

	<b>Comments from submissions</b>
	traditional owners where necessary. <<yes Howard it does give such right provided they agree to Matthew's drafting>>

**NLC 47** – The NLC will be consulted in accordance with the terms of the Land Access Agreement between the NLC and APT.

**5.3.1. Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP)**

**5.3.2. Operations Environmental Management Plan (OEMP)**

**5.4. Monitoring and Reporting Strategies**

## 6. HEALTH AND SAFETY PROGRAM

## **7. RISK ASSESSMENT AND EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT PLANS**

### **7.1. Risk Assessment**

***7.1.1. Project Execution Risk Assessment***

***7.1.2. AS2885 Risk Assessment***

***7.1.3. Construction Risk Assessment***

***7.1.4. Operations Risk Assessment***

***7.1.5. Decommissioning***

### **7.2. Emergency Management Plan**

***7.2.1. Construction Emergency Management Plan***

***7.2.2. Operations Emergency Management Plan***

## 8. PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT AND CONSULTATION

### 8.1. Stakeholders

### 8.2. Processes Undertaken

### 8.3. Indigenous Consultations

### 8.4. Consultation Outcomes

	Comments from submissions
DHCS 04 Comments	<b>Appendix J – Consultation log</b> DHCS must be included in the log in relation to “seeking agreement and/or signoff of all appropriate licences/permits”. The current log refers to NRETA only. It must be noted that DHCS is the main regulatory authority in relation to waste disposal (landfill and sewage), accommodation (staff), food safety, potable water and public health nuisances.

**DHCS 04** – Noted.

## APPENDIX B

### Draft Construction Environmental Management Plan

	Comments from submissions
NLC 48 Comments	<p><b>Alignment, Access and Site Selection – Management Strategy</b> Where there is reference to “additional work areas” and “new access tracks”, <i>p14 of 67</i>, it is unclear whether these are references to areas and tracks not yet a part of the Project but which are anticipated as being possibly required during construction or whether the terms refer to work areas and tracks already identified following route survey in late 2006. Clarification would be helpful.</p> <p>Reference to <i>“where road construction material is required, borrow material will be sourced from...a new site established within the 100m study corridor...”</i> needs to note that, in relation to Land Trust land, an agreement with the Land Trust for any such sourcing of material would be necessary for all such proposed extractions.</p>
NLC 49 Comments	<p><b>Pipe Laying and Backfilling – Management Strategy</b> Reference to <i>“where padding material cannot be provided from trench spoil, weed free borrow material will be sourced from...a new site established within the 100m study corridor...”</i> needs to note that, in relation to Land Trust land, an agreement with the Land Trust for any such sourcing of material would be necessary for all such proposed extractions</p>
NLC 50 Comments	<p><b>Clean Up and Rehabilitation – Management Strategy &amp; Erosion Management – Management Strategy</b> Reference is made to the development of <i>“a construction timetable which provides for clean-up and reinstatement to be able to be fully completed by the time the pipeline is commissioned – i.e before the commencement of the wet season” p27 of 67</i></p> <p>Reference is also made to <i>“The timing of construction to occur predominantly in the dry season minimising likelihood of construction sedimentation events...Rehabilitation to be scheduled to be completed prior to the first storms of the wet season”.p35 of 67</i></p> <p>There does not appear to be any actual proposed construction timetable against which the time frame necessary for clean up and reinstatement prior to the onset of either the “first storms” or the “wet season” can be gauged. What is the proposed timetable and what is the proposed date for commencement of clean-up and reinstatement?</p> <p>In the event that, irrespective of timetable, the first storms commence and or the wet season arrives ahead of completion of construction what then is the plan for erosion control?</p>
NLC 51 Comments	<p><b>Fire Management – Management Strategy</b> Reference is made to <i>“Burning of timber and vegetation stockpiles will be avoided (brush spreading is preferred). If burning should be required, permits must be obtained from the Bush Fires Council prior to carrying out any such activity.” P44 of 67</i></p> <p>There will be no burning of timber and vegetation stockpiles on Land Trust land and it is not an acceptable proposal for those with native title interests in the proposed route.</p>

**NLC 48** – Additional work areas and new access tracks which were surveyed during the surveys on 2006 and earlier will be located in accordance with these criteria, most of which were assessed in the field. If areas required for the Project have not been surveyed, they will be subject to survey prior to any works being undertaken on those areas, in conjunction with the relevant stakeholders, including NLC.

**NLC 48; NLC 49** - Extraction of material from within the 100m survey area will still be subject to negotiation with the relevant landholder and the NLC where appropriate, in addition to licences and permits required under NT legislation.

**NLC 50** – A Project Schedule was provided in Table 2-5 on p21 of the PER (See below). A very detailed construction program is being developed for the Project. Clean-up and reinstatement will be undertaken progressively so that the works are completed in good time and cost-effectively, and the reinstatement crew does not lag behind and require additional servicing, equipment and return visits.

Monitoring and corrective actions were addressed in each of the sub-plans to the Draft CEMP. Erosion control is a prime concern for the Project and will receive serious attention.

**Table 0-5: Project Schedule**

<b>Item</b>	<b>Timing</b>
Completion of Approvals	July 2007
Notice of Intent to Northern Territory Government	7 July 2006
Issue of Assessment Level and Guidelines	October 2006
Conduct of PER Studies	July 2006 – February 2007
Issue of PER for Public Comment	19 March 2007
Supplement to PER	May 2007
Northern Territory Government Approval	June 2007
DEH Approval	July 2007
Pipeline Licence Issued	August/September 2007
Financial Close	July 2007
Early works (e.g. geotechnical investigations)	September 2007
Construction Commence	2Q2008 - ~ 5 months duration
Commissioning Commences	4Q2008 – 1 month duration
First Gas Flow (commissioning)	4Q2008
First Gas Supply	1 January 2009

**NLC 51** – Burning is not proposed as it is intended to return the vegetation across the cleared construction corridor.

## APPENDIX D

### Road Use Management Plan

	Comments from submissions
NLC 52 Comments	<p><b>Project Description</b></p> <p>The expectation that vehicle movements won't create issues for overtaking is absurd in relation to all vehicle movements utilising the unsealed Daly River to Wadeye main road.</p> <p>Any vehicle utilising this road creates an overtaking issue if there is speed differential. It is not possible to overtake with any safety when the dust emitted makes it impossible to see. Whether the vehicle is a 4WD or a truck it emits dust such that vehicles travelling behind cannot overtake. Trucks travel more slowly than other vehicles but all vehicle travel in one direction is limited to the speed of the vehicle in front.</p> <p>Safety and inconvenience to other road users are major issues.</p> <p>There is no evidence that dust suppression activities are planned at all in relation to the Daly/Wadeye main road. The only reference to dust suppression and water requirements associated with it are in relation to temporary construction access tracks and the construction corridor.</p> <p>The PER must address dust suppression on the Daly/Wadeye main road. It must identify who will be responsible for dust suppression and identify the methods to be used. The quantity of water required for dust suppression on this road, and its source needs to be identified in the PER.</p> <p>The PER needs to acknowledge that activity on the Daly/Wadeye road will not be simply limited to normal road-use and additional use associated with BGP but that there will be significant increase in road-use associated with construction activity at the Blacktip Plant at Yeltcherr Beach near Wadeye.</p>
NLC 53 Comments	<p><b>Public</b></p> <p>The list supplied simply ignores the reality that none of the minimisation techniques addresses a dirt road situation where that road is a public main road servicing a number of communities, and where there is no alternate route for 178kms. Further, it is not simply a matter of potential disruption but a significant safety issue that must be addressed properly and in detail.</p> <p>There is no evidence that the proponent has given any consideration to the physical reality associated with the road and access conditions that will apply, rather, what is presented here as a road use management plan appears little more than a standard template designed from and in relation to somewhere else.</p> <p>The Social Impact Assessment carried out early in 2004, in relation to the then proposed Trans Territory Pipeline identified the risk of increase in injury and death during the construction period. "<b>Potential Disruption</b>" to the public is the term used in the BGP PER to describe road use impacts on local users. The NLC considers the numerous large and other vehicle movements required for the BGP and ongoing construction at the Blacktip Gas Plant as likely to create a real risk of road accidents involving local drivers unless there is in place a detailed Road Use Management Plan that identifies the problem and provides appropriate measures to address it.</p>
App B Draft CEMP	<p><b>NTP 03</b></p> <p>That should any suspected human remains be unearthed or located during works that the Police be immediately notified and that the remains are not disturbed until all necessary investigations are complete.</p>

**NLC 52** – The RUMP is being revised and will be reissued shortly.

**NLC 53** – As above.

**NTP 03** – Noted, and this requirement will be recorded in the RUMP.



## APPENDIX I

### Operational Management Plan

	Comments from submissions
<b>NLC 54 Comments</b>	<p><b>Operational Management Plan</b> The NLC would prefer to see a draft Operational Management Plan that was specific to the BGP rather than a plan specific to somewhere else.</p>
<b>NLC 55 Comments</b>	<p><b>Framework</b> The list of legislation and other requirements for environmental management omits reference to the Aboriginal Land Rights (Northern Territory) Act 1976 and omits reference to environmental management requirements that may be contained in an agreement with the Land Trust, under that Act.</p>
<b>NLC 56 Comments</b>	<p><b>Access to Pipeline Right of Way</b> The Operational Environment Management Plan lists a range of “<b>control measures</b>” to address the identified potential impact but these measures appear more as statements of intent or a ‘wish list’ in that there is no detail provided as to how any proposed measure is intended to be implemented or policed.</p> <p>Given the relative remoteness of the ROW there would appear potential for substantial unauthorised access and use of the ROW with limited current local capacity for policing any access restrictions.</p> <p>Unauthorised access along the pipeline alignment would be a concern for traditional owners.</p>

**NLC 54** – An operational management plan will be prepared prior to the commencement of operation, which will address the unique requirements of the BGP. However, the NT Gas Plan submitted is very indicative of the issues addressed in Operations plans, as pipeline operations have many standard issues, and must all conform to the Australian Standard AS2885.3.

**NLC 55** – Noted

**NLC 56** – The form of tenure sought and given from landowners, including Traditional Owners, does not give the pipeline proponent rights to impede access to the pipeline construction corridor other than those expressly provided for under the *Energy Pipeline Act*. However, section 66 of the *Energy Pipelines Act* prevents interference with the pipeline without the permission of the licensee, and therefore limits activity over the pipeline.