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17.1 Introduction

A stakeholder and community consultation program was undertaken to assist in the preparation of the Red Hill Mining Lease (the project) environmental impact statement (EIS), including the development of the social impact assessment (SIA).

BHP Billiton Mitsubishi Alliance (BMA) has undertaken a range of consultation activities since 2008 associated with proposed expansions and greenfield development options for the project. These consultations have generally been undertaken jointly with BMA’s broader portfolio wide consultation activities associated with existing operations and proposed expansion projects in the Bowen Basin.

During 2011-2012, BMA conducted extensive consultation for the the project, including with State Government agencies at local, regional and central levels, Isaac Regional Council (IRC), the Moranbah BMA Community Network (BCN) and key organisations such as the Mackay Isaac Whitsunday Regional Economic Development Corporation. The forums for ongoing consultation will be focused around existing BMA frameworks, including the community network forums for engagement with stakeholders.

17.2 Approach

BMA’s existing operational mines are Blackwater, Broadmeadow, Goonyella Riverside, Peak Downs, Saraji, Crinum and Daunia. The Norwich Park and Gregory Open Cut Mines ceased production in May and October 2012 respectively, and as of the date of publication of this document remain in care and maintenance. BMA also owns and operates the Hay Point coal export terminal near Mackay. The Caval Ridge Mine is currently under construction and will become operational in 2014.

Through its existing operational mines and the Caval Ridge Mine, BMA maintains a strong community network and ongoing stakeholder engagement program to assess and monitor impacts associated with its activities.

BMA has a 40 year history of working with communities in the Bowen Basin. BMA aims to build strong relationships with communities by engaging stakeholders in transparent, two-way dialogue as part of a values-based stakeholder engagement approach.

Consultation on the project has occurred in various phases since 2008 (see Table 17-1 for further details). Wherever possible, project consultation has been integrated into BMA’s existing engagement processes and activities. This has ensured that stakeholders can gain an understanding of the project, its impacts and opportunities within the context of BMA’s overall business strategy.

In addition, the project’s consultation approach is aligned with the BHP Billiton Charter, Code of Business Conduct and Group Level Documents for Community and Major Capital Projects (Mineral) and various Queensland and Commonwealth statutory requirements.

The objectives of the project’s consultation program are to:

- provide a transparent process for stakeholders to participate in the assessment of the project;
- provide opportunities for BMA to obtain information from stakeholders that will inform impact assessments and proposed mitigation options;
provide opportunities for stakeholders to raise issues and concerns and provide feedback on the project; and

continue to build upon BMA’s long-term relationships with stakeholders of Bowen Basin communities.

To meet consultation objectives and statutory requirements, the project used a stakeholder identification process to determine how and when to consult stakeholders during the development of the EIS. A full list of stakeholders consulted is outlined in Appendix E.

For the purposes of the EIS, stakeholders are grouped as follows:

- landholders within and adjacent to the EIS study area;
- traditional owner representatives;
- interested parties, including:
  - non-government organisations:
    - community services providers (social services, community development, health and childcare); and
    - business and industry groups;
  - residents and community members from Moranbah and the greater Isaac and Mackay local government areas; and
  - BMA employees.
- Government, including:
  - Commonwealth Government agencies and elected representatives;
  - Queensland Government agencies and elected representatives; and
  - local government and elected representatives.

Several consultation methods have been used to develop the EIS. These have been based on existing BMA consultation mechanisms, project and business requirements and the knowledge and understanding of stakeholders and their capacity to participate in consultation at particular points in time.

Consultation has been supported by communication tools that provide information specific to the project and BMA’s existing operations, and enable input to be recorded and monitored. Tools included an email address, reply-paid mail address, free-call number, stakeholder letters, public notices and advertising, employee communication, fact sheets, website information and regular updates at BCN meetings.

BMA records all stakeholder feedback and results of every consultation activity via a web-based stakeholder database, the Consultation Manager, Version 1.

Consultation Manager records all instances of contact with the community, helps track stakeholders, details of issues raised by stakeholders, and captures the response by BMA, either specific to a particular project or on a portfolio wide basis.

BMA will continue to regularly revise and update its consultation approach, methods and communication materials to respond to feedback and stakeholder needs.
17.3 Phases of Consultation

As stated previously, consultation regarding the project has been undertaken in various forms since 2008. Information has been collated over this time and utilised in the development and update of the project’s EIS. Table 17-1 provides an overview of these phases. Further detail on how stakeholders were engaged is included in Section 17.4.

17.4 Stakeholder Participation Stage

17.4.1 2008 to 2010 Consultation Phase

BMA provided the Bowen Basin Coal Growth Project (BBCGP) Initial Advice Statement (IAS) to the Queensland Government in May 2008. On 18 July 2008, BBCGP was declared a ‘significant project, for which an EIS is required’. A single TOR for the BBCGP was subsequently drafted and finalised following a public consultation period.

The project was a part of the BBCGP, which consisted of new mine developments Daunia and Caval Ridge, an expansion of Goonyella Riverside Mine (GRM) and a proposed relocation and upgrade of Moranbah Airport.

Consultation methods used during this period focused on stakeholder participation in the EIS processes for Daunia and Caval Ridge Mines, and informing community members and stakeholders of BMA’s general plans in Moranbah and the Isaac region.

Due to market conditions at the time, studies into the expansion of GRM were slowed and further external consultation ceased. In 2011, the underground component of the studies was identified as a greenfield mine opportunity, and named the RHM. Consultation on this project was undertaken to develop the EIS (refer Table 17-1).

17.4.2 2011 to 2012 Consultation Phase

During November 2011 – March 2012 consultation was undertaken with stakeholders to develop baseline assessments, impact assessments and mitigation options detailed in the EIS, including:

- targeted discussions with specific stakeholders;
- briefings with local government and government agencies; and
- public information displays to encourage general community feedback on various elements of the project.

During this time, a total of 560 people were consulted. This involved a broad range of stakeholder groups and included 47 one-on-one and small group meetings. In addition:

- 364 people visited the project’s four public information displays and 62 feedback forms were received;
- 300 project overview fact sheets were distributed via public information displays and stakeholder meetings; and
- the project factsheet was downloaded on 149 occasions from BHP Billiton’s website.

This process enabled the project team to collect, analyse and report on a significant body of data related to impacts, benefits and opportunities. It also provided an opportunity for stakeholders with specific knowledge to contribute to the development of appropriate mitigation options.
## Table 17-1 Consultation Phases Overview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phases</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2011-2012</th>
<th>2012-2013</th>
<th>2014+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Name</strong></td>
<td>Bowen Basin Coal Growth Projects (BBCGP) (Goonyella Riverside Expansion)</td>
<td>Red Hill Project</td>
<td>Red Hill Mining Lease</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EIS stage</strong></td>
<td>IAS and Terms of Reference (TOR) development</td>
<td>EIS development (develop baseline, assess impacts and opportunities)</td>
<td>IAS and TOR development</td>
<td>EIS development (test baseline, update impacts and opportunities)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regulatory requirements</strong></td>
<td>• stakeholder input into TOR; • stakeholder engagement plan aligns with TOR; and • final TOR available on project and government websites.</td>
<td>• prepare consultation chapter for draft EIS; • stakeholder input into EIS and project design; and • consult with stakeholders about potential social impacts and opportunities.</td>
<td>• stakeholder input into TOR; • stakeholder engagement plan aligns with TOR; and • final TOR available on project and government websites.</td>
<td>• prepare consultation chapter for draft EIS; and • stakeholder input into EIS and project design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall purpose of consultation</strong></td>
<td>• Provide transparent information on BBCGP and BMA’s growth plans for TOR input.</td>
<td>• Provide transparent and up to date information on the project and BMA growth plans following a change to market conditions and further</td>
<td>• Provide transparent and up to date information changes to project timing based on current market conditions. • Obtain stakeholder feedback for consideration into TOR and project design.</td>
<td>• Provide transparent information on project impacts and opportunities. • Provide opportunity to comment on EIS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• submission of supplementary EIS to Coordinator-General for final approval.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phases</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>2011-2012</td>
<td>2012-2013</td>
<td>2014+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Name</td>
<td>Bowen Basin Coal Growth Projects (BBCGP) (Goonyella Riverside Expansion)</td>
<td>Red Hill Project</td>
<td>Red Hill Mining Lease</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EIS stage</td>
<td>IAS and Terms of Reference (TOR) development</td>
<td>EIS development (develop baseline, assess impacts and opportunities)</td>
<td>IAS and TOR development</td>
<td>EIS development (test baseline, update impacts and opportunities)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Engineering studies.
- Develop and verify desktop baseline, studies and impact assessments.
- Obtain stakeholder feedback for consideration by the EIS and project design teams.

- Ongoing verification of the 2012 consultation findings, social baseline and impact assessments and contemporise as appropriate to finalise the EIS.
- July 2013 BCN meeting provided a description of the project and timing for the EIS preparation and future public notification.
- July IRC BCN meeting – Further description of the project provided to the IRC relating to the EIS preparation and future consultation.
- Monitor feedback and currency of issues through BMA’s community liaison personnel.
- Representation at Community meetings to gauge key issues.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phases</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2011-2012</th>
<th>2012-2013</th>
<th>2014+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Name</td>
<td>Bowen Basin Coal Growth Projects (BBCGP) (Goonyella Riverside Expansion)</td>
<td>Red Hill Project</td>
<td>Red Hill Mining Lease</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EIS stage</td>
<td>IAS and Terms of Reference (TOR) development</td>
<td>EIS development (develop baseline, assess impacts and opportunities)</td>
<td>IAS and TOR development</td>
<td>EIS development (test baseline, update impacts and opportunities)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Consultation methods | One-on-one and group meetings with:  
- landholders adjacent to the project site;  
- traditional owner representatives;  
- interested parties; and  
- Government.  
- static information displays; and  
- public information displays.  
- IRC  
- BBCGP BCN;  
- Moranbah BCN;  
- static information displays;  
- public information displays; and  
- feedback forms.  
- Briefing to Moranbah BCN; | One-on-one and group meetings with:  
- landholders adjacent to the project site;  
- traditional owner representatives;  
- interested parties; and  
- Government.  
- Briefing to Moranbah BCN; | One-on-one and group meetings with:  
- landholders adjacent to the project site;  
- traditional owner representatives;  
- interested parties; and  
- Government.  
- Briefing to Moranbah BCN; | One-on-one and group meetings with:  
- landholders adjacent to the project site;  
- traditional owner representatives;  
- interested parties; and  
- Government.  
- Moranbah BCN;  
- static information displays;  
- public information displays; and  
- feedback forms.  
- To be determined. |
## Phases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phases</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2011-2012</th>
<th>2012-2013</th>
<th>2014+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Name</td>
<td>Bowen Basin Coal Growth Projects (BBCGP) (Goonyella Riverside Expansion)</td>
<td>Red Hill Project</td>
<td>Red Hill Mining Lease</td>
<td>Red Hill Mining Lease</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### EIS stage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EIS stage</th>
<th>IAS and Terms of Reference (TOR) development</th>
<th>EIS development (develop baseline, assess impacts and opportunities)</th>
<th>IAS and TOR development</th>
<th>EIS development (test baseline, update impacts and opportunities)</th>
<th>Draft EIS comment period</th>
<th>Supplementary EIS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>email address; free-call number; public notices and advertising; employee communication; fact sheets; newsletters; and website.</td>
<td>email address; reply-paid mail address; free-call number; stakeholder letters; public notices and advertising; employee communication; fact sheets; and website.</td>
<td>email address; reply-paid mail address; free-call number; stakeholder letters; public notices and advertising; employee communication; fact sheets; and website.</td>
<td>Public notices and advertising regarding public information display</td>
<td>email address; reply-paid mail address; free-call number; stakeholder letters; public notices and advertising; employee communication; fact sheets; and website.</td>
<td>email address; reply-paid mail address; free-call number; stakeholder letters; public notices and advertising; employee communication; fact sheets; and website.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Communication tools

- email address;
- free-call number;
- public notices and advertising;
- employee communication;
- fact sheets;
- newsletters; and website.

Note 1: the project was presented to the community along with other planned projects within BMA’s BBCGP.
17.4.2.1 Consultation Methods and Communication Tools

Table 17-2 provides an overview of how consultation methods and supporting communication tools were used with each stakeholder group.

Table 17-2 Overview of Consultation Methods and Supporting Communication Tools (November 2011 to March 2012)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder group</th>
<th>Methods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Landholders directly impacted and adjacent to the project | Consultation methods:  
  - One-on-one meetings (commercial and EIS related).  
  Communication tools:  
    - email address, reply-paid mail address and free-call number;  
    - stakeholder letters;  
    - public notices and advertising;  
    - fact sheets; and  
    - website. |
| Traditional owner representatives                      | Consultation methods:  
  - one-on-one meetings (native title, cultural heritage and EIS related); and  
  - BCN.  
  Communication tools:  
    - email address, reply-paid mail address and free-call number;  
    - stakeholder letters;  
    - public notices and advertising;  
    - fact sheets; and  
    - website. |
| Interested parties:                                    | Consultation methods:  
  - one-on-one and small group meetings;  
  - BBCGP BCN;  
  - Moranbah BCN briefings;  
  - community information sessions;  
  - static information displays;  
  - public information displays; and  
  - feedback forms.  
  Communication tools:  
    - email address, reply-paid mail address and free-call number;  
    - stakeholder letters;  
    - public notices and advertising;  
    - employee communication;  
    - fact sheets; and  
    - website. |
|                                                       |                                                                         |
### Stakeholder and Community Consultation

**Government:**
- Commonwealth Government agencies and elected representatives; and
- Local government and elected representatives.

**Consultation methods:**
- One-on-one meetings and small group meetings;
- BBCGP BCN; and
- Moranbah BCN briefings.

**Communication tools:**
- Email address, reply-paid mail address and free-call number;
- Stakeholder letters;
- Public notices and advertising;
- Fact sheets; and
- Website.

#### 17.4.2.2 Representation of Stakeholder Groups

The majority of the face to face consultation was completed via one-on-one and group meetings during the 2011 and 2012 period (Figure 17-1). This created an appropriate environment to engage in two way discussion about key project impacts and mitigations. This approach also allowed key stakeholders to be consulted about a number of projects, reducing the potential for consultation fatigue and providing greater context around the extent and impact of BMA’s broader operations in the Bowen Basin (Figure 17-2).

**Figure 17-1 Consultation by Activity**

![Consultation by Activity Chart]

- Feedback form: 55%
- Meeting - group: 19%
- Meeting - one on one: 19%
- Public information display: 4%
- BCN meeting: 3%
17.4.2.3 Stakeholder Engagement Methods

Stakeholder Meetings
To maximise understanding of stakeholder issues, a number of one-on-one and small group meetings were held with:

- landholders;
- Traditional Owner representatives;
- local, regional and Queensland-based non-government organisations;
- Commonwealth and Queensland Government agencies and elected representatives; and
- local government and elected representatives.

This method was chosen to allow time for in-depth discussion between stakeholders and project representatives.

To reduce the potential for ‘consultation fatigue’, Red Hill meetings were coordinated, where appropriate, with BMA’s Saraji East and Caval Ridge consultation processes.
Additionally, the project team worked with the BMA Communities team to coordinate operational and project engagement with stakeholders where possible, and utilised existing operational consultation activities.

Meetings were supported by communication tools (e.g. PowerPoint presentations and the project fact sheet), copies of which were provided to participants to take away from the meetings.

**BMA Community Networks**

During 2011-13 BMA has had two BCNs to provide a wide cross-section of community representatives with opportunities to engage with BMA on a regular basis and to gather members’ feedback and input.

The BBCGP BCN was established in response to a condition of the Coordinator-General’s approval for Caval Ridge Mine (further information can be found at [www.bhpbilliton.com/regulatoryinformation](http://www.bhpbilliton.com/regulatoryinformation)) to act as a forum for BMA to identify and understand broader potential community impacts, mitigation options and opportunities resulting from the growth projects. The BCN’s 12 members include representatives from local health and community services, schools and businesses, traditional owner representatives, and government.

Additionally, as part of its five-year community strategy for existing operations, BMA has established BCNs across each of its host communities of Blackwater, Emerald, Dysart, Moranbah and Mackay. These BCNs are a forum for BMA to engage with host communities, listen to their needs, and understand the impacts and opportunities associated with its operations. The networks include representation from local health and community services, schools and businesses, workforce partners, Indigenous and traditional owner representatives, and government. The networks play an important role in identifying priority community development projects within a host community.

**Public Information Displays**

During 2011 and 2012, public information displays were used during the development of the EIS. The displays provided opportunities for the project to directly engage with local residents, BMA employees and community members about the project, and to encourage their input into the consultation process. To date, four public information displays have been held to ensure the general community have had opportunity to be involved in consultation about the project.

In order to attract maximum participation, venues for the public information displays were selected based on traffic volumes and accessibility. Advertisements placed in the general news sections of local newspapers were the main vehicle for promoting venues and dates for the public information displays, as described below.

Details of where the public information displays were held, as well as attendance at each display, are provided in **Table 17-3**.
Table 17-3  Public Information Display Locations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Venue</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Attendance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Moranbah</td>
<td>Moranbah Lions Markets</td>
<td>Sunday 27 November 2011</td>
<td>7am-12pm</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mackay</td>
<td>Mackay Caneland Central</td>
<td>Saturday 3 December 2011</td>
<td>9am-1.30pm</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moranbah</td>
<td>Moranbah Fair Shopping Centre</td>
<td>Thursday 2 February 2012</td>
<td>4pm-7:30pm</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mackay</td>
<td>Mackay Showground Markets</td>
<td>Saturday 4 February 2012</td>
<td>6am-11am</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The public information displays provided stakeholders with an opportunity to gain an understanding of the project and BMA’s growth plans. Community members could collect project information to read or complete in their own time (e.g. the project overview fact sheet and feedback form). They could also speak with BMA personnel about the project and the EIS, plus explore any potential impacts and benefits.

A register was available for people to list any key issues and provide contact details to be added to the stakeholder database. Stakeholder feedback, provided in person or through feedback forms, assisted the project team to gather data on general community issues regarding the project. Figure 17-3 depicts the display used in Mackay.

Figure 17-3  Public Information Display, Mackay Caneland Central

Feedback Forms

Feedback forms with reply-paid postage were included as tear-off sections to the project overview fact sheets. These were either distributed directly to stakeholders or provided at public information display locations where stakeholders could fill out the form or take it away to complete in their own time. The
form gave stakeholders the opportunity to provide additional feedback about potential impacts and benefits. A copy of the form is found in Appendix E.

A total of 62 stakeholders and community members provided feedback responses.

**Communication Tools**

Communication tools were developed to support consultation activities and provide further detailed information about the project, BMA’s growth plans and the EIS process. These were also used as standalone tools to respond to general enquiries and provide a project overview to the wider community.

**Email Address, Reply-Paid Mail Address and Free-Call Number**

The project email address (metcoalinfo@bhpbilliton.com); reply-paid mail address (BHP Billiton Mitsubishi Alliance, Reply Paid 1430, Brisbane QLD 4001); and free-call number (1800 078 797) has been used by the project.

These contact details enabled stakeholders to contact the project team with queries relating to the project or to provide feedback regarding its planning and development (refer to Section 17.4.5). They were advertised on project communication materials including newspaper advertisements and the project overview fact sheet.

BMA provides 24-hour coverage of the free-call number; during office hours it is staffed by project team members and after hours by a message centre. Any after-hours calls are promptly followed-up by the project team to ensure a timely response to all contact received.

**Stakeholder Letters**

Stakeholder letters were used by the project as the first contact with relevant stakeholders to provide them with an overview of the project, the EIS process and to encourage contact with the project for a follow-up appointment at a time that was convenient. Project overview fact sheets were included with each letter.

Following one-on-one and small group meetings, the project also distributed letters thanking stakeholders for their participation in the EIS process and encouraging their input into later stages of the consultation program.

**Public Notices and Advertising**

To advertise public information displays, the project ran prominent display advertisements in the news sections of relevant newspapers in Moranbah and the greater Isaac and Mackay local government areas.

Advertisements outlined BMA’s operations and potential growth plans in the Bowen Basin, provided a brief overview of the project and invited participation in the consultation process by contacting BMA or attending a public information display where they could speak directly with a project representative.

Table 17-4 details the advertising schedule and projected reach of these advertisements. Appendix E contains a sample advertisement.
Table 17-4  Advertising Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Publication</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Readership/ Circulation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Friday 18 November 2011</td>
<td>Mackay Daily Mercury</td>
<td>15cm x 3 columns (11.1cm)</td>
<td>13,690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday 19 November 2011</td>
<td>Mackay Daily Mercury</td>
<td>15cm x 3 columns (11.1cm)</td>
<td>18,081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday 23 November 2011</td>
<td>Mackay Daily Mercury</td>
<td>15cm x 3 columns (11.1cm)</td>
<td>13,690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday 23 November 2011</td>
<td>Moranbah and District Advertiser</td>
<td>18.7cm x 13cm</td>
<td>4,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday 26 November 2011</td>
<td>Mackay Daily Mercury</td>
<td>15cm x 3 columns (11.1cm)</td>
<td>18,081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday 30 November 2011</td>
<td>Mackay Daily Mercury</td>
<td>17cm x 3 columns (11.1cm)</td>
<td>13,690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday 21 January 2012</td>
<td>Mackay Daily Mercury</td>
<td>17cm x 3 columns (11.1cm)</td>
<td>17,384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday 25 January 2012</td>
<td>Mackay Daily Mercury</td>
<td>17cm x 3 columns (11.1cm)</td>
<td>13,367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday 28 January 2012</td>
<td>Mackay Daily Mercury</td>
<td>17cm x 3 columns (11.1cm)</td>
<td>17,384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday 2 February 2012</td>
<td>Mackay Daily Mercury</td>
<td>17cm x 3 columns (11.1cm)</td>
<td>13,367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday 4 February 2012</td>
<td>Mackay Daily Mercury</td>
<td>17cm x 3 columns (11.1cm)</td>
<td>17,384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday 1 February 2012</td>
<td>Moranbah and District Advertiser</td>
<td>187mm high x 130mm wide</td>
<td>4,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Employee Communication**

*B MAG*, BMA’s internal newsletter distributed to all employees, was utilised to provide information on the project, the EIS process and how employees could provide their input. Public information display times and locations were also advertised via this process.

The project team also spoke directly with BMA employees during public information displays in Moranbah and Mackay, and at various internal meetings.

**Fact Sheets**

An A4, six-page illustrated project overview fact sheet was developed to provide easy to understand and transparent information about the project for stakeholders and community members, and to support consultation activities during 2012.

Fact sheets were distributed at briefings and stakeholder meetings, and made available at public information displays. They were also distributed via mail to stakeholders the project had provided briefings to, and to community members who contacted the project team via the BMA contact points. In addition, a copy was posted on BHP Billiton’s website. A copy of this fact sheet can be found in Appendix E.

Additional fact sheets will be produced in response to specific stakeholder questions and to provide updates on the progress of the project approval process.
Website
Information on the project, including information on the EIS process and opportunities for involvement in the consultation program, was made available on BHP Billiton’s website (www.bhpbilliton.com/regulatoryinformation).

Communication materials such as the project overview fact sheet and stakeholder letters promoted the website address.

From 1 November 2011 to 16 March 2012, the project factsheet was downloaded on 149 occasions from BHP Billiton’s website.

17.4.3 2012 to 2013 Consultation Phase
Updates on the status of the project EIS are provided at the Moranbah BCN. These meetings provide BMA with an opportunity to describe the project and its current status, maintain awareness of the key issues and strategies currently being delivered in the community, and gauge preliminary feedback on the key social and community issues which the group considers important for the project.

The project will continue to work with the BCN throughout the EIS process and maintain reliance on that group as the key forum to provide feedback on the project and to monitor the effectiveness of existing BMA strategies. Targeted consultation will also occur with identified groups throughout the EIS consultation phase, as described in Appendix E.

17.4.3.1 Draft EIS Comment Period
The draft EIS public comment period will be the primary vehicle by which stakeholders and community members can review and provide formal comment on the EIS to the Queensland Coordinator-General. Stakeholders will also have an opportunity to gain an understanding of the mitigation options associated with the project’s impacts, and the strategies to maximise benefits.

This stage of consultation is a statutory requirement of the State Development and Public Works Organisation Act 1971. The draft EIS public comment period will be widely and prominently advertised at local, regional and state levels.

Consultation during this period focuses on providing opportunities for stakeholders to review the findings of the draft EIS and provide feedback to the project team.

During the release of the draft EIS, the project will use a number of consultation methods including:
- briefings to the IRC and Moranbah BCN;
- public information displays at relevant locations; and
- feedback forms.

Supporting communication tools will include:
- email, reply-paid mail address and free-call number;
- stakeholder letters;
- public notices and/or advertising outlining how to access the draft EIS; dates and locations for static/public information displays and community information sessions; and the submission process;
- BMA’s quarterly eNewsletter;
- employee communication; and
- an updated project page on the BHP Billiton website, with the draft EIS and relevant fact sheets.

17.4.4 2014 to 2015 Consultation Phase

17.4.4.1 Supplementary EIS
On receipt of comments on the EIS, the Coordinator-General will determine whether there is a need for BMA to provide a formal response to comments. If a response is required, BMA will prepare a supplementary EIS addressing all substantive issues raised in relation to the EIS.

Should it be required, BMA will submit the supplementary EIS to the Coordinator-General for a final decision on the project. Stakeholders will be advised of the supplementary EIS lodgement date and where it is available to view.

Following submission of the supplementary EIS, the focus of consultation will shift towards the method and timing for triggering further detailed monitoring and community engagement. These matters will need to be discussed relative to the owner’s future decision on funding and timing for execution of the project.

17.4.5 Feedback and Complaints Process
BMA is committed to working with communities to address concerns fairly and with respect.

To achieve this, BMA has developed feedback and complaints processes in accordance with industry best practice to enable the community to raise issues quickly and easily. The feedback procedure captures both positive and negative input, and details the process by which all feedback must be handled.

Stakeholders can provide feedback and complaints to BMA via:
- free-call number: 1800 078 797;
- email: metcoalinfo@bhpbilliton.com; or
- reply-paid mail address: BHP Billiton Mitsubishi Alliance, Reply Paid 1430, Brisbane QLD 4001.

When investigating issues, BMA ensures it:
- treats all issues and complaints confidentially and with respect;
- investigates the matter thoroughly and objectively;
- keeps the respondent informed throughout the process; and
- acknowledges when it has made a mistake and implements remedial action as quickly as possible.

If a complainant is unhappy with the actions and investigations undertaken by BMA to resolve an issue or complaint, an independent review panel can be convened to review the matter and ensure a fair and equitable process in matters of dispute.

Figure 17-4 provides a schematic of the complaints resolution process. Further information on BMA’s feedback and complaints process is available from the BHP Billiton website.
Figure 17-4 Complaints Resolution Process

Complaints resolution process

1. Complaint received by BMA regarding an issue or concern (construction/operation).
   - Email
   - Letter
   - Telephone/hotline
   - Meeting
   - Community display
   - Other

2. Complaint recorded in the complaints register and forwarded to the relevant BMA department for investigation.

3. Verbal response provided to the complainant by BMA within 48 hours, informing complainant of actions being undertaken to investigate the matter.

4. Internal investigation into the complaint and factors influencing the issue.

5. If the issue is within BMA's control and can be resolved, implement mitigation or management controls.

6. Investigation report including mitigation measures and actions undertaken is recorded in the complaints register.

7. Verbal response is provided to the complainant within seven business days of receipt of original complaint.

8. Detailed written response is provided to the complainant within 10 business days of receipt of the original complaint.

9. If the complainant is happy with the response, the complaint is closed out and result recorded in the register.

10. If the complaint cannot be resolved or is outside BMA's control, develop a detailed report into potential reasons and influencing factors.

11. If the complaintant is unhappy with the response, a manager will review the investigations and make a determination. Response to be recorded in the complaints register.

12. If the complainant requests independent arbitration, BMA to convene review/appeal panel.
17.5 Summary of Consultation Findings

This section provides a summary of the key findings arising from consultation with all identified stakeholder groups during the EIS development stage. An overview of key issues for all stakeholders is provided along with a breakdown of concerns for specific stakeholder groups.

BMA will continue to monitor and update the key community and stakeholder issues in relation to BMA’s existing operations through its engagement with the BCN and targeted consultation activities during the EIS public notification phase.

17.5.1 All Stakeholders

This section lists all issues identified by the stakeholder groups. Five hundred and sixty people were consulted across all stakeholder groups, and 62 specific issues were raised in relation to the project. Most were concerns regarding various potential social impacts. A small number of stakeholders raised concerns about some potential environmental impacts. Figure 17-5 provides an overview of all issues raised by stakeholder groups, focusing specifically on the top 10 issues identified, and are further discussed below.

Figure 17-5 All Issues Raised by Stakeholder Groups

- Housing and/or accommodation affordability: 8%
- Housing and/or accommodation availability: 7%
- Workforce arrangements - remote workforce: 7%
- Attracting and retaining employees: 7%
- Accommodation village: 4%
- Health services: 4%
- Community values: 4%
- Workforce behaviour: 4%
- Community safety: 3%
- Dissatisfaction with government: 3%
- Other: 3%
17.5.1.1 Housing and/or Accommodation Affordability
During consultation, many stakeholders said housing in Moranbah was not affordable and expressed concern that the project could further negatively impact on this issue. It was felt that low housing availability was pushing up purchase prices and rents to unsustainable levels, making it difficult for local businesses and various services to attract and retain workers. Some stakeholders were concerned that a lack of affordable housing would lead to an increased incidence of overcrowded, communal homes, which could impact community safety. Finding available and affordable short-term accommodation for visiting specialists, facilitators, entertainers or trainers was also difficult. Some stakeholders felt this restricted opportunities to attract these people to Moranbah.

A frequently raised issue was the lack of housing (especially family housing) in Moranbah and the Greater IRC and Mackay Regional Council areas. Many stakeholders felt the growth of mining in the Bowen Basin had increased the need for rental and permanent housing to accommodate workers directly employed at the region’s mines and/or those employed by mining service and support contractors. This was placing pressure on already limited housing stock, particularly in Moranbah. Some stakeholders also raised concern about mining and other industry contractors using family homes to house groups of employees in a single residence, creating a form of communal housing. Many stakeholders were concerned about the project’s impact to the current housing issue and wanted to know how the issue, in general, was going to be addressed over the long term by both BMA and the Queensland Government.

Housing costs for both purchase and rental have decreased significantly since 2012, easing some concerns about housing affordability. However, Moranbah’s housing costs remain higher than those in coastal centres. IRC and the community remain focussed on improving access to and affordability of housing in Moranbah.

17.5.1.2 Remote Workforce Arrangements
Most stakeholders based in Moranbah and the greater Isaac region expressed a number of concerns in relation to remote workforce arrangements. Some stakeholders based outside the region also expressed similar concerns.

Some stakeholders believed that non-resident workers would utilise and therefore impact local and regional health and emergency services that are already reported to be at capacity. They also felt remote workforces may lead to a lack of community cohesion, creating separation between the workforce and the local residents. Some stakeholders said they felt unsafe with remote workers living in the community and others believed BMA should employ more local workers and provide incentives for more people to settle in the township. Some were interested to find out what BMA intended to do with regard to workers who wished to change from working on a residential basis to a remote work arrangement.

A number of stakeholders, including some based in Moranbah and the greater Isaac region, understood the need for remote workforces on the basis that mining companies require large amounts of labour to fulfil long-term growth plans. Stakeholders felt impacts from the use of remote workforces needed to be managed appropriately and mining companies needed to remain committed to the long-term sustainability of Bowen Basin towns. Additionally, some stakeholders consulted identified potential source regions for remote workforces.
Feedback from IRC indicates that there is ongoing community concern regarding the availability of local employment options, in order to sustain Moranbah’s population growth.

17.5.1.3 Attracting and Retaining Employees

Some stakeholders, particularly health and emergency services and local business representatives, said they were experiencing difficulty in attracting and retaining employees in Moranbah. Barriers identified were the inability to compete with high wages offered by mining companies, lack of affordable housing and the cost of living in the region, all contributing to financial pressure to non-mining industry workers. As a result, some services reported having difficulty providing appropriate service levels, and some local businesses reported that they were unable to grow as they were unable to find and retain staff.

In 2013, with housing pressures easing, housing affordability has lessened as an impediment to finding staff; however, business and services still have difficulty attracting and retaining staff due to other cost of living pressures, and difficulty competing with coastal and metropolitan centres.

17.5.1.4 Accommodation Village

Some stakeholders acknowledged that the use of an accommodation village to house the project’s construction workers, operations staff and contractors would decrease the pressure on housing in Moranbah. However, some stakeholders were concerned about village management, and the potential impact the village would have on demand for local health and emergency services.

Most stakeholders said they preferred the village to be located out of town and, if near the proposed mine, raised the need to address concerns regarding potential dust, noise and vibration impacts from the operation.

Implementing appropriate village management strategies was seen as vital to mitigating any potential negative impacts. Code of conduct and behaviour standards inside the village and in the community, induction processes, various preventative safety and security measures and regular communication between village management and local police, fire and ambulance services were identified as strategies that need to be considered in the development of the village management plan.

17.5.1.5 Health and Emergency Services

Some stakeholders identified that health and emergency services in Moranbah and the greater Isaac and Mackay regions were already under pressure. This was due to services responding to the needs of a larger population base than they were resourced for. As such, these stakeholders were concerned the project could aggravate pressure on health and emergency services.

Service representatives said that funding and staffing allocations were typically made using census data, and this approach did not capture non-resident workers residing in the area. They suggested that full-time equivalent population statistics should be developed and used by the Queensland Government. Additionally, local health services commented that increased demand by temporary residents was resulting in more administration time and costs associated with caring for new patients.

The Moranbah Hospital reports ongoing issues coping with the demands of non-resident workers. BMA has initiated an agreement with local medical centres to provide services to its remote workers. This has minimised BMA workers’ demands on local health services.
Local medical centres have been able to recruit additional doctors, supported by an industry partnership, of which BMA is a member. Medical centre managers reported in June 2013 that the current number of General Practitioners in Moranbah is sufficient for demand.

17.5.1.6 Community Values

The project’s impact on community values was a concern for some stakeholders, in particular its effect on the ‘fabric’ of the community. These stakeholders believed the growing use of remote workforces was leading to a decreased feeling of community in Moranbah, prompting some residents to leave the region. They felt the project would further impact local values as it was utilising an up to 100 per cent remote workforce and there was a perception that non-resident workers may not have the same respect for Moranbah’s local values as locals did. They also believed that remote workforces may negatively affect volunteerism and participation in local activities, such as sport, as the workers would not have the time to participate.

Some community members have an ongoing concern that remote workforces will impact negatively on community values.

17.5.1.7 Workforce Behaviour and Community Safety

Some stakeholders said they had previously had negative experiences with a small number of non-resident workers misbehaving in public places and/or showing disrespect to local services staff. Some stakeholders suggested enforcement of behaviour standards and induction processes needed to be implemented by the project to reduce the potential for such incidents, including behaviour standards for outside of work hours.

Some felt the increasing number of non-resident workers within Moranbah was impacting the ‘family feel’ of the township. It was noted that some community members were feeling less safe and secure in the community than they had previously. Others felt remote workforces were, or were perceived to be, contributing to an increase in alcohol and drug incidents in the community. Some stakeholders felt the project would further negatively impact community safety.

Local police reported at a public meeting in June 2013 that safety standards in Moranbah were not declining, rather that there were a small number of incidents involving remote workers who misbehaved or committed illegal acts.

17.5.1.8 Dissatisfaction with Government

Some stakeholders voiced dissatisfaction with various levels of government and government delivery of social infrastructure and services to Moranbah. Stakeholders expressed frustration with government and believed it was slow to respond to the growth issues in Moranbah. They also said there was a misconception in government that the majority of people residing in Moranbah and the wider region were earning high wages and, as such, would not require various social services and that this perception was affecting service resourcing and funding.

17.5.1.9 Other

There were in excess of 50 other issues raised by stakeholders during project consultation. Some stakeholders raised concerns regarding environmental impacts such as dust, noise and vibration impacts from mining operations, impacts on flora and fauna, cultural heritage, rehabilitation,
vegetation, and weed and seed management. Some stakeholders raised issues regarding impacts of subsidence, the mining footprint and management of incidental mine gas.

A number of other social impacts were raised including community cohesion and contactor management, and the perceived differences between the local community and contractors. Social mitigation strategies such as workforce management plans, the location of accommodation villages out of town, and assistance for health services were discussed.

Concerns regarding traffic and transport impacts were also raised including driver behaviour and increased road traffic volumes and frequency, particularly along the Peak Downs Highway. Some stakeholders also suggested the project could provide education and training, employment and community investment benefits.

17.5.2 Landholders Directly Impacted and Adjacent to the Project

Landholders directly impacted and adjacent to the project site were contacted via telephone, face-to-face and/or email to advise them of the project, its scope and potential impacts and were invited to participate in the consultation program. Long term engagement has occurred with landholders directly impacted by the project leading to negotiations on land acquisition and compensation.

Concerns raised by landholders included:

- One landholder’s property, which is currently used for cattle grazing, is directly affected by the mining footprint. The landholder owns large land parcels of land in and around the mining footprint. As such, this landholder regularly interfaces with mining and gas companies who are developing and exploring various tenements that reside over their properties.

- Landholders are concerned about alterations or constraints to current land use, subsidence and rehabilitation, dust and noise. These issues are addressed in Section 5, Section 7, Section 11 and Section 13 of the EIS respectively. Also, landholders raised questions about the location of the accommodation village in relation to residences. BMA will continue to work with landholders to minimise disturbance to normal land use and amenity.

- Landholders adjacent to the project study area expressed concerns about an increase in traffic frequency and volume along surrounding roads, in particular Goonyella, Mabbin and Red Hill roads. Adjacent landholders utilise these road networks to access the township of Moranbah and to transport cattle to market. Traffic impacts have been studied as part of the EIS and findings are in Section 14.

17.5.3 Traditional Owner Representatives

There are three Aboriginal groups with cultural heritage and native title interests over various parts of the EIS study area as follows:

- Barada Barna people (registered);
- Wiri Core Country people (Wiri Core) (not registered); and
- Wire People 2 (Wiri 2)

A cultural heritage management plan has been finalised with the registered aboriginal party (Barada Barna people) under the Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Act 2000 for the project. This work is detailed in Section 16.1.
The parties listed above, as well as the Jangga People, who completed some early cultural heritage work near the project’s current footprint, were consulted regarding the project’s general impacts and benefits. Key points raised are detailed below:

- Stakeholders discussed with the project team the proposed footprint in relation to cultural heritage and native title boundaries. The representatives expressed concerns related to the environmental values of the area, specifically the effect of subsidence and clearing of flora, fauna, food sources and watercourses, and how this may affect the cultural heritage values of the land. The representatives also raised mine rehabilitation and closure processes, asking for Traditional Owner representatives to be involved in these processes.

- Stakeholders believed the project offered Indigenous employment and training opportunities. The representatives also recognised the project had potential opportunities for Indigenous businesses to tender for work. Stakeholders felt such opportunities were the best way for Indigenous people to participate in mining projects, and to benefit their communities. The representatives commented they would like BMA to provide more employment and training opportunities across its sites. They also acknowledged BMA was beginning to address these issues across its sites.

- Traditional Owner representatives said their people and other Indigenous people were likely to be interested in mining employment and training opportunities with remote workforce arrangements. Representatives said the project allowed their people to live in their communities with their family networks and still participate in mining. Job readiness training was felt to be particularly important for Indigenous people, especially in relation to remote workforce arrangements and assisting with adapting to rosters. Literacy and numeracy skills could also be addressed through job readiness training or on-the-job assistance.

- Stakeholders suggested financial counselling should be offered to both the Indigenous and non-Indigenous people new to the industry, to ease the transition from earning little money to a significant amount.

17.5.4 Interested Parties

During the EIS development stage, the primary method for consulting with non-government organisations was via small group or one-on-one meetings. Public information displays and feedback forms were utilised to engage with residents and community members from Moranbah and the greater Isaac and Mackay local government areas and BMA employees.

17.5.4.1 Local, Regional and Queensland-based Non-Government Organisations

From November 2011 to March 2012, project consultation was undertaken with local, regional and Queensland-based non-government organisations including community services providers (e.g. health and social/community services) and business and industry groups. Group representatives were consulted to provide feedback on the EIS, and to discuss current services in the area and potential issues that should be noted by the project. Key issues raised by these groups are detailed below:

Community Services Providers

The project's potential impact on housing was a major concern for many community service providers. Housing availability in Moranbah was an existing issue, with low availability affecting purchase prices and rental rates. Service providers reported that the lack of affordable housing was making it difficult
to attract key workers to the area, even with attractive work packages being offered. Finding short-term accommodation such as hotel rooms was also difficult, restricting specialists, facilitators, entertainers or trainers from coming into town, something stakeholders felt restricted development opportunities for Moranbah. Other key issues included:

- Some stakeholders voiced concerns about the current trend of mining contractors using family homes for communal housing and ‘hot bedding’ purposes. They were also concerned that the lack of housing would lead to further overcrowding and felt the use of family homes in family-orientated neighbourhoods was leading to feelings of reduced safety and security. Some stakeholders believed that use of family homes for communal accommodation should not be allowed and called for mining companies to better influence their contractors’ housing strategies.

- The impact of remote workforces on community safety was another social impact concern. Some stakeholders felt remote workforces may utilise drugs and alcohol in their down time to relieve boredom.

- An associated concern for some stakeholders was the continuing perception that Moranbah and the region was a ‘rich community’ and that ‘everyone was in mining’, which was not the case. Some service providers recounted instances where people had found themselves homeless because they could not afford local rents.

- Some stakeholders called for projects considering up to 100 per cent remote workforces to provide services for their employees and contractors that supported employees and their families in adapting to remote workforce arrangements.

- Several stakeholders acknowledged that non-resident workers currently used local health services. The number of non-residents in mining communities was increasing and this was not captured in census data, which was used as a part of funding considerations.

- Some stakeholders suggested the project implement health and wellbeing campaigns and services to promote healthy lifestyles for their employees and contractors living in accommodation villages. It was suggested villages provide a variety of healthy food options and access to recreation facilities to help prevent lifestyle-related diseases, as well as educating workers about the effects of alcohol and drug abuse.

- When discussing the potential cohesion (or lack of) between community members and the project, some stakeholders asked if there were plans to better integrate locals and new project workers and how the project planned to manage workforce behaviour in the community. Community cohesion in relation to non-residential workforces was felt to be particularly challenging, something stakeholders believed would increase with additional project workers. Some stakeholders suggested mining companies could consider encouraging mine workers to participate in community activities as a way to help increase community cohesion.

- Some stakeholders felt that although government departments understood the impacts of mining and associated industries on local health and social/community services, they were slow to respond to capacity concerns.

- There were some concerns that social infrastructure was not keeping up with the current population growth of the Moranbah community. Some stakeholders felt the approval of major projects seemed to overlook such pressures.
Business and Industry Groups

Business and industry groups identified that BMA’s growth plans for the region would bring additional local procurement opportunities. Some stakeholders believed they had capacity to supply and service the mining industry; however they found it difficult to comprehend the needs of BMA and its tendering, supply and payment processes. They believed removing these barriers through clearer processes and more training would help. According to some stakeholders, the loss of staff to the mining industry or associated contractors was a barrier to local business growth. Hospitality and retail industries, for example, were unable to compete with the high wages on offer. The current shortage of affordable housing was seen to be a challenge for non-mining industry workers in the community.

Some stakeholders felt the management of mining project contractors played a significant role in social impact concerns. In particular, appropriate provision of housing and management of contractor behaviour were mentioned as important. Housing affordability and availability were discussed and some stakeholders reported that despite a perception of generally high incomes in the area, the number of mortgage defaults was high. A stakeholder from Mackay felt the region would be a suitable base for some types of remote workforce arrangements, providing economic diversity. Others felt remote workforce arrangements would do nothing for the amenity of a community.

17.5.4.2 Local and Regional Residents, including BMA Employees

The public information displays provided the opportunity for local and regional residents, including BMA employees, to directly engage in two-way discussion with project representatives. Feedback forms, email and the 1800 number was also used by these stakeholder groups to seek information about the project and the EIS process, and to provide feedback.

In general, stakeholders who visited the public information displays and provided feedback were interested in finding out about BMA’s continued growth plans in the Bowen Basin. Some community members felt it was important for mining companies in the Bowen Basin to continue to grow; however, they also commented that environmental and social impacts needed to be managed appropriately.

A key matter raised in relation to the project, and in general, was employment opportunities. Some stakeholders believed the project should bring jobs, apprenticeships and trainee schemes to the community, employing local people first before utilising remote workforces. Some stakeholders expressed concerns about remote workforce arrangements and queried where the project’s workforce would come from. Several stakeholders felt remote workforces should be given the opportunity to take up a residential arrangement or vice versa, as circumstances change.

Residents from Moranbah raised a number of specific issues including:

- The project’s impact on community values was a concern for some stakeholders, in particular the effect of remote workforce arrangements on the ‘fabric’ of the community.

- Community cohesion was raised as a concern, with some stakeholders asking how locals and the new workers would integrate and what measures the project would use to manage workforce behaviour.

- Traffic impacts arising from increased volumes related to mining construction and operation were noted as a concern. Many stakeholders expressed views that road improvements in the area were required.
Many stakeholders felt there was a need for additional social amenities, allowing for a more balanced, family-friendly community. There was a perception that extra recreational facilities, postal services, shops and council services to service the extra capacity may encourage non-mining families to stay in the town.

Access to housing was a major concern. Housing was seen by many to be Moranbah’s biggest problem, with average families unable to afford the current prices and high rents, and the extreme shortage of affordable housing causing families to move.

Some stakeholders suggested BMA should, as a part of its overall growth plans, maximise opportunities for people who have never worked in the mining industry before and wanted to make this transition. It was suggested that BMA could recruit more people with no mining experience, but had relevant transferable skills, such as operating equipment/machinery, and create apprenticeships for locals.

Some stakeholders called on the project to continue consulting the community and keeping them informed about the project. Special mention was made of consulting local social and youth workers to better understand the project’s potential impact on families.

Some of the environmental issues raised included land use and resources (Section 5.1); surface water management (Section 7); groundwater management (Section 8); terrestrial ecology (Section 9); air quality (Section 11); greenhouse gases (Section 12); noise and vibration (Section 13); visual amenity (Section 5.2); and waste management (Section 15).

Residents from the greater Isaac and Mackay local government areas identified benefits and impacts including:

- Some stakeholders believed the project would create more jobs and bring more money into the region. In particular, stakeholders felt it would benefit the Mackay community by encouraging population growth and increasing property values.
- Some stakeholders were concerned that local businesses would lose workers to the project and the growing mining industry, because they would be unable to match the wages. They suggested mining companies should work with small businesses and support local industry.
- Other concerns raised by some stakeholders related to the amount of cultural heritage in the project area that would be affected, and the project’s environmental impact.

17.5.5 Government

The project team liaised with relevant elected representatives, government departments and agencies at the federal, state and local levels to ensure the project meets statutory and regulatory requirements. Key issues for each level of government are detailed below.

17.5.5.1 Commonwealth Government

The project conducted project briefings with Commonwealth Government elected representatives, departments and agencies as detailed in Appendix E. These stakeholders were also contacted via letters and provided with project information.

The Commonwealth Government, under the legislative framework of the Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999, plays a pivotal role in reviewing and approving an EIS. The
The project will continue to liaise with the Department of the Environment (formerly the Department of Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities) in relation to preparation and review of the EIS.

Consultation and communication will continue with appropriate Commonwealth Government stakeholders throughout the life of the project.

17.5.5.2 Queensland Government

The project consulted with Queensland Government representatives across a wide cross-section of departments, agencies and services as detailed in Appendix E. This was completed mainly via one-on-one and group meetings.

Queensland Government department and agency representatives raised a number of specific concerns:

- The project's potential impact on housing, both from a pricing and availability perspective, was a concern for some stakeholders as they believed new mines in the Bowen Basin would increase population throughout the area. Health sector representatives reported that affordable housing availability was already a major barrier to the attraction and retention of health service workers, and a lack of accommodation for visiting specialists and those providing professional development services was resulting in impacts to patient appointments and staff training.

- The impact of the behaviour of the project's non-resident workforce was a concern for some stakeholders, particularly in regards to community safety. Some stakeholders felt the growing use of remote workforces was perceived as being a factor in the increase of crime incidents in the community.

- Community cohesion in relation to non-resident workforces was felt to be lacking by some stakeholders. Some believed non-resident workers did not display respect for the region. However, some stakeholders believed mining companies were encouraging positive interaction and integration with the local community and were encouraged about the community investment made by companies such as BMA.

- The potential impact of the project's workforce on local health services was a particular concern for health sector stakeholders. A recurring issue raised was that non-resident workers were not included in statistical calculations (e.g. census records), used to determine levels of service for doctors, nurses and allied health practitioners, resulting in services being under significant pressure due to inadequate staffing numbers.

- Education providers identified that pupil numbers in particular year levels at local schools were currently declining. A number of reasons were provided as the cause of this trend including families moving to other towns when children reached high school age, the ability for families to reside elsewhere while the parent or parents still work in the region and opportunities for home owners to sell their homes at a premium.

- Specific issues were raised by some stakeholders regarding the management and/or location of the project's accommodation village during construction and operation. Their preference was for the Red Hill accommodation village to be located outside of Moranbah, providing sufficient accommodation for employees and contractors and appropriate facilities to encourage a healthy lifestyle, gaining support of local service providers if required. Stakeholders called for appropriate
workforce behaviour and cohesion strategies to be implemented. Discussions were held regarding the need for safe road access and clear communication lines for emergency services.

The Queensland Government elected representative raised the following issues:

- Concerns were raised in relation to housing and/or accommodation options in the region. It was felt the implementation of a new approach would help to overcome this issue.
- There were concerns that Mackay could be bypassed with the implementation of a remote workforce.
- Project benefits were discussed and it was suggested regional business should continue to obtain flow-on benefits from mining.

### 17.5.5.3 Local Government

The project met with five regional councils as part of the EIS development stage in 2011 and 2012 in association with broader the BBCGP. These regional councils included:

- IRC;
- Mackay Regional Council;
- Cairns Regional Council;
- Rockhampton Regional Council; and
- Sunshine Coast Regional Council.

The project is situated in the IRC local government area. The project team formally briefed elected representatives and council employees during the EIS development stage and in 2013 prior to lodgement of the EIS.

Specific issues expressed by IRC elected and departmental representatives included:

- Social impacts, with particular reference to remote workforce arrangements. Council representatives expressed concern that Moranbah was beginning to turn into a town with a large population of non-residents, limiting opportunities for Moranbah’s permanent population to grow. Council representatives felt BMA, and other mining companies, should look to employ more local workers and provide incentives for workers to settle in the township.
- Attracting and retaining employees was a concern for council, which was experiencing a high turnover of staff (in particular technical service personnel). This was impacting council’s ability to provide services, such as maintaining road infrastructure. Stakeholders believed the high turnover was due primarily to wage competition with the mining industry.
- There was concern by some stakeholders that mining companies, including BMA, were ‘holding onto land’ which could be released and used to develop affordable housing. Stakeholders also believed funding of more residential housing by mining companies would aid availability and help to slow down increasing purchase prices and rent. ‘Red tape’ was seen as a barrier to council’s ability to sub-divide and release land.
- Council said housing affordability was impacted by people leaving Moranbah and selling their houses to investors which contractors would then occupy. There were also concerns about overcrowding in communal housing.
There was interest in how workers would be accommodated, whether in accommodation villages or using accommodation providers in town. Some stakeholders suggested further discussion regarding the potential location of villages on mining leases to ensure alignment with local planning objectives.

A related concern was community cohesion, with some stakeholders calling for BMA to better integrate village residents into the community. Using the commercial kitchens for community purposes, and offering meeting spaces to community groups were suggested tactical solutions.

Increased traffic and transport movements, and the impact on road infrastructure, were a concern for many stakeholders. Stakeholders believed contractors sometimes took short cuts through local roads not built for that volume and weight of traffic. Council said it would like to work with mining companies on joint ventures to upgrade regional roads, and for rail transport solutions to be better utilised.

Some stakeholders advised that council was looking for the project to assess impacts to all infrastructure as part of the EIS process.

As the project will have an up to 100 per cent remote workforce, the project commenced discussions with Mackay, Cairns, Sunshine Coast and Rockhampton regional councils regarding growth plans. Comments captured include:

- Concern regarding the availability and affordability of housing in the Mackay region. Council was also concerned about the high usage of short-term accommodation, which was impacting tourism in the region. Council is currently working to establish a 400-person accommodation facility to alleviate this.
- Concerns regarding the cumulative impacts of mining growth in the Mackay region and the impacts on social services due to more people moving to the area.
- Rockhampton Regional Council had seen significant growth in mining service businesses and was looking to stimulate housing construction in the region.
- Sunshine Coast Regional Council and Cairns Regional Council believed their airports and population would allow the areas to provide a significant number of people to service the mining industry. They also highlighted the regions’ availability of services that were influencing people’s decisions to live in the areas and training opportunities available.

## 17.6 EIS responses to Stakeholder Input

Table 17-5 provides an overview of sections within the EIS where information addressing key stakeholder concerns can be found.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Issues Raised</th>
<th>Section in EIS: Impact Description and Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land use impacts including subsidence; mine footprint; and rehabilitation.</td>
<td>Section 5: Land Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental impacts including weed and seed management; vegetation offsets; and flora and fauna concerns.</td>
<td>Section 9: Terrestrial Ecology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerns regarding dust from mine operations.</td>
<td>Section 11: Air Quality</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Issues Raised</th>
<th>Section in EIS: Impact Description and Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Concerns regarding noise and vibration from mine operations.</td>
<td>Section 13: Noise and Vibration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic and transport impacts including use of local, state and federal roads;</td>
<td>Section 14: Transport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>traffic volume and frequency as a result of construction works and operations;</td>
<td>Section 18: Social Impact Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>driving behaviour; and road safety.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indigenous cultural heritage.</td>
<td>Section 16: Indigenous Cultural Heritage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social impacts including existing social conditions; community values;</td>
<td>Section 18: Social Impact Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>community safety; community cohesion; housing and accommodation; use of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>social infrastructure; health and emergency services; education and training;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>local business; workforce behaviour and accommodation village.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social mitigations including workforce management; accommodation</td>
<td>Section 18: Social Impact Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>village management; local procurement; employment and training; and working with</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>health and emergency services.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumulative social impacts.</td>
<td>Section 21: Cumulative Impacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety risks and hazards including gas management.</td>
<td>Section 20: Health Safety and Risk</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 17.7 Ongoing Consultation

The project acknowledges the value of ongoing consultation as a component of achieving good environmental and social performance.

To achieve this, BMA recognises the importance of building long-term, enduring relationships with stakeholders directly or indirectly affected by the project.

Following the granting of government approvals and obtaining project sanction from BMA, the project will implement a comprehensive consultation and communication plan for the construction, operation and de-commissioning phases. It will identify stakeholders to be consulted; types of consultation and communication activities and timing; consultation responsibilities; communication protocols; reporting; feedback; and monitoring arrangements. The plan will be updated regularly to ensure that it continues to address stakeholder and project needs.

Consultation will also play a vital role in the development of appropriate methods and determining the timing for monitoring and implementation of mitigations.