation   | Relevant EIS<br>Section | Cross<br>Reference to<br>Supplementary<br>Report |
|-------------------------|---|--|-------------------------|--|
|                         | station to road network locations within the project areas.   | procedures and in consultation with key stakeholders.  |                         |  |
| Dpt of Community Safety | The QFRS accepts the Risk Management Framework and Risk<br>Assessment Methodology and criteria documented in this section.  | QFRS resources for emergency response: emergency response would<br>depend on the location and type of incident and could include, but is not<br>limited to, response by the Walkerston, Sarina and Moranbah auxiliary<br>fire stations. QFRS Mackay would be responded as part of any initial<br>response (as per local procedures) until the availability of auxiliary crews<br>is confirmed. A hazardous chemical spill needing specialist equipment,<br>such as fully encapsulated suits, would require a response from Mackay.<br>Other resources that could be responded to assist are the State<br>Emergency Services (SES) unit from Nebo. The Nebo SES Unit has<br>road traffic crash rescue capability and are called upon to assist QFRS<br>at these types of incidents, however the QFRS remains the primary<br>respondent. | 26                      | noted  |
| Dpt of Community Safety | Section 26.4.1.3 & 26.4.2.2. identify that there will be increases in heavy vehicle traffic delivering hazardous materials and dangerous goods to the project site. Section 26.4.2.2 identifies that the proponent is to liaise with emergency services to develop an emergency plan to deal with tanker incidents off-site.  | The QFRS identifies that any increase in emergency response to light<br>and heavy vehicle road traffic crashes as a result of this project will be<br>managed by current QFRS resources. Wildfires in this area are primarily<br>attended by Rural Fire Service which may consist of primary producer<br>brigades, who are essentially the owners of the land. The closet<br>formalised Rural Fire Station is located at Nebo.   | 26.4.1.2 ; 26.4.2.2     | 26.1   |
| Dpt of Community Safety | Emergency Response: due to the project's relative isolation from<br>immediate emergency service response, it is essential that staff<br>working and/or living at the construction site are fully conversant<br>with the above Emergency Management, Action Plan and<br>Response procedures including the use of installed fire fighting<br>equipment along with any other on site equipment that is primarily<br>for their use. | 1. Water supplies and access for attending QFRS appliances have been identified for consideration. Maps should be provided to emergency services agencies identifying access point to, from and within the Project. These maps will enable assessment by all emergency response agencies to determine whether emergency services access will be adversely affected. 2. The proposed site falls outside the urban fire service delivery area, however a QFRS auxiliary station would provide initial response. The proponent should be aware that the consequences of requiring the capabilities and assistance of urban response crews incur a cost for any callout.   | 26.6.1; 26.6.2          | 26.1   |
| Dpt of Community Safety | The QFRS has a legislative jurisdiction to provide input in to the design of a building or a structure's fire safety systems as an advice agency. The advice provided by the QFRS must be in accordance with the Sustainable Planning Regulation 2009 - Schedule 7. Table 1 - For Building Work Assessable against the  | The QFRS seeks formal engagement from the "Authority Having<br>Jurisdiction" (AHJ) or the relevant Assessment Manager for the project<br>under section 272 of Sustainable Planning Act 2009. The formal<br>engagement may also include; - Preliminary responses made by the<br>QFRS under section 271 of Sustainable Planning Act 2009 prior to any  | 2.2.3; 7.1.4            | 26.1   |





| Submitter  | Issue Details   | Submitter Recommendations / Suggested Mitigation  | Relevant EIS<br>Section | Cross<br>Reference to<br>Supplementary<br>Report |
|------------|---|---|-------------------------|--|
|            | Building Act. QFRS understands that the approval for the Project<br>will be under different Acts including the Sustainable Planning Act<br>2009.  | formal application being made Confirmation of above ground and/or<br>special structures that may be assessed as "assessable development"<br>and "self assessable development" in accordance with the Sustainable<br>Planning Regulations 2009 - Schedule 3 and development that is<br>exempt under a planning scheme as per SPA 2009 Fire fighting<br>capability and risk management strategies at the temporary construction<br>camp mention in sections 2.2.3 & 7.1.4 of the EIS. |                         |  |
| Qld Health | QH requires further information on which contaminated land sites<br>will possibly remain on the EMR and how contaminates will not<br>adversely affect dam waters posing a risk on public health.  | The proponent should identify what actions will occur to remediate<br>contaminated land and minimise any potential adverse human health<br>impact.  | 8.2.1.2                 | 8.1  |
| Qld Health | EIS stated that water within this dam will be utilised in urban areas/communities and recreational purposes. No details about the information relating to monitoring regime or treatment prior to any potable use.  | Ensure that appropriate treatment infrastructure and monitoring/testing services are in place to be able to ensure appropriate water quality and this assessment must take into account all potential water users from the proposed dam.  | 2.1 ; 16.2              | 16.2.3   |
| Qld Health | The proponent has only identified the health services offered<br>within Mackay and Moranbah. No actual assessment on the<br>impact on these services was conducted. The proponent has<br>mentioned liaisons with State and Regional Health departments<br>as a mitigation solution only.  | The proponent must assess the potential impacts of the project on<br>existing health services during the construction phase and ensure<br>appropriate health services are in place prior to the establishment of the<br>workers camps.  | 24.2.2.3                | 24.5   |
| Qld Health | Construction camps will need to identify that appropriate food safety and licensing is adhered too.   | The proponent is to indicate that food premises/ activities are designed, approved and operated in accordance with the requirements of the Food Act 2006.   | 2.5.9.4                 | 2.4  |
| Private    | The EIS does not give significant details on limiting downstream water quality degradation from construction and there is very little forewarning of flooding events (dam at top of the catchment)  | Ensure construction plans have a tight set of criteria to adhere to in regard to water quality affects downstream, and that regular reporting is done to local landholders and water users (local land holders/water users should be added to the list as notifiable persons in the event of a breach of water quality conditions).   | 16.2.1.1                | 16.2.1   |
| Private    | The EIS does not address the effect of the dam operation on the<br>quantity and timing of medium flow events through the lower<br>Connors River. It ignores users that will be affected by the capture<br>of medium flows by the dam. If all medium flows are captured by<br>the dam, water harvester reliability will be affected. Timing on<br>these flow events is also of great importance to water users and | The post winter flow event may eliminate some of these concerns, but<br>quantity and quality are not the only criteria. Timing of first flow events is<br>also critical to many landholders and water users. The proponent needs<br>to closely define how medium flow events and first flow events are to be<br>handled in operation plans.   | 14.2.2                  | 1.3, 14.4  |





| Submitter | Issue Details   | Submitter Recommendations / Suggested Mitigation   | Relevant EIS<br>Section | Cross<br>Reference to<br>Supplementary<br>Report |
|-----------|---|--|-------------------------|--|
|           | landholders and water users along the lower Connors allowing<br>restoration of waterhole levels etc. grass regrowth through<br>inundation of river runners, and the start to irrigated cropping<br>programs. Groundwater recharge rate is influenced by the<br>duration of flows.   |  |                         |  |
| Private   | The EIS gives little detail on the calculations and assumptions made to arrive at a design FSL of 169.1m. Why do we not have a modelled storage trace (figures 14-18, 14-19) at various different storage sizes; Show how the FSL was arrived at and the detailed calculation used to get there. The proponent need to detail the yield calculations, difference between high and medium priority water supplied and evaporation allowances and the effects on supply reliability. The provision of much higher proportion of high priority water to medium priority water will lead to a lot of captured flows being lost as evaporation with the storage. The PSI of Delta demand study on agricultural demand was a drive-by look by our of state consultants with a pre-conceived result. | Show the community the detailed reasons why the FSL was set at the current design level; reconsider the mix of product that will be sold from the water storage with the view to minimising evaporation; Use local consultants to investigate possible agricultural areas that could avail of product from the storage; Detail how the high priority water set aside for the stage 2 pipeline upgrade will be used in the interim. | 1.6.7                   | 1.3, 14.5  |
| DERM      | Queensland legislation- Water Act 2000, Requirement for<br>resource operations licence under S108 -Refer the paragraph<br>stating " in relation to the operationare met" in pg 1-55 and<br>Management of extraction and releases - pg 2-93.   | Amend the EIS to recognise that the interference of flow in Connors<br>River will be covered by a resource operations licence and this will relate<br>to all interference from construction to long term operation. The licence<br>will be amended over the period of the project to reflect changes in<br>operation throughout the construction and operational phases.   | 1.10.1.2 ; 2.6.1.2      | 14.8   |
| DERM      | Alternatives to the Project - The Central Queensland Regional<br>Water Supply Strategy (CQRWSS) undertook considerable<br>investigation of the alternative water storage options leading to<br>the selection of the Connors River Dam site. This is not evident<br>from the text in the EIS, suggesting that the decision is less robust<br>than is the case. The Connors River Dam site at Mt Bridget is the<br>only viable site available for a very large water storage that<br>captures runoff from this wet part of the Fitzroy Basin  | Include: 1. Additional information on the options that have been<br>considered; and 2. Discuss on issues/potential for future (major) raising<br>of the dam at Mt Bridget, and whether or not the current design should<br>provide for such an eventuality now.  | 1.6.5 ; 1.6.7.1         | 1.3  |
| DERM      | The EIS refers to the Integrated Planning Act 1997  | Amend references to IPA to Sustainable Planning Act 2009 (SPA).  | 1.10.1.2                | Appendix C                                       |
| DERM      | The EIS states the <i>Water Act 2000</i> provides for the 'regulation of works and other activities undertaken in watercourse'.   | Amend to correct statement regarding construction of works: it is<br>regulated under SPA.  | 1.10.1.2                | Appendix C                                       |





| Submitter | Issue Details   | Submitter Recommendations / Suggested Mitigation   | Relevant EIS<br>Section | Cross<br>Reference to<br>Supplementary<br>Report |
|-----------|---|--|-------------------------|--|
| DERM      | Water Resource (Fitzroy Basin) Plan - The EIS states that the outcomes and objectives of the plan are reviewed every 10 years.  | Amend to say that the 'whole plan is reviewed', not just the outcomes and objectives.  | 1.10.1.2                | Appendix C                                       |
| DERM      | The EIS states that 'The WASOs assess the performance of<br>supplemented and unsupplemented water products.'  | Amend to say that the 'WASOs provide a level of security for<br>supplemented and unsupplemented water entitlement holders.'  | 1.10.1.2                | Appendix C                                       |
| DERM      | The EIS states that a new plan is expected to be released in 2009.  | A new draft plan is not expected to be released until mid 2010.  | 1.10.1.2                | Appendix C                                       |
| DERM      | The EIS references the Fitzroy Basin ROP as the ' <i>Fitzroy Basin Resource Operations Plan (April 2006</i> ".  | Amend the reference the ROP as 'Fitzroy Basin Resource Operations Plan 2004 (amended July 2009 (Revision2))'.  | 1.10.1.2                | Appendix C                                       |
| DERM      | The EIS states that the ROP seeks to achieve the WRP objectives.  | Amend to indicate that the 'ROP seeks to achieve the WRP outcomes rather than the WRP objectives'.   | 1.10.1.2                | Appendix C                                       |
| DERM      | Queensland legislations: These paragraphs in the EIS do not<br>provide a clear introduction to the requirements for clearing native<br>vegetation in accordance with the relevant policies and codes<br>administered under the <i>Vegetation Management Act 1999</i> (VMA)<br>and the <i>Sustainable Planning Act 2009</i> (SPA). | Amend text under the heading 'Vegetation Management Act' to read:<br>'The Vegetation Management Act 1999 (VMA) regulates the clearing of<br>certain native woody vegetation that is 'remnant' or 'regulated regrowth'<br>vegetation. Although the VMA does not apply on all tenures or<br>vegetation types, permits to clear may still be required under other laws.   | 1.10.1.2                | Appendix C                                       |
| DERM      | cont'd  | If the clearing of native vegetation regulated under the VMA is not<br>exempt under schedule 24 of the Sustainable Planning Regulation 2009,<br>it must be conducted in accordance with the Regrowth vegetation code<br>(October 2009) for regulated regrowth vegetation. Alternatively, if the<br>clearing is for operational work that involves native vegetation that is<br>mapped as remnant on a regional ecosystem map, then a permit must<br>be obtained from the Department of Environment and Resource<br>Management as part of the IDAS process. | 1.10.1.2                | Appendix C                                       |
| DERM      | cont  | Applications to clear native vegetation must meet the requirements of section 22A of the VMA to ensure the clearing will be for a relevant purpose. In this case the proposed clearing will be for a declared significant project, which is considered to be a relevant purpose under the VMA. The clearing will be assessed against the criteria for significant projects in Part S of the Regional Vegetation Management Code for Brigalow Belt and New England Tablelands Bioregions'   | 1.10.1.2                | Appendix C                                       |
| DERM      | The EIS outlines potential sources and volume of sand available<br>for bedding material for the pipeline. It is unclear how these<br>figures have been derived, and may not recognise other issues  | Amend to note that: 1. Any extraction of quarry material from a<br>watercourse requires a quarry allocation notice under the Water Act<br>2000 and associated development approval under the Sustainable   | 2.2.3.2                 | 2.2.1  |





| Submitter | Issue Details  | Submitter Recommendations / Suggested Mitigation  | Relevant EIS<br>Section | Cross<br>Reference to<br>Supplementary<br>Report |
|-----------|--|---|-------------------------|--|
|           | associated with extraction of this material.   | Planning Act 2009; and 2. Assessment process for such authorities will consider availability of material with reference to other quarry allocation entitlements, potential subsidence mining on the area and the impacts of extraction.   |                         |  |
| DERM      | The first paragraph on page 60 of this section in the EIS states<br>that a clearing vegetation management plan is required under the<br>VM Act and in accordance with the State Policy for Vegetation<br>Management. However, the vegetation legislation does not make<br>reference to a requirement for a 'clearing vegetation management<br>plan'. Landholders are required to prepare a Property Vegetation<br>Management Plan (PVMP) as part of their application to clear<br>native vegetation under the VMA. This should include a<br>description of the proposal including plans, maps etc. and a<br>statement addressing how the clearing will meet the criteria in the<br>relevant policy and code. | Delete the following from the first paragraph on page 60: 'A clearing<br>vegetation management plan is required under the VM Act and in<br>accordance with the State Policy for Vegetation Management,<br>November 2006 (DNR&W 2006).'  | 2.4.4                   | Appendix C                                       |
| DERM      | The EIS also advised that measures to handle and relocate<br>wildlife would need to be included in the clearing vegetation<br>management plan. The VMA and the State Policy for Vegetation<br>Management do aim to conserve biodiversity but there are no<br>provisions in those two pieces of legislation for specifically dealing<br>with animals in relation to clearing. However this may be a<br>requirement of another act.  |   | 2.4.4                   | 11.2.2   |
| DERM      | Containment/ disposal of construction spoil. The EIS outlines that 218,100 m3 of material will be removed as part of the construction diversion channel and stockpiled on the right bank of the river for later use in construction.   | Amend to read: 'Ensure the stockpile of spoil material should be placed<br>far enough away from the river to ensure there is minimal risk of any of<br>the material from entering the river during flood events. Bunding of the<br>material should also be considered.  | 2.5.1.13                | 2.3.1, Appendix C                                |
| DERM      | The EIS outlines potential water demand during construction.<br>While the EIS states that supplies will come from a number of<br>sources it does not give specific detail about supply volumes and<br>sources.   | Amend to: Recognise that any water permits granted for the taking of water for construction purposes will be dependant on availability from potential sources while ensuring minimal impact on other users. It should also be noted that it is unlikely that permits will be granted for taking water from the Braeside borefield. As part of the water permit application process the proponent will be required to provide details of sources and volumes. This information should be given to DERM as soon as practicable to ensure proposed locations are acceptable: and | 2.5.3.3                 | 29.1.1.2   |





| Submitter | Issue Details  | Submitter Recommendations / Suggested Mitigation  | Relevant EIS<br>Section | Cross<br>Reference to<br>Supplementary<br>Report |
|-----------|--|---|-------------------------|--|
|           |  | Ensure that any overland flow dams built during the construction process are in accordance with the Water Resource (Fitzroy Basin) Plan 1999.   |                         |  |
| DERM      | Medium and high emission scenarios are mentioned in the caption of Table 3-2, however the special report on emissions scenario (SRES) scenario (A1FI) is not specified either as a footnote, in the table or in the text.  | Amend the table caption to read:"50th percentile for the medium (A1B) and high (A1FI) scenarios projected change in climate for the Project area relative to 1990".                     | 3.3.1                   | 3.1  |
| DERM      | Numbers do not match with Central Qld Q2 numbers published in ClimateQ, appendix 3 in late 2009.   | The EIS should be amended to provide an explanation for the variation in numbers is recommended as Q2 is a widely accepted document.  | 3.3.1                   | 3.1  |
| DERM      | Omission of stock routes from the EIS.   | After "major roads, including the Peak Downs Highway, Marlborough<br>Sarina Road and the Fitzroy Development Road' insert the following:<br>Stock routes (Northern pipeline alignment)" | 7.1.3.4                 | 7.1  |
| DERM      | Omission of stock routes from the EIS.   | Insert the words 'stock routes' after road reserve in the first sentence<br>and after road reserves in the second sentence in the first paragraph<br>under Land tenure on page 7-24     | 7.1.3.5                 | 7.1  |
| DERM      | Omission of stock routes from the EIS.   | Insert the words 'including stock routes' after road reserves in the second sentence in the first paragraph under Land uses on Page 7-33  | 7.2.2.2                 | 7.1  |
| DERM      | The northern pipeline alignment intersects stock route U831 east<br>of Moranbah, runs parallel in an easterly direction before<br>intersecting the Peak Downs Highway, which is designated as<br>stock route M404.The pipeline runs parallel to and crosses the<br>Peak Downs Highway to where the Fitzroy Development road<br>merges with the Peak Downs highway.   | insert the words 'stock routes' after roads in the first sentence in the second paragraph under the summary on page 7-40.   | 7.3                     | 7.1  |
| DERM      | Until the pipeline route is finalised and a more detailed response<br>can be provided, the Department requires that: All LGs affected<br>by the proposal must be engaged to ensure that they aware of<br>and can manage any potential disruptions to the stock route<br>network; Relevant land officers from DERM and LG must be<br>consulted from the early planning stages; Where there are to be<br>permanent disruptions to the stock route network, DERM requires<br>realignment/ replacement with corridors of similar width and<br>suitable country type to allow for the unimpeded movement of<br>travelling stock; Where there are to be temporary disruptions to |   | 7.3                     | 7.1  |





| Submitter | Issue Details  | Submitter Recommendations / Suggested Mitigation  | Relevant EIS<br>Section | Cross<br>Reference to<br>Supplementary<br>Report |
|-----------|--|---|-------------------------|--|
|           | travelling stock (e.g. from the installation of buried infrastructure),<br>suitable arrangements to mitigate the disruptions must be<br>negotiated with the relevant local government prior to the<br>commencement of works.   |   |                         |  |
| DERM      | Options for permanent or temporary diversions of stock that are<br>considered unsafe to travelling stock and drovers, as well as the<br>travelling public will not be supported; The provision or<br>replacement of adequate watering facilities and other travelling<br>stock infrastructure may be necessary, particularly where existing<br>facilities become redundant due to the proposal; The stock route<br>network (all or part) disturbed or affected by the proposed works<br>must be rehabilitated upon completion of the project. Where<br>revegetation is required, native vegetation, including pastures,<br>must be used to return the area to its natural state.   |   | 7.3                     | 7.1  |
| DERM      | All available research suggest the dam and weirs have adverse<br>impacts on similar species and no mitigation measures proposed<br>by the EIS. This suggest that the provisions of the QLD<br>government offset policy and the draft policy for Biodiversity<br>offsets should apply. It is noted that a significant population of<br>FRT exists a short distance downstream. It is also likely that<br>further locations exist between the proposed dam site and the<br>confluence with Funnel creek. The habitat on the Connors river<br>downstream of the proposal is currently subject to no special<br>protection and potentially could be impacted by current or future<br>land uses. Consulting with DERM on turtle transfer methods is<br>supported, but it does not assess the likelihood of success of the<br>methods available. | Require that a land use agreement is established to protect and<br>rehabilitate a riparian strip 500m either side of the Connors River<br>downstream from the proposed dam site to the confluence with Funnel<br>Creek as an offset to impacts on aquatic species such as the Fitzroy<br>River turtle.  | 13.1.3.4                | 13.1.2   |
| DERM      | Potential impacts and risk of impacts to FRT have been<br>underestimated. In reference to the last sentence in the last<br>paragraph commencing, 'Populations of both species' on<br>Page 13-44. This statement is not supported by the facts<br>available. In reference to the Appendix E-6 (Pg 16-17) It is noted<br>that none of the methods described are effective in capturing FRT<br>and 6 of the turtles sampled were not identified by the  | Conduct dedicated surveys to determine the presence and abundance<br>of the FRT in and adjacent to the impoundment area; Redraft section<br>13.2 and 13.3 reflecting the available data and reassess the likely<br>impact on the Fitzroy turtle; Develop mitigation measures specifically<br>designed to mitigate impacts on the Fitzroy River Turtle. These should<br>include 1. Detailed assessment of options for movement of turtles<br>across the dam. 2. Development of an offset strategy to enhance the | 13.1.3.4                | 13.1, 28.1.2                                     |





| Submitter | Issue Details  | Submitter Recommendations / Suggested Mitigation  | Relevant EIS<br>Section | Cross<br>Reference to<br>Supplementary<br>Report |
|-----------|--|---|-------------------------|--|
|           | consultants (and presumably could have been FRT).  | protection of turtle habitat downstream of the dam.   |                         |  |
| DERM      | Pg 13-39 suggests that there may be an increase of fish in the inundation area. The justification of this apparently relates to a study of the Glebe Weir and comparisons with Glebe Weir are also spurious. The habitat and conditions that would result from such a storage would be significantly different to that seen in Glebe Weir. The findings of Berghuis & Long (1996) <sup>3</sup> from a study across impoundments and riverine areas in the Fitzroy Basin showed that dams and weirs throughout the Fitzroy Catchment have had a major negative impact on fish communities. This seems more aligned with the broader literature. | If it is proposed that an increase in natural diversity of fish is expected as<br>a result of the dam then a detailed review of literature on the effects of<br>dams and weirs on abundance and diversity of fish is required. The<br>accumulated literature on the impacts of dams worldwide does not<br>support an increase in species' richness. If this view is not adequately<br>supported, it should be deleted.                        | 13.2.1.2                | 13.2   |
| DERM      | Water Allocation Security Objectives This section contains incorrect and misleading reporting of the performance of water entitlements compared to the water allocation security objectives (WASOs) for the existing 'full entitlement' scenario.  | The proponent needs to make contact with DERM to confirm which modelled entitlements are covered by WASOs and to review the modelling methodology and associated reporting for water users.   | 14.1.6.2                | 14.5   |
| DERM      | Statements that WASOs are not being achieved for some<br>unsupplemented users are incorrect. WASOs apply only to water<br>allocations established through the Fitzroy Basin Resource<br>Operations Plan (ROP). Those unsupplemented water users<br>reported as not achieving the WASOs are for water licences<br>located on tributary streams for which WASOs do not apply and<br>would not be or are unlikely to be impacted by the proposed<br>Connors River Dam.  | Amend the EIS to: 1. Remove references to WASOs where they do not<br>apply. 2. Correct the WRP specification for high priority supplies where<br>mentioned to 95 to 100%. 3. Explain unsupplemented 'water harvesting<br>opportunity' in relation to the meaning of the WASOs specifications<br>under the Water Resource Plan 4. Clarify the meaning of 'full<br>entitlement' in relation to 'mean annual diversion' in table 14-21.          | 14.1.6.2                | 14.5   |
| DERM      | Operational strategies should consider DERM's assessments for<br>the new Fitzroy Basin Water Resource Plan to replace the current<br>Water Resource (Fitzroy Basin) Plan 1999.   | Prior to finalising the EIS, the proponent should review the preliminary operational strategies with DERM, particularly in relation to passing flow requirements associated with low flows and first post-winter flow events being developed for the new Fitzroy Basin WRP. Any compensation flow strategies intended to mitigate impacts on other users need to be reviewed having regard to DERM comments made under 14.1.6.2 and 14.2.2.3. | 14.2.2.1                | 14.6   |
| DERM      | WRP objectives, water allocation security objectives. Refer to<br>DERM comments under 14.1.6.2 which need to be addressed<br>and this section changed accordingly.   | Comments on section 14.1.6.2 are relevant to this section.  | 14.2.2.3                | noted  |





| Submitter | Issue Details  | Submitter Recommendations / Suggested Mitigation  | Relevant EIS<br>Section | Cross<br>Reference to<br>Supplementary<br>Report |
|-----------|--|---|-------------------------|--|
| DERM      | Incorrect use of the word 'scenario' renders this paragraph<br>incorrect and invalidates results. "Because of the uncertainty in<br>climate change predictions, three scenarios were selected in<br>order to demonstrate the range of potential impacts. (etc.)"<br>The word "scenario" should be used only for the SRES scenarios<br>(A1B, A1FI etc.)   | Change text: ' <i>three scenarios were selected</i> ' to: 'The range of results produced by the selected sub-set of 11 GCM models (chosen for their QLD specific reliability) was represented by selecting results for the A1FI scenario of the models at the 10th, 50th and 90th percentile of results.' | 14.2.2.6                | 14.7   |
| DERM      | Incorrect use of the word 'scenario' renders these paragraphs<br>below table 14-40 incorrect and invalidates results in the tables.<br>'Figure 14-23, Figure 14-24 and Figure 14-25 present the daily<br>flow exceedance curves for Connors River at Mt Bridget, Connors<br>River at Pink Lagoon and Isaac River at Yatton. These graphs<br>show the impact of the dam on the overall flow regime under<br>current climate conditions as well as under the three climate<br>change scenarios.' The word 'scenario' does not refer to the 10th<br>50th or 90th percentile. The 10th 50th or 90th percentile is the<br>range of results for one single scenario: the A1FI. Low, medium<br>and high scenarios are B2, A1B and A1FI and represent possible<br>carbon emission futures for the globe. The percentiles represent<br>how likely the results are for any one emission scenarios. This<br>range represents uncertainty, not potential carbon emission<br>scenarios. | Change text 'under the three climate change scenario': 'for the range of potential climate under the A1FI scenario.'  | 14.2.2.6                | 14.9   |
| DERM      | Level of service analysis. Assessment appears to have been<br>limited to historical sequence. Accordingly, the analysis of risk<br>should not be considered conservative. Assessment of the<br>adequacy of the level of service for the purposes of use intended<br>is lacking in this section.  | Amend to read: 'analyse and discuss the adequacy of the level of<br>service of the water supplies from the Connors River Dam for the<br>intended purposes of use (mining, urban) in more detail'. The proponent<br>should contact DERM in undertaking this work.  | 14.2.2.7                | 14.10  |
| DERM      | Water Allocation Security ObjectivesReferto DERM's comments under 14.1.6.2 and 14.2.2.3 which need to<br>be addressed and this section changed accordingly.Table 14-48 explanations about the HP and MP entitlement<br>performances are provocative, particularly in relation to the<br>existing HP entitlements.  | Comments on section 14.1.6.2 and 14.2.2.3 are relevant to this section.<br>Review the explanation of entitlement performances associated with<br>Table 14-48 and removes subjective statements.   | 14.2.4.2                | 14.5   |
| DERM      | It is noted that there is a 50% probability that the storage will take 2 years to fill. There is neither assessment of the likelihood of   | Amend to: 'include an assessment of the impacts of stratification during the initial filling phase'.  | 16.2.1.2                | 16.1.1   |





| Submitter | Issue Details   | Submitter Recommendations / Suggested Mitigation  | Relevant EIS<br>Section | Cross<br>Reference to<br>Supplementary<br>Report |
|-----------|---|---|-------------------------|--|
|           | stratification of the storage during this period nor any assessment of the impacts that would happen if stratification occurs.  |   |                         |  |
| DERM      | Stratification of dams and the resultant water quality issues can<br>be related to a range of impacts including fish kills and more<br>frequent algal blooms both within a dam and downstream. The<br>present discussion of this issue is inadequate for a number of<br>reasons. The EIS page 16-36 states: <i>"However, hydrological<br/>analysis (Section 14) and evidence from other storages in the<br/>Fitzroy Basin (Section 16.1.4.2) suggest that strong stratification<br/>is not likely, except in periods of prolonged drought. Such<br/>conditions might occur once in approximately 20 years (Section<br/>14)."</i>  | Amend to provide: 1. More detailed assessment of the risk of<br>stratification must be provided to justify the risk assessment statements<br>made; 2. Detailed assessment of the impacts of stratification and<br>mitigation measures; and 3. Adequate discussion in the executive<br>summary of stratification and other water quality issues related to normal<br>operations. | 16.2.1.3                | 16.1.3   |
| DERM      | It is not clear why discussion of stratification from the shallow<br>weirs of the catchment is relevant to this large dam. The weirs<br>have a greater spill rate and their reduced depth results in<br>increased mixing. It is noted that the Awoonga Dam on the Boyne<br>River which has a similar depth to the proposed dam and is just to<br>the south of the Fitzroy catchment regularly stratifies. Section 14<br>is listed as a justification for stratification occurring only every 20<br>years. There is no mention of stratification in section 14.<br>Presumably frequent flows causing mixing and reduction of<br>stratification is considered likely. It is noted from Figure 14.19 that<br>the modelled dam levels suggest there are around 13 of the 29<br>years modelled where the dam did not spill (with associated<br>reduction in mixing). It is also noted that stratification can occur in<br>less than 12 months. The discussion and assessment provided<br>does not allow a meaningful assessment of whether the impact<br>related to stratification is underestimated, however all available<br>information would suggest that the risk of stratification is high<br>rather than moderate. There is also no discussion of mitigation of<br>stratification impacts and no mention is made of water quality<br>issues in the impoundment during operations within the Executive<br>Summary. |   | 16.2.1.3                | 16.1.3.1   |
| DERM      | DERM agrees that the homestead complexes of Marylands and   | Amend to ensure mitigation measures are put in place for structures to  | 23.2                    | 23.1   |





| Submitter | Issue Details  | Submitter Recommendations / Suggested Mitigation  | Relevant EIS<br>Section | Cross<br>Reference to<br>Supplementary<br>Report |
|-----------|--|---|-------------------------|--|
|           | Collaroy may have local cultural heritage significance. Some<br>buildings will be inundated and as such lost. Some discussion<br>around this matter is presented however no clear indication of<br>how the risk will be managed.   | be inundated.   |                         |  |
| DERM      | EIS recommends an archaeological study of various parts of the Collaroy Homestead complex. Such study should be undertaken with a view to determining the potential of the site to be considered under section 60 of the <i>Queensland Heritage Act 1992</i> in its ability to provide information about Queensland's history, particularly with respect to the pastoral history of the region. Such a study should inform any necessary mitigation.                                 | Amend to ensure: 1. The archaeological surface study of the Collaroy<br>Homestead complex is undertaken; and 2. The results are provided to<br>DERM, including advice on the significance of the archaeology on a<br>local, state or national level, and proposed impact mitigation measures<br>appropriate to the assessment of significance.  | 23.2.4                  | 23.2   |
| DERM      | Table 23-1 suggests that gradual loss of buildings not inundated through deterioration from lack of use and vandalism is unlikely. There is no data to support this assertion. Deterioration with unused buildings is a given, and depending on a range of factors, vandalism could be considered likely. Given that some structures or groups of structures (Collaroy, Marylands) may have local significance (appendix E-11.0) the consequence rating of minor is also questioned. | Amend to incorporate a description of specific mitigation measures for<br>buildings not to be inundated, having regard to significance. Provide<br>detail of 'on going management' measures to be employed.   | 23.2.4                  | 23.1   |
| DERM      | Hydrology of the catchment of Connors river and Funnel creek<br>remains largely unregulated and aquatic habitat has not been<br>altered by dams and weirs, remains with few man made barriers<br>and near natural genetic mixing. This value contributes to the<br>biodiversity, water quality and other values of the Fitzroy basin.  | Amend to ensure: Any assessment of cumulative impacts consider the following: 1. How many large stream catchments within the Fitzroy catchment remain unaltered by dams and weirs and have almost unaltered hydrology. 2. The existence of the longest stream reaches currently uninterrupted by man-made barriers, providing intact movement corridors and possess near natural genetic mixing opportunity. 3. How this proposal combination with other affecting the same values will impact on such values and mitigation measures that will contribute to reducing impacts. | 27                      | 13.6, 27.3                                       |
| DERM      | The process for mitigating the impacts of archaeological discovery should include a process for assessing the potential significance of any non-indigenous archaeological find. Under s. 89 of the <i>Queensland Heritage Act 1992</i> , only archaeological finds that may be "an important source of information about an aspect of <i>Queensland's history</i> " should be reported to DERM.  | Amend to require that the project archaeologist is 'on call' to advise<br>about the potential significance of any discoveries, in the historical<br>context of the area, prior to reporting to DERM.  | 29.9.18                 | 29.1.2   |





| Submitter | Issue Details  | Submitter Recommendations / Suggested Mitigation  | Relevant EIS<br>Section | Cross<br>Reference to<br>Supplementary<br>Report |
|-----------|--|---|-------------------------|--|
| DERM      | The EIS inadequately addresses specific requirements of the <i>Nature Conservation Act 1992</i> with respect to clearing of NCA-listed plants and least concern plants.  | Discuss the options for avoiding, minimising and mitigating impacts to<br>least concern threatened species. If take of threatened species is likely/<br>unavoidable, provide offsets. Strategies should be consistent with the<br>Qld Gov't Environmental Offset Policy 2008 and have regard for the<br>consultation draft policy for Biodiversity offsets. | 10.0.                   | 10.2.1   |
| DERM      | Fauna survey methodology states that it accords with recognised best practice.   | 1. Define the best practice benchmarks survey techniques that were set<br>for the fauna surveys. 2. Detail standard systematic survey techniques<br>and trapping effort. 3. Detail what systematic survey techniques were<br>used for conservation-significant species and trapping effort for each of<br>the species.                                      | 11.1.2                  | 11.1.1, Appendix<br>D                            |
| DERM      | Focus for hierarchy does not consider least concern species,<br>although it picks up issues with biodiversity, connectivity and<br>ecological processes.   | Include impacts to all protected wildlife, including least concern species<br>and how they will be managed. Provide more information to demonstrate<br>that changes to ecological processes and suites of species have been<br>comprehensively addressed.   | 11                      | 11.2.1   |
| DERM      | Discussion addressing NCA-threatened species habitats,<br>migratory birds, riparian zones, refuges and important habitat<br>describes the likelihood of an animal occurring in an area at the<br>time of survey, but not long term impacts to the species. EIS<br>inadequately addresses habitat disturbance and reduction of<br>feeding/ breeding/ roosting/ migratory areas, which will have<br>significant impacts on all species, if not mitigated and managed<br>accordingly. | Provide information on what measures will be provided to meet<br>mitigation and offset requirements for each listed species that is<br>currently under threat by the dam and also for least concern-listed<br>species.  | 11                      | 11.2.1   |
| DERM      | Identifies 6369.27ha of land to be cleared for the project. Dam - 5971.69ha. Pipeline - 397.58ha.  |   | ES.1.5.7                | noted  |
| DERM      | Loss of 576 plants (rare) <i>Cerbera dumicola.</i> Loss of habitat for <i>Eucalyptus raveretiana</i> (Vulnerable EPBC). Translocation for some listed flora proposed in EIS.   | 1. Provide details of this activity including where the translocation will take place and how it will be done, if at all possible. 2. Strategies for rehabilitation, mitigation and offsetting for threatened species also are required.  | 10.1.3.7                | 10.2   |
| DERM      | Impacted individuals of rare and threatened plants will be<br>translocated to suitable translocation sites where this is feasible<br>and if not, seeds of local provenance will be used to produce<br>replacement specimens that will be used in rehabilitation.   | As above, this is insufficient to address the impacts, e.g. there is no discussion of ecological impacts and how these will be addressed.   | 10                      | 10.2   |
| DERM      | Offset options   | Although offset options are proposed for impacts to fauna, there is no  | 10.2.1.1                | 10.2   |





| Submitter          | Issue Details   | Submitter Recommendations / Suggested Mitigation   | Relevant EIS<br>Section | Cross<br>Reference to<br>Supplementary<br>Report |
|--------------------|---|--|-------------------------|--|
|                    |   | discussion on how these have been determined and what species each offset treatment is intended to address. The offset must be applicable to the impact.   |                         |  |
| DERM               | Impacts to aquatic fauna.   | Need to specify what is meant by 'minimal' and 'acceptable'. What certainty is there that affects to affected species are minimal and the populations are secure in the area?  | 13                      | 13.7   |
| DERM               | There is no mention to changes to species' suites and the impact<br>on fauna and flora as a consequence of the dam. | Discuss and address these issues.  | 11                      | 11.2.1   |
| DERM               | This section should address animal safety & welfare during construction phase.                                      | Specify the requirement to ensure animal welfare during construction<br>phase, including the need for licensed spotter-catchers; damage<br>mitigation permits for removal and relocation of wildlife; keeping of<br>records; and notification to DERM of death of wildlife caused by the<br>operations.  | 11.2.4                  | 11.2.2   |
| Dpt of Communities | Design of recreational area and recreational infrastructure.  | Sport and Recreation Services (Nth Qld) is interested to be involved in discussions between SunWater and Isaac Regional Council regarding the facilities to be provided and the promotion of activities offered. Recreational facilities which are fully accessible for people with a disability based on the design for Access and Mobility suite of Australian Standards and include amenities that can be assessed by people with disability. | 2.3.3.4 ; 24.3.5        | 2.1, 24.4  |
| Dpt of Communities | Construction impact on social environment   | Proposed bus transport for fly-in, fly-out and drive-in, drive-out workers from Mackay to and from the construction camp and to worksites is supported as a mitigation measure.  | 2.5.9.4; 24.3.6.1       | noted  |
| Dpt of Communities | Loss of part of the Australian National Bicentennial trail  | What action does the proponent plan to reinstate/restore the trail and access to it around the perimeter of the inundated area?  | 24.3.5; 7.2.1.2         | 24.3   |
| Dpt of Communities | Pipeline route passing between Peak Downs Highway and the MAC Coppabella accommodation village                      | While the intention is for the pipeline to be underground for much of the route, and although not specifically stated it is preferred that the pipeline is located underground also between the Peak Downs Highway and the MAC accommodation village to preserve access.   | 24.3.1.2                | 2.3.2  |
| Dpt of Communities | Education and training - employment, opportunities for local<br>Indigenous people                                   | It is noted that there are 25 people of working age in the primary study<br>area who identify as Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islanders. Similar pro-<br>active employment strategies are recommended for people with<br>disabilities, women and people who speak a language other than   | 24.3.2.2                | 24.1   |





| Submitter                    | Issue Details   | Submitter Recommendations / Suggested Mitigation   | Relevant EIS<br>Section | Cross<br>Reference to<br>Supplementary<br>Report |
|------------------------------|---|--|-------------------------|--|
|                              |   | English.   |                         |  |
| Dpt of Communities           | Affordable housing  | The department supports the potential relocation of acquired properties,<br>or the construction of new properties with Nebo to assist in mitigation<br>any potential impacts on the rental housing market, if workers seek<br>private accommodation during construction.                           | Table 24-32             | noted  |
| Queensland Police<br>Service | Overview of the potential traffic and transport related impacts provided and detailed impact assessment to be provided.   | Preliminary Traffic Management Plan (TMP) should be included in the EIS for traffic enforcement, public safety and incident management purposes and QPS should be consulted as a key stakeholder in the TMP process.   | 21.2.1                  | 21.3.3   |
| Queensland Police<br>Service | Year 2007 traffic volume data does not reflect the increased traffic volume due to project growth in the Bowen Basin  | Table 21.3 (p.21-7) should be updated to enable a more accurate<br>analysis of traffic impact on traffic enforcement and road safety.  | 21.3.2                  | 21.2   |
| Queensland Police<br>Service | While the nearest QPS stations located in Moranbah and Nebo<br>and the QFRS station in Moranbah to the project area, the<br>potential impacts on health and emergency services is expected<br>to be minimal with no significant increases on services required. | The dam and pipeline area encompasses areas of four police divisions.<br>The QPS considers there will be an increase on services in a number of<br>key areas and requirement to provide police communications facilities to<br>service the project areas and roads trafficked by project vehicles. | 21.3.3                  | 21.2.1, 26.1                                     |
| Queensland Police<br>Service | The workforce numbers do not include offsite transport operators or suppliers.  | Include a methodology and assessment of the trip distances and<br>accommodation requirements of contractor transport operators utilised<br>and locations of any camps or advice as to whether existing camp<br>facilities will be utilised/expanded (Nebo MAC camp)                                | 2.5.9; 24.3.2           | 21.3.2.2   |
| Queensland Police<br>Service | Services and facilities in accommodation camps  | If construction camp facilities will include wet mess facilities, include the numbers and locations.   | 24.3.4                  | 2.4  |
| Queensland Police<br>Service | Potential impacts on local access and connectivity may result from the transport of the construction workforce.   | Include fatigue management plan for construction workers travelling from sites at the conclusion of shift/work rotations.  | 24.3.6                  | 24.6   |
| Queensland Police<br>Service | This refers to the details stated under the section 26.6.   | Section 26.6 indicates what should be done but does not detail any of the proponent's responses.   | 26.5                    | 26.1   |
| Queensland Police<br>Service | Liaison with QPS for planning for emergency responses.  | QPS must be include as a key stakeholder in emergency management.<br>This section must also include reference to the QPS for site access and<br>for investigation as part of incident and recovery management.   | 26.6.2                  | 26.1   |
| Powerlink                    | Powerlink have both existing infrastructure and planned projects<br>in the area, and the proposed pipeline will intersect with these<br>corridors.  | recommend that detailed discussions are held with Powerlink prior to finalising the proposed pipeline alignment.   | 7.2.1.4                 | 2.2  |
| DEEDI                        | The current policy applied by DERM for riverine guarry material   | Provide options for sand supply in the event that insufficient sand is   | 2.2.3.2                 | 2.2.1  |





| Submittor | logua Dataila  | Submitter Decommondations / Suggested Mitigation  | Dolovent FIC | Cross                                   |
|-----------|--|---|--------------|---|
| Submitter | Issue Details  | Submitter Recommendations / Suggested Mitigation  | Section      | Reference to<br>Supplementary<br>Report |
|           | extraction under the Water Act 2000 is to maintain extraction<br>levels at the estimated Annual mean Transport Rate. This may<br>severely constrain access to in-stream sand resources for<br>pipeline bedding material both through direct approvals and via<br>commercial operators.   | available from in-stream sources (both through direct approvals and via commercial operators).  |              |   |
| DEEDI     | The proposed pipeline routes traces granted Mining Leases (as<br>shown in Figure 7.2) making them subject to section 403 of the<br>MRA; This section also lacks reference to the prevailing<br>Petroleum and Gas Act 2004 and the mining 'Special Agreements<br>Acts"; Note that proposed pipeline is also likely to intersect<br>granted pipeline licences under the P&G Act, thereby making it<br>subject to sections 807 and 808 of that Act. | This section should be amended to identify the mining lease areas and recognise the application of the MRA, the P&G Act and, if relevant, the Special Agreement Acts, to the pipeline development.  | 6.1.1        | 6.1                                     |
| DEEDI     | Petroleum Pipeline Licences under the P&G Act 2004 (production<br>and safety) are also traversed by the proposed water pipeline.   | This section should also recognise the petroleum pipeline licences under<br>the P&G Act. The distribution of mining and petroleum tenures is<br>updated daily on the interactive Resource and Tenures Map (IRTM) on<br>the Dpt's website: http://www.dme.qld.gov.au   | 7.1.3.5      | 1.4, 6.1, 7.3                           |
| DEEDI     | This section does not contemplate the requirements of the<br>Mineral Resources Act 1989 and the P&G Act 2004 for the<br>consent of mining lease holders and PPL holders prior to<br>construction activities.   | Consent requirements in relation to mining and petroleum tenure holders should be addressed.  | 7.2.2.3      | 1.4, 6.1, 7.3                           |
| DEEDI     | The construction of high voltage powerlines from the existing<br>substation at Nebo may also affect mining leases. In particular<br>there are two small mining leases for dolomite situated adjacent<br>to the Marlborough-Sarina Road.  | The impacts and mitigation measures in relation to the construction of the high voltage power lines over/near Mining leases need to be addressed in the EIS. The IRT maps show the extent of mining leases and other mining and petroleum tenure.   | 7.2.3        | 7.3                                     |
| DEEDI     | Non indigenous cultural heritage issues requiring further detail or clarification. The review of NICH impacts have been include in section 23 (Intro only).  | Section 1.5.19 should be expanded to reflect the Australian Heritage<br>Council research on cultural heritage values of Australian landscapes<br>including the pastoral industry.   | ES.1.5.19    | Noted                                   |
| DEEDI     |  | This is one of the best histories in the section of NICH in EISs that I have read. The report has been researched and compiled by a highly respected practitioner in the CH field. The EIS process has provided an opportunity for detailed study of the homestead building - particularly Collaroy and Marylands and assessment as to whether they may meet state or local beritage criteria. The council's support is available and the | 23           | 23.1                                    |





| Submitter | Issue Details  | Submitter Recommendations / Suggested Mitigation  | Relevant EIS<br>Section | Cross<br>Reference to<br>Supplementary<br>Report |
|-----------|--|---|-------------------------|--|
|           |  | development of a Management Plan for the ongoing management of the sites and building seems essential to reduce vandalism and the rate of decay and to foster visitation to them for historical study and interest, and to provide interpretative signage.  |                         |  |
| DEEDI     | The EIS provides good information on weed and pest animal control and their mitigation in sections 10,11 & 29 however could provide further detail and be improved.  | EIS considers the impacts of the disease phytopthora but does not consider other biosecurity risk associated with the project such as management of plant and animal pest diseases and exotic plants. The following further information should be included: (1) Amend Rural Land Protection Act 1985 to Land Protection (Pest & Stock Route Management) Act 2002 in Section 29.9.11; (2) Undertake risk assessments for invasive plant and pest animals to support the development of threat mitigation plans for them if required (e.g. washdown & inspection at high risk sites); (3) The use of Biosecurity Qld's Annual Pest Distribution Survey 2008 data and predictive pest maps available on the DEEDI website will support an assessments for species likely to be found in the area or predicted to establish in the area. The links below will assist the proponent developing risk assessments proposed in section 10 of the EIS and Recommendation 2 above. http://www.dpi.qld.gov.au/cps/rde/dpi/hs.xsl/4790 9824 ENA HTML.htm; http://www.dpi.qld.gov.au/cps/rde/dpi/hs.xsl/4790 9827 ENA HTML.htm | 10,11,29                | 10.2.5   |
| DEEDI     | maximization of employment outcomes for the project.   | DEEDI is assisting jobseekers, into employment and training through the skilling Queenslanders for work initiative and is keen to assist the proponent of the project to maximise employment opportunities. Detailed information on workforce requirement should be provided to DEEDI and recruitment strategies should be development in collaboration with DEEDI.   | 24.3.2 ; 25.3.1.2       | 24.1   |
| DEEDI     | It has been recognised that Connors River is the best large scale<br>natural dam site in Qld and supply water to mining, urban and<br>industrial customers at Rockhampton, Gladstone and Yeppoon<br>and could provide an alternative supply source. Comparatively the<br>environmental impacts from having a larger dam are likely to be<br>much less than the impacts from the weir projects proposed for<br>Rookwood and Eden Bann. This is based on the comparative<br>types of country being uninundated, their positions in the | In economic terms a larger Connors river dam would offer great cost<br>efficiencies compared to the weir projects. If information on opportunities<br>for future raising of the Connors river dam wall is provided given the<br>circumstances that the water resource plan is amended and that future<br>increases are available. DEEDI would support any cost-effective design<br>solution that could provide for future expansion.  | 1.4.1                   | 1.3.1  |





| Submitter | Issue Details   | Submitter Recommendations / Suggested Mitigation  | Relevant EIS<br>Section | Cross<br>Reference to<br>Supplementary<br>Report |
|-----------|---|---|-------------------------|--|
|           | landscape and the flora/fauna present at the different locations.   |   |                         |  |
| DEEDI     | The proposed dam will provide a large and geographically<br>strategic water body in the Bowen Basin and the recreational and<br>tourism potential for storage and surrounding land.                                   | Opportunities for tourism and recreational uses of the dam and<br>information on capitalising on these opportunities should be considered<br>and information provided in any supplementary EIS. Consideration<br>should be given to any commercial opportunities for external entities<br>being able to develop these opportunities.  | 25.2.5.3                | 24.4   |
| DEEDI     | Use of acquired lands for primary production  | The potential for controlled grazing of the catchment area under lease<br>agreements to minimise adverse impacts on the grazing industry should<br>be considered in the supplementary EIS. (Controlled grazing would be<br>beneficial to reduce fire hazard and the lessees can also be made<br>responsible for pest plant and animal control)  | 7.2.1.2                 | 7.2  |
| DEEDI     | use of 5000ML of medium security water  | DEEDI supports the nominal allocation of water for irrigators along the<br>Isaac-Connors River as a partial compensation/ offset for the loss of<br>good quality agricultural land under the storage. Irrigators in the<br>Mackenzie River Big Bend District will be interested in using this<br>allocation provided that water is available at a reasonable price and can<br>be delivered at a time of year which accommodate their needs. | 14.2.2.1                | noted  |
| DEEDI     | All in-stream barrier works that have the potential to impact on<br>fish movement will require a development approval under the<br>Fisheries Act 1994 or be built according to the relevant self-<br>assessable code. | Additional stream crossing design must consider fish passage<br>requirements. The design of the spillway and dissipation structures in<br>relation to fish passages (in particular injuries and mortalities of fish<br>going over the spillway in spilling flows) will require endorsement as part<br>of the waterway barrier works approval for the dam.   | General                 | 2.2.3  |
| DEEDI     | Public consultation   | It would be beneficial to undertake consultation that is targeted to fisheries or fishing interest groups to improve the recreational requirements.   | 1.9.1                   | 2.1  |
| DEEDI     | Presence of operational staff at the dam.   | In finalising the design and operation of the dam, information should be<br>provided on proposed operational staffing arrangement to ensure<br>monitoring and correct operation of the fish-way is achieved. Information<br>should identify these arrangements including either personnel or<br>mechanised procedures.  | 2.6.1.1                 | 2.2.3  |
| DEEDI     | The design of the spillway and dissipaters.   | There is substantial risk of injuries and mortalities to fish in stepped<br>spillways and their use is currently not supported by Qld Fisheries. The<br>proponent should address these potential risks providing details of the   | 13.2                    | 2.2.4  |





| Submitter | Issue Details  | Submitter Recommendations / Suggested Mitigation  | Relevant EIS<br>Section | Cross<br>Reference to<br>Supplementary<br>Report |
|-----------|--|---|-------------------------|--|
|           |  | design and management of the spillways if they propose to use stepped<br>spillways. Prevention of fish contact with dissipaters and the stilling<br>basin will be a key consideration during the waterway barrier works<br>assessment by Fisheries Qld.   |                         |  |
| DEEDI     | Fishway design and operation   | Fisheries Qld will be the lead agency to undertake the review and<br>assessment of the design of the fishway and is aware of the complex<br>engineering requirements for the design of the dam components and is<br>keen to work with the proponent to develop optimal design of fishway<br>components. This will have significant resource implications for the<br>agency and a collaborative approach between DEEDI and the proponent<br>will be required to ensure optimal design and the ability to meet project<br>design and construction timeframes. | 13.2                    | 2.2.3  |
| DEEDI     | Fishway design and operation(Cont:13.18)                             | Fisheries Qld recommends that SunWater consider significant up-front<br>and strategic consultation in developing the design criteria required<br>fishway. Fisheries Qld has prepared the attached Fish Passage Design<br>Process and Criteria for consideration by SunWater to assist with this<br>process.   | 13.2                    | 2.2.3  |
| DEEDI     | Fish passage considerations during and after decommissioning of dam. | Fish passage should be considered as a component of decommissioning. Partial removal of the structure may be insufficient to restore fish passage to its current state at the site. Fish passage must be flagged as an environmental consideration for any future decommissioning plans.  | 13.2                    | 2.2.3  |
| DEEDI     | Tree and shrub clearance   | Retention of trees (timber) is preferable to maintain habitat for fish<br>although leaf matter, shrubs etc should be removed). Clearing in some<br>deeper areas should be considered by the proponent to allow for other<br>recreational activities and thereby achieve maximum socio-economic<br>and environmental benefits from the dam. It is noted that the water level<br>would be below the proposed 1.5m below FSL for 3-4years every 15<br>years or so.   | 13.2                    | 13.4   |
| DEEDI     | Diversion channel design   | It is understood that the diversion channel is not primarily designed for fauna passage; however allowance for fish passage should be considered.   | 13.2                    | 13.5   |
| DEEDI     | Impacts of in-stream structures                                      | The design of the screens at the off-take towers and the location of the  | 13.2                    | 13.1.2   |





| Submitter | Issue Details                                  | Submitter Recommendations / Suggested Mitigation   | Relevant EIS<br>Section | Cross<br>Reference to<br>Supplementary<br>Report |
|-----------|--|--|-------------------------|--|
|           |  | off-take in relation to the fish way exit should be discussed with<br>Fisheries Qld during consultation on finalising the fishway design.  |                         |  |
| DEEDI     | Unmitigated risk assessment and quantification | While there may not be exotic species in the system now, the likelihood will increase with a dam and recreational fishery and as a result the likelihood of exotic species being transferred through the pipeline; The likelihood of a change in aquatic habitat downstream is 'almost certain' as opposed to 'possible'. The colonisation of the dam by exotic fauna is at least 'likely' or 'almost certain' given that there will be access to the dam by the public.   | 13.2.4 13.10<br>Table   | 13.3   |
| DEEDI     | Unmitigated risk assessment and quantification | There would be a similar likelihood from exotic aquatic flora.   | 12.2.4 12.5<br>Table    | 13.3   |
| DEEDI     | Risk Assessment Tables                         | The risk assessment undertaken of the fishway and spillway may be subject to change once design and operation components are finalised.  | Table 13-11             | Noted  |
| DEEDI     | Stream crossing designs                        | The DEEDI stream crossings design guidelines referred to on page<br>14.31 are now considered outdated. Design advice should be sought<br>from Fisheries Qld on all stream crossings including haul roads,<br>causeways, culvert crossings etc, unless crossings are constructed<br>according to the relevant self assessable code under the Fisheries Act<br>1994.   | 14.2                    | 14.2   |
| DEEDI     | Fishway release flow                           | Fishways should be operated on an inflow-outflow basis as well as when<br>any releases for other purposes are being made. While the provision of<br>a pass flow requirement that will be used to operate the fishway within<br>the proposed operational plan acknowledged, the flexibility to vary the<br>volumes released and timing of those releases (e.g. by 'banking' water)<br>should be considered. It is unlikely that sufficient volume has been<br>allowed for two fishways at the same time. These issues should be<br>considered during fishway design discussions with Fisheries Qld. | 14.2                    | 14.3   |
| DEEDI     | Downstream impacts on flows                    | The impacts on instream connectivity due to changes in flows have not<br>been considered. In particular, to what degree the barrier effect of<br>existing instream structures on fish movement will be increased through<br>the reduction in medium and high flows downstream of the dam. Where<br>this is likely to occur, mitigation measures will need to be employed to<br>address the reduction in fish passage.  | 14.2                    | 14.4   |





| Submitter | Issue Details  | Submitter Recommendations / Suggested Mitigation   | Relevant EIS<br>Section | Cross<br>Reference to<br>Supplementary<br>Report |
|-----------|--|--|-------------------------|--|
| DEEDI     | Consequence and likelihood - reduction in connectivity | Need to expand on how this assessment was made and relate it to the impacts on Connors River as a whole given the predicted changes in flows downstream and the capacity for fish to move upstream through the impoundment.  | 14.2                    | 14.4   |
| DEEDI     | introducing aquatic weeds and pest fish species        | The risk of aquatic weeds being introduced into the site is high, and<br>there is also some risk of introducing pest fish into the catchment,<br>through recreational activities associated with the dam. Management<br>measures and associated funding and commitment to address these<br>risks will also be required.  | 27.3.2                  | 13.3, 27.1                                       |
| DEEDI     | Changes to downstream wetland connectivity             | While the EIS has looked at the impact on local wetlands, Fisheries Qld concerns extend to the significant offstream wetlands along the lower reaches of the Fitzroy adjacent to the river, which are critical nursery and other habitat for significant recreational and commercial fish species. An examination of this should show incremental changes to connectivity with water infrastructure development and what the current and then predicted impacts are with the development of the dam. | 27.3.2                  | 27.2   |
| DEEDI     | Reporting requirement of operations of the fishways    | There will be reporting requirements relating to the operation of the fishways at the dam, which can be determined in consultation with Fisheries Qld during discussions. These are likely to be more frequent than just an annual report and will include reporting on days operated, immediate notification of non-operation due to breakdown, notification of scheduled non-operation etc.  | 29.5.3 ; 29.9.10        | 29.2.1.2   |
| DEEDI     | Aquatic fauna and flora, weeds                         | The EMP should include a provision that water should not be sourced from outside site and brought onto the site as this may carry weeds and possibly exotic fauna. The commitment to preventing weed invasions must not be directed at terrestrial weeds.  | 29.9.10; 29.9.11        | 29.1.1   |
| DEEDI     | Management of pest fish species                        | The management of pest fish also needs to be addressed in this section<br>and construction contractors need to be aware of their obligations to<br>prevent their introduction through the dam and pipeline project.  | 29.9.10                 | 29.1.1   |
| DEEDI     | Management of flows                                    | Monitoring should be undertaken of the impacts on downstream<br>instream and riparian habitat (as a minimum up to 44km downstream of<br>the dam, confluence with Funnel Creek) and the efficacy of flow<br>management on reducing those impacts. Development of a specific   | 29.10                   | 14.4, 29.2.1.1                                   |





| Submitter              | Issue Details   | Submitter Recommendations / Suggested Mitigation   | Relevant EIS<br>Section | Cross<br>Reference to<br>Supplementary<br>Report |
|------------------------|---|--|-------------------------|--|
|                        |   | manual for the operation and maintenance of the fishway should be<br>considered. Fisheries Qld is keen to assist the Proponent to develop this<br>manual. The monitoring of fishways should include assessment of their<br>effectiveness for purpose.  |                         |  |
| Isaac Regional Council | Management of recreation area   | The responsibility for the management and control of any proposed recreational area at the Connors River Dam needs to be fully disclosed for community consultation, deliberation and engagement.  | 2.6                     | 2.1, 24.4  |
| Isaac Regional Council | Damaged road infrastructure as a result of the development<br>project proceeding  | Proponent needs to accept the responsibility for the upgrading and restoration of damaged road infrastructure in the locality.   | 21.4                    | yes  |
| Isaac Regional Council | Provision of urban water supply to Nebo   | EIS need to clearly commit to the provision of urban water supplies to Nebo to ensure the sustainability of urban community.   | 14.1.6.1; 1.3           | 1.1, 24.2  |
| Isaac Regional Council | Future water needs of the coastal area of the Isaac Regional Council Area   | Consider using the project to meet future water needs of the coastal<br>area of the Isaac Regional Council Area surrounding Greenhill and<br>Carmila on the coastal area of IRC directly over the coastal range from<br>the proposed development   | 1.3.1.3                 | 24.2   |
| Isaac Regional Council | Long term diversified water usage.  | The earlier reports summaries (Nebo, Broadsound, Isaac Connors final report September 2003 and the scenarios for the water resource development of the Isaac Connors river catchments final report May 2005) for the maximum development potential of the storage facility need to be fully implemented in the EIS to allow for long term diversified water usage to create long term regional development and sustainable employment opportunities. | 14.1.4.1; 14.2.2.1      | 1.3.1  |
| Isaac Regional Council | Water management and distribution.  | The project needs to focus clearly on the sustainable and the use<br>strategy for the longer term beyond the immediate mine water<br>development needs to allow the residual infrastructure legacy to create<br>maximum cost effective water management and distribution across the<br>region to support sustainable urban and rural communities   | 1.3.1.3                 | 24.2   |
| Isaac Regional Council | Needs to meet world class development outcome.  | The EIS and project implementation needs to meet the challenge of delivering a sustainable world class ecological and development outcome in partnership with all community and industry interest in the region to sustain a viable community beyond the mining of minerals  | 25.3.4                  | Noted  |
| Queensland Railway     | Proposed alignment of the associated pipeline and its potential for conflict with planned rail infrastructure in this area. | Prior to adopting a final alignment, the proponent needs to consult<br>Queensland Railway.   | 21.4.1.6                | Noted, 2.2.2                                     |





## Appendix C

Editorial Corrections

Some submissions noted typographical errors, incorrect cross references or suggested changes to wording. These amendments are addressed below as the EIS cannot be reissued with these changes.

| Issue Category                 | Issue Topic             | Amendment   |
|--------------------------------|-------------------------|---|
| Introduction                   | Legislation             | It is noted that the <i>Transport Infrastructure Act 1994</i> (TI Act) is <i>administered by the Department of Transport and Main Roads</i> and not the Environmental Protection Agency or port authorities.  |
| Land Use and<br>Infrastructure | Land Tenure             | Land tenure along the pipeline route is shown in Figure 7-7 and comprises freehold, leasehold, reserve, <i>rail corridor</i> , road reserve and State Forests. The pipeline route will be co-located within, partly within, or adjacent to electricity transmission, water or gas pipeline easements, road reserves, <i>rail corridor</i> , freehold, leasehold and Unallocated State Land tenures  |
| Transport                      | Regulatory<br>Framework | The TI Act is the relevant State legislation concerning the management of transport infrastructure including roads and railways. Where construction and/or maintenance access to State controlled roads are required, approvals are to be obtained under <i>section 62</i> of the TI Act and construction approval under <i>section 33</i> of the TI Act. <i>When construction access to the rail corridor is required, an approval from QR Network Pty Ltd (QR) limited is required in the form of a Wayleave agreement.</i>   |
| Transport                      | Rail Corridor           | Two alignments are under consideration. The preferred alignment is the southern option, which would run parallel to the Peak Downs Highway, crossing the Norwich Park Branch line south west of Coppabella until the road corridor crosses the Millennium pipeline. At this location the pipeline will cross the Peak Downs Highway. The alternative alignment is the pipeline crossing the Peak Downs Highway following the Braeside pipeline from 5 km west of Annandale, and then paralleling the Goonyella rail line via the Eungella pipeline to the Isaac River.    |
| Introduction                   | Legislation             | References to the <i>Integrated Planning Act 1997</i> (IPA) should be to the <i>Sustainable Planning Act 2009</i> (SPA)   |
| Introduction                   | Legislation             | SPA provides for the 'regulation of works and other activities undertaken in watercourse  |
| Introduction                   | Legislation             | The <i>whole Water Resource (Fitzroy Basin) Plan is reviewed</i> every ten years, not just the outcomes and objectives  |
| Introduction                   | Legislation             | WASO's provide a level of security for supplemented and unsupplemented water<br>entitlement holders   |
| Introduction                   | Legislation             | The new <i>Draft Water Resource (Fitzroy Basin) Plan</i> is expected to be released in mid-2010   |
| Introduction                   | Legislation             | The correct ROP reference is <i>Fitzroy Basin Resource Operations Plan 2004</i> (amended July 2009 (Revision2))   |
| Introduction                   | Legislation             | The ROP seeks to achieve the WRP outcomes rather than the objectives  |
| Introduction                   | Legislation             | The Vegetation Management Act 1999 (VMA) regulates the clearing of certain native woody vegetation that is "regulated" or "regulated regrowth" vegetation. Although the VMA does not apply on all tenures or vegetation types, permits to clear may still be required under other laws. If the clearing of native vegetation regulated under the VAM is not exempt under Schedule 24 of SPA it must be conducted in accordance with the Regrowth vegetation code (October 2009) for regulated regrowth vegetation. Alternatively, if the clearing is for operational work |





| Issue Category            | Issue Topic           | Amendment   |
|---------------------------|-----------------------|---|
|                           |                       | that involves clearing of native vegetation that is mapped as remnant on a regional ecosystem map, then a permit must be obtained from DERM as part of the IDAS process.  |
|                           |                       | Applications to clear native vegetation must meet the requirements of section 22A of the VMA to ensure the clearing will be for a relevant purpose. In this case the clearing will be for a declared significant project, which is considered to be a relevant purpose under the VMA. The clearing will be assessed against the criteria for significant projects in Part S of the Regional Vegetation Management Code for Brigalow Belt and New England Tablelands Bioregions.   |
| Introduction              | Legislation           | Section 2.4.4 (EIS):  |
|                           |                       | A clearing vegetation management plan is required under the VM Act and in<br>accordance with the State Policy for Vegetation Management, November 2006<br>(DNR&W 2006). Appropriate measures to be incorporated in the plan include:  |
|                           |                       | <ul> <li>the presence of fauna spotter/catcher(s) accredited by Queensland Parks<br/>and Wildlife Service (QPWS) during vegetation clearing for safe handling<br/>and possible translocation of animals unable to safely move away from the<br/>disturbance;</li> </ul>   |
|                           |                       | <ul> <li>management procedures for the treatment of any injured animals; and</li> </ul>   |
|                           |                       | <ul> <li>clearing of vegetation to be undertaken so that any more mobile, non-volant<br/>fauna is able to move to other areas of suitable habitat, i.e., patches of<br/>habitat should not be disconnected in a haphazard fashion that limits<br/>movement.</li> </ul>  |
|                           |                       | The fauna spotter/catcher is responsible for:   |
|                           |                       | <ul> <li>actively searching all habitat within areas to be cleared and identifying<br/>wildlife species present; and</li> </ul>   |
|                           |                       | <ul> <li>facilitation of clearing activities, ensuring methods used are appropriate with<br/>minimal risk of injury or death to resident wildlife in accordance with the<br/>EMP and the instructions of the construction site manager.</li> </ul>  |
|                           |                       | As a rule, the fauna spotter/catcher will work ahead of clearing activities and check vegetation and fauna habitats for the presence of native species. The most desirable approach is to allow wildlife to move out of the disturbance area of their own volition.   |
| Description of<br>Project | Construction<br>Spoil | As discussed in Section 2.5.1.13 of the EIS all spoil from the construction of the diversion channel will be stockpiled on the right bank of the river for later use in construction. SunWater acknowledge that when stockpiling, spoil material should be placed far enough away from the river to ensure there is minimal risk of any of the material from entering the river during flood events. The management of stockpiles in this area will be specifically addressed in the Sediment and Erosion Control Plan and will be provided with appropriate runoff control, potentially including bunding. |