



Monthly Environmental Monitoring Report

Yancoal Mt Thorley Warkworth

June 2021

CONTENTS

1.0	INTRODUCTION.....	5
2.0	AIR QUALITY.....	5
2.1	Meteorological Monitoring.....	5
2.1.1	Rainfall.....	5
2.1.2	Wind Speed and Direction.....	5
2.2	Depositional Dust.....	7
2.3	Suspended Particulates.....	7
2.3.1	HVAS PM ₁₀ Results.....	7
2.3.2	TSP Results.....	8
2.3.3	Real Time PM ₁₀ Results.....	8
2.3.4	Real Time Alarms for Air Quality.....	8
3.0	WATER QUALITY.....	9
3.1	Surface Water.....	9
3.1.1	Surface Water Monitoring Results.....	9
3.1.2	Surface Water Trigger Tracking.....	13
3.2	HRSTS Discharge.....	15
3.3	Groundwater Monitoring.....	17
3.2.1	Groundwater Trigger Tracking.....	40
4.0	BLAST MONITORING.....	44
4.1	Blast Monitoring Results.....	44
5.0	NOISE.....	47
5.1	Attended Noise Monitoring Results.....	47
5.1.1	WML Noise Assessment.....	47
5.1.2	MTO Noise Assessment.....	48
5.1.3	Low Frequency Assessment.....	49
5.2	Noise Management Measures.....	52
6.0	OPERATIONAL DOWNTIME.....	52
7.0	REHABILITATION.....	53
8.0	ENVIRONMENTAL INCIDENTS.....	53
9.0	COMPLAINTS.....	53
	Appendix A: Meteorological Data.....	54

Figures

Figure 1: Rainfall Trends YTD	5
Figure 2: Charlton Ridge Wind Rose – June 2021	5
Figure 3: Air Quality Monitoring Locations	6
Figure 4: Depositional Dust – June 2021	7
Figure 5: Individual PM ₁₀ Results – June 2021	7
Figure 6: Annual Average PM ₁₀ – June 2021	8
Figure 7: Annual Average Total Suspended Particulates – June 2021	8
Figure 8: Real Time PM ₁₀ 24hr average and Year-to-date average – June 2021	9
Figure 9: Site Dams Electrical Conductivity Trend – June 2021	10
Figure 10: Site Dams pH Trend – June 2021	10
Figure 11: Site Dams Total Suspended Solids Trend – June 2021	11
Figure 12: Watercourse Electrical Conductivity Trend – June 2021	11
Figure 13: Watercourse pH Trend – June 2021	12
Figure 14: Watercourse Total Suspended Solids Trend – June 2021	12
Figure 15: Surface Water Monitoring Location Plan	16
Figure 16: Bayswater Seam Electrical Conductivity Trend – June 2021	17
Figure 17: Bayswater Seam pH Trend – June 2021	18
Figure 18: Bayswater Seam Standing Water Level Trend – June 2021	18
Figure 19: Blakefield Seam Electrical Conductivity Trend – June 2021	19
Figure 20: Blakefield Seam pH Trend – June 2021	19
Figure 21: Blakefield Seam Standing Water Level Trend – June 2021	20
Figure 22: Bowfield Seam Electrical Conductivity Trend – June 2021	20
Figure 23: Bowfield Seam pH Trend – June 2021	21
Figure 24: Bowfield Seam Standing Water Level Trend – June 2021	21
Figure 25: Redbank Seam Electrical Conductivity Trend – June 2021	22
Figure 26: Redbank Seam pH Trend – June 2021	22
Figure 27: Redbank Seam Standing Water Level Trend – June 2021	23
Figure 28: Shallow Overburden Electrical Conductivity Trend – June 2021	23
Figure 29: Shallow Overburden pH Trend – June 2021	24
Figure 30: Shallow Overburden Standing Water Level Trend – June 2021	24
Figure 31: Vaux Seam Electrical Conductivity Trend – June 2021	25
Figure 32: Vaux Seam pH Trend – June 2021	25
Figure 33: Vaux Seam Standing Water Level Trend – June 2021	26
Figure 34: Wambo Seam Electrical Conductivity Trend – June 2021	26
Figure 35: Wambo Seam pH Trend – June 2021	27
Figure 36: Wambo Seam Standing Water Level Trend – June 2021	27
Figure 37: Warkworth Seam Electrical Conductivity Trend – June 2021	28
Figure 38: Warkworth Seam pH Trend – June 2021	28
Figure 39: Warkworth Seam Standing Water Level Trend – June 2021	29
Figure 40: Wollombi Alluvium Electrical Conductivity Trend – June 2021	29
Figure 41: Wollombi Alluvium pH Trend – June 2021	30
Figure 42: Wollombi Alluvium 2 Electrical Conductivity Trend – June 2021	30
Figure 43: Wollombi Alluvium 2 pH Trend – June 2021	31
Figure 44: Wollombi Alluvium Standing Water Level Trend – June 2021	31
Figure 45: Woodlands Hill Seam Electrical Conductivity Trend - June 2021	32
Figure 46: Woodlands Hill Seam pH Trend - June 2021	32
Figure 47: Woodlands Hill Seam Standing Water Level Trend - June 2021	33

Figure 48: Aeolian Warkworth Sands Electrical Conductivity Trend – June 2021	33
Figure 49: Aeolian Warkworth Sands pH Trend – June 2021	34
Figure 50: Aeolian Warkworth Sands Standing Water Level Trend – June 2021	34
Figure 51: Hunter River Alluvium 1 Electrical Conductivity Trend – June 2021	35
Figure 52: Hunter River Alluvium 1 pH Trend – June 2021	35
Figure 53: Hunter River Alluvium 2 Electrical Conductivity Trend – June 2021	36
Figure 54: Hunter River Alluvium 2 pH Trend – June 2021	36
Figure 55: Hunter River Alluvium 3 Electrical Conductivity Trend – June 2021	37
Figure 56: Hunter River Alluvium 3 pH Trend – June 2021	37
Figure 57: Hunter River Alluvium 4 Electrical Conductivity Trend – June 2021	38
Figure 58: Hunter River Alluvium 4 pH Trend – June 2021	38
Figure 59: Hunter River Alluvium 5 Electrical Conductivity – June 2021	39
Figure 60: Hunter River Alluvium 5 pH Trend – June 2021	39
Figure 61: Hunter River Alluvium Standing Water Level Trend – June 2021	40
Figure 62: Groundwater Monitoring Location Plan	43
Figure 63: Abbey Green Blast Monitoring Results – June 2021	44
Figure 64: Bulga Village Blast Monitoring Results – June 2021	44
Figure 65: MTIE Blast Monitoring Results – June 2021	45
Figure 66: Warkworth Blast Monitoring Results - June 2021	45
Figure 67: Wambo Road Blast Monitoring Results – June 2021	45
Figure 68: Wollemi Peak Road Blast Monitoring Results - June 2021	45
Figure 69: Blast and Vibration Monitoring Location Plan	46
Figure 70: Noise Monitoring Location Plan	51
Figure 71: Operational Downtime by Equipment Type – June 2021	52
Figure 72: Rehabilitation YTD – June 2021	53

Tables

Table 1: Monthly Rainfall MTW	5
Table 2: Surface Water Trigger Tracking – June YTD 2021	13
Table 3: Groundwater Triggers – 2021	41
Table 4: Blasting Limits	44
Table 5: $L_{Aeq, 15 \text{ minute}}$ Warkworth Impact Assessment Criteria – June 2021	47
Table 6: $L_{A1, 1 \text{ minute}}$ Warkworth Impact Assessment Criteria – June 2021	47
Table 7: $L_{Aeq, 15 \text{ minute}}$ Mount Thorley Operations - Impact Assessment Criteria – June 2021	48
Table 8: $L_{A1, 1 \text{ Minute}}$ Mount Thorley Operations - Impact Assessment Criteria – June 2021	48
Table 9: Warkworth Low Frequency Noise Assessment – June 2021	49
Table 10: Mount Thorley Operations Low Frequency Noise Assessment – June 2021	50
Table 11: Supplementary Attended Noise Monitoring Data – June 2021	52
Table 12: Complaints Summary - YTD June 2021	53
Table 13: Meteorological Data – Charlton Ridge Meteorological Station – June 2021	55

Revision History

Version No.	Person Responsible	Document Status	Date
1.0	Environmental Advisor	Final	12/11/2021

1.0 INTRODUCTION

This report has been compiled to provide a monthly summary of environmental monitoring results for Mt Thorley Warkworth (MTW). This report includes all monitoring data collected for the period 1 June to 30 June.

2.0 AIR QUALITY

2.1 Meteorological Monitoring


Meteorological data is collected at MTW’s ‘Charlton Ridge’ meteorological station (refer to **Figure 3: Air Quality Monitoring Locations**).

2.1.1 Rainfall

Rainfall for the period is summarised in **Table 1**, the year-to-date trend and historical trend are shown in **Figure 1**.

Table 1: Monthly Rainfall MTW

2021	Monthly Rainfall (mm)	Cumulative Rainfall (mm)
June	53	514.2



Note: The historical average monthly rainfall is calculated from 2007 to 2020 monthly totals

2.1.2 Wind Speed and Direction

Winds from the north west were dominant throughout the reporting period as shown in **Figure 2**.




Figure 2: Charlton Ridge Wind Rose – June 2021




Figure 3: Air Quality Monitoring Locations

2.2 Depositional Dust

To monitor regional air quality, MTW operates and maintains a network of seven depositional dust gauges, situated on private and mine owned land surrounding MTW.

Figure 4 displays insoluble solids results from depositional dust gauges during the reporting period compared against the year-to-date average and the annual impact assessment criteria.

During the reporting period the Warkworth monitor recorded a monthly result above the long-term impact assessment criteria of 4.0 g/m² per month. There is no evidence to suggest that the Warkworth result is contaminated. Accordingly, the result will be included in the annual average calculation.

An annual assessment of MTW’s compliance with the Long-Term Impact Assessment Criteria will be provided in the 2021 Annual Review Report.




Figure 4: Depositional Dust – June 2021

2.3 Suspended Particulates

Suspended particulates are measured by a network of High Volume Air Samplers (HVAS) measuring Total Suspended Particulates (TSP) and Particulate Matter <10µm (PM₁₀). The location of these monitors can be found in **Figure 3**. Each HVAS was run for 24 hours on a six-day cycle in accordance with EPA requirements.

2.3.1 HVAS PM₁₀ Results

Figure 5 shows the individual PM₁₀ results at the monitoring station against the short-term impact assessment criteria of 50µg/m³.




Figure 5: Individual PM₁₀ Results – June 2021

Figure 6 shows the annual average PM₁₀ results against the long-term impact assessment criteria.

An annual assessment of MTW’s compliance with the Long-Term Impact Assessment Criteria will be provided in the 2021 Annual Review Report.




Figure 6: Annual Average PM₁₀ – June 2021

2.3.2 TSP Results

Figure 7 shows the annual average TSP results compared against the long-term impact assessment criteria of 90µg/m³.

An annual assessment of MTW’s compliance with the Long-Term Impact Assessment Criteria will be provided in the 2021 Annual Review Report.




Figure 7: Annual Average Total Suspended Particulates – June 2021

2.3.3 Real Time PM₁₀ Results

Mt Thorley Warkworth maintains a network of real time PM₁₀ monitors. The real-time air quality monitoring stations continuously log information and transmit data to a central database, generating alarms when particulate matter levels exceed internal trigger limits.

Results for real time dust sampling are shown in Figure 8, including the daily 24-hour average PM₁₀ result and the annual PM₁₀ average.

2.3.4 Real Time Alarms for Air Quality

During June, the real-time monitoring system generated 41 automated air quality related alerts, including 24 alerts for adverse meteorological conditions and 17 alerts for elevated PM₁₀ levels.




Figure 8: Real Time PM10 24hr average and Year-to-date average – June 2021

3.0 WATER QUALITY

MTW maintains a network of surface water and groundwater monitoring sites.

3.1 Surface Water

Monitoring is conducted at mine site dams and surrounding natural watercourses. The surface water monitoring locations are outlined in Figure 15.

Surface water courses are sampled on a monthly or quarterly sampling regime. Water quality is evaluated through the parameters of pH, Electrical Conductivity (EC) and Total Suspended Solids (TSS). The Hunter River and the Wollombi Brook are sampled both upstream and downstream of mining operations, to monitor the potential impact of mining. Other Hunter River tributaries are also monitored.

3.1.1 Surface Water Monitoring Results

Figure 9 to Figure 11 show the long-term surface water trend (2018 – current) within MTW mine dams. Figure 12 to Figure 14 show the long-term surface water trend (2018 - current) in surrounding watercourses.






Figure 11: Site Dams Total Suspended Solids Trend – June 2021




Note: Missing data indicates that there was insufficient water to take a sample, or that there was no safe access.

Figure 12: Watercourse Electrical Conductivity Trend – June 2021



Note: Missing data indicates that there was insufficient water to take a sample, or that there was no safe access.

Figure 13: Watercourse pH Trend – June 2021



Note: Missing data indicates that there was insufficient water to take a sample, or that there was no safe access.

Figure 14: Watercourse Total Suspended Solids Trend – June 2021

3.1.2 Surface Water Trigger Tracking

Internal trigger limits have been developed to assess monitoring data on an on-going basis, and to highlight potentially adverse surface water impacts. The process for evaluating monitoring results against the internal triggers and subsequent responses are outlined in the MTW Water Management Plan.

Current internal surface water trigger limit breaches are summarised in **Table 2**.

Table 2: Surface Water Trigger Tracking – June YTD 2021

Site	Date	Trigger Limit Breached	Action Taken in Response
SP1	05/01/2021	pH –5 th Percentile	Watching Brief*
W5	05/01/2021	pH –5 th Percentile	Watching Brief*
W15	05/01/2021	pH –5 th Percentile	Cyclical lower-pH measurements are consistently seen in the historical trend for this Loders Creek monitoring location. Monitoring results back within trigger limits for March 2021 sample round. No follow up required.
W29	05/01/2021	pH –5 th Percentile	Watching Brief*
W2	11/03/2021	TSS – 50mg/L (ANZECC criteria)	Watching Brief*. Unlikely to be associated with MTW mining related impacts. Elevated TSS results most likely attributable to sampling from water with no flow. Note: Result is not considered to be a valid representation given that there was no flow at the time of sampling.
W4	05/01/2021	TSS – 50mg/L (ANZECC criteria)	Watching Brief*. Elevated TSS associated with high runoff due to rainfall event (79.4mm on 4 January). Consistent with and higher than upstream sample W29 (which is closer to MTW); no mine site sources of sediment identified (no dam overtopping and/or site discharges recorded during the event). No follow up required.
W4	15/03/2021	TSS – 50mg/L (ANZECC criteria)	Watching Brief*. Elevated TSS associated with rainfall event (36.2mm on 14 March) and is considered related to sampling from slow flowing water. Consistent with and higher than upstream sample W29 (which is closer to MTW); no mine site sources of sediment identified (no dam overtopping and/or site discharges recorded during the event). No follow up required.

Site	Date	Trigger Limit Breached	Action Taken in Response
W5	05/01/2021	TSS – 50mg/L (ANZECC criteria)	Elevated TSS associated with high runoff due to rainfall event (79.4mm on 4 January), resulting in mobilisation of sediment in Loders Creek. No MTW site sources of sediment identified. No follow up required.
W5	15/03/2021	TSS – 50mg/L (ANZECC criteria)	Elevated TSS associated with rainfall event (36.2mm on 14 March), resulting in mobilisation of sediment in Loders Creek. No MTW site sources of sediment identified. No follow up required.
W14	05/01/2021	TSS – 50mg/L (ANZECC criteria)	Elevated TSS associated with high runoff due to rainfall event (79.4mm on 4 January). No mine site sources of sediment identified. Upstream sample W29 (which is closer to MTW) indicates source of sediment may be partially attributable to runoff from downstream farming properties. No follow up required.
W14	15/03/2021	TSS – 50mg/L (ANZECC criteria)	Elevated TSS associated with rainfall event (36.2mm on 14 March), resulting in mobilisation of sediment in Doctors Creek. No mine site sources of sediment identified. Upstream sample W29 (which is closer to MTW) indicates source of sediment may be partially attributable to runoff from downstream farming properties. No follow up required.
W15	05/01/2021	TSS – 50mg/L (ANZECC criteria)	Investigation undertaken. Note: Elevated TSS results most likely attributable to high runoff due to rainfall event (79.4mm on 4 January), resulting in mobilisation of sediment in Loders Creek. In addition, TSS results were potentially affected by turbid water associated with the overtopping of one mine water dam at MTO and several MTCL dams/catchment basins which were reported to EPA and DPIE.
W15	15/03/2021	TSS – 50mg/L (ANZECC criteria)	Elevated TSS associated with rainfall event (36.2mm on 14 March), resulting in mobilisation of sediment in Loders Creek. No mine site sources of sediment identified (no dam overtopping and/or site discharges recorded during the event). No follow up required.

Site	Date	Trigger Limit Breached	Action Taken in Response
W27	05/01/2021	TSS – 50mg/L (ANZECC criteria)	Investigation undertaken. Note: Elevated TSS results most likely attributable to high runoff due to rainfall event (79.4mm on 4 January). In addition, TSS results were potentially affected by turbid water associated with the overtopping of an MTW mine water dam as a result of the rainfall event which was reported to EPA and DPIE.
W28	05/01/2021	TSS – 50mg/L (ANZECC criteria)	Investigation undertaken. Note: Elevated TSS results most likely attributable to high runoff due to rainfall event (79.4mm on 4 January). In addition, TSS results were potentially affected by turbid water associated with the overtopping of MTW sediment dams as a result of greater than design rainfall, which were reported to EPA and DPIE.
W28	15/03/2021	TSS – 50mg/L (ANZECC criteria)	Elevated TSS associated with rainfall event (36.2mm on 14 March). No mine site sources of sediment identified (no dam overtopping and/or site discharges recorded during the event). No follow up required.

* = Watching brief established pending outcomes of subsequent monitoring events.

3.2 HRSTS Discharge

MTW participates in the Hunter River Salinity Trading Scheme (HRSTS), allowing discharge from licensed discharge points located at Dam 1N and Dam 9S. Discharges can only take place subject to HRSTS regulations.

MTW did not undertake any HRSTS discharges in the reporting period.





Figure 15: Surface Water Monitoring Location Plan

3.3 Groundwater Monitoring


Groundwater monitoring is undertaken on a quarterly basis in accordance with the MTW Groundwater Monitoring Programme.

Figure 16 to Figure 61 show the long-term water quality trends (2018 – current) for groundwater bores monitored at MTW.



Note: Missing data indicates that there was insufficient water to take a sample.

Figure 16: Bayswater Seam Electrical Conductivity Trend – June 2021



Note: Missing data indicates that there was insufficient water to take a sample.

Figure 17: Bayswater Seam pH Trend – June 2021




Figure 18: Bayswater Seam Standing Water Level Trend – June 2021




Figure 19: Blakefield Seam Electrical Conductivity Trend – June 2021




Figure 20: Blakefield Seam pH Trend – June 2021




Figure 21: Blakefield Seam Standing Water Level Trend – June 2021




Figure 22: Bowfield Seam Electrical Conductivity Trend – June 2021




Figure 23: Bowfield Seam pH Trend – June 2021




Figure 24: Bowfield Seam Standing Water Level Trend – June 2021




Figure 25: Redbank Seam Electrical Conductivity Trend – June 2021




Figure 26: Redbank Seam pH Trend – June 2021




Figure 27: Redbank Seam Standing Water Level Trend – June 2021




Figure 28: Shallow Overburden Electrical Conductivity Trend – June 2021




Figure 29: Shallow Overburden pH Trend – June 2021






Figure 30: Shallow Overburden Standing Water Level Trend – June 2021




Note: Missing data indicates that there was insufficient water to take a sample.

Figure 31: Vaux Seam Electrical Conductivity Trend – June 2021




Note: Missing data indicates that there was insufficient water to take a sample.

Figure 32: Vaux Seam pH Trend – June 2021




Note: Missing data indicates that there was insufficient water to take a sample.

Figure 33: Vaux Seam Standing Water Level Trend – June 2021



Note: Missing data indicates that there was insufficient water to take a sample.

Figure 34: Wambo Seam Electrical Conductivity Trend – June 2021



Note: Missing data indicates that there was insufficient water to take a sample.

Figure 35: Wambo Seam pH Trend – June 2021




Figure 36: Wambo Seam Standing Water Level Trend – June 2021




Figure 39: Warkworth Seam Standing Water Level Trend – June 2021




Figure 40: Wollombi Alluvium Electrical Conductivity Trend – June 2021






Figure 41: Wollombi Alluvium pH Trend – June 2021



Note: Missing data indicates that there was insufficient water to take a sample.

Figure 42: Wollombi Alluvium 2 Electrical Conductivity Trend – June 2021



Note: Missing data indicates that there was insufficient water to take a sample.

Figure 43: Wollombi Alluvium 2 pH Trend – June 2021




Figure 44: Wollombi Alluvium Standing Water Level Trend – June 2021




Figure 45: Woodlands Hill Seam Electrical Conductivity Trend - June 2021




Figure 46: Woodlands Hill Seam pH Trend - June 2021




Figure 47: Woodlands Hill Seam Standing Water Level Trend - June 2021




Figure 48: Aeolian Warkworth Sands Electrical Conductivity Trend – June 2021




Figure 49: Aeolian Warkworth Sands pH Trend – June 2021




Figure 50: Aeolian Warkworth Sands Standing Water Level Trend – June 2021




Figure 51: Hunter River Alluvium 1 Electrical Conductivity Trend – June 2021




Figure 52: Hunter River Alluvium 1 pH Trend – June 2021




Figure 53: Hunter River Alluvium 2 Electrical Conductivity Trend – June 2021




Figure 54: Hunter River Alluvium 2 pH Trend – June 2021




Figure 55: Hunter River Alluvium 3 Electrical Conductivity Trend – June 2021






Figure 56: Hunter River Alluvium 3 pH Trend – June 2021



Note: Missing data indicates that there was insufficient water to take a sample.

Figure 57: Hunter River Alluvium 4 Electrical Conductivity Trend – June 2021



Note: Missing data indicates that there was insufficient water to take a sample.

Figure 58: Hunter River Alluvium 4 pH Trend – June 2021




Figure 59: Hunter River Alluvium 5 Electrical Conductivity – June 2021




Figure 60: Hunter River Alluvium 5 pH Trend – June 2021




Figure 61: Hunter River Alluvium Standing Water Level Trend – June 2021

3.2.1 Groundwater Trigger Tracking

Internal trigger limits have been developed to assess monitoring data on an on-going basis, and to highlight potentially adverse groundwater impacts. The process for evaluating monitoring results against the internal triggers and subsequent responses are outlined in the MTW Water Management Plan. Locations of groundwater bores are shown in **Figure 62**.

Current internal groundwater trigger limit breaches are summarised in **Table 3**.

Table 3: Groundwater Triggers – 2021

Site	Date	Trigger Limit Breached	Action Taken in Response
OH787	13/04/2021	EC – 95th Percentile	Watching Brief* A change to the sampling methodology implemented in 2019 i.e. low flow pumping/purging prior to all sampling and analysis, is considered the cause of the measured increase in EC since then.
OH787	24/06/2021	EC – 95th Percentile	Watching Brief*
OH788	22/06/2021	EC – 95th Percentile	Watching Brief*
MTD605P	24/05/2021	EC – 95th Percentile	Watching Brief*
WD622P	25/02/2021	EC – 95th Percentile	Watching Brief* Returned to within 95 th percentile for 26/5/21 sample result.
GW98MTCL2	23/06/2021	pH – 5th Percentile	Watching Brief*
WOH2139A	25/02/2021	pH – 95th Percentile	Watching Brief* Returned to within 95 th percentile for 27/5/21 sample result.
WOH2156A	25/02/2021	pH – 5th Percentile	Watching Brief* Returned to above 5 th percentile for 26/5/21 sample result.
MB15MTW01D	25/02/2021	pH – 5th Percentile	Watching Brief* A change to the sampling methodology implemented in 2019 i.e. low flow pumping/purging prior to all sampling and analysis, is possibly considered the cause of the measured drop in pH results below 5 th percentile trigger level since then.
MB15MTW01D	26/05/2021	pH – 5th Percentile	A change to the sampling methodology implemented in 2019 i.e. low flow pumping/purging prior to all sampling and analysis, is possibly considered the cause of the measured drop in pH results below 5 th percentile trigger level since then.
MTD616P	25/02/2021	pH – 5th Percentile	Watching Brief*
MTD616P	25/05/2021	pH – 5th Percentile	Watching Brief*
WD622P	25/02/2021	pH – 5th Percentile	Watching Brief* Returned to above 5 th percentile for 26/5/21 sample result.
WOH2154B	24/02/2021	pH – 95th Percentile	Watching Brief*
WOH2154B	2/06/2021	pH – 95th Percentile	Watching Brief*
PZ9D	29/04/2021	pH – 5th Percentile	Watching Brief* Returned to above 5 th percentile for 22/6/21 sample result.
OH1138(1)	19/01/2021	pH – 5th Percentile	Watching Brief*
OH1138(1)	19/02/2021	pH – 5th Percentile	Watching Brief*

Site	Date	Trigger Limit Breached	Action Taken in Response
OH1138(1)	29/03/2021	pH – 5th Percentile	Results were investigated in the MTW 2020 Annual Groundwater Review. pH results for monitoring bore OH1138 likely to be attributable to the regional drawdown associated within the active mining in North Pit and the potential influences from the abstraction of water from the Lemington underground workings. Continue Watching Brief*
OH1138(1)	8/04/2021	pH – 5th Percentile	See March comment re investigation at this location. Returned to the 5 th percentile for 19/5/21 sample result. Continue Watching Brief*
OH1138(1)	24/06/2021	pH – 5th Percentile	See March comment re investigation at this location. Continue Watching Brief*
PZ7D	27/05/2021	pH – 95th Percentile	Watching Brief*
OH1121	23/06/2021	pH – 95th Percentile	Watching Brief*
OH1126	24/06/2021	pH – 5th Percentile	Watching Brief*

* = Watching brief established pending outcomes of subsequent monitoring events. No specific actions required.




Figure 62: Groundwater Monitoring Location Plan

4.0 BLAST MONITORING

MTW have a network of six blast monitoring units. These are located at nearby privately-owned residences and function as regulatory compliance monitors.

The location of these monitors can be found in **Figure 69**.

4.1 Blast Monitoring Results

During June 2021, 18 blasts were initiated at MTW.

Figure 63 to Figure 68 show the blast monitoring results for the reporting period against the impact assessment criteria. The criteria are summarised in **Table 4**.

Table 4: Blasting Limits

Airblast Overpressure (dB(L))	Comments
115	5% of the total number of blasts in a 12-month period
120	0%
Ground Vibration (mm/s)	Comments
5	5% of the total number of blasts in a 12-month period
10	0%

During the reporting period two blasts exceeded the 115 dB(L) 5% threshold for airblast overpressure, one at the MTIE blast monitoring location and one at the Bulga blast monitoring location. No blasts exceeded the 5mm/s 5% threshold for ground vibration.




Figure 63: Abbey Green Blast Monitoring Results – June 2021




Figure 64: Bulga Village Blast Monitoring Results – June 2021




Figure 65: MTIE Blast Monitoring Results – June 2021




Figure 67: Wambo Road Blast Monitoring Results – June 2021




Figure 66: Warkworth Blast Monitoring Results - June 2021




Figure 68: Wollemi Peak Road Blast Monitoring Results - June 2021




Figure 69: Blast and Vibration Monitoring Location Plan

5.0 NOISE

Routine attended noise monitoring is carried out in accordance with the MTW Noise Management Plan. A review against EIS predictions will be reported in the Annual Review Report. The purpose of the noise surveys is to quantify and describe the acoustic environment around the site and compare results with specified limits. Unattended monitoring (real time noise monitoring) also occurs at five sites surrounding MTW. The attended noise monitoring locations are displayed in **Figure 70**.

5.1 Attended Noise Monitoring Results

Attended monitoring was conducted at receiver locations surrounding MTW on the night of 1 June 2021. All measurements complied with the relevant criteria. Results are detailed in **Table 5** to **Table 8**.

5.1.1 WML Noise Assessment

Compliance assessments undertaken against the WML noise criteria are presented in **Table 5** and **Table 6**.

Table 5: L_{Aeq}, 15 minute Warkworth Impact Assessment Criteria – June 2021

Location	Date and Time	Wind Speed (m/s)	Stability Class	Criterion (dB(A))	Criterion Applies? ¹	WML L _{Aeq} dB ^{2,3}	Exceedance ^{3,4}
Bulga RFS	1/06/2021 23:10	0.8	F	37	Yes	<30	Nil
Bulga Village	1/06/2021 22:25	1.8	D	38	Yes	32	Nil
Gouldsville	1/06/2021 21:38	2	E	38	Yes	IA	Nil
Inlet Rd	1/06/2021 21:36	2	E	37	Yes	32	Nil
Inlet Rd West	1/06/2021 21:15	1.8	E	35	Yes	25	Nil
Long Point	1/06/2021 21:13	1.8	E	35	No	IA	NA
South Bulga	1/06/2021 23:50	1	F	35	Yes	28	Nil
Wambo Road	1/06/2021 22:02	2.4	D	38	Yes	30	Nil

Notes:

- Noise emission limits apply during all meteorological conditions except the following: during periods of rain or hail; average wind speed at microphone height exceeds 5 m/s; wind speeds greater than 3 m/s measured at 10 metres above ground level; stability category F temperature inversion conditions and wind speeds greater than 2m/s at 10m above ground level; or stability category G temperature inversion conditions. Criterion may or may not apply due to rounding of meteorological data values;
- Estimated or measured L_{Aeq},15minute attributed to WML;
- Bold results in red are possible exceedances of relevant criteria;
- NA in exceedance column means atmospheric conditions outside conditions specified in development consent and so criterion is not Applicable.

Table 6: L_{A1}, 1 minute Warkworth Impact Assessment Criteria – June 2021

Location	Date and Time	Wind Speed (m/s)	Stability Class	Criterion (dB(A))	Criterion Applies? ¹	WML L _{Aeq} dB ^{2,3}	Exceedance ^{3,4}
Bulga RFS	1/06/2021 23:10	0.8	F	47	Yes	<30	Nil
Bulga Village	1/06/2021 22:25	1.8	D	48	Yes	35	Nil
Gouldsville	1/06/2021 21:38	2	E	48	Yes	IA	Nil
Inlet Rd	1/06/2021 21:36	2	E	47	Yes	34	Nil
Inlet Rd West	1/06/2021 21:15	1.8	E	45	Yes	30	Nil
Long Point	1/06/2021 21:13	1.8	E	45	No	IA	NA
South Bulga	1/06/2021 23:50	1	F	45	Yes	30	Nil
Wambo Road	1/06/2021 22:02	2.4	D	48	Yes	32	Nil

Notes:

- Noise emission limits apply during all meteorological conditions except the following: during periods of rain or hail; average wind speed at microphone height exceeds 5 m/s; wind speeds greater than 3 m/s measured at 10 metres above ground level; stability category F temperature inversion conditions and wind speeds greater than 2m/s at 10m above ground level; or stability category G temperature inversion conditions. Criterion may or may not apply due to rounding of meteorological data values;
- Estimated or measured L_{A1},1minute attributed to WML;
- Bold results in red are possible exceedances of relevant criteria;
- NA in exceedance column means atmospheric conditions outside conditions specified in development consent and so criterion is not Applicable.

5.1.2 MTO Noise Assessment

Compliance assessments undertaken against the MTO noise criteria are presented in **Table 7** and **Table 8**.

Table 7: L_{Aeq, 15minute} Mount Thorley Operations - Impact Assessment Criteria – June 2021

Location	Date and Time	Wind Speed (m/s)	Stability Class	Criterion dB	Criterion Applies? ¹	MTO L _{Aeq} dB ^{2,3}	Exceedance ^{3,4}
Bulga RFS	1/06/2021 23:10	0.8	F	37	Yes	<30	Nil
Bulga Village	1/06/2021 22:25	1.8	D	38	Yes	IA	Nil
Gouldsville	1/06/2021 21:38	2	E	35	Yes	IA	Nil
Inlet Rd	1/06/2021 21:36	2	E	37	Yes	IA	Nil
Inlet Rd West	1/06/2021 21:15	1.8	E	35	Yes	IA	Nil
Long Point	1/06/2021 21:13	1.8	E	35	No	IA	NA
South Bulga	1/06/2021 23:50	1	F	36	Yes	IA	Nil
Wambo Road	1/06/2021 22:02	2.4	D	38	Yes	IA	Nil

Notes:

- Noise emission limits apply during all meteorological conditions except the following: during periods of rain or hail; average wind speed at microphone height exceeds 5 m/s; wind speeds greater than 3 m/s measured at 10 metres above ground level; stability category F temperature inversion conditions and wind speeds greater than 2m/s at 10m above ground level; or stability category G temperature inversion conditions. Criterion may or may not apply due to rounding of meteorological data values;
- Estimated or measured L_{Aeq,15minute} attributed to MTO;
- Bold results in red are possible exceedances of relevant criteria;
- NA in exceedance column means atmospheric conditions outside conditions specified in project approval and so criterion is not applicable.

Table 8: L_{A1, 1Minute} Mount Thorley Operations - Impact Assessment Criteria – June 2021

Location	Date and Time	Wind Speed (m/s)	Stability Class	Criterion dB	Criterion Applies? ¹	MTO L _{A1, 1min} dB ^{2,3}	Exceedance ^{3,4}
Bulga RFS	1/06/2021 23:10	0.8	F	47	Yes	<30	Nil
Bulga Village	1/06/2021 22:25	1.8	D	48	Yes	IA	Nil
Gouldsville	1/06/2021 21:38	2	E	45	Yes	IA	Nil
Inlet Rd	1/06/2021 21:36	2	E	47	Yes	IA	Nil
Inlet Rd West	1/06/2021 21:15	1.8	E	45	Yes	IA	Nil
Long Point	1/06/2021 21:13	1.8	E	45	No	IA	NA
South Bulga	1/06/2021 23:50	1	F	46	Yes	IA	Nil
Wambo Road	1/06/2021 22:02	2.4	D	48	Yes	IA	Nil

Notes:

- Noise emission limits apply during all meteorological conditions except the following: during periods of rain or hail; average wind speed at microphone height exceeds 5 m/s; wind speeds greater than 3 m/s measured at 10 metres above ground level; stability category F temperature inversion conditions and wind speeds greater than 2m/s at 10m above ground level; or stability category G temperature inversion conditions. Criterion may or may not apply due to rounding of meteorological data values;
- Estimated or measured L_{Aeq,15minute} attributed to MTO;
- Bold results in red are possible exceedances of relevant criteria;
- NA in exceedance column means atmospheric conditions outside conditions specified in project approval and so criterion is not applicable.

5.1.3 Low Frequency Assessment

In accordance with the requirements of the EPA's Noise Policy for Industry (NPfI), the applicability of the low frequency modification penalty has been assessed. There were no noise measurements taken during the reporting period which required the penalty to be applied. The WML assessment for low frequency noise is shown in **Table 9** and the MTO assessment for low frequency noise is shown in **Table 10**.

Table 9: Warkworth Low Frequency Noise Assessment – June 2021

Location	Date and Time	Measured WML LAeq dB	Criterion Applies?	Intermittency Modifying Factor?	Tonality Modifying Factor?	Frequency of Tonality ¹	Low-frequency Modifying Factor?	Maximum Exceedance of Reference Spectrum ^{1,2}	Penalty dB ²	Exceedance
Bulga RFS	1/06/2021 23:10	<30	Yes	No	No	NA	No	NA	Nil	NA
Bulga Village	1/06/2021 22:25	32	Yes	No	No	NA	No	NA	Nil	NA
Gouldsville	1/06/2021 21:38	IA	Yes	No	No	NA	No	NA	Nil	NA
Inlet Rd	1/06/2021 21:36	32	Yes	No	No	NA	No	NA	Nil	NA
Inlet Rd West	1/06/2021 21:15	25	Yes	No	No	NA	No	NA	Nil	NA
Long Point	1/06/2021 21:13	IA	No	No	No	NA	No	NA	Nil	NA
South Bulga	1/06/2021 23:50	28	Yes	No	No	NA	No	NA	Nil	NA
Wambo Road	1/06/2021 22:02	30	Yes	No	No	NA	No	NA	Nil	NA

Notes:

1. NA denotes 'not applicable'; and

2. Bold results indicate that application of NPfI modifying factor/s is required.

Table 10: Mount Thorley Operations Low Frequency Noise Assessment – June 2021

Location	Date and Time	Measured WML LAeq dB	Criterion Applies?	Intermittency Modifying Factor?	Tonality Modifying Factor?	Frequency of Tonality ¹	Low-frequency Modifying Factor?	Maximum Exceedance of Reference Spectrum ^{1,2}	Penalty dB ²	Exceedance
Bulga RFS	1/06/2021 23:10	<30	Yes	No	No	NA	No	NA	Nil	NA
Bulga Village	1/06/2021 22:25	IA	Yes	No	No	NA	No	NA	Nil	NA
Gouldsville	1/06/2021 21:38	IA	Yes	No	No	NA	No	NA	Nil	NA
Inlet Rd	1/06/2021 21:36	IA	Yes	No	No	NA	No	NA	Nil	NA
Inlet Rd West	1/06/2021 21:15	IA	Yes	No	No	NA	No	NA	Nil	NA
Long Point	1/06/2021 21:13	IA	No	No	No	NA	No	NA	Nil	NA
South Bulga	1/06/2021 23:50	IA	Yes	No	No	NA	No	NA	Nil	NA
Wambo Road	1/06/2021 22:02	IA	Yes	No	No	NA	No	NA	Nil	NA

Notes:

1. NA denotes 'not applicable'; and

2. Bold results indicate that application of NPfI modifying factor/s is required.




Figure 70: Noise Monitoring Location Plan

5.2 Noise Management Measures

A program of targeted supplementary attended noise monitoring is in place at MTW, supported by the real-time directional monitoring network and ensuring the highest level of noise management is maintained. The supplementary program is undertaken by MTW personnel and involves:

- Routine inspections from both inside and outside the mine boundary;
- Routine and as-required handheld noise assessments (undertaken in response to noise alarm and/or community complaint), comparing measured levels against consent noise limits; and
- Validation monitoring following operational modifications to assess the adequacy of the modifications.

Where a noise assessment identifies noise emissions which are exceeding the relevant noise limit(s) for any particular residence, modifications will be made so as to ensure that the noise event is resolved within 75 minutes of identification. The actions taken are commensurate with the nature and severity of the noise event, but can include:

- Changing the haul route to a less noise sensitive haul;
- Changing dump locations (in-pit or less exposed dump option)
- Reducing equipment numbers;
- Shut down of task; or
- Site shut down.

A summary of these assessments undertaken during June are provided in **Table 11**.

Table 11: Supplementary Attended Noise Monitoring Data – June 2021

No. of assessments	No. of assessments > trigger	No. of nights where assessments > trigger	% greater than trigger
667	8	6	1.2

: Measurements are taken under all meteorological conditions, including conditions under which the consent noise criteria do not apply.

6.0 OPERATIONAL DOWNTIME

During June a total of 86 hours of equipment downtime was logged in response to environmental events such as dust, noise and elevated wind impacts. Operational downtime by equipment type is shown in **Figure 71**.




Figure 71: Operational Downtime by Equipment Type – June 2021

7.0 REHABILITATION

During June, 2.4 Ha of land was released for rehabilitation and 5.2 Ha was bulk shaped. Year-to-date progress can be viewed in **Figure 72**.




Figure 72: Rehabilitation YTD – June 2021

8.0 ENVIRONMENTAL INCIDENTS

There was no environmental incident recorded during the reporting period.

9.0 COMPLAINTS

During the reporting period 6 complaints were received, details of these complaints are displayed in **Table 12** below.

Table 12: Complaints Summary - YTD June 2021

	Noise	Dust	Blast	Lighting	Other	Total
January	1	0	6	4	1	12
February	4	0	3	0	0	7
March	5	0	3	3	1	12
April	6	2	1	10	0	19
May	3	1	10	5	0	19
June	2	0	4	0	0	6
July						
August						
September						
October						
November						
December						
Total	21	3	27	22	2	75

Appendix A: Meteorological Data

Table 13: Meteorological Data – Charlton Ridge Meteorological Station – June 2021

Date	Air Temperature Maximum (°C)	Air Temperature Minimum (°C)	Relative Humidity Maximum (%)	Relative Humidity Minimum (%)	Wind Direction Average (°)	Wind Speed Average (m/sec)	Rainfall(mm)
1/06/2021	19	1	98	40	263	2.0	0.0
2/06/2021	22	3	95	30	194	1.7	0.0
3/06/2021	12	4	99	74	217	1.4	16.0
4/06/2021	20	6	97	42	291	3.8	0.0
5/06/2021	17	1	97	43	262	2.0	0.0
6/06/2021	18	1	91	34	262	2.6	0.0
7/06/2021	19	-1	97	33	264	1.8	0.0
8/06/2021	19	1	98	47	212	2.0	17.0
9/06/2021	12	2	98	58	301	4.0	1.2
10/06/2021	8	2	98	75	233	2.2	12.8
11/06/2021	13	0	96	56	311	4.4	0.0
12/06/2021	16	3	86	44	312	4.4	0.0
13/06/2021	17	3	92	42	306	3.2	0.0
14/06/2021	16	0	97	41	270	1.8	0.0
15/06/2021	18	0	95	41	268	1.8	0.0
16/06/2021	20	0	98	43	203	1.4	2.0
17/06/2021	16	5	97	42	300	4.8	0.0
18/06/2021	17	5	82	47	306	4.0	0.0
19/06/2021	16	4	82	46	248	4.7	0.6
20/06/2021	16	7	87	57	171	5.2	0.2
21/06/2021	18	4	94	46	166	3.4	0.0
22/06/2021	19	3	98	52	159	2.1	0.2
23/06/2021	16	3	99	66	180	1.1	0.0
24/06/2021	20	7	94	50	289	3.4	0.0
25/06/2021	19	6	95	42	300	3.0	0.2
26/06/2021	18	4	92	41	300	3.1	0.0
27/06/2021	17	1	93	35	277	2.9	0.0
28/06/2021	18	1	94	53	209	1.9	0.0
29/06/2021	17	5	98	67	163	3.3	2.6
30/06/2021	18	5	98	67	172	2.7	0.2