

EIS SECTION	PAGE	PARA-GRAPH	LINE	SUBMITTER COMMENT	WARATAH COAL RESPONSE
Department of Transport and Main Roads					
Vol 2, Ch 13, Section 13.4.3, Table 5	360			The reference to Table 5 in the text is for estimated traffic generation external to the mine site, whereas Table 5 is headed "Estimated Mine Site Traffic". This requires clarification as to which figures are included in Table 5.	Waratah Coal acknowledges that table 5 should read as "Estimated Mine Off-Site Traffic"
Vol 1, Chap 2, S2.2.2 Table 3	24			"Approval to interfere with a railway line (relevant authority is the Department of Transport and main Roads" should read "Approval to interfere with a railway line (relevant authority is Queensland Rail)"	Noted and will be referenced correctly in future publications dealing with this issue
Vol 2, Ch 13, Section 13.3.1.6, p358; Vol 5, Ch 21, Section 3.10.9	51			These sections indicate that there is no flooding regularly occurring to the west of Alpha. The EIS should correctly state that flooding on the Capricorn Highway occurs regularly in the wet season west of Alpha.	Waratah Coal acknowledges flooding on the Capricorn Highway occurs west of Alpha.
Barcaldine Regional Council					
Executive Summary, 1.1.1	2				This could be more clearly described as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> One open cut mine comprising two surface mining pits (North and South) in the B seam resource producing 10 Mtpa total One open cut mine comprising two surface mining pits (North and South) in the C and D seam resources producing 10 Mtpa total
			Dot Point 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Two surface mining pits in the B seam resource producing 10 Mtpa total; 	
			Dot Point 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Two surface mining pits in the C and D seam resources producing 10 Mtpa total; 	
	3				

EIS SECTION	PAGE	PARA-GRAPH	LINE	SUBMITTER COMMENT	WARATAH COAL RESPONSE
Abbot Point State Development Area Branch					
Volume 4 Chap 2 Port, Figure 1	15			All maps and figures need to be amended to clarify that the APSDA is not part of the EIS.	All maps and figures that reference the APSDA in this SEIS note that the APSDA is the limit of the assessment for this SEIS. No indicative development within the APSDA is presented.
Volume 4, Port, Chapter 1	5, 23			Reference to the proposed multi-user transport corridor is incorrect and should be replaced with proposed multi-user infrastructure corridor (MUIIC).	
Volume 4, Figure 3	9			The rail planning in the APSDA shown is a working option and indicative only and should be noted as such.	
Volume 4, Port, Chapter 1,	6, 23			The indicative development parcels, and indicative road layout shown in this map are not included in the legend and could be misleading. These should be identified in the mapping legend, annotated or further explained in the text of the report as indicative.	
Volume 4, Figure 3	9				
Executive Summary, Chap 1 – Introduction.				“Multi-User Corridor (MUC)” should read “Multi-User Infrastructure Corridor (MUIIC)”	Noted and will be referenced correctly in future publications dealing with this issue
Volume 1 – Project Overview, Chapter 1 – Introduction, Section 1.5.3 Coal Terminal					
Volume 4, Port, Chapter 1 – Project Description					
Department of Employment Economic Development & Innovation (Fisheries)					
Volume 1 Chapter 2 – 2.2.2.13	28	6	11	“Fish Habitat Reserve” should read “declared Fish Habitat Area”	Noted and will be referenced correctly in future publications dealing with this issue

EIS SECTION	PAGE	PARA-GRAPH	LINE	SUBMITTER COMMENT	WARATAH COAL RESPONSE
Department of Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities					
Volume 5 – Appendices, Appendix 10 – Terrestrial Ecology – Mine, Figure 2, Table 2	24 37– 39			Sites Identified as within the Bimblebox do not correlate with Map.	Waratah Coal assumes this refers to a typographical error in paragraph two in which RE 10.3.27 (depicted correctly on the associated map) is incorrectly referred to as 10.3.25 as the subdominant component of RE10.4.3/RE10.3.27. Waratah Coal acknowledges the error. The assessment and mapping of terrestrial flora and vegetation values at the mine site has been completely redone and is presented in the two Flora and Vegetation Reports – contained in the Appendices – Volume 2 of this SEIS
Volume 5 – Appendices, Appendix 10 – Terrestrial Ecology – Mine				Appendix 1 still includes the old description. Table 1 does not include the ornamental snake yet mapping shows its habitat is present within the mine site.	Discrepancies have been resolved refer to the Fauna Assessment Report contained within the Appendices – Volume 2 of this SEIS.
Appendix 1 (Table 1)					
Alpha Coal Management as manager of the South Galilee Coal Project					
Executive Summary, 1.3	12	2	2	It is not clear from the Waratah EIS exactly what the initial capacity of the rail line will be with 50 Mtpa, 56 Mtpa and 60Mtpa all referenced as the initial capacity.	The annual Run-of-mine (ROM) coal production will be 56 Mtpa to produce 40 Mtpa of salable export product coal.
Executive Summary, 1.3	13	2	6		
Executive Summary, 1.3	13	4	4		The rail alignment capacity (tonnage) was initially proposed to be 60Mtpa, but has since been increased to 400Mtpa (ultimate design capacity) to cater for a number of Galilee proponents.
Volume 3 – Rail, Chapter 1 – Project Description, 1.1.2.4	4	1	5		
Volume 3 – Rail, Chapter 1 – Project Description, 1.1.2.4				Waratah Coal claims that it has ‘in principle’ agreement with AMCI (proponents of the Carmichael Coal Project) and the Meijin Group (trading as Macmines Austasia Pty Ltd) regarding third party usage of the proposed rail infrastructure.	Alpha Coal Management has agreed to progress commercial negotiations with Waratah in good faith in relation to rail access and haulage arrangements on Waratah Coal’s proposed rail line.
Volume 3 – Rail, Chapter 1 – Project Description, 1.1.2.5				Alpha Coal Management wished to clarify that it has not entered into a ‘in principle’ agreement with Waratah Coal regarding third party usage of the proposed rail infrastructure as stated by Waratah Coal	
Executive Summary, 1.7.2					

EIS SECTION	PAGE	PARA-GRAPH	LINE	SUBMITTER COMMENT	WARATAH COAL RESPONSE												
Department of Environment and Resource Management																	
Volume 2, Mine, Chapter 8, Groundwater Resources, 8.7	248	1		Implementation of the groundwater monitoring program.	Implementation of the groundwater monitoring program as detailed in Volume 5 Appendix 14, Groundwater, Table 7-2.												
Executive Summary, 1.10, Table 3: Key Approvals required for the Project	25			<p>This table references Development Permit (Water Licence) for the take or interference with water. The statement is incorrect and should be replaced with the following:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Legislation</th> <th>Relevant Authority</th> <th>Action/Approval</th> <th>Timing</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Water Act 2000</td> <td>DERM</td> <td>Water Licence to take or interfere</td> <td>No set statutory timeframe</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Sustainable Planning Act 2009</td> <td>Assessment Managers</td> <td>Operational works that take of interfere with the flow of water</td> <td>In accordance with Statutory timeframes under the Sustainable Planning Act 2009.</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Legislation	Relevant Authority	Action/Approval	Timing	Water Act 2000	DERM	Water Licence to take or interfere	No set statutory timeframe	Sustainable Planning Act 2009	Assessment Managers	Operational works that take of interfere with the flow of water	In accordance with Statutory timeframes under the Sustainable Planning Act 2009.	Noted and will be referenced correctly in future publications dealing with this issue
Legislation	Relevant Authority	Action/Approval	Timing														
Water Act 2000	DERM	Water Licence to take or interfere	No set statutory timeframe														
Sustainable Planning Act 2009	Assessment Managers	Operational works that take of interfere with the flow of water	In accordance with Statutory timeframes under the Sustainable Planning Act 2009.														
Chapter 2, Table 3. Summary of Likely Queensland Government Approvals Required for the Project	24			<p>This table references Development Permit (Water Licence) for the take or interference with water. The statement is incorrect and should be replaced with the following:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Approval/Permit</th> <th>Legislation</th> <th>Relevant Authority</th> <th>Timing</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Water Licence to take or interfere with water</td> <td>Water Act 2000,</td> <td>DERM</td> <td>2012</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Development permit for the operational works for the taking or interfering with water</td> <td>Sustainable Planning Act 2009</td> <td>DERM</td> <td>2012</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Approval/Permit	Legislation	Relevant Authority	Timing	Water Licence to take or interfere with water	Water Act 2000,	DERM	2012	Development permit for the operational works for the taking or interfering with water	Sustainable Planning Act 2009	DERM	2012	Noted and will be referenced correctly in future publications dealing with this issue, however timing will be 2013
Approval/Permit	Legislation	Relevant Authority	Timing														
Water Licence to take or interfere with water	Water Act 2000,	DERM	2012														
Development permit for the operational works for the taking or interfering with water	Sustainable Planning Act 2009	DERM	2012														

EIS SECTION	PAGE	PARA- GRAPH	LINE	SUBMITTER COMMENT	WARATAH COAL RESPONSE
Volume 1 – Project Overview, Chapter 2, 2.2.2.16	29	1	6	“An application for a Riverine Protection Permit (RPP) to divert water from water courses during construction and mine operational activities will be sort prior to the commencement of construction activities” should read “A water licence to interfere with the flow under the Water Act 2000 and a development permit for the operational works to interfere with the flow of water by diversion will be required under the Sustainable Planning Act 2009 for any diversion of a water course.”	Noted and will be referenced correctly in future publications dealing with this issue
Section 2.2.3,	7			“A summary of the emission factors used is provided in Figure 2.2” should read “A summary of the emission factors used is provided in Table 2.2.”	Should any future reference be made to this table, it will note the typographical error as suggested.
Volume 5, Appendix 14, Groundwater, Table 7-1 Mitigation Measures	7-1			<p>In this table a management requirement of ‘Impacts on farm bores’ has been identified. The management measure has been identified as follows:</p> <p>“Where drawdown impacts farm bores, replacement bores and pumps should be drilled to either intersect deeper areas of the aquifers currently being used or to access deeper aquifers below the level of mining. Waratah Coal may enter into agreements with the landowners regarding these options prior to mining.” This should be reworded as follows “be reworded as follows:</p> <p>“Where the operation of the mine impacts on farm bores and the make good agreement provides for a replacement bore, the existing supply should be replaced. The replacement supply will be of the same quality and or better. Options for replacing supplies will include replacing pumps to supply water from a deeper level, drilling bores to access deeper sections of the existing aquifer or to access deeper aquifers below the level of mining. Waratah Coal will enter into agreements with landowners, prior to mining commencing, where it is predicted that mining will impact on the farm bores belonging to those landowners.</p> <p>Agreements will also be entered into with those landowners who are predicted to be affected after mining ceases, for alternative water supplies or other agreed rectification measures”</p>	Noted and will be referenced correctly in future publications dealing with this issue

EIS SECTION	PAGE	PARA-GRAPH	LINE	SUBMITTER COMMENT	WARATAH COAL RESPONSE
Volume 5, Appendix 13, Aquatic Ecology, Section 3.10, Artesian Spring Communities, Stygofauna,	3-20)			<p>There appears to be confusion between an ‘aquifer ecosystem’ and a ‘spring community’. Aquifer ecosystems occur within subterranean water-bearing rock formations whereas, spring communities are surface wetland features that have groundwater connection.</p> <p>Section 3.10 of the EIS should be reworded to read Aquifer Ecosystems – Stygofauna.</p>	<p>This SEIS references either stygofauna or Groundwater Dependent Ecosystems (GDEs)</p>
Volume 2, Mine, Section 3.5.9, Decommissioning and Rehabilitation Phase	136			<p>This section is poorly worded. It is unclear what Waratah Coal will facilitate.</p>	<p>Noted. A Decommissioning and Rehabilitation section is contained in the Draft Mine EM Plan (see the Appendices – Volume 2 of this SEIS) – refer to section 9.6.3-9.9</p>
Volume 5, Appendix 7, Contaminated Land - Appendices A – E				<p>Volume 5, Appendix 7, Appendices A – E of the EIS have not been provided for review and assessment.</p>	<p>Noted. The EIS Volume 5 Appendix 1, Appendices A - E are included in the Appendices – Volume 2 of this SEIS.</p>
Volume 5 Appendices, Appendix 20, Appendix D, Table 26				<p>According to the guideline, Planning for noise control, the tonal adjustment (K1) should be 2dBA if just detectable and 5dBA if prominent. The impulse adjustment should be 2dBA if just detectable and 5dBA if prominent.</p> <p>The EIS Table 26 should be amended accordingly, including all repeated versions of Table 26 within the EIS.</p>	<p>The updated table regarding adjustments for tonality and impulsivity from the DERM guideline has been included in the revised Planning noise levels in Section 3 and Appendix A of the Supplementary Noise Assessment Report contained in Appendices – Volume 2 of this SEIS.</p>
Volume 4 Port, Chapter 2, Section 2.2.8				<p>Figure 17 could not be located in Volume 5, Appendix 20 of the EIS</p>	<p>Port components are no longer part of the scope of the EIS/SEIS</p>
Volume 3 Rail, Chapter 11, Section 11.1				<p>It is mentioned in the Introduction that this Chapter identifies sensitive receptors. It seems that the receptors are identified in Volume 5, Appendix 20. The quality objective of the sensitive receptors are however identified 11.2.3.</p> <p>The EIS should either corrects the paragraph so as to point the reader to where the sensitive receptors are identified, or amends the EIS to read ‘the quality objective of the sensitive receptors are identified.’</p>	<p>Figure 1 (Location of Sensitive Receptors and Monitoring Locations Adjacent to the Proposed Rail Alignment) presented in the EIS Volume 5 - Appendix 20, pg 419, identifies the sensitive receptors used. Therefore no amendments are required.</p> <p>Location of sensitive receptors along the rail are shown in Figure 2 of Appendix B of the Supplementary Noise Assessment Report contained in Appendices – Volume 2 of this SEIS.</p>

EIS SECTION	PAGE	PARA-GRAPH	LINE	SUBMITTER COMMENT	WARATAH COAL RESPONSE
Volume 3 Rail, Chapter 11, Section 11.2.4.1.2				Table 2 in the EIS was derived in Volume 5 Appendix 20 Appendix C. This section should reference Volume 5 Appendix 20 Appendix C for the derivation of the values.	Updated design planning levels are provided in the Supplementary Noise Assessment Report contained in Appendices – Volume 2 of this SEIS, and the derivation is provided in Appendix A of the same report.
Volume 3 Rail, Chapter 11, Section 11.2.4.1.2				In Table 2 the value for Day time value for Other Areas should be 37 and not 39. However all the derivation of this table needs to be revisited as per Issues discussed above.	Waratah Coal acknowledge that the daytime planning noise level of 39dBA shown for “Other areas” in the referenced table does contain a typographical error. The daytime planning noise level should be 37dBA $L_{Aeq,1hour,adj}$ The updated table of the design planning levels for each receiver (proximity to highways and others) is shown in Table
Volume 3 Rail, Chapter 11, Section 11.2.4.1.2				Table 3 is a reproduction from Volume 5 Appendix 20 Appendix C Table 26. The EIS should reference Volume 5 Appendix 20 Appendix C for the derivation of the values of Table 3. Table 3 should be amended to reflect previous issue of the table in Volume 5 Appendix 20 Appendix D.	3. Design PNLs at Residential Receivers (outdoors) Table 3 in the response to Issue reference 16005. The derivation for these calculations is shown in Appendix A of the Supplementary Noise Assessment Report contained in Appendices – Volume 2 of this SEIS. The daytime planning noise levels for the areas isolated from transportation corridors ranges from 28dBA to 41dBA $L_{Aeq,1hour,adj}$. As described in Issue Reference 16001 and 16002, the updated table regarding adjustments for tonality and impulsivity from the DERM guideline has been included in the revised Planning noise levels in Section 3 of the Supplementary Noise Assessment Report contained in Appendices – Volume 2 of this SEIS, and the derivation is contained in Appendix A of the same document.

EIS SECTION	PAGE	PARA-GRAPH	LINE	SUBMITTER COMMENT	WARATAH COAL RESPONSE
Volume 3 Rail, Chapter 11, Section 11.2.4.2, Table 4				<p>The RBL values are based only on the measurement of site N1-Salisbury Plain in the first line table 4 and site N6 – Lambton Meadow for the second line.</p> <p>Table 2 from Volume 5 Appendix 20 gives the rating background noise levels. The EIS should either include all the rating background noise levels in the proximity of the railway (6 according to text) in the calculation, or state and explain why site N1 and site N6 are the only sites used for rating background noise levels.</p>	<p>The “representative six locations” mentioned in the text is a typographical error. This should read “representative two locations”. These two areas are representative of receiver areas which are in “Proximity to Bruce Highway west of Bowen” and “Other remote rural areas”. This categorisation is dependent on the proximity of the receptors to existing transport corridors.</p> <p>The updated table of the design planning levels for each receiver (proximity to highways and others) is shown in Table 3 in the response to Issue Reference 16005. The derivation for these calculations is shown in Appendix A of the Supplementary Noise Assessment Report contained in Appendices – Volume 2 of this SEIS</p>
Volume 3 Rail, Chapter 11, Section 11.2.4.2, Table 5				<p>In Table 5 the title of the first column should be reworded as “Typical Noise Reduction NR (dBA)” unless the noise reduction has been measured.</p>	<p>Table 5 first column title is “Typical Façade Noise Reduction”. This table is a direct reproduction of Table 7 of DERM guideline Planning for noise control. This could be modified to be clearer by including a unit type in brackets: “Typical Façade Noise Reduction (dBA)”, though it is considered that this heading requires no further modification, as it was not measured and is what the guideline describes as typical.</p>
Volume 3 Rail, Chapter 11, Section 11.2.4.2				<p>In the final paragraph of this section the units are not correct for the transient pass-by event. The EIS should correct the unit to dBA (max LpA).</p>	<p>This was a typographical error, and has been corrected in the Supplementary Noise Assessment Report contained in Appendices – Volume 2 of this SEIS.</p>
Volume 2, Chapter 9, Table 1	252			<p>The Queensland Water Quality Guideline for Conductivity in the Belyando-Suttor Zone is incorrectly presented in of the Surface Water Resources Chapter</p>	<p>The technical reports for Aquatic Ecology and Water Quality, and the draft Mine EM Plan, contain the correct values (where relevant). All are contained in the Appendices – Volume 2 of this SEIS.</p>

EIS SECTION	PAGE	PARA-GRAPH	LINE	SUBMITTER COMMENT	WARATAH COAL RESPONSE
Volume 2, Chapter 9 , Table 2	252			The ANZECC and ARMCANZ Guidelines for 95% species protection tabulated in Table 2 of the Surface Water Resources Section (Chapter 9,) contain a number of errors.	The technical reports for Aquatic Ecology and Water Quality, and the draft Mine EM Plan, contain the correct values (where relevant). All are contained in the Appendices – Volume 2 of this SEIS.
Volume 2, Chapter 9 , Table 7 and Table 3-2 of Appendix 15				The EIS presents a summary of baseline water quality results for the Upper Belyando Catchment in both Table 7 (of Surface Water Resources, Chapter 9) and in Table 3-2 (of Appendix 15). The data presented in these tables do not match each other and it is not clear which data set is an accurate reflection of water quality data collected to date.	The technical reports for Aquatic Ecology and Water Quality, and the draft Mine EM Plan, contain the correct values (where relevant). All are contained in the Appendices – Volume 2 of this SEIS.
Volume 1, Chapter 7, EMP				The EM Plan is incorrectly titled “Emergency Management Plan: Mine” at the top of each page. This should read Environmental Management Plan	The revised Draft Mine EM Plan contained in the Appendices – Volume 2 of this SEIS contains the correct header.
Department of Local Government and Planning (DLGP)					
Volume 4, Chapter 2, 2.2.3.2 Nature and Conservation Reserves	19			The reference to the Parsons Brinckerhoff report is incorrect and needs to be updated. The correct reference for this paragraph is : Office of the Coordinator-General, Land and Infrastructure Study for the Central Portion of the APSDA, 2010.	If required in future correct reference will be made to this report.
Private submitter – name withheld					
Executive Summary, Section 3.1.7.1 and Volume 2, Chapter 6, Section 6.3	34 and 4			Bimblebox Nature Refuge is referred to in the Executive Summary as being of Local Significance within the Desert Uplands Biodiversity Planning Assessment, whilst Volume 2, Chapter 6, Section 6.3, page 4 refers to it as being of State Significance. Bimblebox Nature Refuge is listed as being of State Significance, not Local Significance	Waratah acknowledges that there was an erroneous description of the BNR being of Local Significance in the Executive Summary, but as noted by the submitter, the proper description of the BNR being of State Significance, is given in Volume 2, Chapter 6, pg 4 and also in Volume 5 Appendix 10B, pg 33.
Appendix 14, Section 2.2and Appendix 14, Section 6.1.1	2-2, 6-1,			Issues with regards to the Great Artesian Basin (GAB) and how it is represented in the EIS	Waratah Coal acknowledges that the EIS did not have the correct position for the GAB boundary. It was previously incorrectly reported in the EIS as the base of the Clematis Sandstone, which is the most easterly recharge aquifer of the GAB. The Groundwater Assessment has been completely revised and is presented in the Appendices – Volume 2 of this SEIS. Particular attention has been paid to the GAB.