No.	General		
1	Proposed	It is understood the proposed amendment seeks the following:	Noted – No updates to the application required.
	Amendments	Authorise the surface disturbances for the following approved	
		infrastructure that will result in impacts to Environmentally Sensitive areas	
		(ESA), ESA buffers and Prescribed Environmental Matters (PEMs)	
		o 39 wells;	
		o Pipeline corridors;	
		o Access tracks;	
		o Laydown areas;	
		o Temporary camps and sewage treatment plants and irrigation;	
		o Surveys;	
		o Communication systems; and	
		o Incidental petroleum activities.	
		Proposed condition amendments:	
		Administrative amendments to update current editions of environmental	
		protection regulation;	
		Administrative amendments to remove conditions no longer required to	
		be authorised under this EA due to de-amalgamation;	
		Amend ESA table (Schedule D Table 2) and PEMs table (Schedule D	
		Table 3) and related conditions;	
2	Application of	Section 139 of the Environmental Protection Act 1994 (EP Act) states that an	Noted – No updates to the application required.
	s139 and s150	information request does not apply in particular circumstances.	
	of the	Section 139 (2) states that section 139 applies only if, the matters mentioned in section 125(1)(I) have	
	Environmental	been provided to the administering authority (whether with the application, through the EIS or in	
	Protection Act	another way).	
	1994.	The Department of Environment and Science (the department) considers that information required by	
		section 125(1)(I) has not been previously provided (whether through the EIS or other) in relation to the	
		proposed amendments. As such, the information request will apply to the proposed amendment,	
		provided the assessment level decision is that the amendment is a major amendment.	
		Section 150 of the EP Act states that public notification does not apply in particular circumstances.	
		Section 150(1)(c) states that section 150 applies if: since the EIS, the environmental risks of the relevant	
		activity and the way it will be carried out have not changed; or the administering authority is satisfied	
		the change would not be likely to attract a submission objecting to the change.	
		The department considers that the environmental risks of the relevant activity had changed and that	
		the change may attract a submission objecting to the changed.	
		As such, provided the assessment level decision for the proposed amendment is a major amendment,	
		then public notification will be required.	
3	Proposed	It is recommended spatial data for disturbance is provided as part of the application.	Noted. Acknowledge this may be addressed through the processing of the
	disturbances	The proposed amendment seeks authorisation for disturbance to Prescribed Environmental Matters	application.
	and	and Environmentally Sensitive Areas (PEMs and ESAs).	
	infrastructure		
4	Environmental	Biodiversity and ESA values have been provided, however other environmental values (EVs) have not	Arrow have updated section 5 to also include the values not expected to be
	Values	been provided. Arrow are currently not authorised for the extent of clearing proposed in this	impacted by this amendment application.
		application. Clearing presents dust, noise, water and land impacts that have not yet been discussed. To	process of the control of the contro
		satisfy the requirements for a properly made application further detail is required on EVs or provide a	
		statement and sufficient justification that there will be no impacts to environmental values.	
		The same same same passing and there will be no impacts to environmental values.	
	1	L	I .

5	Offsets mitigation hierarchy	Justification on how the offsets mitigation hierarchy has been applied in determining the location of disturbance. Justification must be presented in a detailed and considered way to support the proposed amendment on how the avoid and mitigate measures have been applied.	Section 1.3 has been updated to clarify that PL194 includes the State Forest, and the tenure is awarded subject to meeting obligations included in a development plan approved by DoR. Arrow have updated section 6.4 to include examples of where the hierarchy has been implemented. Section 7.3 explains that some clearing of remnant vegetation is required to enable the resource to be brought to surface.
6	Specific statements	Please ensure specific statements are provided to justify amendments and to support biodiversity impact conclusions. For example the use of 'Limited' when referring to the presence of habitat features or 'small' when referring to impact areas. As a further example, the following statement referenced in the supporting information by Ecosmart (2017) does not provide information relevant to the current status of the site and the matters that require protection: "While, on balance, the State Forests have retained greater conservation value than vegetation on freehold land, the future of these areas may be affected by changes to fire regime. Within the last 10 years, three extremely hot fires have affected large expanses of State Forest within the SGP study area, and in the case of Kumbarilla State Forest on more than one occasionThese hot fires can cause significant damage to the canopy and vegetation composition (by removing fire-sensitive species). It is likely the vegetation will take many decades to fully recover after a significant wildfire. The frequency and intensity of wildfires are predicted to increase due to climate change (Williams et al. 2001), possibly leading to possible broad-scale vegetation changes." This comment does not identify whether fires have occurred in Dalby State Forest, to what extent there are damages, whether there are habitat features remaining such as tree hollows etc. Note: the definition of habitat according to the Nature Conservation Act 1992 states 'habitat of wildlife includes an area that is not presently occupied by the wildlife.'	Noted – are unable to request a third party amend a comment in their report.
7	Biodiversity 8B	Table 2 – Maximum significant disturbance in environmentally sensitive areas and their protection zones is not a 'despite' table. The wording of this condition and table requires compliance with both Table 1 and Table 2. Therefore, this current table is not providing authorisation for the disturbance. Impacts to environmentally sensitive areas (ESAs) must be quantified per ESA trigger in the application so that specific authorisation, 'despite' Table 1, can be provided (example provided below). Despite condition xx activity may be located in << environmentally sensitive areas and/or their primary and/or their secondary protection zones>> as specified in Table X – Petroleum activity exemptions in environmentally sensitive areas. Table X – Petroleum activity exemptions in environmentally sensitive areas	Noted - Arrow are seeking an alternative to the coordinate approach through this amendment application. Section 7.3 has been updated to clarify the history of Schedule D, Table 2.

		etroleum activity	exemptions in	n environme	ntally		
		eas Description of Infrastructure	Max Disturbance footprint	ESA Protection Zone	Coordinates		
	e.g.,	.g., Sas Trunkline – Alfred FCS to Petrie Creek CPP	(ha)	e.g., PPZ and SPZ of Category B ESA	e.g., -26.289358, 149.720436 -26.29579, 149.7563		
	zone as 0 ha for As the activities maximum foot petroleum activ amendment is Additionally, ca	r impacts in Cat E s authorised und orint in schedule vities, have occur not retrospective n context be pro	ESAs, Cat B proper Biodiversity & D, Table 2, provered within the law seeking approvided as to why	otection zone. BA and Schedo ride confirmate ESAs and protoval. Cat B ESAs an	s Cat C ESAs and ule D, Table 1 maion that no implection zones would protection zones	ESAs and their protection Cat C protection zones. Ist not exceed the acts, including essential thin PL194 to date and this one of Cat B ESAs and diment to table 2.	
Biodiversity 8C	The proposed condition links ESAs and PEMs. While there are some cross-overs between ESAs and MSES, they have different definitions and are not considered like for like. ESAs and PEMs are not translatable, therefore this is not an appropriate proposal. The department does not support this proposed amendment.					Noted.	
Protecting biodiversity values, Table 3 — Significant residual impacts to prescribed environmental matters	Protecting biodiversity values, Table 3 — Significant residual impacts to prescribed environmental matters: o Needs to reflect and make clear to what extent SRIs have already been authorised and undertaken. o Include areas that are to be offset. Where seeking impacts to MSES, ensure all MSESs are identified and quantified, regardless of whether a significant residual impact (SRI) is considered likely. The current table identifying SRI to PEMs should be replaced with a table that confirms what MSES impacts have been authorised (example template provided below). Include detailed justification for each removal or amendment of areas of impact from PL194 from what is currently approved in Table 3.					Add to Section 8 of the Supporting Information Report has been updated clarify prior impacts were undertaken under a broader EA which was subsequently de-amalgamated. Any updates or amendments to the draft SRI report can be provided post approval of this amendment, and in accordance with existing condition Biodiversity 14.	

	_							T
		Prescribed environmental m Impacts to matters of State en activity must only occur within Authorised impacts to MSES. Table X – Authorised impact	vironmental significand the locations and to th	ce (MSES) <u>as a re</u>	sult of carrying out		
		Matters of State environmental significance	Location of impact	Signi ficant resid ual impa ct	Off set Req uire d	Maximum extent of impact of total area on site		
		REGULATED VEGETATION						
		Endangered regional ecosystem – insert RE ID	Insert reference to map to be attached to the EA as an appendix showing locations and areas of residual impacts OR Insert coordinates OR Insert lot on plan, resource authorities or project areas.	Yes/ No	Yes/ No	X ha of Y total site ha		
		Of concern regional ecosystem (not within an urban area) – insert RE ID	as per above	Yes/ No	Yes/ No	X ha of Y total site ha		
		Regional ecosystems (not within an urban area) that intersect a wetland on the vegetation management wetlands map – insert RE ID	as per above	Yes/ No	Yes/ No	X ha of Y total site ha		
10	Removal of conditions no longer required under this EA	An area of essential Additional details are not required and there	•			emoval of the	Arrow have reviewed and confirmed Section 4 of the Supporting Information Report refers to Attachment 3 which contains the detailed justification for each amendment.	
11	Table 9: Impacts to Environmental ly Sensitive Areas	Clarification is needed on the methodology used to determine ESAs anticipated to be impacted in Table 9 Impacts to Environmentally Sensitive Areas in the supporting report.						Section 7.1 has been updated to clarify that Environmentally Sensitive Areas (ESAs) have been determined in accordance with the existing EA which defines Category A, B and C ESAs. Section 7.3 has been updated to clarify the methodology for determining anticipated impacts to ESAs.
12	Quantifying existing and proposed impacts	Section 1.1.2 and 2.4.3 of the Queensland Environmental Offset Policy states that when an amendment to an existing authority is proposed, the significant residual impact assessment relates to the cumulative impacts of the entire project. i.e. impacts proposed in both the existing authority and any additional impacts proposed in the amendment. Provide details (including total area of disturbance) of all PEMs that have been impacted to date.						See item 9.

		A SRI assessment should consider the existing impacts to each PEM and the proposed impacts to each PEM for the significant residual impact assessment.	
		Identify the extent of SRI already undertaken under PL194 and when they were approved and the estimated SRI as per condition Biodiversity 14 of the EA.	
13	Acceptable impacts to MSES	The supporting information includes a brief summary of avoidance and minimisation. Mitigation measures are detailed in the Species Impact Management Plan. The supporting information should also include:	Additional information has been provided in Section 8.1
	Wide	 For each PEM that is proposed to be impacted you must demonstrate: a) that the impact is an acceptable impact (for example, an impact would not be considered reasonable or acceptable if it proposed to clear the last remaining habitat of a critically endangered species); and b) that the impact is necessary. Provide reasoning for how the benefits of those impacts outweigh the ecological disturbances. 	
		2. Where an offset is proposed, land-based or financial. You must demonstrate that it is feasible for an offset to be delivered. Even when a financial offset is proposed, these funds are provided to the department, in which the department must undertake the offset. It must be feasible for a land-based offset to be delivered for the proposed impact and PEM. A significant residual impact on a PEM may not be authorised if there is realistically no locations left to provide the offset.	
14	Protected Wildlife	Flora and fauna Survey efforts Attachment 5: The Terrestrial Ecology Report (EcoSmart 2017) references flora and fauna assessments	Responses have been added to Section 6.1 of the Supporting Information Report to clarify the dates and methodology for surveys which have addressed
	Habitat	within or in close proximity to Surat Gas Project study area being conducted in 2009, 2011, 2013 and 2014.	the entire footprint. Further details on targeted surveys are provided in the EcoSmart Report.
		 Provide further details of these flora and fauna surveys including any reports; Confirm whether the fauna surveys meet the Guideline: Terrestrial Vertebrate Fauna Survey Guidelines for Queensland, and if not, provide justification for alternative methods used; 	
		 Confirm the dates the flora and fauna surveys were conducted; Confirm the extent of survey efforts undertaken relevant to the proposed activity locations associated with this amendment. 	
		• The department notes that the most recent survey efforts are 6 years old in the Ecosmart 2017 report. There is mention in the Significant Residual Impacts to Prescribed Environmental Matters Report that	
		ecological assessments were undertaken in 2018, 2019 and 2021 for the SGP area. Provide details on these assessments related to the area of proposed disturbance; • Describe any targeted species surveys conducted. There is mention in the supporting report that, Arrow has surveyed poorly 280 has on PL104, split between Secondary Site Validation. Flora and Fauna.	
		Arrow has surveyed nearly 280 ha on PL194, split between Secondary, Site Validation, Flora and Fauna surveys, Koala surveys (240 trees) and Protected Plant Surveys (approx. 7 hours). Supply details on these surveys.	
15		Connectivity Section 8.3 of the Supporting Report states that the Landscape Fragmentation and Connectivity (LFC) tool determined 98.98ha of impact, however no SRI on connectivity areas. Supporting information is required to justify how connectivity has not been determined an SRI for PL194.	Section 8.3 has been updated to confirm the background to how the connectivity analysis has changed since this EA was deamalgamated.
16		 Table 1 ESA Potential Impacts and Key Management Practices Key management practices in Table 10 for direct disturbance of an ESA of protection zone has that: Prior to undertaking activities that result in significant disturbance to land, an ecological survey to confirm on ground biodiversity values will be undertaken by a suitably qualified person. Ground truthing surveys of ESAs are required for all remnant vegetation and essential habitat regardless of the level of disturbance. 	Noted
17		Species list The following endangered and vulnerable species identified in a WildNet species search have not been considered: • White-throated Needletail	Additional detail has been provided in section 8.1

		Major Mitchell Cockatoo	
		These species need to be included in the ecological assessment and addressed in the SRI to PEMs report in accordance with Condition Biodiversity 14 of the EA or justification provided on why they have been excluded.	
18	Section 7	Checked:	Forms updated
	Amendment options	Locations – removal/addition of activity location Section 7 and Section 10 answers contradict each other.	
19	Section 10	Checked:	Forms updated
	Amend	No - for Amend locations	
	location(s)	Section 7 and Section 10 answers contradict each other.	
20	Section 17	Checked:	Forms updated
	Regional	Yes - for Regional interest area	
	interest areas	Please check and clarify this answer.	
21	Section 20	Checked:	Forms updated
	Environmental	No - for Has the EIS assessment report lapsed under section 59A of the EP Act.	
	impact	Please clarify how this answer meets the requirements under section 59A of the	
	statement	EP Act.	
	(EIS)		
22	GHG	The application should include an assessment of greenhouse gas emissions associated with the	No additional impact requested on GHG. The overall number of wells is less
	Assessment	proposed amendment.	than already approved on the EA.
		The department has released a draft Greenhouse Gas Emissions Guideline.	
		While this guideline is in 'draft', this guideline does not have to be satisfied, however it can be used to	
		identify what information can be provided.	