Notice

Environmental Protection Act 1994

Information request

This information request is issued by the administering authority under section 140 of the Environmental Protection Act 1994 *to request further information needed to assess an amendment application for a site-specific environmental authority and PRCP schedule.*

To: Mineral Projects Pty Ltd and
Tableland Resources Pty Ltd

C/o: Mineral Projects Pty Ltd
c/- Alands Accountants
Level 15, 300 Queen Street
BRISBANE CITY QLD 4000
Australia
Via electronic transmission only

Attention: Patrick Williams
Email: patw@rangerresources.com.au

Our reference: EPML00881213, 101/0008676

Further information is required to assess an amendment application for an environmental authority and PRCP schedule

1. Application details

The amendment application for a site-specific environmental authority and PRCP schedule was received by the administering authority on 24 February 2025.

The application reference number is: A-EA-AMD-100776882

Land description: Mining Lease (ML) 2810, ML2811, ML2831, ML2832, ML2833 and ML2834

2. Information request

The administering authority has considered the abovementioned application and is writing to inform you that further information is required to assess the application (an information request).

The information required is specified in **the Appendices**, attached to this notice.

3. Actions

The abovementioned application will lapse unless you respond by giving the administering authority -

(a) all of the information requested; or
(b) part of the information requested together with a written notice asking the authority to proceed with the assessment of the application; or
(c) a written notice –
    i. stating that you do not intend to supply any of the information requested; and
    ii. asking the administering authority to proceed with the assessment of the application.

Should the information request require an EIS process or applicant to submit a progressive rehabilitation and closure (PRC) plan then it must be completed and submitted.

A response to the information requested must be provided by **26 June 2026** (the information response period). If you wish to extend the information response period, a request to extend the period must be made at least 10 business days before the last day of the information response period.

The response to this information request or a request to extend the information response period can be submitted to the administering authority by email to ESCairns@des.qld.gov.au.

If the information provided in response to this information request is still not adequate for the administering authority to make a decision, your application may be refused as a result of section 176 of the *Environmental Protection Act 1994,* where the administering authority must have regard to any response given for an information request.

4. Human rights

A human rights assessment was carried out in relation to this decision and it was determined that the decision is compatible with human rights.

If you require more information, please contact the Minerals Business Centre via the contact details below.

T.Gibbs	27 June 2025
Signature	Date

Teale Gibbs
Department of the Environment, Tourism, Science and Innovation
Delegate of the administering authority
Environmental Protection Act 1994

Enquiries:
Minerals Business Centre
PO Box 7230, Cairns QLD 4870
Phone: (07) 4222 5340
Email: ESCairns@detsi.qld.gov.au

Attachments

Information sheet: Internal review and appeals (ESR/2015/1742)

Appendices

Appendix 1 – General

In responding to this Information Request, it is requested that the response be summarised in a table that identifies how each item has been addressed, including the relevant sections/ attachments/appendices of the application documents and/or any other material provided to support the response. Whilst there may be some overlap between the topic or themes contained in the EA and PRCP components of this Information Request, please ensure that the response clearly identifies how both components have been addressed. This table should be completed for both the EA and PRCP components.

Appendix 2 – PRCP

Generally, and with specific reference to the matters raised in Appendix 4, the rehabilitation milestone criteria should be contemporised and revised so that they deliver on the SMART principles as required by the Statutory Guideline – *'Progressive rehabilitation and closure plans'* (ESR/2019/4964) [the PRCP Guideline]. Milestones are legally enforceable commitments once the PRCP schedule is approved. Therefore, it is essential that milestones be written in a manner that delivers on SMART principles, meaning that they are:

Specific – it is clear what must be done

Measurable – it must be possible to know when it has been achieved

Achievable – it is capable of being achieved

Reasonable/relevant – there is a clear connection between the milestone and the desired outcomes. The requirement Is reasonable

Time Specific – it is clear when the milestone will be completed.

Further, where updated or changed criteria are proposed, the application will need to include a revised risk assessment which contemplates the risk of not achieving a stable condition or best practice management (see section 3.7 *Risk assessment* of the PRCP Guideline).

The Monitoring and Maintenance Program required under section 3.8 of the PRCP Guideline should also then be revised to ensure the program identifies and describes the monitoring program and systems which will be carried out to demonstrate each milestone and milestone criteria have been achieved.

Appendix 3 – Information request for matters relating to the Environmental Authority

Item	Reference	Matter	Information Request
EA1.	Dianne Copper Mine (DCM) Recommencement Project Environmental Authority Amendment Application Environment Assessment Report (EAR)	The EAR includes maps that do not meet the requirements of the department's guideline – '*Spatial Information guideline'* (ESR/2018/4337 Version 6.00) (the Spatial Guideline). The following errors or matters must be addressed: i) Figure 2: Project Layout, (Section 2), scale is incorrect, unable to read detail due to size and image resolution provided in the report. ii) Figure 2a: Project Layout – Sewage Treatment Plant Location (Section 2), scale is incorrect, unable to read detail due to size and image resolution provided in the report. iii) Figure 2b: Project Layout – Sewage Treatment Plant Indicative Layout (Section 2), scale is incorrect, unable to read detail due to size and image resolution provided in the report. iv) Figure 2c: Project Layout – Mine Electrical Reticulation (Section 2), scale is incorrect, unable to read detail due to size and image resolution provided in the report. v) Figure 3: Indicative processing flowchart (Section 2), unable to read detail due to size and image resolution provided in the report. vi) Figure 4: Indicative Processing Infrastructure Layout (Section 2), scale is incorrect, unable to read detail due to size and image resolution provided in the report.	Provide maps in accordance with the department's Spatial Information guideline, and rectify the errors noted. Where required, provide the images as higher resolution files.

Item	Reference	Matter	Information Request
		vii) Figure 6: Overburden Stockpile (Section 6.2), scale is incorrect, unable to read detail due to size and image resolution provided in the report. viii) Figure 7: Soil Sampling Locations, (Section 11.3) unable to read detail due to size and image resolution provided in the report. ix) Figure 8: Backfilled Pit (Section 11.4), unable to read detail due to size and image resolution provided in the report. x) Figure 12: Predicted Landfill Layout (Section 14.6), unable to read detail due to size and image resolution provided in the report. xi) Figure 12a: Predicted Landfill Layout – Plan and Cross Section (Section 14.6 unable to read detail due to size and image resolution provided in the report. xii) Figure 12b: Predicted Landfill Layout – Detailed Cross Section (Section 14.6), unable to read detail due to size and image resolution provided in the report. xiii) Appendix 11 – New Figure for Environmental Authority, scale is incorrect, unable to read detail due to size and image resolution provided in the report.	
EA2.	Appendix 4 Dianne Copper Mine Terrestrial Ecology Report	The report does not provide information or assessment of controls to demonstrate the following: i) Mitigation measures for vegetation clearing and associated habitat loss. ii) Decisions made to protect against unnecessary clearing.	i) Describe mitigation measures for vegetation clearing and associated habitat loss in detail, with reference to 7.2.1.2 Mitigation and Management Measures. ii) Provide a plan for proposed clearing and a decision list of measures which will be undertaken to avoid any unnecessary clearing.

Item	Reference	Matter	Information Request
		iii) A schedule of clearing. iv) What is the definition of a "significant area" to avoid in the vegetation clearing, and species-specific method of identification of animal breeding places v) Section 7.2.1.2.5 lists a mitigation action as "… no excessive clearing occurs". However, there is no definition of what excessive clearing is. vi) Management plan for species-specific breeding places. vii) Definition of residual impacts and proposed offsets for these residual impacts on environmental values. viii) Self-assessment of significant residual impact and supporting spatial data which complied with the department's Spatial Guideline.	iii) Provide a plan, map and schedule for sequential clearing including area size estimates. iv) Provide a list of defining attributes and definition of significant areas to avoid when clearing, and a species-specific method of identification of animal breeding places. v) In 7.2.1.2.5: Define "excessive clearing" in terms of the following description supplied: "Topsoil and subsoil will be stripped to a minimum of 200 mm depth for all new disturbance for the project. Over much of the project site, clay is present below the topsoil for an additional 500 mm dept(h). In these areas, additional stripping of clay material will be undertaken." vi) Provide a species-specific management plan for tampering with animal breeding places. vii) Provide indicative proposed offsets for compensation for residual impacts on environmental values, including a threshold definition for residual impacts. viii) Provide the significant residual impact self-assessment test details including spatial data showing the calculation of remnant vegetation intersecting a watercourse.
EA3.	Appendix 2 Dianne Copper Mine Water Management Plan Appendix 3 Dianne Copper Mine Groundwater and Surface Water Impact Assessment Report	Receiving environment water quality data has been provided in Appendix A: Water Quality Data, however there are identified gaps in the data and a lack of analysis and interpretation in relation to consideration of potential surface and groundwater interactions for the proposed mining disturbances. Background surface water quality data is required for the checking and derivation of water quality limits, suitability of monitoring locations to demonstrate an effective and	i) Provide background/baseline receiving environment water quality monitoring data and upstream reference data for the Gum Creek Tributary for dissolved metals and metalloids, general parameters, and nutrients; and site water dissolved metals and metalloids for raw water dams and mine water dams, as well as release dam data for general parameters, all of which are more up to date, from at least 2024 and through 2025.

Item	Reference	Matter	Information Request
		appropriate monitoring network and compliance framework is established for the operations. The following data has been provided: Gum Creek Tributary – Dissolved Metals and Metalloids: Upstream / Reference site data has been provided for sites S7 and S13 up until April 2023, Downstream / Receiving sites S11 and S12 data have been provided up to April 2023. Gum Creek Tributary – General Parameters: Upstream / Reference site data has been provided for sites S7 and S13 up until April 2023, Downstream / Receiving sites S11 and S12 data have been provided up to April 2023. Gum Creek Tributary – Nutrients: Upstream / Reference site data has been provided for sites S7 and S13 up until April 2023, Downstream / Receiving sites S11 and S12 data have been provided up to April 2023. Site Water – Dissolved Metals and Metalloids: Raw Water Dams (Clean Water) site data has been provided for S1 (RWD 1) up until July 2022, S3 (RWD2) until July 2022, and Mine Water Dams (Mine Affected Water) S4 (Pit) until July 2022. Release dam – General Parameters: site data has been provided for S6 up to April 2023.	ii) Provide projection of potential changes in the water quality downstream of the receiving environment with consideration of the potential surface water - groundwater interaction and the proposed expansion features, including pit, WRD, heap leach pads and processing plant. iii) Provide the raw data (with no outlier removal) utilised to derive the water quality objectives proposed in Table 7 of Appendix 3 (section 6.2.6).
EA4.	Appendix 2 Dianne Copper Mine Water Management Plan	Groundwater quality data has been provided in the section 3.5.2.1 Groundwater Quality however there are identified gaps in the data and a lack of analysis and interpretation in relation to groundwater flow direction/s for the proposed mining disturbances and the location and siting of monitoring bores and requirements for additional bores to	i) Provide a conceptual groundwater flow model supporting the choice of bore locations proposed. ii) Provide an updated application/Water Management Plan that includes updated data for Groundwater Monitoring Water

Item	Reference	Matter	Information Request
		provide a comprehensive and appropriate monitoring network. Background groundwater is required to check and derive appropriate site-specific water quality limits for monitoring of controls and to establish the compliance framework during the operations. The data which has been provided for GW01 (reference site), GW04 (reference site) and GW03 (impact site) is up to April 2023.	Quality Results parameters using the most recently available data (e.g. from at least 2024 or later). iii) Provide a comprehensive assessment of the groundwater system that captures the potential pathways and impacts from all the proposed mine features. This requires: ○ inclusion of further monitoring bores upgradient and downgradient of each key structure (e.g. pit, WRD, heap leach pads, processing plant and settling/release dam), with justification of bore placements (e.g. between the mine features and sensitive receptors) ○ baseline data of at least 18 months (if monitored 1-2 monthly) to allow for understanding the groundwater system and potential seasonality impacts. iv) Provide the raw data (with no outlier removal) utilised to derive the water quality objectives proposed in Table 7 of the report (p.40).
EA5.	Dianne Copper Mine Recommencement Project Environmental Authority Amendment Application Environment Assessment Report	Further to the above points, the application material states that the water quality objectives within the DCM EA will be updated to be site specific objectives once sufficient data has been collected, which is expected to occur in 2024. The data from the first and second sampling events from 2024 have been included, but data points are insufficient to establish site-specific surface water trigger values.	Provide all available water quality data for surface and groundwater, in support of, and as detailed above.
EA6.	Appendix 1 Dianne Copper Mine – Waste Rock Management Plan	The current monitoring program on site includes 10 surface water and 5 groundwater locations. This is proposed to be increased to include newly constructed features. There is no information on the location, intensity and the objectives to be achieved through the monitoring	Provide a comprehensive assessment of the groundwater system that captures the potential pathways and impacts from all the proposed mine features. This requires:

Item	Reference	Matter	Information Request
		program. It is noted that Figure 8 proposes 11 surface water monitoring points and 2 groundwater bores, with no monitoring coverage for most of the mine features (e.g. no monitoring around pit area, Waste Rock Dump (WRD) or Run of Mine (RoM) area).	i) Inclusion of further monitoring bores upgradient and downgradient of each key structure (e.g. pit, WRD, heap leach pads, processing plant and settling/release dam), with justification of bore placements (e.g. between the mine features and sensitive receptors); and ii) Baseline data of at least 18 months (if monitored 1-2 monthly) to allow for understanding the groundwater system and potential seasonality impacts.
EA7.	Appendix 3 Dianne Copper Mine Groundwater and Surface Water Impact Assessment Report	There are no groundwater dependent ecosystems identified through the standard mapping systems. However, the presence of regional riparian vegetation communities (with greater zones around Gum Creek) that rely on the ephemeral watercourses suggests that there may be indirect groundwater dependence. The deep-rooted Melaleuca and Eucalyptus would tap into shallow water tables and perched aquifers.	Provide an assessment of seasonal surface water persistence and potential baseflow contributions to the Regional Ecosystems within and surrounding the site.
EA8.	Appendix 3 Dianne Copper Mine Groundwater and Surface Water Impact Assessment Report	Several sections of the report provide evidence that the seepage is likely accruing downstream of MAW dam (e.g. higher sulphate in monitoring sites S6, S9, S11 and S12 compared with the rest of the monitoring locations – section 6.2.2). The report highlights that the concentration of toxicants in the receiving environment of South Creek were significantly higher than the background levels. This also confirms the likelihood of downstream water quality being influenced by the potential seepage from the MAW within the settling dam. The information further confirms the likelihood of surface water and groundwater interactions on site.	Detail all and propose any additional management and mitigation measures to address the apparent seepage of mine-affect water from the MAW dam, and any other affected dams.

Item	Reference	Matter	Information Request
EA9.	Appendix 3 Dianne Copper Mine Groundwater and Surface Water Impact Assessment Report	The reported groundwater monitoring network and data is a limiting factor in identifying and enabling an understanding of the groundwater behaviour and its interaction with the site. Based on the information provided, the network is unable to define the groundwater gradients or drawdown contours. There are no bores to the east of the pit or around the proposed WRD which limits the ability to capture a baseline for comparison of impacts in future. There are no bores between the main features such as heap leach pads and the pit or the processing plant, or the RoM, or the WRD – This does not allow for any delineation of potential source of contamination and/or localised impacts. This limiting factor also questions the proposed mitigation strategies (stated to be part of the site water management plan). There is limited vertical profiling and therefore limited capacity to capture information on potential pathways to the groundwater system and potential downstream users. For these reasons, the conclusion of limited impact on the surface water and groundwater environmental values identified in the project area (statement included in section 8 of the report) is not supported. There is no demonstration of the consideration of water quality objectives and the Australian and New Zealand Guidelines for Fresh and Marine Water Quality (ANZG 2018).	Provide a comprehensive assessment of the groundwater system that captures the potential pathways and impacts from all the proposed mine features. This would require: i) Inclusion of further monitoring bores upgradient and downgradient of each key structure (e.g. pit, WRD, heap leach pads, processing plant and settling/release dam), with justification of bore placements (e.g. between the mine features and sensitive receptors). ii) Baseline data of at least 18 months (if monitored 1-2 monthly) to allow for understanding the groundwater system and potential seasonality impacts. iii) Appropriate groundwater operational monitoring locations, monitoring frequency, quality characteristics and limits that are fit for purpose and capable of identifying contamination from all disturbed areas. iv) An updated monitoring program that specifies frequency of water quality monitoring at sufficient intervals to be suitable to monitor for potential impacts and to detect potential changes indicating controls are not adequate or other intervention is required. v) Demonstrate how the water quality objectives and the ANZG 2018 guidelines have been considered. vi) Groundwater modelling showing potential drawdown zone, and potential changes to groundwater level, including vertical profiling. vii) Information regarding groundwater impacts to potential downstream users

Item	Reference	Matter	Information Request
EA10.	Appendix 3 Dianne Copper Mine Groundwater and Surface Water Impact Assessment Report	The application is unclear as to the contaminants of concern (CoC) that pose a risk to environmental values of the receiving groundwater environment. These should also be consistent with (or in addition to) the CoC for the surface water environment. The application is unclear as to the extent of Groundwater modelling and the demonstration of any potential drawdown zone, and/or potential changes to groundwater level.	Provide an identification of Contaminants of Concern (CoC) that pose a risk to environmental values of the receiving groundwater environment. The CoCs should be consistent with the parameters monitored for surface water (i.e. to determine any interaction between surface and groundwater), and a description of the following: i) source, pathway and fate of contaminants that have the potential to impact environmental values; ii) infiltration and seepage intervention and collection controls; iii) surface water diversions and long-term management requirements; iv) dewatering requirements; and v) on-going water management and reduction requirements (i.e. treatment).
EA11.	Appendix 2 Dianne Copper Mine Water Management Plan	Figure 4.1 in the Water Management Plan shows a catchment boundary line for the contributing catchment upstream of the Settling Dam (to be renamed the Release Dam). However, the area (in km^2) of the catchment area was not provided. The emphasis in Section 5.3.2.2 is on the annual volumes of water released; not on the potential instantaneous rate of discharge from the Release Dam, which is what determines the required spillway capacity. The total catchment area upstream of the Release Dam would have had to be known, for insertion into the water balance modelling which is discussed in Section 5 of the Water Management Plan. Water management model parameters	i) Provide the area (in km^2) for the contributing catchment area upstream of the Settling Dam (to be renamed the Release Dam). ii) Provide data on the potential instantaneous rate of discharge from the Release Dam, and how this was calculated to determine the required spillway capacity. iii) Under a 0.1% AEP, provide estimate of the maximum flood discharge which could occur in the Release Dam, including the instantaneous rate of discharge.

Item	Reference	Matter	Information Request
		are discussed in Section 5; but without mention of actual catchment areas contributing. The Water Management Plan contains information on the total annual volumes of water discharging through and around Release Dam. However, it lacks information on the maximum flood discharge and instantaneous rate of discharge.	
EA12.	Dianne Copper Mine Recommencement Project Environmental Authority Amendment Application Environment Assessment Report	The application does not contain information on temporary/permanent watercourse diversions, however they are expected to be required based on this information provided in the application. For example, the Heap Leach Pads are proposed to be in a valley where there would surface water control issues and heightened risk to receiving environment. Watercourse diversions should comply with the Department of Natural Resources, Mines and Energy Guideline: "*Works that interfere with water in a watercourse for a resource activity— watercourse diversions authorised under the* Water Act 2000*"*.	Provide information regarding the proposed watercourse diversions planned and required for the project. Include information on: i) Provide information and drawings outlining the design of the water diversion(s), both permanent and / or temporary; ii) How any permanent watercourse diversion is to be designed and operated to ensure that it is stable, self-sustaining and does not impact on the adjoining upstream and downstream reaches of the existing watercourse; and describe how it will meet the requirements for functional design, design plan and operation and monitoring plan of permanent watercourse diversions. iii) Any temporary watercourse diversion, and how it meets similar outcomes as required for permanent watercourse diversions, however, a temporary watercourse diversion is not expected to be self-sustaining or incorporate natural features typical of local watercourses. iv) Any interactions between surface water diversions, the Heap Leach Pads, and the watercourse bed within which the Heap Leach Pads are proposed to be located.

Item	Reference	Matter	Information Request
			Describe management controls and measures to ensure mine affected water is kept separate from clean runoff. v) Any authorisations required / lodged under the *Water Act 2000*, relevant approval of the diversion, and long-term management requirements.
EA13.	Appendix 14 Acid consuming properties of Dianne heap leach ore Appendix 13 Geochemistry Report for the Dianne Copper	Heap Leach column testing results. The information the department received with the application on 24 February included a report which gave results for two leach columns, and partial results for the remaining two. The application does not address or make clear how the requirements of Schedule 8 of the Environmental Protection Regulation 2019 (EP Reg) will be achieved. In particular, Schedule 8, Part 3, Division 1, Water, Performance Outcome 2(e) as below; *(e) acid producing rock will be managed to ensure that the production and release of acidic waste is prevented or minimised, including impacts during operation and after the environmental authority has been surrendered;*	i) The results on the remaining two leach columns. ii) Demonstration that the project has been designed and how it will be operated to meet the requirements of Schedule 8 of the EP Reg. Including, but not limited to, Schedule 8, Part 3, Division 1, Water, Performance Outcome 2(e) as below; *(e) acid producing rock will be managed to ensure that the production and release of acidic waste is prevented or minimised, including impacts during operation and after the environmental authority has been surrendered;*
EA14.	Appendix 1 Dianne Copper Mine – Waste Rock Management Plan Appendix 7 Dianne Copper Mine – Final Landform & Cover Design	The planned activities are mining of the overburden and waste rock and heap leaching of ore. The WRM plan states that any material mined from the pit that is below the ore cutoff grade of 0.25% copper will be classified as waste rock and will be used (for construction) or deposited of in an out of pit WRD or for backfilling the mined open pit/void. The EA includes conditions for an 'Action Plan' to manage existing WRD, part of which also requires a waste rock characterisation, condition D6 (C (iii)). There is an existing WRD with a capacity of 0.4Mt after reshaping. A WRD	i) Provide a complete waste rock characterisation of the existing WRD and the material from the pit to be deposited in the new WRD. ii) Provide information on the static sulphur testing on selection of samples across depth and location within the existing WRD. iii) Provide an updated assessment of this characterisation and comparison of worst-case scenario with the lower risk scenarios for taking conservative approaches.

Item	Reference	Matter	Information Request
		characterisation was conducted in 2020, as per section 5.2 of the plan. The block model based on the average sulphur content of the material shows less than 2% of material having higher than 0.5% sulphur content. It is unclear how the average sulphur content for areas with no auger samples was determined. There is a risk with averaging across areas with no samples, as it does not consider the spatial variability, and therefore may lead to missing the potential high sulphur zones entirely. The WRD plan states that prior to construction of the new WRD, the designs plan will be completed which would include geotechnical analysis and proposed placement of potentially acid forming (PAF) material. A detailed characterisation of the existing waste and/or the potential waste to be stockpiled (e.g. spent ore from the pit) is not provided. The metrics of the existing WRD are unclear, and what will be excavated out of the old pit. Furthermore, it is unclear whether waste rock characterisation that was completed in 2020 on the existing WRD has also considered testing the material from the open pit to be labelled as WRD. It is proposed that the spent ore (post heap leaching process) will also be deposited in the new WRD and/or used as backfill in the mined pit. Information on the characterisation of this material is not provided.	iv) Provide information on the characterisation and the geotechnical stability of the spent ore.
EA15.	Appendix 7 Dianne Copper Mine – Final Landform & Cover Design	The final landform report includes information on the geotechnical stability of the WRD. However, the report indicates that the assessment is based on literature information and no foundation or WRD material investigation.	i) Provide clarification on how conservative parameters were adopted for the WRD stability assessment. Clarify whether suitability and availability of material prior to construction is assessed.

Item	Reference	Matter	Information Request
		The report notes that the geochemical characterisation of the WRD is out of scope of the report. The placement and compaction method for the PAF material is suggested to be incapsulated in the interior of the landform. However, there is no information on the estimated volume/percentage of the PAF and non acid forming (NAF) material and the subsurface conditions (foundation or settlement risk). No geotechnical testing or sampling was carried out for the assessment, only recommendations for testing in future is provided. The stability assessment was undertaken based on the assumption that non-hazardous material will be dumped within the WRD. It is not clear how conservative parameters were adopted for the stability assessment.	ii) Provide a geochemical stability analysis that assesses the impact from the proposed new WRD that includes: • the waste rock characterisation of all material to be placed in the WRD (acid producing potential, pH and EC, leachable material, etc) • kinetic testing and geochemical modelling (what will leach out and how fast, especially under rainfall infiltration).
EA16.	Appendix 1 Dianne Copper Mine – Waste Rock Management Plan	i) The general description of soil in the area is provided in section 3.5 is brief and difficult to link to the various sections of the project on site. ii) The soil information concludes that majority of the soils sampled are not overly susceptible to erosion based on the physical and chemical properties observed. However, detailed observations were not provided. This raises concerns, for example if the soil type has high bulk density can limit infiltration but increases the runoff and erosion.	i) Provide soil types information across the site as a colour-coded figure and in accordance with the Australian Soil Classification (ASC) system. ii) Provide descriptive information that relates to erosion risk factors to verify the conclusions. This must include information on soil texture and structure, bulk density, soil infiltration rate, and stability.
EA17.	Appendix 1 Dianne Copper Mine – Waste Rock Management Plan	i) The application is not clear on the soil description relating to EC tests of soil samples from the RoM area. However, the application does not provide the relevant information. Furthermore, no leach testing results have been provided in relation to this material.	i) Provide information on the EC level and toxicants such as metals/metalloids from the soil samples in the ROM area.

Item	Reference	Matter	Information Request
		ii) The management plan notes the EC levels are extreme. Given the highly acidic nature of the soil in this area and high level of EC there is a high likelihood of metal leaching.	ii) Provide results of further leach testing analysis on ROM material to help understand how the metals mobilise over time.
EA18.	Appendix 3 Dianne Copper Mine Groundwater and Surface Water Impact Assessment Report	The proposal provides limited information to describe the hydrogeology of the Dianne Copper Mine Project Site including hydraulic conductivity or the current or potential future connection to surrounding groundwater and surface waters. It is indicated that the total depth of the proposed pit will be 124m, however no information on its potential cross section/s with the underlaying geological structure is provided. Section 3.2 provides description of the geology around the area. It is evident that the pit likely will intersect the groundwater system. The information is indicative of structural complexity and highlights the presence of faults and intrusive bodies. The secondary fault that trends west-northwest may create zone of structural weakness and act as preferential groundwater flow paths, which potentially could result in water ingress into the pit but also it can create localised sulphide mineralisation which can increase acid mine drainage (AMD) risk. However, the elevated bedrock plateau location of the site, with intense fracturing and faulting in the area can limit the groundwater inflows to the pit (e.g. likely water will flow vertically to deeper aquifers, high risk of seepage). In addition, the potential joints and fractures developed through multiple deformation events creates high potential for surface water and groundwater interaction (e.g. surface runoffs can	Provide a hydrogeological conceptual model to understand and describe potential risks from the project to the groundwater system. This model needs to provide the relevant information requirements (including contemporary information) as follows: i) determination of the groundwater occurrence including the existence of, and depth to, aquifers and aquitards ii) location of groundwater recharge and discharge locations locally and regionally iii) groundwater quality within each of the aquifers and from surface expressions (i.e. seeps and springs) iv) current and potential future uses of groundwater including existing groundwater extraction bores v) groundwater flow direction and velocity, including field tests to determine hydraulic conductivity vi) the development of potentiometric mapping and hydro stratigraphic cross sections vii) groundwater modelling to determine contaminant transport and potential changes to groundwater level from dewatering or waste storage.

Item	Reference	Matter	Information Request
		infiltrate quickly through fractures and increase recharge rate).	
EA19.	Appendix 3 Dianne Copper Mine Groundwater and Surface Water Impact Assessment Report	Without an understanding of the hydrological intersections with the site features, particularly the pit expansion, it is impossible to estimate whether there is a potential drawdown or change in inflow and outflows of the groundwater system. This limits the identification of potential zone of influence from the pit. The information on outflows will also assist with assessment of risk from WRD and heap leach pads. The application is unclear as to the derivation of the groundwater inflow. It is noted that Section 7.2.3. estimates this value at 32ML/year. However, it is unclear how this value has been estimated.	Provide a water balance model for the site with an estimation of potential inflows and outflows to and from groundwater with consideration of all new expansion features, including the pit, WRD, heap leach pads and processing plant. The estimations must also include post closure scenario.
EA20.	Appendix 12 Dianne Recommencement Project Preliminary Consequence Category Assessment	Detailed and certified Consequence Category Assessments (CCAs) for all structures, dams and levees in accordance with the *Manual for assessing consequence categories and hydraulic performance of structures* (the Manual) is required. The preliminary CCA provided within Appendix 12 is preliminary and limited in relation to its assessment risks associated with each structure.	i) Provide certified CCA for all relevant structures, dams and levees undertaken in accordance with the Manual. ii) Provide a Register of Regulated Structures in the format provided for under the Manual.
EA21.	Appendix 3 Dianne Copper Mine Groundwater and Surface Water Impact Assessment Report	Water quality – The negative impact to the water quality of the receiving environment downstream of the current settling dam on site is evident. For example, the GW-SW report presents significantly higher concentrations of EC and metals such as copper in AQ03 compared with AQ06 (section 6.2.3). AQ03 is located downstream of Gum Creek and within the surface water monitoring network of the site and AQ06 is an upstream location in upper	Provide information on: i) the settling dam sediment characteristics, information on the volume and depth of sediments. ii) How the project will manage and mitigate impacts to the receiving waters, including stream sediments, from the settling dam. iii) The controls to be implemented to minimise the risk of overtopping and seepage from the structure.

Item	Reference	Matter	Information Request
		catchment of Gum Creek. The report also highlights the significantly high levels of copper and zinc in downstream monitoring location in South Creek. It is suggested that the exceedances are associated with the potential seepage from the settling dam and also overtopping during the heavy rainfall event in 2024 (section 6.2.3). The assessment of this impact is not considered.	iv) How any ongoing or additional impacts from the settling dam to the receiving water and/or stream sediments will be monitored. v) Confirm the triggers for any corrective action or remediation.
EA22.	Appendix 12 Dianne Recommencement Project Preliminary Consequence Category Assessment	Table 6-1 (section 6.2) The Consequence Category Assessment document states that *"The Release Dam (previously the Settling Dam) will be rebuilt…Contaminated sediment will be stored in a discrete compartment within the new waste rock dump."*	i) Describe the method of storing contaminated sediment within the new waste rock dump ii) Describe the settling dam (to be renamed the Release Dam) sediment characteristics iii) Provide information on the volume and depth of sediments in the settling dam iv) Provide a decommissioning plan and timeframe for the settling dam, including information on the transfer or remediation of contaminants (if left in situ) v) Provide information on post decommissioning flow and predicted changes in water quality downstream of settling dam.
EA23.	Appendix 12 Dianne Recommencement Project Preliminary Consequence Category Assessment	The application is unclear regarding the details of the release dam rebuild incorporating a geosynthetic clay layer (GCL) liner and spillway. The following sheets were listed on the plan list, Appendix B, design drawings, but not included: Sheet 11, J022.200.40 – DWG – 001 Release Dam – Plan and Longsection , Rev. C Sheet 12, J022.200.40 – DWG – 002 Release dam – Detail Cross Sections, Rev. A	i) Provide additional details regarding the construction of the release dam rebuild, GCL liner, and spillway, including when it will be built ii) Provide plans: Sheet 11, J022.200.40 – DWG – 001 Release Dam – Plan and Longsection , Rev. C Sheet 12, J022.200.40 – DWG – 002 Release dam – Detail Cross Sections, Rev. A

Item	Reference	Matter	Information Request
EA24.	Appendix 12 Dianne Recommencement Project Preliminary Consequence Category Assessment	The Spillway Capacity for the Release Dam, and the design of the Release Dam Spillway has not been discussed. The Environmental Assessment Report, February 2025, does not include any assessment of the required spillway capacity for the Release Dam.	Provide assessment of the required spillway capacity for the Release Dam during various flood scenarios including the 0.1% AEP. Provide 0.1% AEP modelling for catchment above the Release Dam and Spillway and design storage allowance for the release dam and spillway, as per 1st November guideline.
EA25.	Appendix 12 Dianne Recommencement Project Preliminary Consequence Category Assessment	The Release Dam and Spillway. Due to the contaminated mine affected water upstream, the size of the catchment upstream, the failure to provide sediment protection and potential for the release dam to fill with transported sediment, the Release Dam and Spillway appear to be high risk category, a significant hazard dam.	Provide re-evaluation of the consequence category assessment for the release dam and spillway in terms of 0.1% AEP and considering the modelled catchment in terms of this scenario above the release dam.
EA26.	Dianne Recommencement Project, Preliminary Consequence Category Assessment,	A comprehensive risk assessment associated with seepage, release of contaminants, overtopping, drainage failure, liner failure, residual cyanide contamination, long-term monitoring and management measures to be in place to minimise environmental impacts has not been provided. It is unclear whether reliance on the functionality of the liner is an appropriate measure to conclude that there will be no contamination to the underlying material and groundwater. It is unclear whether the selected location is suitable for the proposed activity, The presented assessment in the current application generally does not appear to align with best practice environmental management therefore, justification on how the HLP is designed to operate in accordance with leading practice	i) Given other lower risk (closed system) processing / extraction methods are readily available, provide justification why such measures have been discounted in the context of the risk of environmental harm. ii) Clarify the timeframe over which spent residue will be processed through the HLP and provide justification for the appropriateness of this timeframe considering the risks of unrehabilitated HLP in the environment e.g. presenting an ongoing contaminant source, and an expectation that disturbed land should be progressively rehabilitated. iii) Provide a detailed risk assessment of potential environmental harm associated with the chosen location and operation of the HLP on the environmental values, mitigation measures and management practices proposed to be implemented to

Item	Reference	Matter	Information Request
		environmental management is required and how the requirements of Schedule 8 of the EP Reg have been met.	minimise adverse environmental harm. Ensure risks such as overflow during heavy rainfall accounts for extreme weather events and climate change impacts, direct or indirect release of contaminants to groundwater from the operation of the activity are included. iv) Provide details of long-term monitoring (monitoring of liners, pads and leachate collection systems) and measures in place to monitor residual contaminants in leach and that will prevent or minimise adverse effects to groundwater or any associated surface ecological systems. v) Provide conceptual designs of heap leach facilities including adequate measures to capture seepage (such as seepage interception and drainage) and how it will be isolated and contained in recognising the proposed location within a drainage channel. vi) Provide details of heap leach material. vii) Provide justification on how the HLP is designed to operate in a manner that aligns with best practice environmental management and prevents adverse effects on adjacent areas. viii) Provide the referenced model or additional information on how the capacity of heap leach or storm water ponds were determined.

Item	Reference	Matter	Information Request
EA27.	Schedule 8, EP Reg	The application does not make clear how it meets the matters prescribed under Schedule 8 of the EP Reg.	Provide a full assessment against all matters provided for in Schedule 8 of the EP Reg including details how the performance outcomes have been achieved for all aspects of the amendment. This must include information necessary to inform the assessment of how the application meets the environmental objectives and performance outcomes of Part 3, Schedule 8. This will need to include all of the following areas at a minimum: • Operational assessment— o Air; o Water; o Groundwater; o Noise; and o Waste; • Land use assessment— o Site suitability; o Location on site; and o Critical design requirements.
EA28.	Human Rights Act 2019	Relevant decision makers are required to consider human rights in any decision or action or action taken.	Provide any additional or specific information regarding human rights implications associated with the amendment to ensure the decision maker is fully informed. This may or may not be a relevant matter that you choose to respond to.

Appendix 4 – Information request for matters relating to the Progressive Rehabilitation and Closure Plan and Schedule

Item	Reference	Matter	Information Request
PRCP1.	Dianne Copper Mine, Progressive Rehabilitation and Closure Plan	The justification for this soil stripping is required, in light of the fact that this material has not been included in "*Table 3 Preliminary Soil Material Balance"* (section 2.1.9 *"Other Disturbance Areas will have minor disturbance, so for a conservative material balance it is assumed no topsoil stripping"*) and that there is sufficient material according to this ("*The preliminary material balance shows that there is sufficient topsoil/subsoil for use in rehabilitation"*) without the need for the inclusion of stripping these areas. It is unclear what the proposed process of rehabilitation to return the stripped areas to a PMLU of cattle grazing, given the following information: i) there is no provision for topsoil replacement for the 27.8 ha of minor disturbance for stock feed and vegetation to grow in, ii) no method has been provided to reestablish the identified environmental values for this area, iii) the required topsoil replacement source for rehabilitation has not been identified (PRCP document Page 41 states "*It is not anticipated that import of topsoil will be required due to initial positive rehabilitation outcomes, risk of importing pests, weeds and disease, economic constraints, distance from substantial topsoil resources.*"), and iv) The Mattes of state environmental significance (MSES) tool identified within the study area consists of regulated vegetation intersecting a watercourse. It is estimated that up to 1.042 ha of remnant vegetation intersecting a watercourse may be affected by the proposed development. No detail as to how these areas are to be avoided has been provided.	i) Provide proposed rehabilitation methodology of the new disturbance areas for a PMLU of cattle grazing, including a schedule as to methods to replicate the identified environmental values. ii) Provide the source, quantity and haul distance from site of the topsoil for rehabilitation of the new disturbance areas. iii) Provide methodology for avoidance of MSES 1.042 ha of remnant vegetation intersecting a watercourse. iv) Provide a list of all the areas which are planned to have topsoil stripped, the size of the areas, and the depth of stripping (≥200mm) for each area, v) Provide a list of all the areas for which an additional stripping of clay material, below the topsoil for an additional 500mm depth is planned, including the size of each area. vi) Provide details of erosion mitigation measures proposed for the topsoil / clay stripping, particularly in terms of erosion and sediment control.

Item	Reference	Matter	Information Request
		The application is unclear is whether topsoil stripping in 'Other Disturbance' areas is planned and proposed in accordance with best practice and if it would incur more disturbance that necessary. It is also unclear if this stripping method is proposed to supplement the overall site's available topsoil reserves. It is noted that section 2.1 of the PRCP identifies these areas are to include 'minor' disturbance in the form of access tracks, powerlines and pipelines. However, section 2.1.9 of PRCP also states that topsoil and subsoil will be stripped to a minimum of 200mm for *"...all new disturbance for the project."*	
PRCP2.	Dianne Copper Mine, Progressive Rehabilitation and Closure Plan	Several figures are unclear in the PRCP: i) Figure 2: Project Layout (section 2.1), scale is incorrect, unable to read detail due to size and image resolution provided in the report. ii) Figure 4: Reference Map (section 2.1.2.2), scale is incorrect, unable to read detail due to size and image resolution provided in the report. iii) Figure 7: Regional Ecosystems (C&R, 2024) (section 2.1.12), scale is incorrect, unable to read detail due to size and image resolution provided in the report. iv) Figure 9: Final Site Design (section 2.3.1.3) too small to see detail, unable to read detail due to size and image resolution provided in the report. v) Figure 10: Final Landform 3D Design (section 2.4.5unable to read detail due to size and image resolution provided in the report.	Provide replacement Figures to rectify the identified issues.
PRCP3.	Dianne Copper Mine Recommencement Project Environmental	There are Figures referred to in the EAR documents which do not appear in the PRCP document, these are listed below.	Provide inclusion of these figures, subject to any improved versions referred to above, into the PRCP document.

Item	Reference	Matter	Information Request
	Authority Amendment Application Environment Assessment Report Dianne Copper Mine, Progressive Rehabilitation and Closure Plan	i) Figures and Sections which were responded to regarding the Not Properly Made Notice which appear in EAR but require inclusion in PRCP ii) Figure 2a: Project Layout – Sewage Treatment Plant Location iii) Figure 2b: Project Layout – Sewage Treatment Plant Indicative Layout iv) Figure 2c: Project Layout – Mine Electrical Reticulation v) Updated bounding coordinates (EAR Page 10), indicative project infrastructure to replace the current Environmental Authority Schedule A – Table 1 (Project Infrastructure Layout), based on discussions with the DETSI compliance team vi) Figure 12: Predicted Landfill Layout vii) Figure 12a: Predicted Landfill Layout – Plan and Cross Section viii) Figure 12b: Predicted Landfill Layout – Detailed Cross Section ix) Section 14.2 EAR Page 58 Air quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions x) Section 14.1 EAR Page 58 Noise and Vibration xi) Section 11 EAR Page 49 Land, Soils and Rehabilitation xii) Section 7 EAR Page 38 Groundwater xiii) Section 8 EAR Page 41 Surface Water and Mine Water Management xiv) No detailed description of sewage treatment plant, or power infrastructure in PRCP xv) Section 11.3 EAR Page 49 Soils and land capability	

Item	Reference	Matter	Information Request
PRCP4.	Appendix 2 Dianne Copper Mine Water Management Plan	The PRCP guideline section 3.1 requires the EA holder to provide baseline information with respect to site hydrology and fluvial networks Section 3.6.1 of the PRCP Guideline requires information regarding the effect of flood flow through the site for the post mining land use. The Rehabilitation Planning Part does not provide information on the long-term sustainability of the final landform. Flood modelling is required to determine the influence of flood depth and velocity on the final landform.	i) Provide flood depth and velocity for a variety of flood flow events including 0.1% AEP, for the final landform and justify how this will form a stable condition. ii) Provide information on the future conditions of watercourses, including the geotechnical assessment against flood modelling velocities, the post mining flood model, and justify how this will form a stable condition.
PRCP5.	Appendix 2 Dianne Copper Mine Water Management Plan Appendix 3 Dianne Copper Mine Groundwater and Surface Water Impact Assessment Report	Appendix 2 identifies the relevant waterways and their environmental values. Receiving environment water quality data has been provided in Appendix A: Water Quality Data. The PRCP guideline section 3.1 requires the EA holder to provide baseline information with respect to site hydrology and fluvial networks. Background surface water quality data is required to derive or otherwise allocate water quality limits, suitability of monitoring locations to demonstrate the stability and non-polluting state of the final rehabilitated landform. <u>Gum Creek Tributary – Dissolved Metals and Metalloids:</u> Upstream / Reference site data has been provided for sites S7 and S13 up until April 2023, Downstream / Receiving sites S11 and S12 data have been provided up to April 2023. <u>Gum Creek Tributary – General Parameters:</u> Upstream / Reference site data has been provided for sites S7 and S13 up until April 2023,	i) Provide background/baseline receiving environment water quality monitoring data and upstream reference data for the Gum Creek Tributary for dissolved metals and metalloids, general parameters, and nutrients; and site water dissolved metals and metalloids for raw water dams and mine water dams, as well as release dam data for general parameters, all of which are more up to date, from at least 2024. ii) Provide projection of potential changes in the water quality downstream of the receiving environment with consideration of the potential surface water - groundwater interaction and the proposed expansion features, including pit, WRD, heap leach pads and processing plant.

Item	Reference	Matter	Information Request
		Downstream / Receiving sites S11 and S12 data have been provided up to April 2023. Gum Creek Tributary – Nutrients: Upstream / Reference site data has been provided for sites S7 and S13 up until April 2023, Downstream / Receiving sites S11 and S12 data have been provided up to April 2023. Site Water – Dissolved Metals and Metalloids: Raw Water Dams (Clean Water) site data has been provided for S1 (RWD 1) up until July 2022, S3 (RWD2) until July 2022, and Mine Water Dams (Mine Affected Water) S4 (Pit) until July 2022. Release dam – General Parameters: site data has been provided for S6 up to April 2023.	iii) Provide the raw data (with no outlier removal) utilised to derive the water quality objectives proposed in Table 7 of Appendix 3 (section 6.2.6)
PRCP6.	Appendix 3 Dianne Copper Mine Groundwater and Surface Water Impact Assessment Report	The application does not contain sufficient information on watercourse diversions, however they are expected to be required based on the information provided in the application. Watercourse diversions should comply with the Department of Natural Resources, Mines and Energy Guideline: "*Works that interfere with water in a watercourse for a resource activity— watercourse diversions authorised under the* Water Act 2000*"*. There may be other considerations for any permanent watercourse diversions or alterations to site drainage in the final landform.	i) Provide information and drawings outlining the design of the water diversion(s), both permanent and / or temporary, in terms of post-mine operations. ii) Provide a description and drawings outlining the method and final design of the diversion(s) post rehabilitation. iii) Provide information showing how The Functional Diversion Design Report aligns with the PMLU identified in the PRCP schedule and demonstrate that the diversion alignment and final landform design will achieve a stable condition. iv) Provide details of any licenses required under the *Water Act 2000* for closure.

Item	Reference	Matter	Information Request
PRCP7.	DCM_PRCP2024 Appendix 1 – PRCP Schedule_V2	Proposed Rehabilitation Milestone 5 (RM5) is focused on the rehabilitation of existing and proposed mine water management structures. The Milestone Criteria are written in broad terms, and detail is lacking in the description of transfer of water, i.e. 'Free-standing water transferred out of structures to an appropriate place'.	i) Refine RM5 to adhere to the SMART principles. This may include rewriting criteria to more clearly achieve the desired outcome. Where terms which are open to interpretation are used, it may be desirable to provide a definition (e.g. what constitutes free-standing water, etc.). ii) Provide structured detail and an inventory as to the locations of the water to be transferred, the method of transfer, rate and schedule of the transfer, and the receiving destination of the water in each instance.
PRCP8.	Appendix 3 Dianne Copper Mine Groundwater and Surface Water Impact Assessment Report	The application indicates that the decommissioning and remediation of the settling dam will be planned, but it does not provide any information on the logistics of the potential plan and the management strategies in the meantime to minimise the identified impact, or strategies to minimise the impacts during the decommissioning process.	i) Update the PRCP and Schedule and provide information regarding to include information on the rehabilitation activities to decommission the settling dam and information on post decommissioning flow and predicted changes in water quality downstream of settling dam. ii) Update the PRCP and Schedule to contemplate the above for any other water management structures or dams.
PRCP9.	Appendix 2 Dianne Copper Mine Water Management Plan Appendix 3 Dianne Copper Mine Groundwater and	The proposed PRCP provides limited information to describe the hydrogeology of the Dianne Copper Mine Project Site including hydraulic conductivity or the current or potential future connection to surrounding groundwater and surface waters. It is indicated that the total depth of the proposed pit will reach 124m, however, no information on its potential cross section/s with the	Provide an updated PRCP that includes the relevant information requirements (including contemporary information) of section 3.6.1 of the PRCP Guideline as follows: i) determining the groundwater occurrence including the existence

Item	Reference	Matter	Information Request
	Surface Water Impact Assessment Report	underlaying geological structure is provided. Section 3.2 provides description of the geology around the area. It is evident that the pit likely will intersect the groundwater system. The information is indicative of structural complexity and highlights the presence of faults and intrusive bodies. The secondary fault that trends west-northwest may create zone of structural weakness and act as preferential groundwater flow paths, which potentially could result in water ingress into the pit but also it can create localised sulphide mineralisation which can increase AMD risk. However, the elevated bedrock plateau location of the site, with intense fracturing and faulting in the area can limit the groundwater inflows to the pit (e.g. likely water will flow vertically to deeper aquifers, high risk of seepage). In addition, the potential joints and fractures developed through multiple deformation events creates high potential for surface water and groundwater interaction (e.g. surface runoffs can infiltrate quickly through fractures and increase recharge rate).	of, and depth to, aquifers and aquitards ii) locating groundwater recharge and discharge locations locally and regionally iii) groundwater quality within each of the aquifers and from surface expressions (i.e. seeps and springs) iv) current and potential future uses of groundwater including existing groundwater extraction bores v) groundwater flow direction and velocity, including field tests to determine hydraulic conductivity vi) the development of potentiometric mapping and hydro stratigraphic cross sections vii) groundwater modelling to determine contaminant transport and potential changes to groundwater level from dewatering or waste storage. Provide an updated PRCP that captures all relevant information within the PRCP and if required, provide all referenced documentation that is considered critical to the proposed PRCP.
PRCP10	Appendix 3 Dianne Copper Mine	Groundwater quality data has been provided in the section 3.5.2.1 Groundwater Quality however there are identified gaps in the data and a	i) Provide an updated PRCP that includes updated data for Groundwater Monitoring

Item	Reference	Matter	Information Request
	Groundwater and Surface Water Impact Assessment Report	lack of analysis and interpretation in relation to groundwater flow direction/s for the proposed mining disturbances and the location and siting of monitoring bores and requirements for additional bores to provide a comprehensive and appropriate monitoring network for closure. Background groundwater is required to check and derive appropriate site-specific water quality limits for monitoring of controls and to establish the compliance framework during closure. The data which has been provided for GW01 (reference site), GW04 (reference site) and GW03 (impact site) is up to April 2023.	Water Quality Results parameters using the most recently available data (e.g. from at least 2024 or later). ii) Provide a comprehensive assessment of the groundwater system that captures the potential pathways and impacts from all the proposed mine features at closure. This requires: o inclusion of further monitoring bores upgradient and downgradient of each key structure (e.g. pit, WRD, heap leach pads, processing plant and settling/release dam), with justification of bore placements (e.g. between the mine features and sensitive receptors) o baseline data of at least 18 months (if monitored 1-2 monthly) to allow for understanding the groundwater system and potential seasonality impacts. iii) Provide the raw data (with no outlier removal) utilised to derive the water quality objectives proposed in Table 7 of the report (p.40).

Item	Reference	Matter	Information Request
PRCP11	Appendix 3 Dianne Copper Mine Groundwater and Surface Water Impact Assessment Report	The reported groundwater monitoring network and data is a limiting factor in identifying and enabling an understanding of the groundwater behaviour and its interaction with the site. Based on the information provided, the network is unable to define the groundwater gradients or drawdown contours. There are no bores to the east of the pit or around the proposed WRD which limits the ability to capture a baseline for comparison of impacts in future. There are no bores between the main features such as heap leach pads and the pit or the processing plant, or the RoM, or the WRD – This does not allow for any delineation of potential source of contamination and/or localised impacts. This limiting factor also questions the proposed mitigation and closure strategies (stated to be part of the site water management plan). There is limited vertical profiling and therefore limited capacity to capture information on potential pathways to the groundwater system and potential downstream users. There is no demonstration of the consideration of water quality objectives and the Australian and New Zealand Guidelines for Fresh and Marine Water Quality (ANZG 2018).	Provide a comprehensive assessment of the groundwater system that captures the potential pathways and impacts from all the proposed mine features in the closure setting. This would require: i) Inclusion of further monitoring bores upgradient and downgradient of each key structure (e.g. pit, WRD, heap leach pads, processing plant and settling/release dam), with justification of bore placements (e.g. between the mine features and sensitive receptors). ii) Baseline data of at least 18 months (if monitored 1-2 monthly) to allow for understanding the groundwater system and potential seasonality impacts. iii) Appropriate groundwater rehabilitation and closure monitoring locations, monitoring frequency, quality characteristics and limits that are fit for purpose and capable of identifying contamination from all disturbed areas. iv) An updated monitoring program that specifies frequency of water quality monitoring at sufficient intervals to be suitable to demonstrate that the land

Item	Reference	Matter	Information Request
			will achieve a stable conditions (i.e. non-polluting). v) Demonstrate how the water quality objectives and the ANZG 2018 guidelines have been considered. vi) Groundwater modelling showing potential drawdown zone, and potential changes to groundwater level, including vertical profiling. vii) Information regarding groundwater impacts to potential downstream users
PRCP12.	Appendix 1 Dianne Copper Mine Waste Rock Management Plan	Out of Pit Waste Dump. The proposed final landforms for the waste rock dumps (WRD) have not been provided, and limited information has been provided to demonstrate that they can be expected to remain erosionally stable in the long term (refer to Section 3.6.1 of the *Statutory guideline Progressive rehabilitation and closure plan*). Furthermore, insufficient information has been provided to demonstrate the proposed final WRD landforms will achieve a stable condition. Erosion assessment modelling for the out of pit waste dump, presented in a way that adequately quantifies risk or demonstrates stability has not been provided. The department expects any erosion modelling undertaken for the WRD landforms to be presented in a way that appropriately identifies the critical risks of erosional failure on slopes.	Provide a revised rehabilitation planning part that includes an updated PRCP that addresses the requirements of section 3.6.1 of the *Statutory guideline Progressive rehabilitation and closure plan* including: i) 3D design plans of the final landform ii) method of determining landform design iii) modelling predicting the long-term stability of the final landform design iv) method of construction v) Quality Assurance / Quality Control (QA/QC) requirements

Item	Reference	Matter	Information Request
			vi) trial methodology to verify the predicted success of the final landform design vii) limitations and assumptions of the landform design. viii) clear and detailed description of the proposed WRD final landforms (including slope geometries). ix) Operational lift heights, batter angles, and berms to allow for safe construction of the waste dump and removal of additional stockpiled waste material; x) Geotechnical analysis to support the operational waste dump design; xi) Additional detail on placement of any identified PAF material. xii) erosion assessment based on measured material properties demonstrating that the proposed landforms can be expected to remain erosionally stable, with consideration given to the specific risks of each landform (e.g., containing potentially acid forming (PAF) material, topographic features that may concentrate flows, ability of growth media to support adequate plant growth, etc.).

Item	Reference	Matter	Information Request
			xiii) demonstrate how the proposed landforms are compatible with the proposed PMLUs. xiv) Provide SMART milestone criteria which demonstrate stability of the final landform Furthermore, provide details as per the section 3.6.1 of the PRCP Guideline addressing the key considerations of the landform design to achieve long-term stability.
PRCP13.	Appendix 7 Dianne Copper Mine Final Landform & Cover Design	Erosion assessment is required to be undertaken prior to commencement of expansion. However, no information is provided to predict the potential risks associated with the erodibility of the material and its interactions under various weather conditions. While it is noted that two soil sample tests have been conducted which indicated a low erosion risk (with Emerson ranking of 7), the conclusions remain to be based on insufficient data. Erosion and/or stability issues may cause failure of rehabilitation areas (i.e. not a stable landform). Section 2.5.3 states that further erosion assessment should be undertaken which should include an evaluation of the interactions between soil erodibility, rainfall erosivity, landform height, gradient and vegetation cover to ensure long-term stability of the final landform. A final landform design is a key component of rehabilitation and closure planning. The final landform design must be based on the proposed PMLUs and NUMAs and demonstrate that the land will be safe and structurally stable. The final landform design must include:	i) Provide erosion modelling to predict the potential risks associated with the erodibility of the waste rock material and its interactions under various weather conditions. The erosion modelling must also consider the long-term stability of the final landform. ii) Provide an updated PRCP schedule that includes milestone criteria that meet the SMART principles for erosion (maximum erosion rate) and soil testing criteria (e.g. Rootzone EC, Soil pH, Exchangeable Sodium Percentage, etc.) sufficient to ensure that the final landform is stable. iii) Provide additional erosion modelling including evaluation of the interactions between soil erodibility,

Item	Reference	Matter	Information Request
		i) 3D design plans of the final landform ii) method of determining landform design iii) modelling predicting the long-term stability of the final landform design iv) method of construction v) Quality Assurance / Quality Control (QA/QC) requirements vi) trial methodology to verify the predicted success of the final landform design vii) limitations and assumptions of the landform design. Key considerations of the landform design report must also include: i) structure location, footprint and height (including proposed lift heights) – these factors may be influenced by location of environmental values, local topography, location of sensitive receptors or visual impact ii) whether the structure requires a lining to prevent water or air ingress and minimise the potential for seepage release and/or a seepage collection system iii) whether the landform is 'water-retaining' or 'water-shedding', considering rainfall patterns, and intensity, and the composition and texture of the waste iv) the identification of materials available for landform rehabilitation including their ability to achieve the required landform design outcomes v) erosion assessments to determine landform heights, gradients, profiles, and material placement	rainfall erosivity, landform height, gradient and vegetation cover to ensure long-term stability of the final landform, and to guide final landform design.

Item	Reference	Matter	Information Request
		vi) slope profile design considering the interactions between soil erodibility, rainfall erosivity, landform height, gradient and vegetation cover to identify acceptable erosion rates over a long-term average vii) settling and subsidence over time, which may impact the availability of areas for rehabilitation viii) hydrological and hydrogeological assessments ix) a waste placement strategy developed to mitigate environmental and rehabilitation risks during the construction and decommissioning phase x) • specific landform requirements committed to in stakeholder consultation, mine planning or other sources, which could include rock incorporation, designed flow paths, aesthetic considerations, non-linear batter slopes and targeted placement of materials xi) • monitoring to determine performance of control measures (i.e. liners or seepage collection systems). The landform design objective must be targeted at achieving long-term stability. To demonstrate this, the applicant must provide an analysis of future stability based on the factors described above (e.g. landform evolution modelling). Rehabilitation trials should be carried out during the rehabilitation planning stage to confirm the landform design predictions prior to the construction of the final site design.	
PRCP14	DCM_PRCP2024 Appendix 1 – PRCP Schedule_V2	The application is unclear as to how minimum soil quality requirements in terms of stable condition can be achieved; RM7 does not have the provision for an AQP to assess the suitability of soil proposed for use as growth media. To achieve a stable outcome, the topsoil needs to be of suitable quality to achieve the target vegetation community.	Provide details as to the assessment of an AQP regarding the suitability of soil proposed for use as growth media.

Item	Reference	Matter	Information Request
PRCP15.	BioCondition Assessment Manual V2, February 2025, Queensland Herbarium	The application does not appear to propose criteria that follow the BioCondition Assessment Manual (V2, February 2025, Queensland Herbarium) (Assessment Manual).	Provide an updated PRCP Schedule to include criteria for a BioCondition assessment in line with the Assessment Manual.
PRCP16.	PRCP 20230331 Final Schedule EPML00881213 Dianne Copper Mine; Dianne Copper Mine Recommencement Project Environmental Authority Amendment Application Environment Assessment Report	It is noted that Rehabilitation Milestones in the PRCP Schedule and EAR refer to analogue/reference sites, however, the justification of analogue/reference sites is not provided.	i) Provide an updated Rehabilitation Planning Part that identifies analogue/references sites are justified and discussed with relation to the proposed RM's. ii) Provide an updated Rehabilitation Planning Part that includes a description of the analogue/reference site attributes.
PRCP17.	PRCP 20230331 Final Schedule EPML00881213 Dianne Copper Mine; Dianne Copper Mine Recommencement Project Environmental Authority Amendment Application Environment Assessment Report	The PRCP schedule proposes to allow 1 year for each of the milestones. The risk assessment does not identify the potential for significant events to impact on the ability to achieve the milestone criteria by the scheduled date.	Provide an updated PRCP Schedule that considers the time required to achieve each rehabilitation milestone. Provide timeframes that consider impacts from events identified in the risk assessment.
PRCP18.	Queensland Mine Rehabilitation	Pursuant to section 176A(2)(b)(vi) and Chapter 8A of (including but not limited to 444A – 444O) of the EP Act, the Office of the Queensland Mine Rehabilitation Commissioner (QMRC) has published advice, reports, and guidance. The administering authority is required to consider the QMRC's	Provide an updated PRCP Schedule that considers published advice, reports and

Item	Reference	Matter	Information Request
	Commissioner Research and Guidance	published advice in making its decision. Accordingly, the advice, reports and guidance should be considered where appropriate for the Project. All advice, reports and guidance can be located on the following Queensland Government website: https://www.qmrc.qld.gov.au/publications/research	guidance from the QMRC as it relates to the Project.
PRCP19.	Queensland Mine Rehabilitation Commissioner Research and Guidance	The Rehabilitation Monitoring Program does not include an appropriate range of characteristics to demonstrate native vegetation has achieved a stable condition. It is unclear how the proposed monitoring program is specific, measurable, demonstrates the PMLU has been achieved and is sustainable (resilient to disturbance).	Provide an updated rehabilitation planning part that includes a monitoring program that considers the recommendations of the Office of the Queensland Mine Rehabilitation Commissioner.
PRCP20.	PRCP 20230331 Final Schedule EPML00881213 Dianne Copper Mine; Dianne Copper Mine Recommencement Project Environmental Authority Amendment Application Environment Assessment Report	The proposed PRCP provides limited detail on the status of existing rehabilitation, or the rehabilitation techniques implemented. Details of when rehabilitation activities commenced and were completed and evidence that the land has been rehabilitated to a stable condition have not been provided. In the absence of progressive certification, a detailed assessment of each area considered to have undergone rehabilitation must include monitoring data that supports the assertion that a stable condition has been achieved. In addition, the assessment of the final landform design, land stability and residual contamination, to rehabilitation areas is required. The information provided in the proposed PRCPning part does not satisfy the requirements of section 3.1 of the PRCP Guideline. PRCPs must also include details about any existing rehabilitation already completed at the time of submission of the proposed PRCP. Spatial Information outlining the location of all existing rehabilitation has also not been submitted as part of the proposed PRCP.	Provide an updated PRCP that includes the relevant information requirements of section 126C(1)(j) of the EP Act and section 3.1 of the PRCP Guideline as follows: i) a description of the rehabilitation works previously carried out; ii) when the rehabilitation works commenced and were completed; iii) whether the rehabilitation has been applied for or approved as progressively certified under the EP Act. Provide an updated PRCP that includes evidence that the areas of existing rehabilitation are safe, stable and non-polluting, including:

Item	Reference	Matter	Information Request
			i) monitoring data demonstrating performance of control measures; ii) erosion assessments and landform evolution modelling; iii) geotechnical stability assessment; iv) information on infiltration and seepage intervention and collection controls; v) surface water diversions and long-term management requirements; vi) source, pathway and fate of any contaminants that have the potential to impact environmental values; vii) erosion assessments; viii) contaminated land assessments. Provide updated Spatial Information that includes the relevant information requirements of 3.1 of the PRCP Guideline outlining the location of all existing rehabilitation as part of the proposed PRCP.
PRCP21.	DCM_PRCP2024 Appendix 1 – PRCP Schedule_V2	The proposed RM8 is the previous RM6 but otherwise remains functionally similar except for the absence of the criteria that there is no evidence of seepage from Settling Dam from external embankments and toe, and no seepage evident into diversion drains. Seepage does not appear to be addressed directly in the proposed PRCP Schedule.	Provide detail on mitigation measures and methods, including lining the dam, proposed to prevent seepage from Settling Dam from external embankments and toe, and seepage into diversion drains.

Item	Reference	Matter	Information Request
PRCP22.	Dianne Copper Mine Progressive Rehabilitation and Closure Plan	Retained infrastructure handover (Raw Water Dam 1 and roads), raw water dam 1 has the ability to spill during the wet season. Raw Water Dam to remain post mining per existing written agreement with landowner as important assets to grazing activities, with additional positive environmental outcomes. The schedule must demonstrate that all retained infrastructure items have achieved a stable condition, including a non-polluting state with respect to the receiving environment. Stock water limits and parameters concerning Raw Water Dam 1 do not clearly achieve a non-polluting state in respect of the receiving environment.	Demonstrate that all retained infrastructure, specifically Raw Water Dam 1 is non-polluting to the receiving environment. Provide justification and data to support the retention of dams in final landform such that any spills do not release contaminants to the receiving waters.
PRCP23.	Dianne Copper Mine Recommencement Project Environmental Authority Amendment Application Environment Assessment Report Dianne Copper Mine Progressive Rehabilitation and Closure Plan February 2025	A landholder agreement has not been provided for the infrastructure proposed to be retained.	Provide a landholder agreement for any infrastructure proposed to retained post closure.
PRCP24.	Schedule 8A, EP Reg	The application does not make clear how it meets the matters prescribed under Schedule 8A of the EP Reg.	Provide a full assessment against all matters provided for in Schedule 8A of the EP Reg including details how the performance outcomes have been achieved for all aspects of the amendment.

Item	Reference	Matter	Information Request
			This must include information necessary to inform the assessment of how the application meets the PRCP objectives and PRCP performance outcomes of Part 3, Schedule 8A. This will need to include (not exhaustive): i) Final site design assessment— ii) PMLU assessment— o Rehabilitation milestones; and o Progressive rehabilitation;

Please note: the approval sought for under the application subject to this Notice, only provides approval under the *Environmental Protection Act 1994* (the EP Act). The information provided in the application indicates several other approvals may be required in order to lawfully operate. This includes (but is not limited to):

- Water licenses of permits: if the project involves taking or interfering with water from a river, stream or underground source you may need a water licence or water permit under the *Water Act 2000;*
- Riverine protection permit: if the project involves removing vegetation, excavating or placing fill in a watercourse, a riverine protection permit may be required under the *Water Act 2000;*
- Cultural heritage approvals: if the project is near areas of cultural significance, such as Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander cultural heritage sites, compliance with the *Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Act 2003* and/or the *Torres Strait Islander Cultural Heritage Act 2003* is required. For more information on your obligations under this legislation, please visit the Department of Women, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Partnerships and Multiculturalism webpage at, https://www.tatsipca.qld.gov.au/.
- Environmental offsets: if the project has significant residual impacts on MSES, an environmental offset may be required under the *Environmental Offsets Act 2014.*
- Commonwealth approval: if the project has potential impacts on MNES, approval under the *Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999* may be required.

It is recommended that engagement with the relevant administering authorities commence as soon as possible to minimise potential project delays.

In addition, please be aware your application may be subject to the following process:

Public interest evaluation (PIE): In exceptional cases, where an area of disturbance cannot be rehabilitated to a stable condition, a non-use management area (NUMA) may be proposed. An applicant may seek approval to leave a NUMA only if grounds exist under section 126D(2) of the EP Act. As part of the assessment process for your application, the department must engage an independent qualified entity (QE) to carry out a public interest evaluation and provide a recommendation as to whether the proposed NUMA is in the public interest. As part of this evaluation, the QE will review and verify the justification provided for the NUMA in the application. The QE will also consider any relevant information contained in the economic, environmental and social impact assessments undertaken as part of the EA application and may request supplementary information from you as required.

It is important to note that, as the applicant, you will be required to reimburse the department for the cost of the PIE. The Department will provide you with an estimate of the cost before engaging the QE. The length of time that it will take for the QE to complete a PIE will be determined by factors such as the number and type of NUMA proposed. The Department cannot make a decision on your application until the PIE report is received. If the PIE report concludes that it is not in the public interest to approve the proposed NUMA, the department cannot approve your application. When the PIE is completed you (and any submitters for your application) will be notified and provided with an opportunity to request a review of the original PIE report (if grounds exist).