

New Oakleigh

Section (proposed PRCP)	Legislative provision or prescribed Guideline reference	Issue	Recommendation	NHG Response
PRC Plan – rehabilitation planning part				
3.2 Community consultation	PRCP Guideline – Section 3.5	A community consultation plan was not included with the application. As this is a legislative requirement under section 126C(1)(c)(iv) of the EP Act, it is advised to tailor the existing aspects of the SEP to meet the requirements established under section 3.5 of the PRCP Guideline. The intent of the community consultation plan is to detail how ongoing consultation will be carried out in relation to the rehabilitation to be carried out under the PRC plan.	Include a copy of the community consultation plan in the PRC plan.	Included updated Stakeholder Engagement Plan in Appendix E.
3.1.3	PRCP Guideline – Section 3.6.1	Flooding Section 3.1.3 of the application references that flood plain modelling was not carried out as no relevant watercourses exist on site. However, the flood assessment set out in Section 3.6.1 in the Guideline requires a determination of flood susceptibility across the site and demonstration that the final landform will remain in a stable condition in a range of flow events. This is relevant considering the post mining landform and considering the significant backfilling that has occurred, particularly associated with West Pit.	It is required that the applicant demonstrate the relevancy of flooding impacts on rehabilitation success and provide sufficient justification for omitting modelling flood levels i.e. Site located at top of catchment, presence of stream order 1.	The potential for flooding is addressed in Sections 3.1.3 and 3.5.7. Potential impacts of high flow events on rehabilitation success are or will be mitigated through the construction of engineered drainage networks as described throughout Section 3.57.
3.5.7.5 and Table 12	PRCP Guideline – Section 3.6.1	Waste Characterisation Acknowledging that waste rock dumps and tailing storage facilities have been historically reprofiled and capped it is not understood from the planning part if acid or saline drainage has the potential to occur. The Department is not requesting further waste characterisation data to support this application, however there is an expectation that surface water and groundwater monitoring consider the potential for contaminants associated with AMD/ saline mine drainage that pose a risk to the environment.	Provide further justification on the potential for acid or saline drainage occurring and determine if the risks require further mitigation/monitoring	Potential for acid or saline drainage to occur addressed in Section 3.5.7.5 following a review of available water quality data.
3.5.1	PRCP Guideline – Section 3.6.1	Soil and Capping material assessment It is understood that additional rehabilitation works including topsoiling is required in Oakleigh East to support the nominated PMLUs. The planning part does not identify the expected volumes of available topsoil and ameliorants to be applied. This is considered material to the application as Table 12 refers to completion criteria for both topdressing and applying ameliorants however the planning part does not provide this basis.	Provide rationale in the planning part to support criteria associated with topdressing and application of ameliorants	Topsoil requirements and availability is addressed in Section 3.5.4.2.
3.5.4	PRCP Guideline – Section 3.6.1	Landform design The planning part references a Landloch 2013 report that included assessment of erodibility and validation of the proposed landform design, however the planning part doesn't elaborate on these conclusions. This is considered material to the application as milestone criteria associated with erosion is provided in Table 12 but the nominated erosion classification scheme is not discussed in the planning part.	It is recommended to include relevant information from this report into the planning part and use this to justify milestone criteria associated with erosion.	Section 3.5.4 updated to elaborate on the application of the landform design proposed in the Landloch 2013 report. The nominated erosion classification scheme is described in the Maintenance and Monitoring Plan (Appendix G).

Section (proposed PRCP)	Legislative provision or prescribed Guideline reference	Issue	Recommendation	NHG Response
PRC Plan – rehabilitation planning part				
3.5.7	PRCP Guideline – Section 3.6.1	Water management As completion criteria references water quality limits for both stock water and discharge, the water quality data presented in Tables 16, 17 and 18 suggests that there is a risk that completion criteria won't be achieved. As the completion criteria references trigger values for livestock drinking water as defined in ANZECC/ARMCANZ it's not understood from the monitoring and maintenance section what analytes are proposed to be sampled to demonstrate that the PMLU can be achieved.	Provide rationale on the appropriateness of water quality limits provided as completion criteria considering the current understanding of contaminant sources	The suite of analytes proposed to be monitored as part of the surface water monitoring program are defined in the Maintenance and Monitoring Plan (Appendix G).
3.7	PRCP Guideline – Section 3.6.4	It is not clear from the monitoring and maintenance section what measures are in place to demonstrate that underground mining areas and associated tunnels and shafts can demonstrate that land is in a stable condition. The hydrological information provided in the planning part indicates that given the extent of the underground mining footprint at the site these workings are likely to have significant influence on local groundwater. As the risk assessment was not provided, the Department does not have an understanding on potential subsidence and groundwater impacts associated with the former underground workings.	Provide rationale as to whether subsidence is a risk that requires criteria and/or monitoring to demonstrate land can achieved a stable condition	Potential subsidence and groundwater impacts associated with legacy underground mining are addressed in the risk assessment (refer to Section 3.6.4 and Appendix D).
NA	PRCP Guideline – 3.2 & Section 3.6.5	The planning part indicates that 2ha of infrastructure is intended to be retained and Section 3.5.4.1 references a Landholder Agreement (NHG 2018). As the current EA doesn't refer to the specific infrastructure, it is recommended to provide the landholder agreement with the application to demonstrate that the PMLU of infrastructure is viable having regard to the use of land in the surrounding region. Additionally, the PRCP Guideline requires that if the underlying landholder is also the EA holder (or a parent corporation or a subsidiary corporation) they must justify how the infrastructure will provide a benefit or improvement to the use of the land and/or community once mining has ceased.	Provide a copy of the Landholder Agreement	Landholder agreement (NHG 2021) provided in Appendix H. Retained infrastructure will support grazing land use activities as described in Section 3.5.4.1.
3.6 Risk assessment	PRCP Guideline – Section 3.7	A risk assessment wasn't provided with the application.	Provide a risk assessment that is consistent with the requirements of Section 3.7 of the Guideline	Risk Assessment provided in Appendix D.
NA	PRCP Guideline – Section 3.1 & Attachment 1 of the PRCP submission application form	Spatial information was not provided with the application.	Ensure that the submission includes spatial information as required by the Guideline and application form.	Spatial information submitted via email. Spatial information submission includes location and maximum extent of disturbance footprint, PMLUs for the area within the resource tenures, rehabilitation areas within the resource tenures, sensitive receptors and existing rehabilitation. There are no NUMAs or floodplains within the resource tenures.
3.7	PRCP Guideline – Section 3.7	The intention of the monitoring and maintenance plan is to facilitate that monitoring will be carried out in order to demonstrate that a milestone and associated milestone criteria have been achieved.	Address the information requirements for Monitoring and Maintenance as prescribed in 3.8 of the PRCP Guideline.	Monitoring and Maintenance Plan provided in Appendix G.

Section (proposed PRCP)	Legislative provision or prescribed Guideline reference	Issue	Recommendation	NHG Response
PRC Plan – rehabilitation planning part				
		The summary table provided in Table 25 indicates some of the proposed management/monitoring measures however there are some completion criteria provided in Table 12 that do not have associated monitoring assigned in Table 25.		Table 25 updated to incorporate the proposed management/monitoring measures described in the Monitoring and Maintenance Plan.
3.5.3	PRCP Guideline – Section 4.1	A reference map must be attached to the proposed PRCP Schedule that identify the boundary of each rehabilitation area and improvement area. This is considered material to the application as this reference map will become a component of the approved PRCP Schedule.	Provide a reference map. An example of a reference map is provided in Appendix 2 of the PRCP Guideline.	Reference map provided in Appendix B. The boundary of each rehabilitation area is shown on the reference map. No improvement areas apply to the resource tenures.
Figure 21	PRCP Guideline – 4.1 Steps for developing a PRCP schedule Step 1. Final site design	As required in Section 4.1 of the PRCP Guideline, the final site design is a map showing: - The maximum disturbance footprint - Resources tenure boundaries - PMLUs for the land within the resource tenure - Floodplain extent The final site design provided as Figure 21 doesn't meet these requirements as the floodplain extent is not shown, the identified PMLUs is missing the proposed infrastructure PMLU, and additional layers are shown (contours, QLD Land Use, indicative water flow) that are not relevant to the requirements. This is considered material to the application as the final site design figure will become a component of the approved PRCP Schedule.	Provide a revised Final Site Design map consistent with the requirements in Section 4.1.	Final Site Design map provided in Appendix B.
3.5.3	PRCP Guideline – 6.4 Step 4- Identify milestones	It is understood from Table 11 that approximately 50ha of available land requires additional rehabilitation works, whilst the remaining ~229ha requires monitoring to confirm that the target PMLU has been achieved. Whilst the applicant is encouraged to develop site-specific milestones, rather than rely on the reference milestones detailed in Appendix 3 of the PRCP Guideline, the completion criteria proposed in Table 12 doesn't distinguish between the activities required to be undertaken on the 50ha and the monitoring to be undertaken on the balance. Further to this, the Schedule has been prepared in a way that RM1, RM2 and RM3 is applicable to every rehabilitation area, which the Department understands is not the intent as this approach does not acknowledge the historical rehabilitation that has occurred. It is recommended to provide additional rehabilitation milestones which will facilitate distinguishing between the remaining rehabilitation activities e.g. provide rehabilitation milestones associated with landform development, surface preparation and revegetation and ensure that this is applicable only to the Rehabilitation Areas that require these actions	Consider and incorporate changes where relevant.	Monitoring is required in all Rehabilitation Areas (RA) subject to RM1 or RM2 as described in Table 25 of the PRCP and Appendix G (Monitoring and Maintenance Plan; Section 6). Extensive rehabilitation efforts have been undertaken progressively prior to PRCP implementation. Rehabilitation milestones have been defined on the basis of historical rehabilitation works, the function of RAs and the PMLU. Rehabilitation milestone activities (as relevant to each RA) are described in Sections 3.5.9 to 3.5.13 of the PRCP. Specific remedial works required in certain RAs are described in detail in Section 3.5.4.2 of the PRCP and the Monitoring and Maintenance Plan (Appendix G to the PRCP).
Rehabilitation Milestone Criteria	PRCP Guideline –	Milestone criteria have not been provided in the excel spreadsheet. It is inferred that Table 12 in the planning part provides completion criteria that is intended to be included in the PRCP Schedule.	Propose milestone criteria in the PRCP schedule.	Milestone criteria included in PRCP schedule spreadsheet provided in Appendix A.

Section (proposed PRCP)	Legislative provision or prescribed Guideline reference	Issue	Recommendation	NHG Response
PRC Plan – rehabilitation planning part				
	4.1 Steps for developing a PRCP schedule Step 5. Identify milestone criteria			
Table 12	PRCP Guideline – Section 4.1, Step 5 – Develop site specific milestone criteria	Criteria which demonstrate the relevant rehabilitation milestone has been achieved, facilitate achieving subsequent rehabilitation milestones and meet SMART principles must be proposed. As provided for in Step 5 of Section 6.4 of the Guideline, criteria for showing success or completion of the PMLU in a LOD may be able to be transitioned in the PRCP schedule as milestone criteria. Any criteria being transitioned into the PRCP schedule must meet the SMART principles outlined in section 4.1 (Steps 3 and 4) of the guideline. Consequently, criteria may need to be reviewed and re-worded in order to meet those principles. The comments below on the appropriateness of the milestone criteria is not exhaustive as without the planning part providing justification this review was limited. • Stable landform development. The landform design criteria reference in ATCW isn't provided in the planning part. This criteria does not align with SMART principles • Stable landform development. The planning part justifies an appropriate FoS for the north highwall that should be included to make the criteria align with SMART principles • Stable landform development. The planning part states that Oakleigh East requires maintenance works to address slope issues and incorporate a drainage system, however it's not understood if this has been included in Table 12. • Grazing and native ecosystem PMLU. This criteria does not align with SMART principles • Grazing PMLU. The vegetation groundcover of greater than 50% isn't justified in the planning part. This is considered material to demonstrate that the land can sustain the nominated PMLUs • Grazing PMLU. The erosion classification rating system isn't referenced in the planning part and the monitoring and maintenance plan wasn't provided as an appendix. • Retained infrastructure PMLU. Most of the criteria proposed for this domain don't seem to reflect the low level of risk associated with retaining infrastructure on site.	Consider and incorporate changes where relevant. Provide justification for milestone criteria in the planning part or where appropriate reference the LOD that provides the criteria	Rehabilitation milestone criteria (Table 12) revised in line with the SMART principles, where applicable.
Table 12	PRCP Guideline – 4.1 & 6.4 Step 6- Identify when the first milestone must commence and completion dates for milestones	It is recommended to provide justification in the planning part for the milestone completed dates nominated in the schedule. If there are timeframes stated in land outcome documents for completing a particular rehabilitation or closure activity or outcome, these may be able to be transitioned directly into the PRCP schedule as completion dates for a milestone. Further feedback on the timings in the schedule includes:	Consider and incorporate changes where relevant.	Revised Schedule has completion dates of December 10. Mining operations ceased prior to PRCP implementation. As such, all areas became available for rehabilitation prior to 2021. Rehabilitation work has been undertaken

Section (proposed PRCP)	Legislative provision or prescribed Guideline reference	Issue	Recommendation	NHG Response
PRC Plan – rehabilitation planning part				
		• The date area is available should be different to the milestone completed by date • For reasons detailed in the PRCP Guideline it is required that Milestones have a completion date of the 10 December of the calendar year nominated by the applicant • Using RA8 as an example, the date area is available should be sequential and reflect the cumulative achievement of rehabilitation milestones. Currently the date area is available is replicated 5 times. Refer to Appendix 2 of the PRCP Guideline for how to structure a schedule to indicate progression of rehabilitation		progressively and work in all areas commenced prior to PRCP implementation.