



Mr Michael Alexander  
Director Projects  
Wambo Coal Pty Ltd  
Singleton NSW 2330

*Michael*

Dear Mr Alexander

**Wambo Mine Modification 12 (DA 305-7-2003 MOD 12)  
Request for Response to Submissions**

The public exhibition of the Environmental Assessment (EA) for Wambo Mine Modification 12 concluded on Friday 13 May 2016.

The Secretary requests that you prepare and submit a report detailing your responses to the issues raised in submissions, at your earliest convenience. The submissions can be viewed on the Department's website [www.majorprojects.planning.nsw.gov.au](http://www.majorprojects.planning.nsw.gov.au).

In addition, the Department has identified several areas where further assessment or additional information is required (see **Attachment A**).

If you wish to discuss this matter, please contact Jessie Evans.

Yours sincerely,

*Howard Reed*

Howard Reed

Director

Resource Assessments

*27.5.16*



## Attachment A

### Water

#### 1. Water

- a. Many public submitters raised the issue of existing subsidence impacts on Wambo Creek, and noted that repair works had not been undertaken to rectify existing damages. A large number of submissions also raised concerns over the mine's water storage system, noting previous dam collapses and waste water discharges. The Applicant should address these concerns by providing details regarding current management to prevent reoccurrences and contingency measures in place to mitigate against further such incidents. A discussion regarding the incidents, management and remediation should also be provided.
- b. Provide assessment of potential impacts on perched aquifers supporting the endangered Warkworth Sands Woodlands.
- c. Provide an assessment of the modification with respect to the *Aquifer Interference Policy's* minimal impact consideration regarding 'No mining activity to be below the natural ground surface within 200 metres laterally from the top of high bank or 100 metres vertically beneath (or the three dimensional extent of the alluvial water source – whichever is the lesser disturbance) of a highly connected surface water source that is defined as a "reliable water supply"'.

#### 2. Biodiversity

Section 8 of the Flora Assessment notes that the gas management infrastructure locations will be determined based on the location of threatened species. However, no indicative surface infrastructure layout has been provided. Provide a conceptual layout showing indicative locations of proposed surface infrastructure.

#### 3. Agriculture

The proposed surface development area has been assessed as Class 4 and 5 Land Soil Capability (LSC). Please provide predicted LSC for this area post-disturbance.

#### 4. Heritage

- a. The CHIA states that there would be no change in the currently approved subsidence parameters for the Wambo Homestead Complex or other buildings as a result of the modification. However, it also states the predicted additional vertical subsidence for the mounting yard and horse boxes will be 30mm and 60mm respectively. There is no assessment of whether the heritage values of the Wambo Homestead would be affected by this additional subsidence (MSEC 2016).
- b. Provide an assessment of potential impacts for 'Abandoned Stoney Creek'. Identify where this site is located in relation to the proposed modification, if it will be directly or indirectly impacted and any management or mitigation measures that may be required or undertaken.

#### 5. Air Quality

Although there is a predicted reduction in dust emissions, the proximity of the surface infrastructure area to sensitive receivers should be considered. The Department seeks clarification that the closest receivers to the proposed surface infrastructure would experience similar (or lower) air quality impacts than those previously approved.

#### 6. Noise

- a. Residence 19 A & B does not appear to be included in the ventilation system intrusive and amenity noise level assessment detailed within the noise impact assessment. This may be due to this residence having acquisition rights; however this should be clarified and justified. The EPA has requested that a noise limit of 35 dB(A) is adopted at this residence during both the construction and operation of the ventilation shafts, and all other activities associated with the site.

- b. The project specific impacts at sensitive receptors are not clearly identified in the Noise Review. There is predicted ventilation system intrusive and amenity noise emission levels for 2028, but not for the 2019 and 2023 scenarios. Please provide clarification that 2028 is the worst case scenario, and if it is not, provide the results of 2019 and 2023 modelling along with appropriate discussion.

**7. Peabody's Financial Status**

DPE requests that the RTS provide an update on the current status of Peabody Energy Australia and discussion regarding any implications this may have for ongoing mine site management.

**8. Agency and public submissions**

DPE requests the RTS consider and respond to all agency and public submissions received, including advice presented and recommendations made therein.