

**Nathan Dam and Pipelines Project EIS  
Community Liaison Group  
Minutes of meeting**



Meeting number: 1  
Date: Tuesday 7 October 2008

<b>Agenda item</b>	<b>Action/discussion</b>
Welcome/intro	Facilitator welcomed attendees Members introduced themselves and the group they represented
CLG ToR	Facilitator reviewed key points of the ToR with the group including the role of the CLG, membership selection and responsibilities of the members, facilitator and SunWater.
Draft study ToR	<p>Coordinator-General representative presented overview of the project's state significant status, the EIS process and timings, and the project review process under a bilateral agreement between the Federal and State Government.</p> <p>He provided the indicative timeframe for the EIS process as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Comments on draft ToR by 17 October 2008</li> <li>▪ ToR finalised ~ November 2008</li> <li>▪ Public comment on EIS ~ July 2009</li> <li>▪ Public comment on the SEIS ~ November 2009</li> <li>▪ CG's Report – January 2010</li> </ul> <p>He handed out DIP fact sheet about how to make a submission to the draft ToR.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clarification sought on the term 'state significant' for a project and its relation to "fast tracking" projects – confirmed SSP status and what it means to a project</li> </ul>
Project overview and scope	<p>SunWater representative presented project overview and scope of EIS studies.</p> <p>Questions and comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• AHD for the dam wall - the presentation mentions 185 AHD but the ToR refers to it as 183.5 AHD - noted and advised this would be corrected in the final ToR.</li> <li>• What amount of water would be available from the dam if Xstrata had a preset allocation of water from Glebe Weir – existing water allocations would remain in place.</li> </ul>

Agenda item	Action/discussion
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Why is the project name has a plural in “pipelines” – at the time of the project referral the number of pipelines required was unknown, however now that it’s known only one pipeline is required it’s too late to change the project name with the government.</li> <li>• Would the pipeline be located above or below ground – it would be below ground, but some infrastructure would need to be located above ground (e.g. balancing tanks etc).</li> <li>• Will the pipeline route be co-located with the Surat Basin Rail in a common corridor – this option would be fully investigated as part of the EIS process. A State Development Area was also being considered with regards to a common corridor.</li> <li>• Does the fish-lift design at Baralaba give any innovative ideas for the Nathan Dam design.</li> <li>• Road access issues at Bullock Gully – not aware of any issues with road access over this gully, but noted local road access would be adjusted to suit the expected inundation.</li> <li>• Reliability and cost of water from the dam – this would be investigated as part of the EIS process and would depend on priority and demand modelling.</li> <li>• Is there a guarantee on the water quality – water quality was not guaranteed but environmental management of the water would be managed as part of the project.</li> <li>• Water priority and existing allocations in relation to the storage capacity and yield –water modelling and demand analysis would determine the yield.</li> <li>• How does SunWater plan to undertake the water demand surveys – some surveys will be simple, such as those with the mines, however SunWater is still considering how they will structure and undertake the demand survey with agricultural users.</li> <li>• How high will the water level would be at, for example, the bridge in town and how the changing levels would cause sand fly issues –not exactly sure of the height at this location, but options to mitigate issues such as sand flies were being considered as part of the EIS studies.</li> <li>• Request for core samples from dry boggomosses (prior to future inundation) to determine age of boggomosses –request noted for</li> </ul>

Agenda item	Action/discussion
	consideration.
Consultation update	<p data-bbox="456 280 1401 383">Community liaison officer gave brief overview of what consultation is planned for the future and invited suggestions from the group for information to be included in future consultation activities.</p> <ul data-bbox="456 434 1393 539" style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="456 434 1393 539">• Was consultation planned to occur in Rockhampton –not planned however presentation could be given to Rockhampton Conservation Council</li> </ul>
Next meeting	<ul data-bbox="456 546 1382 1171" style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="456 546 1382 667">• Suggested schedule presented for group discussion; next meeting proposed for December and to be a 4hr workshop on technical studies – group agreed to this timing.</li> <li data-bbox="456 712 1382 786">• The group discussed the location of the next meeting – consensus was for the meeting to remain in Taroom.</li> <li data-bbox="456 831 1382 904">• Suggestion made to tour the proposed dam location and see a boggomoss – all agreed good idea.</li> <li data-bbox="456 949 1382 1070">• Suggestion made that next meeting could be ran as an overnighter with the meeting one day and the tour the next – the group agreed. Detailed proposed agenda/schedule to be circulated to the group.</li> <li data-bbox="456 1115 1382 1171">• Group discussed timing of December meeting and Monday 1 and Tuesday 2 December were agreed.</li> </ul>