



PINE DALE MINE ANNUAL REVIEW 2024

Prepared by Enhance Place Pty Ltd

27 February 2025

TITLE BLOCK

Name of Operation:	Pine Dale Mine
Name of Operator:	Enhance Place Pty Limited
Project Approval Number:	10_0041
Project Approval Holder:	Enhance Place Pty Limited
Mining Lease Numbers:	ML1569, ML1578, ML1664, ML1637
Mining Lease Holder:	Enhance Place Pty Limited
Environment Protection Licence Anniversary Date:	24 November
Water Licence Number:	10WA118780
Water Licence Holder:	Enhance Place Pty Ltd
Rehabilitation Management Plan Commencement Date:	1 July 2022
Forward Plan Anniversary Date:	30 June
Annual Review Start Date:	1 January 2024
Annual Review End Date:	31 December 2024
Annual Review Report Author:	Muhammad Hayyat (RCA Australia)
I, Graham Goodwin, certify that this audit report is a true and accurate record of the compliance status of Pine Dale Mine, for the period 1 January 2024 to 31 December 2024 and that I am authorised to make this statement on behalf of Enhance Place Pty Ltd. <i>Note.</i> <i>a) The Annual Review is an 'environmental audit' for the purposes of section 9.39 of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979. Section 9.42 provides that a person must not include false or misleading information (or provide information for inclusion in) an audit report produced to the Minister in connection with an environmental audit if the person knows that the information is false or misleading in a material respect. The maximum penalty is Tier 3 monetary penalty.</i> <i>b) The Crimes Act 1900 contains other offences relating to false and misleading information: section 192G (Intention to defraud by false or misleading statement—maximum penalty 5 years imprisonment); sections 307A, 307B and 307C (False or misleading applications/information/documents—maximum penalty 2 years imprisonment or a fine of 200 penalty units or both).</i>	
Authorised Reporting Officer:	Graham Goodwin
Title:	Mining Engineering Manager
Signature:	
Date:	27 February 2025

STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE

The Pine Dale Mine (PDM) Annual Review has been prepared to provide a summary of the performance of PDM operations during the period 1 January 2024 – 31 December 2024 (the reporting period).

This Annual Review has been prepared pursuant to Schedule 5, Condition 3 of the Project Approval 10_0041, and in accordance with the Annual Review Guideline developed by the NSW Department of Planning and Environment (Ref [1]).

A summary of the PDM compliance status during this reporting period is provided in **Table 1**. There was one (1) non-compliance during the 2024 reporting period and a description of the administrative non-compliance are provided in **Table 2**. The non-compliance status recorded during the reporting period has been ranked according to the risk included in **Table 3**.

Table 1 *Statement of compliance*

Approval No.	Were all conditions of the approval complied with?
PA 10_0041	No
EPL 4911	Yes
ML1569	Yes
ML1578	Yes
ML1664	Yes
ML1637	Yes
10WA118780	Yes

Table 2 *Non-Compliances*

Relevant Approval	Condition #	Condition Description Summary	Compliance Status	Comment	Where Addressed in Annual Review
PA 10_0041	Condition 18	Air quality monitoring requirements of the Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Management Plan	Non-compliant	Results from dust gauges D1, D2-D6, and PCB1-PCB3, PCB7 were collected one (1) day outside recommended (Ref [7]) exposure period and no results from dust gauge D5 due to broken bottle in November. Did not comply to the Australian Standard.	Section 5.2
PA 10_0041	27 (c) Groundwater Management Plan	Groundwater monitoring requirements of Groundwater Management Plan.	Non-compliant	Yarraboldy Groundwater monitoring schedule unable to be adhered to due to the State Forest closure, safety risks accessing bores caused by bushfire damage and saturated ground, and overgrown vegetation obscuring bore location.	Section 6.2

Table 3 *Compliance status Key for Table 2*

Risk Level	Colour Code	Description
High	Non-compliant	Non-compliance with potential for significant environmental consequences, regardless of the likelihood of occurrence
Medium	Non-compliant	Non-compliance with: - Potential for serious environmental consequences, but is unlikely to occur; or - Potential for moderate environmental consequences but is likely to occur.
Low	Non-compliant	Non-compliance with: - Potential for moderate environmental consequences, but is unlikely to occur; or - Potential for low environmental consequences, but is likely to occur
Administrative non-compliance	Non-compliant	Only to be applied where the non-compliance does not result in any risk of environmental harm (e.g., submitting a report to government later than required under approval conditions).

There were no reportable incidents, official cautions, warning letters, penalty notices or prosecution proceedings by any regulatory body during the reporting period.

An acceptable standard of environmental performance was achieved during the reporting period as evidenced by the following:

- Air quality monitoring results recorded during the reporting period for depositional dust were below the air quality criteria stipulated in the Project Approval 10_0041 at all monitoring locations with the exception of the January and March 2024 results from dust gauge D6 which increased by more than NSW EPA threshold of 2g/m² from the December 2023 and February 2024 monitoring results respectively. The majority of the D6 results are from combustible matter such as insects and other organic matter and not considered to indicate airborne particulates from soil disturbance works at PDM.
- There were no noise exceedances from mining activities recorded at privately owned properties during the reporting period.
- There were no surface water discharge events during the reporting period.
- The standing water level at onsite bore P6 and P7 were above the trigger levels throughout the reporting period which is consistent with expectations following above average rainfall during previous reporting periods.
- There were some intermittent exceedances of groundwater chemistry trigger levels during the reporting period; however, these are considered to be primarily due to climatic influences (increased rainfall) and potential ingress of water into the underground workings outside of the control and influence of PDM.
- There were some intermittent exceedances of surface water trigger levels during the reporting period; however, these are considered to be due to activities upstream of PDM and / or natural variation and not associated with activities undertaken by PDM during the reporting period.

During the reporting period, an assessment of rehabilitation areas was completed. Rehabilitation areas are generally stable in both the pasture and treed revegetation areas, whilst weed presence continues to be adequately controlled. It is recommended to continue weed management and monitoring of performance indicators over the 2025 reporting period.

Contents

1	INTRODUCTION	1
1.1	KEY PERSONNEL	2
2	APPROVALS, LEASES AND LICENCES	2
3	OPERATIONS SUMMARY	3
3.1	EXPLORATION	3
3.2	LAND PREPARATION	3
3.3	CONSTRUCTION	3
3.4	MINING OPERATIONS	3
3.5	COAL PROCESSING	4
3.6	COAL TRANSPORTING	4
3.7	WASTE MANAGEMENT	4
3.8	PRODUCT STOCKPILES	4
3.9	HAZARDOUS MATERIAL MANAGEMENT	4
3.10	FORECAST OPERATIONS	4
4	ACTIONS REQUIRED FROM PREVIOUS ANNUAL REVIEW	5
5	ENVIRONMENTAL PERFORMANCE	5
5.1	NOISE	6
5.2	AIR QUALITY	8
5.2.1	DEPOSITIONAL DUST	8
5.3	METEOROLOGICAL MONITORING	10
5.3.1	RAINFALL	11
5.3.2	TEMPERATURE	11
5.3.3	WIND SPEED AND DIRECTION	12
5.3.4	RELATIVE HUMIDITY	12
5.4	EROSION AND SEDIMENT	14
5.5	CONTAMINATED AND POLLUTED LAND	14
5.6	THREATENED FLORA AND FAUNA	14
5.6.1	PURPLE COPPER BUTTERFLY	14
5.6.2	AUSTRAL TOADFLAX (THESIUM AUSTRALE)	15
5.7	WEEDS AND FERAL ANIMALS	15
5.8	BLASTING	16
5.9	VISUAL AND STRAY LIGHT	16
5.10	ABORIGINAL HERITAGE	16
5.11	NATURAL HERITAGE	16
5.12	SPONTANEOUS COMBUSTION	16
5.13	MINE SUBSIDENCE	16
5.14	BUSHFIRE	16
5.15	METHANE DRAINAGE AND VENTILATION	17
5.16	PUBLIC SAFETY	17
6	WATER MANAGEMENT	18
6.1	GROUNDWATER	18
6.2	GROUNDWATER MONITORING	18
6.2.1	GROUNDWATER ASSESSMENT CRITERIA	20
6.2.2	GROUNDWATER QUALITY AND SWL	22
6.3	STORED WATER	28

6.4	SURFACE WATER MONITORING.....	28
6.4.1	SURFACE WATER ASSESSMENT CRITERIA	29
6.4.2	SURFACE WATER QUALITY	31
6.5	CHANNEL STABILITY AND STREAM HEALTH MONITORING	38
7	REHABILITATION	40
7.1	REHABILITATION PERFORMANCE DURING THE REPORTING PERIOD.....	41
7.1.1	AGREED POST REHABILITATION LAND USE	41
7.1.2	REHABILITATION STATUS SUMMARY	42
7.1.3	YARRABOLDY EXTENSION REHABILITATION PERFORMANCE.....	45
7.1.4	AREA A REHABILITATION PERFORMANCE.....	46
7.1.5	AREA B AND C REHABILITATION PERFORMANCE	51
7.1.6	AREA 8 REHABILITATION PERFORMANCE	52
7.1.7	ADDITIONAL REHABILITATION MAINTENANCE WORKS.....	54
7.1.8	RENOVATION / REMOVAL OF BUILDINGS.....	54
7.1.9	REHABILITATION FORMAL SIGN OFF	54
7.1.10	REHABILITATION TRIALS AND RESEARCH	54
7.1.11	THREATS TO REHABILITATION SUCCESS	54
7.2	ACTIONS FOR THE 2025 REPORTING PERIOD	55
8	COMMUNITY RELATIONS	56
8.1	ENVIRONMENTAL COMPLAINTS	56
8.2	COMMUNITY	56
8.2.1	COMMUNITY CONSULTIVE COMMITTEE	56
8.2.2	WEBSITE INFORMATION.....	57
8.2.3	SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC CONTRIBUTIONS.....	57
9	INDEPENDENT ENVIRONMENTAL AUDIT	57
10	INCIDENTS AND NON-COMPLIANCES.....	58
11	PROPOSED ACTIVITIES IN THE NEXT REPORTING PERIOD	58
11.1	MINING.....	58
11.2	FUTURE MINING DEVELOPMENT	59
11.3	DOCUMENT REVIEWS.....	59
	REFERENCES	59

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

SITE PLANS

APPENDIX B

ENVIRONMENTAL MONITORING SUMMARY REPORT

APPENDIX C

PDM 2024 REHABILITATION MONITORING REPORT (REF [4])

1 INTRODUCTION

EnergyAustralia acquired Enhance Place Pty Ltd (Enhance Place) which owns and operates the Pine Dale Mine (PDM) in June 2012.

PDM is located at Blackmans Flat in NSW, 17km north of Lithgow off the Castlereagh Highway. The site is approximately 3km via the Castlereagh Highway from the Mt. Piper Power Station (MPPS). A locality plan is provided in **Plan 1, Appendix A**.

PDM is authorised by Project Approval (PA) 10_0041, dated 20 February 2011, granted by the former Department of Planning and Infrastructure, currently the Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure (DPHI), under section 75J of the Environmental Planning & Assessment Act 1979 (EP&A Act). The Project Approval provided for the extraction of up to 800,000 tonnes of Run of Mine (ROM) coal from the Yarraboldy Extension at PDM up to 31 December 2014 at a maximum rate of 350,000 tonnes per annum. Approved mining resources at PDM were exhausted in March 2014. From April 2014 the mine was placed under care and maintenance, with only rehabilitation activities undertaken intermittently at the site from this time.

This Annual Review (AR) has been generated to meet:

- The requirements of the NSW DPHI (Ref [1]), under the conditions of a development consent and/ or project approval.
- The routine reporting expectations of the NSW Resources Regulator.
- The annual reporting requirements of the Environment Protection Authority (EPA) under the conditions of the site Environmental Protection Licence 4911.

This Annual Review will be distributed to the following stakeholders:

- NSW DPHI – Compliance.
- Department of Regional NSW – Resources Regulator.
- NSW Department of Climate Change, Energy, the Environment and Water (DCCEEW) – Natural Resources Access Regulator.
- NSW Environment Protection Authority.
- Lithgow City Council.
- Community Consultative Committee (CCC) via the EnergyAustralia website (<https://www.energyaustralia.com.au/about-us/energy-generation/pine-dale-coal-mine/yarraboldy-stage-1>).

1.1 KEY PERSONNEL

The key personnel for environmental management at the PDM are listed in **Table 1-1**.

Table 1-1 *Key Personnel and contact information*

Contact Person	Position	Telephone	Email
Mr Graham Goodwin	Mining Engineering Manager	(02) 6354 8111	community@energyaustralia.com.au
Mr Mark Frewin	Coal Supply Lead	(02) 6354 8111	community@energyaustralia.com.au
Mr Ben Eastwood	NSW Environment Leader	(02) 6354 8111	community@energyaustralia.com.au

2 APPROVALS, LEASES AND LICENCES

PDM operates in accordance with a number of relevant licenses and approvals which are summarised in **Table 2-1**. The mining and exploration lease boundaries are shown in **Plan 2, Appendix A**.

Table 2-1 *Pine Dale Mine Consents, Leases and Licences*

Permit Type	Permit Number	Relevant Dates	Description
Project Approval	PA 10_0041	Granted 20 Feb 2011 Expired 31 Dec 2014	Granted by Minister of DP&I, Section 75J of the EP&A Act. A modification to PA 10_0041 was granted in March 2012.
Referral Decision	2011/6016	Date of Decision 20 October 2011	Issued by Department of Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities under section 75 & 77A of the EPBC Act 1999; to avoid impact on Purple Copper Butterfly & Austral toadflax (<i>Thesium australe</i>).
Environment Protection Licence	EPL 4911	Anniversary Date 24 November	EPL held by Enhance Place Pty Ltd.
Mining Lease	ML1578	Granted 5 November 2013	ML 1578 incorporates 69.4 hectares (ha) of land within the boundary of the PDM site.
Mining Lease	ML1664	Grouped under ML1578, 5 November 2013	ML 1664 incorporates 4.1ha of land within the boundary of the PDM site.
Mining Lease	ML1569	Grouped under ML1578, 5 November 2013	ML1569 incorporates 161ha of land with the Yarraboldy Extension and a portion of PDM.
Mining Lease	ML1637	Grouped under ML1578, 5 November 2013	ML1637 covers an area to the south of PDM for the purpose of proposed rail infrastructure.

Permit Type	Permit Number	Relevant Dates	Description
Exploration Mining Lease	EL7621	Granted 1 October 2010	EL 7621 incorporates 312ha of land within the northwestern and central parts of the Wallerawang Colliery.
Bore Licence	10BL 165933	Issued 22 December 2005	Issued by the Department of Natural Resources (DNR) under Part 5 of the Water Act 1912 for the use of (6) six piezometers for monitoring groundwater levels and quality on the PDM site.
Bore Licence	10BL 603588	Issued 17 December 2010	Issued by the DNR under Part 5 of the Water Act 1912 for the use of eight (8) piezometers for monitoring groundwater levels and quality on the Yarraboldy Extension.
Water Access Licence	WAL 36480 (approval no 10WA118780)	Dated 1 July 2013 Expires 30 June 2026	This licence was issued by the (former) Department of Environment Climate Change and Water under Part 5 of the Water Act 1912 for interception and use of up to 200ML of groundwater per year from The Bong.

3 OPERATIONS SUMMARY

PDM was in care and maintenance during the reporting period, as such, no extractive mining operations were undertaken.

3.1 EXPLORATION

There were no exploration drilling activities carried out at PDM during the reporting period.

3.2 LAND PREPARATION

There were no land preparation activities carried out at PDM during the reporting period.

3.3 CONSTRUCTION

No construction work was undertaken at PDM during the reporting period.

3.4 MINING OPERATIONS

There were no mining activities undertaken at PDM during the reporting period: PDM is currently in care and maintenance. The production and waste summary for 2023, 2024 and forecast for 2025 is provided in **Table 3-1**.

Table 3-1 *Production Summary*

	Approved Limit	2023 Reporting Period (actual)	2024 Reporting Period (actual)	2025 Reporting Period (forecast)
Waste Rock / Overburden	NA	0	0	0
ROM Coal	800,000tonne (over life of mine)	0	0	0
Coarse Reject	NA	0	0	0
Fine Reject (Tailings)	NA	0	0	0
Saleable product	350,000tonne per annum	0	0	0

3.5 COAL PROCESSING

Due to the care and maintenance status of PDM, no coal was processed during the reporting period. The coal crushing plant was decommissioned at the completion of mining extraction in April 2014.

3.6 COAL TRANSPORTING

Due to the care and maintenance status of PDM, no product coal was required to be transported during the reporting period.

3.7 WASTE MANAGEMENT

General waste bins are kept at the site office for the collection of putrescible waste. These bins are inspected and emptied as part of the regular inspection and maintenance programme. Minimal general waste is generated at PDM as the mine in care and maintenance.

Sewage management facilities associated with personnel offices were maintained at the site during the reporting period with regular inspections and pump outs undertaken as required.

3.8 PRODUCT STOCKPILES

All product stockpiles were decommissioned prior to the reporting period.

3.9 HAZARDOUS MATERIAL MANAGEMENT

There are no bulk oils stored on site and none were brought onto site during the reporting period. In the event hazardous materials are to be brought on site, they are to be accompanied by Safety Data Sheets (SDS).

3.10 FORECAST OPERATIONS

There are no operations forecast for PDM during 2025. The mine will continue to remain under care and maintenance.

4 ACTIONS REQUIRED FROM PREVIOUS ANNUAL REVIEW

The 2023 Annual Review recommended:

- Weed management and fertilising as part of rehabilitation activities. Chemical control and fertilising have been undertaken (refer **Section 5.7**) and audited against relevant legislative requirements. The current status is considered satisfactory, and it continues to be monitored.
- Installation of nesting boxes once the treed area contains adequate structure to support nesting birds.
- Stabilisation of the minor slumping at Transect 5 and monitoring for any further erosion.

Relinquishment of successfully remediated Areas B, C and 8 (as confirmed by the 2018 SLR Rehabilitation and Completion Assessment report (Ref [2])) was intended to be further progressed during the 2024 reporting period.

There were no further specific actions (other than maintenance requirements) from the 2023 Annual Review.

5 ENVIRONMENTAL PERFORMANCE

PDM regards sound environmental performance and community liaison as integral components of its operations.

Environmental monitoring and management at PDM are governed by the requirements of PA 10_0041 and the supporting environmental assessment. The following management plans have been developed for PDM to minimise the potential risk to the surrounding environment.

- PDM Rehabilitation Management Plan, Ref [3]).
- Aboriginal Heritage Management Plan.
- Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Management Plan.
- Blast Management Plan.
- Bushfire Management Plan.
- Waste Management Plan.
- Water Management Plan.
- Noise Management Plan.
- Pollution Incident Response Management Plan.
- Pine Dale Mine Environmental Management Strategy.

These management plans are available on the EnergyAustralia website.

A summary of the environmental performance for noise and air quality monitoring is provided in **Table 5-1**. Applicable approval and Environmental Assessment criteria are also provided in **Table 5-1**. Detailed discussions of the environmental performance are presented further in this section.

Meteorological data is collected from the existing Mt. Piper Power Station (MPPS) weather station.

Table 5-1 *Summary of Environmental Performance and assessment criteria*

Aspect	Approval Criteria	Environment Assessment Prediction	Performance during 2024	Trends /Management Implications	Management Actions
Noise	NM1 – NM3 Daytime Criterion 42dB(A) $L_{Aeq}(15\text{minute})^a$	NM1 41 NM2 32 NM3 39 dB(A) $L_{Aeq}(15\text{minute})$	NM1 Nil detected. NM2 Nil detected. NM3 Nil detected. dB(A) $L_{Aeq}(15\text{minute})$	Not Applicable (NA) – no operational noise generated	Nil management actions required
	NM4 – NM6 Daytime Criterion 35dB(A) $L_{Aeq}(15\text{minute})^a$	NM4 34 NM6 <30 dB(A) $L_{Aeq}(15\text{minute})$	NM4 Nil detected. NM5 Nil detected. NM6 Nil detected. dB(A) $L_{Aeq}(15\text{minute})$	NA – no operational noise generated	Nil management actions required
Air Quality: Depositional Dust	Maximum total deposited dust 4g/m ² /month	Annual average of 3.2g/m ² /month deposited dust	Annual average range of 0.5 to 1.8g/m ² /month deposited dust	Concentrations during previous five (5) years are considered consistent noting that there has been impact to the results from external factors (climate and bushfires in 2019 and 2020)	Maintain dust suppression measures as required
	Maximum increase in deposited dust 2g/m ² /month	Annual average increase of deposited dust 1.2g/m ² /month	Monthly change of -6.2 to 6.6g/m ² . Annual average change -0.1 to 1.4g/m ² /month deposited dust	Annual average dust levels are generally consistent with 2021-2023 data and less than 2020 data except D6 which has the highest annual average in the 2011-2024 data set.	Ensure dust suppression measures are efficiently utilised during extended dry periods, otherwise maintain current measures as required.

^a The A-weighted, equivalent continuous sound level in decibels measured across 15-minutes.

5.1 NOISE

Mining related noise impacts at PDM are managed in accordance with Schedule 3, Condition 1 of PA 10_0041, EPL 4911 and the Noise Management Plan. Noise emissions from PDM operations were monitored on a quarterly basis at six (6) locations surrounding PDM. Although PDM is currently in care and maintenance, rehabilitation maintenance activities and inspections were undertaken on the site during the 2024 reporting period. The noise monitoring locations are described as:

- NM1 – Noon Street, Blackman's Flat.

- NM2 – former Cherry residence, Blackman's Flat.
- NM3 – front of Barnes residence, east of Blackman's Flat along the Castlereagh Highway.
- NM4 – North of View Street, Blackman's Flat.
- NM5 – Fraser residence, Wolgan Road, Lidsdale.
- NM6 – Turek residence, Wolgan Road, Lidsdale.

The locations of these noise monitoring locations are shown in **Plan 3a**, located in **Appendix A**.

The operational noise assessment criteria are summarised in **Table 5-2**.

Table 5-2 *Noise Impact Assessment Criteria*

Location	Day ^a Period L _{Aeq} (15min), dB	Evening ^b Period L _{Aeq} (15min), dB
NM1	42	39
NM2	42	35
NM3	42	35
NM4	35	35
NM5	35	35
NM6	35	35

^a Day is defined as the period from 7am to 6pm Monday to Saturday and 8am to 6pm Sundays and public holidays.

^b Evening is defined as the period between 6pm and 10pm.

Attended noise monitoring was undertaken quarterly during the reporting period to assess any noise impacts from PDM against the relevant criteria detailed within EPL 4911 and PA 10_0041 (**Table 5-2**) on the following dates:

- Quarter 1 – January to March, monitoring conducted 25 & 26 March 2024.
- Quarter 2 – April to June, monitoring conducted 16 & 17 May 2024.
- Quarter 3 – July to September, monitoring conducted on 23 & 24 September 2024.
- Quarter 4 – October to December, monitoring conducted on 5 November 2024.

The measured L_{Aeq} 15 minutes noise contribution from PDM was below the noise assessment criteria for all 15-minute surveys at all noise monitoring locations measured during the reporting period. Similarly, the measured noise contribution from PDM was below the noise levels predicted in the Environmental Assessment (refer **Table 5-1**). Audible noise emanating from PDM operations have not been detected during noise surveys since the cessation of mining operations in April 2014.

Results for each noise monitoring survey during the 2024 reporting period are presented in full in **Appendix B**.

During the reporting period, no environmental performance or management measures were required to be implemented at the site in respect to noise generation by PDM.

5.2 AIR QUALITY

During care and maintenance, water for dust suppression is to be sourced from the onsite sediment basins.

Air quality at PDM is managed in accordance with Schedule 3, Condition 18 of PA 10_0041, EPL 4911 and the approved Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Management Plan.

The scope of air quality comprises five (5) depositional dust gauges (D1, D3, D4, D5 & D6) as shown on **Plan 3a, Appendix A**.

Four (4) additional dust gauges associated with the Purple Copper Butterfly (PCB) Monitoring Programme are located surrounding the Yarraboldy Extension. The PCB Monitoring Programme was prepared to address concerns raised by the Commonwealth Department of Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities (SEWPaC) (now Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry, DAFF). The PCB monitoring programme has been suspended as the decision relates to mining activities only, which have stopped at PDM and EnergyAustralia has notified the relevant Federal agency accordingly. EnergyAustralia has continued the dust monitoring for due diligence and to provide baseline data.

Monitoring is undertaken by RCA Australia; a summary report data collected throughout the monitoring period is available in **Appendix B**.

5.2.1 DEPOSITIONAL DUST

All deposited dust results have been compared to the nominated annual average assessment criterion of 4.0g/m²/month, as stipulated in PA 10_0041. Depositional dust results for the reporting period showed an annual average insoluble solids range of 0.5g/m²/month to 1.8g/m²/month across the nine (9) dust gauges.

Comparative annual average depositional data for the previous five (5) year period is presented in **Table 5-3**. Depositional dust data are presented graphically in **Figure 5-1**.

An examination of the historical data (**Table 5-3**) that the majority of 2024 annual averages are slightly higher than those from 2023; the averages for D4 and PCB7 is the same as 2023 and the average for PCB1 is slightly less. The average for D6 is significantly higher and 2023 and is the highest in the 2011-2024 data set, primarily due to two (2) monthly results (January 2024 and March 2024). All results remain below the NSW EPA criterion. The substantial decrease in the 2021 & 2022 annual averages of deposited dust concentrations when compared to the 2020 historical data is not considered to be due to a change in site activities at PDM as the mine has been in care and maintenance since 2014, rather it is considered to be influenced by the increased rainfall following prolonged dry conditions and associated correlation with dust storms and bushfires (observed in early 2020).

Table 5-3 *Depositional dust monitoring results*

Total insoluble solids (g/m ² per month)									
Date	D1	D3	D4	D5	D6	PCB1	PCB2	PCB3	PCB7
Jan-24	1.3	1.4	1.1	1.6	7.6	2.0	1.2	1.2	1.2
Feb-24	1.2	0.6	0.8	0.3	1.4	1.9	1.0	2.0	0.4
Mar-24	0.9	1.7	0.9	1.3	3.8	1.0	0.9	1.7	0.8
Apr-24	0.8	0.5	0.4	1.9	1.6	0.8	0.6	0.2	0.4
May-24	0.3	0.5	0.5	0.2	0.2	0.6	0.3	0.4	0.4
Jun-24	0.4	0.5	0.4	0.2	0.1	1.0	0.4	0.6	0.4
Jul-24	0.4	0.6	0.3	0.8	0.5	0.4	0.3	0.2	0.3
Aug-24	0.5	0.8	0.5	0.4	2.1	0.8	0.3	0.5	0.6
Sep-24	0.8	0.6	0.6	0.5	0.6	0.9	0.2	0.7	1.0
Oct-24	0.6	2.4	0.5	1.3	0.4	0.8	0.3	0.5	0.4
Nov-24	0.4	1.2	0.2	-	0.5	1.0	0.3	0.7	0.6
Dec-24	1.2	1.6	0.3	0.4	1.9	1.9	1.1	0.8	0.5
Annual Averages									
2020	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.6	1.1	1.9	1.1	1.1	1.1
2021	0.5	1.0	0.3	0.4	0.6	0.7	0.4	0.4	0.2
2022	0.6	0.5	0.3	0.5	0.8	0.8	0.4	0.5	0.5
2023	0.5	0.7	0.5	0.4	0.4	1.2	0.5	0.6	0.6
2024	0.7	1.0	0.5	0.8	1.8	1.1	0.6	0.8	0.6
Annual average assessment criterion: 4.0g/m ² /month									

Sample bottle for D5 broken in November 2024.




Figure 5-1 *Depositional dust data: 2020 – 2024*

The 2024 annual average deposited dust concentrations are shown to be significantly lower than the concentrations predicted in the site Environmental Assessment annual average criterion of 3.2g/m²/month annual average (refer **Table 5-1**), noting that the prediction was for an operational mine.

5.3 METEOROLOGICAL MONITORING

In accordance with Schedule 3, Condition 22 of PA 10_0041 and EPL 4911, data from the meteorological monitoring station situated at Mt. Piper Power Station (MPPS, located 3.2km to the west of PDM) is used to monitor conditions relating to revegetation and rehabilitation progress. Air temperature, wind direction, wind speed, solar radiation, sigma theta, rainfall, evapotranspiration and relative humidity data were collected from this station.

A summary of monthly meteorological conditions recorded during the 2024 reporting period are presented in the following sub-sections and in **Appendix B**.

The total annual rainfall and the minimum and maximum temperature at 2m from 2020 to 2024 are shown graphically in **Figure 5-2**.




Figure 5-2 Annual Temperature and Rainfall Summary: 2020 – 2024

5.3.1 RAINFALL

PDM received 770.6mm of rainfall across 203 rainfall days during the 2024 reporting period. Rainfall during this reporting period was observed to be greater than the annual rainfall recorded during 2023 and lower than that in 2020 to 2022 (**Figure 5-2**).

The Bureau of Meteorology (BoM) weather station located at Lithgow¹ (Birdwood Street) (approximately 16km from PDM), reported a long-term median² annual rainfall total (years 1889 – 2006) of 858.6mm. During the last five (5) years (**Figure 5-2**), the 2020 and 2022 monitoring periods are the only years that reported total rainfalls greater than the median (and the average). The 2021, 2023 and 2024 received below median annual rainfall.

The monthly rainfall data for 2024 is summarised in **Table 5-4**.

5.3.2 TEMPERATURE

Temperature is monitored at two (2) heights (2 metres and 10 metres above the ground surface) to account for temperature inversions. The maximum temperatures recorded during the reporting period were 34.3°C at the 2m sensor and 33.4°C at the 10m sensor during February. The lowest temperatures were -7.0°C at 2m and -4.0°C at 10m in September.

A summary of monthly temperatures for 2024 is included in **Table 5-4**. A graphical presentation of annual temperature variations at 2m during the last five (5) years is presented in **Figure 5-2**.

¹ Data for the Coerwull Station (14km from PDM) was not available at date of access (19/1/2024)

² The use of median value is specified as the preferred measure for 'typical' rainfall from a meteorological perspective as it reduces bias from extreme rainfall events.

5.3.3 WIND SPEED AND DIRECTION

The wind direction at PDM during 2024 was observed to be primarily from the south-westerly quadrant with the exception in January and February where an east-south-easterly and an easterly direction respectively were observed (refer **Table 5-4**).

The maximum wind speed measured at the site was 13.8m/s during July when the predominant winds were from the west-south-west.

Sigma theta data was measured continuously throughout the entire 2024 monitoring period.

A summary of monthly wind speed, predominant directions and sigma theta recordings in 2024 is included in **Table 5-4**.

5.3.4 RELATIVE HUMIDITY

Relative humidity was measured during the reporting period. The lowest humidity, at 9.5%, was recorded in February, while the highest humidity, reaching 99.1%, occurred in January 2024. A summary of monthly humidity variations for 2024 is included in **Table 5-4**.

Table 5-4 Pine Dale Mine Meteorological Monitoring Summary 2024

Month	Rainfall (mm)	Cumulative Rainfall (mm)	No of Rain Days/ Month	Air Temp. @ 2m (°C)			Air Temp. @ 10m (°C)			Sigma theta (°)			Relative Humidity (%)			Wind Speed (m/s)			Modal Wind Direction
				Mean	Min	Max	Mean	Min	Max	Mean	Min	Max	Mean	Min	Max	Mean	Min	Max	
Jan	108.6	108.6	16	19.4	7.6	32.9	19.4	8.6	31.5	25	1	98	81	18.9	99.1	2	0.1	9.1	ESE
Feb	86.6	195.2	18	19.1	9.7	34.3	19.1	10.2	33.4	24	2	103	81	9.5	98.7	0	0.2	0.2	E
Mar	39.8	235	16	16.6	4.5	31.0	16.8	5.8	30.3	24	1	102	79	17.1	98.7	2	0.09	6.0	SW
April	98.6	333.6	19	11.7	0.3	26.7	12.2	2.0	26.0	21	2	101	82	16.3	98.6	2	0.09	6.2	WSW
May	49.8	383.4	24	8.7	-3.0	18.0	9.3	-2.0	18.0	22	1	99	87	18.0	99.0	2	0.1	7.1	SW
June	53.6	437	22	5.3	-5.0	14.0	6.0	-3.0	15.0	20	2	100	86	25.0	99.0	2	0.1	11.4	SW
July	44	481	22	5.2	-4.0	15.0	5.7	-2.0	15.0	19	2	100	82	34.0	98.0	3	0.2	13.8	WSW
Aug	60.2	541.2	23	8.6	-5.0	21.0	9.2	-3.0	21.0	24	2	101	77	18.0	99.0	2	0.1	9.4	WSW
Sept	28.4	569.6	12	9.3	-7.0	22.0	10.2	-4.0	22.0	22	2	99	64	13.0	99.0	3	0.1	11.5	WSW
Oct	15.2	584.8	11	12.2	1.3	24.9	12.8	2.3	24.0	23	2	102	69	19.3	98.5	2	0.1	8.7	WSW
Nov	122.8	707.6	10	15.5	2.3	29.9	17.2	4.3	30.4	25	2	101	71	19.0	98.6	2	0.1	8.6	SW
Dec	63	770.6	10	16.3	1.9	29.7	19.1	5.8	31.4	23	2	103	65	12	98.6	2	0.1	8.9	WSW
TOTAL				770.6	217	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	SW
Minimum				15.2	10	--	--	-7.0	--	--	1	--	--	9.5	--	--	0.09	--	--
Maximum				122.8	30	--	--	34.3	--	--	--	103	--	--	99.1	--	--	13.8	--

5.4 EROSION AND SEDIMENT

The erosion and sediment controls for PDM have been implemented to safeguard against soil loss and minimise potential water quality impacts. Erosion control structures have been installed around PDM with the principle aim of containing sediment at its source. All runoff from disturbed areas is contained in temporary pollution control ponds within the open cut mine and surrounding hardstand areas.

Exposed areas which have been disturbed by previous mining operations are controlled through the use of windrows constructed by subsoil and/or clay material. Once vegetation has been cleared and topsoil removed, subsoil and clay material are pushed against the interface between the disturbed and undisturbed area creating a windrow where the potential for erosion impacts exist. Exposed areas are also managed through the use of temporary measures, such as silt fencing, to avoid sedimentation impacts on downstream waterways until the area has been rehabilitated. Additionally, temporary sediment ponds are constructed downslope of disturbed areas to ensure the capture of 'dirty' water and enable treatment prior to discharge into the underground workings. The management measures for the control of erosion described above are also put in place to increase batter and bench stability prior to establishment of permanent rehabilitation measures, where possible.

Erosion control structures at PDM are inspected on a monthly basis by the Mining Engineering Manager, particularly after significant rainfall events and repaired where necessary. Erosion and sediment control works which were undertaken during the reporting period comprised the inspection and maintenance of windrows and silt fencing to prevent potential surface water impacts and sediment entering Wangcol Creek.

5.5 CONTAMINATED AND POLLUTED LAND

There was no land identified as being contaminated or polluted during the reporting period. In the unlikely event that contaminated material is identified at the site, the remedial actions taken shall be those outlined in the PDM RMP (Ref [3]), whereby the affected material is either treated on-site or disposed of offsite by a licenced contractor.

5.6 THREATENED FLORA AND FAUNA

Measures for the management and mitigation of flora and fauna impacts at PDM and in the surrounding area are provided in the PDM RMP (Ref [3]).

5.6.1 PURPLE COPPER BUTTERFLY

The Purple Copper Butterfly (PCB), also known as the Bathurst Copper Butterfly, is listed as an endangered species under the *Biodiversity Conservation Act 2016* and vulnerable under the *Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999*. The PCB and larvae have been identified adjacent to the eastern boundary of the PDM Yarraboldy Extension within an area of its habitat of native Blackthorn (*Bursaria spinosa subsp. Lasiophylla*).

PCB monitoring has been suspended with the agreement of DAFF in early November 2020. Monitoring at the four (4) deposition dust gauges associated with the PCB Monitoring Programme has continued.

5.6.2 AUSTRAL TOADFLAX (*THESIUM AUSTRALE*)

Austral Toadflax is listed as vulnerable under the *Biodiversity Conservation Act 2016* and the *Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999*. An erect to scrambling perennial herb, it occurs in small populations, parasitising a range of grass species, which at PDM is Kangaroo Grass. At subalpine and tableland climates the species dies back to rootstock during winter and re-sprouts in spring.

Surveys conducted by Eco Logical Australia in March 2011 identified a total of 260 individual Austral Toadflax plants in three (3) patches located beyond the north-west crest of the Yarraboldy Stage 1 Extension pit.

A 2014 Species Management Plan completed in 2014 in consultation with the Department of Planning and Environment was developed to mitigate the impact of open cut mining on the host habitat within the Austral Toadflax buffer area. This includes:

- Inclusion of a buffer zone from known specimens referred to as the Austral Toadflax buffer area.
- Installation and maintenance of fencing and signage between the open cut boundary and known location of specimens.
- Installation of additional signage and barriers (e.g., tape) when operating in close proximity to the Austral toadflax buffer area.
- Control of priority weed infestations and feral animals.

The Gospers Mountain bushfire, which spread through Ben Bullen State Forest and PDM during December 2019 and January 2020, had burnt out the Austral Toadflax during the 2020 reporting period.

During the reporting period, care and maintenance operations did not encroach within the habitat area. Details regarding control of noxious weeds within and surrounding the habitat area for the reporting period is presented in **Section 5.7** and will continue to be undertaken in the next reporting period.

5.7 WEEDS AND FERAL ANIMALS

Weed and feral animal control activities at PDM are undertaken in accordance with the PDM RMP (Ref [3]). Weed control methods target four (4) priority weeds previously identified within PDM and the Yarraboldy Extension area, namely:

- African Lovegrass (*Eragrostis curvula*)
- Blackberry (*Rubus fruticosus* aggregate species)
- Briar Rose (*Rosa rubiginosa*)
- St John's Wort (*Hypericum perforatum*)

The PDM 2024 Rehabilitation Monitoring Report (Ref [4], **Appendix C**) identified African Lovegrass (*Eragrostis curvula*) was the primary weed present at all rehabilitated pasture locations. The presence of weeds including African Lovegrass comprised <10% of the pasture sward and have been subjected to ongoing chemical control in accordance with legislation.

The PDM 2024 Rehabilitation Monitoring Report (Ref [4], **Appendix C**) indicated there were no holes, burrows or dens observed within and in the vicinity of the transects. Scat, considered to be from foxes, was observed within the treed rehabilitation areas.

The control of weeds and feral animals will be undertaken on an ongoing basis as required and consistent with the PDM RMP (Ref [3]) to ensure species are managed accordingly.

5.8 BLASTING

As PDM is currently in care and maintenance, there were no blasting activities undertaken during the reporting period.

5.9 VISUAL AND STRAY LIGHT

There were no adverse impacts associated with stray light or visual disturbance identified during the reporting period. There were no complaints received during the reporting period regarding visual and stray light impacts.

5.10 ABORIGINAL HERITAGE

There were no artefacts of Aboriginal cultural heritage found at PDM during the reporting period.

5.11 NATURAL HERITAGE

No items or areas of natural heritage significance have been recorded or are considered to occur within the approved disturbance area at PDM.

5.12 SPONTANEOUS COMBUSTION

There were no incidences of spontaneous combustion in or overburden material during the reporting period. The Lithgow Seam is known to have a low propensity for spontaneous combustion. All coal stockpiles have been decommissioned.

5.13 MINE SUBSIDENCE

There were no issues identified regarding mine subsidence during the reporting period.

5.14 BUSHFIRE

Bush fire control strategies for PDM are managed in accordance with Project Approval PA 10_0041 and the approved PDM Bush Fire Management Plan. These strategies are employed for preventing the occurrence and spread of any fire events that may impact on the site or in surrounding lands (i.e., Ben Bullen State Forest). As such, measures are taken at PDM to prevent the occurrence and spread of fire through proper maintenance of machinery and equipment, and the maintenance of access roads.

The PDM 2024 Rehabilitation Monitoring Report (Ref [4]), determined fuel loads within rehabilitation areas A, B, C and 8 were low and fuel hazard mitigation activities were not required. The internal access road within PDM provides a firebreak between Area A (refer **Plan 4, Appendix A**) and the PDM office and infrastructure to the south. The haul road provides a firebreak to the north of area A, and to the north and west of Areas B, C and 8 (refer **Plan 4, Appendix A**). Fire-fighting access roads were also considered to be adequate, with all access roads within rehabilitated areas maintained in good condition and suitable for the passage of Category 1 (vertical clearance of >4m and width of >2.8m) tankers.

During the 2024 reporting period there were no bush fire events at PDM however there was a grass fire on 2nd September 2024 along the Castlereagh Highway which extended into the lease area; indicative photographs along the Haul Road are presented in **Figure 5-3** below. The Rural Fire Service attended and extinguished the fire the day it started. Some damage to fencing was caused; this was repaired in December 2024. No rehabilitation was considered necessary.



Figure 5-3 *Indicate Photographs of Fire Impact Adjacent Haul Road*

5.15 METHANE DRAINAGE AND VENTILATION

The underground workings at the PDM site were closed in 1986 and decommissioned over a period from 1987 to 1990. Methane levels are considered to be negligible at PDM.

5.16 PUBLIC SAFETY

No issues of public safety occurred during the reporting period. The entire perimeter of PDM is fenced, with “*No Trespassing*” signs displayed at various intervals. “*Do Not Enter*” and “*Danger*” signs are also displayed along the fence of the private sealed haul road. Continuation of the control of trespassing during the reporting period has occurred through routine inspection, monitoring, upgrades and repairs of fencing structures. During the care and maintenance term, PDM has continued to be regularly monitored by mine personnel.

The padlock on the gate from PDM to the Haul Road was found to be broken on 13 September 2024 during the inspection of the area impacted by bushfire (refer **Section 5.14**); this was considered to have been from Rural Fire Service making entry as part of fire fighting activities rather than due to trespassing. A new lock was placed and has remained intact since the replacement.

6 WATER MANAGEMENT

PDM lies within the Wangcol Creek (also known, and formerly referred to as, Neubeck's Creek) catchment which is a sub-catchment of the Upper Cocks River catchment, which in turn is part of the Warragamba Catchment, administered by WaterNSW.

The runoff from the surrounding area flows to the Cocks River via Wangcol Creek (a perennial tributary) which runs into Blue Lake, a former open cut mining void. Wangcol Creek is understood to flow intermittently (noting that many of its tributaries are temporary), with flows influenced by water discharges from other upstream industrial land uses and/or natural seepage.

Water resources at PDM are managed in accordance with the Water Management Plan (WMP, Ref [5]) which was developed under the requirements of project approval PA 10_0041, EPL 4911, respective groundwater bore licences, the water access licence (WAL 36480) and Water Supply Works Approval 10WA118780.

The water management system has been designed as a closed loop system, with all clean water diverted around the mining site where practicable. It is also designed not to discharge any water from PDM into Wangcol Creek unless required to under an emergency. Drainage of surface water within the site's disturbed areas is generally to the south and southeast following the natural topography for treatment prior to free draining into the underground workings (see **Plan 2, Appendix A**). The runoff from the north is captured in temporary sumps and used as dust suppression when required.

Potable water for use in the offices and amenities is sourced from town water mains supply.

6.1 GROUNDWATER

Management of groundwater at PDM is undertaken in accordance with project approval PA 10_0041 and the PDM WMP. PDM has a water access licence (WAL 36480) for the extraction and use of groundwater from the underground mine workings; and Bore Licences (10BL 165933 & 10BL 603588) for the monitoring of groundwater levels and quality. Results of groundwater monitoring are discussed in **Section 6.2**, with the complete results for the reporting period provided in **Appendix B**.

Review of groundwater extraction data is required to be undertaken by a qualified groundwater consultant in accordance with WAL 36480 to validate the recorded data against groundwater predictions. As there was no measurable groundwater intercepted from the underground workings during the 2024 reporting period, no review was required.

6.2 GROUNDWATER MONITORING

The Groundwater Management Plan detailed within the Water Management Plan (WMP, Ref [5]) includes the monitoring of:

- Four (4) locations within PDM. Groundwater bores P6, Old Shaft and The Bong are located within the old Wallerawang Underground workings; whilst P7 is located within the Lithgow seam.
- Five (5) monitoring locations surrounding the Yarraboldy Extension. Monitoring bores A, D and E are located within the Middle River seam and bore C is within the Lithgow seam. Bore B is not a groundwater quality monitoring location and consists of a vibrating piezometer for the purposes of monitoring groundwater levels only.

- It is noted that sampling of these locations has been historically limited due to unsafe access due to falling trees from a combination of wet conditions and remnant damage from the bushfire in early 2020. The National Parks and Wildlife Service formally closed access to the Gardens of Stone State Conservation Area on 14 October 2022.

- Two (2) locations at the former Enhance Place mine site (EP-PDH3 and EP-PDH4).

Current groundwater monitoring locations are shown in **Plan 3a**, **Appendix A**. Groundwater field data and samples are collected by RCA Australia personnel and analysed at a NATA registered laboratory.

Monitoring during the reporting period was not in accordance with the WMP as per the following:

- Sampling from Old Shaft was discontinued after the February 2021 sampling round when an internal audit identified that the sampling posed a fall risk due to the requirement for an elevated position to collect samples and the absence of any formal attachment points for a harness required for working at heights.
- Sampling from bores within the Yarraboldy extension Bore E has not been attempted during the monitoring period due to safety concerns associated with falling trees in the area.
 - Bore B logger data has not been retrieved since the middle of May 2024 during the monitoring period; several attempts to reconfigure the logger have been undertaken without success and the unit is presumed to require replacement. A new unit will be installed in the 2025 monitoring period.
 - Bore C logger data has not been retrieved since September 2022; several battery replacements and attempts to reconfigure have been undertaken without success and the logger was retrieved in August 2024 for replacement. A new unit will be installed in the 2025 monitoring period.
- EP-PDH3 and EP-PDH4 bores were decommissioned in the first quarter of the 2023 reporting period as part of the Enhance Place mining lease relinquishment.

Sampling was conducted at the onsite PDM bores (P6, P7) generally in accordance with the WMP (Ref [5]) undertaken on monthly basis for standing water level and physical water quality parameters, and on a quarterly basis for cations, anions and dissolved metals. The quarterly rounds were undertaken in February, May, August and November in this reporting period.

The Bong is an opening to the old underground workings and groundwater cannot be accessed as it is under pressure; historically samples of groundwater were collected by pumping water from the underground opening into the Water Cart Dam at PDM (location of Water Cart Dam is shown in **Plan 3a**). Water is not pumped into the Water Cart Dam during the care and maintenance period; thus, water quality at Water Cart Dam is now considered to be representative of surface water runoff and has been presented in **Section 6.4**.

6.2.1 GROUNDWATER ASSESSMENT CRITERIA

The approved groundwater trigger levels developed for PDM are detailed in the WMP in accordance with Schedule 3, Condition 27(c) of the Project Approval (PA 10_0041). The approved trigger levels are detailed in **Table 6-1**.

Table 6-1 *Approved Groundwater Assessment Criteria*

Groundwater Site	pH (range)	Electrical Conductivity (µS/cm)	SWL ^a Trigger (m, AHD)
P6	6.2 - 8.0	1180	887.90
P7	6.3 - 8.0	852	883.28
EP DDH7/GW (Site A)	6.5 - 8.0	326	954.40
EP DDH5/GW (Site B)	NA	NA	NA
EP PDH1/GW (Site C)	6.9 - 8.0	490	889.25
EP DDH4/GW (Site D)	6.8 - 8.0	608	940.61
<i>EP PDH7/GW (Site E)</i>	<i>5.5 - 8.0</i>	<i>151</i>	<i>938.43</i>

^a SWL: standing water level.

NA: Not applicable – No trigger level required for these locations.

Small, *italicised* text is not relevant to the 2024 reporting period due to access restrictions as detailed in **Section 6.2**.

Vibrating wire piezometers are installed within bores B, C and E at various target aquifers. A summary of the target aquifers and corresponding trigger levels for each bore location is shown in **Table 6-2**.

Table 6-2 *Approved Groundwater Trigger Levels (vibrating piezometers)*

Groundwater Site	Aquifer	SWL Trigger (m AHD)
Bore B (EP DDH5)	Sandstone	921.23
	Irondale	NA
	Lidsdale	899.23
	Lithgow	No trigger level
Bore C (EP HHD3)	Irondale	909.40
	Lithgow	No trigger level
	Lidsdale	891.78
	Marangaroo	889.76
Bore E (EP DDH6)	Irondale	884.67
	Lithgow	No trigger level

NA: no data, bore is depressurised (water level has dropped below sensor installation height)

Small text is not relevant to the 2024 reporting period due to access restrictions as detailed in **Section 6.2**.

The current approved assessment criteria detailed in **Table 6-1** was developed from groundwater quality data collected during the period January 2011 – December 2014. During the 2017 monitoring period, it was observed that intermittent exceedances of the approved trigger levels occurred. During the scheduled review of the WMP in 2017 revised trigger levels were proposed which were developed using the entire groundwater quality data set (2005 – 2017), as it was considered that using all available data would provide a robust data set which incorporated diverse climatic influences. These revised trigger levels were submitted to the Natural Resources Access Regulator (NRAR) (formerly Department of Industries – Water) for approval. NRAR recommended that an investigation be undertaken to determine the cause of the exceedances as a basis for the revision of trigger levels.

An investigation was undertaken, and the findings indicated that the likely cause of the decreasing pH trend observed in bore P6 and Old Shaft (which is now replaced by Wallerawang Underground) was acid mine drainage from historical underground workings (Ref [6]). The investigation recommended revised trigger levels which are summarised in **Table 6-3**.

Table 6-3 *Revised Groundwater Trigger Levels*

Monitoring location	P6	P7
pH trigger level ^a	5.6	6.3
Water Level (AHD) ^b	--	--

^a pH trigger level is exceeded if the pH drops below the nominated value.

^b Water Level trigger is exceeded if the AHD water level drops below the nominated trigger level.

-- remain unchanged from **Table 6-1**.

These values were submitted to the Department of Planning and Industry and a response was received in June 2020 that further work was required for the revised trigger levels to be accepted for use. At the time of writing this report, the revised trigger levels detailed in **Table 6-3** have been utilised alongside the approved trigger levels in **Table 6-1**.

6.2.2 GROUNDWATER QUALITY AND SWL

The full suite of groundwater results for the 2024 reporting period is presented in **Appendix B**.

6.2.2.1 ONSITE GROUNDWATER

The onsite groundwater standing water level (SWL) and rainfall for the period 2020 – 2024 is shown in **Figure 6-1** and are compared against the approved groundwater trigger levels.




Figure 6-1 Onsite Groundwater Bores SWL and Rainfall 2020 – 2024

There were no instances of the SWL at bore P6 and bore P7 being below their approved trigger levels (refer **Table 6-1**) during the 2024 reporting period.

Overall, the groundwater level in both bores P6 and P7 have fluctuated during the last five (5) years. This is considered to be due to changes in annual rainfall during the years (refer **Section 5.3**). There have been no activities which have included groundwater extraction or injection undertaken at PDM since it was placed in care and maintenance. Furthermore, there is evidence of surface water ingress entering the old workings of the historic Wallerawang Underground mine as indicated by the development of a seep coming from an old audit of the historic Wallerawang Underground mine (refer **Section 6.3**) which was first identified in March 2021.

The pH of the onsite groundwater monitoring bores for the period 2020 – 2024 is shown in **Figure 6-2**. During the last five (5) years, fluctuations in pH are observable across both onsite groundwater sampling locations with pH values fluctuate between approximately 5.7 and 7.2 pH units.




Figure 6-2 Onsite Groundwater Bores pH: 2020 – 2024

During the reporting period, pH at Bore P6 ranged from 6.26 to 6.98 and the pH at P7 ranged from 6.38 to 7.05. All P6 and P7 values were within the approved trigger ranges (refer **Table 6-1**). All P6 and P7 values were within the revised trigger ranges.

The electrical conductivity of the onsite groundwater monitoring bores for the period 2020 – 2024 is shown in **Figure 6-3**.




Figure 6-3 Onsite Groundwater Bores Electrical Conductivity: 2020 – 2024

The electrical conductivity fluctuates in both bores P6 and P7 significantly throughout the 2020 – 2024 period (refer **Figure 6-3**) noting that this parameter was relatively stable in bore P7 until February 2022 at which time it dropped significantly. The bore P7 electrical conductivity appears to be re-establishing to the pre-February 2022 levels at the end of this monitoring period. There were no activities undertaken at PDM which extracted or discharged water into the old Wallerawang Underground workings, as such, the factors causing the increase or decrease of the electrical conductivity are considered outside the control of PDM.

During the reporting period, electrical conductivity ranged from 1080 to 1330 μ S/cm at P6 and 111 to 1430 μ S/cm at P7. The November P6 and May 2024 values were higher than the respective trigger level. The revised trigger levels (refer **Table 6-3**) do not include electrical conductivity.

6.2.2.2 YARRABOLDY GROUNDWATER (OFFSITE)

As discussed in **Section 6.2** there were some limitations to the monitoring since 2020, including within the reporting period. Monthly standing water level measurements compared with rainfall for the last five (5) years are shown in **Figure 6-4** and the quarterly pH and electrical conductivity measurements for the same period are shown in **Figure 6-5** and **Figure 6-6**. The gaps in the graphs indicate that the bore was unable to be sampled because it was dry, or it was inaccessible.




Figure 6-4 Yarraboldy Groundwater Bores Standing Water Level: 2020 – 2024

There is insufficient data to comment on the variation in standing water levels within the Yarraboldy groundwater bores over the five (5)-year period from 2020 to 2024. However, during reporting period 2024, the water levels in Bore A, Bore C, and Bore D were generally stable and higher than their respective levels. It is noted that the water levels are higher than those recorded in 2019.




Figure 6-5 Yarraboldy Groundwater Bores pH: 2020 – 2024

There is insufficient data to comment on the variation of pH within the Yarraboldy groundwater bores over the five (5) years' period. However, during reporting period 2024, fluctuations were observed in the pH values at Bores A, B and D. The May and August results for Bores A and D, along with all of the results for Bore C were below (more acidic than) the lower limit of the respective approved trigger level range. There were no activities undertaken at PDM which have the potential to impact the groundwater in the Yarraboldy area; as such, the factors causing the variation of pH are considered outside the control of PDM.




Figure 6-6 Yarraboldy Groundwater Bores Electrical Conductivity: 2020 – 2024

There is insufficient data to comment on the variation of electrical conductivity within the Yarraboldy groundwater bores over the five (5)-year period. However, during the reporting period of 2024, all bores indicated a slight increasing trend although well below the respective approved trigger levels. Similar to pH, in the absence of any activities at PDM which have the potential to impact the groundwater in the Yarraboldy area, the factors causing the variation of pH are considered outside the control of PDM.

A groundwater level hydrograph for Bore B along with rainfall from 2020 to 2024 is shown in **Figure 6-7** noting that there was no data available at Lithgow aquifer for Bore B since November 2021 due to a logger malfunction. A hydrograph for Bore C along with rainfall from 2020 to the point of battery failure (September 2022) is presented in **Figure 6-8** noting that the Bore C logger status was retrieved for replacement in August 2024; a new unit will be installed in 2025.




Figure 6-7 Yarraboldy Bore B Hydrograph and Rainfall 2020 – 2024




Figure 6-8 Yarraboldy Bore C Hydrograph and Rainfall 2020 – 2024

The groundwater levels at Bore B at the various aquifers have shown some variation in response to rainfall trends, however the response is generally minimal until between May 2020 and May 2022 (depending on the aquifer). Both of monitored seams (Lidsdale and Sandstone) were indicating a decrease in water level in early 2024, presumed to be due to decrease in rainfall during. The water levels have not fallen below the groundwater trigger levels (refer **Figure 6-7**) 2023 at the last reading (10 May 2024). There is no data available for the Irondale seam during the last five (5) years as the water level has fallen below the sensor height.

Data was collected from Bore C from January 2020 to September 2022 indicate an increase in groundwater levels in all the monitored seams, considered to be due to increased rainfall (refer **Figure 6-8**). All aquifers indicate a similar response to rainfall; the Lidsdale aquifer has a slightly more level response to rainfall than the Marrangaroo and Lithgow aquifers.

6.3 STORED WATER

There are no permanent water storage structures at the PDM. Clean water diversion structures are utilised at the site in conjunction with temporary sediment ponds. Temporary sediment ponds are constructed downslope of disturbed areas to ensure the capture of 'dirty' water and enable treatment prior to draining into the underground workings.

6.4 SURFACE WATER MONITORING

Surface water quality at PDM is managed in accordance with the WMP (Ref [5]) and EPL 4911 and comprise a total of thirteen (13) surface water locations within and surrounding the mine site (see **Plan 3a, Appendix A**).

In accordance with EPL 4911 the following locations are required to be monitored at PDM on a quarterly basis for total suspended solids (TSS), sulphate and dissolved iron:

- EPL Point 2 – Upstream of confluence with Lamberts Gully.
- EPL Point 3 – 100m downstream of open cut area of PDM.
- EPL Point 14 – Cox's River downstream of Blue Lake.
- EPL Point 16 – a seep of underground water emanating from an adit associated with the historic Wallerawang Underground Mine which then enters the surface water system.

In accordance with EPL 4911 and in the event of a discharge to water, via PDM's licence discharge point (EPL Point 13), samples are required to be collected daily during discharge for electrical conductivity (EC), pH, and turbidity and weekly for dissolved iron, oil and grease, sulphate and total suspended solids. EPL Points 2, 3 and 14 are also required to be sampled daily for EC, pH and turbidity.

The WMP also details monitoring of a further seven (7) locations, S1 to S7. S1 and S3 to S7 are sampled on a monthly basis for analysis of pH, temperature, EC and turbidity plus a quarterly analysis suite comprising major ions, anions and filtered metals. No sample is collected at S2, monitoring comprises measurement of the water level on a monthly frequency. Monitoring at a further location, Wallerawang Downstream, was commenced after the issue of the WMP and is sampled on a monthly basis for analysis of pH, temperature, EC and turbidity plus a quarterly analysis suite comprising major ions, anions and filtered metals. The description of surface water monitoring sites is as follows:

- S1 is located within Wangcol Creek upstream of PDM operations (slightly downstream of EPL Point 2) and downstream of a water discharge point licensed to other parties (i.e., not associated with PDM operations).
- S2 is located in Wangcol Creek downstream of S1, the off-site water licensed discharge point and some of PDM operations.
- S3 is located within Wangcol Creek downstream of S1, PDM operations and the off-site water licensed discharge point.
- Surface location S3 is the same location as EPL Point 3.

- S4 is located on Coxs River, upstream of the confluence of Wangcol Creek and does not receive water from PDM operations or the off-site water licensed discharge point.
- S5 is located within Blue Lake at the point of confluence with Coxs River.
- S6 is located within Wangcol Creek downstream of the PDM operations and the PDM licensed discharge point and just prior to the Creek's confluence with Blue Lake.
- S7 located within Coxs River, downstream of Blue Lake.
- Wallerawang Downstream, located downstream of the adit seepage (EPL Point 16).

The surface water monitoring locations are shown in **Plan 3a, Appendix A**.

During the reporting period, all surface water monitoring at PDM was undertaken in accordance with the surface water monitoring programme documented in the PDM WMP and EPL 4911.

Results of surface water monitoring are discussed in **Section 6.4.2** and also provided in **Appendix B**. As detailed in **Section 6.2**, samples from Water Cart Dam are considered representative of surface water and are presented in this Section.

The water quality entering Wangcol Creek from the off-site water licensed discharge is monitored voluntarily for the purposes of assessing trends within Wangcol Creek; samples are collected from the drainage line prior to the water entering Wangcol Creek within the PDM boundary.

6.4.1 SURFACE WATER ASSESSMENT CRITERIA

Concentration limits are specified in EPL 4911 for the licenced discharge point LDP13, whilst the remaining water monitoring locations only have water quality trigger levels stipulated in the site WMP (Ref [5]) – surface water section in accordance with Schedule 3, Condition 27(b) of the Project Approval (PA 10_0041). The current approved WMP trigger levels are presented in **Table 6-4**.

The WMP details the protocol for the investigation, notification, and mitigation of any identified adverse impacts on surface water quality. The surface water component of the WMP also provides impact assessment criteria, including trigger levels for investigating any potentially adverse surface water impacts.

Table 6-4 PDM Approved Surface Water Trigger Levels

Surface Water Site	pH (range)	Electrical Conductivity ($\mu\text{S/cm}$)	Total Suspended Solids (mg/L)	Oil and Grease (mg/L)
S1	6.2 – 8.0	2,325	30	10
S2	NA	NA	NA	NA
S3	6.4 – 8.0	2,223	30	10
S4	7.3 – 8.0	957	30	10
S5	7.0 – 8.0	1,013	30	10
S6	6.7 – 8.0	1,941	30	10
S7	6.8 – 8.0	1,007	30	10
The Bong (at Water Cart Dam)	5.8-8.0	1,157	NA	NA
Wallerawang Downstream	NA	NA	NA	NA
EPL Point 2	7.1 – 8.0	2,055	30	NA
EPL Point 3	6.4 – 8.0	2,223	30	NA
EPL Point 13	6.5 – 8.0 ^a	NA	30 ^a	10 ^a
EPL Point 14	7.5 – 8.0	1,166	30	NA
EPL Point 16	NA	NA	NA	NA

^a EPL concentration limit only applicable during discharge events.

EnergyAustralia commissioned an investigation of surface water quality at PDM which included identification of factors that influence surface water quality. This investigation was concluded in 2018 and, as a result, new surface water trigger levels were proposed. The investigation (Ref [6]) concluded that water quality monitored at EPL Point 2 and S1, which are located within Wangcol Creek, to be primarily influenced by the off-site licensed discharge point (not associated with PDM) located between EPL Point 2 and S1. The revised surface water trigger levels (Ref [6]) are shown in **Table 6-5**.

Table 6-5 Revised Surface Water Trigger Levels (Ref [6])

pH trigger level ^a	6.5 – 8.0
Electrical conductivity ($\mu\text{S/cm}$)	5,592
Total suspended solids (mg/L)	25

^a pH trigger level is exceeded if the pH is outside the nominated range.

The trigger levels presented in **Table 6-5** are applicable to all PDM surface water monitoring sites, noting that EPL Point 2, S1 and S4 are not influenced by activities at PDM.

These values were submitted to the Department of Planning and Industry and a response was received in June 2020 that further work was required for the revised trigger levels to be accepted for use. At the time of writing this report, the revised trigger levels detailed in **Table 6-5** have been utilised alongside the approved trigger levels presented in **Table 6-4**.

No trigger levels are ascribed to the off-site water licensed discharge.

6.4.2 SURFACE WATER QUALITY

Surface water field data and samples are collected by RCA Australia personnel and analysed at a NATA registered laboratory.

6.4.2.1 EPA SURFACE WATER MONITORING

During the monitoring period, the four (4) surface water sampling locations specified in the EPL 4911 were monitored on a quarterly basis: February, May, August and November.

There are no concentration limits stipulated in EPL 4911 for monitoring points 2, 3, 14 and 16 and results of surface water samples collected during the reporting period are compared against the approved surface water trigger levels (**Table 6-4**) from the WMP and the revised surface water trigger levels (**Table 6-5**) in **Appendix B** noting that as these were derived before the commencement of the seep which comprises EPL Point 16 that there are no approved trigger levels for that location and the comparison is with the revised trigger levels only.

pH was within the respective approved trigger level ranges for EPL Point 2 and 3 throughout the reporting period. All pH results of EPL Point 14 were above the upper limit of the approved trigger range during the reporting period with exception of February. pH values were within the revised pH trigger range with the exception of EPL Point 16 August and November results.

The electrical conductivity results were within the approved trigger level in the reporting period with exception of the EPL Point 3 May and November, and EPL Point 14 November results. Electrical conductivity was less than the revised surface water quality trigger level at all locations (EPL Point 2, 3, 14 and 16) during the reporting period.

Total suspended solids (TSS) concentrations were all below the approved trigger level and the revised trigger level.

The electrical conductivity and pH for the period 2020 – 2024 is shown in **Figure 6-9**; electrical conductivity and rainfall for the same period is shown in **Figure 6-10**.




Figure 6-9 Surface water at EPL monitoring points: pH and Electrical Conductivity (2020 – 2024)




Figure 6-10 Surface water at EPL monitoring points: Rainfall and Electrical Conductivity (2020 – 2024)

During the 2020 – 2024 monitoring period, pH has remained generally stable at EPL Point 2 and indicated a decreasing trend at EPL Point 3. The pH at both EPL Point 14 and EPL Point 16 fluctuated with no trend. The pH is generally neutral in the surface water samples; the August 2024 sample for EPL Point 16 is considered slightly acidic.

During the 2020 – 2024 monitoring period, electrical conductivity indicates a slight increasing trend at all EPL Points; the trend at EPL Point 2 and EPL Point 16 was consistent whereas the results for EPL Point 3 and EPL Point 14 had fluctuations. The electrical conductivity is generally fresh with some concentrations representative of brackish water ($>1,500\mu\text{S}/\text{cm}$) at EPL Point 3 and EPL Point 14.

pH and electrical conductivity results of EPL Point 2 and EPL Point 3 are generally consistent during the 2020-2024 monitoring period however there are significant divergence of pH in August 2021, February 2023, and of electrical conductivity in February 2023 to November 2023, May and November 2024. pH of EPL Point 14 do not correlate with either the results of EPL Point 2 or EPL Point 3, although there is some similarity. There does appear to be correlation between the electrical conductivity of EPL Point 2 and EPL Point 14 however it is not consistent.

Rainfall appears to have some influence on electrical conductivity during the 2020-2024 monitoring period however not consistently; there is no influence of rainfall to the electrical conductivity at EPL Point 16. As there are no mining activities being undertaken at PDM which may impact the surface water quality, the difference of results between EPL Point 2 and of EPL Point 3 are considered to be representative of the off-site water licensed discharge and localised natural influences between the two (2) sample points. The inconsistency in the correlation between EPL Point 2 and EPL Point 14 is considered to indicate that there are other influences to water quality at EPL Point 14 as would be expected downstream of Blue Lake and Coxs River.

6.4.2.2 GENERAL SURFACE WATER MONITORING

During the monitoring period, the seven (7) surface water sampling locations were monitored on a monthly basis: all samples were collected and analysed as per the requirements.

Results of surface water samples collected during the reporting period are compared against the approved surface water trigger levels (**Table 6-4**) from the WMP and the revised surface water trigger levels (**Table 6-5**) in **Appendix B** noting that as these were derived before the commencement of the seep which comprises EPL Point 16 that there are no approved trigger levels for Wallerawang Downstream and the comparison is with the revised trigger levels only.

During the reporting period, pH was generally within the approved trigger levels (refer **Table 6-4**) with the exception of the six (6) of the eighty-four (84) results noting an additional twelve (12) samples were collected from Wallerawang Downstream for which there are no approved trigger levels and the approved trigger levels are not considered relevant to Water Cart Dam in the absence of groundwater being pumped to it. All the results were compliant with the revised trigger range with exception of Water Cart Dam May result only.

Electrical conductivity was higher than the relevant approved trigger levels in thirty-five (35) of the eighty-four (84) results during the reporting period. No results were in excess of the revised trigger level.

pH, and electrical conductivity along with rainfall for sampling locations within Wangcol Creek and the results at the off-site water licensed discharge are presented in **Figure 6-11** and **Figure 6-12** below.




Figure 6-11 pH results at Wangcol Creek Sampling Locations S1, S3 and S6 2020 – 2024




Figure 6-12 Electrical Conductivity results at Wangcol Creek Sampling Locations S1, S3 and S6 2020 – 2024

During the last five (5) years, pH in Wangcol Creek (refer **Figure 6-11**) are generally consistent between the upstream (S1) location and the downstream locations (S3 and S6) along with the off-site water licensed discharge. The off-site water licensed discharge and S1 are generally slightly more acidic in historical monitoring however have been more alkaline since late 2021 to 2023, and throughout the 2024 monitoring period. Overall, the pH trend is generally stable for all the monitoring locations (noting some large fluctuations).

Similarly, electrical conductivity (refer **Figure 6-12**) results have demonstration correlation at all sampling locations. The electrical conductivity of the off-site water licensed discharge is the highest of the data set on almost all occasions. Overall, the electrical conductivity trend for the of-site water discharge is slightly decreasing and increasing for all other locations, noting that there large fluctuations in the data set and the December 2024 readings may be reflective of part of a fluctuation rather than the overall trend. The spike in electrical conductivity at S6 in October 2022 is not considered to be solely related to the off-site water licensed discharge as it is one month after, and almost double in concentrations. Rainfall appears to have some influence on electrical conductivity during the 2020-2024 monitoring period however not consistently. As such, while Wangcol Creek (S1, S3 and S6) is considered to be impacted by the off-site water licensed discharge, it is considered that sediment from the catchment is a potential contributor to electrical conductivity.

As no water is being discharged by PDM to Wangcol Creek and there are no activities being undertaken which may contribute to erosion of soil it is not considered that the variation observed within Wangcol Creek is due to PDM activities.

pH, and electrical conductivity along with rainfall for sampling locations within Coxs River, including the quarterly results for EPL Point 14, are presented in **Figure 6-13** and **Figure 6-14** below.




Figure 6-13 S4, S5, S7 and EPL Point 14 pH Results 2020 – 2024




Figure 6-14 S4, S5, S7 and EPL Point 14 Electrical Conductivity Results & Rainfall 2020 – 2024 (noting that EPL Point 14 was dry in November 2023 such that no sample was collected)

During the last five (5) years, pH values in Coxs River (**Figure 6-13**) are higher (more alkaline) upstream of Blue Lake (i.e., S4) compared to those of S5 and S7 and overall similar to those in Wangcol Creek. Overall, the pH trend is generally stable for all the monitoring locations (noting some large fluctuations). The cause of the significant spike in acidity at S4 in March 2020 is unknown however this location is upstream of the confluence with Wangcol Creek and as such does not receive any water from PDM and therefore the results are indicative of impacts from other areas of the catchment.

Electrical conductivity concentrations in Coxs River during the last five (5) years (refer **Figure 6-14**) is lower upstream of Blue Lake (i.e., S4) compared to those in S5 and S7; S5 and S7 are generally very well correlated with the exception of late 2022 and early 2023 and October 2023. The cause of the concentration spike at S4 in February and March 2020 is considered to be likely due to erosion of land burnt in the 2019 / 2020 bushfires and the decreasing trend from that point is considered likely due to revegetation of the catchment. The cause for the significant spike at S7 in December 2022 is unknown; it is almost 1,000µS/cm more and two (2) months later than that observed in Wangcol Creek (S6) and as such the concentrations are considered to be representative of overall conditions within the catchment.

The pH of EPL Point 14 does not appear to have significant correlation with any of the other surface water locations other than S7 which it is downstream of by approximately 1,500m. The pH has trended marginally to more acid conditions over the 2020 – 2024 monitoring period which doesn't appear to be the case for any other sampling locations within Coxs River. Similarly, the electrical conductivity of EPL Point 14 appears to be best correlated with S7 and to a lesser extent S5; correlation with S4 is not obviously apparent however this is primarily due to the low variation in concentrations at S4 and the absence of results for EPL Point 14 at the time of spikes at S4 (March 2020, March 2022, October and November 2023). As such, while the flows from PDM and other upstream sources of Coxs River are considered to influence EPL Point 14, it is considered that there are also influences such as the intermittent creeks flowing to Coxs River downstream of S7. In the absence of any activities except those regarding care and maintenance the water quality impacts in Wangcol Creek are not considered to be related to PDM.

pH and electrical conductivity for Wallerawang Downstream and Water Cart Dam have been plotted with the quarterly results for Wallerawang Underground as presented in **Figure 6-15** and **Figure 6-16** below.




Figure 6-15 *Wallerawang Downstream, Water Cart Dam and Wallerawang Underground pH Results 2020 - 2024 (noting that data gaps are when Water Cart Dam was dry and dates prior to the commencement of sampling at Wallerawang Downstream and Underground)*




Figure 6-16 *Wallerawang Downstream, Water Cart Dam and Wallerawang Underground Electrical Conductivity Results 2020 - 2024* (noting that data gaps are when Water Cart Dam was dry and dates prior to the commencement of sampling at Wallerawang Downstream and Underground)

During the last five (5) years (**Figure 6-15**), pH in Water Cart Dam has fluctuated towards a higher (more alkaline) value, presumed to be associated with the lessening influence from historically pumped groundwater from The Bong. While there is some sporadic correlation between the results of Wallerawang Underground and Wallerawang Downstream, the absence of consistency is considered to indicate other influences to the pH of the Water Cart Dam.

Electrical conductivity has been representative of fresh water for the last five (5) years (**Figure 6-16**) with one spike into concentrations representative of brackish in February 2023, the concentrations are significantly disparate to those of Wallerawang Downstream and Wallerawang Underground, which generally correlate with each other, such that other influences to the water quality of Water Cart Dam are considered to be present. The reason for the spike in concentrations in February 2023 at Water Cart Dam and of August 2023 in Wallerawang Downstream is not known however does not appear to be related to Wallerawang Underground, noting that this is sampled only once a quarter. However, the results generally stable during reporting periods 2024.

6.5 CHANNEL STABILITY AND STREAM HEALTH MONITORING

Channel stability and stream health monitoring of Wangcol Creek is conducted on a six-monthly basis in accordance with project approval PA 10_0041 and the WMP. Monitoring was conducted in March and September 2024. It is noted that additional inspections are undertaken on a voluntary basis each month.

Monitoring is conducted at four (4) monitoring points along Wangcol Creek (SH1, SH2, SH3 & SH3A) and one (1) location at Coxs River (SH5), which is downstream of Blue Lake (refer **Plan 3b, Appendix A**). An additional location at Blue Lake (SH4) is also included to allow for visual observation of the condition of the water bodies.

The monitoring involves an observational survey which provides a description of the locations and dimensions of erosive features. Indicators then produce a rating based on a scoring system. The combined total score of the indicators then ranks each monitoring location from very actively eroding through to very stable. This assessment enables determinations to be made as to whether the section of creek has changed over time from the classification derived during the original baseline survey. The criteria and scoring methodology are based on the CSIRO Ephemeral Stream Assessment protocol (Ref [7]).

A baseline assessment of channel stability, stream health and vegetation health of Wangcol Creek and Coxs River undertaken in 2013 indicated the drainage lines were classified as 'potentially stabilising.'

Follow-up (six-monthly) assessments have been conducted at the same monitoring locations; results are presented **Figure 6-17**. Generally, the stability of all the locations have remained consistent or increased with the exception of decrease in classification based on a loss of vegetation in October 2019 presumed to be due to below average rainfall (drought conditions).

Locations SH1, SH2 and SH3 were considered 'stable', and SH5 was considered 'very stable' during the 2024 assessment, noting that the stability at SH3A is based on the presence of spray-concrete lining.




Figure 6-17 Channel Stability and Stream Health Scores during 2016 – 2024

Detailed results are presented in **Appendix B**.

7 REHABILITATION

Rehabilitation works at PDM are conducted in accordance with rehabilitation objectives in the approved PDM RMP (Ref [3]). Rehabilitation performance criteria documented in the PDM RMP define the performance indicators, measuring criteria, status and progress of rehabilitation at PDM.

PDM is made up of a series of rehabilitation areas, comprising a series of parcels of land which are at various stages of being progressively rehabilitated back to the agreed post rehabilitation land use (acceptable post-mining land use and capability). This includes Areas A, B, C and 8. As the Yarraboldy Extension may form part of future mining operations, only temporary maintenance activities have and will be undertaken within this area. The location of each rehabilitation domain is depicted in **Plan 4, Appendix A**.

A soil assessment and revised rehabilitation strategy was developed in 2014 by an agronomist (Ref [8]) and the recommendations were incorporated into the PDM RMP (Ref [3]).

The principal revegetation technique currently employed is direct seeding using native tree and shrub species for areas intended as woodland communities and pasture species for areas intended for agricultural activities.

The proposed final landform aims to emulate the pre-mining environment and to enhance local and regional ecological linkages across the site and surrounding areas.

Maintenance rehabilitation works undertaken within the reporting period comprised topsoiling and mulching of the eastern portion of ML1578 in February / March 2023. A photograph of the area as per September 2024 is presented in **Photograph 7-1**.



Photograph 7-1 *Rehabilitated area within ML1578 looking east in September 2024.*

7.1 REHABILITATION PERFORMANCE DURING THE REPORTING PERIOD

7.1.1 AGREED POST REHABILITATION LAND USE

Areas of privately owned land within PDM (Area B, C & 8) have been returned to pasture for agricultural purposes, including grazing, as per the approved rehabilitation strategy and landholder preferences.

The principal aim for the final land use of the Yarraboldy Extension rehabilitation area (including Area A) is for native vegetation conservation and for the use of Forests NSW. The Rehabilitation domains are shown in **Plan 4, Appendix A**.

7.1.2 REHABILITATION STATUS SUMMARY

A summary of the rehabilitation status for the previous (2023), current (2024) and future (2025) reporting periods are presented in **Table 7-1**.

Table 7-1 Rehabilitation Area Summary

Mine Area Type	Area Affected/Rehabilitated (ha)		
	2023 reporting period (Actual)	2024 reporting period (Actual)	2025 reporting period (Forecast)
A. Total Mine Footprint	98.1	98.1	98.1
B. Total active disturbance	56.8	56.8	56.8
C. Land being prepared for rehabilitation	0	0	0
D. Land under active rehabilitation	7	7	7
E. Completed Rehabilitation	25.4	25.4	25.4

A rehabilitation status survey is undertaken annually, and the monitoring report provides an overview of the rehabilitation status of PDM and recommendations for the improvement of rehabilitation outcomes in reference to the approved completion criteria. The survey comprises six (6) previously established monitoring transects: four (4) transects are located within rehabilitated pastures and two (2) transects are within treed rehabilitation areas. An additional two (2) transects exist as analogue sites in grazed pasture and undisturbed naturally vegetative areas to provide benchmarks against the pasture and treed rehabilitation areas.

The PDM 2024 Rehabilitation Monitoring Report (Ref [4]) is attached in **Appendix C** and Figure 1 of that report shows the location of the transects along with the results of the survey and comparative photographs.

The 2024 rehabilitation status as compared against the performance indicators and completion criteria as defined in the PDM RMP (Ref [3]) is reproduced from the PDM 2024 Rehabilitation Monitoring Report (Ref [4], **Appendix C**) in **Table 7-2**.

Table 7-2 Rehabilitation Status Summary: 2024

Performance indicator	Completion Criteria	Current Status (2024 Reporting Period)
Feral animal and priority weed presence	Feral animal and weed species presence and abundance is not considered to adversely impact the intended final land use.	Satisfactory – continue to monitor.
Feral animal and priority weed control	Feral animals and priority weeds are controlled in accordance with legislation.	Satisfactory – continue to monitor.

Performance indicator	Completion Criteria	Current Status (2024 Reporting Period)
Fuel loads	Fuel loads and fire breaks in and surrounding rehabilitation areas are assessed and maintained in accordance with the Bushfire Management Plan.	Satisfactory – continue to monitor.
Access	Adequate access for firefighting is maintained on rehabilitation areas.	Satisfactory – continue to monitor.
Habitat features	Habitat features are installed on native forest rehabilitation areas including: - Nesting boxes and salvaged hollows - Crushed timber spread over native forest rehab areas. - Rock pile clusters.	Ongoing – nesting boxes to be installed once trees are established.
Vegetation health	More than 75% of native forest indicator species are assessed to be healthy and growing at year 5.	Complete.
	Native forest indicator species tree height and girth is within the range of analogue sites.	Ongoing – continue to monitor.
Soil loss	Net annual soil loss is comparable to analogue sites at year 10.	Complete.
Erosion	There are no significant erosion features that compromise landform stability or public safety (including gullyng or tunnelling).	Satisfactory – continue to monitor.
Woodland birds present	Evidence of woodland birds utilising rehabilitation areas.	Ongoing – continue to monitor.
Evidence of mammals	Evidence of target mammal species present in rehabilitation areas.	Ongoing – continue to monitor.
Natural regeneration	Evidence of second generation of native forest indicator species from desired vegetation community.	Satisfactory – continue to monitor.
	Evidence of natural regeneration of at least four (4) pasture species at year 5.	Complete.
Structure	Structural layers (canopy, mid-storey, understorey and ground cover) are comparable to analogue sites.	Ongoing – continue to monitor.
Management inputs	Management inputs (ameliorants, fertilisers, weed treatments) are within the range of analogue sites.	Satisfactory – continue to monitor.

Performance indicator	Completion Criteria	Current Status (2024 Reporting Period)
Rural land capability	Pasture rehabilitation areas are assessed to have a Rural Land Capability Class VI or better (suitable for grazing).	Satisfactory – continue to monitor.
	Establishment of pasture comprising approximately 70% perennial grass and 20% annual legume, representative of species at analogue sites.	Complete.
Species composition	Vegetation within the treed rehabilitation areas is established in accordance with the approved species mix.	Complete.
	Approved pasture species mix is sown at the specified rate per hectare.	Complete.
Weed presence	Weeds including African Lovegrass to comprise <10% of the pasture sward.	Satisfactory – continue to monitor.
Ground cover	Ground cover (vegetation, leaf litter, mulch) >70% at year 5.	Complete.

7.1.3 YARRABOLDY EXTENSION REHABILITATION PERFORMANCE

To minimise dust dispersion and soil erosion, overburden stockpiles located within the northern area of the Yarraboldy Extension have been re-contoured and seeded with pasture species.

The amenity bund located along the southern boundary of the Yarraboldy Extension was re-profiled in 2014, with the southern batter having a gradient of 18° to minimise erosion and enhance establishment of seedlings. Following the application and tilling of topsoil, a native species grass and tree species seed mix was applied followed by mulch (refer **Photograph 7-2**).



Photograph 7-2 *Amenity Bund looking east following application of mulch and native mix 2015.*

During the reporting period, maintenance works was not required to be undertaken in the Yarraboldy Extension. No rehabilitation maintenance activities were undertaken. Current vegetative cover on the bund is shown in **Photograph 7-3**.



Photograph 7-3 *Amenity Bund looking northeast, January 2025*

7.1.4 AREA A REHABILITATION PERFORMANCE

Area A is a treed rehabilitation area located in the southern area of PDM, south-east of the Yarraboldy Extension (refer to **Plan 4, Appendix A**). During 2008, seeding was commenced in Area A (8 ha) and 1500 trees were planted. In 2010, an additional 400 trees were planted. Further direct seeding and application of an organic mulch layer and lime occurred in October 2013; however, drought conditions late in 2013 limited the outcomes of this work.

Historical rehabilitation activities undertaken in Area A are presented in **Table 7-3**, along with the actions recommended in 2014 (Ref [8]) for improved rehabilitation and recommendations from the 2016 – 2023 annual rehabilitation surveys. Rehabilitation activities undertaken within the reporting period are also presented in **Table 7-3**.

Table 7-3 *Recommended and Completed Rehabilitation Actions in Area A*

Recommended Rehabilitation Actions - Area A		Actions Completed (2014 – 2023)	Undertaken in 2024
SLR Soil Assessment Report (Ref [8])	Continue control of Bidy Bush with current spot spraying regime.	Weed spraying as per Weed Management Schedule (Section 5.7).	Yes
	Continue with further application of mushroom compost, lime & gypsum (10:3:2 tonnes/ha).	Fertiliser and compost applied at recommended rates.	No – not required
	Increase potassium by application of Muriate of Potash or similar (0.25tonnes/ha).	Application of Muriate of Potash at recommended rate.	No – not required.
2014 Rehabilitation Monitoring Report (Ref [9])	Treat surface soil erosion on slopes via placement of cut vegetation or rocks in erosion channels.	Coarse woody debris placed along contours above rills to reduce runoff rate and volume.	No – not required
	Re-sow exposed surfaces with fast-growing groundcover herbs and grasses.	Exposed surfaces ripped and re-sown with locally sourced seed mix.	No – not required
	Install nesting boxes in close proximity treed rehabilitation area.	Installation will be undertaken when the native tree species are of a suitable size to support the nesting boxes.	Yes, refer below.
2015 Rehabilitation Monitoring Report (Ref [10])	Install nesting boxes in or adjacent to treed rehabilitation areas.	Installation will be undertaken when the native tree species are of a suitable size to support the nesting boxes.	Yes, refer below
	Re-apply a mixture of mushroom compost, lime and gypsum to treed rehabilitation areas as per the recommendations (Ref [8]) report.	Application of fertiliser and compost at recommended rates.	No – not required
	Increase canopy cover of tall herbs and shrubs at treed rehabilitation Area A to 75% with 80% groundcover of grasses and broadleaf herbs.	Exposed surfaces ripped and re-sown with fast growing herbs and grasses.	No – not required
	Concentrate tube stock planting in benches of treed rehabilitation areas to take advantage of run-on from banks.	Tree planting undertaken in addition to direct seeding.	No – not required
	Place additional coarse woody debris along contours above rills to reduce runoff rate and volume at treed rehabilitation areas.	Woody mulch placed along contours above rills to reduce runoff rate and volume.	No – not required
	Treat surface soil erosion on slopes via placement of cut vegetation or rocks in erosion channels.	Coarse woody debris placed along contours above rills to reduce runoff rate and volume.	No – not required
	Re-sow exposed surfaces with fast-growing groundcover herbs and grasses.	Exposed surfaces ripped and re-sown with locally sourced seed mix.	No – not required

Recommended Rehabilitation Actions - Area A		Actions Completed (2014 – 2023)	Undertaken in 2024
2016 Rehabilitation Monitoring Report (Ref [11])	Continue to spot spray African Lovegrass outbreaks.	Weed spraying as per Weed Management Schedule (Section 5.7).	Yes
	Install nesting boxes in or adjacent to treed rehabilitation areas.	Installation will be undertaken when the native tree species are of a suitable size to support the nesting boxes.	Yes, refer below
	Place additional coarse woody debris along contours above rills to reduce runoff rate and volume at treed rehabilitation areas.	Woody mulch placed along contours above rills to reduce runoff rate and volume.	No – not required
2017 – 2023 Rehabilitation Monitoring Reports (Ref [12-18])	Continue to spot spray African Lovegrass outbreaks.	Weed spraying as per Weed Management Schedule (Section 5.7).	Yes
	Install nesting boxes in or adjacent to treed rehabilitation areas.	Installation will be undertaken when the native tree species are of a suitable size to support the nesting boxes.	Yes, refer below

The PDM 2024 Rehabilitation Monitoring Report (Ref [4], **Appendix C**) indicated that the total living groundcover within the monitoring transects in Area A (transect 5 and transect 6) was same or slightly reduced compared to that observed during the 2023 survey. Total living cover within the transect 5 decreased to >80%; and there was no change in annual living cover and although decrease in bare surface and increase in litter cover. The total living cover at transect 6 remained consistent with that of 2023 at 80%; and there was no change in perennial living cover and annual living cover, although decrease in bare surface and increase in litter cover.

Comparative photographs are presented in **Appendix C**.

It is noted that a total of twenty (20) nesting boxes were installed in Area A subsequent to the inspection for the rehabilitation report as per **Figure 7-1**; indicative photographs of the boxes are presented in **Photograph 7-4**.




Figure 7-1 Map of Nesting Box Locations within Area A



Photograph 7-4 *Location and Indicative Photographs of Nesting Boxes within Area A*

7.1.5 AREA B AND C REHABILITATION PERFORMANCE

Rehabilitation Areas B and C are located in the eastern area of PDM; the locations are shown in **Plan 4, Appendix A**. Area B and C cover an area of approximately 25ha in total and have been rehabilitated as pasture. The final landform and water management structures have been completed and the areas seeded for pasture in accordance with Planning Approval 10_0041 and the requirements of the landowner.

The 2018 SLR Rehabilitation and Completion Assessment report (Ref [2]) indicated that rehabilitation has been successfully completed in Area B and C and all completion criteria defined in the PDM RMP (Ref [3]) had been met.

Historical rehabilitation activities undertaken in Areas B and C are presented in **Table 7-4**, along with the actions recommended in 2014 (Ref [8]) for improved rehabilitation and recommendations from the 2016 – 2023 annual rehabilitation surveys. Rehabilitation activities undertaken within the reporting period are also presented in **Table 7-4**.

Table 7-4 Recommended and Completed Rehabilitation Actions in Area B and C

Recommended Rehabilitation Actions Area B & C		Actions Completed (2014 to 2023)	Undertaken in 2024
SLR Soil Assessment. Report, 2014 (Ref [8])	Control of African Lovegrass prior to pasture establishment works.	Weed spraying as per Weed Management Schedule (Section 5.7).	Yes
	Ripping with a plough to create furrows, followed by application of pasture seed mix.	Furrows created along pasture poor areas and contour banks, seed, fertiliser & compost applied.	No – not required
	Application of Muriate of Potash (0.25tonnes/ha) and Di-ammonium phosphate 0.20 tonnes/ha).	MAP and DAP applied at recommended rates.	No – not required.
	Application of mushroom compost, lime & gypsum (10:4:1 tonnes/ha).	Fertiliser and compost applied at recommended rates.	No – not required.
2014 Rehabilitation Monitoring Report (Ref [9])	Continue to implement integrated weed management control methods for noxious weeds.	Weed spraying as per Weed Management Schedule (Section 6.7).	Yes
2015 Rehabilitation Monitoring Report (Ref [10])	Rip along contours of poorly established pasture rehabilitation areas and re-sow pasture mix and fertiliser. Cover with a mixture of mushroom compost, lime and gypsum as per the recommendations (Ref [8]).	Poorly established pasture areas and drainage lines mechanically ripped prior to re-sowing with pasture species.	No – not required
	Increase and maintain groundcover in pasture rehabilitation Areas B and C and in Area 8 to at least 95%.	Application of fertiliser and compost at recommended rates.	No – not required.

Recommended Rehabilitation Actions Area B & C		Actions Completed (2014 to 2023)	Undertaken in 2024
2016 Rehabilitation Monitoring Report (Ref [11])	Continue to spot spray African Lovegrass outbreaks.	Weed spraying as per Weed Management Schedule (Section 5.7).	Yes
	Continue to monitor pest animal numbers.	Pest and animal monitoring not required to be undertaken.	No – not required
2017 Rehabilitation Monitoring Report (Ref [12])	Continue to spot spray African Lovegrass outbreaks.	Weed spraying as per Weed Management Schedule (Section 5.7).	Yes
2018 Rehabilitation. Monitoring Report (Ref [13])	Continue to spot spray African Lovegrass outbreaks.	Weed spraying as per Weed Management Schedule (Section 5.7).	Yes
	Repair soil cracking along contours in Area B (transect 3).	Cracking occurred in 2018; repair works undertaken in 2018.	No – not required
2019-2023 Rehabilitation Monitoring Report (Ref [14-18])	Continue to spot spray African Lovegrass outbreaks.	Weed spraying as per Weed Management Schedule (Section 5.7).	Yes

The PDM 2024 Rehabilitation Monitoring Report (Ref [4], **Appendix C**) documented the following findings for Area B and C (transects 1, 2 and 3):

- Total living cover / Rehabilitated pasture surfaces in the three (3) transect areas support living groundcover of greater than 90%.
- Natural regeneration of groundcover species is evident across all the pasture rehabilitation areas.
- Target weed presence comprises African Lovegrass at <10% of the pasture sward.

Comparative photographs are presented in **Appendix C**.

7.1.6 AREA 8 REHABILITATION PERFORMANCE

Area 8 is a pasture rehabilitation area located in the south-eastern area of PDM, immediately south of Area B. The location of Area 8 is shown in **Plan 4, Appendix A**. The vegetation communities prior to mining include a mixture of cleared land, pasture, pines and eucalyptus. Seeding of Area 8 (10 ha) commenced in 2008, with a pasture mixture known as 'Coxs River Mix'.

The 2018 SLR Rehabilitation and Completion Assessment report (Ref [2]) indicated that rehabilitation has been successfully completed in Area 8 and all completion criteria defined in the PDM RMP (Ref [3]) have been met.

Historical rehabilitation activities undertaken in Area 8 are presented in **Table 7-5**, along with the actions recommended in 2014 (Ref [8]) for improved rehabilitation and recommendations from the 2016 – 2023 annual rehabilitation surveys. Rehabilitation activities undertaken within the reporting period are also presented in **Table 7-5**.

Table 7-5 *Recommended and Completed Rehabilitation Actions in Area 8*

Recommended Rehabilitation Actions Area 8		Actions Completed (2014 to 2023)	Undertaken in 2024
SLR Soil Assessment. Report, 2014 (Ref [8])	Control of African Lovegrass prior to pasture establishment works.	Weed spraying as per Weed Management Schedule (Section 5.7).	Yes
	Ripping with a plough to create furrows, followed by application of pasture seed mix.	Furrows created along poorly vegetated areas followed by direct seeding.	No – not required
	Application of Muriate of Potash (0.25tonnes/ha) and Di-ammonium phosphate 0.20 tonnes/ha).	MAP and DAP applied at recommended rates.	No – not required.
	Application of mushroom compost, lime & gypsum (10:4:1 tonnes/ha).	Fertiliser and compost applied at recommended rates.	No – not required.
2014 Rehabilitation Monitoring Report (Ref [9])	Treat surface soil erosion on slopes via placement of cut vegetation or rocks in erosion channels.	Drainage lines re-shaped with rock placement in erosion channels.	No, not required
	Re-sow exposed surfaces with fast-growing groundcover herbs and grasses.	Exposed areas re-sown with pasture seed mix.	No – not required
	Install nesting boxes in close proximity to treed rehabilitation area.	Installation will be undertaken when the native tree species are of a suitable size to support the nesting boxes.	No
2015 Rehabilitation Monitoring Report (Ref [10])	Rip along contours of poorly established pasture rehabilitation areas and re-sow pasture mix and fertiliser. Cover with a mixture of mushroom compost, lime and gypsum as per the recommendations (Ref [8]).	Furrows created over the land, pasture seed mix applied, followed by fertiliser and compost.	No – not required.
	Increase and maintain groundcover in pasture rehabilitation Areas B and C and in Area 8 to at least 95%.	Application of fertiliser and compost at recommended rates.	No – not required

Recommended Rehabilitation Actions Area 8		Actions Completed (2014 to 2023)	Undertaken in 2024
2016 Rehabilitation Monitoring Report (Ref [11])	Continue to spot spray African Lovegrass outbreaks.	Weed spraying as per Weed Management Schedule (Section 5.7).	Yes
	Continue to monitor pest animal numbers.	Pest and animal monitoring not required to be undertaken.	No – not required
2017 – 2023 Rehab Monitoring Reports (Ref [12-18])	Continue to spot spray African Lovegrass outbreaks.	Weed spraying as per Weed Management Schedule (Section 5.7).	Yes

The PDM 2024 Rehabilitation Monitoring Report (Ref [4], **Appendix C**) documented the following findings for Area 8 (transect 4):

- Total living cover / Rehabilitated pasture surfaces in the transect area supports living groundcover of greater than 90%.
- Natural regeneration of groundcover species is evident across all the pasture rehabilitation areas.
- Target weed presence comprises African Lovegrass at <10% of the pasture sward.

Comparative photographs are presented in **Appendix C**.

7.1.7 ADDITIONAL REHABILITATION MAINTENANCE WORKS

There were no additional rehabilitation or maintenance works undertaken or required to be undertaken during the reporting period.

7.1.8 RENOVATION / REMOVAL OF BUILDINGS

No buildings were renovated or removed during the reporting period.

7.1.9 REHABILITATION FORMAL SIGN OFF

There were no areas of rehabilitation which acquired formal sign off from the Resources Regulator during the reporting period.

7.1.10 REHABILITATION TRIALS AND RESEARCH

There were no rehabilitation trials or research undertaken during the reporting period.

7.1.11 THREATS TO REHABILITATION SUCCESS

Significant threats to rehabilitation at PDM have been identified in the PDM RMP (Ref [3]). These threats and mitigation measures have been reproduced in **Table 7-6**. PDM successfully maintained the mitigation and management measures during the 2024 reporting period.

Table 7-6 *Threats to Rehabilitation Success*

Secondary Domains (Post Mining Land Use)	Potential Threat(s)	Mitigation & Management Measures
Infrastructure (A)	Engineering design failure	Any infrastructure remaining in place post mining would be inspected and approved by a suitably qualified person (if required) and agreed by relevant stakeholders.
Water Management Structure (B)	Water damage (erosion, flooding etc.)	Infrastructure and water management structures would be constructed in accordance with relevant guidelines and to ensure erosion and damage from floods is minimised.
Rehabilitation - Pasture (C) Rehabilitation - Native Forest (D) Rehabilitation – Pine Plantation (E)	Adverse soil chemistry	Soil testing and amelioration
	Erosion	Design to relevant guidelines, regular maintenance as required
	Seed germination failure	Seed treatment, soil amelioration, annual monitoring
	Species diversity and density	Annual monitoring and supplementary tree planting and seeding as required
	Weed presence	Inspections and weed control (herbicide application).
	Drought	Drought tolerant species selection, timing seeding to coincide with appropriate soil moisture.
Rehabilitation Areas continued	Grazing	Restrict grazing particularly in early years to rehabilitated areas
	Bushfire	Maintain low fuel loads, emergency preparedness and response

Bushfire was the dominant threat during late 2019 and early January 2020; the PDM 2024 Rehabilitation Monitoring Report (Ref [4], **Appendix D**) indicated that fuel loads within all rehabilitation areas were low and fuel hazard mitigation activities were not required. Details regarding firefighting access tracks, fire breaks and emergency response measures are detailed in **Section 5.14**.

7.2 ACTIONS FOR THE 2025 REPORTING PERIOD

Maintenance and rehabilitation activities recommended in the PDM RMP (Ref [3]) will continue on areas not directly impacted by future mining operations throughout 2025 (sediment fences, fertilising, re-seeding, weed control etc), where required and as conditions allow.

As per the recommendations made in the PDM 2024 Rehabilitation Monitoring Report (Ref [4], **Appendix C**), further weed spraying is proposed.

The 2018 SLR Rehabilitation and Completion Assessment report (Ref [2]) confirms that rehabilitation has been successfully completed in Areas B, C and 8 and all completion criteria defined in the PDM RMP (Ref [3]) has been successfully achieved. The process for the relinquishment of rehabilitation responsibilities of Areas B, C and 8 was commenced in the 2024 reporting period with consultation with the landowner and boundary surveys. The process will be further progressed during the 2025 reporting period.

8 COMMUNITY RELATIONS

8.1 ENVIRONMENTAL COMPLAINTS

All stakeholder and community complaints, enquiries and notifications regarding PDM are documented, with appropriate actions taken as soon as possible to determine the likely cause of the incident and all possible corrective actions to resolve the problem and prevent its recurrence. Complaints, enquiries and notifications are recorded and retained at the site office in addition to monthly publication on the EnergyAustralia website. During the 2024 reporting period, there were no complaints received, enquiries or notifications received as summarised by **Table 8-1**.

Table 8-1 *Community Complaints, Incidents and Notifications*

Incident Type	Incidents Received 2024
Noise	0
Air Quality	0
Blasting	0
Traffic	0
Water	0
Other	0
Total Complaints Received	0
Enquiries/Notifications Received	0

No complaints, enquiries or notifications have been received during the last five (5) years (2020 – 2024): the last was a notification received in May 2018.

8.2 COMMUNITY

8.2.1 COMMUNITY CONSULTIVE COMMITTEE

PDM CCC commenced in January 2012 and comprises representatives from the local community and PDM. During 2017, the then Department of Planning and Environment approved an amalgamation of the PDM CCC and the regional EnergyAustralia CCC into one. The amalgamated CCC meets three (3) times per year to discuss matters relating to PDM and meeting minutes are made publicly available via the EnergyAustralia website. During the 2024 reporting period the CCC meetings were held on 13 February, 11 June, 20 August and 19 November 2024.

8.2.2 WEBSITE INFORMATION

A website has been established to keep the broader community up to date with recent activities at the Pine Dale Mine in accordance with Schedule 5, Condition 10 of the PA 10_0041; and EPL 4911. Copies of the following documents are made publicly available on the EnergyAustralia Website³:

- EPL 4911.
- Environmental Assessment.
- Project Approval 10_0041.
- Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999 Referral Decision 2011/6016.
- The Care and Maintenance Mining Operation Plan.
- Environmental Management Plans for Pine Dale Mine.
- AEMR Reports / Annual Review.
- Pollution Incident Response Management Plan.
- Independent Environmental Audits (refer **Section 9**).
- Community Consultative Committee minutes.
- Community Complaints (Enquiries & Notifications).
- Blasting information.
- Monthly Environmental Performance reports.

8.2.3 SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC CONTRIBUTIONS

PDM has contributed to the economy of the district and NSW by providing direct employment and indirect employment through the purchase of services and materials from regional suppliers. Coal supplies to Mount Piper Power Station provide competitively priced energy for the NSW electricity market which ultimately flows through to provide economic benefit to electricity consumers.

Additionally, EnergyAustralia undertakes a community grants programme which provides funding for local initiatives that will deliver sustainable benefits for the Lithgow region. The two (2) priority areas for funding are education and social inclusion. Details of the community grants programme is provided on the EnergyAustralia website³.

9 INDEPENDENT ENVIRONMENTAL AUDIT

There was no requirement within the Project Approval 10_0041 for an Independent Environmental Audit (IEA) to be conducted at PDM while PDM is in care and maintenance: as such none was undertaken during the 2024 reporting period.

³ <https://www.energyaustralia.com.au/about-us/community>

The last IEA was undertaken in August 2014. Copies of the audit report, the audit Action Plan and the auditor's recommendations and proposed actions by PDM are provided on the EnergyAustralia website.

As per the conditions of Project Approval 10_0041, no further IEA are required at PDM providing the care and maintenance status is maintained.

10 INCIDENTS AND NON-COMPLIANCES

During the 2024 reporting period, there were instances of non-compliance in relation to:

- The Old Shaft is no longer sampled as it is not safe to do so. Samples were collected from Wallerawang Underground as a suitable safe alternative site; the WMP (Ref [5]) will be updated accordingly to reflect this.
- Sampling from Bore E within the Yarraboldy extension could not be undertaken due to access and safety issues.

There were no reportable incidents, official cautions, warning letters, penalty notices or prosecution proceedings by any regulatory body during the reporting period.

The November samples for eight (8) of the nine (9) dust gauges were collected one (1) day outside the recommended exposure period of 28-32 days; there was no November result for D5 as the bottle broke during transport. The results from all gauges were below the criteria, and the December samples were collected within the correct exposure period such that it is not considered that there has been any significant impact to the monitoring results.

The January and March results for dust gauge D6 increased by more than the NSW EPA threshold of 2g/m² from the December 2023 and February 2024 results respectively. The majority of the results are from combustible matter such as insects and other organic matter and not considered to indicate airborne particulates related to activities at PDM.

There were several exceedances of the water quality triggers for surface water and groundwater during the reporting period. As discussed in **Section 6.3** exceedances of surface water triggers are considered to be due to upstream influences in Wangcol Creek and Coxs River outside of the control of PDM. As discussed in **Section 6.2.2** intermittent exceedances of the groundwater trigger levels are not considered to be due to activities undertaken by PDM, rather are due to external factors such as climate.

11 PROPOSED ACTIVITIES IN THE NEXT REPORTING PERIOD

The activities proposed for the 2025 reporting period are consistent with the PDM RMP (Ref [3]). Rehabilitation activities set out in the PDM RMP will be transitioned across into a new Rehabilitation Management Plan inclusive of Rehabilitation Objectives, Completion Criteria and Final Landform Plan. These will remain substantially consistent with that already set out in the PDM RMP. General maintenance will be undertaken at the site in addition to rehabilitation activities including weed management and fertilising as required.

11.1 MINING

All recoverable coal within the approved mining area was extracted during early 2014. No mining activities are proposed during 2025.

11.2 FUTURE MINING DEVELOPMENT

Subject to market conditions, in order to maintain supply of commercial coal to Mount Piper Power Station, Enhance Place may consider lodging an application with the DPHI to extend the existing mining operations. This will be subject to ongoing feasibility assessments associated with coal extraction within the existing authorisations.


11.3 DOCUMENT REVIEWS

The PDM WMP (Ref [5]) is being reviewed for consistency with current arrangements. The Environmental Management Strategy and other environmental Management Plans will be updated to reflect the current status of the site while in Care and Maintenance

REFERENCES

- [1] NSW Government, *Annual Review Guideline*, October 2015.
- [2] SLR, *Pine Dale Mine Rehabilitation Completion Assessment*, SLR ref 630.12362-R01, 2018.
- [3] EnergyAustralia, *Pine Dale Mine Rehabilitation Management Plan*, July 2022
- [4] FirstField Environmental, *Pine Dale Mine Rehabilitation Monitoring Report 2023*, September 2023.
- [5] Enhance Place Pty Limited, *Water Management Plan for the Pine Dale Coal Mine (Including the Yarraboldy Extension)*, August 2015.
- [6] GHD, *Pine Dale Groundwater and Surface Water Investigation Trigger Value Review Report*, September 2018.
- [7] CSIRO, *Ecosystem Function Analysis – Ephemeral Stream Assessment Protocol*.
- [8] SLR, *Soil Assessment and Recommendations for Rehabilitated Areas: Pine Dale Mine and Enhance Place*, November 2014.
- [9] FirstField Environmental, *Pine Dale Mine 2014 Rehabilitation Monitoring Report*, June 2014.
- [10] FirstField Environmental, *Pine Dale Mine 2015 Rehabilitation Monitoring Report*, November 2015.
- [11] FirstField Environmental, *Pine Dale Mine 2016 Rehabilitation Monitoring Report*, November 2016.
- [12] FirstField Environmental, *Pine Dale Mine 2017 Rehabilitation Monitoring Report*, October 2017.
- [13] FirstField Environmental, *Pine Dale Mine 2018 Rehabilitation Monitoring Report*, October 2018.
- [14] FirstField Environmental, *Pine Dale Mine 2019 Rehabilitation Monitoring Report*, October 2019.
- [15] FirstField Environmental, *Pine Dale Mine 2020 Rehabilitation Monitoring Report*, November 2020.
- [16] FirstField Environmental, *Pine Dale Mine Rehabilitation Monitoring Report 2021*, January 2022.

- [17] FirstField Environmental, *Pine Dale Mine Rehabilitation Monitoring Report 2022*, January 2023.
- [18] FirstField Environmental, *Pine Dale Mine Rehabilitation Monitoring Report 2023*, September 2023.




LEGEND

 Pine Dale Mine

Mine Lease Numbers

 1569  1664
 1578  1637

Note: Aerial taken from ArcGis Base Map,
23 May 2023
Coordinate System GDA 1994 Zone 56




DRAWN BY : F.Brooker

ENHANCE PLACE MINE
REGIONAL LOCALITY PLAN

SCALE: 1:24,000 (A3)

DATE: 18/02/2025

PLAN:
1






LEGEND

- | | |
|---------------------------------------|--|
| Noise monitoring location | Historic High Volume Air Sampling Location |
| Depositional dust monitoring location | Meteorological monitoring location (up until 10 November 2021) |
| Groundwater monitoring location | Meteorological monitoring location (from 10 November 2021) |
| Surface water monitoring location | |

Note: Aerial taken from ArcGis Base Map,
23 May 2023
Coordinate System GDA 1994 Zone 56



DRAWN BY : F. Brooker

PINE DALE MINE
ENVIRONMENTAL MONITORING
LOCATION PLAN

PLAN:
3a

SCALE: 1:24,000 (A3)


DATE: 18/02/2025



LEGEND

- Monitoring location
- Licence discharge point location
- Clean water diversion location

Note: Aerial taken from ArcGis Base Map,
23 May 2023
Coordinate System GDa 1994 Zone 56



DRAWN BY : F. Brooker

PINE DALE MINE
ENVIRONMENTAL MONITORING
CHANNEL STABILITY, STREAM AND
VEGETATIVE HEALTH
MONITORING SITES

PLAN:
3b

SCALE: 1:5,000 (A3)

DATE: 18/02/2025


CDT-DWG-A3H-001/1



LEGEND

- Yarraboldy Extension Area (21.9ha)
- Rehabilitation Area - Native Forest (7.1ha)
- Rehabilitation Area - Pasture (25.4ha)
- Dams
- Bund Wall
- Road

NOTE: Drawing adapted from plan supplied by
Craven, Ellistion & Hayes (Lithgow) Pty Ltd
Drawing No. PINE AEMR13
Dated 31/12/2013



	PINE DALE MINE REHABILITATION DOMAINS DECEMBER 2018		PLAN: 4
	DRAWN BY : F. Brooker	SCALE: 1 : 8000 (A3)	
		DATE: 18/02/2025	

**ANNUAL REVIEW ENVIRONMENTAL SUMMARY 2024
PINE DALE MINE**

Prepared for ENHANCE PLACE PTY Limited

Prepared by RCA Australia

RCA ref 6880g-312/0 APPENDIX B

JANUARY 2025



RCA AUSTRALIA

ABN 53 063 515 711

92 Hill Street, CARRINGTON NSW 2294

Telephone: +61 2 4902 9200

Email: administrator@rca.com.au

Internet: www.rca.com.au

This document is and shall remain the property of RCA Australia. The document may only be used for the purpose for which it was commissioned and in accordance with the Terms of Engagement for the commission supplied at the time of proposal. Unauthorised use of this document in any form whatsoever is prohibited.

DOCUMENT STATUS						
Rev No	Comment	Author	Reviewer	Approved for Issue (Project Manager)		
				Name	Signature	Date
/0	Final provided as Appendix B to Pine Dale Mine Annual Review 2024 report	M Hayyat	F Brooker	F Brooker		18.02.2025

DOCUMENT DISTRIBUTION				
Rev No	Copies	Format	Issued to	Date
/0	1	Electronic (email)	EnergyAustralia Graham Goodwin graham.goodwin2@energyaustralia.com.au Ben Eastwood ben.eastwood@energyaustralia.com.au Mark Frewin mark.frewin@energyaustralia.com.au Jarvis Lulham Jarvis.Lulham@energyaustralia.com.au	18.02.2025
/0	1	Electronic report	RCA – job archive	18.02.2025



18 February 2025

Enhance Place Pty Limited
PO Box 202
WALLERAWANG NSW 2845

Attention: Mr Graham Goodwin

Geotechnical Engineering
Engineering Geology
Environmental Engineering
Hydrogeology
Construction Materials Testing
Environmental Monitoring
Noise & Vibration
Occupational Hygiene

ANNUAL REVIEW ENVIRONMENTAL SUMMARY 2024
COMPILED FOR PINE DALE MINE
JANUARY – DECEMBER 2024

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Pine Dale Mine achieved an acceptable standard of environmental performance during the 2024 reporting period, as evidenced by the following:

- Air quality monitoring results recorded during the reporting period for depositional dust were below the Project Approval (PA 10_0041) and Environment Protection Licence limits in Blackmans Flat and other privately owned properties adjacent to the Mining Leases.
 - The January and March 2024 results for DG6 represented an increase of more than the 2g/m² per month deposited matter from the December 2023 and February 2024 results respectively and the results are considered related to insects and other organic matter. As PDM has been in care and maintenance with no specific soil disturbance activities undertaken, the results are not considered indicative of impact from PDM.
- There were no surface water discharge events during the reporting period; and monitoring was conducted in accordance with EPL 4911 and the site Water Management Plan.
- Surface water and groundwater quality were assessed against the respective trigger levels that showed varied results which was generally consistent with previous years.
- There were no community complaints throughout the 2024 reporting period.

Contents

1	INTRODUCTION	1
2	AIR QUALITY MONITORING	1
2.1	<i>ASSESSMENT CRITERIA</i>	<i>1</i>
2.2	<i>AIR MONITORING RESULTS.....</i>	<i>2</i>
2.3	<i>REVIEW & INTERPRETATION OF AIR MONITORING RESULTS.....</i>	<i>7</i>
3	GROUNDWATER QUALITY MONITORING	9
3.1	<i>GROUNDWATER ASSESSMENT CRITERIA.....</i>	<i>9</i>
3.2	<i>GROUNDWATER MONITORING DATA SUMMARY</i>	<i>11</i>
3.3	<i>REVIEW & INTERPRETATION OF GROUND WATER MONITORING.....</i>	<i>18</i>
3.3.1	<i>SITE GROUNDWATER BORES</i>	<i>18</i>
3.3.2	<i>OFF-SITE GROUNDWATER BORES.....</i>	<i>19</i>
4	SURFACE WATER QUALITY MONITORING.....	21
4.1	<i>SURFACE WATER ASSESSMENT CRITERIA</i>	<i>22</i>
4.2	<i>SURFACE WATER MONITORING DATA SUMMARY.....</i>	<i>23</i>
4.3	<i>REVIEW & INTERPRETATION OF SURFACE WATER MONITORING RESULTS</i>	<i>38</i>
4.3.1	<i>EPL SURFACE WATER.....</i>	<i>38</i>
4.3.2	<i>SITE SURFACE WATER.....</i>	<i>39</i>
5	METEOROLOGICAL MONITORING.....	41
5.1	<i>METEOROLOGICAL MONITORING DATA SUMMARY.....</i>	<i>41</i>
5.2	<i>REVIEW OF METEOROLOGICAL MONITORING RESULTS.....</i>	<i>43</i>
6	STREAM HEALTH & CHANNEL STABILITY MONITORING.....	43
6.1	<i>STREAM HEALTH & CHANNEL STABILITY MONITORING SUMMARY</i>	<i>43</i>
6.2	<i>REVIEW & INTERPRETATION OF STREAM HEALTH MONITORING RESULTS</i>	<i>48</i>
7	NOISE MONITORING	49
7.1	<i>NOISE ASSESSMENT CRITERIA</i>	<i>49</i>
7.2	<i>NOISE MONITORING DATA SUMMARY.....</i>	<i>49</i>
7.3	<i>REVIEW & INTERPRETATION OF OPERATIONAL NOISE MONITORING RESULTS..</i>	<i>59</i>
7.3.1	<i>FIRST QUARTER 2024</i>	<i>59</i>
7.3.2	<i>SECOND QUARTER 2024</i>	<i>60</i>
7.3.3	<i>THIRD QUARTER 2024.....</i>	<i>60</i>
7.3.4	<i>FOURTH QUARTER 2024.....</i>	<i>60</i>
7.3.5	<i>OVERALL ASSESSMENT FOR 2024.....</i>	<i>60</i>
8	BLAST MONITORING	60
8.1	<i>BLASTING OPERATIONS ASSESSMENT CRITERIA.....</i>	<i>60</i>
8.2	<i>BLASTING OPERATIONS MONITORING DATA SUMMARY</i>	<i>61</i>
9	LIMITATIONS	61
	REFERENCES	62
	GLOSSARY	62

List of Figures

FIGURE 1	<i>DEPOSITIONAL DUST RESULTS – GAUGES D1 & D3 TO D6.....</i>	7
FIGURE 2	<i>DEPOSITIONAL DUST RESULTS – GAUGES PCB1 TO PCB3 & PCB7.....</i>	7
FIGURE 3	<i>DG6 DUST GAUGE FROM JANUARY 2024 AND FROM MARCH 2024.....</i>	8
FIGURE 4	<i>ONSITE GROUNDWATER STANDING WATER LEVEL 2024.....</i>	17
FIGURE 5	<i>ONSITE GROUNDWATER PH AND ELECTRICAL CONDUCTIVITY 2024.....</i>	17
FIGURE 6	<i>PIPER PLOT COMPARING RESULTS OF 2024 MONITORING TO HISTORICAL DATA</i>	19
FIGURE 7	<i>STANDING WATER LEVEL AND RAINFALL 2020 – 2024.....</i>	20
FIGURE 8	<i>PH IN OFF-SITE GROUNDWATER BORES 2020 – 2024.....</i>	20
FIGURE 9	<i>ELECTRICAL CONDUCTIVITY IN OFF-SITE GROUNDWATER BORES 2020 – 2024</i>	21
FIGURE 10	<i>SITE SURFACE WATER S1, S3 & S6 PH RESULTS 2024.....</i>	35
FIGURE 11	<i>SITE SURFACE WATER S4, S5 & S7 PH RESULTS 2024.....</i>	35
FIGURE 12	<i>WALLERAWANG DOWNSTREAM AND WATER CART DAM PH RESULTS 2024.....</i>	36
FIGURE 13	<i>SITE SURFACE WATER S1, S3 & S6 ELECTRICAL CONDUCTIVITY RESULTS 2024.....</i>	36
FIGURE 14	<i>SITE SURFACE WATER S4, S5 & S7 ELECTRICAL CONDUCTIVITY RESULTS 2024.....</i>	37
FIGURE 15	<i>THE BONG AND WALLERAWANG DOWNSTREAM ELECTRICAL CONDUCTIVITY RESULTS 2024.....</i>	37
FIGURE 16	<i>SITE SURFACE WATER S2 – 2024 WATER LEVEL</i>	38
FIGURE 17	<i>SITE SURFACE WATER ELECTRICAL CONDUCTIVITY AND MONTHLY RAINFALL.....</i>	40

List of Tables

TABLE 1	<i>AIR QUALITY ASSESSMENT CRITERIA</i>	1
TABLE 2	<i>DEPOSITIONAL DUST DATA SUMMARY DUST GAUGE D1 JANUARY – DECEMBER 2024.....</i>	2
TABLE 3	<i>DEPOSITIONAL DUST DATA SUMMARY DUST GAUGE D3 JANUARY – DECEMBER 2024.....</i>	3
TABLE 4	<i>DEPOSITIONAL DUST DATA SUMMARY GAUGE D4 JANUARY – DECEMBER 2024</i>	3
TABLE 5	<i>DEPOSITIONAL DUST DATA SUMMARY GAUGE D5 JANUARY – DECEMBER 2024</i>	4
TABLE 6	<i>DEPOSITIONAL DUST DATA SUMMARY GAUGE D6 JANUARY – DECEMBER 2024</i>	4
TABLE 7	<i>DEPOSITIONAL DUST DATA SUMMARY GAUGE PCB1 JANUARY – DECEMBER 2024</i>	5
TABLE 8	<i>DEPOSITIONAL DUST DATA SUMMARY GAUGE PCB2 JANUARY – DECEMBER 2024</i>	5
TABLE 9	<i>DEPOSITIONAL DUST DATA SUMMARY GAUGE PCB3 JANUARY – DECEMBER 2024</i>	6
TABLE 10	<i>DEPOSITIONAL DUST DATA SUMMARY GAUGE PCB7 JANUARY – DECEMBER 2024</i>	6
TABLE 11	<i>GROUNDWATER TRIGGER LEVELS</i>	10
TABLE 12	<i>REVISED GROUNDWATER TRIGGER LEVELS (REF [9]).....</i>	10
TABLE 13	<i>GROUNDWATER MONITORING BORE P6 RESULTS JANUARY – DECEMBER 2024.....</i>	12

TABLE 14	<i>GROUNDWATER MONITORING BORE P7 RESULTS JANUARY – DECEMBER 2024</i>	13
TABLE 15	<i>GROUNDWATER MONITORING BORE A (EP DDH7/GW) RESULTS JANUARY – DECEMBER 2024</i>	14
TABLE 16	<i>GROUNDWATER MONITORING BORE C (EP PDH1/GW) RESULTS JANUARY – DECEMBER 2024</i>	15
TABLE 17	<i>GROUNDWATER MONITORING BORE D (EP DDH4/GW) RESULTS JANUARY – DECEMBER 2024</i>	16
TABLE 18	<i>SURFACE WATER TRIGGER LEVELS</i>	23
TABLE 19	<i>REVISED SURFACE WATER TRIGGER LEVELS (REF [9])</i>	23
TABLE 20	<i>SURFACE WATER MONITORING LOCATION EPL POINT 2 RESULTS 2024</i>	24
TABLE 21	<i>SURFACE WATER MONITORING LOCATION EPL POINT 3 RESULTS 2024</i>	24
TABLE 22	<i>SURFACE WATER MONITORING LOCATION EPL POINT 14 RESULTS 2024</i>	25
TABLE 23	<i>SURFACE WATER MONITORING LOCATION EPL POINT 16 RESULTS 2024</i>	25
TABLE 24	<i>SURFACE WATER MONITORING LOCATION S1 RESULTS 2024</i>	26
TABLE 25	<i>SURFACE WATER MONITORING LOCATION S2 RESULTS 2024</i>	27
TABLE 26	<i>SURFACE WATER MONITORING LOCATION S3 RESULTS 2024</i>	28
TABLE 27	<i>SURFACE WATER MONITORING LOCATION S4 RESULTS 2024</i>	29
TABLE 28	<i>SURFACE WATER MONITORING LOCATION S5 RESULTS 2024</i>	30
TABLE 29	<i>SURFACE WATER MONITORING LOCATION S6 RESULTS 2024</i>	31
TABLE 30	<i>SURFACE WATER MONITORING LOCATION S7 RESULTS 2024</i>	32
TABLE 31	<i>SURFACE WATER MONITORING LOCATION WALLERAWANG DOWNSTREAM RESULTS 2024</i>	33
TABLE 32	<i>SURFACE WATER MONITORING LOCATION ‘THE BONG’ RESULTS JANUARY – DECEMBER 2024</i>	34
TABLE 33	<i>EPL METEOROLOGICAL MONITORING REQUIREMENTS</i>	41
TABLE 34	<i>COMPLETENESS (%) OF WEATHER STATION DATA CAPTURE</i>	41
TABLE 35	<i>METEOROLOGICAL MONITORING SUMMARY DATA 2024</i>	42
TABLE 36	<i>CLASSIFICATION OF DIFFERENT DRAINAGE LINE STATES (CSIRO)</i>	44
TABLE 37	<i>CLASSIFICATION OF DIFFERENT DRAINAGE LINE STATE – SITE SH1</i>	45
TABLE 38	<i>CLASSIFICATION OF DIFFERENT DRAINAGE LINE STATE – SITE SH2</i>	46
TABLE 39	<i>CLASSIFICATION OF DIFFERENT DRAINAGE LINE STATE – SITE SH3</i>	47
TABLE 40	<i>CLASSIFICATION OF DIFFERENT DRAINAGE LINE STATE – SITE SH5</i>	48
TABLE 41	<i>NOISE ASSESSMENT CRITERIA (REF [1] AND [2])</i>	49
TABLE 42	<i>ATTENDED NOISE SURVEY – QUARTER 1, MARCH 2024</i>	51
TABLE 43	<i>ATTENDED NOISE SURVEY – QUARTER 2, MAY 2024</i>	53
TABLE 44	<i>ATTENDED NOISE SURVEY – QUARTER 3, SEPTEMBER 2024</i>	55

TABLE 45	<i>ATTENDED NOISE SURVEY – QUARTER 4, NOVEMBER 2024</i>	57
TABLE 46	<i>METEOROLOGICAL CONDITIONS DURING ATTENDED NOISE SURVEYS</i>	59
TABLE 47	<i>BLASTING OPERATIONS: COMPLIANCE REQUIREMENTS</i>	61

Attachments

ATTACHMENT 1

DRAWING 1 - ENVIRONMENTAL MONITORING LOCATIONS

DRAWING 2 - STREAM HEALTH & CHANNEL STABILITY MONITORING LOCATIONS

1 INTRODUCTION

The following report provides a summary of monthly environmental monitoring data for Pine Dale Mine (PDM) for the period January – December 2024. The 2024 environmental summary data includes:

- Depositional dust monitoring.
- Groundwater monitoring.
- Surface water monitoring.
- Meteorological monitoring.
- Channel stability and stream health monitoring.
- Noise monitoring.

This report satisfies the requirements to monitor environmental parameters as presented in the PDM Environment Protection Licence (EPL 4911, Ref [1]) and Project Approval (PA 10_0041, (Ref [2])). Monitoring is also undertaken in general accordance with the PDM: Water Management Plan (Ref [3]); Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Management Plan (Ref [4]; Purple Copper Butterfly Monitoring Programme (Ref [5]); and Noise Management Plan (Ref [6]).

A compliance assessment of each environmental monitoring parameter is made in accordance with the relevant assessment criteria outlined in EPL 4911 (Ref [1]), Project Approval (Ref [2]) and the PDM Management Plans (Ref [3] to [6]).

It is noted that quarterly reports have been issued with the monitoring data for the majority of the year; this report is the only presentation of the October to December quarter for air quality, groundwater, surface water and meteorological data.

2 AIR QUALITY MONITORING

2.1 ASSESSMENT CRITERIA

The PDM Project Approval (Schedule 3 Condition 18, Ref [2]) and Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Management Plan (Ref [4]) stipulates that dust emissions generated by the project must not cause additional exceedances of the long-term impact assessment criteria listed in **Table 1**.

Table 1 *Air Quality Assessment Criteria*

Pollutant	Average Period	Assessment Criteria	
		Maximum increase in deposited dust level	Maximum total deposited dust level
^c Deposited dust	Annual	^b 2.0g/m ² .month	^a 4.0g/m ² .month

^a Total impact (incremental increase in concentrations due to the project plus background concentrations due to other sources).

^b Incremental impact (incremental increase in concentrations due to the project on its own).

^c Deposited dust is to be assessed as insoluble solids as defined by Standards Australia, AS/NZS3580.10.1 (Ref [7]).

Criteria excludes extraordinary events such as bushfires, prescribed burning, dust storms, sea fog, fire incidents, illegal activities or any other activity agreed to by the Director-General in consultation with Department of Planning and Environment (DPIE).

2.2 AIR MONITORING RESULTS

Depositional dust monitoring is undertaken at nine (9) locations across PDM.

A total of five (5) depositional dust gauges are monitored in accordance with EPL 4911 (Ref [1]) and the Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Management Plan (Ref [4]). One (1) dust gauge is located within the settlement of Blackmans Flat (gauge D1) and one (1) is located to the east of Blackmans Flat (gauge D3). The remaining three (3) gauges (D4, D5 & D6) were installed in November 2006 to coincide with the commencement of mining in Areas B & C. Gauge D4 is located to the north of View St, Blackmans Flat. Gauges D5 & D6 are located to the east of Mining Areas B & C, along Wolgan Road, Lidsdale (refer **Drawing 1, Attachment 1**).

The remaining four (4) depositional dust gauges are monitored in accordance with the Purple Copper Butterfly Monitoring Programme (Ref [5]) assessing the level of dust present at each location to aid in the study of the Purple Copper Butterfly population. These gauges are: PCB1, PCB2, PCB3 and PCB7. Three (3) of the dust gauges were located within what was the major butterfly population to the east of the mine workings in the Yarraboldy Extension (PCB1, PCB2 and PCB3); whilst the fourth dust gauge (PCB7) is located to the south west of the butterfly habitat area (refer **Drawing 1, Attachment 1**).

Depositional dust summary results for the period January – December 2024 are shown in **Table 2** to **Table 10**. Graphical presentations are shown in **Figures 1** and **2**. A discussion of results is presented in **Section 2.3**.

Table 2 *Depositional Dust Data Summary Dust Gauge D1 January – December 2024*

Month	Insoluble Solids (g/m ² .month)	Ash Residue (g/m ² .month)	Combustible Matter (g/m ² .month)
Jan-24	1.3	0.5	0.8
Feb-24	1.2	0.3	0.9
Mar-24	0.9	0.3	0.6
Apr-24	0.8	0.2	0.6
May-24	0.3	0.1	0.2
Jun-24	0.4	0.1	0.3
Jul-24	0.4	0.2	0.2
Aug-24	0.5	0.2	0.3
Sep-24	0.8	0.4	0.4
Oct-24	0.6	0.3	0.3
Nov-24	0.4	0.2	0.2
Dec-24	1.2	0.3	0.9
Annual Average	0.7	0.3	0.5

Small & underline – Where results are less than the detection limit, half of the detection limit has been used in statistical calculations.

Table 3 *Depositional Dust Data Summary Dust Gauge D3 January – December 2024*

Month	Insoluble Solids (g/m ² .month)	Ash Residue (g/m ² .month)	Combustible Matter (g/m ² .month)
Jan-24	1.4	0.5	0.9
Feb-24	0.6	0.5	0.1
Mar-24	1.7	0.8	0.9
Apr-24	0.5	0.3	0.2
May-24	0.5	0.3	0.2
Jun-24	0.5	0.3	0.2
Jul-24	0.6	0.3	0.3
Aug-24	0.8	0.5	0.3
Sep-24	0.6	0.3	0.3
Oct-24	2.4	1.1	1.3
Nov-24	1.2	0.7	0.5
Dec-24	1.6	0.7	0.9
Annual Average	1.0	0.5	0.5

Small & underline – Where results are less than the detection limit, half of the detection limit has been used in statistical calculations.

Table 4 *Depositional Dust Data Summary Gauge D4 January – December 2024*

Month	Insoluble Solids (g/m ² .month)	Ash Residue (g/m ² .month)	Combustible Matter (g/m ² .month)
Jan-24	1.1	0.5	0.6
Feb-24	0.8	0.2	0.6
Mar-24	0.9	0.5	0.4
Apr-24	0.4	<u>0.05</u>	0.4
May-24	0.5	0.1	0.4
Jun-24	0.4	0.2	0.2
Jul-24	0.3	0.1	0.2
Aug-24	0.5	0.2	0.3
Sep-24	0.6	0.1	0.5
Oct-24	0.5	0.1	0.4
Nov-24	0.2	0.1	0.1
Dec-24	0.3	<u>0.05</u>	0.3
Annual Average	0.5	0.2	0.4

Small & underline – Where results are less than the detection limit, half of the detection limit has been used in statistical calculations.

Table 5 *Depositional Dust Data Summary Gauge D5 January – December 2024*

Month	Insoluble Solids (g/m ² .month)	Ash Residue (g/m ² .month)	Combustible Matter (g/m ² .month)
Jan-24	1.6	0.8	0.8
Feb-24	0.3	0.2	0.1
Mar-24	1.3	0.6	0.7
Apr-24	1.9	1.0	0.9
May-24	0.2	0.1	0.1
Jun-24	0.2	0.1	0.1
Jul-24	0.8	0.5	0.3
Aug-24	0.4	0.1	0.3
Sep-24	0.5	0.2	0.3
Oct-24	1.3	1.1	0.2
Nov-24	--	--	--
Dec-24	0.4	<u>0.05</u>	0.4
Annual Average	0.8	0.4	0.4

Small & underline – Where results are less than the detection limit, half of the detection limit has been used in statistical calculations.

-- D5 Dust gauge was broken in November during transportation.

Table 6 *Depositional Dust Data Summary Gauge D6 January – December 2024*

Month	Insoluble Solids (g/m ² .month)	Ash Residue (g/m ² .month)	Combustible Matter (g/m ² .month)
Jan-24	7.6	3.0	4.6
Feb-24	1.4	1.0	0.4
Mar-24	3.8	0.9	2.9
Apr-24	1.6	0.7	0.9
May-24	0.3	0.1	0.2
Jun-24	1.2	0.8	0.4
Jul-24	0.5	0.3	0.2
Aug-24	2.1	1.7	0.4
Sep-24	0.6	0.2	0.4
Oct-24	0.4	0.3	0.1
Nov-24	0.5	0.3	0.2
Dec-24	1.9	0.8	1.1
Annual Average	1.8	0.8	1.0

Small & underline – Where results are less than the detection limit, half of the detection limit has been used in statistical calculations.

Table 7 *Depositional Dust Data Summary Gauge PCB1 January – December 2024*

Month	Insoluble Solids (g/m ² .month)	Ash Residue (g/m ² .month)	Combustible Matter (g/m ² .month)
Jan-24	2.0	0.7	1.3
Feb-24	1.9	<u>0.05</u>	1.9
Mar-24	1.0	0.2	0.8
Apr-24	0.8	0.1	0.7
May-24	0.6	0.1	0.5
Jun-24	1.0	0.1	0.9
Jul-24	0.4	0.1	0.3
Aug-24	0.8	0.3	0.5
Sep-24	0.9	0.2	0.7
Oct-24	0.8	0.3	0.5
Nov-24	1.0	0.3	0.7
Dec-24	1.9	1.1	0.8
Annual Average	1.1	0.3	0.8

Small & underline – Where results are less than the detection limit, half of the detection limit has been used in statistical calculations.

Table 8 *Depositional Dust Data Summary Gauge PCB2 January – December 2024*

Month	Insoluble Solids (g/m ² .month)	Ash Residue (g/m ² .month)	Combustible Matter (g/m ² .month)
Jan-24	1.2	0.5	0.7
Feb-24	1.0	0.3	0.7
Mar-24	0.9	0.4	0.5
Apr-24	0.6	0.1	0.5
May-24	0.3	0.1	0.2
Jun-24	0.4	0.1	0.3
Jul-24	0.3	<u>0.05</u>	0.3
Aug-24	0.4	0.1	0.3
Sep-24	0.5	0.1	0.4
Oct-24	0.4	0.2	0.2
Nov-24	0.4	0.1	0.3
Dec-24	0.7	<u>0.05</u>	0.7
Annual Average	0.6	0.2	0.4

Small & underline – Where results are less than the detection limit, half of the detection limit has been used in statistical calculations.

Table 9 *Depositional Dust Data Summary Gauge PCB3 January – December 2024*

Month	Insoluble Solids (g/m ² .month)	Ash Residue (g/m ² .month)	Combustible Matter (g/m ² .month)
Jan-24	1.2	0.3	0.9
Feb-24	2.0	0.2	1.8
Mar-24	1.7	0.3	1.4
Apr-24	0.2	<u>0.05</u>	0.2
May-24	0.4	0.1	0.3
Jun-24	0.6	0.1	0.5
Jul-24	0.2	<u>0.05</u>	0.2
Aug-24	0.6	0.2	0.4
Sep-24	0.5	0.1	0.4
Oct-24	0.8	0.3	0.5
Nov-24	0.8	0.2	0.6
Dec-24	1.6	0.2	1.4
Annual Average	0.9	0.2	0.7

Small & underline – Where results are less than the detection limit, half of the detection limit has been used in statistical calculations.

Table 10 *Depositional Dust Data Summary Gauge PCB7 January – December 2024*

Month	Insoluble Solids (g/m ² .month)	Ash Residue (g/m ² .month)	Combustible Matter (g/m ² .month)
Jan-24	1.2	0.4	0.8
Feb-24	0.4	0.1	0.3
Mar-24	0.8	0.2	0.6
Apr-24	0.4	<u>0.05</u>	0.4
May-24	0.4	<u>0.05</u>	0.4
Jun-24	0.4	0.1	0.3
Jul-24	0.3	0.1	0.2
Aug-24	0.6	0.2	0.4
Sep-24	1	0.1	0.9
Oct-24	0.4	0.1	0.3
Nov-24	0.6	0.2	0.4
Dec-24	0.5	<u>0.05</u>	0.5
Annual Average	0.6	0.1	0.5

Small & underline – Where results are less than the detection limit, half of the detection limit has been used in statistical calculations.




Figure 1 *Depositional Dust Results – Gauges D1 & D3 to D6*




Figure 2 *Depositional Dust Results – Gauges PCB1 to PCB3 & PCB7*

2.3 REVIEW & INTERPRETATION OF AIR MONITORING RESULTS

The average insoluble solids within depositional dust gauges D1 and D3 to D6 for the period January – December 2024 range from 0.5g/m² per month to 1.8g/m² per month. These results are well below the long-term assessment criteria detailed in **Table 1**. The highest result, 7.6g/m² per month, was recorded in January at D6. The results (refer **Table 6**) indicates that a significant portion of insoluble solids (61%) was combustible matter which is considered to be insects as observed in the samples.

The average insoluble solids within depositional dust gauges PCB1, PCB2, PCB3 and PCB7 for the period January – December 2024 range from 0.6g/m² per month to 1.1g/m² per month. These results are well below the long-term assessment criteria detailed in **Table 1**, noting that as the dust gauges are located in a bushland setting under the canopy of tall trees and therefore do not conform to the siting requirements of AS/NZS 3580.1.1 (Ref [8]) the criteria are not strictly applicable. The highest results, 2.0g/m² per month, were recorded in January at PCB1 and February at PCB3.

It is noted that the dust gauges were collected after a thirty-three (33) day exposure in November which is one (1) day longer than the recommended (Ref [7]) exposure period. The results do not appear to have been unduly impacted and the exposure period for the following month was within the recommended timeframe.

A review of historical data captured over the previous five (5) years including the 2024 monitoring period indicate there were nine (9) instances where the dust gauges D1 and D3 to D6, and four (4) instances where dust gauges PCB1, PCB2, PCB3 and PCB7 showed results which were greater than the allowable maximum annual average increase of 2.0g/m² per month deposited matter **Table 1**. Two (2) results within the 2024 monitoring period were identified as below:

- DG6 increased 6.6g/m² per month from the December 2023 to the January 2024 monitoring result and increased 3.8g/m² per month from the February to March 2024 monitoring result. The majority of the insoluble solids results (~61% and ~76% respectively, refer **Table 6**) was from combustible matter such as insects and other organic matter and the photograph of the dust gauge bottles, **Figure 3** below, indicates the presence of multiple insects and bird droppings, particularly in the January 2024 sample. As such these results are not considered to represent elevated dust particulates. Given the absence of any soil disturbance works at PDM it is not considered that the source of the particulates is from PDM activities; however, the particulates may be sourced from the site itself.




Figure 3 DG6 Dust Gauge from January 2024 and from March 2024

All results, including the result at DG6, are within the historical ranges of results available to RCA (from December 2005 for DDG gauges and July 2011 for PCB gauges).

3 GROUNDWATER QUALITY MONITORING

Groundwater monitoring is undertaken at PDM to monitor for any potential impacts on local groundwater due to past mining operations. The intended monitoring scope in accordance with the Water Management Plan (Ref [3]) comprises:

- Four (4) locations within the mine site and a further seven (7) locations surrounding the Yarraboldy Extension area comprising four (4) sampling wells and three (3) vibrating wire piezometer wells.
 - The scope of sampling at the Yarraboldy bores was reduced to a quarterly download of Bore B only following the Gospers Mountain bushfire during late 2019 / early 2020 as detailed in the 2020 Annual Review Environmental Summary Report.
 - Access to Bore E has been restricted throughout the monitoring period due to the risk of falling branches.

Groundwater monitoring is not a requirement of EPL 4911 (refer **Drawing 1, Attachment 1**).

Sampling from one of the in-site locations, Old Shaft, was discontinued in 2021 following an internal audit which identified that the sampling posed a fall risk due to the requirement for an elevated position to collect samples and the absence of any formal attachment points for a harness required for working at heights.

Sampling of another of the on-site locations, an opening to the Old Wallerawang underground workings known as The Bong, is conducted from Water Cart Dam. Groundwater from The Bong was historically pumped into the Water Cart Dam however during care and maintenance, water is no longer pumped into the Water Cart Dam and therefore water quality from the Water Cart Dam is now considered to be representative of surface water runoff rather than groundwater quality. Thus, any results reported in excess of the trigger levels at the Bong are not considered indicative of impacts to groundwater and results are presented in **Section 4**.

3.1 GROUNDWATER ASSESSMENT CRITERIA

Site specific trigger levels for standing water level (SWL) and water quality parameters pH and electrical conductivity were developed for PDM are stipulated in the Water Management Plan (Ref [3]) which is in accordance with Schedule 3, Condition 27(c) of the Project Approval (PA 10_0041). The groundwater trigger levels (Ref [3]) are shown in **Table 11**: compliance with these trigger levels is not an EPL requirement.

Table 11 *Groundwater Trigger Levels*

Bore	pH (range)	Electrical Conductivity ($\mu\text{S/cm}$)	SWL Trigger (m, AHD)
P6	6.2 - 8.0	1,180	887.90
P7	6.3 - 8.0	852	883.28
EP DDH4/GW (Bore D)	6.8 - 8.0	608	940.61
EP DDH7/GW (Bore A)	6.5 - 8.0	326	954.40
EP PDH1/GW Bore C)	6.9 - 8.0	490	889.25
EP PDH7/GW (Bore E)	5.5 - 8.0	151	938.43

NA – no trigger level required for these locations.

Trigger levels for Old Shaft, PDH3 and PDH4 not presented in the absence of sampling in the monitoring period.

Trigger levels for The Bong are presented in **Table 18**.

It is noted that an investigation (Ref [9]) derived revised site-specific pH trigger levels as per **Table 12** below and recommended the removal of electrical conductivity as a trigger level.

Table 12 *Revised Groundwater Trigger Levels (Ref [9])*

Monitoring location	P6	P7
pH trigger level ^a	5.6	6.3 (unchanged)
Water Level (AHD) ^b	--	--

^a pH trigger level is exceeded if the pH is outside the nominated range

^b Water level trigger level is exceeded if the water level is below the nominated level

These values were submitted to the Department of Planning and Industry and a response was received in June 2020 that further work was required for the revised trigger levels to be accepted for use. At the time of writing this report, the revised trigger levels detailed in **Table 12** have been utilised alongside the approved trigger levels in **Table 11**.

3.2 GROUNDWATER MONITORING DATA SUMMARY

Samples were collected from P6 and P7 each month during the January – December 2024 monitoring period.

Sampling from bores A, B, C and D within the Yarraboldy extension were undertaken in each quarter of the monitoring period. No sampling attempts of Bore E were made in the reporting period due to safety concerns associated with falling trees as encountered in the previous reporting period.

No data has been retrieved from the Bore B logger since the middle of May 2024 during the monitoring period. Batteries have been replaced and unit has been reset however the logger is not recording data in accordance to its normal performance. The unit is presumed to require replacement. Similarly, no data has been retrieved from the Bore C logger since September 2022. Multiple attempts to replace the batteries have not resolved the issue and the logger was retrieved in August 2024. A quote for its replacement has been sought and a new unit will be installed during the next monitoring period.

Groundwater summary results for the period January – December 2024 are shown in **Table 13** to **Table 17**. Graphical presentations of standing water levels, pH and electrical conductivity in on-site bores are shown in **Figure 4** and **Figure 5**.

Table 13 Groundwater Monitoring Bore P6 Results January – December 2024

Location	Site Bore P6												Trigger Level
Sampling Month	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	
Date Sampled	08/01/24	06/02/24	05/03/24	08/04/24	08/05/24	11/06/24	10/07/24	08/08/24	10/09/24	08/10/24	19/11/24	10/12/24	
Time Sampled	9:45	16:32	16:15	6:50	15:12	10:40	10:31	14:58	6:26	15:35	6:24	14:40	
Standing Water Level (m)	22.82	22.69	22.10	22.75	22.77	22.83	22.84	22.86	22.85	22.87	22.95	22.83	
Standpipe Height (m)	0.66	0.66	0.66	0.66	0.66	0.66	0.66	0.66	0.66	0.66	0.66	0.66	
Relative Water Level (m)	22.16	22.03	21.44	22.09	22.11	22.17	22.18	22.20	22.19	22.21	22.29	22.17	
Water Level AHD (m)	894.79	894.92	895.51	894.86	894.84	894.78	894.77	894.75	894.76	894.74	894.66	894.78	887.90 [#]
Temperature (°C)	16.8	17.75	18.2	14.4	15.5	13.5	13.6	15.3	12.8	14.5	14.8	20.4	
pH	6.74	6.98	6.52	6.39	6.44	6.31	6.26	6.28	6.32	6.39	6.37	6.31	6.2 to 8.0*
Conductivity (µS/cm)	1140	1080	1120	1180	1180	1180	1150	1170	1100	1180	1330	1180	1180
Turbidity (NTU)	15.1	103.0	80.8	74.3	90.8	72.4	65.1	60.1	106.0	109.0	30.6	39.6	
Dissolved Oxygen (mg/L)	2.1	2.6	2.9	2.2	9.1	8.6	1.8	1.8	3.1	2.9	1.4	1.6	
TSS (mg/L)	25	99	89	59	68	<5	<5	40	40	36	28	55	
Oil & Grease (mg/L)	<5	<5	<5	<5	<5	<5	<5	<5	<5	<5	<5	<5	
Bicarbonate Alkalinity (mg/L)	151	135	131	129	128	118	107	106	120	114	96	101	
Total Alkalinity (mg/L)	151	135	131	129	128	118	107	106	120	114	96	101	
Sulphate (mg/L)	472	450	406	449	451	437	464	427	452	487	489	538	
Chloride (mg/L)	32	37	41	36	35	32	33	41	36	42	39	39	
Calcium (mg/L)	120	114	118	117	108	124	128	120	118	121	124	120	
Magnesium (mg/L)	50	50	49	52	45	50	54	55	53	51	58	55	
Sodium (mg/L)	47	47	51	50	52	51	58	60	57	56	62	61	
Potassium (mg/L)	21	24	24	22	23	22	22	20	22	21	22	21	
Cobalt (dissolved, mg/L)	0.006	0.006	0.006	0.004	0.006	0.003	0.003	0.004	0.005	0.005	0.005	0.006	
Manganese (dissolved, mg/L)	1.94	2.03	1.87	1.97	1.9	2.07	1.92	2.24	1.93	1.84	2.03	1.95	
Nickel (dissolved, mg/L)	0.013	0.015	0.019	0.013	0.022	0.019	0.016	0.018	0.02	0.02	0.022	0.022	
Zinc (dissolved, mg/L)	0.044	0.082	0.085	0.028	0.099	0.056	0.043	0.045	0.042	0.07	0.079	0.044	
Iron (dissolved, mg/L)	17.7	10	8.7	16.5	9.77	14.5	14.4	16.3	17.4	17.2	17.9	20.7	

Shaded Cells – Indicates results are outside of the nominated trigger level.

* Results are rounded to 1 decimal place when comparing to trigger level

Water Level trigger is exceeded if the AHD water level drops below the nominated trigger level.

Table 14 Groundwater Monitoring Bore P7 Results January – December 2024

Location	Site Bore P7												Trigger Level
Sampling Month	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	
Date Sampled	8/01/24	6/02/24	05/03/24	08/04/24	08/05/24	11/06/24	10/07/24	08/08/24	10/09/24	08/10/24	19/11/24	10/12/24	
Time Sampled	10:00	16:40	16:36	7:15	15:59	11:20	10:45	15:11	6:39	15:48	6:41	14:55	
Standing Water Level (m)	5.57	5.52	5.37	5.45	5.56	5.36	5.30	5.30	5.45	5.86	5.82	5.30	
Standpipe Height (m)	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	
Relative Water Level (m)	5.52	5.47	5.32	5.40	5.51	5.31	5.25	5.25	5.40	5.81	5.77	5.25	
Water Level AHD (m)	888.88	888.93	889.08	889.00	888.89	889.09	889.15	889.15	889.00	888.59	888.63	889.15	883.28 [#]
Temperature (°C)	15.7	17.4	18.2	13.9	14.5	12.6	13.4	14.8	12.1	13.5	13.9	17.1	
pH (pH units)	7.05	6.85	6.65	6.53	6.45	6.38	6.48	6.52	6.88	6.75	6.39	6.45	6.3 to 8.0*
Conductivity (µS/cm)	133	130	148	111	1430	156	181	146	215	273	719	823	852
Bicarbonate Alkalinity (mg/L)	--	29	--	--	37	--	--	41	--	--	68	--	
Total Alkalinity (mg/L)	--	29	--	--	37	--	--	41	--	--	68	--	
Sulphate (mg/L)	--	2	--	--	4	--	--	5	--	--	7	--	
Chloride (mg/L)	--	10	--	--	8	--	--	12	--	--	20	--	
Calcium (mg/L)	--	3	--	--	3	--	--	5	--	--	8	--	
Magnesium (mg/L)	--	2	--	--	2	--	--	4	--	--	7	--	
Sodium (mg/L)	--	3	--	--	3	--	--	6	--	--	8	--	
Potassium (mg/L)	--	12	--	--	9	--	--	10	--	--	7	--	
Iron (dissolved, mg/L)	--	1.62	--	--	1.73	--	--	1.08	--	--	0.71	--	

Shaded Cells – Indicates results are outside of the nominated trigger level.

* Results are rounded to 1 decimal place when comparing to trigger level

-- Indicates no analysis for compound required.

Water Level trigger is exceeded if the AHD water level drops below the nominated trigger level.

Table 15 Groundwater Monitoring Bore A (EP DDH7/GW) Results January – December 2024

Location	Off-Site Bore A (EP DDH7/GW)												Trigger Level
Sampling Month	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	
Date Sampled	Sampling not required	7/02/24	Sampling not required	Sampling not required	8/05/24	Sampling not required	Sampling not required	8/08/24	Sampling not required	Sampling not required	18/11/4	Sampling not required	Trigger Level
Time Sampled		14:35			5:31			13:58			16:15		
Standing Water Level (m)		67.34			67.35			67.86			68.19		
Standpipe Height (m)		0.75			0.75			0.75			0.75		
Relative Water Level (m)		66.59			66.60			67.11			67.44		
Water Level AHD (m)		957.21			957.20			956.69			956.36		954.40 [#]
pH (pH units)		6.55			6.43			6.31			7.07		6.5 to 8.0
Conductivity (µS/cm)		223			224			225			210		326
Temperature (°C)		17.9			14.2			14.1			18.8		
Total Dissolved Solid (mg/L)		90			96			146			148		
Bicarbonate Alkalinity (mg/L)		76			74			70			69		
Total Alkalinity (mg/L)		76			74			70			69		
Sulphate (mg/L)		9			8			9			9		
Chloride (mg/L)		9			8			11			8		
Calcium (mg/L)		17			16			16			18		
Magnesium (mg/L)		7			5			7			7		
Sodium (mg/L)		12			5			8			6		
Potassium (mg/L)		13			11			12			12		
Arsenic (dissolved, mg/L)		<0.001			<0.001			<0.001			<0.001		
Cadmium (dissolved, mg/L)		<0.0001			<0.0001			<0.0001			<0.0001		
Chromium (dissolved, mg/L)		<0.001			<0.001			<0.001			<0.001		
Copper (dissolved, mg/L)		<0.001			<0.001			<0.001			0.001		
Lead (dissolved, mg/L)		<0.001			<0.001			<0.001			<0.001		
Nickel (dissolved, mg/L)		0.002			0.001			0.002			0.002		
Zinc (dissolved, mg/L)		0.053			0.076			0.052			0.064		
Iron (dissolved, mg/L)		<0.05			<0.05			<0.05			<0.05		

Shaded Cells – Indicates results are outside of the nominated Trigger Level.

--- Indicates no sampling required

Water Level trigger is exceeded if the AHD water level drops below the nominated trigger level.

Table 16 Groundwater Monitoring Bore C (EP PDH1/GW) Results January – December 2024

Location	Off-Site Bore C (EP PDH1/GW)												Trigger Level
Sampling Month	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	
Date Sampled		7/02/24			8/05/24			8/08/24			18/11/4		
Time Sampled		8:35			7:00			8:00			8:10		
Standing Water Level (m)		72.22			72.29			71.60			72.46		
Standpipe Height (m)		0.74			0.74			0.74			0.74		
Relative Water Level (m)		71.48			71.55			70.86			71.72		
Water Level AHD (m)		896.02			895.95			896.64			895.78		889.25#
pH (pH units)		6.44			6.16			6.36			6.55		6.9 to 8.0
Conductivity (µS/cm)		190			206			222			233		490
Temperature (°C)		17.7			16.6			15.2			18		
Total Dissolved Solid (mg/L)		47			63			161			152		
Bicarbonate Alkalinity (mg/L)		117			56			51			55		
Total Alkalinity (mg/L)		117			56			51			55		
Sulphate (mg/L)	Sampling not required	16	Sampling not required	Sampling not required	25	Sampling not required	Sampling not required	27	Sampling not required	Sampling not required	28	Sampling not required	
Chloride (mg/L)		12			12			12			15		
Calcium (mg/L)		6			16			16			19		
Magnesium (mg/L)		2			5			7			7		
Sodium (mg/L)		51			10			9			10		
Potassium (mg/L)		8			6			7			7		
Arsenic (dissolved, mg/L)		<0.001			<0.001			<0.001			<0.001		
Cadmium (dissolved, mg/L)		<0.0001			<0.0001			<0.0001			<0.0001		
Chromium (dissolved, mg/L)		<0.001			<0.001			<0.001			<0.001		
Copper (dissolved, mg/L)		<0.001			<0.001			<0.001			<0.001		
Lead (dissolved, mg/L)		<0.001			<0.001			<0.001			<0.001		
Nickel (dissolved, mg/L)		0.002			0.003			0.002			0.001		
Zinc (dissolved, mg/L)		0.052			0.072			0.061			0.043		
Iron (dissolved, mg/L)		<0.05			<0.05			<0.05			<0.05		

Shaded Cells – Indicates results are outside of the nominated Trigger Level.

Water Level trigger is exceeded if the AHD water level drops below the nominated trigger level.

--- Indicates no sampling required

Table 17 Groundwater Monitoring Bore D (EP DDH4/GW) Results January – December 2024

Location	Off-Site Bore D (EP DDH4/GW)												Trigger Level
Sampling Month	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	
Date Sampled	Sampling not required	7/02/24	Sampling not required	Sampling not required	8/05/24	Sampling not required	Sampling not required	8/08/24	Sampling not required	Sampling not required	18/11/4	Sampling not required	Trigger Level
Time Sampled		8:55			7:21			8:29			8:34		
Standing Water Level (m)		34.40			34.59			34.59			34.70		
Standpipe Height (m)		0.71			0.71			0.71			0.71		
Relative Water Level (m)		33.69			33.88			33.88			33.99		
Water Level AHD (m)		944.81			944.62			944.62			944.51		940.61 [#]
pH (pH units)		7.03			6.72			6.27			6.82		6.8 to 8.0
Conductivity (µS/cm)		278			267			218			278		608
Temperature (°C)		15.7			14.5			14.2			15.7		
Total Dissolved Solid (mg/L)		313			20			199			241		
Bicarbonate Alkalinity (mg/L)		52			104			99			90		
Total Alkalinity (mg/L)		52			104			99			90		
Sulphate (mg/L)		22			16			14			14		
Chloride (mg/L)		11			12			12			12		
Calcium (mg/L)		16			6			7			7		
Magnesium (mg/L)		6			1			2			2		
Sodium (mg/L)		10			47			48			46		
Potassium (mg/L)		7			6			7			7		
Arsenic (dissolved, mg/L)		<0.001			<0.001			<0.001			<0.001		
Cadmium (dissolved, mg/L)		<0.0001			<0.0001			<0.0001			<0.0001		
Chromium (dissolved, mg/L)		<0.001			<0.001			<0.001			<0.001		
Copper (dissolved, mg/L)		<0.001			<0.001			<0.001			<0.001		
Lead (dissolved, mg/L)		<0.001			<0.001			<0.001			<0.001		
Nickel (dissolved, mg/L)		0.002			0.002			0.003			0.001		
Zinc (dissolved, mg/L)		0.046			0.052			0.052			0.042		
Iron (dissolved, mg/L)		<0.05			<0.05			<0.05			<0.05		

Shaded Cells – Indicates results are outside of the nominated Trigger Level.

--- Indicates no sampling required

Water Level trigger is exceeded if the AHD water level drops below the nominated trigger level.




Figure 4 *Onsite Groundwater Standing Water Level 2024*




Figure 5 *Onsite Groundwater pH and Electrical Conductivity 2024*

3.3 REVIEW & INTERPRETATION OF GROUND WATER MONITORING

3.3.1 SITE GROUNDWATER BORES

The standing water level at P6 and P7 was generally stable over the 12-months to December 2024, except for March at P6, with minimal fluctuations during the monitoring period. All water levels were above the relevant trigger levels at the monitoring locations in 2024 (refer **Figure 4**).

pH values decreased overall within the on-site bores (refer **Figure 5**) during the monitoring period with P6 having a slightly larger variation than P7. The pH fluctuations do not show any apparent correlation. All values were within the site-specific pH trigger levels.

The electrical conductivity (EC) at bore P6 showed an overall stable trend however with fluctuations, including above the approved trigger level in November 2024. The EC of P7 was generally stable for the first part of the monitoring period with the exception of a spike above the approved trigger level in May 2024 however has indicated an increasing trend since July 2024 (refer **Figure 5**).

For the purpose of completeness, RCA notes the following with regards to the revised trigger levels (**Table 12**):

- The pH at Bore P6 is within the trigger level range for all twelve (12) monitoring events.
- The pH trigger levels for Bore P7 remains unchanged, thus the pH remained within trigger level range for all twelve (12) monitoring events.

Concentrations of analytes in P6 and P7 recorded in the reporting period were compared to historical data:

- Turbidity and total suspended solids at P6 throughout the reporting period were within the historical ranges.
- Oil and Grease was not detected in P6 in any of the monitoring events in 2024 consistent with the majority of the historical range.
- Alkalinity at P6 and P7 was within the historical range.
- Sulphate and chloride at P6 and P7 were within the relevant historical ranges.
- Calcium, magnesium, sodium and potassium were within the relevant historical ranges at both P6 and P7.
- Cobalt, manganese, nickel and zinc concentrations were within the relevant historical ranges at P6.
- Iron concentrations at P6 and P7 are within the relevant historical ranges.

A Piper Plot is presented in **Figure 6** below to demonstrate the change in water chemistry between the monitoring period and the historical data.




Figure 6 Piper Plot comparing results of 2024 monitoring to historical data

Based on the above **Figure 6** the chemistry of P6 and P7 remains altered in comparison to historical data, noting that the extent of variance has decreased from that identified during the previous reporting period. The magnitude of these variation differs depending on the specific cation/anion involved. It is noted that, due to the absence of any excavation, injection of water or extraction of water at PDM, that the change in groundwater level and chemistry is not considered likely to be as a result of activities at PDM.

3.3.2 OFF-SITE GROUNDWATER BORES

The water levels within Bore A, Bore C and Bore D are (refer **Figure 7**) above their respective levels, with a generally stable trend observed across all the bores since the middle of 2023 when the Bores were able to be accessed following access restrictions.




Figure 7 Standing water level and rainfall 2020 – 2024




Figure 8 pH in off-site groundwater bores 2020 – 2024

The pH of groundwater samples collected from off-site bores during the reporting period are generally outside the respective pH trigger level ranges (**Figure 8**), as below:

- Bore A was below the lower pH trigger level during two (2) of the four (4) monitoring events.
- Bore C was below the lower pH trigger level in all monitoring events.

- Bore D was below the lower pH trigger level during two (2) of the four (4) monitoring events.

Electrical conductivity levels fluctuated within an overall slightly increasing trend for all the bores, however, were below the respective conductivity trigger levels for all off-site bores during the 2024 monitoring period (**Figure 10**).




Figure 9 Electrical conductivity in off-site groundwater bores 2020 – 2024

4 SURFACE WATER QUALITY MONITORING

The purpose of surface water monitoring is to ensure that any impact of the mining operations on surface water bodies and streams can be identified, and to demonstrate compliance with relevant legislative requirements.

Surface water monitoring for the Pine Dale Mine is undertaken in accordance with the EPL 4911 (Ref [1]) and the Water Management Plan (Ref [3]) at twelve (12) monitoring locations within and surrounding the mine site (refer **Drawing 1, Attachment 1**). Frequency is on a quarterly and monthly basis for routine samples depending on location and in accordance with the EPL 4911 (Ref [1]) and Water Management Plan (Ref [3]).

EPL 4911 (Ref [1]) specifies sampling to be undertaken daily or weekly from EPL Point 13 during discharge with daily samples analysed for pH, electrical conductivity and turbidity, and weekly samples analysed for filterable (dissolved) iron, oil and grease, sulphate and total suspended solids.

EPL 4911 (Ref [1]) specifies quarterly surface water monitoring is to be undertaken at four (4) surface water monitoring locations:

- EPL Point 2: ambient water monitoring point.
- EPL Point 3: ambient water monitoring point.

- EPL Point 14: ambient water monitoring point.
- EPL Point 16: ambient water monitoring point.

The PDM Water Management Plan (Ref [3]) stipulates quarterly monitoring of EPL Point 2, 3, 14 is to include analysis for pH, electrical conductivity, turbidity, total suspended solids, sulphate and filterable (dissolved) iron.

The PDM Water Management Plan (Ref [3]) also stipulates the water level of Wangcol Creek (referred to as Neubecks Creek in the Plan) is measured (at S2) on a monthly frequency, and monthly monitoring of a further six (6) monitoring locations:

- S1 is located within Wangcol Creek upstream of PDM operations (slightly downstream of EPL Point 2).
- S3 which is the same location as EPL Point 3.
- S4 is located on Coxs River, upstream of the confluence of Wangcol Creek and does not receive water from PDM operations.
- S5 is located within Blue Lake which receives flow from Wangcol Creek and Coxs River.
- S6 is located within Wangcol Creek; downstream of S1 and PDM operations.
- S7 located within Coxs River, downstream of Wangcol Creek.

A further point, Wallerawang Downstream, has been included in the monitoring since the commencement of monitoring at EPL Point 16.

Analysis at locations S1, and locations S3-S7 is stipulated in the PDM Water Quality Management Plan (Ref [3]) to include pH electrical conductivity, turbidity, dissolved oxygen, total suspended solids, oil & grease, bicarbonate and total alkalinity, sulphate, chloride, calcium, magnesium, sodium, potassium and filterable (dissolved) metals (cobalt, manganese, nickel, zinc, iron). Sampling at Wallerawang Downstream post-dates the WMP such that there are no stipulations with regards to analysis; analysis is undertaken consistent with the other locations.

4.1 SURFACE WATER ASSESSMENT CRITERIA

EPL 4911 stipulates maximum concentrations limits applicable to EPL Point 13 discharge events for pH, oil and grease, and total suspended solids. No concentration limits are detailed in EPL 4911 for any other analytes at EPL Point 13, or any analytes at the other locations (EPL Points 2, 3, 14 and 16).

Site specific trigger levels for pH and electrical conductivity are stipulated in the PDM Water Management Plan (Ref [3]) in accordance with Schedule 3, Condition 27(c) of the Project Approval (Pa 10_0041) except for EPL Point 16 and Wallerawang Downstream for which monitoring postdates the Plan and have not yet had site specific triggers derived. Trigger levels for oil and grease and total suspended solids are not site specific and are uniform across all surface water sites except for Water Cart Dam (refer **Section 3**). Compliance with these trigger levels, refer **Table 18**, is not an EPL requirement.

It is noted that an investigation (Ref [9]) derived revised site-specific pH trigger levels as per **Table 19**. The investigation indicated that surface water sites EPL Point 2, S1 and S4 are considered appropriate background sites for the purpose of assessing influences of PDM on water quality.

Table 18 *Surface Water Trigger Levels*

Surface Water Site	pH (range)	Electrical Conductivity ($\mu\text{S}/\text{cm}$)	Total Suspended Solids (mg/L)	Oil and Grease (mg/L)
EPL Point 2	7.1 – 8.0	2,055	30	NA
EPL Point 3	6.4 – 8.0	2,223	30	NA
EPL Point 13	6.5 – 8.0 [^]	NA	30 [^]	10
EPL Point 14	7.5 – 8.0	1,166	30	NA
EPL Point 16	NA	NA	30	NA
S1	6.2 – 8.0	2,325	30	10
S2	NA	NA	NA	NA
S3	6.4 – 8.0	2,223	30	10
S4	7.3 – 8.0	957	30	10
S5	7.0 – 8.0	1,013	30	10
S6	6.7 – 8.0	1,941	30	10
S7	6.8 – 8.0	1,007	30	10
The Bong (at SW location)	5.8 - 8.0	1,157	NA	NA

NA – no trigger level required for these locations.

[^]refers to maximum concentration limits applicable during discharge events as detailed in EPL 4911 section L2.

Table 19 *Revised Surface Water Trigger Levels (Ref [9])*

pH trigger level ^a	6.5 – 8.0
Electrical conductivity ($\mu\text{S}/\text{cm}$)	5,592
TSS (mg/L)	25

^a pH trigger level is exceeded if the pH is outside the nominated range.

These values were submitted to the Department of Planning and Industry and a response was received in June 2020 that further work was required for the revised trigger levels to be accepted for use. At the time of writing this report, the revised trigger levels detailed in **Table 19** have been utilised alongside the approved trigger levels in **Table 18**.

4.2 SURFACE WATER MONITORING DATA SUMMARY

Four (4) quarterly surface water monitoring events were conducted at EPL Point 2, 3, 14 and 16: February, May, August and November 2024.

Twelve (12) monthly surface water monitoring events were conducted at S1 – S7, Wallerawang Downstream and Water Cart Dam during the January to December 2024 monitoring period.

Surface water summary results for the period January – December 2024 are shown in **Table 20** to **Table 32**. Graphical presentations are shown in **Figure 10** to **Figure 16**.

Table 20 Surface Water Monitoring Location EPL Point 2 Results 2024

Location	EPL Point 2				Trigger Level
Sampling Month	Feb	May	Aug	Nov	
Date Sampled	6/02/2024	8/05/2024	8/08/2024	19/11/2024	
Time Sampled	15:58	16:51	16:20	07:38	
pH (pH units)	7.57	7.79	7.39	7.66	7.1 – 8.0
Conductivity (µS/cm)	741	841	856	1,480	2,055
Sulphate (mg/L)	232	239	281	459	
Iron filterable (mg/L)	0.07	<0.05	<0.05	0.11	
TSS (mg/L)	22	<5	<5	<5	30
Turbidity (NTU)	65.4	1.0	6.8	21.8	

Shaded Cells – Indicates results are outside of the nominated Trigger Level

Table 21 Surface Water Monitoring Location EPL Point 3 Results 2024

Location	EPL Point 3				Trigger Level
Sampling Month	Feb	May	Aug	Nov	
Date Sampled	6/02/2024	8/05/2024	8/05/2024	19/11/2024	
Time Sampled	15:07	14:51	14:36	06:02	
pH (pH units)	7.48	7.34	7.01	7.07	6.4 – 8.0
Conductivity (µS/cm)	955	2,370	1,030	2,430	2,223
Sulphate (mg/L)	321	876	380	935	
Iron filterable (mg/L)	0.1	0.1	0.83	0.1	
TSS (mg/L)	17	<5	<5	6	30
Turbidity (NTU)	53.6	2.8	8.8	27.9	

Shaded Cells - Indicates results are outside of the nominated Trigger Level

Table 22 Surface Water Monitoring Location EPL Point 14 Results 2024

Location	EPL Point 14				Trigger Level
Sampling Month	Feb	May	Aug	Nov	
Date Sampled	6/02/2024	8/05/2024	8/08/2024	19/11/2024	
Time Sampled	17:35	17:50	16:43	09:28	
pH (pH units)	7.61	6.75	7.31	6.99	7.45 – 8.0
Conductivity (µS/cm)	814	758	909	1,670	1,166
Sulphate (mg/L)	304	287	344	597	
Iron filterable (mg/L)	0.11	0.05	0.06	0.09	
TSS (mg/L)	12	<5	<5	<5	30
Turbidity (NTU)	15.1	3.4	7.8	17.6	

Shaded Cells - Indicates results are outside of the nominated Trigger Level

-- Indicates no sample was collected: location was dry.

Table 23 Surface Water Monitoring Location EPL Point 16 Results 2024

Location	EPL Point 16				Trigger Level
Sampling Month	Feb	May	Aug	Nov	
Date Sampled	6/02/2024	8/05/2024	8/08/2024	19/11/2024	
Time Sampled	16:20	15:02	14:46	06:11	
pH (pH units)	7	7.78	6.06	6.41	NA
Conductivity (µS/cm)	577	1,290	1,390	1,500	NA
Sulphate (mg/L)	247	534	719	584	
Iron filterable (mg/L)	3.07	<0.05	19.8	22.1	
TSS (mg/L)	19	<5	18	12	NA
Turbidity (NTU)	27.0	4.8	7.1	2.4	

NA: Trigger levels are not applicable in this monitoring location.

Table 24 Surface Water Monitoring Location S1 Results 2024

Location	Surface Water S1												Trigger Level
Sampling Month	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	
Date Sampled	8/01/24	6/02/2024	6/03/24	8/04/24	8/05/24	11/06/24	10/07/24	8/08/24	9/09/24	9/10/24	19/11/24	9/12/24	
Time Sampled	9:24	15:50	15:57	16:30	16:45	10:15	16:11	16:26	16:32	16:52	7:33	16:06	
Temperature (°C)	19	21.2	23.28	17.50	13.70	8.50	10.39	8.50	14.20	14.14	16.50	24.04	
pH	7.66	7.57	7.76	6.81	7.75	7.65	7.31	7.22	7.68	7.66	7.62	7.39	6.2 – 8.0*
Conductivity (µS/cm)	2,380	845	2,660	791	2,540	2,490	2,460	1,150	3,490	2,700	,2520	1920	2,325
Turbidity (NTU)	9.9	60.0	3.8	25.6	1.5	2.3	7.6	6.7	9.2	16.2	25.0	16.9	
Dissolved Oxygen (mg/L)	--	5.50	--	--	4.90	--	--	8.20	--	--	5.8	--	
TSS (mg/L)	--	21.00	--	--	<5	--	--	<5	--	--	<5	--	30
Oil & Grease (mg/L)	--	<5	--	--	<5	--	--	<5	--	--	<5	--	10
Bicarbonate Alkalinity (mg/L)	--	83	--	--	125	--	--	60	--	--	105	--	
Total Alkalinity (mg/L)	--	83	--	--	125	--	--	60	--	--	105	--	
Sulphate (mg/L)	--	284	--	--	926	--	--	420	--	--	1,100	--	
Chloride (mg/L)	--	53	--	--	143	--	--	77	--	--	192	--	
Calcium (mg/L)	--	34	--	--	93	--	--	43	--	--	113	--	
Magnesium (mg/L)	--	28	--	--	69	--	--	40	--	--	93	--	
Sodium (mg/L)	--	93	--	--	340	--	--	146	--	--	370	--	
Potassium (mg/L)	--	9	--	--	32	--	--	12	--	--	31	--	
Cobalt (dissolved, mg/L)	--	<0.001	--	--	0.012	--	--	0.002	--	--	0.007	--	
Manganese (dissolved, mg/L)	--	0.518	--	--	0.847	--	--	0.305	--	--	0.595	--	
Nickel (dissolved, mg/L)	--	0.04	--	--	0.147	--	--	0.06	--	--	0.187	--	
Zinc (dissolved, mg/L)	--	0.02	--	--	0.05	--	--	0.027	--	--	0.024	--	
Iron (dissolved, mg/L)	--	0.07	--	--	<0.05	--	--	0.08	--	--	0.06	--	

Shaded Cells - Indicates results are outside of the nominated trigger level.

* Results are rounded to 1 decimal place when comparing to trigger level.

--- Indicates no analysis for compound required during particular period.

Table 25 *Surface Water Monitoring Location S2 Results 2024*

Location	Surface Water Site S2											
Sampling Month	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
Date Sampled	8/01/24	6/02/24	5/03/24	8/04/24	8/05/24	11/06/24	10/07/24	8/08/24	9/09/24	9/10/24	19/11/24	9/12/24
Time Sampled	8:49	15:14	15:19	16:35	14:58	9:35	15:33	14:42	16:46	15:15	6:06	14:27
Depth to Surface from Top of Rail Bridge (m)	3.74	3.15	3.74	3.7	3.75	3.74	3.74	3.76	3.19	3.72	3.7	3.74

Table 26 Surface Water Monitoring Location S3 Results 2024

Location	Surface Water S3												Trigger Level
Sampling Month	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	
Date Sampled	8/01/24	6/02/24	5/03/24	8/04/24	8/05/24	11/06/24	10/07/24	8/08/24	9/09/24	9/10/24	19/11/24	9/12/24	
Time Sampled	8:46	15:07	15:16	6:21	14:51	9:30	15:30	14:36	15:49	15:13	6:02	14:25	
Temperature (°C)	20	20.8	24.6	13.9	15.1	8.0	10.4	11.2	14.7	13.5	15.2	23.6	
pH	7.49	7.48	7.81	7.30	7.34	7.36	7.23	7.01	7.70	7.64	7.07	7.66	6.4 – 8.0*
Conductivity (µS/cm)	2,470	955	2,320	754	2,370	2,440	2,310	1,030	2,310	2,340	2,430	1,750	2,223
Turbidity (NTU)	9.5	53.6	2.90	16.50	2.80	1.90	7.60	8.80	10.60	12.70	27.90	18.50	
Dissolved Oxygen (mg/L)	--	5.0	--	--	7.40	--	--	8.30	--	--	6.60	--	
TSS (mg/L)	--	17	--	--	<5	--	--	<5	--	--	6	--	30
Oil & Grease (mg/L)	--	<5	--	--	<5	--	--	<5	--	--	<5	--	10
Bicarbonate Alkalinity (mg/L)	--	89	--	--	119	--	--	48	--	--	102	--	
Total Alkalinity (mg/L)	--	89	--	--	119	--	--	48	--	--	102	--	
Sulphate (mg/L)	--	321	--	--	876	--	--	380	--	--	935	--	
Chloride (mg/L)	--	61	--	--	137	--	--	64	--	--	179	--	
Calcium (mg/L)	--	42	--	--	88	--	--	41	--	--	107	--	
Magnesium (mg/L)	--	33	--	--	64	--	--	36	--	--	87	--	
Sodium (mg/L)	--	109	--	--	316	--	--	127	--	--	346	--	
Potassium (mg/L)	--	11	--	--	29	--	--	10	--	--	28	--	
Cobalt (dissolved, mg/L)	--	0.002	--	--	0.012	--	--	0.009	--	--	0.006	--	
Manganese (dissolved, mg/L)	--	0.672	--	--	0.978	--	--	1.280	--	--	0.571	--	
Nickel (dissolved, mg/L)	--	0.056	--	--	0.143	--	--	0.060	--	--	0.177	--	
Zinc (dissolved, mg/L)	--	0.031	--	--	0.035	--	--	0.045	--	--	0.037	--	
Iron (dissolved, mg/L)	--	0.100	--	--	0.100	--	--	0.830	--	--	0.100	--	

Shaded Cells – Indicates results are outside of the nominated trigger level.

* Results are rounded to 1 decimal place when comparing to trigger level.

--- Indicates no analysis for compound required during particular period.

Table 27 *Surface Water Monitoring Location S4 Results 2024*

Location	Surface Water S4												Trigger Level
Sampling Month	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	
Date Sampled	8/01/24	6/02/24	5/03/24	8/04/24	8/05/24	11/06/24	10/07/24	8/08/24	9/09/24	9/10/24	19/11/24	9/12/24	
Time Sampled	10:13	17:00	16:44	7:45	15:45	11:00	10:59	15:33	6:58	16:00	7:04	15:08	
Temperature (°C)	17.81	20.9	21.31	11.5	12.9	6.3	8.06	7.47	8.8	12.04	14.3	23.4	
pH	7.71	7.53	7.58	7.31	7.82	7.85	7.31	7.32	7.31	7.54	7.46	7.4	7.3 – 8.0*
Conductivity (µS/cm)	162	151	245	110	158	140	132	176	169	199	210	131	957
Turbidity (NTU)	19.2	39.9	13.8	<1	2.5	1.7	10.0	5.8	16.4	19.7	28.9	18.0	
Dissolved Oxygen (mg/L)	--	4.3	--	--	6.2	--	--	9.3	--	--	5.3	--	
TSS (mg/L)	--	12	--	--	<5	--	--	9	--	--	<5	--	30
Oil & Grease (mg/L)	--	<5	--	--	<5	--	--	<5	--	--	<5	--	10
Bicarbonate Alkalinity (mg/L)	--	58	--	--	30	--	--	30	--	--	32	--	
Total Alkalinity (mg/L)	--	58	--	--	30	--	--	30	--	--	32	--	
Sulphate (mg/L)	--	3	--	--	9	--	--	9	--	--	17	--	
Chloride (mg/L)	--	9	--	--	10	--	--	10	--	--	9	--	
Calcium (mg/L)	--	9	--	--	5	--	--	4	--	--	6	--	
Magnesium (mg/L)	--	5	--	--	3	--	--	3	--	--	4	--	
Sodium (mg/L)	--	8	--	--	10	--	--	9	--	--	11	--	
Potassium (mg/L)	--	5	--	--	5	--	--	4	--	--	7	--	
Cobalt (dissolved, mg/L)	--	0.001	--	--	<0.001	--	--	<0.001	--	--	<0.001	--	
Manganese (dissolved, mg/L)	--	0.78	--	--	0.023	--	--	0.028	--	--	0.04	--	
Nickel (dissolved, mg/L)	--	<0.001	--	--	0.001	--	--	0.003	--	--	<0.001	--	
Zinc (dissolved, mg/L)	--	0.022	--	--	0.037	--	--	0.016	--	--	0.026	--	
Iron (dissolved, mg/L)	--	0.68	--	--	0.14	--	--	0.08	--	--	0.32	--	

Shaded Cells - Indicates results are outside of the nominated trigger level.

* Results are rounded to 1 decimal place when comparing to trigger level.

--- Indicates no analysis for compound required during particular period.

Table 28 *Surface Water Monitoring Location S5 Results 2024*

Location	Surface Water S5												Trigger Level
Sampling Month	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	
Date Sampled	8/01/24	6/02/24	5/03/24	8/04/24	8/05/24	11/06/24	10/07/24	8/08/24	9/09/24	9/10/24	19/11/24	9/12/24	
Time Sampled	10:10	17:05	16:46	7:40	15:48	10:55	10:55	15:31	6:55	15:58	7:00	15:05	
Temperature (°C)	18.8	22.2	22.8	13.2	13.5	8.8	10.6	11.4	10.4	14.03	17.00	23.10	
pH	7.13	7.25	6.95	7.00	6.86	7.13	6.95	6.94	6.95	7.24	7.08	6.99	7.0 – 8.0*
Conductivity (µS/cm)	535	1,160	1,230	530	827	870	1,040	1,020	1,190	1,100	1,800	681	1013
Turbidity (NTU)	21.2	17.5	17.5	26.4	2.6	5.3	16.0	13.8	17.6	16.7	27.0	37.9	
Dissolved Oxygen (mg/L)	--	4.2	--	--	5.2	--	--	7.0	--	--	4.6	--	
TSS (mg/L)	--	6	--	--	11	--	--	<5	--	--	<5	--	30
Oil & Grease (mg/L)	--	<5	--	--	<5	--	--	<8	--	--	<5	--	10
Bicarbonate Alkalinity (mg/L)	--	72	--	--	48	--	--	46	--	--	69	--	
Total Alkalinity (mg/L)	--	72	--	--	48	--	--	46	--	--	69	--	
Sulphate (mg/L)	--	450	--	--	309	--	--	376	--	--	616	--	
Chloride (mg/L)	--	57	--	--	39	--	--	58	--	--	108	--	
Calcium (mg/L)	--	56	--	--	39	--	--	44	--	--	86	--	
Magnesium (mg/L)	--	38	--	--	26	--	--	35	--	--	63	--	
Sodium (mg/L)	--	128	--	--	87	--	--	116	--	--	220	--	
Potassium (mg/L)	--	16	--	--	11	--	--	13	--	--	22	--	
Cobalt (dissolved, mg/L)	--	0.01	--	--	0.01	--	--	0.011	--	--	0.01	--	
Manganese (dissolved, mg/L)	--	1.1	--	--	0.708	--	--	0.845	--	--	0.761	--	
Nickel (dissolved, mg/L)	--	0.065	--	--	0.054	--	--	0.067	--	--	0.121	--	
Zinc (dissolved, mg/L)	--	0.044	--	--	0.056	--	--	0.056	--	--	0.055	--	
Iron (dissolved, mg/L)	--	0.15	--	--	0.06	--	--	<0.05	--	--	0.07	--	

Shaded Cells - Indicates results are outside of the nominated trigger level.

* Results are rounded to 1 decimal place when comparing to trigger level.

--- Indicates no analysis for compound required during particular period.

Table 29 Surface Water Monitoring Location S6 Results 2024

Location	Surface Water S6												Trigger Level
Sampling Month	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	
Date Sampled	8/01/24	6/02/24	5/03/24	8/04/24	8/05/24	11/06/24	10/07/24	8/08/24	9/09/24	9/10/24	19/11/24	9/12/24	
Time Sampled	10:07	16:55	16:39	7:20	15:32	10:58	10:50	15:22	6:48	15:53	6:55	15:00	
Temperature (°C)	18.4	20.7	21.7	13.0	14.4	8.3	9.8	10.8	9.1	12.68	15.00	21.85	
pH	7.34	7.27	7.12	7.17	7.71	7.52	7.05	7.06	7.26	7.39	7.06	7.03	6.7 – 8.0*
Conductivity (µS/cm)	2,130	924	2,440	716	226	1,892	1,780	1,120	3,190	3,221	2,380	1,610	1,941
Turbidity (NTU)	7.4	52.8	3.2	16.6	1.8	3.5	14.4	7.3	16.7	16.1	18.8	20.1	
Dissolved Oxygen (mg/L)	--	5.1	--	--	7.8	--	--	9.0	--	--	5.8	--	
TSS (mg/L)	--	18	--	--	<5	--	--	<5	--	--	<5	--	30
Oil & Grease (mg/L)	--	<5	--	--	<5	--	--	<5	--	--	<5	--	10
Bicarbonate Alkalinity (mg/L)	--	86	--	--	111	--	--	50	--	--	101	--	
Total Alkalinity (mg/L)	--	86	--	--	111	--	--	50	--	--	101	--	
Sulphate (mg/L)	--	314	--	--	857	--	--	400	--	--	863	--	
Chloride (mg/L)	--	59	--	--	128	--	--	69	--	--	174	--	
Calcium (mg/L)	--	40	--	--	90	--	--	55	--	--	105	--	
Magnesium (mg/L)	--	31	--	--	64	--	--	43	--	--	86	--	
Sodium (mg/L)	--	105	--	--	304	--	--	130	--	--	333	--	
Potassium (mg/L)	--	11	--	--	29	--	--	12	--	--	26	--	
Cobalt (dissolved, mg/L)	--	0.002	--	--	0.009	--	--	0.011	--	--	0.003	--	
Manganese (dissolved, mg/L)	--	0.55	--	--	0.836	--	--	1.19	--	--	0.296	--	
Nickel (dissolved, mg/L)	--	0.054	--	--	0.129	--	--	0.072	--	--	0.169	--	
Zinc (dissolved, mg/L)	--	0.019	--	--	0.041	--	--	0.039	--	--	0.03	--	
Iron (dissolved, mg/L)	--	0.08	--	--	<0.05	--	--	0.09	--	--	<0.05	--	

Shaded Cells - Indicates results are outside of the nominated trigger level.

* Results are rounded to 1 decimal place when comparing to trigger level.

--- Indicates no analysis for compound required during particular period.

Table 30 Surface Water Monitoring Location S7 Results 2024

Location	Surface Water S7												Trigger Level
Month	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	
Date Sampled	8/01/24	6/02/24	5/03/24	8/04/24	8/05/24	11/06/24	10/07/24	8/08/24	9/09/24	9/10/24	19/11/24	9/12/24	
Time Sampled	10:20	17:15	16:55	7:52	15:53	11:10	11:03	15:40	7:03	16:04	7:13	15:15	
Temperature (°C)	19.1	23.2	22.84	13.2	13.8	8.1	9.21	9.39	10.7	13.88	17.6	23.4	
pH	7.13	7.39	7.25	6.78	6.79	6.97	6.81	6.9	7.03	7.2	7.1	7.03	6.8 – 8.0*
Conductivity (µS/cm)	538	1,230	1,260	561	962	916	1,020	1,020	1,160	1,080	1,790	667	1,007
Turbidity (NTU)	18.4	7.7	8.6	22.3	3	2.6	13.6	9	14.5	10.6	18	25.1	
Dissolved Oxygen (mg/L)	--	4.8	--	--	6.99	--	--	7.7	--	--	5.1	--	
TSS (mg/L)	--	9	--	--	<5	--	--	<5	--	--	<5	--	30
Oil & Grease (mg/L)	--	<5	--	--	<5	--	--	<5	--	--	<5	--	10
Bicarbonate Alkalinity (mg/L)	--	75	--	--	56	--	--	48	--	--	73	--	
Total Alkalinity (mg/L)	--	75	--	--	56	--	--	48	--	--	73	--	
Sulphate (mg/L)	--	479	--	--	357	--	--	374	--	--	636	--	
Chloride (mg/L)	--	62	--	--	44	--	--	56	--	--	108	--	
Calcium (mg/L)	--	59	--	--	46	--	--	45	--	--	89	--	
Magnesium (mg/L)	--	41	--	--	30	--	--	35	--	--	65	--	
Sodium (mg/L)	--	143	--	--	100	--	--	113	--	--	217	--	
Potassium (mg/L)	--	17	--	--	13	--	--	13	--	--	22	--	
Cobalt (dissolved, mg/L)	--	0.007	--	--	0.013	--	--	0.011	--	--	0.011	--	
Manganese (dissolved, mg/L)	--	1.070	--	--	1.000	--	--	0.928	--	--	1.030	--	
Nickel (dissolved, mg/L)	--	0.068	--	--	0.065	--	--	0.070	--	--	0.120	--	
Zinc (dissolved, mg/L)	--	0.025	--	--	0.065	--	--	0.048	--	--	0.044	--	
Iron (dissolved, mg/L)	--	0.13	--	--	0.18	--	--	0.25	--	--	0.11	--	

Shaded Cells - Indicates results are outside of the nominated trigger level.

* Results are rounded to 1 decimal place when comparing to trigger level.

--- Indicates no analysis for compound required during particular period.

Table 31 Surface Water Monitoring Location Wallerawang Downstream Results 2024

Location	Surface Water Wallerawang Downstream												Trigger Level
Sampling Month	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	
Date Sampled	8/01/24	6/02/24	5/03/24	8/04/24	8/05/24	11/06/24	10/07/24	8/08/24	9/09/24	9/10/24	19/11/24	9/12/24	
Time Sampled	9:38	16:28	16:08	6:40	15:07	10:30	10:27	14:50	6:20	15:24	6:17	14:35	
Temperature (°C)	18.6	21.6	22.8	13.1	15.6	8.9	10.6	13.5	9.6	13.4	14.9	22.1	
pH	6.91	7.40	6.84	6.92	7.00	6.87	6.66	6.65	6.76	7.04	6.83	6.64	NA
Conductivity (µS/cm)	1,540	932	1,820	747	1,770	2,070	1,890	1,260	2,610	2,790	1,910	1,240	NA
Turbidity (NTU)	19.5	49.0	3.5	23.9	2.8	3.1	10.4	4.2	21.7	16.2	14.2	6.4	
Oil & Grease (mg/L)	--	<5	--	--	<5	--	--	<5	--	--	<5	--	NA
Bicarbonate Alkalinity (mg/L)	--	87	--	--	88	--	--	51	--	--	72	--	
Total Alkalinity (mg/L)	--	87	--	--	88	--	--	51	--	--	72	--	
Sulphate (mg/L)	--	331	--	--	735	--	--	491	--	--	705	--	
Chloride (mg/L)	--	61	--	--	89	--	--	52	--	--	110	--	
Calcium (mg/L)	--	41	--	--	105	--	--	102	--	--	122	--	
Magnesium (mg/L)	--	33	--	--	59	--	--	54	--	--	73	--	
Sodium (mg/L)	--	108	--	--	175	--	--	91	--	--	188	--	
Potassium (mg/L)	--	11	--	--	24	--	--	16	--	--	24	--	
Cobalt (dissolved, mg/L)	--	0.002	--	--	0.026	--	--	0.031	--	--	0.035	--	
Manganese (dissolved, mg/L)	--	0.565	--	--	1.430	--	--	1.830	--	--	1.510	--	
Nickel (dissolved, mg/L)	--	0.054	--	--	0.124	--	--	0.095	--	--	0.149	--	
Zinc (dissolved, mg/L)	--	0.032	--	--	0.086	--	--	0.081	--	--	0.080	--	
Iron (dissolved, mg/L)	--	0.08	--	--	7.19	--	--	9.17	--	--	8.48	--	

NA: Trigger levels are not applicable in this monitoring location.

-- Indicates no analysis for compound required during particular period.

Table 32 Surface Water Monitoring Location 'The Bong' Results January – December 2024

Location	The Bong												Trigger Level
Month	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	
Date Sampled	8/01/24	6/02/24	5/03/24	8/04/24	8/05/24	11/06/24	10/07/24	8/08/24	9/09/24	9/10/24	19/11/24	9/12/24	
Time Sampled	8:56	15:21	15:30	06:08	16:15	9:42	15:42	15:54	15:57	16:05	7:45	15:16	
Temperature (°C)	19.6	21.9	26.6	13.9	13.8	6.2	10.8	11.3	14.5	13.9	15.2	23.3	
pH	6.97	7.45	7.51	6.80	6.29	6.91	7.18	6.73	7.85	6.85	7.40	7.20	5.8 – 8.0*
Conductivity (µS/cm)	148	125	171	67	160	198	207	190	247	243	191	116	1,157
Turbidity (NTU)	41.2	96.7	6.5	15.5	7.3	2.9	7.7	7.8	12.9	75	168	52	
Dissolved Oxygen (mg/L)	--	17	--	--	7	--	--	5	--	--	5	--	
TSS (mg/L)	--	17	--	--	7	--	--	5	--	--	5	--	
Oil & Grease (mg/L)	--	24	--	--	36	--	--	55	--	--	59	--	
Bicarbonate Alkalinity (mg/L)	--	3.00	--	--	3.00	--	--	4.00	--	--	2.00	--	
Total Alkalinity (mg/L)	--	9	--	--	10	--	--	16	--	--	16	--	
Sulphate (mg/L)	--	3	--	--	3	--	--	5	--	--	4	--	
Chloride (mg/L)	--	2	--	--	2	--	--	2	--	--	3	--	
Calcium (mg/L)	--	3	--	--	4	--	--	5	--	--	5	--	
Magnesium (mg/L)	--	<0.001	--	--	<0.001	--	--	<0.001	--	--	<0.001	--	
Sodium (mg/L)	--	<0.0001	--	--	<0.0001	--	--	<0.0001	--	--	<0.0001	--	
Potassium (mg/L)	--	<0.001	--	--	0.007	--	--	<0.001	--	--	<0.001	--	
Cobalt (dissolved, mg/L)	--	<0.001	--	--	<0.001	--	--	<0.001	--	--	<0.001	--	
Manganese (dissolved, mg/L)	--	<0.001	--	--	<0.001	--	--	<0.001	--	--	<0.001	--	
Nickel (dissolved, mg/L)	--	0.004	--	--	0.002	--	--	0.002	--	--	0.018	--	
Zinc (dissolved, mg/L)	--	0.028	--	--	0.024	--	--	0.032	--	--	0.042	--	
Iron (dissolved, mg/L)	--	0.05	--	--	0.07	--	--	<0.05	--	--	<0.05	--	

Shaded Cells - Indicates results are outside of the nominated trigger level.

* Results are rounded to 1 decimal place when comparing to trigger level.

--- Indicates no analysis for compound required




Figure 10 Site Surface Water S1, S3 & S6 pH Results 2024




Figure 11 Site Surface Water S4, S5 & S7 pH Results 2024




Figure 12 Wallerawang Downstream and Water Cart Dam pH Results 2024




Figure 13 Site Surface Water S1, S3 & S6 Electrical Conductivity Results 2024




Figure 14 Site Surface Water S4, S5 & S7 Electrical Conductivity Results 2024




Figure 15 The Bong and Wallerawang Downstream Electrical Conductivity Results 2024




Figure 16 Site Surface Water S2 – 2024 Water Level

4.3 REVIEW & INTERPRETATION OF SURFACE WATER MONITORING RESULTS

4.3.1 EPL SURFACE WATER

The results of the water quality monitoring were generally within the respective water quality trigger level range with the exception of the following:

- pH
 - The EPL Point 14 May, August and November 2024 results were below the approved lower trigger level.
- Electrical conductivity
 - The EPL Point 3 May and November 2024 results were above the approved trigger level.
 - The EPL Point 14 November 2024 results was above the approved trigger level.

Total suspended solids (TSS) were compliant with the respective trigger values at all locations during all monitoring events.

For the purpose of completeness, RCA notes the following with regards to the revised trigger level (refer **Table 19**):

- The EPL Point 16 August and November pH results were below the revised lower trigger level.
- All electrical conductivity results were below the revised trigger level.
- The TSS results were below the revised trigger level.

4.3.2 SITE SURFACE WATER

During the 2024 monitoring period, pH was intermittently outside the site-specific trigger level ranges at:

- S5 for six (6) of the monitoring events; the pH was below the lower trigger level for the March, May, July to September and November 2024 monitoring rounds.

During the 2024 monitoring period, electrical conductivity was intermittently above the site-specific trigger levels at:

- S1 and S3 for eight (8) monitoring events (January, March, May to July, and September to November).
- S5 and S7 for seven (7) monitoring events (February, March, and July to November).
- S6 for five (5) monitoring events (January, March, and September to November).

Oil and grease concentrations were below the trigger level in all sampling locations throughout the 2024 monitoring period.

Total suspended solids values at all the monitoring locations were below the trigger level.

For the purpose of completeness, RCA notes the following with regards to the revised trigger levels (refer **Table 19**):

- The pH result for Water Cart Dam in May was below the lower trigger level.
- The pH result was below the relevant trigger levels for all locations.
- The electrical conductivity was below the relevant trigger levels for all locations.
- TSS was below the relevant trigger levels for all locations.

The variation of electrical conductivity with rainfall is presented in **Figure 17**: electrical conductivity theoretically increases in response to decreased rainfall and the majority of the results in this monitoring period appear to reflect this. It is noted that other contributions to the salinity of the water, potentially including sediment which is eroded by rainfall from the catchment, has been considered to present an influence to electrical conductivity in previous monitoring periods.




Figure 17 Site Surface Water Electrical Conductivity and Monthly Rainfall

5 METEOROLOGICAL MONITORING

The meteorological monitoring requirements of EPL 4911 (Ref [1]) are presented in **Table 33**.

Table 33 *EPL Meteorological Monitoring Requirements*

Parameter	Units of Measure	Frequency	Averaging Period
Rainfall	mm	Continuous	15 minute
Air temperature	°C	Continuous	1.0 hour
Sigma theta	°	Continuous	15 minute
Relative humidity	%	Continuous	1.0 hour
Wind direction	°	Continuous	15 minute
Wind speed	m/s	Continuous	15 minute

5.1 METEOROLOGICAL MONITORING DATA SUMMARY

Meteorological monitoring was undertaken via the monitoring station at Mt Piper Power Station in accordance with the EPL 4911.

The station presents data for rainfall, temperature at 2m height, temperature at 10m height, sigma theta, humidity, wind speed, wind direction and satisfies the requirements as per **Table 33**. The station does record additional data (pressure, solar radiation, evapotranspiration) which is not considered relevant to this report and is therefore not presented.

The completeness of the data set is presented in **Table 34** and a summary of the weather data recorded for the period January to December 2024 is presented in **Table 35**.

Table 34 *Completeness (%) of Weather Station Data Capture*

Month	Rainfall	Air Temperature		Sigma Theta	Relative Humidity	Wind Speed	Wind Direction
		2m	10m				
January	100	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	83.7	83.7
February	99.4	99.4	99.4	99.4	99.4	99.4	99.4
March	98.1	96.7	98.1	96.7	96.7	96.7	96.7
April	99	98.9	99.0	99.7	99.7	98.9	98.9
May	98.5	99.6	98.5	99.6	99.6	99.6	99.6
June	99.9	99.9	99.9	99.9	99.9	99.9	99.9
July	99.9	99.9	99.9	99.9	99.9	99.9	99.9
August	99.8	99.2	99.7	99.1	99.1	99.2	99.2
September	100	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
October	99.6	99.6	99.6	99.6	99.6	99.6	99.6
November	99.7	99.7	99.7	99.7	99.7	99.7	99.7
December	99.2	99.2	99.2	99.1	99.1	99.2	99.2

Table 35 *Meteorological Monitoring Summary Data 2024*

Month	Rainfall (mm)	Cumulative Rainfall (mm)	No of Rain Days/ Month	Air Temp. @ 2m (°C)			Air Temp. @ 10m (°C)			Sigma theta (°)			Relative Humidity (%)			Wind Speed (m/s)			Modal Wind Direction
				Mean	Min	Max	Mean	Min	Max	Mean	Min	Max	Mean	Min	Max	Mean	Min	Max	
Jan	108.6	108.6	16	19.4	7.6	32.9	19.4	8.6	31.5	25	1	98	81	18.9	99.1	2	0.1	9.1	ESE
Feb	86.6	195.2	18	19.1	9.7	34.3	19.1	10.2	33.4	24	2	103	81	9.5	98.7	0	0.2	0.2	E
Mar	39.8	235	16	16.6	4.5	31.0	16.8	5.8	30.3	24	1	102	79	17.1	98.7	2	0.09	6.0	SW
April	98.6	333.6	19	11.7	0.3	26.7	12.2	2.0	26.0	21	2	101	82	16.3	98.6	2	0.09	6.2	WSW
May	49.8	383.4	24	8.7	-3.0	18.0	9.3	-2.0	18.0	22	1	99	87	18.0	99.0	2	0.1	7.1	SW
June	53.6	437	22	5.3	-5.0	14.0	6.0	-3.0	15.0	20	2	100	86	25.0	99.0	2	0.1	11.4	SW
July	44	481	22	5.2	-4.0	15.0	5.7	-2.0	15.0	19	2	100	82	34.0	98.0	3	0.2	13.8	WSW
Aug	60.2	541.2	23	8.6	-5.0	21.0	9.2	-3.0	21.0	24	2	101	77	18.0	99.0	2	0.1	9.4	WSW
Sept	28.4	569.6	12	9.3	-7.0	22.0	10.2	-4.0	22.0	22	2	99	64	13.0	99.0	3	0.1	11.5	WSW
Oct	15.2	584.8	11	12.2	1.3	24.9	12.8	2.3	24.0	23	2	102	69	19.3	98.5	2	0.1	8.7	WSW
Nov	122.8	707.6	10	15.5	2.3	29.9	17.2	4.3	30.4	25	2	101	71	19.0	98.6	2	0.1	8.6	SW
Dec	63	770.6	10	16.3	1.9	29.7	19.1	5.8	31.4	23	2	103	65	12	98.6	2	0.1	8.9	WSW
TOTAL		770.6	203	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Minimum		15.2	10	--	-7.0	--	--	-4.0	--	--	1	--	--	9.5	--	--	0.09	--	--
Maximum		122.8	24	--	--	34.3	--	--	33.4	--	--	103	--	--	99.1	--	--	13.8	--

5.2 REVIEW OF METEOROLOGICAL MONITORING RESULTS

Rainfall was recorded across 203 days during the 2024 monitoring period.

The total rainfall recorded by the meteorological monitoring was 770.6mm, higher than rainfall recorded during 2023 (634mm) but lower than those in 2020 to 2022 (892, 835 and 1133mm respectively).

The maximum temperatures recorded during the reporting period were 34.3°C at the 2m sensor and 33.4°C at the 10m sensor during February. The lowest temperatures were both in September: -7.0°C at the 2m sensor and -4.0°C at the 10m sensor.

Predominant wind directions at the PDM during 2024 was observed to be primarily from the south-westerly quadrant.

6 STREAM HEALTH & CHANNEL STABILITY MONITORING

6.1 STREAM HEALTH & CHANNEL STABILITY MONITORING SUMMARY

Schedule 3 Condition 27(b) of Project Approval PA 10_0041 requires performance criteria and a programme to monitor the stream health, riparian vegetation health and channel stability of creeks and other water bodies that could potentially be affected by the PDM. As defined in Schedule 3 Condition 27(b) of the Project Approval, the creeks and other water bodies that could potentially be affected by the project include Wangcol Creek, the Blue Lake and Coxs River.

A Channel Stability and Stream Health Monitoring programme is outlined in Section 4.6.5 of the PDM Water Management Plan (Ref [3]) for the purpose of monitoring channel stability and stream health and vegetation health of Wangcol Creek. In addition to the requirements of the Channel Stability and Stream Health Monitoring programme, the water bodies of Blue Lake and Coxs River have also been included in the monitoring programme, to satisfy the conditions outlined in the Project Approval (Ref [2]).

Routine six-monthly assessments of Wangcol Creek, Blue Lake and Coxs River were undertaken in March and September 2024 in accordance with the Channel Stability and Stream Health Monitoring programme. The performance criteria utilised for the stream health assessment of each monitoring point is derived from the CSIRO Ephemeral Stream Assessment protocol (Ref [10]) which is reproduced in **Table 36**.

Results of the routine six-monthly assessments are presented in **Table 37** to **Table 40**. The locations of stream health monitoring sites are presented in **Drawing 2, Attachment 1**.

Visual assessments and photographic documentation of each site are also undertaken on monthly basis detailing evidence of erosion, newly exposed soils, and vegetation disturbance. Results of this monthly monitoring indicate no evidence of erosion, newly exposed soils, or vegetation disturbance.

A stream health assessment of the Blue Lake site was not undertaken, as the site does not fit the requirements of the Ephemeral Stream Assessment protocol (Ref [10]), which has been developed for streams and drainage lines. Nevertheless, the Blue Lake is still included in monthly erosion and vegetation disturbance observation inspections.

Table 36 *Classification of Different Drainage Line States (CSIRO)*

Activity Rating (%)	Classification	Discussion of Classification
80 +	Very Stable	Drainage line is very stable and likely to be in original form. It is able to withstand all flow velocities that have previously occurred in this area and only minimal monitoring is required, predominantly after high flow events, to ensure condition does not deteriorate.
70-80	Stable	Drainage line is stable. It is important to assess this zone in relation to the other classifications and define whether this zone is moving from potentially stabilising to a more stable form, or if it is deteriorating from a very stable form. The nature of this relationship will identify the type of monitoring required.
60-69	Potentially Stabilising	Drainage line is potentially stabilising. Ongoing monitoring is required while rehabilitation works are not needed in the immediate future.
50-59	Active	Drainage line is actively eroding and remedial actions are required. It is important to classify if erosion is caused primarily by upstream flows, lateral flows or unstable wall materials so that appropriate rehabilitation can be carried out.
< 50	Very Active	Drainage line is very actively eroding and immediate remedial actions are required. It is important to classify if erosion is caused primarily by upstream flows, lateral flows or unstable wall materials so that appropriate rehabilitation can be carried out.

Table Source: CSIRO Ephemeral Stream Assessment (CSIRO, undated)

Table 37 *Classification of Different Drainage Line State – Site SH1*

Activity		Rating 7 March	Rating 10 September	Explanation of Rating
Vegetation	On Drainage Line Floor	2	2	Any vegetation present is annual or short lived; partial burial of plants by recently deposited sediment evident.
	On Drainage Line Walls	3	3	Dense perennial plant cover, similar to vegetation on floodplain/riparian zone. Characteristic wetland species composition. No observable plant burial by sediment.
Profile of D/L	Shape and Aspect of Drainage Line Section	3	3	Potentially stabilising. Side walls become rounded and crusted alluvial fan at foot of side walls. Width > depth.
	Longitudinal Morphology of Drainage Line	3	3	Flat with a cohesive fine textured 'soil-like' bed.
	Particle Size of Materials on Drainage Line Floor	3	3	Material on floor is much larger in particle size and/or denser (more consolidated) than material on walls (e.g., well sorted gravel).
Wall Materials	Nature of Drainage Line Materials	3	3	Materials that slake rapidly and/or disperse are exposed on less than 0.3 metres of vertical wall height (the sum of multiple layers if present).
Bank Edge	Shape of Stream Bordering Slopes	2	3	2 – Steep bank, 10-30°, permitting moderate to high velocity flows.
				3 – Moderately sloped bank, 5-10°.
	Nature of Lateral Flow Regulation	4	4	Dense grassland: low inflow rate, mostly diffuse.
2024 Overall Scores				
Classification of Drainage Line		23/32 72%	24/32 75%	Drainage is considered stable.

Table 38 *Classification of Different Drainage Line State – Site SH2*

Activity		Rating 7 March	Rating 10 September	Explanation of Rating
Vegetation	On Drainage Line Floor	2	2	Any vegetation present is annual or short lived; partial burial of plants by recently deposited sediment evident.
	On Drainage Line Walls	3	3	Dense perennial plant cover, similar to vegetation on floodplain/riparian zone. Characteristic wetland species composition. No observable plant burial by sediment.
Profile of D/L	Shape and Aspect of Drainage Line Section	3	3	Potentially stabilising. Side walls become rounded and crusted alluvial fan at foot of side walls. Width > depth.
	Longitudinal Morphology of Drainage Line	3	3	Flat with a cohesive fine textured 'soil-like' bed.
	Particle Size of Materials on Drainage Line Floor	3	3	Material on floor is much larger in particle size and/ or denser than material on walls. Surface armouring (e.g., cobbles, competent country rock).
Wall Materials	Nature of Drainage Line Materials	3	3	Materials that slake and/or disperse are exposed on less than 0.3m of wall height.
Bank Edge	Shape of Stream Bordering Slopes	3	3	Moderately sloped bank, 6-10°.
	Nature of Lateral Flow Regulation	4	4	Dense grassland: low inflow rate, mostly diffuse.
2024 Overall Scores				
Classification of Drainage Line		24/32 75%	24/32 75%	Drainage is considered stable.

Table 39 *Classification of Different Drainage Line State – Site SH3*

Activity		Rating 7 March	Rating 10 September	Explanation of Rating
Vegetation	On Drainage Line Floor	2	2	Any vegetation present is annual or short lived; partial burial of plants by recently deposited sediment evident.
	On Drainage Line Walls	3	3	Dense perennial plant cover, similar to vegetation on floodplain/riparian zone. Characteristic wetland species composition. No observable plant burial by sediment.
Profile of D/L	Shape and Aspect of Drainage Line Section	3	2	2 – Actively eroding: slight undercutting, near vertical walls fans also eroding: depth = width
				3 – Potentially stabilising. Side walls become rounded and crusted alluvial fan at foot of side walls. Width > depth.
	Longitudinal Morphology of Drainage Line	3	2	2 – Flat, continuous, loose sediment with signs of recent/frequent movement.
				3 – Flat with a cohesive fine textured 'soil-like' bed.
	Particle Size of Materials on Drainage Line Floor	3	2	2 – Material on floor is slightly larger in particle size and/or denser (more consolidated) than material on walls (e.g. well sorted gravel).
				3 – Material on floor is much larger in particle size and/ or denser than material on walls. Surface armouring (e.g., cobbles, competent country rock).
Wall Materials	Nature of Drainage Line Materials	3	3	Materials that slake and/or disperse are exposed on less than 0.3m of wall height.
Bank Edge	Shape of Stream Bordering Slopes	3	3	Moderately sloped bank, 6-10°.
	Nature of Lateral Flow Regulation	5	4	4 – Dense grassland: low inflow rate, mostly diffuse.
				5 – Woodland with dense litter; very low, diffuse inflow rates.
2024 Overall Scores				
Classification of Drainage Line		25/32 78%	21/32 66%	66% – Drainage line is potentially stabilising. Ongoing monitoring is required while rehabilitation works are not needed in the immediate future.
				78% – Drainage line is considered stable.

Table 40 *Classification of Different Drainage Line State – Site SH5*

Activity		Rating 7 March	Rating 10 September	Explanation of Rating
Vegetation	On Drainage Line Floor	2	2	Any vegetation present is annual or short lived; partial burial of plants by recently deposited sediment evident.
	On Drainage Line Walls	3	3	Dense perennial plant cover, similar to vegetation on floodplain/riparian zone. Characteristic wetland species composition. No observable plant burial by sediment.
Profile of D/L	Shape and Aspect of Drainage Line Section	3	3	Potentially stabilising. Side walls become rounded and crusted alluvial fan at foot of side walls. Width > depth.
	Longitudinal Morphology of Drainage Line	3	3	Flat with a cohesive fine textured 'soil-like' bed.
	Particle Size of Materials on Drainage Line Floor	3	3	Material on floor is much larger in particle size and/ or denser than material on walls. Surface armouring (e.g., cobbles, competent country rock).
Wall Materials	Nature of Drainage Line Materials	4	4	Materials that do not slake or disperse are exposed on wall surface.
Bank Edge	Shape of Stream Bordering Slopes	4	4	Moderately sloped bank, 5 – 10°.
	Nature of Lateral Flow Regulation	4	4	Dense grassland: low inflow rate, mostly diffuse.
2024 Overall Scores				
Classification of Drainage Line		26/32 81%	30/32 94%	Drainage line is very stable.

6.2 REVIEW & INTERPRETATION OF STREAM HEALTH MONITORING RESULTS

The routine six-monthly assessment of channel stability, stream health and vegetation health of the Wangcol Creek monitoring locations (SH1, SH2, and SH3) at PDM indicates the drainage line classification is 'stable' at SH1 and SH2, while it is considered 'potentially stabilising' at SH3 in September 2024. The drainage line at location SH3a is considered stable as this section of the creek is lined with spray concrete.

An assessment of the Coxs River monitoring site (SH5) indicated the drainage line is 'very stable' conditions.

The CSIRO Ephemeral Stream Assessment protocol Ref [10]) does not indicate either specific ongoing monitoring or rehabilitation works are required for the stable systems. Ongoing monitoring is required for the potentially stabilising systems.

7 NOISE MONITORING

Noise monitoring is undertaken in accordance with Project Approval (Ref [2]) conditions and the PDM Noise Management Plan (Ref [6]) on a quarterly basis. There is no specific requirement for monitoring in the EPL 4911 (Ref [1]) although limits are set (refer **Section 7.1**).

The purpose of noise monitoring is to ensure that any impact of operations on the surrounding sensitive receivers can be identified; and to show compliance with relevant legislative requirements.

As PDM is currently in care and maintenance, rehabilitation activities are considered to be the primary noise source.

7.1 NOISE ASSESSMENT CRITERIA

The conditional requirements within EPL 4911 (Ref [1]), Project Approval 10_0041 (Schedule 3, Condition 1, Ref [2]) are presented in **Table 41**.

Table 41 Noise Assessment Criteria (Ref [1] and [2])

Location		Noise Monitoring Location	Day LAeq (15 min)dBA	Evening LAeq (15 min)dBA
Residences 18, 32 and 33		NM1 - (EPL Ref No.33)	42	39
Residences 20-23, 25 and 27-29		N/A	42	36
Residences 8, 10-12 and 14		NM2 - (EPL Ref No.14) NM3 - (EPL Ref No.10)	42	35
Residences 2, 5-7 and 35		NM4 - (EPL Ref No.5) NM6 - (EPL Ref No.2)	35	35
All other residences		NM5 - (EPL Ref No.4)	35	35
During construction and removal of the amenity bund	Residences 8, 10-12, 14, 18, 20-23, 25, 27-29 and 32 - 33	N/A	46	N/A

Noise generated by the project should not exceed the above criteria at any residence on privately-owned land or on more than 25% of any privately-owned land.

Day: The period from 7:00am to 6:00pm Monday to Saturday and 8:00am to 6:00pm Sundays and Public Holidays

Evening: The period from 6:00pm to 10:00pm Monday to Sunday

Noise survey locations are presented in **Drawing 1, Attachment 1**.

7.2 NOISE MONITORING DATA SUMMARY

Quarterly attended noise surveys of PDM for the 2024 monitoring period were undertaken during the care and maintenance stage of the site on the following dates:

- Quarter 1 – January to March, monitoring conducted 25 & 26 March 2024.
- Quarter 2 – April to June, monitoring conducted 16 & 17 May 2024.
- Quarter 3 – July to September, monitoring conducted on 23 & 24 September 2024.
- Quarter 4 – October to December, monitoring conducted on 5 November 2024.

The conditions and operations during noise surveys were considered to be representative of those undertaken on a normal daily basis.

Monitoring comprised two (2) consecutive 15-minute surveys conducted at each of the six (6) monitoring locations. Measurements were recorded in free field conditions with a Class 1 sound level meter (SLM) attached to a tripod at a height of 1.5 metres above the ground. A handheld calibrator was used to check the calibration of the SLM in between all measurement locations. All calibration checks were within the acceptable range of $94 \text{ dB} \pm 0.5$.

Results of attended noise surveys carried out during the 2024 monitoring period are presented in **Table 42** to **Table 45**. Meteorological conditions recorded during each noise survey are presented in **Table 46**; the 10m data has been sourced from the meteorological data (refer **Section 5**) subsequent to the completion of the noise surveys.

Table 42 *Attended Noise Survey – Quarter 1, March 2024*

Survey Date	Survey Start Time	Location	Overall			Pine Dale Mine L _{Aeq} 15min Contribution	Pine Dale Mine L _{Aeq} 15min Limit	Road traffic, birds & other L _{Aeq} 15min Contribution	Noise Sources & Level Ranges (Min to Max) dB(A)
			L _{Aeq} 15min	L _{A10} 15min	L _{A90} 15min				
25/03/2024	15:45	NM1	56	59	41	NIL	42	56	Pine Dale Mine NIL* Road Traffic 48 to 66dBA Birds 40 to 42dBA
25/03/2024	16:00	NM1	57	60	42	NIL	42	57	Pine Dale Mine NIL* Road Traffic 48 to 79dBA Birds 40 to 42dBA
25/03/2024	16:30	NM2	46	50	34	NIL	42	46	Pine Dale Mine NIL* Road Traffic 44 to 59dBA Birds 38 to 47dBA
25/03/2024	17:00	NM2	48	52	34	NIL	42	48	Pine Dale Mine NIL* Road Traffic 44 to 67dBA Birds 38 to 47dBA
26/03/2024	08:45	NM3	59	63	45	NIL	42	59	Pine Dale Mine NIL* Road Traffic 50 to 80dBA Birds 42 to 48dBA
26/03/2024	09:00	NM3	60	63	42	NIL	42	60	Pine Dale Mine NIL* Road Traffic 50 to 76dBA Birds 42 to 48dBA
26/03/2024	09:30	NM4	43	43	39	NIL	35	43	Pine Dale Mine NIL* Birds 46 to 64dBA Distant Traffic 33 to 41dBA
25/03/2024	15:45	NM1	56	59	41	NIL	42	56	Pine Dale Mine NIL* Road Traffic 48 to 66dBA Birds 40 to 42dBA
26/03/2024	09:45	NM4	45	45	38	NIL	35	45	Pine Dale Mine NIL* Birds 45 to 72dBA Distant Traffic 33 to 41dBA
26/03/2024	10:15	NM5	58	49	36	NIL	35	58	Pine Dale Mine NIL* Road Traffic 44 to 85dBA Birds 36 to 46dBA

* Nil – Noise source not audible during survey session

Table 42 *Continued*

Survey Date	Survey Start Time	Location	Overall			Pine Dale Mine L _{Aeq} 15min Contribution	Pine Dale Mine L _{Aeq} 15min Limit	Road traffic, birds & other L _{Aeq} 15min Contribution	Noise Sources & Level Ranges (Min to Max) dB(A)
			L _{Aeq} 15min	L _{A10} 15min	L _{A90} 15min				
26/03/2024	11:00	NM6	56	48	31	NIL	35	56	Pine Dale Mine NIL* Road Traffic 46 to 81dBA Birds 42 to 46dBA
26/03/2024	11:15	NM6	61	46	32	NIL	35	61	Pine Dale Mine NIL* Road Traffic 46 to 81dBA Birds 42 to 58dBA

* Nil – Noise source not audible during survey session

Table 43 *Attended Noise Survey – Quarter 2, May 2024*

Survey Date	Survey Start Time	Location	Overall			Pine Dale Mine LAeq 15min Contribution	Pine Dale Mine LAeq 15min Limit	Road traffic, birds & other LAeq 15min Contribution	Noise Sources & Level Ranges (Min to Max) dB(A)
			LAeq 15min	LA10 15min	LA90 15min				
16/05/2024	1:30 pm	NM1	57	61	43	Nil	42	57	Pine Dale Mine NIL* Insects constant. Small birds constant. Passing trucks/cars/motorbikes: 61 – 67dBA.
16/05/2024	1:45 pm	NM1	55	59	36	Nil	42	55	Pine Dale Mine NIL* Distant road noise constant. Insects constant. Passing trucks and cars: 65 – 70dBA.
16/05/2024	2:15 pm	NM2	52	56	39	Nil	42	52	Pine Dale Mine NIL* Insects constant. Small birds constant when audible. Passing trucks, cars, and motorbikes: 60 – 63dBA.
16/05/2024	2:30 pm	NM2	52	56	39	Nil	42	52	Pine Dale Mine NIL* Birds and insects constant. Distant road noise constant. Passing trucks and cars: 60 – 65dBA.
16/05/2024	3:00 pm	NM3	63	67	47	Nil	42	63	Pine Dale Mine NIL* Traffic noise: 71 – 80dBA.
16/05/2024	3:15 pm	NM3	63	67	40	Nil	42	63	Pine Dale Mine NIL* Traffic noise: 73 – 76dBA.
16/05/2024	3:45 pm	NM4	38	37	26	Nil	35	38	Pine Dale Mine NIL* Horses in paddocks around car. Distant traffic ~55dBA.
16/05/2024	4:00 pm	NM4	35	36	26	Nil	35	35	Pine Dale Mine NIL* Distant traffic. Horses near car. Dogs barking: ~52dBA. Resident cutting wood: 39 – 44dBA.

* Nil – Noise source not audible during survey session

Table 43 *Continued*

Survey Date	Survey Start Time	Location	Overall			Pine Dale Mine LAeq 15min Contribution	Pine Dale Mine LAeq 15min Limit	Road traffic, birds & other LAeq 15min Contribution	Noise Sources & Level Ranges (Min to Max) dB(A)
			LAeq 15min	LA10 15min	LA90 15min				
17/05/2024	9:15 am	NM5	51	46	38	Nil	35	51	Pine Dale Mine NIL* Birds constant. Distant road noise constant. Occasional car passing: 74 – 76dBA.
17/05/2024	9:30 am	NM5	59	52	37	Nil	35	59	Pine Dale Mine NIL* Birds constant. Distant road noise constant. Occasional car passing: 76 – 81dBA.
17/05/2024	8:30 am	NM6	51	45	37	Nil	35	51	Pine Dale Mine NIL* Birds constant. Distant road noise constant. Occasional car passing: 74 – 75dBA.
17/05/2024	8:45 am	NM6	51	46	38	Nil	35	51	Pine Dale Mine NIL* Birds and insects constant. Occasional vehicle passing. Distant road noise constant. Road noise: 70 – 71dBA.

* Nil – Noise source not audible during survey session

Table 44 *Attended Noise Survey – Quarter 3, September 2024*

Survey Date	Survey Start Time	Location	Overall			Pine Dale Mine LAeq 15min Contribution	Pine Dale Mine LAeq 15min Limit	Road traffic, birds & other LAeq 15min Contribution	Noise Sources & Level Ranges (Min to Max) dB(A)
			LAeq 15min	LA10 15min	LA90 15min				
23/09/2024	12:00 pm	NM1	53	56	43	Nil	42	53	Pine Dale Mine NIL* Insects constant Small birds constant Passing trucks/cars/motorbikes: 55 – 64dBA
23/09/2024	12:15 pm	NM1	52	56	40	Nil	42	52	Pine Dale Mine NIL* Small birds constant Passing trucks and cars: 59 – 66dBA
23/09/2024	1:30 pm	NM2	52	54	45	Nil	42	52	Pine Dale Mine NIL* Small birds constant Wind noise from trees constant Passing trucks, cars, and motorbikes: 51 – 62dBA
23/09/2024	1:45 pm	NM2	50	53	43	Nil	42	50	Pine Dale Mine NIL* Small birds constant when audible Wind noise from trees constant Passing trucks, cars, and motorbikes: 51 – 62dBA
23/09/2024	12:45 pm	NM3	62	66	48	Nil	42	62	Pine Dale Mine NIL* Occasional rooster crow Birds: 50-52dBA Traffic noise: 66 – 78dBA
23/09/2024	1:00 pm	NM3	64	67	46	Nil	42	64	Pine Dale Mine NIL* Birds: 50-52dBA Traffic noise: 66 – 79dBA
23/09/2024	2:15 pm	NM4	45	46	39	Nil	35	45	Pine Dale Mine NIL* Insects and birds constant Horse in paddock: ~48dBA Distant traffic ~55dBA
23/09/2024	2:30 pm	NM4	44	46	39	Nil	35	44	Pine Dale Mine NIL* Dog barks: ~58dBA

* Nil – Noise source not audible during survey session

Table 44 *Continued*

Survey Date	Survey Start Time	Location	Overall			Pine Dale Mine L _{Aeq} 15min Contribution	Pine Dale Mine L _{Aeq} 15min Limit	Road traffic, birds & other L _{Aeq} 15min Contribution	Noise Sources & Level Ranges (Min to Max) dB(A)
			L _{Aeq} 15min	LA10 15min	LA90 15min				
24/09/2024	8:00 am	NM5	58	46	36	Nil	35	58	Pine Dale Mine NIL* Birds constant Occasional car pass: 70 – 79dBA
24/09/2024	8:15 am	NM5	60	50	35	Nil	35	60	Pine Dale Mine NIL* Birds constant Birds: 48 – 51dBA Occasional car pass: 71 – 81dBA
24/09/2024	8:45 am	NM6	52	45	34	Nil	35	52	Pine Dale Mine NIL* Birds/Insects constant Occasional car pass: 65 – 75dBA
24/09/2024	9:00 am	NM6	52	44	30	Nil	35	52	Pine Dale Mine NIL* Birds/Insects constant Occasional car pass: 68 – 74dBA.

* Nil – Noise source not audible during survey session

Table 45 *Attended Noise Survey – Quarter 4, November 2024*

Survey Date	Survey Start Time	Location	Overall			Pine Dale Mine LAeq 15min Contribution	Pine Dale Mine LAeq 15min Limit	Road traffic, birds & other LAeq 15min Contribution	Noise Sources & Level Ranges (Min to Max) dB(A)
			LAeq 15min	LA10 15min	LA90 15min				
05/11/2024	12:38 pm	NM1	48	52	36	Nil	42	48	Pine Dale Mine NIL* Insects and Small birds constant Passing trucks/cars/motorbikes: 55 – 61dBA
05/11/2024	12:53 pm	NM1	51	54	37	Nil	42	51	Pine Dale Mine NIL* Small birds constant Passing trucks and cars: 59 – 66dBA
05/11/2024	01:12 pm	NM2	48	51	37	Nil	42	48	Pine Dale Mine NIL* Insects and Small birds constant Passing trucks, cars, and motorbikes: 51 – 59dBA
05/11/2024	01:27 pm	NM2	49	52	39	Nil	42	49	Pine Dale Mine NIL* Insects and Small birds constant Passing trucks, cars, and motorbikes: 51 – 60dBA
05/11/2024	01:48 pm	NM3	58	62	40	Nil	42	58	Pine Dale Mine NIL* Insects and birds constant Traffic noise: 61 – 74dBA
05/11/2024	02:03 pm	NM3	57	60	40	Nil	42	57	Pine Dale Mine NIL* Insects and birds constant Traffic noise: 61 – 75dBA
05/11/2024	02:27 pm	NM4	46	49	38	Nil	35	46	Pine Dale Mine NIL* Insects and birds constant Dogs in resident yard intermittent: >50dBA Horse in paddock: ~46dBA
05/11/2024	02:42 pm	NM4	42	45	36	Nil	35	42	Pine Dale Mine NIL* Insects and birds constant
05/11/2024	03:11 pm	NM5	60	45	31	Nil	35	60	Pine Dale Mine NIL* Birds constant Occasional vehicle pass: 71 – 80dBA

* Nil – Noise source not audible during survey session

Table 45 *Continued*

Survey Date	Survey Start Time	Location	Overall			Pine Dale Mine L _{Aeq} 15min Contribution	Pine Dale Mine L _{Aeq} 15min Limit	Road traffic, birds & other L _{Aeq} 15min Contribution	Noise Sources & Level Ranges (Min to Max) dB(A)
			L _{Aeq} 15min	L _{Aeq} 15min	L _{Aeq} 15min				
05/11/2024	03:26 pm	NM5	59	46	31	Nil	35	59	Pine Dale Mine NIL* Birds constant Occasional vehicle pass: 71 – 80dBA
05/11/2024	03:44 pm	NM6	57	50	35	Nil	35	57	Pine Dale Mine NIL* Birds/Insects constant Distant plane: ~38dBA Occasional vehicle pass: 65 – 75dBA
05/11/2024	03:59 pm	NM6	57	48	37	Nil	35	57	Pine Dale Mine NIL* Birds/Insects constant Distant plane: ~38dBA Occasional vehicle pass: 65 – 75dBA.

* Nil – Noise source not audible during survey session

Table 46 *Meteorological Conditions during Attended Noise Surveys*

Survey Date	Start Time	Location	Temp at 10m (°C)	Average Wind Speed (m/s)	Average Wind Direction (degrees)
25/03/2024	15:45	NM1	23	2.3	226
25/03/2024	16:30	NM2	23	1.7	240
26/03/2024	08:45	NM3	21	0.3	82
26/03/2024	09:30	NM4	22	0.8	359
26/03/2024	10:15	NM5	23	1.9	349
26/03/2024	11:00	NM6	24	1 - 2	349
16/05/2024	13:30	NM1	16	1.8	24
16/05/2024	14:15	NM2	16	1.8	19
16/05/2024	15:00	NM3	15	1.6	33
16/05/2024	15:45	NM4	15	1.0	35
17/05/2024	09:15	NM5	10	0.6	2
17/05/2024	08:30	NM6	8	0.1	316
23/09/2024	12:00 pm	NM1	18	4.0	272
23/09/2024	1:30 pm	NM2	19	5.3	246
23/09/2024	12:45 pm	NM3	19	5.2	249
23/09/2024	2:15 pm	NM4	19	4.2	251
24/09/2024	8:00 am	NM5	15	1.3	14
24/09/2024	8:45 am	NM6	16	1.6	340
05/11/2024	12:38 pm	NM1	13	2.8	124
05/11/2024	01:12 pm	NM2	13	3.4	111
05/11/2024	01:48 pm	NM3	13	2.4	102
05/11/2024	02:27 pm	NM4	13	2.3	104
05/11/2024	03:11 pm	NM5	12	2.4	119
05/11/2024	03:44 pm	NM6	12	3.3	128

The Industrial Noise Policy states “Wind can also create extraneous noise on noise-monitoring equipment; an upper limit of 5 m/s at the microphone position is commonly applied during noise measurement to reduce this effect”.

7.3 REVIEW & INTERPRETATION OF OPERATIONAL NOISE MONITORING RESULTS

7.3.1 FIRST QUARTER 2024

Attended noise surveys for the January to March 2024 quarter were undertaken on 25 & 26 March at six (6) PDM noise monitoring locations. During the surveys, no activities were observed at the mine, with no traffic observed to be using the privately-owned Angus Place haul road located within PDM.

The surveys showed that road traffic along Castlereagh Highway was typically the dominant noise source with bird calls and distant traffic contributing to the acoustic environment.

There were no audible noise contributions from PDM at the six (6) noise monitoring locations.

7.3.2 SECOND QUARTER 2024

Attended noise surveys for the April to June 2024 quarter were undertaken on 16 & 17 May. During the surveys, no activities were observed at the mine, with no traffic observed to be using the privately-owned Angus Place haul road located within PDM.

The surveys showed that road traffic along Castlereagh Highway was typically the dominant noise source with bird calls and distant traffic contributing to the acoustic environment.

There were no audible noise contributions from PDM at the six (6) noise monitoring locations.

7.3.3 THIRD QUARTER 2024

Attended noise surveys for the July to September 2024 quarter were undertaken on 23 & 24 July. During the surveys, no activities were observed at the mine, with no traffic observed to be using the privately-owned Angus Place haul road located within PDM.

The surveys showed that road traffic along Castlereagh Highway was typically the dominant noise source with bird calls and distant traffic contributing to the acoustic environment.

There were no audible noise contributions from PDM at the six (6) noise monitoring locations.

7.3.4 FOURTH QUARTER 2024

Attended noise surveys for the October to December 2024 quarter were undertaken on 5 November. During the surveys, no activities were observed at the mine, with no traffic observed to be using the privately-owned Angus Place haul road located within PDM.

The surveys showed that road traffic along Castlereagh Highway was typically the dominant noise source with bird calls and distant traffic contributing to the acoustic environment.

There were no audible noise contributions from PDM at the six (6) noise monitoring locations.

7.3.5 OVERALL ASSESSMENT FOR 2024

The assessable sound levels from PDM were below the assessment criteria at the six (6) locations during the 2024 monitoring period.

It is a requirement under AS 1055 that the noise surveys also document levels of ambient sound resulting from non PDM sources; these are represented by the “Overall” L_{Aeq} 15 minute noise levels (refer **Table 42** to **Table 45**). In the surveys conducted for PDM, traffic from the Castlereagh Highway was observed to be the dominant noise source with natural sounds and more distant traffic significant contributors to the acoustic environment.

8 BLAST MONITORING

8.1 BLASTING OPERATIONS ASSESSMENT CRITERIA

The purpose of blast monitoring is to ensure that any impact of blasting operations on the surrounding land and nearby sensitive locations can be identified, and to show compliance with relevant legislative requirements. Conditional requirements within Project Approval 10_0041 (Schedule 3, Condition 8) and Environment Protection License (EPL 4911) are presented in **Table 47**.

Table 47 *Blasting Operations: Compliance Requirements*

Location	Airblast overpressure (dB (Lin Peak))	Ground vibration (mm/s)	Allowable exceedance
Residence on privately-owned land	115	5	5% of the total number of blasts over a period of 12 months
	120	10	0%

8.2 **BLASTING OPERATIONS MONITORING DATA SUMMARY**

Throughout the 2024 monitoring period there were no blast events conducted at the site as a result of the mine being in care and maintenance.

9 **LIMITATIONS**

This report has been prepared for Enhance Place Pty Limited in accordance with an agreement with RCA Australia (RCA). The services performed by RCA have been conducted in a manner consistent with that generally exercised by members of its profession and consulting practice.

This report has been prepared for the sole use of Enhance Place Pty Limited. The report may not contain sufficient information for purposes of other uses or for parties other than Enhance Place Pty Limited. This report shall only be presented in full and may not be used to support objectives other than those stated in the report without written permission from RCA Australia.

The information in this report is considered accurate at the date of issue with regard to the current conditions of the site. Conditions can vary across any site that cannot be explicitly defined by investigation.

Environmental conditions including analyte concentrations can change in a limited period of time. This should be considered if the report is used following a significant period of time after the date of issue.

Yours faithfully

RCA AUSTRALIA



Muhammad Hayyat
Environmental Engineer
MEng (Env), BEng

REFERENCES

- [1] NSW EPA, *Environment Protection Licence 4911*, 22 March 2013 updated 10 November 2021.
- [2] NSW Department of Planning, *Project Approval Application Number 10_0041*.
- [3] Enhance Place Pty Ltd, *Water Management Plan for the Pine Dale Coal Mine*, August 2015.
- [4] Enhance Place Pty Ltd, *Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Management Plan for the Pine Dale Coal Mine*, November 2020.
- [5] Enhance Place Pty Ltd, *Purple Copper Butterfly Monitoring Program for the Pine Dale Coal Mine*, August 2015.
- [6] Enhance Place Pty Ltd, *Noise Management Plan for the Pine Dale Coal Mine*, August 2015.
- [7] Standards Australia, *AS/NZS 3580.10.1:2016: Methods for sampling and analysis of ambient air: Determination of particulate matter – Deposited matter – Gravimetric Method*, 2016.
- [8] Standards Australia, *AS/NZS 3580.1.1:2007: Methods for sampling and analysis of ambient air: Guide to siting air monitoring equipment*, 2007.
- [9] GHD, *Pine Dale Groundwater and Surface Water Investigation Trigger Value Review Report*, September 2018.
- [10] CSIRO, *Ecosystem Function Analysis – Ephemeral Stream Assessment*.

GLOSSARY

AHD	Australian height datum, based on a mean sea level.
dB	Unit of sound pressure level
DPIE	Department of Planning and Environment – formerly known as Department of Planning, Industry and Environment (2019 – 2023), Department of Planning and Environment (2014 – 2019), Department of Industry (2015 – 2019) and the Office of Environment and Heritage (OEHS, 2011 – 2019).
EPL	Environment Protection Licence
kg	kilogram, 1000 gram.
L _{A90}	Average A-weighted minimum noise level in a measurement period
L _{Aeq}	Average acoustic energy over the duration of the measurement, represented using the A-weighting filter.
L _{Aeqmax}	Maximum A-weighted noise level in a measurement period.
mg	milligram, 1/1000 gram.
NSW EPA	NSW Environment Protection Authority.
NTU	Nephelometric Turbidity Units: unit for the measurement of turbidity.
PDM	Pine Dale Mine

µg microgram, 1/1000 milligram.

Chemical Compounds

EC	Electrical conductivity: a measure of the ability of a solution to conduct electricity.
PM ₁₀	particulate matter less than or equal to 10 micrometres.
TSP	Total suspended Particulates
TSS	Total suspended solids.
Turbidity	Cloudiness of fluid

Attachment 1

Drawing 1 - Environmental Monitoring Locations


Drawing 2 - Stream Health & Channel Stability
Monitoring Locations



LEGEND

-  Noise monitoring location
-  Depositional dust monitoring location
-  Groundwater monitoring location
-  Surface water monitoring location
-  Meteorological monitoring location (from 10 November 2021)

Note: Aerial taken from ArcGIS Base Map, 24 May 2023



PINE DALE MINE
ENVIRONMENTAL MONITORING
LOCATION PLAN


CLIENT Enhance Place Pty Ltd			RCA Ref 6880g-312/0 AppB		
DRAWN BY MH	SCALE 1:24,000 (A3)		DRAWING 1	REV 0	
APPROVED BY FB	DATE 18/02/2025		OFFICE NEWCASTLE		



LEGEND

- Monitoring location
- Licence discharge point location
- Clean water diversion location

Note: Aerial taken from ArcGis Base Map,
23 May 2023



PINE DALE MINE
CHANNEL STABILITY, STREAM AND
VEGETATIVE HEALTH MONITORING SITES

CLIENT Enhance Place Pty Ltd		RCA Ref 6880g-312/0 AppB	
DRAWN BY MH	SCALE 1:5,000 (A3)	DRAWING 2	REV 0
APPROVED BY FB	DATE 18/02/2025	OFFICE NEWCASTLE	



Pine Dale Mine Rehabilitation Monitoring Report 2024

Report prepared by First Field Environmental Pty Ltd
on behalf of EnergyAustralia

1 November 2024

Revision history		
Version	Date	Author
Version 1	4 October 2024	Kaitlen Rawsthorne Myrna Calumpong Michelle Evans
Version 2	1 November 2024	Michelle Evans

Cover image: Pasture adjacent to transect 1

This report has been prepared by First Field Environmental Pty Ltd for EnergyAustralia. The opinions, conclusions and any recommendations in this report are based on conditions encountered and information reviewed at the date of preparation of the report.

© First Field Environmental Pty Ltd 2024

This document is and shall remain the property of First Field Environmental Pty Ltd. The document may only be used for the purpose for which it was commissioned and in accordance with the Terms of Engagement for the commission. Unauthorised use of this document in any form whatsoever is prohibited.

First Field Environmental Pty Ltd

T: 0468 708 520

E: michelle@firstfield.com.au

Contents

1. Introduction	5
2. Performance indicators.....	5
3. Weather conditions	6
4. Survey methodology	6
4.1 Rehabilitation monitoring	6
4.2 Erosion and sedimentation	7
4.3 Soil loss	7
4.4 Vegetation assessment.....	9
4.5 Evidence of fauna and habitat features	9
4.6 Pest animal and weed survey.....	9
4.7 Fuel loads and fire-fighting access	9
4.8 Rural land capability assessment	9
4.9 Management input assessment	10
5. Field survey results.....	10
5.1 Erosion and sedimentation	10
5.2 Soil loss	10
5.3 Vegetation assessment.....	11
5.4 Evidence of fauna and habitat features	13
5.5 Feral animals and weeds	13
5.6 Fuel loads and fire-fighting access	13
5.7 Rural land capability assessment	14
5.8 Management input assessment	14
6. Rehabilitation status	15
7. Key findings	16
8. Recommendations	16
9. References.....	17

Appendices

Appendix A Survey data 2024	18
Appendix B Vegetation assessment of treed areas	27
Appendix C Estimation of annual soil loss	39
Appendix D Species list	41
Appendix E Photo point monitoring to 2024	46

Figures

Figure 1 Monitoring locations	8
Figure 2 Pasture composition at analogue site	11
Figure 3 Pasture composition Area C	11
Figure 4 Natural regeneration of the treed analogue site	12

Tables

Table 1 Performance indicators and completion criteria	5
Table 2 Maximum temperature (°C) recorded May-August	6
Table 3 Rainfall (mm) recorded May-August	6
Table 4 Estimated soil loss due to erosion	10
Table 5 Feral animal and priority weed presence	13
Table 6 Rural land capability assessment of pasture areas	14
Table 7 Status of completion criteria	15

1. Introduction

Pine Dale Mine is located in the Western Coalfields of NSW at Blackmans Flat, 15 km north of Lithgow on the northern side of Castlereagh Highway. The property is approximately 3 km east of Mount Piper Power Station.

Pine Dale Mine is managed in accordance with Project Approval 10_0041 and relevant subsidiary licenses and approvals.

The preparation of this Rehabilitation Monitoring Report has been prepared to satisfy Schedule 3, Condition 55 of Project Approval 10_0041.

This report aims to identify successes and failures in rehabilitation in regard to agreed performance indicators and completion criteria. Recommendations are made in areas that could be improved.

2. Performance indicators

Table 1 identifies the performance indicators and completion criteria for Pine Dale Mine as determined by the *Rehabilitation Management Plan 2024* (EnergyAustralia NSW 2024).

Table 1 Performance indicators and completion criteria

Performance indicator	Completion criteria
Feral animal and priority weed presence	Feral animal and weed species presence and abundance is not considered to adversely impact the intended final land use.
Feral animal and priority weed control	Feral animals and priority weeds are controlled in accordance with legislation.
Fuel loads	Fuel loads and fire breaks in and surrounding rehabilitation areas are assessed and maintained in accordance with the Bushfire Management Plan.
Access	Adequate access for fire-fighting is maintained on rehabilitation areas.
Habitat features	Habitat features are installed on native forest rehabilitation areas including: - Nesting boxes and salvaged hollows - Crushed timber spread over native forest rehabilitation areas - Rock pile clusters.
Vegetation health	More than 75% of native forest indicator species are assessed to be healthy and growing at year 5.
	Native forest indicator species tree height and girth is within the range of analogue sites.
Soil loss	Net annual soil loss is comparable to analogue sites at year 10.
Erosion	There are no significant erosion features that compromise landform stability or public safety (including gullyng or tunnelling).
Woodland birds present	Evidence of woodland birds utilising rehabilitation areas.
Evidence of mammals	Evidence of target mammal species presence in rehabilitation areas.
Natural regeneration	Evidence of second generation of native forest indicator species from desired vegetation community. Evidence of natural regeneration of at least four pasture species at year 5.
Structure	Structural layers (canopy, mid-storey, understorey and ground cover) are comparable to analogue sites.

Performance indicator	Completion criteria
Management inputs	Management inputs (ameliorants, fertilisers, weed treatments) are within the range of analogue sites.
Rural land capability	Pasture rehabilitation areas are assessed to have a Rural Land Capability Class VI or better (suitable for grazing).
Species composition	Establishment of pasture comprising approximately 70% perennial grass and 20% annual legume, representative of species at analogue sites. Vegetation within the treed rehabilitation areas are established in accordance with the approved species mix. Approved pasture species mix is sown at the specified rate per hectare.
Weed presence	Weeds including African Lovegrass to comprise <10% of the pasture sward.
Ground cover	Ground cover (vegetation, leaf litter, mulch) >70% at year 5.

Source: *Rehabilitation Management Plan 2024* (EnergyAustralia NSW 2024)

3. Weather conditions

The three months leading up to the survey experienced mixed temperatures, with June and July being cooler than average, while May remained consistent with the 5-year average. Rainfall during this period was above average, with a total of 151.8 mm recorded, compared to the 15-year average of 130 mm for May to July (Bureau of Meteorology 2023).

Table 2 Maximum temperature (°C) recorded May-August

Month	6-year average	2024 average
May	14.7	14.7
June	11.6	11.3
July	11.9	10.3
August	13.0	-

Source: Bureau of Meteorology 2024 (Marrangaroo (Defence))

Table 3 Rainfall (mm) recorded May-August

Month	15- year average	2024 average
May	33.2	45.8
June	49.1	66.8
July	47.7	39.2
August	53.0	-

Source: Bureau of Meteorology 2024 (Marrangaroo (Defence))

4. Survey methodology

4.1 Rehabilitation monitoring

Monitoring locations - Previous studies have seen the establishment of six monitoring transects; four transects are located within rehabilitated pastures while the remaining two transects are within treed rehabilitation areas. Additional transects exist as analogue sites in grazed pasture and an undisturbed naturally vegetated area of the property to provide benchmarks against which the pasture and treed rehabilitation areas are assessed. Monitoring locations are shown in Figure 1.

Photopoint monitoring - Coordinates for each transect and analogue site are provided in Appendix A. Each transect area contains previously established photo monitoring points. Photos taken from these points enable a visual comparison to photos from previous surveys and are provided in Appendix E.

4.2 Erosion and sedimentation

Evidence of erosion and sedimentation along and within the vicinity of each transect has been determined in accordance with *Best Practice Erosion and Sediment Control* (IECA 2006).

4.3 Soil loss

The *Rehabilitation Management Plan 2024* (EnergyAustralia NSW 2024) recommends that net soil loss be determined in accordance with the *Ecosystem Function Analysis* (CSIRO 2008). This method has been found to be inadequate for determining soil loss in comparison with the widely used *RUSLE* (IEAC Australasia 2012). An estimation of soil loss at each transect site has been calculated using the *Revised Universal Soil Loss Equation* (RUSLE) (IEAC Australasia 2012). Values used for these calculations are presented in Appendix C.




Figure 1 Monitoring locations

4.4 Vegetation assessment

Pasture rehabilitation areas – Cox’s River seed mix was sown in 2010-2011 at Areas B, C and Area 8 at the following rates:

- 40% Fescue (*Festuca* spp.)
- 25% Cocksfoot (*Dactylis glomerata*)
- 20% Subterranean clover (*Trifolium subterranean*)
- 6% Perennial rye grass (*Lolium perenne*)
- 5% White clover (*Trifolium repens*)
- 4% Phalaris (*Phalaris aquatica*)

The proportion of perennial grasses and annual legumes currently in evidence at pasture transects has been recorded and compared with the proportion at which these species were initially sown.

Tree rehabilitation areas – The *Rehabilitation Management Plan 2024* (EnergyAustralia NSW 2024) recommends that vegetation structure be determined in accordance with the *Ecosystem Function Analysis* (CSIRO 2008). This method does not adequately enable the identification of all completion criteria and vegetation health, natural regeneration, structure and species composition have instead been determined in accordance with the *Australian Soil and Land Survey Field Handbook* (CSIRO 2009).

4.5 Evidence of fauna and habitat features

Fauna - Evidence of woodland birds and native fauna utilising rehabilitated areas has been recorded through the observation of scats and tracks and sightings.

Habitat features - The presence of crushed timber piles and rock pile clusters within the rehabilitation areas is noted.

4.6 Pest animal and weed survey

Pest animal presence - Evidence of feral animal presence across the rehabilitation areas has been determined through scat and trail identification.

Priority weeds - The location and extent of priority weeds as declared for the Central Tablelands Region (Central Tablelands Local Land Services 2019) have been recorded. Target weed species, particularly African Lovegrass were identified in accordance with field guides and botanical keys.

4.7 Fuel loads and fire-fighting access

Fuel loads - Fuel loads within and adjacent to rehabilitation areas have been assessed in accordance with the *Overall Fuel Hazard Assessment Guide* (Department of Sustainability 2010).

Fire-fighting access - Access trails within rehabilitated areas have been assessed in accordance with *Policy No. 2/2007 Fire Trails* (Bush Fire Coordinating Committee 2007).

4.8 Rural land capability assessment

Pasture rehabilitation areas have been assessed in accordance with the *Land and Soil Capability Assessment* (OEH 2007).

4.9 Management input assessment

Land management activities - Land management and soil amelioration activities conducted in the past year have been identified through discussions with the land manager.

Feral animal and weed management - Evidence of feral animal and priority weed control activities have been sought from the land manager and audited against relevant legislative requirements.

5. Field survey results

Field survey was conducted on 15 August 2024 by a qualified ecologist. The survey revisited six transects representing rehabilitated pasture and treed areas as well as pasture and treed analogue sites.

5.1 Erosion and sedimentation

The presence and extent of active surface erosion within transect areas is recorded in Appendix A. There are no significant erosion features that compromise landform stability or public safety (including gullying or tunnelling) within the pasture rehabilitation areas.

Pasture rehabilitation areas – No active erosion was evident at pasture rehabilitation sites.

Treed rehabilitation areas - Minor wind and rill erosion is occurring at treed rehabilitation areas.

Analogue sites - No active erosion was evident at the pasture or treed analogue sites.

5.2 Soil loss

Estimated annual soil loss at rehabilitated transects is summarised in

Table 4. Note that soil loss in transect 3 is affected by increased slope. Current tonnes per hectare soil loss in transect 3 is considered acceptable. Full calculations are provided in Appendix C.

Table 4 Estimated soil loss due to erosion

Estimated annual soil loss t/ha	Pasture analogue site	Transect 1 (pasture)	Transect 2 (pasture)	Transect 3 (pasture)	Transect 4 (pasture)	Transect 5 (treed)	Transect 6 (treed)	Treed analogue site (transect 7)
	0.09 t/ha	0.09 t/ha	0.09 t/ha	0.18 t/ha	0.03 t/ha	0.36 t/ha	0.36 t/ha	0.00 t/ha

5.3 Vegetation assessment

Flora species identified along and within the vicinity of transects are listed in Appendix D.

Species composition at pasture rehabilitation areas – Pasture rehabilitation areas were established with a mix of ~70% perennial grasses and ~20% annual legumes consistent with species composition at the analogue pasture site. Examples of analogue pasture and rehabilitated pasture at Area C are shown in Figure 2 and Figure 3.



Figure 2 Pasture composition at analogue site



Figure 3 Pasture composition Area C

Groundcover at pasture rehabilitation areas – Rehabilitated pasture surfaces in each of the transect areas support living groundcover of >90%.

Natural regeneration at pasture rehabilitation areas – Natural regeneration of groundcover species is evident across all the pasture rehabilitation areas.

The treed analogue site was affected by fire in 2020 which resulted in the loss of groundcover, shrubby understorey and canopy. Natural regeneration is occurring and is characterised by an increase in shrubby vegetation and juvenile tree growth evident in Figure 4.



Figure 4 Natural regeneration of the treed analogue site

Rehabilitation of the treed rehabilitation areas aims to achieve structural complexity and species diversity comparable to established forest and they have therefore been compared to 2019 data from the treed analogue site.

In 2019 the treed analogue site was characterised by a canopy to 14 m height with 20% canopy cover over a sparse shrubby mid-storey to 3 m height and isolated shrubs to 1.5 m height in the understorey. Groundcover consisted of grasses and herbs with a cover of >95%.

Species composition at treed rehabilitation areas – Treed rehabilitation areas were established in accordance with an approved species mix representing local native species.

Vegetation cover at treed rehabilitation areas – Canopy cover is sparse in treed rehabilitation areas. A sparse mid-storey of isolated juvenile trees and shrubs exists over a low, shrubby understorey. Groundcover is a mix of broadleaf herbs and grasses. Changes in vegetation structure over time (as shown in Appendix B) are not considered significant. Annual living cover at transect 5 has increased to 30%, from 20% in 2023 while % perennial groundcover has remained stable. Both % of litter cover and bare soil have decreased.

Total living cover at transect 6 of 80% has not changed from 2023. Non-living cover consists of 10% litter cover and 10% bare surface.

Structure of vegetation at treed rehabilitation areas – Structural layers of vegetation at treed rehabilitation areas are not comparable to those of the treed analogue site.

Vegetation health at treed rehabilitation areas – Native forest indicator species are those that occur both in treed rehabilitation areas and the treed analogue site and provide an opportunity for comparison of growth between natural and rehabilitation conditions. Indicator species include native trees, shrubs and groundcovers.

More than 60% of native tree and shrub species recorded within the treed analogue site in 2024 are actively growing in the treed rehabilitation areas.

Natural regeneration of treed rehabilitation areas - There is evidence of second-generation native forest indicator tree and shrub species on treed rehabilitation areas.

5.4 Evidence of fauna and habitat features

Habitat features – Nesting boxes have not been installed in treed rehabilitation areas. Habitat features were previously installed and were evident in treed rehabilitation areas prior to 2020. These included timber and rock pile clusters. Whilst still present, the 2020 bushfire reduced the amount of mulch and fallen timber at transects 5 and 6.

Fauna – Macropod scats and tracks were evident throughout the property were observed on the property. Native woodland birds were observed landing within the treed vegetation areas. Native bird activity was evident on inspection of the treed analogue site and included specialist forest species. Magpies were observed on the ground within pasture areas A, B and C. A flock of Straw-necked Ibis was observed roosting within trees to the east of transect 1.

5.5 Feral animals and weeds

Feral animal and weed species presence and abundance is not considered likely to adversely impact the intended final land use. Feral animals and priority weeds are controlled in accordance with legislation. Weeds including African Lovegrass comprise <10% of the pasture sward. The presence or evidence of pests and weeds within and in the vicinity of each transect is recorded in Appendix A.

Pest animal presence – No holes, burrows, or dens were observed. Scat was observed within treed rehabilitation areas and was likely from foxes.

Priority and targeted weed species – Priority weeds observed during field survey are listed in Table 5.

Table 5 Feral animal and priority weed presence

Common name <i>Species name</i>	Location	Treatment
African lovegrass <i>Eragrostis curvula</i>	All pasture locations	All plants are regulated with a general biosecurity duty to prevent, eliminate or minimise any biosecurity risk they may pose. Any person who deals with any plant, who knows (or ought to know) of any biosecurity risk, has a duty to ensure the risk is prevented, eliminated or minimised, so far as is reasonably practicable.

The presence of African lovegrass was noted at all rehabilitated pasture locations and occurred across less than 10% of the pasture area. These outbreaks have been subjected to ongoing chemical control.

5.6 Fuel loads and fire-fighting access

Fuel loads and fire breaks in and surrounding rehabilitation areas are assessed and maintained in accordance with the Bushfire Management Plan, and adequate access for firefighting is maintained on rehabilitation areas.

Fuel loads – Fuel loads within Areas A, B and C and Area 8 are low and fuel hazard mitigation activities are not required at this time.

Firebreaks - The internal road provides a mineral earth firebreak between Area A and Pine Dale Mine infrastructure to the south, while the Coal Haul Road provides a mineral earth firebreak immediately to the north of Area A. The Coal Haul Road and internal road provide a mineral earth firebreak to the north and west of Areas B and C and Area 8. Private grazing land is located immediately adjacent to the east and south of Areas B and C and Area 8. The majority of this interface supports mature Pine and Eucalypt trees which would provide a barrier to wind-borne embers spreading to private grazing land during a fire event.

Fire-fighting access - Access to each of the rehabilitation areas is considered to be adequate. The Coal Haul Road is a private road located immediately to the north of Areas A, B and C and Area 8 and allows movement from within the former Wallerawang Power Station site, through Pine Dale Mine and to Mount Piper Power Station. An internal road is located immediately to the south of Areas A and B and to the north of Area 8. This road connects to Castlereagh Highway through the administration area of Pine Dale Mine. Area C is accessible by following the internal road through Area B. All access roads within rehabilitated areas are maintained in good condition and are suitable for the passage of Category 1 tankers, having a vertical clearance of >4 m and a width of >2.8 m (*Policy No. 2/2007 Fire Trails* (Bush Fire Coordinating Committee 2007)).

5.7 Rural land capability assessment

Pasture rehabilitation areas are assessed as being Land and Soil Capability Class V and are suitable for grazing. The limiting factors for land use are generally related to wind erosion hazard. Note that the area of Transect 4 is also subject to soil acidification hazard due to soil texture (Table 6).

Table 6 Rural land capability assessment of pasture areas

Class	Transect 1	Transect 2	Transect 3	Transect 4
Water erosion hazard class	2 1 - <3% slope	3 3 - <10% slope	4 10 - <20% slope, no gully erosion present	2 1 - <3% slope
Wind erosion hazard class	5 Moderate wind erodibility class of surface soil, high winds erosive power, high exposure to wind, average annual rainfall >500 mm			
Soil structural decline class	4 Fragile light textured soil - hardsetting			
Soil acidification hazard class	4 Very low texture /buffering capacity, pH 6.7 – 7.5 (CaCl ₂)			5 Very low texture /buffering capacity, pH 4.0 – 4.7 (CaCl ₂)
Salinity hazard class	1 Moderate to high recharge potential, low discharge potential, low salt store			
Waterlogging hazard class	2 0 – 0.25 months typical waterlogging duration, moderately well drained soils			
Shallow soils and rockiness hazard class	1 Nil rocky outcrop, soil depth >100 cm			
Mass movement hazard class	1 No mass movement present			

5.8 Management input assessment

Management inputs (ameliorants, fertilisers, weed treatments) are within the range of analogue sites.

Control of priority and targeted weed species has been undertaken across all rehabilitation areas as required and in accordance with the recommendations of the *Pine Dale Mine Rehabilitation Monitoring Report 2014* (First Field Environmental 2014).

6. Rehabilitation status

The status of performance indicators and completion criteria are summarised in Table 7.

Table 7 Status of completion criteria

Performance indicator	Completion criteria	Status
Feral animal and priority weed presence	Feral animal and weed species presence and abundance is not considered to adversely impact the intended final land use.	Satisfactory – Continue to monitor
Feral animal and priority weed control	Feral animals and priority weeds are controlled in accordance with legislation.	Satisfactory – Continue to monitor
Fuel loads	Fuel loads and fire breaks in and surrounding rehabilitation areas are assessed and maintained in accordance with the Bushfire Management Plan.	Satisfactory – Continue to monitor
Access	Adequate access for firefighting is maintained on rehabilitation areas.	Satisfactory – Continue to monitor
Habitat features	Habitat features are installed on native forest rehabilitation areas including: - Nesting boxes and salvaged hollows - Crushed timber spread over native forest rehabilitation areas - Rock pile clusters.	Ongoing – nesting boxes to be installed once trees are established.
Vegetation health	More than 75% of native forest indicator species are assessed to be healthy and growing at year 5.	Complete
	Native forest indicator species tree height and girth is within the range of analogue sites.	Ongoing – continue to monitor
Soil loss	Net annual soil loss is comparable to analogue sites at year 10.	Complete
Erosion	There are no significant erosion features that compromise landform stability or public safety (including gully or tunnelling).	Satisfactory – Continue to monitor
Woodland birds present	Evidence of woodland birds utilising rehabilitation areas.	Ongoing – continue to monitor
Evidence of mammals	Evidence of target mammal species presence in rehabilitation areas.	Ongoing – continue to monitor
Natural regeneration	Evidence of second generation of native forest indicator species from desired vegetation community.	Satisfactory – Continue to monitor
	Evidence of natural regeneration of at least four pasture species at year 5.	Complete
Structure	Structural layers (canopy, mid-storey, understorey and ground cover) are comparable to analogue sites.	Ongoing – continue to monitor

Performance indicator	Completion criteria	Status
Management inputs	Management inputs (ameliorants, fertilisers, weed treatments) are within the range of analogue sites.	Satisfactory – Continue to monitor
Rural land capability	Pasture rehabilitation areas are assessed to have a Rural Land Capability Class VI or better (suitable for grazing).	Satisfactory – Continue to monitor
Species composition	Establishment of pasture comprising approximately 70% perennial grass and 20% annual legume, representative of species at analogue sites.	Complete
	Vegetation within the treed rehabilitation areas is established in accordance with the approved species mix.	Complete
	Approved pasture species mix is sown at the specified rate per hectare.	Complete
Weed presence	Weeds including African lovegrass to comprise <10% of the pasture sward.	Satisfactory – Continue to monitor
Ground cover	Ground cover (vegetation, leaf litter, mulch) >70% at year 5.	Complete

7. Key findings

- Rainfall preceding the August survey was higher than the mean annual rainfall for the area.
- Feral animal and weed control are satisfactory and are to continue to be monitored to ensure that the criteria remain satisfactorily met prior to completion of rehabilitation requirements.
- Fuel loads and access are satisfactory and are to continue to be monitored to ensure that the criteria remain satisfactorily met prior to completion of rehabilitation requirements.
- Nesting boxes are not installed in or adjacent to the treed rehabilitation areas.
- Vegetation health in treed areas is satisfactory and is to continue to be monitored to ensure that the criteria remain satisfactorily met prior to completion of rehabilitation requirements.
- African Lovegrass is present. The extent of establishment is to be monitored, and the species is to be controlled to within less than 10% of the pasture sward.

8. Recommendations

The following recommendations for mitigation and management are consistent with intervention and adaptive management measures contained within the *Rehabilitation Management Plan 2024* (EnergyAustralia NSW 2024).

- Continue to monitor performance indicators;
- Continue to spot-spray outbreaks of African Lovegrass;
- Install nesting boxes once the treed rehabilitation areas contain adequate structure to support nesting woodland birds.

9. References

- BFCC (2007) *Policy No. 2/2007 Fire Trails*, Bush Fire Coordinating Committee, Australia
- Bureau of Meteorology (2024) Weather data Marrangaroo (Defence) NSW
- CSIRO (2008) *Ecosystem Function Analysis*, CSIRO, Australia
- CSIRO (2009) *Australian Soil and Land Survey Field Handbook*, CSIRO, Australia
- Cunningham, G (2012) *Flora Monitoring Report: Pine Dale Mine – February 2010 to November 2010*, Geoff Cunningham Natural Resource Consultants Pty Ltd, Killara NSW
- DSE (2010) Overall Fuel Hazard Assessment Guide, Department of Sustainability and Environment, VIC
- EnergyAustralia NSW (2024) *Rehabilitation Management Plan 2024*, EnergyAustralia NSW
- First Field Environmental (2023) *Pine Dale Mine Rehabilitation Monitoring Report*, First Field Environmental, NSW
- IECA (2008) *Best Practice Erosion and Sediment Control*, International Erosion Control Association (Australasia)
- New South Wales Department of Primary Industries (n.d.). *National Environmental Alert List Weeds*. Available at: <https://weeds.dpi.nsw.gov.au/WeedListPublics/CategoryResults?showImages=True&categoryId=5&pageTitle=National%20Environmental%20Alert%20List%20weeds> (Accessed: 19 September 2024).
- New South Wales Department of Primary Industries (n.d.). *Weed Biosecurity*. Available at: <https://weeds.dpi.nsw.gov.au/WeedBiosecurity?Areald=84> (Accessed: 19 September 2024).
- New South Wales Department of Primary Industries (n.d.). *Weeds of National Significance*. Available at: <https://weeds.dpi.nsw.gov.au/WeedListPublics/CategoryResults?showImages=True&categoryId=1&pageTitle=Weeds%20of%20National%20Significance> (Accessed: 19 September 2024).
- OEHL (2007) *Land and Soil Capability Assessment*, Office of Environment and Heritage, NSW
- SLR (2014) *Soil Assessment and Recommendations for Rehabilitation Areas*, NSW

Appendix A

Survey data 2024

Pasture analogue site (Pine Dale Mine) 2024	
Easting	Northing
228300	6304880
228317	6304925
Landform and soils	
Slope	1 - <3% slope inclining to the northwest.
Erosion	Not observed.
Cracking soils	Not observed.
Surface drainage impediments	No significant drainage impediments.
Vegetation	
Vegetation structure	Groundcover of mixed native and exotic grasses and broadleaf herbs.
Species richness	>30 herb and 10 grass species identified.
Cover classification	
Total living cover	>90%
Annual living cover	20%
Perennial living cover	70%
Litter cover	<5%
Bare surface	<5%

Transect 1 Pasture rehabilitation area 2024								
Easting				Northing				
228621				6305093				
228594				6305048				
Landform and soils								
Slope	Transect located along a contour. 1 - <3% slope inclining to the northwest.							
Erosion	Not observed.							
Cracking soils	Not observed.							
Surface drainage impediments	No significant drainage impediments.							
Vegetation								
Vegetation structure	Groundcover of mixed native exotic grasses and broadleaf herbs.							
Species richness	>40 herbs and grasses identified, dominated by exotic species.							
Cover classification	% cover at each observation							
	September 2017	September 2018	September 2019	September 2020	November 2021	November 2022	September 2023	August 2024
Total living cover	90%	90%	90%	90%	>90%	>90%	>95%	>90%
Annual living cover	40%	40%	40%	20%	20%	20%	20%	20%
Perennial living cover	50%	50%	50%	70%	70%	70%	75%	70%
Litter cover	<10%	10%	-	-	-	-	-	<5%
Bare surface	<10%	10%	10%	10%	<10%	<10%	<5%	<5%
Target weed presence								
African Lovegrass (<i>Eragrostis curvula</i>)	<10%							

Transect 2 Pasture rehabilitation area 2024								
Easting				Northing				
228454				6304718				
228400				6304744				
Landform and soils								
Slope	Transect located along a contour. 3 - <10% slope inclining to the west.							
Erosion	Not observed.							
Cracking soils	Not observed.							
Surface drainage impediments	No significant drainage impediments.							
Vegetation								
Vegetation structure	Groundcover of mixed native exotic grasses and broadleaf herbs.							
Species richness	>40 herbs and grasses identified, dominated by exotic species.							
Cover classification	% cover at each observation							
	September 2017	September 2018	September 2019	September 2020	November 2021	November 2022	September 2023	August 2024
Total living cover	90%	90%	90%	90%	>90%	>90%	>95%	>90%
Annual living cover	40%	40%	40%	20%	20%	20%	20%	20%
Perennial living cover	50%	50%	50%	70%	70%	70%	75%	70%
Litter cover	<10%	10%	-	-	-	-	-	<5%
Bare surface	<10%	10%	10%	10%	<10%	<10%	<5%	<5%
Target weed presence								
African Lovegrass (<i>Eragrostis curvula</i>)	<10%							

Transect 3 Pasture rehabilitation area 2024								
Easting				Northing				
228267				6304532				
228306				6304560				
Landform and soils								
Slope	Transect located along a contour. 10 - <20% slope declining to the northwest.							
Erosion	Not observed.							
Cracking soils	Not observed.							
Surface drainage impediments	No significant drainage impediments.							
Vegetation								
Vegetation structure	Groundcover of mixed native and exotic grasses and broadleaf herbs.							
Species richness	>40 herbs and grasses recorded, dominated by exotic species.							
Cover classification	% cover at each observation							
	September 2017	September 2018	September 2019	September 2020	November 2021	November 2022	September 2023	August 2024
Total living cover	90%	90%	90%	90%	>90%	>90%	>95%	>90%
Annual living cover	40%	40%	40%	20%	20%	20%	20%	20%
Perennial living cover	50%	50%	50%	70%	70%	70%	75%	70%
Litter cover	<10%	10%	-	-	-	-	-	<5%
Bare surface	<10%	10%	10%	10%	<10%	<10%	<5%	<5%
Target weed presence								
African Lovegrass (<i>Eragrostis curvula</i>)	<10%							

Transect 4 Pasture rehabilitation area 2024									
Easting				Northing					
228318				6304224					
228249				6304227					
Landform and soils									
Slope		Transect located along a contour. 1 - <3% slope declining to the west.							
Erosion		Not observed.							
Cracking soils									
Surface drainage impediments									No significant drainage impediments.
Vegetation									
Vegetation structure		Groundcover of mixed native and exotic grasses and broadleaf herbs.							
Species richness									>40 herbs and grasses recorded, dominated by exotic species.
Cover classification		% cover at each observation							
		September 2017	September 2018	September 2019	September 2020	November 2021	November 2022	September 2023	August 2024
Total living cover		90%	90%	90%	>90%	>90%	Not assessed due to inaccessibility	>95%	>90%
Annual living cover		30%	30%	40%	20%	20%		20%	20%
Perennial living cover		60%	60%	50%	70%	70%		75%	70%
Litter cover		<10%	10%	-	-	-		-	<5%
Bare surface		<10%	10%	10%	10%	<10%		<5%	<5%
Target weed presence									
African Lovegrass (<i>Eragrostis curvula</i>)		<10%							

Transect 5 Treed rehabilitation area 2024

Easting				Northing				
227846				6304272				
227787				6304251				
Landform and soils								
Slope	Transect located along contour of mid slope inclining 10-20% to the north.							
Erosion	Minor wind erosion observed on exposed soils. Isolated incidences of inactive gullyng observed.							
Cracking soils	Not observed.							
Surface drainage impediments	No significant drainage impediments.							
Vegetation								
Vegetation structure	Sparse tree layer to 3 m height with juvenile trees and sparse mixed native shrub species. Sparse shrub layer consists of native species and juvenile trees to 2 m height. Groundcover dominated by native and exotic grasses with scattered mixed native and exotic herbs.							
Species richness	Groundcover dominated by exotic grasses. >45 species recorded.							
Cover classification	% cover at each observation							
	September 2017	September 2018	September 2019	September 2020	November 2021	November 2022	September 2023	August 2024
Total living cover	70%	70%	70%	80%	80%	80%	>90%	80%
Annual living cover	10%	10%	10%	10%	20%	10%	20%	20%
Perennial living cover	60%	60%	60%	60%	60%	70%	70%	60%
Litter cover	10%	10%	15%	10%	-	10%	5%	>10%
Bare surface	20%	20%	15%	10%	20%	10%	<5%	<10%
Target weed presence								
None observed.								

Transect 6 Treed rehabilitation area 2024									
Easting				Northing					
226604				6304724					
226647				6304706					
Landform and soils									
Slope		Transect located along contour of mid slope inclining 10-20% to the northeast.							
Erosion		Minor wind erosion observed on exposed soils. Isolated incidences of inactive gullying observed.							
Cracking soils		Not observed.							
Surface drainage impediments		No significant drainage impediments.							
Vegetation									
Vegetation structure		Sparse tree layer to 5 m height with juvenile trees and sparse mixed native shrub species. Sparse shrub layer consists of native species and juvenile trees to 3 m height. Groundcover dominated by native and exotic grasses with scattered mixed native and exotic herbs.							
Species richness		Groundcover dominated by exotic grasses. >45 species recorded.							
Cover classification		% cover at each observation							
		September 2017	September 2018	September 2019	September 2020	November 2021	November 2022	September 2023	August 2024
Total living cover		80%	70%	70%	80%	>90%	80%	80%	80%
Annual living cover		10%	10%	10%	10%	20%	20%	20%	20%
Perennial living cover		70%	60%	60%	70%	70%	60%	60%	60%
Litter cover		10%	10%	15%	10%	-	10%	10%	>10%
Bare surface		10%	20%	15%	10%	<10%	10%	10%	<10%
Target weed presence									
None observed.									

Treed analogue site (transect 7) 2024	
Easting	Northing
226801	6305097
226838	6305039
Landform and soils	
Slope	Transect located along contour of mid slope gently inclining to the north.
Erosion	Minor wind erosion observed on exposed soils.
Cracking soils	Not observed.
Surface drainage impediments	No significant drainage impediments.
Vegetation	
Vegetation structure	Open canopy to 12 m height. Dense shrub layer including juvenile tree species. Groundcover dominated by native grasses with sparse native herbs.
Species richness	>20 species observed.
Cover classification	
Total living cover	>95%
Annual living cover	<5%
Perennial living cover	>90%
Litter cover	10%
Bare surface	<5%
Target weed presence	
None observed.	

Appendix B

Vegetation assessment of treed areas

Vegetation assessment treed areas 2024

Transect	Treed rehabilitation area (transect 5)	Treed rehabilitation area (transect 6)	2019 treed analogue site (transect 7)
Vegetation type	Rehabilitated	Rehabilitated	Dry Sclerophyll Forest (grassy)
Native plant species richness	>20	>25	>25
Trees	Sparse. To 3 m height.	Sparse. To 5 m height.	>10 species, 12-14 m height. 20% canopy cover.
Understorey	Sparse, to 2 m height. Includes juvenile Eucalyptus and Acacia species.	Sparse, to 3 m height. Includes juvenile Eucalyptus and Acacia species.	>14 species, 1-3 m height, 10% cover
Groundcover	90% cover. Mix of exotic grasses, native and exotic herbs.	80% cover. Mix of exotic grasses, native and exotic herbs.	Dominated by <i>Poa</i> spp. >95% cover. Mixed herbs and grasses also present.
Non-native species	>30	>30	<5
Recruitment	Observed.	Observed.	Observed.
Organic litter	Thin, sparse.	Thin, sparse.	Well-developed to 2 cm depth.
Logs	Large logs placed along contours on upper slope. Some burned.	Large logs placed along contours on upper slope.	>10 fallen logs of >20 cm diameter present along transect.

Vegetation assessment treed areas 2023

Transect	Treed rehabilitation area (transect 5)	Treed rehabilitation area (transect 6)	2019 treed analogue site (transect 7)
Vegetation type	Rehabilitated	Rehabilitated	Dry Sclerophyll Forest (grassy)
Native plant species richness	>10	>15	>25
Trees	Sparse. To 3 m height.	Sparse. To 5 m height.	>10 species, 12-14 m height. 20% canopy cover.
Understorey	Sparse, to 2 m height. Includes juvenile Eucalyptus and Acacia species.	Sparse, to 3 m height. Includes juvenile Eucalyptus and Acacia species.	>14 species, 1-3 m height, 10% cover
Groundcover	90% cover. Mix of exotic grasses, native and exotic herbs.	80% cover. Mix of exotic grasses, native and exotic herbs.	Dominated by <i>Poa</i> spp. >95% cover. Mixed herbs and grasses also present.
Non-native species	>25	>20	<5
Recruitment	Observed.	Observed.	Observed.
Organic litter	Thin, sparse.	Thin, sparse.	Well-developed to 2 cm depth.
Logs	Large logs placed along contours on upper slope. Some burned.	Large logs placed along contours on upper slope.	>10 fallen logs of >20 cm diameter present along transect.

Vegetation assessment treed areas 2022

Transect	Treed rehabilitation area (transect 5)	Treed rehabilitation area (transect 6)	2019 treed analogue site (transect 7)
Vegetation type	Rehabilitated	Rehabilitated	Dry Sclerophyll Forest (grassy)
Native plant species richness	>5	>10	>25
Trees	Sparse. To 3 m height.	Sparse. To 3 m height.	>10 species, 12-14 m height. 20% canopy cover.
Understorey	Sparse, to 2 m height. Includes juvenile Eucalyptus and Acacia species.	Sparse, to 3 m height. Includes juvenile Eucalyptus and Acacia species.	>14 species, 1-3 m height, 10% cover
Groundcover	80% cover. Mix of exotic grasses, native and exotic herbs.	80% cover. Mix of exotic grasses, native and exotic herbs.	Dominated by <i>Poa</i> spp. >95% cover. Mixed herbs and grasses also present.
Non-native species	>25	>25	<5
Recruitment	Observed.	Observed.	Observed.
Organic litter	Thin, sparse.	Thin, sparse.	Well-developed to 2 cm depth.
Logs	Large logs placed along contours on upper slope. Some burned.	Large logs placed along contours on upper slope.	>10 fallen logs of >20 cm diameter present along transect.

Vegetation assessment treed areas 2021

Transect	Treed rehabilitation area (transect 5)	Treed rehabilitation area (transect 6)	2019 treed analogue site (transect 7)
Vegetation type	Rehabilitated	Rehabilitated	Dry Sclerophyll Forest (grassy)
Native plant species richness	>5	>10	>25
Trees	Sparse. To 3 m height.	Sparse. To 3 m height.	>10 species, 12-14 m height. 20% canopy cover.
Understorey	Sparse, to 2 m height. Includes juvenile Eucalyptus and Acacia species.	Sparse, to 3 m height. Includes juvenile Eucalyptus and Acacia species.	>14 species, 1-3 m height, 10% cover
Groundcover	80% cover. Mix of exotic grasses, native and exotic herbs.	Dominated by exotic grasses and herbs. Some native herbs present. >90% cover.	Dominated by <i>Poa</i> spp. >95% cover. Mixed herbs and grasses also present.
Non-native species	>5	>10	<5
Recruitment	Observed.	Observed.	Observed.
Organic litter	Thin, sparse.	Thin, sparse.	Well-developed to 2 cm depth.
Logs	Large logs placed along contours on upper slope. Some burned.	Large logs placed along contours on upper slope.	>10 fallen logs of >20 cm diameter present along transect.

Vegetation assessment treed areas 2020

Transect	Treed rehabilitation area (transect 5)	Treed rehabilitation area (transect 6)	Treed analogue site (transect 7)
Vegetation type	Rehabilitated	Rehabilitated	Dry Sclerophyll Forest (grassy)
Native plant species richness	>5	>10	>20
Trees	Sparse. To 3 m height.	Sparse. To 3 m height.	>5 species, 12-14 m height. No significant canopy cover not assessable due to recent fire.
Understorey	Sparse, to 2 m height. Includes juvenile Eucalyptus and Acacia species.	Sparse, to 3 m height. Includes juvenile Eucalyptus and Acacia species.	Sparse. <10 species, 1-3 m height, No significant cover due to recent fire.
Groundcover	90% cover. Mix of exotic grasses, native and exotic herbs.	Dominated by exotic grasses and herbs. Some native herbs present. 90% cover.	70% cover. Mixed native herbs and grasses.
Non-native species	>5	>10	<5
Recruitment	Observed.	Observed.	Regeneration observed.
Organic litter	Thin, sparse.	Thin, sparse.	Thin, sparse.
Logs	Large logs placed along contours on upper slope. Some burned.	Large logs placed along contours on upper slope.	Sparse fallen timber from burned trees.

Vegetation assessment treed areas 2019

Transect	Treed rehabilitation area (transect 5)	Treed rehabilitation area (transect 6)	Treed analogue site (transect 7)
Vegetation type	Rehabilitated	Rehabilitated	Dry Sclerophyll Forest (grassy)
Native plant species richness	>10	>15	>25
Trees	Sparse. To 3 m height.	Sparse. To 3 m height.	>10 species, 12-14 m height. 20% canopy cover.
Understorey	Sparse, to 2 m height. Includes juvenile Eucalyptus and Acacia species.	Sparse, to 3 m height. Includes juvenile Eucalyptus and Acacia species.	>14 species, 1-3 m height, 10% cover
Groundcover	80% cover. Mix of exotic grasses, native and exotic herbs.	Dominated by exotic grasses and herbs. Some native herbs present. 80% cover.	Dominated by <i>Poa</i> spp. >95% cover. Mixed herbs and grasses also present.
Non-native species	>10	>10	<5
Recruitment	Not observed.	Not observed.	Observed.
Organic litter	Very sparse layer of mulch remaining.	Very sparse layer of mulch remaining.	Well-developed to 2 cm depth.
Logs	Large logs placed along contours on upper slope.	Large logs placed along contours on upper slope.	>10 fallen logs of >20 cm diameter present along transect.

Vegetation assessment treed areas 2018

Transect	Treed rehabilitation area (transect 5)	Treed rehabilitation area (transect 6)	Treed analogue site (transect 7)
Vegetation type	Rehabilitated	Rehabilitated	Dry Sclerophyll Forest (grassy)
Native plant species richness	>30	>30	>50
Trees	Sparse. To 3 m height.	Sparse. To 3 m height.	>10 species, 12-14 m height. 20% canopy cover.
Understorey	Sparse, to 2 m height. Includes juvenile Eucalyptus and Acacia species.	Sparse, to 3 m height. Includes juvenile Eucalyptus and Acacia species.	>14 species, 1-3 m height, 10% cover
Groundcover	70% cover. Mix of exotic grasses, native and exotic herbs.	Dominated by exotic grasses and herbs. Some native herbs present. 80% cover.	Dominated by <i>Poa</i> spp. >95% cover. Mixed herbs and grasses also present.
Non-native species	>10	>10	<5
Recruitment	Not observed.	Not observed.	Observed.
Organic litter	Very sparse layer of mulch remaining.	Very sparse layer of mulch remaining.	Well-developed to 2 cm depth.
Logs	Large logs placed along contours on upper slope.	Large logs placed along contours on upper slope.	>10 fallen logs of >20 cm diameter present along transect.

Vegetation assessment treed areas 2017

Transect	Treed rehabilitation area (transect 5)	Treed rehabilitation area (transect 6)	Treed analogue site (transect 7)
Vegetation type	Rehabilitated	Rehabilitated	Dry Sclerophyll Forest (grassy)
Native plant species richness	>30	>30	>50
Trees	Sparse. To 3 m height.	Sparse. To 3 m height.	>10 species, 12-14 m height. 20% canopy cover.
Understorey	Sparse, to 2 m height. Includes juvenile Eucalyptus and Acacia species.	Sparse, to 3 m height. Includes juvenile Eucalyptus and Acacia species.	>9 species, 1-2 m height, 10% cover
Groundcover	70% cover. Mix of exotic grasses, native and exotic herbs.	Dominated by exotic grasses and herbs. Some native herbs present. 80% cover.	Dominated by <i>Poa</i> spp. >95% cover. Mixed herbs and grasses also present.
Non-native species	>10	>10	<5
Recruitment	Not observed.	Not observed.	Observed.
Organic litter	Very sparse layer of mulch remaining.	Very sparse layer of mulch remaining.	Well-developed to 2 cm depth.
Logs	Large logs placed along contours on upper slope.	Large logs placed along contours on upper slope.	8 fallen logs of >20 cm diameter present along transect.

Vegetation assessment treed areas 2016

Transect	Treed rehabilitation area (transect 5)	Treed rehabilitation area (transect 6)	Treed analogue site (transect 7)
Vegetation type	Rehabilitated	Rehabilitated	Dry Sclerophyll Forest (grassy)
Native plant species richness	>30	>30	>50
Trees	Sparse. To 3 m height.	Sparse. To 3 m height.	>10 species, 12-14 m height. 20% canopy cover.
Understorey	Sparse, to 2 m height. Juvenile Eucalyptus and Acacia species.	Sparse, to 3 m height. Juvenile Eucalyptus and Acacia species.	>9 species, 1-2 m height, 10% cover
Groundcover	75% cover. Mix of exotic grasses, native and exotic herbs.	Dominated by exotic grasses and herbs. Some native herbs present. 80% cover.	Dominated by <i>Poa</i> spp. >95% cover. Mixed herbs and grasses also present.
Non-native species	>15	>13, including <i>Senecio madagascariensis</i> .	<10
Recruitment	Not observed.	Not observed.	Present
Organic litter	Very sparse layer of mulch remaining.	Very sparse layer of mulch remaining.	Well-developed to 2 cm depth.
Logs	Large logs placed along contours on upper slope.	Large logs placed along contours on upper slope.	8 fallen logs of >20 cm diameter present along transect.

Vegetation assessment treed areas 2015

Transect	Treed rehabilitation area (transect 5)	Treed rehabilitation area (transect 6)	Treed analogue site (transect 7)
Vegetation type	Rehabilitated	Rehabilitated	Dry Sclerophyll Forest (grassy)
Native plant species richness	>30	>30	>50
Trees	Sparse. To 3 m height.	Sparse. To 3 m height.	>5 species, 12-14 m height. 20% canopy cover.
Understorey	Sparse, to 2 m height. Juvenile Eucalyptus and Acacia species. <i>Cassinia arcuata</i> .	Sparse, to 2 m height. Juvenile Eucalyptus and Acacia species. <i>Cassinia arcuata</i> .	>7 species, 1-2m height, 10% cover
Groundcover	<40%. Mix of exotic grasses, native and exotic herbs.	Dominated by exotic grasses and herbs. Some native herbs present. 20% cover.	Dominated by <i>Poa</i> spp. >95% cover. Mixed herbs and grasses also present.
Non-native species	>10, including <i>Rubus fruticosus</i> .	>10	<10
Recruitment	Not observed.	Not observed.	Present
Organic litter	Thin mulch present.	Thin mulch present.	Well-developed to 2 cm depth.
Logs	Large logs placed along contours on upper slope.	Large logs placed along contours on upper slope.	8 fallen logs of >20 cm diameter present along transect.

Vegetation assessment treed areas 2014

Transect	Treed rehabilitation area (transect 5)	Treed rehabilitation area (transect 6)	Treed analogue site (transect 7)
Vegetation type	Rehabilitated	Rehabilitated	Dry Sclerophyll Forest (grassy)
Native plant species richness	>30	>30	>50
Trees	Sparse. To 3m height.	Sparse. To 3m height.	>5 species, 12-14 m height. 40% canopy cover.
Understorey	Sparse. Juvenile Eucalyptus spp. present with Acacia shrubs.	Sparse. Juvenile Eucalyptus spp. present with Acacia shrubs.	>7 species, 1.5 - 3 m height, 35% cover
Groundcover	Sparse. Mix of exotic grasses, native and exotic herbs.	Sparse. Mix of exotic grasses, native and exotic herbs.	70% cover. Dominated by <i>Poa</i> spp. with mixed native herbs.
Non-native species	>10	>10	<10
Recruitment	Not observed.	Not observed.	Present
Organic litter	Thin mulch present.	Thin mulch present.	Well-developed to >2cm depth.
Logs	Large logs placed along contours on upper slope.	Large logs placed along contours on upper slope.	8 fallen logs of >20 cm diameter present along transect.

Appendix C

Estimation of annual soil loss

Annual soil loss factors	Pasture analogue site	Transect 1 (pasture)	Transect 2 (pasture)	Transect 3 (pasture)	Transect 4 (pasture)	Transect 5 (treed)	Transect 6 (treed)	Treed analogue site (transect 7)
Annual rainfall erosivity factor (R)	1365 Bathurst							
Soil erodibility factor (K)	0.03 Sandy loam /fine sandy loam			0.025 Sandy clay-loam			0.03 Sandy loam /fine sandy loam	
Topographic factor (LS)	0.17 3% gradient, 5 m slope length		0.34 8% gradient, 5 m slope length	0.09 1% gradient, 5 m slope length	0.89 20% gradient, 5 m slope length		0.52 12% gradient, 5 m slope length	
Cover and management factor (C)	0.01 No appreciable canopy cover, 80-95% grassy groundcover				0.01 25% canopy cover of tall weeds or short brush, 80-95% grassy groundcover	0.01 25% canopy cover of tall weeds or short brush, 80-95% grassy groundcover	0.00 50% canopy cover of appreciable brush, 80-95% grassy groundcover	
Erosion control practice factor (P)	1.3 Compacted				1.2 Consistent with track walking along contour		1.2 Consistent with track walking along contour	
Annual soil loss due to erosion (A)	0.09 t/ha	0.09 t/ha	0.09 t/ha	0.18 t/ha	0.18 t/ha	0.36 t/ha	0.36 t/ha	0.00 t/ha

Appendix D

Species list

Scientific name	Transect 1	Transect 2	Transect 3	Transect 4	Transect 5	Transect 6	Treed analogue site (Pine Dale Mine transect 7)
<i>Acacia baileyana</i>					✓	✓	✓
<i>Acacia dealbata</i> subsp. <i>dealbata</i>					✓	✓	✓
<i>Acacia nana</i>					✓	✓	
<i>Acacia parramattensis</i>						✓	
<i>Acacia parvipinnula</i>					✓	✓	✓
<i>Acacia rubida</i>					✓	✓	✓
<i>Acacia</i> sp.					✓	✓	
<i>Acacia spectabilis</i>						✓	✓
<i>Amaranthus</i> sp.	✓	✓	✓	✓			
<i>Anagalis arvensis</i>	✓	✓	✓	✓			
<i>Brassica</i> spp.	✓	✓	✓	✓			
<i>Bursaria spinosa</i> subsp. <i>lasiophylla</i>					✓	✓	✓
<i>Cassinia arcuata</i>					✓	✓	
<i>Chloris truncata</i>	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
<i>Cirsium vulgare</i>	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
<i>Conyza bonariensis</i>	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
<i>Conyza</i> sp.					✓	✓	
<i>Cortaderia</i> sp.						✓	
<i>Cymbonotis</i> sp.					✓	✓	
<i>Cyperus eragrostis</i>		✓			✓		
<i>Dactylis glomerata</i>	✓	✓	✓	✓			
<i>Daviesia alata</i>					✓		
<i>Eragrostis</i> sp.	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
<i>Eucalyptus aggregata</i>					✓		

Scientific name	Transect 1	Transect 2	Transect 3	Transect 4	Transect 5	Transect 6	Treed analogue site (Pine Dale Mine transect 7)
<i>Eucalyptus bensonii</i>							✓
<i>Eucalyptus cypellocarpa</i>						✓	
<i>Eucalyptus dalrympleana</i> subsp. <i>dalrympleana</i>							✓
<i>Eucalyptus dealbata</i>						✓	
<i>Eucalyptus dives</i>					✓	✓	✓
<i>Eucalyptus macrorhyncha</i> subsp. <i>cannonii</i>							✓
<i>Eucalyptus mannifera</i> subsp. <i>mannifera</i>							✓
<i>Eucalyptus melliodora</i>						✓	
<i>Eucalyptus pauciflora</i>					✓	✓	
<i>Eucalyptus pulverulenta</i>						✓	
<i>Eucalyptus radiata</i> subsp. <i>radiata</i>						✓	✓
<i>Eucalyptus rubida</i> subsp. <i>rubida</i>							✓
<i>Eucalyptus</i> sp.					✓	✓	✓
<i>Euphorbia</i> sp.	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
<i>Festuca</i> sp.	✓	✓	✓	✓			
<i>Gamochaeta</i> sp.	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
<i>Geranium molle</i> var. <i>molle</i>	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
<i>Gnaphalium sphaericum</i>	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		
<i>Hypochaeris radicata</i>	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
<i>Juncus</i> spp.		✓		✓	✓		
<i>Lepidium</i> sp.	✓	✓	✓	✓			
<i>Leucopogon</i> sp.							✓
<i>Lissanthe strigosa</i> subsp. <i>strigosa</i>							✓

Scientific name	Transect 1	Transect 2	Transect 3	Transect 4	Transect 5	Transect 6	Treed analogue site (Pine Dale Mine transect 7)
<i>Lolium perenne</i>	✓	✓	✓	✓			
<i>Malva neglecta</i>				✓			
<i>Malva</i> sp.	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
<i>Medicago</i> sp.	✓	✓	✓	✓			
<i>Modiola Carolina</i>	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
<i>Oxalis corniculata</i>	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
<i>Oxalis</i> sp.	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
<i>Paspalum</i> sp.	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
<i>Patersonia</i> sp.				✓			
<i>Persoonia</i> sp.							✓
<i>Phalaris</i> sp.	✓	✓	✓	✓			
<i>Plantago lanceolata</i>	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
<i>Poa annua</i>	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		
<i>Poa</i> spp.	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
<i>Portulaca oleracea</i>			✓	✓	✓	✓	
<i>Ranunculus</i> sp.	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
<i>Romulea minutiflora</i>	✓	✓	✓	✓			
<i>Rorippa</i> sp.	✓	✓	✓	✓			
<i>Rumex acetosella</i>	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
<i>Solanum</i> sp.	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
<i>Sonchus oleraceus</i>	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
<i>Stellaria media</i>	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
<i>Taraxacum officinale</i>	✓	✓	✓	✓			
<i>Themeda australis</i>					✓	✓	✓

Scientific name	Transect 1	Transect 2	Transect 3	Transect 4	Transect 5	Transect 6	Treed analogue site (Pine Dale Mine transect 7)
<i>Trifolium arvense</i>	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
<i>Trifolium campestre</i>	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
<i>Trifolium pratense</i>	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
<i>Trifolium repens</i>	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
<i>Trifolium subterraneum</i>	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
<i>Vulpia</i> sp.	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		

Appendix E

Photo point monitoring to 2024



Transect 1 looking south 2014



Transect 1 looking south 2015



Transect 1 looking south 2016



Transect 1 looking south 2017



Transect 1 looking south 2018



Transect 1 looking south 2019



Transect 1 looking south 2020



Transect 1 looking east 2021 note that the transect 1 photo-monitoring point was inaccessible to the presence of livestock



Transect 1 looking south 2022



Transect 1 looking south 2023



Transect 1 looking south 2024



Transect 2 looking southeast 2014



Transect 2 looking southeast 2015



Transect 2 looking southeast 2016



Transect 2 looking southeast 2017



Transect 2 looking southeast 2018



Transect 2 looking southeast 2019



Transect 2 looking southeast 2020



Transect 2 looking southeast 2021



Transect 2 looking southeast 2022



Transect 2 looking southeast 2023



Transect 2 looking southeast 2024



Transect 3 looking southwest 2014



Transect 3 looking southwest 2015



Transect 3 looking southwest 2016



Transect 3 looking southwest 2017



Transect 3 looking southwest 2018



Transect 3 looking southwest 2019



Transect 3 looking southwest 2020



Transect 3 looking south 2021



Transect 3 looking south 2022



Transect 3 looking south 2023



Transect 3 looking south 2024



Transect 4 looking west 2014



Transect 4 looking west 2015



Transect 4 looking west 2016



Transect 4 looking west 2017



Transect 4 looking west 2018



Transect 4 looking west 2019



Transect 4 looking west 2020



Transect 4 looking west 2021



Adjacent to Transect 4 looking south-west 2022



Transect 4 looking west 2023



Transect 4 looking west 2024



Transect 5 looking west 2014



Transect 5 looking west 2015



Transect 5 looking west 2016



Transect 5 looking west 2017



Transect 5 looking west 2018



Transect 5 looking west 2019



Transect 5 looking west 2020



Transect 5 looking west 2021



Transect 5 looking west 2022



Transect 5 looking west 2023



Transect 5 looking west 2024



Transect 6 looking east 2014



Transect 6 looking east 2015



Transect 6 looking east 2016



Transect 6 looking east 2017



Transect 6 looking east 2018



Transect 6 looking east 2019



Transect 6 looking east 2020



Transect 6 looking east 2021



Transect 6 looking east 2022



Transect 6 looking east 2023



Transect 6 looking east 2024



Transect 7 looking east 2014



Transect 7 looking east 2015



Transect 7 looking east 2016



Transect 7 looking east 2017



Transect 7 looking east 2018



Transect 7 looking east 2019



Transect 7 looking east 2020

Note that Transect 7 was inaccessible in 2021 and 2022



Looking towards Transect 7 2022



Transect 7 looking east 2023



Transect 7 looking east 2024



Quadrat 1 February 2010 (Cunningham 2012)



Quadrat 1 September 2011 (Cunningham 2012)



Quadrat 1 November 2012 (Cunningham 2012)



Quadrat 1 April 2014



Quadrat 1 September 2015



Quadrat 1 September 2016



Quadrat 1 September 2017



Quadrat 1 September 2018



Quadrat 1 September 2019



Quadrat 1 September 2020



Quadrat 1 November 2021

Note that Quadrat 1 was inaccessible in 2022



Quadrat 1 November 2023



Quadrat 1 August 2024