



NEW HOPE
GROUP

Appendix A1 AEIS Submission Analysis Register



New Acland Coal Mine Stage 3 project - EIS Submission Analysis Register (Condensed)

Please Note: The majority of items labelled 'comment noted' in the 'proponent response' column below, were raised by multiple private submitters. The Coordinator-General directed the proponent to provide a collective response to such submission items. The proponent responded to this direction at Chapter 5.1 of the AEIS. Additionally, in many instances where 'comment noted' is indicated against a submission comment, the comment was to be addressed in responses to advisory agency submissions. These responses are included at Chapter 5.2 of the AEIS.

Instances where a direct response to a submission item was requested in the AEIS, the appropriate reference has been provided in the far right hand column.

Sub. No.	Issue No.	Issue - Overview / Topic	Submitter Recommendations / Suggested Mitigation/additional information	Proponent response	Relevant AEIS Reference
1	1	Political Promise not kept	Refusal of New Acland Coal Mine Stage 3 project	Comment Noted	NA
1	2	Mine sites aren't 100% rehabilitated sufficiently enough and the damage done during construction not only effects the land but the air, water catchments around covering adjoining properties and the people lifestyles that will never return to original state	Acland/Oakey/Jondaryan/Brymaroo (connecting into Toowoomba or Dalby) is prime agricultural land and should be kept for such purposes only.	Comment Noted	NA
1	3	Coal dust / toxins	Coal dump should not be allowed	Comment Noted	NA
2	1	Acland coal supports community utilising local contractors to supply goods and services of the mine.	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
2	2	Successful rehabilitation is transforming previously underutilised farmland/ open cut coal mining processes - to farmland once again.	Farmland practices and rehabilitation of the coal mine should continue.	Comment Noted	NA
2.1	1	Acland coal supports community utilising local contractors to supply goods and services of the mine.	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
2.1	2	Successful rehabilitation is transforming previously underutilised farmland/ open cut coal mining processes - to farmland once again.	Farmland practices and rehabilitation of the coal mine should continue.	Comment Noted	NA
3	1	Acland coal utilises local contractors to supply goods and services of the mine.	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
4	1	Economic advantages of the project - Effect on families	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
4	2	Members of the TSBE have conveyed their satisfaction with rehabilitation works.	New Hope should be congratulated for rehabilitation efforts	Comment Noted	NA
5	1	Fear project will drain property aquifer. Property bore 18m deep.	"No solutions seem possible"	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.1.1
5	2	Prevailing trade wind from the mine (proximity to the mine)	"No solutions seem possible"	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.1.2
5	3	Prevailing trade wind from the mine (proximity to the mine)	"No solutions seem possible"	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.1.3
5	4	Existing noise pollution from stage 1 and 2 operations	"No solutions seem possible"	Comment Noted	NA
5	5	Access from Brymaroo through Acland will be shut.	"No solutions seem possible"	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.1.4
5	6	House prices diminishing as a result of the mine	"No solutions seem possible"	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.1.5
6	1	Significant benefits to local, State and national economies		Comment Noted	NA
6	2	NHG support local community. Consultation is open, honest and professional.	Encourage ongoing commitment to community as is being shown	Comment Noted	NA
6	3	NHG's commitment to WPHS is demonstrated regularly by their attitude to sharing learning's and offering advice on workplace improvement	Agriculture sector can learn a lot on how to manage safety and health in the workplace	Comment Noted	NA
6	4	EMPs develop, audit, maintain and improve such plans	Regulations imposed on the development through EMP are adequate.	Comment Noted	NA
7	1	Chapter 18 Takes no account of extensive international health data showing adverse health impacts of coal mining on communities	A full health impact assessment is a minimum requirement before any decision is made on the project	Comment Noted	NA
7	2	Lack of enforcement of existing standards has been ably demonstrated at NAS2 mine. Air quality exceedences	A full health impact assessment is a minimum requirement before any decision is made on the project	Comment Noted	NA
8	1	Destruction of SCL and GQAL	SCL land should not be mined	Comment Noted	NA
8	2	Koala Habitat	Koala habitat should be noted	Comment Noted	NA
8	3	Mitigation & commitments	Groundwater should be monitored continuously for this project.	Comment Noted	NA
8	4	Road closures MLA 50232 Acland-Silverleigh Road should not be closed - Inconvenience for travel East	The resource under the road should stay there. Resource north of the mine should be mined in conjunction with existing mine	Comment Noted	NA
8	5	Acland management strategy	AMS should include re-instatement of historic Acland township. Should be condition of any future mine approvals	Comment Noted	NA
8	6	Housing/ Rental Market	Some housing and accommodation should be re-established in Acland	Comment Noted	NA
8	7	Acland Colliery Conservation Management Plan	Initiative supported	Comment Noted	NA
8	8	Land use conflicts with mining and farming	No recommendation	Comment Noted	NA
9	1	Increase rail movements in SEQ/ Downstream rail upgrades	Until transport studies such as South East Corridor Freight Line, are finalised, a decision to proceed with the mine should not be made	Comment Noted	NA
9	2	The health of adjacent land users as a result of air, noise, vibration have not been addressed adequately - TOR 5.9.3	Noise monitoring needs to be done by an independent body along the freight corridor	Comment Noted	NA
9	3	The effectiveness of veneering cannot be proved	NHC should be conditioned to cover with lids (not veneer) coal loads	Comment Noted	NA
10	1	Flow on economic contributions to local economy	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
11	1	Increase in home ownership would free up the rental market	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
11	2	Flow on economic contributions to local economy	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
12	1	Jobs, Growth and Opportunity	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
12	2	Mine Safety standards/ good employer	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
12	3	Economics - Business Opportunities	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
13	1	Wider benefits of mine to community	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA

Sub. No.	Issue No.	Issue - Overview / Topic	Submitter Recommendations / Suggested Mitigation/additional information	Proponent response	Relevant AEIS Reference
14	1	Land - Rehabilitation	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
14	2	Social - Community Awareness / Social responsibility	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
14	3	Commitment to implement veneering to reduce dust	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
14	4	Flow on economic contributions to local economy and employees	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
15	1	Social - Community Awareness / Social responsibility	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
15	2	Commitment to implement veneering to reduce dust	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
15	3	Land - Rehabilitation	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
15	4	Flow on economic contributions to local economy and employees	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
16	1	Road realignment would impact on SCL on Lot 19 (refer to EIS Table 13.6) and Cooke Road closure will hinder access to land areas on property.	Keep road alignment as close to Jondaryan Muldu Road as possible and identify access points for Lot 21 and 20 on RP 36468 .	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.2.1
16	2	Proposed rail line to loop will impose on current operation and land use	Consult with landholder on issue of operational impacts of rail on adjoining property to rail facilities	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.2.2
16	3	Road realignment would impact on Lot 3444	Consult with landholder on issue of operational impacts of rail on adjoining property to rail facilities	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.2.3
17	1	Project noise level at Receptor 35 needs to be mitigated	Provision of direct community consultation and noise reducing trees near residence	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.3.1
17	2	Project dust level at Receptor 35 needs to be mitigated	Provision of direct community consultation and dust shielding trees near residence	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.3.2
17	3	Road realignment would impact on Lot 3444 and 3306	Consult with landholder on issue of operational access and impacts of closure of Cooke Street	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.3.3
18	1	Manning Vale and Willaroo resource mining will impact on SCL as per Fig 4.3	Proponent adopt strategies/measures the minimise impacts on SCL on project footprint,	Comment Noted	NA
18	2	Identifiable remnant vegetation on Lot 3448 needs to be retained/restored as is representative of fauna and flora in area for current and future generations	Proponent adopt strategies/measures to address retention of nominated acres and establish protocol of restoration and retention of areas.	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.4.1
19	1	Support for the project due to the economic benefit it has brought	Ensure that the project proceeds due to economic benefit workers and local community.	Comment Noted	NA
19	2	Support for the project due to the wider economic benefit it has brought for region	Ensure that the project proceeds due to economic benefit workers and local community.	Comment Noted	NA
19	3	Use of unique coal resources may benefit future State Royalties as alternative coal resources	Ensure that the project proceeds due to economic benefits to the State.	Comment Noted	NA
20	1	Revised scope of NAS3 successfully accounts for mitigations to limit impacts and previous concerns	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
20	2	Compliance with existing EA and adequate testing on community request	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
20	3		Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
21	1	Business relationships with local companies	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
21	2	NHG support local sporting clubs ect. Demonstrating good corporate citizenship	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
22	1	Loss of jobs should NAS 3 not proceed	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
22	2	Good rehabilitation strategies currently yielding good results	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
23	1	Notes proponents commitments and supports implementation	Consult with DATSIMA in implementation/construction of future strategies	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.1.1
24	1	Economics - Employment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	
25	1	Economics - Business Opportunities	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	
25	2	NHG takes matters of the environment seriously and work within their envt. Permits	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	
26	1	Economics - Employment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	
26	2	Social - Community Awareness / Social responsibility	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
27	1	NGH focus on safety, open communication & community responsibility.	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
27	2	Economics - Business Opportunities	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
28	1	Social - Community Awareness / Social responsibility	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
28	2	Closure of NAS3 would have a damaging impact on the Jeebropilly mine	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
29	1	Social - Training and apprenticeships	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
29	2	Economics - Business Opportunities	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
30	N/A	No submission received	No submission received	Comment Noted	NA
31	1	Business relationships with local companies	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
32	1	Flow on economic contributions to local economy and employees	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
32		Support for the project due to the benefits it brings compared to current business losses in Australia	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
33	1	Prediction of direct and indirect jobs losses if expansion does not occur	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
33	2	Proponent has committed to proper mitigation of coal dust for communities	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
34	1	New Hope strategies currently yielding good environmental results	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
34	2	Economic benefits of ongoing coal mining	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
35	1	Flow on benefits and contributions to environment; employment; royalties and economy	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
36	1	Economic benefits of ongoing coal mining	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
37	1	Current operations benefiting many areas through Investment Fund.	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA

Sub. No.	Issue No.	Issue - Overview / Topic	Submitter Recommendations / Suggested Mitigation/additional information	Proponent response	Relevant AEIS Reference
37	2	Creation of Acland Pastoral Company is sound land and environmental management	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
37	3	Financial security and employment with approval of ongoing coal mining	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
38	1	Flow on benefits and contributions to environment; employment; royalties and economy	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
39	1	N/A	N/A	Comment Noted	NA
40	1	Economics - Employment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
41	1	Coal dust issues for Jondaryan and surrounding area	Stockpiles, train loads must be covered. Real time air monitoring and noise data must be made available online with clear recourse if unacceptable.	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.5.1
41	2	JRLF will remain operational 2 years if the expansion is approved. EIS does not give indication as to the size of the stockpiles/ limitations. Increased production will make JRLF stockpiles larger	Supplementary information to the EIS required to assess the health and amenity impacts of increased train traffic and stockpiles.	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.5.2
41	3	Non-compliance with existing EA and relevant approvals.	These histories should be made available for public notice before EIS consultation period is closed	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.5.3
42	1	Economics - Employment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
42	2	Economics - Business Opportunities	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
42	3	Economics - Royalties	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
43	1	Benefit of increased household income	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
43	2	Training opportunities provided by NHG	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
43	3	Economics - Employment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
44	1	Economics - Employment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
44	2	Economics - Support for Project	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
45	1	Ecologically sustainable development	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
46	1	Economics - Support for Project	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
46	2	Economics - Support for Project	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
47	1	Ecologically sustainable development	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
48	1	Economics - Support for Project	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
49	1	Economics - Support for Project	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
49	2	Economics - Support for Project	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
50	1	Ecologically sustainable development	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
51	1	Economics - Support for Project	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
52	1	Economics - Support for Project	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
53	1	Economics - Support for Project	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
54	1	Economics - Support for Project	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
55	1	Economics - Support for Project	Provision of direct community consultation and noise reducing trees near residence	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.6.1
55	2	Economics - Support for Project	Provision of buffer zone of trees to reduce dust impact on private residence.	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.6.2
56	1	Economics - Support for Project	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
57	1	Ecologically sustainable development	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
58	1	Economics - Support for Project	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
58	2	Economics - Support for Project	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
59	1	Ecologically sustainable development	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
59	2	General Comment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
60	1	General Comment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
61	1	General Comment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
62	1	Economics - Support for Project	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
63	1	Economics - Support for Project	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
64	1	Economics - Support for Project	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
65	1	Economics - Support for Project	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
66	1	Economics - Support for Project	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
67	1	Economics - Support for Project	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
68	1	Economics - Support for Project	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
69	1	Economics - Support for Project	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
70	1	Economics - Support for Project	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
71	1	Economics - Support for Project	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
72	1	Economics - Support for Project	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
72	2	Economics - Support for Project	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
73	1	Economics - Support for Project	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
74	1		Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
75	1	Economics - Support for Project	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
75	2	Economics - Support for Project	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
76	1	Economics - Support for Project	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
77	1	Economics - Support for Project	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
78	1	Support for the project	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
79	1	Support for the project	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
80	1	Economics - Support for Project	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
81	1		Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
81	2	Economics - Support for Project	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
82	1	Economics - Support for Project	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
83	1		Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
83	2	Economics - Support for Project	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
84	1	Economics - Support for Project	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
84	2		Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
85	1	Economics - Support for Project	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
85	2		Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
85	3	Economics - Support for Project	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
86	1	Economics - Support for Project	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
87	1	Economics - Support for Project	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
88	1	Economics - Support for Project	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
89	1	Economics - Support for Project	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
90	1	Economics - Support for Project	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
91	1	Economics - Support for Project	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
92	1	Ecologically sustainable development	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
92	2	Economics - Support for Project	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
93	1	Economics - Support for Project	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
94	1	Economics - Support for Project	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
95	1	Hazard and risk - health and safety	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA

Sub. No.	Issue No.	Issue - Overview / Topic	Submitter Recommendations / Suggested Mitigation/additional information	Proponent response	Relevant AEIS Reference
96	1	Economics - Support for Project	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
96	2	Social - Community values and change	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
96	3	Economics - Support for Project	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
97	1	Ecologically sustainable development	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
97	2	Economics - Support for Project	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
98	1	Ecologically sustainable development	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
98	2	Ecologically sustainable development	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
99	1	Economics - Support for Project	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
99	2	Ecologically sustainable development	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
100	1	Economics - Support for Project	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
100	2	Ecologically sustainable development	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
101	1	Economics - Support for Project	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
101	2	Economics - Support for Project	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
102	1	Economics - Support for Project	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
103	1	Social - Community values and change	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
103	2	Economics - Support for Project	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
103	3	Economics - Support for Project	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
104	1	Economics - Support for Project	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
105	1	Social - Training and apprenticeships	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
105	2	Social - Training and apprenticeships	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
106	1	Economics - Support for Project	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
106	2	Economics - Support for Project	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
107	1	Social - Community values and change	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
107	2	Ecologically sustainable development	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
107	3	Economics - Support for Project	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
108	1	Economics - Support for Project	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
109	1	Ecologically sustainable development	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
109	2	Economics - Support for Project	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
110	1	Ecologically sustainable development	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
111	1	Economics - Analysis Approach	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
111	2	Social - Community values and change	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
111	3	Ecologically sustainable development	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
112	1	Economics - Analysis Approach	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
112	2	Social - Community values and change	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
112	3	Ecologically sustainable development	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
113	1	Economics - Analysis Approach	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
113	2	Social - Community values and change	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
114	1	Economics - Support for Project	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
114	2	Ecologically sustainable development	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
114	3	Economics - Support for Project	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
115	1	Economics - Support for Project	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
116	1	Economics - Support for Project	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
117	1	Economics - Support for Project	Landholder agreements	Comment Noted	NA
118	1	Economics - Support for Project	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
119	1	Economics - Support for Project	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
120	1	continuation of the mine's local jobs, and economic benefits is vital.	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
120	2	local economic benefits of the mine need to continue	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
120	3	young people from the area may be able to stay given employment opportunities	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
120	4	NHG's rehabilitation strategies are supported.	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
121	1	local economic benefits of the mine need to continue. NHG has significantly modified the project to reduce impacts.	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
121	2	the mine's community support initiatives must be allowed to continue	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
121	3	mine's focus on local employment will help keep young people in the area	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
121	4	mining and agriculture can co-exist.	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
122	1	The project is critically important to NHG, its employees, contractors and shareholders	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
123	1	NHG is invaluable to the learning and development for mining and environmental students of University of Qld - project must go ahead	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
123	2		Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
123	3	NHG is a socially responsible organisation that delivers benefits locally, nationally and internationally	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
124	1	local economic benefits of the mine need to continue	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
124	2	job opportunities for young people depend on projects such as this being allowed to proceed	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
124	3	many who oppose the project are not directly impacted; and their arguments against it are hypocritical to their way of living. Australia's current living standards depend on mining. Submissions from those directly affected (both positively/negatively) should be more closely considered by decision makers.	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
125	1	continuation of the mine's local jobs, and economic benefits is vital	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
126	1	continuation of the mine's local jobs, and economic benefits is vital	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
126	2		Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
127	1	continuation of the mine's local jobs, and economic benefits is vital.	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
127	2	mining and agriculture can co-exist. NHG have demonstrated good pastoral and rehab expertise. Mine jobs allow employed farmers to farm part-time	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
128	1	NHG is environmentally responsible and supportive of the community.	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
128	2	continuation of the mine's local jobs, and economic benefits is vital.	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA

Sub. No.	Issue No.	Issue - Overview / Topic	Submitter Recommendations / Suggested Mitigation/additional information	Proponent response	Relevant AEIS Reference
129	1	continuation of the mine's local jobs, and economic benefits is vital. NHG is environmentally responsible and supportive of the community. Unless there are compelling environmental reasons, the project should proceed.	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
130	1	continuation of the mine's local jobs, the opportunities it provides for young people is vital.	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
130	2	NHG is environmentally responsible and supportive of the community.	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
130	3		Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
131	1	continuation of the mine's local jobs, and economic benefits is vital.	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
131	2	NHG's rehabilitation works; water management are best practice. Use of recycled water and moving JRLF commendable.	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
132	1	continuation of the mine's local jobs, and economic benefits is vital.	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
132	2	NHG ensures staff are well trained in environmental management.	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
132	3	NHG is socially responsible and supports the local community.	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
133	1	mine is well run with high standard revegetation.	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
133	2	continuation of the mine's local jobs, and economic benefits is vital.	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
134	1	continuation of the mine's local jobs, and economic benefits is vital.	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
134	2	It's economic benefits are widespread; e.g. he lives in Yamba.	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
135	1	NHG are an outstanding forward thinking organization who are very conscious re the environment, carbon footprint, implementation of industry leading practices and sustainability	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
135	2	continuation of the mine's local jobs, and economic benefits is vital.	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
136	1	continuation of the mine's local jobs, and economic benefits is vital.	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
136	2	NHG's rehabilitation works; water management are best practice. Use of recycled water and moving JRLF commendable.	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
137	1	continuation of the mine's local jobs, and economic benefits is vital.	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
137	2	Social - Regional economies and businesses	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
138	1	Social - Regional economies and businesses	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
138	2	Ecologically sustainable development	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
139	1	Need for air quality to be reported daily, to a greater level and with worse case scenario being of most importance	Proponent should bear cost of monitoring and public access daily reports	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.7.1
139	2	What measures are in place for worker exposure to coal dust	Health checks for workers exposed to emissions	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.7.2
139	3	Coal randomly veneered from site to reduce dust exposure .	Need for all coal to be veneered for transportation	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.7.3
139	4	Exposure to diesel fumes due idling trains in residential locations	Need to improve loading facilities to prevent other locos idling in residential locations	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.7.4
139	5	Hard cover on coal carriage	Issues not addressed in EIS	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.7.5
139	6	Dust readings need to be updated to 2013	Requirement must meet before approval can be given	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.7.6
139	7	Need for measure to address greenhouse gas are recorded as they may be needed in the future taxes are imposed	Proponent should consider and report on how greenhouse gas issue can be addressed if required.	Comment Noted	NA
139	8	Rail movements between 10pm and 5 am should not occur	Proposal but states this is unlikely	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.7.7
139	9	Exposure to noise and vibration due idling trains in residential locations	Need to improve loading facilities to prevent other locos idling in residential locations	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.7.8
139	10	Exposure to noise and vibration due idling trains in residential locations	Need to improve loading facilities to prevent other locos idling in residential locations	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.7.8
139	10	Restrict loading to day time hours	Suggestion to have more independent reviews of circumstances.	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.7.9
139	11	Restrict all night time operations	Suggestion to rate curfew from 8pm to 6 am not identified in the EIS	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.7.10
139	12	Site explosions should not occur if subsequent fumes and dust will enter residential areas	Issues not addressed in EIS	Comment Noted	NA
139	13	Need to reassess water flows in Doctor Creek between Jondaryan and Oakey	Issues not addressed in EIS	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.7.11
139	14	Flood management of mine pondage and downstream impacts of toxic minerals	Doubtful if addressed in EIS	Comment Noted	NA
139	15	Concern over collection of contaminated groundwater in voids left by project	Deep depressions should be treated to prevent contamination of ground water in the voids	Comment Noted	NA
139	16	Other sites (Manning Vale and Willaroo) are prime agricultural land and mining impacts should be considered (Other references to these mines in submission)	Proposal should be terminated as untenable.	Comment Noted	NA
139	17	Group elected does not truly reflect the community and this causes a bias towards the community representative	Need to review community to ensure representation for Oakey	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.7.12
139	18	Need to independent chair on committee to have more meetings	Allow open forum with Independent chairperson	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.7.13
139	19	Need to review waste management practices	Proposal of a waste water treatment plant to be considered	Comment Noted	NA
139	20	Treat waste water prior to use in coal washing process	Water monitoring to ensure there is no water borne contaminates	Comment Noted	NA

Sub. No.	Issue No.	Issue - Overview / Topic	Submitter Recommendations / Suggested Mitigation/additional information	Proponent response	Relevant AEIS Reference
139	21	Need to detail water allocation of both mine and pastoral lease as both are used in proposal	Water monitoring to ensure water allocation is used effectively	Comment Noted	NA
139	22	Prevent mine site leakage into Lagoon Creek after rain periods	Water monitoring to ensure there is no water borne contaminates	Comment Noted	NA
139	23	Provide monthly records of volume and cost of water from Wetella	Proponent should bear cost of monitoring and public access daily reports	Comment Noted	NA
139	24	Increase trains on line e increase dust, noise and vibrations	Suggestion to create curfew from 11pm to 5 am not identified in the EIS	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.7.14
139	25	Closure of QR Western Line	Limits project alternative to solely road transport if distribution of coal is hindered by damaged rail lines	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.7.15
139	26	Remove fuel tankers from roads by use of rail delivery	Transport fuels by rail to new rail loops site and then transfer to trucks within site.	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.7.16
139	27	Reduce road congestion in Toowoomba and the Toowoomba Range	Transport coal by rail only	Comment Noted	NA
139	28	Length of coal trains impacts on communities	Transport coal by rail through communities should not occur during peak road traffic hours .	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.7.17
139	29	Need to preserve Colliery 2 site	Note there is les commitment in EIS for this to occur	Comment Noted	NA
139	30	Need to preserve Acland site	Note there is less commitment in EIS for this to occur as well as road closure in area.	Comment Noted	NA
139	31	Need to preserve more trees on current NAC! And NAC2 for koala habitat	Issue not addressed in EIS and potential for further destruction of habitat	Comment Noted	NA
139	32	Need to improve quality and details provides in community Updates	Allow open forum with Independent assessment of current issues	Comment Noted	NA
139	33	Oakey Cooyar Road is a vital link to south Burnett	Need to place 1/2 km buffer on road from blasting, light and changes to water flow	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.7.18
139	34	Need to reconsider GQAL for land use impacts	Refer to Darling Downs Statutory Regional Plan by DSDIP in 2013	Comment Noted	NA
139	35	Lighting from project impacts on those in surrounding environment	Suggestion to create curfew from 11pm to 5 am not identified in the EIS	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.7.19
139	36	Reviews of natural environment is not being fully explored.	Need to review further the need to retain remnant areas of vegetation	Comment Noted	NA
139	37	document: Chapter 7 - Evaluation of EIS Terrestrial Ecology	various deficiencies of surveying and reporting and assumptions of likely species raised. Concerns with insufficient response to TOR requirements. Concerns with conflicting data.	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.7.20
139	38	Issues of weed and pest management and survey of impacts of introduce species in not being reviewed	Need to more detail and regular reporting of outcomes of surveys conducted	Comment Noted	NA
140	1	Economics - Support for Project	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
141	1	Economics - Support for Project	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
142	1	Social - Regional economies and businesses	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
142	2	Ecologically sustainable development	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
143	1	Economics - Support for Project	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
143	2	Ecologically sustainable development	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
143	3	Social - Community values and change	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
144	1	Economics - Support for Project	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
144	2	Social - Regional economies and businesses	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
145	1	Economics - Support for Project	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
145	2	Social - Regional economies and businesses	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
145	3	Social - Community values and change	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
146	1	Ecologically sustainable development	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
146	2	Economics - Support for Project	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
147	1	Ecologically sustainable development	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
147	2	Economics - Support for Project	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
148	1	Social - Regional economies and businesses	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
148	2	Economics - Support for Project	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
149	1	Ecologically sustainable development	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
149	2	Social - Regional economies and businesses	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
150	1	Ecologically sustainable development	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
150	2	Social - Regional economies and businesses	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
151	1	Social - Community values and change	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
151	2	Ecologically sustainable development	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
152	1	Social - Regional economies and businesses	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
153	1	Social - Regional economies and businesses	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
153	2	Social - Community values and change	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
154	1	General Comment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
155	1	General Comment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
156	1	General Comment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
157	1	Economics - Support for Project	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
157	2	Social - Regional economies and businesses	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
158	1	Social - Regional economies and businesses	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
158	2	Social - Community values and change	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
159	1	Economics - Support for Project	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
160	1	Ecologically sustainable development	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
160	2	General Comment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
160	3	Economics - Support for Project	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
160	4	Land - use and tenure	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
161	1	General Comment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
161	2	Ecologically sustainable development	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
161	3	Mitigation/management	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
161	4	Social - Community values and change	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
161	5	Social - Training and apprenticeships	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
162	1	Social - Community values and change	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
162	2	Social - Regional economies and businesses	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
162	3	General Comment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
163	1	Social - Regional economies and businesses	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
164	1	Economics - Support for Project	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
164	2	Ecologically sustainable development	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
164	3	Mitigation/management	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
164	4	Social - Regional economies and businesses	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
165	1	Social - Regional economies and businesses	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
166	1	Social - Regional economies and businesses	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
167	1	Social - Regional economies and businesses	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
168	1	Social - Regional economies and businesses	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
169	1	Social - Training and apprenticeships	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA

Sub. No.	Issue No.	Issue - Overview / Topic	Submitter Recommendations / Suggested Mitigation/additional information	Proponent response	Relevant AEIS Reference
170	1	Social - Regional economies and businesses	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
171	1	General Comment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
172	1	Social - Training and apprenticeships	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
173	1	General Comment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
174	1	General Comment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
175	1	General Comment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
176	1	General Comment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
177	1	Economics - Support for Project	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
178	1	Social - Community values and change	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
178	2	Ecologically sustainable development	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
178	3	Economics - Support for Project	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
179	1	Economics - Support for Project	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
179	2	Social - Community values and change	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
179	3	Social - Regional economies and businesses	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
179	4	Hazard and risk - health and safety	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
179	5	General Comment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
180	1	Social - Regional economies and businesses	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
181	1	Economics - Business Opportunities	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
181	2	Social - Community values and change	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
182	1	Land - Rehabilitation	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
182	2	Social - Regional economies and businesses	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
182	3	Social - Acland Heritage/ Social Change	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
182	4	Economics - Support for Project	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
183	1	Social - Employment strategy	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
183	2	Economics - Support for Project	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
184	1	Economics - Employment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
184	2	Economics - Business Opportunities	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
185	1	Economics - Employment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
185	2	Ecologically sustainable development	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
186	1	Economics - Employment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
186	2	Ecologically sustainable development	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
187	1	Economics - Employment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
187	2	Ecologically sustainable development	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
188	1	Economics - Employment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
188	2	Ecologically sustainable development	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
189	1	Economics - Support for Project	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
189	2	Local/regional climate	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
189	3	Aquatic ecology impacts	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
189	4	Economics - Business Opportunities	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
189	5	General Comment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
190	1	Concern on the impacts to their property on dust/air quality, noise & health issues.	Refusal of New Acland Coal Mine Stage 3 project	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.8.1
190	2	Concern over the use of groundwater to great expense of taxpayers. And that it is not available to farmers only New Hope Mine.	Instigate a plan to utilise water to the benefit of Australians and not foreign businesses.	Comment Noted	NA
191	1	Economics - Support for Project	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
192	1	Economics - Support for Project	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
192	2	Social - Community Awareness / Social responsibility	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
193	1	The current mining and tailings storage method are effective and cost-efficient.	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
193	2	Economics - Employment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
193	3	General Comment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
193	4	General Comment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
193	5	Hazard and risk - health and safety	Principle Hazard Management Plans, should be: "Principal" throughout the EIS.	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.9.1
193	6		Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
193	7	The risks associated with not proceeding with Stage 3 have not been presented, nor mitigating actions discussed.	The risks of not proceeding should be discussed.	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.9.2
194	1	The Aviation Hazard Management Plan does not address the Defence (Areas Control) Regulations [D(AC)R] for AAC Oakey.	Include a statement that if the D(AC)R height assessment is triggered, that NHG will seek a specific assessment and approval through the Defence.	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.2.1
194	2	Risks imposed by tall structures to aircraft safety can be minimised if information on the tall structure is conveyed to pilots so that they can fly at a safe margin above the structure.	If any structures at the mine meet the definition of a tall structure, details are to be provided to RAAF AIS.	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.2.2
194	3	update stakeholders register		Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.2.3
195	1	Economics - Support for Project	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
195	2	Social - Regional economies and businesses	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
195	3	Land - Rehabilitation	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
195	4	Economics - Employment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
196	1	New Acland Coal should be commended for the work they do to ensure high quality of mining land rehabilitation.	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
196	2	Increasing employment opportunities through the expansion of the mine, would have a significant positive impact on mental health and potentially decrease the suicide rate.	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
196	3		Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
196	4	The implications of rejecting the expansion of the mine is likely to be devastating to the local community, infrastructure, level of employment, mental health and general demographic in the area.	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
197	1	Economics - Employment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
197	2	Land - Rehabilitation	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
197	3	Economics - Business Opportunities	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA

Sub. No.	Issue No.	Issue - Overview / Topic	Submitter Recommendations / Suggested Mitigation/additional information	Proponent response	Relevant AEIS Reference
197	4	New Hope Group have assisted not just social groups locally, but internationally in PNG.	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
198	1	The impact of the expansion not being approved, would have a significant impact on Oakey and the surrounding community.	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
198	2	Social - Regional economies and businesses	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
199	1	Economics - Employment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
200	1	Economics - Employment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
200	2	Ecologically sustainable development	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
201	1	Sold other property area with belief of no further mining extending into agricultural areas	Explanation of what is seen is misrepresentations of intent by New Hope	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.10.1
201	2	Economic impacts of departure of community and small family farms is not being considered	Review Australian Institute's "Biting the land that feeds you..." for review of impacts	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.10.2
201	3	Predicted increase to current unacceptable dust pollution and impacts to respiratory health	Concerns not being addressed now and will only increase with expansion	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.10.3
201	4	Current level of noise pollution is unacceptable and expansion will only increase volume and frequency of such events	Concerns not being addressed now and will only increase with expansion	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.10.4
201	5	Bore testing on property in May 2013 was poorly undertaken	Review the status, depth and conditions of certain bores	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.10.5
201	6	Uncertainty over Groundwater Numerical modelling report in EIS	Vagaries and complexities of ground water patterns and behaviours have not been fully reported.	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.10.6
201	7	Property will suffer groundwater draw down due to project	Predict long term draw down risks impacts to be in excess of figure provided	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.10.7
201	8	Doubt that New Hope will "make good" loss of groundwater and for an indefinite period	Seeking commitment from New Hope in this area	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.10.8
201	9	Concern that the long term impacts of mining will impact on the property's future sales value	Questions how mining impacts will not effect financial outcome of sale at property to support retirement plans	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.10.9
201	10	Concerns relating to project impacts need to be resolved with proponent	Need for a landholder's agreement to be arranged with New Hope	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.10.10
201	11	Group elected does not truly reflect the diversity or experience in views of the community. Minutes not published since Nov 2013	Need to review make up of community reference group and delay in information access of meetings since Nov 2013.	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.10.11
201	12	Expectation that mining would stop in area in 2017.	LNP promise to cease mining in 2017 should be honoured.	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.10.12
202	1	Social - Regional economies and businesses	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
202	2	Economics - Support for Project	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
202	3	Ecologically sustainable development	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
203	1	No comments at this stage			NA
204	1	Ecologically sustainable development	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
204	2	Social - Regional economies and businesses	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
204	3	Economics - Support for Project	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
205	1	Economics - Support for Project	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
205	2	Social - Regional economies and businesses	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
205	3	Economics - Analysis Approach	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
205	2	Social - Community values and change	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
206	1	Social - Regional economies and businesses	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
207	1	Social - Regional economies and businesses	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
208	1	Ecologically sustainable development	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
208	2	Economics - Support for Project	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
208	3	Social - Regional economies and businesses	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
209	1	Economics - Support for Project	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
209	2	Social - Regional economies and businesses	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
209	3	Ecologically sustainable development	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
210	1	Ecologically sustainable development	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
210	2	Social - Regional economies and businesses	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
211	1	Ecologically sustainable development	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
211	2	Social - Regional economies and businesses	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
212	1	Economics - Support for Project	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
212	2	Social - Regional economies and businesses	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
212	3	Economics - Analysis Approach	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
212	4	Coal dust management	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
212	5	Ecologically sustainable development	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
212	6	Social - Community values and change	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
213	1	Concern that the long term impacts of mining will impact on the property's future sales value	Purchase property in close proximity to mine including those off the mining lease or compensate for loss of value	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.11.1
214	1	Uncertainty over proper economic assessment has been excluded from CG consideration	Economic impacts of value to the community or State or Australia is not being considered	Comment Noted	NA
214	2	Health impacts assessment not conducted for EIS	Proponent should supply a health risk assessment report given the future expectations of a clean air environment	Comment Noted	NA
214	3	Predicted increase to current unacceptable dust pollution and impacts to respiratory health	Concerns not being addressed now and will only increase with expansion	Comment Noted	NA
214	4	Current level of noise pollution is unacceptable and expansion will only increase volume and frequency of such events	Concerns not being addressed now and will only increase with expansion	Comment Noted	NA
214	5	Doubt that New Hope will "make good" loss of environment etc. for an indefinite period	Need to review impacts of coal mining on people and the communities they live in	Comment Noted	NA
215	1	Economics - Analysis Approach	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
215	2	Social - Regional economies and businesses	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
216	1	Economics - Analysis Approach	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
217	1	Ecologically sustainable development	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
218	1	Ecologically sustainable development	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA

Sub. No.	Issue No.	Issue - Overview / Topic	Submitter Recommendations / Suggested Mitigation/additional information	Proponent response	Relevant AEIS Reference
218	2	Social - Regional economies and businesses	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
219	1	Social - Community values and change	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
219	2	Social - Regional economies and businesses	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
219	3	Economics - Support for Project	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
220	1	Social - Regional economies and businesses	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
220	2	Social - Community values and change	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
220	3	Ecologically sustainable development	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
221	1	Economics - Support for Project	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
222	1	Social - Regional economies and businesses	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
223	1	Social - Regional economies and businesses	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
224	1	Social - Regional economies and businesses	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
225	1	Economics - Employment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
226	1	Social - Regional economies and businesses	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
226	2	Social - Workforce	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
227	1	Social - Workforce	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
227	2	Social - Regional economies and businesses	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
228	1	OCAA proposes an alternative development for Acland comprising agriculture, large-scale solar farm and eco-tourism.	Reject Stage 3 proposal for a more ecologically sustainable development	Comment Noted	NA
228	2	Cultural Heritage - aboriginal cultural heritage	Reject Stage 3 proposal for a more ecologically sustainable development	Comment Noted	NA
228	3	Economics - Royalties	Reject Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
228	4	analysis should be conducted on the cost-benefit of the mine to residents of Acland	Reject Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
228	5		Reject Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
228	6	EIS does not include GHG emissions from transport of coal offsite	Reject Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
228	7	EIS contains out-dated data on road traffic accidents	EIS should contain up-to-date data on road traffic accidents	Comment Noted	NA
228	8	State Government's Gowrie to Grandchester Rail Study lists some road and rail upgrades that are not mentioned in the EIS	EIS should address the outcomes of the Gowrie to Grandchester Rail Study and any relevance it has on the project	Comment Noted	NA
228	9	Transport - Rail - Regional Impacts	EIS should include O'Mara Road upgrade and Acland-Sabine Road	Comment Noted	NA
228	10	General Comment	EIS should state the relevance of the Wellcamp Airport and business park to the project	Comment Noted	NA
228	11	Road closures may cut off residents in cases of fires and floods.	Road closures should be strictly limited and access to Acland should be maintained in each direction.	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.12.1
228	12	Transport - Rail - Impacts	Proponent should cover costs of upgrading the Oaky Cooyar connection road	Comment Noted	NA
228	13	Transport - Rail - Impacts	EIS should demonstrate how rail upgrades will reduce noise impacts	Comment Noted	NA
228	14	Water - Watercourse impacts	EIS should demonstrate how water will be contained in the new RLF and whether levees will affect floodplain flows	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.12.2
228	15	Construction material for the railway will be sourced from outside the Darling Downs with only concrete being sourced from Oakey. Local suppliers should be contracted to supply materials to the project	EIS should demonstrate that alternative suppliers for material to construct the railway have been considered	Comment Noted	NA
228	16	Unclear statement on sources of workforce and proposed location of workforce residences.	EIS should clarify where employees will be sourced from and where they will reside.	Comment Noted	NA
228	17	Doctors Creek and changes to the railway bridge east of Jondaryan played a role in the flood of 2011. They caused the first flooding of houses on the northern side of the Oakey railway line before Oakey Creek broke its banks.	Reject Stage 3 proposal on the basis that it poses significant flood risk to residents in the area	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.12.3
228	18	General Comment	Reject Stage 3 proposal based on predicted unsustainable water usage and wastage	Comment Noted	NA
228	19	OCAA advised that New Hope Group intends to end their Wetalla contract with council to 'capture water onsite'. This requires clarification.	EIS should include the impacts of the Wetalla Pipeline	Comment Noted	NA
228	20	Water quality testing sites do not represent clean upstream flows and do not report on lead and BTEX concentrations.	EIS should conduct/provide more detailed water quality testing	Comment Noted	NA
228	21	Social - Consultation	Northern Basin Aboriginal National should be consulted	Comment Noted	NA
228	22	Flooding impacts	EIS should report historical flood records and landholder input regarding flood levels.	Comment Noted	NA
228	23	Biodiversity loss	EIS should demonstrate why Approved Conservation plans are ignored in the assessment.	Comment Noted	NA
228	24	Coal dust management	PM 2.5 should be assessed as per the 2013 Senate Inquiry into Australian Air quality. PM 2.5 should be monitored and results provided to residents in real time with early warning alerts	Comment Noted	NA
228	25	Impacts	Reject Stage 3 proposal on the basis that it will be unable to stay within the parameters of the air quality guidelines.	Comment Noted	NA
228	26	Blasting	External independent monitoring of blasts should continue at Acland	Comment Noted	NA
228	27	Coal dust management	Coal stockpile must be covered to reduce dust levels.	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.12.4
228	28	Impacts	Reject Stage 3 proposal on the basis that noise impacts on residents at a number of sensitive receptor locations cannot be mitigated.	Comment Noted	NA
228	29	Railway spur line is not included in terrestrial surveys	All road construction and power easements should be taken into account when assessing terrestrial vegetation clearance	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.12.5
228	30	Terrestrial Ecology	All relevant conservation-listed species to be potentially impacted by the project should be identified in the EIS	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.12.6

Sub. No.	Issue No.	Issue - Overview / Topic	Submitter Recommendations / Suggested Mitigation/additional information	Proponent response	Relevant AEIS Reference
228	31	Assessment methodology	EIS should present survey methodologies for terrestrial fauna and flora in a consistent format	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.12.7
228	32	Terrestrial Ecology	In Tables 7-13 and 3-13, replace "not present" with "not recorded"	Comment Noted	NA
228	33	Restoration areas	Koalas should be considered in the EIS	Comment Noted	NA
228	34	Restoration areas	The species used for rehabilitation of areas back to grazing land requires review and input from specialists.	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.12.8
228	35	Contaminant release	Prove that jobs listed for Stage 3 are actual FTE jobs at the mine and that 'local employment' figures are correct.	Comment Noted	NA
228	36	in pit tailing disposal	EIS should demonstrate that best practice agricultural methods and rehabilitation methods are used	Comment Noted	NA
228	37	Local employment figure discrepancy	Detail the assumptions made to determine the portion of salaries to be outplayed in the local area	Comment Noted	NA
228	38	Land - SCL/Good quality ag land	No mining on SCL	Comment Noted	NA
228	39	Erosion and sediment control	Rehabilitation must be completed to prevent erosion.	Comment Noted	NA
228	40	Ecologically sustainable development	Consider Re-New Acland as an alternative to Stage 3 and all direct, indirect and cumulative impacts and costs of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
228	41	General Comment	Stage 3 should be assessed on its own impacts and not compared to previous, rejected proposals	Comment Noted	NA
228	42	The new CHPP location will increase impacts from noise, dust and lighting on nearby residents	Reject Stage 3	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.12.9
228	43	Impacts	Rainwater from nearby residents should be tested for coal contamination and heavy metals	Comment Noted	NA
228	44	Infrastructure - RLF New Proposal	Provide more detailed mapping including likely water movements in high rainfall and flood events	Comment Noted	NA
228	45	Coal dust management	Explain why veneering is preferred to covered wagons	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.12.10
228	46	Water - Groundwater - Drawdown	Proponent must supply copies of its bore logs and WWW usage. Reject Stage 3 on the grounds of severe short- and long-term impacts to aquifers	Comment Noted	NA
228	47	Ecologically sustainable development	Agriculture achieves better ESD than mining	Comment Noted	NA
228	48	Biodiversity loss	Reject Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
228	49	Land - Rehabilitation	Reject Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
228	50	Social - Consultation	Reject Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
228	51	Social - Community values and change	CG should take into consideration published reports on the socio-economics of Oakey	Comment Noted	NA
228	52	Economics - Land Values	Proponent should address impacts to agricultural land values in addition to housing values	Comment Noted	NA
228	53	Out-dated information presented in EIS	Reject Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
228	54	Economics - Analysis Approach	Demonstrate the actual viability of the project given current and forecast thermal coal prices	Comment Noted	NA
228	55	Mining farmland breaks local cash flow cycles	Reject Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
228	56	Economics - Employment	Impacts discussed in Chapter 17 are addressed at a regional scale. Local impacts should also be discussed	Comment Noted	NA
228	57	Land - Topography, geology and soils	Reject Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
228	58	Impacts	Reject Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
229	1	Social - Regional economies and businesses	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
229	2	Social - Community values and change	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
230	1	Economics - Employment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
230	2	Social - Regional economies and businesses	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
231	1	Economics - Employment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
231	2	Social - Regional economies and businesses	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
232	1	Economics - Business Opportunities	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
232	2	Ecologically sustainable development	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
232	3	Social - Community values and change	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
232	4	Social - Regional economies and businesses	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
233	1	Social - Training and apprenticeships	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
233	2	Social - Regional economies and businesses	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
234	1	Economics - Employment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
235	1	Social - Regional economies and businesses	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
235	2	Economics - Business Opportunities	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
236	1	Social - Regional economies and businesses	The EIS must assess the potential impacts of project traffic at all State-controlled road intersections, not just Warrego Hwy/Jondaryan-Sabine Rd intersection, and mitigate.	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.3.1
236	2	re closure of Acland-Silverleigh Road between Oakey-Cooyar Road and the eastern boundary of Acland town - TMR would support this road closure, however, from the edges of the road boundary, the existing road surface should be scarified and returned to its natural state and a table drain constructed.	The proponent should also confirm whether this is the only road closure affecting a SCR.	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.3.2
236	3	main access to Acland will be the existing Acland-Sabine Road which connects to Oakey-Cooyar Road. No mention of assessing or addressing potential impacts involving a state road	The EIS should also clarify which access will become the most important i.e.. be subject to higher project traffic volumes: Cherrys Road or the Acland – Sabine Road?	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.3.3
236	4	Little traffic info about 200,000T domestic haulage	the routes and destinations of any major haulage volumes be provided, to ensure the safety and efficiency of the haul route is maintained and the access to the receiving property is adequate for the transport task. Community amenity in terms of traffic noise and coal dust management should also be considered. Particularly, the EIS should state how much, if any, coal haulage traffic heads west, taking a right turn into the Warrego Hwy.	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.3.4

Sub. No.	Issue No.	Issue - Overview / Topic	Submitter Recommendations / Suggested Mitigation/additional information	Proponent response	Relevant AEIS Reference
236	5	Trucks on Jondaryan-Sabine Road - part of previous comment	It should be noted that only semi-trailers are legally permitted onto the Jondaryan - Sabine Road at the level crossing with the Warrego Highway. No B-Doubles or larger vehicles are currently permitted.	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.3.4
236	6	section justifies only undertaking SIDRA analysis of the Jondaryan-Sabine Rd with the Warrego Hwy on the basis of there being no intersection data available for others. Commitment is made to complete any outstanding intersection counts during prelim design phase	TMR contends an intersection analysis can be undertaken with existing road link traffic data and NHC estimates of turning traffic generated by the proposal. These can be validated by the proponent undertaking intersection traffic counts where project traffic will increase turn movements, as input into the required intersection analysis	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.3.5
236	7	Warrego – Highway/ Jondaryan – Sabine Road impacts	signalised intersection installation advice provided	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.3.6
236	8	s 13.11.4 - traffic data to include all project traffic, including haulage of domestic coal.	as per submission	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.3.7
236	9	existing level crossings at Jondaryan and Oakey	as per commitments made in section 13.12.3 - ensure discussions with Downs-South West Region continue to take place to reach agreement about the form and construction approvals of level crossings in close proximity to State-controlled roads	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.3.8
236	10	recommended conditions		Comment Noted	NA
236	11	Attachment B comments dust mitigation for coal transported on roads	proponent to ensure transport operators comply with Load Restraint Guide (2004).	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.3.9
236	12	insufficient ALCAM use to assess requirements for existing level and proposed level crossings	The proponent is requested to consult with the appropriate railway manager with regard to the outcomes of the assessment methodology utilised and the potential need for further assessment in order to comply with statutory requirements of a railway manager associated with the safe operation of a railway.	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.3.10
236	13	200,000t transport via roads	The proponent is requested to provide information regarding the destination and routes undertaken for the road transport task of 200 000 tonnes of coal per annum	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.3.11
236	14	recommended conditions		Comment Noted	NA
236	15	Attachment C comments Road Use Management Plan and Traffic Management Plans commitments	advice on structure/approach	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.3.12
236	16	section 3.3.2 lists activities such as decommission of JRLF, gravel/quarry materials and diversion of Jondaryan-Muldu Road - have these activities been included in tables 13-7 and 13-29	table 13-7 to list all construction inputs. state which elements of the list of construction phase activities are and are not included in traffic estimates and the road impact assessment. A map depicting construction inputs transport routes would help	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.3.13
236	17	Little traffic info about 200,000T domestic haulage	At a minimum, TMR requires the vehicles types, routes and destinations of any major haulage volumes be provided, to ensure the safety and efficiency of the haul route is maintained and the access to the receiving property is adequate for the transport task. For example, it is unclear whether B-doubles are used for coal haul and whether local and state road haul routes are approved for this size of vehicle? Community amenity in terms of traffic noise and coal dust management should also be considered	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.3.14
236	18	road safety - Warrego Hwy is discussed but little discussion of road safety risk on other local or state roads. Further, further opportunities to ensure road safety risks should be explored	as per submission	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.3.15
236	19	some good mitigations, however suggest include covering loads in operations phase list	as per submission	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.3.16
236	20	recommended conditions		Comment Noted	NA
237	1	Social - Regional economies and businesses	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
238	1	Economics - Agriculture vs Mining	No development should be permitted in strategic cropping land	Comment Noted	NA
238	2	Social - Acland Heritage/ Social Change	SIA for the EIS should address the evacuation of towns that is likely to be caused by mass purchase of local property.	Comment Noted	NA
238	3	Social - Employment strategy	SIA for the EIS should address the effect of increased labour market competition and wage disparity in an area of low unemployment.	Comment Noted	NA
238	4	Social - Housing impacts	EIS should address project impacts on the local housing market, particularly to rental properties.	Comment Noted	NA
238	5	Hazard and risk - health and safety		Comment Noted	NA
238	6	Coal dust management	The proponent should commit to temporarily cease mining operations when wind speeds exceed 6 m/s.	Comment Noted	NA
238	7	Natural hazards	The EIS should address flood risks completely.	Comment Noted	NA
238	8	Water - Groundwater - Drawdown		Comment Noted	NA
238	9	Groundwater resources in the Condamine aquifers	The EIS should address the cumulative impacts on upper Condamine aquifers given that multiple CSG and mining developments extract from this aquifer.	Comment Noted	NA

Sub. No.	Issue No.	Issue - Overview / Topic	Submitter Recommendations / Suggested Mitigation/additional information	Proponent response	Relevant AEIS Reference
238	10	Flooding impacts	The EIS should demonstrate that all water management and infrastructure will be designed and constructed to manage a 1 in 100 year AEP rainfall event, as per the SPP.	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.13.1
238	11	The proponent also failed to address the Terms of Reference and omitted inclusion of flood records and heights for the district. Local knowledge suggests that the effective Lagoon Creek channelisation from close proximity of the two mine pits (150 metres only each side of a watercourse) presents a real and potentially serious flood risk.		Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.13.2
238	12	Economics - Analysis Approach	EIS should provide a clear cost-benefit analysis of the proposal in the Acland area	Comment Noted	NA
239	1	Social - Regional economies and businesses	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
239	2	Land - Rehabilitation	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
239	3	New Acland Mine uses recycled water purchased from the Toowoomba Regional Council, reducing its impact on water resources.	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
240	1	General Comment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
241	1	Economics - Employment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
241	2	Land - Rehabilitation	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
242	1	Economics - Employment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
243	1	Economics - Employment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
243	2	Land - Rehabilitation	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
244	1	Economics - Support for Project	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
245	1	Land - Rehabilitation	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
246	1	Economics - Employment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
247	1	Project need	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
247	2	Economics - Employment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
248	1	Insufficient attention to health outcomes.	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
248	2	Insufficient attention to review outcomes of prior acquisition of land etc.		Comment Noted	NA
249	1	Economics - Employment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
249	2	Land - Rehabilitation	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
250	1	Land - Rehabilitation	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
250	2	Social - Regional economies and businesses	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
250	3	Economics - Employment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
250	4	Hazard and risk - health and safety	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
251	1	Ensure only uncontaminated water from undisturbed catchments flow into Lagoon Creek.	No disturbance of any part of the catchment should be allowed.	Comment Noted	NA
251	2	Air quality monitoring period of atmospheric inversion conditions.	Mining and loading must stop when inversion conditions occur, so dust is not carried several kilometres from its source.	Comment Noted	NA
251	3	Acland - Silverleigh Road must remain open for public traffic travelling from Jondaryan to Goombungee and for access to the cultural heritage of Acland.		Comment Noted	NA
251	4	The mine has had an adverse impact on the social and economic viability of Oakey and District. Local farmer have been displaced by the mines acquisition of viable farming land.		Comment Noted	NA
251	5	The mine has not made use of the services provided by the Oakey businesses.	New Acland needs to make more use of services and businesses in the Oakey District.	Comment Noted	NA
251	6	The proposed mine site is prime agricultural land which was and still is capable of producing high quality crops. Since purchasing the land, New Hope Group have been allowed to deteriorate to grazing land, so that they only have to return it to grazing land after mining. Nowhere in the world has rehabilitated land been used for sustained agriculture (food production will be a potential world problem in the future).		Comment Noted	NA
252	1	Economics - Employment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
253	1	Economics - Employment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
254	1	Economics - Support for Project	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
255	1	Economics - Business Opportunities	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
256	1	1.8 Project Rationale - Truck and Loader operation til 2029. The amount of coal dust being distributed is currently excessive. The method of loading is incongruous & not best practice. The residents of Jondaryan are being impacted/causing significant impacts. The excessive dust has caused us to spend additional time cleaning (which is futile), using excessive water	Move the coal loading facility, or compensate residents for the inconvenience, additional expense and disruption.	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.14.1
256	2	The most affected township (Jondaryan) does not even rate a mention. The township is situated S/W of the Coal Dump and the wind charts map 75% of wind from the East. Jondaryan thus gets the brunt of dust generated from the Truck and Loader operation. There are no receptors within the township of Jondaryan.		Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.14.2
256	3	The noise levels very high.		Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.14.3
257	1	Economics - Employment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
258	1	Economics - Employment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA

Sub. No.	Issue No.	Issue - Overview / Topic	Submitter Recommendations / Suggested Mitigation/additional information	Proponent response	Relevant AEIS Reference
258	2	Land - Rehabilitation	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
259	1	Due to the threat of altered flow, erosion and habitat destruction, the buffer zone applied to the mining operations should also apply to agricultural practices.	I.e. Limit operations from 150 metres from the creek bank including a 50 metre 'no disturbance' buffer to actively promote healthy riparian structure. Stock watering should be performed via pumping out of water from the creek to a stock trough.	Comment Noted	NA
259	2	Fire fuel load in agricultural areas.	A comprehensive management plan needs to be devised and presented to the community including mixed grazing, intense grazing, spelling, bailing and periodic/mosaic hazard reduction burns.	Comment Noted	NA
259	3	Management of noxious/environmental weeds. No description of weed management has been offer for comment. Prevalent weeds in the area include African box thorn, lantana, rodes grass, velvet tree pear	Consult with local knowledgeable land holders, NED landcare, Toowoomba Regional Council and specialists in adapting a mine & neighbouring property weed management plan. Offer the findings to the community for comment.	Comment Noted	NA
259	4	Management of pests No description of pest management has been offer for comment. Prevalent pests in the area are feral pigs, fox, wild dog / dingo, rabbit/hare, Indian miners.	Consult with local knowledgeable land holders, NED landcare, Toowoomba Regional Council and specialists in adapting a mine & neighbouring property pest management plan. Offer the findings to the community for comment.	Comment Noted	NA
259	5	Failure to provide adequate mix of rehabilitated remanent vegetation and agricultural land. Species known to be under threat: • Koala • Grey headed flying fox • Little pied bat • Echidna	More consideration needs to be given to rehabilitation of land for BIODIVERSITY. The additional issue is the growth rate of these system require at least 20 years for maturity and ultimate effectiveness and therefore need to be prioritised. In addition it is now common practice for land holders to establish windbreaks through planting remanent species as it offer protection from destructive winds and in addition it enables better soil/water retention and stabilisation of sub surface water.	Comment Noted	NA
259	6	Reference Figure 9.1 sensitive receptors ; additional monitors	Place up to 3 monitors strategically placed within Oakey township to monitor air quality & contaminant level / sources. 1. Close proximity to rail line 2. Oakey water tower 3. Residential area / schools	Comment Noted	NA
259	7	Table 9.3pm10 concentrations (24hour average) recorded around the mine 2003 - 2012 Inadequate data for assessment	Propose that due to incomplete data, the assessment is continued until a full comprehensive study can be concluded on. In addition if results are unavailable due to equipment failure recordings should be regarded as the 'highest levels'.	Comment Noted	NA
259	8	Noise, vibration & Dust from passing coal trains through Oakey township, higher use by rail transport is expected and will consequently impact the town of Oakey.	I propose that the speed limit from trains travelling through Oakey be reduced to a minimum and the area should commence 1klm on the east side of the town ship to 1klm west of Devon Park Road.	Comment Noted	NA
259	9	Increase road use due & therefore green house gas emissions due to increase in workforce.	Assess alternative modes of transport for workers travelling from Toowoomba and Oakey. Possibly bus in workers from a designated parking area within the townships at a cost to the company.	Comment Noted	NA
259	10	No indication of future plans for rail crossing upgrade at Oakey even though higher use by rail transport is expected and will consequently impact the town of Oakey.	Consultation should be sought from community, Queensland Rail & Toowoomba Regional Council to a long term goal to upgrade the rail crossing at Oakey Cooyar road.	Comment Noted	NA
259	11	No indication of plans to conduct Residential rain water quality &/or contamination testing.	I believe that testing of residential rain water storage should be conducted periodically to rule out contaminated water claims. Parameters need to be established for this study.	Comment Noted	NA
260	1	Economics - Employment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
261	1	Economics - Employment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
262	1	Social - Community Awareness / Social responsibility	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
262	2	Social - Regional economies and businesses	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
262	3	Economics - Support for Project	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
263	1	Social - Regional economies and businesses	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
263	2	Economics - Employment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
264	1	Social - Community values and change	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
265	1	Economics - Business Opportunities	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
265	2	Social - Regional economies and businesses	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
266	1	Land - Rehabilitation	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
	2	Economics - Support for Project	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
	3	No impact on War Memorial if project		Comment Noted	NA
	4	Economics - Support for Project	Acquisition sole occupant of Acland. Remove the voluntary exclusion zone.	Comment Noted	NA
267	1	Economics - Employment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
268	1	Economics - Support for Project	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
269	1	Chronic noise will continue unabated until 2029 from the noise sources of the CHPP, conveyors and loaders		Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.15.1
269	2	Chronic fugitive dust emission and nobody has been named as responsible for taking action		Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.15.2
269	3	Lack of proposed monitoring of diesel exhaust at the mine		Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.15.3
269	4	The information and potential additional vehicle movements per day omitted from the traffic assessment	introduce approved travel route on sealed roads	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.15.4
269	5	Proposed power supply route traverses our property, no definition of amenity	Invest further to suitably remove the existing power line	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.15.5
269	6	Broken windows and overgrown with weeds in gardens of abandoned houses	Removal of dysfunctional and abandoned buildings in a tidy condition	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.15.6

Sub. No.	Issue No.	Issue - Overview / Topic	Submitter Recommendations / Suggested Mitigation/additional information	Proponent response	Relevant AEIS Reference
269	7	affected persons and other sensitive receptors		Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.15.7
270	1	Economics - Employment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
270	2	Social - Regional economies and businesses	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
271	1	Economics - Employment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
271	2	Ecologically sustainable development	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
271	3	Social - Regional economies and businesses	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
272	1	Directional flow changes in flood times	lessen bottle-necking of flood waters	Comment Noted	NA
272	2	Watercourse and channels siltation	De-silt watercourses and roadside channels, replantation after mining	Comment Noted	NA
272	3	Weeds and noxious plants	Under the same rules and regulations as farmers	Comment Noted	NA
272	4	100m height flood levees, minimum 50m buffer zones	Further investigations and monitoring, minimum 100m buffer zones	Comment Noted	NA
272	5	Rail spur on Lagoon Creek flood plain	Place culverts	Comment Noted	NA
272	6	Road and rail spur construction	The highest standard of facilities construction	Comment Noted	NA
272	7	Bi-annual monitoring	Monthly check of rehabilitated land	Comment Noted	NA
272	8	Degraded aquatic habitat and connectivity	Improve Lagoon Creek, plant trees, improve water quality and the aquatic habitat	Comment Noted	NA
272	9	a) Riparian buffer zones, b) 5% reduction of total catchment area, c) Pest and Weed management plan	a) Minimum of 100m buffer zones, b) liable for additional water sources c) include eradication	Comment Noted	NA
272	10	No sensitive receptors monitoring west or south of Jondaryan	More receptors and measuring devices	Comment Noted	NA
272	11	Dust from coal transportation, ingested by livestock	Dust emissions control, monitor workers lung health, research of livestock of ingesting plants	Comment Noted	NA
272	12	Cost dust from RLF	Animal health research	Comment Noted	NA
272	13	Future health of residents and workers	Independent testing and monitoring twice a year by Q Health	Comment Noted	NA
272	14	Water supplies contamination	liable for cleaning costs of tanks	Comment Noted	NA
272	15	Rail loads subject to adequately covered condition	Cover the load when transport	Comment Noted	NA
272	16	Potential noise from construction	Develop clear legislation	Comment Noted	NA
272	17	Large number of vehicles at peak time	Provide bus service. Stagger start and finish times	Comment Noted	NA
272	18	Decommissioning Waste	Extensively covered	Comment Noted	NA
272	19	Mining leases are excluded in planning schemes	Change legislation	Comment Noted	NA
272	20	Visual and dust pollution		Comment Noted	NA
272	21	Night lighting	Insulate and air condition affected houses	Comment Noted	NA
272	22	Rehabilitation to rural outlook	Plant trees and native vegetation	Comment Noted	NA
272	23	Social - Consultation	Hold information seminars, community reference group, media articles and mine tours	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.17.1
272	24	Training opportunities	Provide a bursary to study	Comment Noted	NA
272	25	Decommissioning of RLF	Minimise dust near the new facility	Comment Noted	NA
272	26	Periods of inversion	Cease mining when an inversion episode is occurring	Comment Noted	NA
272	27	Distance between remnant vegetation areas	Planting corridors	Comment Noted	NA
272	28	Clearing of 142 ha vegetation	Equivalent replanted	Comment Noted	NA
272	29	The plan should state "eradicating"	Hire registered contractors	Comment Noted	NA
273	1	Continued dust	Monitoring, move the loading facility	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.17.1
273	2	green tree frogs have dwindled - indicative of declining environ health		Comment Noted	NA
273	3	Air quality objectives	Set up a proper air monitoring station	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.17.2
273	4	Noise testing inappropriate	and lack of ambient noise monitoring	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.17.3
274	1	Economics - Employment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
274	2	Social - Regional economies and businesses	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
275	1	Mental health and social impacts	perform an adequate 'targeted baseline study' as required by TOR	Comment Noted	NA
275	2	Anxiety, community cohesion, social and psychological effects	Assess negative impacts	Comment Noted	NA
276	1	Land - SCL/Good quality ag land	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
276	2	Water - Groundwater - Drawdown	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
276	3	Terrestrial Ecology - terrestrial fauna - Koala	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
276	4	Hazard and risk - health and safety	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
276	5	Economics - Analysis Approach	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
276	6	Carbon Emissions	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
276	7	Coal dust management	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
277	1	Economics - Support for Project	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
278	1	Flooding impacts on Jondaryan, dust, noise and community changes, business impacts		Comment Noted	NA
278	2	Decline in business due to farm closures and families leaving the region	Do not approve mine as things will only get worse	Comment Noted	NA
279	1	Coal dust management	Road watering/seal internal roads/install shakers, cover loads	Comment Noted	NA
279	2	Pigs, dogs and cats damage fauna	Eradicate feral animals on land	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.18.1
279	3	Need for qualified staff	Apprenticeships, bursaries to study	Comment Noted	NA
279	4	Unable to attend consultation	Night sessions suggested	Comment Noted	NA
279	5	RLF	Nature reserve	Comment Noted	NA
280	1	Economics - Support for Project	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
280	2	Social - Regional economies and businesses	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
280	3	General Comment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
281	1	Economics - Employment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
281	2	Social - Community values and change	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
282	1	Economics - Employment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
282	2	Social - Community values and change	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
282	3	Land - Rehabilitation	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
283	1	Economics - Employment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
283	2	Economics - Support for Project	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA

Sub. No.	Issue No.	Issue - Overview / Topic	Submitter Recommendations / Suggested Mitigation/additional information	Proponent response	Relevant AEIS Reference
284	1	Does not support the project. Extensive comments included about the LNP's election commitment to stop the mine not being honoured	no justification for the mine. Little in the way of royalties to support economic benefits argument.	Comment Noted	NA
284	2	inappropriate land use		Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.19.1
284	3	EIS process is onerous and intimidating, time consuming and stressful. Can't comment on 4,400 pages in 6 weeks.		Comment Noted	
284	4	Proponent's past engagement has been bullying, intimidating, untrustworthy and with no regard for community and environment.		Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.19.2
284	5	Cumulative Impacts	limit dependence on fossil fuels	Comment Noted	NA
284	6	project vehicles add to pollution, but not modelled. PM 2.5, PM 1 concerns. Concerns with monitoring methodology and results, both on their property and elsewhere.		Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.19.3
284	7	health impacts are real and untenable, and cause great stress and concern about impacts on her family. Experts on health impacts have expressed concerns about New Acland. Senate committee report on air quality cited.		Comment Noted	NA
284	8	concerns for Brymaroo given proximity		Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.19.4
284	9	concern about current unknowns about health impacts of proximity to mines		Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.19.5
284	10	coal fires can present a range of hazards. Concern about fire at stockpiles close to her family's homes.		Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.19.6
284	11	noise pollution, particularly night noise, is extensive, constant and stressful. Complaining makes no difference. Monitoring noise - averages over time - illogical. Extended exposure can cause deafness.		Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.19.7
284	12	noise disturbance is also from the trucks transporting the coal.		Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.19.8
284	13	has had damage to the house and a painting due to vibration from blasting.		Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.19.9
284	14	Electromagnetic frequency concerns - linked to vibrations from blasting and digging machinery.		Comment Noted	NA
284	15	additional 34kms to travel to Acland if the road is closed.		Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.19.10
284	16	Concerns with road safety - slip lanes should be considered.		Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.19.11
284	17	Sky is lit up at night like Sydney Harbour Bridge. Not only affects amenity but also sleep. Some plants die without some darkness.		Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.19.12
284	18	are koalas and other animals removed from trees prior to clearing? So many less koalas than in prior years. Won't eat leaves with coal dust on them. Koalas difficult to relocate.		Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.19.13
284	19	Anzac day in Acland is a significant event. People will have to travel much greater distances. EIS says they maintain the park/memorial, which is a lie.		Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.19.14
284	20	Extensive commentary on history of the area, social meaning, change that the mine has caused. NAC's community engagement is all about PR. Donations inappropriate. They divide and conquer neighbours.		Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.19.15
284	21	No substance to claims about job benefits. Jobs are replacing those that would have been there if farming practiced. Mining heading to automation. Other opportunities are in the region - e.g. Bunning's.		Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.19.16
284	22	concerned all Indigenous groups were not consulted		Comment Noted	NA
284	23	concerns with amount of water use; impacts on water tanks - no longer drinks from tanks but purchases drinking water. Feels itchy after showering. NAC said previously water would be shared with farmers - didn't eventuate.		Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.19.17
285	1	Does not support project - Election commitment was not honoured		Comment Noted	NA
285	2	no confidence in NAC's social licence.		Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.20.1
285	3	mine is too close to Oakey - noise, blasting, dust, lighting impacts too close	minimum distance from a coal mine should be 20kms.	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.20.2
285	4	land will not be able to be used for cropping once mined.	Leave good strategic cropping land alone	Comment Noted	NA
285	5	veneering not world's best practice. Monitoring doesn't occur 24/7.	All coal wagons should be hard covered to prevent coal dust from escaping and machinery needs to be washed before leaving the mine site	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.20.3
285	6	concerns with quantities of water the mine will use - limited resource and increasingly so given drought. Also concerned about mine practices causing contamination of water due to run off.	Don't give the mine permission to have open air dams that can overflow, caused by human error, machinery faults or extreme weather events	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.20.4
285	7	The local roads are already in a state. Better roads and road networks will be needed for safety of the travelling public.		Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.20.5
285	8	No confidence in economic benefits as opposed to agricultural use of the land.	OCAA alternate use of the land for solar farm supported.	Comment Noted	NA
285	9	Other businesses /govt operations have provided long term jobs and in a more beneficial way than NAC would.		Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.20.6

Sub. No.	Issue No.	Issue - Overview / Topic	Submitter Recommendations / Suggested Mitigation/additional information	Proponent response	Relevant AEIS Reference
285	10	local businesses have closed due to the mine	return to farming better for the local economy.	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.20.7
285	11	Economics - Agriculture vs Mining	With help from the government we can rekindle the farming sector to its former glory.	Comment Noted	NA
285	12	Economics - Agriculture vs Mining	Govt. to support local agribusiness		NA
285	13	SCL			NA
285	14	H&R - Hazardous substances	No dumping in mine pits - e.g. tyres or anything toxic	Comment Noted	NA
285	15	Flooding impacts		Comment Noted	NA
286	16	TRC took away water from farmers in favour of the coal mine			NA
287	17	Air Quality			NA
285	18	Transport - Rail - Impacts	Stop the trains from making as much noise during night time operations e.g. reduce sound of horn for extended periods; avoid accelerating aggressively, making engines quieter	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.20.8
285	19	additional trains - additional dust impacts.		Comment Noted	NA
285	20	don't believe cumulative impacts are not significant. Air, dust, water, land, noise will be increased.		Comment Noted	NA
285	21	Oakey, Jondaryan and people located along the length of the railway are sensitive receptors and NAC should be responsible.	There are not particulate monitors in the towns of Oakey, Jondaryan or along the rail way. Monitors should be placed in all of these areas because coal dust is evident in all of these areas	Comment Noted	NA
285	22	Self assessed monitoring at site is inappropriate. Also - don't believe results of dust from monitoring conducted along the rail line to port.		Comment Noted	NA
285	23	Air Quality			NA
285	24	water tank owners should be able to have their water independently tested for coal dust deposits.	This should be paid for by the coal mine	Comment Noted	NA
285	25	Coal dust from Rail Transport			NA
285	26	Noise Sensitive Receptors are people	Change the terminology to make this whole process more personal. WE are people who have made or are making a home for our family's	Comment Noted	NA
285	27	noise concerns.	Stop NHC from killing off the koala population	Comment Noted	NA
285	28	Night lighting from the mine should be reduced so as not to illuminate the night sky		Comment Noted	NA
285	29	negative social change has occurred due to the mine, not due to other factors as cited in the EIS (e.g. ageing population)		Comment Noted	NA
285	30	NHC needs to engage more with local rural community		Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.20.9
286	1	I wish to express my extreme disgust that this project is even being considered given the government's election and post-election commitments to not allow mining expansion at Acland. If the government approve this mine it will prove that they lied to the people.		Comment Noted	NA
286	2	Mine at Muldu will only worsen dust and noise impacts at our property		Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.21.1
286	3	The mine has already been proven by the state government to breach noise conditions at our property		Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.21.2
286	4	Mine lies - NAC said would not mine within 2km of Acland at night, this is not what is proposed in EIS		Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.21.3
286	5	EIS says that mine maintains the tom Doherty park at Acland and the War memorial - this is untrue		Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.21.4
286	6	There has never been any dust or noise monitoring at Muldu.		Comment Noted	NA
286	7	The EIS is based on lies, omission, corruption and deceit, which is not surprising because the whole process is flawed. 6 weeks to review 4400 pages unreasonable.		Comment Noted	NA
286	8	My experience with the mine has been terrible. Over the last 13 years or so the mine's impact on my family has been constant and negative. Promises to provide info that never came. Complete lack of understanding about the community.		Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.21.5
286	9	Even when the government did limited monitoring and found that the mine exceeded its EA limits, still nothing was done.		Comment Noted	NA
286	10	EIS says that mine maintains the tom Doherty park at Acland and the War memorial - this is untrue		Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.21.6
286	11	No covered wagons - why		Comment Noted	NA
286	12	The EIS states that koalas are plentiful around here suggesting that there is no need to worry about them. I strong disagree with this. Koalas won't eat leaves contaminated by pollutants such as coal dust		Comment Noted	NA
286	13	Mine should contribute to care of park and memorial but should never be given control or ownership.		Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.21.6
286	14	The mine should not be allowed to adversely impact on airspace.		Comment Noted	NA
287	1	Gain experience and uni sponsorship as geologist	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
287	2	Training opportunities for mining professionals	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
287	3	Oakey business and development enhanced by NHG	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
288	1	Husband works for New Hope Group	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA

Sub. No.	Issue No.	Issue - Overview / Topic	Submitter Recommendations / Suggested Mitigation/additional information	Proponent response	Relevant AEIS Reference
289	1	Works for New Hope Group	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
290	1	Partner works for new Hope Group	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
290	2	Business and development enhanced by NHG and alternative work in times of changes in opportunities	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
291	1	Economics - Employment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
291	2	Land - Rehabilitation	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
291	3	General Comment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
291	4	Infrastructure - RLF New Proposal	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
292	1	Time constraints in public advertising period	Sufficient time to review ad make comment on the draft EIS	Comment Noted	NA
292	2	Diminishing quantity of good quality agricultural land / Land suitability rating too low	NAC reassess the significance of net reduction in land suitability to high	Comment Noted	NA
292	3	Proposed mitigation measures proposed are not significant to reduce residual effect to low	NAC should reassess the significance of this residual impact to at least medium.	Comment Noted	NA
292	4	"No diversion of Lagoon Creek" - Appears to be a statement referring to previous Stage 3 project, which should not be the focus of this EIS	Removal of bullet point "No diversion of Lagoon Creek and similar statements throughout EIS.	Comment Noted	NA
292	5	Table ES-1 "Aquatic Ecology - Proposed mitigation measure "Buffer along Lagoon Creek"	Amendment of this bullet-point to accurately state the impact of the proposed Project on the surface water, rather than NAC's contention of the impact on surface water of the previous proposed Stage 3 being revised.	Comment Noted	NA
292	6	"NAC will continue to work in close consultation with local residents, landholders, local businesses, government agencies, community and environmental groups and other key stakeholders throughout the planning and development of the revised Project to achieve mutually beneficial outcomes and relationships."	NAC should consider rewording this statement to accurately reflect reality. EA should include requirements for NAC to provide any monitoring data and management plans to sensitive receptors, upon request. This would then support any claims of transparency that NAC make.	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.22.1
292	7	Cattle Grazing Trials/ Rehabilitation	NAC to remove all references in the EIS to successful grazing trials when no empirical data is provided to support these assertions.	Comment Noted	NA
292	8	Terminology of final voids as "depressed landforms".	NAC revert all references to "depressed landforms" to the term "final void". This is consistent with mining terminology and removes from the EIS what appears to be a clear PR 'word smithing'.	Comment Noted	NA
292	9	No final land use for the voids.	EA condition requiring NAC to provide the regulatory body (and sensitive receptors, upon request) a copy of their final plan for land use in/around the voids a minimum of 1 year prior to those voids being finalised. NAC should include evidence of their investigations into possible mine void alternatives within their annual returns, or as part of an annual third party auditors report.	Comment Noted	NA
292	10	NAC state that groundwater records from 2012 show that groundwater use had reduced to less than 42 ML per annum. However, it is uncertain why NAC have not included groundwater use for the mine in 2013. Why is NAC instead relying of data that is not up-to date?	NAC to provide 2013 annual groundwater use in addition to 2012 in order to ensure that the quoted 2012 figure is not simply an anomaly and that quoted data is the most current available. NAC to include historical groundwater data for a more extensive water quality analyse suite, such as BTEX. PAH's, phenols etc.	Comment Noted	NA
292	11	NAC state that they will vary or limit their operations in Manning Vale East pit in order to meet noise objectives (dependent on ambient conditions). Previously - Upon questioning NAC and EHP about this apparent pattern, both parties have informed us that it would be unfeasible that NAC could vary their operations in this way.	EA condition(s) to properly enforce/audit the implementation of 'best practice operations' and evaluate the efficacy of the noise mitigation system (comprising real time noise monitoring, meteorological assessment and resultant changes in NAC mining operations). As element of this evaluation must include feedback from sensitive receptors and be assessed by an independent third party auditor annually.	Comment Noted	NA
292	12	NAC's response, even the sub-section title of "Individual and Community Well-being and Welfare" has an unbalanced focus on short-term economic outcomes and fails to address the key component of "...that safeguards the welfare of future generations."	NAC to broaden their focus to ALL aspects of the ESD principles and not just elements that their project can link to. In particular, NAC should comment on how their proposed project ""...safeguards the welfare of future generations."	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.22.2
292	13	Concessions made from previous stage 3 proposal is used to justify the intergenerational equity principle.	NAC to include a commitment in the EIS that: · This Stage 3 proposal will not be followed by, at any point in the future, another proposed NAC mining operations Stage that will incorporate (fully or partly) the mining operations that were removed between the initial and revised Stage 3 EIS's NAC to remove all references to reductions/changes made from the previous Stage 3 EIS proposal. These are irrelevant to the assessment of impacts from the current proposal	Comment Noted	NA
292	14	ESD guidelines have not been adhered too. Lack of consultation		Comment Noted	NA

Sub. No.	Issue No.	Issue - Overview / Topic	Submitter Recommendations / Suggested Mitigation/additional information	Proponent response	Relevant AEIS Reference
292	15	While NAC provide some economic statistics in response, they do not appear to have addressed the "...which can enhance the Capacity for Environmental Protection" aspect of the ESD principle.	NAC should address the "...which can enhance the Capacity for Environmental Protection" aspect of the ESD principle in the EIS.	Comment Noted	NA
292	16	Under sub-heading "Model calibration" NAC state that the groundwater model does not incorporate pre-mining data. Ideally, pre-mining data would be incorporated into the calibration of the model since it represents the true 'baseline' for the site.	NAC to incorporate pre-mining data into the groundwater model calibration.	Comment Noted	NA
292	17	The model calibration hydrographs in Figure 6-23 show very different water level between calculated and observed	NAC to address this apparent incongruity in their data, or (at least) explain this data pattern in the EIS.	Comment Noted	NA
292	18	TYP0 - Reference to model calibrations shown in hydrographs in Figure 6-22. These are actually shown in Figure 6-23 instead.	NAC to correct this typo.	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.22.3
292	19	NAC notes that comparison of values between the model and local pump tests indicates that the Walloon Coal Measures represent a more important aquifer locally than it is regionally.	NAC to have this statement reflected in their risk mitigation component for groundwater, to apportion a representative risk level.	Comment Noted	NA
292	20	While the NAC EIS regularly refers to 5 metre impacts (presumably a reference to the current legislative statutory trigger level to instigate 'make good' for petroleum and gas wells under Chapter 3 of the Water Act 2000) it is worth noting that even a 1 metre drawdown can have significant impacts on a bore.	A decent and socially responsible step would be for NAC to undertake 'baseline assessment' (although current mine operations may have already impacted some of these bores to some extent) on all bores that fall within the 1m projected drawdown boundary. This would account for any model inaccuracies (although NAC argue that their model is conservative), would not cost much, and would provide local landholders some additional assurance, particularly if supported by a commitment by NAC to properly investigate any complaints of decreasing bore yield that appears linked to mine operations, and to 'make good' any bores that are impacted.	Comment Noted	NA
292	21	There is an apparent break in the text between page 6-62 and 6-68.	NAC to rectify mistake in text so that it reads correctly.	Comment Noted	NA
292	22	NAC illustrate reductions in stream flow from Oakey Creek and Myall Creek. NAC state that they do not have stream flow gauging data for Myall Creek and so it is unclear how NAC have calculated their projected impacts on Myall Creek.	NAC to educate how projected impacts on Myall Creek were calculated, given the apparent absence of empirical data.	Comment Noted	NA
292	23	The Oakey Creek stream flow data used is from approximately 37km west of the project site. It is very feasible that a difference of 37km between sites could translate into a considerable difference in flow regimes, which brings doubt in the accuracy of this data used by NAC.	NAC to explain how representative the Oakey Creek stream flow data is, and potential 'feedback' or 'knock-on' effects in any subsequent modelling based on any inaccuracies in this data and any flawed assumptions.	Comment Noted	NA
292	24	While NAC provide maximum projected daily losses to the stream flow in these creeks, it should be noted that the use of daily averages in this way is unlikely to fully reflect the asymmetry of the stream flow system.	NAC to provide stream flow data in a form that accounts for the ephemeral nature of the creek stream flows.	Comment Noted	NA
292	25	Under the sub-heading of "Effects on Groundwater Levels Post Mining" NAC state that "...groundwater levels are predicted to gradually recover so that for the most part there is less than 5 m residual drawdown outside the revised Project's boundary as depicted in Figure 6-33 and Figure 6-34."	NAC to appropriately acknowledge the extent and longevity of the impact upon groundwater in the local area and upon local users.	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.22.4
292	26	Evaporation loss/ Final Voids - It is understood that NAC have adopted BOM information for the Stage 3 calculation but it is not clear why (a) NAC appeared to use other data in the Stage 2 EIS, and (b) why they made the change towards the BOM information to generate these projections.	NAC to address differences in the evaporation rates stated for Stage 2 and 3 in their respective EIS documents.	Comment Noted	NA
292	27	Pit inflow/wastewater - water losses are truly staggering and are exacerbated by the fact that much of this loss will be, for a short period, concentrated in highly saline waters with little avenues for beneficial use without extensive treatment. These long-term impacts have not been addressed by NAC. In the EIS. Certainly, NAC's focus appears to be on the impacts now, rather than the ongoing loss into the long-term future	Two suggestions are suggested: · NAC not be given project approval for the proposed Stage 3 mining operations · NAC be made to address the long-term water loss impacts of their operations, beyond a simple statement (as currently exists) regarding approximately 1.3ML/yr loss.	Comment Noted	NA
292	28	Over time, it is very feasible that the voids will become highly saline scorched land with a highly disturbed ecosystem. It is worth noting though that it cannot be assumed that the evaporative loss will exceed the associated recharge rates.	Two key solutions are proposed: · NAC not be allowed to gain approval for their Stage 2 mining operations Project. · NAC provide further conceptual and empirical reasoning to support their suggestion in the Stage 3 EIS that increases in salinity levels will be limited in the final voids.	Comment Noted	NA

Sub. No.	Issue No.	Issue - Overview / Topic	Submitter Recommendations / Suggested Mitigation/additional information	Proponent response	Relevant AEIS Reference
292	29	NAC presents a very dictatorial version of the 'make good' process. The make good process should be a two-way street; a negotiation between the company and landholder towards making good on the impacts placed upon the bore owner's bore.	NAC should rewrite this section in order to communicate that their make good process will be in equal and fair negotiation with the impacted bore owners.	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.22.5
292	30	Figure 6-37 does not show any groundwater monitoring bores for the Tertiary Basalt to the east of the existing and proposed mining operations.	NAC should add some monitoring groundwater bores on the eastern boundary of the Site.	Comment Noted	NA
292	31	NAC open the 'Land Resources' chapter by focusing on negative 'challenges' previously identified for the entire catchment, while failing to mention any positive aspects of Lagoon Creek. NAC state that the land has "...been subject to long periods of continued dry years and unreliable rainfall since the early 1990's." However, it is also worth noting that the area has also received periods of significant rainfall. In fact, NAC incorporate an estimate of several gigalitres (billion litres) of rainfall per year into their models of post-mining water input into the final voids.	NAC to provide a more balanced, and accurate, description of lagoon creek in their Stage 3 EIS. NAC to provide a more balanced, and accurate, description of the climatological setting in/around the proposed Stage 3 project site.	Comment Noted	NA
292	32	NAC state that "Local commercial services such as small workshops, general store and fuel supply have long ceased operation." It is worth noting that these have ceased operation largely as a direct result of NAC mining in the area and the systematic dismantling of the Acland community.	NAC provide a more balanced, and accurate, account of the changes that have occurred in Acland, and their pivotal role in the demise of Acland township.	Comment Noted	NA
292	33	NAC state that there is a single stock route that "may" be affected by the proposed new operations. However, Figure 4-1 shows quite clearly that the northern tip of the proposed Manning Vale West Pit would swallow up approximately 0.5km of the stock route.	NAC change their statement to acknowledge that the stock route transects the planned Manning Vale West pit and therefore will be impacted.	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.22.6
292	34	The fact that much of this land has not been used for cropping ever since NAC took ownership (appearing to thereby reduce its agricultural capacity) should not be mistaken for land that is not capable of being used for cropping at all, as suggested by NAC.	NAC should be directed to map the proposed mining site for PALU presence, taking into consideration historical land usage and not just the usage since the mine has taken ownership of the land and changed its overarching usage from cropping to grazing.	Comment Noted	NA
292	35	The removal of 'key resource areas - KRA's' from the TRC plan for the Acland area should speak volumes about the direction that local government, and supporting community, wish to take this area.	NAC remove their preferred linkage with the out-dated Rosalie Shore KRA's and give more weight towards/provide further details that address aspects of TRC's criteria that relate to protecting "...the productive capacity of all rural land for rural land use."	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.22.7
292	36	NAC propose a number of "community benefits" that their revised Project may deliver. However, many of these do not appear to have meaningful benefit to the community and focus on financial, rather than anything tangible going to the local community.	Two suggested solutions for this component; these being: · NAC's Stage 3 project application be refused; and · NAC to remove all references to community benefits where the true benefit really to NAC.	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.22.8
292	37	NAC show that the vast majority of land they intend to mine is designated as 'potential SCL', falling within the Eastern Darling Downs Zone and protection area under the SCL Act. What is of particular interest, however, is that the site of the existing mine is not mapped as potential SCL land. While expected, this clearly illustrates the impact that the mine will have on future categorisation and agricultural value of the land, in perpetuity.	Two solutions are proposed to this item: · NAC's Stage 3 project be refused; and · NAC provide comment in the Stage 3 EIS about the absence of SCL on their mining footprint, indicating whether this is anticipated to fall into SCL (or equivalent) land within the next 50 years and 100 years.	Comment Noted	NA
292	38	Public records show that NAC's application was issued on 23 August 2012; the final date possible for NAC's exclusion from the 'permanent impact restriction'. This raises real concerns about the validity of this application and whether the regulatory authority was able to direct appropriate resources and consideration to the matter under such a tight deadline for such a key decision.	For full transparency, NAC should clearly state the dates involved in this decision making process, including (but not limited to): · Date of submission · Date of approval · Any other key dates involved in the process	Comment Noted	NA
292	39	Figure 4-6b shows NAC's interpretation of representative soils in the mining lease. However, for some reason NAC have not provided this information for ML50216, which incorporates significant northern areas of the proposed Manning Vale East Pit and Willeroo Pit.	NAC to provide revised Figures (Figure 4-6b and any other figures in the EIS that face similar issues) showing full data for the northern areas of the proposed pits that are located within ML50216.	Comment Noted	NA
292	40	Indeed, on page 4-44 NAC allude to the historical and continued presence of significant dry land cropping in the region.	Two solutions are proposed for this item: · NAC's Stage 3 project be refused; and · NAC to give greater acknowledgement of the good soil qualities in the Acland area.	Comment Noted	NA
292	41	NAC go on to say they will examine the feasibility of commercially extracting the basalt. This is of great concern to me as it could represent yet more noise and detrimental impacts on air quality around our home, which is already proposed to have the 'materials handling facility' about 2km away.	Potential cumulative impacts of the project, such as NAC's exploration for other extractive resources like basalt quarrying	Comment Noted	NA

Sub. No.	Issue No.	Issue - Overview / Topic	Submitter Recommendations / Suggested Mitigation/additional information	Proponent response	Relevant AEIS Reference
292	42	NAC's assessment of 'major limiting factors to agricultural and pastoral production' and resulting 'agricultural suitability classes' (outlined in table 4-15) appears incorrect in several key components. The summary Table 4-15 states, for soil type A4, a plant PAWC of '5' (dry land cropping) and '4' (beef cattle grazing). As a result of this, the stated 'suitability class' is '5' (dry land cropping) and '4' (beef cattle grazing). This is only a single example in an assessment full of inaccuracies. This problem with NAC's assessment is equally incorrect for the rail and road section, incorrect results being shown in Table 4-17.	NAC should revise this section of the EIS, with particular attention to their floored methodologies, to accurately reflect the soil classifications.	Comment Noted	NA
292	43	4-44 to 4-49 - An additional feature of NAC's inaccurate assessment of pre-mining soil suitability (for dry land cropping and beef cattle grazing) is that the written descriptions of the various 'limiting factors' does not appear to correspond well to the resulting 'severity number class '.	NAC should revise this section of the EIS, with particular attention to their floored methodologies, to accurately reflect the soil classifications.	Comment Noted	NA
292	44	The legend for Figure 4-7b is incorrect, showing the wrong colours for what is illustrated in the mapping polygons. Such silly mistakes does not inspire confidence in the scientific rigour of the NAC EIS.	NAC amend the legend for Figure 4-7b accordingly.	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.22.9
292	45	It is worth noting that, despite NAC's inept soil suitability assessment, the resulting map shows that: • a significant amount of high quality land suitable for cropping and high quality grazing land is located on the mining area; and • the mapping does not cover all of these areas of the proposed Manning Vale East pit or Willeroo Pit, which both impress into ML50216.	NAC's Stage 3 project be refused.	Comment Noted	NA
292	46	Phase 1 and Phase 2 of the mine has destroyed addition large tracts of good quality farming land. It would be counterproductive not to acknowledge this aspect of NAC's operations the staged dismantling of the ecological value in this area.	NAC's Stage 3 project be refused.	Comment Noted	NA
292	47	NAC state that they will "...eliminate unusable post-mined land for the revised project." This appears to be a very fluffy statement. Anything will have some form of use - it's just about how low NAC are able to set the bar.	NAC to revise this statement to something with more clarity and much less opaqueness.	Comment Noted	NA
292	48	Chapter 4 - Pages appear to be in the wrong order.	NAC to amend incorrect page orders.	Comment Noted	NA
292	49	A comparison of Figures 4.9 (conceptual final land use plan) and 3.16 (showing final voids) suggests that Figure 4.9 has the areas of final voids marked as post-mining grazing land. This may be challenging since NAC has indicated in Chapter 3 that at least one of the final three voids will be under water permanently while another of the final voids will be semi-submerged, depending upon other factors (e.g. climate).	NAC to redress this apparent incongruity in their EIS.	Comment Noted	NA
292	50	NAC state that "A total of 67.4 ha of remnant vegetation will require specific management actions under Queensland and Commonwealth legislation, espectively." However, Table 4-36 below suggests that a total of 102.9 ha and 64.7 ha of remnant vegetation are categorised under Queensland and Commonwealth legislation, respectively.	NAC to correct mistake and amend management actions (as necessary) to accommodate the amendments.	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.22.10
292	51	I would hope that the transfer of land to APC in this way does not result in legal requirements of NAC for rehabilitation and long-term environmental stewardship of the post-mining land being reduced in any way.	NAC to commit in writing that any transfer of land to APC will not reduce the obligations either party may have towards long-term rehabilitation and stewardship of the land post mining.	Comment Noted	NA
292	52	NAC mention that they have contracted Earth trade (Offset Broker) to identify a third party option to offset the Endangered Regional Ecosystems dominated by Brigalow and Poplar Box, and that three possible options have been identified. However, no options are put forward.	NAC to outline the three options currently on the table for full transparency and public scrutiny.	Comment Noted	5.3.22.11
292	53	NAC state numerous commitments towards proposed rehabilitation measures. I would hope that these commitments, and others, put forward in the EIS are implemented by NAC and monitored effectively by the appropriate regulatory authority.	All commitments made in the EIS and supporting documents be enforceable and auditable (independent third party) as a requirement of NAC's EA, should the project be approved.	Comment Noted	NA
292	54	The incongruity of NAC's TUFLOW model outcomes to that produced by the Queensland Reconstruction Authority (QldRA) does not provide great confidence in the scientific accuracy and rigour of the NAC TUFLOW model.	Two solutions are proposed for this item: · NAC's Stage 3 project be refused; and · NAC comment on why the TUFLOW model presents such different results from the modelling undertaken by NAC.	Comment Noted	NA

Sub. No.	Issue No.	Issue - Overview / Topic	Submitter Recommendations / Suggested Mitigation/additional information	Proponent response	Relevant AEIS Reference
292	55	NAC state that “An operational separation distance of approximately 150 m will be maintained from the edge of the mining pits to Lagoon Creek, which will include a 50m conservation buffer where no mining activities will be undertaken.” This appears quite confusing as an “operational separation distance” suggests to me as though no mining activities (i.e. mining operations) should take place within the 150 m	Two solutions are proposed for this items: · NAC’s outline exactly what they suggest are the mining operations that can, and what mining operations that can’t, take place within the 150m and 50m buffers respectively. · No mining operations be allowed within 150m buffer area around Lagoon Creek.	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.22.12
292	56	NAC state that “...where possible NHG will seek to improve the environmental values of the Lagoon Creek catchment through the preservation of the main channel and the riparian zone 50 m either side of the creek.” I think this statement is very inconsistent with elsewhere in the EIS, where NAC commits to the widespread rehabilitation of Lagoon Creek as a component of their offset strategy that may create an ecological corridor, I think should be better reflected in this section also.	NAC to state clearly and consistently throughout appropriate sections of the EIS the full extent of their offset strategy in relation to the rehabilitation of Lagoon Creek.	Comment Noted	NA
292	57	NAC extrapolate the number of traps per night to “trapping days” equivalence. Extrapolation in this way fails to account for potential repeat trapping, transient appearances rather than habitual appearances of wildlife, and any seasonal movements that may occur.	NAC to clarify exactly how many trapping nights they undertook, without exaggerating to maximise and appear to mislead.	Comment Noted	NA
292	58	The use of references in the Terrestrial Ecology chapter is quite painful as there is rarely an explanation of what the reference pertains to, while there also appears to be inconsistencies in the use of what should be the same reference (for example: the use of both “Neldner 2005” and “Neldner et al 2005”	NAC to apply an appropriate (better) standard of referencing and use of acronyms. While the comment relates to a particular section, it is a problem throughout the EIS document.	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.22.13
292	59	There is little doubt that in mining Stage 1 and Stage 2 land, NAC has significantly contributed to the dismantling of the already limited (and thus more irreplaceable) available habitats in the area. Even in consideration of the mitigation measures NAC propose, approval of Stage 3 would be placing further stress on this system and adversely impact on the strained habitats and corridors.	Two solutions are proposed for this item: · NAC’s Stage 3 project be refused; and · NAC to comment on the impact that previous Stages (1 and 2) of NAC mining operations has had on the local terrestrial ecosystems.	Comment Noted	NA
292	60	Large amount of endangered RE’s in close proximity to Lagoon Creek	NAC’s Stage 3 project be refused	Comment Noted	NA
292	61	NAC label various ‘endangered’ and ‘vulnerable’ species of birds, reptile, and mammals as “not present” in Table 7-13. In many cases this appears based on NAC’s inability to observe the species in the field, which is hardly surprising given the near-absence of observational activities over a 13 year period.	NAC should amends labels of “not present” to “not observed” as this appears to be a more accurate reflection of reality.	Comment Noted	NA
292	62	NAC state that “Sensitive receptor 3 (in Muldu) has been removed from Figure 9-1 because NAC have reached agreement to relocate the current tenant and purchase this property.” The ‘tenant’ in question is well known to me and it is also well known that no such agreement is currently in place. Negotiations are ongoing and are not certain. As such, NAC should have included sensitive receptor 3 in the EIS and should not have falsely reported that an agreement has been reached when it has not.	NAC to amend EIS to include Sensitive Receptor 3 in Muldu while the house is still owned by a private resident and not NAC.	Comment Noted	NA
292	63	in consideration of BoM meteorological records indicating dominant winds from the east, northeast and southeast (further supported by the wind roses provided in figure 9-2 to 9-3), it seems very unusual that additional potential sensitive receptors on the west/northwest side of the proposed Project have not been included.	NAC to include in the EIS addition sensitive receptors in the surrounding area (particularly families living around Brymaroo and other areas to the east where dominant winds blow).	Comment Noted	NA
292	64	Not all of the dust deposition sites are able to be compared against data from NAC’s Stage 2 EIS. Those sampling sites that can be compared over time, focussing on the sites downwind of the mine (according to the wind roses illustrated in Figures 9-2 and 9-3), sites AD1 and AD10, now average 72mg/m2/day and 84mg/m2/day respectively for period 2009-2011. When compared with the NAC Stage 2 EIS data for these sites the difference is significant.	NAC’s Stage 3 project be refused.	Comment Noted	NA
292	65	Figure 9-8 suggests that there has not been a monitoring site at Jondaryan, which is very surprising considering the township is located in the immediate vicinity of the extensive coal dump that has gained significant media attention as a result of the anomalously high incidence of health problems encountered there and dark particles deposited on roofing and collecting in water supplies.	Inclusion of any air quality data for Jondaryan in the EIS.	Comment Noted	NA

Sub. No.	Issue No.	Issue - Overview / Topic	Submitter Recommendations / Suggested Mitigation/additional information	Proponent response	Relevant AEIS Reference
292	66	Figure 9-8; Tables 9-3, 9-4, 9-5 - The Total Suspended Particulates (TSP) levels at the Balgowan site (NAC-owned site) are generally lower than several sites over twice the distance away from the mine.	NAC to comment on the relatively low TSP levels at Balgowan compared with a number of other, more distant, sensitive receptors (particularly since cropping has been occurring on the Balgowan site). This comment should address the appropriateness of the TSP measuring location at the Balgowan site.	Comment Noted	NA
292	67	NAC indicate that they have included a 3 month monitoring campaign of simultaneous, TSP, PM10 and PM2.5 at Balgowan (NAC owned property) with compositional analysis to determine coal content. It should be pointed out that, in terms of the compositional analysis, it is not simply the coal content that is of concern for the surrounding community. It is clear that the majority of dust produced by the mine will not be coal.	NAC's Stage 3 project be refused.	Comment Noted	NA
292	68	NAC have adopted a dust deposition background average of 63 mg/m2/day in their Stage 3 EIS. Within NAC's Stage 2 EIS (Chapter 6 – Air Quality, Page 6-7, Table 6-4) NAC adopted a pre-mining background dust deposition of 16 mg/m2.	Three solutions are suggested for this item: · NAC's Stage 3 project be refused; and · NAC comment on why the background has increased significantly from their Stage 2 EIS; and · Any background level stated in the respective EA must revert to the 16 mg/m2 as purported in NAC's Stage 2 EIS.	Comment Noted	NA
292	69	NAC do not include construction activities in their modelling for air quality impacts, suggesting such impacts will be too short-lived and negligible to be worth their inclusion.	NAC include air quality impacts for proposed construction activities in the EIS.	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.22.14
292	70	NAC state that ambient levels of “air toxics” such as formaldehyde, toluene, xylene and polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAH) will be negligible. The volatile nature of these chemicals suggest that this may be the case, however NAC should model the impact of such chemicals and other volatile organic compounds (VOC's) on their workforce (i.e. staff that may come into contact regularly with these chemicals prior to their volatilisation).	NAC include in the EIS modelling of impacts of “air toxics” ” such as formaldehyde, toluene, xylene, polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAH) and other volatile organic compounds (VOC's) on their workforce (i.e. staff that may come into contact regularly with these chemicals prior to their volatilisation).	Comment Noted	NA
292	71	Under the sub-heading “NOx from Blasting” NAC suggest that blast emissions in each of three mining scenarios are expected to be similar to results from a 2007 study of NO2 at two mines in the Hunter Valley, noting the maximum of 17 ppm and quick dissipation. However, this does not appear to meld well with reality – NAC have previously blasted in very inappropriate conditions (waterlogged) that resulted in a dangerous plume in the surrounding area.	NAC's Stage 3 proposal be refused.	Comment Noted	NA
292	72	It is unclear whether the measurements of dust emissions from other operational mines in Australia and the US employ best practice at their respective operations. NAC should be aiming to employ best practice standards rather than relying on data from other existing coal mines where other factors could significantly affect the data relied on by NAC	NAC be more transparent in the data they are relying on to shape their quoted emissions factors etc.	Comment Noted	NA
292	73		NAC's Stage 3 proposal be refused.	Comment Noted	NA
292	74	I would contend that some of the dimensions quoted for volume source parameters in Table 9-15 are underestimated. For example, blasting has a 'height of releases (m)' of 50, a 'vertical spread (m)' of 100 and a 'horizontal spread (m)' of 100.	NAC adjust the dimensions of their blasting in Table 9-15 to realistic scales.	Comment Noted	NA
292	75	Refer to submission	Should NAC's Stage 3 proposal be approved, that EA conditions are adopted to ensure NAC: · Transparently inform sensitive receptors of operational changes when they occur. · Validate their predictive models against real life (i.e. at the very least there should be a program in place to calibrate (and thus validate) NAC's predictive model against what was actually observed, in order to refine their “adaptive management” of the situation. This should be undertaken at regular (6 monthly) intervals by an appropriately qualified independent third party auditor. · What NAC intend to do should their currently stated “adaptive management” options not work and air quality breaches are made	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.22.15
292	76	NAC quote a 15 year old study regarding human health impacts of mining that appears to be rather dismissive of potential impacts in surrounding communities. While NAC are accurate in that there is, comparatively, more data regarding health impacts on coal mine workers, there are an increasing amount of data that points towards chronic adverse health impacts on communities surrounding coal mines.	NAC to utilise the increasing body of evidence focussed on health impacts on communities surrounding coal mining and coal-fired power stations to objectively discuss this subject in the context of their proposed project, rather than rely on a single 15 year likely out-dated study in a seemingly dismissive manner.	Comment Noted	NA

Sub. No.	Issue No.	Issue - Overview / Topic	Submitter Recommendations / Suggested Mitigation/additional information	Proponent response	Relevant AEIS Reference
292	77	NAC state that "...current assessment procedures using dispersion modelling, local meteorological data and NPI emission estimation techniques can provide some confidence that predictions are accurate to within a factor of two."	NAC amend maximum air quality levels to account for apparently significant inaccuracies, and that these be enforceable within the respective EA.	Comment Noted	NA
292	78	The EIS provides a greenhouse gas (GHG) inventory for scopes 1, 2 and 3. While polluting industries are only required by law to report to NGERS on scopes 1 and 2 at this stage of the polluter, there is a moral responsibility to consider scope 3 emissions in the decision over whether the Stage 3 mine expansion should occur.	NAC to adopt a socially responsible approach and include Scope 3 GHG emissions within their assessment and mitigation measures committed to.	Comment Noted	NA
292	79	NAC state that the mine will produce approximately 0.18 Mt CO2-e in GHG annually for the life of the mine. This amounts to an approximate total of 2.16 Mt CO2-e. This is equivalent to approximately 1.6% of Queensland entire greenhouse gas emissions.	NAC's Stage 3 EIS application is refused.	Comment Noted	NA
292	80	NAC state that the operation of the Phase 3 project would increase GHG emissions by 0.055 Mt CO2-e on existing GHG emissions. However, this is an unfair and inappropriate comparison since the Acland Mine operations would otherwise be completing in 2017 and GHG emissions would be zero.	NAC to amend this sentence to accurately account for the otherwise closing of the mine and resultant reduction in GHG emissions from the mine site.	Comment Noted	NA
292	81	NAC state that the Department of Environment and Heritage Protection (DEHP) "...has acknowledged that a PNL [planning noise level] of 28 dB(A) is an inappropriate level for practical compliance purposes." As such, NAC have not considered this in their noise assessment.	There are two solutions proposed for this item: · NAC's Stage 3 EIS application be refused; and · NAC provide further evident/detail from DEHP directly about why the Planning for Noise Control Guideline is deemed unobtainable and should be omitted from this project assessment.	Comment Noted	NA
292	82	"...the predicted noise levels from the mining operation will still exceed the Planning for Noise Control Guideline's PNL at a number of noise sensitive receptors."	NAC's Stage 3 EIS application be refused.	Comment Noted	NA
292	83	By implementing noise management and mitigation measures including reduced night time operation using attenuated equipment.....There are several key issues with this admission by NAC; these being: · NAC are unable to meet appropriate noise levels for their Stage 3 project under ordinary operating conditions · The elements of noise control proposed by NAC to be implemented has to be best practice and not fall short of this standard · Given the importance of NAC implementing best practice standards, it should be effectively enforced (i.e. through third party audit) in NAC's environmental authority	NAC's Stage 3 EIS application be refused.	Comment Noted	NA
292	84	Real time monitoring - During past discussions with NAC and DEHP representatives, we have often been told that such rapid changes in operations would not be possible, so I am uncertain how NAC will be successful now in doing so. Also, it is very unclear what NAC would do should the proposed real-time noise monitoring system not work effectively; the result being that noise limits would be breached time after time.	NAC's Stage 3 EIS application be refused.	Comment Noted	NA
292	85	It is worth noting that a perfectly good public road (Acland-Muldu Road) is being proposed to be shut to the public despite it not being within the current surface rights of NAC (which are, incidentally, much greater than their proposed operations warrant).	Acland –Muldu Road remain open and the northern route to the township of Acland remain open to the public.	Comment Noted	NA
292	86	Regarding acid rock drainage, the EIS indicates that this should not be a significant factor, since any groundwater acidifying processes, due to the oxidation of pyrites in the Walloon Coal Measures, would be mitigated by the neutralizing effect of the surrounding sediments which are alkaline by nature. However, existing mine void evidence should not be taken for granted, and the scale and variations in localized geology could easily result in acid mine drainage in the final voids. This should be avoided at all costs as the effects of acid mine drainage are often devastating.	NAC's Stage 3 EIS application be refused.	Comment Noted	NA
292	87	The only access to Acland will be from the south, which will disrupt a large number of local community residents that rely on the route through to the north of Acland. These include people working in Oakey and Toowoomba, tourists heading to the Bunya Mountains and visiting the Jondaryan Woolshed.	The northern route to the township of Acland remain open to the public.	Comment Noted	NA

Sub. No.	Issue No.	Issue - Overview / Topic	Submitter Recommendations / Suggested Mitigation/additional information	Proponent response	Relevant AEIS Reference
292	88	It is unclear why the local Acland Roads in the south-east of the township are proposed to be closed by NAC. These are parts of Bothams Road and Greenwood School Road. The Willeroo Pit appears to be, at full extension, almost 1km to the north of these roads and so it is unclear how they are otherwise going to be impacted by the mine.	Roads in Acland that will not be impacted by the proposed mining operations (such as parts of Bothams Road and Greenwood School Road) should be left open to the public.	Comment Noted	NA
292	89	NAC assume that 25% of their construction workforce will 'pool' transportation and that the remaining 75% will be transported via private vehicles. However, NAC do not provide any data to support this assumption that 25% of their construction workforce will adopt 'pooling'. This is important since a random estimate, as this appears to reflect, is (a) not good enough for an EIS, and (b) could have significant knock-on effects to NAC's traffic modelling and any resulting mitigation or road maintenance/capacity measures that are consequently required of NAC.	NAC to provide empirical data to support their assumption that 25% of their construction workforce will 'pool' transportation and that the remaining 75% will be transported via private vehicles. Should NAC be unable to provide such evidence to support their assumption, addition changes should be made to the traffic modelling to reflect more conservative (and realistic) worker traffic use patterns.	Comment Noted	NA
292	90	NAC state that "Local roads such as Jondaryan Muldu, Acland Muldu Road and Cherry's Road effectively only provide access to the Mine, Muldu and Acland and the traffic volumes are considered to be minor." This is simply inaccurate. The roads stated are used frequently by locals travelling to nodal points of Oakey, Jondaryan etc. and by tourist heading towards the Bunya Mountains.	NAC to amend their methodology in this chapter to better reflect the full use of the roads through Acland and surrounding area, such as tourism and visits by interested parties.	Comment Noted	NA
292	91	While describing existing landscape character, in order to determine NAC's estimation of visual amenity impact of the proposed project, NAC inappropriately reduce the impact on visual amenity by including existing mining operations, stating that existing mining operations would "...contribute to offsetting the visual impacts caused by the revised Project."	NAC remove statement that the existing mining operations would "...contribute to offsetting the visual impacts caused by the revised Project." And any other similar statements within the EIS.	Comment Noted	NA
292	92	The photo of the existing Jondaryan Rail Load out Facility (JRLF) is a rather poorly chosen example as it is taken from some distance away from the coal JRLF dumps, and does not accurately illustrate the imposing size of the coal dumps on local residents.	NAC to utilise a better photograph of the JRLF that incorporates the full (typical) scale of the coal stockpiles during the majority of NAC's tenure (rather than the much reduced stockpiles that appear to coincide with EIS approvals pending.	Comment Noted	NA
292	93	The choice of viewpoints do not appear very pragmatic. Surely a viewpoint should have included the proposed approach to Acland from the south and east. Moreover the choice of Viewpoint 6 seems really quite random as it is at the junction with Oakey-Cooyar Road (approximately 1km to the west of viewpoint 6 on the north/eastern side of Greenwood Hill) where the view of the current and proposed mining operations would be most imposing and disruptive.	NAC change viewpoints to be changed to incorporate more representative sites (and corresponding assessment of amenity for the amended sites).	Comment Noted	NA
292	94	NAC fail to include ancillary visual impacts of the mine, such as the large dust plumes that you can see for kilometres around from the mining operations. This does impair visual amenity and should not be dismissed.	NAC to include ancillary visual impacts of the mine in their amenity assessment, such as the large dust plumes that you can see for kilometres around from the mining operations.	Comment Noted	NA
292	95	The description associated with Photograph 15-8 states that "However, the predominant sensitive receptors in this area would be passing traffic along Oakey-Cooyar Road and as such, impacts would be temporary and will therefore not be considered of substantial concern." I think this statement significantly underestimates the impact of driving past an open-cut mine day-in day-out. It may be temporary" but, just like the mining operations will impact daily on the visual amenity of a local residence, it has a very similar effect on daily commuters suffering (twice daily at least) the expansive scar on the otherwise rural landscape.	NAC to place significantly more weight on "temporary" reductions in amenity such as passing traffic viewing the mine operations. This does impact on amenity for (sometimes) quite some time after viewing the operations, and should not be dismissed by NAC.	Comment Noted	NA
292	96	I don't wish to seem cynical but the overuse of vibrant green in the "Post-Mining Unmitigated View" image in Photograph 15-8 is just a bit too much like propaganda for comfort. I'm reminded of dodgy pre- and post- photographs in infomercials where the 'pre-product use' image depicts a sad, drawn-out face while the 'post-product use' image depicts a smiling, healthy subject. It is clear that the post-mining landscape will not be the rolling hills of the English Downs so NAC should employ more realistic post-mining images.	NAC should employ more realistic post-mining images.	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.22.16

Sub. No.	Issue No.	Issue - Overview / Topic	Submitter Recommendations / Suggested Mitigation/additional information	Proponent response	Relevant AEIS Reference
292	97	While I appreciate the intent of the 3D visualisations of various targeted viewpoints by NAC, it might best if they used better graphics and it really doesn't seem to assist the reader.	NAC to utilise better graphics for 3D visualisations that assist the reader.	Comment Noted	NA
292	98	The methodology employed, whilst relatively complicated, still seems to be based on purely subjective assessment. I would strongly argue that a consultant from a large city, such as Brisbane, is likely to categorise visual amenity parameters in a very different manner to that of a member of the local community that has grown up in the neighbourhood. I would strongly contest that a local community member would likely have a greater fondness for the pre-mining visual amenity of the landscape and as such the results of the assessment (in terms of extent of loss of visual amenity due to the proposed project progressing) would be greater than the current assessment.	Since the people that may be suffering the visual amenity are local community members, it makes more sense that a random selection of such would be utilised for providing the subjective assessment in this methodology.	Comment Noted	NA
292	99	NAC's map showing the social impact assessment (SIA) study area does not appear to include communities to the north-east of the mine. It is not clear why these communities have been left out of the SIA, apart from NAC delineating their assessment via particular postcodes. Communities to the north-east of the mine site will generally be as impacted as those communities in other directions from the mine so they should be included in NAC's SIA.	Include populations to the north-east of the mine within NAC's SIA study area.	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.22.17
292	100	NAC's map showing the social impact assessment (SIA) study area does not appear to include communities to the north-east of the mine. It is not clear why these communities have been left out of the SIA, apart from NAC delineating their assessment via particular postcodes. Communities to the north-east of the mine site will generally be as impacted as those communities in other directions from the mine so they should be included in NAC's SIA.	Include populations to the north-east of the mine within NAC's SIA study area.	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.22.17
292	101	While NAC have opened a Community Information Centre, it appears rarely attended, which I understand has made it difficult for local community members that I know in gathering information on mining operations etc.	NAC to be aware that the limited opening hours of their Community Information Centre can be problematic to the local community.	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.22.18
292	102	NAC state a key paragraph from the Toowoomba Regional Council's Community Plan (2010) with: "...A network of vibrant towns, each with their own character and identity, embraces a relaxed country lifestyle and rural qualities. Our family-friendly and safe communities are defined by their resilience, a spirit of collaboration and a rich cultural life. ..." It is ironic then that NAC have systematically dismantled the town of Acland that held all of the qualities espoused in the Toowoomba Regional Community Plan.	NAC's Stage 3 project to be refused.	Comment Noted	NA
292	103	NAC states that small farms have been amalgamated into larger properties run by corporations. I am not aware of any examples of this in the local community apart from NAC taking over a number of small farms for their mining operations.	No solutions provided.	Comment Noted	NA
292	104	Beside the dubious way that NAC rely upon an internal personal communication for this recounting of history, other accounts of history, both anecdotal and recorded, show that the systematic dismantling of the Acland township and community by NAC was far from consensual. For example, the transcript of ABC's Stateline (10 March 2006) of a township-wide garage sale at Acland painted a very different picture:	NAC's Stage 3 Project be refused.	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.22.19
292	105	NAC depict the township of Acland as without significance beyond what any other rural township may offer. However, it is worth noting that much of the decline in Acland township, and the absence of key community buildings that would add to the 'fabric' of the area (local shop, church's, post office, service stations) is directly due to the systematic dismantling of the community and infrastructure by NAC to expand their mining operations.	NAC's Stage 3 Project be refused.	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.22.20
292	106	It is worth noting that the Acland No.2 Colliery has, under the responsibility of NAC, been left to a state of disrepair such that it is understood that termites (white ants) have significantly damaged the heritage site.	More stringent obligations be placed upon NAC in their stewardship of heritage sites, including stronger enforcement measures when stewards fail to meet their obligations.	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.22.21

Sub. No.	Issue No.	Issue - Overview / Topic	Submitter Recommendations / Suggested Mitigation/additional information	Proponent response	Relevant AEIS Reference
292	107	NAC state that, during consultation, it was suggested the greater population increase in the social impact assessment (SIA) between 2006-11, relative to the greater Toowoomba Regional Council (TRC) area was "...as a result of immigration to Oakey for employment at the abattoirs and at the Mine...(pers. Comm 08/05/13)"	NAC remove this, and other similar example, of 'Pers. Comm' statements that have no supporting information or proof of where the quote came from and in what context. Such use of 'Pers. Comm' statements appears unprofessional.	Comment Noted	NA
292	108	It is unclear why NAC are able to state percentages of the SIA population that are employed in the Meat and Meat product Manufacturing industries, and agricultural industries, yet are unable to provide the same statistics for mining, instead resorting to a 'regional' report (Regional Surat Basin Population Report, June 2011).	NAC to provide statistics/data that show what percentage of the SIA population is directly involved in mining as a profession(stating whether their sample population is of 'working age' persons)	Comment Noted	NA
292	109	NAC state that, during consultation for the SIA, come community members raised concerns about loss of land for mining but were appreciative of the APC. Just to reiterate, our residence is directly adjacent) next-door neighbours) to the mine and we were not consulted by NAC once for the SIA.	NAC to include ALL sensitive receptors in their community consultations.	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.22.22
292	110	NAC state that "NAC also supports a community bus which operates between Oakey and Toowoomba City. The community bus provides access to transport for people with a disability, people who are largely immobile, older people and people without private transport." I am aware that the owner of this bus service was allegedly surprised to find out about this NAC statement, since he has allegedly never received any such support from NAC. It is understood that the Mayor of Toowoomba Regional Council was also allegedly unaware of any such NAC support for this community bus service.	NAC to remove this reference	Comment Noted	NA
292	111	For example, the child care centre that our daughter previously attended was approached by NAC at the start of NAC's recent EIS television PR campaign with an offer of a new shade sail for the kids playing area. Allegedly, this was with the condition that the child care centre had to say positive things about NAC for their current EIS PR television campaign. The teacher at the child care centre explained to my wife how she found the position she was placed in by NAC as very difficult, since the kids would no doubt benefit from the shade sail but she wasn't comfortable with the wording that NAC was asking her to provide for the NAC EIS television adverts, since NAC's suggested wording was not otherwise supported by NAC actions.	NAC's Stage 3 Project be refused.	Comment Noted	NA
292	112	NAC note that they spent 2007-2012 securing surface rights within MLA 50232. It is worth noting that the various maps within the EIS clearly show that NAC have kept hold of the extended surface rights (i.e. area coverage of the previous Stage 3 EIS proposal), despite this current proposal having been reduced in size. Surely these extended surface rights should not be needed, unless NAC had future ambitions to make another bid to mine the remaining areas designated in the initial Stage 3 – a future Stage 4.	NAC should return the extended surface rights that they have, for some reason, maintained as they are not needed for this proposed project.	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.22.23
292	113	The systematic dismantling of the Acland community was far from "voluntary".	NAC's Stage 3 Project be refused.	Comment Noted	NA
292	114	NAC note that "Some community members have previously identified concerns about potential amenity impacts from the revised Project impacting on property values of neighbouring properties." NAC then go on to dismiss this impact.	NAC's Stage 3 Project be refused.	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.22.24
292	115	NAC state "Consultation with local real estate agents for this SIA suggested that increased demand from the revised Project workforce and increased investment activity in the SIA area may have a positive influence on property prices." Can NAC support this with their own data? Statistics presented earlier in Chapter 16 suggest that there has been no clear positive impact on property prices in the SIA due to their presence, despite this being a key promise to the local community when Stage 1 was being developed.	Removal of such opaque NAC statements as this that are not attributed to anyone and cannot be supported by empirical data.	Comment Noted	NA
292	116	NAC suggest that the approval of the EIS could result in increased membership of local sports/community groups. The results so far seem to show that NAC has had a negligible impact on local community/sports groups.	Rather than just throwing out vague 'could be' scenarios, it would be much better if NAC were to provide empirical data that supports such statements, alongside clear strategies and information on how they will commit to increased community/sports group participation by their employees and increased resourcing for such clubs/groups.	Comment Noted	NA

Sub. No.	Issue No.	Issue - Overview / Topic	Submitter Recommendations / Suggested Mitigation/additional information	Proponent response	Relevant AEIS Reference
292	117	NAC suggest that the local community have not raised concerns of “project fatigue”. I can, without any doubt, state that my family has experienced ongoing hardships, including project fatigue, through NAC being its direct neighbours. We’ve lived for several years with concern over our families health, the detrimental impact on land prices should we ever wish to move.	NAC’s Stage 3 Project be refused.	Comment Noted	NA
292	118	NAC suggest that residents of the SIA regularly visiting the NAC community information centre in Oakey, and apparent requests for future involvement in the community reference group, as reflecting no project fatigue in the area. This could well be case, however it’s worth considering that residents frequenting the information centre could reflect the lack of proactive residential community consultation by NAC (we, as next door neighbours to the mine and sensitive receptors in the EIS, received notification from NAC of the EIS nearly two weeks after the EIS had been out for public consultation), while the apparent requests for potential involvement	No solution offered.	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.22.25
292	119	NAC’s matrix to summarise impacts appears to be quite random. For example: Several of the ‘significance’ determinations appear not to match the corresponding colour, with an apparent bias towards green colours (i.e. positive impact) where the descriptor doesn’t warrant this colour.	NAC to utilise a more appropriate, objective and accurate matrix to assess and summarise impacts, and reassess those impacts included in this EIS section.	Comment Noted	NA
292	120	NAC describe the ‘specialisation’ of various industries in the study area versus Queensland, as a measure of the relative importance of various industries to areas. Specialisation ratios are provided for the key local industries of agriculture and construction but there appears to be no mention of mining. This seems unusual since the focus of the EIS is a mining operation.	NAC to provide ‘specialisation’ ratio(s) for mining in the EIS.	Comment Noted	NA
292	121	NAC make a comparison between ‘agriculture, forestry and fishing’ and the mining industry in terms of economic output. Using economic output as the economic scope for the comparison appears quite misleading since it only (I believe) deals with the worth of products produced over a specific time period/geographic area, rather than accounting for how much of that remains in the local/regional/state economy. For example, it is known that, under NAC’s current operations, only 2.5% of the coal is used domestically. I would contend that, of the \$1.2 billion and \$6.8 billion that agriculture, forestry and fishing was worth to the Darling Downs and Queensland respectively, a greater proportion was kept within these economies, compared to mining.	Suggest NAC change their economic comparisons so that economic output is not used. Suggest it is replaced by an economic parameter that better accounts for positive feedbacks into the local and state economies.	Comment Noted	NA
292	122	NAC’s inconsistency in describing the economic contributions of mining compared to other key industries serves to exaggerate the economic contribution of mining to the local, regional and state economies, while minimising the importance of other industries.	NAC to be consistent in their description of ALL key industries at local, regional and state scale and include quantitative economic contribution statistics for non-mining key industries.	Comment Noted	NA
292	123	NAC’s use of various multipliers to estimate the potential direct, indirect and induced impacts of the Stage 3 operations does not appear to account for the fact that these direct impacts (i.e. new/revamped jobs at the Acland mine) will not follow a linear response. For example, NAC state on page 17-21 that the construction workforce will not reach its projected 260 FTE’s until 2016, while the operation workforce won’t reach the projected 435 FTE’s until 2024. As such, it would be expected that the projected impacts would be significantly lower than those overall projected by AC while the workforces are below capacity.	NAC to reassess their multipliers to account for incremental increases in workforce	Comment Noted	NA
292	124	NAC’s use of various multipliers to estimate the potential direct, indirect and induced impacts of the Stage 3 operations appear to be significantly greater than those employed by NAC within their 2006 Stage 2 EIS, despite the same apparent parameters	NAC to give explanation for the apparent significant increase in multiplier effects in the current Stage 3 EIS compared with the Stage 2 EIS. NAC should also employ a consistent approach and if data for the current EIS was based on mining boom statistics, a more representative dataset should be utilised instead to reflect the current (and future) economic situation	Comment Noted	NA
292	125	NAC refer to Figure 17-15 as showing the approximate industry distribution of revised Project impacts. However, Figure 17-15 shows the regional distribution rather than the industry distribution. The industry distribution is shown in Figure 17-16.	NAC to change the reference on page 17-25 to Figure 17-15 to 17-16.	Comment Noted	NA

Sub. No.	Issue No.	Issue - Overview / Topic	Submitter Recommendations / Suggested Mitigation/additional information	Proponent response	Relevant AEIS Reference
292	126	NAC estimate a reduction of 5 FTE's (direct) per year due to the reduction in agricultural production. This appears to be a clear underestimation considering the various farm enterprises that had previously belong to the proposed project area. Furthermore, this figure does not account for any indirect FTE's that would be generated from this	NAC to reassess the FTE's from the removal of the cropping and grazing land, inclusive of both direct and indirect FTE's.	Comment Noted	NA
292	127	NAC openly admit and highlight in their Stage 3 EIS that employment of the local community (workers and suppliers) is an area for improvement. This is certainly the experience of the local community where a number of local businesses, that had previously been ignored by NAC, seem only to have been engaged once the EIS PR campaign has been initiated.	NAC to include some new strategies rather than a continuation of existing strategies.	Comment Noted	NA
292	128	NAC restricts the economic risk for the Project on reduction in agricultural output to \$37 million, contending that "It is expected that rehabilitation during de-commissioning would return the majority of impacted land to a state suitable for agricultural production and therefore impacts are not estimated beyond this period."	NAC to reassess the economic risk for the Project on reduction of agricultural output but accounting for the 'in perpetuity' sterilisation of the land from future cropping use.	Comment Noted	NA
292	129	We received negligible information regarding the revised Phase 3 project, despite being sensitive receptors that reside directly adjacent to the mine.	NAC's Stage 3 Project be refused.	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.22.26
292	130	We received negligible information regarding the revised Phase 3 project, despite being sensitive receptors that reside directly adjacent to the mine	NAC's Stage 3 Project be refused.	Comment Noted	NA
292	131	The community information centre in Oakey appears rarely open. Indeed, I have heard numerous people comment along these lines. It is also my understanding that NAC began renting out a separate shop that had previous housed information collated by the Oakey Coal Alliance. This information was obviously removed once NAC took over the renting of that property.	NAC's Stage 3 Project be refused.	Comment Noted	NA
292	132	We had staged a number of meetings with the mine during early 2012 in response to dust and consequential health concerns my wife and I held over our eldest daughter at the time, who was suffering regular coughing fits over a number of months. Promises made during these meetings, particularly surrounding the transparency and provision of monitoring data, were subsequently reneged on by NAC. This was very disappointing for us as NAC neighbours and sensitive receptors, and does not support a respectful model	NAC's Stage 3 Project be refused.	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.22.27
292	133	The activities of the Community Reference Group (CRG) are not well known or understood. The first I had heard of the minutes being available was while reading Ch19 of the EIS. How representative can a CRG actually be for the community if there is negligible or no information sharing or mechanisms for the CRG to raise wider community concerns?	NAC's Stage 3 Project be refused.	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.22.28
292	134	The cumulative impacts chapter appears to demonstrate limited connection to actual cumulative impacts caused by successive stages of NAC's operations at the Acland Mine, while placing excess focus on other major project exhibiting similar detrimental impacts in the region. I believe this is a significant flaw in this chapter.	NAC's Stage 3 Project be refused. NAC's evaluation should include, but not be limited to, the following cumulative impacts from the various stages of their mine operations/expansions: Cumulative destruction of good cropping land. Cumulative greenhouse gas levels Cumulative dismantling of integral social fabric of the local area through the removal of Acland township Long-term environmental nuisance,	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.22.29
292	135	NAC state that "Mining operations for the existing operations will not be contemporaneous with mining operations for the revised project." However, section 11.7.5 (page 11-44) states that "There will be a short period of time during the start of the revised Project when limited activities will occur at the existing mine."	Clarification from NAC regarding the true effects on cumulative impact during this cross-over period.	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.22.30
292	136	NAC state that the Acland approval "...is particularly important considering the NHG's West Moreton Operations near Ipswich will exhaust current coal reserves in the near future."	The projected end-of-life closure of one operation should not be used as leverage to gain approval for a whole new set of considerable environmental and social impacts at a new site. NAC's Stage 3 Project be refused.	Comment Noted	NA
293	1	Wolff engaged as subcontractor by NHC	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
293	2	Impressed by NHC commitment to community and their understanding f the short and long term social impacts of their operations.	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
294	1	Before the Acland coal mine became open cut there were good communities at Acland and Jondaryan.		Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.23.1

Sub. No.	Issue No.	Issue - Overview / Topic	Submitter Recommendations / Suggested Mitigation/additional information	Proponent response	Relevant AEIS Reference
294	2	No air-conditioning, sleep with the windows open and hear the clanging off the tracks on the dossers, the buckets of the frontend loaders hitting the sides of the train carriages, the trains shunting and boom gates.		Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.23.2
294	3	I have to clean the dust off the furniture in the morning		Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.23.3
294	4	Jondaryan has been abandoned and like living in a third world country due to the fact that the mine is nearby		Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.23.4
294	5	tank water impacts from dust		Comment Noted	NA
294	6	NHC sponsors a lot of events to get people on their sideJondaryan residence are not benefiting from the progress that New Hop are making at our expense		Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.23.5
294	7	If we relocate who will compensate for loss of value to our property and the lifestyle we had		Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.23.6
295	1		Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
295	2	Business and development enhanced by NHG and alternative work in times of changes in opportunities	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
296	1	General Comment	Take into consideration the proponent's history of delivering on outcomes and false promises as proposed in their previous EIS documents	Comment Noted	NA
296	2	Mining lease area has not reduced in the revised proposal.	Reduce mining lease area to absolute minimum. Remove roads and Acland from mining lease area - see page 7 of 'New Acland Project Draft Project Descriptions Overview, October 2012'.	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.24.1
296	3	Surface rights	Ensure that all surface rights closer to Acland or the perimeter of the project are surrendered	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.24.2
296	4	Two of the nearest sensitive receptors to the mine are not included in monitoring regimes	Recognise Muldu and Balgowan as sensitive receptors	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.24.3
296	5	Location, size and scope of MHF. Are 6 or 4 stockpiles considered? 200,000t stockpile is too much and too great a risk of dust impacts.	Limit the size and scope of MHF and consider moving it to a more central location.	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.24.4
296	6	Stockpile height is a major factor in dust generation. Has MHF been considered in dust and noise modelling?	Require world's best practice equipment and processes to minimise impacts. Cover and enclose stockpiles as per table 9-21.	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.24.5
296	7	Stockpile fires	Stockpiles should have temperature gauges, smoke detectors and be amply equipped with fire fighting equipment	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.24.6
296	8	Coal to Liquids proposal	Is this intended?	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.24.7
296	9	Increasing capacity of Coal handling and processing plant (CHPP) will only result in more coal dust and increased impacts	Do not increase size or capacity of CHPP. Consider relocating CHPP. Justify location of CHPP relative to pits.	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.24.8
296	10	Larger CHPP will result in more noise impacts	Do not approve licence for additional capacity until proponent complies with EA conditions under existing production levels. Enclose CHPP.	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.24.9
296	11	ML 50126 and ML 50170 are inadequately considered in the EIS	Fully consider impacts of the Manning Vale East pit and Willeroo pit. Consider relocating infrastructure from these leases to MLA50232.	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.24.10
296	12	legislative applicability of SCLA questioned.	Reject Stage 3	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.24.11
296	13	Priority Agricultural Areas under the Darling Downs Regional Plan within the mining lease. Project is triggered by the Regional Planning Interests Bill 2013	Reject Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
296	14	The project conflicts with the priorities of the Toowoomba Regional Council	Reject Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
296	15	Chapter 4 implies that the Surat Basin Regional Planning Framework (SBRPF) supports the project	The SBRPF is non-statutory and does not override the Darling Downs Regional Plan or the Toowoomba Regional Council Planning Scheme or SCL policies.	Comment Noted	NA
296	16	Project impacts on the rights of current and future neighbouring property owners. Land sterilisation concerns.		Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.24.12
296	17	EIS claims to source water from bore licenses and groundwater inflows. This would be 'double dipping'. Is water licence in place?	Revoke proponent's bore licenses in light of the proposed use of groundwater inflows	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.24.13
296	18	Predicted drawdown impacts are unacceptable	Reject Stage 3	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.24.14
296	19	loss of stream flow in Myall Creek and Spring Creek is a concern and will impact on their property. Also, Alluvium is used as a primary water source for houses, irrigation and livestock - business would be jeopardised without it		Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.24.15
296	20	flooding considerations upstream not adequately considered. Levee bank not included in hydraulic model extent.	Take precautionary approach to flood models and take into serious consideration the potential risk of increasing erosion and flooding risks	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.24.16
296	21	Proponent has approval to construct a pipeline to utilise recycled water to reduce reliance on groundwater	Bore licenses should be revoked or reduced	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.24.17
296	22	Table 7-13 pre-emptively lists species as 'not present'	Not present' entries in Table 7-13 should be replaced with 'not recorded / not found'	Comment Noted	NA
296	23	Indirect impacts to koalas and other protected species are inadequately addressed	EIS should thoroughly address indirect impacts to koalas and other protected species. Furthermore, do not allow disturbance to REs or other significant ecosystems	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.24.18
296	24	Buffer around Lagoon Creek is inadequate - flooding concerns as well as creek impact concerns	Keep all landform disturbance at least 300m from Lagoon Creek	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.24.19
296	25	Offsets are unclear and inadequate	Offsets are poor substitutes for protecting biodiversity in-situ	Comment Noted	NA
296	26	Proponent provides unacceptable claim that it is unlikely to preserve fossils	Proponent must be required to take specific action to ensure that fossils or artefacts are preserved	Comment Noted	NA

Sub. No.	Issue No.	Issue - Overview / Topic	Submitter Recommendations / Suggested Mitigation/additional information	Proponent response	Relevant AEIS Reference
296	27	Closure of roads leading to Acland will result in unacceptable impacts to local residents and alienation of Acland - increasing travel to the park from 5km to 35km	Do not permit the closure of Acland-Muldu Road. Reduce road closures to those only absolutely necessary.	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.24.20
296	28	Transport - Road Access/ Closures / Diversions	EIS should list the Acland-Silverleigh Road in 13.3.3 Local Roads section	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.24.21
296	29	Closure of roads leading to Acland will result in unacceptable impacts to school students	Do not allow school bus routes or students to be adversely affected by project	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.24.22
296	30	Transport - Rail - Impacts	Demonstrate that existing rail capacity is adequate	Comment Noted	NA
296	31	Proponent has failed to comply with EPP conditions for noise	EIS should address section 10 of Noise EPP. Limit operation activities to daytime only. Up-to-date monitoring data should be freely available	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.24.23
296	32	Table 11-6 is misleading. The proponent makes assumptions in their noise model which do not accurately reflect reality.	There should be a good complaints process, effective monitoring program and conditions must be complied with.	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.24.24
296	33	EIS reports that air quality objectives are expected to be exceeded at several sensitive receptors	Reject Stage 3. Project must use world's best practice dust management and suppression practices and should consider the cattle feedlot as part of cumulative impacts	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.24.25
296	34	Coal dust management	Proponent must be held accountable for complying with their commitments and should monitor dust, noise and rainwater at the residence at Muldu and Balgowan	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.24.26
296	35	Study area did not include residents within 1km of the mining lease area. Incomplete study.	Include ALL directly affected residents in the SIA study.	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.24.27
296	36	Consultation only included a pool of 42 people. Insufficient consultation.	Increase the scope of consultation and ensure that residents directly affected by the mine are involved.	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.24.28
296	37	Land purchases by the proponent has had a substantial adverse social impact.	Adverse social impact from widespread land purchases and amalgamations should be recognised in the EIS.	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.24.29
296	38	EIS underestimates the project's impacts on the mental health of the local community.	EIS must recognise solastalgia as a project impact on the local community.	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.24.30
296	39	Risk of fatigue-related road accidents is also a concern for other road users - not just mine workers.	EIS should recognise the risk of fatigue-related road accidents for road users other than mine workers	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.24.31
296	40	Social - Regional economies and businesses	Reject Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
296	41	Increased crime and loss of community sentiment since the mine began	Reject Stage 3	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.24.32
296	42	inadequately addressed	Reject Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
296	43	EIS contains various errors concerning non-indigenous cultural heritage e.g.. location of the Canberra Bomber is at Brymaroo not Oakey	EIS should provide correct and factual information	Comment Noted	
296	44	Indigenous heritage needs further consideration, including Yarrowair	EIS should contain further information on Indigenous heritage including the Yarrowair	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.24.33
296	45	Most of the claimed jobs are 'indirect' or 'induced'	EIS needs to validate the reported job figures	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.24.34
296	46	Economics analysis methods undertaken for the EIS are not credible according to the ABS and Productivity Commission	Credible economic analysis methods must be used in the EIS	Comment Noted	NA
296	47	Ecologically sustainable development	Reject Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
296	48	Economics - Analysis Approach	The EIS should consider the impacts of this project on the wider state and national economies, given the current coal market and decline in mining jobs	Comment Noted	NA
296	49	EIS has not addressed the implication for changes to the electricity network	EIS must consider impacts to the utility networks including electricity and telecommunications	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.24.35
296	50	Rehabilitated land does not have the same agricultural capacity as unmined land	Provide stringent conditions for rehabilitation including natural landforms, gentle slopes, high plant basal cover	Comment Noted	NA
296	51	Land - Rehabilitation	EIS needs to provide further detail on the rehabilitation trial including, season, inputs and details of control sites	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.24.36
296	52	Land - SCL/Good quality ag land	EIS should acknowledge that climate is a factor in creating productive agricultural regions	Comment Noted	NA
296	53	Project and mine pit intersect with stock route	Maintain stock route. Otherwise, stock route must be realigned with appropriate land and water resources for stock	Comment Noted	NA
296	54	Conflict with SPP - Good quality agricultural land	Reject Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
296	55	The project increases the risk of fire and flood in the region	Reject Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
296	56	The project is projected to consume large amounts of fuel (potentially low grade) over its life, leading to excessive emissions	Ensure air quality is not adversely impacted by using high quality fuel, maintaining engines and reducing spills and leakages.	Comment Noted	NA
296	57	EIS does not address REs near Manning Vale East or Willaroo pits	EIS should map all REs including regrowth within the mine lease area	Comment Noted	NA
296	58	Project proponent	Proponent should not be permitted to shuffle ownership of land between its subsidiaries to forego any obligations	Comment Noted	NA
296	59	Project Justification	Reject Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
296	60	Blasting	EIS should recognise nitrous oxide emissions from blasting activities in GHG analyses	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.24.37
296	61	Impacts	Reduce amount of lighting to that only necessary and install shielding to reduce light glow impacts. Ensure landforms are lower than surrounding hills	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.24.38
296	62	Contaminant release	Waste management must ensure that important resources are not contaminated	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.24.39
296	63	Impacts	Risks are unacceptable and proposed mitigation measures are inadequate	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.24.40
296	64	Mitigation/management	Conditions should increase scope of monitoring and require world's best practice for all activities	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.24.41
296	65	Project proponent	Commitments do not adequately address noise and air quality	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.24.42
296	66	Proponent has mistreated the local community	Reject Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
296	67	EIS recognises that compliance with Planning Noise Levels cannot be met.	Best practice noise controls must indeed be best practice and mandatory compliance with ALL relevant EPP (noise) noise level limits should be conditioned	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.24.43

Sub. No.	Issue No.	Issue - Overview / Topic	Submitter Recommendations / Suggested Mitigation/additional information	Proponent response	Relevant AEIS Reference
296	68	Dust modelling justifies using 2011 as the meteorological year.	It is considered good practice to compare a number of years against long term weather patterns. Suggest EIS modelling be updated	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.24.44
296	69	Background PM10 of 13ug/m3-e	A full year's reading at a suitable site would have been more appropriate for this. Suggest EIS modelling be updated	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.24.45
296	70	Emission estimation	An hourly emission rate based on hourly wind speeds would be more appropriate for capturing peak emissions. Suggest EIS modelling be updated	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.24.46
296	71	Model settings for modelled volumes sources are highly inappropriate.	Recommend that initial vertical dimensions for a surface based source is the vertical dimension of the sources divided by 2.15. Suggest EIS modelling be updated	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.24.47
296	72	Particle sizes in Table 9-16	EIS must report the source of data for this table	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.24.48
296	73	Appendix G6 states that the modelled year was 2011, yet background dust levels came from 2011/2012 (wet year)	This needs to be addressed/fixed	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.24.49
297	1	Economics - Employment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
297.1	1	Economics - Employment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
297.2	1	Economics - Employment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
297.3	1	Economics - Employment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
297.4	1	Economics - Employment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
298	1	Economics - Employment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
299	1	Great that new Hope group are continuing to rehabilitate and use the land after mining with the pastoral company.	The only suggestion I have is a buy back scheme could be offered to some of the original owners down the track, this may possible elevate some of the disgruntled landowners.	Comment Noted	NA
299	2	Coal dust management	approve the revised EIS based on factual data not on emotional statements made by misinformed action groups or individuals	Comment Noted	NA
300	1	Economics - Support for Project	Approve the revised EIS as all issues have been addressed	Comment Noted	NA
300	2	Coal dust management	approve the revised EIS based on factual data not on emotional statements made by misinformed action groups or individuals	Comment Noted	NA
300	3	The New Acland coal Mine supports the families of over 300 direct employees and over 100 indirect employees	Approve the EIS to ensure that these families employed by the mine have secure futures	Comment Noted	NA
301	1	Social - Regional economies and businesses	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
302	1	Economics - Employment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
302	2	Local business and development enhanced by NHG and their alternative work opportunities.	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
303	1	Economics - Employment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
303	2	Local business and development enhanced by NHG and their alternative work opportunities.	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
304	1	Economics - Employment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
304	2	Economics - Royalties	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
304	3	Land - Rehabilitation	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
304	4	Social - Regional economies and businesses	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
305	1	Social - Regional economies and businesses	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
305	2	Social - Regional economies and businesses	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
306	1	Section 3.6 does not provide information necessary for global warming, climate change and ocean acidification impact assessments. MNES ecological significance stemming from development approval cannot be properly addressed.	Refer to submission for further details.	Comment Noted	NA
307	1	Economics - Support for Project	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
307	2	Assessment methodology	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
308	1	Social - Regional economies and businesses	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
308	2	Social - Community values and change	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
309	1	Economics - Employment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
309	2	Social - Regional economies and businesses	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
309	3	Land - Rehabilitation	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
310	1	Economics - Support for Project	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
311	1	Economics - Support for Project	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
312	1	Social - Community Awareness / Social responsibility	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
312	2	Economics - Employment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
313		No comments			NA
314	1	Economics - Employment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
314	2	Potential for a coal to diesel industry with NHG	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
315	1	Extremely competitive market with pressure from imported refined sugars eroding market share and profitability and sources coal from New Hope (over the last 25 years)	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
316	1	Previous loading of rail vehicles by front end loader require double handling of coal from mine site. The new proposed design promotes transport efficiency and likely improved environmental outcomes in terms of dust & noise.	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
316	2	The project will benefit the state of Qld.	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA

Sub. No.	Issue No.	Issue - Overview / Topic	Submitter Recommendations / Suggested Mitigation/additional information	Proponent response	Relevant AEIS Reference
317	1	The impact of the revisions made to the EIS has had a very substantial impact on stakeholders, employee and the local economy when compared to the original proposal. With the current state of the coal markets, the cost of these revisions has been even more detrimental to these stakeholders.	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
317	2	Potential for a coal to diesel industry with NHG	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
317	3	Social - Regional economies and businesses	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
318	1	The entire area of the revised Stage 3 Project is classified as strategic cropping land. Even though NAC obtained a licence of exemption from the cropping land legislation, I believe the company has a moral responsibility to consider the long term impact that mining will have on high value cropping land. The mining act clearly states that mined land must be rehabilitated to its original condition. NAC clearly has no intention of returning a large portion of the mined area to any form of production. Stark unsightly voids over hundreds of hectares of land that is currently highly productive is an example of gross irresponsibility.	Non approval of Stage 3	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.25.1
318	2	Inaccurate modelling grossly underestimates the impact on basalt aquifers - see submitters comments.	Non approval of Stage 3	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.25.2
318	3	The proposed Manning Vale West pit is located to the south-east of our property and will be directly in the path of prevailing winds. We expect dust contamination from stage 3 to impact rainwater, stored feed and forage crops used in our dairy farming enterprise.	Non approval of Stage 3	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.25.3
318	4	The permanent reduction of population and job opportunities in the north-eastern Downs region post mining, must be considered when evaluating the short term benefits of the proposed Stage 3 project.		Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.25.4
319	1	Economics - Employment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
319	2	Land - Rehabilitation	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
319	3	Social - Regional economies and businesses	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
320	1	Economics - Employment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
320	2	Land - Rehabilitation	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
320	3	Social - Regional economies and businesses	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
321	1	Economics - Employment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
321	2	Social - Regional economies and businesses	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
322	1	Economics - Employment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
322	2	Social - Regional economies and businesses	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
323	1	Economics - Employment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
324	1	Social - Regional economies and businesses	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
324	2	Ecologically sustainable development	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
324	3	Land - Rehabilitation	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
325	1	Economics - Employment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
325	2	Social - Regional economies and businesses	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
325	3	Project proponent	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
326	1	Social - Regional economies and businesses	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
327	1	Economics - Employment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
327	2	Ecologically sustainable development	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
328	1	Economics - Employment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
329	1	Economics - Employment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
329	2	Social - Community Awareness / Social responsibility	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
329	3	Land - Rehabilitation	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
329	4	Social - Regional economies and businesses	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
330	1	Social - Regional economies and businesses	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
331	1		Treat mine waste water with reverse osmosis	Comment Noted	NA
331	2	Concerns regarding release of contaminated waste water into floodwaters	Treat mine waste water with reverse osmosis	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.26.1
332	1	EHP notes no application for partial abandonment under s.307 of MRA has been made.	Seek via NRM to confirm the surface rights areas as described in the EIS - e.g. through s.307 MRA process - partial abandonment. Clearly outline process and timeframes for achieving this.	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.4.1
332	2	further to above	Clarify ambiguous references. Provide evidence that a mining exclusion zone has been established including details on what this zone means in terms of meeting environmental performance requirements	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.4.2
332	3	mention of an infra corridor MLA 55005 is made; however not clear whether the corridor is associated with a transport MLA or not	clarify whether or not the project includes or excludes the MLA	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.4.3
332	4	Infrastructure - RLF New Proposal	clarify the approvals process for the rail spur	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.4.4
332	5	ERAs for the rail spur - the EIS does not include proposed location and/or scale of the activities	outline the location and scale of the ERAs identified as part of the construction phase of the rail spur and balloon loop	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.4.5
332	6	LSMP refers to 'enquiry related to [the project]' will be dealt with in a certain way - this should be changed to include the entire mine	amend Appendix J.18	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.4.6
332	7	Appendices J.19 and J.11 refer to responding to 'legitimate complaints'	provide a definition of 'legitimate complaint' in management plans and include a decision framework to assist with determining such a complaint	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.4.7

Sub. No.	Issue No.	Issue - Overview / Topic	Submitter Recommendations / Suggested Mitigation/additional information	Proponent response	Relevant AEIS Reference
332	8	Noise Management Plan relies heavily on real time noise monitoring in Acland to achieve compliance with proposed noise limits	commit to making real time monitoring data available to EHP on request to demonstrate effectiveness of the adaptive management measures	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.4.8
332	9	Appendix K.1 does not mention the Acland Heritage Precinct Advisory Committee	include this	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.4.9
332	10	meteorological data used for the air and noise assessments differ. Air uses 2011 (a wet year) while noise uses data from 2012.	provide an explanation to justify the selection of meteorological data used in both the air and noise assessment	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.4.10
332	11	different derivations of the period of time when inversions are predicted to occur are presented in the Air and Noise chapters.	explain the different approaches. If any changes are made - outline implications for assessments; and repeat any assessments/redo mitigations as required	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.4.11
332	12	EIS interchanges between terms ambient noise and background noise. The current operations of the mine should not be included in background noise as they are not typical for the predominant rural land use	ensure the terms are correctly used. Note the 1996 winter noise monitoring is considered by EHP to represent background noise levels	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.4.12
332	13	insufficient evidence in EIS to demonstrate that night time noise criteria can be met; the adaptive management process does not commit to direct and immediate actions but instead relies on investigation of exceedences/alerts prior to taking action.	Discuss the possible effectiveness of the current Noise TARP trial (which was not included in the EIS) in Ch.11 and App J.11. Commit to undertaking direct and immediate measures in response to real time monitoring/predictive monitoring	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.4.13
332	14	App J.11 does not reference compliance with the criteria for 'operational mining noise (all noise sources)'	provide commitments on the project's predicted compliance with this criteria	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.4.14
332	15	errors in sound pressure levels relating to the MHF reclaimer	amend the errors; and confirm whether or not such changes affect noise modelling	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.4.15
332	16	further information on offsets required - some BOP requirements not adequately addressed in Biodiversity Offsets Strategy and Bluegrass Offset Management Plan	provide a commitment to develop an OAMP which addresses submission's detail incl. GIS; values of offsets sites; monitoring and evaluate program for management areas including bluegrass. Provide timeframes for OAMP approval.	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.4.16
332	17	the commitment to develop a monitoring and evaluation plan for all offsets management areas does not provide the scope of the plan.	commit to including a monitoring program for the bluegrass offset area which considers various recommendations provided by EHP	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.4.17
332	18	real property descriptions and shape files should be provided to EHP when offset areas have been legally secured	as per contact details of submission.	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.4.18
332	19	water requirements of translocation sites - quantitative measures for monitoring water requirements e.g. tensiometers should be used	update Threatened Species Translocation Plan	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.4.19
332	20	ongoing monitoring timeframes for translocated species questioned	update Threatened Species Translocation Plan - minimum of five years regular monitoring and then ongoing monitoring for rest of mine life suggested	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.4.20
332	21	mine rehab areas should include native grassland, particularly bluegrass		Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.4.21
332	22	for the 50 metre conservation zone either side of Lagoon Creek - recommended to col-locate some threatened grasses in this zone; commit to exclude grazing from the zone; restore the riparian zone to a functional condition in accordance with cited guidelines		Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.4.22
332	23	further information and review of current information is required before EHP can confidently apply end-of-pipe limits and triggers that would adequately protect surface water quality and aquatic ecosystem health.	provide data on background water quality and aquatic biota surveys - allow for variability due to mine as opposed to naturally occurring variability provide a robust characterisation of the proposed controlled discharge to Lagoon Creek and overflow of mine affected water	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.4.23
332	24	potential impacts listed in surface water and aquatic ecology tables are incorrect	clearly list the potential impacts of the project to surface waters and aquatic ecosystems without mitigation measures in place and then list the proposed mitigation measures for these potential impacts	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.4.24
332	25	further to preceding comment, list the activities that may result in potential impacts		Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.4.25
332	26	replace 'heavy metals' reference in EIS with metals and metalloids		Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.4.26
332	27	information on the quality of mine affected water is needed to determine dilution required to achieve water quality objectives; and MAW release rates, stream flow triggers for MAW release and end-of-pipe limits.	as per submission	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.4.27
332	28	Flood levees and PMF	1. Will flood levees be removed, retained or modified post-project? 2. demonstrate that the final landforms would not be affected by the PMF	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.4.28

Sub. No.	Issue No.	Issue - Overview / Topic	Submitter Recommendations / Suggested Mitigation/additional information	Proponent response	Relevant AEIS Reference
332	29	more information on buffer zone definitions (e.g. where creek is braided/indistinct); what minor work are and their impacts on the creek	as per submission	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.4.29
332	30		Clearly define in the EIS which mining activities (if any) are proposed to occur within the 150m “operational offset” along Lagoon Creek.	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.4.30
332	31	results of water balance modelling is not clear and inconsistent	as per submission	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.4.31
332	32	It is essential that all planned offsite release points and receiving waters are clearly defined in the EIS in order to assess the potential risks to surface waters.	as per submission	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.4.32
332	33	greater sampling is required to confirm whether Murray Cod is present or absent		Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.4.33
332	34	Revise comments and conclusions regarding the presence of suitable habitat for Murray Cod and the likelihood of the species occurring in or immediately adjacent to the project area.		Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.4.34
332	35		Confirm whether the updated risk assessment methods used are consistent with AS/NZS ISO 31000:2009. If not, discuss any differences that may result if the 2004 was used	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.4.35
332	36	If erosion is occurring at 87% of the stream length this would not likely represent 'mostly stable' conditions.	as per submission	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.4.36
332	37	Correct the colour coding used in Table 8-8 to reflect water quality objective value exceedences.	as per submission	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.4.37
332	38	None of the data in Appendix G3 comes with quantitative flow data	as per submission	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.4.38
332	39	Review the manganese data in Appendix G.3 of the EIS for site LCU1-SKM.	as per submission	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.4.39
332	40	Values for analysis of pesticides in Lagoon Creek water have been included in Appendix G.3. Coal mining in not expected to generate significant levels of pesticides	as per submission	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.4.40
332	41	DERM cumulative risk assessment in Appendix G.3.2 is irrelevant as it is based on water quality and mine discharge information from an entirely different catchment	as per submission	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.4.41
332	42	It is not clear whether water quality samples may have been affected by releases from the current mining operation	as per submission	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.4.42
332	43	Nominate the ecological condition that is being used for freshwaters of south east Australia in Section 2, page 8, Appendix J.4, EIS.	as per submission	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.4.43
332	44	Ensure that the metal guidelines that should be modified for hardness are modified for hardness. The current guidelines values may be too low for this location	as per submission	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.4.44
332	45	Review Table 2-2, (Section 2, page 8-9, Appendix J.4, EIS) to correct several technical inconsistencies	as per submission	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.4.45
332	46	State in Section 2.3.1, page 9, Appendix J.4, EIS, how far the gauge on Oakey Creek at Fairview is downstream of the confluence with Lagoon Creek and the distance from the current and proposed mine lease	as per submission	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.4.46
332	47	further to preceding comment - assumptions re water quality at the site should be revisited	consider using the data from the gauge to assist with assessing local water quality for relevant parameters	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.4.47
332	48	ensure that site names and locations for water quality sampling are consistent throughout the entire document	as per submission	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.4.48
332	49	Add current mine discharge points to Figure 2-1, App J.4	as per submission	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.4.49
332	50	“releasing from the mine water management system only during times of flow, or following a period of flow in Lagoon Creek;” but the EIS does not clarify how this period following the flow event would be defined.	as per submission	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.4.50
332	51	revisit the statement 'The electrical conductivity level is not expected to be exceeded in downstream waters in Lagoon Creek due to releases from the revised Project's mine water management system being set at 1,000 µS/cm'	as per submission	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.4.51

Sub. No.	Issue No.	Issue - Overview / Topic	Submitter Recommendations / Suggested Mitigation/additional information	Proponent response	Relevant AEIS Reference
332	52	revisit the statement 'it is noted that the revised project site has been highly disturbed by grazing and dry land cropping' given receiving environment is described elsewhere as slightly-moderately disturbed	as per submission	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.4.52
332	53	define old and new dams; where uncontrolled releases would occur; and if different qualities of mine affected water would be mixed and stored together	as per submission	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.4.53
332	54	Update Table 2-1 page 7 of Appendix J.4 to include 'cultural and spiritual values' as an Environmental Value and include this value when considering potential impacts.	as per submission	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.4.54
332	55	Explain an "average year" in the context of water balance modelling and provide a clear definition in Section 5.1.2 of Appendix J.4	as per submission	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.4.55
332	56	In general, the presentation of results for the water balance modelling is very confusing and does not clearly explain the potential controlled release of MAW	as per submission	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.4.56
332	57	According to the text Figure 5-4 represents results for an "average year" although it is not clear what exactly and average year is. Figure 5-5 illustrates the predicted salinity within Lagoon Creek at the point immediately downstream of the mine release but it is not stated under which scenario this will occur.	as per submission	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.4.57
332	58	State where water quality monitoring would occur. Include regular monitoring of water quality in storages, particularly those where water is due for controlled release to the environment or where water is to be used for stock watering or irrigation of crops.	as per submission	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.4.58
332	59	The acronyms used to identify in-pit tailings storage facilities are inconsistent throughout the EIS	as per submission	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.4.59
332	60	Provide information on flow at the time of sampling for any water quality sampling. Consider using the gauge data to establish a flow salinity relationship.	as per submission	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.4.60
332	61	It is unclear if the data provided for Oakey Creek at Fairview (DNRM) have been cleared of data according to the data quality codes that are supplied with these data. Also, mine discharges could have affected water quality at the Oakey Creek gauge, downstream of the current mine. Therefore the data provided for this gauge may not be representative	as per submission	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.4.61
332	62	1. State the number of samples used to characterise water quality in Appendix J.19, Table 3-14 page 73. 2. State what the 'ranges' refer to 3. Revise the units for dissolved oxygen and the date format used	as per submission	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.4.62
332	63	EHP considers that the sites LCD1 and LCD2, which are downstream of the current mine discharge points, should not be used to characterise the background water quality for the site	as per submission	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.4.63
332	64	1. Discuss all data values in the EIS that appear to be outliers or erroneous and where they do not accurately describe the baseline condition of the receiving environment 2. Provide an explanation for the high EC observed in Lagoon Creek 3. Provide an explanation for the high turbidity observed 4. Explain why the pH values for the in situ sampling in Lagoon Creek might be slightly alkaline	as per submission	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.4.64
333	1	Economics - Employment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
333	2	Ecologically sustainable development	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
333	3	Social - Regional economies and businesses	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
334	1	Social - Regional economies and businesses	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
335	1	Social - Regional economies and businesses	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
335	2	Economics - Employment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
336	1	Social - Regional economies and businesses	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
336	2	Economics - Employment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
336	3	Social - Community Awareness / Social responsibility	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
337	1	Economics - Employment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
337	2	Economics - Employment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
337	3	Social - Regional economies and businesses	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
338		No comments	No comments		NA
339	1	Economics - Employment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
340	1	Economics - Employment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
341	1	Economics - Employment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA

Sub. No.	Issue No.	Issue - Overview / Topic	Submitter Recommendations / Suggested Mitigation/additional information	Proponent response	Relevant AEIS Reference
342	1	Economics - Employment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
343	1	Social - Regional economies and businesses	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
344	1	Social - Regional economies and businesses	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
345	1	Economics - Employment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
346	1	Social - Regional economies and businesses	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
347	1	Economics - Employment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
348	1	Economics - Employment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
349	1	Economics - Employment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
350	1	Economics - Employment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
351	1	Economics - Employment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
352	1	Economics - Support for Project	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
353	1	Economics - Employment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
353	2	Social - Housing impacts	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
354	1	Economics - Employment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
355	1	Social - Regional economies and businesses	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
356	1	Economics - Employment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
357	1	Economics - Employment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
358	1	Economics - Employment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
359	1	Economics - Employment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
360	1	Economics - Employment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
361	1	Economics - Employment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
362	1	Economics - Employment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
363	1	Economics - Employment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
364	1	Economics - Employment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
365	1	Economics - Employment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
365	2	Social - Regional economies and businesses	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
366	1	Economics - Business Opportunities	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
366	2	Social - Regional economies and businesses	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
367	1	Economics - Business Opportunities	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
368	1	Closing Acland-Silverleigh road	Finish the mine at the edge of the road	Comment Noted	NA
368	2	Surface rights area: destroy vegetation, Lagoon Creek	Remove 'surface right area'	Comment Noted	NA
368	3	Dust to Lagoon Creek	Independent assessment	Comment Noted	NA
368	4		Use the new info from Toowoomba City Council after 2011 floods, wider outlets	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.27.1
368	5	not appropriately rehabilitated	Close the mine	Comment Noted	NA
368	6	Ambient Air bottle missing, air quality monitoring	Investigate 4 DERM employees, solve the problem	Comment Noted	NA
368	7	Increased dust. Air quality at Jondaryan is worst in Australia	Close the mine/shift the RLF immediately	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.27.2
368	8	Suffer immensely from noise - beepers 24/7; vibrations, large blasts j- house damage	Study in noise vibrations, small blasts or no blasting	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.27.3
368	9	Road traffic noise	no increase through JRLF. No extra trains until RLF is moved. supply buses for staff to minimise road use.	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.27.4
368	10	Truck tyres, used oils and other waste on mine	No more waste products	Comment Noted	NA
368	11	suffers from health impacts; odour		Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.27.5
368	12	general comments about unhelpful and manipulative treatment by the proponent in the past.		Comment Noted	NA
369	1	Impacts	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
369	2	Terrestrial Ecology - terrestrial fauna - Koala	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
369	3	Restoration areas	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
369	4	Social - Community Awareness / Social responsibility	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
370	1	Social - Training and apprenticeships	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
370	2	Social - Regional economies and businesses	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
371	1	Economics - Employment	No contaminated water should flow into Lagoon Creek	Comment Noted	NA
371	2	Land - Rehabilitation	Mining and loading should temporarily cease operations when inversion conditions in air quality arise	Comment Noted	NA
371	3	Social - Community Awareness / Social responsibility	Acland-Silverleigh Road should remain open	Comment Noted	NA
371	4	Economics - Business Opportunities	Mine should make use of local services provided by Oakey businesses	Comment Noted	NA
371	5	Social - Regional economies and businesses	Agricultural land on the mine site should be maintained for the life of the project, not just restored at the end	Comment Noted	NA
372	1	Economics - Employment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
372	2	Land - Rehabilitation	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
372	3	Social - Community Awareness / Social responsibility	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
373	1	Economics - Business Opportunities	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
373	2	Social - Regional economies and businesses	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
374	1	Social - Community Awareness / Social responsibility	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
374	2	Economics - Employment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
374	3	Social - Regional economies and businesses	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
375	1	Economics - Employment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
375	2	Social - Regional economies and businesses	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
376	1	Economics - Employment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
376	2	Social - Regional economies and businesses	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
377	1	Social - Community Awareness / Social responsibility	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
377	2	Restoration areas	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
378	1	Economics - Employment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
378	2	Social - Regional economies and businesses	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
378	3	Social - Community Awareness / Social responsibility	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
378	4	Restoration areas	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
379	1	Social - Community Awareness / Social responsibility	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA

Sub. No.	Issue No.	Issue - Overview / Topic	Submitter Recommendations / Suggested Mitigation/additional information	Proponent response	Relevant AEIS Reference
379	2	Social - Regional economies and businesses	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
379	3	Will Queensland Bulk Handling Ports be viable if project does not go ahead?	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
379	4	Sterilisation of 50% of coal resources around Acland means that Qld only receives 50% of potential royalties.	Allow sustainable development of remaining coal resources around Acland.	Comment Noted	NA
380	1	Hazard and risk - health and safety	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
380	2	Ecologically sustainable development	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
380	3	Economics - Employment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
381	1	Social - Regional economies and businesses	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
382	1	Social - Regional economies and businesses	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
383	1	Economics - Employment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
383	2	Social - Community Awareness / Social responsibility	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
383	3	Social - Workforce	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
383	4	Land - Rehabilitation	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
384	1	Economics - Support for Project	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
385	1	Economics - Employment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
386	1	Economics - Support for Project	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
386	2	Social - Regional economies and businesses	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
387	1	Land - Rehabilitation	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
387	2	Social - Community Awareness / Social responsibility	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
387	3	Social - Regional economies and businesses	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
388	1	Social - Regional economies and businesses	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
388	2	Economics - Employment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
389	1	Economics - Employment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
389	2	Land - Rehabilitation	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
390	1	Economics - Employment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
390	2	Social - Community Awareness / Social responsibility	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
390	3	Land - Rehabilitation	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
391	1	Dust and Noise at mine site and along the rail corridor.	Provide more detailed historical data on dust and noise emissions and these would be monitored and contained in the Stage 3 expansion .	Comment Noted	NA
391	2	Koala habitat which will be destroyed by the open cut coal mine.	More detailed assessment of the current koala population and measures to protect koalas.	Comment Noted	NA
391	3	SCL which will be irreversibly degraded by the open cut mine.	The expansion not be approved due to its destruction of SCL	Comment Noted	NA
391	4	The 7.5Mt of coal exported each year from Stage 3 will further commit the world to dangerous climate change.	Certain and irreversible impacts on the global climate and should not be allowed under the latest research and UN comments	Comment Noted	NA
392	1	Economics - Business Opportunities	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
392	2	Social - Regional economies and businesses	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
393	1	Primary producers issues : - scale of the mine and its impacts; concerns of their livelihoods, living standards and community implications.		Comment Noted	NA
393	2	Organisation and the producers do not have the funding means to respond adequately to the massive documents (EIS and the like) Consequently the producers are automatically at a disadvantage in getting their concerns addressed.		Comment Noted	NA
393	3	Producers do not want Stage 3 to proceed with a range of issues are at the core of their concerns:- Dust and noise, community impacts, road implications, groundwater issues and the previous poor interaction from the mining company. The local impacts would increase what is locally seen as an already unjust imposition on livelihoods and community impacts.		Comment Noted	NA
393	4	Given the fact that the expansion has already proceeded to the current point, it would appear to be a possibility that another expansion could be approved.	Limiting the size of the materials handling facility, ensuring dust and noise modelling is based on worst case scenario, ensuring transparency of environmental monitoring, more robust cover facilities being put in place at the MHF, ensuring compliance with the EA conditions at the coal handling and processing plant before approving further development, and ensuring clear paths of communication with local producers to ensure their concerns are considered.	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.28.1
393	5	Groundwater and surface water issues are highly susceptible to potential contamination. Ensuring heavy metals do not contaminate water and that appropriate safeguards are in place in the case of levee banks and water courses is also vital.		Comment Noted	NA
393	6	Consideration of daytime loading only, flexibility of road closures to limit impact on school children's travelling time and ensuring families have remedial action taken to limit their dust and noise issues is paramount.		Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.28.2
393	7	Significant policy activity at a state level surrounding the regional planning processes. Local producers do not wish to have mining or related activities on SCL or PAA. These processes are currently under negotiation with the State Government as a protection mechanism for producers.		Comment Noted	NA
394	1	Not confident that rehabilitation of land can return to pre-existing quality		Comment Noted	NA

Sub. No.	Issue No.	Issue - Overview / Topic	Submitter Recommendations / Suggested Mitigation/additional information	Proponent response	Relevant AEIS Reference
394	2	The existing RLF should be removed ASAP and not a number of years into the project		Comment Noted	NA
394	3	Treatment of water or run off water from disturbed areas.	All steps should be taken to protect water quality and aquatic ecology.	Comment Noted	NA
394	4	Health impacts relating to noise and dust		Comment Noted	NA
394	5	Belief exists that process is about facilitating the expansion rather than taking seriously the concerns of effected residents. Comm. Ref Committee rarely include people who may be outspoken		Comment Noted	NA
394	6	Suggestion to publically state targets of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander employees living in local postcodes		Comment Noted	NA
394	7	Climate change is not fully discussed in EIS		Comment Noted	NA
394	8	Happy to see the significant changes/ re-scope of the project		Comment Noted	NA
395	1	Economics - Business Opportunities	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
395	2	Social - Regional economies and businesses	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
396	1	Social - Regional economies and businesses	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
396	2	Economics - Employment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
396	3	Economics - Royalties	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
397	1	Economics - Employment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
398	1	MLA 50232 should be re-evaluated under current legislative conditions such as MR Act a and SCL	Evaluation of new version of Stage 3 should be restarted as current EIS does not apply most up to date legislation	Comment Noted	NA
398	2	As NHC owns the land, the degraded condition of surrounding area is due to NHC actions.	NHC need to address the degraded land they themselves have reported on	Comment Noted	NA
398	3	Reports of insufficient testing and sampling in areas of concern or SCL	Need for further approved soil testing and details be provided to ensure issues are explored and these are fully reported.	Comment Noted	NA
398	4	NHC have noted that land suitability and rating will be reduced, post mining	If NHC cannot return to simular value land post mining, then the mine should not go ahead,	Comment Noted	NA
398	5	The stripping depths for topsoil is too large	Issues when mix of good topsoil with and need to reduce this down from 65 down to 30	Comment Noted	NA
398	6	Large allocation of water for project comes from Wetalla Waste Water Reclamation Facility	Concerns that any cancellation of contract with WWRF not being factored into risks	Comment Noted	NA
398	7	Pending court case may change water allocation to the mines and then NHC may impact the bore water storage .	Seeking commitment from New Hope to not increase any impact in this area, regardless of the court case outcome	Comment Noted	NA
398	8	On site use of water going from 6MLpa to 50 ML pa	Need to provide a report on how this is going to be monitored and ensure water is not being sourced elsewhere.	Comment Noted	NA
398	9	Groundwater dependant ecosystems (GDE)	Mentions in Chap. 6 but not at all in Chap 7 & 8: Uncertain which systems are being considered	Comment Noted	NA
398	10	Groundwater decline post mining	Fully modelling of critical GDE's need to be undertaken	Comment Noted	NA
398	11	EPBC Biodiversity impacts need to be done in range of environmental conditions	Studies currently only assessed under drought but losses needs to be assessed under range of environments.	Comment Noted	NA
398	12	Incremental and cumulative impacts not be identified	Incremental and cumulative impacts need to be studied and reported	Comment Noted	NA
398	13	Assessment of the biodiversity or ecological service an area provides	Identify how to maintain the existing biodiversity and ecological service regardless of the status	Comment Noted	NA
398	14	Air quality to be done at Jondaryan and sensitive receptors	Doubts commitment as proponent has no prior history of monitoring	Comment Noted	NA
398	15	Evaluation of NO2 emissions using consistent nomenclature	Need to provide new report on NO2 emissions and how this is going to be monitored	Comment Noted	NA
398	16	Need to review of testing protocols to include impacts of short term high or extreme exposures	Short term extreme or excessive exposures hidden in the wider time weighted average exposure results	Comment Noted	NA
398	17	Need for NHC to identify how they are reducing greenhouse gas impacts and use renewables.	Proponent should consider and report on how greenhouse gas issue will be addressed if required.	Comment Noted	NA
398	18	Impacts of departure of community and small family farms is not being considered	Questions how mining impacts will not effect social impacts lost in area. Concerns not being addressed now and will only increase with expansion	Comment Noted	NA
398	19	Concern that the long term impacts of mining will impact on the property's future sales value	Questions how mining impacts will not effect financial outcome of sale at property to support families	Comment Noted	NA
398	20	Concern that the long term health impacts of coal dust	Government funded health checks for workers and those living near mining areas that are exposed to emissions	Comment Noted	NA
398	21	Air quality to be done at Jondaryan and sensitive receptors	Doubts commitment as proponent has no prior history of monitoring	Comment Noted	NA
398	22	Exposure to diesel fumes compounds impacts in sensitive receptors and in residential locations	Need to improve loading facilities to prevent other locos idling in residential locations	Comment Noted	NA
398	23	Coal randomly veneered from site to reduce dust exposure .	Need for all coal to be veneered for transportation and nominate when and how often the coal will be veneered	Comment Noted	NA
398	24	Closures mean single entry/exit road to Acland and impacts of mine operations (trucks , dust noise etc.) will have adverse social amenities issues for residents	Need to review as this will impacts of current resident quality of life. Need to do an entire SIA again	Comment Noted	NA
398	25	Concerns that the long term impacts of mining are not fully recognised and preventive measures for impacts are not in place	Need to review as this will impacts of current resident quality of life. Need to do an entire SIA again	Comment Noted	NA
398	26	Economics of large projects is not being fully analysed	Need to for special economic agencies to undertake economic review further and identify public interests in economic methodology of review	Comment Noted	NA

Sub. No.	Issue No.	Issue - Overview / Topic	Submitter Recommendations / Suggested Mitigation/additional information	Proponent response	Relevant AEIS Reference
398	27	Details of key feedback is not reflective of the full community impacts	Details of the community consultation of previous Stage 3 proposal should also be shown as it was part of getting community awareness of the current proposal	Comment Noted	NA
398	28	NHC have noted that land suitability and rating will be reduced, post mining	If NHC cannot return to similar value land post mining, then the mine should not go ahead,	Comment Noted	NA
398	29	Large allocation of water for project comes from Wetalla Waste Water Reclamation Facility	Concerns that any cancellation of contract with WWRF not being factored into risks	Comment Noted	NA
398	30	NHC have noted that cumulative impacts of terrestrial fauna be reduced, post mining	Evaluation of Stage 1& 2 should be as current EIS does not apply most up to date legislation	Comment Noted	NA
398	31	Predicted increase to current unacceptable coal dust pollution and impacts to respiratory health	Concerns not being addressed now and will only increase with expansion	Comment Noted	NA
398	32	NHC have noted that SCL land suitability and rating will be reduced, post mining	If NHC cannot return to similar SCL land for growing crops post mining, then the mine should not go ahead,	Comment Noted	NA
398	33	The NHC mine has already caused social and environmental damage yet they continue to benefit	No mine has ever been rejected in Queensland due to an EIS but this mine should be the exception.	Comment Noted	NA
398	34	Tailing disposal methodology does not mimic the hydrology of the pre mining land form	If NHC cannot return to similar hydrology post mining, then the mine should not go ahead,	Comment Noted	NA
398	35	Reduced area of land suitable for cropping /rehab due to mining	If NHC cannot return to similar use for land post mining, then the mine should not go ahead,	Comment Noted	NA
398	36	NHC should be required to comply with all SCL legislation	If NHC cannot comply with all SCL legislation then the mine should not go ahead,	Comment Noted	NA
398	37	Rehab goal of returning land to grazing standard	Grazing standard in line with Acland Pastoral requirements but should be returned so future owners can use it for cropping if they choose.	Comment Noted	NA
398	38	Reported poor soil in western area is exaggerated and other good cropping land unseized	Need for corrections in mapping of areas of various soil quality.	Comment Noted	NA
398	39	Stockpiling of topsoil to 3 m will have issues of compaction and structural damage	Stockpiles should not be higher than 1 m.	Comment Noted	NA
398	40	Dry land cropping trial to be conducted by suitable academic institution	No parameter set and regardless should be done by independent experts in the area	Comment Noted	NA
398	1	NHC have noted that land suitability and rating will be reduced, post mining	If NHC cannot return to similar value land post mining, then the mine should not go ahead,	Comment Noted	NA
398	2	Air quality reported as detrimental and outputs of the mine unable to be controlled.	If NHC cannot address the impacts of mining, then the mine should not go ahead.	Comment Noted	NA
398	3	Groundwater decline post mining	Fully modelling of groundwater impacts need to be undertaken. If NHC cannot address the impacts of mining, then the mine should not go ahead.	Comment Noted	NA
398	4	The NHC mine has already caused social and environmental damage yet they continue to benefit	No mine has ever been rejected in Queensland due to an EIS but this mine should be the exception.	Comment Noted	NA
398	5	Doubts that there are royalties for his operation	NHC needs to provide evidence that they are providing royalties to the government as indicated in s.2.2.1	Comment Noted	NA
398	6	Expectation that mining would stop in area in 2017.	LNP promise to cease mining in 2017 should be honoured.	Comment Noted	NA
398	7	Commitment to work with mine neighbours on mitigation has only just occurred since Stage 3 was sought	Doubts commitment as proponent has no prior history of accepting responsibility for the damage they cause.	Comment Noted	NA
398	8	The NHC mine has already caused social and environmental damage yet they continue to benefit	If NHC cannot return to similar SCL land for growing crops post mining, then the mine should not go ahead,	Comment Noted	NA
398	9	Economics of employment of large short term projects is not being fully analysed	Need for special employment evaluation to occur to identify whether the employment issues outcomes are actually in the public interests	Comment Noted	NA
398	10	The NHC mine has already caused social and environmental damage yet they continue to benefit	No mine has ever been rejected in Queensland due to an EIS but this mine should be the exception.	Comment Noted	NA
399	1	Cost benefit analysis of net public benefit including considerations of external costs.	Project should be rejected until cost benefit analysis of net public benefit is done	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.29.1
399	2	Inappropriate economic modelling	input /Outport model is not a supported model of analysis. Concerns with how IO modelling does not account for a fixed supply of labour and capital. Ergo, not known whether employment constitutes generated or supported employment.	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.29.2
399	3	Employment data does not represent the research undertaken	Agriculture has large percentile of workers in district despite NHC stating they are a major employer in area (only 2.5 % of employees work in the all the coal mines in the district).	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.29.3
399	4	inconsistent employment figures		Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.29.4
399	5	misrepresentation of agricultural economy		Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.29.5
399	6	health impacts not quantified or costed		Comment Noted	NA
399	7	indirect impacts not considered		Comment Noted	NA
399	8	The EIS misrepresents the results of the economics chapter - that agriculture is particularly important as a local employer, five times the Queensland average, but that mining accounts for only 2.5 per cent of local employment, lower than the Qld average.		Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.29.6
400	1	Economics - Employment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
400	2	Social - Regional economies and businesses	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
401	1	Social - Consultation	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
401	2	Restoration areas	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
401	3	Water - Watercourse impacts	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
401	4	Economics - Employment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
401	5	Social - Regional economies and businesses	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
401	6	Economics - Royalties	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
402	1	Economics - Employment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
402	2	Economics - Royalties	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
402	3	Social - Regional economies and businesses	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA

Sub. No.	Issue No.	Issue - Overview / Topic	Submitter Recommendations / Suggested Mitigation/additional information	Proponent response	Relevant AEIS Reference
402	4	Social - Community Awareness / Social responsibility	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
403	1	Economics - Employment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
404	1	Economics - Employment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
404	2	Social - Regional economies and businesses	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
404	3	Social - Community values and change	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
404	4	Social - Consultation	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
404	5	Restoration areas	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
405	1	Economics - Employment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
405	2	Restoration areas	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
406	1	Economics - Employment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
407	1	Social - Regional economies and businesses	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
407	2	Economics - Employment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
408	1	Social - Consultation	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
408	2	Restoration areas	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
408	3	Social - Regional economies and businesses	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
408	4	Economics - Employment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
409	1	Economics - Employment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
409	2	Social - Regional economies and businesses	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
410	1	concerns with potential impacts on human health and well-being due to groundwater quality impacts. Monitoring only six monthly and no solutions if groundwater quality is degraded	provide commitments to: An improved ground water risk management program which will more regularly monitor ground water quality and provide solutions/actions in the event that the coal mining activity has contaminated the ground waters supply and is no longer suitable for its intended use (ie potable/ agricultural/ industrial use)	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.5.1
410	2	PM2.5: The Darling Downs Hospital and Health Service (DDHHS) is concerned that the proponent has not appropriately assessed the increase in risk to human health at the surrounding sensitive receivers/population of respiratory illnesses and symptoms due to exceedences of the air quality goals.	clarify suitability of air monitoring sites; undertake PM2.5 monitoring to validate assumptions; commit to liaise with DDHHS about monitoring	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.5.2
410	3	social impacts - housing (expand as necessary)		Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.5.3
410	4	concerns with road safety - provide detail re risk management solutions; and complete intersection assessment	as per submission	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.5.4
410	5	disease risks with pests such as mosquitoes or the potential for the project o create breeding sites for such pests not addressed. mosquito management/mitigation need to be discussed	as per submission	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.5.5
410	6	food services - commit to obtaining all relevant licences	as per submission	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.5.6
411	1	Social - Regional economies and businesses	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
411	2	Social - Community values and change	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
411	3	Restoration areas	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
411	4	Social - Training and apprenticeships	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
412	1	Social - Community values and change	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
412	2	Economics - Employment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
413	1	Economics - Employment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
413	2	Social - Community values and change	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
413	3	Social - Regional economies and businesses	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
414	1	Economics - Employment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
414	2	Social - Regional economies and businesses	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
415	1	Economics - Business Opportunities	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
416	1	contact DAFF to obtain relevant permits if State owned forest products and/or quarry material are to be used		Comment Noted	NA
416	2	SCL impacts discussion - avoiding impacts; restoration to original state where possible; and off-lease SCL impacts - advised to locate infrastructure in pre-cleared areas		Comment Noted	NA
416	3	advice provided re waterway barrier works requirements and design of cross-waterway structures		Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.6.1
417	1	Global warming and climate change	Reject Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
418	1	the actual quality of the land to be mined is misrepresented.	Reject Stage 3	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.30.1
418	2	project alternatives not reasonably discussed.		Comment Noted	NA
418	3	no accounting for Oakey businesses that have closed . No royalties figures provided. No economic contribution from the land following mining.		Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.30.2
418	4	Inadequate information about GQAL impacts.		Comment Noted	NA
418	5	promise to stop the project should be honoured.	Mining on SCL should not be allowed.	Comment Noted	NA
418	6	bad past performance of community management e.g. Jondaryan residents subject to years of unresolved impacts	Reject Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
418	7	we have great concerns regarding the sustainability and suitability of this project due to its location on Strategic Cropping Land and the resultant destruction of such SCL along with other potential negative impacts on groundwater aquifers and surface runoff to the Murray Darling Basin	Reject Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA

Sub. No.	Issue No.	Issue - Overview / Topic	Submitter Recommendations / Suggested Mitigation/additional information	Proponent response	Relevant AEIS Reference
418	8	We have witnessed first hand the social dislocation and decline in Oakey commerce and liveability since New Hope started mining at Acland and the decimation of the Acland township and surrounding rural community (drive on the local roads around Acland and you'll witness many abandoned farmhouses, sadly left to slowly degrade into a state of ruin).	Reject Stage 3	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.30.3
419	1	Coal dust management	Cease mining operations if the air quality objective is exceeded and an air quality monitoring network with an SMS alert system to residents and businesses.	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.31.1
419	2	Hazard and risk - health and safety	Air quality chapter should discuss health impacts	Comment Noted	
419	3	Coal dust management	The Jondaryan stockpile should be shutdown until relocated.	Comment Noted	
419	4	There is no proposal by the proponent to monitor PM _{2.5}	Air quality impact mitigation measures for blasting activities are insufficient. Proponent should cease mining operations when wind speeds exceed 6m/s.	Comment Noted	
419	5	significant air impacts from mine through SEQ suburbs to port		Comment Noted	
420	1	DETE acknowledger's proponent's commitment to operate as an equal opportunity employer.	DETE recommends that the proponent establish percentage of workforce targets for under-represented groups in the workforce.	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.7.1
421	1	Economics - Business Opportunities	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
421	2	Economics - Employment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
422	1	Economics - Business Opportunities	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
422	2	Economics - Employment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
423	1	Economics - Business Opportunities	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
423	2	Economics - Employment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
424	1	Economics - Business Opportunities	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
424	2	Economics - Employment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
425	1	Economics - Business Opportunities	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
425	2	Economics - Employment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
426	1	Economics - Business Opportunities	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
426	2	Economics - Employment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
427	1	Economics - Business Opportunities	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
427	2	Economics - Employment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
428	1	Economics - Business Opportunities	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
428	2	Economics - Employment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
429	1	Economics - Business Opportunities	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
429	2	Economics - Employment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
430	1	Economics - Business Opportunities	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
430	2	Economics - Employment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
431	1	Economics - Business Opportunities	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
431	2	Economics - Employment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
432	1	Economics - Business Opportunities	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
432	2	Economics - Employment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
433	1	Economics - Business Opportunities	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
433	2	Economics - Employment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
434	1	Economics - Business Opportunities	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
434	2	Economics - Employment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
435	1	Social - Community Awareness / Social responsibility	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
435	2	Ecologically sustainable development	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
435	3	Social - Regional economies and businesses	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
435	4	Economics - Employment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
436	1	Economics - Employment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
437	1	Economics - Business Opportunities	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
437	2	Economics - Employment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
438	1	Site locations for groundwater monitoring bores in the Quaternary Alluvium.	Proponent should describe proposed site locations and model the three units to be completely hydraulically connected.	Comment Noted	NA
439	1	Social - Acland Heritage/ Social Change	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
439	2	Social - Community Awareness / Social responsibility	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
439	3	Social - Housing impacts	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
439	4	Coal dust management	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
439	5	Social - Consultation	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
439	6	Land - Rehabilitation	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
439	7	Economics - Employment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
439	8	Social - Training and apprenticeships	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
439	9	Social - Regional economies and businesses	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
439	10	Social - Community values and change	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
439	11	Project proponent	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
440	1	Economics - Business Opportunities	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
440	2	Economics - Employment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
440	3	Social - Training and apprenticeships	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
440	4	Social - Community values and change	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
440	5	Ecologically sustainable development	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
440	6	Land - Rehabilitation	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
441	1	Economics - Business Opportunities	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
441	2	Economics - Employment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
442	1	Economics - Employment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
442	2	Social - Regional economies and businesses	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
442	3	Social - Training and apprenticeships	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA

Sub. No.	Issue No.	Issue - Overview / Topic	Submitter Recommendations / Suggested Mitigation/additional information	Proponent response	Relevant AEIS Reference
443	1	Sections 18 and 18A (listed threatened species and communities) and Sections 24D and 24E (water resources) of the Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999 (the EPBC Act) are controlling provisions for the proposed action. Additional information was requested by DE on the controlling provisions, and to satisfy the information requirements of the IESC. The IESC submission response is provided at Appendix N.	In addition DE informed the proponent that two species, finger panic grass (<i>Digitaria porrecta</i>) and lobed bluegrass (<i>Bothriochloa biloba</i>), were now delisted by the Commonwealth. These would no longer be subject to assessment by DE. Matters of National Environmental Significance relevant to the project include the following: - Threatened Ecological Communities - Bluegrass (<i>Dichanthium</i> spp.) dominant grasslands of the Brigalow Belt Bioregions (North and South); - Brigalow (<i>Acacia harpophylla</i> dominant and co-dominant); - Semi-evergreen vine thickets of the Brigalow Belt (North and South) and Nandewar Bioregions; - Listed species <i>Bothriochloa biloba</i>, Lobed bluegrass (DELISTED) <i>Digitaria porrecta</i>, Finger Panic Grass (DELISTED) <i>Homopholis belsonii</i>, Belson's Panic The proponent has provided a revised Biodiversity Offset Strategy (appendix M) and a Threatened Species Translocation Plan (Appendix L) to respond to the	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.8 Appendix L - Threatened Species Translocation Plan Appendix N - IESC Submission Response Appendix M - Revised Biodiversity Offset Strategy
444	1	statement that there will be 'negligible' impacts to users downstream in section 3.2 should be revisited given the flow event analysis		Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.9.1
444	2	Page 41 The sentence - "Basic water quality indicators (i.e. Salinity, pH, DO, EC, temperature)", why have EC and Salinity both been included as one is a measure and the other is a result?	Amend the EMP to remove salinity as a basic water quality monitoring indicator.	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.9.2
444	3	Jondaryan-Muldu Road is a dedicated stock route currently classified as inactive for operational purposes. The stock route is administered by DNRM and managed by Toowoomba Regional Council (TRC)	The proponent should consult with the department at the earliest possible time to determine process requirements	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.9.3
444	4	EIS does not effectively communicate the reduced mining footprint area or inform that the areas within ML 50232 but outside the Stage 3 Pit Areas will not be subsequently mined into the future	discuss with NRM any changes in the mining lease application boundary or surface area and lodge documentation accordingly. Document surface rights areas in the AEIS.	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.9.4
444	5	There are two State Land non-road reserves within MLA 50232. In the event that these reserves are no longer required for their dedicated purpose, TRC may apply to purchase the land in priority. Any existing native title rights and interests over the land would be required to be addressed by TRC prior to the issue of a deed of grant		Comment Noted	NA
444	6	duplicate of previous stock route reference but referring to EIS text in Chapter 3.		Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.9.5
444	7	EIS does not specify the source of the approximately 1.5 million cubic metres of gravel to be used as haul road base and indicates this material will be "sourced off-site preferably from local suppliers. proposed measures to mitigate the impacts the supply of this material will have on the region's extractive suppliers and other consumers is not addressed.	recommended the proponent provides an analysis specifying proposed suppliers and/or locations of extractive materials required for the project, the impacts on those supplies and proposed mitigating measures to address any regional shortfall	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.9.6
444	8	duplication of point re previous two State land tenure parcels, but with reference to mention in a different section of the EIS		Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.9.7
444	9	duplication of stock route reference, but pertaining to different section of the EIS.		Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.9.8
444	10	the EIS suggests that approximately 1060 hectares of Class 2 and 3 cropping land will be lost, with the post-mining land suitability being only Class 4 or 5 cropping land	Presumptive to assume that this level of degradation of cropping land will be acceptable; some contingency should be provided for the restoration of the impacted land to a suitability better than Class 4, if the Protection Decision conditions were to require this. And so amendments to plans such as the Final Land Use and Rehabilitation Plan and Topsoil Management Plan, and if it is shown to be feasible to restore the impacted land to a suitable condition, higher restoration costs than those currently budgeted for may need to be considered.	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.9.9
444	11	DNRM is unable to confirm that native title has been extinguished over the project area. Where an application to purchase State land is made, DNRM will conduct a full native title assessment in relation to individual parcels of land to determine extinguishment.	Where native title rights and interests are found to continue to exist, resolution of these rights by the applicant would be required	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.9.10
444	12	As the <i>Topsoil Management Plan</i> and the <i>Final Land Use and Rehabilitation Plan</i> are based on the soil survey and soil analysis information, it is recommended that more detailed soil survey and soil analysis be undertaken to better inform plans for proposed rehabilitation and future land use	To avoid possible land degradation it is recommended the proponent undertakes detailed soils studies of the three areas proposed for mining to determine topsoil availability for rehabilitation of disturbed areas, and procedures to ensure proposed future land use suitability's are attainable	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.9.11

Sub. No.	Issue No.	Issue - Overview / Topic	Submitter Recommendations / Suggested Mitigation/additional information	Proponent response	Relevant AEIS Reference
444	13	the proposal to provide final landforms that will be rehabilitated to provide for Grazing Land suitability Classes 2-5 enabling future pastoral grazing uses. This includes a high proportion of batters graded between 8.5-17 ⁰ (15-30%). However, Table 4-14, Land Suitability for Grazing (p4-20) indicates that slopes greater than 15% would be Class 5 Grazing Land Suitability, implying not suitable for grazing land uses. This brings into question the methodology for assessing grazing land suitability; or the viability of future pastoral uses; or both.	as per submission	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.9.12
444	14	duplication of point re previous two State land tenure parcels, but with reference to mention in a different section of the EIS		Comment Noted	
444	15	salinisation of depressed landforms may severely restrict grazing land use	recommended the proponent undertakes a salt balance assessment of the three depressed landforms with a view to gauging the risk of salinisation of the lower levels of these landforms.	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.9.13
444	16	slope criteria for grazing land suitability	recommended the proponent qualify adopted slope ranges in relation to anticipated Grazing Land Suitability, and incorporate into the Environmental Management Plan (EMP).	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.9.14
444	17	topsoil survey - more analysis suggested to inform topsoil stripping plan/Rehab and Future Land Use Plan	as per submission	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.9.15
444	18	duplication of point re previous two State land tenure parcels, but with reference to mention in a different section of the EIS		Comment Noted	NA
444	19	duplication of stock route reference, but pertaining to different section of the EIS.		Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.9.16
444	20	corrections to legislative terminology/requirements re watercourses, water resource planning/approvals		Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.9.17
444	21	the event analysis process has been applied to assessing water security objectives (with a view to determining impacts on downstream water licence holders).	Use the 2004 WRP to analyse impacts to surface water resources and provide further mitigation where necessary	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.9.18
444	22	page 5-31 should cite NRM instead of EHP as responsible agency		Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.9.19
444	23	DEWS, not NRM, is the lead agency re referable dams		Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.9.20
444	24	Incorrect statement - "No licenced surface users were identified in Lagoon Creek"		Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.9.21
444	25	include reference to amending moratorium notice 'Condamine Catchment Underground Water Area' 13 July 2012 as instrument that limits the take of water		Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.9.22
444	26	potential impacts of faults on Marburg aquifer; why has the southern part of the eastern lateral model boundary defined as no flow; range of modelling scenarios should be used to identify potential range of groundwater impacts	as per submission	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.9.23
444	27	The proposed trigger levels and make good requirements are inconsistent with current approach under the <i>Water Act 2000</i> . The EIS also needs to identify bores that will be impacted by aquifer	as per submission	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.9.24
444	28	regional vegetation management codes now replaced by Mod 8 of SDAP		Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.9.25
444	29	about half of the proposed bluegrass offsets area is located on potential SCL. These areas would appear to be subject to the prohibitions of permanent impacts on SCL as per legislation	as per submission	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.9.26
444	30	spelling error: 'cree'		Comment Noted	NA
444	31	riverine protection permit exemption requirements for works in the creek	as per submission	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.9.27
444	32	as per above comment re regional vegetation management codes		Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.9.28
444	33	duplication of stock route reference, but relating to a different section of the EIS.		Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.9.29

Sub. No.	Issue No.	Issue - Overview / Topic	Submitter Recommendations / Suggested Mitigation/additional information	Proponent response	Relevant AEIS Reference
444	34	duplication of previous comment “No licenced surface users were identified in Lagoon Creek”		Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.9.30
444	35	Consult with NRM re road closures		Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.9.31
444	36	clearing of remnant vegetation off-lease will require approval under SPA		Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.9.32
444	37	correction to riverine protection legislative requirements		Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.9.33
444	38	Approvals appendix to note previous comment re SCL impact decision		Comment Noted	NA
444	39	for activities not associated with the environmental authority, a water licence would be required if the project will take or interfere with the flow of water on, under or adjoining any of the land subject of the MI		Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.9.34
444	40	correction to riverine protection legislative requirements		Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.9.35
444	41	correction to riverine protection legislative requirements		Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.9.36
444	42	may wish to see with DSDIP whether off-lease infrastructure could be considered community infrastructure as mentioned in the Sustainable Planning Reg		Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.9.37
444	43	code for self-assessable development of operational works that interfere with water in a watercourse, lake or spring does not apply to the <i>Condamine and Balonne Resource Operations Plan area</i>		Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.9.38
444	44	repeat of previous comment re consult with NRM re road closures - relates to different section of the EIS		Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.9.39
444	45	update to TOR cross-reference table suggested		Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.9.40
444	46	duplicate reference to offsets area impacts on SCL but with reference to a different section of the EIS		Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.9.41
444	47	duplicate reference to offsets area impacts on SCL but with reference to a different section of the EIS		Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.9.41
444	48	Approvals appendix to note previous comment re SCL impact decision		Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.9.42
444	49	duplicate reference to offsets area impacts on SCL but with reference to a different section of the EIS		Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.9.43
444	50	repeat of previous comment (but relating to a different section of the EIS) re topsoil survey - more analysis suggested to inform topsoil stripping plan/Rehab and Future Land Use Plan	as per submission	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.9.44
444	51	Consideration should be given to having irrigation water available when pasture seeding is carried out, to facilitate the establishment of an effective cover	as per submission	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.9.45
444	52	duplication of stock route reference, but relating to a different section of the EIS.		Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.9.46
444	53	duplicate reference to offsets area impacts on SCL but with reference to a different section of the EIS		Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.9.47
444	54	repeat of previous comment re consult with NRM re road closures - relates to different section of the EIS		Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.9.48
444	55	EM Plan state “NAC plan to return the revised Project site back to a landform that is consistent with the pre-mine disturbance land use ...” This statement is incorrect. The EIS shows that the rehabilitated land is intended for grazing land use, while most of the land has a cropping history.	as per submission	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.9.49
444	56	duplication of stock route reference, but relating to a different section of the EIS.		Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.9.50

Sub. No.	Issue No.	Issue - Overview / Topic	Submitter Recommendations / Suggested Mitigation/additional information	Proponent response	Relevant AEIS Reference
444	57	repeat of previous comment re consult with NRM re road closures - relates to different section of the EIS		Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.9.51
444	58	duplicate reference to offsets area impacts on SCL but with reference to a different section of the EIS		Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.9.52
445	1	Positive economics of employment of NAC 3 is not being recognised	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
446	1	Positive employment impacts of NAC 3	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
446	2	NHG noted for their rehab efforts	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
447	1	Reliance on ag alone is not economically viable	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
447	2	Benefits to the community by NHG	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
448	1	Experience whilst studying uni	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
448	2	Benefits to the surrounding area	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
448	3	Benefits to the beyond the local area	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
449	1	Benefits to the surrounding area	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
449	2	Benefits to the surrounding area	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
449	3	Training locals trade qualifications	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
450	1	Work at port also effected in coal area is clouded	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
451	1	Advantage if living close to the mine	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
451	2	Benefits to the surrounding area	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
452	1	Economics - Employment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
453	1	key assets at risk due to the project: water, surface and groundwater) vegetation and biodiversity, land and soils, air.		Comment Noted	NA
453	2	NAC has failed to demonstrate with certainty that management and mitigation strategies will provide adequate protection to natural resources and community assets of the Qld Murray Darling Basin (OMDB)		Comment Noted	NA
453	3	concerned that the local impact of this Project contributes to a wider impact on global ecosystem services and natural resources and those international communities depending on them	NAC have not achieved is a full appreciation of the Project's long term impacts and the damage they will have on the environment and community	Comment Noted	NA
453	4	NAC have not conducted a proper and full analysis on the cumulative impact of the Project within a regional, state and national context.		Comment Noted	NA
453	5	There are serious economic limitations to the Project's viability, which means it is not justified		Comment Noted	NA
453	6	The Regional NRM Plan provides a framework to improve the management and condition of natural resources in the project area. The lack of integration of the Regional NRM Plan within NAC's EMP undermines regional resource conditions and aspirational targets and does not support the actions of regional communities to reach those targets.	the QMDB Regional NRM Plan was not seriously considered by NAC.	Comment Noted	NA
453	7	QMDC urges the Coordinator-General to make a decision on this EIS that is in the public interest at a local, state and national level.	Should the Coordinator-General find the EIS lacking in crucial detail and data, and NAC fails to provide confidence that adverse impacts on strategic cropping land (SCL) and associated groundwater resources will be avoided or adequately mitigated then the Project should, in the interests of the public, not be allowed to proceed	Comment Noted	NA
453	8	QMDC does not support NAC being given an opportunity to have a second "bite of the cherry", namely to submit a Supplementary EIS on the impacts it will have on SCL. NAC have had ample legal opportunity to justify this Project, any extended opportunity jeopardises further the health and wellbeing of local communities who have suffered long enough		Comment Noted	NA
453	9	QMDC does not support the moving of the coal heaps from Jondaryan, for a number of reasons. QMDC does not support a another contaminated site created at the new proposed siting of the coal heap	QMDC asserts the best option is to mitigate the current site by providing adequate screening and coal dust suppression methods. Additionally a novel and new economic resource could be to modify and utilise the current site as a tourism destiny once it is assessed to be feasible on economic, health and safety levels	Comment Noted	NA
453	10	NAC fails to show how the Project is justified in terms of its strategic, economic, environmental and social implications. The Project's status is not discussed adequately to address a range of issues relevant to a regional, state, and national context	Additionally the Project is not compatible with policy and planning trends relevant to sustainable development, environmental accounting, greenhouse gas (carbon) emission reduction, renewable energy commitments, and global market demands	Comment Noted	NA
453	11	QMDC argues that he estimated benefits \$18.7 billion to Australia, \$16.7 billion to the State and \$3.9 billion to the region are estimations only. We do not believe that these estimations take into account key matters such as externalities, tax subsidies afforded to the company at the expense of public monies, the vagaries of the Australian and international energy market	do not reflect the costs associated with both local and international social, human health and environmental harm. The figures offered by NAC are therefore unreliable and cannot be relied upon as a true and accurate estimation	Comment Noted	NA

Sub. No.	Issue No.	Issue - Overview / Topic	Submitter Recommendations / Suggested Mitigation/additional information	Proponent response	Relevant AEIS Reference
453	12	NAC have failed to produce crucial technical reports that demonstrate an evaluation of alternative forms of development, and what significant weight should be given to strategies which would avoid or minimise the impacts on the region's natural resources		Comment Noted	NA
453	13	Overall QMDC is concerned that the drive for this Project is swimming against the tide of community expectations of government.	Communities in the Darling Downs region are strongly advocating for development that aims to balance the protection of the natural environment whilst developing a sustainable economic platform for the region	Comment Noted	NA
453	14	NAC clearly fails to address social planning issues pertinent to the region such as the long term productive capacity of agriculture including the mental health of farmers and their concerns related to business surety	NAC have not given equal consideration to social, economic and environmental interests and values.	Comment Noted	NA
453	15	key 'economic growth' driver of NAC is obviously biased towards expansion – there is no assessment of the boom/bust syndrome and whether this is acceptable in terms of sustainable productivity	a public resource such as coal should be managed for public good. NAC could therefore better preserve that public good by addressing in balance the region's social, environmental and economic needs	Comment Noted	NA
453	16	NAC does not recognise that agriculture contributes more to GDP and employment in the region than the mining industry. The lifespan of the Project is approx 15 years in comparison to the much longer lifespan of agricultural industry	For the regional economy, to run effectively and sustainably, this requires the Queensland Government to account for the finite character of natural resources, especially water and highly productive soils	Comment Noted	NA
453	17	The Project will undermine the stated election policy intent of doubling agricultural production by 2040.		Comment Noted	NA
453	18	Profiles of the mining and agricultural sectors could have allowed NAC to calculate a damage cost and apply it to each resource and emission, so as to generate an external environmental cost profile	The costs would then have represented the quantities of natural resources used or pollutants emitted multiplied by their environmental damage costs to the economy and the region. These costs are rarely borne by the company.	Comment Noted	NA
453	19	EU estimation that emissions incl. fuel cause almost 370,000 premature deaths and could result in 189-609bn euros in health costs by 2020.	Hunter Valley air exceedences discussed. In QMDC's opinion, this is frequent with coal mining.	Comment Noted	NA
453	20	that these types of external costs are not apparent in the EIS means that the inherent assumptions about the economic "growth" created by the mining industry do not take into account, for example, how burning diesel for road transport generates particulates which have an adverse effect on human health and the environment	the EIS does not account for the total social costs associated with this product - these will be borne by health services	Comment Noted	NA
453	21	Accounting for the damage that is done to society and human capital by pollutants and natural resource use, will progress better decisions on development including quantifying associated human health costs		Comment Noted	NA
453	22	Weight should be given to the serious consideration of the economic and social impacts of mining developments on agriculture. Mining companies' economic analyses are notoriously poor and rarely consider base case scenarios such as loss of farm production through impacts on mental health and decreasing family succession on farms	NAC should have considered these social factors alongside climate impacts and extreme events, renewable energy opportunities, and resource efficiency. They should have also considered risk, resilience and transformative strategies as they relate to the surety of agriculture, tourism and mining investments	Comment Noted	NA
453	23	The Project is not insulating the region from turbulent times, it doesn't align with Government's election promises, and it does not ensure, that communities, where mining companies may be permitted by the Queensland Government to operate, will welcome that development	NAC have failed to secure a 'social license' to operate within the region. The Project is guaranteed to increase uncertainty, interpersonal conflict and the cost of doing business for all parties.	Comment Noted	NA
453	24	Should the Project be implemented in its current form, the Darling Downs region may well degenerate into an undesirable state of being: with depleted natural resources; economic crises and social disharmony	A better plan for the region is needed to identify specific contingency planning strategies that prepare the region for transformation	Comment Noted	NA
453	25	Transformation actions required from NAC including using the EIS to look to that future (or current) untenable state of the region and anticipate what makes it unbearable and evaluate the Project's impacts within that context. Rehabilitation of soils and aquifers is not a given	For example, if communities cannot live with the pollution caused by fossil fuels extraction, production and use, government and corporate businesses have a responsibility to plan and promote alternative ways of generating power.	Comment Noted	NA
453	26	Impacts - Nature Conservation	If communities cannot live in a condition that lacks biodiversity and healthy ecosystems, it is incumbent that the State and development projects protect species and habitat immediately.	Comment Noted	NA
453	27	Impacts - Project Methodology	The need for contingency planning by NAC should have been seriously addressed in the EIS as part of a discussion around the Project's rationale.	Comment Noted	NA
453	28	key regional issues have not been considered, such as agricultural growth; protection of SCL; sustainable development, business, and management practices; water security; ecosystem impacts; weed control; ongoing R&D to improve food security		Comment Noted	NA
453	29	project area is ideal for intensification of agriculture but is compromised particularly due to project's water allocation being taken away from potential Gowrie Creek irrigators	The State needs to restore balance to rectify current unacceptable water impacts and hazards and deal with current operations rather than adding more impacts and issues which the Project will present	Comment Noted	NA

Sub. No.	Issue No.	Issue - Overview / Topic	Submitter Recommendations / Suggested Mitigation/additional information	Proponent response	Relevant AEIS Reference
453	30	does not seem to be a total water balance and total salt (pollutants) balance approach to management of water from this Project	The 'liberation' of these salts and their storage has to be monitored	Comment Noted	NA
453	31	Oakey Creek, which confluences with Lagoon at Jondaryan, may be moderately groundwater dependant		Comment Noted	NA
453	32	what impact on other potential and actual businesses the project's use of water?		Comment Noted	NA
453	33	current regional planning interests bill not considered in the EIS. Success of coexistence questioned.		Comment Noted	NA
453	34	cumulative effects of groundwater		Comment Noted	NA
453	35	bioregional assessments - protecting water resources at the regional level. Key input for IESC. QMDC has prepared an assessment raft of bioregional water assets of Border Rivers and Maranoa Balonne Region.	NAC have failed to incorporate bioregional assessment data	Comment Noted	NA
453	36	Condamine and Balonne Resource Operations Plan Amendment should have encouraged NAC to address surface and groundwater sustainable use of the QMDB and GAB water resources.		Comment Noted	NA
453	37	not confident that operations will minimise disturbances to surface and ground water resources and protect resources for future human and environmental purposes. NAC's access to regional water resources and any exercise of water "rights" must be tenable in terms of the long term sustainability of water resources		Comment Noted	NA
453	38	project key issues re water include aquifer contamination, increasing contam sites, degradation of groundwater, farming land disturbance; leachate, thermal pollution, excessive water consumption, land subsidence		Comment Noted	NA
453	39	Rural unemployment is a serious issue. For this reason alone it is disappointing NAC have not provided reliable research into the causal effect of the mining industry on loss of employment in other industries and businesses and what potential sustainable economic solutions for this region could be instead of and beyond the Project		Comment Noted	NA
453	40	In Toowoomba region, employment within 14 industries surpass mining jobs.	mining upturn coincided with agriculture, forestry and fishing downturn.	Comment Noted	NA
453	41	Diversification in rural economies and new business opportunities needed to sustain this region		Comment Noted	NA
453	42	Mental illness in rural communities is a big concern	develop employment alternatives for miners affected by boom/bus vagaries to address social and mental health needs. Creating jobs in energy efficient industry is one alternative. NHG should consider renewable energy as part of their energy portfolio. Trevor Berrill alternative energy study cited.	Comment Noted	NA
453	43	negative effects of mined land regarding degradation and limited tax revenues, discussed. Need to commit to emissions reduction discussed.		Comment Noted	NA
453	44	Importance of food security.	NAC have failed to consider how developing sustainable agricultural programs could well serve the region's economy and national food security requirements as an alternative to the Project	Comment Noted	NA
453	45	Community engagement, disclosure of information and public consultation must meet community expectations for a more enduring and direct role in the planning, decision-making and implementation of natural resource policies and activities as they relate to coal projects	QMDC asserts NAC's process still need improving to ensure timely and adequate notification of proposed developments.	Comment Noted	NA
453	46	QMDC is concerned that a full assessment has not been carried out to evaluate the impacts associated with NAC's demand on electricity and other energy sources		Comment Noted	NA
453	47	aggregate volumes are likely to place pressure on the existing quarry resources		Comment Noted	NA
453	48	impacts will/may be erosion; SCL alienation; contamination; conflicting land use; waste	NAC to include a threshold limit approach in the EIS	Comment Noted	NA
453	49	project is located in flood prone areas meaning flooding poses risk of further damage to stockpiles. Flood management strategies also discussed. Flood risks are major.	NAC has not considered key flood mitigation measures e.g. natural sloping; grasses that spread floodwaters; crop rotation; infrastructure design.	Comment Noted	NA
453	50	impacts on agricultural businesses in the area - fragmentation, dust, water, diminished productivity.		Comment Noted	NA
453	51	people need reassurance that NHG can fulfil financial obligations of cumulative impacts e.g. global crises such as world food shortages		Comment Noted	NA
453	52	is coordinated project declaration improving the resilience of Darling Downs communities		Comment Noted	NA

Sub. No.	Issue No.	Issue - Overview / Topic	Submitter Recommendations / Suggested Mitigation/additional information	Proponent response	Relevant AEIS Reference
453	53	Contam land exposure assumptions (including indoor/outdoor activity patterns, soil ingestion, home-grown food production and consumption patterns) need to be kept under review. Improving methodologies to study issues specific to contamination and rehabilitation at every opportunity, will improve knowledge on the links and differences between theoretical exposure scenarios and likely actual exposure patterns, making them as clear as possible		Comment Noted	NA
453	54	QMDC asserts these issues require an economic analysis to assess how the reduction of SCL and GQAL over the lifetime of the Project affects regional and national economies. This should include an assessment of economic losses resulting from changing cropping land into grazing land over the life of the Project.		Comment Noted	NA
453	55	contaminated water risks		Comment Noted	NA
453	56	EIS fails to respond adequately to the complexities in the ways in which threats affect ecological processes and regional ecosystems	NAC has failed to direct its management strategies where it will have the greatest impact. NAC has not accurately assessed the complexities in the ways in which threats affect ecological processes.	Comment Noted	NA
453	57	Hydrology, ecosystems, chemicals, cumulative impacts are of concern		Comment Noted	NA
453	58	surface water analysis methodology concerns. Links to Condamine catchment surface water environ values provided.		Comment Noted	NA
453	59	health burden	literature examples provided	Comment Noted	NA
453	60	blasting fumes	QMDC does not believe the modelling conducted by NAC is adequate	Comment Noted	NA
453	61	fugitive emissions	not thoroughly considered in the EIS	Comment Noted	NA
453	62	EIS fails to provide all relevant information on GGEs.	NAC should have addressed in the EIS their responsibility for the Project's proportional contribution to the global impacts of 2 degrees Celsius warming	Comment Noted	NA
453	63	there will still be exceedences, recognised as being harmful to neighbours		Comment Noted	NA
453	64	Waste Impacts		Comment Noted	NA
453	65	dispersed indigenous traditional owners not consulted		Comment Noted	NA
453	66	NAC must address social impacts in relation to their 'social licence to operate'.		Comment Noted	NA
453	67	Evidence has not been produced clearly showing what the net economic value will be should the Project proceed. QMDC is concerned that a thorough economic analysis may show liabilities, such as regulatory, social and environmental costs far outweigh its worth in royalties, jobs and taxes.	Need to know that a decision on the Project is not unduly influenced by the current debt the Queensland Government is carrying and the reliance on royalties to fix that debt	Comment Noted	NA
453	68	Mining on land that was alienated in fee simple by the Crown before 1 March 1910 (prevalent throughout the Darling Downs region) returns nothing in royalties to the State. It is our understanding many of the early mining permits in Acland fall in to this category. NAC has failed to disclose this information.	no evidence re royalties. NSW example of insignificance of royalties in supporting state revenues relative to other inputs.	Comment Noted	NA
453	69	proposed mining jobs across Qld could destroy 20,000 jobs, potentially mostly in manufacturing.	Research is showing in Australian and globally that politicians are overestimating the positive economic effects of the mining boom and not enough consideration is being given to economic costs	Comment Noted	NA
453	70	public expense of diesel fuel tax rebates	Where are the calculations measuring the public cost of NAC's fuel subsidies, carbon permit and tax discounts?	Comment Noted	NA
453	71	environmental accounting development underway - measuring enviro assets.		Comment Noted	NA
453	72	Coal fired power generation has been found to produce damages from 0.8 to 5.6 times its value added. In other words, the damage caused is worth at best 80 percent of the net value of the industry and at worst 5.6 times greater	further discussion pages 84, 85 on extensive cost to society due to mining	Comment Noted	NA
453	73	deaths and injuries caused by rail transportation		Comment Noted	NA
453	74	peer review would help protect public/enviro health	methodology critiqued.	Comment Noted	NA
453	75	social and enviro impacts are significant	failed to identify and respond to cumulative impacts	Comment Noted	NA
453	76			Comment Noted	NA
453	77	located within the Condamine alluvium, which needs to be protected.		Comment Noted	NA
453	78	24/7 operation over 15 years will have a major impact on any "sensitive receptors", agricultural businesses, towns, residences, and other human dwellings or services, regional ecosystem and their biodiversity		Comment Noted	NA
453	79	cumulative impacts of CSG and mine need to be looked at		Comment Noted	NA
453	80	QMDC is concerned that this Project could be potentially propped up by campaign contributions and subsidies, which is why NAC should have provided a rigorous economic and environmental analysis, proving otherwise		Comment Noted	NA

Sub. No.	Issue No.	Issue - Overview / Topic	Submitter Recommendations / Suggested Mitigation/additional information	Proponent response	Relevant AEIS Reference
453	81	Per investment dollar, investments in wind and solar power would create at least 2.8x the number of jobs as coal; investments in conservation would create 3.8x as many jobs, and investments in mass transit would create 6x as many jobs as coal		Comment Noted	NA
453	82	Upper Condamine aquifers, the Great Artesian Basin (GAB) and the Murray-Darling Basin are already recognised as the most susceptible aquifers in the country so added impacts on their already existing stresses are likely to be major. The GAB underpins the economy of inland Queensland	Not permitting activities that may, or will cause an impact to the groundwater quality, quantity and pressures in the Great Artesian Basin	Comment Noted	NA
453	83	erosion concerns, especially SCL soil. Pollution of soil into waterways.		Comment Noted	NA
453	84	QMDC is concerned that NAC is relying on dams to store mine water (treated and untreated). impacts, leakage and salinity impacts	NAC fails to fully assess the ongoing liability and cumulative impact these dams create in respect to increasing soil and water contamination in the region, the risks associated with flooding and other climate change	Comment Noted	NA
453	85	global trends in sustainability reporting have been overlooked and ignored by NAC		Comment Noted	NA
453	86	EMP - is an assumption that each activity can be undertaken in a similar manner and with appropriate environmental controls without scientific site specific analysis	one size does not fit all	Comment Noted	NA
453	87	EMP - Adaptive management must not be used as a substitute for committing to specific mitigation measures in order to cover a situation.	Adaptive management cannot be used to reduce uncertainty regarding mitigation measures, nor be used to "offset" the precautionary principle.	Comment Noted	NA
453	88	concerned monitoring is not going to meet performance criteria and objectives in relation to environmental impacts with measurable indicators and standards	some of that concern is based on NAC not providing sufficient data on eco-toxicity and bioaccumulation risks, potential for environmental contamination with persistent heavy metals, salt, explosives and other contaminants such as radioactive substances	Comment Noted	NA
453	89	The EMP fails to provide an array of information to ensure its compliance with section 203 of the EP Act.	as per submission	Comment Noted	NA
453	90	EMP's Water management plan fails to provide an array of information.	as per submission	Comment Noted	NA
453	91	EMP does not ensure that all air emissions impacts are appropriately avoided and mitigated		Comment Noted	NA
453	92	NAC's solution to major noise, dust and lighting impacts is to 'buy property and move sensitive receptors', which is not acceptable. Mechanisms to address exceedences are inadequate in the EMP		Comment Noted	NA
453	93	NAC has not developed appropriate response plans, consultation processes and resourcing for disasters. The proposed EMP does not adequately help communities avoid disaster or mitigate the potential adverse effects of an event		Comment Noted	NA
453	94	monitoring that is required to assess NAC's compliance and both site specific and the cumulative impact of the Project is extensive. How will monitoring be resourced?		Comment Noted	NA
453	95	a number of recommendations provided as to why the project should not be approved based on economic, social, environmental considerations provided	as per submission	Comment Noted	NA
454	1	Economics - Employment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
455	1	Economics - Support for Project	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
456	1	Assurances were given by political parties that the expansion would not go ahead	Reject Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
456	2	This mine expansion is a disaster for ever shrinking area of strategic cropping land.	Reject Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
457	1	Economics - Employment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
458	1	The project fails to value the importance of maintaining quality farming land across Australia	Cease coal mining operations and use the land to multiple activities including solar PV farming (electricity generation) in combination with food production, tourism and recreation.	Comment Noted	NA
458	2	Fails to account for the full external costs of coal mining on society.	Cease coal mining operations and use the land to multiple activities including solar PV farming (electricity generation) in combination with food production, tourism and recreation.	Comment Noted	NA
458	3	Environmental and social impacts of projects including impacts on Great Barrier Reef and Wet Tropics	Cease coal mining operations and use the land to multiple activities including solar PV farming (electricity generation) in combination with food production, tourism and recreation.	Comment Noted	NA
458	4	The project appears to pay few if any royalties to the Qld Government	The project produces short term jobs but fails to account for the full negative impacts of the project on the Australian economy and households. This includes external costs of pollution and health.	Comment Noted	NA
459	1	Economics - Employment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
459	2	Land - Rehabilitation	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
459	3	Social - Community Awareness / Social responsibility	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
459	4	Social - Community values and change	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
460	1	Economics - Employment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
461	1	Employment of local people = vested interest in project outcomes	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
461	2	Social - Employment strategy	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
461	3	Economics - Support for Project	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
462	1	Economics - Employment	Continue to maintain current New Hope operations	Comment Noted	NA

Sub. No.	Issue No.	Issue - Overview / Topic	Submitter Recommendations / Suggested Mitigation/additional information	Proponent response	Relevant AEIS Reference
462	2	Stage 3 will bring increased employment for this business as well as NHC	Support NAC# as it will bring greater employment into the area.	Comment Noted	NA
463	1	Coal dust impacts de to uncovered coal stockpile and trains	No safe level of particulate pollution	Comment Noted	NA
463	2	Increase trains on line increase dust, noise and vibrations	Increase level of storage at Jondaryan for two years and transport of coal by rail through communities should not occur	Comment Noted	NA
463	3	Has poor history and record of not addressing dust and noise	History of poor response should be made public and part of assessment	Comment Noted	NA
463	4	Commitment to cover trains and stockpiles. air monitoring and attention to health and amenities should occur	Should only approve Stage 3 if commitment are determined.	Comment Noted	NA
464	1	Number of matters not addressed and report poorly laid out. Difficult to read	Report should be more say to read and sections in their own right	Comment Noted	NA
464	2	Project geology around Manning Vale West site is incorrect and mapping reports are misleading	Proponent should be reported for misleading information to CG	Comment Noted	NA
464	3	Project description are incorrect with areas incorrectly defined (Example location provided)-		Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.32.1
464	4	Project geology / water bores around Manning Vale West site are not fully investigated. Will require drilling through basalt thus impacting on the water tables below. Local knowledge indicate water going away for the mine site	Insufficient evidence provided to disprove known occurrences by locals. Mine approval should not proceed given this	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.32.2
464	5	Previous testing by government bodies has proven an alternative result to what proponent is proposing in underground.	Insufficient evidence provided to disprove known occurrences by locals. Mine approval should not proceed given this	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.32.3
464	6	Need to ensure all potential impacts are fully explored	Delay project until assertions can be investigated	Comment Noted	NA
464	7	land can't be returned to prior standard - will be severely degraded.	all areas must be rehabilitated to their original use - voids included	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.32.4
464	8	Inadequate reporting on the social impacts of the area.	Need to speak more to the long term locals who have a greater social history of the area,	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.32.5
464	9	least one could expect is the mine to provide new roadways		Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.32.6
464	10	Short term gain does not guarantee long term benefits for the area	farming is the long term solution for the area. Mining removes that solution.	Comment Noted	NA
464	11	commercial benefits of coal long term are uncertain		Comment Noted	NA
464	12	Need to get clear commitment to ensure that all rehab occurs		Comment Noted	NA
464	13	Economic impacts of departure of community and small family farms is not being considered	New Hope needs to ensure that the land is returned to agriculture on completion	Comment Noted	NA
464	14	Insufficient time to read the report	Need for this to be more user friendly	Comment Noted	NA
464	15	No approach by NHC to nearest neighbour (submitter) during consultation period	Would have like to seen "Good Neighbour" actions during consultations.	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.32.7
464	16	Despite being close to mine, has not received a copy of the EIS	Would have like to seen "Good Neighbour" actions during consultations.	Comment Noted	NA
465	1	Social - Community values and change	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
465	2	Economics - Support for Project	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
465	3	Social - Regional economies and businesses	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
466	1	(from cover letter.) appreciate economic benefits from project for Toowoomba.		Comment Noted	NA
466	2	(from cover letter.) Due to community concerns, requested that the CG require further community consultation and investigation.		Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.10.1
466	3	(from cover letter.) insufficient content in EIS for Council to understand its obligations; or existing site values e.g. koala and other fauna habitats. Approach tends to over rely on offsetting rather than avoid, mitigate and offset as a last resort.	requested that the Coordinator-General ensure that a strategic up-front approach is taken in review and amendment of the EIS to address issues raised in TRC submission to assist with the State's assessment	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.10.2
466	4	inadequate description of legislative approvals and assessment requirements. Some requirements appear not to have been stated.	as per submission.	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.10.3
466	5	EIS does not address all provisions contained within Chapter 10 of the MR Act.	as per submission	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.10.4
466	6	in its current form, EIS does not override MRA local govt approval requirements.	as per submission	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.10.5
466	7	Lack of clarity about current EPBC Act obligations, the role of Commonwealth and State approval bodies and NAC's obligations in relation to Matters of National Environmental Significance (MNES)	as per submission	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.10.6
466	8	Lack of detail on offsetting policy obligations under current Commonwealth and State legislation and policy.	as per submission	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.10.7
466	9	Chap 3 s.3.4.1 :NHC states ML compensation agreements and land purchase agreements with Toowoomba Regional Council (TRC)	TRC does not have a signed copy of these agreements	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.10.8

Sub. No.	Issue No.	Issue - Overview / Topic	Submitter Recommendations / Suggested Mitigation/additional information	Proponent response	Relevant AEIS Reference
466	10	protect Lagoon Creek from excessive runoff during extreme rainfall events. Protect and enhance riparian vegetation.	as per submission	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.10.9
466	11	Chap 4 s 4.2.3: Need to reconsider cropping potential and land use impacts	Refer to Darling Downs Statutory Regional Plan by DSDIP	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.10.10
466	12	Chap 4 s 4.2.4: Need to reconsider SCL for land use impacts	Refer to Darling Downs Statutory Regional Plan by DSDIP	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.10.11
466	13	Chap. 4 Table 4-19 : Need State authorities to re-evaluate land as areas of ML appear to have change their impacts or values.	Need State agencies to check validity of EIS statement and impact assessment of these	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.10.12
466	14	Chap 4 s 4.4.6 : Need to ensure seed bank in topsoil is captured and protected for reuse	Ensure Soil Conservation Plan includes native seed bank and identifies additional endemic species seeds that may be needed at regrowth sites	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.10.13
466	15	stock route use in the future should be considered	as per submission	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.10.14
466	16	The proposed activity as described in the EIS does not consider the existing and potential use of the land for strategic cropping as opposed to grazing. It only recognises the current use of the land. This appears to be contrary to the State Planning Policy - Agriculture State Interest	as per submission	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.10.15
466	17	SCL assessment process. Information required for SCL application, while noted is a separate process, would provide for better assessment of impacts and risks to the land resources in the project area	Undertake and state progress and implications for project design, impacts and mitigation in relation to a SCL Protection Decision and validation as input to the Supplementary EIS.	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.10.16
466	18	EIS takes a different position on the quality of Class A GQAL (54% of site) based on recent use rather than potential use.	requested that the relevant State agencies conduct independent checks on the validity of information in the EIS to determine if the activity will cause a significant decline/reduction in the land use capability from cropping and grazing and condition the Environmental Authority appropriately	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.10.17
466	19	Ensure that the Soils Conservation Plan provides that the extraction and storage of top soil for regrowth areas protects the existing native seed bank and identify that additional endemic species seeds may be required for each regrowth site	as per submission	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.10.18
466	20	Top soil stripping, collection and storage techniques will greatly diminish quality of agricultural land and limit land to a grazing function	highly detailed scoping studies on topsoil and overburden characteristics needed. There also need to be plan for topsoil stripping and its management to ensure soil characteristics are maintained	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.10.19
466	21	statement "a return to grazing should be feasible for a majority of the revised project site post mining and include most of the spoil areas and also the infrastructure area" does not provide spatial info on how much mine area that can't be rehabbed; therefore difficult to qualify the statement. In addition, section does not consider endangered vegetation which will be cleared.	Include a description of, spatial representation and amount of area of the post mine sites / land that will not be able to be rehabilitated or have use limitations. Include an analysis of and measures to rehabilitate endangered vegetation communities.	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.10.20
466	22	concern over the successful regeneration of the regrowth (no plantings) areas without active planting and relying on the native seed bank in topsoil stockpiles. No detail or evidence has been provided to demonstrate the potential success of this technique. The placement of the regrowth areas isolates them from each other reducing connectivity	Include a description of, spatial representation and amount of area of the post mine sites / land that will not be able to be rehabilitated or have use limitations. Include an analysis of and measures to rehabilitate endangered vegetation communities.	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.10.21
466	23	ground/surface water contamination	Monitoring of how leachates are moving through the soil should be conducted at waste water sites, particularly pollutants contaminating ground and surface water supplies.	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.10.22
466	24	return to grazing - science unknown	as per submission	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.10.23
466	25	Detail on Lagoon Creek rehabilitation to be provided	as per submission	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.10.24
466	26	'Sustainable grazing' of bluegrass offset areas has not been clearly defined. Over 100ha of regional remanent vegetation is to be cleared and the 3 offset options identified by Earthtrade have not been provided.	as per submission	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.10.25
466	27	The grazing land success criteria described does not include any measures that relate to heavy metal concentrations or toxicity.	as per submission	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.10.26
466	28	There is a lack of detail regarding the parameters for release of mine water into Lagoon Creek; this is only stated as 'Good Quality'.	as per submission	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.10.27

Sub. No.	Issue No.	Issue - Overview / Topic	Submitter Recommendations / Suggested Mitigation/additional information	Proponent response	Relevant AEIS Reference
466	29	Concern regarding potential overtopping of tailings dams in flood events and the proponents' ability to regulate dam levels to minimise flooding risk	as per submission	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.10.28
466	30	Water should be treated to a standard that does not negatively affect any downstream aquatic or terrestrial ecology.	as per submission	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.10.29
466	31	Disposal of dewatered groundwater into Lagoon Creek may have detrimental impacts on aquatic ecology.	as per submission	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.10.30
466	32	A significant amount of groundwater is expected to be dewatered as a result of the mining activity.	Identify strategies for treatment and re-use of dewatered groundwater in consultation with the State government and other appropriate regional water management agencies.	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.10.31
466	33	groundwater bore impacts	Include more detail on groundwater modelling and ensure that the project does not impact shallow groundwater bores on and off the site.	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.10.32
466	34	various concerns with terminology inconsistencies, detail on risk assessment approach; inadequate mitigation; absence of overlay map showing impact areas/values	as per submission	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.10.33
466	35	discrepancies with REs described by NHG and those listed by EHP.	Include reasons for and the methodology used to make modifications (additions, changes and deletions) to the DEHP regional ecosystems mapping.	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.10.34
466	36	survey methodology		Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.10.35
466	37	inadequate detail re koalas - e.g density of koalas per area of habitat; what re impacts and mitigations?	as per submission	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.10.36
466	38	Include significantly more detail based on a thorough assessment on fauna impacts for each species either known to occur on the site or whose fauna habitats are to be impacted either directly or indirectly by all mining-related activities	as per submission	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.10.37
466	39	NAC classifies clearing of over 64 hectares of endangered and Threatened Ecological Communities as 'low impact'. The reasons given are qualitative statements	Undertake appropriate quantitative assessment	Comment Noted	NA
466	40	lack of consistency in terminology re risk assessment impacts descriptors	use consistent terminology	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.10.38
466	41	inadequate aquatic ecology surveys undertaken	undertake additional dry season surveys.	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.10.39
466	42	inadequate discussion re riparian vegetation management	as per submission	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.10.40
466	43	difficult for Council to verify air quality modelling.	as per submission	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.10.41
466	44	existing issue re Jondaryan	include detailed dust suppression to avoid dust impacts and address issues raised by the community in the past	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.10.42
466	45	No use of tree plantings to mitigate impact on dust emissions if planted in an appropriate width and length. This would also have benefits for biodiversity conservation, erosion prevention and carbon sequestration.	consider tree planting.	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.10.43
466	46	emission figures for clearing of woodland and grassland are not specific to local conditions.	conduct further studies to determine CO2 stored within native and local woodlands and grasslands.	Comment Noted	NA
466	47	Carbon Emission Offsetting details are not investigated in any depth and no detail is provided as to whether these options will be explored in the future. Carbon offsetting may be a more viable option if carbon pricing is discontinued		Comment Noted	NA
466	48	section relating to the cumulative noise impact from both the revised Project and the existing Mine during the early stage of the revised Project life is brief and does not contain enough detailed information	Provide more detailed information regarding timeframes (i.e. how long will the overlap of projects occur and the phase of each project), predictions of cumulative impacts (including methodology and results) and what requirements have been met (as per statement).	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.10.44
466	49	It is difficult for Council to verify the findings of air quality impact modelling carried out for the EIS.	Specify detailed measures to avoid air and dust impacts on local communities on or adjoining the mine site or along road rail haulage routes.	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.10.45
466	50	state heritage finds	Note in Chapter 12 that any incidental finds of potentially State Heritage significance in any excavation should involve stop work which might disturb the object(s) and report to EHP	Comment Noted	NA

Sub. No.	Issue No.	Issue - Overview / Topic	Submitter Recommendations / Suggested Mitigation/additional information	Proponent response	Relevant AEIS Reference
466	51	EIS does not include references to all relevant legislation in terms of road use	New Acland Coal (NAC) must identify, without limitation, the <i>Local Government Act 2009</i> and the <i>Mineral Resources Act 1989</i> . TRC notes that the Project triggers a <i>notifiable road use</i> under section 318EO(1)(b) of the <i>Mineral Resources Act 1989</i> .	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.10.46
466	52	chapter 13 does not deal with local roads.		Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.10.47
466	53	Jondaryan-Nungil Road, Jondaryan-Muldu, Muldu-Brymaroo Road, Muldu – Plainview Road are Local Roads of Regional Significance, which serve both state and local (regional) functionality.	NAC should identify the LRRS status of these roads in the EIS to emphasise the regional importance of these roads. NAC should demonstrate in the EIS, that implementation of the Project will not diminish the regional road function capability provided by the existing LRRS road network	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.10.48
466	54	section does not include crash statistics for local government controlled roads. Road crash data for local government controlled roads	as per submission	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.10.49
466	55	Traffic section does not include scheduled road improvements for local government controlled roads.	as per submission	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.10.50
466	56	This section does not identify the existing capacity limitations on the Western Railway, which connects to the Port of Brisbane	as per submission	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.10.51
466	57	Road closure due to flood inundation is a foreseeable risk, in isolating regional communities that are dependent on key regional and local roads. The identification of key roads that are prone to flooding and the level of flooding immunity that they currently experience should be included in this section	NAC should include in the EIS, the level of flooding immunity that is experienced by the key roads in the project area. It is understood that detailed design will address key regional and local roads flooding immunity requirements.	Comment Noted	NA
466	58	local road traffic counts insufficient	as per submission	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.10.52
466	59	criteria used to characterise the LoS for key roads (refer to section 13.5.1) is based on two-lane, two-way roads. A number of sections of the Warrego Highway, as identified in Table13-4 (Clifford Gardens, Hursley Road, Boundary Street) are four-lane, two-way roads	LoS should be revised	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.10.53
466	60	projected traffic growth rates indicated in this section do not include a unit rate (i.e. is it % increase per annum)	as per submission	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.10.54
466	61	This section indicates that assumed growth accounts for committed development in the area, in line with advice received from the DTMR	NAC should update this section of the EIS, to identify if TRC was approached for advice regarding committed developments in the area, and if the proposed growth assumptions are in line with TRC advices	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.10.55
466	62	request for further information about the range of road realignments	as per submission	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.10.56
466	63	various comments regarding road impacts during times of flood impacting rail line and increased use of Childs Road.	as per submission	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.10.57
466	64	road construction material sources - EIS states to be sourced within study area.	validate this statement and identify sources of materials	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.10.58
466	65	oversize vehicle movements - Toowoomba road network impacts should be assessed		Comment Noted	NA
466	66	not all intersections have been analysed.		Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.10.59
466	67	contradictory statements re how tyres will be disposed		Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.10.60
466	68	Generally the SIA covers the main issues and made adequate assessments, however, there appears to be a tendency to underestimate the severity of negative impacts and overestimate the positive impacts.	N/A	Comment Noted	NA
466	69	The EIS focusses on the positive benefits to the community and does not record or address many outstanding community concerns that have been brought the attention of Council.	Carry out community consultation and detail outstanding community concerns with the existing operations and outline how these concerns/impacts will be avoided for the Stage 3 expansion or addressed in impact mitigation measures.	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.10.61
466	70	The Social Impact Assessment (SIA) area only considers the directly affected communities of Oakey, Acland, Jondaryan, Muldu and Quinalow but does not include Toowoomba. NAC, in other sections of this Chapter have acknowledged that there will be impacts on Toowoomba in terms of extra housing and social pressures. The EIS has not adequately addressed the potential impacts of the proposed project on indirect communities including Toowoomba.	Include indirectly affected communities including Toowoomba in the SIA and consider the impacts on Toowoomba and provide mitigation strategies.	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.10.62

Sub. No.	Issue No.	Issue - Overview / Topic	Submitter Recommendations / Suggested Mitigation/additional information	Proponent response	Relevant AEIS Reference
466	71	This Chapter does not consider the TRC Community Plan.	Consider the TRC Community Plan as a key input into this Chapter.	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.10.63
466	72	Road safety issues (including commuting works, movement of heavy vehicles, condition of the highway and local roads) are acknowledged but impacts are underestimated.	Better consider the road safety issues.	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.10.64
466	73	Impacts on accommodation and housing are underestimated. Vulnerability to rising house prices for lower socio-economic groups in Oakey specifically is not addressed.	Address the impacts on accommodation and housing for lower socio-economic groups from rising prices.	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.10.65
466	74	Dust/odour is already a significant issue for local residents which are likely to increase as the operation expands which will require significant additional mitigation measures to be implemented	Consider and mitigate against increased dust/odour issues due to the revised project that local residents' experience.	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.10.66
466	75	There is potential for local businesses (including the service industries and farm workers) to experience employee shortages and the requirement to back-fill local positions due to the employment opportunities created by the revised projects. This could affect the viability of local businesses and the potential of these businesses to respond to business opportunities created by the project.	Consider the impact on local business by having to back-fill positions.	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.10.67
466	76	Additionally, cumulative impacts on Toowoomba was acknowledged but not considered to be significant.	Review and better consider the cumulative impacts on Toowoomba.	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.10.68
466	77	cumulative impacts on Toowoomba was acknowledged but not considered to be significant	better consider the cumulative impacts on Toowoomba	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.10.69
466	78	cumulative impacts re water, noise, air, transport, GGEs, social	provide more information as per submission	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.10.69
466	79	returning land use to grazing when the land has been mapped by the Govt as Classes A and B GQAL and SCL and seeing this as a 'low' impact on land capability is subjective.	modify the rating to 'medium'. Prepare a flora and fauna conservation strategy based on AMO principles.	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.10.70
466	80	NAC considers that the potential for cumulative impacts from existing operations on the revised project for terrestrial ecology will be low, based on that clearing to be undertaken is minor in comparison with historical clearing. This does not adequately consider the values that still exist on the site including State and Federal significant values such as Threatened Ecological Communities, Endangered, Vulnerable and Rare plants and animals and Endangered and Of Concern Regional Ecosystems.	Modify the rating to “Medium” to better represent impacts on terrestrial ecology (i.e., several endangered species and communities) which are being impacted.	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.10.71
466	81	Greenhouse gas and climate change is missing from the table identifying potential for cumulative impacts from existing operations		Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.10.72
466	82	Surat Gas, located approx. 50km west is inside the 60km radius of consideration for cumulative impacts, however was excluded from analysis. And what was the basis for the 60km criteria?	as per submission	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.10.73
466	83	Numerical modelling of the various aquifers should cover a broader area. TRC wants to know the impact on bores that are currently used for drinking water		Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.10.74
466	84	The Conservation Management Plan is vague and non-descript when it discusses what it will do if natural regeneration does not work. This section needs to include a plan for direct seeding and planting if natural regeneration does not succeed		Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.10.75
466	85	Remove any in-stream impoundments to restore natural hydrology of Lagoon Creek to ensure health of creek system. This restoration of natural flows will also assist rehabilitation of riparian zone surrounding the creek		Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.10.76
466	86	NAC mentions only two areas in the Conservation Management Plan – Lagoon Creek and Bottle Tree Hill. How does NAC propose to provide protection for and improvement to other areas of vegetation on the mining tenement and land owned by them	action plan should include protection/management for other areas of remnant veg.	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.10.77
466	87	Stock access to the creek will damage newly established riparian zones and increase erosion on the banks of the creek.	Include in the Action Plan that stock access be prohibited within Lagoon Creek and fencing provided to keep stock outside the 50m riparian zone	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.10.78
466	88	Re The Conservation Zone Management Plan: long term protection measures such as covenanting (Nature Refuge) or PMAV assessment are not discussed or determined.	Include long-term protection measures for the conservation zone at Lagoon Creek and Bottle Tree Hill and any other remnant areas on NAC and the associated Pastoral Company.	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.10.79

Sub. No.	Issue No.	Issue - Overview / Topic	Submitter Recommendations / Suggested Mitigation/additional information	Proponent response	Relevant AEIS Reference
466	89	How does NAC propose to deal with new finds of threatened species in the proposed mine disturbance area or mining tenement area?	Describe NAC's proposed response to dealing with new finds of threatened species in Threatened Species Translocation Plan	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.10.80
466	90	The plan does not adequately describe the ongoing management measures that NAC proposes to undertake to maintain the bluegrass areas in the long term.	much detail on plan mechanics requested.	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.10.81
466	91	The site specific management plans proposed to be developed in Section 3.1 should be included in the Biodiversity Offset Plan.	Include the site specific management plans in the Biodiversity Offset Plan.	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.10.82
466	92	Describe any potential impacts on the long term protection of the offset areas including any potential for future mining within the mining tenement boundary that may impact on the offset areas	Apply suitable protection mechanisms that conserve these areas in perpetuity ie to safeguard them against future mining.	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.10.83
466	93	Bluegrass Offset Management Plan does not adequately describe the individual size or location of two proposed offset areas and does not provide enough scientific information in order to make an assessment of landscape suitability or ecological benefits	Include maps using robust scientific datasets to support the proposal.	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.10.84
466	94	Section 3.3 does not list the performance criteria that will be used to assess the offset areas	as per submission	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.10.85
466	95	Bluegrass Offset Management Plan does not describe the size of the proposed offset areas and how they were calculated to aid in a determination of adequacy to suit the requirements of the EPBC Act	The plan does not result in a "net gain" of Bluegrass community as the proposed offset area already exists	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.10.86
466	96	The plan only includes a brief mention of the way NAC will respond to, account for and manage the risks of the offset area not succeeding. The requirement for this information to be included in an Offset plan is clearly stated in the EPBC Act	Better describe NAC's proposed response to account for and manage the risks of the offset not succeeding in the Bluegrass Offset Management Plan	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.10.87
466	97	EMP lacks detail re carbon capture via vegetation planting.	Consider the use of vegetation planting to reduce carbon emissions	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.10.88
466	98	EMP does not mention indirect emissions from burning of project coal. Methane from coal seams - lack of detail. 1% of total GGEs is a significant figure.	as per submission.	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.10.89
466	99	Waste should account for cleared vegetation. Consider re-using cleared timber.	as per submission.	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.10.90
466	100	completion criteria for rehabilitation its states "Return to previous use (grazing)". Grazing is not the only previous use and therefore should not be the only criteria for completion	Rehabilitation completion criteria should include ecological condition, corridor function and cropping	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.10.91
466	101	is stated that fragmentation impacts are expected to be minimal. The vegetated areas which are proposed to be cleared provide both habitat and function as stepping stones for fauna moving throughout the region. Due to the already sparsely vegetated nature of the landscape, these remaining areas of habitat are highly important.	Remove the statement regarding impacts being minimal. Ensure that areas identified as offsets are in locations that add to corridor functionality of existing patches.	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.10.92
466	102	the Biodiversity Offsets Strategy contains only vague statements of intent from NAC and does not provide any definitive information on whether NAC can meet the requirements of the Queensland or EPBC Offsets Policies.	Complete the Biodiversity Offsets Strategy to address all requirements of the Queensland Biodiversity Offsets Policy and the EPBC Environmental Offsets Policy prior to the Supplementary EIS being released	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.10.93
467	1	Social - Training and apprenticeships	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
467	2	Economics - Support for Project	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
468	1	Social - Regional economies and businesses	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
468	2	Economics - Analysis Approach	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
468	3	Ecologically sustainable development	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
468	4	General Comment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
468	5	Economics - Agriculture vs Mining	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
468	6	Land - use and tenure	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
468	7	Social - Community Awareness / Social responsibility	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
469	1	Economics - Employment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
469	2	Social - Community values and change	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
469	3	Impacts	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
470	1	Economics - Business Opportunities	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
471	1		Nothing further to add	Comment Noted	NA
472	1	Approvals - Conditions	Still has jurisdiction and functions of QFRS	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.2.11.1
472	2	Hazard and Risk	Still has jurisdiction and functions of QFRS	Comment Noted	NA
472	3	Stakeholder Consultation	Consultation re: Police, QFRS, EMQ, as jurisdiction and functions remain	Comment Noted	NA
472	4	Stakeholder Consultation	Ongoing consultation with QAS on any potential for increased expectancy of QAS responses or risks that may impact on emergency response due to this development	Comment Noted	NA
472	5	Stakeholder Consultation	QAS involvement in developing emergency responses and simulated drills over the life of the project	Comment Noted	NA

Sub. No.	Issue No.	Issue - Overview / Topic	Submitter Recommendations / Suggested Mitigation/additional information	Proponent response	Relevant AEIS Reference
473	1	Project sustainability and justification are not fully explored as the alternatives such as retaining farming areas instead of mining are not identified	Need to review sustainability and justification for project as not all factors are identified	Comment Noted	NA
473	2	Traffic impacts of drive in drive out project not fully reported	Need to prevent overuse of roads and volumes in excess of what the roads are designed to hold, not being identified	Comment Noted	NA
473	3	Predicted increasing impacts on health services due to exposure to coal mine activities	Proponent should bear cost of monitoring and the subsequent health impacts due to their activities	Comment Noted	NA
473	5	Need to review project description as amendment provision in s.3.4.1 could allow NHC to go ahead with previous Stage 3 proposal	Proponent should not be permitted to amend anything further than within the reduced footprint	Comment Noted	NA
473	6	Much of the project is SCL	Before approval given , proponent should get peer approval that after mining, the land can be returned to SCL , as it would be if not mined.	Comment Noted	NA
473	7	Change in the watershed will increase flooding in Oakey and Jondaryan	Not addressed in EIS	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.33.1
473	8	Use of 8.9 GL should not be justified	Use by NHC of the GAB water should not be allowed	Comment Noted	NA
473	9	Loss of environment and nature will impact on local species and flora e.g. koala	Need to explore the impact on current natural environment such as local flora and fauna	Comment Noted	NA
473	10	resident aquatic species have not been adequately addressed		Comment Noted	NA
473	11	Need for air quality in Jondaryan and Acland and Oakey to be reported on now and into the future, to a greater level at sensitive receptor points	Proponent should bear implement monitoring now and bear the cost of monitoring. Notify sensitive receptors immediately.	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.33.2
473	12	Look for alternative energy production at Acland	Undertake investigations of solar energy production as alternative power source.	Comment Noted	NA
473	13	Current level of noise pollution is unacceptable and expansion will only increase volume and frequency of such events	Concerns not being addressed now and will only increase with expansion	Comment Noted	NA
473	14	Concern that the long term impacts of mining will impact on the historical and cultural values of local areas	Concerns not being addressed now and will only increase with expansion	Comment Noted	NA
473	15	Concern that the long term impacts of mining will impact on the traffic and rail congestion	overhead flyover at Bridge Street to keep road and rail traffic separated. Provide access for emergency vehicles and rotary winged aircraft at the level crossing for the hospital.	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.33.3
473	16	NAC3 plans to dump old truck tyres and other toxic waste in the mine pits	Do not use pits as a dumping ground for mine waste	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.33.4
474	1	Royalties are not going to State	Due to pre existing prior to 1912, royalties not going to Queensland	Comment Noted	NA
474	2	coal dust impacts from site to port.	all coal to be covered and all loading facilities to be covered.	Comment Noted	NA
474	3	transportation of coal has caused enormous damage to roads		Comment Noted	NA
474	4	Assessment does not take into account loss of farms, businesses displaced due to mine	Proponent should investigate all economic impacts due to their activities	Comment Noted	NA
474	5	Assessment does not take into account reduced demand for coal in such areas as China	Proponent should investigate all economic impacts due to their activities	Comment Noted	NA
474	6	Property owners will suffer groundwater draw downs due to the project	Wetalla wastewater could be better used elsewhere	Comment Noted	NA
474	7	Predicted increase in impacts		Comment Noted	NA
474	8	respond to complaints as a matter of urgency. People should not have to leave their homes to sleep.		Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.34.1
474	9	night lighting could be intolerable for people nearby.		Comment Noted	NA
474	10	Road closures will mean only one road available to get into Acland	Need for more than one road access into Acland	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.34.2
474	11	sewerage treatment - what risks to the health and wellbeing of humans, the environment, groundwater? How effective is the treatment process?		Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.34.3
474	12	Impacts of Stage 3 on groundwater is too risky	Do not go ahead with Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
474	13	Impacts of Stage 3 on housing in Oakey was due to loss of 70 farms and 30 businesses and this has resulted in sudden decline in house prices nearer to the mine	Do not go ahead with Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
474	14	Already the impacts of Stage 2 in areas surrounding the mine are too risky and present great impacts on residents.	Do not go ahead with Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
475	1	Getting limited sleep due to noise and vibration from mine	Restrict operations to daylight hours only	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.35.1
475	2	"Remove dysfunctional building "	"Complete clean-up as promised "	Comment Noted	NA
475	3	Denied access to move heavy machinery between properties	No road closures	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.35.2
475	4	Risk of dust pollution impacting on human and animal health		Comment Noted	NA
475	5	impact on water tanks		Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.35.3
476	1	Getting limited sleep due to noise and vibration from mine	Restrict operations to daylight hours only	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.36.1
476	2	"Remove dysfunctional building "	"Complete clean-up as promised "	Comment Noted	NA
476	3	Denied access to move heavy machinery between properties	No road closures	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.36.2
476	4	Risk of dust pollution impacting on human and animal health		Comment Noted	NA
476	5	impact on water tanks		Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.36.3

Sub. No.	Issue No.	Issue - Overview / Topic	Submitter Recommendations / Suggested Mitigation/additional information	Proponent response	Relevant AEIS Reference
477	1	Getting limited sleep due to noise and vibration from mine	Restrict operations to daylight hours only	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.37.1
477	2	"Remove dysfunctional building "	"Complete clean-up as promised "	Comment Noted	NA
477	3	Denied access to move heavy machinery between properties	No road closures	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.37.2
477	4	Risk of dust pollution impacting on human and animal health		Comment Noted	NA
477	5	impact on water tanks		Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.37.3
477	6	NAC not as obliging as they'd like to be thought to be. Hard to have community spirit when no community is left.		Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.37.4
477	7	NAC has only given us weeds, noise, dust and extra traffic along with less agricultural services and less trustworthy neighbours.		Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.37.5
478	1	Getting limited sleep due to noise and vibration from mine	Restrict operations to daylight hours only	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.38.1
478	2	"Remove dysfunctional building "	"Complete clean-up as promised "	Comment Noted	NA
478	3	Denied access to move heavy machinery between properties	No road closures	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.38.2
478	4	Risk of dust pollution impacting on human and animal health		Comment Noted	NA
478	5	impact on water tanks		Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.38.3
479	1	Getting limited sleep due to noise and vibration from mine	Restrict operations to daylight hours only	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.39.1
479	2	"Remove dysfunctional building "	"Complete clean-up as promised "	Comment Noted	NA
479	3	Denied access to move heavy machinery between properties	No road closures	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.39.2
479	4	Risk of dust pollution impacting on human and animal health		Comment Noted	NA
479	5	impact on water tanks		Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.39.3
480	1	Social - Community values and change	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
480	2	Economics - Employment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
480	3	Social - Regional economies and businesses	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
480	4	Social - Community Awareness / Social responsibility	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
481	1	Social - Community values and change	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
481	2	Economics - Employment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
482	1	Social - Community values and change	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
482	2	Economics - Employment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
482	3	Social - Regional economies and businesses	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
483	1	Economics - Employment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
483	2	Social - Community values and change	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
484	1	Economics - Employment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
484	2	Social - Regional economies and businesses	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
484	3	Social - Community values and change	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
485	1	Transport - Road Access/ Closures / Diversions	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
485	2	Economics - Employment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
485	3	Social - Regional economies and businesses	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
485	4	Social - Community values and change	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
486	1	His health has declined since mining started. Respiratory problems disappear when away from mining.	Jondaryan needs to be relocated or JRLF to move before stage 3 proceeds	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.40.1
486	2	home covered in dust; tanks polluted; air polluted.		Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.40.2
486	3	homes are devalued	relocation at relocation price not valuation price.	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.40.3
487	1	Monitoring	The proponent should expand its bore monitoring network	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.41.1
487	2	Coal dust management	Expand air quality monitoring network to include gauges at dairy farm	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.41.2
487.1	1	Pest and weeds	Better management and control of noxious weeds and feral animals	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.42.1
487.2	1	concerned with impact on dairy pastures and livestock health due to mine		Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.43.1
487.3	2	concerned with impact on dairy pastures and livestock health due to mine		Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.43.2
488	1	Economics - Employment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
489	1	Social - Community values and change	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
489	2	Social - Training and apprenticeships	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
489	3	Economics - Employment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
490	1	Social - Community values and change	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
490	2	Economics - Employment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
490	3	Social - Regional economies and businesses	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
491	1	Social - Community values and change	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
491	2	Social - Regional economies and businesses	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
492	1	Economics - Employment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
493	1	Social - Community Awareness / Social responsibility	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
493	2	Economics - Employment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
494	1	Social - Housing impacts	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
495	1	Social - Regional economies and businesses	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
495	2	Social - Community values and change	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
496	1	Social - Regional economies and businesses	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
496	2	Economics - Employment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
496	3	Social - Community values and change	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
496	4	Social - Training and apprenticeships	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
497	1	Economics - Employment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
498	1	Economics - Employment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
499	1	Social - Community values and change	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
499	2	Social - Regional economies and businesses	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA

Sub. No.	Issue No.	Issue - Overview / Topic	Submitter Recommendations / Suggested Mitigation/additional information	Proponent response	Relevant AEIS Reference
500	1	Social - Housing impacts	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
500	2	Economics - Employment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
500	3	Social - Community values and change	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
501	1	Social - Community values and change	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
501	2	Economics - Employment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
501	3	Land - Rehabilitation	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
502	1	Social - Regional economies and businesses	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
502	2	Economics - Employment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
503	1	prefers contact from proponent in writing. No contact from NHG in 2013 except blast notices, newsletters and the EIS notification. Meeting with proponent achieves nothing due to their aggressive tactics and their agenda is already decided	anything that can be said by meeting can be put in writing.	Comment Noted	none
503	2	company's behaviour and bad management of removal of Acland infrastructure feels like post-natural disaster theft. NHG are alien to the people, land and the environment.		Comment Noted	none
503	3	questioned EIS's mention that a purchase agreement for Tom Dougherty park is in place with TRC	Should not be part of the ML.	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.44.1
503	4	mine should only operate during the day. Past experience shows they can't manage night time noise.		Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.44.2
503	5	blasting is excessive	remove the one in 15 above 115dba	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.44.3
503	6	noise and dust of haul roads. No light roads listed on figure 3-18	bunding	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.44.4
503	7	road closures - unnecessary and not appropriate. Affect bus routes, mail, power, telephone. Access for heritage trails should be maintained	retain access between Acland to north and west and east. No road closures.	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.44.5
503	8	mining northern tip of Manning vale not appropriate due to MNES impacts and basalt aquifer impacts. MNES will be affected by Sabine Road upgrade.	more detail about upgrade of road and impacts	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.44.6
503	9	power supply intentions are confusing.	elaborate on Acland power supply. If 11kV can remain, so can the roads.	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.44.7
503	10	Telstra - no detail about how service to Acland will remain.		Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.44.8
503	11	potential contamination of Oakey RO water by Army fire fighting	consult with army base	Comment Noted	none
503	12	flood design should incorporate Doctors Creek and its catchment South of Willeroo pit		Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.44.9
503	13	rail transport and noise, dust 24 hours. Tight turning circle of train. No physical mitigation barrier. This facility will almost be as close to Acland as Jondaryan is to the RLF	model train noises as well	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.44.10
503	14	Acland Management Strategy (AMS) - removal of additional buildings from Acland will diminish the local cultural heritage. These buildings have historical significance		Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.44.11
503	15	Acland Management Strategy (AMS) - removal of additional buildings from Acland will diminish the local cultural heritage. These buildings have historical significance	report on asbestos locations should be published in the EIS. Rest as per submission.	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.44.12
503	16	photos about house removal in Acland that damaged tree branches		Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.44.13
503	17	photos of items considered to have local heritage significance - tank stand meaningful relic for railway heritage trail. Old survey post too	should be retained for trails	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.44.14
503	18	Colliery conservation plan - timing of work is urgent in order to preserve the site		Comment Noted	none
503	19	2008 letter from NHG re tree removal. Concerns re viability of position that trees were in the way, and that their removal was premature given project was not yet assessed.	trees provide noise abatement and their loss contributes to a diminished environment. Consider landscape planting to province habitat and amenity	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.44.15
503	20	building removal have local heritage significance	buildings should be presented well and maintained, fenced	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.44.16
503	21	AMS	house slabs could be used by campers and caravans	Comment Noted	none
503	22	Tom Doherty park - community place and management by the proponent would be inappropriate. Should not be in the mining lease	TRC and he manage the park satisfactorily	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.44.17
503	23	School building - significant local heritage	as per submission.	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.44.18
503	24	Current house blocks should be maintained		Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.44.19
503	25	Acland Hall	fund raising charity ball could improve NHG social responsibility. Hall memorabilia could be given to TRC. Ideas for memorial landscaping and historical significants, habitat enhancement, heritage value enhancement	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.44.20
503	26	farm houses could be shifted to Acland.		Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.44.21
503	27	Summer Hill hotel	Converge report recommendation 3 page 104 - should be adapted to new Stage 3 as development has a different impact	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.44.22
503	28	Butcher shop and Millglen - historical significance discussed	to demolish this would be an act of vandalism.	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.44.23
503	29	telephone exchange and shop - historical significance discussed	should be retained and maintained and used	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.44.24

Sub. No.	Issue No.	Issue - Overview / Topic	Submitter Recommendations / Suggested Mitigation/additional information	Proponent response	Relevant AEIS Reference
503	30	Converge report excerpt regarding retaining highly significant cultural places included. Also ongoing review re heritage treatment.	report excerpt further discusses offering historical buildings to museums such as Jondaryan Woolshed	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.44.25
503	31	John Oxley, National Archives and other correspondence copies included regarding local heritage.		Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.44.26
503	32	Roberts House, St Judes Church, town signage	maintain, reuse, retain - could be incorporated with other heritage buildings to an Acland creative plan	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.44.27
503	33	bottle trees - removal adds to horror.	could be replaces as part of ongoing enhancement	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.44.28
503	34	TRC Planning Scheme - omits cropping land and emphasises grazing land		Comment Noted	none
503	35	ecotourism at Acland. Heritage trails.	plenty of creative uses for Acland in the future	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.44.29
503	36	pg 4-15 says Acland 'conserved for future development'	what does this mean?	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.44.30
503	37	cropping for grain production is one of the largest agricultural land uses within the study area	this should be considered	Comment Noted	none
503	38	fig 4-9 - final land use plan - tree planning is not depicted clearly. Acland plantings should not be like the roadside screening plantings.	as per submission.	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.44.31
503	39	not all locations of Austral Cornflower have been shown and no effort has been made to avoid the locality. Further, flora marked least concern. Work quality questioned. Cornflower not listed in table 7-13 other cited EIS sections	avoid mining northern end of western pit east of Haul Road basalt is marked here. Closure of haul road not necessary. Protect the area. List Cornflower as impacted by WM pit	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.44.32
503	40	Acland Sabine Road upgrade- likely to impact on rare and endangered flora, koala habitat and movement corridors	avoid closure of roads elsewhere. Avoid upgrade of sabine road.	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.44.33
503	41	cited EIS sections fail to report negative impacts of the mine as reason for people from Acland selling. Businesses were destroyed. Visual amenity and sense of place altered by removal of dwellings		Comment Noted	none
503	42	EIS's discussion about Tom Doherty Park questioned. History provided.	details of any arrangement that NAC has to buy the park should be made public. Agreement should be changed. TRC should be responsible for the park.	Comment Noted	none
503	43	NHG has referred to Acland as a dying town. 14 new homes established between 1978 and 2000. Dying began with New Hope. Discussion of deconstruction of local heritage items		Comment Noted	none
503	44	Trees of Acland are a part of Acland's heritage. They provide amenity and habitat, refuge for fauna including koalas. Koalas threatened re mining.		Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.44.33
503	45	A NHG employee said a colony of koalas has been wiped out on the haul road.		Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.44.34
503	46	removal of Acland heritage items. Tree impacts.	remnant buildings in town should be retained; lived in, or presented for tourism.	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.44.35
503	47	various photos of infrastructure removal, burning, dilapidation		Comment Noted	none
503	48	discussion of Acland history and its resilience prior to the open cut mine. Impossible to relate to the proponent with no regard for Acland environment.	destruction of Acland gives no confidence in the proponent's ability to care and maintain Acland items. Shouldn't be permitted to destroy last fragments.	Comment Noted	none
503	49	no confidence in proponent who will sell the business		Comment Noted	none
503	50	monitoring 15 minutes a month for noise is not meaningful		Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.44.36
503	51	EM Plan - no detail re specific activates for the white area		Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.44.37
503	52	how can dust issue not be worse with so much more activity - dust is an issue now.		Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.44.38
503	53	stop mining at night. Enough horror has been experienced with intimidation and threatening behaviour by the company	Fines should be imposed on the proponent if monitoring is not adequate and compliance is not known	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.44.39
503	54	EMP - Acland will be closed and removed	removal of heritage buildings is not acceptable	Comment Noted	none
503	55	EMP re compliance - management of conditions by complaint is not acceptable - not fair.	internally police conditions. No exceedences should be permitted. Penalties useful.	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.44.40
503	56	Rhaponticum Australe is located onsite. Rufus Fantail also. Survey does not include migratory species. Page 64 of submission lists other species the submitter has seen locally.	impacts should be considered. As per submission.	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.44.41
503	57	koala impacts, photos provided incl. sighting locations	plant koala habitat	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.44.42
503	58		remove	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.44.43
503	59	School buildings could be an environ display and local botanic gardens		Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.44.29
503	60	dust on surfaces, in water tank is a nuisance. NHG said it was from ploughing.	exceedences should not be permitted. Penalties.	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.44.44
503	61	Why use Hunter Valley information? Where is the info for Acland?		Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.44.45
503	62	stakeholder engagement cannot reduce dust. No point having an authority if its going to be breached.	24 hr monitoring is essential. Stop mining if levels too high	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.44.46
503	63	dust impacts on fauna?		Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.44.47
503	64	deficiency of reporting to affected landholders re dust, noise, blasting. Monitoring for noise of 15 minutes for 15 minutes is inadequate.	24/7 monitoring is necessary, preferably independently managed	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.44.48

Sub. No.	Issue No.	Issue - Overview / Topic	Submitter Recommendations / Suggested Mitigation/additional information	Proponent response	Relevant AEIS Reference
503	65	Complaint management unhelpful, inadequate. NHG has breached EA conditions. Table of noise events and complaints included.	breaches should be penalised by EHP	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.44.49
503	66	blasting is distressing. Fumes sometimes over Acland. House rattles.	as per submission.	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.44.50
503	67	various fauna photos included	as per page 124 - Acland has been described as a degraded landscape and yet the environment sustains a variety of species which will be impacted if the project goes ahead.	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.44.51
503	68	various heritage photos, articles included		Comment Noted	None
503	69	does the new RLF look like the one in Wyoming?		Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.44.52
503	70	NHG's behaviour has been disappointing. Impacts on the environment and Acland have been premature given ML not yet granted. Aspects of the historic fabric have been dismissed. Millglen has not been included in the EIS. No genuine considerations of alternative land use for Acland.		Comment Noted	None
503	71	Company's agenda is to sell the business. Privately held coal royalties exist on much of the land. This should be taken into account when considering the benefits of the project.		Comment Noted	None
503	72	closeness of surface mining to Acland is of concern given noise, dust, blasting, amenity impacts, past failures re EA compliance		Comment Noted	None
503	73	Converge report not updated to take into account revised stage 3		Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.44.53
504	1	Impacts at Jondaryan will remain until the new RLF is built	no expansion until the RLF is moved	Comment Noted	NA
504	2	There are no photos of the existing mine in the EIS	aerial photo should be provided	Comment Noted	NA
504	3	show map of EPC 919		Comment Noted	NA
504	4	inconsistencies in rail movements reported in EIS. 20.3 states an additional 22		Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.45.1
504	5	Canberra Bomber at the Oakey Army Aviation Museum - not a bomber there. Name of museum is also incorrect.		Comment Noted	NA
504	6	Proponent should be heavily fined if they don't continue to use water from the WWRF and use aquifer water instead		Comment Noted	NA
504	7	figures re how much will go to governments and local organisations are hard to believe. Local roads, public transport in the area are lacking.	publish a list re where the money is going to	Comment Noted	NA
504	8	figures quoted regarding no project scenario are biased. No figures re if the land was returned to farming prior to NHG's purchase of it		Comment Noted	NA
505	1	Social - Regional economies and businesses	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
506	1	Land - Rehabilitation	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
506	2	Social - Community values and change	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
507	1	Economics - Business Opportunities	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
508	1	dust, increased traffic	Seal the roads with bitumen	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.46.1
508	2	General Comment	N/A	Comment Noted	NA
509	1	Hazard and risk - health and safety	Reject Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
509	2	Economics - Agriculture vs Mining	Reject Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
510	1	dust; increased vehicles	Seal the roads with bitumen to mitigate dust impacts and update speed zones	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.47.1
510	2	General Comment	N/A	Comment Noted	NA
511	1	dust pervades his house, stains belongings, has to keep windows closed.	Reject Stage 3	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.48.1
511	2	Dust affects his tank water. Lead in water.		Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.48.2
511	3	His health suffers from the dust; doctor confirmed an environmental allergen is the cause	Reject Stage 3	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.48.3
511	4	concerned the new pits will alter the floodplain and affect Jondaryan	Reject Stage 3	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.48.4
511	5	Can't sleep through the night due to the noise	Reject Stage 3	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.48.5
511	6	Social - Housing impacts	Reject Stage 3	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.48.6
512	1	Can't open windows in summer due to dust and noise. People, family suffer health effects.	Relocate affected residents	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.49.1
512	2	Will have to endure JRLF for another 3-5 years if project approved.	Relocate affected residents	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.49.2
512	3	depression is high in Jondaryan due to close proximity to JRLF	Relocate affected residents	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.49.3
512	4	Water supply has 16 times the allowable lead level - diesel machinery at JRLF is the cause.	Relocate affected residents	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.49.4
512	5	Mine pits will cause a funnelling effect with Jondaryan in the floodwater's path	Relocate affected residents	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.49.5
513	1	Tank water polluted	Relocate affected residents	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.50.1
513	2	She and her husband suffer respiratory and other illnesses due to proximity to JRLF. Doctor says problems made worse by coal dust exposure	Relocate affected residents	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.50.2
513	3	Want to sell but property values affected by mine. Want to be relocated by NAC.	Reject Stage 3	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.50.3

Sub. No.	Issue No.	Issue - Overview / Topic	Submitter Recommendations / Suggested Mitigation/additional information	Proponent response	Relevant AEIS Reference
514	1	Insufficient 12 mth reporting and public access to impacts of excess water contamination due to weather events or spillage on site	Need to be tested monthly and results public accessible both electronic and in notice format at council service centre	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.51.1
514	2	Ground water quality charts do not detail contamination measurement limits for 9 elements	Need to measure with baseline established for every project bore	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.51.2
514	3	No reference to where the dedicated contaminated land areas are.	Need to review how close these are to ground water sources	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.51.3
514	4	Proponent should not place used tyres in the coal pit	Properly dispose of tyres away from site and possible ground water sites	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.51.4
514	5	Removed matured trees should not be regarded as waste	Trees should be chipped and used for reveg or stabilisation programs.	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.51.5
514	6	Need to review waste management practices of electrical (blasting-related) waste	Need to review how close these are to ground water sources	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.51.6
514	7	Oakey residents exposure to noise and vibration in residential locations	Need to improve rail procedures or infrastructure to prevent noise and vibration in residential locations	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.51.7
514	8	Closure of Acland roads	Restricts access to Acland so should not occur	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.51.8
514	9	Need to reconsider identified high valued SCL for farmland use rather than mining	Need to do more detail review on SCL areas which should be used as high yield farmland and not be mined	Comment Noted	NA
514	10	Covering SCL with overburden should not occur (refer Fig 3.13 & 3.4)	Exclusion would protect Acland to Acland/Oakey Road crossroad	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.51.9
514	11	Acland Pastoral should maintain an acceptable level of land management practices	Ensure the value of land post rehabilitation does not drop due to poor land management practices	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.51.10
514	12	Addressing contaminated soils is not mention in the dismantling of current JRLF	Investigate and test land cleared before returning area to grazing	Comment Noted	NA
514	13	Map on p 124 does not show EPC919 and MLA50232 is still awaiting to be granted	as per submission	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.51.11
514	14	IF EIS approved why not removed the JRLF stockpile immediately to reduce exposure to noise and vibration in residential locations	Proponent should consider and report on why not remove the JRLF sooner than planned .	Comment Noted	NA
514	15	Degradation of Lagoon Creek banks due to cattle grazing	Ensure stock proof fencing around Lagoon Creek in areas used by NHPC for cattle grazing	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.51.12
514	16	Lagoon Creek water quality (Table 5.6 & Table 5.7) is flawed	No mine effluent to be pumped into Lagoon Creek that endangers downstream ecosystems	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.51.13
514	17	pit rehabilitation objectives		Comment Noted	NA
514	18	There are major impacts on koala habitat across project site	apply conservation methods as per EPBC recommendations	Comment Noted	NA
514	19	Table 2.1 :- RE 11 23.1 (blue grass) is critically endangered.	RE 11 23.1 (blue grass) should be conserved at all costs	Comment Noted	NA
514	20	Mine pits are too close to Lagoon Creek and there are unknown multiple impacts not assessed	Greater separation between mine its and Lagoon Creek.	Comment Noted	NA
514	21	Before Stage 3 is approved, more rehabilitation of Stage 1 and 2 needs to be done.	Proponent should demonstrate more complete restoration from Stage 1 and 2 before Stage 3 approvals .	Comment Noted	NA
514	22	Need to reassess water flows in Doctor Creek between Jondaryan and Oakey	additional culverts need to be installed; rail crossing should be widened	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.51.14
514	23	Drawdown west of project understated	Risk of this and CSG on GAB is unacceptable	Comment Noted	NA
514	24	Table 2.1 :- Disagree on flood impacts of Lagoon Creek flows and mine release of water in recent flood periods	Proponent needs to show records of Lagoon Creek flows and mine release of water in recent flood periods to allow proper evaluation	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.51.15
514	25	"Adaptive air quality" is late and ineffective response and major issue of why this should not be approved	Proponent's poor history of reporting and recording will mean this will remain a extreme impact for nearby residents. Polluted air impacts on physical and mental health is major.	Comment Noted	NA
514	26	Cultural values of Acland have been significantly and permanently damaged by NAC. Project will result in continued degradation.	Need greater consultation and respect for local community values	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.51.16
514	27	Closure of roads and reduced access to Acland poses higher accident risks and social isolation	Need more than one access road to Acland	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.51.17
514	28	Ongoing buying up of farms etc. by mining eroded local farm based economy	Prevent any further farm purchases as agriculture and mining cannot co-exist to the benefit of Acland or locals	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.51.18
514	29	Why do the maps have cadastre listed in legend	Any misleading information needs to be removed from report	Comment Noted	NA
514	30	Federal members identified is incorrect and misleading	Penalties should be applied pursuant to SDPWO Act s.1570 and new EIS issued with perusal period extended until this is released.	Comment Noted	NA
514	31	Concern that existing JRLF (will continue to operate at greater coal output for first 2 years after Stage 3 commences	as per submission	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.51.19
514	32	Residents already leaving Jondaryan at night to get sleep	Need to improve noise monitoring and rail procedure to prevent noise and vibration impacts in residential locations	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.51.20
514	33	Studies of water contamination at Jondaryan has not be sufficient	Studies of water contamination at Jondaryan by DEHP should be done	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.51.21
514	34	Insufficient mapping and information regarding potential impacts of rail spur on environmental issues	Proponent should provide additional public access information on rail spur impacts	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.51.22
514	35	Coal randomly veneered from site to reduce dust exposure .	Need for all coal to be veneered for transportation	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.51.23
514	36	Concerns over the contamination of soil and water due to in-pit tailings and waste disposal	Farming communities are extremely concerned about long term contaminated land at Acland.	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.51.24
514	37	concerns re delays in rehab of stages 1 and 2		Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.51.25
514	38	Voids in rehab area of Stage 1 area have extreme slopes	Need clearer definition of what is void or depression and wall heights and slopes.	Comment Noted	NA
514	39	Need to detail water allocation of both mine and pastoral lease as both are used in proposal	Water monitoring to ensure water allocation is used effectively	Comment Noted	NA
514	40	Ongoing buying up of water allocation and use by mining eroded local farm based economy	Prevent any further farm and water purchases as agriculture and mining cannot exist to the benefit of Acland or locals	Comment Noted	NA

Sub. No.	Issue No.	Issue - Overview / Topic	Submitter Recommendations / Suggested Mitigation/additional information	Proponent response	Relevant AEIS Reference
514	41	Insufficient or suspected incorrect reporting as to what water is being used on site	Need for allocations to be public accessible both electronic and in notice format at council service centre to prove that water used is coming from correct sources,	Comment Noted	NA
514	42	EIS fails to explore the differences in community of individual wellbeing from what existed at Acland before, to community breakdown, enviro and social loss and solastalgia effects now. Fails to demonstrate what constitutes liveable communities. Likely workers will move on after mining finished - effects on community.	Only achievable is return to agriculture in Acland, so should mining not occur at all.	Comment Noted	NA
514	43	Road crash data incorrect and need to be updated to review impacts of mines and CSG in area	Revision of road crash data and include impacts of mines and CSG in area.	Comment Noted	NA
514	44	Allocation of money to road upgrade is based on mine need not community need of road infrastructure planning	Transport allocation should be reviewed as need to road infrastructure is greater elsewhere.	Comment Noted	NA
514	45	excessive night-time noise is a human rights infringement and will lead to great mental health and physical health impacts		Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.51.26
514	46	Impacts of Wellcamp (West Brisbane) International Airport has not been explored for water run-off; transport impacts		Comment Noted	NA
514	47	Need to detail water allocation for dust suppression on mine and pastoral lease as both are used in proposal	Water monitoring to ensure water allocation is used effectively as belief that dust suppression allocation needed is underestimated.	Comment Noted	NA
514	48	Disagree with proponent commitment to possible involvement in upgrades to West Moreton line	Agrees this needs to be reviewed but by government and to address impacts previously experienced.	Comment Noted	NA
514	49	Need to know impacts of rail spur - EIS detail insufficient. E.g. veg clearing; flooding impacts, SCL	as per submission	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.51.27
514	50	Uncertainty re jobs strategy and where workers to be sourced from. Employment numbers are exaggerated		Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.51.28
514	51	Type and definition of what they are using as a employment source is confusing	Review all stated employment commitments as all need to be clarified.	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.51.29
514	52	emergency services access issues to residents due to road diversions		Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.51.30
514	53	Believe that NHC is using GAB water not WWW water		Comment Noted	NA
514	54	Believe that NHC plans to cancel the WWW water contract with council.	EIS should be rejected due to this deception of facts	Comment Noted	NA
514	55	Insufficient flooding analysis	independent expert hydrological advice must be sought regarding flood concerns	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.51.31
514	56	Issues of climate change not addressed sufficiently in EIS		Comment Noted	NA
514	57	No confidence in risk assessment	Proponent should re-evaluate the real risk factors and other mining disasters. Explain why residents should be satisfied with these risks and any stated remediation efforts given the proponent's poor record of land management and complaint resolution at Acland	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.51.32
514	58	insufficient water quality analysis. No confidence in commitment to improve riparian habitat given past performance	as per submission	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.51.33
514	59	Cultural significance of area around Acland not being fully investigated. Consultation with Indigenous groups inadequate		Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.51.34
514	60	dubious monitoring regime given impacts of existing mine		Comment Noted	NA
514	61	Insufficient attention to Conservation Plans - NRM corro re potential 10-12 plans that could be affected cited		Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.51.35
515	1	Flooding impacts	Reject Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
515	2	Coal dust management	Reject Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
515	3	Impacts	Reject Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
516	1	Economics - Employment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
516	2	Social - Regional economies and businesses	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
516	3	Economics - Support for Project	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
517	1	Economics - Agriculture vs Mining	Reject Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
517	2	Land - Rehabilitation	Reject Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
517	3	Impacts	Reject Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
518	1	Social - Consultation	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
518	2	Land - Rehabilitation	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
518	3	Economics - Employment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
518	4	Social - Regional economies and businesses	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
519	1	Social - Regional economies and businesses	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
519	2	Coal dust management	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
519	3	Transport - Rail - Impacts	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
519	4	Land - Rehabilitation	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
519	5	Economics - Employment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
520	1	Sensitive receptor 39 - concerns re drawdown effects on bore water	1. make good agreement and supply an alternative water source prior to dewatering OR 2. Proponent should acquire affected properties with suitable recompense.	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.52.1
520	2	Sensitive receptor 39 - air impacts, tank water impacts, stock impacts of dust	1. Proponent should adopt an adaptive air quality management plan OR 2. Proponent should acquire affected properties.	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.52.2
520	3	being 1km from activities, noise could have a major effect on SR 39	1. Proponent should implement mitigation measures outlined in Section 11.8 OR 2. Proponent should acquire affected properties.	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.52.3
520	4	road diversion impacts will inconvenience farming operation	1. Western side of the Jondaryan-Muldu Road diversion could be made wider to accommodate farm machinery movement. OR 2. Proponent should acquire affected properties.	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.52.4

Sub. No.	Issue No.	Issue - Overview / Topic	Submitter Recommendations / Suggested Mitigation/additional information	Proponent response	Relevant AEIS Reference
521	1	Surface water flow to Doctors Creek.	More information is required on the short and long term impact on underground water flow and aquifer changes including the Oakey Creek Alluvial.	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.60.1
521	2	Rainfall near Greenwood Hill (Willeroo Pit)	Can cause run off to the south into Doctors Creek , even when no creek flows occur form the east	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.60.2
521	3	Oakey Creek Alluvial	EIS assumes here will be no impacts on the Oakey Creek Alluvial	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.60.3
522	1	The transport company I work for transports freight to New Acland and back loads scrap metal for recycling. New Acland is very professional in its approach to safety and the environment and recycling program. They actively support the local schools and sporting activities. New Acland will continue to take an active role in employment and the communities with the Stage 3 Project	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
523	1	Economics - Business Opportunities	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
524	1	Economics - Employment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
524	2	Social - Community Awareness / Social responsibility	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
525	1	Economics - Employment	Bitumen and upgrade of road	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.61.1
526	1	Land - Rehabilitation	Bitumen and upgrade of road	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.62.1
527	1	Economics - Employment	Move the loading facility away from Jondaryan ASAP	Comment Noted	NA
527	2	Land - Rehabilitation	Set up proper air monitoring stations that will tell the true story.	Comment Noted	NA
527	3	Economics - Employment	Move the stockpile as soon as possible	Comment Noted	NA
527	4	Economics - Employment	Set up proper air testing equipment in more appropriate locations for loading facility	Comment Noted	NA
527	5	Economics - Royalties	Move the coal loading facility (stockpile) ASAP NOT IN 2-5 YEARS	Comment Noted	NA
527	6	Social - Regional economies and businesses	Relocate effected residents at relocation costs not market value	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.63.1
528	1	Land - Rehabilitation		Comment Noted	NA
529	1	Economics - Employment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
529	2	Land - Rehabilitation	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
530	1	Economics - Employment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
530	2	Land - Rehabilitation	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
531	1	Economics - Employment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
532	1	Economics - Employment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
532	2	Economics - Royalties	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
532	3	Social - Regional economies and businesses	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
532	4	Land - Rehabilitation	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
532	5	Social - Community Awareness / Social responsibility	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
533	1	Economics - Employment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
533	2	Social - Community values and change	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
533	3	Social - Community Awareness / Social responsibility	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
534	1	Economics - Employment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
535	1	Economics - Employment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
536	1	Economics - Employment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
537	1	Economics - Employment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
538	1	Decline of business due to farm closures a		Comment Noted	NA
538	2	Flooding due to levee banks beside the proposed 8km rail extension).		Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.64.1
538	3	Health impacts due to dust from truck and loader operations of NAS2 at Jondaryan		Comment Noted	NA
538	4	Decommissioned Jondaryan and in the meantime the heap be watered and all coal wagons and coal motor vehicles be covered		Comment Noted	NA
538	5	Koala and bird life habitats of great concern. NHG should cease further destruction of trees and native vegetation as fauna and flora need sustained corridors in which to survive		Comment Noted	NA
538	6	The validity of grazing of cattle on rehabilitated ground independently investigated		Comment Noted	NA
538	7	Deterioration in our area of the surface of the Warrego Highway		Comment Noted	NA
538	8	Lagoon Creek runs straight through Jondaryan and is already prone to flooding. Mine flooding will worsen this risk and could be a serious danger to Jondaryan		Comment Noted	NA
539	1	Economics - Employment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
540	1	Economics - Employment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
541	1	Economics - Employment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
541	2	Social - Community values and change	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
542	1	Economics - Employment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
543	1	Economics - Support for Project	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
544	1	Economics - Employment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
545	1	Economics - Employment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
546	1	Social - Employment strategy	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
546	2	Ecologically sustainable development	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
546	3	Economics - Employment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
546	4	Social - Community values and change	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
547	1	Report of coal dust and noise impact on health	Proponent should bear cost of monitoring and public impacts in the future impact of coal dust generation in area.	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.65.1
547	2	Impacts of mining on property value and resale value	Impacts on mine has not been measures in reduction of land values	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.65.2

Sub. No.	Issue No.	Issue - Overview / Topic	Submitter Recommendations / Suggested Mitigation/additional information	Proponent response	Relevant AEIS Reference
547	3	Doubt whether the rail loading yard will be moved	Note there needs to be absolute commitment for this to occur	Comment Noted	NA
548	1	Exposure to noise and vibration due to train movements and signalling (gates / horns blowing) 24 /7	Need to improve <i>facilities</i> on site to prevent other impacts in external residential locations	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.66.1
548.1	1	Increasing coal dust on roof and removed paint. Drinking supplies collected from same roof.	Proponent should bear cost of monitoring and repair damage caused by their current operations	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.4.67.1
549	1	Economics - Employment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
550	1	Transport - Rail - Impacts		Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.68.1
550	2	Rail line is inadequate for coal and makes noise worse; Oakey crossing is in disrepair and dangerous		Comment Noted	NA
550	3	QR rail infrastructure caused Oakey 2011 flooding		Comment Noted	NA
550	4	Impacts - Social Impact Assessment	Cancel the project and let us live our rural life	Comment Noted	NA
551	1	Social - Regional economies and businesses	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
551	2	Economics - Employment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
551	3	Social - Community values and change	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
551	4	Social - Community Awareness / Social responsibility	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
552	1	Ecologically sustainable development	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
552	2	Social - Regional economies and businesses	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
553	1	Economics - Support for Project	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
553	2	Social - Regional economies and businesses	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
553	3	Ecologically sustainable development	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
553	4	Economics - Business Opportunities	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
554	1	Ecologically sustainable development	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
554	2	Coal dust management	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
554	3	Impacts	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
554	4	Cultural Heritage - non-indigenous cultural heritage	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
554	5	Cultural Heritage - non-indigenous cultural heritage	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
555	1	Economics - Support for Project	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
556	1	Economics - Employment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
557	1	Economics - Employment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
557	2	Social - Community values and change	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
558	1	Increasing coal dust on roof - due to rail have to pay for cleaning.	Proponent should bear cost of monitoring and repair damage caused by their operations	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.69.1
558	2	water supply affected by dust		Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.69.2
558	3	rail movements at night keep them awake	trains go slower and coal covered	Comment Noted	NA
559	1	Social - Regional economies and businesses	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
559	2	Ecologically sustainable development	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
560	1	Social - Community values and change	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
560	2	Ecologically sustainable development	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
561	1	Economics - Employment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
562	1	Smoking on site	Ban smoking on house area	Comment Noted	NA
563	1	Economics - Support for Project	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
564	1	JRLF coal stockpile - water more and move asap		Comment Noted	NA
564	2	Travelling inconvenience due to closure of Jondaryan and Muldu roads		Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.70.1
564	3	loop must be adequately engineered		Comment Noted	NA
564	4	Land - Rehabilitation	test animals grazed on rehabilitated land for toxins	Comment Noted	NA
564	5	Coal trucks spill coal	Cover vehicles	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.70.2
564	6	Wildlife habitat destruction	Areas should be left intact	Comment Noted	NA
564	7	Contaminates enter the waterway	No mining adjacent to watercourse	Comment Noted	NA
564	8	Monitoring	Monitoring must be independent	Comment Noted	NA
565	1	air impacts of JRLF on health of residents is disgraceful	shifting the stockpile must be a condition of stage 3 proceeding	Comment Noted	NA
565	2	air impacts of JRLF on drinking water of residents is disgraceful		Comment Noted	NA
565	3	Flooding impacts	No rail line across a floodway	Comment Noted	NA
565	4	Coal trucks spill coal	Cover vehicles	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.71.1
565	5	Monitoring	Monitoring must be independent	Comment Noted	NA
565	6	prime downs country should not be mined - can't be returned to cropping		Comment Noted	NA
565	7	Habitat loss - koalas - untenable		Comment Noted	NA
566	1	Economics - Support for Project	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
567	1	Economics - Support for Project	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
567.1	1	Economics - Support for Project	Approval of Stage 4	Comment Noted	NA
567.2	1	Economics - Support for Project	Approval of Stage 5	Comment Noted	NA
567.3	1	Economics - Support for Project	Approval of Stage 6	Comment Noted	NA
568	1	Respect mining operation, but don't want it to impact on their cattle breeding business nearby		Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.72.1
568	2	current operation's noise is continually evident. Blasting is an intrusion.		Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.72.2
568	3	dust from current operation evident. Depending on wind conditions, settles in their backyard.		Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.72.3

Sub. No.	Issue No.	Issue - Overview / Topic	Submitter Recommendations / Suggested Mitigation/additional information	Proponent response	Relevant AEIS Reference
568	4	concerns with recycled water and mine discharge water effect on aquifers.		Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.72.4
568	5	Transport - Road Access/ Closures / Diversions		Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.72.5
568	6	visual pollution is intrusive (night lighting)		Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.72.6
569	1	Economics - Support for Project	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
569	2	Land - Rehabilitation	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
569	3	Social - Consultation	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
569	4	Economics - Employment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
570	1	Social - Employment strategy	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
571	1	Social - Employment strategy	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
572	1	Economics - Employment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
572	2	Social - Employment strategy	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
572	3	Land - Rehabilitation	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
572	4	Social - Regional economies and businesses	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
573	1	Social - Employment strategy	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
573	2	Social - Community Awareness / Social responsibility	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
573	3	Land - Rehabilitation	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
573	4	Social - Regional economies and businesses	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
574	1	Social - Employment strategy	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
574	2	Social - Community values and change	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
574	3	Land - Rehabilitation	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
575	1	p. 17 : With buyout, land is under utilised. Weed and plant infesting area	Notes under utilisation of land is having impacts already	Comment Noted	NA
575	2	Reports of contaminated material not being recorded	p.18: A 1960 dump with chemical residues- No recognition in current report	Comment Noted	NA
575	3	Voids	p.19 Still has reports of finals voids in the text	Comment Noted	NA
575	4	Grazing vs. current use for area	The issue of the comparative benefit of ongoing farming rather than mining has not be fully factored	Comment Noted	NA
575	5	Ability for nature conservation to occur and for this to be permitted.	p. 19 - Still waiting for issues of nature conservation identified in Stage 1 and 2 to arrive so predicts that the Stage 3 will be further delayed	Comment Noted	NA
575	6	Flooding in area	p.19 Lack of consultations with locals on flood events (not recorded elsewhere) could be to the determent of NAC3	Comment Noted	NA
575	7	Understory in the area	p.23 issues of weed and pest invasion over the past years to the determent of those living near NAC	Comment Noted	NA
575	8	Type of farming on closure off the mine	NHC staff indicate that there is no intention to crop rehab land	Comment Noted	NA
575	9	Blue grass - regrowth in offset areas.	Unseen 2010 report on blue grass feasibility in off set area. Belief that as this remains unsighted , this cannot be regarded as a suitable solution for blue grass offset	Comment Noted	NA
575	10	Project impacts effect all fauna and flora	Doubts over whether there will be any return of fauna and flora after 30 years of mine activity	Comment Noted	NA
575	11	Impacts on aquatic ecology	Impacts of coal dust on freshwater environment in Lagoon Creek	Comment Noted	NA
575	12	Impacts on aquatic ecology	Impacts of NA Pastoral cattle on freshwater environment in Lagoon Creek as they are reportedly doing currently.	Comment Noted	NA
575	13	Impacts on aquatic ecology	Flooding and channelling of water due to project have not been explored for impacts on areas	Comment Noted	NA
575	14	Details of aquatic ecology	Research and reporting on areas has not identified several aspects and species found or are know to occur in the aquatic environment dependant on seasonal and climatic conditions	Comment Noted	NA
575	15	Flood events relative to Dalby events	Flood events differ to Dalby due to specific land and watercourse influences	Comment Noted	NA
575	16	Conservation zones	Reports of areas put aside for NAC Stage 2 cannot be seen so doubtful about promises made in NAC 3	Comment Noted	NA
575	17	Channelling of Lagoon Creek	No repair plan in case of flood impacts	Comment Noted	NA
575	18	p. 8 to 9 Wet season habitat survey	Results are not representative of habitat during this period. Condamine Alliance can provide more data and survey results.	Comment Noted	NA
575	19	Photos and representation do not reflect true biodiversity in areas shown.	Photo 8.4 AE 3; Photo 8-5 Site AE4; Survey site AH4 ; Survey Site AH6	Comment Noted	NA
575	20	Road closure to prevent proper public security	Closure of Acland access road will prevent true disclosure of impacts to areas.	Comment Noted	NA
575	21	Water for NAP cattle	If there is no reported water in areas, where are NAP cattle going to get water	Comment Noted	NA
575	22	p.8.26 Murray cod	Insufficient food and suitable breeding conditions	Comment Noted	NA
575	23	p.8.27 Turtles	Sufficient numbers for there to be a species survey	Comment Noted	NA
575	24	p.8.29 Floods	Need to review on how to address flood impacts	Comment Noted	NA
575	25	Impacts of flooded mine on the surrounding environ	8.5.2 p. 8.31 - Need to identify strategies for dealing with a flooded mine, discharges and impacts on surrounding environs	Comment Noted	NA
575	26	History of disturbance by mining	8.8- p. 8.39- 8.8.1 Prior history indicates that tinning does impact on the surrounding environments	Comment Noted	NA
575	27	High impact and exotic weeds	Infestations of weeds is increasing due to mine activities	Comment Noted	NA
575	28	Flood plain areas	Flood plain area do not have defined watercourse or micro life that a defined water course does.	Comment Noted	NA
575	29	Impacts on environment	Refer Table ES 1 - Muldu Stage 1 & 2- issues of coal dust not fully addressed	Comment Noted	NA
575	30	Impacts of noise and vibration on people	Measures and standards of noise and vibrations cannot fully address the needs of individuals effected and each case must be reviewed	Comment Noted	NA
575	31	Acland and surrounds	Difficult to preserve something the proponent has changed themselves or not looked after	Comment Noted	NA
575	32	Road closures /diversions	Road closures will increase travel times for emergency services, non NHC workers , residents and those going to Acland for ANZAC Day services.	Comment Noted	NA
575	33	Changes in the regional activities	Changes due to NHC mining have lead to other economies (farming/cropping/horse sales) to fail.	Comment Noted	NA

Sub. No.	Issue No.	Issue - Overview / Topic	Submitter Recommendations / Suggested Mitigation/additional information	Proponent response	Relevant AEIS Reference
575	34	Impacts of contaminated land and water	Issues of the detrimental effects of such is not discussed	Comment Noted	NA
575	35	Stage 2 and Stage 3 areas	How close Stage 2 traverse Stage 3 and why wasn't this presented as an upgrade to Stage 2	Comment Noted	NA
575	36	Employment data does not include after project employment	Increased regional unemployment once project closes down	Comment Noted	NA
575	37	Consultation between NHC And residents	Lack of understanding that no response at time of NHC announcement does not mean full acceptance by residents	Comment Noted	NA
575	38	Consultation between NHC And residents	NHC Oakey Office is often unattended for consultations	Comment Noted	NA
575	39	Austral Cornflower (as spelt in submission)	Belief that this is in area and endangered. Should be part of investigation of biodiversity loss	Comment Noted	NA
575	40	Grey Headed Flying Fox	Already experiencing loss of habitat and food supply in area. Long term impacts of loss of species to area and time to return to the area should be part of investigation of biodiversity loss	Comment Noted	NA
575	41	Koala	Already experiencing loss of habitat and food supply in area. Long term impacts of loss of species to area and time to return to the area should be part of investigation of biodiversity loss	Comment Noted	NA
575	42	Surface rights impacts on Lagoon Creek	Disclosure of impacts to area and possibility that 2 part of Lagoon Creek could be mined in the future are identified but not fully explained in the EIS.	Comment Noted	NA
575	43	Grass but not mature tree regrowth in areas.	Belief that as only grasses are being renewed not mature tree , there is an environmental impacts not being addressed in the offset	Comment Noted	NA
575	44	Wildlife corridors	No mention of wildlife corridors in EIS so not an environmental impacts are being addressed.	Comment Noted	NA
575	45	Impacts on environment due to wind events	issues of wind and dust not fully addressed	Comment Noted	NA
575	46	Feral cats	Issues of introduced pest not fully addressed	Comment Noted	NA
575	47	Indian myas	Already experiencing expansion in area. Long term impacts of species invasion to area and time to return to the area should be part of investigation of biodiversity loss	Comment Noted	NA
575	48	Dingos	Issues of native animal impacts and management due to introduced NAP cattle stock not fully addressed	Comment Noted	NA
575	49	Rabbits	Issues of introduced pest not fully addressed	Comment Noted	NA
575	50	Feral pigs	Issues of introduced pest not fully addressed	Comment Noted	NA
575	51	Noxious weed	Issues of noxious plants infestations not fully addressed	Comment Noted	NA
575	52	Impacts on environment	Stage 1 & 2- issues of coal dust not fully addressed so believes Stage 3 air quality impacts would be impossible to manage	Comment Noted	NA
575	53	Voids	Reports of finals voids is not a desirable result to non mining sector of industry, at the end of project operations and rehab.	Comment Noted	NA
575	54	Cumulative impacts of blasting on the environment	Impacts of blasting is not a desirable result to non mining sector of industry. Whilst contained with in site and externally monitored there is a "good as can be expected " outcome but increased activities in this area will only increase the impacts	Comment Noted	NA
575	55	Night lighting	Impacts of night lighting will be further expanded with the widening of the operational site.	Comment Noted	NA
575	56	Site access and haul routes	Level of noise and dust impacts on site access and haul routes cannot fully address the needs of individuals effected and each case must be reviewed	Comment Noted	NA
575	57	Water for dust suppression for Stage 3	Table 3-17 & 3.23- If there is no reported water in areas, where are will NHC get water for Stage 3 dust suppression	Comment Noted	NA
575	58	Acquisition of land	The issue of the spur line land acquisition remains undecided and has not been fully factored in	Comment Noted	NA
575	59	Impacts of mine on the value of land and housing in the area	Issues of the detrimental effects of such is not discussed	Comment Noted	NA
575	60	Consultation between NHC And residents	NHC does not engage with community well for consultations (examples provided)	Comment Noted	NA
576	1	Social - Employment strategy	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
576	2	Land - Rehabilitation	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
577	1	Environmental impacts of loss of agricultural land is not being fully considered	Need to reconsider the values of retaining finite agriculture land over using it for mining.	Comment Noted	NA
577	2	No confidence in ability to rehabilitate land to any useful state - past experience shows otherwise.	The continued use of the land for agricultural use will be of greater benefit that expansion of the mine	Comment Noted	NA
577	3	Need to preserve Acland	Note there is less commitment in EIS for this to occur. Doubts that NHC will promote the area, given NHC was responsible for the town's demise.	Comment Noted	NA
577	4	Lagoon Creek's importance is downplayed - plays an important part during high flow events within the wider catchment area		Comment Noted	NA
577	5	Impacts on veg clearing of remnant vegetation and native fauna and flora	Regardless of the state and level of remnant vegetation, mining will clear everything and destroy any protection of areas for native fauna and flora	Comment Noted	NA
577	6	Need to preserve more trees particularly for koala habitat	Issue not addressed in EIS and potential for further destruction of habitat	Comment Noted	NA
578	1	Economics - Employment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
578	2	Social - Regional economies and businesses	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
579	1	submission is as per form letter template; raises concerns regarding health impacts of JRLF and rail transportation to port.	as per submission	Comment Noted	NA
579	2	very concerned about health impacts of JRLF - air and drinking water.	believe stockpiles should be covered.	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.73.1
580	1	Decreased Land Value	Purchase nearby properties or subsidise	Refer to relevant AEIS report chapter / section	5.3.74.1
581	1	Economics - Employment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA

Sub. No.	Issue No.	Issue - Overview / Topic	Submitter Recommendations / Suggested Mitigation/additional information	Proponent response	Relevant AEIS Reference
582	1	Social - Community Awareness / Social responsibility	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
582	2	Social - Employment strategy	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
582	3	Land - Rehabilitation	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
583	1	Economics - Employment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
584	1	Economics - Employment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
585	1		Existing roads into Acland remaining as the rights to visit the War Memorial	Comment Noted	NA
585	2	Lagoon Creek, flood township	No run off into Lagoon Creek, levy banks flood Jondaryan	Comment Noted	NA
586	1		Fill the last hole, land to be returned to original quality	Comment Noted	NA
586	2	Impacts on road closure not fully reviewed	Existing roads into Acland remaining for public access	Comment Noted	NA
586	3	Noise from machinery	Day time operations only	Comment Noted	NA
586	4	Excess dust impacts	Increased dust monitoring and recognition of impacts	Comment Noted	NA
586	5	Affect human and animals	No blasting or blast without dust, fumes, noise and trembling	Comment Noted	NA
586	6	Bores dropped and dried up		Comment Noted	NA
586	7	Many local business closed		Comment Noted	NA
586	8	Lighting		Comment Noted	NA
586	9	Lagoon Creek, flood township	No run off into Lagoon Creek, levy banks flood Jondaryan	Comment Noted	NA
586	10	Impossible to move the rail line		Comment Noted	NA
586	11	Proponent does not maintain land and control weeds		Comment Noted	NA
586	12	Mine irrevocably changed their and many others' circumstances; affected their business and ability to negotiate a good property purchase price due to land value impacts. Living next to the mine affected their health, mental health and prosperity		Comment Noted	NA
587	1	Social - Regional economies and businesses	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
588	1	Economics - Employment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
589	1	Economics - Employment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
590	1	Economics - Employment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
590	2	Social - Community Awareness / Social responsibility	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
591	1	Economics - Employment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
592	1	Economics - Employment	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
593	1	Coal dust from transport coal	Trucks/trains must be covered. Stop Acland Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
594	1	Social - Community Awareness / Social responsibility	Approval of Stage 3	Comment Noted	NA
Submissions 595 to 669 are predominantly variations of template (form-letter) submissions. The majority of the					
595	1	Land - SCL/Good quality ag land	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
595	2	Water - Groundwater - Drawdown	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
595	3	Terrestrial Ecology - terrestrial fauna - Koala	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
595	4	Coal dust management	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
595	5	Economics - Analysis Approach	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
595	6	Carbon Emissions	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
596	1	Carbon Emissions	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
597	1	Land - SCL/Good quality ag land	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
597	2	Water - Groundwater - Drawdown	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
597	3	Terrestrial Ecology - terrestrial fauna - Koala	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
597	4	Coal dust management	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
597	5	Carbon Emissions	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
597	6	Economics - Analysis Approach	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
598	1	Land - SCL/Good quality ag land	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
598	2	Water - Groundwater - Drawdown	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
598	3	Terrestrial Ecology - terrestrial fauna - Koala	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
598	4	Coal dust management	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
598	5	Carbon Emissions	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
598	6	Economics - Analysis Approach	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
599	1	Land - SCL/Good quality ag land	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
599	2	Water - Groundwater - Drawdown	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
599	3	Terrestrial Ecology - terrestrial fauna - Koala	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
599	4	Coal dust management	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
599	5	Carbon Emissions	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
599	6	Economics - Analysis Approach	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
600	1	Land - SCL/Good quality ag land	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
600	2	Water - Groundwater - Drawdown	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
600	3	Terrestrial Ecology - terrestrial fauna - Koala	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
600	4	Coal dust management	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
600	5	Carbon Emissions	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
600	6	Economics - Analysis Approach	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
601	1	Land - SCL/Good quality ag land	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
601	2	Water - Groundwater - Drawdown	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
601	3	Terrestrial Ecology - terrestrial fauna - Koala	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
601	4	Coal dust management	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
601	5	Carbon Emissions	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
601	6	Economics - Analysis Approach	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
602	1	Land - SCL/Good quality ag land	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
602	2	Water - Groundwater - Drawdown	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
602	3	Terrestrial Ecology - terrestrial fauna - Koala	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
602	4	Coal dust management	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
602	5	Transport - Rail - Impacts	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
602	6	Economics - Analysis Approach	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
602	7	Carbon Emissions	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
603	1	Economics - Agriculture vs Mining	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
603	2	Economics - Analysis Approach	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
603	3	Land - SCL/Good quality ag land	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
603	4	Water - Groundwater - Drawdown	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	

~~D14/124130~~

Sub. No.	Issue No.	Issue - Overview / Topic	Submitter Recommendations / Suggested Mitigation/additional information	Proponent response	Relevant AEIS Reference
619	5	Coal dust management	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
619	6	Economics - Analysis Approach	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
619	7	Carbon Emissions	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
620	1	Land - SCL/Good quality ag land	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
620	2	Land - Rehabilitation	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
620	3	Water - Groundwater - Drawdown	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
620	4	Terrestrial Ecology - terrestrial fauna - Koala	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
620	5	Terrestrial Ecology - terrestrial flora	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
620	6	Coal dust management	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
620	7	Hazard and risk - health and safety	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
620	8	Economics - Land Values	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
620	9	Social - Compensation	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
620	10	Transport - Rail - Impacts	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
620	11	Economics - Agriculture vs Mining	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
620	12	Social - Community values and change	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
620	13	Transport - Road Access/ Closures / Diversions	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
620	14	Carbon Emissions	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
620	15	General Comment	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
620	16	Monitoring	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
621	1	Land - SCL/Good quality ag land	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
621	2	Water - Groundwater - Drawdown	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
621	3	Coal dust management	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
621	4	Economics - Analysis Approach	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
621	5	Carbon Emissions	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
622	1	Land - SCL/Good quality ag land	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
622	2	Water - Groundwater - Drawdown	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
622	3	Coal dust management	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
622	4	Economics - Analysis Approach	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
622	5	Carbon Emissions	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
623	1	Land - SCL/Good quality ag land	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
623	2	Water - Groundwater - Drawdown	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
623	3	Terrestrial Ecology - terrestrial fauna - Koala	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
623	4	Coal dust management	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
623	5	Social - Acland Heritage/ Social Change	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
623	6	Transport - Road Access/ Closures / Diversions	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
623	7	Social - Consultation	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
623	8	Economics - Agriculture vs Mining	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
623	9	Carbon Emissions	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
624	1	Land - SCL/Good quality ag land	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
624	2	Water - Groundwater - Drawdown	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
624	3	Terrestrial Ecology - terrestrial fauna - Koala	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
624	4	Coal dust management	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
624	5	Economics - Agriculture vs Mining	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
624	6	Hazard and risk - health and safety	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
624	7	Social - Regional economies and businesses	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
625	1	Land - SCL/Good quality ag land	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
625	2	Water - Groundwater - Drawdown	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
625	3	Terrestrial Ecology - terrestrial fauna - Koala	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
625	4	Coal dust management	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
625	5	Economics - Agriculture vs Mining	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
625	6	Carbon Emissions	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
626	1	Land - SCL/Good quality ag land	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
626	2	Water - Groundwater - Drawdown	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
626	3	Terrestrial Ecology - terrestrial fauna - Koala	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
626	4	Coal dust management	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
626	5	Economics - Analysis Approach	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
626	6	Carbon Emissions	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
626	7	General Comment	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
627	1	Land - SCL/Good quality ag land	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
627	2	Water - Groundwater - Drawdown	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
627	3	Terrestrial Ecology - terrestrial fauna - Koala	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
627	4	Coal dust management	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
627	5	Economics - Analysis Approach	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
627	6	Economics - Agriculture vs Mining	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
627	7	Carbon Emissions	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
628	1	Impacts	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
628	2	Water - Groundwater - Drawdown	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
628	3	Coal dust management	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
628	4	Land - SCL/Good quality ag land	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
628	5	Terrestrial Ecology - terrestrial fauna - Koala	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
628	6	Land - Rehabilitation	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
628	7	Economics - Analysis Approach	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
628	8	Economics - Business Opportunities	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
629	1	Land - SCL/Good quality ag land	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
629	2	Water - Groundwater - Drawdown	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
629	3	Terrestrial Ecology - terrestrial fauna - Koala	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
629	4	Coal dust management	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
629	5	Economics - Agriculture vs Mining	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
629	6	Carbon Emissions	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
630	1	General Comment	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
631	1	Carbon Emissions	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
631	2	Terrestrial Ecology - terrestrial fauna - Koala	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
631	3	Land - SCL/Good quality ag land	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
631	4	General Comment	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
632	1	Land - SCL/Good quality ag land	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
632	2	Water - Groundwater - Drawdown	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
632	3	Terrestrial Ecology - terrestrial fauna - Koala	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
632	4	Coal dust management	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	

D14/I24I30

Sub. No.	Issue No.	Issue - Overview / Topic	Submitter Recommendations / Suggested Mitigation/additional information	Proponent response	Relevant AEIS Reference
646	3	Terrestrial Ecology - terrestrial fauna - Koala	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
646	4	Coal dust management	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
646	5	Economics - Analysis Approach	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
646	6	Carbon Emissions	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
647	1	Land - SCL/Good quality ag land	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
647	2	Water - Groundwater - Drawdown	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
647	3	Terrestrial Ecology - terrestrial fauna - Koala	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
647	4	Coal dust management	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
647	5	Economics - Analysis Approach	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
647	6	Carbon Emissions	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
648	1	Land - SCL/Good quality ag land	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
648	2	Water - Groundwater - Drawdown	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
648	3	Terrestrial Ecology - terrestrial fauna - Koala	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
648	4	Coal dust management	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
648	5	Economics - Analysis Approach	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
648	6	Carbon Emissions	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
649	1	Land - SCL/Good quality ag land	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
649	2	Water - Groundwater - Drawdown	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
649	3	Terrestrial Ecology - terrestrial fauna - Koala	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
649	4	Coal dust management	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
649	5	Economics - Analysis Approach	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
649	6	Carbon Emissions	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
649	7	Transport - Rail - Impacts	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
649	8	Social - Acland Heritage/ Social Change	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
649	9	Land - Rehabilitation	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
650	1	Land - SCL/Good quality ag land	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
650	2	Water - Groundwater - Drawdown	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
650	3	Social - Community values and change	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
650	4	Land - Topography, geology and soils	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
650	5	Economics - Analysis Approach	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
651	1	Land - SCL/Good quality ag land	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
651	2	Terrestrial Ecology - terrestrial fauna - Koala	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
651	3	Cultural Heritage - aboriginal cultural heritage	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
651	4	Land - Rehabilitation	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
651	5	Coal dust management	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
651	6	Hazard and risk - health and safety	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
651	7	Carbon Emissions	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
652	1	Land - SCL/Good quality ag land	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
652	2	Water - Groundwater - Drawdown	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
652	3	Terrestrial Ecology - terrestrial fauna - Koala	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
652	4	Coal dust management	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
652	5	Hazard and risk - health and safety	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
652	6	Economics - Analysis Approach	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
652	7	Carbon Emissions	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
653	1	Land - SCL/Good quality ag land	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
653	2	Water - Groundwater - Drawdown	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
653	3	Terrestrial Ecology - terrestrial fauna - Koala	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
653	4	Coal dust management	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
653	5	Economics - Analysis Approach	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
653	6	Carbon Emissions	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
654	1	Economics - Agriculture vs Mining	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
654	2	Carbon Emissions	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
654	3	Land - SCL/Good quality ag land	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
654	4	Carbon Emissions	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
655	1	Land - SCL/Good quality ag land	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
655	2	Water - Groundwater - Drawdown	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
655	3	Terrestrial Ecology - terrestrial fauna - Koala	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
655	4	Coal dust management	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
655	5	Economics - Analysis Approach	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
655	6	Carbon Emissions	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
656	1	Land - SCL/Good quality ag land	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
656	2	Water - Groundwater - Drawdown	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
656	3	Terrestrial Ecology - terrestrial fauna - Koala	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
656	4	Coal dust management	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
656	5	Economics - Analysis Approach	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
656	6	Carbon Emissions	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
656	7	General Comment	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
657	1	Land - SCL/Good quality ag land	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
657	2	Water - Groundwater - Drawdown	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
657	3	Terrestrial Ecology - terrestrial fauna - Koala	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
657	4	Coal dust management	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
657	5	Economics - Analysis Approach	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
657	6	Carbon Emissions	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
658	1	Land - SCL/Good quality ag land	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
658	2	Water - Groundwater - Drawdown	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
658	3	Terrestrial Ecology - terrestrial fauna - Koala	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
658	4	Coal dust management	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
658	5	Economics - Analysis Approach	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
658	6	Carbon Emissions	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
659	1	General Comment	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
659	2	Land - SCL/Good quality ag land	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
659	3	Water - Groundwater - Drawdown	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
659	4	Terrestrial Ecology - terrestrial fauna - Koala	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
659	5	Coal dust management	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
659	6	Economics - Analysis Approach	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
659	7	Carbon Emissions	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
660	1	Land - SCL/Good quality ag land	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	

Sub. No.	Issue No.	Issue - Overview / Topic	Submitter Recommendations / Suggested Mitigation/additional information	Proponent response	Relevant AEIS Reference
660	2	Water - Groundwater - Drawdown	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
660	3	Terrestrial Ecology - terrestrial fauna - Koala	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
660	4	Coal dust management	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
660	5	Transport - Rail - Regional Impacts	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
660	6	Economics - Analysis Approach	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
660	7	Carbon Emissions	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
661	1	Land - SCL/Good quality ag land	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
661	2	Water - Groundwater - Drawdown	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
661	3	Terrestrial Ecology - terrestrial fauna - Koala	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
661	4	Hazard and risk - health and safety	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
661	5	Economics - Analysis Approach	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
661	6	Carbon Emissions	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
661	7	Hazard and risk - health and safety	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
662	1	Land - SCL/Good quality ag land	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
662	2	Water - Groundwater - Drawdown	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
662	3	Terrestrial Ecology - terrestrial fauna - Koala	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
662	4	Hazard and risk - health and safety	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
662	5	Economics - Analysis Approach	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
662	6	Carbon Emissions	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
662	7	General Comment	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
663	1	Land - SCL/Good quality ag land	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
663	2	Water - Groundwater - Drawdown	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
663	3	Terrestrial Ecology - terrestrial fauna - Koala	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
663	4	Coal dust management	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
663	5	Economics - Analysis Approach	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
663	6	Carbon Emissions	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
664	1	Land - SCL/Good quality ag land	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
664	2	Water - Groundwater - Drawdown	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
664	3	Terrestrial Ecology - terrestrial fauna - Koala	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
664	4	Coal dust management	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
664	5	Economics - Analysis Approach	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
664	6	Carbon Emissions	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
664	7	General Comment	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
665	1	Land - SCL/Good quality ag land	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
666	1	Land - SCL/Good quality ag land	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
666	2	Water - Groundwater - Drawdown	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
666	3	Terrestrial Ecology - terrestrial fauna - Koala	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
666	4	Hazard and risk - health and safety	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
666	5	Economics - Analysis Approach	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
666	6	Carbon Emissions	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
667	1	Carbon Emissions	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
667	2	Economics - Agriculture vs Mining	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
667	3	Land - SCL/Good quality ag land	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
667	4	Water - Groundwater - Drawdown	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
667	5	Terrestrial Ecology - terrestrial fauna - Koala	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
667	6	Economics - Analysis Approach	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
667	7	Carbon Emissions	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
668	1	Hazard and risk - health and safety	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
668	2	Land - SCL/Good quality ag land	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
668	3	Water - Groundwater - Drawdown	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
668	4	Terrestrial Ecology - terrestrial fauna - Koala	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
668	5	Carbon Emissions	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
668	6	Carbon Emissions	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
669	1	Land - SCL/Good quality ag land	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
669	2	Water - Groundwater - Drawdown	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
669	3	Terrestrial Ecology - terrestrial fauna - Koala	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
669	4	Coal dust management	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
669	5	Economics - Analysis Approach	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
669	6	Carbon Emissions	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
Form Letter Submission - Template 1					
670-714	1	Need to improve rail infrastructure and procedures (day time hours/no increase in trains) to prevent impacts in residential locations	Need to provide additional EIS information on health and amenities impacts of increased coal train traffic and stockpiles	Comment Noted	
	2	Need to improve rail infrastructure and procedures (day time hours/no increase in trains) to prevent impacts in residential locations	Need to provide additional EIS information on health and amenities impacts of increased coal train traffic and stockpiles	Comment Noted	
	3	Stockpile and train coverage should be the minimum requirement	Need to provide additional EIS information on health and amenities impacts of increased coal train traffic and stockpiles	Comment Noted	
	4	Histories should be publically made available prior to closure of the current EIS consultation period.	Need to provide additional EIS information on health and amenities impacts of increased coal train traffic and stockpiles	Comment Noted	
Form Letter Submission - Template 2					
715-939	1	Destruction of large amounts of cropping land	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
	2	Damage and depletion of aquifers	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
	3	Destroys koala habitat	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
	4	High levels of dust pollution in Acland and Jondaryan and rail corridor	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
	5	High levels of noise pollution in Acland and Jondaryan and rail corridor	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
	6	High levels of dust and noise pollution in entire rail corridor	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
	7	Unacceptable health risks for nearby residents	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
	8	Flawed presentation of economic benefits	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
	9	Unacceptable coal burden on the climate	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
Form Letter Submission - Template 3					

Sub. No.	Issue No.	Issue - Overview / Topic	Submitter Recommendations / Suggested Mitigation/additional information	Proponent response	Relevant AEIS Reference
940 - 1154	1	Destruction of large amounts of cropping land	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
	2	Land will not be returned to allow its full agricultural potential.	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
	3	Impacts of removing food producing land has not be fully accounted for	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
	4	Election promise not approve project (regardless of re-scope)	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
	5	Unacceptable coal burden on the climate	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
Form Letter Submission - Template 4					
1155 - 1251	1	Need to improve rail infrastructure and procedures (day time hours/no increase in trains) to prevent impacts in residential locations	Need to provide additional EIS information on health and amenities impacts of increased coal train traffic and stockpiles	Comment Noted	
	2	Need to improve rail infrastructure and procedures (day time hours/no increase in trains) to prevent impacts in residential locations - dust and noise unacceptable	Need to provide additional EIS information on health and amenities impacts of increased coal train traffic and stockpiles	Comment Noted	
	3	Stockpile and train coverage should be the minimum requirement	Need to provide additional EIS information on health and amenities impacts of increased coal train traffic and stockpiles	Comment Noted	
	4	Histories should be publically made available prior to closure of the current EIS consultation period.	Need to provide additional EIS information on health and amenities impacts of increased coal train traffic and stockpiles	Comment Noted	
Form Letter Submission - Template 5					
1252 - 1310	1	Need to improve rail infrastructure and procedures (day time hours/no increase in trains) to prevent impacts in residential locations	Need to provide additional EIS information on health and amenities impacts of increased coal train traffic and stockpiles	Comment Noted	
	2	Need to improve rail infrastructure and procedures (day time hours/no increase in trains) to prevent impacts in residential locations - dust and noise unacceptable	Need to provide additional EIS information on health and amenities impacts of increased coal train traffic and stockpiles	Comment Noted	
	3	High levels of dust pollution in Acland and Jondaryan and rail corridor	Need to provide additional EIS information on health and amenities impacts of increased coal train traffic and stockpiles	Comment Noted	
	4	High levels of noise pollution in Acland and Jondaryan and rail corridor	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
	5	Histories should be publically made available prior to closure of the current EIS consultation period.	Need to provide additional EIS information on health and amenities impacts of increased coal train traffic and stockpiles	Comment Noted	
Form Letter Submission - Template 6					
1311 - 1359	1	Destruction of large amounts of cropping land	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
	2	Land will not be returned to allow its full agricultural potential.	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
	3	Election promise not approve project (regardless of re-scope)	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
	4	Unacceptable coal burden on the climate	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
Form Letter Submission - Template 7					
1360 - 1361	1	Destruction of large amounts of cropping land	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
	2	Land will not be returned to allow its full agricultural potential.	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
	3	Election promise not approve project (regardless of re-scope)	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
	4	Destruction of large amounts of cropping land will reduce Australia's self sufficiency and international trade standing	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	
	5	Unacceptable coal burden on the climate	Do not approve Stage 3	Comment Noted	

Total Respondants = 1397