

# METROPOLITAN COAL

## 2018 ANNUAL REVIEW



**Peabody**




**METROPOLITAN COAL**

METROPOLITAN COAL

2018 ANNUAL REVIEW

Project No. MET-19-16  
Document No. 00964839



<b>Name of Operation</b>	Metropolitan Coal
<b>Name of Operator</b>	Peabody Energy Australia Pty Ltd
<b>Project Approval</b>	Project Approval 08_0149
<b>Name of Holder of Project Approval</b>	Metropolitan Collieries Pty Ltd
<b>Mining Leases</b>	Consolidated Coal Lease 703 Mining Lease 1610 Mining Lease 1702 Mining Purpose Lease 320 Coal Lease 379
<b>Name of Holder of Mining Leases</b>	Metropolitan Collieries Pty Ltd
<b>Water Licence</b>	Water Access Licence – WAL25410 Bore Licence Certificate – 10BL603595
<b>Name of Holder of Water Licence</b>	Metropolitan Collieries Pty Ltd
<b>MOP Start Date</b>	October 2012
<b>MOP End Date</b>	September 2019
<b>Annual Review Start Date</b>	1 January 2018
<b>Annual Review End Date</b>	31 December 2018
<b>I, Jon Degotardi, certify that this audit report is a true and accurate record of the compliance status of Metropolitan Coal for the period 1 January to 31 December 2018 and that I am authorised to make this statement on behalf of Peabody Energy Australia Pty Ltd.</b>	
<i>Note.</i>	
a) <i>The Annual Review is an 'environmental audit' for the purposes of section 122B(2) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979. Section 122E 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, in the case of a corporation, \$1 million and for an individual, \$250,000.</i>	
b) <i>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 \$22,000, or both).</i>	
<b>Name of Authorised Reporting Officer</b>	Jon Degotardi
<b>Title of Authorised Reporting Officer</b>	Manager – Technical Services
<b>Signature of Authorised Reporting Officer</b>	
<b>Date</b>	29/03/2019

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>Section</u>	<u>Page</u>	
1	STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE	1
2	INTRODUCTION	2
	2.1 PURPOSE AND SCOPE	2
	2.2 MINE CONTACTS	3
3	APPROVALS	3
4	OPERATIONS SUMMARY	4
	4.1 MINING OPERATIONS	4
	4.2 OTHER OPERATIONS – METROPOLITAN COAL SURFACE FACILITIES AREA	4
	4.3 OPERATIONAL ACTIVITIES IN THE NEXT REPORTING PERIOD	6
5	ACTIONS REQUIRED FROM PREVIOUS ANNUAL REVIEW	6
6	ENVIRONMENTAL PERFORMANCE – UNDERGROUND MINING AREA AND SURROUNDS	7
	6.1 SUBSIDENCE MONITORING	7
	6.1.1 Predicted and Observed Subsidence Movements	7
	6.2 WATER MANAGEMENT	9
	6.2.1 Stream Features	9
	6.2.2 Surface Water Flow	14
	6.2.3 Pool Water Levels	16
	6.2.4 Stream Water Quality	32
	6.2.5 Woronora Reservoir Water Quality	52
	6.2.6 Swamp Groundwater Levels	56
	6.2.7 Shallow Groundwater Levels	59
	6.2.8 Deep Groundwater Levels	65
	6.2.9 Groundwater Quality	71
	6.2.10 Inspections of Mine Workings	75
	6.2.11 Mine Water Intake	75
	6.2.12 Woronora Reservoir Impact Strategy	76
	6.3 BIODIVERSITY MANAGEMENT	77
	6.3.1 Upland Swamp Vegetation Monitoring	77
	6.3.1.1 Longwalls 20-22 and Longwalls 23-27	77
	6.3.1.2 Longwalls 301-303	81
	6.3.2 Upland Swamp Groundwater Monitoring	82
	6.3.3 Riparian Vegetation Monitoring	83
	6.3.4 Aquatic Biota and Their Habitats	85
	6.3.4.1 Stream Monitoring Program	86
	6.3.4.2 Pool Monitoring Program	87
	6.3.4.3 Assessment of Subsidence Impacts and Environmental Consequences on Aquatic Habitats and Biodiversity	88
	6.3.5 Amphibian Surveys	89
	6.3.5.1 Longwalls 20-22 Amphibian Monitoring	89
	6.3.5.2 Longwalls 23-27 Amphibian Monitoring	90
	6.3.5.3 Longwalls 301-303 Amphibian Monitoring	90
	6.3.5.4 Statistical Analysis of Amphibian Monitoring Results	91
	6.4 LAND MANAGEMENT	91
	6.4.1 Cliffs and Overhangs	92
	6.4.2 Steep Slopes and Land in General	92
	6.5 HERITAGE MANAGEMENT	92
	6.5.1 Longwalls 20-22 and Longwalls 23-27	93

	6.5.2	Longwalls 301-303	94
	6.6	BUILT FEATURES MANAGEMENT	95
	6.7	PUBLIC SAFETY MANAGEMENT	96
	6.8	ASSESSMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PERFORMANCE	96
7		ENVIRONMENTAL PERFORMANCE – SURFACE FACILITIES AREA	111
	7.1	NOISE MANAGEMENT	111
	7.2	AIR QUALITY AND GREENHOUSE GASES MANAGEMENT	115
	7.3	TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT	121
	7.4	WASTE MANAGEMENT	121
	7.5	ASSESSMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PERFORMANCE	122
8		WATER MANAGEMENT	130
9		CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT	133
10		REHABILITATION	134
	10.1	REHABILITATION SUMMARY	134
	10.2	REHABILITATION STRATEGY – SURFACE FACILITIES AREA	135
	10.3	REHABILITATION MANAGEMENT – UNDERGROUND MINING AREA	135
		10.3.1 Rehabilitation of Surface Disturbance Areas	135
		10.3.2 Stream Remediation Measures	136
	10.4	CATCHMENT IMPROVEMENT WORKS	137
	10.5	ASSESSMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PERFORMANCE	137
11		COMMUNITY	141
	11.1	COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT ACTIVITIES AND INITIATIVES	141
	11.2	COMMUNITY CONTRIBUTIONS	141
	11.3	COMMUNITY COMPLAINTS	142
12		INDEPENDENT ENVIRONMENTAL AUDIT	142
13		INCIDENTS AND NON-COMPLIANCES DURING THE REPORTING PERIOD	143
	13.1	EASTERN TRIBUTARY PERFORMANCE MEASURE	143
	13.2	NOISE	143
	13.3	WATER LEAK TO CAMP CREEK	145
14		ACTIVITIES PROPOSED IN THE NEXT REPORTING PERIOD	145

## LIST OF TABLES

Table 1	Statement of Compliance
Table 2	Summary of Non-Compliances
Table 3	Consent, Lease and Licence Details
Table 4	Production Summary
Table 5	Other Relevant Operational Conditions
Table 6	Monitoring of Stream Features – Waratah Rivulet, Downstream of Longwall 23 Maingate
Table 7	Monitoring of Stream Features – Eastern Tributary, between the Full Supply Level of the Woronora Reservoir and the Longwall 26 Maingate
Table 8	Summary of Results for Key Water Quality Parameters During the Reporting Period
Table 9	Assessment of Environmental Performance – Underground Mining Area and Surrounds
Table 10	Assessment of Environmental Performance – Surface Facilities Area

**LIST OF TABLES (Continued)**

Table 11	Assessment of Environmental Performance – Surface Facilities Water Management
Table 12	Rehabilitation Status
Table 13	Assessment of Environmental Performance – Rehabilitation

**LIST OF FIGURES**

Figure 1	Project Longwalls 20-27 and Longwalls 301-317 Layout
Figure 2	General Arrangement of the Major Surface Facilities Area
Figure 3	Environmental Management Structure
Figure 4	Monthly Production Plan January to December 2018
Figure 5	Production Plan Forecast January to December 2019
Figure 6	Subsidence Monitoring Locations
Figure 7	Surface Water Quantity Sites
Figure 8	Surface Water Quality Sites
Figure 9	Upland Swamp Groundwater Piezometer Locations
Figure 10	Groundwater Level and/or Pressure Bore Locations
Figure 11	Groundwater Quality Sites
Figure 12	Meteorological Sites
Figure 13	Riparian Vegetation Monitoring Locations
Figure 14	Aquatic Ecology Monitoring Locations
Figure 15	Amphibian Monitoring Locations
Figure 16	Cliffs and Overhangs, Steep Slopes and Land in General within the Project Underground Mining Areas and Surrounds
Figure 17	Known Aboriginal Heritage Sites within Project Underground Mining Area and Surrounds
Figure 18	Noise Monitoring Locations
Figure 19a	Quarterly Operator Attended Noise Monitoring Results at 16 Oxley Place (September 2010 to December 2018)
Figure 19b	Quarterly Operator Attended Noise Monitoring Results at 53 Parkes Street (September 2010 to December 2018)
Figure 19c	Quarterly Operator Attended Noise Monitoring Results at 50 Parkes Street (September 2010 to December 2018)
Figure 19d	Quarterly Operator Attended Noise Monitoring Results at 36 Old Station Road (September 2010 to December 2018)
Figure 20	Air Quality Monitoring Sites
Figure 21	Comparison of Waste Generated and Recycled in 2018 with Previous Years
Figure 22	Surface Facilities Area Water Monitoring Sites
Figure 23	Rehabilitation Zones Currently Available at the Surface Facilities Area
Figure 24	Summary of Complaints Recorded, January 2006 to December 2018

**LIST OF APPENDICES**

- Appendix A 2018 Annual Review Subsidence Monitoring Results
- Appendix B1 Metropolitan Coal Six Monthly Surface Water Review 1 January to 30 June 2018
- Appendix B2 Metropolitan Coal Six Monthly Surface Water Review 1 July to 31 December 2018
- Appendix C1 Metropolitan Coal Six Monthly Review Groundwater Monitoring and Environmental Performance Assessment 1 January to 30 June 2018
- Appendix C2 Metropolitan Coal Six Monthly Review Groundwater Monitoring and Environmental Performance Assessment 1 July to 31 December 2018
- Appendix D Mapped Pool Locations on The Waratah Rivulet, Eastern Tributary, Tributary A and Tributary B
- Appendix E1 Pool P Gas Release Performance Measure Assessment
- Appendix E2 Eastern Tributary Assessment Against Water Quality Performance Measure – January to December 2018
- Appendix F1 Metropolitan Mine – Groundwater Transect Bore T3 Investigation Report
- Appendix F2 Metropolitan Mine – 9GGW2B Investigation Report
- Appendix G1 Longwalls 20-22 Spring 2017 Vegetation Monitoring Report
- Appendix G2 Longwalls 23-27 Spring 2017 Vegetation Monitoring Report
- Appendix G3 Longwalls 301-303 Spring 2017 Vegetation Monitoring Report
- Appendix G4 Longwalls 20-22 Autumn 2018 Vegetation Monitoring Report
- Appendix G5 Longwalls 23-27 Autumn 2018 Vegetation Monitoring Report
- Appendix G6 Longwalls 301-303 Autumn 2018 Vegetation Monitoring Report
- Appendix H1 Swamp 20 and Swamp 28 Threatened Flora Assessments
- Appendix H2 Riparian Vegetation on the Eastern Tributary Threatened Flora Assessment
- Appendix H3 Swamp 20, Swamp 28 And Site MRIP05 Threatened Fauna Assessments
- Appendix H4 Supplementary Survey Targeting Littlejohn's Tree Frog, a Threatened Species, in the Metropolitan Coal Underground Mining Area and Surrounds in the Woronora Catchment
- Appendix I1 Longwalls 20-22 Spring 2017 Aquatic Ecology Monitoring Report
- Appendix I2 Longwalls 23-27 Spring 2017 Aquatic Ecology Monitoring Report
- Appendix I3 Longwalls 20-22 Autumn 2018 Aquatic Ecology Monitoring Report
- Appendix I4 Longwalls 23-27 Autumn 2018 Aquatic Ecology Monitoring Report
- Appendix J1 Longwalls 20-22 Spring-Summer 2017 Amphibian Survey Report
- Appendix J2 Longwalls 23-27 Spring-Summer 2017 Amphibian Survey Report
- Appendix J3 Longwalls 301-303 Spring-Summer 2017 Amphibian Survey Report
- Appendix K 2018 Quarterly Attended Noise Monitoring Results
- Appendix L Quarter 1, Quarter 2, Quarter 3 And Quarter 4 Noise Modelling Predictions
- Appendix M Air Quality Monitoring and Environmental Performance Assessment Report
- Appendix N Letter from The Independent Chair of The Community Consultative Committee to The Secretary of The Department of Planning and Environment

## 1 STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE

The compliance status of the Metropolitan Coal Mine with its relevant approval conditions at the end of the review period (31 December 2018) is provided in Table 1.

**Table 1  
Statement of Compliance**

Were all conditions of the relevant approval(s) complied with?	
Project Approval 08_0149	No
Development Consent D90/832	Yes
Consolidated Coal Lease 703	Yes
Mining Lease 1610	Yes
Mining Lease 1702	Yes
Coal Lease 379	Yes
Mining Purpose Lease 320	Yes
Environment Protection Licence No. 767	Yes

Table 2 summarises the non-compliances with the approval conditions.

**Table 2  
Summary of Non-Compliances**

Relevant Approval	Condition Number	Condition Description	Compliance Status	Comment	Report Section
Project Approval 08_0149	Condition 1, Schedule 3	Subsidence Impact Performance Measures (Table 1 of Project Approval)	Non-compliant	Exceedance of the Eastern Tributary watercourse subsidence impact performance measure in relation to iron staining and pool flow/drainage behaviour downstream of the Longwall 26 maingate.	6.2 and 13.1
Project Approval 08_0149	Condition 1, Schedule 4	Noise Impact Assessment Criteria (Table 2 of Project Approval)	Non-compliant	Noise monitoring has identified sustained non-compliances during the review period.	7.1 and 13.2

### Compliance Status Key for Table 2 – Non-Compliances

Risk Level	Colour Code	Comment
High	Non-compliant	Non-compliance with potential for significant environmental consequences, regardless of the likelihood of occurrence.
Medium	Non-compliant	Non-compliance with: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>potential for serious environmental consequences, but is unlikely to occur; or</li> <li>potential for moderate environmental consequences, but is likely to occur.</li> </ul>
Low	Non-compliant	Non-compliance with: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>potential for moderate environmental consequences, but is unlikely to occur; or</li> <li>potential for low environmental consequences, but is likely to occur.</li> </ul>
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).

## 2 INTRODUCTION

Metropolitan Coal is wholly owned by Peabody Energy Australia Pty Ltd (Peabody), and is located adjacent to the township of Helensburgh and approximately 30 kilometres (km) north of Wollongong in New South Wales (NSW) (Figure 1). Metropolitan Coal is located within Consolidated Coal Lease (CCL) 703, Mining Lease (ML) 1610 and ML 1702. Metropolitan Coal is one of the earliest established and longest continually running coal mining operations in Australia, with a history dating back to the 1880s.

Metropolitan Coal was granted approval for the Metropolitan Coal Project (the Project) by the Minister for Planning under section 75J of the NSW *Environmental Planning and Assessment Act, 1979* (EP&A Act) on 22 June 2009. A copy of Project Approval (08\_0149) is available on the Peabody website (<http://www.peabodyenergy.com>). The Project comprises the continuation, upgrade and extension of underground coal mining operations and surface facilities at Metropolitan Coal. The underground mining longwall layout is shown on Figure 1. The extent of the mine's surface facilities area is shown on Figure 2.

The surface facilities include administration buildings, workshops, bath houses, ablution facilities, haul roads, access roads, fuel and consumables storages, hardstand areas, a coal handling and preparation plant (CHPP), stockpiles (including run-of-mine [ROM] coal, product coal and coal reject stockpiles), underground coal reject emplacement plant and associated coal handling infrastructure (for example conveyors, transfer points and buffer bins).

Coal extracted from the underground mining operations is transferred by conveyor to the surface facilities area. ROM coal is crushed, screened and washed at the CHPP. The majority of product coal is transported by train to the Port Kembla Coal Terminal (in Wollongong) for domestic and overseas customers. CHPP coal reject material is transported by truck to the Glenlee Washery, is emplaced in unused workings, used on site for construction purposes or beneficially reused for engineered fill purposes at urban developments in the Illawarra region.

The Environmental Management Structure of the Project is shown on Figure 3. It includes the Metropolitan Coal Environmental Management Strategy, developed to provide the strategic context for environmental management at Metropolitan Coal, and management plans and monitoring programs applicable to the underground mining area or mine's surface facilities area.

Metropolitan Coal has prepared the Longwalls 301-303 Extraction Plan, which includes post-mining monitoring and management of potential subsidence impacts and environmental consequences, subject to the previously approved Metropolitan Coal Extraction Plans for Longwalls 20-22 and Longwalls 23-27.

In accordance with the mining lease conditions, Metropolitan Coal has also prepared the *Metropolitan Coal Mining Operations Plan, 2012 – 2019* (herein referred to as the Metropolitan Coal MOP).

### 2.1 PURPOSE AND SCOPE

Metropolitan Coal's environmental reporting requirements include an Annual Review, which is to be prepared in accordance with Condition 3, Schedule 7 of the Project Approval, an Annual Environmental Management Report, to be prepared in accordance with CCL 703, and an Annual Rehabilitation Report, to be prepared in accordance with ML 1610, ML 1702, MPL 320 and CL 379.

The Metropolitan Coal 2018 Annual Review has been prepared to meet the above reporting requirements and to review the environmental performance of the Project during the review period (i.e. 1 January to 31 December 2018), consistent with the NSW Government (2015) *Annual Review Guideline for State Significant Mining Developments*.

## 2.2 MINE CONTACTS

Contact details for key Metropolitan Coal employees are provided below:

Andy Hyslop General Manager Telephone: (02) 4294 7201 Fax: (02) 4294 2604 Email: ahyslop@peabodyenergy.com	Jon Degotardi Manager – Technical Services Telephone: (02) 4294 7233 Fax: (02) 4294 2604 Email: jdegotardi@peabodyenergy.com	Stephen Love Environment and Community Superintendent Telephone: (02) 4294 7384 Fax: (02) 4294 2604 Email: slove@peabodyenergy.com
---	---	---

The street and postal address for Metropolitan Coal is provided below:

<b>Street Address</b> Parkes Street HELENSBURGH NSW 2508	<b>Postal Address</b> PO Box 402 HELENSBURGH NSW 2508
--	---

## 3 APPROVALS

Metropolitan Coal operates under a number of statutory approvals, leases and licences granted by the NSW Government as outlined in Table 3.

**Table 3  
Consent, Lease and Licence Details**

Consent/Lease/Licence	Authority	Grant/Renewal	Expiry Date
Project Approval 08_0149	DP&E	22/6/2009	22/6/2032
Project Approval 08_0149 – Mod 1	DP&E	8/9/2010	22/6/2032
Project Approval 08_0149 – Mod 2	DP&E	2/7/2011	22/6/2032
Project Approval 08_0149 – Mod 3	DP&E	3/10/2013	22/6/2032
Development Consent D90/832	WCC	5/1/1995	-
Consolidated Coal Lease 703	DRG	1/4/2004	26/1/2024
Mining Lease 1610	DRG	7/5/2014	26/9/2031
Coal Lease 379	DRG	14/11/2013*	4/10/2033
Mining Purpose Lease 320	DRG	16/6/2014	9/12/2035
Mining Lease 1702	DRG	13/10/2014	13/10/2035
Bore Licence Certificate 10BL603595	DI-Water	25/1/2013	24/1/2028
Camp Creek Weir Surface Water Certificate of Title	DI-Water	28/11/2012	-
Environment Protection Licence (EPL) No. 767	EPA	9/9/2002	-
Radiation Licence – Radiation Management Licence 5063985	EPA	27/9/2018	27/9/2019
Licence to store explosives and/or security sensitive dangerous substances – Licence XSTR200082	SafeWork NSW	15/06/2017	15/06/2022

Note: DI-Water = Department of Industry – Water; DP&E = NSW Department of Planning and Environment; DRG = NSW Division of Resources and Geoscience; EPA = NSW Environment Protection Authority; WCC = Wollongong City Council.

\* Date lease offer was signed.



## 4 OPERATIONS SUMMARY

### 4.1 MINING OPERATIONS

During the review period, the extraction of Longwall 301 was completed in February 2018 (Figure 4). The extraction of Longwall 302 commenced in March 2018 and was completed in October 2018. The extraction of Longwall 303 commenced in November 2018 and continued for the remainder of the review period.

Metropolitan Coal submitted the Longwalls 301-303 Extraction Plan to the DP&E in November 2016. On 11 May 2017, the DP&E granted approval for Longwalls 301 and 302 with conditions. Metropolitan Coal submitted a revised Longwalls 301-303 Extraction Plan to DP&E in September 2018 for the extraction of Longwall 303. On 8 November 2018, DP&E granted approval for extraction of the first 1,143 metres (m) of Longwall 303.

The amount of waste rock/overburden, ROM coal, coal reject and product coal produced in the previous reporting period, current reporting period and forecast for the next reporting period is provided in Table 4.

**Table 4  
Production Summary**

Material	Approval Limit	2017 Reporting Period (Actual)	2018 Reporting Period (Actual)	2019 Reporting Period (Forecast)
Waste Rock/Overburden	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
ROM Coal	3.2 Mt per calendar year <sup>1</sup>	1,370,574 t	2,024,404 t	2,001,434 t
Coal Reject	N/A	327,369 t	439,506 t <sup>2</sup>	477,640 t
Saleable Product <sup>3</sup>	[2.8 Mt per calendar year <sup>1</sup> ]	1,063,269 t	1,584,898 t	1,577,794 t

N/A = not applicable; Mt = million tonnes; t = tonnes.

<sup>1</sup> Condition 6, Schedule 2 of the Project Approval states:

*The Proponent shall not:*

- (a) extract more than 3.2 million tonnes of ROM coal from the mining area in a calendar year, or
- (b) transport more than 2.8 million tonnes of product coal from the site in a calendar year.

<sup>2</sup> Of the 439,506 t of coal reject produced, 295,781 t was transported to the Glenlee Washery for disposal, 74,281 t was beneficially re-used as engineered fill material at the Sanctuary Ponds residential development, and approximately 69,444 t was emplaced underground.

<sup>3</sup> Note, there is no Approval limit for saleable product itself. The only Approval limit relating to saleable product is the amount of product coal transported from the site in a calendar year. Note that the quantities presented in Table 4 reflect the saleable product produced by Metropolitan Coal and are therefore not consistent with the quantities dispatched from site that are reported on the Peabody website in the Truck and Rail Register.

### 4.2 OTHER OPERATIONS – METROPOLITAN COAL SURFACE FACILITIES AREA

In addition to the production Approval limits detailed in Table 4, other relevant operational conditions are described in Table 5 and primarily relate to the Metropolitan Coal surface facilities area.

During the review period, Metropolitan Coal continued the coal reject backfill emplacement project. Metropolitan Coal also continued its consultation with the Wollongong City Council regarding the potential for coal rejects to be beneficially re-used at the Helensburgh Landfill and commenced construction of a gas drainage plant at the No. 3 Vent Shaft site.

**Table 5  
Other Relevant Operational Conditions**

	Operational Condition	Operational Condition Met?	Comment
Limits on Approval (Project Approval Conditions 5, 7 and 8, Schedule 2)	5. <i>The Proponent may undertake mining operations in the mining area for up to 23 years from the date of this approval.</i>  <u>Note: Under this approval, the Proponent is required to rehabilitate the site and perform additional undertakings to the satisfaction of the Director-General. Consequently, this approval will continue to apply in all other respects other than the right to conduct mining operations until the site has been properly rehabilitated.</u>	Yes	Metropolitan Coal was granted approval for the Project in June 2009.
	7. <i>The Proponent shall not export any coal reject from the site after 2021 without the written approval of the Director-General.</i>	Yes	-
	8. <i>The Proponent shall not emplace coal reject on the surface of the site without the written approval of the Director-General.</i>  <u>Note: This condition applies to the Camp Gully Emplacement Area, as well as to the rest of the surface of the site. It does not apply to the proposed additional coal reject stockpile shown in Appendix 4.</u>	Yes	Metropolitan Coal has DP&E approval to emplace coal reject on the site when used for construction purposes (e.g. as engineered fill material). No construction activities requiring fill were undertaken and no coal reject was emplaced on the surface of the site during the review period.
Structural Adequacy (Project Approval Condition 9, Schedule 2)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>The Proponent shall ensure that all new buildings and structures, and any alterations or additions to existing buildings and structure, are constructed in accordance with:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) <i>the relevant requirements of the BCA; and</i></li> <li>(b) <i>any additional requirements of the MSB in areas where subsidence effects are likely to occur.</i></li> </ul> </li> </ul> <u>Notes:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Under Part 4A of the EP&amp;A Act, the Proponent is required to obtain construction and occupation certificates for the proposed building works.</u></li> <li>• <u>Part 8 of the EP&amp;A Regulation sets out the requirements for the certification of the project.</u></li> </ul>	Yes	Building construction activities during the reporting period included the commencement of construction of a new gas drainage plant at Metropolitan's Vent Shaft No. 3. Building Code of Australia requirements were stipulated for all buildings.
Demolition (Project Approval Condition 10, Schedule 2)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>The Proponent shall ensure that all demolition work is carried out in accordance with <u>Australian Standard AS 2601-2001: The Demolition of Structures</u>, or its latest version.</i></li> </ul>	Yes	Metropolitan Coal did not undertake any demolition activities during the review period.
Operation of Plant and Equipment (Project Approval Condition 11, Schedule 2)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>The Proponent shall ensure that all plant and equipment used at the site is:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) <i>maintained in a proper and efficient condition; and</i></li> <li>(b) <i>operated in a proper and efficient manner.</i></li> </ul> </li> </ul>	Yes	All plant and equipment in use at Metropolitan Coal is regularly serviced in accordance with the relevant Industry & Investment NSW <i>Mining Design Guidelines</i> to ensure plant and equipment is maintained in proper and efficient condition. All plant and equipment are operated in a proper and efficient manner.

**Table 5  
Other Relevant Operational Conditions (continued)**

Operational Condition		Operational Condition Met?	Comment
Rail Noise (Project Approval Condition 4, Schedule 4)	4. <i>The Proponent shall only use locomotives that are approved to operate on the NSW rail network in accordance with noise limits L6.1 to L6.4 in RailCorp's EPL (No. 12208) and ARTC's EPL (No. 3142) or a Pollution Control Approval issued under the former <u>Pollution Control Act 1970</u>.</i>	Yes	All locomotives used by Metropolitan Coal are approved to operate on the NSW rail network in accordance with the relevant noise limits.
Blasting (Project Approval Condition 7, Schedule 4)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>The Proponent shall not undertake blasting operations at the surface facilities area without the written approval of the Director-General.</i></li> </ul>	Yes	<p>No blasting activities were carried out at the surface facilities area during the review period.</p> <p>Minor blasting underground is necessary at times when geological structures are encountered that cannot be excavated by the continuous miner or the longwall mining machine and when a section of the longwall roof falls ahead of the hydraulic supports of the longwall mining machine.</p>

#### **4.3 OPERATIONAL ACTIVITIES IN THE NEXT REPORTING PERIOD**

Metropolitan Coal has submitted an application to extract the first 1,326 m of Longwall 303, which would extend the currently approved Longwall 303 length by 182 m. In accordance with Condition 6, Schedule 3 of the Project Approval, Metropolitan Coal will submit an Extraction Plan for secondary extraction of Longwall 304 in April 2019. The figures presented in this Annual Review show the proposed Longwalls 303 and 304 layouts. In the next reporting period, Longwall 303 is anticipated to be completed in May 2019 and Longwall 304 is anticipated to commence in July 2019 (Figure 5).

The amount of waste rock/overburden, ROM coal, coal reject and product coal forecast for the next reporting period is provided in Table 4.

#### **5 ACTIONS REQUIRED FROM PREVIOUS ANNUAL REVIEW**

Following the submission of the Metropolitan Coal 2017 Annual Review in April 2018, additional information was requested by WaterNSW in its letter of 20 September 2018. WaterNSW's comments on the 2017 Annual Review have been considered in this report where appropriate.

## **6 ENVIRONMENTAL PERFORMANCE – UNDERGROUND MINING AREA AND SURROUNDS**

This section provides a summary of the key environmental monitoring results for subsidence, surface water, groundwater, biodiversity, land, heritage, built features and public safety in the underground mining area, an assessment of environmental performance and a description of the management measures implemented during the review period.

Each section indicates the relevant management plan or monitoring program where details of the underground mining management and monitoring are available. The Metropolitan Coal management plans/monitoring programs are available on the Peabody website (<http://www.peabodyenergy.com>).

The Longwalls 301-303 Extraction Plan includes post-mining monitoring and management of potential subsidence impacts and environmental consequences, subject to the two previously approved Metropolitan Coal Extraction Plans for Longwalls 20-22 and Longwalls 23-27.

### **6.1 SUBSIDENCE MONITORING**

The Metropolitan Coal Longwalls 301-303 Subsidence Monitoring Program was prepared to validate subsidence predictions and analyse the relationship between the subsidence effects and subsidence impacts of the Metropolitan Coal Longwalls 301-303 Extraction Plan in accordance with Condition 6(e), Schedule 3 of the Project Approval.

Subsidence movements are surveyed in three dimensions using a total station survey instrument. The subsidence parameter monitoring locations are shown on Figure 6.

A review of the subsidence survey results and comparison between the predicted and observed subsidence movements for the review period has been conducted by Mine Subsidence Engineering Consultants (MSEC). The report prepared by MSEC is provided in Appendix A. A summary of the key findings is provided below.

#### **6.1.1 Predicted and Observed Subsidence Movements**

The review period included the completion of Longwalls 301 and 302 and partial extraction of Longwall 303. Details of the observed and predicted subsidence movements at the subsidence monitoring locations (300 XL Line, Princes Highway Line, Optic Water Line, M1 North Bound Line, Transmission Line, Transmission Towers, Telecommunication Towers, Bridge 2 [Old Princes Highway Underpass], Cawley Road Overbridge, Eastern Tributary Cross Line and Ridge Top Survey Stations) are provided in Appendix A. The monitoring locations are shown on Figure 6.


The observed subsidence profile shapes and subsidence parameters were generally similar to those predicted or within limits of accuracy of the predicted subsidence parameters. The maximum observed total conventional subsidence along the 300 XL Line and Optic Water Line was greater than predicted however, the observed Optic Water Line subsidence was within the quoted accuracy limit of 50 millimetres of predicted subsidence (at low magnitudes of subsidence). The greater than predicted subsidence at the northern end of the longwalls is believed to have been influenced by variation in extracted seam thickness due to operational and geotechnical reasons at the northern end of Longwall 301 (Appendix A).

During the reporting period, Metropolitan Coal also trialled the effectiveness of LiDAR as a subsidence survey technique compared to traditional subsidence survey techniques following the extraction of Longwall 301. The ground movements measured using the LiDAR surveys are consistent with the predictions and observed survey data along the monitoring lines (Appendix A).

Condition 3, Schedule 3 of the Project Approval states:

3. *If the subsidence effects and subsidence impacts of the project exceed the relevant predictions by more than 15% at any time after mining has progressed beyond the halfway mark of Longwall 21, or if the profile of vertical displacement does not reflect predictions, then the Proponent shall use appropriate numerical modelling to supplement the subsequent predictions of subsidence effects and subsidence impacts for the project to the satisfaction of the Director-General.*

A comparison of the maximum observed and maximum predicted total conventional subsidence for the Project after each longwall for Longwalls 3 to 27 and Longwalls 301 to 302 and partial extraction of Longwall 303 is shown in Chart 1. The comparison of conventional subsidence effects excludes the valley cross lines which represent non-conventional subsidence movements.



**Chart 1 Comparison Between the Maximum Observed and Maximum Predicted Total Conventional Subsidence for Longwalls 3 to 27, Longwalls 301 to 302 and Partial Extraction of Longwall 303 at Metropolitan Colliery**

An analysis of the maximum observed versus maximum predicted vertical subsidence was undertaken by MSEC (Appendix A). Based on the results of survey data to date and comparison with predicted conventional subsidence parameters, the profiles of vertical displacement adequately reflect the predictions. The overall subsidence effects of the project do not exceed predictions by more than 15% (Appendix A).

## **6.2 WATER MANAGEMENT**

The Metropolitan Coal Longwalls 301-303 Water Management Plan was prepared to manage the potential environmental consequences of the Metropolitan Coal Longwalls 301-303 Extraction Plan on watercourses (including the Woronora Reservoir), aquifers and catchment yield in accordance with Condition 6, Schedule 3 of the Project Approval.

The Longwalls 301-303 Water Management Plan includes post-mining monitoring and management of potential subsidence impacts and environmental consequences associated with Longwalls 20-22 and Longwalls 23-27. During the reporting period, the Metropolitan Coal Catchment Monitoring Program and Longwalls 301-303 Water Management Plan were updated as part of Metropolitan Coal's application to mine Longwall 303.

Hydro Engineering & Consulting (Appendices B1 and B2) and HydroSimulations (Appendices C1 and C2) have reviewed the environmental performance of the Project in relation to surface water and groundwater in the underground mining area and surrounds for the reporting period.

The surface water, groundwater and meteorological monitoring locations are shown on Figures 7 to 12.

Sections 6.2.1 to 6.2.11 provide a summary of the surface water and groundwater assessments for the reporting period. Section 6.2.12 provides a summary of the Woronora Reservoir Impact Strategy, conducted in accordance with Condition 2 of the Longwalls 301 and 302 approval.

Section 6.8 provides a summary of the assessments against the water resource and watercourse subsidence impact performance indicators and measures for the reporting period in Table 9.

### **6.2.1 Stream Features**

Visual inspections and photographic surveys of Waratah Rivulet (from Pool P [downstream of Longwall 23] to the full supply level of the Woronora Reservoir) and the Eastern Tributary (from the full supply level of the Woronora Reservoir to the maingate of Longwall 26) were conducted within three months of the completion of Longwalls 301 and 302.

The visual and photographic surveys conducted at the completion of each longwall provide a detailed photographic record of stream features. The visual and photographic surveys have recorded observations of mining impacts including surface cracking, iron staining, gas releases and water discoloration/opacity. A summary of the observations for the reporting period is provided for the Waratah Rivulet (Table 6) and Eastern Tributary (Table 7). The location of mapped pools on the Waratah Rivulet and Eastern Tributary are provided in Appendix D.

During the reporting period, weekly inspections have also been undertaken where gas releases occur, and monthly inspections have been undertaken of the Eastern Tributary between the full supply level of the Woronora Reservoir and the Longwall 26 maingate to document surface cracking and iron staining. The results of these inspections are included in Table 7.

Visual inspections and photographic surveys of the Waratah Rivulet (from Pool P to the full supply level of the Woronora Reservoir) and Eastern Tributary (from the Woronora Reservoir full supply level to the Longwall 26 maingate) will be conducted within three months of the completion of Longwall 303 (i.e. within the next reporting period). Visual inspection and photographic surveys of the Eastern Tributary from the full supply level of the Woronora Reservoir to the maingate of Longwall 26 will also be conducted monthly when mining is within 400 m of the stream.

**Table 6**  
**Monitoring of Stream Features – Waratah Rivulet, Downstream of Longwall 23 Maingate**

Stream Feature	Summary of Observations
<b>Surface Cracking</b>	<p>No surface cracking was observed downstream of the Longwall 23 maingate on the Waratah Rivulet during the Longwall 301 or Longwall 302 inspections.</p> <p>The performance indicator, <i>No change to the natural drainage behaviour of Pools P, Q, R, S, T, U, V and W</i>, was not exceeded during the reporting period.</p>
<b>Surface Flow/ Pool Water Levels</b>	<p>During the Longwall 301 visual inspections in June 2018, the surface flow/pool water levels were noted to be lower than, or consistent with, the January/February 2017 inspection (following the completion of Longwall 27) as a result of the prevailing climatic conditions.</p> <p>During the Longwall 302 visual inspections in October 2018, the surface flow/pool water levels were noted to be higher than the June 2018 inspection (following the completion of Longwall 301) as a result of the prevailing climatic conditions.</p> <p>The performance indicator, <i>No change to the natural drainage behaviour of Pools P, Q, R, S, T, U, V and W</i>, was not exceeded during the reporting period.</p> <p>Water levels in pools on the Waratah Rivulet from Pool P to the full supply level of the Woronora Reservoir (i.e. in Pools P, Q, R, S, T, U, V and W) have been monitored using a continuous water level sensor and logger (Figure 7 and Appendix D). The monitoring results for the reporting period are discussed in Section 6.2.3 and Appendices B1 and B2.</p>
<b>Iron Staining/ Flocculent</b>	<p>No change in iron staining was observed between Pools P to W on the Waratah Rivulet as a result of mining during the reporting period. Natural seeps and associated iron staining (as recorded by baseline mapping) continue to be recorded within this reach. Iron staining has also been recorded in Tributary B, near the confluence with the Waratah Rivulet at the upstream end of Pool P, however this was not present during the October 2018 visual inspection.</p> <p>The performance indicator, <i>Visual inspection of the Waratah Rivulet from Pool P to the full supply level of the Woronora Reservoir does not show significant changes in the extent or nature of iron staining that isn't also occurring in the Woronora River (control site)</i>, was not exceeded during the reporting period.</p>
<b>Gas Releases</b>	<p>Gas releases continued to be observed and monitored on the Waratah Rivulet at:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pool P, from January to December 2018;</li> <li>• Pool S, in January, March, April, October and November 2018;</li> <li>• Pool U, from January to May and July to December 2018; and</li> <li>• Pool W, in December 2018.</li> </ul> <p>No environmental effects resulting from the gas releases (such as riparian vegetation dieback or dead fish) have been observed.</p> <p>The performance indicator, <i>Gas releases in Waratah Rivulet from Pool P to the full supply level of the Woronora Reservoir have not increased beyond those observed up to the commencement of Longwall 301 extraction</i>, was exceeded on 31 July 2018 at Pool P during the reporting period. An assessment against the performance measure was undertaken (Appendix E1) and confirmed the performance measure had not been exceeded.</p>
<b>Water Discoloration/ Opacity</b>	<p>Pools along the Waratah Rivulet continue to be observed with a green or clear opacity.</p>

**Table 7**  
**Monitoring of Stream Features – Eastern Tributary, between the Full Supply Level of the Woronora Reservoir and the Longwall 26 Maingate**

Stream Feature	Summary of Observations
<b>Surface Cracking</b>	<p>As at 10 December 2018, cracking had been recorded at Rock bar ETAF(2), Pool ETAG, Pool ETAH, Rock bar ETAH, Pool ETAI, Rock bar ETAI, Pool ETAJ, Pool ETAK, Rock bar ETAK, Pool ETAL, Boulderfield ETAL, Rock bar ETAL, Pool ETAM, Boulderfield ETAM, Pool ETAN, Rock bar ETAN, Pool ETAO, Rock bar ETAO, Pool ETAP, Boulderfield ETAP, Rock bar ETAP, Pool ETAQ, Rock bar ETAQ, Pool ETAR, Rock bar ETAR and Rock bar ETAU.</p> <p>Monthly inspections undertaken from January to December 2018 identified new cracking at Rock bar ETAF(2), Pool ETAH, Rock bar ETAH, Pool ETAI, Pool ETAJ, Rock bar ETAK, Pool ETAL, Rock bar ETAL, Pool ETAM, Pool ETAN, Rock bar ETAO, Pool ETAQ, Pool ETAR and Rock bar ETAR.</p> <p>Existing cracking was observed to have widened or lengthened at Pool ETAH, Rock bar ETAK, Pool ETAL, Rock bar ETAL, Rock bar ETAO, Boulderfield ETAP, Rock bar ETAP and Pool ETAR.</p> <p>No cracking has been recorded at Pool ETAS or Pool ETAT to date. No changes to the existing cracking at Pool ETAU were observed during the reporting period.</p> <p>The performance indicator, <i>No change to the natural drainage behaviour of Pools ETAS, ETAT and ETAU</i>, was not exceeded during the reporting period.</p>
<b>Surface Flow/ Pool Water Levels</b>	<p>In January 2017, impacts to Eastern Tributary pools resulted in the exceedance of the negligible environmental consequences performance measure for the Eastern Tributary in relation to diversion of flows and drainage behaviour (emphasis added): <i>Negligible environmental consequences over at least 70% of the stream length (that is no diversion of flows, no change in the natural drainage behaviour of pools, minimal iron staining and minimal gas releases)</i>. The exceedance of this component of the Eastern Tributary performance measure was reported to the DP&amp;E and other relevant agencies in February 2017. A summary of the Eastern Tributary Incident was provided in the Metropolitan Coal 2016 Annual Review and an update was provided in the Metropolitan Coal 2017 Annual Review.</p> <p>In summary, between the full supply level of the Woronora Reservoir and the Longwall 26 maingate, mine subsidence has resulted in the diversion of flows or change to the natural drainage behaviour of Pools ETAG to ETAR (Figure 7 and Appendix D). As at December 2017, mining had not resulted in the diversion of flows or change to the natural drainage behaviour of Pools ETAS, ETAT and ETAU (Figure 7 and Appendix D).</p> <p>During the reporting period, the natural drainage behaviour of Pools ETAS, ETAT and ETAU has not been observed to be impacted by mine subsidence.</p> <p>The performance indicator for visual observations, <i>No change to the natural drainage behaviour of Pools ETAS, ETAT and ETAU</i>, was not exceeded during the reporting period.</p> <p>Water levels in Pool ETAU and, since May 2018, in Pools ETAS/ETAT have been monitored using a continuous water level sensor and logger (Figure 7 and Appendix D). The monitoring results are discussed in Section 6.2.3 and in Appendices B1 and B2 and indicate the natural drainage behaviour of Pools ETAS/ETAT and ETAU have not been impacted by mine subsidence.</p>
<b>Iron Staining/ Flocculent</b>	<p>On 14 October 2016, Metropolitan Coal reported the exceedance of the Eastern Tributary performance measure in relation to iron staining to the DP&amp;E and other relevant agencies (emphasis added): <i>Negligible environmental consequences over at least 70% of the stream length (that is no diversion of flows, no change in the natural drainage behaviour of pools, minimal iron staining and minimal gas releases)</i>. A summary of the Eastern Tributary Incident was provided in the Metropolitan Coal 2016 Annual Review and an update was provided in the Metropolitan Coal 2017 Annual Review.</p> <p>Since October 2016, inspections have been conducted monthly to record the extent of iron staining. From January to October 2018, iron staining was not visible from Boulderfield ETAF to Rock bar ETAP as a result of the limited amount or absence of water in the pools, however iron staining was typically evident in the reach from Pool ETAQ to Boulderfield ETAU. In November and December 2018, iron staining was visible from Boulderfield ETAF to Pool ETAG and from Pool ETAQ to Boulderfield ETAU.</p>
<b>Gas Releases</b>	<p>Gas releases were observed in Pool ETAG on 4 April 2018 and in Pool ETAH on 8 October 2018 (location of pools shown in Appendix D). No gas releases were observed on the Eastern Tributary for the remainder of the reporting period. No environmental effects resulting from the gas releases (such as riparian vegetation dieback or dead fish) have been observed.</p> <p>The performance indicator, <i>Gas releases in Eastern Tributary between the full supply level of the Woronora Reservoir and the maingate of Longwall 26 have not increased beyond those observed up to the commencement of Longwall 301 extraction</i>, was not exceeded during the reporting period.</p>
<b>Water Discoloration/ Opacity</b>	<p>Orange in colour where iron staining occurred. Pools along the Eastern Tributary observed with a green opacity.</p>



The results of the stream inspections are consistent with the potential subsidence impacts described in the Metropolitan Coal Project Environmental Assessment (Project EA) (Helensburgh Coal Pty Ltd [HCPL], 2008), the Preferred Project Report (HCPL, 2009) and the Longwalls 301-303 Water Management Plan, including cracking and dilation of bedrock which has resulted in the localised diversion of a portion of the surface flow through either:

- **diversion into subterranean flows**, where water travels via new mining induced fractures and opened natural joints in the bedrock into near-surface dilated strata beneath the bedrock, ultimately re-emerging at the surface downstream; or
- **leakage through rock bars**, where the rate of leakage from pools through rock bars to the downstream reaches of the stream is increased by new mining induced fractures.

The Project EA, Preferred Project Report and Metropolitan Coal Water Management Plan indicated that the effects of underflow would be localised to the subsidence affected reaches of streams. Underflow has been observed to result in lower water levels in pools as they become hydraulically connected with the fracture network. During prolonged dry periods when flows recede to low levels, the number of instances where loss of flow continuity between pools occurs increases with a greater proportion of the flow being conveyed entirely in the subsurface fracture network.

The Preferred Project Report and Metropolitan Coal Water Management Plan indicated that valley closure values of greater than 200 mm were predicted at pools/rock bars on the Waratah Rivulet upstream of the maingate of Longwall 23, on the Eastern Tributary, downstream to rock bar ETAL, and on Tributary B. The NSW Planning Assessment Commission's Report for the Metropolitan Coal Project (NSW Planning Assessment Commission, 2009) indicates the Panel considered 'negligible consequence' for a watercourse to mean, *'no diversion of flows, no change in the natural drainage behaviour of pools, minimal iron staining, and minimal gas releases'*, and was assumed to be achieved in circumstances where predicted valley closure was less than 200 mm.

Up until December 2016, the monitoring of water levels/drainage behaviour of pools on the Eastern Tributary between the maingate of Longwall 26 and the full supply level of the Woronora Reservoir was consistent with predictions. In the Longwalls 20-22 Extraction Plan Subsidence Assessment it was recognised that fracturing resulting in surface flow diversion could be observed at a site where the predicted total closure is less than 200 mm, although none had been observed to date. The report also noted that reference to the 200 mm predicted total closure value should be viewed as an indication of low probability (10%) of impact rather than certainty. In the Longwalls 23-27 Extraction Plan Subsidence Assessment, additional case studies were added to the pool impact model, including cases where loss of pool water levels had occurred at less than 200 mm predicted total closure. Similar to the previous database for Longwalls 20-22, the updated database showed that based on a maximum predicted total closure of 200 mm, the proportion of pools that experienced loss of pool water levels was around 10%.

In December 2016 and January 2017, a number of pools with predicted closure values of less than 200 mm experienced loss of pool water levels. This resulted in the exceedance of the negligible environmental consequences performance measure for the Eastern Tributary in relation to diversion of flows and drainage behaviour. The impacts are considered to be anomalous in that more than 15% of pools on the Eastern Tributary have experienced loss of pool water levels at predicted closure values of less than 200 mm. However, the combined data that is available to MSEC for the Southern Coalfield (including the Waratah Rivulet and Eastern Tributary results) indicates that less than 10% of all pools have experienced the diversion of flow at predicted closure values of less than 200 mm, consistent with previous assessments of potential pool impacts. On their own, the impacts for the Eastern Tributary are outside of the predictions of the empirical based model.

Metropolitan Coal's actions in relation to the Eastern Tributary Incident are described in Section 13.1. No additional pools downstream of the Longwall 26 maingate to those identified previously as being impacted (in terms of drainage behaviour) have been impacted during the review period.

The key potential subsidence impacts and environmental consequences in relation to bed gradients, scouring and stream alignment described in the Project EA, Preferred Project Report and Metropolitan Coal Water Management Plans included:

- Potential changes in bed gradients could occur, however, were anticipated to be small relative to the existing grades.
- An increased potential for scouring of the stream bed and banks (at locations where the predicted tilts considerably increase the natural pre-mining stream gradients). The potential for scouring is greatest in stream sections with alluvial deposits. Since the streambed of the Waratah Rivulet and the Eastern Tributary is predominantly erosion-resistant Hawkesbury Sandstone, scouring was expected to be very low.
- Subsidence fracturing of bedrock has the potential to cause dislodgement of rock fragments during high flow events.
- The potential for changes to stream alignment as a result of mine subsidence effects was considered to be low.
- Minor stream bank erosion, where changes in channel gradients result in increases in flow energy. It would be expected that bank erosion would be relatively minor and comprise a slow retreat of the bank until a new dynamic equilibrium is reached.

The results of the stream inspections have generally been consistent with these predictions. On the Waratah Rivulet (in a section of the stream over Longwall 21) and Eastern Tributary (in a section of the stream over Longwalls 20 and 21) increased ponding from changes in bed gradients has previously resulted in the prolonged inundation of the adjacent riparian vegetation which has resulted in some vegetation dieback on a local scale as described in Section 6.3.3.

As described in the Southern Coalfield Panel Report (Department of Planning [DoP], 2008) and the NSW Planning Assessment Commission's Report for the Metropolitan Coal Project (NSW Planning Assessment Commission, 2009), under certain conditions the cracking of stream beds and underlying strata has the potential to result in changes in water quality, particularly ferruginous springs and/or development of iron bacterial mats. Experience at Metropolitan Coal prior to Project Approval indicated that areas of the substratum can be covered by iron flocculent material for several hundred metres downstream of mine subsidence fractures.

Metropolitan Coal has monitored the extent of iron staining through visual and photographic surveys and assessed the extent of iron staining against the subsidence impact performance measures as follows:

- *Negligible environmental consequences (that is, no diversion of flows, no change in the natural drainage behaviour of pools, minimal iron staining, and minimal gas releases) on the Waratah Rivulet between the full supply level of the Woronora Reservoir and the maingate of Longwall 23 (upstream of Pool P).*
- *Negligible environmental consequences over at least 70% of the stream length (that is, no diversion of flows, no change in the natural drainage behaviour of pools, minimal iron staining, and minimal gas releases) on the Eastern Tributary between the full supply level of the Woronora Reservoir and the maingate of Longwall 26.*

From January to October 2018, iron staining was not visible within the Eastern Tributary from Boulderfield ETAF to Rock bar ETAP as a result of the limited amount or absence of water in the pools, however iron staining was typically evident in the reach from Pool ETAQ to Boulderfield ETAU. In November and December 2018, iron staining was visible from Boulderfield ETAF to Pool ETAG and from Pool ETAQ to Boulderfield ETAU.


Prior to approval of the Project in 2009, no gas releases had been observed along the Waratah Rivulet, Eastern Tributary or other tributaries over the Metropolitan Coal lease, either before or during mining. Notwithstanding, the Project EA, Preferred Project Report, and Metropolitan Coal Water Management Plans recognised there was the potential for gas releases to occur.

Monitoring of gas releases undertaken during the reporting period in accordance with the Metropolitan Coal Longwalls 301-303 Water Management Plan identified an exceedance of the performance indicator (with regard to free carbon dioxide as CO<sub>2</sub> concentrations) at Pool P on the Waratah Rivulet on 31 July 2018. No other gas releases observed on the Eastern Tributary or Waratah Rivulet exceeded the performance indicator. Assessment of the gas releases in Pool P on the Waratah Rivulet for the period July to September 2018 (provided in Appendix E1) indicate the Waratah Rivulet subsidence impact performance measure had been met (Appendix E1).

**6.2.2 Surface Water Flow**

Waratah Rivulet stream flow data (GS 2132102, Figure 7) is analysed to assess whether a statistically significant reduction in the quantity of water entering Woronora Reservoir in the post-mine period relative to the pre-mine period has occurred, that has not also occurred in the control catchment(s).

The quantity of water entering the Woronora Reservoir is not considered to be significantly different post-mining compared to pre-mining if the median of the ratios (of 14 day sums of monitored flow) for the ‘sliding’ 12 month period does not fall below the 20<sup>th</sup> percentile of the baseline data. The 12 month sliding median is shown on Chart 2.




**Chart 2 One Year Sliding Median for the Ratios of the 14 Day Sums of Monitored and Modelled Flow Rates at Waratah Rivulet (GS 2132102)**

For the Project EA a comprehensive analysis of stream flow data and data on the yield behaviour of Woronora Reservoir indicated that past mining at Metropolitan Coal had no discernible effect on the inflow to, or yield from, the reservoir. Surface water flow monitoring indicates there has been a negligible reduction in the quantity of water resources reaching the Woronora Reservoir during the review period.

Results of the assessment for the reporting period indicate that the performance indicator for the quantity of flow reaching the Woronora Reservoir from Waratah Rivulet was not exceeded between January and June 2018. From July to September 2018, the sliding 12 month median of the ratio fell below the 35<sup>th</sup> percentile of the baseline data and between September and December 2018 the sliding 12 month median of the ratio fell below the 20<sup>th</sup> percentile of the baseline data, resulting in a potential<sup>1</sup> exceedance of the performance indicator *Changes in the quantity of water entering Woronora Reservoir are not significantly different post-mining compared to pre-mining, that are not also occurring in the control catchment(s)* (Appendix B2).

Chart 3 shows the flow monitoring data that is available since gauging station construction on the Eastern Tributary (GS 300078; Figure 7) in September 2012 compared to model predictions. The results for the reporting period indicate that flow has been continuous at the gauging station and that it has been generally consistent with, or above, model predictions (Chart 3). This indicates that flows reaching the Woronora Reservoir have not been reduced by mining (Appendices B1 and B2).



**Chart 3 Monitored and Model Predicted Flows – Eastern Tributary Upstream of Woronora Reservoir**

<sup>1</sup> Assessment against the performance indicator could not be completed in time for inclusion in the 2018 Annual Review due to incomplete and late WaterNSW data (received on 19 and 28 March 2019). Assessment against this performance indicator will be undertaken in the next review period.

During the reporting period, Metropolitan Coal installed two new streamflow monitoring stations in sub-catchments K and I (Figure 7) to obtain additional surface water flow data in relation to future longwalls. The monitoring data from these monitoring stations will be reported in the 2019 Annual Review.

### 6.2.3 Pool Water Levels

The water level in a number of pools on the Waratah Rivulet, Eastern Tributary, Tributary B and Woronora River (Figure 7) has been either manually monitored on a daily basis<sup>2</sup> or monitored using a continuous water level sensor and logger.

During the reporting period, Waratah Rivulet Pools H, I, J, L, P, Q, R, S, T, U, V and W remained above their cease to flow levels or historical minimums<sup>3</sup>. Pools A, B, C, E, F, G, G1, K, M, N and O on the Waratah Rivulet (Charts 4 to 15) fell below their cease to flow levels or historically low water levels in January, February and/or March 2018. Pool N also fell below its cease to flow level for parts of April and May 2018. Pool B also fell below the cease to flow level in parts of August, September and October 2018. The reduction in water levels from January to March 2018 is consistent with a reduction in water levels in the control pools WRP2, WRP3 and WRP4 on the Woronora River (Charts 16 to 18) during the same periods (Appendices B1 and B2)<sup>4</sup>. The decline in water level observed at Pool B from mid-August to early October 2018 is consistent with a reduction in water levels observed in the control pools WRP2, WRP3 and WRP4 on the Woronora River during the same periods, however the control pools did not cease to flow during this time (Appendix B2).


Mining has not resulted in the diversion of flows or change to the natural drainage behaviour of pools on the Waratah Rivulet downstream of the maingate of Longwall 23 (i.e. Pools P to W).

---


<sup>2</sup> Specifically, Pools B, C, E, G, G1, H and I on Waratah Rivulet.

<sup>3</sup> A single hourly reading at Pool S was recorded below the cease to flow level in January 2018 and two hourly readings at Pool T were recorded below the pool's previously recorded minimum in January and February 2018, however these readings were attributed to water level sensor faults (as the water levels returned to normal at the next hourly reading).


<sup>4</sup> Pool water level data for the Woronora River pools prior to January 2016 is considered to be largely unreliable as a result of water level sensor issues and is not shown.




**Chart 4 Pool A Waratah Rivulet**




**Chart 5 Pool B Waratah Rivulet (Manual Observations)**




**Chart 6 Pool C Waratah Rivulet (Manual Observations)**



**Chart 7 Pool E Waratah Rivulet (Manual Observations)**




**Chart 8 Pool F Waratah Rivulet (Manual Observations)**




**Chart 9 Pool F Waratah Rivulet**







**Chart 10 Pool G Waratah Rivulet (Manual Observations)**




**Chart 11 Pool G1 Waratah Rivulet (Manual Observations)**




**Chart 12 Pool K Waratah Rivulet**




**Chart 13 Pool M Waratah Rivulet**




**Chart 14 Pool N Waratah Rivulet**




**Chart 15 Pool O Waratah Rivulet**



**Chart 16 Pool WRP2**



**Chart 17 Pool WRP3**



**Chart 18 Pool WRP4**


On the Eastern Tributary, water levels in Pools ETG, ETJ, ETM, ETU, ETW, ETAF, ETAG, ETAH, ETAI, ETAQ, ETAS/ETAT<sup>5</sup> and ETAU are monitored using a continuous water level sensor and logger (Figure 7).

Water levels in Pools ETG, ETJ, ETM, ETU, ETW, ETAF, ETAG, ETAH, ETAI and ETAQ on the Eastern Tributary were regularly below their cease to flow levels or their historically low water levels during the reporting period (Charts 19 to 28). Pool water levels responded to rainfall events during the reporting period before returning to below their cease to flow levels or sensor levels. Pool ETAS/ETAT did not cease overflowing for the period of recorded data (i.e. from 24 May 2018) and Pool ETAU did not fall below its cease to flow level during the reporting period (Appendices B1 and B2).


Pool RTP1 on Tributary B was typically dry during the reporting period. Pool RTP2 on Tributary B was typically below its cease to flow level, however water levels rose for short durations following rainfall events (Appendices B1 and B2).

As described in Section 6.2.1, the Eastern Tributary pool water level monitoring results for the review period were consistent with the potential subsidence impacts and environmental consequences described in the Project EA, Preferred Project Report and Metropolitan Coal Water Management Plan in that data that is available to MSEC for the Southern Coalfield (including the Waratah Rivulet and Eastern Tributary results) indicates that less than 10% of all pools have experienced the diversion of flow at predicted closure values of less than 200 mm, consistent with previous assessments of potential pool impacts. On their own, the impacts for the Eastern Tributary are outside of the predictions of the empirical based model.


<sup>5</sup> Due to the nature of rock bar ETAS, Pool ETAS and Pool ETAT typically sit at the same level. A continuous water level sensor and logger was installed at Pool ETAT during the reporting period. Water level data for Pools ETAS/ETAT is available from 24 May 2018.




**Chart 19 Pool ETG**




**Chart 20 Pool ETJ**




**Chart 21 Pool ETM**



**Chart 22 Pool ETU**



**Chart 23 Pool ETW<sup>6,7</sup>**




**Chart 24 Pool ETAF**


<sup>6</sup> Note discrepancies in water levels caused by pool being dry and water level sensor being exposed at time of download.

<sup>7</sup> After heavy rainfalls in early June 2016, the diver stand at Pool ETW became clogged with sediment and the diver was unable to reach the bottom. On 14 July 2016, a new diver was installed at Pool ETW to replace the previous diver. In September 2017, the old diver was cleared of sediment and was able to be used again. The original diver extends deeper into the pool, allowing additional information to be obtained during periods when the pool water level is below the cease to flow level. Data shown after September 2017 is from the original diver.






**Chart 25 Pool ETAG**




**Chart 26 Pool ETAH<sup>8</sup>**

<sup>8</sup> Water level was below measurable levels for ETAH from the 10/12/18 to the 31/12/18.



**Chart 27 Pool ETAI<sup>9</sup>**



**Chart 28 Pool ETAQ**

<sup>9</sup> Water level was below measurable levels for ETAI from the 10/12/18 to the 31/12/18.

**Table 8**  
**Summary of Results for Key Water Quality Parameters During the Reporting Period**

Stream(s)	pH	EC	Dissolved Iron	Dissolved Manganese	Dissolved Aluminium
Waratah Rivulet (sites WRWQ2, WRWQ6, WRWQ8, WRWQ9, WRWQM, WRWQN, WRWQP, WRWQR, WRWQT and WRWQW) (Charts 29 to 38)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Upstream sites (e.g. sites WRWQ2 and WRWQ6) were slightly acidic to near neutral.</li> <li>Middle and lower reach sites (e.g. sites WRWQ8, WRWQT and WRWQW) were higher (slightly alkaline).</li> <li>Site WRWQ8 has shown a generally increasing trend in pH since mid-2016.</li> <li>A historically high pH value (field) of 8.66 was recorded at WRWQT in March 2018.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Generally higher than previous values at upper to middle reach sites.</li> <li>Historically high results were recorded at WRWQ2 (437 microSiemens per centimetre [<math>\mu\text{S}/\text{cm}</math>]), WRWQ8 (342 <math>\mu\text{S}/\text{cm}</math>), WRWQ9 (390 <math>\mu\text{S}/\text{cm}</math>), WRWQM (337 <math>\mu\text{S}/\text{cm}</math>) and WRWQN (338 <math>\mu\text{S}/\text{cm}</math>) during the reporting period.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concentrations were typically below 0.5 milligrams per litre (mg/L).</li> <li>WRWQM recorded concentrations above 0.5 mg/L but at or below 1 mg/L in February, March, June, July, August and September 2018.</li> <li>WRWQN recorded a concentration of 0.58 mg/L in August 2018.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concentrations were generally low and consistent with historical trends.</li> <li>Elevated concentrations (relative to historic levels) were recorded in January 2018 at WRWQM (0.67 mg/L), March 2018 at WRWQ6 (0.62 mg/L) and August 2018 at WRWQN (0.58 mg/L).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concentrations were either low or below the detection limit.</li> </ul>
Woronora River (sites WOWQ1 and WOWQ2, control stream) (Charts 39 to 43) (Note, WOWQ1 was dry from 1 January 2018 to 20 December 2018)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Slightly acidic pH levels at WOWQ1 and WOWQ2, consistent with historical trends.</li> <li>The singular sampling event completed for WOWQ1 recorded a pH of 5.19.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Slightly elevated, although no values exceeded the historical peak.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Typically low concentrations at WOWQ2, similar to those recorded in Waratah Rivulet.</li> <li>Typically low concentrations recorded at WOWQ1.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Typically low concentrations.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Typically low concentrations at WOWQ2.</li> <li>The singular sampling event completed for WOWQ1 recorded a slightly elevated concentration of 0.19 mg/L.</li> </ul>
Bee Creek (site BCWQ1, control stream), Honeysuckle Creek (site HCWQ1, control stream), Far Eastern Tributary (site FEWQ1), Tributary B (site RTWQ1) and Tributary D (site UTWQ1) (Charts 44 to 48)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bee Creek and Honeysuckle Creek had slightly acidic pH levels.</li> <li>Far Eastern Tributary, Tributary B and Tributary D had near neutral pH levels.</li> <li>Overall, the pH levels were consistent with historical values.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Generally low, with the exception of Tributary B (RTWQ1).</li> <li>RTWQ1 has been variable and periodically elevated since late 2013 and this trend continued during the reporting period.</li> <li>An upward trend was identified from July to December 2018, although historically high levels were only marginally exceeded at HCWQ1, and were not exceeded at other sites.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Low and consistent with historical values.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Low and consistent with historical values.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Less than 0.2 mg/L at FEWQ1, RTWQ1 and UTWQ1.</li> <li>Spikes above historical levels were recorded at BCWQ1 in October 2018 (1.3 mg/L) and at HCWQ1 in September and December 2018 (0.66 mg/L and 0.68 mg/L, respectively).</li> </ul>

**Table 8 (Continued)**  
**Summary of Results for Key Water Quality Parameters During the Reporting Period**

Stream(s)	pH	EC	Dissolved Iron	Dissolved Manganese	Dissolved Aluminium
<p>Eastern Tributary (sites ETWQF, ETWQJ, ETWQN, ETWQU, ETWQW, ETWQAF, ETWQAH, ETWQAQ and ETWQAU)<sup>1</sup> (Charts 49 to 53)</p> <p>Variable results in February and March 2018 are considered to be a result of sampling non-flowing or stagnant pools.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Highly variable during late February and early March 2018, including historically low pH levels recorded at ETWQJ, ETWQW, ETWQAH and ETWQAQ.</li> <li>For the remainder of March, April and May 2018, pH levels returned to near historical levels at all sites.</li> <li>Low pH results were recorded at ETWQN in June 2018, ETWQAH in June 2018 and November 2018 and ETWQAQ in October 2018.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Higher than historical levels were primarily recorded in late February (994 µS/cm at ETWQAH, 1,991 µS/cm at ETWQAQ) and early March (553 µS/cm at ETWQU, 746 µS/cm at ETWQJ and 1,052 µS/cm at ETWQW).</li> <li>Additional elevated values were recorded in May (404 µS/cm at ETWQAF) and June 2018 (385 µS/cm at ETWQN).</li> <li>All sites returned to near historically recorded levels from June 2018 to the end of the reporting period.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Spikes (above historical levels) were recorded at sites ETWQAH and ETWQAQ in late February 2018 and at sites ETWQJ, ETWQU, ETWQW, ETWQAQ and ETWQAU in early March 2018.</li> <li>A maximum concentration of 73.2 mg/L was recorded at site ETWQAQ in February 2018.</li> <li>At all sites, the dissolved iron concentrations returned to near historically recorded levels from August 2018 to the end of the review period.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Elevated concentrations were recorded during the reporting period, particularly in February and March 2018.</li> <li>The highest concentrations were recorded at site ETWQAQ (32.8 mg/L) in late February and at site ETWQW (6.5 mg/L) in early March 2018.</li> <li>Other elevated concentrations were also recorded at sites ETWQJ (1.4 mg/L), ETWQN (0.61 mg/L), ETWQU (1.94 mg/L) and ETWQAU (2.86 mg/L).</li> <li>Higher concentrations of dissolved manganese have been recorded in the Eastern Tributary since mid-2016.</li> <li>From July 2018 to the end of the review period, the dissolved manganese concentrations returned to near historical levels at all sites.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Spikes were recorded in late February and early March 2018 at sites ETWQJ, ETWQW, ETWQAH and ETWQAQ following periods of no flow in these sections of the Eastern Tributary.</li> <li>The highest concentration recorded was 32.2 mg/L at ETWQAQ in February 2018.</li> <li>At all sites, concentrations returned to near historically recorded levels from June 2018 to the end of the review period.</li> </ul>

<sup>1</sup> Due to a combination of mining impacts and climatic conditions, water quality sampling sites on the Eastern Tributary (upstream of Pool ETAS) were irregularly flowing during the reporting period. Many sampling events included the sampling of non-flowing or stagnant pools, resulting in irregular water quality results. This is particularly evident in the results obtained during late February and early March 2018.

#### 6.2.4 Stream Water Quality

Surface water quality sampling has been conducted monthly in the Waratah Rivulet (sites WRWQ2, WRWQ6, WRWQ8, WRWQ9, WRWQM, WRWQN, WRWQP, WRWQR, WRWQT, WRWQW), Eastern Tributary (sites ETWQF, ETWQJ, ETWQN, ETWQU, ETWQW, ETWQAF, ETWQAH, ETWQAA, ETWQAU), Tributary B (site RTWQ1), Tributary D (site UTWQ1), Far Eastern Tributary (site FEWQ1), Honeysuckle Creek (site HCWQ1), Bee Creek (site BCWQ1) and Woronora River (WOWQ1 and WOWQ2) (Figure 8) in accordance with the Metropolitan Coal Longwalls 301-303 Water Management Plan.

In October 2016, Metropolitan Coal increased the frequency of water quality sampling at select sites on the Eastern Tributary (sites ETWQF, ETWQN, ETWQAF, ETWQAG, ETWQAH, ETWQAI, ETWQAK, ETWQAA and ETWQAU) and at site WOWQ2 on the Woronora Reservoir from monthly to weekly in response to the Eastern Tributary Incident. The weekly sampling continued throughout the reporting period.

Trends in the monitoring data to date for key parameters (pH, electrical conductivity [EC], dissolved iron, dissolved manganese and dissolved aluminium) are summarised in Table 8 and shown on Charts 29 to 53 (Appendices B1 and B2).

Water quality data has been analysed for key water quality parameters of relevance to water supply and the effects of subsidence, namely iron, manganese and aluminium at site WRWQ9 on Waratah Rivulet, site ETWQ AU on Eastern Tributary and at control site WOWQ2 on the Woronora River.

The performance indicator, *Changes in the quality of water entering Woronora Reservoir are not significantly different post-mining compared to pre-mining concentrations that are not also occurring at control site WOWQ2*, is considered to have been exceeded if data analysis indicates a significant change in the quality of water post-mining of Longwall 20. Specifically, if<sup>10</sup>:

- any water quality parameter exceeds the adjusted baseline mean plus two standard deviations for two consecutive months; or
- over a three month period the water quality parameter exceeds the adjusted mean plus two standard deviations in the first month, the adjusted mean plus one standard deviation in the next month and the adjusted mean plus two standard deviations in the third month; or
- the six month mean of the water quality parameter exceeds the adjusted baseline mean plus one standard deviation for two consecutive assessment periods (i.e. over two six monthly reports); and
- there was not a similar exceedance of the trigger at the control site.

##### **Assessment of Water Quality at Site WRWQ9**

There was no exceedance of the performance indicator as a result of the assessment methods for dissolved iron, dissolved aluminium or dissolved manganese at site WRWQ9 on the Waratah Rivulet during the reporting period. There were no exceedances of the same triggers at control site WOWQ2 on Woronora River (Appendices B1 and B2).

##### **Assessment of Water Quality at Site ETWQ AU**

There were no exceedances of the performance indicator as a result of the assessment methods for dissolved aluminium during the reporting period. There were exceedances of the performance indicator as a result of the assessment methods for dissolved iron and dissolved manganese during the reporting period (Appendices B1 and B2).

<sup>10</sup> Note each 'mean' is calculated as a geometric mean.

The dissolved iron concentrations exceeded the adjusted baseline mean plus two standard deviations at sampling site ETWQ AU in March, April, June, July, August, September, November and December 2018. This resulted in exceedances of the adjusted baseline mean plus two standard deviations for two consecutive months in April (March and April 2018), July (June and July), August (July and August), September (August and September) and December (November and December) (Chart 54).

Dissolved iron concentrations also exceeded the adjusted mean plus two standard deviations in one month, the adjusted mean plus one standard deviation in the second month and the adjusted mean plus two standard deviations in the third month in June (April, May and June), July (May, June and July), August (June, July and August) and September (July, August and September) (Chart 54).

There was also an exceedance of the adjusted baseline mean plus one standard deviation for two consecutive six month means for dissolved iron (Chart 55).

There were no exceedances of these triggers at control site WOWQ2 on the Woronora River (Appendices B1 and B2).

The dissolved manganese concentrations continued to exceed the adjusted baseline mean plus two standard deviations at sampling site ETWQ AU from January to December 2018 (Chart 56).

Dissolved manganese concentrations also exceeded the adjusted mean plus two standard deviations in the first month, the adjusted mean plus one standard deviation in the next month and the adjusted mean plus two standard deviations in the third month from January to December 2018 (Chart 56).

There was also an exceedance of the adjusted baseline mean plus one standard deviation for two consecutive six month means for dissolved manganese (Chart 57).

There were no exceedances of these triggers at control site WOWQ2 on the Woronora River (Appendices B1 and B2).


The cracking and dilation of bedrock and associated diversion of surface flow and leakage of water through rock bars at pools which has occurred on the Eastern Tributary, including at the location of the stream which was the subject of the exceedance of the Eastern Tributary watercourse performance measure (the Eastern Tributary Incident), has resulted in increases in dissolved manganese and iron.

As a result of the performance indicator exceedances for dissolved manganese and dissolved iron at site ETWQ AU on the Eastern Tributary, assessments were made against the subsidence impact performance measure, *Negligible reduction to the quality of water resources reaching the Woronora Reservoir*. The assessments were undertaken by Associate Professor Barry Noller (Appendix E2) and are provided in Appendices E2.

The manganese and iron concentrations reaching the Woronora Reservoir have been considered. Water quality monitoring results to date indicate there has been a negligible reduction in the quality of water resources reaching the Woronora Reservoir. The watercourse performance measure, *Negligible reduction to the quality of water resources reaching the Woronora Reservoir*, is not considered to have been exceeded (Appendices E2).

The environmental consequences of subsidence impacts on water quality were predicted by the Project EA, Preferred Project Report and Metropolitan Coal Water Management Plans to be similar to that previously observed at Metropolitan Coal, specifically, transient pulses of iron, manganese and aluminium, which would likely occur following fresh cracking of the stream bed.

Monitoring and analysis of water quality data will continue in accordance with the Longwalls 301-303 Water Management Plan. Metropolitan Coal is committed to the remediation of pools on the Eastern Tributary. It is anticipated that the stream remediation activities will reduce the transfer of iron and manganese from the groundwater to the Eastern Tributary.



**Chart 29 pH Levels Waratah Rivulet – Upper to Middle Reach Sites**




Chart 30 pH Levels Waratah Rivulet – Lower Reach Sites






Chart 31 EC Waratah Rivulet – Upper to Middle Reach Sites







**Chart 32 EC Waratah Rivulet – Lower Reach Sites**




**Chart 33 Dissolved Iron Waratah Rivulet – Upper and Middle Reach Sites**




**Chart 34 Dissolved Iron Waratah Rivulet – Lower Reach Sites**




**Chart 35 Dissolved Manganese Waratah Rivulet – Upper to Middle Reach Sites**




**Chart 36 Dissolved Manganese Waratah Rivulet – Lower Reach Sites**



**Chart 37 Dissolved Aluminium Waratah Rivulet – Upper to Middle Reach Sites**



**Chart 38 Dissolved Aluminium Waratah Rivulet – Lower Reach Sites**



**Chart 39 pH Levels Woronora River<sup>11</sup>**

<sup>11</sup> WOWQ1 was dry between 23/10/17 and 20/12/2018 and hence no water quality samples were collected.




Chart 40 EC Woronora River







Chart 40a EC Woronora River




**Chart 41 Dissolved Iron Woronora River**




**Chart 42 Dissolved Manganese Woronora River**




**Chart 43 Dissolved Aluminium Woronora River**



**Chart 44 pH Levels Tributary B, Tributary D, Far Eastern Tributary, Bee Creek and Honeysuckle Creek**




**Chart 45 EC Tributary B, Tributary D, Far Eastern Tributary, Bee Creek and Honeysuckle Creek**




**Chart 46 Dissolved Iron Tributary B, Tributary D, Far Eastern Tributary, Bee Creek and Honeysuckle Creek**







**Chart 47 Dissolved Manganese Tributary B, Tributary D, Far Eastern Tributary, Bee Creek and Honeysuckle Creek**




**Chart 48 Dissolved Aluminium Tributary B, Tributary D, Far Eastern Tributary, Bee Creek and Honeysuckle Creek**




**Chart 48a Dissolved Aluminium Tributary B, Tributary D, Far Eastern Tributary, Bee Creek and Honeysuckle Creek**



**Chart 49 pH Levels Eastern Tributary**



**Chart 50 EC Eastern Tributary**



**Chart 50a EC Eastern Tributary**




Chart 51 Dissolved Iron Eastern Tributary




Chart 51a Dissolved Iron Eastern Tributary




Chart 52 Dissolved Manganese Eastern Tributary




Chart 52a Dissolved Manganese Eastern Tributary




Chart 53 Dissolved Aluminium Eastern Tributary







Chart 53a Dissolved Aluminium Eastern Tributary




**Chart 54 Dissolved Iron Concentrations in Eastern Tributary at ETWQ AU**



**Chart 55 Six Month Means of Dissolved Iron Concentrations in Eastern Tributary at ETWQ AU**



**Chart 56 Dissolved Manganese Concentrations in Eastern Tributary at ETWQ AU**



**Chart 57 Six Month Means of Dissolved Manganese Concentrations in Eastern Tributary at ETWQ AU**



### 6.2.5 Woronora Reservoir Water Quality

Metropolitan Coal has sourced water quality data for the Woronora Reservoir from WaterNSW in accordance with a data exchange agreement. Results in relation to total iron, aluminium and manganese at levels from 0 m to 9 m below the reservoir surface for Woronora Reservoir throughout the period of record are presented in Charts 58 to 60.




Chart 58 Total Iron Concentration Woronora Reservoir





Chart 59 Total Aluminium Concentration Woronora Reservoir



**Chart 60 Total Manganese Concentration Woronora Reservoir**


Water quality data in the Woronora Reservoir is analysed annually and assessed against the following performance indicator:

*Changes in the quality of water in the Woronora Reservoir are not significantly different post-mining compared to pre-mining concentrations.*

The performance indicator is considered to have been exceeded if data analysis indicates a significant change in the quality of water post-mining, specifically if the current year's duration exceedance curve for a water quality parameter in Woronora Reservoir (total iron, total manganese and total aluminium) is above the baseline 20 year average recurrence interval (ARI) exceedance curve for any range of the duration percentages from 0% to 75%. The results of this assessment are shown on Chart 61, Chart 62 and Chart 63, respectively.

There were no exceedances of the Woronora Reservoir water quality performance indicator (the 20 year ARI exceedance curve) for total iron, total aluminium or total manganese during the review period (Charts 61, 62 and 63, respectively) (Appendix B2). There were also no exceedances of the 10 year ARI exceedance curve for total iron, total aluminium or total manganese (Charts 61, 62 and 63, respectively) (Appendix B2).

The Project EA, Preferred Project Report and Metropolitan Coal Water Management Plans predicted the Project would not impact on the performance of the Woronora Reservoir and would have a neutral effect on water quality. The water quality monitoring results are consistent with the predictions.



**Chart 61 Total Iron Performance Indicator Woronora Reservoir 2018**




Chart 62 Total Aluminium Performance Indicator Woronora Reservoir 2018




Chart 63 Total Manganese Performance Indicator Woronora Reservoir 2018

## 6.2.6 Swamp Groundwater Levels

Groundwater monitoring of upland swamps has involved the use, where practicable, of paired piezometers, one in the swamp substrate (at approximately 1 m depth) and one in the underlying sandstone (at a depth of approximately 10 m) (Figure 9). Data shows that water levels within the swamps over longwalls are typically perched above those of the local Hawkesbury Sandstone groundwater levels and indicates a separate control on swamp water levels. That is, the swamps are primarily surface water fed systems and generally water infiltrates downwards from the swamps to the groundwater.

Swamp substrate water levels are assessed against the following upland swamp groundwater performance indicator:

*Surface cracking within upland swamps resulting from mine subsidence is not expected to result in measurable changes to swamp groundwater levels when compared to control swamps or seasonal variations in water levels experienced by upland swamps prior to mining.*


### **Swamp Monitoring for Longwalls 20-27**

Paired piezometers have been monitored in Swamp 25 overlying Longwalls 20-22, Swamps 28, 30, 33 and 35 overlying Longwalls 23-27, and in control swamps 101, 137a, 137b and Bee Creek Swamp (Figure 9). At Swamp 20 (overlying Longwall 21) and at control swamp Woronora River Swamp 1, multiple piezometers have been monitored (i.e. one swamp substrate piezometer to a depth of approximately 1 m and two sandstone piezometers to depths of approximately 4 and 10 m) (Figure 9).


The upland swamp groundwater performance indicator has been exceeded at Swamp 20 since 2012. Swamp 20 substrate water levels changed from being permanently saturated to being periodically saturated as a result of the passing of Longwall 21 (Chart 64 and Appendices C1 and C2). There is a very strong correlation with rainfall trend at Swamp 20 and control swamp Woronora River Swamp 1 over the period of record. As the rate of decline in the two piezometers is similar from 2013, but different in 2012, it is considered that Longwall 21 caused a mining effect at Swamp 20, but the effects have not been exacerbated by Longwalls 22-27 or Longwalls 301-303 (Appendices C1 and C2). The water levels in both Swamp 20 and control swamp Woronora River Swamp 1 were at the base of the dataloggers for the entirety of the reporting period from July 2017 to November 2018. During December 2018 the substrate piezometers became saturated, following rainfall, but did not reach the two standard deviation limit (Chart 64 and Appendices C1 and C2).

A mining effect to the substrate water levels of Swamp 28 (overlying Longwall 24) was identified in 2016 based on the incomplete recovery of substrate water levels following rainfall events (Chart 65 and Appendices C1 and C2). Swamp 28 is considered to have an impact from mining of Longwall 25, although no effect on swamp substrate water levels occurred when Longwall 24 passed directly beneath the monitoring site (Appendices C1 and C2). The substrate piezometer at Swamp 28 returned to dry conditions from September 2017, remaining so until the end of this reporting period, as did the two control swamp piezometers (Swamps 137a and 137b; Chart 65).

Semi-quantitative comparisons of the swamp substrate water levels of Swamps 25, 30, 33 and 35 with control swamps and rainfall records do not show a definitive mining effect and the dry conditions are regarded as a natural response to reduced rainfall (Appendices C1 and C2).



**Chart 64 Comparison of Piezometer Responses at Swamp 20 and Woronora River 1 Control Swamp**



**Chart 65 Groundwater Hydrographs at Swamp 28 and Two Control Swamps (137a and 137b) Swamp Monitoring for Longwalls 301-303**

Paired piezometers (i.e. one swamp substrate piezometer and one sandstone piezometer) have also been monitored in Swamps 40, 41, 46, 51, 52 and 53 overlying Longwalls 301-303 (Figure 9). As indicated in Section 4.1, Longwall 301 extraction was completed in February 2018, Longwall 302 extraction commenced in March 2018 and Longwall 303 commenced in November 2018.

Swamps 40, 41, 46, 51, 52 and 53 sensor depths were re-measured in February 2018 and the water levels recorded prior to this period were adjusted. This has resulted in changes to the measured minimum water level recorded to 30 June 2017<sup>12</sup>. Sensors in Swamp 52 that were considered to have been providing unreliable data have been replaced<sup>13</sup>.

The swamp substrate hydrographs for Swamps 40, 41, 46, 51, 52 and 53 indicate that the correlation of swamp substrate with the rainfall trend is strong (Appendices C1 and C2). Data analysis for the reporting period indicates the seven day moving averages for Swamps 40, 46, 51 and 53 were at or above the swamp's minimum recorded in the baseline period (Appendices C1 and C2).

Data analysis for the reporting period indicates the seven day moving averages for Swamps 41 and 52 were below the swamp's minimum recorded in the baseline period from January to September 2018, and recovered from October to December 2018. Semi-quantitative comparisons with the control swamps and rainfall record indicates that dry swamp conditions are natural (Appendices C1 and C2).

The key potential subsidence impacts and environmental consequences on perched groundwater systems described in the Project EA, Preferred Project Report and Metropolitan Coal Water Management Plans and Biodiversity Management Plans, included:

- Any cracking of the bedrock within upland swamps is expected to be isolated and of a minor nature, due to the relatively low magnitudes of the predicted strains and the relatively high depths of cover.
- Surface cracking resulting from mine subsidence within the upland swamps is not expected to result in an increase in the vertical movement of water from the perched water table into the regional aquifer as the sandstone bedrock is massive in structure and permeability decreases with depth.
- It is expected that any surface cracking that may occur would be superficial in nature (i.e. would be relatively shallow) and would terminate within the unsaturated part of the low permeability sandstone. Any changes in swamp water levels as a result of cracking are expected to be immeasurable when compared to the scale of seasonal and even individual rainfall event based changes in swamp groundwater levels.
- Whilst swamp grades vary naturally, the predicted maximum mining-induced tilts are generally orders of magnitude lower than the existing natural grades within the swamps. The predicted tilts would not have any significant effect on the localised or overall gradient of the swamps or the flow of water. Any minor mining-induced tilting of the scale and nature predicted is not expected to significantly increase lateral surface water movements which are small in relation to the other components in the swamp water balance.

No change to the fundamental surface hydrological processes and upland swamp vegetation were expected within upland swamps.

---

<sup>12</sup> The Longwalls 301-303 Biodiversity Management Plan minimum levels will be updated to indicate the minimum water level recorded to 30 June 2017 was 230.38 mAHD for Swamp 40, 277.71 mAHD for Swamp 41 and 280.64 mAHD for Swamp 46, 273.18 mAHD for Swamp 51, 281.73 mAHD for Swamp 52 and 293.0 mAHD for Swamp 53 in the next revision of the management plan.

<sup>13</sup> Swamp 52 (1 m piezo) was replaced during the reporting period, on 28 August 2018. Swamp 46 piezometer is scheduled to be replaced during the new reporting period

In relation to impacts of the Project on upland swamps, the NSW Planning Assessment Commission (2009) concluded that the mining parameters were such that:

- for most swamps in the Project Area, there was low risk of negative environmental consequences; and
- that there was a very low risk that a significant number of swamps would suffer such consequences.

While the water lost from Swamp 20 and Swamp 28 was retained in the unsaturated sandstone above the regional water table, the changes in swamp water levels as a result of cracking are measurable when compared to seasonal individual rainfall event based changes in swamp groundwater levels. There is currently no sign that the vegetation in Swamp 20 is being impacted by the changed hydrological conditions, however, the vegetation monitoring results suggest that the changes in vegetation occurring in Swamp 28 have been significantly different to changes in the control swamps since autumn 2017 (refer Section 6.3.1).

## 6.2.7 Shallow Groundwater Levels

### *Shallow Groundwater Level Sites near Streams*

Continuous water level monitoring of shallow groundwater levels has been conducted at sites WRGW1, WRGW2 and WRGW7 along Waratah Rivulet and sites ETGW1<sup>14</sup> and ETGW2 on the Eastern Tributary (Figure 10).

At the time of passage of the Longwall 21 mining face past the piezometer sites WRGW1 and WRGW2 on the Waratah Rivulet (March 2012), the groundwater levels dropped by approximately 1 m (Chart 66). Since March 2012, groundwater levels recorded in WRGW1 and WRGW2 have fluctuated in response to seasonal rainfall variations with a seasonal (dry) minimum that is approximately 0.75 m below previous levels (Chart 66 and Appendices C1 and C2). From January to June 2018 the rainfall residual mass continued to decline and water levels in WRGW1 and WRGW2 spiked following rainfall in March 2018. From July 2018, the water level trend followed the rainfall residual mass trend, declining from July to September 2018 and increasing from October to December 2018. The water levels have not returned to pre-March 2012 levels.

Shallow groundwater levels at site WRGW7 remained correlated with rainfall trends and unaffected by mining during the reporting period<sup>15</sup>. (Chart 67; Appendices C1 and C2).

At the Eastern Tributary sites ETGW1 and ETGW2, shallow groundwater levels have previously followed the rainfall trends closely (Chart 68) and have continued to show a close correlation during the reporting period. The variations at these sites are unrelated to mining (Appendices C1 and C2). Although Woronora Reservoir water levels also respond to rainfall with a similar pattern, a groundwater hydraulic gradient is maintained towards the reservoir because the groundwater levels are 5-8 m higher than the dynamic reservoir levels (Appendices C1 and C2).

<sup>14</sup> Site ETGW1 was unable to be sampled from January to March 2017, and since August 2017.

<sup>15</sup> WRGW7 readings up to 15/11/2018.






Chart 66 Shallow Groundwater Hydrographs on Waratah Rivulet at WRG1 and WRG2





Chart 67 Shallow Groundwater Hydrographs on Waratah Rivulet at WRG7




**Chart 68 Shallow Groundwater Hydrographs on Eastern Tributary at ETGW1 and ETGW2**

**Shallow Groundwater Transect**

Continuous groundwater level monitoring has also been conducted at an approximately east-west transect of bores (sites T1, T2, T3, T4 and T5) located to the west of Longwalls 301-303 (Figure 10) in accordance with the Longwalls 301-303 Water Management Plan.

The measured water level transect for shallow bores T1-T5 are shown in Chart 69. The water levels measured on 15 December 2018 at T1, T2, T3 and T5 were slightly lower than previously recorded except at T5 (Appendices C1 and C2). The water level at bore T4 remains anomalous and unreliable as its head has always been higher than the head at upgradient site T5. This is considered unlikely to be a groundwater divide as it is not related to the topographic ridge well upgradient (Appendices C1 and C2).



**Chart 69 Measured T1-T5 Boreholes Transect**

Groundwater levels at bores T2, T3 and T5 are assessed against the following performance indicators for Longwalls 301-303:

*The water level at bore T2 is greater than 170.0 m AHD.*


*The water level at bore T3 is greater than 171.8 m AHD.*

*The hydraulic gradient from transect bore T5 to bore T3 is reduced by no more than 10% from that measured on 30 June 2017.*


The performance indicators are designed to provide an early warning for assessment of negligible leakage from the Woronora Reservoir. Leakage from the Woronora Reservoir to the surrounding groundwater environment would occur if there is a reversal of hydraulic gradient (i.e. when the water table in surrounding piezometers is below the water level in the Woronora Reservoir).

The performance indicator for the hydraulic gradient from bore T5 to bore T3 was not exceeded during the reporting period (Chart 70 and Appendices C1 and C2).


The performance indicator for bore T3 was exceeded in April 2018 (Chart 71) and the performance indicator for bore T2 was exceeded in July 2018 (Chart 72). The Woronora Reservoir water level has been displayed on Charts 56 and 57 to aid interpretation. An assessment against the subsidence impact performance measure, *Negligible leakage from the Woronora Reservoir*, was undertaken when the exceedance of the Level 3 Trigger and performance indicator was first identified for bore T3 in April 2018 (Appendix F1).



**Chart 70 Hydraulic Gradient Measured from Bore T5 to Bore T3**



**Chart 71 Groundwater Level at Bore T3**



**Chart 72 Groundwater Level at Bore T2**

Charts 71 and 72 indicate that the declining water levels in bores T2 and T3 are driven by a decline in the Woronora Reservoir water level due to climatic conditions and dam operations. HydroSimulations (Appendix F1) concluded that there has not been an exceedance of the performance measure for negligible leakage from the Woronora Reservoir.

Given the strong dependence of bore T2 and bore T3 water levels on the Woronora Reservoir water level, HydroSimulations considered there to be no merit in setting any absolute trigger levels at these sites (Appendix F1). HydroSimulations recommended the bore T2 and bore T3 trigger levels be either modified to take into consideration changes in the water level of the Woronora Reservoir or be removed in the next revision of the Metropolitan Coal Longwalls 301-303 Water Management Plan.

It was also considered likely by HydroSimulations that the water levels in bores T2 and T3 would continue to fall if the dry prevailing climatic conditions continued (Appendix F1). If monthly analyses of water levels in bores T2 and T3 indicate the water levels reflect a similar trend to the Woronora Reservoir water levels (i.e. they fall when water levels in the Woronora Reservoir fall) and the water levels in bores T2 and T3 remain above the Woronora Reservoir water level, there was considered to be no need to conduct further assessments against the performance measure, *Negligible leakage from the Woronora Reservoir* (Appendix F1).

The key potential subsidence impacts and environmental consequences on shallow groundwater systems and inflows to the Woronora Reservoir described in the Project EA, Preferred Project Report and Metropolitan Coal Water Management Plans included:

- Permanent mining-induced changes in the groundwater levels of shallow aquifers in connection with streams and ecosystems at Metropolitan Coal would not occur to any significant degree (i.e. the direction of shallow groundwater system flow [i.e. in the Hawkesbury Sandstone] has not been altered by mining).
- As there is an alternation of thick sandstone/claystone lithologies, there is a constrained zone in the overburden that remains rigid and acts as a bridge which isolates shallow and deep aquifers. At the substantial depths of cover of the Project, there would not be connective cracking from the mined seam to the surface.

- The depressurisation effects described below for the deep groundwater system would not propagate to the Hawkesbury Sandstone where the shallow groundwater system is located. As a result, no measurable impacts on registered bores in the wider Project area and surrounds would be expected.

Based on the analysis of the conceptual groundwater system, there would be negligible loss of groundwater yield to the Woronora Reservoir. This is reinforced by the groundwater modelling which indicates negligible reduction in cumulative average inflows to the Woronora Reservoir. In relation to the potential loss of catchment yield, the NSW Planning Assessment Commission (2009) was of the view that the risk of any significant loss is very low unless a major geological discontinuity is encountered during mining that provides a direct hydraulic connection between the surface and the mine workings.

The groundwater monitoring results are considered to be consistent with the potential subsidence impacts and environmental consequences described in the Project EA, Preferred Project Report and the Metropolitan Coal Water Management Plan.

### **6.2.8 Deep Groundwater Levels**

Immediately above a mined coal seam, rocks collapse into the void created by the removal of coal to form a caved zone and a fractured zone develops above the caved zone. This causes aquifer properties to change (e.g. permeability and porosity) and results in a higher vertical permeability as a result of mining.

A three-dimensional numerical model of groundwater flow was developed in 2008 for the Project EA. The groundwater model was recalibrated in December 2012 for the Preferred Project Layout by revising the hydraulic conductivities in the Hawkesbury Sandstone and the Bald Hill Claystone. At this time, two extra layers were added to the Hawkesbury Sandstone section to improve resolution of the vertical hydraulic gradient in the shallow groundwater system. The model simulations are based on initial conditions at the end of Longwall 14, consistent with the Project EA assessment (Heritage Computing, 2008). Model outputs have been examined every six months for review of environmental performance.

Transient calibration has been undertaken to incorporate Metropolitan Coal updates to the geological model. The revised model includes an update of the topographical surface and geological interfaces, the addition of two model layers below the Bulli seam and updated estimates of the fractured zone height. A report for the updated model has been prepared. The updated model has not been used for assessments in the Annual Review, however will be used for the assessment of future longwalls (i.e. for Longwall 304 on).

#### ***Time Series Head Variations and Vertical Head Differences***

Continuous groundwater level/pressure monitoring has been conducted at bores 9HGW0 (Longwall 10 Goaf Hole), 9EGW1B, 9FGW1A, 9GGW1-80, 9GGW2B, 9HGW1B, PM02, PM01 (9DGW1B), 9EGW2A, PM03, PHGW1B, PHGW2A, F6GW3A and F6GW4A (Figure 10) in accordance with the Metropolitan Coal Water Management Plan. The time-series head variations and vertical head differences for these bores have been examined (Appendices C1 and C2).

The monitoring sites closest to Longwalls 301-303 are bore F6GW4A (west of Longwall 303), bore F6GW3A (to the south of Longwall 301) and bore 9GGW2B (above 300-series mains and to the south-west of Longwall 303) (Figure 10 and Appendices C1 and C2).



New groundwater monitoring bores were installed in the third quarter of 2017 as a component of the Woronora Reservoir Impact Strategy including a goaf hole over Longwall 302 (302GW01). Metropolitan Coal installed five copper wire and four optical fibre piezometers in hole 302GW01 to monitor groundwater as longwall extraction progressed. Unfortunately, most of the sensor cables were severed by ground movement as Longwall 302 passed under the site (Appendices C1 and C2).

Metropolitan Coal also installed additional bores over Longwall 302 (TBS02-80, TBS02-250 and TBS02-15) and Longwall 303 (TBS03-230 and TBS03-15). The two deep holes each have vibrating wire piezometers installed 15 m above and below the Bald Hill Claystone (192 m and 243 m at TBS02-250; 162 m and 213 m at TBS03-230).

The time-series record for bore F6GW4 is shown on Chart 73. This bore is two panel widths from Longwall 301 and one panel width from Longwall 302. The respective mining faces came closest to the bore in late-September 2017 and late-May 2018, at which times distinct features are evident on all hydrographs. The passage of Longwall 301 caused mild responses, generally short-term increases in head, while the passage of Longwall 302 caused sharp cusp-like features on the Hawkesbury Sandstone hydrographs, sustained rises in the upper and mid Bulgo Sandstone, and strong declines in the three deepest piezometers (Appendices C1 and C2). From July to December 2018, the Bulli Seam piezometer (512 m) continued to depressurise, following the passage of Longwall 302, becoming depressurised and stabilising in October 2018. The approach and passage of Longwall 303 occurred in November and December 2018 respectively. The Scarborough Sandstone and Bulgo Sandstone sensors (201 m, 278 m, 362 m, 440 m) all displayed depressurisation beginning at this time. The two upper Hawkesbury Sandstone hydrographs displayed rises during November to December 2018. The rises in head are attributable to lateral and vertical compression (Appendices C1 and C2).

The time-series record for bore F6GW3A is shown on Chart 74. Bore F6GW3A is located adjacent to Longwall 301, approximately 150 m beyond its southern end, and approximately 800 m from Longwall 27. Significant depressurisation has occurred from historical workings to the east at approximately 500 m distance. The 450 m deep piezometer at the base of the Coal Cliff Sandstone displays significant depressurisation continuing from the mining of the first heading in the 300 mains in November 2013. The rise in pressure in the 380 m piezometer, noted originally in March 2018 as potentially related to compression from the adjacent Longwall 302 commencing, continued to September 2018 and appears to have stabilised from October to December 2018 (Appendices C1 and C2).




Chart 73 Time Variations in Potentiometric Heads at F6GW4A





Chart 74 Time Variations in Potentiometric Heads at F6GW3A



The time-series record for bore 9GGW2B is shown on Chart 75. As the hydrographs show inconsistent head variations with depth, some of the piezometers are unreliable. During the passage of Longwall 24 (>600 m away), minor drawdowns were observed in the Bulli Coal Seam and the Scarborough Sandstone, but other sensors exhibited no effect or a rise in head (Appendices C1 and C2). The passage of Longwall 25 (>400 m away) caused distinct drawdowns in the Scarborough Sandstone, Wombarra Claystone, Stanwell Park Claystone and upper Bulgo Sandstone. Characteristic arcuate segments between cusps associated with subsequent longwall crossings are evident in the Scarborough Sandstone, Wombarra Claystone and Stanwell Park Claystone, but not in the Bulli Coal Seam. The lower Bulgo Sandstone shows rising head arcuate segments for Longwall 26 and Longwall 27 crossings, due to compression at that level. Sympathetic drawdowns are also exhibited in the three Hawkesbury Sandstone piezometers at the times of the Longwall 26 and Longwall 27 crossings. The 138 m, 163 m, 304 m and 474 m deep vibrating wire piezometers have not recorded data since the end of 2016. The 340 m deep vibrating wire piezometer has not recorded data since June 2017. The mid and upper Hawkesbury Sandstone piezometers (55 m and 80 m) remained stable, and a very minor decline was observed in the lower Hawkesbury Sandstone piezometer (106 m) during the reporting period (Appendices C1 and C2).



**Chart 75 Time Variations in Potentiometric Heads at 9GGW2B**

### Assessment of Vertical Potentiometric Head Profiles

Vertical potentiometric head profiles at Bores 9GGW2B and F6GW3A are used to assess connective cracking between the surface and the mine in accordance with the Longwalls 301-303 Water Management Plan.

The vertical potentiometric head profiles have been assessed against the following performance indicators:

*Significant departure from the predicted envelope of the vertical potentiometric head profile at Bore 9GGW2B does not occur.*

*Significant departure from the predicted envelope of the vertical potentiometric head profile at Bore F6GW3A does not occur.*

The performance indicators were not exceeded during the reporting period because the measured potentiometric head profiles are consistent in shape and do not lie significantly to the left of the predicted high-inflow model curves (Appendices C1 and C2).

### **Assessment of Hydraulic Gradient to the Woronora Reservoir**

The groundwater head of Bores F6GW4A, PHGW2A, 9GGW2B, 9EGW2A and PM02 are compared to the full supply level of the Woronora Reservoir to assess reductions in hydraulic gradient from the bores to the Woronora Reservoir.

The results have been assessed against the following performance indicators:

*The hydraulic gradient to the Woronora Reservoir at full supply level from Bore F6GW4A is reduced by no more than 20% from that measured to 30 June 2017.*

*The hydraulic gradient to the Woronora Reservoir at full supply level from Bore PHGW2A is reduced by no more than 20% from that measured to 30 June 2017.*


*The hydraulic gradient to the Woronora Reservoir at full supply level from Bore 9GGW2B is reduced by no more than 40% from that measured to 30 June 2017.*

*The hydraulic gradient to the Woronora Reservoir at full supply level from Bore 9EGW2A is reduced by no more than 20% from that measured to 30 June 2017.*

*The hydraulic gradient to the Woronora Reservoir at full supply level from Bore PM02 is reduced by no more than 20% from that measured to 30 June 2017.*

The performance indicators for bores F6GW4A, PHGW2A, 9EGW2A and PM02 were not exceeded during the reporting period (Appendices C1 and C2).

An exceedance of the Longwalls 301-303 Water Management Plan (Version D) Level 3 trigger and performance indicator was identified for bore 9GGW2B in January 2018 and an assessment against the subsidence impact performance measure, *Negligible leakage from the Woronora Reservoir*, was undertaken by HydroSimulations in February 2018 and is provided in Appendix F2. The assessment concluded the performance measure had not been exceeded and recommended the trigger levels be revised in the next revision of the Longwalls 301-303 Water Management Plan (Version E). The revised performance indicator for bore 9GGW2B was not exceeded for the remainder of the reporting period (Chart 76 and Appendices C1 and C2).



**Chart 76 7-day Average mid Hawkesbury Sandstone Groundwater Levels at 9GGW2B since 1 January 2017**

The key potential subsidence impacts and environmental consequences on the deep groundwater system described in the Project EA, Preferred Project Report and Metropolitan Coal Water Management Plans, included:

- Based on experience at Metropolitan Coal, substantial depressurisation of the deep aquifers in the fractured zone above the goaf is restricted to a height of less than 130 m from the top of the goaf, while transient pressure effects have been observed to propagate to a height of about 300 m above the goaf. That is, there is a pronounced increase in vertical hydraulic gradient in the deep groundwater system over the Metropolitan Coal longwalls.
- Above goaf zones there would be substantial changes in fracture porosity and permeability, due to opening up of existing joints, new fractures and bed separation. Permeability increases would have accompanying reductions in lateral hydraulic gradients, with associated changes in groundwater levels and pressures. Pronounced changes in groundwater levels can occur without any significant drainage into a mine, particularly from the Narrabeen Group sandstones.
- Groundwater discharge to the mined seam would occur from above and below the seam in proportion to local permeabilities. The water make (i.e. groundwater inflow) is expected to be in the order of 0.1 megalitres per day (ML/day) for Longwalls 20-27 and from 0.045 to 0.6 ML/day for Longwalls 301-303. Modelling indicated that the inflow could be up to 0.5 ML/day from the deep groundwater system during the mining of Longwall 24 and up to 0.6 ML/day during the mining of Longwall 302.
- Due to the substantial depths of cover at the Project, there would not be connective cracking from the mined seam to the surface. Groundwater modelling for the Project indicates that there is expected to be eventual recovery of deep groundwater system pressures over many decades following the cessation of mining.

The NSW Planning Assessment Commission (2009) concluded that given the considerable depth of mining and the restricted panel width in the Project area, that, in the absence of geological structures such as faults and igneous intrusions (sills, dykes and diatremes), there is a very high probability that a constrained zone will be associated with the mine layout proposed over the Project area, thereby preventing direct hydraulic connections between mine workings and surface water bodies.

The groundwater monitoring results are considered to be consistent with the potential subsidence impacts and environmental consequences described in the Project EA, Preferred Project Report and Metropolitan Coal Water Management Plans.

### **6.2.9 Groundwater Quality**

Groundwater quality at sites WRGW1 to WRGW7<sup>16</sup> on Waratah Rivulet (Figure 11) is shown on Charts 77 to 79 for iron, manganese and pH, respectively.

Groundwater quality monitoring at sites WRGW1 to WRGW7 indicates dissolved iron concentrations are usually in the 1-10 mg/L range, with the exception of sites WRGW1 and WRGW2 which peaked at 14 mg/L in earlier years (2010-2011) (Chart 77). Dissolved iron concentrations have remained below 11 mg/L during reporting period (Chart 77, Appendices C1 and C2).

Dissolved manganese concentrations at the Waratah Rivulet sites have typically been less than 1 mg/L. Higher concentrations of manganese were reported for WRGW3 in June 2015 (3.36 mg/L), September 2015 (1.47 mg/L), March 2017 (1.31 mg/L) and April 2017 (1.65 mg/L) and for WRGW6 in April 2017 (1.77 mg/L) (Chart 78). During the reporting period, all sites remained below 1.2 mg/L. All sites recorded increases in manganese concentrations in March 2018 following rainfall (Chart 78, Appendices C1 and C2).

Dissolved aluminium concentrations have been low, and largely below the detection limit (Appendices C1 and C2).

pH at the Waratah Rivulet sites has been generally acidic and usually between pH 5.5 and 7. Occasional excursions in excess of pH 9 and less than pH 5 in prior reporting periods are unsustained outliers. pH at all sites remained within the historical range during the reporting period; except for one reading at WRGW2 of 5.15 in August 2018, however, the corresponding laboratory reading of that sample was 6.25 (Chart 79, Appendices C1 and C2).

---

<sup>16</sup> WRGW4 has been sheared and no longer sampled since 2011.




Chart 77 Iron Concentrations at WRGW1 to WRGW7 on Waratah Rivulet





Chart 78 Manganese Concentrations at WRGW1 to WRGW7 on Waratah Rivulet



**Chart 79 pH Levels at WRG1 to WRG7 on Waratah Rivulet**

Groundwater quality at Eastern Tributary sites ETGW1 and ETGW2 (Figures 10 and 11) is shown on Charts 80 to 82 for iron, manganese and pH, respectively. Bore ETGW1 was unable to be sampled for groundwater quality from January to March 2017 and since August 2017. Bore ETGW2 was also unable to be sampled from August to October 2018.

Groundwater quality monitoring on the Eastern Tributary (Figure 11) indicates high iron concentrations with an increasing trend, and larger variability than recorded in the period 2010–2015, persisted until July 2017 when the concentration decreased. Dissolved iron concentrations fluctuated throughout 2017, with the maximum concentration for the period of record (21.5 mg/L) recorded in June 2017 and the minimum concentration for the period of record (6.4 mg/L) recorded in September 2017 (Chart 80). Dissolved iron concentrations at site ETGW2 continued to display a variable trend during the reporting period (Chart 90).

Dissolved manganese concentrations remain below 1 mg/L, however, the values continue to be consistently higher than the historically recorded manganese concentrations (Chart 81) (Appendices C1 and C2). ETGW2 recorded its maximum concentration for the period of record (0.97 mg/L) in February 2017. A maximum concentration of 0.85 mg/L was recorded during the reporting period at site ETGW2.

The increasing trend in dissolved iron and manganese concentrations in the Eastern Tributary sites occurring since December 2015 appears to have peaked in June 2017 and then started to decline.

Aluminium was below 0.01 mg/L in all samples during the reporting period (Appendices C1 and C2).

The groundwater at the Eastern Tributary sites is generally acidic, ranging between pH 5.5 and pH 6.5 for most of the monitoring record (since 2010). At ETGW2, pH remained between pH 5.7 and pH 6.5 during the reporting period (Chart 82) (Appendices C1 and C2).

The Project EA, Preferred Project Report and Metropolitan Coal Water Management Plans predicted local surface water quality impacts as a result of enhanced groundwater-surface water interactions (as described for surface water quality above). The groundwater quality monitoring results are considered to be consistent with the predictions.






Chart 80 Iron Concentrations at ETGW1 and ETGW2





Chart 81 Manganese Concentrations at ETGW1 and ETGW2



**Chart 82 pH Levels at ETGW1 and ETGW2**

### 6.2.10 Inspections of Mine Workings

Mine inspections did not identify any abnormal water flows from the goaf, geological structure, or strata generally during the reporting period.

### 6.2.11 Mine Water Intake

Monitoring of the mine water balance comprises:

- Metered water reticulated into the mine (recorded continuously and downloaded monthly).
- Backfill water used to assist pumping into the mine (recorded continuously and downloaded monthly). Metered water reticulated out of the mine (recorded continuously and downloaded monthly).
- Manual measurement of moisture content into and out of the mine through the mine ventilation system using a digital psychrometer. The frequency of readings is as follows:
  - every hour over a 9 hour period on two occasions during a 12 month period;
  - daily (week day) except public holidays or other circumstances (access, fan maintenance, etc.) that prevent readings to be taken; and
  - once per week as a minimum.
- Measurement of the *in-situ* moisture content of the coal during channel sampling for coal quality.
- Measurement of the moisture content of run-of-mine (ROM) coal conveyed out of the mine at the drift portal using an automated moisture scanner. A fully automated data acquisition system records and stores the data.



The inferred water make (i.e. groundwater that has seeped into the mine from the strata) is calculated from the difference between total mine inflows (reticulated water into the mine, moisture in the downcast ventilation, and the *in-situ* coal moisture content) and total mine outflows (reticulated water out of the mine, moisture in the exhaust ventilation, and moisture in the ROM coal). Given the large fluctuations in daily water usage and the cycle period for water entering the mine, a 20 day average is used to provide a more reliable estimate of water make.

The 20 day average daily mine water make was less than 0.5 ML/day during the reporting period (Chart 83).




Chart 83 Estimated Daily Mine Water Make<sup>17</sup>

6.2.12 Woronora Reservoir Impact Strategy

Condition 2 of the Longwalls 301 and 302 approval requires Metropolitan Coal to conduct further investigation into potential impacts on Woronora Reservoir. Metropolitan Coal engaged independent experts to prepare a Woronora Reservoir Impact Strategy to provide a staged plan of action for further investigations and a report into the impacts of mining near the reservoir. Professor Bruce Hebblewhite (B. K. Hebblewhite Consulting), Dr Frans Kalf (Kalf and Associates Pty Ltd) and Emeritus Professor Thomas McMahon (University of Melbourne) were endorsed by the DP&E for the Woronora Reservoir Impact Strategy in May 2017.

The *Woronora Reservoir Strategy Report - Stage 1* was provided by the independent experts to the DP&E in September 2017. The Stage 1 report included recommendations for further groundwater and surface water investigations and monitoring and was approved by the Secretary for Planning in December 2017.

<sup>17</sup> The logger failed between 1 and 20 June 2018 (inclusive).

A number of groundwater monitoring bores and inclinometer monitoring points have been installed as a component of the Woronora Reservoir Impact Strategy. Two streamflow monitoring stations have also been installed in sub-catchments I and K to the west of Longwalls 301-303 and a pluviometer has been installed in the vicinity of the northern end of Longwall 307.

A preliminary water balance of Woronora Reservoir has been developed as a component of the Woronora Reservoir Impact Strategy. The Woronora Reservoir Impact Strategy is also considering the use of LiDAR, InSAR and bathymetric survey technologies for ongoing subsidence/geotechnical assessment. The outcomes will be reported in the Woronora Reservoir Strategy Report - Stage 2 report in the next reporting period.

### 6.3 BIODIVERSITY MANAGEMENT

The Metropolitan Coal Longwalls 301-303 Biodiversity Management Plan was prepared to manage the potential environmental consequences of the Longwalls 301-303 Extraction Plan on aquatic and terrestrial flora and fauna, with a specific focus on swamps, in accordance with Condition 6, Schedule 3 of the Project Approval.

During the reporting period, the Metropolitan Coal Longwalls 301-303 Biodiversity Management Plan was updated.

Sections 6.3.1 to 6.3.5 provide a summary of the biodiversity assessments for the reporting period. Section 6.8 provides a summary of the assessments against the biodiversity subsidence impact performance indicators and measures for the reporting period in Table 9.

#### 6.3.1 Upland Swamp Vegetation Monitoring

##### 6.3.1.1 Longwalls 20-22 and Longwalls 23-27

Upland swamp vegetation monitoring is conducted biannually (in autumn and spring) at a number of swamps overlying or adjacent to Longwalls 20-22 and Longwalls 23-27 and at a number of control swamps (Figure 9).

In autumn 2018, visual inspections were conducted in Swamps 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 24, 25, 28, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36 and 94 overlying or adjacent to Longwalls 20-27 and in control Swamps 101, 111a, 125, 135, 136, 137a, 137b, 138, Bee Creek Swamp, Woronora River 1, Woronora River south arm and Dahlia Swamp.

Transect/quadrat monitoring was conducted in Swamps 16, 17, 18, 20, 24 and 25 overlying or adjacent to Longwalls 20-22, in Swamps 28, 30, 33, 35 and 94 overlying or adjacent to Longwalls 23-27 and in control Swamps 101, 111a, 125, 135, 136, 137a, 137b, 138, Bee Creek Swamp, Woronora River 1, Woronora River south arm and Dahlia Swamp.


Indicator species monitoring for Longwalls 20-22 includes 20 tagged individuals of *Epacris obtusifolia* (in Swamps 18, 24, 25, 101, 111a and 125), *Sprengelia incarnata* (in Swamps 24, 101 and 125) and *Pultenaea aristata* (in Swamps 18, 24, 25, 101 and 111a). Three indicator species characteristic of the Tea Tree Thicket vegetation community, namely *Banksia robur*, *Callistemon citrinus* and *Leptospermum juniperinum* are monitored in Swamp 20 and at control Swamps Woronora River 1, Woronora River south arm and Dahlia Swamp.

Indicator species monitoring for Longwalls 23-27 includes 20 tagged individuals of *Epacris obtusifolia* (in Swamps 19, 30, 33, 35, 94, 101, 111a, 125, 135, 136, 137a, 137b and 138), *Pultenaea aristata* (in Swamps 19, 30, 33, 35, 94, 101, 111a, 135, 136, 137a and 138), *Sprengelia incarnata* (in Swamps 19, 33, 35, 94, 101, 125, 135, 136, 137a and 138) and *Banksia robur* and *Callistemon citrinus* in Swamp 28 and control Swamps Woronora River 1, Woronora River south arm and Dahlia Swamp.


The vegetation survey results for autumn 2018 have been assessed in accordance with the Longwalls 301-303 Biodiversity Management Plan. The results of the autumn 2018 survey in relation to the Biodiversity Management Plan Trigger Action Response Plan are summarised in Table 9 in Section 6.8. The results of the Longwalls 20-22 and Longwalls 23-27 upland swamp vegetation monitoring programs (up to and including the autumn 2018 survey) can be summarised as follows (Appendices G4 and G5):

- Visual inspections did not identify any cracking of exposed bedrock areas or swamp sediments in longwall swamps as a result of mine subsidence.
- Areas in which active erosion was observed were all minor and limited to fire trails, access tracks, drainage lines or as surface wash.
- Iron-stained groundwater seepage has been observed since spring 2012 on the terminal rocky step and/or the small rocky step of Swamp 20. Standing water was not observed in the single Tea Tree Thicket longwall site, Swamp 20, where it has been observed in previous seasons. In autumn 2018, iron staining continued to be reduced in area compared to previous seasons.
- The autumn 2018 survey was conducted following an extremely dry period from July 2017. During the survey period rainfall was well below average for all months but increased slightly during March 2018. These dry conditions have contributed to the absence of seepage observed within the swamps and the water stress frequently observed in the vegetation throughout the survey.
- Visual inspections of Restioid Heath/Banksia Thicket swamps identified that vegetation at both longwall and control sites was found to be in an overall decreased condition, with yellowing and senescence considered to be common and widespread, particularly in longwall swamps. The occurrence of stressed vegetation within both longwall and control swamps, and areas well beyond the current survey area, indicates the yellowing and dieback is likely attributable to environmental conditions, including the stress associated with drying out of shallow soils during below-average rainfall prior to and during the autumn 2018 survey period, and not related to mining of Longwalls 20-27.
- For the Tea Tree Thicket swamps, vegetation of both longwall and control swamps was found to be generally in good condition in autumn 2018. Some isolated dieback was recorded throughout most longwall and control swamps. Consistent with previous observations including the baseline monitoring period, dieback of *Empodisma minus* and *Gleichenia microphylla* in Swamp 28 appeared to be more common compared to control swamps, attributed to the dense mid-storey vegetation shading the understorey. Consistent with all prior surveys, no standing water was observed within Swamp 28.
  - Dieback of the understorey species *Empodisma minus* and *Gleichenia microphylla* was observed within the lower portion of longwall Swamp 28, similar to that observed in spring 2017. The dieback of these species within Swamp 28 has been previously observed, including within baseline monitoring periods, and was attributed to the dense mid-storey vegetation shading the understorey. *Banksia robur* and *Gleichenia microphylla* were observed with dieback within all Tea Tree Thicket Swamps (both longwall and control swamps) and was related to leaf herbivory and dieback of fronds respectively.
- No notable changes in vegetation structure, dominant species or estimated cover which could be attributed to impacts associated with the mining of Longwalls 20-27 were recorded within longwall or control swamps in autumn 2018.


- Fluctuations in species cover/abundance and condition have been recorded across all sites. No patterns of increasing or decreasing cover/abundance, or declines in vegetation condition, were identified in relation to individual species across sites or groups of species (i.e. swamp indicator species, generalist species, shrubs, ground covers) within sites.
- Species richness within individual Restioid Heath/Banksia Thicket swamps in autumn 2018 was within the range of previous seasons for all Longwall 20-22 swamps, with the exception of Swamp 25 (Chart 84). Species richness within individual Restioid Heath/Banksia Thicket swamps in autumn 2018 was below the range of previous seasons for most longwall and controls swamps in the Longwall 23-27 survey (Chart 85). Analysis of species richness within Restioid Heath/Banksia Thicket sites using analysis of variance (ANOVA) did not detect significant differences between longwall and control sites in any season including autumn 2018.
- Species richness within individual Tea Tree Thicket sites in autumn 2018 was within the range of previous seasons at all longwall sites and at all control sites, with the exception of one control site (Woronora River 1) (Chart 86).
- Monitoring of indicator species indicates the observed mortality at Restioid Heath/Banksia Thicket and Tea Tree Thicket swamps appears to be driven by natural factors including predation, competition with other vegetation and abiotic factors and not related to longwall mining.
- The upland swamp vegetation performance indicator, *vegetation in upland swamps is not expected to experience changes significantly different to changes in control swamps*, has not been exceeded for any of the monitored Restioid Heath/Banksia Thicket Swamps or Swamp 20 (Tea Tree Thicket vegetation). As reported in the Metropolitan Coal 2017 Annual Review, the vegetation performance indicator was exceeded at longwall Tea Tree Thicket Swamp 28 in autumn 2017 based on the continual decline in condition of both the understorey and species richness, and the high mortality rate of *Banksia robur* in comparison to the control sites. Assessments against the biodiversity subsidence impact performance measure, *negligible impact on the species, populations or ecological communities* have been completed and the performance measure has been met (Appendices H1 and H3).



**Chart 84 Native Species Richness in Longwalls 20-22 Upland Swamp Sites, Spring 2009 – Autumn 2018**



**Chart 85 Native Species Richness within Longwalls 23-27 Upland Swamp Sites Supporting Restioid Heath and Banksia Thicket, Spring 2010 – Autumn 2018**



**Chart 86 Native Species Richness within Longwalls 23-27 Upland Swamp Sites Supporting Tea Tree Thicket, Spring 2010 – Autumn 2018**

The spring 2017 Longwalls 20-22 and Longwalls 23-27 Vegetation Monitoring Reports prepared by Eco Logical Australia (Ecological) are provided in Appendices G1 and G2, respectively. The autumn 2018 Longwalls 20-22 and Longwalls 23-27 Vegetation Monitoring Reports prepared by Eco Logical are provided in Appendices G4 and G5, respectively.

### 6.3.1.2 Longwalls 301-303

The upland swamp vegetation monitoring program used for Longwalls 301-303 (visual, transect/quadrate and indicator species monitoring) is consistent with those used for the Longwalls 20-22 and Longwalls 23-27 upland swamp vegetation monitoring programs. Upland swamp vegetation monitoring is conducted biannually (in autumn and spring) at a number of swamps overlying or adjacent to Longwalls 301-303 and at a number of control swamps (Figure 9).

In autumn 2018, visual inspections were conducted in Swamps 38, 40, 41, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51/52, 53 and 58 and transect/quadrate monitoring was conducted in Swamps 40, 41, 46, 51/52 and 53 overlying or adjacent to Longwalls 301-303. Control Swamps 101, 111a, 125, 135, 136, 137a, 137b and 138, were selected for comparison with the swamps over Longwalls 301-303 and the same transect/quadrate monitoring methodology was used to survey each of these swamps in autumn 2018. Swamp 46 and Swamp 51/52 were subject to WaterNSW hazard reduction burns following the autumn 2017 baseline survey and prior to the spring 2017 survey.

Indicator species monitoring for Longwalls 301-303 previously included 20 tagged individuals of *Epacris obtusifolia* (in Swamps 40, 51/52, 53, 101, 136 and 137a) and *Sprengelia incarnata* (in Swamps 40, 51/52, 53, 101, 136 and 137b). However, subsequent to the autumn 2017 baseline survey and prior to the spring 2017 survey, Swamp 51/52 was subject to WaterNSW hazard reduction burns, resulting in the death of indicator species in Swamp 51/52. As a result, indicator species monitoring in Swamp 51/52 was removed from the monitoring program.

The vegetation survey results for autumn 2018 have been assessed in accordance with the Longwalls 301-303 Biodiversity Management Plan. The results of the autumn 2018 survey in relation to the Biodiversity Management Plan Trigger Action Response Plan are summarised in Table 9 in Section 6.8. The results of the Longwalls 301-303 upland swamp vegetation monitoring program (up to and including the autumn 2018 survey) can be summarised as follows:

- Visual inspections did not identify any cracking of exposed bedrock areas or swamp sediments in longwall swamps as a result of mine subsidence.
- Areas in which active erosion was observed were minor and limited to sheet/surface wash (Swamps 48, 51/52 and 111a) or along the drainage line of Swamp 125.
- The autumn 2018 survey was conducted following an extremely dry period from July 2017. During the survey period rainfall was well below average for all months but increased slightly during March 2018. These dry conditions have contributed to the absence of seepage observed within all longwall and control the swamps, except for Control Swamp 135 where minor seepage was observed.
- Vegetation at both longwall and control sites was found to be generally in good condition with no unusual areas of vegetation senescence observed. Some isolated dieback and senescence of individuals occurred throughout most longwall and control swamps.
- Species richness within individual valley side swamps in autumn 2018 was lower than the range recorded in previous seasons for most longwall and control swamps. The changes in species richness recorded in autumn 2018 are consistent with the fluctuations observed within the baseline monitoring period. All observed changes in species richness are considered to be within the range of natural fluctuations in response to weather, population dynamics, seasonality of survey and natural disturbances including grazing by fauna species.

- Fluctuations in species cover/abundance and condition were recorded across all sites throughout the baseline monitoring period. No patterns of increasing or decreasing cover/abundance, or declines in vegetation condition, were identified during the autumn 2018 monitoring in relation to individual species across sites or groups of species (i.e. swamp indicator species, generalist species, shrubs, ground covers) within sites.
- In autumn 2018 the proportion of upland swamp indicator species which were dead was greater at longwall sites than control sites for both indicator species, *Epacris obtusifolia* and *Sprengelia incarnata*. This trend has been observed within the baseline monitoring period. There have been considerable increases in the proportion of tagged individuals which were dead between spring 2017 and autumn 2018, particularly in longwall sites for *Epacris obtusifolia* (increased by factor of 4) and control sites for *Sprengelia incarnata* (increased by a factor of 6).
- The mean vegetation condition of tagged *Epacris obtusifolia* and *Sprengelia incarnata* was lower in autumn 2018 than the range observed for these species during the baseline or mining period for both longwall and control sites. The mean vegetation condition for both species was greater at control sites than longwall sites for both species in autumn 2018.
- The flowering status of tagged indicator species, as recorded in the mean reproductive status, shows that across all seasons flowering has been highly variable, particularly within control sites. The mean reproductive status of tagged indicator species has also been variable between longwall and control swamps in individual seasons.
- The upland swamp performance indicator '*The vegetation in upland swamps is not expected to experience changes significantly different to changes in control swamps*' has not been exceeded in autumn 2018.

The spring 2017 Longwalls 301-303 Vegetation Monitoring Report prepared by Eco Logical is provided in Appendix G3. The autumn 2018 Longwalls 301-303 Vegetation Monitoring Report prepared by Eco Logical is provided in Appendix G6.

### 6.3.2 Upland Swamp Groundwater Monitoring

Swamp substrate water levels are assessed against the following upland swamp groundwater performance indicator:

*Surface cracking within upland swamps resulting from mine subsidence is not expected to result in measurable changes to swamp groundwater levels when compared to control swamps or seasonal variations in water levels experienced by upland swamps prior to mining.*

As described in Section 6.2.6, semi-quantitative comparisons of the swamp substrate water levels of Swamps 25, 30, 33 and 35 with control swamps and rainfall records do not show a definitive mining effect and the dry conditions are regarded as a natural response to reduced rainfall (Appendices C1 and C2).

The swamp substrate hydrographs for Swamps 40, 41, 46, 51, 52 and 53 indicate that the correlation of swamp substrate with the rainfall trend is strong (Appendices C1 and C2). Data analysis for the reporting period indicates the seven day moving averages for Swamps 40, 46, 51 and 53 were at or above the swamp's minimum recorded in the baseline period (Appendices C1 and C2).

The upland swamp groundwater performance indicator has been exceeded at Swamp 20 since 2012. Swamp 20 substrate water levels changed from being permanently saturated to being periodically saturated as a result of the passing of Longwall 21 (Chart 64 and Appendices C1 and C2). The water levels in both Swamp 20 and control swamp Woronora River Swamp 1 were at the base of the dataloggers for the entirety of the reporting period from July 2017 to November 2018.

A mining effect to the substrate water levels of Swamp 28 (overlying Longwall 24) was identified in 2016 based on the incomplete recovery of substrate water levels following rainfall events (Chart 65 and Appendices C1 and C2). Swamp 28 is considered to have an impact from mining of Longwall 25, although no effect on swamp substrate water levels occurred when Longwall 24 passed directly beneath the monitoring site (Appendices C1 and C2). The substrate piezometer at Swamp 28 returned to dry conditions from September 2017, remaining so until the end of this reporting period, as did the two control swamp piezometers (Swamps 137a and 137b; Chart 65).

The subsidence impacts on the substrate water levels of Swamp 20 and Swamp 28 have triggered assessments against the biodiversity subsidence impact performance measure, *Negligible impact on threatened species, populations, or ecological communities*. The Swamp 20 and Swamp 28 threatened flora and fauna assessments by Eco Logical and Cenwest Environmental Services are provided in Appendices H1 and H2, respectively. The assessments conclude that the subsidence impact performance measure has been met.

### 6.3.3 Riparian Vegetation Monitoring

Riparian vegetation monitoring is conducted at a number of sites on the Waratah Rivulet and Eastern Tributary, overlying Longwalls 20-27 and downstream of Longwalls 20-27 (Figure 13).


The vegetation survey results for autumn 2018 have been assessed in accordance with the Longwalls 301-303 Biodiversity Management Plan. The results of the autumn 2018 survey in relation to the Biodiversity Management Plan Trigger Action Response Plan is summarised in Table 9 in Section 6.8. The results of the Longwalls 20-22 and Longwalls 23-27 riparian vegetation monitoring programs (up to and including the autumn 2018 survey) can be summarised as follows:

- Water levels across most riparian sites along both Waratah Rivulet and Eastern Tributary were observed to be low, similar to the previous spring 2017 survey, following the below-average rainfall that preceded the autumn 2018 surveys. Along the Eastern Tributary there was no water at MRIP06 and very low water levels at MRIP05 and only minor flow at MRIP09.
- Scouring of the stream bank and erosion of sediments was observed across all riparian monitoring sites in autumn 2018, attributed to high water flows following heavy rain events. The extent of bank scouring ranged from minor to severe and was often associated with sandy areas where vegetation was lost during high water flows.
- Vegetation at riparian monitoring sites MRIP01, MRIP03, MRIP04, MRIP07, MRIP08 and MRIP10 was generally observed in good condition. Exceptions to the generally good condition of vegetation within these riparian sites was limited to isolated and scattered individuals observed with dieback and flood impacts including prone vegetation and burial by flood debris.
- Riparian vegetation previously identified as having dieback as a result of mine subsidence at site MRIP05 was inspected and it was found that the extent of vegetation dieback had increased compared to that recorded in spring 2017 and continued to be greater than 50 cm from the stream. As a result the performance indicator *'impacts to riparian vegetation are expected to be localised and limited in extent, similar to the impacts previously experienced at Metropolitan Coal'* continues to be exceeded. Assessments against the biodiversity subsidence impact performance measure, *negligible impact on the species, populations or ecological communities* have been completed and the performance measure has been met (Appendices H2 and H3).
- In autumn 2018 a decrease in the cover of the lower-storey was observed at a number of sites including MRIP02, MRIP03, MRIP05 and MRIP06, with the largest decrease observed at MRIP02. This decrease is similar to cover previously recorded at these sites, most recently in autumn 2017. These trends and the fluctuations observed in other sites, are considered to reflect the natural variations in the height and cover/abundance of vegetation structural layers through time (including in response to flooding impacts).




- Species richness in autumn 2018 was generally similar to previous seasons with most values within the range of previous seasons for individual sites (Charts 87 and 88). The exception were two longwall sites, MRIP01 and MRIP11, where species richness was lower than the previously recorded ranges for these sites.
- In autumn 2018 the mean vegetation condition for tagged riparian indicator species was greater in longwall sites than controls site for *Prostanthera linearis*, whilst mean vegetation condition was greater within control sites than longwall sites for *Lomatia myricoides*, and mean vegetation condition of *Schoenus melanostachys* was the same for longwall and control sites.
- In autumn 2018 the mean reproductive status for tagged riparian indicator species was similar between longwall and control sites for *Lomatia myricoides*, *Prostanthera linearis* and *Schoenus melanostachys*.
- Two species of conservation significance were recorded at riparian vegetation monitoring sites in autumn 2018, namely *Hibbertia nitida* and *Lomandra fluviatilis*. *Hibbertia nitida* was commonly recorded with a healthy condition, similar to spring 2017 which represents an improvement in the overall condition of this species relative to previous monitoring periods. *Lomandra fluviatilis* was predominantly observed in good condition. This represents an increase in vegetation condition on previous years.
- Six introduced species were observed in autumn 2018, namely *Ageratina adenophora* (Crofton Weed) (MRIP04 and MRIP10), *Andropogon virginicus* (Whiskey grass) (MRIP01 and MRIP10), *Conyza* sp. (MRIP01, MRIP02 and MRIP10), *Facelis retusa* (Annual Trampweed) (MRIP04), *Gamochaeta* sp. (MRIP10), *Senecio madagascariensis* (Fireweed) (MRIP02, MRIP04, MRIP10 and MRIP12). Observations of these species within riparian monitoring sites were limited to isolated individuals.

The spring 2017 Longwalls 20-22 and Longwalls 23-27 Vegetation Monitoring Reports prepared by Eco Logical are provided in Appendix G (G1 and G2, respectively). The autumn 2018 Longwalls 20-22 and Longwalls 23-27 Vegetation Monitoring Reports prepared by Eco Logical are provided in Appendix G (G4 and G5, respectively).



**Chart 87 Native Species Richness within Riparian Monitoring Sites across All Seasons - Longwalls 20-22 Monitoring Program**



**Chart 88 Native Species Richness within Riparian Monitoring Sites across All Seasons-Longwalls 23-27 Monitoring Program**

### 6.3.4 Aquatic Biota and Their Habitats

The aquatic ecology monitoring programs for Longwalls 20-22 and Longwalls 23-27 were designed to monitor subsidence-induced impacts on aquatic ecology (referred to as stream monitoring) and the response of aquatic ecosystems to the implementation of potential future stream remediation works (referred to as pool monitoring). The locations of the monitoring sites are shown on Figure 14.

The Longwalls 301-303 Biodiversity Management Plan includes post-mining monitoring and management of potential subsidence impacts and environmental consequences associated with Longwalls 20-22 and Longwalls 23-27. No additional aquatic ecology monitoring sites have been established for Longwalls 301-303.

Multivariate and univariate statistical procedures (Permutational Multivariate Analyses of Variance [PERMANOVA] and Plymouth Routines in Multivariate Ecological research [PRIMER] software packages) are used to examine temporal and spatial patterns in macroinvertebrates and macrophytes sampled within the study area. Specifically, PERMANOVA's are used to test hypotheses related to differential changes (e.g. before-vs-after commencement of mining) in multivariate and univariate (e.g. total number of taxa, total abundance and abundances of the most important taxonomic groups identified from the samples) estimates occurring in streams or pools subject to mining (i.e. potential 'impact' streams) in comparison to independent streams or pools that are not subject to mine subsidence (i.e. control places).

The spring 2017 Longwalls 20-22 and Longwalls 23-27 Aquatic Ecology Monitoring Reports prepared by Bio-Analysis Pty Ltd are provided in Appendix I (I1 and I2, respectively). The autumn 2018 Longwalls 20-22 and Longwalls 23-27 Aquatic Ecology Monitoring Reports prepared by Bio-Analysis Pty Ltd are provided in Appendix I (I3 and I4, respectively).

The results of the Longwalls 20-22 and Longwalls 23-27 aquatic ecology programs (up to and including the autumn 2018 survey) are summarised below.

### 6.3.4.1 Stream Monitoring Program

#### **Eastern Tributary**

In autumn 2018, pool water levels at Locations C1, C2, C3 and C4 on the Eastern Tributary<sup>18</sup> were generally observed to be below pre-mining levels and some sites were dry or had no surface flow as a result of mining impacts. Iron staining/flocculent continued to be observed in submerged areas of the stream channel along the Eastern Tributary.

Multivariate and univariate analyses of the monitoring data were used to test whether there was evidence of significant change in aquatic macroinvertebrate and macrophyte indicators at Eastern Tributary locations before to after mining of Longwall 20 (mining commenced in May 2010) and Longwall 23 (mining commenced in May 2014), in relation to Control locations.

To date, no significant changes to aquatic macroinvertebrate or macrophyte indicators have been detected at Location C1 in relation to the mining of Longwalls 20-22. At Location C1, analyses for Longwalls 23-27 detected a significant before to after mining change in the structure of the aquatic macroinvertebrate assemblage in spring 2016, but not for subsequent surveys, including autumn 2018. Mean numbers of the mayfly family, Leptophlebiidae, have varied significantly within the Longwalls 23-27 after-mining period (since autumn 2015), with considerable spikes (increases) in abundance at C1 within the after-mining period. Analyses for Longwalls 23-27 detected a significant change in the structure of assemblages of macrophytes at Location C1 in autumn 2018, in relation to the control locations.

No significant before to after mining change in assemblages of aquatic macroinvertebrates or aquatic macrophytes have been detected at Location C2 in relation to mining of Longwalls 20-22. A significant decrease in mean numbers of the freshwater shrimp family, Atyidae, was detected at Location C2 within the after-mining period in spring 2015, in relation to the control locations, but not for subsequent surveys. Analyses for Longwalls 23-27 at Location C2 have detected a significant decrease in mean numbers of Atyidae within the after-mining period since autumn 2016. The structure of the macrophyte assemblage at Location C2 appears to have changed significantly within the after-period for Longwalls 23-27 although changes prior to the spring 2017 survey did not appear to be related to mining activities. There have been no measurable changes in diversity or cover of aquatic plants along the study reach at Location C2.

No significant change in aquatic macroinvertebrate or aquatic macrophyte indicators sampled at Location C3 before to after mining of Longwalls 20-22 have been detected.

For the first time since sampling commenced, analyses detected decreased diversity of macroinvertebrates at Location C4 in autumn 2018, in relation to the control locations. Diversity appears to have increased significantly between periods at the control locations but not at C4. Significantly fewer Atyidae were recorded at Location C4 within the after-period in autumn 2016, but not subsequently. No significant changes to aquatic macrophyte indicators have been detected at Location C4.

#### **Waratah Rivulet**

Multivariate analyses comparing temporal changes in components of the aquatic macroinvertebrate and macrophyte assemblages at locations sampled along the Waratah Rivulet (Locations WT3, WT4 and WT5) with control locations have not detected significant changes from before to after-mining of the Longwalls 20-22 underground mining area.

<sup>18</sup> The Eastern Tributary is also known as Tributary C. Locations ET1 to ET4 shown on Figure 14 are the same as Locations C1 to C4 discussed in this section of the Annual Review, and in Appendices I1 and I2.

Univariate analyses detected a change in mean diversity of macroinvertebrates at Location WT3 within the after-period in spring 2016, and during the autumn 2018 survey. Differences appeared to be related to diversity decreasing at Location WT3 between periods whilst there was a small increase at the control locations.

There were no detectable impacts to aquatic macrophytes at the Waratah Rivulet locations in relation to the control locations that could be associated with mining.

### ***Tributary B - Locations B1 and B2***

A considerable drop in water level was noted in a large pool at Location B1 in spring 2012. Since autumn 2013, pools along the study reach have been mostly dry and there has been no surface flow as a result of mine subsidence. Quantitative sampling of aquatic macroinvertebrates has not been carried out at Location B1 on Tributary B in spring 2013 or since spring 2014 due to insufficient habitat available for sampling.

Past analyses examining patterns of change in the assemblage of aquatic macroinvertebrates and key components at Location B1 on Tributary B in relation to control locations found evidence of impacts related to mining activities within the Longwalls 20-22 underground mining area. Analyses indicate that the assemblage of macrophytes at Location B1 have experienced a degree of environmental stress since spring 2012 as a result of mining activities within the Longwalls 20-22 underground mining area.

Since spring 2016, subsidence associated with extraction of Longwalls 23-27 appears to have impacted aquatic indicators at Location B2. These impacts include evidence of a reduction in availability and quality of aquatic habitat and significant changes in numbers of Leptophlebiidae and Atyidae. To date, no changes to aquatic macrophyte indicators have been evident.

As described in the Metropolitan Coal 2017 Annual Review, the aquatic ecology subsidence impact performance indicator, *aquatic macroinvertebrate and macrophyte assemblages in streams are not expected to experience long-term impacts as a result of mine subsidence*, has been exceeded at Location B1 and Location B2 on Tributary B for aquatic macroinvertebrates since the spring 2016 survey and assessments have been made against the performance measure. Given the distance from Longwalls 301-303, Tributary B is not expected to experience any measurable subsidence or valley related movements resulting from the extraction of Longwalls 301-303.

In accordance with the Longwalls 301-303 Biodiversity Management Plan, sites B1 and B2 are no longer subject to assessment against performance indicators or measures using the Trigger Action Response Plans. Monitoring of sites B1 and B2 will be conducted biannually up to and including spring 2018, and thereafter every three years in autumn and spring (i.e. next surveys to be conducted in autumn 2021 and spring 2021) consistent with the revised monitoring schedule for Location B1 for previous Longwalls 18-19A.

#### ***6.3.4.2 Pool Monitoring Program***

### ***Pools on Eastern Tributary***

Large Pool ETAH and small pools ETAG, ETAI and ETAK on the Eastern Tributary were dry at the time of the spring 2017 and autumn 2018 surveys and there was no surface flow for a considerable distance upstream or downstream of the pools.

Metropolitan Coal will conduct stream remediation of pools on the Eastern Tributary in accordance with the Metropolitan Coal Water Management Plan and Rehabilitation Management Plan.

### ***Pools on Waratah Rivulet***

Pool water levels in the Waratah Rivulet pools were similar to before-mining levels in autumn 2018.

Multivariate analyses comparing temporal and spatial patterns of change in assemblages of aquatic macroinvertebrates or macrophytes in large pools (J, M1 and N) and small pools (K, L and M) sampled on the Waratah Rivulet have not detected significant changes in relation to the control pools.

Univariate analyses determined that patterns of change in mean diversity of macroinvertebrates have differed significantly in Pools J (from autumn 2015 to autumn 2017) and M1 (from autumn 2015 to autumn 2018) in relation to the control pools. Patterns of change in mean abundance of macroinvertebrates and in mean numbers of Atyidae and Leptophlebiidae in the Waratah Rivulet pools have not differed significantly between the before to after periods in relation to the control pools.

Mean cover of macrophytes decreased significantly at Pool M1 within the after-period (since autumn 2016) but not at the control pools. Diversity of macrophytes at Pool M1 has become significantly more variable within the after-mining period (since autumn 2016) in relation to the control pools.

No significant changes to aquatic macroinvertebrate indicators have been detected for comparisons between Pool N and the control pools within the after-period. Diversity of macrophytes however, has decreased significantly at Pool N within the after-period (since autumn 2016). Aquatic plants and some trees growing immediately adjacent to Pool N appeared desiccated.

#### ***6.3.4.3 Assessment of Subsidence Impacts and Environmental Consequences on Aquatic Habitats and Biodiversity***

The key potential subsidence impacts and environmental consequences for streams described in the Project EA, Preferred Project Report and Metropolitan Coal Biodiversity Management Plan are described in Section 6.3. Potential environmental consequences include impacts on aquatic habitats (e.g. alteration of hydrology, pool habitat, in-stream connectivity and water quality), and on biodiversity (e.g. aquatic macrophytes, macroinvertebrates, fish and riparian vegetation). In summary, the key potential environmental consequences described in the Project EA, Preferred Project Report, and Metropolitan Coal Biodiversity Management Plan include:

- Changes in stream flows as a result of fracturing of bedrock and the consequent diversion of a portion of the total stream flow as underflow. The effects of underflow would be most noticeable during periods of low flow and on the frequency of no flow, while the effects on the frequency and magnitude of high flows would be negligible.
- Changes in pool water levels and in-stream connectivity - underflow has been observed to result in lower water levels in pools as they become hydraulically connected with the fracture network. During prolonged dry periods when flows recede to low levels, the number of instances where loss of flow continuity between pools occurs increases with a greater proportion of these lower flows being conveyed entirely in the subsurface fracture network.
- Impacts on water quality following cracking of the stream bed that can reduce the quality of habitat for aquatic biota (e.g. generation of iron flocculent material).
- Minor stream bank erosion, where changes in channel gradients result in increases in flow energy.
- Impacts on aquatic macrophytes plants (e.g. as a result of changes in hydrology described above) resulting in exposure and desiccation or smothering of plants by iron flocculent material. Aquatic macrophytes have evolved reproductive strategies to cope with the variable nature of flow in streams and wetlands within Australia. Obligate water plants generally require permanent water, however they can recolonise once water becomes available again.

- Localised impacts on aquatic macroinvertebrates as a result of changes in aquatic habitat/hydrology described above. The Project is unlikely to have any significant long-term impacts on assemblages of macroinvertebrates.
- The conveyance of surface water flows to sub-surface fractures in the area affected by subsidence has the potential to reduce available habitat for fish and connectivity among sections of the stream channel, impeding fish passage.

The results of aquatic ecology monitoring are considered to be consistent with the potential subsidence impacts and environmental consequences described in the Project EA, Preferred Project Report and the Metropolitan Coal Water Management Plans and Biodiversity Management Plans.

However, subsidence impacts on Tributary B have resulted in no surface flow along the stream in the vicinity of Location B1 for an extended period of time. This change in aquatic habitat/hydrology has resulted in long term impacts to the aquatic macroinvertebrate assemblage at this location (location B1) and downstream at location B2. This has not resulted in an exceedance of the biodiversity subsidence impact performance measure, *Negligible impact on threatened species, populations or ecological communities* (Appendices H3 and H4).

### 6.3.5 Amphibian Surveys

Monitoring programs have been developed for Longwalls 20-22, Longwalls 23-27 and Longwalls 301-303 to monitor amphibian species, with a focus on the habitats of the Giant Burrowing Frog (*Heleioporus australiacus*) and Red-crowned Toadlet (*Pseudophryne australis*) associated with tributaries. The locations of the monitoring sites are shown on Figure 15.

Sites are surveyed annually in spring/summer (i.e. October to February) during suitable weather conditions. The 2017 spring/summer survey was carried out in two separate surveys, over ten days and ten nights in February and March 2018. The first survey period was delayed due to the exceptionally dry weather leading up to and after December 2017.

#### 6.3.5.1 Longwalls 20-22 Amphibian Monitoring

The Spring/Summer 2017 Longwalls 20-22 Amphibian Monitoring Report prepared by Cenwest Environmental Services is provided in Appendix J1.

The spring/summer 2017 survey is the ninth amphibian survey for Longwalls 20-22. At the time of the spring/summer 2017 survey six test sites above Longwalls 20-22 had been undermined for periods ranging from four to six years. Habitats of five test sites (1, 2, 4, 5 and 6) have been adversely impacted by longwall mining.

Seven amphibian species were recorded by the spring/summer 2017 survey, including six in test sites and three in control sites, being representatives from the two families Myobatrachidae and Hylidae. The most species diverse site in the spring/summer 2017 survey with six species was test site 6, while test site 1 recorded four species and control site 10 recorded three species (Figure 15). The Red-crowned Toadlet was located at three test sites (sites 1, 3 and 6), but was not recorded at any control sites. The Giant Burrowing Frog was not recorded during the spring/summer 2017 survey. Individuals of the Giant Burrowing Frog have only been recorded during the 2009 (1 control site), 2011 (1 test site, 1 control site) and 2016 (1 control site) surveys. Littlejohn's Tree Frog (*Litoria littlejohni*) was recorded for the first time for Longwalls 20-22, during the spring/summer 2017 survey at control site 10.

Five breeding events (three species) were recorded by the spring/summer 2017 survey in both test and control sites. No breeding events were recorded for the Red-crowned Toadlet, Giant Burrowing Frog or Littlejohn's Tree Frog.

Since the commencement of the Longwalls 20-22 amphibian monitoring program, species diversity across all sites has varied between five (2013) and 11 (2009). At test sites, species diversity has varied between 4-9 species and at control sites, between 2-9 species.

#### 6.3.5.2 Longwalls 23-27 Amphibian Monitoring

The Spring/Summer 2017 Longwalls 23-27 Amphibian Monitoring Report prepared by Cenwest Environmental Services is provided in Appendix J2.

The spring/summer 2017 survey is the eighth amphibian survey for Longwalls 23-27. All test sites above Longwalls 23-27 had been undermined prior to the commencement of the 2016 spring/summer survey. Habitats of two sites (13 and 14) have been adversely impacted by longwall mining. However, both sites 13 and 14 have usually demonstrated the highest amphibian species diversity of the ten survey sites over eight survey years, with the exception of 2016 and 2017, with 2017 being an exceptionally dry year.

Three amphibian species were recorded by the spring/summer 2017 survey, including two in test sites (13 and 14) and two in control sites (18 and 20), also being representatives from the two families Myobatrachidae and Hylidae. The most widespread frog was the Common Eastern Froglet (*Crinia signifera*), recorded at test sites 12 and 14, and control sites 18 and 20. The Giant Burrowing Frog and Red-crowned Toadlet were not located during the survey. Littlejohn's Tree Frog was recorded for the first time for Longwalls 23-27, during the spring/summer 2017 survey at control site 18.

Only two species (Common Eastern Froglet and Southern Rocket Frog [*Litoria freycineti*]), were found breeding in the spring/summer 2017 survey, both at test site 14, however these were only minor breeding events. No breeding events were recorded for the Red-crowned Toadlet, Giant Burrowing Frog or Littlejohn's Tree Frog.

Since the commencement of the Longwalls 23-27 amphibian monitoring program, species diversity across all sites has varied between three (2017) and eight (2010). At test sites, species diversity has varied between 2-7 species and at control sites, between 2-6 species.

#### 6.3.5.3 Longwalls 301-303 Amphibian Monitoring

Baseline amphibian surveys have been conducted in spring/summer 2015 and spring/summer 2016 at six test sites (23, 24, 25, 26, 27 and 28) overlying Longwalls 301-303 (Figure 15). The control sites for Longwalls 301-303 consist of the eleven existing sites associated with Longwalls 20-22 and Longwalls 23-27. The spring/summer 2017 survey was the first survey conducted since the commencement of Longwalls 301-303.

The Spring/Summer 2017 Longwalls 301-303 Amphibian Monitoring Report prepared by Cenwest Environmental Services is provided in Appendix J3.

At the time of the spring/summer 2017 survey, two test sites had been undermined by Longwall 301, namely sites 27 and 28. No longwall test sites were adversely impacted by mining at the time of the spring/summer 2017 survey.

In the spring/summer 2017 survey, two amphibian species were recorded at test sites, namely the Common Eastern Froglet (sites 24, 25, 26 and 27) and Littlejohn's Tree Frog (site 24). Littlejohn's Tree Frog was also recorded at site 24 during the spring/summer 2016 survey. No evidence of breeding was observed for any species in the spring/summer 2017 survey.

Following the results of the spring/summer 2016 survey, Metropolitan Coal commissioned a targeted survey for the Littlejohn's Tree Frog to be carried out in August or September 2017 when adult calling was likely to be at its peak under wet conditions to determine the status of the species within the Project area. However, the dry weather conditions experienced in August and September 2017 did not provide suitable weather conditions for the conduct of the targeted survey.

A one-off survey targeting the Littlejohn's Tree Frog was carried out in October and November 2018. The accumulative surveys, whilst confined to the area of the Metropolitan Coal footprint and surrounds on the Woronora Plateau, suggests that the species is likely to be more widespread than previously thought, has a patchy distribution and is found in very low numbers (Appendix H4). A further targeted survey for the Littlejohn's Tree Frog will be carried out in 2019, following heavy rainfall, subject to Metropolitan Coal obtaining access permission to relevant survey areas from WaterNSW.

#### 6.3.5.4 *Statistical Analysis of Amphibian Monitoring Results*

A feature of the amphibian surveys to date is the high numbers of zero records that dominate the data, indicating a non-normal distribution (i.e. a skewed distribution of data). This means that the results of the amphibian surveys cannot be analysed by simple parametric statistics such as Chi<sup>2</sup> or an analysis of variance (ANOVA). A Poisson regression<sup>19</sup> analysis has been carried out by Dr Bernard Ellem for Cenwest Environmental Services to analyse the amphibian survey results obtained to date (i.e. to spring/summer 2017). The three data sets (Longwalls 20-22, 23-27 and 301-303) have been analysed together to increase the resolution of the analyses.

No adverse impact from mining has been detected for the amphibian assemblage at the 95% confidence level for Longwalls 20-22 and Longwalls 301-303.

However, analyses undertaken following the Longwalls 23-27 spring/summer 2017 survey detected a significant difference between the test and control sites at the 95% confidence level at sites 15, 16 and 17 for the spring/summer 2014 survey. The impact was not detected by the Poisson Regression analyses conducted following the 2014, 2015 and 2016 surveys and may be a result of the improved capacity of the model over time as the data set builds. However, an ongoing impact could not be detected in the three subsequent years – 2015, 2016 and 2017.

The monitoring results are consistent with the predictions described in the Project EA, Preferred Project Report, and Metropolitan Coal Longwalls 20-22, Longwalls 23-27 and Longwalls 301-303 Biodiversity Management Plans, specifically, that it is unlikely that any vertebrate population would be put at risk by the Project.

## **6.4 LAND MANAGEMENT**

The Metropolitan Coal Longwalls 301-303 Land Management Plans were prepared to manage the potential environmental consequences of the Metropolitan Coal Longwalls 301-303 Extraction Plan on cliffs, overhangs, steep slopes and land in general, in accordance with Condition 6, Schedule 3 of the Project Approval.

The Longwalls 301-303 Land Management Plan includes post-mining monitoring and management of potential subsidence impacts and environmental consequences associated with Longwalls 20-22 and Longwalls 23-27. During the review period the Longwalls 301-303 Land Management Plan Trigger Action Response Plan was updated.

---

<sup>19</sup> Poisson regression is a generalized linear model form of regression analysis used to model count data and contingency tables.



Sections 6.4.1 and 6.4.2 provide a summary of the land assessments for the review period. Section 6.8 provides a summary of the assessments against the cliffs and overhangs, steep slopes and land in general subsidence impact performance indicators and measures for the reporting period.

#### **6.4.1 Cliffs and Overhangs<sup>20</sup>**

Visual inspections of cliffs and overhangs were conducted monthly when mining of Longwalls 20-22 and/or Longwalls 23-27 was within 400 m of sites COH1, COH2, COH3, COH4, COH5, COH6, COH6A, COH7, COH8, COH9, COH10, COH14, COH15 and COH16 (Figure 16) and following the completion of each longwall to record evidence of subsidence impacts. A vertical tension crack (approximately 50 mm wide and 15 m long) on the cliff face and a small rock fall (approximately 1.5 m long, 0.5 m wide and 0.5 m<sup>3</sup>) were recorded at site COH2 (Figure 16) in December 2013 during the mining of Longwall 22. No additional subsidence impacts at the cliff or overhang sites were recorded following the completion of Longwall 27.

The Project EA, Preferred Project Report and Metropolitan Coal Longwalls 301-303 Land Management Plan predicted that the length of potential cliff instabilities would be expected to be less than 3% of the lengths of the cliffs. The total length of cliffs and associated overhangs within the Project underground mining area is approximately 772 m. The total length of cliffs and associated overhangs within the mining area to experience cliff instability (i.e. the exposure of a fresh face of rock and debris scattered around the base of the cliff or overhang) is to be less than 23 m. Less than 3% of the total length of cliffs (and associated overhangs) within the mining area have experienced mining-induced rock fall.

#### **6.4.2 Steep Slopes and Land in General**

Visual inspections for subsidence impacts on steep slopes and land in general are conducted by Metropolitan Coal and its contractors as part of routine works conducted in the catchment.

No subsidence impacts on steep slopes or land in general were identified by Metropolitan Coal or its contractors during the reporting period. No management measures were required to be implemented.

The recorded subsidence impacts are consistent with the potential subsidence impacts described in the Project EA, Preferred Project Report Longwalls 301-303 Land Management Plan, specifically that the size and extent of surface cracking at the steep slopes and land in general would be similar to that observed previously at Metropolitan Coal, and that the maximum predicted systematic strains would be of sufficient magnitude to result in the fracturing of sandstone and, hence, there is potential for rock falls, particularly where rock ledges are marginally stable.

### **6.5 HERITAGE MANAGEMENT**

The Metropolitan Coal Longwalls 20-22, Longwalls 23-27 and Longwalls 301-303 Heritage Management Plans were prepared to manage the potential environmental consequences of the Metropolitan Coal Longwalls 301-303 Extraction Plan on Aboriginal heritage sites or values in accordance with Condition 6, Schedule 3 of the Project Approval.

The Longwalls 301-303 Heritage Management Plan includes post-mining monitoring and management of potential subsidence impacts and environmental consequences associated with Longwalls 20-22 and Longwalls 23-27. During the review period the Longwalls 301-303 Heritage Management Plan was updated.

<sup>20</sup> A new cliff and overhang site (COH17) was identified below the full supply level on the Eastern Tributary arm of the Woronora Reservoir subsequent to the reporting period in August 2018 (Figure 16). Detailed baseline recording for this site has been conducted and will be included in the LW304 Extraction Plan.

Sections 6.5.1 and 6.5.2 provides a summary of the heritage assessments for the review period. Section 6.8 provides a summary of the assessments against the Aboriginal heritage sites subsidence impact performance indicators and measures.

### **6.5.1 Longwalls 20-22 and Longwalls 23-27**

Aboriginal heritage monitoring programs have been implemented at Metropolitan Coal for Longwalls 20-22 and Longwalls 23-27 to monitor the impacts and environmental consequences of Project related subsidence on Aboriginal heritage sites. The monitoring programs have been undertaken by a suitably qualified archaeologist (with experience in rock art recording and management) and representatives of the Aboriginal stakeholders.

As reported in the Metropolitan Coal 2017 Annual Review, following the conduct of the Longwalls 23-27 Round 5 Aboriginal heritage survey (following the completion of Longwall 27), of the 52 Aboriginal heritage sites that have been subject to monitoring for Longwalls 20-22 and Longwalls 23-27, 12 have been determined to have changes due to mining induced subsidence.

Five Aboriginal heritage sites (FRC 15, FRC 281, FRC 283, FRC 284 and MET 1) have been determined to have changes due to mining induced subsidence from Longwalls 20-22 (Figure 17). The observed impacts at each site were as follows:

- Site FRC 15 – vertical cracking, not coincident with any art.
- Site FRC 281 – multiple cracks running either through or adjacent to the motifs (although the majority of art showed no damage or changes).
- Site FRC 283 – cracking of the rear wall of the shelter, not coincident with any art.
- Site FRC 284 – fracturing of the rear wall of the shelter and exfoliation, not coincident with any art.
- Site MET 1 – two vertical cracks along the rear wall and ceiling of the shelter, not coincident with any art.

Seven Aboriginal heritage sites (FRC 28, FRC 29, FRC 34, FRC 60, FRC 176, FRC 275 and FRC 301) have been determined to have changes due to mining induced subsidence from Longwalls 23-27 (Figure 17). The observed impacts at each site were as follows:

- Site FRC 28 – vertical cracking of the rear shelter wall, opening of horizontal planes/joints and movement of the rock shelf that is part of the shelter floor, not coincident with any art.
- Site FRC 29 – horizontal crack along the back wall and a joining vertical crack, not coincident with any art.
- Site FRC 34 – horizontal cracking along the roof of the shelter and cracking over the most southern hand stencil on the back panel.
- Site FRC 60 – three vertical cracks along the back wall of the shelter, no art recorded at this shelter, the artefacts could not be relocated.
- Site FRC 176 – where vertical cracking along the northern and southern ends of the shelter was observed, not coincident with art.
- Site FRC 275 – opening of horizontal bedding plane at rear of the shelter, five vertical hairline cracks along the back wall of the shelter, not coincident with any art.
- Site FRC 301 – surface cracking on the rock platform, not coincident with the grinding grooves.

Aboriginal heritage site monitoring results for Longwalls 20-27 have been assessed against the Aboriginal heritage subsidence impact performance measure:

*Less than 10% of Aboriginal heritage sites within the mining area are affected by subsidence impacts.*

For the purpose of measuring performance against the Aboriginal heritage subsidence impact performance measure, sites are considered to be “affected by subsidence impacts” if they exhibit one or more of the following consequences that cannot be attributed to natural weathering or deterioration:

- overhang collapse;
- cracking of sandstone that coincides with Aboriginal art or grinding grooves; and
- rock fall that damages Aboriginal art.

The mining area is defined by the Project Approval and is shown on Figure 1 of this report (labelled as Project Underground Mining Area Longwalls 20-27 and 301-317). There are 143 Aboriginal heritage sites within the mining area.

Of the sites at which changes due to mining induced subsidence have occurred, sites FRC 34 and FRC 281 have been affected by subsidence impacts as a result of cracking of sandstone that coincides with Aboriginal art. This means that less than 2% of sites within the mining area have been affected by subsidence impacts. In addition to the changes recorded as a result of mining induced subsidence, natural weathering processes can also result in changes/deterioration of Aboriginal heritage sites.

Metropolitan Coal acknowledges that all Aboriginal heritage sites are considered to be culturally significant to the Aboriginal people who have a traditional connection to Country.

The Aboriginal heritage monitoring results are consistent with the potential subsidence impacts and environmental consequences described in the Project EA, Preferred Project Report and Metropolitan Coal Longwalls 20-22, Longwalls 23-27 and Longwalls 301-303 Heritage Management Plans, including the potential for open sites and overhang sites to be impacted by the cracking of sandstone resulting from mine subsidence. The observed rate of subsidence effects at the time of the Project EA and Preferred Project Report was that up to 10% of sites experience an effect such as cracking, accelerated weathering or blockfall. It was expected that the majority of identified Aboriginal heritage sites would experience no significant change, particularly when compared to natural deteriorating processes unrelated to mining.

### **6.5.2 Longwalls 301-303**

In accordance with the Metropolitan Coal Longwalls 301-303 Heritage Management Plan, the next round of Aboriginal heritage surveys is to be undertaken within three months of the completion of Longwall 303.

Monitoring will be conducted of the Longwalls 20-27 Aboriginal heritage sites at which previous monitoring indicates continued change due to mining induced subsidence. The Aboriginal heritage sites that show continued change by the Round 5 monitoring survey are sites MET 1 and FRC 176. Sites FRC 28, FRC 29, FRC 34 and FRC 60 were observed to have shown change for the first time during the Round 5 survey (Figure 17). These sites will be monitored within three months of the completion of Longwall 303.

Monitoring will also be conducted of Aboriginal heritage site FRC 76 (sandstone overhang with art only) and site FRC 117 (sandstone overhang with art and potential archaeological deposit [PAD]) for Longwalls 301-303 within three months of the completion of Longwall 303 (Figure 17).

## 6.6 BUILT FEATURES MANAGEMENT

The Metropolitan Coal Longwalls 20-22, Longwalls 23-27 and Longwalls 301-303 Built Features Management Plans were prepared to manage the potential environmental consequences of the Metropolitan Coal Longwalls 301-303 Extraction Plan on built features in accordance with Condition 6, Schedule 3 of the Project Approval.

During the review period Metropolitan Coal upgraded subsidence monitoring to certain infrastructure in consultation with the infrastructure owner, including:

- Axicom – additional tower leg and ground monitoring by fixed prisms to both communication towers.
- Roads and Maritime Services – incorporated real time Global Positioning Systems (GPS) monitoring into BFMP after recognising the effectiveness of real time GPS monitoring on adjacent transmission line.
- Sydney Trains – structural analysis of radio tower, peer reviewed by Sydney Trains to confirm design drawings. Installation of additional radio tower leg prism and ground monitoring points in collaboration with structural assessment. Installation of four additional real time GPS units along railway to confirm no far field movement around Cawley's Creek and Wilsons Creek crossings.
- Sydney Water – in conjunction with Sydney Water a trial has been established to determine the effectiveness of real time acoustic monitoring of a pipeline. 14 acoustic monitors with telemetry have been installed. Traditional routine inspections continue as per Built Features Management Plan.
- Wollongong City Council – installation of six GPS real time units to expand trial of this monitoring system to roadways and monitoring of Longwall 303 extraction in 2019.

Metropolitan Coal has also implemented subsidence works for public safety, as per agreement with South Eastern Sydney Local Health District (SESLHD), including erection of temporary fencing around derelict cottages B04a-B09a, water tank B14t02, Kiln F01b and communication towers adjacent to SESLHD Garrawarra Centre property to exclude public access to these areas during nearby mining.

During the review period the following non-survey monitoring occurred:

- M1 Motorway – inspection and audit of pavement condition, cutting risk ranking, bridge audits and culvert condition inspection.
- Waterfall General (Garrawarra) Cemetery – post mining condition audit of grave sites completed with no noted change other than natural items.
- Optic Fibre Cables – Telstra and Nextgen Optical Time Domain Reflectometer routine cable analysis completed.
- Water pipeline – visual inspections of pipeline route for moisture when LW face in proximity to pipe.
- Princes Highway – weekly visual inspections of pavement, culverts and road furniture nearby longwall operations.
- Railway – railway culverts post mining structural and condition inspection.
- Garrawarra – Post Longwall extraction condition inspection of Garrawarra Facilities to confirm negligible damage criteria.

Monitoring of infrastructure owned by Axicom, Endeavour Energy, Nextgen, TransGrid, Optus, Telstra, Roads and Maritime Services, SESLHD, Sydney Trains, Sydney Water and Wollongong City Council was conducted during the review period for subsidence impacts. No subsidence impact to any built feature was evident over the review period.

The Project Approval requires Metropolitan Coal not to exceed the following built features subsidence impact performance measure:

*Safe, serviceable and repairable, unless the owner and the MSB agree otherwise in writing.*

The built features subsidence impact performance measure was not exceeded during the review period.

The Project Approval also requires Metropolitan Coal not to exceed the subsidence impact performance measure for items of heritage or historical significance at the Garrawarra Centre:

*Negligible damage (fine or hairline cracks that do not require repair), unless the owner of the item and the appropriate heritage authority agree otherwise in writing.*

The heritage subsidence impact performance measure for the Garrawarra Centre was not exceeded during the review period.

## **6.7 PUBLIC SAFETY MANAGEMENT**

The Metropolitan Coal Longwalls 301-303 Public Safety Management Plan was prepared to manage the potential consequences of the Metropolitan Coal Longwalls 301-303 Extraction Plan on public safety within the underground mining areas in accordance with Condition 6, Schedule 3 of the Project Approval.

Monitoring of cliffs and overhangs, steep slopes and land in general has been conducted for subsidence impacts in accordance with the Metropolitan Coal Longwalls 301-303 Land Management Plan. Monitoring of infrastructure items has been conducted in accordance with the Metropolitan Coal Built Features Management Plans. No subsidence impacts were identified during the reporting period that were considered to pose a risk to public safety.

Further, no subsidence safety incidents were reported by visitors, personnel or contractors to Metropolitan Coal in the underground mining area during the reporting period.

## **6.8 ASSESSMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PERFORMANCE**

The subsidence impact performance indicators and performance measures in Table 9 were developed to address the predictions of subsidence impacts and environmental consequences on water resources, watercourses, biodiversity, land, heritage, built features and public safety included in the Project Environmental Assessment, Preferred Project Report, Metropolitan Coal Longwalls 301-303 Extraction Plan.

Assessments against the subsidence impact performance indicators and performance measures have been conducted for the reporting period in Table 9.

**Table 9**  
**Assessment of Environmental Performance – Underground Mining Area and Surrounds**

Performance Measure	Performance Indicator	Monitoring Site(s) being Assessed	Parameters	Highest Significance Level/Trigger Recorded	Comments	Subsidence Impact Indicator Exceeded?	Subsidence Impact Measure Exceeded?	
<b>WATER MANAGEMENT</b>								
<b>Negligible Reduction to the Quantity of Water Resources Reaching the Woronora Reservoir</b>								
<b>Negligible reduction to the quantity of water resources reaching the Woronora Reservoir</b>	<i>Changes in the quantity of water entering Woronora Reservoir are not significantly different post-mining compared to pre-mining, that are not also occurring in the control catchment(s)</i>	WaterNSW gauging station on Waratah Rivulet (GS 2132102)	Surface water flow	Level 1	The median of the ratios does not fall below the 35 <sup>th</sup> percentile of the baseline data.	-	No	No
				Level 2	The median of the ratios falls below the 35 <sup>th</sup> percentile but does not fall below the 20 <sup>th</sup> percentile of the baseline data.	From July to September 2018, the sliding 12 month median of the ratio fell below the 35 <sup>th</sup> percentile of the baseline data but did not fall below the 20 <sup>th</sup> percentile of the baseline data.	No	No
				Level 3	The median of the ratios falls below the 20 <sup>th</sup> percentile of the baseline data.	Between September and December 2018 the sliding 12 month median of the ratio fell below the 20 <sup>th</sup> percentile of the baseline data.	Yes <sup>1</sup>	No <sup>1</sup>
<b>Negligible Reduction to the Quality of Water Resources Reaching the Woronora Reservoir</b>								
<b>Negligible reduction to the quality of water resources reaching the Woronora Reservoir</b>	<i>Changes in the quality of water entering Woronora Reservoir are not significantly different post-mining compared to pre-mining concentrations that are not also occurring at control site WOWQ2</i>	Site WRWQ9 on the Waratah Rivulet	Iron (Fe) Manganese (Mn) Aluminium (Al) [Field filtered]	Level 1	Data analysis indicates no water quality parameter exceeds the adjusted baseline mean plus two standard deviations.	Dissolved iron, aluminium and manganese were at Level 1 throughout the reporting period.	No	No
				Level 1	Data analysis indicates no water quality parameter exceeds the adjusted baseline mean plus two standard deviations.	Dissolved aluminium was at Level 1 throughout the reporting period. Dissolved iron was at Level 1 in January, February, May and October 2018.	No	No
		Site ETWQ AU on the Eastern Tributary	Iron (Fe) Manganese (Mn) Aluminium (Al) [Field filtered]	Level 2	Data analysis indicates any water quality parameter exceeds the adjusted baseline mean plus two standard deviations for one month.	Dissolved iron was at Level 2 in March and November 2018.	No	No
				Level 3	Data analysis indicates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>any water quality parameter exceeds the adjusted baseline mean plus two standard deviations for two consecutive months; or</li> <li>over a three month period the water quality parameter exceeds the adjusted mean plus two standard deviations in the first month, the adjusted mean plus one standard deviation in the next month and the adjusted mean plus two standard deviations in the third month; or</li> <li>the six month mean exceeds the adjusted baseline mean plus one standard deviation for two consecutive assessment periods (i.e. over two six monthly reports); and</li> <li>there was not a similar exceedance of the trigger at the control site.</li> </ul>	Dissolved iron was at Level 3 in April, June, July, August, September and December 2018. Dissolved manganese was at Level 3 throughout the reporting period. Assessment required against performance measure.	Yes	No Assessments conducted by Associate Professor Barry Noller (Appendix E2)

**Table 9 (Continued)**  
**Assessment of Environmental Performance – Underground Mining Area and Surrounds**

Performance Measure	Performance Indicator	Monitoring Site(s) being Assessed	Parameters	Highest Significance Level/Trigger Recorded	Comments	Subsidence Impact Performance Indicator Exceeded?	Subsidence Impact Performance Measure Exceeded?	
<b>WATER MANAGEMENT (Continued)</b>								
<b>No Connective Cracking Between the Surface and the Mine and Negligible Leakage from Woronora Reservoir</b>								
<b>No connective cracking between the surface and the mine</b>	<i>Visual inspection does not identify abnormal water flow from the goaf, geological structure, or the strata generally</i>	Underground	Inspections of development workings for water accumulation	Level 1	Normal water flow identified from the goaf, geological structure, or the strata generally.	-	No	No
	<i>The 20-day average mine water make does not exceed 1 ML/day</i>	Underground	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Metered water reticulated into the mine (mine inflow)</li> <li>Metered water reticulated out of the mine (mine outflow)</li> <li>Moisture content into and out of the mine through the mine ventilation system (mine inflow and outflow)</li> <li><i>In-situ</i> moisture content of the coal (mine inflow)</li> <li>Moisture content of ROM coal conveyed out of the mine at the drift portal (mine outflow)</li> </ul>	Level 1	20-day average mine water make is less than or equal to 0.5 ML/day.	-	No	No
<b>No connective cracking between the surface and the mine</b>	<i>Significant departure from the predicted envelope of the vertical potentiometric head profile at Bore 9GGW2B does not occur</i>	Bore 9GGW2B	Groundwater pressures/levels	Level 2	9GGW2B Head Profile is consistent with the shape of, and does not lie significantly to the left of the predicted High Inflow Model Curve.	-	No	No
	<i>Significant departure from the predicted envelope of the vertical potentiometric head profile at Bore F6GW3A does not occur</i>	Bore F6GW3A	Groundwater pressures/levels	Level 2	F6GW3A Head Profile is consistent with the shape of, and does not lie significantly to the left of the predicted High Inflow Model Curve.	-	No	No
<b>No connective cracking between the surface and the mine</b> <b>Negligible leakage from the Woronora Reservoir</b>	<i>The hydraulic gradient to the Woronora Reservoir at full supply level from Bore F6GW4A is reduced by no more than 20% from that measured to 30 June 2017</i>	Bore F6GW4A (90.0 m)	Groundwater pressures/levels	Level 2	F6GW4A < 199.92 m AHD and > 193.71 m AHD.	-	No	No
	<i>The hydraulic gradient to the Woronora Reservoir at full supply level from Bore PHGW2A is reduced by no more than 20% from that measured to 30 June 2017</i>	Bore PHGW2A (97.5 m)	Groundwater pressures/levels	Level 1	PHGW2A ≥ 186.92 m AHD.	-	No	No
<b>Negligible leakage from the Woronora Reservoir</b>	<i>The hydraulic gradient to the Woronora Reservoir at full supply level from Bore 9GGW2B is reduced by no more than 20% from that measured in December 2016</i>	Bore 9GGW2B (80.3 m)	Groundwater pressures/levels	Level 3	9GGW2B ≤ 180.2 m AHD	Exceedance of the Longwalls 301-303 Water Management Plan (Version D) Level 3 trigger and performance indicator in January 2018.	Yes	No Assessment conducted by HydroSimulations in February 2018 (Appendix F2)
	<i>The hydraulic gradient to the Woronora Reservoir at full supply level from Bore 9GGW2B is reduced by no more than 40% from that measured to 30 June 2017</i>	Bore 9GGW2B (80.3 m)	Groundwater pressures/levels	Level 2	9GGW2B < 181.38 m AHD and > 176.38 m AHD.	Longwalls 301-303 Water Management Plan (Versions E and F) revised performance indicator and Level 3 trigger.	No	No
	<i>The hydraulic gradient to the Woronora Reservoir at full supply level from Bore 9EGW2A is reduced by no more than 20% from that measured to 30 June 2017</i>	Bore 9EGW2A (107.5 m)	Groundwater pressures/levels	Level 2	9EGW2A < 186.32 m AHD and > 182.83 m AHD.	-	No	No
	<i>The hydraulic gradient to the Woronora Reservoir at full supply level from Bore PM02 is reduced by no more than 20% from that measured to 30 June 2017</i>	Bore PM02 (100 m)	Groundwater pressures/levels	Level 1	PM02 ≥ 183.86 m AHD.	-	No	No

**Table 9 (Continued)**  
**Assessment of Environmental Performance – Underground Mining Area and Surrounds**

Performance Measure	Performance Indicator	Monitoring Site(s) being Assessed	Parameters	Highest Significance Level/Trigger Recorded	Comments	Subsidence Impact Performance Indicator Exceeded?	Subsidence Impact Performance Measure Exceeded?	
<b>WATER MANAGEMENT (Continued)</b>								
<b>No Connective Cracking Between the Surface and the Mine and Negligible Leakage from Woronora Reservoir (Continued)</b>								
Negligible leakage from the Woronora Reservoir	The water level at bore T2 is greater than 170.0 m	Bore T2	Groundwater levels	Level 3	T2 ≤ 170.0 m AHD.	The water level at Bore T2 first dropped below 170.0 m AHD in July 2018. Assessment required against performance measure.	Yes	No Assessment undertaken by HydroSimulations (Appendix F1). Trigger levels for bores T2 and T3 to be modified or removed in the next revision of the Metropolitan Coal Water Management Plan.
	The water level at bore T3 is greater than 171.8 m	Bore T3	Groundwater levels	Level 3	T3 ≤ 171.8 m AHD.	The water level at Bore T3 first dropped below 171.8 m AHD in April 2018. Assessment required against performance measure.	Yes	
	The hydraulic gradient from transect bore T5 to bore T3 is reduced by no more than 10% from that measured on 30 June 2017	Bores T3 and T5	Groundwater levels	Level 2	T5-T3 < 17.92 m and > 16.13 m.	This performance indicator was at Level 2 from June 2017 to April 2018, but returned to Level 1 from April 2018 until the end of the review period.	No	
<b>Negligible Reduction to the Quality of Water Resources in the Woronora Reservoir</b>								
Negligible reduction in the water quality of Woronora Reservoir	Changes in the quality of water in the Woronora Reservoir are not significantly different post-mining compared to pre-mining concentrations	Woronora Reservoir (site DW01) (subject to data availability from WaterNSW)	Total Iron (Fe) Total Manganese (Mn) Total Aluminium (Al)	Level 1	The current year's duration exceedance curve for a water quality parameter in Woronora Reservoir (total iron, total manganese and total aluminium) is below the baseline 10 year ARI exceedance curve for any range of the duration percentages from 0% to 75%.	Total iron, total manganese and total aluminium were at Level 1 throughout the reporting period.	No	No
<b>Negligible Environmental Consequences on Waratah Rivulet</b>								
Negligible environmental consequences (that is, no diversion of flows, no change in the natural drainage behaviour of pools, minimal iron staining, and minimal gas releases) on the Waratah Rivulet between the full supply level of the Woronora Reservoir and the maingate of Longwall 23 (upstream of Pool P)	<b>No Diversion of Flows, No Change in the Natural Drainage Behaviour</b>							
	No change to the natural drainage behaviour of Pools P, Q, R, S, T, U, V and W	Pools P to W on Waratah Rivulet	Streambed cracking and drainage behaviour (visual observations)	Level 1	No mine-induced surface cracking or impacts to natural drainage behaviour observed.	-	No	No
	Analysis of water level data for Pools P, T, U, V and W indicates the water level is at or above the pool's previous minimum	Pools P, T, U, V and W on Waratah Rivulet	Pool water level	Level 1	The water level in Pools P, T, U, V or W has not been below the pool's previous minimum.	Pools P, U, V and W were at Level 1 throughout the reporting period. Pool T was at Level 1 from March to December 2018.	No	No
				Level 2	The water level in Pools P, T, U, V or W has been below the pool's previous minimum, however, is considered to be due to an error type.			
	Analysis of water level data for Pools Q, R and S indicates the water levels are above that required to maintain water over the downstream rock bar	Pools Q, R and S on the Waratah Rivulet	Pool water level	Level 1	The water level in Pools Q, R or S has been above that required to maintain water over the downstream rock bar.	Pools Q and R were at Level 1 throughout the reporting period. Pool S was at Level 1 from February to December 2018.	No	No
Level 2				The water level in Pools Q, R or S has been below that required to maintain water over the downstream rock bar, however, appears to be due to an error type.	Pool S was at Level 2 in January 2018.			



**Table 9 (Continued)**  
**Assessment of Environmental Performance – Underground Mining Area and Surrounds**

Performance Measure	Performance Indicator	Monitoring Site(s) being Assessed	Parameters	Highest Significance Level/Trigger Recorded	Comments	Subsidence Impact Performance Indicator Exceeded?	Subsidence Impact Performance Measure Exceeded?	
<b>WATER MANAGEMENT (Continued)</b>								
<b>Negligible Environmental Consequences on Waratah Rivulet</b>								
<b>Negligible environmental consequences (that is, no diversion of flows, no change in the natural drainage behaviour of pools, minimal iron staining, and minimal gas releases) on the Waratah Rivulet between the full supply level of the Woronora Reservoir and the maingate of Longwall 23 (upstream of Pool P)</b>	<b>Minimal Iron Staining</b>							
	<i>Visual inspection of the Waratah Rivulet from Pool P to the full supply level of the Woronora Reservoir does not show significant changes in the extent or nature of iron staining that isn't also occurring in the Woronora River (control site)</i>	Waratah Rivulet, from Pool P to the full supply level of the Woronora Reservoir	Nature and extent of iron staining	Level 1	The extent or nature of iron staining in the Waratah Rivulet from Pool P to the full supply level of the Woronora Reservoir has not changed.	-	No	No
	<b>Minimal Gas Releases</b>							
	<i>Gas releases in Waratah Rivulet from Pool P to the full supply level of the Woronora Reservoir have not increased beyond those observed up to the commencement of Longwall 301 extraction</i>	Waratah Rivulet, from Pool P to the full supply level of the Woronora Reservoir	Free Carbon Dioxide as CO <sub>2</sub> (mg/L) Methane (mg/L)	Level 1	Free carbon dioxide concentrations are equal to or less than 4 mg/L in Waratah Rivulet pools from Pool P to the full supply level of the Woronora Reservoir. Methane concentrations are equal to or less than 0.159 mg/L in Waratah Rivulet pools from Pool P to the full supply level of the Woronora Reservoir.	Pool P was at Level 1 in April, May and September 2018. Pool S was at Level 1 throughout the reporting period. Pool U was at Level 1 in January, February, April, May, August, September, October, November and December 2018. Pool W was at Level 1 in December 2018.	No	No
				Level 2	Free carbon dioxide concentrations are above 4 mg/L and equal to or less than 13 mg/L in Waratah Rivulet pools from Pool P to the full supply level of the Woronora Reservoir. Methane concentrations are above 0.159 mg/L and equal to or less than 0.478 mg/L in Waratah Rivulet pools from Pool P to the full supply level of the Woronora Reservoir.	Pool P was at Level 2 in January, February and March 2018 (free carbon dioxide and methane concentrations), June 2018 (methane concentrations), July 2018 (free carbon dioxide and methane concentrations), August 2018 (methane concentrations), October and December 2018 (free carbon dioxide concentrations). Pool U was at Level 2 in March and July 2018 (free carbon dioxide concentrations).	No	No
				Level 3	Free carbon dioxide concentrations are above 13 mg/L in Waratah Rivulet pools from Pool P to the full supply level of the Woronora Reservoir. Methane concentrations are above 0.478 mg/L in Waratah Rivulet pools from Pool P to the full supply level of the Woronora Reservoir.	Pool P was at Level 3 in July 2018 (free carbon dioxide concentrations).	Yes	No Assessment conducted by Professor Barry Noller (Appendix E1)

**Table 9 (Continued)**  
**Assessment of Environmental Performance – Underground Mining Area and Surrounds**

Performance Measure	Performance Indicator	Monitoring Site(s) being Assessed	Parameters	Highest Significance Level/Trigger Recorded	Comments	Subsidence Impact Indicator Exceeded?	Subsidence Impact Performance Measure Exceeded?	
<b>WATER MANAGEMENT (Continued)</b>								
<b>Negligible Environmental Consequences on Eastern Tributary</b>								
<b>Negligible environmental consequences over at least 70% of the stream length (that is, no diversion of flows, no change in the natural drainage behaviour of pools, minimal iron staining, and minimal gas releases) on the Eastern Tributary between the full supply level of the Woronora Reservoir and the maingate of Longwall 26<sup>2,3</sup></b>	<b>No Diversion of Flows, No Change in the Natural Drainage Behaviour</b>							
	<i>No change to the natural drainage behaviour of Pools ETAS, ETAT and ETAU</i>	Eastern Tributary between the full supply level of the Woronora Reservoir and the maingate of Longwall 26	Stream cracking and drainage behaviour (visual observations)	Level 1	No mine-induced surface cracking at Pool ETAS or Pool ETAT; no increase in previous cracking at Pool ETAU. No impacts to natural drainage behaviour observed.	-	No	No
	<i>Analysis of water level data for Pool ETAU indicates the water levels are above that required to maintain water over the downstream rock bar</i>	Pool ETAU on the Eastern Tributary	Pool water level	Level 1	The water levels in Pool ETAU have been above that required to maintain water over the downstream rock bar.	-	No	No
	<i>Observed total closure at cross line ETAT and cross line ETAU is less than the predicted total closure</i>	Cross lines ETAT and ETAU on the Eastern Tributary	Observed total valley closure (mm) Predicted total valley closure (mm)	Level 1	Observed total valley closure: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• at cross line ETAT is: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- less than or equal to 30 mm during LW302; and</li> <li>- less than or equal to 125 mm during LW303.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• at cross line ETAU is: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- less than or equal to 30 mm during LW302; and</li> <li>- less than or equal to 120 mm during LW303.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	-	No	No
	<b>Minimal Iron Staining</b>							
	N/A	Eastern Tributary between the full supply level of the Woronora Reservoir and the maingate of Longwall 26	Nature and extent of iron staining	On 14 October 2016, Metropolitan Coal reported the exceedance of the Eastern Tributary performance measure in relation to iron staining to the DP&E and other relevant agencies. Iron staining/flocculent is present at a number of stream features between the maingate of Longwall 26 and the full supply level of the Woronora Reservoir. Metropolitan Coal to monitor the nature and extent of iron staining on the Eastern Tributary during the mining of Longwalls 301-303. Metropolitan Coal to implement contingency measures (stream remediation measures) in accordance with the Project Approval.	-	N/A	Yes	
	<b>Minimal Gas Releases</b>							
<i>Gas releases in Eastern Tributary between the full supply level of the Woronora Reservoir and the maingate of Longwall 26 have not increased beyond those observed up to the commencement of Longwall 301 extraction</i>	Eastern Tributary between the full supply level of the Woronora Reservoir and the maingate of Longwall 26	Free Carbon Dioxide as CO <sub>2</sub> (mg/L) Methane (mg/L)	Level 1	Free carbon dioxide concentrations are equal to or less than 4 mg/L in Eastern Tributary pools between the full supply level of the Woronora Reservoir and the maingate of Longwall 26. Methane concentrations are equal to or less than 0.159 mg/L in Eastern Tributary pools between the full supply level of the Woronora Reservoir and the maingate of Longwall 26.	Pool ETAG was at Level 1 in April 2018.	No	No	
			Level 2	Free carbon dioxide concentrations are above 4 mg/L and equal to or less than 13 mg/L in Eastern Tributary pools between the full supply level of the Woronora Reservoir and the maingate of Longwall 26. Methane concentrations are above 0.159 mg/L and equal to or less than 0.478 mg/L in Eastern Tributary pools between the full supply level of the Woronora Reservoir and the maingate of Longwall 26.	Pool ETAH was at Level 2 in October 2018 (free carbon dioxide concentrations).	No	No	

**Table 9 (Continued)**  
**Assessment of Environmental Performance – Underground Mining Area and Surrounds**

Performance Measure	Performance Indicator	Monitoring Site(s) being Assessed	Parameters	Highest Significance Level/Trigger Recorded	Comments	Subsidence Impact Performance Indicator Exceeded?	Subsidence Impact Performance Measure Exceeded?	
<b>BIODIVERSITY MANAGEMENT</b>								
<b>Upland Swamp Vegetation Monitoring</b>								
<b>Negligible impact on Threatened Species, Populations, or Ecological Communities</b>	<i>The vegetation in upland swamps is not expected to experience changes significantly different to vegetation in control swamps</i>	Swamps 16, 17, 18, 20, 24 and 25 overlying or adjacent to Longwalls 20-22 Swamps 19, 28, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36 and 94 overlying or adjacent to Longwalls 23-27 Swamps 38, 40, 41, 46 <sup>4</sup> , 47, 48, 49, 50, 51/52 <sup>4</sup> , 53 and 58 overlying or adjacent to Longwalls 301-303 and Control Swamps 101, 111a, 125, 135, 136, 137a, 137b, 138, Bee Creek Swamp, Woronora River 1, Woronora River south arm and Dahlia Swamp	Visual inspections Transect/ quadrat data Population monitoring of indicator species	Level 1	Data analysis indicates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>there is not a declining trend in the condition of longwall swamp vegetation; and</li> <li>there are no significant changes in vegetation between the mined and control swamps.</li> </ul>	Swamps 38, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51/52 and 58.	No	No
				Level 2	Data analysis indicates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>there is a declining trend in the condition of longwall swamp vegetation over time, however a similar trend is occurring in control swamp vegetation; or</li> <li>there are significant differences in vegetation between the mined and control swamps, however, the data indicates longwall swamp vegetation is consistent with the baseline monitoring results.</li> </ul>	Continued observation of <i>Gleichenia microphylla</i> and <i>Empodisma minus</i> dieback in the north-east section of Swamp 20, however, a similar trend has been observed in control Swamp Woronora River 1. Vegetation monitoring indicates a declining trend in the condition of longwall swamp vegetation in autumns 2018 in Swamps 16, 17, 18, 19, 24, 25, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36 and 94 however a similar trend is occurring in control swamp vegetation. Vegetation monitoring indicates a significant difference in vegetation at Swamps 40, 41 and 53 compared to controls sites, however swamp vegetation is consistent with the baseline monitoring results. Continue close monitoring of trends in vegetation to assess the contribution of dry climatic conditions versus mine subsidence impacts.	No	No
				Level 3	Data analysis indicates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>there is a declining trend in the condition of longwall swamp vegetation over time that is not occurring in control swamp vegetation; or</li> <li>there are significant differences in vegetation between the mined and control swamps, and the data indicates longwall swamp vegetation is not consistent with the baseline monitoring results.</li> </ul>	Swamp 28 Vegetation monitoring indicates a continuing decline in the vegetation condition of Swamp 28, particularly with regards to condition of understorey species, loss of species richness and mortality of indicator species.  Assessments against the performance measure conducted by Eco Logical (threatened flora) and Cenwest Environmental Services (threatened fauna).	Yes	No Assessment undertaken by EcoPlanning and Cenwest Environmental Services (Appendices H1 and H3)

**Table 9 (Continued)**  
**Assessment of Environmental Performance – Underground Mining Area and Surrounds**

Performance Measure	Performance Indicator	Monitoring Site(s) being Assessed	Parameters	Highest Significance Level/Trigger Recorded	Comments	Subsidence Impact Performance Indicator Exceeded?	Subsidence Impact Performance Measure Exceeded?	
<b>BIODIVERSITY MANAGEMENT (Continued)</b>								
<b>Upland Swamp Groundwater Monitoring</b>								
<b>Negligible impact on Threatened Species, Populations, or Ecological Communities</b>	<i>Surface cracking within upland swamps resulting from mine subsidence is not expected to result in measurable changes to swamp groundwater levels when compared to control swamps or seasonal variations in water levels experienced by upland swamps prior to mining<sup>5</sup></i>	Swamp 25 overlying Longwalls 20-22 Swamps 30, 33 and 35 overlying Longwalls 23-27 Swamps 40, 41, 46, 51, 52 and 53 overlying Longwalls 301-303 Control Swamps 101, 137a, 137b and Bee Creek Swamp.	Swamp substrate groundwater levels	Level 1	Data analysis for Longwalls 20-27 swamps indicates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the seven day moving average for Swamps 25, 30 and 33 is within the 5th percentile established for the swamp's full length of record; and</li> <li>the seven day moving average for Swamp 35 is within two standard deviations below the mean established for the swamp's full length of record.</li> </ul> Data analysis for Longwalls 301-303 swamps indicates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the seven day moving average for Swamps 40, 41, 46, 51, 52 and 53 is at or above the minimum established for the swamp's full length of record.</li> </ul>	Swamps 40, 46, 51 and 53.	No	No
				Level 2	Data analysis for Longwalls 20-27 swamps indicates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the seven day moving average for Swamps 25, 30 and 33 is below the 5th percentile established for the swamp's full length of record;</li> <li>the seven day moving average for Swamp 35 lie outside two standard deviations below the mean established for the swamp's full length of record; and</li> <li>semi-quantitative comparisons with control swamps and rainfall record indicates that dry swamp conditions are natural.</li> </ul> Data analysis for Longwalls 301-303 swamps indicates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the seven day moving average for Swamps 40, 41, 46, 51, 52 and 53 is below the minimum established for the swamp's full length of record; and</li> <li>semi-quantitative comparisons with control swamps and rainfall record indicates that dry swamp conditions are natural.</li> </ul>	Swamps 25, 30, 33, 35, 41 and 52.	No	No
<b>Riparian Vegetation Monitoring</b>								
<b>Negligible impact on Threatened Species, Populations, or Ecological Communities</b>	<i>Impacts to riparian vegetation are expected to be localised and limited in extent, similar to the impacts previously experienced at Metropolitan Coal</i>	Locations adjacent to riparian vegetation monitoring sites (MRIP01 to MRIP12) and areas traversed whilst accessing the monitoring sites: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>sites MRIP01, MRIP02, MRIP05, MRIP06 and MRIP09 overlying Longwalls 20-22;</li> <li>sites MRIP11 and MRIP12 overlying Longwalls 23-27;</li> <li>sites MRIP03, MRIP04 and MRIP10 downstream of Longwall 23A; and</li> <li>sites MRIP07 and MRIP08 downstream of Longwalls 23-27 and within the 35° angle of draw and/or predicted 20 mm subsidence contour for Longwalls 301-303</li> </ul>	The extent of vegetation subject to vegetation dieback	Level 1	No dieback of riparian vegetation greater than 50 cm from the stream as a result of mine subsidence.	Sites MRIP01, MRIP03, MRIP04, MRIP06, MRIP07, MRIP08, MRIP10 and MRIP11.	No	No
				Level 2	Vegetation monitoring: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>does not identify an increase in the extent of vegetation dieback compared to that observed at site MRIP02 on the Waratah Rivulet and between sites MRIP05 and MRIP09 on the Eastern Tributary; and</li> <li>does not identify vegetation dieback greater than 50 cm from the stream at sites MRIP01, MRIP03, MRIP04, MRIP06, MRIP07, MRIP08, MRIP10, MRIP11 or MRIP12, as a result of mine subsidence.</li> </ul>	Sites MRIP02, MRIP09 and MRIP12.	No	No
				Level 3	Vegetation monitoring: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>identifies an increase in the extent of vegetation dieback compared to that observed at site MRIP02 on the Waratah Rivulet and between sites MRIP05 and MRIP09 on the Eastern Tributary; and</li> <li>identifies vegetation dieback greater than 50 cm from the stream at sites MRIP01, MRIP03, MRIP04, MRIP06, MRIP07, MRIP08, MRIP10, MRIP11 or MRIP12, as a result of mine subsidence.</li> </ul>	Site MRIP05.	Yes	No Assessment undertaken by Ecoplanning and Cenwest Environmental Services (Appendices H2 and H3)

**Table 9 (Continued)**  
**Assessment of Environmental Performance – Underground Mining Area and Surrounds**

Performance Measure	Performance Indicator	Monitoring Site(s) being Assessed	Parameters	Highest Significance Level/Trigger Recorded	Comments	Subsidence Impact Performance Indicator Exceeded?	Subsidence Impact Performance Measure Exceeded?	
<b>BIODIVERSITY MANAGEMENT (Continued)</b>								
<b>Monitoring of Aquatic Biota, Stream Monitoring</b>								
<b>Negligible impact on Threatened Species, Populations, or Ecological Communities</b>	<i>The aquatic macroinvertebrate and macrophyte assemblages in streams are not expected to experience long-term impacts as a result of mine subsidence<sup>6</sup></i>	Two sampling sites (approximately 100 m in length) at the following locations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Location WT3 on Waratah Rivulet, Locations ET1, ET3 and ET4 on the Eastern Tributary overlying Longwalls 20-27.</li> <li>• Locations WT4 and WT5 on the Waratah Rivulet, downstream of Longwalls 20-27.</li> <li>• Location ET2 on the Eastern Tributary, downstream of Longwalls 20-27 and within the Longwalls 301-303 35° angle of draw and/or predicted 20 mm subsidence contour.</li> <li>• Control Locations: WR1 on Woronora River; and OC on O'Hares Creek.</li> </ul>	Aquatic macroinvertebrates Aquatic macrophytes	Level 1	Data analysis indicates no significant changes in relation to control places pre-mining compared to post-extraction: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- occur in the aquatic macroinvertebrate and macrophyte assemblages in Waratah Rivulet or the Eastern Tributary at Locations WT3, ET1, ET3 or ET4, located within the LW20-22 and LW23-27 mining areas during the mining of LW301-303; or</li> <li>- occur in the aquatic macroinvertebrate and macrophyte assemblages in the Eastern Tributary at Location ET2 during the mining of LW301-303.</li> </ul>	Longwalls 20-22 monitoring program autumn 2018 results: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Locations WT3 (all parameters excluding those noted in Level 2 below), WT4 and WT5.</li> <li>- Locations ET1 (all parameters excluding those noted in Level 2 below), ET2 (all parameters excluding those noted in Level 2 below) and ET3.</li> </ul> Longwalls 23-27 monitoring program autumn 2018 results: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Locations ET1 (all parameters excluding those noted in Level 2 below), ET2 (all parameters excluding those noted in Level 2 below) and ET4 (all parameters excluding those noted in Level 2 below).</li> </ul>	No	No-



**Table 9 (Continued)**  
**Assessment of Environmental Performance – Underground Mining Area and Surrounds**

Performance Measure	Performance Indicator	Monitoring Site(s) being Assessed	Parameters	Highest Significance Level/Trigger Recorded	Comments	Subsidence Impact Indicator Exceeded?	Subsidence Impact Performance Measure Exceeded?	
<b>BIODIVERSITY MANAGEMENT (Continued)</b>								
<b>Monitoring of Aquatic Biota, Stream Monitoring (Continued)</b>								
<b>Negligible impact on Threatened Species, Populations, or Ecological Communities</b>	<i>The aquatic macroinvertebrate and macrophyte assemblages in streams are not expected to experience long-term impacts as a result of mine subsidence<sup>6</sup></i>	Two sampling sites (approximately 100 m in length) at the following locations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Location WT3 on Waratah Rivulet, Locations ET1, ET3 and ET4 on the Eastern Tributary overlying Longwalls 20-27.</li> <li>Locations WT4 and WT5 on the Waratah Rivulet, downstream of Longwalls 20-27.</li> <li>Location ET2 on the Eastern Tributary, downstream of Longwalls 20-27 and within the Longwalls 301-303 35° angle of draw and/or predicted 20 mm subsidence contour.</li> <li>Control Locations: WR1 on Woronora River; and OC on O'Hares Creek.</li> </ul>	Aquatic macroinvertebrates Aquatic macrophytes	Level 2	Data analysis indicates significant (not long-term), changes in relation to control places pre-mining compared to post-extraction: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- occur in the aquatic macroinvertebrate and macrophyte assemblages in Waratah Rivulet or the Eastern Tributary at Locations WT3, ET1, ET3 or ET4, located within the LW20-22 and LW23-27 mining areas during the mining of LW301-303; or</li> <li>- occur in the aquatic macroinvertebrate and macrophyte assemblages in the Eastern Tributary at Location ET2 within the LW301-303 mining area after the completion of Longwall 306.</li> </ul>	Longwalls 20-22 monitoring program autumn 2018 results: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Location ET1 (altered macrophyte assemblage in spring 2014 but not subsequently).</li> <li>- Location ET2 (change in Atyidae in spring 2015 but not subsequently; altered macrophyte assemblage<sup>7</sup> in spring 2014 but not subsequently).</li> <li>- Location WT3 (change in diversity of macroinvertebrates in spring 2016 and autumn 2018).</li> </ul> Longwalls 23-27 monitoring program autumn 2018 results: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Location ET1 (change in assemblage of macroinvertebrates in spring 2016 but not subsequently; altered patterns of change in Leptophlebiidae since autumn 2015; altered patterns of change in macrophyte assemblage since spring 2017).</li> <li>- Location ET2 (change in assemblage of macroinvertebrates since spring 2017; decreased numbers of Atyidae since autumn 2016; altered macrophyte assemblage since spring 2017)<sup>8</sup>.</li> <li>- ET4 (change in numbers of Atyidae in autumn 2016, but not subsequently; change in diversity of macroinvertebrates in relation to the controls in autumn 2018).</li> </ul>	No	No

**Table 9 (Continued)**  
**Assessment of Environmental Performance – Underground Mining Area and Surrounds**

Performance Measure	Performance Indicator	Monitoring Site(s) being Assessed	Parameters	Highest Significance Level/Trigger Recorded	Comments	Subsidence Impact Performance Indicator Exceeded?	Subsidence Impact Performance Measure Exceeded?	
<b>BIODIVERSITY MANAGEMENT (Continued)</b>								
<b>Monitoring of Aquatic Biota, Pool Monitoring</b>								
<b>Negligible impact on Threatened Species, Populations, or Ecological Communities</b>	<i>The aquatic macroinvertebrate and macrophyte assemblages in pools are not expected to experience long-term impacts as a result of mine subsidence</i>	Larger pools J, M1 and N on Waratah Rivulet and ETAH on the Eastern Tributary, overlying Longwalls 20-27.  Smaller pools K, L and M on Waratah Rivulet and ETAG, ETAK and ETAI on the Eastern Tributary, overlying Longwalls 20-27.  One larger control pool on Woronora River (Pool WP) and one larger control pool on O'Hares Creek (Pool OC).  Three smaller control pools on Woronora River (Pools WP-A, WP-B and WP-C) and three smaller control pools on O'Hares Creek (Pools OC-A, OC-B and OC-C).	Aquatic macroinvertebrates  Aquatic macrophytes	Level 1	Data analysis indicates no significant changes or significant (not long term) changes in relation to control places pre-mining compared to post-extraction:  - occur in the aquatic macroinvertebrate and macrophyte assemblages at pools J, K, L, M1, M or N; or  - occur in the aquatic macroinvertebrate and macrophyte assemblages at pools ETAG, ETAH, ETAI or ETAK.	Larger pools autumn 2018 results <sup>10</sup> :  - Pool J (change in diversity of macroinvertebrates from autumn 2015 to autumn 2017 but not spring 2017 and autumn 2018).  - Pool M1 (all parameters excluding those noted in Level 2 below).  - Pool N (decreased diversity of macrophytes since autumn 2016).  - ETAH on the Eastern Tributary (all parameters excluding those noted in Level 2 below).  Smaller pools autumn 2018 results <sup>9</sup> :  - Pools K, L and M on Waratah Rivulet (all parameters).  - Pools ETAG, ETAK and ETAI on the Eastern Tributary (all parameters excluding those noted in Level 2 below).	No	No
				Level 2	Data analysis indicates significant long-term changes in relation to control places pre-mining compared to post-extraction:  - occur in the aquatic macroinvertebrate and macrophyte assemblages at pools J, K, L, M1, M or N; or  - occur in the aquatic macroinvertebrate and macrophyte assemblages at pools ETAG, ETAH, ETAI or ETAK.			
<b>Amphibian Monitoring</b>								
<b>Negligible impact on Threatened Species, Populations, or Ecological Communities</b>	<i>The amphibian assemblage is not expected to experience changes significantly different to the amphibian assemblage at control sites</i>	Test sites 1 to 6 overlying Longwalls 20-22  Test sites 13 to 17 overlying Longwalls 23-27  Test sites 23 to 28 overlying Longwalls 301-303  Control sites 7 to 12 and 18 to 22.	Amphibian species diversity and relative abundance	Level 1	Data analysis does not identify a significant change in the amphibian population.	Autumn 2018 survey results:  - Sites 1 to 6, sites 13 to 17, and sites 23 to 28.	No	No
				Level 2	Data analysis identifies a significant change in the amphibian population for one survey period.			

**Table 9 (Continued)**  
**Assessment of Environmental Performance – Underground Mining Area and Surrounds**

Performance Measure	Performance Indicator	Monitoring Site(s) being Assessed	Parameters	Highest Significance Level/Trigger Recorded	Comments	Subsidence Impact Performance Indicator Exceeded?	Subsidence Impact Performance Measure Exceeded?
<b>LAND MANAGEMENT</b>							
<b>Cliffs and Overhangs, Steep Slopes and Land in General</b>							
Less than 3% of the total length of cliffs (and associated overhangs) within the mining area experience mining-induced rock fall	-	Cliff sites COH1, COH2, COH3, COH4, COH5, COH6, COH6A, COH7, COH8, COH9, COH10, COH14, COH15 and COH16 <sup>10, 11</sup>	Cliff instabilities		- Visual inspections of the cliffs and overhangs were conducted monthly when mining of Longwalls 20-22 and/or Longwalls 23-27 were within 400 m of sites and following the completion of each longwall to record evidence of subsidence impacts. - Visual inspections of the cliffs and overhangs following the completion of Longwall 27 did not identify any additional subsidence impacts to those recorded during the mining of Longwalls 20-27.	-	No
	<i>Steep slopes and land in general experience sandstone fracturing/cracking and rock falls that do not require management measures to be implemented</i>	Steep slopes and land in general within 600 m of Longwalls 20-27 and Longwalls 301-303	Sandstone fracturing/cracking and rock falls	Level 1	No subsidence impacts (i.e. sandstone fracturing/cracking and rock falls) recorded on steep slopes or land in general: • not previously recorded within 600 m of Longwalls 20-27; or • recorded within 600 m of Longwalls 301-303.	-	No
<b>HERITAGE MANAGEMENT</b>							
<b>Aboriginal Heritage Sites Monitoring</b>							
Less than 10% of Aboriginal heritage sites within the mining area are affected by subsidence impacts	<i>Less than 7% of Aboriginal heritage sites within the mining area are affected by subsidence impacts</i>	Monitoring of the Longwalls 20-22 and Longwalls 23-27 Aboriginal heritage sites at which Longwalls 23-27 Round 5 monitoring indicates continued change due to mining induced subsidence, namely sites MET 1, FRC 28, FRC 29, FRC 34, FRC 60 and FRC 176  Monitoring of Aboriginal heritage sites FRC 76 (sandstone overhang with art only) and FRC 117 (sandstone overhang with art and PAD)	Cracking of sandstone at open sites Cracking and/or exfoliation of sandstone, blockfall, displacement, breakage and/or collapse of sandstone overhang sites  Damage or deterioration of art motifs	Level 1	Monitoring results indicate sites FRC 281 and FRC 34 have been affected by subsidence impacts.	No	No



**Table 9 (Continued)**  
**Assessment of Environmental Performance – Underground Mining Area and Surrounds**

Performance Measure	Performance Indicator	Monitoring Site(s) being Assessed	Parameters	Highest Significance Level/Trigger Recorded	Subsidence Impact Performance Indicator Exceeded?	Subsidence Impact Performance Measure Exceeded?
<b>BUILT FEATURES MANAGEMENT – GARRAWARRA CENTRE COMPLEX</b>						
<b>Negligible damage (that is fine or hairline cracks that do not require repair), unless the owner of the item and the appropriate heritage authority agree otherwise in writing</b>  <b>Safe, serviceable and repairable, unless the owner and the MSB agree otherwise in writing</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No greater tilt impact to buildings than Category A or B (i.e. mining induced ground tilt of less than 7 mm/m) for items of historical or heritage significance (i.e. either 'high' or 'exceptional' in the Conservation Plan for the Garrawarra Centre for Aged Care [Howard Tanner &amp; Associates, 1993])</li> <li>No greater strain impact to buildings than Category 0 or 1 (i.e. crack width of less than 1 mm) for items of historical or heritage significance (i.e. either 'high' or 'exceptional' in the Conservation Plan for the Garrawarra Centre for Aged Care [Howard Tanner &amp; Associates, 1993])</li> <li>No more than repairable (minor) defects (cracks, etc.) in the structural integrity for all other buildings, houses, structures and other services (including telecommunications towers and compounds, powerlines, pipelines and associated connections) due to mining</li> <li>The electrical clearance from vegetation is maintained</li> <li>Serviceability of the private roads and access roads/tracks has been maintained</li> <li>The land in general is expected to experience minor cracking consistent with that observed during the extraction of previous longwalls at Metropolitan Coal (i.e. no more than minor cracking)</li> </ul>	Garrawarra Centre Complex Buildings/Structures (Excluding Services)	Subsidence effects parameters, fine or hair line cracks, cracking at pre-existing rock joints, columns, opening and closing of joints, or tilting of piers, water tank leaks and structural integrity	Level 1	Expected subsidence conditions	No
		Garrawarra Centre Complex Services	Subsidence effects parameters, ground tension cracks and faults	Level 1	Expected subsidence conditions	No
<b>BUILT FEATURES MANAGEMENT – ENDEAVOUR ENERGY</b>						
<b>Safe, serviceable and repairable, unless the owner and the MSB agree otherwise in writing</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The structural integrity of the 132 kV transmission lines and towers is maintained</li> <li>The structural integrity of the timber poles and high voltage powerlines is maintained</li> <li>The electrical clearance from vegetation is maintained</li> <li>The serviceability of the access roads/tracks is maintained</li> </ul>	132 kV Towers	Subsidence effects parameters, differential movements, ground deformations, observable surface cracking, and faults	Level 1	Expected subsidence conditions	No
<b>BUILT FEATURES MANAGEMENT – TRANSGRID</b>						
<b>Safe, serviceable and repairable, unless the owner and the MSB agree otherwise in writing</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The structural integrity of the transmission line and towers is maintained</li> <li>The electrical clearance from vegetation is maintained</li> <li>The serviceability of the access roads/tracks is maintained</li> </ul>	330 kV Towers	Subsidence effects parameters, differential movements, ground deformations, observable surface cracking, and faults	Level 1	Expected subsidence conditions	No
<b>BUILT FEATURES MANAGEMENT – NEXTGEN</b>						
<b>Safe, serviceable and repairable, unless the owner and the MSB agree otherwise in writing</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Negligible transmission loss in fibre optic cables from mine subsidence impacts</li> <li>The structural integrity of the cable line and associated joint housing pit is maintained</li> <li>The serviceability of the access roads/tracks is maintained</li> </ul>	Optical Fibre Cable – Major Interstate Trunk Cable: SM1 Waterfall to Corrimal Section	Subsidence effects parameters, OTDR (OTDR) signal loss, and faults	Level 1	Expected subsidence conditions	No
<b>BUILT FEATURES MANAGEMENT – OPTUS</b>						
<b>Safe, serviceable and repairable, unless the owner and the MSB agree otherwise in writing</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Negligible transmission loss from mine subsidence impacts</li> <li>The structural integrity of the cable lines and associated facilities is maintained</li> <li>The serviceability of the access roads/tracks is maintained</li> </ul>	Optical Fibre Cable – Trunk: IOF SYD-MEL 2 (Coastal Inter Office Fibre two sections known as WAT-WOL 2 and WAT-WOL 3)	Subsidence effects parameters, OTDR signal loss, and faults	Level 1	Expected subsidence conditions	No
		Optical Fibre Cable – Cable: 36S SMOF (In leased Telstra Conduit and Manholes/pits. Cable manufacturer: MM Olex. Heavy polyethylene sheath, manufactured prior to 1993 and installation completed 1993)	Subsidence effects parameters, OTDR signal loss, and faults	Level 1	Expected subsidence conditions	No

**Table 9 (Continued)**  
**Assessment of Environmental Performance – Underground Mining Area and Surrounds**

Performance Measure	Performance Indicator	Monitoring Site(s) being Assessed	Parameters	Highest Significance Level/Trigger Recorded	Subsidence Impact Performance Indicator Exceeded?	Subsidence Impact Performance Measure Exceeded?
<b>BUILT FEATURES MANAGEMENT – TELSTRA</b>						
<b>Safe, serviceable and repairable, unless the owner and the MSB agree otherwise in writing</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Negligible transmission loss in fibre optic cables from mine subsidence impacts</li> <li>The structural integrity of the cable line and associated facilities is maintained</li> <li>The structural integrity of the telecommunications tower and compound is maintained</li> <li>The serviceability of the access roads/tracks is maintained</li> </ul>	Trunk Cable F KNST 2005 ENGA-HBGH 80f Sydney-Melbourne No.3 Optical Fibre Cable (Labelled as Cable 1)	Subsidence effects parameters, OTDR signal loss, and faults	Level 1	Expected subsidence conditions	No
		Customer Access Network (CAN) Cables: F ENGA 3001 6f Engadine-Garrawarra-Mobile Phone Tower optical fibre cable / F ENGA 3005 12f Engadine-Garrawarra-RIM and Garrawarra Hospital customer cable (Labelled as Cable 2)	Subsidence effects parameters, OTDR signal loss, and faults	Level 1	Expected subsidence conditions	No
		Customer Access Network (CAN) Copper Cables	Subsidence effects parameters, anomalous service condition, complaints and faults	Level 1	Expected subsidence conditions	No
		Telecommunications Tower (and Compound)	Subsidence effects parameters and faults	Level 1	Expected subsidence conditions	No
<b>BUILT FEATURES MANAGEMENT – RMS</b>						
<b>Safe, serviceable and repairable, unless the owner and the MSB agree otherwise in writing</b>	<p><u>Bridge Distortion and Cracking</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>absolute 3D horizontal movement of survey lines (M1 Northbound Line and Transmission Line) of 30 mm or more at key points on the ground near the bridge;</li> <li>relative movement of 5 mm or more between any two points monitored by the conventional survey system;</li> <li>relative movement of 2 mm or more between any two points monitored by the FBG sensor system; and</li> <li>crack in concrete elements exceeding 0.2 mm width</li> </ul> <p><u>M1 Princes Motorway Pavement Deformation</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a measured compressive ground strain of greater than 0.5 mm/m;</li> <li>pavement cracking;</li> <li>deterioration in ride quality; and</li> <li>defects in minor structures such as kerbs and gutters, pits, etc.</li> </ul> <p><u>Cuttings and Faults</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a measured ground strain of greater than 0.5 mm/m;</li> <li>rock falls;</li> <li>cracking or visual deterioration at the rock face; and</li> <li>visual displacement at joints</li> </ul> <p><u>Culverts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>visual displacement at joints;</li> <li>cracks in culverts; and</li> <li>ponding</li> </ul>	Bridge 2 (Old Princes Highway Underpass)	Subsidence effects parameters, absolute horizontal movements, incremental relative movement, structural cracks, observable subsidence ground deformations, and faults	Level 1	Expected subsidence conditions	No
		Cawley Road Overpass	Subsidence effects parameters, absolute horizontal movements, incremental relative movement, structural cracks, observable subsidence ground deformations, and faults	Level 1	Expected subsidence conditions	No
		Pavements	Subsidence effects parameters, absolute horizontal movements, observable subsidence ground deformations, pavement cracking, deterioration in ride quality, defects in structure, and faults	Level 1	Expected subsidence conditions	No
		Cuttings	Subsidence effects parameters, absolute horizontal movements, observable subsidence ground deformation, rock fall, cracking or visual deterioration at the rock face, visual displacement at joints, and faults	Level 1	Expected subsidence conditions	No
		Culverts	Subsidence effects parameters, absolute horizontal movements, observable subsidence ground deformations, cracking in culverts, visual displacement at joints, ponding, and faults	Level 1	Expected subsidence conditions	No
<b>BUILT FEATURES MANAGEMENT – WOLLONGONG CITY COUNCIL OLD PRINCES HIGHWAY</b>						
<b>Safe, serviceable and repairable, unless the owner and the MSB agree otherwise in writing</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No pavement cracking exceeding 5 mm, or other defects of the road pavement resulting in deterioration of ride quality</li> <li>No ponding of water on the road surface as a result of changes in grade from subsidence associated with Longwalls 301-303</li> <li>No joint displacement or cracking or other defects of the drainage structure (e.g. pipes/culverts) in excess of 5 mm</li> <li>Serviceability of guard rails, marker posts and signage is maintained</li> </ul>	Pavements, Drainage Structures and Furniture	Subsidence effects parameters, observable subsidence ground deformations including ponding, pavement cracking, joint displacement or cracking/defects of drainage structures, defects in minor structures, and faults	Level 1	Expected subsidence conditions	No

**Table 9 (Continued)**  
**Assessment of Environmental Performance – Underground Mining Area and Surrounds**

Performance Measure	Performance Indicator	Monitoring Site(s) being Assessed	Parameters	Highest Significance Level/Trigger Recorded	Subsidence Impact Performance Indicator Exceeded?	Subsidence Impact Performance Measure Exceeded?
<b>BUILT FEATURES MANAGEMENT – WOLLONGONG CITY COUNCIL GENERAL [GARRAWARRA] CEMETERY</b>						
Safe, serviceable and repairable, unless the owner and the MSB agree otherwise in writing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No defects to the structural integrity of headstones or fencing (beyond the baseline [pre-mining] conditions)</li> <li>The land in general is expected to experience minor cracking consistent with that observed during the extraction of previous longwalls at Metropolitan Coal (i.e. no more than minor cracking)</li> </ul>	Waterfall General [Garrawarra] Cemetery	Subsidence effects parameters, observable impacts to fencing, surface cracking and buckling, and damage to grave sites and/or monuments	Level 1	Expected subsidence conditions	No
<b>BUILT FEATURES MANAGEMENT – SYDNEY WATER</b>						
Safe, serviceable and repairable, unless the owner and the MSB agree otherwise in writing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No more than repairable (minor) leakages of the water pipelines occur due to mining</li> <li>No more than repairable (minor) defects (cracks, etc.) in the structural integrity of the pipes and associated connections occur due to mining</li> </ul>	Pipelines	Subsidence effects parameters, observable subsidence ground deformations or surface cracks, cracks or leaks, loss of flow/pressure, and faults	Level 1	Expected subsidence conditions	No
<b>BUILT FEATURES MANAGEMENT – SYDNEY TRAINS</b>						
Safe, serviceable and repairable, unless the owner and the MSB agree otherwise in writing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No defects or deformation of the Illawarra Railway Line due to mining</li> <li>The structural integrity of the telecommunications tower (and compound) is maintained</li> </ul>	Illawarra Railway Line	Subsidence effects parameters, absolute horizontal movements, observable subsidence ground deformations, defects or deformation, and faults	Level 1	Expected subsidence conditions	No
		Telecommunications Tower (and Compound)	Subsidence effects parameters, anomalous service condition, and faults	Level 1	Expected subsidence conditions	No
<b>BUILT FEATURES MANAGEMENT – AXICOM</b>						
Safe, serviceable and repairable, unless the owner and the MSB agree otherwise in writing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Structural integrity of the telecommunications towers and compounds has been maintained</li> <li>Serviceability of the access roads/tracks has been maintained</li> </ul>	Telecommunications Towers (and Compounds)	Subsidence effects parameters, differential horizontal movement, and faults	Level 1	Expected subsidence conditions	No
<b>PUBLIC SAFETY MANAGEMENT</b>						
Safe, serviceable and repairable, unless the owner and the MSB agree otherwise in writing	Public safety will be ensured in the event that any hazard to the general public arising from subsidence effects becomes evident.	Cliffs and overhangs, steep slopes and land in general Built features	Public safety	Level 1	Expected subsidence conditions	No

<sup>1</sup> Assessment against the performance indicator could not be completed in time for inclusion in the 2018 Annual Review due to incomplete (i.e. missing control site data) and late WaterNSW data (received on 19 and 28 March 2019). Assessment against this performance indicator will be undertaken in the next review period. If necessary based on consideration of outstanding WaterNSW data, assessment against the performance measure would also be undertaken in the next review period.

<sup>2</sup> The no diversion of flows, no change in natural drainage behaviour component of this performance measure was exceeded during the mining of Longwalls 23-27, triggering contingency measures for the impacted pools. This TARP monitors pools not impacted during the mining of Longwalls 23-27.

<sup>3</sup> The minimal iron staining component of this performance measure was exceeded during the mining of Longwalls 23-27, triggering contingency measures for the impacted pools. The nature and extent of iron staining on the Eastern Tributary will continue to be monitored during the mining of Longwalls 301-303.

<sup>4</sup> Subsequent to the autumn 2017 baseline survey and prior to the spring 2017 survey, Swamp 46 and Swamp 51/52 were subject to WaterNSW hazard reduction burns.

<sup>5</sup> This performance indicator has been exceeded at Swamp 20 since 2012 and at Swamp 28 since 2016. Swamp water levels at Swamp 20 and Swamp 28 will continue to be analysed on a six monthly basis and assessments against the performance measure will be conducted annually.

<sup>6</sup> This performance indicator has been exceeded at Location B1 since the autumn 2016 survey and at Location B2 since the spring 2016 survey and assessments have been made against the performance measure. Aquatic macroinvertebrate (if sufficient aquatic habitat is available for sampling) and macrophyte sampling at these locations will be conducted every three years after spring 2018, in autumn and spring (i.e. next surveys to be conducted in autumn 2021 and spring 2021) consistent with the revised monitoring schedule for Location B1 for previous Longwalls 18-19A. Given the distance from Longwalls 301-303, Tributary B will not experience any measurable subsidence or valley related movements resulting from the extraction of Longwalls 301-303.

<sup>7</sup> Altered macrophyte assemblage at Location ET2 in spring 2014 considered to be unrelated to mining.

<sup>8</sup> The structure of the macrophyte assemblage at Location C2 appears to have changed significantly within the after-period for Longwalls 23-27 although changes prior to the spring 2017 survey do not appear to be related to mining activities.

<sup>9</sup> A summary of mining impacts to pools on the Waratah Rivulet and Eastern Tributary, including Pool N on the Waratah Rivulet and Pools ETAG, ETAH, ETAI and ETAK on the Eastern Tributary, is provided in Section 6.2.3 of this report.

<sup>10</sup> A new cliff and overhang site (COH17) was identified below the full supply level on the Eastern Tributary arm of the Woronora Reservoir in August 2018. Detailed baseline recording for this site has been conducted and will be included in the Longwall 304 Extraction Plan. The location of the site COH17 is shown on Figure 16.

<sup>11</sup> The Longwalls 301-303 Land Management Plan (Version F) includes the future monitoring and assessment of the new cliff and overhang site (COH17).

## 7 ENVIRONMENTAL PERFORMANCE – SURFACE FACILITIES AREA

This section provides a summary of the key environmental monitoring results for noise, air quality, traffic and waste at the surface facilities area, an assessment of environmental performance and a description of the management measures implemented during the review period.

The environmental performance of surface facilities water management is described in Section 8.

Each section indicates which management plan contains details of the surface facilities management and monitoring. The Metropolitan Coal management plans are available on the Peabody website (<http://www.peabodyenergy.com>).

### 7.1 NOISE MANAGEMENT

The Metropolitan Coal Noise Management Plan has been prepared for the surface facilities area in accordance with Condition 8, Schedule 4 of the Project Approval.

#### ***Real-time Noise Monitoring***

Real-time noise monitoring for the Project is undertaken using an unattended statistical noise logger located at the northern boundary of 16 Oxley Place (Figure 18). Real-time noise monitoring is used as an internal noise management tool and not for compliance purposes.

The real-time noise monitor records noise levels 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, and a graphical summary of the previous 24 hours of noise is sent to mine staff via email on a daily basis.

A real-time noise performance indicator, *The  $L_{Aeq(5\text{ minute})}$  night-time noise level does not exceed 50 dB(A) for six consecutive 5 minute samples*, has been developed in consideration of façade reflection and as an alert to the potential exceedance of the noise acquisition criteria.

Real-time noise monitoring includes an audio function which allows the monitor to record audio of the noise signal and an ‘alarm’ function whereby noise data is processed and compared against the real-time noise performance indicator. The audio of these events can then be reviewed to see if the cause is Project related, allowing Metropolitan Coal to investigate the causes and potential controls for high Project related noise events.

The real-time noise performance indicator is considered to be exceeded if the  $L_{Aeq(5\text{ minute})}$  night-time noise level exceeds 50 A-weighted decibels (dB[A]) for six consecutive 5 minute samples.

The real-time noise performance indicator was triggered 125 times during the review period. Reviews conducted following these triggers typically indicated that the source was overflying aircraft, birds, bats, insects, vehicles on Parkes Street, dogs barking, thunder, wind and/or rain.

### ***Attended Noise Monitoring***

Consistent with the Metropolitan Coal Noise Management Plan, attended noise monitoring for the Project has consisted of quarterly monitoring at 16 Oxley Place, 53 Parkes Street, 50 Parkes Street and 36 Old Station Road (sites representative of the nearest residences to the Project [Figure 18]) to quantify the intrusive noise emissions from the mine, including coal processing and transportation operations that contribute to the overall level of ambient noise.

Noise monitoring is conducted for 15 minute periods during the daytime, evening and night-time over two consecutive days and nights and compared to applicable Noise Impact Assessment Criteria, Noise Mitigation Criteria and Noise Acquisition Criteria (refer Section 7.5 and Appendix K).

The attended quarterly noise monitoring and compliance results for the review period are available in the quarterly monitoring reports prepared by SLR Consulting Pty Ltd (Appendix K). A comparison of the quarterly attended monitoring results at each location for the period September 2010 to December 2018 is provided in Figures 19a to 19d.

In summary, during 2018, attended monitoring indicated exceedances of the noise criteria detailed in Conditions 1, 2 and 3, Schedule 4 of Project Approval (08\_0149) as follows:

- Daytime ( $L_{Aeq}$ ):
  - Monitoring at 16 Oxley Place (in Quarters 3 and 4) measured noise levels of 53 dBA and 57 dBA, respectively, which were non-compliant with the daytime Noise Impact Assessment Criterion (50 dBA) and exceeded the daytime Noise Mitigation Assessment (53 dBA) and Noise Acquisition Criterion (55 dBA).
- Evening ( $L_{Aeq}$ ):
  - Monitoring at 16 Oxley Place (in Quarters 1, 2 and 3) measured a noise level of 48 dBA for all three quarters, which were conditionally<sup>21</sup> non-compliant (Quarter 1) and non-compliant (Quarters 2 and 3) with the evening Noise Impact Assessment Criterion (45 dBA).
  - Monitoring at 53 Parkes Street (in Quarter 4) measured a noise level of 48 dBA, which was non-compliant with the evening Noise Impact Assessment Criterion (45 dBA).
  - Monitoring at 36 Old Station Road (in Quarter 3) measured a noise level of 48 dBA, which was conditionally<sup>22</sup> non-compliant with the evening Noise Impact Assessment Criterion (45 dBA).
  - No exceedances of the evening Noise Mitigation Criterion (48 dBA) or Noise Acquisition Criterion (50 dBA) were recorded.
- Night-time ( $L_{Aeq}$ ):
  - Monitoring at 16 Oxley Place (in Quarters 2 and 3) measured noise levels of 48dBA and 49 dBA, respectively, which were non-compliant (Quarter 2) and conditionally<sup>22</sup> non-compliant (Quarter 3) with the night-time Noise Impact Assessment Criterion (45 dBA), respectively, and exceeded the night-time Noise Mitigation Assessment Criterion (48 dBA).
  - Monitoring at 50 Parkes Street (in Quarter 1) measured noise levels of 48 dBA, which was conditionally<sup>21</sup> non-compliant with the night-time Noise Impact Assessment Criterion (45 dBA).
  - Monitoring at 36 Old Station Road (in Quarter 1) measured noise levels of 48 dBA, which was conditionally<sup>22</sup> non-compliant with the night-time Noise Impact Assessment Criterion (45 dBA).
  - No exceedances of the night-time Noise Acquisition Criterion (50 dBA) were recorded.

<sup>21</sup> A conditional non-compliance has been nominated for attended monitoring results that exceed the Noise Impact Assessment Criteria by more than 2 dBA and were recorded during temperature inversions with Stability Class F. Stability Class F corresponds to an estimated Environmental Lapse Rate (ELR) ranging from 1.5°C/100 m to 4.0°C/100 m. Project Approval 08\_0149 limits temperature inversions up to 3.0°C/100 m. In the absence of direct measurement of the ELR, it cannot be certain if the actual temperature inversion was less than 3.0°C/100 m for this period.

- Night-time ( $L_{A1}$ ):
  - Monitoring at 16 Oxley Place (in Quarters 1, 2, 3 and 4) measured noise levels of 55 dBA, 57 dBA, 55 dBA and 57 dBA, respectively, which were conditionally<sup>22</sup> non-compliant (Quarters 1 and 3) and non-compliant (Quarters 2 and 4) with the night-time  $L_{A1}$  Noise Impact Assessment Criterion (50 dBA).
  - Monitoring at 53 Parkes Street (in Quarter 1) measured a noise level of 54 dBA, which was conditionally<sup>22</sup> non-compliant with the night-time  $L_{A1}$  Noise Impact Assessment Criterion (50 dBA).
  - Monitoring at 50 Parkes Street (in Quarter 1) measured a noise level of 53 dBA, which was conditionally<sup>22</sup> non-compliant with the night-time  $L_{A1}$  Noise Impact Assessment Criterion (50 dBA).
  - Monitoring at 36 Old Station Road (in Quarters 1 and 2) measured noise levels of 67 dBA and 54 dBA, respectively, which were conditionally<sup>22</sup> non-compliant and non-compliant (Quarter 2) with the night-time  $L_{A1}$  Noise Impact Assessment Criterion (50 dBA).

### ***Identification of Sustained Non-compliances – Attended Noise Monitoring***

A sustained non-compliance has been defined as two consecutive quarters of non-compliant noise monitoring results at the same representative attended noise monitoring location, coinciding with normal mine operations.

Sustained non-compliances with respect to the evening intrusive ( $L_{Aeq}$ ) Noise Impact Assessment Criteria (Table 2, Condition 1, Schedule 4 of the Project Approval) have been identified during 2018 at 16 Oxley Place. The sustained non-compliances at 16 Oxley Place occurred in Quarters 2 and 3 (Appendix K).

A conditional<sup>22</sup> sustained non-compliance with respect to the night-time maximum ( $L_{A1}$ ) Noise Impact Assessment Criteria (Table 2, Condition 1, Schedule 4 of the Project Approval) was also identified during 2018 at 16 Oxley Place. The conditional<sup>22</sup> sustained non-compliance at 16 Oxley Place occurred in Quarter 1 (Appendix K).

A sustained non-compliance with respect to the night-time maximum ( $L_{A1}$ ) Noise Impact Assessment Criteria (Table 2, Condition 1, Schedule 4 of the Project Approval) was also identified during 2018 at 16 Oxley Place and at 36 Old Station Road. The sustained non-compliance at 16 Oxley Place and at 36 Old Station Road occurred in Quarter 2 (Appendix K).

Further details are provided in Table 10.

### ***Identification of Non-compliances – Noise Modelling***

Metropolitan Coal, in consultation with its noise specialist (SLR Consulting), has continued to review and evaluate appropriate contingency measures and conduct further technical evaluation of the implementation of these measures during 2018.

This has included ongoing noise modelling of predicted noise levels at nearby residences in order to determine the remaining reasonable and feasible noise mitigation measures that could be implemented in consultation with the DP&E.



In the absence of the identified remaining reasonable and feasible mitigation measures, the noise modelling predicted non-compliances with the Noise Impact Assessment Criteria at 13 residences (11 residences in Oxley Place and two residences on Parkes Street) during the day-time, evening and night-time. Exceedances of the Noise Mitigation Criteria were also predicted at the nine residences in Oxley Place during the day-time, evening and night-time. The modelling also predicted exceedances of the Noise Acquisition Criteria at five residences in Oxley Place during 2018 (it is noted these residences were predicted to exceed the Noise Acquisition Criteria by 1 or 2 dBA) (Appendix L).

Further details are provided in Table 10.

It should be noted that all of the residences modelled to be experiencing exceedances of the Noise Mitigation Criteria have previously been offered noise mitigation measures on a voluntary basis by Metropolitan Coal (in the form of double glazing). Of the nine residences predicted to exceed the Noise Mitigation Criteria, only two did not accept the previous offer by Metropolitan Coal (Appendix L).

### ***Reporting and Notification of Noise Exceedances***

In July 2018 and March 2019 (i.e. following conclusive identification of sustained non-compliances and review of associated noise modelling), Metropolitan Coal notified a number of nearby residents that the most recent noise modelling continues to predict are experiencing noise levels exceeding the Noise Impact Assessment Criteria contained in the Project Approval. Residences predicted to experience non-compliances or conditional compliances based on the most recent noise modelling were notified. The notifications also advised the residents of the current process underway to re-assess noise impacts (Section 14).

### ***Noise Management***

Operational noise levels from the Metropolitan Coal Mine were materially higher prior to the approval of the Metropolitan Coal Project in June 2009.

A range of operational noise control measures has been implemented since that time, in association with extensive upgrades of existing infrastructure at the surface facilities area, including the upgrade of the CHPP. Extensive noise reduction works have been implemented progressively and noise monitoring and modelling has been used to identify areas where additional reasonable and feasible noise attenuation measures could be implemented. The Metropolitan Coal 2010 to 2017 Annual Reviews describe the noise mitigation measures implemented prior to 2018.

The extensive and long running noise control program has reduced noise emissions at nearby residences. However, Metropolitan Coal has found the number of remaining material, reasonable and feasible noise controls is diminishing.

During 2017, in consultation with the DP&E, Metropolitan Coal prepared a technical review of remaining available feasible noise mitigation measures and an associated evaluation of the reasonableness of these options (the Noise Mitigation Assessment) (SLR Consulting, 2017). This assessment was independently peer reviewed by Hatch. The reasonable and feasible contingency mitigation measures identified by Metropolitan Coal included:

- Ensuring all crusher and washer doors are closed at all times (except when being accessed).
- Progressively replacing the idlers on all surface conveyors with low noise idlers.

Following DP&E's review of the Noise Mitigation Assessment, Metropolitan Coal signed a Voluntary Undertaking which formalised the implementation of the mitigation measures identified by the 2017 Noise Mitigation Assessment. This included a timeframe for implementation of the identified mitigation measures (i.e. all existing conveyor idlers were replaced with low noise idlers by 31 December 2018), subsequent remodelling of noise levels and consultation with residents with predicted residual noise exceedances (to be undertaken in 2019).

In accordance with the Voluntary Undertaking, Metropolitan Coal completed an assessment in 2018 of Metropolitan's noise levels under the Noise Policy for Industry (released in 2017) and provided to DP&E in April 2018.

Metropolitan Coal will continue to implement noise monitoring, management and modelling in accordance with the Metropolitan Coal Noise Management Plan.

It is noted that Metropolitan Coal did not receive any requests for at-receiver noise mitigation in accordance with Condition 3, Schedule 4 of Project Approval (08\_0149) in 2018. Metropolitan Coal has previously offered double glazing noise mitigation voluntarily to a number of the nearest private residences.

### ***Operational Noise Complaints***

No operational noise related complaints were received by Metropolitan Coal during the review period.

## **7.2 AIR QUALITY AND GREENHOUSE GASES MANAGEMENT**

The Metropolitan Coal Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Management Plan has been prepared for the surface facilities area in accordance with Condition 13, Schedule 4 of the Project Approval.

Pacific Environment Operations Pty Ltd has reviewed the environmental performance of the Project in relation to air quality for the review period. The report prepared in support of this Metropolitan Coal 2018 Annual Review is provided in Appendix M.

### ***Dust Deposition***

Metropolitan Coal monitors monthly dust deposition rates at ten dust gauges (DG1 to DG10, Figure 20), consistent with EPL No. 767 and the Metropolitan Coal Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Management Plan.

Sampling during the review period was conducted at all monitoring points at the frequencies described in Conditions M2.1 and M2.2 of EPL No. 767. All of the potential 120 samples (10 sites over 12 months) were deployed during the period. On one occasion (DG1, June 2018), the flask was found to be broken upon collection and the sample was unable to be recovered. The above therefore represents 99% data availability.


The results of the dust deposition monitoring are assessed against air quality performance indicators and air quality impact assessment criteria. The results of the assessment are provided in Section 7.5 and key aspects are summarised below.

The performance indicator concentration for annual average deposited dust of 3 grams per square metre per month ( $\text{g/m}^2/\text{month}$ ) was met at all dust deposition monitoring sites during the review period (Chart 89). The annual average dust deposition rate at all dust gauges was below the long-term impact assessment criteria for deposited dust of  $4 \text{ g/m}^2/\text{month}$  (Chart 89).



Annual average dust deposition rates at each gauge from 2003 to 2018 are shown in Chart 90 and Chart 90a. From 2003 to 2018, there were no clear trends in dust deposition rates; however, relatively higher dust deposition rates were recorded at some sites in 2009 and 2015. The annual average dust deposition rate at each gauge in 2018 was within or below the range previously recorded for the dust gauges.

The Project EA (modelling for Years 3 and 15) predicted that the annual average dust deposition due to the Project plus background would not be above the applicable 4 g/m<sup>2</sup>/month amenity criterion at any receiver (modelling for Years 3 and 15). The air quality monitoring results are consistent with the Project EA predictions in relation to dust deposition.



**Chart 89 Annual Average Dust Deposition Rates Measured at Dust Gauges (DG1 to DG10)**




Chart 90a Annual Average Dust Deposition Rates at DG1 to DG10 from 2003 to 2010




Chart 90b Annual Average Dust Deposition Rates at DG1 to DG10 from 2011 to 2018


### Particulate Matter

One Tapered Element Oscillating Microbalance (TEOM) and one High Volume Air Sampler (HVAS) are located near the surface facilities area (Figure 20). The TEOM allows for continuous measurement of particulate matter less than 10 micrometres in diameter (PM<sub>10</sub>) concentrations at ten-minute intervals, while the HVAS provides an average PM<sub>10</sub> concentration for a specific 24-hour period, on a one-day-in-six cycle.

Sampling of PM<sub>10</sub> during the review period was conducted at all monitoring points at the frequencies described in Conditions M2.1 and M2.2 of EPL No. 767.

The results of the PM<sub>10</sub> monitoring are assessed against air quality performance indicators and air quality impact assessment criteria. The results of the assessment are provided in Section 7.5 and key aspects are summarised below.

The annual average PM<sub>10</sub> concentrations (measured by the HVAS) from 2007 to 2018 are shown on Chart 91. The annual average PM<sub>10</sub> concentration measured at the HVAS for the review period was 14.6 micrograms per cubic metre (µg/m<sup>3</sup>), which is lower than the annual average PM<sub>10</sub> performance indicator of 25 µg/m<sup>3</sup> and well below the annual average PM<sub>10</sub> air quality impact assessment criterion of 30 µg/m<sup>3</sup> (Chart 91).



**Chart 91 Annual Average PM<sub>10</sub> Concentrations from 2007 to 2018 (measured by the HVAS)**

There were seven exceedances of the PM<sub>10</sub> 24-hour average performance indicator concentration (37.5 µg/m<sup>3</sup>) recorded by the TEOM during 2018 (Chart 92). Exceedances on 22 January 2018, 15 February 2018 and 19 March 2018 are documented as being related to bushfire activities in the Royal National Park, Helensburgh and Tathra, respectively.

Exceedances of the 24-hour average performance indicator concentration on 28 July, 31 July, 1 August 2018 and 3 August 2018 also precipitated exceedances of the short-term impact assessment criterion of  $50 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$  (Chart 92). However, these elevated results were noted to have coincided with bushfires in Holsworthy Military Reserve.


Chart 93 indicates that there was one exceedance of the  $\text{PM}_{10}$  24-hour average performance indicator concentration recorded by the HVAS on 17 August 2018, noted to coincide with hazard reduction burning in the region.

The highest 10-minute average  $\text{PM}_{10}$  concentration measured at the TEOM for the review period was  $870.8 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$  on 3 August 2018. These values exceeded the air quality performance indicator for the 10-minute average  $\text{PM}_{10}$  concentration of  $150 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ . However, these observations were noted to coincide with bushfire activity within the Holsworthy Military Reserve and, as a result, the exceedance of the performance indicator is not considered to be a result of the Project.


There were several exceedances throughout the year of 10-minute average  $\text{PM}_{10}$  concentration. Exceedances on 20-22 January 2018 and 14 April 2018, 28 July to 3 August 2018 coincide with the bushfire activities in Royal National Park and Holsworthy area, respectively. Similarly, exceedances on 17 August 2018 was due to hazard reduction burns at Helensburgh. There were a number of days (12 September 2018, 22 November 2018 and 2, 20, 28, 29 and 30 December 2018) when exceedances were from undocumented sources, however prevailing wind direction at the time of the exceedances, as well as coinciding elevated  $\text{PM}_{10}$  levels at the regional (Wollongong) air quality station maintained by the NSW Office of Environment & Heritage suggests a larger scale source of  $\text{PM}_{10}$ , likely as a result of ongoing drought conditions in western NSW. Exceedances on 15 August 2018 and 18 July 2018 were noted as being related to domestic wood burning in the neighbouring area. The highest 10-minute average  $\text{PM}_{10}$  concentration measured at the TEOM for the reporting period was  $870.8 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ , which was recorded on 3 August 2018. This value exceeded the air quality performance indicator for the 10-minute average  $\text{PM}_{10}$  concentration of  $150 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ . As indicated above, this observation was anticipated to be associated with bushfire activity within the Holsworthy Military Reserve.

The predicted annual average  $\text{PM}_{10}$  (Project plus background) concentrations modelled for Years 3 and 15 in the Project EA were not predicted to be above the  $30 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$  assessment criterion at any receiver. The maximum 24-hour average  $\text{PM}_{10}$  concentrations modelled for Years 3 and 15 by the Project EA were not predicted to exceed the assessment criterion (Project only) of  $50 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$  at any receiver. Residences located in close proximity to the major surface facilities area on Parkes Street were predicted to experience maximum 24-hour average  $\text{PM}_{10}$  concentrations close to the criteria (i.e.  $49 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ ) in Year 15 due to their close proximity to the coal stockpiles and train loading activities.

The monitoring results in 2018 are thus considered to be lower than the Project EA predictions in relation to particulate matter.



**Chart 92 24-hour Average PM<sub>10</sub> Concentrations (measured by the TEOM)**



**Chart 93 24-hour Average PM<sub>10</sub> Concentrations (measured by the HVAS)**

## **Management Measures**

A number of ongoing air quality management measures are implemented at Metropolitan Coal to manage and mitigate air quality impacts, as reported in previous Annual Reviews. During the review period, Metropolitan Coal installed a train wagon profiler to evenly spread and wash loose coal off the wagon gunnels after it is loaded by front end loader. The consistent profile minimises turbulence during transport, reducing coal dust emissions from the wagons.

### **7.3 TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT**

The Metropolitan Coal Traffic Management Plan has been prepared to minimise the traffic impacts of the Project on the residential areas and schools within Helensburgh in accordance with Condition 22, Schedule 4 of the Project Approval.

Metropolitan Coal monitors the amount of product coal transported from site by road and by rail. A total of 1,723,747 t of product coal was transported from site by rail during the review period. No product coal was transported from the site by road.

Metropolitan Coal also monitors the amount of coal reject that is transported from the site by road each year. A total of 370,062 t of coal reject was transported from the site by road in 2018. Of this total 295,781 t of coal reject was transported to the Glenlee Washery for disposal, with the remaining 74,281 t transported to the Sanctuary Ponds residential development for beneficial reuse as engineered fill.

In September 2010, a Road Safety Audit of the Mine Access Road and Parkes Street intersection was conducted in accordance with Condition 17(a), Schedule 4 of the Project Approval. The Road Safety Audit recommended an upgrade of the Parkes Street and Colliery Road intersection. However, Metropolitan Coal was unable to address all of the recommended intersection upgrades due to the inability to obtain a mutually acceptable outcome with the Wollongong City Council (as reported in the 2016 Annual Review). In May 2016, the DP&E (Compliance Southern Region) noted that Metropolitan Coal had made considerable effort to address the findings in the road safety report, however recommended a road safety expert be engaged to review whether the works undertaken are sufficient to address the original risk identified, or whether alternative/additional actions can be undertaken to address the risk.

In 2018 Metropolitan Coal met with the Wollongong City Council to discuss if a mutually acceptable outcome regarding the intersection upgrade could be reached, and will continue to consult with Council in 2019.

### **7.4 WASTE MANAGEMENT**

The Metropolitan Coal Waste Management Plan has been prepared for the surface facilities area in accordance with Condition 25, Schedule 4 of the Project Approval to identify waste streams and monitor the quantities generated, identify waste management measures to minimise waste generation, and ensure that waste generated by Metropolitan Coal is appropriately stored, handled and disposed.

Waste generated by Metropolitan Coal can include tyres, oil, sewage effluent, paint, lead acid batteries, coal rejects, drift waste rock, office waste (e.g. paper, plastics, and cardboard), scrap metal, general inert waste (e.g. concrete, timber, pipe, rope and rags), underground waste (e.g. packaging, cloths and pipe), oil/fuel filters, aerosol cans, absorbents (e.g. spent oil spill material) and food waste.

Metropolitan Coal monitors waste generated on a monthly basis through waste disposal receipts provided by Metropolitan Coal's waste contractors. Figure 21(a) shows the amount of general waste disposed of in 2018 compared with previous calendar years. Approximately 197,850 kilograms (kg) of general waste was disposed of at a licensed landfill facility in 2018. Approximately 33,200 kg of diesel particulate filters from underground mine equipment, was also disposed of at a licensed landfill facility during the review period.

Waste recycled by Metropolitan Coal during the review period included waste oil, scrap metal and office waste (e.g. paper, cardboard and plastic). Figure 21(b-e) shows the amount of waste oil, scrap metal and office waste recycled in 2018, respectively, compared with previous calendar years.

Figure 21(f) and Figure 21(g) show the amount of coal reject emplaced by Metropolitan Coal in underground workings and disposed of at the Glenlee Washery, respectively, during the 2012 to 2018 calendar years. In 2018, 69,444 t of coal reject were emplaced underground, 295,781 t of coal reject were disposed of at the Glenlee Washery and 74,281 t of coal reject were beneficially re-used as engineered fill at the Sanctuary Ponds residential development.

During the 2016 review period, the capacity of the coal reject backfill emplacement plant was upgraded to allow up to 60% of coal rejects generated by Metropolitan Coal to be disposed of by underground emplacement into the operating goaf. In 2018, Metropolitan Coal commissioned a project team to undertake a review of the backfill emplacement process to understand current limitations and identify potential improvements and/or efficiencies that can be achieved. The coal reject backfill emplacement project will continue in 2019.

The Wollongong City Council is continuing works to confirm the suitability of Metropolitan Coal rejects to be beneficially re-used at the Helensburgh Landfill in consultation with the EPA.

The education program continued to be implemented during the review period to increase the awareness of mine site personnel in relation to waste management and measures to minimise the generation of waste. Metropolitan Coal will continue to seek opportunities for additional waste minimisation and for the recycling and re-use of materials at the site.

## **7.5 ASSESSMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PERFORMANCE**

The performance indicators, impact assessment criteria and Project Approval conditions in Table 10 assess the performance of environmental management at the surface facilities area including those related to noise, air quality, greenhouse gases, odour, traffic, waste and visual impacts for the review period and reflect the predictions included in the Project EA, Preferred Project Report and the surface facilities management plans (Noise Management Plan, Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Management Plan, Traffic Management Plan, Surface Facilities Water Management Plan and Waste Management Plan).

**Table 10**  
**Assessment of Environmental Performance – Surface Facilities Area**

Monitoring Aspect	Performance Indicator, Impact Assessment Criteria and/or Project Approval Condition	Indicator, Criteria or Condition Met?	Comments
<b>NOISE</b>			
Real-time Noise Performance Indicator	<i>The <math>L_{Aeq(5\text{ minute})}</math> night-time noise level does not exceed 50 dB(A) for six consecutive 5 minute samples.</i>	No	The Real Time Noise Performance Indicator was triggered 125 times during the review period. In all cases, source was determined to be non-mine related.
Noise Impact Assessment Criteria (Project Approval Table 2, Condition 1, Schedule 4)	Day $L_{Aeq(15\text{ minute})}$ – 50 dBA	No	A sustained non-compliance with respect to the day-time Noise Impact Assessment Criterion was identified by monitoring at 16 Oxley Place as a result of consecutive exceedances in Quarters 3 and 4 (Appendix K).  Consistent with the monitoring results, it can be inferred from noise modelling that sustained non-compliances with respect to the day-time Noise Impact Assessment Criteria at seven residences in Oxley Place (Appendix L).
	Evening $L_{Aeq(15\text{ minute})}$ – 45 dBA	No	A sustained non-compliance with respect to the evening Noise Impact Assessment Criterion was identified by monitoring at 16 Oxley Place as a result of consecutive exceedances in Quarters 2 and 3, and conditional exceedance in Quarter 1 (Appendix K).  Consistent with the monitoring results, it can be inferred from noise modelling that sustained non-compliances with respect to the evening Noise Impact Assessment Criteria occurred at 13 residences (11 residences in Oxley Place and two residences on Parkes Street) (Appendix L).
	Night $L_{Aeq(15\text{ minute})}$ – 45 dBA	No	A conditional sustained non-compliance with respect to the night Noise Impact Assessment Criterion was identified by monitoring at 16 Oxley Place as a result of consecutive exceedances in Quarters 2 and 3 (Appendix K).  Consistent with the monitoring results, it can be inferred from noise modelling that sustained non-compliances with respect to the night-time Noise Impact Assessment Criteria occurred at 13 residences (11 residences in Oxley Place and two residences on Parkes Street) (Appendix L).
	Night $L_{A1(1\text{ minute})}$ – 50 dBA	No	A conditional sustained non-compliance with respect to the night-time maximum Noise Impact Assessment Criterion was identified by noise monitoring at 16 Oxley Place as a result of consecutive exceedances in Quarters 4 (2017) and Quarter 1 (2018), and again in Quarters 2 and 3 (2018).  A sustained non-compliance with respect to the night-time maximum Noise Impact Assessment Criterion was identified by noise monitoring at 16 Oxley Place as a result of consecutive exceedances in Quarters 1 and 2 (Appendix K).  A sustained non-compliance with respect to the night-time maximum Noise Impact Assessment Criterion was identified by noise monitoring at 36 Old Station Road as a result of consecutive exceedances in Quarters 1 and 2 (Appendix K).



**Table 10 (Continued)**  
**Assessment of Environmental Performance – Surface Facilities Area**

Monitoring Aspect	Performance Indicator, Impact Assessment Criteria and/or Project Approval Condition	Indicator, Criteria or Condition Met?	Comments
<b>NOISE (Continued)</b>			
Noise Mitigation Criteria (Project Approval Table 4, Condition 3, Schedule 4)	Day $L_{Aeq(15\text{ minute})}$ – 53 dBA	No	No sustained exceedances of the day-time Noise Mitigation Criteria were identified by monitoring during the review period (Appendix K). Modelling predicts that there may have been sustained exceedances of the day-time Noise Mitigation Criteria in two private residences in Oxley Place (Appendix L).
	Evening $L_{Aeq(15\text{ minute})}$ – 48 dBA	No	No sustained exceedances of the evening Noise Mitigation Criterion were identified by monitoring during the review period (Appendix K). Modelling predicts that there may have been sustained exceedances of the evening Noise Mitigation Criteria occurred in nine private residences in Oxley Place (Appendix L).
	Night $L_{Aeq(15\text{ minute})}$ – 48 dBA	No	No sustained exceedances of the night-time Noise Mitigation Criterion were identified by monitoring during the review period (Appendix K). Modelling predicts that there may have been sustained exceedances of the night-time Noise Mitigation Criteria occurred in nine private residences in Oxley Place (Appendix L).
Noise Acquisition Criteria (Project Approval Table 3, Condition 2, Schedule 4)	Day $L_{Aeq(15\text{ minute})}$ – 55 dBA	Yes	No sustained exceedances of the day-time Noise Acquisition Criterion were identified by monitoring or monitoring during the review period (Appendix K).
	Evening $L_{Aeq(15\text{ minute})}$ – 50 dBA	No	No sustained exceedances of the evening or night-time Noise Acquisition Criterion were identified by monitoring during the review period (Appendix K).
	Night $L_{Aeq(15\text{ minute})}$ – 50 dBA	No	Modelling predicts that there may have been exceedances of the evening Noise Acquisition Criterion at five of the private residences in Oxley Place (by 1 or 2 dBA) during the review period (Appendix L).
Rail Noise (Project Approval Conditions 4, 5 and 6, Schedule 4)	4. <i>The Proponent shall only use locomotives that are approved to operate on the NSW rail network in accordance with noise limits L6.1 to L6.4 in RailCorp's EPL (No. 12208) and ARTC's EPL (No. 3142) or a Pollution Control Approval issued under the former <u>Pollution Control Act 1970</u>.</i>	Yes	All locomotives used by Metropolitan Coal are approved for operations in accordance with the noise limits in the relevant EPL.
	5. <i>The Proponent shall use its best endeavours to minimise night-time movements of rolling stock on the Metropolitan rail spur.</i>	Yes	Metropolitan Coal has endeavoured to minimise night-time movements of rolling stock on the Metropolitan rail spur.
Rail Noise (Project Approval Conditions 4, 5 and 6, Schedule 4) (Continued)	6. <i>In the event of any rail noise or vibration issues that may arise from the haulage of coal over the life of the Project, the Proponent shall liaise with the CCC and the rail service provider to facilitate resolution of these issues and implement additional noise reduction measures where appropriate.</i>	Yes	No issues with rail noise or vibration were identified during the review period.

**Table 10 (Continued)**  
**Assessment of Environmental Performance – Surface Facilities Area**

Monitoring Aspect	Performance Indicator, Impact Assessment Criteria and/or Project Approval Condition	Indicator, Criteria or Condition Met?	Comments
<b>NOISE (Continued)</b>			
Notification of Landowners (Project Approval Condition 1, Schedule 5)	1. <i>If the results of the monitoring required in schedule 4 identify that impacts generated by the project are greater than the relevant impact assessment criteria in schedule 4, except where a negotiated agreement has been entered into in relation to that impact, then the Proponent shall, within 2 weeks of obtaining the monitoring results, notify the Executive Director Mineral Resources, the affected landowners and tenants (including tenants of mine owned properties) accordingly, and provide quarterly monitoring results to each of these parties until the results show that the project is complying with the criteria in schedule 4.</i>	Yes	In August 2018 and March 2019 (i.e. following conclusive identification of the sustained non-compliances and review of associated noise modelling), Metropolitan Coal notified a number of nearby residents that the most recent noise modelling continues to predict are experiencing noise levels exceeding the Noise Impact Assessment Criteria contained in the Project Approval. The notifications also advised the residents of the current process underway to re-assess noise impacts (Section 13.2).
<b>AIR QUALITY</b>			
Air Quality Performance Indicators <sup>1,2</sup>	PM <sub>10</sub> indicator = 150 µg/m <sup>3</sup> (10 minute averaging period assessed using TEOM data)	Yes	The maximum 10-minute average PM <sub>10</sub> concentration recorded by the TEOM was 870.8 µg/m <sup>3</sup> on 3 August 2018. However, this is due to a bushfire activity within the nearby Holsworthy Military Reserve. There were several other exceedances as well. Exceedances on 20-22 January 2018 and 14 April 2018, 28 July to 3 August 2018 coincide with the bushfire activities in Royal National Park and Holsworthy area, respectively. Similarly, exceedances on 17 August 2018 was due to hazard reduction burns at Helensburgh. There were a number of few days (12 September 2018, 22 November 2018 and 2, 20, 28, 29 and 30 December 2018) when exceedances were from undocumented sources, however these were attributable to wind direction at the time of the exceedances so exceedances of the performance indicator is not considered to be a result of the Project.
	PM <sub>10</sub> indicator = 37.5 µg/m <sup>3</sup> (24-hour averaging period assessed using TEOM data)	Yes	All observed exceedances of the performance indicator concentration noted to have coincided with bushfire / back burning events and as such are not considered to be a result of the Project.
	PM <sub>10</sub> indicator = 37.5 µg/m <sup>3</sup> (24-hour averaging period assessed using HVAS data)	Yes	All observed exceedances of the performance indicator concentration noted to have coincided with bushfire / back burning events and as such are not considered to be a result of the Project.
Air Quality Performance Indicators <sup>1,2</sup> (Continued)	PM <sub>10</sub> indicator = 25 µg/m <sup>3</sup> (Annual averaging period assessed using HVAS data)	Yes	An annual average of PM <sub>10</sub> concentration of 14.6 µg/m <sup>3</sup> was recorded by the HVAS.
	Maximum total deposited dust level = 3 g/m <sup>2</sup> /month (Annual averaging period) <sup>3</sup>	Yes	The annual average dust deposition rates for all monitoring sites indicate that compliance with the performance indicator was achieved during the reporting period

**Table 10 (Continued)**  
**Assessment of Environmental Performance – Surface Facilities Area**

Monitoring Aspect	Performance Indicator, Impact Assessment Criteria and/or Project Approval Condition	Indicator, Criteria or Condition Met?	Comments
<b>AIR QUALITY (Continued)</b>			
Air Quality Impact Assessment Criteria (Project Approval Condition 11, Schedule 4)	TSP Criteria <sup>4</sup> = 90 µg/m <sup>3</sup> (Annual averaging period)	Yes	Based on the annual average PM <sub>10</sub> concentrations recorded by the HVAS, the annual average TSP is estimated to be less than 29.2 µg/m <sup>3</sup>
	PM <sub>10</sub> Criteria <sup>4</sup> = 30 µg/m <sup>3</sup> (Annual averaging period)	Yes	An annual average of PM <sub>10</sub> concentration of 14.6 µg/m <sup>3</sup> was recorded by the HVAS.
	PM <sub>10</sub> Criteria <sup>4</sup> = 50 µg/m <sup>3</sup> (24 hour averaging period)	Yes	Four exceedances of the 24-hour average PM <sub>10</sub> impact assessment criterion of 50 µg/m <sup>3</sup> were observed using the TEOM instrument. However, all of these events are noted to be associated with bushfires in the surrounding area.  Compliance with the 24-hour average PM <sub>10</sub> impact assessment criterion was observed using the HVAS instrument during the reporting period.
	Maximum total deposited dust level = 4 g/m <sup>2</sup> /month (Annual averaging period)	Yes	The maximum annual average dust deposition rate was below 4 g/m <sup>2</sup> /month during the reporting period at all dust gauges.
<b>ODOUR</b>			
Odour (Project Approval Condition 9, Schedule 4)	9. <i>The Proponent shall not cause or permit the emission of offensive odours from the site, as defined under Section 129 of the POEO Act.</i>	Yes	No odour complaints were received during the review period.
<b>GREENHOUSE GASES</b>			
Greenhouse Gas Emissions (Project Approval Condition 10, Schedule 4)	10. <i>The Proponent shall implement all reasonable and feasible measures to minimise:</i> <i>(a) energy use on site; and</i> <i>(b) the scope 1, 2 and 3 greenhouse gas emissions produced on site,</i> <i>to the satisfaction of the Director-General.</i>	Yes	Metropolitan Coal has implemented the viable energy saving measures contained within their Energy Savings Action Plan.
<b>TRAFFIC</b>			
Annual Road Maintenance Performance Indicators	<i>When annual road maintenance contribution negotiations are required, the negotiations should commence with the relevant councils and/or DP&amp;I by 31 August.</i>	Yes	No negotiations with the Wollongong City Council, Campbelltown City Council and Wollondilly Shire Council were required during the review period.
	<i>Annual road maintenance contributions to relevant councils are made by 30 November.</i>	Yes	Metropolitan Coal made contributions to the Wollongong City Council, Campbelltown City Council and Wollondilly Shire Council by 30 November 2018.
Coal Transport Off-site Performance Indicators	<i>Coal transported off-site by road in a calendar year does not reach 150,000 tonnes prior to 31 October.</i>	Yes	Metropolitan Coal did not transport any product coal from the site by road in the 2018 calendar year.

**Table 10 (Continued)**  
**Assessment of Environmental Performance – Surface Facilities Area**

Monitoring Aspect	Performance Indicator, Impact Assessment Criteria and/or Project Approval Condition	Indicator, Criteria or Condition Met?	Comments
<b>TRAFFIC (Continued)</b>			
Coal Transport Off-site Performance Indicators (Continued)	<i>Product coal truck movements to the Corrimal Cokeworks and Coalcliff Cokeworks do not exceed 22 and 27 movements respectively in any one day.</i>	Yes	Metropolitan Coal has ceased the transport of product coal to Corrimal Cokeworks and Coalcliff Cokeworks. No product coal was transported by road during the review period.
Limits on Approval (Project Approval Condition 6[b], Schedule 2)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>The Proponent shall not:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) ...</li> <li>(b) <i>transport more than 2.8 million tonnes of product coal from the site in a calendar year.</i></li> </ul> </li> </ul>	Yes	Metropolitan Coal transported a total of 1,723,747 t of product coal from site by rail in the 2018 calendar year.
Transport (Project Approval Conditions 17, 18, 19, 20 and 21, Schedule 4)	<p><i>17. By the end of 2010, the Proponent shall:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) <i>undertake a road safety audit of the Parkes Street and Colliery Road intersection, in consultation with the RTA and WCC; and</i></li> <li>(b) <i>implement any recommendations of this audit,</i></li> </ul> <p><i>to the satisfaction of the Director-General<sup>F</sup>.</i></p>	<p>Yes, the road safety audit has been undertaken.</p> <p>Further actions required in relation to the audit recommendations.</p>	<p>The Road Safety Audit of the Mine Access Road and Parkes Street intersection was conducted in September 2010 in accordance with Condition 17(a), Schedule 4 of the Project Approval. The Road Safety Audit recommended an upgrade of the Parkes Street and Colliery Road intersection. However, Metropolitan Coal was unable to address all of the recommended intersection upgrades due to the inability to obtain a mutually acceptable outcome with the Wollongong City Council.</p> <p>Metropolitan Coal engaged a road safety expert to review whether the works undertaken are sufficient to address the original risk identified, or whether alternative/additional actions can be undertaken to address the risk. The review indicated that the civil works associated with the full intersection upgrade were not achievable within the Colliery Road Crown Land lease area. Metropolitan Coal met with Wollongong City Council in 2018 to discuss the potential to revisit Council's previous position and will continue to consult further in relation to the intersection upgrade.</p>
	<p><i>18. From the end of 2009, the Proponent shall make a suitable annual contribution to WCC, WSC, and CC for the maintenance of local roads that are used as haulage routes by the project. If there is any dispute over the amount of the contribution, the matter must be referred to the Director-General<sup>F</sup> for resolution.</i></p>	Yes	Metropolitan Coal has made a suitable annual contribution to the Wollongong City Council, Campbelltown City Council and Wollondilly Shire Council.

**Table 10 (Continued)**  
**Assessment of Environmental Performance – Surface Facilities Area**

Monitoring Aspect	Performance Indicator, Impact Assessment Criteria and/or Project Approval Condition	Indicator, Criteria or Condition Met?	Comments
<b>TRAFFIC (Continued)</b>			
Transport (Project Approval Conditions 17, 18, 19, 20 and 21, Schedule 4) (Continued)	<p>19. <i>The Proponent shall not:</i></p> <p>(a) <i>load coal or coal reject onto trucks, or transport it off site by road, outside the hours of 7am and 6pm Monday to Friday;</i></p> <p>(b) <i>transport more than 170,000 tonnes of coal off site by road in a calendar year;</i></p> <p>(c) <i>transport any coal off site to the Port Kembla Coal Terminal by road;</i></p> <p>(d) <i>permit the departure of more than 25 trucks containing product coal for delivery to the Corrimal Cokeworks on any given day; or</i></p> <p>(e) <i>permit the departure of more than 30 trucks containing product coal for delivery to the Coalcliff Cokeworks on any given day.</i></p>	Yes	The loading and transport of coal product and coal reject has been undertaken in accordance with Condition 19, Schedule 4 of the Project Approval.
	20. <i>During emergencies (such as the disruption of rail services) the Proponent may exceed the restrictions in condition 19 above with the written approval of the Director-General<sup>f</sup>.</i>	Yes	No emergencies requiring amendments to Condition 19 occurred during the review period.
	21. <i>The Proponent shall monitor the amount of coal and coal reject transported from the site by road and rail each year, and report the results of this monitoring on its website every six months.</i>	Yes	The results of coal and coal reject transport monitoring have been provided on Metropolitan Coal's website and updated every six months.
<b>WASTE</b>			
Waste Generation Performance Indicator	<p><i>Waste generation has been minimised, as evidenced by:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>an increase in the amount or type of waste recycled;</i></li> <li>• <i>a decrease in the amount of waste generated that is disposed of to licensed landfill facilities; and/or</i></li> <li>• <i>no practicable opportunities for additional waste minimisation have been identified to those currently being implemented.</i></li> </ul>	Yes	<p>Metropolitan Coal has minimised waste generation during the review period.</p> <p>The underground emplacement project reduced the off-site disposal of coal reject by approximately 69,444 t during the review period.</p> <p>Beneficial reuse of coal rejects as engineered fill at residential developments in the Illawarra region reduced the disposal of coal reject by 74, 281 during the review period.</p> <p>No further practicable opportunities for waste minimisation were identified.</p>

**Table 10 (Continued)**  
**Assessment of Environmental Performance – Surface Facilities Area**

Monitoring Aspect	Performance Indicator, Impact Assessment Criteria and/or Project Approval Condition	Indicator, Criteria or Condition Met?	Comments
<b>WASTE (Continued)</b>			
Storage of Waste Performance Indicator	<i>Waste has been separated and stored according to type in appropriate storage facilities (e.g. sealed containers for liquid waste).</i>	Yes	Waste on-site is adequately sorted and stored according to waste type prior to collection. Weekly site inspections are conducted by the site Environment & Community Superintendent to ensure waste is separated and stored in accordance with the Metropolitan Coal Waste Management Plan.
Handling and Disposal of Waste Performance Indicator	<i>The transport of particular waste types has been tracked in accordance with NSW EPA waste tracking requirements. Metropolitan Coal's waste management contracts, where relevant, specify that the waste is to be transported by an appropriately licensed contractor and disposed of at an appropriately licensed facility.</i>	Yes	All transport of waste from the Metropolitan Coal site has been tracked in accordance with the NSW Office of Environment and Heritage waste tracking requirements. Metropolitan Coal's waste management contracts specify waste is to be removed by an appropriately licensed contractor and disposed of at an appropriately licensed facility.
Waste Generation (Project Approval Condition 24, Schedule 4)	<i>24. The Proponent shall: (a) minimise the waste (including coal reject) generated by the project; and (b) ensure that the waste generated by the project is appropriately stored, handled, and disposed of, to the satisfaction of the Director-General.</i>	Yes	Metropolitan Coal has minimised waste (including coal reject) generated during the review period. The underground emplacement project had reduced the off-site disposal of coal reject by approximately 69,444 t during the review period.  Beneficial reuse of coal rejects as engineered fill at residential developments in the Illawarra region reduced the disposal of coal reject by 74, 281 during the review period. Waste on-site is adequately sorted and stored according to waste type prior to collection. Weekly site inspections are conducted by the site Environment & Community Superintendent to ensure waste is separated and stored in accordance with the Metropolitan Coal Waste Management Plan.  Metropolitan Coal's waste management contracts specify waste is to be removed by an appropriately licensed contractor and disposed of at an appropriately licensed facility.
<b>VISUAL</b>			
Visual Impacts (Project Approval Condition 23, Schedule 4)	<i>23. The Proponent shall minimise the visual impacts, and particularly the off-site lighting impacts, of the surface facilities area and two ventilation shaft sites to the satisfaction of the Director-General.</i>	Yes	

Note:  $L_{Aeq(15 \text{ minute})}$  = intrusive equivalent noise level;  $L_{A1(1 \text{ minute})}$  = short-term noise level; dBA = A-weighted decibels;  $PM_{10}$  = Particulate matter less than 10 microns; HVAS1 = High Volume Air Sampler 1; TEOM1 = Tapered Element Oscillating Microbalance 1;  $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$  = micrograms per cubic metre;  $\text{g}/\text{m}^2/\text{month}$  = grams per square metre per month; TSP = total suspended particulate matter.

<sup>1</sup> Total measured level excluding extraordinary events such as bushfires, prescribed burning, dust storms, sea fog, fire incidents, illegal activities.

<sup>2</sup> Background  $PM_{10}$  concentrations due to all other sources plus the incremental increase in  $PM_{10}$  concentrations due to the mine alone.

<sup>3</sup> Dust deposition assessment criteria are to be measured using DG1 to DG10 excluding DG4, which is a control dust gauge that is located at the Helensburgh Golf Course some 2 km from the mine's surface facilities area.

<sup>4</sup>  $PM_{10}$  air quality impact assessment criteria are to be measured using HVAS data.

## 8 WATER MANAGEMENT

A Metropolitan Coal Surface Facilities Water Management Plan has been prepared for the surface facilities area and two ventilation shaft sites in accordance with Condition 15, Schedule 4 of the Project Approval.

This section details the water use, licensed discharge and water quality monitoring results for the surface facilities area and the management measures implemented during the review period. The environmental performance of water management in the underground mining area and surrounds is described in Section 6.2.

The surface facilities area is located in a steep-sided valley adjacent to the town of Helensburgh and next to Camp Gully (Figure 2). The site water management system comprises a series of collection dams, sumps and treatment systems. The system is operated to avoid the mixing of clean water runoff and mine water, minimise off-site release of runoff, and to provide water supply requirements on-site.

### ***Water Use***


The main uses of water on site are to supply underground mining operations and the coal washery. Metropolitan Coal draws its water from three main sources, namely, Camp Gully, the potable town water supply and water captured on-site.

Camp Gully runs adjacent to the southern edge of Metropolitan Coal's surface facilities area (Figure 22). Metropolitan Coal's extraction of water from Camp Gully is specifically regulated by the Camp Creek Weir Surface Water Certificate of Title and more generally by the *Water Act, 1912* and the *Water Management Act, 2000*.

Metropolitan Coal's annual entitlement under the Camp Gully extraction licence is 130 megalitres (ML). A concrete weir was historically constructed on Camp Gully (approximately 1930s) to facilitate the extraction of water for the mine. Metropolitan Coal did not source any water from Camp Gully during the review period. In comparison, Metropolitan Coal sourced 39 ML of water from Camp Gully in the 2017 calendar year, 70 ML of water in the 2016 calendar year, 47 ML of water in the 2015 calendar year, 77 ML of water in the 2014 calendar year, 99 ML in the 2013 calendar year and 94 ML in the 2012 calendar year.

The use of potable water (sourced from Sydney Water) for mine purposes occurs when insufficient water is available from Camp Gully and/or on-site harvesting. Potable water is sourced from two mains, one of which supplies the bathhouses and drinking water utilities and one that supplements water supplies for mining purposes. Use of potable water is recorded and minimised in accordance with the site's commitments under the Water Savings Action Plan. Metropolitan Coal used approximately 365 ML of potable town water (as recorded by the Sydney Water meters) during 2018 (a monthly average of approximately 30.4 ML), in comparison to 513 ML in 2017, 386 ML in 2016, 378 ML in 2015 and 388 ML in 2014.

The use of potable water per tonne of ROM coal produced is variable and is generally higher during periods of low rainfall (Chart 94). Ongoing site auditing during the review period has not identified incidences of potable water being used where there is a viable alternative. In 2018 potable water consumption correlated well with ROM production throughout the year.



**Chart 94 Potable Water Used per ROM Tonne Produced vs Rainfall**

### ***Licensed Discharge***

Water discharged from the Water Treatment Plant to Camp Gully is monitored in accordance with EPL No. 767, which requires Metropolitan Coal to continuously monitor the volume (kilolitres per day) of water discharged from the clean water tank in the Water Treatment Plant to Camp Gully. The total amount of water discharged from the Water Treatment Plant to Camp Gully during the review period was approximately 67 ML, in comparison to 133 ML in 2017, 166 ML in 2016, 96 ML in 2015, 109 ML in 2014, 151 ML in 2013 and 98 ML in 2012.

### ***Water Quality***

Surface water quality monitoring of pH, oil and grease and total suspended solids is conducted at the Water Treatment Plant in accordance with EPL No. 767.

The water quality monitoring results indicate that pH levels (8.4 pH), oil and grease (less than 5 mg/L) and total suspended solids (13 mg/L) were within the water quality limits prescribed by EPL No. 767 (i.e. 6.5 to 8.5 pH, less than 10 mg/L for oil and grease, and less than 30 mg/L for total suspended solids) during the review period. Similarly, no exceedances of the EPL No. 767 concentration limits were recorded by Metropolitan Coal in the 2011 to 2017 calendar years.

The Project EA predicted there would be no material effect to downstream water quality as a result of water releases from the major surface facilities area to Camp Gully (which are constrained by EPL No. 767). The monitoring results are consistent with the Project EA predictions in relation to water quality.



### Overall System Integrity

Surface facilities water management items (such as pipelines and pumps, bunded areas, main water storages, signs of discharge of site runoff, upslope diversions and erosion control measures) are visually inspected by Metropolitan Coal and reported in accordance with the mine's maintenance system.

During the review period, erosion and sediment controls continued to be maintained around the perimeter of the Turkey's Nest Dam (which was upgraded during the 2016 review period) while revegetation works of the Turkey's Nest outer batters have been conducted. Erosion and sediment controls will continue until the revegetation works have been completed.

The Turkey's Nest Dam and Sediment Ponds were de-silted during the review period to increase the available water capacity of the storages. De-silting of the storages will continue in the next reporting period.

### Assessment of Environmental Performance

In accordance with the Metropolitan Coal Surface Facilities Water Management Plan, an assessment of the environmental performance of water management at the surface facilities area is provided in Table 11.

**Table 11**  
**Assessment of Environmental Performance – Surface Facilities Water Management**

Monitoring Aspect	Performance Indicator or Project Approval Condition	Indicator or Condition Met?	Comments
<b>SURFACE FACILITIES WATER MANAGEMENT</b>			
Water Use Performance Indicator	<i>The use of potable water (i.e. megalitres of town water used per tonne of coal produced) does not increase over time, after taking into consideration climatic conditions.</i>  <i>Potable water has not been used in circumstances where there is a viable alternative.</i>	Yes	Ongoing site auditing during the review period has not identified incidences of potable water being used where there is a viable alternative.
Erosion Control Performance Indicator	<i>Inspections of the major surface facilities area and ventilation shaft(s) indicate the measures implemented are effectively controlling erosion.</i>	Yes	Weekly inspections of the surface facilities area and ventilation shaft(s) indicate that the erosion control measures implemented during the review period have effectively controlled erosion.
Containment of Contaminants Performance Indicator	<i>Effective containment and/or isolation measures are in place for potential contaminants on site.</i>	Yes	Weekly inspections have confirmed that effective containment and isolation measures have been in place for potential contaminants on-site.
Licensed Discharge Performance Indicator	<i>Surface water discharges comply with the requirements of EPL No. 767.</i>	Yes	All water discharge criteria were met during the review period.
System Integrity Performance Indicator	<i>Inspections of system components indicate the integrity of the system is not at risk of being compromised.</i>	Yes	Daily and weekly inspections of the water management system confirmed the integrity of the system was not at risk.
Discharges (Project Approval Condition 14, Schedule 4)	<i>14. The Proponent shall ensure that all surface water discharges from the site comply with the discharge limits (both volume and quality) set for the project in any EPL.</i>	Yes	The water discharge volume and quality limits were met during the review period.

## **9 CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT**

A Metropolitan Coal Construction Management Plan has been prepared for surface construction works (excluding remediation or rehabilitation works) in the Woronora Special Area in accordance with Condition 11, Schedule 3 of the Project Approval. During the review period, Metropolitan Coal commenced the review and revision of the Metropolitan Coal Construction Management Plan to be consistent with the Longwalls 301-303 Extraction Plan.

As the requirement for surface construction works arise, Metropolitan Coal provide the specific details of the proposed surface construction works (in the form of a completed Surface Works Assessment Form) to the DP&E and WaterNSW for comment. The Surface Works Assessment Form details the specific management measures that will be implemented to minimise potential impacts associated with surface construction works, including management measures relevant to vegetation, Aboriginal heritage, erosion and sediment control, fuel and spill management, transport, waste, bushfire preparedness, pest management and site clean-up.

During the reporting period, Metropolitan Coal submitted a Construction Management Plan Surface Works Assessment Form to the DP&E for the proposed installation of piezometers in upland swamps within the angle of draw of Longwalls 304-306. Based on vegetation characteristics, landform features, swamp sediment profile and predicted subsidence, Metropolitan proposed to install piezometers in Swamps 60, 62, 64, 72, 133 and 134. The upland swamp piezometers were installed during the reporting period.

Metropolitan Coal also submitted an addendum to a previously approved Surface Works Assessment Form to install a replacement deep groundwater piezometer at 302GW01 which failed after Longwall 302 passed under the piezometer. The replacement piezometer was installed during the reporting period.

No other construction activities in the underground mining area were conducted during the review period.

In the next reporting period, Metropolitan Coal will investigate the potential to install small surface water flow gauges immediately downstream of Swamps 92, 77 and 76. Metropolitan Coal will also prepare Surface Works Assessment Forms and install additional upland swamp groundwater piezometers and soil moisture probes in select swamps over and/or proximal to Longwalls 307-309.

## 10 REHABILITATION

### 10.1 REHABILITATION SUMMARY

Metropolitan Coal has prepared a Rehabilitation Strategy for the surface facilities area in accordance with Condition 2, Schedule 6 of the Project Approval. The surface facilities area includes roads, facilities (e.g. the CHPP, administration buildings and workshops), stockpiles (coal and reject stockpiles), railroads, water storages and infrastructure. Rehabilitation of the surface facilities area is described in Section 10.2.

A Metropolitan Coal Rehabilitation Management Plan has been prepared for underground mining areas requiring rehabilitation or remediation measures, including surface disturbance and stream pool/rock bar remediation in accordance with Condition 4, Schedule 6 of the Project Approval. Rehabilitation of the underground mining area is described in Section 10.3

A summary of the rehabilitation status at Metropolitan Coal for the previous, current and forecast review periods is provided in Table 12.

An assessment of rehabilitation environmental performance is provided in Section 10.5.

**Table 12**  
**Rehabilitation Status**

Mine Area Type	As at December 2017	As at December 2018	As at December 2019 (Forecast)
A. Total mine footprint <sup>1</sup>	~ 17 ha	~ 17 ha	~ 17 ha
B. Total active disturbance <sup>2</sup>	~ 17 ha	~ 17 ha	~ 17 ha
C. Land being prepared for rehabilitation <sup>3</sup>	0	0	0
D. Land under active rehabilitation <sup>4</sup>	0	0	0
E. Completed rehabilitation <sup>5</sup>	0	0	0

<sup>1</sup> **Total mine footprint:** includes all areas within a mining lease that either have at some point in time, or continue to, pose a rehabilitation liability due to mining and associated activities. As such, it is the sum of total active disturbance, decommissioning, landform establishment, growth medium development, ecosystem establishment, ecosystem development and relinquished lands (as defined in the DRE (now DRG) MOP/RMP Guidelines). Please note that subsidence remediation areas are excluded.

<sup>2</sup> **Total active disturbance:** includes all areas ultimately requiring rehabilitation such as: on-lease exploration areas, stripped areas ahead of mining, infrastructure areas, water management infrastructure, sewage treatment facilities, topsoil stockpile areas, access tracks and haul roads, active mining areas, waste emplacements (active/unshaped/in or out-of-pit), and tailings dams (active/unshaped/uncapped).

<sup>3</sup> **Land being prepared for rehabilitation:** includes the sum of mine disturbed land that is under the following rehabilitation phases – decommissioning, landform establishment and growth medium development (as defined in DRE (now DRG) MOP/RMP Guidelines).

<sup>4</sup> **Land under active rehabilitation:** includes areas under rehabilitation and being managed to achieve relinquishment – includes the following rehabilitation phases as described in the DRE (now DRG) MOP/RMP Guidelines – “ecosystem and land use establishment” (area seeded OR surface developed in accordance with final land use) and “ecosystem and land use sustainability” (revegetation assessed as showing signs of trending towards relinquishment OR infrastructure development).

<sup>5</sup> **Completed rehabilitation:** requires formal sign-off by DRE (now DRG) that the area has successfully met the rehabilitation land use objectives and completion criteria.

The total mine footprint includes the Metropolitan Coal surface facilities, the No. 3 Ventilation Shaft facilities, the temporary cable runway and electricity cable, disturbance associated with exploration boreholes and monitoring equipment installation in the underground mining area.

Two Catchment Improvement Works Projects have been conducted in accordance with Condition 5(b), Schedule 6 of the Project Approval, which requires Metropolitan Coal to carry out catchment improvement works in the Woronora catchment area. Catchment improvement works conducted in the review period are described in Section 10.4.

## **10.2 REHABILITATION STRATEGY – SURFACE FACILITIES AREA**

The Metropolitan Coal Rehabilitation Strategy has been developed to be a concise framework document which describes the development of rehabilitation objectives and completion criteria for the preferred future landuse for the surface facilities area following the completion of mining activities. Detailed rehabilitation plans for the surface facilities area will be developed over the life of the Project and will be presented in the Mine Closure Plan and future revisions of the Rehabilitation Strategy.

As various factors will influence the landuse options available for the surface facilities area following the completion of mining activities, it is not possible for Metropolitan Coal to define a final landuse option (and associated final rehabilitation objectives and completion criteria) at this stage of the Project life. The final landuse and associated final rehabilitation objectives and completion criteria will be documented in future Metropolitan Coal MOP and the Mine Closure Plan as part of the Mining, Rehabilitation and Environmental Management Process. The Metropolitan Coal MOP has been prepared for the operating period 2012 to 2019.

Disturbance areas at the Metropolitan Coal surface facilities area are minimal and have remained relatively unchanged for many years. The surface facilities area includes roads, facilities (e.g. the CHPP, administration buildings and workshops), stockpiles (coal and reject stockpiles), railroads, water storages and infrastructure. The surface facilities area is an active operational area which will be required for the entire mine life.

Figure 23 shows the designated rehabilitation zones (1 to 7) that are currently available for rehabilitation at the surface facilities area. Rehabilitation activities undertaken during the review period included control of introduced and environmental weeds across the designated rehabilitation zones (in particular Lantana [*Lantana camara*], Ginger Lily [*Hedychium gardnerianum*], Crofton Weed [*Ageratina adenophora*] and Mistflower [*Ageratina riparia*]). Control works were also undertaken on noxious weeds identified on Camp Creek (namely Pampas Grass [*Cortaderia selloana*] and Senegal Tea Plant [*Gymnocoronis spilanthoides*]).

No buildings were renovated or removed during the review period.

## **10.3 REHABILITATION MANAGEMENT – UNDERGROUND MINING AREA**

### **10.3.1 Rehabilitation of Surface Disturbance Areas**

Some surface disturbance areas will be able to be rehabilitated during the life of the Project (e.g. monitoring sites no longer required), while other surface disturbance areas will likely remain until after the completion of mining operations.

No surface disturbance areas in the underground mining area were rehabilitated during the review period as the majority of disturbance pertains to the installation and ongoing maintenance of environmental monitoring sites which are a life of mine asset. These sites will be rehabilitated to appropriate standards following cessation of mining.

### 10.3.2 Stream Remediation Measures

Metropolitan Coal is required to achieve the rehabilitation objective specified in Table 11 of Condition 1, Schedule 6 of the Project Approval for the Waratah Rivulet and the Eastern Tributary watercourses.

Table 11: Rehabilitation Objectives

<b>Domain</b>	<b>Rehabilitation Objective</b>
<p><i>Waratah Rivulet, between the downstream edge of Flat Rock Swamp and the full supply level of the Woronora Reservoir</i></p> <p><i>Eastern Tributary, between the maingate of Longwall 26 and the full supply level of the Woronora Reservoir</i></p>	<p><i>Restore surface flow and pool holding capacity as soon as reasonably practicable</i></p>

Metropolitan Coal is also required to achieve the subsidence impact performance measures specified in Table 1 of Condition 1, Schedule 3 of the Project Approval in relation to the Waratah Rivulet and Eastern Tributary watercourses.

Table 1: Subsidence Impact Performance Measures

<b>Watercourses</b>	
<p><i>Waratah Rivulet between the full supply level of the Woronora Reservoir and the maingate of Longwall 23 (upstream of Pool P)</i></p>	<p><i>Negligible environmental consequences (that is, no diversion of flows, no change in the natural drainage behaviour of pools, minimal iron staining, and minimal gas releases)</i></p>
<p><i>Eastern Tributary between the full supply level of the Woronora Reservoir and the maingate of Longwall 26</i></p>	<p><i>Negligible environmental consequences over at least 70% of the stream length (that is no diversion of flows, no change in the natural drainage behaviour of pools, minimal iron staining and minimal gas releases)</i></p>

#### **Waratah Rivulet**

Stream remediation is initiated at pools/rock bars on Waratah Rivulet between the downstream edge of Flat Rock Swamp and the full supply level of the Woronora Reservoir (i.e. Pools A to W) if the water level in a pool falls below its cease to overflow level (i.e. stops overflowing), except as a result of climatic conditions.

As a result of previous mining, the water levels in pools upstream of Flat Rock Crossing (i.e. Pools A to G) and immediately downstream of Flat Rock Crossing (Pool G1) have previously been impacted by mine subsidence (i.e. the pool water level has fallen below its cease to flow level). Metropolitan Coal identified that the water level in Pool N fell below its cease to flow level in early September 2012.

Stream remediation activities have been undertaken at Pools A, F and G. The rock bars at Pools A and F are considered to largely control the pools located upstream of these rock bars. As a result, Metropolitan Coal anticipated that the restoration of surface flow and pool holding capacity at Pools A, and F would restore the surface flow and pool holding capacity of pools between Flat Rock Swamp and Pool F. Metropolitan considers the pool remediation efforts to have largely been successful but continues to monitor the performance of these works.

Mining has not resulted in the diversion of flows or change to the natural drainage behaviour of pools on the Waratah Rivulet downstream of the maingate of Longwall 23 (i.e. Pools P to W).

### **Eastern Tributary**

Monitoring conducted in accordance with the Metropolitan Coal Longwalls 23-27 Water Management Plan identified that the Eastern Tributary watercourse performance measure was exceeded in relation to *minimal iron staining* and *no diversion of flows, no change in the natural drainage behaviour of pools*. The exceedance of the Eastern Tributary watercourse performance measure (referred to as the Eastern Tributary Incident) was reported to the DP&E and other relevant agencies in October 2016.

Metropolitan Coal provided the DP&E with a proposed course of action in relation to the exceedance of the Eastern Tributary subsidence impact performance measure, focused on the implementation of stream remediation measures.

Metropolitan Coal is committed to stream remediation at the earliest opportunity. Metropolitan Coal will conduct stream remediation works in accordance with the Metropolitan Coal Stream Remediation Plan. The Draft Metropolitan Coal Stream Remediation Plan was provided to the DP&E and relevant agencies in November 2018. Once finalised, the Metropolitan Coal Stream Remediation Plan will be included in the Metropolitan Coal Water Management Plan.

In the next reporting period, Metropolitan Coal propose to commence stream remediation on the Eastern Tributary at Pool ETO (immediately upstream of the Fire Road 9J crossing and upstream of the Longwall 26 maingate), followed by stream remediation at Pools ETAH and ETAK.

#### **10.4 CATCHMENT IMPROVEMENT WORKS**

Two Catchment Improvement Works Projects in the Woronora catchment area have been conducted in accordance with Condition 5(b), Schedule 6 of the Project Approval . The catchment improvement works include:

- the rehabilitation of a former quarry on Fire Road 9H; and
- the rehabilitation of a disused access track to the Darkes Forest Mine (a historic mine located to the south of Metropolitan Coal).

Rehabilitation activities at the former quarry on Fire Road 9H during the review period included supplementary brush matting in areas of low regeneration potential and the direct seeding of local native plant species. Weed control activities at the former quarry and along Fire Road 9H were also undertaken.

Rehabilitation activities along the disused access track to the Darkes Forest Mine during the review period included supplementary brush matting and weed control measures targeting Crofton Weed (*Ageratina adenophora*), Fleabane (*Conyza spp.*), Whiskey Grass (*Andropogon virginicus*) and introduced grass species.

Additional catchment improvement works conducted by Metropolitan Coal during the review period included the implementation of weed control measures along Fire Road 9J targeting Crofton Weed, Fleabane, Scotch Thistle (*Onopordum acanthium*) and Whiskey Grass.

#### **10.5 ASSESSMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PERFORMANCE**

An assessment of the environmental performance of rehabilitation management during the review period is provided in Table 13.

**Table 13**  
**Assessment of Environmental Performance – Rehabilitation**

Monitoring Component		Performance Indicator, Rehabilitation Objective and/or Project Approval Condition	Indicator, Objective or Condition Met?	Comments
Other land affected by the Project Performance Indicator		<p><i>Redundant equipment/infrastructure items have been removed.</i></p> <p><i>The site is neat and tidy (i.e. it does not contain any rubbish).</i></p> <p><i>No weed management measures are required.</i></p> <p><i>No erosion or sediment control measures are required.</i></p> <p><i>Where appropriate, native vegetation is naturally regenerating or active revegetation is establishing.</i></p> <p><i>No further active revegetation measures are required.</i></p>	Not currently applicable	<p>Not applicable during the review period as no rehabilitation of surface distribution areas in the underground mining area has been conducted.</p> <p>Once a surface disturbance area is no longer being utilised, Metropolitan Coal will use the Rehabilitation Management Plan – Surface Disturbance Register to monitor the performance of the measures implemented to rehabilitate surface disturbance areas.</p>
Stream Remediation Performance Indicator		<p><i>Analysis of water level recession rates for a pool indicates a similar pool behaviour to that which existed prior to being impacted by subsidence.</i></p>	To be determined	<p>While stream remediation activities have been conducted at Pools A, F and G on the Waratah Rivulet, assessment against the rehabilitation performance indicator has not been made to date. Assessment following the stream remediation works was delayed until a significant period of drier climatic conditions had been experienced and an updated Stream Remediation Management Plan including proposed pool remediation success assessment criteria has been approved.</p>
Rehabilitation Objectives (Project Approval Table 11, Condition 1 Schedule 6)	Surface Facilities Area	<p><i>Set through condition 2 below.</i></p>	Yes	<p>The rehabilitation objective for the surface facilities area is addressed in the Metropolitan Coal Rehabilitation Strategy.</p>
	Waratah Rivulet, between the downstream edge of Flat Rock Swamp and the full supply level of the Woronora Reservoir	<p><i>Restore surface flow and pool holding capacity as soon as reasonably practicable.</i></p>	To be determined	<p>Metropolitan Coal will assess surface flow and pool holding capacity using the results of the assessment of the stream remediation performance indicator for the completed stream remediation activities at Pools A, F and G once a significant period of drier climatic conditions has been experienced.</p>
	Eastern Tributary, between the maingate of Longwall 26 and the full supply level of the Woronora Reservoir		To be determined	<p>Draft stream remediation plans for individual rock bars on the Eastern Tributary have been provided to the DP&amp;E (as described in Section 10.3.2).</p>
	Cliffs	<p><i>Ensure that there is no safety hazard beyond that existing prior to mining.</i></p>	Yes	<p>No safety hazard associated with cliffs was identified during the review period.</p>
	Other land affected by the Project	<p><i>Restore ecosystem function, including maintaining or establishing self sustaining native ecosystems:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>comprised of local native plant species; with</i></li> <li>• <i>a landform consistent with the surrounding environment.</i></li> </ul>	Not currently applicable	<p>The Rehabilitation Management Plan – Surface Disturbance Register will be used to manage the implementation of rehabilitation measures. The performance indicator for other land affected by the Project will be used to monitor the performance of rehabilitation measures being implemented.</p>

**Table 13 (Continued)**  
**Assessment of Environmental Performance – Rehabilitation**

Monitoring Component		Performance Indicator, Rehabilitation Objective and/or Project Approval Condition	Indicator, Objective or Condition Met?	Comments
Rehabilitation Objectives (Project Approval Table 11, Condition 1 Schedule 6) (Continued)	<i>Built features</i>	<i>Repair/restore to pre-mining condition or equivalent.</i>	Yes	Assessed through the Metropolitan Coal Built Features Management Plans. No impacts to built features were recorded during the review period.
	<i>Community</i>	<i>Minimise the adverse socio-economic effects associated with mine closure including the reduction in local and regional employment.</i>	Not currently applicable	The socio-economic effects associated with mine closure will be addressed in the Metropolitan Coal Mine Closure Plan and will be considered in consultation with the local community (through the Community Consultative Committee [CCC]) when determining the final landuse option.
		<i>Ensure public safety.</i>	Yes	Assessed through the Metropolitan Coal Public Safety Management Plan for the underground mining area and in the Metropolitan Coal Rehabilitation Strategy for the surface facilities area.
Rehabilitation Strategy – Surface Facilities Area (Project Approval Condition 2, Schedule 6)		<p>2. <i>By the end of October 2011, the Proponent shall prepare a Rehabilitation Strategy for the surface facilities area to the satisfaction of the Director-General. This strategy must:</i></p> <p><i>(a) be prepared by a team of suitably qualified and experienced experts whose appointment has been endorsed by the Director-General;</i></p> <p><i>(b) be prepared in consultation with relevant stakeholders, including the WCC and the CCC;</i></p> <p><i>(c) investigate options for the future use of the area upon the completion of mining;</i></p> <p><i>(d) describe and justify the proposed rehabilitation strategy for the area; and</i></p> <p><i>(e) define the rehabilitation objectives for the area, as well as the proposed completion criteria for this rehabilitation.</i></p>	Yes	-
Progressive Rehabilitation (Project Approval Condition 3, Schedule 6)		<p>3. <i>To the extent that mining operations permit, the Proponent shall carry out rehabilitation progressively, that is, as soon as reasonably practicable following the disturbance.</i></p>	Yes	-



**Table 13 (Continued)**  
**Assessment of Environmental Performance – Rehabilitation**

Monitoring Component	Performance Indicator, Rehabilitation Objective and/or Project Approval Condition	Indicator, Objective or Condition Met?	Comments
Rehabilitation Management Plan (Project Approval Condition 4, Schedule 6)	<p>4. <i>The Proponent shall prepare and implement a Rehabilitation Management Plan for the project to the satisfaction of the Executive Director Mineral Resources. This plan must be prepared in consultation with the relevant stakeholders, and submitted to DRE for approval prior to carrying out any second workings in the mining area.</i></p> <p><u>Note: In accordance with condition 12 of schedule 2, the preparation and implementation of Rehabilitation Management Plans is likely to be staged, with each plan covering a defined area (or domain) for rehabilitation. In addition, while mining operations are being carried out, some of the proposed remediation or rehabilitation measures may be included in the detailed management plans that form part of the Extraction Plan. If this is the case, however, then the Proponent will be required to ensure that there is good cross-referencing between the various management plans.</u></p>	Yes	-
Catchment Improvement Works (Project Approval Condition 5, Schedule 6)	<p>5. <i>The Proponent shall:</i></p> <p>(a) <i>pay SCA \$100,000 by the end of 2011 to carry out catchment improvement works within the Woronora catchment area; or</i></p> <p>(b) <i>carry out catchment improvement works within this area that have an equivalent value to the satisfaction of SCA.</i></p>	Yes	Metropolitan Coal conducts catchment improvement works in the Woronora catchment area in accordance with Condition 5(b), Schedule 6 of the Project Approval (refer Section 10.4).
Offsets (Project Approval Condition 6, Schedule 6)	<p>6. <i>If the Proponent exceeds the performance measures in Table 1 of this approval, and either</i></p> <p>(a) <i>The contingency measures implemented by the Proponent have failed to remediate the impact; or</i></p> <p>(b) <i>The Director-General determines that it is not reasonable or feasible to remediate the impact,</i></p> <p><i>then the Proponent shall provide a suitable offset to compensate for the impact to the satisfaction of the Director-General.</i></p> <p><u>Note: Any offsets required under this condition must be proportionate with the significance of the impact.</u></p>	To be determined	In October 2016 Metropolitan Coal identified the subsidence impact performance measure for the Eastern Tributary, between the full supply level of the Woronora Reservoir and the Longwall 26 maingate in Table 1, Condition 1, Schedule 3 of the Project Approval had been exceeded in relation to iron staining. In early 2017 the same performance measure was identified as being exceeded in relation to pool drainage behaviour (refer to Sections 6.2, 10.3 and 13.1). Metropolitan Coal proposed to conduct stream remediation measures on the Eastern Tributary in accordance with the Longwalls 23-27 Water Management Plan Contingency Plan. In 2018 Metropolitan submitted a Stream Remediation Management Plan to relevant stakeholders prior to commencement of any stream remediation.

## 11 COMMUNITY

Metropolitan Coal engages with the Helensburgh community and strives to maintain positive relationships with stakeholders given the extensive history shared between the mine and township. Generations of locals have worked at the mine and it is widely accepted that the operation is an integral component of the Helensburgh community.

The majority of workers reside in the local area or within 50 km of the mine. As far as practicable, the mine seeks to employ local contractors, supply companies and services during the course of its operations.

Metropolitan Coal has also continued to provide sponsorship and/or donations to the local community during the review period. Metropolitan Coal's proactive community engagement program aims to work in partnership with the community for mutually beneficial and sustainable outcomes, and achieves this through the development of specific community programs as discussed below.

### 11.1 COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT ACTIVITIES AND INITIATIVES

#### *Community Consultative Committee*

Three Community Consultative Committee (CCC) meetings were held during the review period (18 April, 8 August and 12 December 2018). These meetings facilitated Metropolitan Coal consultation and engagement with community members on matters of general business and the environmental performance of the operation. Discussions during the review period included the Longwalls 301-303 Extraction Plan, monitoring of the Eastern Tributary, the 2018 Independent Environmental Audit, noise mitigation, trucking movements and community funding.

A report on the progress of the CCC in 2018 was provided to the Secretary of the DP&E on 27 February 2019 and a copy of the letter is provided as Appendix N.

### 11.2 COMMUNITY CONTRIBUTIONS

In addition to the community engagement activities and initiatives discussed above, Metropolitan Coal has made a number of significant donations to support the community of Helensburgh and the greater Illawarra region throughout 2018. All donation requests were assessed on their individual merit and funding was distributed accordingly.

In total, community donations and sponsorship during 2018 amounted to over \$100,000 and included the following:

- Donation to the Era Surf Life Saving Club.
- Donation to the Helensburgh Stanwell Park Surf Life Saving Club.
- Donation to the Helensburgh & District Citizens Tennis Club for clubhouse roof repairs.
- Donation to the Helensburgh Christmas Carols Fireworks display.
- Donation to the Helensburgh Tigers Rugby League Club.
- Donation to the Helensburgh Tigers Junior Rugby League Club.
- Ongoing sponsorship of the Helensburgh Public School and Holy Cross Primary School environment programs.
- Donation to the Otford Public School for their Colour Run fundraiser.
- Donation to the Rotary Club of Fairy Meadow for the Razzamatazz Annual Children's Festival.

- Donation to the Helensburgh Santa's Fire Truck Christmas Event.
- Donation to the Lions Club of Woonona for their World Festival of Magic fundraiser.
- Ongoing Sponsorship of local BMX athletes.

### **11.3 COMMUNITY COMPLAINTS**

A protocol for the management and reporting of complaints has been developed as a component of Metropolitan Coal's Environmental Management Strategy. A dedicated telephone number for the provision of comments or complaints is maintained by Metropolitan Coal (1800 115 003) and is displayed on signage at an entrance to the mine. Metropolitan Coal records and responds to all complaints and maintains a complaints register on its website.

During the review period, one complaint was received in May 2018 from a Helensburgh resident regarding trucks transporting coal wash reject from site. Metropolitan Coal explained the coal washing process which resulted in the production of coal washery rejects, and the efforts to date to emplace a portion of this material underground. Metropolitan Coal also explained that the longwall had recently moved to a new longwall block and improving yield as the longwall progressed would result in a further reduction in coal washery rejects relative to product coal produced.

A summary of community complaints received since January 2006 is provided on Figure 24. Very few complaints have been received on an annual basis since the Project was approved in June 2009, and have typically related to noise, dust and/or traffic.

## **12 INDEPENDENT ENVIRONMENTAL AUDIT**

In accordance with Condition 8, Schedule 7 of the Project Approval, an Independent Environmental Audit of the Project is to be commissioned by the end of December 2011, and every three years thereafter, and be conducted by a team of experienced and independent experts endorsed by the Director-General (now Secretary) of the Department of Planning and Environment.

Metropolitan Coal commissioned the 2017 Independent Environmental Audit by 31 December 2017 and received the final report in June 2018. In accordance with Condition 9, Schedule 7 of the Project Approval, Metropolitan Coal provided a copy of the Independent Environmental Audit to the Secretary of the Department of Planning and Environment on 26 June 2018, with Metropolitan Coal's response to the Audit recommendations provided on 31 July 2018. All recommendations made in the 2017 Independent Environmental Audit have been closed out.

Three Independent Environmental Audits have been completed to date (as reported in previous Annual Reviews). The next Independent Environmental Audit is to be commissioned by 31 December 2020 and will be submitted to the DP&E by 30 June 2021.

## 13 INCIDENTS AND NON-COMPLIANCES DURING THE REPORTING PERIOD

### 13.1 EASTERN TRIBUTARY PERFORMANCE MEASURE

The Metropolitan Coal Project Approval (08\_0149) requires Metropolitan Coal not to exceed the subsidence impact performance measures outlined in Table 1 of Condition 1, Schedule 3.

The subsidence impact performance measure for the Eastern Tributary watercourse is:

*Negligible environmental consequences over at least 70% of the stream length (that is no diversion of flows, no change in the natural drainage behaviour of pools, minimal iron staining and minimal gas releases)*

Monitoring conducted in accordance with the Metropolitan Coal Longwalls 23-27 Water Management Plan in 2016 identified that the Eastern Tributary watercourse performance measure for the Eastern Tributary between the full supply level of the Woronora Reservoir and the maingate of Longwall 26 was exceeded in relation to *minimal iron staining* in October 2016. The exceedance was reported to the Secretary of the DP&E and other relevant agencies on 14 October 2016 in accordance with Condition 6, Schedule 7 of the Project Approval and the Metropolitan Coal Longwalls 23-27 Water Management Plan Contingency Plan.

The *no diversion of flows, no change in the natural drainage behaviour of pools* component of the Eastern Tributary subsidence impact performance measure was exceeded in January 2017 and reported to the DP&E and other relevant agencies.

Metropolitan Coal is committed to stream remediation at the earliest opportunity. Metropolitan Coal will conduct stream remediation works in accordance with the Metropolitan Coal Stream Remediation Plan. The draft Metropolitan Coal Stream Remediation Plan was provided to the DP&E and relevant agencies in November 2018. Once finalised, the Metropolitan Coal Stream Remediation Plan will be included in the Metropolitan Coal Water Management Plan.

### 13.2 NOISE

#### ***Sustained Non-compliances – Attended Noise Monitoring and Modelling***

Conclusive identification of the Quarter 1 and 2 sustained noise non-compliances in 2018 were determined in August 2018. The Quarter 3 and 4 sustained non-compliances were identified in March 2019.

As described in Section 7.1, during 2018 Metropolitan Coal identified conditional sustained non-compliances at two representative noise monitoring locations (16 Oxley Place & 36 Old Station Road) with respect to the Noise Impact Assessment Criteria (Condition 1, Schedule 4 of the Project Approval).

As part of the Noise Mitigation Strategy and as a result of the continuation of the monitored non-compliances, modelling of predicted noise levels for nearby residences was conducted and identified non-compliances with respect to the Noise Impact Assessment Criteria at 13 residences (11 residences in Oxley Place and two residences on Parkes Street) during the day-time, evening and night-time. The modelling also predicted that nine private residences in Oxley Place also experienced exceedances of the Noise Mitigation Criteria (Condition 3, Schedule 4 of the Project Approval) and five of the private residences in Oxley Place were predicted to experience exceedances of the Noise Acquisition Criteria (Condition 2, Schedule 4 of the Project Approval) (it is noted these residences were predicted to exceed the criteria by 1 or 2 dBA).

It is noted that the locations modelled to be experiencing exceedances were experiencing daytime, evening and night-time operational noise levels from the Metropolitan Coal Mine prior to the approval of the Project in June 2009 that were materially higher than the levels recorded in the current review period, and a range of operational noise control measures have been implemented since Project Approval (Section 7.1).

It should also be noted that all of the residences modelled to be experiencing sustained exceedances of the Noise Mitigation Criteria have previously been offered noise mitigation measures on a voluntary basis by Metropolitan Coal (in the form of double glazing). Of the nine residences predicted to exceed the Noise Mitigation Criteria, only two did not accept the previous offer by Metropolitan Coal (Appendix K) and one has since accepted noise mitigation in 2018.

The extensive and long running noise control program at Metropolitan Coal has reduced noise emissions at nearby residences, however, the number of remaining material, reasonable and feasible noise controls is diminishing and the Noise Impact Assessment Criteria may not be achievable in the medium to long term.

In 2017, in consultation with the DP&E, Metropolitan Coal prepared a technical review of remaining available feasible noise mitigation measures and an associated evaluation of the reasonableness of these options (Noise Mitigation Strategy). This assessment was independently peer reviewed.

Following DP&E's review of the Noise Mitigation Strategy, Metropolitan Coal signed a Voluntary Undertaking which formalised the implementation of the mitigation measures identified by the Mitigation Strategy. The Voluntary Undertaking also outlined a process for re-assessing predicted noise levels and reasonable and feasible noise controls in accordance with the Noise Policy for Industry released in 2017.

During the review period, Metropolitan Coal completed an assessment of Metropolitan Coal's noise levels under the Noise Policy for Industry (released in 2017) and provided to DP&E in April 2018. Metropolitan Coal completed replacement of all conveyor idlers at the surface facilities area by 31 December 2018.

In the next reporting period, Metropolitan Coal will remodel noise levels and consult with residents with predicted residual noise exceedances of the Noise Mitigation Criteria who have not previously accepted property noise mitigation offers from Metropolitan Coal.

Metropolitan Coal anticipates that, during implementation of the Voluntary Undertaking, sustained non-compliances with respect to the Noise Impact Assessment Criteria and, to a lesser extent, exceedances of the Noise Mitigation Criteria, will continue to be observed. Metropolitan Coal will continue to consult with the DP&E, DRG, EPA and the local community and implement all identified reasonable and feasible mitigation options.

### 13.3 WATER LEAK TO CAMP CREEK

During the week of 19 May 2018, a spill of hydraulic fluid (Quintolubric 818-02, a water-based biodegradable fluid) containing a green marker dye occurred underground and was circulated around the recycled water circuit onsite while the dye dissipated. On 19 May 2018, Metropolitan Coal personnel observed water in Camp Gully to have a green discolouration. Immediate investigation indicated that recycled water in the site water tanks had a similar discolouration, and one of these tanks was leaking. The leak was found to be running downslope to a clean water drain which runs to Camp Creek. Metropolitan Coal personnel immediately isolated the leak and sandbagged the clean water drain and made observations of the distribution of the coloured water, which was found to have travelled approximately 100 m along Camp Creek downstream from the drain, remaining within the site boundary. Further observations over several hours indicated that the dye was dissipating in situ and was not travelling further downstream.

In addition to sampling in response to the incident on 19 May 2018, routine monthly surface water quality monitoring is conducted on Camp Gully both upstream (Sites A and D) and downstream (Sites B and C) of the Metropolitan Coal water treatment plant, in accordance with the Metropolitan Coal Surface Facilities Water Management Plan. Samples were collected on 29 May 2018 and sent for laboratory analysis of ethanolamine and isopropanolamine (constituents of Quintolubric 818-02). The results indicate that concentrations of ethanolamine and isopropanolamine were less than the detection limit of 0.5 mg/L and 0.1 mg/L, respectively.

Metropolitan Coal contacted EPA to report the spill and subsequent observations.

To ensure a similar incident does not occur in the future, the clean water drain was permanently sealed on 30 May 2018, and the leaking valve at the recycled water tanks was replaced on 1 June 2018.

## 14 ACTIVITIES PROPOSED IN THE NEXT REPORTING PERIOD

In the next reporting period, Longwall 303 is anticipated to be completed in May 2019 and Longwall 304 is anticipated to commence in July 2019 (Figure 5).


In the next reporting period, the following activities will be conducted:

- Metropolitan Coal will prepare and consult with stakeholders in relation to the Longwall 304 Extraction Plan in the first quarter of 2019.
- Metropolitan Coal will prepare and consult with stakeholders in relation to Longwalls 305-309 Extraction Plan throughout 2019.
- Metropolitan Coal will continue the construction and commissioning of a gas drainage plant at Ventilation Shaft No.3 to improve safety for underground operations.
- As a result of the Noise Mitigation Assessment and commencement of the Voluntary Undertaking throughout 2019:
  - All crusher and washer doors will be closed at all times (except when being accessed).
  - Metropolitan Coal will continue to consult with the DP&E, DRG and EPA and to notify relevant residences of noise exceedances.
- Metropolitan Coal will continue its ongoing consultation with the Wollongong City Council regarding the potential for coal rejects to be beneficially re-used at the Helensburgh Landfill.
- The coal reject backfill emplacement project will also continue throughout 2019.

- Metropolitan Coal will continue to consult with the Wollongong City Council in relation to the upgrade of the Mine Access Road and Parkes Street intersection.
- Metropolitan Coal will investigate the potential to install small surface water flow gauges immediately downstream of Swamps 92, 77 and 76 by June 2019.
- Metropolitan Coal will also prepare Surface Works Assessment Forms and install additional upland swamp groundwater piezometers and soil moisture probes in select swamps over and/or proximal to Longwalls 307-309 by September 2019.
- Metropolitan Coal will continue to revegetate/rehabilitate the outer batters of the Turkey's Nest Dam.
- Metropolitan Coal propose to conduct stream remediation on the Eastern Tributary at Pool ETO (immediately upstream of the Fire Road 9J crossing and upstream of the Longwall 26 maingate), followed by stream remediation at Pools ETAH and ETAK.
- Catchment improvement works will continue in the Woronora catchment area, namely, rehabilitation of the former quarry on Fire Road 9H and rehabilitation of the disused access track to the Darkes Forest Mine. Weather permitting, catchment improvement works in the Woronora catchment area will be undertaken as required throughout 2019.

## FIGURES






- LEGEND**
- Mining Lease Boundary
  - Woronora Special Area
  - Railway
  - Project Underground Mining Area  
Longwalls 20-27 and 301-317
  - Woronora Notification Area
  - Existing Underground Access Drive (Main Drift)

Source: Land and Property Information (2015); Department of Industry (2015); Metropolitan Coal (2019)

**Peabody**  
METROPOLITAN COAL  
Project Longwalls 20-27  
and Longwalls 301-317 Layout

**Figure 1**






MET-08-08-2018\_AR\_001A

- LEGEND**
- Additional/Upgraded Project Infrastructure
  - Approximate Extent of Major Surface Facilities Area

Source: Aerial Photography (2005)


**Figure 2**





MEF-08-2018AR\_002A

Figure 3




- LEGEND**
- Mining Lease Boundary
  - Previous Extraction
  - Railway
  - Project Underground Mining Area Longwalls 20-27 and 301-317
  - Woronora Notification Area
  - Existing Underground Access Drive (Main Drift)

- Monthly Development 2018**
- January
  - February
  - March
  - April
  - May
  - June
  - July
  - August
  - September
  - October
  - November
  - December

Source: Land and Property Information (2015); Department of Industry (2015); Metropolitan Coal (2016)

**Peabody**  
 METROPOLITAN COAL  
**Monthly Production Plan**  
 January to December 2018

**Figure 4**



- LEGEND**
- Mining Lease Boundary
  - Previous Extraction
  - Railway
  - Project Underground Mining Area Longwalls 20-27 and 301-317
  - Woronora Notification Area
  - Existing Underground Access Drive (Main Drift)


- | Monthly Development 2018   |           | Monthly Development 2019  |           |
|--|-----------|---|-----------|
| <span style="background-color: yellow; display: inline-block; width: 15px; height: 10px; margin-right: 5px;"></span>     | January   | <span style="background-color: limegreen; display: inline-block; width: 15px; height: 10px; margin-right: 5px;"></span> | January   |
| <span style="background-color: lightblue; display: inline-block; width: 15px; height: 10px; margin-right: 5px;"></span>  | February  | <span style="background-color: green; display: inline-block; width: 15px; height: 10px; margin-right: 5px;"></span>     | February  |
| <span style="background-color: lightgreen; display: inline-block; width: 15px; height: 10px; margin-right: 5px;"></span> | March     | <span style="background-color: red; display: inline-block; width: 15px; height: 10px; margin-right: 5px;"></span>       | March     |
| <span style="background-color: orange; display: inline-block; width: 15px; height: 10px; margin-right: 5px;"></span>     | April     | <span style="background-color: cyan; display: inline-block; width: 15px; height: 10px; margin-right: 5px;"></span>      | April     |
| <span style="background-color: lightcyan; display: inline-block; width: 15px; height: 10px; margin-right: 5px;"></span>  | May       | <span style="background-color: blue; display: inline-block; width: 15px; height: 10px; margin-right: 5px;"></span>      | May       |
| <span style="background-color: lightblue; display: inline-block; width: 15px; height: 10px; margin-right: 5px;"></span>  | June      | <span style="background-color: darkgreen; display: inline-block; width: 15px; height: 10px; margin-right: 5px;"></span> | July      |
| <span style="background-color: pink; display: inline-block; width: 15px; height: 10px; margin-right: 5px;"></span>       | July      | <span style="background-color: purple; display: inline-block; width: 15px; height: 10px; margin-right: 5px;"></span>    | August    |
| <span style="background-color: lightgreen; display: inline-block; width: 15px; height: 10px; margin-right: 5px;"></span> | August    | <span style="background-color: yellow; display: inline-block; width: 15px; height: 10px; margin-right: 5px;"></span>    | September |
| <span style="background-color: lightblue; display: inline-block; width: 15px; height: 10px; margin-right: 5px;"></span>  | September | <span style="background-color: orange; display: inline-block; width: 15px; height: 10px; margin-right: 5px;"></span>    | October   |
| <span style="background-color: lightblue; display: inline-block; width: 15px; height: 10px; margin-right: 5px;"></span>  | October   | <span style="background-color: brown; display: inline-block; width: 15px; height: 10px; margin-right: 5px;"></span>     | November  |
| <span style="background-color: lightblue; display: inline-block; width: 15px; height: 10px; margin-right: 5px;"></span>  | November  | <span style="background-color: purple; display: inline-block; width: 15px; height: 10px; margin-right: 5px;"></span>    | December  |
| <span style="background-color: lightgreen; display: inline-block; width: 15px; height: 10px; margin-right: 5px;"></span> | December  |   |           |

Source: Land and Property Information (2015); Department of Industry (2015); Metropolitan Coal (2016)

**Peabody**  
 METROPOLITAN COAL  
 Production Plan Forecast  
 January to December 2019

**Figure 5**






- LEGEND**
- Mining Lease Boundary
  - Railway
  - Project Underground Mining Area  
Longwalls 20-27 and 301-317
  - Existing Underground Access Drive (Main Drift)
  - ▲ Ridge Survey Point
  - Subsidence Line
  - Transmission Towers - Endeavour Energy and TransGrid
  - Communications Towers
  - Freeway Bridge Subsidence Monitoring

Source: Land and Property Information (2015); Date of Aerial Photography 1998; Department of Industry (2015); Metropolitan Coal (2018); MSEC (2018)

**Peabody**  
METROPOLITAN COAL  
Subsidence Monitoring Locations

Figure 6






- LEGEND**
- Mining Lease Boundary
  - Railway
  - Project Underground Mining Area  
Longwalls 20-27 and 301-317
  - Existing Underground Access Drive (Main Drift)
  - ▼ Gauging Station
  - Pool Water Level Site

Source: Land and Property Information (2015); Date of Aerial Photography 1998; Department of Industry (2015); Metropolitan Coal (2019)

**Figure 7**





MET-06-08-2018 AR\_203A


- LEGEND**
- Mining Lease Boundary
  - Railway
  - Project Underground Mining Area  
Longwalls 20-27 and 301-317
  - Existing Underground Access Drive (Main Drift)
  - Surface Water Quality Site

Source: Land and Property Information (2015); Date of Aerial Photography 1998; Department of Industry (2015); Metropolitan Coal (2019)

**Peabody**  
METROPOLITAN COAL  
Surface Water Quality Sites

**Figure 8**





- LEGEND**
- Mining Lease Boundary
  - Woronora Special Area
  - Railway
  - Project Underground Mining Area Longwalls 20-27 and 301-317
  - Existing Underground Access Drive (Main Drift)
  - Woronora Notification Area


- Upland Swamp
- Swamp Substrate and Shallow Groundwater Piezometer
- Swamp Substrate Groundwater Piezometer
- Swamp Shallow Groundwater Piezometer

Source: Land and Property Information (2015); Department of Industry (2015); Metropolitan Coal (2019); after NPWS (2003), Bangalay Botanical Surveys (2008) and Eco Logical Australia (2015; 2016; 2018)

**Peabody**  
 METROPOLITAN COAL  
 Upland Swamp Groundwater  
 Piezometer Locations

**Figure 9**






- LEGEND
- Mining Lease Boundary
  - Railway
  - Project Underground Mining Area  
Longwalls 20-27 and 301-317
  - Existing Underground Access Drive (Main Drift)
  - Groundwater Level/Pressure Bore
  - Groundwater Level Bore

Source: Land and Property Information (2015); Date of Aerial Photography 1998;  
Department of Industry (2015); Metropolitan Coal (2019)

**Peabody**  
METROPOLITAN COAL  
Groundwater Level  
and/or Pressure Bore Locations

**Figure 10**






- LEGEND**
- Mining Lease Boundary
  - Railway
  - Project Underground Mining Area  
Longwalls 20-27 and 301-317
  - Existing Underground Access Drive (Main Drift)
  - Deep Groundwater Chemistry Monitoring Site
  - Stream Shallow Groundwater Quality Monitoring Site

Source: Land and Property Information (2015); Date of Aerial Photography 1998;  
Department of Industry (2015); Metropolitan Coal (2019)

**Peabody**  
METROPOLITAN COAL  
Groundwater Quality Sites

**Figure 11**






- LEGEND**
- Mining Lease Boundary
  - Railway
  - Project Underground Mining Area  
Longwalls 20-27 and 301-317
  - Existing Underground Access Drive (Main Drift)
  - ◆ Evaporimeter
  - Pluviometer

- Notes:**
1. The Bureau of Meteorology pluviometer at Dorkes Forest (68024) is not shown. It is located approximately 3.75 km south of the Metropolitan Coal pluviometer (PV2).
  2. The Bureau of Meteorology pluviometer at Lucas Heights (66078) is not shown. It is located approximately 12.5 km north of the Metropolitan Coal pluviometer (PV8).

Source: Land and Property Information (2015); Date of Aerial Photography 1998; Department of Industry (2015); Metropolitan Coal (2019)

**Figure 12**





- LEGEND**
- Mining Lease Boundary
  - Railway
  - Project Underground Mining Area  
Longwalls 20-27 and 301-317
  - Existing Underground Access Drive (Main Drift)


- Monitoring Site**
- Riparian Vegetation Monitoring Site

Source: Land and Property Information (2015); Date of Aerial Photography 1998; Department of Industry (2015); Metropolitan Coal (2019)

**Peabody**  
 METROPOLITAN COAL  
 Riparian Vegetation Monitoring Locations

Figure 13





**LEGEND**

- Mining Lease Boundary
- Railway
- Project Underground Mining Area  
Longwalls 20-27 and 301-317
- Existing Underground Access Drive (Main Drift)

**Monitoring**


- Pool Aquatic Ecology Sampling Site
- Stream Aquatic Ecology Sampling Site

Source: Land and Property Information (2015); Date of Aerial Photography 1998;  
Department of Industry (2015); Metropolitan Coal (2019)

**Peabody**  
METROPOLITAN COAL  
Aquatic Ecology Monitoring Locations

Figure 14





NET-08-08-2018 AR 2108

- LEGEND**
- Mining Lease Boundary
  - Railway
  - Project Underground Mining Area  
Longwalls 20-27 and 301-317
  - Existing Underground Access Drive (Main Drift)


- Monitoring Sites**
- Longwalls 20-22 Amphibian Monitoring
  - Longwalls 23-27 Amphibian Monitoring
  - Longwalls 301-303 Amphibian Monitoring
  - Longwalls 305-306 Amphibian Monitoring
  - Control Site

Source: Land and Property Information (2015); Date of Aerial Photography 1998; Department of Industry (2015); Metropolitan Coal (2019)

**Peabody**  
METROPOLITAN COAL  
Amphibian Monitoring Locations

Figure 15






Source: Land and Property Information (2015); Date of Aerial Photography 1998; Department of Industry (2015); Metropolitan Coal (2019); MSEC (2008; 2019)

**Peabody**

METROPOLITAN COAL  
Cliffs and Overhangs, Steep Slopes and  
Land in General within the Project  
Underground Mining Area and Surrounds

Figure 16





- LEGEND**
- Mining Lease Boundary
  - Railway
  - Project Underground Mining Area  
Longwalls 20-27 and 301-317
  - Existing Underground Access Drive (Main Drift)
  - Aboriginal Heritage Site

Source: Land and Property Information (2015); Date of Aerial Photography 1998; Department of Industry (2015); Metropolitan Coal (2019) Illawarra Prehistory Group (2007; 2008); AHIMS (2007); Kayandel Archaeological Services (2006; 2007; 2008); Niche Environment and Heritage (2013)


**Peabody**

METROPOLITAN COAL

Known Aboriginal Heritage Sites  
Within Project Underground Mining Area  
and Surrounds

Figure 17





MET-08-08-2018 AR 003A


- LEGEND**
- P40 Receiver Location
  - Approximate Extent of Major Surface Facilities Area
  - Real-time Noise Monitoring Site
  - Attended Noise Monitoring Site
  - ★ Automatic Weather Station

Source: Aerial Photography 2005





**Figure 18**



MEF-08-2018 AR\_004A







Note: In accordance with Conditions 1, 2 and 3, Schedule 4 of the Project Approval, the assessment, acquisition and mitigation criteria are only applicable from the end of 2014



MET-08-2018-AR\_005A

*Note: In accordance with Conditions 1, 2 and 3, Schedule 4 of the Project Approval, the assessment, acquisition and mitigation criteria are only applicable from the end of 2014*





MET-08-2018-AR\_006A


*Note: In accordance with Conditions 1, 2 and 3, Schedule 4 of the Project Approval, the assessment, acquisition and mitigation criteria are only applicable from the end of 2014*



METROPOLITAN COAL  
 Quarterly Operator Attended  
 Noise Monitoring Results at 50 Parkes Street  
 (September 2010 to December 2018)

**Figure 19c**

MEF-08-2018 AR\_007A










Note: In accordance with Conditions 1, 2 and 3, Schedule 4 of the Project Approval, the assessment, acquisition and mitigation criteria are only applicable from the end of 2014









MET-08-2018 AR 013A





MET-06-06-2018.AR\_010A

**LEGEND**

- Water Pipeline
- Camp Gully Water Extraction Pipeline
- Licensed Discharge Point
- Water Quality Monitoring
- Volume Monitoring

Note: Site D is located approximately 2.3 km upstream of Site A

Source: Metropolitan Coal (2014) Date of Aerial Photography October 2014

**Peabody**

METROPOLITAN COAL

Surface Facilities Area  
Water Monitoring Sites

**Figure 22**





- LEGEND
- Previously Rehabilitated
- REHABILITATION ZONES
- Zone 1
  - Zone 2
  - Zone 3
  - Zone 4
  - Zone 5
  - Zone 6
  - Zone 7

**Peabody**  
 METROPOLITAN COAL  
 Rehabilitation Zones Currently Available at the Surface Facilities Area

**Figure 23**






Figure 24 (a)




Figure 24 (b)

## APPENDICES

APPENDICES A TO N ARE AVAILABLE ON CD (AS LISTED BELOW):

APPENDIX A	2018 ANNUAL REVIEW SUBSIDENCE MONITORING RESULTS
APPENDIX B1	METROPOLITAN COAL SIX MONTHLY SURFACE WATER REVIEW 1 JANUARY TO 30 JUNE 2018
APPENDIX B2	METROPOLITAN COAL SIX MONTHLY SURFACE WATER REVIEW 1 JULY TO 31 DECEMBER 2018
APPENDIX C1	METROPOLITAN COAL SIX MONTHLY REVIEW GROUNDWATER MONITORING AND ENVIRONMENTAL PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT 1 JANUARY TO 30 JUNE 2018
APPENDIX C2	METROPOLITAN COAL SIX MONTHLY REVIEW GROUNDWATER MONITORING AND ENVIRONMENTAL PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT 1 JULY TO 31 DECEMBER 2018
APPENDIX D	MAPPED POOL LOCATIONS ON THE WARATAH RIVULET, EASTERN TRIBUTARY, TRIBUTARY A AND TRIBUTARY B
APPENDIX E1	POOL P GAS RELEASE PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT
APPENDIX E2	EASTERN TRIBUTARY ASSESSMENT AGAINST WATER QUALITY PERFORMANCE MEASURE – JANUARY TO DECEMBER 2018
APPENDIX F1	METROPOLITAN MINE – GROUNDWATER TRANSECT BORE T3 INVESTIGATION REPORT
APPENDIX F2	METROPOLITAN MINE – 9GGW2B INVESTIGATION REPORT
APPENDIX G1	LONGWALLS 20-22 SPRING 2017 VEGETATION MONITORING REPORT
APPENDIX G2	LONGWALLS 23-27 SPRING 2017 VEGETATION MONITORING REPORT
APPENDIX G3	LONGWALLS 301-303 SPRING 2017 VEGETATION MONITORING REPORT
APPENDIX G4	LONGWALLS 20-22 AUTUMN 2018 VEGETATION MONITORING REPORT
APPENDIX G5	LONGWALLS 23-27 AUTUMN 2018 VEGETATION MONITORING REPORT
APPENDIX G6	LONGWALLS 301-303 AUTUMN 2018 VEGETATION MONITORING REPORT
APPENDIX H1	SWAMP 20 AND SWAMP 28 THREATENED FLORA ASSESSMENTS
APPENDIX H2	RIPARIAN VEGETATION ON THE EASTERN TRIBUTARY THREATENED FLORA ASSESSMENT
APPENDIX H3	SWAMP 20, SWAMP 28 AND SITE MRIP05 THREATENED FAUNA ASSESSMENTS

APPENDIX H4	SUPPLEMENTARY SURVEY TARGETING LITTLEJOHN'S TREE FROG, A THREATENED SPECIES, IN THE METROPOLITAN COAL UNDERGROUND MINING AREA AND SURROUNDS IN THE WORONORA CATCHMENT
APPENDIX I1	LONGWALLS 20-22 SPRING 2017 AQUATIC ECOLOGY MONITORING REPORT
APPENDIX I2	LONGWALLS 23-27 SPRING 2017 AQUATIC ECOLOGY MONITORING REPORT
APPENDIX I3	LONGWALLS 20-22 AUTUMN 2018 AQUATIC ECOLOGY MONITORING REPORT
APPENDIX I4	LONGWALLS 23-27 AUTUMN 2018 AQUATIC ECOLOGY MONITORING REPORT
APPENDIX J1	LONGWALLS 20-22 SPRING-SUMMER 2017 AMPHIBIAN SURVEY REPORT
APPENDIX J2	LONGWALLS 23-27 SPRING-SUMMER 2017 AMPHIBIAN SURVEY REPORT
APPENDIX J3	LONGWALLS 301-303 SPRING-SUMMER 2017 AMPHIBIAN SURVEY REPORT
APPENDIX K	2018 QUARTERLY ATTENDED NOISE MONITORING RESULTS
APPENDIX L	QUARTER 1, QUARTER 2, QUARTER 3 AND QUARTER 4 NOISE MODELLING PREDICTIONS
APPENDIX M	AIR QUALITY MONITORING AND ENVIRONMENTAL PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT REPORT
APPENDIX N	LETTER FROM THE INDEPENDENT CHAIR OF THE COMMUNITY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE TO THE SECRETARY OF THE DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENT