

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



Meeting number: 3
Date: Tuesday 3 March 2009
Time: 10.30am to 1.45pm

Agenda item	Action/discussion
Welcome / introductions	Facilitator introduced new participants.
Minutes from last meeting	<p>Facilitator revisited outstanding items from last meeting:</p> <p>Local water use - member advised that Banana Shire Council received a letter from DVDA about potential town water allocations from the dam, particularly for those upstream and downstream of the river. CG rep advised SunWater is currently undertaking water demand analysis surveys to determine local water needs; but landowners will get stock access to the dam (which is a normal arrangement). SunWater rep stated he had previously been advised by the Taroom Council that water from the dam wasn't required for town purposes (due to good bores), but he suggested if this had changed to let him know and this would be reviewed.</p> <p>5km extent of studies – SunWater rep clarified definition of 5km radius as noted in ToR. CLG member suggested that it should be written that way in the ToR, to which SunWater rep responded that it was clearly identified in the ToR that the extent of studies would extend to the Great Barrier Reef.</p> <p>Snail translocation – will be covered later in agenda.</p>

Agenda item	Action/discussion
	<p>Platypus studies – SunWater rep advised platypus were in the terrestrial fauna brief and that observational studies were being undertaken on the platypus, but not trapping.</p> <p>Fish passages – Fish passages between Fitzroy and Glebe Weir</p> <p>Dawson River</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Glebe Weir – no fish passage (yet) • Gylanda Weir – no fish passage • Orange Creek Weir – no fish passage • Theodore Weir – no fish passage • Moura Weir – fish ladder • Neville Hewitt Weir – fish ladder <p>Fitzroy River</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Eden Bann – fish lock • Fitzroy Barrage – fish ladder <p>Landowner representation – now addressed with new landholder reps joining the CLG.</p> <p>Water quality – will be covered later in agenda.</p> <p>CLG member suggested that SunWater is being stubborn by not considering to locate the pipeline route outside of the road reserve, particularly when other infrastructure is looking at alternative routes. SuNWater advised it was required to consider alternative routes and this would be addressed as part of the EIS.</p>
ToR / EIS update Coordinator- General	<p>CG rep advised the CG finalised the ToR on 13 February and handed out a ToR package to the CLG members (including cover letter and final ToR).</p> <p>He noted that other entities who made submissions will also receive this package.</p> <p>He advised the group there were major changes to the ToR, with the most prominent being in the social/economic sections.</p>

Agenda item	Action/discussion
	<p>He advised 18 submissions were received from advisory agencies and 16 from members of public and that the main topics covered in the submissions included (in order of priority):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – cumulative impacts of this project and other projects on the social and economic environment through the loss of agricultural land and increased competition on workforce and accommodation – the impacts of the project on existing water entitlements – water allocation from the project for agricultural expansion – water allocation from the project for future industrial growth – the downstream impacts of the water use – impacts on the riparian environment/corridor – fish transfer devices for the project and downstream structures – the alternative use of coal seam gas water – co-location opportunities <p>He advised the next stage was for SunWater to prepare the EIS, to which the CG's office would assess to ensure it met the requirements of the ToR. The EIS would then be released for public and advisory agency comment.</p> <p>CLG member suggested a key part of the EIS was the EMP and voiced concern about the proponent preparing their own EMP and asked what the CG's office and DIP thought of this. CG rep responded that the CG's office and EPA (who had the most input into the EMP) both take the EMPs seriously and would review this document as part of the EIS assessment.</p>
Project update SunWater	<p>SunWater rep presented an update on various aspects of the project, including:</p> <p>Engineering:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - geotechnical drilling confirmed chosen site is suitable for the dam wall - dam size confirmed at 185m AHD with a capacity of just over 1million megalitres across 15,000 hectares - vertical lift gates preferred <p>CG rep asked about average depth – SunWater rep advised he didn't have the figures with him and would distribute this information with the minutes.</p>

Agenda item	Action/discussion
	<p>Note: Average depth of the dam is 6.7m</p> <p>CLG rep asked about extent of impacts to local bores from the dam – SunWater rep advised modelling is being undertaken to determine these impacts, after which discussions would be held with the landowners to determine mitigation measures.</p> <p>CLG rep suggested 185m AHD would be devastating to the town of Taroom and do maximum damage to the river. He states at this height the water would come up to the bridge and, because of this he could not support the project at all and didn't think others would either. AC suggested there should be more balance between the engineering requirements and the environment. He also asked if the 185m height would impact on Bundulla and the Aboriginal burial ground. SunWater rep advised that surveys are being undertaken at the moment and if the burial ground was impacted this would be discussed further with the native claimants.</p> <p>CLG rep asked about the impacts to Boggomosses at the 185m height. SunWater rep advised that all of the Boggomosses had been mapped and, regardless of the final height, some would be impacted by the project. He noted that all of the factual data would be presented in the EIS and then it's up to the public to review these facts and make up their own mind whether to support it or not.</p> <p>Cultural heritage:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - surveys over compound area completed - Iman #2 and Wulli Wulli reports being completed - engagement agreement signed with Buranggum - Native Title strategy developed - ILUA for the dam, but not the pipeline <p>EIS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - terrestrial and aquatic fauna completed for both impoundment area and pipeline - air and noise monitoring performed at representative sites - baseline data gathered to cost benefit model as part of economic study - property acquisition strategy being developed (most full land acquisitions completed, remainder of acquisitions will most likely

Agenda item	Action/discussion
	<p>be part takes)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - agricultural and urban demand studies under way - existing environment sections of EIS have been written - proposal for translocation trial being prepared; expect to lodge referral to Federal Government within the month. <p>Approximate timeframes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Draft EIS to CG office in August 09 - Public release late October 09 - Supplementary EIS February 10 - CG report April 10 - EPBC approval – TBA <p>SunWater rep noted that most dates have been pushed back due to the translocation trial.</p> <p>CLG rep read out a letter he received from BSC engineers voicing their concerns and ideas about project infrastructure collocating with other project infrastructure in common corridors. CG rep responded that the pipeline was being constructed for the proposed Wandoan Coal Mine project and as part of the EIS process the proponent would need to demonstrate why the proposed pipeline alignment was preferred over other alternatives. It would be up to the DIP project manager for this project to evaluate the EIS and submissions when considering what was the most appropriate pipeline alignment.</p> <p>CLG rep noted that the purpose of a road reserve is specifically for road infrastructure, not to preserve flora and fauna.</p> <p>SunWater rep added that investigations for the pipeline route started in the rail reserve with a preference for co-location, but as the studies progressed it was shown that it would be preferable to site the pipeline in the road reserve, particularly as it would significantly reduce impacts to landowners. By collocating with existing power and water in the road only two landowners would be impacted, as opposed to several more if the pipeline was colocated within the rail corridor.</p> <p>CLG rep advised that as landowners they would prefer project infrastructure to be located as close to the road as possible to reduce impacts on landholders.</p>

Agenda item	Action/discussion
	<p>SunWater rep advised he did talk to several landowners about their preferences for the preferred route and the majority indicated the road reserve corridor was less of an impact to them when compared to the rail corridor. PM advised that all opportunities would be taken into consideration during the EIS studies.</p> <p>CLG rep asked if the agricultural demand survey had commenced yet and if they were consulting with council too. PM advised that the agricultural survey was underway and, as it included industrial and other uses, the council were being consulted.</p> <p>Some members advised that the closing date for the agricultural survey was very short and didn't allow enough time to complete it (closing 13 Feb) – SunWater rep advised he would investigate this issue and advise.</p> <p>CLG rep stated that the economics of the town would be affected and, as such, would water be allocated to the local community to reduce this impact. SunWater rep advised that compensation would be available to landowners under per the standard land acquisition process, but it would not be SunWater who decides who would get the priority allocations. Rather, this would be part of the ROP.</p> <p>CLG rep advised from a landowner point of view it's difficult to respond to the surveys, particularly when they only just found out the AHD height today.</p> <p>CLG rep asked that if the FSL was 185m, how would this change the 1 in 100 flood level lines (ie. how much higher). SunWater rep advised he did not have the specific data with him now, but the impact would be incremental. He stated that the increments wouldn't be significant, but there would be an impact and this information would be in the EIS.</p>
<p>Water quality presentation SunWater</p>	<p>SunWater gave a brief overview of his role and past project experience, then presented an overview on the water quality modelling and results.</p> <p>CLG rep asked what water quality changes would happen upstream of the dam. SunWater advised that upstream changes were not assessed beyond the ponded areas, as this was out of the project's influence.</p> <p>CLG rep suggested that two large gas field upstream of the dam had not been taken into consideration, nor the Wandoan coal</p>

Agenda item	Action/discussion
	<p>mine, and how these projects would impact water quality for those along the river. He noted that water testing along the river was being started by his group to gauge the impacts being generated by these projects.</p> <p>SunWater rep responded that these projects had been taken into account, they just weren't specifically mentioned in the presentation. He advised that all cumulative impacts would be addressed in various chapters of the EIS, not just cumulative water quality impacts.</p> <p>CLG rep asked if the same process had been followed for groundwater analysis. MWH rep advised the groundwater analysis was not yet completed and results could be provided at a future time.</p> <p>CLG rep asked if the project team was aware that water quality in Moura was not as good as it should be, and at times water would be closed off for a week and asked how these instances could affect Nathan Dam in the bigger picture?</p> <p>CLG rep asked who he could get this water quality information from and SunWater advised (Banana Shire Council). CLG pre advised if they knew what the issues were, they could set out flow regimes to satisfy user needs and will talk to council about this further.</p> <p>CLG rep asked how the first post-winter flow event would be handled. SunWater rep advised the modelling would determine this and that it's likely the first flush could be let through the valves, without using the gates. Post winter flow event is an Environmental Flow Objective, and as such must be complied with in order for the project to obtain approval under the Water Resource Plan.</p> <p>CLG rep asked how landowners would be notified when testing for blue-green algae was underway. SunWater rep advised water testing was generally performed monthly, or increased when the frequency of breakouts increased. He also added that public signage would indicate when testing was underway.</p> <p>SunWater rep clarified that the public signage was more for public advice and warning, not as notification for landowners. This process would need to be determined as part of developing the operational procedures.</p>
Social impact	SKM rep gave a brief overview of her role and past project experience, then presented an overview of the social impact

Agenda item	Action/discussion
<p>study presentation SKM</p>	<p>assessment process and early findings.</p> <p>CLG rep voice concern about the range of towns selected for assessment and how these were decided (eg. why choose Miles of Dalby over Theodore etc). SKM rep responded that the presentation currently focussed on the impacted towns, but benefited user areas would be also assessed – they just weren't included in the presentation.</p> <p>SKM rep asked the group to add to and/or confirm the community values, benefits and social issues noted in the presentation by writing their ideas and thoughts on to sticky-notes that were placed under various social impact headings.</p> <p>She summarised the comments received and asked the group to continue providing feedback via normal mechanisms (email, 1800 phone, project office) should any more ideas come to mind.</p>
<p>Meeting close</p>	<p>Facilitator discussed timing of next CLG meeting, taking into consideration the extended project timeframes.</p> <p>SunWater rep suggested the next CLG meeting should be timed to occur when more information was available in relation to the impacts of the project and proposed mitigation measures, but at a point when there was still enough time to input feedback into EIS (due out in August). He suggested one full day around May/June 2008.</p> <p>CLG rep asked if a date could be set now, or if as much notice as possible could be given to allow for adequate planning. Facilitator advised a date could not be set yet due to too many unknowns, but she would contact members with an update around April.</p> <p>CLG rep asked about the timings required by Canberra on the EPBC referral for the Boggomoss snail translocation trial and how that would impact project timings. SunWater rep advised he would notify the group when the referral was available publicly on the federal government's website and it would state the statutory timeframes they require. He also confirmed that budget was available to undertake the translocation trial.</p> <p>CG rep asked if the report prepared by John Stanisic was publicly available. SunWater rep advised it was currently with the federal government so it wasn't at the moment, but would become a public document when the referral was finalised.</p>

Agenda item	Action/discussion
	<p>CG rep noted that John Stanisic was pushing for the translocation trial to be undertaken, irrespective of Nathan Dam. Timeframes could not be determined until advice from the federal government was received.</p> <p>CLG rep asked if any studies were being undertaken on the infrastructure downstream of the dam. He clarified his question to ask if the existing downstream infrastructure is adequate for the expected increase in supply. SunWater rep responded that no upgrades to other infrastructure will be required in order to deliver water supplies to customers in the Dawson.</p> <p>CLG rep asked how the water would be allocated to Xstrata, and what would happen in the future when the mine was eventually mined out and they no longer needed the water. SunWater rep responded that this would be a commercial arrangement between the provider and purchaser, but he was not able to comment of these agreements right now.</p> <p>Faciliator advised the minutes would be distributed in the next week and she would also advise when more information was available about the snail translocation trial.</p>

Next meeting: TBA