



SUBMISSION NUMBER 13 – SUNWATER

BYERWEN COAL PTY LTD – BYERWEN COAL PROJECT

13. SUBMISSION NUMBER 13 – SUNWATER

13.1 Issue Number 13.1

Issue Details

Section 3.2 of the Byerwen Coal project Terms of Reference for an EIS (TOR) requires the following: "A description of:

- Impacts on surrounding land uses and strategies for minimisation;
- Where the project conflicts with existing land use of the affected and adjoining land parcels, and mitigation strategies to minimise the adverse impacts of this land use conflict;
- Management of the Immediate environs of the project including construction buffer zones; and
- Potential issues involved in proximity and/or co-location of other current or proposed infrastructure services. Outline mitigation strategies to minimise adverse impacts of the construction and operation on the project. "

SunWater notes that the EIS is largely void of the necessary information that would enable SunWater to assess, for example potential impacts of the project on SunWater water pipelines, or potential issues involved in proximity to infrastructure, as required by the TOR. SunWater provides the following as examples of our current concerns:

- The proposed End of Life Project Layout South (Figure ES1-3) which shows several waste dumps adjacent to or surrounding the Burdekin Moranbah Pipeline (BMP) alignment. The waste dumps are proposed to be 60 metres high with a proposed 75m exclusion zone. In SunWater's experience encroachments from either erosion of the face or slips on rehabilitated waste dumps are not rectified by operators of the mine, making access for maintenance and operation of the pipeline impossible.
- The mine waste dump located on the western side of the BMP (Figure ES1-3) will require several haul road access points across both rail lines, the NQ gas pipeline and the BMP. The is not detailed discussion as to how any of this infrastructure will be protected. Haul roads access the BMP will introduce numerous risks to the operation and access along the pipeline at these locations.

The proponent appears to have committed in the EIS to negotiate compensation with landholders for impacts to infrastructure, including the provision of alternative infrastructure and crossing points where project linear infrastructure intersects properties.

In addition, the provision of buffers between third party infrastructure and project activities and/or a commitment to work closely with third party infrastructure owners where crossing points.

SunWater would suggest that agreement between Sunwater and Byerwen Coal Pty Ltd occurs prior to lease approval. This will enable potential impacts on SunWater infrastructure and sufficient mitigation measures to be identified prior to project approval.

Submitter Recommendations / Suggested Mitigation

1. The proponent to liaise with SunWater prior to the lease approval to agree on sufficient mitigation measures for potential impacts to the Burdekin to Moranbah Pipelines (BMP).

2. The EIS should be amended to reflect the TOR so that approvals, such as the eventual Environmental Authority, can be conditioned accordingly.

Response

EIS **Chapter 14, Section 14.6.5.1** provides an assessment of impacts to third party infrastructure and proposes mitigation measures.

An assessment of the risks associated with wall / slope failure operating the waste rock dumps was conducted in EIS **Chapter 32, Section 32.6.4** and resulted in buffers being imposed between mining operations and fixed infrastructure, including the Burdekin Moranbah Pipeline (BMP) alignment (refer EIS **Chapter 14, Section 14.6.5.1**). In addition commitment number 377 of **Appendix 8** to the EIS states 'Hazards relating to interaction with the SunWater Pipeline (Burdekin to Moranbah) will be mitigated through the following risk treatment measures – demarcation of easement, traffic controls'.

To ensure that ongoing erosion from waste dumps is managed, and does not impact on third parties, the proponent has committed to a rehabilitation management plan.

During the construction and detailed design phase the proponent is committed to consulting with SunWater and the ongoing assessment of hazards.

The EIS identified that crossings will be required to the western side of the BMP to access waste dumps. During the detailed design phase the proponent will make an application to SunWater for a crossing agreement for the crossing points. The crossing agreement, as negotiated between SunWater and the proponent, will contain conditions for construction and operation of the crossings. The crossing agreement is not required prior to mining lease approval.

13.2 Issue Number 13.2

Issue Details

The EIS indicates that monitoring to ensure effects of vibration on infrastructure does not occur through compliance with Vibration Limits in Table 24-6.

SunWater notes that blasting within the pits in most cases will be several hundred metres from the BMP.

Submitter Recommendations / Suggested Mitigation

1. Monitoring of the BMP during blasting should occur to ensure there are no impacts of vibration on the integrity of the pipeline.
2. As the BMP has concrete lining for corrosion protection of the steal pipe, blasting should be set to achieve peak particle velocity limits for masonry of 25mm/sec².

Direction to Proponent

Address in conditions or recommendations, if required.

13.3 Issue Number 13.3

Issue Details

Section 3.4.1 of the Byerwen Coal Project Terms of Reference for an EIS (TOR) required the following:

A description of:

- Potential impacts of surface water flow on existing infrastructure;

- Potential impacts on other downstream receiving environments, if it is proposed to discharge water to a riverine system.

SunWater also notes section 8.5 of the EIS which highlighted that discharge to Suttor River and Kangaroo Creeks will occur under Byerwen's Low/No flow regime which may permit discharge for up to 42 days after a 'medium' flow ceases. As identified in the EIS, Suttor River and Kangaroo Creek have no flow around 60% of the time.

As required by section 3.10.3 of the TOR, the EIS is to assess the projects impacts on overland water flows and their interaction with the road networks.

In light of the above, SunWater has the following concerns in relation to the project:

- Discharges from the mine site are proposed into both the Suttor River (South Pits) and Kangaroo Creek (Northern Pits). Discharges to the Suttor River appear to be via smaller creeks which cross the BMP alignment at approximate chainage 129 and 132.3 km. SunWater is concerned of the impact of the low/no flow regime as highlighted above on access along the pipeline. As discharge water will restrict access along the pipeline, specific crossings along the pipeline will be required to be constructed by the proponent to provide access to and along the pipeline.
- SunWater access to approx. 132 chainage on the BMP is currently via Wollambi Road and Wollombi homestead access or the stock route from Wollombi Road. There is very little alternative access to the pipeline route in this location without many kilometres of additional travel.
- Access through the mine lease will necessitate significant WH&S restrictions upon operations and maintenance personnel and ongoing costs to SunWater. For example, SunWater personnel and/or contractors requiring access authorisation from Senior Site Executives.
- Onerous access requirements such as those explained above, may lead to impacts on SunWater's water delivery obligations due to extended outage times.

Submitter Recommendations / Suggested Mitigation

1. The proponent to liaise with SunWater prior to the lease approval to agree on sufficient mitigation measures for potential impacts to the Burdekin to Moranbah Pipeline (BMP).
2. The EIS should be amended to reflect the TOR so that approvals, such as the eventual environmental authority, can be conditioned accordingly.

Direction to Proponent

Address in conditions or recommendations, if required.



SUBMISSION NUMBER 14 – GLENCORE COAL ASSETS
AUSTRALIA PTY LTD

BYERWEN COAL PTY LTD – BYERWEN COAL PROJECT

14. SUBMISSION NUMBER 14 – GLENCORE COAL ASSETS AUSTRALIA PTY LTD

14.1 Issue Number 14.1

Issue Details

Given the proximity of the proposed Byerwen Mine to the existing Newlands Mine, Glencore seeks some clarification from the proponent on a number of matters, as outlined below:

Newlands Coal Extension Project

It is noted that throughout the EIS, the Newlands Coal Extension Project (NCEP) and Eastern Creek Project appear to be used interchangeably. The NCEP (EIS approved in May 2013) includes MIA 10352, MLA 10361 and MLA 10362, and to be clear, the NCEP and Eastern Creek Project are not separate projects. Further, there are references throughout the document to impacts potentially attributed to the NCEP, which is described in the EIS as a 'substantial extension to existing mining operations'. The NCEP does not provide for additional tonnages for the Newlands Mine, rather it allows a continuation of mining over an extended time. The proponent should review any impact assessments undertaken which have assumed increased tonnages from the Newlands Mine.

Submitter Recommendations / Suggested Mitigation

The NCEP (EIS approved in May 2013) includes MIA 10352, MLA 10361 and MLA 10362, and to be clear, the NCEP and Eastern Creek Project are not separate projects.

The proponent should review any impact assessments undertaken which have assumed increased tonnages from the Newlands Mine.

Response

The proponent acknowledges that the Newlands Coal Extension Project and Eastern Creek Project are not separate projects. The proponent's understanding is that:

- The tenements associated with the Eastern Creek Project are ML 4755 (active open cut mining area), ML 4754 (future open cut mining area), ML10176 (haul road) and ML 10322 (haul road).
- The tenements associated with the Newlands Coal Extension Project are MLA 10352, MLA 10361 and MLA 10362 and that these tenements will adjoin and surround the 'Eastern Creek' tenements to form a single project.

Any reference in the EIS to the Eastern Creek Project should be assumed to read Newlands Coal Extension Project.

The Newlands Coal Extension Project will involve additional disturbance areas and these have been included in cumulative impact assessments involving land disturbance in EIS **Chapter 34**, specifically EIS **Chapter 34, Section 34.9 Terrestrial Ecology** and EIS **Chapter 34, Section 34.5 Soils and Land Use**.

The proponent recognises that the Newlands mine output will not increase as a result of the Newlands Coal Extension Project and therefore there are no additional impacts associated with, for example, an increased workforce. As stated in EIS **Chapter 34, Section 34.21**:

The proposed extensions associated with the Newlands Coal Extension Project would enable the existing workforce and equipment to move into new areas as coal reserves in existing parts of

Newlands mine are depleted. Subsequently, it is not anticipated that the extension will result in any additional workforce requirement. As such the Newlands Coal Extension Project's contribution to cumulative impacts on housing and community infrastructure, facilities and services in Glenden would be negligible.

14.2 Issue Number 14.2

Issue Details

Hydrology

The EIS notes the Byerwen project will impact on adjacent area including to surface soils, surface water, groundwater, and changes to hydrology flows. Mitigation measures to ensure that works do not encroach onto off site areas are outlined in the EIS. As proposed diversions from the Byerwen mine may affect flows and flood levels through its mining lease areas, Newlands Mine would appreciate the opportunity to review the flood studies through the Newlands Mine area to verify that the works will not impact on current and future infrastructure.

Submitter Recommendations / Suggested Mitigation

As proposed diversions from the Byerwen mine may affect flows and flood levels through its mining lease areas, Newlands Mine would appreciate the opportunity to review the flood studies through the Newlands Mine area to verify that the works will not impact on current and future infrastructure.

Response

The Coordinator General has directed the proponent to note this issue and has provided the following cross reference(s) to the EIS indicating that the issue has been addressed in **Chapter 12, Section 12.3.3, Chapter 16, Sections 16.4.3, 16.5, 16.6, and 16.7.1** of the EIS.

14.3 Issue Number 14.3

Issue Details

Hydrology

The groundwater study identifies the potential for interaction of dewatering for both Byerwen and Newlands; and we would again appreciate further details to determine any potential impact on our operations.

Submitter Recommendations / Suggested Mitigation

We would again appreciate further details to determine any potential impact of dewatering on our operations.

Response

The Coordinator General has directed the proponent to note this issue and has provided the following cross reference(s) to the EIS indicating that the issue has been addressed in **Chapter 17, Section 17.5** of the EIS.

14.4 Issue Number 14.4

Issue Details

Suttor Creek Haul Road

The EIS notes that Wollombi Road and/or land adjacent to Wollombi Road are the subject of Xstrata Coal's (now Glencore's) MLA 70460. The Suttor Creek Haul Road was constructed in 2005 when mining at Suttor Creek commenced. Based on Departmental advice at the time, the haul road had been registered in 2004 as a 'varied access route' into the mine under s317 of the Mineral Resources Act 1989 (MRA). Since 2004, the MRA has been amended to now include a 'road' to the list in s316 of transportation methods over land to access a mining lease. An application under s316 has been made by Glencore for MLA 70460, which overlaps the proponent's application.

The EIS notes that the proponent will consult with Glencore about all construction, operational, hazards and design related issues where there is potential for interaction between project activities.

Submitter Recommendations / Suggested Mitigation

Newlands Mine welcomes the commitment from the proponent to on-going dialogue and co-operation in relation to the Suttor Creek Haul Road. The existing road is a critical infrastructure associated with the current operations of the Newlands Mine.

Response

The Coordinator General has directed the proponent to note this issue. This issue is addressed in **Chapter 14, Section 14.6.6** of the EIS.

14.5 Issue Number 14.5

Issue Details

Glenden Waste Facility

The EIS notes that the proponent will use the Glenden waste facility for disposal of general waste and bio-solids. The EIS also states that the Newlands Mine also uses the waste facility. However, this is incorrect, as the Newlands Mine uses its own onsite waste facility.

Submitter Recommendations / Suggested Mitigation

The proponent should review the capacity and capability of the Glenden waste facility to handle the additional waste generated by the project and any associated development proposed with Glenden.

Response

EIS **Chapter 34, Section 34.16** describes cumulative impacts from management of non-mining waste. This section states:

Byerwen Coal proposes to use IRC's²¹ Glenden Waste Facility for disposal of general wastes other than:

- wastes that are reused or recycled, either on-site or at a designated facility
- wastes planned for on-site disposal
- regulated wastes or other wastes that cannot be accepted by the Glenden Waste Facility.

This section also states 'Other projects in the local area (e.g. Xstrata Coal's mines) are also likely to use Glenden Waste Facility for disposal of general waste and biosolids'.

The proponent will consult with the operators of waste facilities in the Mackay and Glenden region, including the Glenden Waste Facility and will make arrangements for acceptance of project wastes which cannot be accepted at the Glenden Waste Facility

²² EHP (formerly DERM, 2011. Waste Site Characterisation Survey – Final Report, <https://www.ehp.qld.gov.au/waste/pdf/characterisation-survey-report.pdf>

The proponent recognises that Newlands Mine uses its own onsite waste facility and as such will not contribute to cumulative impacts associated with disposal of wastes at the Glenden Waste Facility, as the statement above suggests.

Operational waste volumes are described in EIS **Chapter 26, Table 26-4** and total approximately 1,000 tonnes per annum.

EHP conducted a waste site characterisation survey (EHP (formerly DERM), 2011)²², in which it was estimated that the Mackay region received 189,000 tonnes of waste in 2009/10. Thus the project is estimated to produce approximately 0.5% of the waste received in the region.

There are a number of waste facilities in the region with potential to receive waste from the Project, including the following:

- Paget Waste Management Centre in Mackay accepts commercial waste and used oil and has a resource recovery facility for waste that can be recycled.
- Townsville Waste Services (TWS) is Queensland's largest council operated solid waste management provider and provides a waste collection service, including recycling and disposal for commercial premises, as well as the management of several landfills and transfer stations. TWS receive, handle and process approximately 1200 tonnes of waste each day²³. The project will generate approximately 1,000 tonnes per annum which is less than the daily volume handled by TWS in a day.
- Private waste contractors in MacKay and Townsville (e.g. Veolia, Transpacific) accept recyclable / reusable material.
- Private waste contractors collect and dispose of potentially hazardous waste.
- There are a number of smaller waste facilities in the region (e.g. in Dysart, Middlemount, Moranbah and Nebo) that may be able to accept waste from the project.

Therefore the proponent considers that waste disposal facilities in the region have capacity to accept waste from the project.

As outlined in EIS **Chapter 34, Section 34.16**, the proponent is committed to working closely with regional councils and waste contractors to ensure that waste disposal facilities (such as Glenden Waste Facility) have the required capacity to meet the needs of the Byerwen project and other projects. Discussions with waste service providers and operators of waste facilities, to ensure the required capacity for project waste is available, will occur prior to commencement of construction activities.

²² EHP (formerly DERM, 2011. Waste Site Characterisation Survey – Final Report, <https://www.ehp.qld.gov.au/waste/pdf/characterisation-survey-report.pdf>

²³ <http://www.townsville.qld.gov.au/business/waste/Documents/Townsville%20Waste%20Services%20Business%20Profile.pdf>