Planning, Industry & Environment

Mr Chris Lauritzen
General Manager – Resource Development
MACH Energy Australia Pty Ltd

Via email: chris.lauritzen@machenergy.com.au;

27/08/2021

Dear Mr Lauritzen

Mount Pleasant Optimisation Project (SSD-10418)
Request for Additional Information

The Department is continuing to progress its assessment of the Mount Pleasant Optimisation Project (SSD 10418) and has identified several areas where additional information is required (see **Attachment A**).

Please provide the information or notification that the information will not be provided, by **Thursday 16 September 2021**. If you are unable to provide the information by this date, you may request an alternative timeframe.

If you have any questions regarding this matter, please contact Tegan Cole, on 02 9895 6457 or via email at Tegan.Cole@planning.nsw.gov.au.

Yours sincerely,

Carl Dumpleton
A/Director
Resource Assessments (Coal & Quarries)

cc: sbartlam@resourcestrategies.com.au

Enclosed: Attachment A

Attachment A

Noise and Blasting Assessment

1. Please review the footnotes associated with each of the receivers listed in Table 6-12 of the Noise and Blasting Assessment against condition 1 and condition 2 of Schedule 3 of DA 92/97 to ensure the correct allocation of acquisition and/or mitigation rights for receivers under Development Consent DA 92/97. Should any changes be required, please revise Table 6-12 and any subsequent text in the assessment.

Employment

2. Please provide clarification regarding projected workforce numbers for the project throughout the EIS. Please clarify:
   a. the total average additional employment (full-time equivalent positions) for:
      - project construction over the life of the project; and
      - project operations over the life of the project.
   b. the maximum work force numbers (full-time equivalent positions) for:
      - project construction; and
      - project operations.

Rossgole Communication Facilities

3. Regarding the community and Muswellbrook Council's concerns with the Rossgole transmission facilities, please clarify if the increased elevation of the project's integrated waste rock emplacement would impact upon the ability of the tower to transmit radio, television and emergency broadcasts to Muswellbrook.

Traffic

4. The EIS indicated that two options are proposed for the Northern Link Road alignment, noting that only one of these options would be developed. Please provide an outline of the key milestones and dates for determining the final alignment and completion of the associated works for the Northern Link Road (i.e., detailed engineering design, private landowners consent, obtaining approval under section 138 consent under the *Roads Act 1993*, additional consultation with Council).

Heritage

5. For the purposes of clarifying the area of land that would be subject to future Aboriginal Heritage surveys, please provide:
   a. a detailed figure showing the 13.8 hectares of unsurveyed land within the proposed Northern Link Road area. Please include the Development Consent approval boundary (DA 92/97), the mining lease boundaries (ML1645, ML1708, ML1808, ML1709, ML1750, ML1713) and the project disturbance area boundaries (SSD 10418); and
   b. a detailed figure showing the total land that remains unsurveyed within the Development Consent approval boundary (DA 92/97), the mining lease boundaries (ML1645, ML1708, ML1808, ML1709, ML1750, ML1713) and the project disturbance area boundaries (SSD 10418).

6. To clarify the location of the separate 'SSD Zones' referred to in the Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment, please provide a detailed figure (or series of figures) showing each of the 15 zones discussed in the Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment (i.e. zones A-A4, A1R-A4R, B-B4 and C). Please include the Development Consent approval boundary (DA 92/97), the mining lease boundaries (ML1645, ML1708, ML1808, ML1709, ML1750, ML1713) and the project disturbance area boundaries (SSD 10418) for each figure.

Final Void

7. Further analysis and justification is required with respect to the proposed final landform. In particular:

   a. The EIS does not provide sufficient information and justification for the size and depth of the final void. Please clarify the size and depth of the proposed final void and the proposed slope (%) of the internal batters;
   b. Further options analysis should be provided to refine and improve the design of the proposed final void. For example, reducing the total depth, total size, and slope of the internal batters (currently up to 18 degrees); and

c. Please provide a comparison of the proposed final void for the project relative to the currently approved final voids, including size and depth of the voids and a figure showing their relative locations.