

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



Meeting number: 2
Date: Monday 1 December 2008
Time: 12:30pm – 5:00 pm

Chaired by:	Minuted by:	Distribution date:
Pauline Bourke Terrace Communications	Kathy Major MarCom Communication	19 December 2008
Apologies	Peter MacTaggart – SunWater	
Not present	Todd Graham Sam Jerrard – Taroom Lions Club	

Agenda item	Action/discussion
Lunch	12.30pm – 1pm
Welcome, intro & housekeeping	PB welcomed attendees, noted apologies and confirmed last meeting's minutes were accepted PB discussed the field trip – agreed to meet at Cattle Camp Hotel at 7am CLG member asked if there was an opportunity to raise issues – PB advised at end of meeting
Overview of EIS progress	Coordinator-General (CG) representative noted 32 submissions were received about the draft ToR, with the following key issues noted: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • social impacts • downstream water use • water for local consumption

Agenda item	Action/discussion
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • impacts on riverine environment • inter-basin transfers • co-location of infrastructure • economic impacts <p>Advised ToR expected to be finalised by end of year and final copy will be emailed to CLG members.</p> <p>CLG member asked for clarification of “local water use” and how local is local –advised SunWater should really respond to question</p> <p>Update provided on EIS progress and noted current works focus primarily on describing the current environment and noted the next stage of assessing the impacts is due to start around December</p> <p>Member asked if the Glebe Weir pipeline was a separate line to the one extending to Dalby– CG representative advised that it was dependant on the outcome of the Wandoan Coal Project and their water needs, but noted the COG office is requiring projects to consider co-location opportunities (where possible)</p> <p>CLG member suggested the pipeline should not be located within the road reserve due to location of natural timbers sited within these areas</p>
Presentation 1 – Terrestrial Fauna	<p>Consultant presented overview, methodology and findings of terrestrial fauna surveys conducted to date</p> <p>CLG member asked if pests were surveyed –yes and they found pest species such as cane toads, pigs, dogs, cats and foxes</p> <p>CLG member asked if any bandicoot were found –not many were found as they were mostly restricted to areas with good ground cover</p> <p>CLG member asked which pipeline route was surveyed, given that the final route has not yet been determined – same route as that which was noted in the draft ToR, which was understood to be the one following the road reserve</p>

Agenda item	Action/discussion
Presentation 2 – Flora	<p data-bbox="465 236 1671 268">Consultant presented overview, methodology and findings of flora surveys conducted to date</p> <p data-bbox="465 316 1951 384">CLG member asked if any South African citrus mites were found in the Mother of Millions –no, but noted there was recent spraying in the area</p> <p data-bbox="465 432 1968 539">CLG member asked that, considering the Dawson River would change from natural flows to controlled flows, did the survey area extend far enough to take into consideration potential downstream changes to the ecology from controlled releases of water –scope of work extended about 5km downstream</p> <p data-bbox="465 587 1973 655">CLG member suggested that if Santos ever put water into the river upstream this could also change the ecology and suggested the survey area should be extended upstream to include this too</p> <p data-bbox="465 703 1982 927">CLG member suggested the survey areas seemed to concentrate on identified impact and adjoining areas only and questioned if that was enough, given that water could be released further downstream than the survey area extended –their brief was to look at fauna communities up to 5km downstream, but CG representative also noted that the ToR left it to the proponent to determine how far the survey areas should extend and said the proponent should take into consideration suggestions from surveyors about the extent of studies being undertaken and whether further studies were required</p> <p data-bbox="465 975 1899 1086">CLG member noted the previous EIS didn't note how the controlled release of water downstream impacted the ecology downstream – CG representative advised SunWater will need to look at the method of water delivery mechanisms and how they get it there in this EIS (including controlled releases)</p> <p data-bbox="465 1134 1962 1278">CLG member suggested that with the amount of work being done and money being spent on surveying the pipeline route to Dalby, if there was a need for a pipeline to take water to other areas like Biloela this work would need to be done again – CG representative advised further impact studies would be undertaken if additional pipelines were required to deliver water to other areas</p> <p data-bbox="465 1326 1879 1358">CLG member suggested that as the previous court findings noted cumulative impacts should be investigated,</p>

Agenda item	Action/discussion
	<p>shouldn't the survey areas be extended (eg. as far as the Great Barrier Reef) – CG representative advised the Commonwealth Minister's decision last time suggested the impacts didn't address the EPBC Act and this should be considered; the proponent (SunWater) will determine how far the levels of impacts are assessed and the COG office will determine if that's suitable or not</p>
Break	2.30pm - 2.45pm
Presentation 3 – Boggomoss Snail	<p>Consultant presented overview, methodology and findings of Boggomoss Snail surveys conducted to date</p> <p>CLG member asked for clarification about number of snails estimated at Mt Rose and Isla Delusion in the previous recovery plan –previous estimates were determined by block categories (0-100, 100-300, 300-500 etc) and were based on ball-park areas of habitat, but given habitat information now known he can confidently revise previous estimates</p> <p>CLG member asked if the records would be retrospectively adjusted –recovery plans have to be revisited from time to time and these kind of errors would be corrected at that time</p> <p>CLG member asked how long the translocation would take to be shown as successful –it would depend on the criteria set</p> <p>CLG member asked about the translocation sites in Isla Delusion and if there were any other suitable sites considered near Theodore –advised they looked at all areas where snails have been found (extended to north as far as Theodore).</p> <p>CLG member suggested there might be suitable translocation sites on her property –consultant advised he would look into any sites considered suitable, as long as they were on dry sites enclosed by canopy vegetation</p> <p>CLG member asked if the Boggomosses with fallen trees could be rehabilitated for translocation –anything was possible, but it was really dependant upon time (eg. a tree canopy could take 30-40 yrs to grow)</p> <p>CG representative asked if estimate of 300 snails were from all three sites at Mt Rose – the method used to estimate</p>

Agenda item	Action/discussion
	<p>the number of snails</p> <p>CG representative asked what were the chances of the species survival if the dam didn't go ahead – JS advised he didn't know</p> <p>CG representative asked if there was any way to tell if the number of snails were increasing or decreasing – consultant advised he believed they were increasing, given the recent studies found adults breeding, but also noted the habit was decreasing so this may impact their future if the dam didn't proceed</p> <p>CLG member asked if it was worth considering putting aside Brigalow habitats for future translocation –consultant responded would look into all viable options but probably not suitable</p> <p>CLG member asked if wetland areas were suitable –not really as it was more or a secondary habitat as the snails would be prone to being washed away during floods</p> <p>CLG member asked why different Boggomosses with similar floristic characteristics didn't all house snails – most likely be due to their location with the river and suggested the areas in question were too wet to promote the ongoing survival of the species</p> <p>CLG member asked if the Boggomosses were fed by the Great Artesian Basin or where the water came from – water was artesian and noted that the Boggomosses were actually irrelevant to the snails (they only provided the environment)</p> <p>CLG member asked if there was enough money to do all of the translocation works required – consultant advised that was a question for SunWater, but DEWHA asked for the feasibility of such an exercise to be presented in the EIS</p>
Presentation 4 – Freshwater ecology	<p>Consultant presented overview, methodology and findings of freshwater ecology surveys conducted to date</p> <p>CLG member asked if any Planaria was found –Planaria (a type of flatworm) was not found during the study.</p>

Agenda item	Action/discussion
	<p>However, based on Department of Natural Resources & Water macro invertebrate data, flatworms are known from the Fitzroy Basin.</p> <p>CLG member asked if carp were found around here – no</p> <p>CLG member asked if the sample results would be available – all technical data will be available in the EIS.</p> <p>CLG member asked about the ripple zones – these zones would increase the food resources available to them and is likely to increase their population long term</p> <p>CLG member noted that platypus were not mentioned, but he has seen them around the area, eg. the caravan park – advised platypus were not targeted as they were not part of their scope, but would be addressed in the EIS</p> <p>CLG member asked if any Saratoga caught in the Guyundah weir – no</p> <p>CLG member asked if there was going to be a platypus survey and was worried about their population – CG representative advised that would be a decision of SunWater and this would be raised with SunWater.</p> <p>CG representative asked how many weirs were located between the mouth of the Fitzroy River and Glebe Weir and how many didn't have fish passageways – couldn't give definite answer, but would look up info and advise</p>
General business	<p>CLG member asked if dam would be under jurisdiction of the QLD Water Commission – CG representative responded no, noting that SunWater's mandate was only to undertake the EIS process and, if the dam was approved, preparation of the business case</p> <p>CLG member said he would like to talk to SunWater further about availability of water downstream and a few other questions – Facilitator noted she would advise SunWater</p> <p>CLG member noted that he felt AgForce should have representation on the CLG (which was also indicated to him by some of their members) – Facilitator will follow-up lack of landowner representation with SunWater and opportunity</p>

Agenda item	Action/discussion
	<p>for other memberships</p> <p>CLG member mentioned they were very keen to get an official water testing system in place if the dam was to proceed (it used to happen, but not as much anymore)</p> <p>CLG member added there used to be monthly water sampling of the lower Dawson but this has been reduced to quarterly, and recent funding requests to include other parts of the Dawson was knocked back</p> <p>Another CLG member continued with suggesting it's not just an issue with funding, but with a long term commitment to maintaining and monitoring the sampling stations – Facilitator noted this issue was a little outside of this project's remit, but would note issue with SunWater; EIS consultant also noted that water quality sampling was already written into the studies</p> <p>Facilitator advised that all feedback from the meeting would be personally discussed with SunWater for their consideration.</p>
Next meeting	Facilitator stated she would need to talk to SunWater about timing and agenda of next meeting and get back to group with timing (coordinated to occur near next round of Community Information Days)
Workshop close	Facilitator asked if the group would like to bring dinner forward – all agreed
Field trip	Most members of the group attended a field visit to the proposed dam site the next morning including a stop to view a Boggomoss. The field visit concluded at 11.00am

Next meeting: Proposed to be around late February or early March 2009. PB to advise group of exact timing in the new year.