

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: Centurion Coal Mining Pty Ltd
Level 14, 31 Duncan Street
Fortitude Valley, QLD 4006
By email transmission only

Attention: Marianne Gibbons

Email: MGibbons@peabodyenergy.com

Our reference: P-EA-100658735 and P-PRCP-100669070_V4

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

1 Application details

The **amendment application** for a **site-specific environmental authority and PRCP schedule** was received by the administering authority on **3 November 2025**.

The application reference number is: **A-EA-AMD-100973471**

Land description: **ML1790 and ML70495**

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 requested is provided below in **Appendix A: Information Requested**.

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 **19 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 CRMining@detsi.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.

Should you have any questions about the notice, please contact Business Centre Coal using the details provided below.



Signature

19 December 2026

Date

Juliana McCosker

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

Enquiries:

Business Centre Coal
PO Box 3028, Emerald QLD 4720
Phone: 0749873200
Email: CRMining@detsi.qld.gov.au

Attachments

Appendix A: Information Requested.

Appendix A: Information Requested

Item #	Information Sought	Requested Actions															
Report – EA Amendment Application Supporting Information																	
1.	<u>Table 4-2 EA P-EA-100658735 Condition A15</u> This amendment seeks to amend EA condition A15 including updates to Figures 1, 3 and 4 referenced in the condition and the addition of a new Figure 5. It is recommended that the updated EA figures 1, 3, and 4, along with the additional figure 5 be provided separately, preferably in a high-resolution image format as they are required for inclusion in the final EA.	1.1 Provide the figures relevant to EA condition A15 separately, preferably in a high-resolution image format (JPEG, TIF, etc.).															
2.	<u>Table 4-2 EA P-EA-100658735 Condition A15</u> This amendment seeks to update the EA Table 1 (Mining Activities) to include a maximum disturbance area to 234 ha for exploration activities and ancillary infrastructure, as outlined in the amended EA Table 1 (Mining Activities) provided below. The supporting report in Table 3-1: ‘Drill Pad, Ancillary Infrastructure, and Access Track Disturbance Area’ indicates a total new disturbance of 167.41 ha. The current EA includes only a maximum disturbance of 13.2 ha for exploration activities and does not specify the extent of the area associated with historic drill holes and pads (310 drill holes). Therefore, it is unclear how the proposed 234 ha in the provided EA Table 1 has been calculated. <table><tr><th>Mine Domain</th><th>Mine Feature Domain</th><th>Location (GDA94)</th><th>Maximum Disturbance Area</th></tr><tr><td>Exploration activities</td><td>Drill holes and pads Vertical and lateral wells Historical holes and pads</td><td>As per Figure 1</td><td rowspan="2">Total disturbance area must not exceed 234 ha</td></tr><tr><td>Ancillary infrastructure</td><td>Roads and tracks Bleeder shaft Laydown area Goaf Drainage Lines</td><td>As per Figure 1</td></tr><tr><td>Underground activities</td><td>Gate roads</td><td>As per Figure 5</td><td></td></tr></table>	Mine Domain	Mine Feature Domain	Location (GDA94)	Maximum Disturbance Area	Exploration activities	Drill holes and pads Vertical and lateral wells Historical holes and pads	As per Figure 1	Total disturbance area must not exceed 234 ha	Ancillary infrastructure	Roads and tracks Bleeder shaft Laydown area Goaf Drainage Lines	As per Figure 1	Underground activities	Gate roads	As per Figure 5		2.1 Provide clarification as to how the 234 ha has been accounted for exploration activities and ancillary infrastructure. 2.2 If required, provide a revised EA table 1 that includes a detailed breakdown of the proposed maximum disturbance of 234ha for the associated exploration activities (including historical drill holes) and ancillary infrastructure.
Mine Domain	Mine Feature Domain	Location (GDA94)	Maximum Disturbance Area														
Exploration activities	Drill holes and pads Vertical and lateral wells Historical holes and pads	As per Figure 1	Total disturbance area must not exceed 234 ha														
Ancillary infrastructure	Roads and tracks Bleeder shaft Laydown area Goaf Drainage Lines	As per Figure 1															
Underground activities	Gate roads	As per Figure 5															
Appendix C - Terrestrial Ecology Technical Report																	
3.	<u>Section 8 – Significant residual impact assessments</u> The koala is listed as endangered under both the NC Act and the EPBC Act. The significant residual impact assessment provided in Section 8 indicates that the Project has the potential to result in a significant residual impact on the koala, affecting an area of 64.83 ha. The EA holder has identified the offset requirements under the Queensland Environmental Offset Framework to compensate for the significant residual impacts. However, the supporting application materials do not provide detailed information on the measures	3.1 Provide evidence of how Peabody has adhered to the hierarchy of impact management, prioritising avoidance and mitigation measures before considering offset requirement. 3.2 Provide additional information on the offset															

	proposed to first avoid and mitigate these impacts, nor do they specify the type of intended offsets, whether land-based or financial.	proposal, specifying whether it will involve land-based or financial offsets, along with a justification for the chosen preference.
4.	<u>Regional ecosystem mapping – Certified map amendment (MAR3577B) and E2M ground-truthed mapping</u> Section 3.2.2.1 – Regional ecosystems states: “An RE map amendment was submitted by Kleinfelder and approved by the Queensland Herbarium (MAR3577) in June 2024 to refine vegetation mapping within the Study Area prior to this current assessment. MSES impact assessments and calculations relative to MSES regulated vegetation will utilise this Queensland Herbarium certified amendment mapping. However, ground-truthed RE mapping undertaken by e2m as part of this current assessment will be utilised for habitat mapping for all other MSES values.” The department is concerned with the use of one set of RE mapping for regulated vegetation and a different set of RE mapping for habitat as both assessments apply to the same project area. Based on Section 5.1 (Vegetation Communities) and Figure 7 (Ground-truthed Regional Ecosystems) in Appendix C, it is understood that E2M has undertaken additional ground-truthing and identified discrepancies between the RE areas mapped during the field survey and those shown in the Queensland Herbarium-certified map amendment (MAR3577B). However, the assessment does not provide a quantitative comparison (in hectares) between the ground-truthed RE mapping and the MAR3577B mapping within the Centurion North project footprint, making it difficult to determine the extent of area variation between the two datasets. If significant differences are identified between the extent of the ground-truthed RE areas and the MAR3577B mapping, it would be more appropriate to repeat the significant residual impact assessment using the most recently conducted and validated mapping. Furthermore, Table 11 in Section 6.2 outlines direct impacts to vegetation communities within the disturbance footprint, indicating a notable difference between the mapped and ground-truthed areas for several REs, including 11.5.15, 11.5.3, 11.5.16, 11.8.5, and 11.8.11. If the E2M ground-truthing was undertaken after the MAR3577 map amendment, the impact mitigation measures, particularly environmental offset requirements derived from the significant residual impact assessment based on the MAR3577 mapping may not accurately reflect the actual extent of ground disturbance to prescribed matters. Therefore, the ground-truthed RE areas must be validated via a further RE mapping amendment by the Queensland Herbarium. This is necessary to ensure that the disturbance areas used in the significant residual impact assessment are accurate and appropriately reflect the most recent on-ground values.	4.1 Provide clarification on whether different sets of RE mapping have been used for regulated vegetation and habitat mapping within the same project area. 4.2 Update Section 5.1 of Appendix C to include a table that provides a detailed comparison of the extent (in hectares) of the ground-truthed RE areas within the Centurion North project footprint against the certified map amendment MAR3577B. 4.3 Where a significant difference is identified between the extent of the ground-truthed RE areas and the MAR3577 mapping, repeat the significant residual impact assessment using the most recently conducted mapping. 4.4 Update the proposed impact mitigation measures to reflect the outcomes of the revised significant residual impact assessment undertaken as per RFI item 4.3. 4.5 If required, take necessary steps to obtain RE mapping certification from the Queensland Herbarium to validate the ground-truthed results.
Appendix A – Groundwater Assessment		

5.	<u>Executive Summary</u> This section states: • <i>'Given the scale and location, the Project activities can be largely managed under the monitoring and compliance requirements of the existing EA and Centurion Coal Mine management practices that will be applied to the Project to minimise and/or prevent unauthorised harm to EVs from the Project.'</i> The department notes that it would be unacceptable to manage the groundwater impacts of this Project solely under the requirements of the Centurion Coal Mine EA. Therefore, the Centurion North EA will require amendment to include provision of groundwater monitoring as part of this EA amendment process. A detailed groundwater monitoring program is required to be presented which will provide the information required to support the development of a numerical groundwater model capable of adequately simulating the proposed project and its impacts on the groundwater system. The monitoring program will need to be capable of monitoring groundwater conditions (groundwater levels, quality and flow directions) prior to any project operations occurring and monitor any impacts as the project develops. The monitoring program will also require sufficient standpipe monitoring bores in the various units within the Permian formations and the Tertiary sediments (including the basalt, basalt sands and non-basalt Tertiary unit) to provide the data required.	5.1 Provide details of a groundwater monitoring program which will provide the information required to support the development of a numerical groundwater model capable of adequately simulating the proposed project and its impacts on the groundwater system.
6.	<u>Section 1.2.1 Water extracted from CSG wells</u> This section states: • <i>'Currently, Peabody estimates a total water production of 20 kilolitres (kL) over the operational life of one CSG well.'</i> The section goes on to assume the life of one CSG well is 21 months. No reference is provided as to how the water production has been determined.	6.1 Provide supporting information for the estimate of a total water production of 20 kilolitres over the operational life of one CSG well.
7.	<u>Section 2.2.1 Monitoring bore details</u> This section provides some details of the hydrostratigraphy of the project area. Figure 2-3 provides some details of monitoring bores on a map. However, a table providing details of all monitoring bores, including the following information, has not been provided: - Location – coordinates - Depth - Screened depth - Geologic unit monitored - Length of water level record - Length of water quality record A detailed description of the monitoring network is required to determine what information is available on which to base the	7.1 Provide details of all monitoring bores in a table that includes: - Location – coordinates, - Depth, - Screened depth, - Geologic unit monitored, - Length of water level record, and - Length of water quality record.

	assessment. The lack of such detail reduces confidence in the conceptualisation, numerical groundwater model and its predictions. It is further noted in Figure 2-3 that monitoring bores at Centurion, some of which located just south of this project, are not plotted on the figure. It is unclear that data from these bores was used in this assessment.	
8.	<u>Section 2.2.1.3 Permian Stratigraphy</u> This section provides some discussion on the Permian. Based on Figure 2-2, it is assumed that Permian formations, Fort Cooper Coal Measures, Moranbah Coal Measures and the Back Creek Group are present on site. However, there is no discussion of these formations in section 2.2.1.3. It is also assumed based on figure 2-2 that there are multiple coal seams present, most in the Moranbah Coal Measures and perhaps one at the base of the Fort Cooper Coal Measures. There is no discussion of the various coal seams in section 2.2.1.3 except to say that there are coal seams in the Permian. Other parts of the report appear to indicate that CSG will be removed from the Lower Goonyella seam and that the Goonyella middle seam is the target seam. The model has layers representing the RQ and GU seams as well as the Goonyella middle and lower seams. The hydrostratigraphy section should provide details of this geology as a basis for the rest of the report.	8.1 Provide additional information in section 2.2.1.3 on the Permian formations and the coal seams on site.
9.	<u>Section 2.3.1 Water level information</u> Figure 2-6 provides a hydrograph for basalt monitoring bore MB08. This is the only hydrograph provided for a standpipe bore in the entire report. Figure 2-7 provides hydrographs from a vibrating wire piezometer (VWP) for a period of 4 months starting in November 2011. It is not clear whether the VWP was equilibrated or representative of the geologic units being monitored. This impacts the reliability of the data. The only other water level data provided is in Figure 2-8 where contours are drawn based on water levels in exploration holes open to multiple Permian geologic units in 2011. They cover an area north of the project site. In relation to these contours section 2.3.1 states: <i>'These are considered to be low reliability water level estimates as they are likely to present as averaged piezometric level Permian strata that are exposed in the borehole (including coal and overburden). Based on these localised contours for data collected in 2011, the interpreted groundwater flow direction is to the south and west.'</i> It is noted that section 2.2.1.1 states that no water level data is available in the alluvium in the network. Further, there appear to be a number of basalt monitoring bores plotted on Figure 2-3. However, there are no groundwater elevation	9.1 Provide additional information to demonstrate groundwater flow direction and groundwater trends in the major geologic units at the project site, including the basalt and Permian formations and alluvium where present. 9.2 Where there are obvious gaps in the data provide detailed advice as to how those data gaps are being addressed.

	contours for the basalt provided based on this data or spot height (groundwater elevation) information using data from these bores. Overall, it is considered that the water level data presented in this application is limited in it's ability to represent the area for assessment. Further information is required to address data gaps, and better demonstrate the groundwater flow in project the area and surrounds.	
10.	<u>Section 2.3.2 Water Chemistry</u> This section states: <i>'Alluvium: Variable salinity, but generally brackish to saline (up to 6,600 $\mu\text{S}/\text{cm}$, with an average of $\sim 3,700 \mu\text{S}/\text{cm}$), slightly alkaline pH (7.32 to 7.61) and sodium chloride dominated;'</i> It is not clear where this data comes from given the report states there are no alluvial bores in the network. The section also states: <i>'Permian Coal Measures: Limited data exists for monitoring bores screened within the coal measures outside of two rounds of grab samples in late 2011. Chemistry results from these sampling rounds indicated that groundwater in the coal measures is of significantly higher in salinity, and more alkaline compared to samples from the basalt and alluvium.'</i> It is not clear what bores the grab samples in late 2011 relate to. Additionally, no chemistry data is provided for those bores. In the basalt, a range of electrical conductivity and pH is provided but no details as to which bores were sampled and how water quality varies spatially (mapped) is provided. A piper plot is also provided for basalt, weathered basalt and Tertiary (assume non basalt) but it is not clear which bores are represented by these samples. Overall, there is limited connection between the statements on water quality and the supporting data for each unit. In order to enable sufficient assessment of the project, the application should address these information gaps.	10.1 Provide additional additional information that completes the water quality reporting to the greatest extent possible and 10.2 If gaps remain provide advise as to how gaps in the water quality data will be addressed.
11.	<u>Section 3.3 Model layers – Fort Cooper Coal Measures</u> Figure 2-2 indicates that the Fort Cooper Coal Measures overlies the Moranbah Coal Measures in much of the project and model area. Section 3.3 and Table 3-1 don't mention the Fort Cooper Coal Measures when describing the model layers. Section 3.3 states: <i>'The overburden was divided into three layers of equal thickness and pinch-out occurs where the target coal seam or interburden units come into direct contact with higher units (alluvium, regolith / weathered material, basal sands).'</i>	11.1 Provide advice as to how the Fort Cooper Coal Measures have been represented in the numerical groundwater model.

	Additionally, it is noted that Table 3-1 identifies layers 15 – 17 as Permian overburden 1, 2 and 3. However, it is unclear that the Fort Cooper Coal Measures is included in parts of layers 15 to 17. Similarly, Appendix A, Table A1 makes no mention of the Fort Cooper Coal Measures when describing hydraulic parameters used to represent the various model layers. Given that the Fort Cooper Coal Measures is a significant formation on site, it is important to clearly define how it has been represented in the numerical groundwater model.	
12.	<u>Section 3.5.1 General Head Boundaries</u> This section states: <i>'The model boundary conditions are presented in Figure 3-1. The general head boundary (GHB) condition was used primarily to represent the regional flow into and out of the model area. GHB cells have been assigned in all model layers along the general head boundaries indicated in Figure 3-1.'</i> A review of Figure 3-1 would appear to indicate that the model boundary conditions are not presented in Figure 3-1.	12.1 Provide additional advice in regard to the model boundary conditions.
13.	<u>Sections 3.5, 3.6 and 3.7 Initial conditions</u> Section 3.5 states: <i>'The GHB water levels were assigned based on the topographic gradients beyond the model boundaries, most recently recorded water levels at monitoring bores and aligned with conceptualised regional flow behaviour (Section 2.3.1).'</i> Section 3.6 states: <i>'Initial heads were assigned based on the converged steady-state condition prior to the commencement of the proposed dewatering and underground mining activities.'</i> Section 3.7 states: Hydraulic Parameterisation <i>'To optimise the match between the measurements and the model simulated levels, the hydraulic properties (i.e., horizontal and vertical conductivity) for each hydraulic parameter zone were adjusted during an initial calibration phase.'</i> Limited information is provided in Section 3 of the report as to what measured or recorded water levels were used to support the development of initial heads and the steady state model.	16.1 Given the very limited measured and recorded water level data presented in the report, provide further information indicating what water level data was used to develop the steady state model. 16.2 Provide a discussion on what limitations the lack of water level data places on the model predictions.
14.	<u>Section 3.8 – Model Performance</u> This section states: <i>'The model shows a reasonable fit between observed and modelled groundwater levels.'</i>	17.1 Provide supporting information that demonstrates a reasonable fit between observed and modelled groundwater levels.

	The report does not appear to provide any evidence to support this statement.	
15.	<u>Table 3-2 Groundwater model and data limitations</u> This table states under the heading of measurement error: 'Bore logs and construction details available for most site bores, and long-term site water level data available for various units.' The report provides only one hydrograph for a standpipe bore. It is MB08 in basalt.	15.1 Provide supporting information demonstrating that long term site water level data is available for various units.
16.	<u>Table 3-2 Groundwater model and data limitations</u> This table states under the heading of scenario uncertainties – calibration: 'A steady state calibration to initial heads was performed. Lack of data at model bounds complicates assignment of boundary condition constant heads and, based on the declining groundwater level and change in storage observed in the model through out runs, the system is not in equilibrium with heads that match piezometric contouring of available data. This is likely to be due to groundwater abstraction in the southern area of site and additional data may address this limitation.' Given DETSI's concern about the lack of reliable water level data to calibrate the model against, the statement above even further reduces confidence in the numerical groundwater model. Item 12 of this request raises an issue concerning the lack of water level data which is not addressed in the above statement as a limitation. Understanding on a range of limitations of the model is important for the assessment.	16.1 Provide discussion as to how the lack of reliable water level data may have influence the model limitations and inability of the model to reach equilibrium.
17.	<u>Section 4.3 Model predicted drawdowns</u> Figure 4-3 demonstrates that predicted drawdown in layer 22 (GM seam) extends to the western and northern boundaries. The model boundary conditions at the lateral boundaries may therefore be unduly impacting model predicted drawdown. Additionally, it is noted that predicted drawdown in layer 22 ceases abruptly in the west where the target seam subcrops. However, there are no predicted drawdowns provided for layer 25 representing the Back Creek Group which adjoins layer 22 to the west.	17.1 Provide advice on whether the lateral model boundaries of the numerical groundwater model will be extended to reduce potential impact on model predicted drawdown. 17.2 Provide predicted drawdowns in layer 25 representing the Back Creek Group.
18.	<u>Section 4.4 – Sensitivity analysis</u> This section provides information on changing predicted drawdown in basalt monitoring bore MB09 as a result of varying, hydraulic conductivity, storage coefficient and recharge. Whilst it is considered that this provides some additional information it does appear to provide a very narrow focus for a sensitivity analysis. It is considered that a much better appreciation of the impact of these changes would have been gained by changing parameters in the major layers and then presenting and comparing the changed predicted	18.1 Provide advice as to why the predicted drawdown extents were not provided as outputs to the sensitivity analysis.

	drawdown extents in those layers as would typically occur with a sensitivity analysis.	
19.	<u>Appendix A, Table A1 – Parameter values</u> The figures for Specific Yield in general in this table seem low, particularly for the alluvium where a range of 1-10% would usually be expected. It is unclear if Table A1 provides 0.001 or 0.1%. In any case this requires clarification, and the use of either value requires justification.	19.1 Provide advice as to what data supports the use of a Specific Yield of 0.1% to represent alluvium in the numerical groundwater model.
PRCP schedule		
20.	<u>Section B – Final site design and reference maps</u> This amendment seeks to update Figure 1 – Final Site Design and Figure 2 – Reference Map in Section B of the PRCP schedule. It is recommended that the updated Figure 1 and 2 be provided as separate files, preferably in a high-resolution image format (JPEG, TIF, etc.) to facilitate their inclusion in the final schedule.	20.1 Provide the updated versions of Figure 1 and Figure 2 as separate files, preferably in a high-resolution image format.
21.	<u>Section C – Post-mining land uses</u> The proposed amendment seeks to extend the date of land availability (a total area of 234 ha) for rehabilitation from 2028 to 2055, representing a 27-year extension. Consequently, the completion date for the final rehabilitation milestone (RM7) is deferred to 10 December 2075. Given that the project is planned for completion by 2031, it is expected that the disturbed land subject to this amendment should be made available for commencement of first milestone (RM1) from 2032 (at least within 6 months after the area becomes available for rehabilitation). The application supporting report or the updated PRC plan does not provide clear justifications as to why the disturbed land associated with RA1 will not be available for rehabilitation until 2055. Therefore, the department requests further justification for the proposed timeframes, specifically regarding the availability of land for rehabilitation and the achievement of subsequent rehabilitation milestones relevant to RA1.	21.1 Provide justification for why the land cannot be made available for progressive rehabilitation immediately following the completion of the project subject to this EA amendment. 21.2 If required, revise the timeframes for the availability of land for rehabilitation as well as the associated rehabilitation milestones for RA1 in the schedule.
22.	<u>Section C – Post-mining land uses</u> PRCP Schedule RA1 currently designates 234 ha for exploration activities, early works and ancillary infrastructure. However, there is uncertainty regarding the specific surface disturbance associated with early works as it is not specified in the schedule. The consolidation of all these activities under RA1 makes it difficult to clearly identify and define specific rehabilitation criteria for disturbances associated with the newly proposed activities, such as underground gate roads, gas risers, service boreholes, SIS wells and VPWs. It is not clear that the current rehabilitation milestone criteria proposed for the 234 ha of collective disturbance under RA1 adequately address the potential impacts of the newly proposed activities to the land to	22.1 Provide clarification on how the proposed milestone criteria under RA1 in the amended schedule address the potential impacts of the newly proposed activities. 22.2 If required, develop specific milestone criteria to address potential impacts of the newly proposed activities and provide the revised PRCP schedule.

	ensure the achievement of a safe, stable, non-polluting, and self-sustaining post-mining land use (PMLU). To enhance the clarity and effectiveness of rehabilitation milestone criteria, it is recommended that specific milestone criteria (SMART) be developed to address potential impacts of the proposed various disturbances associated with the project.	
23.	<u>Section C – Post-mining land uses</u> It is understood that most of the additional disturbance area proposed consists of cleared land and efforts will be made to minimise the clearance of mature trees for drill sites and access tracks. However, it is noted that some drill sites will encroach upon remnant vegetation (endangered or of concern) as depicted in Figures 6-12 and 6-13 of the supporting report. The current PRCP schedule only identifies cattle grazing as the post-mining land use (PMLU). Therefore, it is unclear how the proposed PRC plan addresses the reestablishment of vegetation and the associated monitoring plan for remnant vegetation areas affected by drilling activities and access tracks. To address this, it is recommended that areas of remnant vegetation proposed for clearing be designated as a separate rehabilitation area (RA). These areas should be managed in accordance with relevant SMART criteria to ensure effective rehabilitation and facilitate the monitoring of vegetation reestablishment.	23.1 Provide clarification on how the proposed PRC plan and schedule incorporate measures to rehabilitate the revegetation of remnant vegetation areas impacted by the proposed surface disturbances. 23.2 If required, designate areas of remnant vegetation proposed for clearing under a separate Rehabilitation Areas (RA) and establish relevant SMART criteria to ensure successful rehabilitation and effective monitoring of revegetation.
24.	<u>Grazing species mix</u> The MSES assessment provided in Appendix C identifies two conservation significant flora species: king bluegrass (<i>Dichanthium queenslandicum</i>) – vulnerable; and finger panic (<i>Digitaria porrecta</i>) – near threatened which are listed under the NC act. Additionally, the potential for significant residual impacts to koala has been identified. However, the proposed seed mix is not representative of these grazing species or suitable koala feed tree species. It is recommended that the seed mix be enhanced to include species impacted by the project, including the identified grazing species and koala feed tree species.	24.1 Update the proposed seed mix to incorporate king bluegrass (<i>Dichanthium queenslandicum</i>) and finger panic (<i>Digitaria porrecta</i>), as well suitable koala feed tree species.