Corvus Metallurgical Coal Project

Application Number: **02866** Commencement Date: **09/04/2025** Status: **Locked**

1. About the project

1.1 Project details

1.1.1 Project title *

Corvus Metallurgical Coal Project

1.1.2 Project industry type *

Mining

1.1.3 Project industry sub-type

Coal

1.1.4 Estimated start date *

01/01/2027

1.1.4 Estimated end date *

31/12/2055

1.2 Proposed Action details

1.2.1 Provide an overview of the proposed action, including all proposed activities. *

Corvus Resources Pty Ltd (Corvus), an Australian, privately-owned proponent, is seeking to develop an underground coal mine (i.e. the Action) approximately 17 kilometres (km) north of Emerald in the Bowen Basin, Queensland (Figure 1).

A detailed description of the activities proposed to be undertaken as part of the Action (including figures) is provided in Attachment 2 of this Referral.

The Action will extract up to 8 million tonnes per annum (Mtpa) of run of mine (ROM) coal with saleable production of approximately 6.6 Mtpa over a planned mine life of 25 years. Approximately 90 percent (%) of coal produced by the Action would be used in blast furnaces to make steel (i.e. metallurgical/coking coal).

The proposed Action that is the subject of this Referral includes the following components and activities within the Action Area (shown on Figure 2):

- underground mining of the Corvus 2 and German Creek Seams within Exploration Permits for Coal (EPCs) 980 and EPC 1267 using longwall mining as shown on Figure 2;
- mining operations for a period of approximately 25 years;
- development of a pit top area for underground mine entries and associated facilities that support the underground mining activities;
- establishment and use of ventilation and water management infrastructure including shafts, bores, pumps and pipelines;
- management of water that accumulates in the underground workings within the Action Area;
- construction and operation of a new coal processing plant (CPP) that would be established at the existing Gregory Crinum Mine;
- construction and operation of an overland conveyor to transport ROM coal from the underground mining area to the new CPP for processing; and
- construction and operation of an overland conveyor to transport product coal from the CPP to a new train load-out bin on Aurizon's existing Gordonstone Balloon Loop via an overland conveyor.

The Action, the subject of this Referral, explicitly does not include the following:

- development of infrastructure required to supply the Action with power and/or water (i.e. external electricity transmission lines and water pipelines);
- disposal of coarse and fine rejects within existing open cut mining areas at the Gregory Crinum Mine;
- any other activity associated with the Gregory Crinum Mine under existing environmental approvals; and
- ongoing exploration activities within EPC 980, EPC 1226, EPC 1267 and EPC 2841.

Power Supply

Permanent electricity supply for the Action would be provided from the existing regional power network via construction of 66 kilovolt (kv) electricity transmission lines to the Action from the Lilyvale substation and/or construction of a new substation along the existing 66 kV feeder line (Figure 2).

Any transmission lines constructed for the Action would be owned and operated by Ergon Energy Corporation Limited (ABN 50 087646 062). The EPBC Act does not allow individual elements of a single referred Action to be transferred between proponents. Accordingly, construction and operation of off-site powerlines has been excluded from this Action.

Construction of a feeder line and/or construction of a new substation along the existing 66 kV feeder line are unlikely to require referral under the EPBC Act on the basis that this infrastructure would be located within existing cleared easements associated with the existing transmission line, Lilyvale Road and Fairhills Road or areas that will be disturbed as part of the Action (i.e. it would be located within the same corridor as the Action access road and conveyor) (Figure 2).

Water Supply

The main water demands for the Action would be construction activities, underground mining operations and the supply of process water for the CPP. Subject to detailed engineering design, water would likely be supplied through a combination of the following sources:

- underground dewatering;
- water re-use and recycling;
- incidental rainfall and runoff collection;
- supplementary raw water supply from groundwater bores; and
- supplementary raw water supply from existing off-site water supply networks.

The requirement for off-lease water pipelines is dependent on the availability of water from the other sources identified above. Assessment of the need for any external water management infrastructure (e.g. pipelines) required for the Action will be included in the EIS. Should additional water pipelines be required for the Action, they would likely be owned and operated by Sunwater Limited (ABN 17 020 276 523).

Sunwater has advised that the only supply available (Selma Weir – Fairburn Dam) is currently fully allocated. Should Corvus require off-site supply it will be sourced from the secondary market utilising predominantly existing off-site infrastructure.

As described above, the EPBC Act does not allow individual elements of a single referred Action to be transferred between proponents. Accordingly, construction and operation of off-site water pipelines has been excluded from this Action. Should Sunwater Limited determine that any such infrastructure is likely to impact on Matters of National Environmental Significance, they would be responsible for preparing and lodging a Referral at that time.

Rejects Disposal

The Action would involve the construction of a new CPP at the existing Gregory Crinum Mine. Coal reject material, including coarse and fine rejects, would be produced over the life of the Action. Corvus proposes to emplace this coal reject material within disturbed mining areas at the Gregory Crinum Mine.

Positioning the CPP at the Gregory Crinum Mine allows coal rejects to be disposed of in disturbed mining areas and removes the need for above ground rejects storage at EPC 980 (which would require approximately 300 ha of additional disturbance).

Sojitz Gregory Crinum Pty Ltd (Sojitz) currently disposes coal rejects within disturbed mining areas at the Gregory Crinum Mine in accordance with Environmental Authority EPML00945013. Condition F7 of Environmental Authority EPML00945013 also requires that Sojitz *"complete an investigation into residual voids"*. This void investigation report "*must be reviewed and updated every three (3) years*" and must include "*a study of options available for minimising final void area and volume*".

The Action does not include the disposal of coal rejects within existing mining areas at the Gregory Crinum Mine on the basis that this activity is already approved and being carried out by Sojitz.

1.2.2 Is the project action part of a staged development or related to other actions or proposals in the region?

Yes

1.2.3 Is the proposed action the first stage of a staged development (or a larger project)?

No

1.2.4 Related referral(s)

—

1.2.5 Provide information about the staged development (or relevant larger project).

As outlined above, Corvus proposes to emplace coal reject material within disturbed mining areas at the Gregory Crinum Mine.

Sojitz currently disposes coal rejects within disturbed mining areas at the Gregory Crinum Mine in accordance with Environmental Authority EPML00945013. Condition F7 of Environmental Authority EPML00945013 also requires that Sojitz *"complete an investigation into residual voids"*. This void investigation report "*must be reviewed and updated every three (3) years*" and must include "*a study of options available for minimising final void area and volume*".

The Action does not include the disposal of coal rejects within existing mining areas at the Gregory Crinum Mine on the basis that this activity is already approved and being carried out by Sojitz.

1.2.6 What Commonwealth or state legislation, planning frameworks or policy documents are relevant to the proposed action, and how are they relevant? *

Commonwealth Environmental Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999 (EPBC Act)

Under the EPBC Act, any action that is likely to have a significant impact on a matter of national environmental significance (MNES) is deemed to be a 'controlled action' and requires approval under the EPBC Act.

This referral has been prepared to assist the Commonwealth Minister for the Environment in determining whether or not the Action is a controlled action by providing a preliminary assessment of potential impacts on all MNES.

State Development and Public Works Organisation Act 1971 (SDPWO Act)

Corvus has submitted an application to the Coordinator-General for declaration of the Action as a 'Coordinated Project' under Part 4 of the SDPWO Act. The application was supported by an Initial Advice Statement, which detailed information about the Action to inform the Coordinator-General's decision.

If declared a Coordinated Project, an EIS will be prepared under Part 4 of the SDPWO Act.

Environmental Protection Act 1994 (EP Act)

Prescribed environmentally relevant activities (ERAs) and resource activities (which includes mining activities) are regulated under the *Environmental Protection Act 1994* (EP Act) through the issuing of an environmental authority (EA).

Corvus will lodge an application for a site-specific environmental authority in accordance with the requirements listed in Division 3 of Part 2 of the EP Act.

Mineral Resources Act 1989 (MR Act)

The MR Act provides for the granting, conditioning and management of mining tenements, being prospecting permits, exploration permits, mineral development licences, mining leases and mining claims.

Corvus will lodge mining lease applications (MLAs) under Chapter 7 of the MR Act.

Other relevant leases, licences or approvals required under Qld legislation would also be obtained for the Action as required.

1.2.7 Describe any public consultation that has been, is being or will be undertaken regarding the project area, including with Indigenous stakeholders. Attach any completed consultation documentations, if relevant. *

Corvus considers that meaningful stakeholder engagement is a key element in the assessment process for the Action. As such, Corvus has developed a detailed stakeholder engagement strategy for the Action, in consultation with experienced social impact assessment specialists, Square Peg Social Performance (Square Peg).

In accordance with its stakeholder engagement strategy, Corvus has commenced engagement with the following stakeholders:

- local landholders;
- CHRC;
- the Western Kangoulu People as the recognised Native Title Claimant;
- Office of the Coordinator-General;
- DETSI;
- DoR;
- Commonwealth DCCEEW;
- nearby tenure holders (including Kestrel and Sojitz); and
- relevant infrastructure service providers (including Aurizon Network, Pacific National, One Rail, Gladstone Ports Corporation, Energy Queensland Limited and Wiggins Island Coal Export Terminal Pty Ltd [WICET]).

Consultation Undertaken to Date

Engagement undertaken to date has focussed on:

- land access arrangements for exploration and environmental studies, including frequent engagement with private landholders in the immediate vicinity of the Action in accordance with agreed land access protocols;
- providing an overview of the Action;
- discussion on the assessment process, including opportunities for public input; and
- identification of key assessment considerations and opportunities to refine the Action to avoid or minimise impacts.

Feedback Provided by Stakeholders

Feedback provided by stakeholders to-date has primarily pertained to the following matters:

- socio-economic benefits of the Action;
- potential impacts to groundwater and surface water;
- potential subsidence impacts to agricultural activities;
- benefits of project design to limit amenity impacts at residential receivers near EPC 980 and along Lilyvale Road;
- potential interactions with neighbouring mining operations; and
- workforce accommodation.

Ongoing Consultation

The stakeholder engagement strategy has been implemented during preparation of this Referral. Importantly, the strategy will continue to be updated and implemented by Corvus during the assessment and approvals process for the Action.

The strategy includes a range of consultation mechanisms, including (but not necessarily limited to):

- face-to-face meetings;
- community information sessions;
- publication of factsheets and frequently asked questions (FAQs);
- telephone conversations and virtual meetings;
- emails and newsletters;

- development of individual assessment summaries for affected persons;
- advertising and media releases;
- maintenance of a Project website; and
- publication of application and environmental assessment documentation online.

Implementation of the stakeholder engagement strategy will allow for all interested and affected persons, advisory bodies, and the wider community to engage and provide input into the assessment process.

Consultation in relation to Aboriginal cultural heritage will be conducted with the Western Kangoulu People in accordance with the requirements of the *Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Act 2003*.

1.3.1 Identity: Referring party

Privacy Notice:

Personal information means information or an opinion about an identified individual, or an individual who is reasonably identifiable.

By completing and submitting this form, you consent to the collection of all personal information contained in this form. If you are providing the personal information of other individuals in this form, please ensure you have their consent before doing so.

The Department of Climate Change, Energy, the Environment and Water (the department) collects your personal information (as defined by the Privacy Act 1988) through this platform for the purposes of enabling the department to consider your submission and contact you in relation to your submission. If you fail to provide some or all of the personal information requested on this platform (name and email address), the department will be unable to contact you to seek further information (if required) and subsequently may impact the consideration given to your submission.

Personal information may be disclosed to other Australian government agencies, persons or organisations where necessary for the above purposes, provided the disclosure is consistent with relevant laws, in particular the Privacy Act 1988 (Privacy Act). Your personal information will be used and stored in accordance with the Australian Privacy Principles.

See our Privacy Policy to learn more about accessing or correcting personal information or making a complaint.

Alternatively, email us at privacy@awe.gov.au.

☑ **Confirm that you have read and understand this Privacy Notice ***

1.3.1.1 Is Referring party an organisation or business? *

No

Referring party details	
Name	Joe Fittell
Job title	Principal Environmental Manager
Phone	0466445072
Email	joe@vessi.com.au
Address	South Brisbane, QLD, 4101

1.3.2 Identity: Person proposing to take the action

1.3.2.1 Are the Person proposing to take the action details the same as the Referring party details? *

No

1.3.2.2 Is Person proposing to take the action an organisation or business? *

Yes

Person proposing to take the action organisation details

ABN/ACN	621807412
Organisation name	CORVUS RESOURCES PTY LTD
Organisation address	2000 NSW

Person proposing to take the action details

Name	Chris Coombes
Job title	CEO
Phone	0731719635
Email	admin@corvusops.com.au
Address	62 Oak Rd, Kirrawee NSW 2232

1.3.2.14 Are you proposing the action as part of a Joint Venture? *

No

1.3.2.15 Are you proposing the action as part of a Trust? *

No

1.3.2.17 Describe the Person proposing the action's history of responsible environmental management including details of any proceedings under a Commonwealth, State or Territory law for the protection of the environment or the conservation and sustainable use of natural resources against the Person proposing to take the action. *

Corvus is a registered suitable operator under the *Environmental Protection Act 1994* (EP Act) (Registration Number RSO003341). There are no past or present proceedings against Corvus or its Directors under a Commonwealth, State or Territory law in relation to the protection of the environment or the conservation and sustainable use of natural resources.

1.3.2.18 If the person proposing to take the action is a corporation, provide details of the corporation's environmental policy and planning framework

Corvus will establish an integrated environmental management system across all operations/activities for the Action to track that environmental management commitments and strategies are implemented, monitored and reviewed to continually improve environmental performance at the operations.

Corvus will employ a team of appropriately qualified environmental personnel to ensure compliance with current legislation (e.g. EPBC Act and EP Act) and environmental planning frameworks.

1.3.3 Identity: Proposed designated proponent

1.3.3.1 Are the Proposed designated proponent details the same as the Person proposing to take the action? *

Yes

Proposed designated proponent organisation details

ABN/ACN	621807412
Organisation name	CORVUS RESOURCES PTY LTD
Organisation address	2000 NSW

Proposed designated proponent details

Name	Chris Coombes
Job title	CEO
Phone	0731719635
Email	admin@corvusops.com.au
Address	62 Oak Rd, Kirrawee NSW 2232

1.3.4 Identity: Summary of allocation

Confirmed Referring party's identity

The Referring party is the person preparing the information in this referral.

Name	Joe Fittell
Job title	Principal Environmental Manager
Phone	0466445072
Email	joe@vessi.com.au
Address	South Brisbane, QLD, 4101

Confirmed Person proposing to take the action's identity

The Person proposing to take the action is the individual, business, government agency or trustee that will be responsible for the proposed action.

ABN/ACN	621807412
Organisation name	CORVUS RESOURCES PTY LTD
Organisation address	2000 NSW
Representative's name	Chris Coombes
Representative's job title	CEO
Phone	0731719635
Email	admin@corvusops.com.au
Address	62 Oak Rd, Kirrawee NSW 2232

Confirmed Proposed designated proponent's identity

The Person proposing to take the action is the individual or organisation proposed to be responsible for meeting the requirements of the EPBC Act during the assessment process, if the Minister decides that this project is a controlled action.

Same as Person proposing to take the action information.

1.4 Payment details: Payment exemption and fee waiver

1.4.1 Do you qualify for an exemption from fees under EPBC Regulation 5.23 (1) (a)? *

No

1.4.3 Have you applied for or been granted a waiver for full or partial fees under Regulation 5.21A? *

No

1.4.5 Are you going to apply for a waiver of full or partial fees under EPBC Regulation 5.21A?

No

1.4.7 Has the department issued you with a credit note? *

No

1.4.9 Would you like to add a purchase order number to your invoice? *

Yes

1.4.10 Enter purchase order number *

PO-000133

1.4 Payment details: Payment allocation

1.4.11 Who would you like to allocate as the entity responsible for payment? *

Person proposing to take the action

2. Location

2.1 Project footprint

Project Area: 8550.49 Ha **Disturbance Footprint:** 299.48 Ha

2.2 Footprint details

2.2.1 What is the address of the proposed action? *

Gregory Highway, Emerald, QLD, 4720, Australia

2.2.2 Where is the primary jurisdiction of the proposed action? *

Queensland

2.2.3 Is there a secondary jurisdiction for this proposed action? *

No

2.2.5 What is the tenure of the action area relevant to the project area? *

Corvus holds four Exploration Permits for Coal (EPCs) (EPC 980, EPC 1226, EPC 1267 and EPC 2841). The Action underground mining area, Pit Top Area and ventilation shafts are located within EPC 980 and EPC 1267. The CPP Area and parts of the overland ROM and product coal conveyors are located within tenements owned by other mining companies.

The underground mining area and Pit Top Area are located primarily on privately-owned, freehold land. The Gregory Highway and Blair Athol Branch Railway pass through the underground mining area, however, the underground mine layout has been designed to avoid subsidence impacts to this infrastructure.

The CPP Area is located within existing mining leases owned by Sojitz Gregory Crinum Pty Ltd (Sojitz).

A schedule of land summarising land tenure and reserves within the Action underground mining area and surface development area is provided at the back of Attachment 1, along with Figures 9a and 9b which show the overlapping mining and petroleum tenements and rural property boundaries.

3. Existing environment

3.1 Physical description

3.1.1 Describe the current condition of the project area's environment.

The existing land use within the underground mining area is a mix of dryland cropping and grazing of native pasture. Within the Action area, the original character of the vegetation has been greatly altered as a result of historical and current land uses.

Previous surveys conducted over the Action area have identified the following introduced flora species (EcoSmart, in prep.):

- Prickly Acacia (*Acacia nilotica*);
- Rubber Vine (Cryptostegia grandiflora);
- Prickly Pear (*Opuntia stricta*);
- Velvety Tree Pear (*Opuntia tomentosa*);
- Parkinsonia (Parkinsonia aculeata);
- Parthenium (Parthenium hysterophorus); and
- Giant Parramatta Grass (*Sporobolus fertilis*).

A total of seven introduced fauna species have also been recorded within the Action area (EcoSmart, in prep.). These include:

- Feral Cat (*Felis catus*);
- European Fox (*Vulpes vulpes*);
- European Rabbit (*Oryctolagus cuniculus*);
- Feral Pig (*Sus scrofa*);
- Wild Dog (*Canis lupus*);
- Cane Toad (*Rhinella marina*); and
- Feral Pigeon (*Columba livia*).

The overland ROM coal and product coal conveyors traverse a biodiversity offset area established for the Gregory Crinum Mine M-Block Extension. The Action area covers approximately 12 ha of the offset area which is all mapped by Stantec as regrowth grassland vegetation. All instances of woodland within the offset area would be avoided by the Action.

3.1.2 Describe any existing or proposed uses for the project area.

The existing land use within the underground mining area is a mix of dryland cropping and grazing of native pasture.

The Action Area has been largely cleared through past agricultural practices, however some tracts of remnant or regrowth vegetation exist, particularly along drainage lines. Remnant vegetation is also present to the south-west and north-east of the Action along Theresa Creek and Gordonstone Creek, respectively (Figure 4).

The Action is located in an existing mining and industrial precinct that provides synergies with existing infrastructure and other mining operations in the surrounds. Existing mining operations near the Action include the Kestrel and Gregory Crinum Mines.

3.1.3 Describe any outstanding natural features and/or any other important or unique values that applies to the project area.

There are no outstanding natural features within the Action area.

3.1.4 Describe the gradient (or depth range if action is to be taken in a marine area) relevant to the project area.

The Action area consists primarily of slightly undulating grazing land. Surface elevations vary from a low point of approximately 180 metres above Australian Height Datum (mAHD) in the southern and western areas of the Action area (adjacent Theresa Creek), to a high point of approximately 210 mAHD adjacent the Gregory highway, before falling again to approximately 200 mAHD adjacent Gordonstone Creek in the east. The CPP area is located at approximately 200 m AHD.

The Action underground mining area is located within the catchments of Theresa Creek and Gordonstone Creek, which flow separately to the Nogoa River (Figure 2). The Nogoa River flows in a south-easterly direction away from the underground mining area (Figures 3a and 3b).

3.2 Flora and fauna

3.2.1 Describe the flora and fauna within the affected area and attach any investigations of surveys if applicable.

Seasonal terrestrial and aquatic biodiversity surveys were undertaken across the underground mining area and wider surrounds during the preparation of an EIS for the Teresa Coal Project which was ultimately withdrawn by Linc Energy in 2016.

As outlined in Section 3.4.1 of Attachment 3 of this referral, these surveys were undertaken in September and October 2011 and between February and May 2012 and included:

- terrestrial flora surveys, including:
    - ground-truthing regional ecosystems;
    - assessing vegetation against listing criteria for threatened ecological communities;
    - targeted threatened species surveys;
- terrestrial fauna surveys, including:
    - diurnal bird surveys and habitat searches;
    - fauna trapping (Elliot, cage funnel and pitfall trapping);
    - active searches for reptiles;
    - nocturnal spotlighting and call playback;
    - anabat call recording;
    - motion-sensing cameras;
    - Koala SAT searches;
    - habitat assessments;
- aquatic ecology surveys, including:
    - in-situ water quality sampling;
    - aquatic habitat assessments;
    - macroinvertebrate sampling; and
    - fish and turtle surveys.

Further to this, EcoSmart Ecology (in prep.), who has been commissioned by Corvus to complete the Terrestrial Ecology Assessment for the EIS, has undertaken one round of comprehensive flora surveys and two rounds of fauna surveys across the Action area. The surveys are being conducted in accordance with relevant State and Commonwealth surveys guidelines, and the methodologies being employed are consistent with those listed above. An additional round of flora surveys, along with the additional aquatic ecology surveys are yet to be completed. These will all be described in the EIS.

Threatened flora and fauna species and ecological communities identified and potentially impacted by the Action are detailed in section 3.4 of Attachment 3 of this Referral.

Based on the extensive survey work undertaken to date across the Action area, the following threatened ecological communities are known to occur within the Action area (see Table 2 of Attachment 3 of this Referral):

- Brigalow (*Acacia harpophylla* dominant and co-dominant);
- Natural Grasslands of the Queensland Central Highlands and northern Fitzroy Basin;
- Poplar Box Grassy Woodland on Alluvial Plains; and
- Weeping Myall Woodlands.

Importantly, no threatened species are known to occur within the Action surface development area or underground mining area despite the extensive survey work that has been undertaken to date.

Despite this, the following threatened species are considered to have potential to occur (see Table 2 of Attachment 3 of this Referral):

- Bluegrass (*Dichanthium setosum*);
- King Bluegrass (*Dichanthium queenslandicum*);
- Ornamental Snake (*Denisonia maculata*);
- Australian Painted Snipe (*Rostratula australis*);
- Grey Falcon (*Falco hypoleucos*);

- Squatter Pigeon (southern) (*Geophaps scripta scripta*);
- Greater Glider (*Petauroides volans*); and
- Koala (combined populations of Queensland, New South Wales and the Australian Capital Territory) (*Phascolarctos cinereus*).

3.2.2 Describe the vegetation (including the status of native vegetation and soil) within the project area.

The majority (approximately 75%) of the Action area has been previously cleared (Figure 4). While there are small patches of remnant and regrowth vegetation within the Action area, the vegetation and fauna habitat which is present has also been heavily impacted by historical and current broad-scale vegetation clearing, cattle grazing and weed encroachment.

The Action would involve construction of an overland conveyor which would cross small area of riparian vegetation associated with Gordonstone Creek and Belcong Creek, along with associated tributaries (Figure 4). The Action does not involve any direct clearing of riparian vegetation along Theresa Creek where the better-quality vegetation and fauna habitat occurs.

Based on the Government mapping and ground-truthing undertaken to date, the Action surface development area contains approximately 12 ha of woodland, 193 ha of native grassland and 94 ha of previously cleared land (Figure 4). The underground mining area contains approximately 3,718 ha of previously cleared land, 109 ha of native grassland and 1,067 ha of woodland vegetation (Figure 4).

Soil types in the underground mining area can generally be described as:

- deep to very deep brown duplex soil with thick, sandy surface and moderately to strongly alkaline subsoil (Sodosol) located on the undulating areas; and
- very deep, black to grey cracking clay on alluvial sediments (Vertosol) located on the low-lying areas in the south and west of the Action underground mining area.

3.3 Heritage

3.3.1 Describe any Commonwealth Heritage Places Overseas or other places recognised as having heritage values that apply to the project area.

The Action area does not contain any Commonwealth Heritage Places. The cultural heritage surveys undertaken as part of the Teresa Coal EIS in 2012 did not identify any items of cultural heritage value within or adjacent to the Action area.

The *Queensland Heritage Register* includes no culturally significant sites in the general vicinity of the Action. The closest sites are:

- Lilyvale Stand Monument, located approximately 25 km east of the underground mining area and approximately 150 m west from the CPP Area; and
- Emerald Railway Station Complex, located in Emerald, approximately 14 km south of the Action.

There are no local heritage places in the vicinity of the Action. The nearest local heritage places are located in Emerald.

The National Heritage List, which identifies nationally significant cultural sites, also showed no sites within the Action area or its surrounds.

3.3.2 Describe any Indigenous heritage values that apply to the project area.

The cultural heritage surveys undertaken as part of the Teresa Coal EIS in 2012 did not identify any items of Indigenous cultural heritage value within or adjacent to the Action area.

Corvus has commenced engagement with the Western Kangoulu People and will develop a Cultural heritage Management Plan (CHMP). The CHMP will describe the assessment of the cultural heritage values within the Action area, and the development of appropriate management strategies.

3.4 Hydrology

3.4.1 Describe the hydrology characteristics that apply to the project area and attach any hydrological investigations or surveys if applicable. *

Surface Water

The Action lies within the Lower Nogoa River/Theresa Creek sub-basin within the Fitzroy River basin as defined by the *Environmental Protection (Water and Wetland Biodiversity) Policy 2019*.

The Action is located within the catchments of Theresa Creek and Gordonstone Creek, which flow separately to the Nogoa River. Flows from Gordonstone Creek join the Nogoa River approximately 13 km downstream of the Theresa Creek confluence via the lower reach of Crinum Creek. Gordonstone Creek has a catchment area of approximately 260 km2 and a length of 62 km.

Theresa Creek has a catchment area of approximately 8,600 km2 representing 31% of the contributing catchment area draining to the Nogoa River. The majority of this catchment area lies north of the Action area. Theresa Creek joins the Nogoa River approximately 30 km downstream of Fairbairn Dam.

Flow duration data from the Queensland Government operated monitoring stations is available at the following sites:

- Gauging Station 130210A – Theresa Creek at Valeria (upstream of Action) has been monitoring streamflow since 1971;
- Gauging Station 130206A – Theresa Creek at Gregory Highway has been monitoring streamflow since 1956 (Figure 7);
- Gauging Station 130219A – Nogoa River at Duck Ponds has been monitoring streamflow since 1993; and
- three gauging stations established on Gordonstone Creek as part of the Cascading Catchments monitoring project that monitored stream water levels and quality from 2000 to 2017.

Five additional surface water monitoring sites (SW1-SW5) were established in the vicinity of the Action and sampled for water quality monthly for approximately two years as part of the Teresa Coal Project (Figure 7). These sites, together with SW6, have continued to be sampled for the Action in 2024 and 2025.

Groundwater

The coal resource is within the Highlands Groundwater Management Area (GMA) as defined by the *Water Plan (Fitzroy Basin) 2011*. The Highlands GMA consists of the following groundwater units:

- Highlands Groundwater Unit 1, containing the aquifers of the quaternary alluvium; and
- Highlands Groundwater Unit 2, containing all subartesian aquifers within the Highlands groundwater management area other than the aquifers included in Highlands Groundwater Unit 1.

The ‘Tertiary Sands’ or ‘Basal Sand’ unit has been identified as the primary aquifer at the site and elsewhere in the region. The Tertiary sands form a distinct and recognisable layer in the otherwise undifferentiated sequence of the Emerald Formation, and display hydraulic properties that are also distinct to the bulk of the overlying formation.

The Tertiary aged basalt is also an aquifer in some areas. Aquifers within the Tertiary aged sequences are typically separated from each other and the underlying Permian by clay aquitards.

The deeper Permian aquifer, including the coal seams, is not as widely utilised as a resource due to the depth of the water bearing strata and the typically high salinity of the water.

A groundwater monitoring network was established by Linc Energy as part of the Teresa Coal Project in 2012, and has been supplemented with additional groundwater monitoring bores established by Corvus in 2024. Groundwater monitoring data is also available from several Qld Government and Kestrel Mine monitoring bores in the vicinity of the Project (each monitoring for over 10 years).

Groundwater monitoring bores are shown on Figure 8.

4. Impacts and mitigation

4.1 Impact details

Potential Matters of National Environmental Significance (MNES) relevant to your proposed action area.

EPBC Act section	Controlling provision	Impacted	Reviewed
S12	World Heritage	No	Yes
S15B	National Heritage	No	Yes
S16	Ramsar Wetland	No	Yes
S18	Threatened Species and Ecological Communities	Yes	Yes
S20	Migratory Species	Yes	Yes
S21	Nuclear	No	Yes
S23	Commonwealth Marine Area	No	Yes
S24B	Great Barrier Reef	No	Yes
S24D	Water resource in relation to large coal mining development or coal seam gas	Yes	Yes
S26	Commonwealth Land	No	Yes
S27B	Commonwealth Heritage Places Overseas	No	Yes
S28	Commonwealth or Commonwealth Agency	No	Yes

4.1.1 World Heritage

You have identified your proposed action will likely directly and/or indirectly impact the following protected matters.

A direct impact is a direct consequence of an action taken – for example, clearing of habitat for a threatened species or permanent shading on an ecological community as the result of installing solar panels.

An indirect impact is an 'indirect consequence' such as a downstream impact or a facilitated third-party action.

—

4.1.1.1 Is the proposed action likely to have any direct and/or indirect impact on any of these protected matters? *

No

4.1.1.3 Briefly describe why your action is unlikely to have a direct and/or indirect impact. *

The Action would not directly impact any World Heritage properties. The nearest World Heritage property is the Great Barrier Reef, which is located **approximately 660 km downstream** (or 150 km due east) of the Action area (Figures 3a and 3b).

Given the Action would not directly impact the Great Barrier Reef World Heritage property, the only potential indirect impact pathway between the Action and the Great Barrier Reef would be via greenhouse gas emissions (and associated climate change impacts) and/or surface water release and run-off.

Detailed consideration of the potential for indirect impacts on the Great Barrier Reef from greenhouse gas emissions and surface water runoff associated with the Action is provided in Section 3.1 of Attachment 3 of this Referral, along with Attachments 4 and 5 of this Referral.

In summary, it is concluded that the Action's potential indirect impacts on water quality and/or greenhouse gas emissions would not be a '*substantial cause'* of impacts to the World Heritage values of the Great Barrier Reef World Heritage property, and therefore potential indirect impacts would not meet the definition of an 'impact' under section 527E of the EPBC Act.

Importantly, the Action would not result in any impact (as defined under section 527E of the EPBC Act) on a World Heritage property.

4.1.2 National Heritage

You have identified your proposed action will likely directly and/or indirectly impact the following protected matters.

A direct impact is a direct consequence of an action taken – for example, clearing of habitat for a threatened species or permanent shading on an ecological community as the result of installing solar panels.

An indirect impact is an 'indirect consequence' such as a downstream impact or a facilitated third-party action.

—

4.1.2.1 Is the proposed action likely to have any direct and/or indirect impact on any of these protected matters? *

No

4.1.2.3 Briefly describe why your action is unlikely to have a direct and/or indirect impact. *

The Action would not directly impact any National Heritage places. The nearest National Heritage Place is the Great Barrier Reef, which is located **approximately 660 km downstream** (or 150 km due east) of the Action area (Figure 3b).

Given the Action would not directly impact the Great Barrier Reef National Heritage Place, the only potential indirect impact pathway between the Action and the Great Barrier Reef would be via greenhouse gas emissions (and associated climate change impacts) and/or surface water release and run-off.

Detailed consideration of the potential for indirect impacts on the Great Barrier Reef from greenhouse gas emissions and surface water runoff associated with the Action is provided in Section 3.1 of Attachment 3 of this Referral (in relation to the Great Barrier Reef World Heritage Property), along with Attachments 4 and 5 of this Referral. The same conclusions apply to the Great Barrier Reef National Heritage place.

In summary, it is concluded that the Action's potential indirect impacts on water quality and/or greenhouse gas emissions would not be a '*substantial cause'* of impacts to the National Heritage values of the Great Barrier Reef National Heritage Place, and therefore potential indirect impacts would not meet the definition of an 'impact' under section 527E of the EPBC Act.

Importantly, the Action would not result in any impact (as defined under section 527E of the EPBC Act) on a National Heritage Place.

4.1.3 Ramsar Wetland

You have identified your proposed action will likely directly and/or indirectly impact the following protected matters.

A direct impact is a direct consequence of an action taken – for example, clearing of habitat for a threatened species or permanent shading on an ecological community as the result of installing solar panels.

An indirect impact is an 'indirect consequence' such as a downstream impact or a facilitated third-party action.

—

4.1.3.1 Is the proposed action likely to have any direct and/or indirect impact on any of these protected matters? *

No

4.1.3.3 Briefly describe why your action is unlikely to have a direct and/or indirect impact. *

The Action would not directly impact any Wetlands of International Importance (otherwise referred to as a Ramsar Wetland). The nearest Ramsar Wetland is the Shoalwater and Corio Bays Area, which is located **approximately 660 km downstream** (or 150 km due east) of the Action area, within the Great Barrier Reef World Heritage property (Figure 3b).

Given the Action would not directly impact the Shoalwater and Corio Bays Area, the only potential indirect impact pathway between the Action and the Ramsar Wetland would be via greenhouse gas emissions (and associated climate change impacts) and/or surface water release and run-off, noting the flow path from the Action does not release directly into the Shoalwater and Corio Bays Area (Figure 3b).

Detailed consideration of the potential for indirect impacts on the Great Barrier Reef World Heritage property (which includes the Shoalwater and Corio Bays Area) from greenhouse gas emissions and surface water runoff associated with the Action is provided in Section 3.1, along with Attachments 4 and 5 of the Referral. The same conclusions apply to the Shoalwater and Corio Bays Area.

In summary, it is concluded that the Action's potential indirect impacts on water quality and/or greenhouse gas emissions would not be a '*substantial cause'* of impacts to the ecological character of the Shoalwater and Corio Bays Area, and therefore potential indirect impacts would not meet the definition of an 'impact' under section 527E of the EPBC Act.

Importantly, the Action would not result in any impact (as defined under section 527E of the EPBC Act) on a Ramsar Wetland.

4.1.4 Threatened Species and Ecological Communities

You have identified your proposed action will likely directly and/or indirectly impact the following protected matters.

A direct impact is a direct consequence of an action taken – for example, clearing of habitat for a threatened species or permanent shading on an ecological community as the result of installing solar panels.

An indirect impact is an 'indirect consequence' such as a downstream impact or a facilitated third-party action.

Threatened species

Direct impact	Indirect impact	Species	Common name
No	No	Cadellia pentastylis	Ooline
No	No	Calidris acuminata	Sharp-tailed Sandpiper
No	No	Calidris ferruginea	Curlew Sandpiper
No	No	Dasyurus hallucatus	Northern Quoll, Digul [Gogo-Yimidir], Wijingadda [Dambimangari], Wiminji [Martu]
No	No	Delma torquata	Adorned Delma, Collared Delma
Yes	Yes	Denisonia maculata	Ornamental Snake
Yes	Yes	Dichanthium queenslandicum	King Blue-grass
Yes	Yes	Dichanthium setosum	bluegrass
No	No	Egernia rugosa	Yakka Skink
No	No	Elseya albagula	Southern Snapping Turtle, White-throated Snapping Turtle
No	No	Erythrotriorchis radiatus	Red Goshawk
Yes	Yes	Falco hypoleucos	Grey Falcon
No	No	Furina dunmalli	Dunmall's Snake
No	No	Gallinago hardwickii	Latham's Snipe, Japanese Snipe
Yes	Yes	Geophaps scripta scripta	Squatter Pigeon (southern)
No	No	Grantiella picta	Painted Honeyeater
No	No	Hemiaspis damelii	Grey Snake
No	No	Lerista allanae	Allan's Lerista, Retro Slider
No	No	Neochmia ruficauda ruficauda	Star Finch (eastern), Star Finch (southern)
No	No	Nyctophilus corbeni	Corben's Long-eared Bat, South-eastern Long-eared Bat

Direct impact	Indirect impact	Species	Common name
Yes	Yes	Petauroides volans	Greater Glider (southern and central)
Yes	Yes	Phascolarctos cinereus (combined populations of Qld, NSW and the ACT)	Koala (combined populations of Queensland, New South Wales and the Australian Capital Territory)
No	No	Poephila cincta cincta	Southern Black-throated Finch
No	No	Polianthion minutiflorum	
No	No	Rheodytes leukops	Fitzroy River Turtle, Fitzroy Tortoise, Fitzroy Turtle, White-eyed River Diver
Yes	Yes	Rostratula australis	Australian Painted Snipe
No	No	Stagonopleura guttata	Diamond Firetail

Ecological communities

Direct impact	Indirect impact	Ecological community
Yes	Yes	Brigalow (Acacia harpophylla dominant and co-dominant)
Yes	Yes	Natural Grasslands of the Queensland Central Highlands and northern Fitzroy Basin
Yes	Yes	Poplar Box Grassy Woodland on Alluvial Plains
Yes	Yes	Weeping Myall Woodlands

4.1.4.1 Is the proposed action likely to have any direct and/or indirect impact on any of these protected matters? *

Yes

4.1.4.2 Briefly describe why your action has a direct and/or indirect impact on these protected matters. *

The Action is a greenfield underground mining project which includes vegetation clearance and potential subsidence that has the potential to impact listed threatened species and communities.

As outlined earlier in this Referral, based on the Government mapping and ground-truthing undertaken to date, the Action will result in the direct clearance of approximately 12 ha of woodland and 193 ha of native grassland that includes areas of threatened ecological communities and habitat for listed threatened flora and fauna species. In addition, the underground mining area contains approximately 109 ha of native grassland and 1,067 ha of woodland vegetation which also includes areas of threatened ecological communities and habitat for listed threatened flora and fauna species.

4.1.4.4 Do you consider this likely direct and/or indirect impact to be a Significant Impact? *

Yes

4.1.4.5 Describe why you consider this to be a Significant Impact. *

Based on the extensive survey work undertaken to date across the Action area, the following threatened ecological communities are known to occur within the Action area (see Table 2 of Attachment 3 to this Referral):

- Brigalow (*Acacia harpophylla* dominant and co-dominant);
- Natural Grasslands of the Queensland Central Highlands and northern Fitzroy Basin;
- Poplar Box Grassy Woodland on Alluvial Plains; and
- Weeping Myall Woodlands.

Importantly, no threatened species are known to occur within the Action area despite the extensive survey work that has been undertaken to date.

Despite this, the following threatened species are considered to have potential to occur (see Table 2 of Attachment 3 to this Referral):

- Bluegrass (*Dichanthium setosum*);
- King Bluegrass (*Dichanthium queenslandicum*);
- Ornamental Snake (*Denisonia maculata*);
- Australian Painted Snipe (*Rostratula australis*);
- Grey Falcon (*Falco hypoleucos*);
- Squatter Pigeon (southern) (*Geophaps scripta scripta*);
- Greater Glider (*Petauroides volans*); and
- Koala (combined populations of Queensland, New South Wales and the Australian Capital Territory) (*Phascolarctos cinereus*).

As outlined in Section 3.4.1 of Attachment 3 to this Referral, despite the extensive survey work that has been carried out to date, additional terrestrial and aquatic ecology survey will be undertaken across the Action area. Along with targeted threatened species surveys, these surveys will solidify the ground-truthed vegetation and fauna habitat mapping across the Action area, including confirmation of extent of threatened ecological communities.

As part of the EIS which is being prepared for the Action, the detailed terrestrial and aquatic ecology assessments will provide a refined assessment of the likelihood of occurrence of threatened species based on the additional survey information. Further to this, ongoing development of the project design will allow for the identification of further avoidance, mitigation and management proposed to minimise impacts on threatened species and communities.

A detailed assessment of potential impacts (including consideration of direct and indirect impacts) on threatened species known or likely to occur will be undertaken in accordance with the Significant Impact Guideline and provided in the EIS.

In consideration of the information provided above, it is not yet possible to comprehensively determine whether the Action would result in a significant impact to threatened species and communities known or considered to have potential to occur within the Action area. As such, it is considered that further assessment under the EPBC Act for this controlling provision is warranted.

4.1.4.7 Do you think your proposed action is a controlled action? *

Yes

4.1.4.8 Please elaborate why you think your proposed action is a controlled action. *

As outlined above (and in further detail in Section 3.4 of Attachment 3 to this Referral), it is not yet possible to comprehensively determine whether the Action would result in a significant impact to threatened species and communities known or considered to have potential to occur within the Action area.

Given further assessment work is ongoing, a precautionary approach has been adopted in suggesting the Action be considered as a controlled action. Corvus considers that further assessment under the EPBC Act for this controlling provision is warranted.

4.1.4.10 Please describe any avoidance or mitigation measures proposed for this action and attach any supporting documentation for these avoidance and mitigation measures. *

Incorporation of the following measures into the Action design have resulted in avoidance of impacts on MNES:

- Avoid direct clearance of woodland vegetation as far as possible, in consideration of other environmental matters.
- Positioning of the CPP Area at the Gregory Crinum Mine to allow coal rejects to be disposed of in already disturbed mining areas. This removes the need for a new rejects storage in the vicinity of EPC 980, which would require approximately 300 ha of additional disturbance.
- The Pit Top Area has been positioned to avoid disturbance of regional ecosystems that may also conform to the Commonwealth Brigalow Woodland and Weeping Myall Woodlands.
- Locating the Pit Top Area on the eastern side of Theresa Creek to avoid surface disturbance within the Theresa Creek floodplain (and associated riparian vegetation).
- The non-subsiding mine access drift and main headings have been positioned beneath the Brigalow Woodland in the north of the Action Area to avoid subsidence in these areas.

In addition to the above avoidance measures, Corvus will implement the following measures to mitigate, manage and offset potential residual impacts on biodiversity:

- Surface disturbance protocols (including demarcation of clearance areas, pre-clearance surveys and salvage of habitat features for use in rehabilitation activities).
- Progressive clearing of native vegetation to allow fauna species to move away from the clearing area.
- Implementation of environmental management plans.
- Provision of State and Commonwealth biodiversity offsets (if required), in accordance with the Queensland *Environmental Offsets Policy* and the Commonwealth EPBC Act *Environmental Offsets Policy*.

Other measures that are relevant to reducing potential indirect impacts on biodiversity, such as invasive species control, erosion and sediment, dust, noise, lighting and groundwater.

4.1.4.11 Please describe any proposed offsets and attach any supporting documentation relevant to these measures. *

Following the detailed assessment that will be provided in the EIS, and in consideration of all avoidance, minimisation, mitigation and management measures, any significant residual impacts will be offset in accordance with the *EPBC Act Environmental Offsets Policy*.

4.1.5 Migratory Species

You have identified your proposed action will likely directly and/or indirectly impact the following protected matters.

A direct impact is a direct consequence of an action taken – for example, clearing of habitat for a threatened species or permanent shading on an ecological community as the result of installing solar panels.

An indirect impact is an 'indirect consequence' such as a downstream impact or a facilitated third-party action.

Direct impact	Indirect impact	Species	Common name
No	No	Actitis hypoleucos	Common Sandpiper
No	No	Apus pacificus	Fork-tailed Swift
No	No	Calidris acuminata	Sharp-tailed Sandpiper
No	No	Calidris ferruginea	Curlew Sandpiper
No	No	Calidris melanotos	Pectoral Sandpiper
No	No	Cuculus optatus	Oriental Cuckoo, Horsfield's Cuckoo
No	No	Gallinago hardwickii	Latham's Snipe, Japanese Snipe
No	No	Motacilla flava	Yellow Wagtail
Yes	Yes	Plegadis falcinellus	Glossy Ibis

4.1.5.1 Is the proposed action likely to have any direct and/or indirect impact on any of these protected matters? *

Yes

4.1.5.2 Briefly describe why your action has a direct and/or indirect impact on these protected matters. *

A detailed assessment of likelihood of occurrence of migratory species is provided in Section 3.5 of Attachment 3 to this Referral.

One migratory species (the Glossy Ibis) has been previously recorded within the wider locality of the Action area (see Section 3.5 of Attachment 3 to this Referral). The Action underground mining area contains some limited potential foraging habitat for this species which may be subject to subsidence effects. The Action would not involve any direct clearing of habitat for this species.

4.1.5.4 Do you consider this likely direct and/or indirect impact to be a Significant Impact? *

No

4.1.5.6 Describe why you do not consider this to be a Significant Impact. *

As detailed in Section 3.5 of Attachment 3 to this Referral, no migratory species predicted to occur by the Protected Matters Search are considered to be at the limit of their known migratory ranges. The surface development area would not impact an area of important habitat for any of these species.

Any potentially suitable habitat in the Action area is not a known breeding place for any migratory species, and foraging habitat for each is abundant outside the Action area. The Action would include very little (if any) clearance of potential foraging habitat for migratory species, noting there are no areas of wetlands, claypans, saltmarshes or mudflats within the Action area.

By their nature migratory species are wide-ranging and the land undisturbed by the Action would provide a higher quality habitat for these species. The subsidence which would occur as a result of underground mining is also highly unlikely to affect any potential foraging habitat for these species. As such, the proposed action is unlikely to disrupt the lifecycle of any of these species.

Further to the above, there are no migratory flyways located over the Action area. Migratory flyways correspond with the vast majority of Important Bird and Biodiversity Areas globally. The East Asia/Australasia Flyway extends from Arctic Russia and North America to the southern extents of Australia and New Zealand.

This flyway predominately traverses the coastal extents of Australia, occasionally travelling inward through parts of Queensland, South Australia and Western Australia. The Action does not occur within the important extents of this flyway (i.e. coastal areas).

Given the information provided above, it is very unlikely that the Action will have a significant impact on a listed migratory species given it would not:

- *substantially modify (including by fragmenting, altering fire regimes, altering nutrient cycles or altering biological) cycles, destroy or isolate an area of important habitat for a migratory species;*
- *result in an invasive species that is harmful to the migratory species becoming established in an area of important habitat for the migratory species; or*
- *seriously disrupt the lifecycle (breeding, feeding, migration or resting behaviour) of an ecologically significant proportion of the population of a migratory species.*

4.1.5.7 Do you think your proposed action is a controlled action? *

No

4.1.5.9 Please elaborate why you do not think your proposed action is a controlled action. *

As outlined above, and in further detail in Section 3.5 of Attachment 3 to this Referral, impacts to migratory species are not anticipated to be significant. Given the nature of the Action, with little impact above ground, impacts to migratory species will be minimal. Habitat within the Action area is not consistent with habitat associated with migratory species (i.e. there are no wetlands, claypans, saltmarshes or mudflats within the Action area). Should migratory species be present they are likely to be transient visitors.

As such, it is concluded that the Action is not likely to have a significant impact on any migratory species, and therefore approval under the EPBC Act for this controlling provision is not required.

4.1.5.10 Please describe any avoidance or mitigation measures proposed for this action and attach any supporting documentation for these avoidance and mitigation measures. *

Incorporation of the following measures into the project design have resulted in avoidance of impacts on biodiversity, including potential impacts on migratory species:

- Avoid direct clearance of woodland vegetation as far as possible, in consideration of other environmental matters.
- Positioning of the CPP Area at the Gregory Crinum Mine to allow coal rejects to be disposed of in already disturbed mining areas. This removes the need for a new rejects storage in the vicinity of EPC 980, which would require approximately 300 ha of additional disturbance.
- Locating the Pit Top Area on the eastern side of Theresa Creek to avoid surface disturbance within the Theresa Creek floodplain (and associated riparian vegetation).

Further to this, Corvus will implement the following measures to mitigate and manage potential impacts on migratory species:

- Surface disturbance protocols (including demarcation of clearance areas, pre-clearance surveys and salvage of habitat features for use in rehabilitation activities).
- Progressive clearing of native vegetation to allow fauna species to move away from the clearing area.
- Implementation of environmental management plans.
- Other measures that are relevant to reducing potential indirect impacts on biodiversity, such as invasive species control, erosion and sediment, dust, noise, lighting and groundwater.

4.1.5.11 Please describe any proposed offsets and attach any supporting documentation relevant to these measures. *

As the Action is not likely to have a significant impact on any migratory species, offsets under the *EPBC Act Environmental Offsets Policy* would not be required.

4.1.6 Nuclear

4.1.6.1 Is the proposed action likely to have any direct and/or indirect impact on this protected matter? *

No

4.1.6.3 Briefly describe why your action is unlikely to have a direct and/or indirect impact. *

The Action is not a ‘nuclear action’, and therefore approval under the EPBC Act for this controlling provision is not required.

4.1.7 Commonwealth Marine Area

You have identified your proposed action will likely directly and/or indirectly impact the following protected matters.

A direct impact is a direct consequence of an action taken – for example, clearing of habitat for a threatened species or permanent shading on an ecological community as the result of installing solar panels.

An indirect impact is an 'indirect consequence' such as a downstream impact or a facilitated third-party action.

—

4.1.7.1 Is the proposed action likely to have any direct and/or indirect impact on any of these protected matters? *

No

4.1.7.3 Briefly describe why your action is unlikely to have a direct and/or indirect impact. *

The Action would not directly impact any Commonwealth marine areas. The nearest Commonwealth marine area is the Coral Sea Marine Region, which is located east of the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park (i.e. **more than 660 km downstream of the Action area**).

Given the Action would not directly impact the Coral Sea Marine Region, the only potential impact pathway between the Action and the Coral Sea Marine Region would be via greenhouse gas emissions (and associated climate change impacts) and/or surface water release and run-off, noting the flow path from the Action does not release directly into the Coral Sea Marine Region.

Detailed consideration of the potential for indirect impacts on the Great Barrier Reef (which is located between the Coral Sea Marine Region and the Action) from greenhouse gas emissions and surface water runoff associated with the Action is provided in Section 3.1 of Attachment 3 of this Referral, along with Attachments 4 and 5 of this Referral. The same conclusions apply to the Coral Sea Marine Region.

In summary, it is concluded that the Action's potential indirect impacts on water quality and/or greenhouse gas emissions would not be a '*substantial cause'* of impacts to the environment within the Coral Sea Marine Region, and therefore potential indirect impacts would not meet the definition of an 'impact' under section 527E of the EPBC Act.

Importantly, the Action would not result in any impact (as defined under section 527E of the EPBC Act) on the Commonwealth marine area.

4.1.8 Great Barrier Reef

4.1.8.1 Is the proposed action likely to have any direct and/or indirect impact on this protected matter? *

No

4.1.8.3 Briefly describe why your action is unlikely to have a direct and/or indirect impact. *

The Action would not directly impact the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park, which is located **more than 660 km downstream** (or 150 km due east) of the Action area, within the Great Barrier Reef World Heritage property (Figure 3b).

Given the Action would not directly impact the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park, the only potential impact pathway between the Action and the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park would be via greenhouse gas emissions (and associated climate change impacts) and/or surface water release and run-off, noting the flow path from the Action does not release directly into the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park (Figure 3b).

Detailed consideration of the potential for indirect impacts on the Great Barrier Reef from greenhouse gas emissions and surface water runoff associated with the Action is provided in Section 3.1 of Attachment 3 of this referral (in relation to the Great Barrier Reef World Heritage property), along with Attachments 4 and 5 of this Referral. The same conclusions apply to the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park.

In summary, it is concluded that the Action's potential indirect impacts on water quality and/or greenhouse gas emissions would not be a '*substantial cause'* of impacts on the environment of the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park, and therefore potential indirect impacts would not meet the definition of an 'impact' under section 527E of the EPBC Act.

Importantly, the Action would not result in any impact (as defined under section 527E of the EPBC Act) on the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park.

4.1.9 Water resource in relation to large coal mining development or coal seam gas

4.1.9.1 Is the proposed action likely to have any direct and/or indirect impact on this protected matter? *

Yes

4.1.9.2 Briefly describe why your action has a direct and/or indirect impact on this protected matter. *

Surface Water

The Action lies within the Lower Nogoa River/Theresa Creek sub-basin within the Fitzroy River basin as defined by the *Environmental Protection (Water and Wetland Biodiversity) Policy 2019*.

The Action is located within the catchments of Theresa Creek and Gordonstone Creek, which flow separately to the Nogoa River. Flows from Gordonstone Creek join the Nogoa River approximately 13 km downstream of the Theresa Creek confluence via the lower reach of Crinum Creek. Gordonstone Creek has a catchment area of approximately 260 km2 and a length of 62 km.

Theresa Creek has a catchment area of approximately 8,600 km2 representing 31% of the contributing catchment area draining to the Nogoa River. The majority of this catchment area lies north of the Action area. Theresa Creek joins the Nogoa River approximately 30 km downstream of Fairbairn Dam.

Flow duration data from the Queensland Government operated monitoring stations is available at the following sites:

- Gauging Station 130210A – Theresa Creek at Valeria (upstream of Action) has been monitoring streamflow since 1971;
- Gauging Station 130206A – Theresa Creek at Gregory Highway has been monitoring streamflow since 1956 (Figure 7);
- Gauging Station 130219A – Nogoa River at Duck Ponds has been monitoring streamflow since 1993; and
- three gauging stations established on Gordonstone Creek as part of the Cascading Catchments monitoring project that monitored stream water levels and quality from 2000 to 2017.

Five additional surface water monitoring sites (SW1-SW5) were established in the vicinity of the Action and sampled for water quality monthly for approximately two years as part of the Teresa Coal Project. These sites, together with SW6, have continued to be sampled for the Action in 2024 and 2025.

Potential impacts of the Action on surface water resources may arise due to:

- direct disturbance for surface infrastructure and the management of captured water within the water management system;
- subsidence of the surface due to underground mining activities, which may alter flow patterns on a local scale; and
- changes in baseflow as a result of underground mining activities.

The Action underground mining area has been designed to avoid direct subsidence to the main channel of Theresa Creek.

A Subsidence Assessment, Surface Water and Flooding Assessment and Geomorphology Assessment will be prepared as part of the EIS for the Action. These assessments will be prepared in accordance with the *Significant Impact Guidelines 1.3 Coal Seam Gas and Large Coal Mining Developments — Impacts on Water Resources*.

Groundwater

The coal resource is within the Highlands Groundwater Management Area (GMA) as defined by the *Water Plan (Fitzroy Basin) 2011*. The Highlands GMA consists of the following groundwater units:

- Highlands Groundwater Unit 1, containing the aquifers of the quaternary alluvium; and
- Highlands Groundwater Unit 2, containing all subartesian aquifers within the Highlands groundwater management area other than the aquifers included in Highlands Groundwater Unit 1.

Key hydrostratigraphic units relevant to the Action include:

- Quaternary aged unconsolidated alluvial deposits primarily associated with Theresa Creek and the Nogoa River.

- Tertiary aged basalts.
- Tertiary aged undifferentiated deposits of soil, sands, gravel, claystone and siltstone, sandstone, gravel, lignite, shale and basalt.
- Permian-aged siltstones, mudstones, sandstones and coal (including the target Corvus 2 Seam).

The 'Tertiary Sands' or 'Basal Sand' unit has been identified as the primary aquifer at the site and elsewhere in the region. The Tertiary sands form a distinct and recognisable layer in the otherwise undifferentiated sequence of the Emerald Formation, and display hydraulic properties that are also distinct to the bulk of the overlying formation.

The Tertiary aged basalt is also an aquifer in some areas. Aquifers within the Tertiary aged sequences are typically separated from each other and the underlying Permian by clay aquitards.

The deeper Permian aquifer, including the coal seams, is not as widely utilised as a resource due to the depth of the water bearing strata and the typically high salinity of the water.

A groundwater monitoring network was established by Linc Energy as part of the Teresa Coal Project in 2012, and has been supplemented with additional groundwater monitoring bores established by Corvus in 2024. Groundwater monitoring data is also available from several Qld Government and Kestrel Mine monitoring bores in the vicinity of the Action (each monitoring for over 10 years).

Groundwater monitoring bores are shown on Figure 8.

Potential impacts of the Action on groundwater resources may arise because of:

- subsurface fracturing and shearing of sedimentary strata above the proposed longwalls resulting in changes in bulk rock mass permeability and storage capacity; and
- dewatering of groundwater that enters underground mining area as a result of the above.

These potential impacts include depressurisation of aquifer and drawdown on the groundwater table and changes in groundwater flow patterns, aquifer storage and baseflow.

A Groundwater Assessment will be prepared as part of the EIS for the Action. This assessment will be prepared in accordance with the *Significant Impact Guidelines 1.3 Coal Seam Gas and Large Coal Mining Developments — Impacts on Water Resources*. The Groundwater Assessment will also be prepared in consideration of the Independent Expert Scientific Committee on Unconventional Gas Development and Large Coal Mining Development's *Guidelines for Proponents Preparing Coal Seam Gas and Large Coal Mining Development Proposals* and relevant explanatory notes.

4.1.9.4 Do you consider this likely direct and/or indirect impact to be a Significant Impact? *

Yes

4.1.9.5 Describe why you consider this to be a Significant Impact. *

In consideration of the information provided above, it is not yet possible to comprehensively determine whether the Action would result in a significant impact to water resources. A detailed assessment will be provided as part of the EIS.

4.1.9.7 Do you think your proposed action is a controlled action? *

Yes

4.1.9.8 Please elaborate why you think your proposed action is a controlled action. *

Given further assessment work is ongoing to determine likely impacts on water resources, a precautionary approach has been adopted in suggesting the Action be considered as a controlled action. Corvus considers that further assessment under the EPBC Act for this controlling provision is warranted.

4.1.9.10 Please describe any avoidance or mitigation measures proposed for this action and attach any supporting documentation for these avoidance and mitigation measures. *

Potential impacts on water resources would be managed in accordance with the EA issued for the Action under the EP Act. It is anticipated that this would include:

- Specific conditions under which mine water discharge may be carried out.
- Preparation of water management plans and monitoring programs.
- Investigation and reporting requirements.

Corvus would also implement the following water management measures:

- Maximising reuse of mine water on-site (e.g. for CPP water supply and dust suppression on stockpiles).
- Investigations into beneficial use of surplus site water, including potential provision to neighbouring agricultural properties (subject to suitable water quality).
- Licensed extraction of water resources in accordance with the *Water Act 2000*.
- Make good provisions for impacted groundwater bores in accordance with the *Water Act 2000*.
- Adaptive management of potential subsidence impacts on surface water features, noting in some cases remediation may not be required (e.g. recognising that ponding or changes to stream alignment should not always be arrested or reversed).

4.1.9.11 Please describe any proposed offsets and attach any supporting documentation relevant to these measures. *

Following detailed assessment of potential impacts on water resources, in consideration of all avoidance, minimisation, mitigation and management measures, any significant residual impacts will be offset in accordance with the *EPBC Act Environmental Offsets Policy*. A detailed assessment of significance will be provided in the EIS.

4.1.10 Commonwealth Land

You have identified your proposed action will likely directly and/or indirectly impact the following protected matters.

A direct impact is a direct consequence of an action taken – for example, clearing of habitat for a threatened species or permanent shading on an ecological community as the result of installing solar panels.

An indirect impact is an 'indirect consequence' such as a downstream impact or a facilitated third-party action.

—

4.1.10.1 Is the proposed action likely to have any direct and/or indirect impact on any of these protected matters? *

No

4.1.10.3 Briefly describe why your action is unlikely to have a direct and/or indirect impact. *

There is no Commonwealth Land located within the Action Area.

4.1.11 Commonwealth Heritage Places Overseas

You have identified your proposed action will likely directly and/or indirectly impact the following protected matters.

A direct impact is a direct consequence of an action taken – for example, clearing of habitat for a threatened species or permanent shading on an ecological community as the result of installing solar panels.

An indirect impact is an 'indirect consequence' such as a downstream impact or a facilitated third-party action.

—

4.1.11.1 Is the proposed action likely to have any direct and/or indirect impact on any of these protected matters? *

No

4.1.11.3 Briefly describe why your action is unlikely to have a direct and/or indirect impact. *

The Action would not impact any places identified on the List of Overseas Places of Historic Significance to Australia (LOPHSA), including:

- Anzac Cove, Gallipoli;
- Kokoda Track, Papua New Guinea; and
- Howard Florey’s Laboratory, Sir William Dunn School of Pathology, UK.

4.1.12 Commonwealth or Commonwealth Agency

4.1.12.1 Is the proposed action to be taken by the Commonwealth or a Commonwealth Agency? *

No

4.2 Impact summary

Conclusion on the likelihood of significant impacts

You have indicated that the proposed action will likely have a significant impact on the following Matters of National Environmental Significance:

- Threatened Species and Ecological Communities (S18)
- Water resource in relation to large coal mining development or coal seam gas (S24D)

Conclusion on the likelihood of unlikely significant impacts

You have indicated that the proposed action will unlikely have a significant impact on the following Matters of National Environmental Significance:

- World Heritage (S12)
- National Heritage (S15B)
- Ramsar Wetland (S16)
- Migratory Species (S20)
- Nuclear (S21)
- Commonwealth Marine Area (S23)
- Great Barrier Reef (S24B)
- Commonwealth Land (S26)
- Commonwealth Heritage Places Overseas (S27B)
- Commonwealth or Commonwealth Agency (S28)

4.3 Alternatives

4.3.1 Do you have any possible alternatives for your proposed action to be considered as part of your referral? *

No

4.3.8 Describe why alternatives for your proposed action were not possible. *

Strategic Context and Project Benefits

The development of new coal resources is considered necessary to meet demand for high quality metallurgical coal due to industrial growth, particularly in Asia. Forecasts published by Coronado Global Resources Inc. indicate global export metallurgical coal demand is forecast to grow from 388 Million tonnes (Mt) in 2024 to 482 Mt by 2050, led primarily by blast furnace steel production in India. Australia is forecast to be the primary source for export metallurgical coal, with projected demand for Australian metallurgical coal expected to reach 248 Mt in 2050 (Coronado Global Resources Inc., 2025).

Coal production data published by the Queensland Government indicates that metallurgical coal production in Queensland has fallen from 160 Mt in 2018 to 136 Mt in 2024. Total coal production has also declined within the Central Highlands Region in the past ten years.

The Action is located in an established mining precinct, well serviced by established infrastructure and proximal to existing underground mining operations. The local and regional community is accustomed to the benefits, costs and demands associated with mining operations. Development of the Action will provide significant direct employment opportunities to the regional communities, and long-term flow on social and economic benefits.

In summary, development of the Action would provide the following key benefits:

- help meet the increasing global demand for metallurgical coal, particularly in Asia;
- partially offset declining coal production in Queensland;
- provide continued mining employment in the Central Highlands Region and continuation of the associated social and economic benefits for the nearby regional communities; and
- provide significant royalties and export revenue to the State of Queensland and Commonwealth tax revenue.

Location and Extent

The State of Queensland has procedures for the allocation of tenements for coal, which determines where permits and mineral development licences are granted. The location for the Action is determined by the presence of coal seams that are able to be economically mined, and are within coal tenements held by Corvus.

The location of the Action is well placed within an existing mining precinct and in proximity to existing water, transport and energy infrastructure. The proximity of the Action to the existing Gregory Crinum Mine facilitates the use of disturbed mining areas for reject deposition, avoiding the need for a new above ground rejects storage in the vicinity of EPC 980.

Corvus would seek to maximise resource recovery within geological, environmental and tenement constraints. The underground mine layout has been designed to avoid subsidence of the Blair Athol Branch Railway, Gregory Highway and main channel of Theresa Creek.

Mining Method

Corvus is committed to developing the Action solely as an underground mining operation using conventional longwall mining methods.

Bord and pillar extraction involves the extraction of coal using first workings from a network of underground roadways followed by the extraction of a portion of the remaining coal using continuous miners. This mining method was considered for the Action. However, unfavourable geotechnical conditions in the coal seam roof are unsuitable for bord and pillar mining.

Mining Lease Applications (MLA) 70405 and MLA 70442 were submitted over the Action area in November 2009 and February 2011 by a previous proponent unrelated to Corvus. The Initial Development Plan submitted with the MLA described the proposed mine as an "*open cut (approximately 5 kilometre strike and 2 km wide) mining seams from between 95m to 110m below the natural ground surface*" followed by an

"*underground longwall operation*" utilising the open cut excavation for longwall panel access. An EIS for the Teresa Coal Project later sought approval for a longwall mining operation within MLA 70405 and MLA 70442.

Mine Access, Surface Infrastructure and Coal Transport

Corvus has evaluated several surface infrastructure options for the Action. The three primary options that were evaluated are:

- The preferred Action scenario shown on Figure 2.
- A 'central' mine entry option positioned between the Blair Athol Branch Railway and Gregory Highway, with a co-located CPP and above ground rejects storage. This was the preferred option for the Teresa Coal Project due to its proximity to the central main headings beneath the Blair Athol Branch railway.
- A 'western' mine entry option, which included a Pit Top, CPP and above ground rejects storage located west of Theresa Creek to take advantage of the Corvus 2 Seam subcrop and favourable geotechnical conditions for drift drivage.

The proposed Action layout shown on Figure 2 involves additional capital expenditure associated with establishment of the mine access drifts/shafts and ROM coal transport and introduces complexity due to interactions with the existing Gregory Crinum Mine and Kestrel Mine. However, the preferred Action option delivers several benefits:

- Avoids the need to cross the Gregory Highway or Theresa Creek floodplain with surface infrastructure.
- Significantly reduces the surface footprint of the Action in the vicinity of EPC 980, which reduces potential impacts on neighbouring rural properties and sensitive receivers.
- Avoids the need for a new rejects storage in the vicinity of EPC 980. The surface footprint associated with an above ground rejects storage would be approximately 300 ha.
- Positions the CPP and associated infrastructure away from sensitive receivers within an area of existing mining activity.
- Provides an opportunity to dispose of rejects within disturbed mining areas at the Gregory Crinum Mine.

Corvus also considered a mine plan that included transporting coal from the Pit Top Area to a train load-out facility at the Blair Athol Branch railway line. This option was discounted as the existing train line does not have a sufficient gauge width to support loaded coal trains and there would be a considerable capital expenditure required to upgrade the rail between the Action area and Emerald. In addition, routing coal trains through the main regional hub of Emerald would have significant amenity impacts that are avoided by the preferred solution.

'Do Nothing' Option

Were the Action not to proceed, the following consequences are inferred:

- approximately 500 direct operational employment opportunities would be foregone and the associated flow-on effects would not be created;
- approximately 180 direct construction employment opportunities and the associated flow-on effects would not be created;
- the opportunity to reduce the depth of the residual open cut mining voids at the Gregory Crinum Mine would not be realised;
- substantial royalties and tax contributions would not be generated;
- the potential environmental impacts of the Action would not occur; and
- the coal resource would remain available to be extracted by other means.

5. Lodgement

5.1 Attachments

1.2.1 Overview of the proposed action

	Type	Name	Date	Sensitivity	Confidence
#1.	Document	Att_1_Figures_and_Schedule_of_Lands.pdf Figures and Schedule of lands for the Action	09/05/2025	No	High
#2.	Document	Att_1_Figures_and_Schedule_of_Lands_Confidential.pdf Figures (including confidential species locations) and schedule of lands	09/05/2025	Yes	High
#3.	Document	Att_2_Action_Description.pdf Detailed description of activities included in the action and activities not included	09/05/2025	No	High

1.2.5 Information about the staged development

	Type	Name	Date	Sensitivity	Confidence
#1.	Document	Att_2_Action_Description.pdf Detailed description of activities included in the action and activities not included	08/05/2025	No	High

2.2.5 Tenure of the action area relevant to the project area

	Type	Name	Date	Sensitivity	Confidence
#1.	Document	Att_1_Figures_and_Schedule_of_Lands.pdf Figures and Schedule of lands for the Action	08/05/2025	No	High

3.1.2 Existing or proposed uses for the project area

	Type	Name	Date	Sensitivity	Confidence
#1.	Document	Att_1_Figures_and_Schedule_of_Lands.pdf Figures and Schedule of lands for the Action	08/05/2025	No	High

3.1.4 Gradient relevant to the project area

	Type	Name	Date	Sensitivity	Confidence
#1.	Document	Att_1_Figures_and_Schedule_of_Lands.pdf Figures and Schedule of lands for the Action	08/05/2025	No	High

3.2.1 Flora and fauna within the affected area

	Type	Name	Date	Sensitivity	Confidence
#1.	Document				

Att_3_MNES_Assessment.pdf Detailed Assessment of Potential Impacts on all MNES			09/05/2025	No	High
#2.	Document	Att_3_MNES_Assessment_Confidential.pdf Detailed Assessment of Potential Impacts on all MNES, including confidential species record	09/05/2025	Yes	High

3.2.2 Vegetation within the project area

	Type	Name	Date	Sensitivity	Confidence
#1.	Document	Att_1_Figures_and_Schedule_of_Lands.pdf Figures and Schedule of lands for the Action	08/05/2025	No	High

3.4.1 Hydrology characteristics that apply to the project area

	Type	Name	Date	Sensitivity	Confidence
#1.	Document	Att_1_Figures_and_Schedule_of_Lands.pdf Figures and Schedule of lands for the Action	08/05/2025	No	High

4.1.1.3 (World Heritage) Why your action is unlikely to have a direct and/or indirect impact

	Type	Name	Date	Sensitivity	Confidence
#1.	Document	Att_3_MNES_Assessment.pdf Detailed Assessment of Potential Impacts on all MNES	08/05/2025	No	High
#2.	Document	Att_4_GHG_Review.pdf Detailed GHG Calculations	09/05/2025	No	High
#3.	Document	Att_5_Potential_Surface_Water_Impacts_GBR.pdf Consideration of surface water impacts on Great Barrier Reef	09/05/2025	No	High

4.1.2.3 (National Heritage) Why your action is unlikely to have a direct and/or indirect impact

	Type	Name	Date	Sensitivity	Confidence
#1.	Document	Att_3_MNES_Assessment.pdf Detailed Assessment of Potential Impacts on all MNES	08/05/2025	No	High
#2.	Document	Att_4_GHG_Review.pdf Detailed GHG Calculations	08/05/2025	No	High
#3.	Document	Att_5_Potential_Surface_Water_Impacts_GBR.pdf Consideration of surface water impacts on Great Barrier Reef	09/05/2025	No	High

4.1.3.3 (Ramsar Wetland) Why your action is unlikely to have a direct and/or indirect impact

	Type	Name	Date	Sensitivity	Confidence
#1.	Document	Att_3_MNES_Assessment.pdf Detailed Assessment of Potential Impacts on all MNES	08/05/2025	No	High
#2.	Document	Att_4_GHG_Review.pdf Detailed GHG Calculations	08/05/2025	No	High
#3.	Document	Att_5_Potential_Surface_Water_Impacts_GBR.pdf Consideration of surface water impacts on Great Barrier Reef	08/05/2025	No	High

4.1.4.2 (Threatened Species and Ecological Communities) Why your action has a direct and/or indirect impact on the identified protected matters

	Type	Name	Date	Sensitivity	Confidence
#1.	Document	Att_3_MNES_Assessment.pdf Detailed Assessment of Potential Impacts on all MNES	08/05/2025	No	High

4.1.4.5 (Threatened Species and Ecological Communities) Why you consider the direct and/or indirect impact to be a Significant Impact

	Type	Name	Date	Sensitivity	Confidence
#1.	Document	Att_3_MNES_Assessment.pdf Detailed Assessment of Potential Impacts on all MNES	08/05/2025	No	High
#2.	Document	Att_3_MNES_Assessment_Confidential.pdf Detailed Assessment of Potential Impacts on all MNES, including confidential species record	08/05/2025	Yes	High

4.1.4.8 (Threatened Species and Ecological Communities) Why you think your proposed action is a controlled action

	Type	Name	Date	Sensitivity	Confidence
#1.	Document	Att_3_MNES_Assessment.pdf Detailed Assessment of Potential Impacts on all MNES	08/05/2025	No	High

4.1.5.2 (Migratory Species) Why your action has a direct and/or indirect impact on the identified protected matters

	Type	Name	Date	Sensitivity	Confidence
#1.	Document	Att_3_MNES_Assessment.pdf Detailed Assessment of Potential Impacts on all MNES	08/05/2025	No	High

4.1.5.6 (Migratory Species) Why you do not consider the direct and/or indirect impact to be a Significant Impact

	Type	Name	Date	Sensitivity	Confidence
#1.	Document	Att_3_MNES_Assessment.pdf Detailed Assessment of Potential Impacts on all MNES	08/05/2025	No	High

4.1.5.9 (Migratory Species) Why you do not think your proposed action is a controlled action

	Type	Name	Date	Sensitivity	Confidence
#1.	Document	Att_3_MNES_Assessment.pdf Detailed Assessment of Potential Impacts on all MNES	08/05/2025	No	High

4.1.7.3 (Commonwealth Marine Area) Why your action is unlikely to have a direct and/or indirect impact

	Type	Name	Date	Sensitivity	Confidence
#1.	Document	Att_3_MNES_Assessment.pdf Detailed Assessment of Potential Impacts on all MNES	08/05/2025	No	High
#2.	Document	Att_4_GHG_Review.pdf Detailed GHG Calculations	08/05/2025	No	High
#3.	Document	Att_5_Potential_Surface_Water_Impacts_GBR.pdf Consideration of surface water impacts on Great Barrier Reef	08/05/2025	No	High

4.1.8.3 (Great Barrier Reef) Why your action is unlikely to have a direct and/or indirect impact

	Type	Name	Date	Sensitivity	Confidence
#1.	Document	Att_3_MNES_Assessment.pdf Detailed Assessment of Potential Impacts on all MNES	08/05/2025	No	High
#2.	Document	Att_4_GHG_Review.pdf Detailed GHG Calculations	08/05/2025	No	High
#3.	Document	Att_5_Potential_Surface_Water_Impacts_GBR.pdf Consideration of surface water impacts on Great Barrier Reef	08/05/2025	No	High

4.1.9.2 (Water resource in relation to large coal mining development or coal seam gas) Why your action has a direct and/or indirect impact

	Type	Name	Date	Sensitivity	Confidence
#1.	Document	Att_3_MNES_Assessment.pdf Detailed Assessment of Potential Impacts on all MNES	08/05/2025	No	High

4.3.8 Why alternatives for your proposed action were not possible

Type	Name		Date	Sensitivity	Confidence	
#1.	Document	Att_1_Figures_and_Schedule_of_Lands.pdf Figures and Schedule of lands for the Action	08/05/2025	No		High

5.2 Declarations

Completed Referring party's declaration

The Referring party is the person preparing the information in this referral.

Name	Joe Fittell
Job title	Principal Environmental Manager
Phone	0466445072
Email	joe@vessi.com.au
Address	South Brisbane, QLD, 4101

☑ Check this box to indicate you have read the referral form. *

☑ I would like to receive notifications and track the referral progress through the EPBC portal. *

☑ By checking this box, I, **Joe Fittell**, declare that to the best of my knowledge the information I have given on, or attached to this EPBC Act Referral is complete, current and correct. I understand that giving false or misleading information is a serious offence. *

☑ I would like to receive notifications and track the referral progress through the EPBC portal. *

Completed Person proposing to take the action's declaration

The Person proposing to take the action is the individual, business, government agency or trustee that will be responsible for the proposed action.

ABN/ACN	621807412
Organisation name	CORVUS RESOURCES PTY LTD
Organisation address	2000 NSW
Representative's name	Chris Coombes
Representative's job title	CEO
Phone	0731719635
Email	admin@corvusops.com.au
Address	62 Oak Rd, Kirrawee NSW 2232

☑ Check this box to indicate you have read the referral form. *

☑ I would like to receive notifications and track the referral progress through the EPBC portal. *

☑ I, **Chris Coombes of CORVUS RESOURCES PTY LTD**, declare that to the best of my knowledge the information I have given on, or attached to the EPBC Act Referral is complete, current and correct. I understand that giving false or misleading information is a serious offence. I declare that I am not taking the action on behalf or for the benefit of any other person or entity. *

☑ I would like to receive notifications and track the referral progress through the EPBC portal. *

✔ Completed Proposed designated proponent's declaration

The Proposed designated proponent is the individual or organisation proposed to be responsible for meeting the requirements of the EPBC Act during the assessment process, if the Minister decides that this project is a controlled action.

Same as Person proposing to take the action information.

☑ Check this box to indicate you have read the referral form. *

☑ I would like to receive notifications and track the referral progress through the EPBC portal. *

☑ I, **Chris Coombes of CORVUS RESOURCES PTY LTD**, the Proposed designated proponent, consent to the designation of myself as the Proposed designated proponent for the purposes of the action described in this EPBC Act Referral. *

☐ I would like to receive notifications and track the referral progress through the EPBC portal. *