

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



Meeting number: 6
Date: Thursday, 21 May 2012
Time: 9am – 10:30am

Present	<p>Vaughn Becker (Banana Shire Council) Cecily Brockhurst (Murilla Community Centre) Adam Clarke (Wildlife Preservation Society of Queensland (Upper Dawson Branch)) Rob Hutchinson (Dawson Valley Irrigators) Charisse Edwards (Dawson Catchment Coordinating Association) Stephen Hegedus (Replaces Max Henderson WDRC) Michael McCabe (Replaces Ian Herbert Capricorn Conservation Council) Sam Jerrand (Taroom Lions) Mark & Kathy Liddle (Landholders) Andrea Beard (Dawson Catchment Coordinating Association) Kirrily Addison (SunWater) Lee Benson (SunWater) Michelle Watson (SKM)) Samantha Watt (SKM)</p>
Apologies	<p>Jeanie Conachan (Fitzroy Basin Food and Fibre) Warren Phelps (Taroom Lions) Barbara Smith (Taroom District Development Association) should have been sent to Doug Adam Nigel Pariat (Queensland Conservation Council) Sam Rathbone (Landholder)</p>

Agenda Item	Discussion
Welcome/ introductions	<p>Kirrily Addison (KA) welcomed attendants and apologised for the delay between meetings which was due to further information being required by the Coordinator-General/SEWPAC.</p> <p>KA set out the agenda for meeting.</p>
Summary of EIS	<p>Dam Design</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A CLG member queried what will happen to any timber that dies within the dam and the impact on rural/agricultural land lost. KA stated that there would be no impact on a regional scale. - A CLG member queried cattle numbers in the Taroom area. He believed there were more cattle in the Taroom area 25 years ago than in the Northern Territory. Lee Benson (LB) compared this to regions within Queensland and recent cattle numbers. - A CLG member said he hoped the dam wall would stay up as the area is high pressure. He also asked about Platypus. - A CLG member questioned the conditions of landholders for land use upstream of the dam.
Issues summary (from consultation)	<p>The group discussed the various issues raised by the public at the public information days</p> <p>Dalby:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Pipeline ■ Access to water ■ Large amount of infrastructure on property ■ Existing rail acts as flood levee - erosion at location of proposed pipeline ■ Fossil finds <p>Chinchilla:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Pipeline on properties, other infrastructure ■ Access agreements ■ Does EMP get implemented by contractor? ■ CRD – draft EMP conditioned ■ Change process – formal process via approval authorities. ■ EIS process – some people thought the EIS was the final part but were informed it is the starting point for negotiations with individuals <p>Wandoan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Pipeline alignment

Agenda Item	Discussion
Questions	<p>A CLG member queried the Woleebee Creek project and how it is related to the Nathan Project. A SunWater rep identified that this project is completely separate from the Nathan Project.</p> <p>A CLG member queried having a dam further upstream and asked why this was not possible. KA said SunWater had looked at these sites previously, but there was no yield. The CLG member queried the Nathan Gorge location. LB said the gorge causes flooding and water can't get away during flooding.</p> <p>A CLG member stated it was an insult to the district – The Government has over-allocated the Murray-Darling system and as a result, Dawson water is now being sent there to compensate. He said the split of water to Dalby/Dawson was 44:22 (p14 – 24). To maintain water quality, there will be a multi-level offtake. Additionally, the operational strategy will try to mimic the natural flow regime.</p> <p>A member raised the point that when water levels went down stock gets stuck. A member asked if offstream watering points would be fenced with gates every 500m.</p> <p>A SunWater rep said there was a commitment from SunWater that the pipeline would be constructed in reasonable time with a clear schedule (tied into contractor's contracts).</p> <p>A member raised that the Banana Shire Council Mayor is going to put it to Council to get the Coordinator-General to Taroom, plus all proponents to deal with cumulative impacts.</p> <p>A SunWater rep advised that no location has been chosen as yet for the accommodation camps but two positions had been identified. The rep stated it was SunWater's preference that the council suggest the best location for the camp.</p> <p>A member raised the issue of ground water and queried whether the dam would cut ground water flow downstream. A SunWater rep reiterated that this would not be the case.</p> <p>The SunWater rep said with regards to transport – some roads will need widening / upgrades.</p> <p>All CLG members were asked if they would like the CLG to continue to operate. They all agreed, that yes, they would like the meetings to continue. It was agreed the next meeting would be held at the time of the Supplementary EIS.</p> <p>Offsets:</p>

Agenda Item	Discussion
	<p>A member queried whether offsets would be on acquired property and whether they would be done before construction? Indicating that they want to see set in stone.</p> <p>A SunWater rep confirmed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ This is preferred or abutting remnant vegetation or National Park. ▪ Sufficient offsets are available but no landholder discussions held as yet. ▪ Usually have 12 months from start of construction to secure offsets <p>A member noted that they believe there will be lots of area of muddy, scrubby regrowth created on the fringes of the water storage area</p> <p>A SunWater rep noted that there would be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Compensation as part of initial negotiations ▪ If on SunWater land, SunWater to manage (FSL) ▪ If on SunWater easement, an agreement would be developed over who manages <p>A CLG member queried if there would be places for displaced residents in rural production in the area when competing with mines, dams, offsets.</p> <p>A member queried the impact of water capture by mines on yield of the dam</p> <p>A SunWater rep noted that they are required to consider all cumulative impacts including Traffic, SIMPs, etc</p> <p>Queries were raised by members around the liability of landholders and SunWater regarding land access along the pipeline.</p> <p>A SunWater rep noted that the landholder agreement developed between SunWater and the landholder would include aspects such as</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Liability ▪ Indemnity ▪ Notice <p style="margin-left: 150px;">} On both sides</p>

Next meeting: TBC closer to time of Supplementary EIS.