

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**VOLUME 1: EIS PROCESS OVERVIEW****VOLUME 2: PROJECT DESCRIPTION****VOLUME 3: ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT OF GAS FIELD COMPONENT****VOLUME 4: ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT OF PIPELINE COMPONENT****VOLUME 5: ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT OF LNG COMPONENT****VOLUME 6: ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT MARINE FACILITIES****Chapter 1****1 INTRODUCTION 1****Chapter 2****2 IMPACT ASSESSMENT – PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT 4****2.1 SCOPE OF DREDGING ACTIVITIES PROPOSED 4****2.2 DREDGE METHODOLOGY 4**

2.2.1 Cutter Suction Dredge (CSD) 4

2.2.2 Backhoe Dredge (BHD) 5

2.2.3 Jetting 5

2.2.4 Approach to the Dredging Assessment 5

2.3 DREDGE PLUME MODELLING 6

2.3.1 Description of Additional Modelling 6

2.3.2 Description of Modelled scenarios 8

2.3.3 Dredge Plume Modelling Summary of Results 13

2.3.4 Total Suspended Solids 28

2.3.5 Depth Averaged Total Suspended Solids Concentration 41

2.3.6 Sedimentation 55

2.4 LIGHT ATTENUATION 63

2.4.1 Methodology 63

2.4.2 Results of Light Attenuation Modelling 65

2.5 ACID SULFATE SOILS 80

2.5.1 Construction Dock and MOF 80

2.5.2 Crossing of The Narrows 82

2.6	ACID SULFATE SOILS MANAGEMENT PLAN FRAMEWORK	83
2.7	OFFSETS	83
2.8	SEDIMENT QUALITY	83
2.9	CONCLUSION	84

Figures

6.2.1	LOCATION OF TIME SERIES OUTPUT SITES MOF AND CONSTRUCTION DOCK	11
6.2.2	LOCATION OF TIME-SERIES OUTPUT SITES NARROWS PIPELINE CROSSING	12
6.2.3	SNAPSHOT OF MAXIMUM PREDICTED TSS CONCENTRATION PLUME (ABOVE AMBIENT) GENERATED FROM LOSS AT THE CUTTER HEAD DURING DREDGING OF THE MOF STAGE II, DURING A TYPICAL FEBRUARY EBB (TOP) AND FLOOD (BOTTOM) PEAK CURRENT	15
6.2.4	HOURLY TIME SERIES PLOTS (8 AM, 9 AM, 10 AM AND 11 AM 4TH FEBRUARY 2009) OF MAXIMUM TSS PLUMES (MG/L) GENERATED FROM LOSS AT THE CUTTER HEAD WHILE DREDGING WITHIN THE MOF (STAGE 2)	16
6.2.5	HOURLY TIME SERIES PLOTS (8 AM, 9 AM, 10 AM AND 11AM 4TH FEBRUARY 2009) OF BOTTOM THICKNESS (MILLIMETRES) GENERATED FROM LOSS AT THE CUTTER HEAD WHILE DREDGING WITHIN THE MOF (STAGE 2)	17
6.2.6	HOURLY TIME SERIES PLOTS (9 AM, 10 AM, 11 AM AND 12AM) OF MAXIMUM TSS PLUMES (MG/L) GENERATED BY THE TAIL-WATER DISCHARGE AT THE NORTH-WESTERN SECTOR OF THE RECLAMATION SITE	19
6.2.7	HOURLY TIME SERIES PLOTS (8 AM, 9 AM, 10 AM AND 11 AM 4TH FEBRUARY 2009) OF MAXIMUM TSS PLUMES (MG/L) GENERATED FROM LOSS AT THE BHD BUCKET WHILE DREDGING WITHIN THE MOF (STAGE 1)	21
6.2.8	SNAPSHOT OF THE MAXIMUM PREDICTED SUSPENDED SEDIMENT CONCENTRATION AT ANY DEPTH LAYER (ABOVE BACKGROUND) GENERATED FROM LOSSES BY THE BHD WHILE TRENCHING WITHIN TARGINIE CREEK DURING A SAMPLE FEBRUARY 2009, FLOOD (ABOVE) AND EBB (BELOW) TIDE	22
6.2.9	SNAPSHOT OF THE MAXIMUM PREDICTED SUSPENDED SEDIMENT CONCENTRATION (ABOVE BACKGROUND) AT ANY DEPTH LEVEL GENERATED FROM LOSSES BY THE BHD WHEN TRENCHING ON THE WEST SIDE OF THE NARROWS SECTION DURING A SAMPLE FEBRUARY 2009 FLOOD (TOP) AND EBB (BOTTOM) SPRING TIDE	23
6.2.10	HOURLY TIME SERIES PLOTS (6 PM, 7 PM, 8 PM AND 9 PM 1ST FEBRUARY 2009) OF MAXIMUM TSS PLUMES (MG/L) GENERATED FROM THE PROPELLER WASH	25
6.2.11	CUMULATIVE BOTTOM THICKNESS (METRES) FROM 91 DAYS OF DISCHARGE AT A RATE OF 6 DISCHARGES PER DAY INTO THE CENTRE OF THE GLADSTONE PORTS CORPORATION EXISTING SPOIL GROUND	27
6.2.12	TIME SERIES GRAPHS OF MAXIMUM PREDICTED TSS CONCENTRATION (ABOVE BACKGROUND) AT SITES 1, 2 AND 3. RESULTS ARE BASED ON SEDIMENT SOURCES IDENTIFIED IN SCENARIO 1	30
6.2.13	TIME SERIES GRAPHS OF MAXIMUM PREDICTED TSS CONCENTRATION (ABOVE BACKGROUND) AT SITES 4, 5 AND 6. RESULTS ARE BASED ON SEDIMENT SOURCES IDENTIFIED IN SCENARIO 1	31

6.2.14	<i>TIME SERIES GRAPHS OF MAXIMUM PREDICTED TSS CONCENTRATION (ABOVE BACKGROUND) AT TURTLE ISLAND, DIAMANTINA AND BUSHY ISLET. RESULTS ARE BASED ON SEDIMENT SOURCES IDENTIFIED IN SCENARIO 1</i>	32
6.2.15	<i>TIME SERIES GRAPHS OF MAXIMUM PREDICTED TSS CONCENTRATION (ABOVE BACKGROUND) AT SITES 1, 2 AND 3. RESULTS ARE BASED ON SEDIMENT SOURCES IDENTIFIED IN SCENARIO 2</i>	34
6.2.16	<i>TIME SERIES GRAPHS OF MAXIMUM PREDICTED TSS CONCENTRATION (ABOVE BACKGROUND) AT SITES 4, 5 AND 6. RESULTS ARE BASED ON SEDIMENT SOURCES IDENTIFIED IN SCENARIO 2</i>	35
6.2.17	<i>TIME SERIES GRAPHS OF MAXIMUM PREDICTED TSS CONCENTRATION (ABOVE BACKGROUND) AT TURTLE ISLAND, DIAMANTINA AND BUSHY ISLET. RESULTS ARE BASED ON SEDIMENT SOURCES IDENTIFIED IN SCENARIO 2</i>	36
6.2.18	<i>TIME SERIES GRAPHS OF MAXIMUM PREDICTED TSS CONCENTRATION (ABOVE BACKGROUND) AT SITES 1, 2 AND 3. RESULTS ARE BASED ON SEDIMENT SOURCES IDENTIFIED IN SCENARIO 3</i>	38
6.2.19	<i>TIME SERIES GRAPHS OF MAXIMUM PREDICTED TSS CONCENTRATION (ABOVE BACKGROUND) AT SITES 4, 5 AND 6. RESULTS ARE BASED ON SEDIMENT SOURCES IDENTIFIED IN SCENARIO 3</i>	39
6.2.20	<i>TIME SERIES GRAPHS OF MAXIMUM PREDICTED TSS CONCENTRATION (ABOVE BACKGROUND) AT TURTLE ISLAND, DIAMANTINA AND BUSHY ISLET. RESULTS ARE BASED ON SEDIMENT SOURCES IDENTIFIED IN SCENARIO 3</i>	40
6.2.21	<i>MAXIMUM TSS CONCENTRATIONS PREDICTED AT ANY DEPTH LEVEL OVER TIME AT SITE 1 (ABOVE) AND SITE 2 (BELOW) WITHIN TARGINIE CREEK (INCLUSIVE OF AVERAGE BACKGROUND TSS ESTIMATES)</i>	43
6.2.22	<i>MAXIMUM TSS CONCENTRATIONS PREDICTED AT ANY DEPTH LEVEL OVER TIME AT SITE 3 (ABOVE) AND SITE 4 (BELOW) WITHIN TARGINIE CREEK (INCLUSIVE OF AVERAGE BACKGROUND TSS ESTIMATES)</i>	44
6.2.23	<i>SCENARIO 1 TSS DEPTH-AVERAGED 50TH PERCENTILE CONCENTRATION CONTOUR PLOTS WITHOUT (TOP) AND WITH BACKGROUND LEVELS INCLUDED (BOTTOM)</i>	45
6.2.24	<i>SCENARIO 1 TSS DEPTH-AVERAGED 95TH PERCENTILE CONCENTRATION CONTOUR PLOTS WITHOUT (TOP) AND WITH BACKGROUND LEVELS INCLUDED (BOTTOM)</i>	46
6.2.25	<i>SCENARIO 2 TSS DEPTH-AVERAGED 50TH PERCENTILE CONCENTRATION CONTOUR PLOTS WITHOUT (TOP) AND WITH BACKGROUND LEVELS INCLUDED (BOTTOM)</i>	48
6.2.26	<i>SCENARIO 2 TSS DEPTH-AVERAGED 95TH PERCENTILE CONCENTRATION CONTOUR PLOTS WITHOUT (TOP) AND WITH BACKGROUND LEVELS INCLUDED (BOTTOM)</i>	49
6.2.27	<i>SCENARIO 3 TSS DEPTH-AVERAGED 50TH PERCENTILE CONCENTRATION CONTOUR PLOTS WITHOUT (TOP) AND WITH BACKGROUND LEVELS INCLUDED (BOTTOM)</i>	51
6.2.28	<i>SCENARIO 3 TSS DEPTH-AVERAGED 95TH PERCENTILE CONCENTRATION CONTOUR PLOTS WITHOUT (TOP) AND WITH BACKGROUND LEVELS INCLUDED (BOTTOM)</i>	52
6.2.29	<i>ESTIMATES FOR THE 95TH PERCENTILE CONCENTRATIONS OVER TIME CALCULATED FOR DEPTH-AVERAGED TSS. RESULTS ARE SHOWN WITH (ABOVE) AND WITHOUT (BELOW) BACKGROUND ESTIMATES</i>	54

6.2.30	<i>PREDICTED 50TH PERCENTILE (TOP) AND 95TH PERCENTILE (BOTTOM) SEDIMENTATION RATE (G/M2/DAY) FROM DREDGING OPERATIONS IN SCENARIO 156</i>	
6.2.31	<i>PREDICTED 50TH PERCENTILE (TOP) AND 95TH PERCENTILE (BOTTOM) SEDIMENTATION RATE (G/M2/DAY) FROM DREDGING OPERATIONS IN SCENARIO 258</i>	
6.2.32	<i>PREDICTED 50TH PERCENTILE (TOP) AND 95TH PERCENTILE (BOTTOM) SEDIMENTATION RATE (G/M2/DAY) FROM DREDGING OPERATIONS IN SCENARIO 360</i>	
6.2.33	<i>ESTIMATES FOR THE CUMULATIVE SEDIMENTATION (ABOVE BACKGROUND) DUE TO THE COMBINED OPERATIONS</i>	62
6.2.34	<i>DERIVED 50TH PERCENTILE AMBIENT LEVELS, IN ABSENCE OF DREDGING, OF %SI AT THE SEABED FOR PORT CURTIS OVER THE MODELLED PERIOD</i>	67
6.2.35	<i>DERIVED 95TH PERCENTILE AMBIENT LEVELS, IN ABSENCE OF DREDGING, OF %SI AT THE SEABED FOR PORT CURTIS OVER THE MODELLED PERIOD</i>	68
6.2.36	<i>DERIVED DIFFERENCE IN 50TH PERCENTILE LEVELS OF %SI (AMBIENT VERSUS DREDGE CONDITIONS) AT THE SEABED FOR PORT CURTIS OVER THE MODELED PERIOD, FOR SCENARIO 1</i>	71
6.2.37	<i>DERIVED DIFFERENCE IN 95TH PERCENTILE LEVELS OF %SI (AMBIENT VERSUS DREDGE CONDITIONS) AT THE SEABED FOR PORT CURTIS OVER THE MODELED PERIOD, FOR SCENARIO 1</i>	72
6.2.38	<i>DERIVED DIFFERENCE IN 50TH PERCENTILE LEVELS OF %SI (AMBIENT VERSUS DREDGE CONDITIONS) AT THE SEABED FOR PORT CURTIS OVER THE MODELED PERIOD, FOR SCENARIO 2</i>	74
6.2.39	<i>DERIVED DIFFERENCE IN 95TH PERCENTILE LEVELS OF %SI (AMBIENT VERSUS DREDGE CONDITIONS) AT THE SEABED FOR PORT CURTIS OVER THE MODELED PERIOD, FOR SCENARIO 2</i>	75
6.2.40	<i>DERIVED DIFFERENCE IN 50TH PERCENTILE LEVELS OF %SI (AMBIENT VERSUS DREDGE CONDITIONS) AT THE SEABED FOR PORT CURTIS FOR THE MODELED PERIOD, FOR SCENARIO 3</i>	77
6.2.41	<i>DERIVED DIFFERENCE IN 95TH PERCENTILE LEVELS OF %SI (AMBIENT VERSUS DREDGE CONDITIONS) AT THE SEABED FOR PORT CURTIS OVER THE MODELED PERIOD, FOR SCENARIO 3</i>	78
<i>Tables</i>		
6.1.1	<i>RESPONSE TO SUBMISSIONS ON DRAFT EIS: DREDGING</i>	2
6.2.1	<i>PREDICTED AREA OF COVERAGE AS A FUNCTION OF THICKNESS, CALCULATED FROM A 91 DAY DISPOSAL OPERATION AT THE EXISTING GPC OFFSHORE SPOIL GROUND</i>	26
6.2.2	<i>PUBLISHED VALUES OF MINIMUM LIGHT REQUIREMENTS BY SPECIES, FOR LOCALLY OCCURRING OR MORPHOLOGICALLY SIMILAR SPECIES</i>	69
6.2.3	<i>TIME AND LIGHT LEVELS WHERE SEAGRASS DECLINES WERE SIGNIFICANT AND/OR MORTALITY WAS OBSERVED, FOR LOCALLY OCCURRING OR MORPHOLOGICALLY SIMILAR SPECIES</i>	69

VOLUME 7: GREENHOUSE GAS MANAGEMENT

VOLUME 8: SOCIAL, CULTURAL AND ECONOMIC IMPACT ASSESSMENT

VOLUME 9: GAS FIELD COMPONENT ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT PLAN

VOLUME 10: NO UPDATE TO VOLUME 10 (REFER TO DRAFT EIS)

VOLUME 11: LNG COMPONENT ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT PLAN

VOLUME 12: STAKEHOLDER CONSULTATION

VOLUME 13: EPBC ASSESSMENT REPORT

APPENDICES