

Appendix B

Secretary's Environmental Assessment Requirements

Appendix B Secretary's Environmental Assessment Requirements

ONeill, Alison

From: Garry Bailey <gBailey@bloomcoll.com.au>
Sent: Wednesday, 22 March 2017 2:04 PM
To: Murphy, Simon; Greg Lamb; Simon Grassby; Jeff Dunn
Cc: Brendon Clements
Subject: FW: Bloomfield Collieries Proposed Modification

Simon

Thomas has come back with the requirements for the modification. Bloomfield will discuss the biodiversity with Hunter Eco re the biodiversity and develop the additional rehabilitation plan required.

Regards

Garry

From: thomas.watt@planning.nsw.gov.au [mailto:thomas.watt@planning.nsw.gov.au]
Sent: Wednesday, 22 March 2017 1:52 PM
To: Garry Bailey <gBailey@bloomcoll.com.au>
Cc: Howard.Reed@planning.nsw.gov.au
Subject: FW: Bloomfield Collieries Proposed Modification

Hi Garry,

Thanks for consulting further with us on the environmental assessment requirements (EARs) for the proposed modification at Bloomfield Colliery.

We have reviewed the EARs and made some revisions (marked up in red below). In summary, these revisions include:

- additional requirements in relation to biodiversity;
- consideration of all reasonable and feasible measures to minimise final voids, including a scenario in which Abel mine does not recommence operations (ie. no further tailings are available for backfilling pits).

We have also included advice about proposed legislative changes to Part 3A transitional arrangements (ie. removal of s.75W).

Regards,

Thomas Watt

Senior Planning Officer
Resource Assessments
320 Pitt Street | GPO Box 39 | Sydney NSW 2001
T 02 9274 6375



Subscribe to our [newsletter](#)

From: Garry Bailey [<mailto:gBailey@bloomcoll.com.au>]

Sent: Tuesday, 21 March 2017 3:31 PM

Cc: Howard Reed <Howard.Reed@planning.nsw.gov.au>; Thomas Watt <thomas.watt@planning.nsw.gov.au>

Subject: RE: Bloomfield Collieries Proposed Modification

Hi Howard

The email below was the departments requirements for a Bloomfield Mine consent modification, that would enable mining operations to continue up to the approved mining operations limit at the Abel Mine. Mining will be contained within the current approval area. Bloomfield has a preliminary engagement with suitable environmental specialists to complete this task when the departments final requirements are known.

Are there any additional or changed requirements for Bloomfield to complete this consent modification?

Kind regards, Garry

Garry Bailey

General Manager of Mining Development

The Bloomfield Group - *Celebrating 80 years in Business*

PO Box 4, EAST MAITLAND NSW 2323

Tele: 612 4930 2618 | Fax: 612 4933 8940 | Mob: 0407 938 003

Email: gbailey@bloomcoll.com.au | Website: www.bloomcoll.com.au

Please note: If you have received this e-mail in error, please notify the sender immediately by reply e-mail and delete all copies of this transmission together with any attachments as the information contained and any attached files may be confidential and/or subject of legal professional privilege.

P Please consider the environment before printing this email

From: Colin.Phillips@planning.nsw.gov.au [mailto:Colin.Phillips@planning.nsw.gov.au]
Sent: Monday, 16 November 2015 3:05 PM
To: Garry Bailey
Cc: Howard.Reed@planning.nsw.gov.au; thomas.watt@planning.nsw.gov.au
Subject: FW: Bloomfield Collieries Proposed Modification

Good Afternoon Garry,

I refer to your letter dated 9 November 2015 requesting environmental assessment requirements for the modification (by S.75w) of Bloomfield Coal Project to extend the operational life of the mine from 2021 until 2030 and recover additional available coal resources from within the existing approved extraction area.

The Department considers, based on the information presented, that the proposed modification falls within the scope of a Section 75W modification.

However, as you may be aware, current legislative updates propose the removal of transitional arrangements for Part 3A projects, including s.75W (refer [here](#) for more information). In the event that this occurs while you are preparing your application, the project approval may be transitioned to an SSD, which can only be modified under s.96 of the EP&A Act. In the event that this occurs, the modification would need to demonstrate that the proposed development remains substantially the same as the development originally approved (see for example s.96(2) of the EP&A Act).

It is recommended that you further consult with the Department if and when these changes to the EP&A Act are made.

The Department considers the environmental assessment for the **modification application** should include the following requirements:

Preliminary requirements

- a clear description of the existing approved operation and the proposed development;
- the likely interactions between the development and any other existing, approved or proposed developments in the vicinity of the site;
- a list of any approvals that must be obtained before the development may commence;
- an assessment of the likely impacts of the development on the environment, focussing on the specific issues identified below, including:
 - a description of the existing environment likely to be affected by the development, using sufficient baseline data;
 - an assessment of the likely impacts of all stages of the development, including any cumulative impacts, taking into consideration any relevant laws, environmental planning instruments, guidelines, policies, plans and industry codes of practice;
 - a description of the measures that would be implemented to mitigate and/or offset the likely impacts of the development, and an assessment of:
 - o whether these measures are consistent with industry best practice, and represent the full range of reasonable and feasible mitigation measures that could be implemented;
 - o the likely effectiveness of these measures; and
 - o whether contingency plans would be necessary to manage any residual risks; and
 - a description of any measures that would be implemented to monitor and report on the environmental performance of the development if it is approved;

- consideration of the development against all relevant environmental planning instruments (including Part 3 of the *State Environmental Planning Policy (Mining, Petroleum Production and Extractive Industries) 2007*); and
- the reasons why the modification should be approved having regard to biophysical, economic and social considerations, including the principles of ecologically sustainable development.

Biodiversity

- An assessment of any likely biodiversity impacts of the project having regard to any advice and/or guidelines (eg. the Framework for Biodiversity Assessment) from OEH or the Commonwealth Department of Environment and Energy.
- Any resulting offset strategy, prepared in accordance with OEH and DoEE requirements.

Noise

- A noise and blasting impact assessment of the likely operational noise impacts of the development under the *NSW Industrial Noise Policy* (INP), paying particular attention to the obligations in Chapters 8 and 9 of the INP.

Air quality

- An assessment of the likely air quality impacts of the development in accordance with the **current** *Approved Methods for the Modelling and Assessment of Air Pollutants in NSW*.

Soil and Water

- The EA will be required to demonstrate that the existing water management system is adequate in its existing, or in an upgraded form to accommodate the development. This should be in accordance with the *Managing Urban Stormwater: Soils & Construction Guideline Volume 2E: Mines and Quarries*. A new soil and water management plan may be required.

Groundwater

- The EA will be required to assess whether the recovery of deeper coal seams would cause any change to the groundwater resources intercepted by the development and any resultant changes to the site's water balance and water management system.

Visual impacts and rehabilitation

- The EA should discuss any visual impacts that may be greater than approved due to the increased extraction of coal and movement of overburden and any changes to the proposed rehabilitation of the site.
- Changes to the final landform and how this may affect the rehabilitation of the mine need to be clearly shown in the EA. **In particular, the EA should demonstrate that all reasonable and feasible measures have been implemented in mine planning to maximise the use of additional overburden from extracting deeper coal seams to minimise the size of final voids. This should include a scenario that assumes Abel mine does not recommence operations and transfer tailings for backfilling pits at Bloomfield.**

Social and economic

- The EA should identify the economic benefits (such as jobs) of the proposal and any implications on the demand for local infrastructure and services.

Consultation

- Finally, you should also consult with relevant local and State government authorities in particular, including Council, EPA, OEH, DRE and DoEE any local landholders and/or residences who may be affected by the proposal, and any interested community groups. The EA should report on this consultation.

