

1.0 State Development Assessment Provisions

1.1 Introduction

The State Development Assessment Provisions (SDAP) sets out the matters of interest to the State for development assessment, where the chief executive administering the *Sustainable Planning Act 2009*, being the Director-General of the Department, is responsible for assessing or deciding development applications.

The latest version of SDAP is version 1.9 with a date of commencement on 22 July 2016. Table 1.1 provides the SDAP modules and their applicability to the Coopers Gap Wind Farm (the Project).

Table 1.1 SDAP modules and applicability to the Project

SDAP module	Applicability to the Project	Commentary
Module 1. Community amenity	Not applicable	This module relates to managing noise, vibration, air and lighting impacts from transport corridors.
Module 2. Regional plans	Not applicable	This module was previously applied to the assessment of applications for reconfiguration of a lot to which the South East Queensland State Planning Regulatory Policy (SEQ SPRP) applies. However, the prescribed matter specified in schedule 5 of the Sustainable Planning Regulation 2009 for these applications is the SEQ SPRP. As such, development applications for reconfiguration of a lot to which the SEQ SPRP applies must be assessed against the SEQ SPRP, not SDAP, and this module has consequently been deleted.
Module 3. Aquaculture	Not applicable	This module relates to aquaculture industry development and practices.
Module 4. Environmentally relevant activities	Applicable	The Project will require a borrow pit which will trigger ERA 16 for extractive and screening activities.
Module 5. Fisheries resource	Applicable	It is likely that access roads to accommodate construction and maintenance of plant machinery may traverse water features in the area.
Module 6. Strategic cropping land (SCL)	Not applicable	Module deleted due to the removal of the integrated development assessment system referral triggers relating to SCL. The Sustainable Planning Regulation 2009 was amended on 13 June 2014 to remove all referral triggers in Schedule 7, table 3, relating to particular development on SCL or potential SCL.
Module 7. Water resources	Applicable	The Project Site contains watercourses which are likely to be affected by temporary and/or permanent works.
Module 8. Native vegetation clearing	Applicable	The Project will require the taking of protected plants and will interfere with protected fauna including breeding places.
Module 9. Queensland heritage	Applicable	All development must be assessed against the assessment criteria in this module.
Module 10. Coastal protection	Not applicable	The Project does not involve tidal works or development in the coastal management district.
Module 11. Wetland protection	Not applicable	The Project is not located in a wetland protection area.
Module 12. Unexploded ordnance (UXO)	Not applicable	The Project is not located in an area for which an area management advice has been given for substantial UXO potential.

SDAP module	Applicability to the Project	Commentary
Module 13. Major hazard facilities	Not applicable	The Project is not classified as a major hazard facility
Module 14. Maritime safety	Not applicable	The Project is not related to maritime safety
Module 15. Airports	Not applicable	This module was previously applied to the assessment of applications on airport land. However, the prescribed matter specified in schedule 5 of the Sustainable Planning Regulation 2009 for these applications is the <i>Airport Assets (Restructuring and Disposal) Act 2008</i> (under which the Cairns Airport Land Use Plan and Mackay Airport Land Use Plan are made). As such, development applications on airport land must be assessed against the <i>Airport Assets (Restructuring and Disposal) Act 2008</i> , not SDAP, and this module has consequently been deleted.
Module 16. Particular dams	Not applicable	The Project does not contain any dams
Module 17. Public passenger transport	Not applicable	The Project will not interfere with public passenger transport
Module 18. State transport infrastructure protection	Not applicable	The Project will use state transport corridors to deliver components of the wind farm to the site; however, a referral concerning this module will not be triggered under Schedule 7 of the <i>Sustainable Planning Regulation 2009</i> .
Module 19. State transport network functionality	Not applicable	The Project will use state transport corridors to deliver components of the wind farm to the site; however, a referral concerning this module will not be triggered under Schedule 7 of the <i>Sustainable Planning Regulation 2009</i> .
Module 20. Wind farm development	Applicable	The Project is seeking a material change of use for a new wind farm

The following sections outline the performance outcomes of the applicable SDAP modules and provide the relevant section of the EIS that demonstrates compliance.

2.0 Module 4- Environmentally relevant activities

2.1 Concurrence environmentally relevant activities state code

Performance Outcomes	Coopers Gap Compliance with the SDAP Performance Outcomes	Relevant section(s) of the EIS that demonstrate compliance
Site suitability		
<p>PO1 The choice of the site at which the activity is to be carried out minimises serious environmental harm on areas of high conservation value and special significance, and sensitive land uses at adjacent places.</p>	<p>The Project Site and Study Area has been assessed through desktop and on-site surveys to determine the likely impacts to flora and fauna, and the required mitigation measures to manage those impacts.</p> <p>The Project is located in a highly cleared landscape where much of the original vegetation and habitat has been removed for grazing and cropping. The Project Site largely avoids areas of ecological significance, which has been achieved through a process of site verification and design refinement.</p> <p>Decisions on the final location of infrastructure (micro-siting) during detailed design and construction will potentially allow for the further protection of species, habitat and features of localised conservation significance.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Chapter 2 Project Description, Section 2.3 Design considerations and refinement - Chapter 20 Project Commitments
Location of activity on the site		
<p>PO2 The location for the activity on the site protects all environmental values relevant to adjacent sensitive land uses.</p>	As per the response to PO1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Chapter 2 Project Description, Section 2.3 Design considerations and refinement - Chapter 20 Project Commitments
<p>PO3 The activity avoids adverse impacts on matters of state environmental significance or, where this is not reasonably possible, impacts are minimised and, where this is not reasonably possible, an environmental offset is provided for any significant residual impact to matters of state environmental matters that are prescribed environmental matters.</p>	<p>The biodiversity and ecological values and natural assets within the Study Area have been investigated in desktop and field based studies to understand any potential impact the Project may have on these values.</p> <p>The Project represents the efficient and environmentally sound provision of sustainable energy infrastructure. The Project has been designed and refined through a process of filtering possible impacts, such as impact on high value vegetation and geology, land usage patterns and efficient land use.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Chapter 2 Project Description, Section 2.3 Design considerations and refinement - Appendix E Preliminary Offset Strategy, Section 5.1.2 MSES

Performance Outcomes	Coopers Gap Compliance with the SDAP Performance Outcomes	Relevant section(s) of the EIS that demonstrate compliance
<p>PO4 Development avoids or minimises and offsets any adverse impacts on riparian areas and ecological corridors located in a strategic environmental area.</p>	<p>N/A The Project Site is not located within a strategic environmental area.</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>Critical design requirements</p>		
<p>PO5 The design of the facility at which the activity is to be carried out permits the activity to be carried out in accordance with best practice environmental management.</p>	<p>The Project follows the 'Avoidance', 'Mitigation' and 'Offset' principle, thus taking reasonable and practical measures to prevent or minimise harm. Avoidance has been achieved through the design refinement process detailed in Chapter 2 Project Description which has guided the alignment of the Project Site to avoid ecologically significant areas. In cases where avoidance is not possible, mitigation and management measures have been provided</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Chapter 2 Project Description, Section 2.3 Design considerations and refinement - Chapter 20 Project Commitments
<p>PO6 Development avoids or minimises any adverse impacts from pollutants on environmental values and water quality objectives for receiving waters (surface and groundwater) on site or leaving a site located in a strategic environmental area</p>	<p>N/A The Project Site is not located within a strategic environmental area.</p>	<p>N/A</p>

3.0 Module 5 – Fisheries resources

3.1 Constructing or raising waterway barrier works in fish habitats state code

Performance Outcomes	Coopers Gap Compliance with the SDAP Performance Outcomes	Relevant section(s) of the EIS that demonstrate compliance
All assessable waterway barrier works		
<p>PO1 The development will not increase the risk of mortality, <u>disease</u> or injury or compromise the health and productivity of <u>fisheries resources</u>.</p>	<p>The Project Site crosses a number of waterways that are identified under the Fisheries Act as providing fish passage. The creeks within the Study Area are identified as High (red), Moderate (amber), and Low (green). There are no Major (purple) creeks within the vicinity of the proposed works.</p> <p>The Project will aim to design creek crossings in accordance with the DAF self-assessable codes, which exist for low-impact development activities such as temporary works, bed level crossings and culverts on red, amber and green creeks. Where the design provisions of the codes cannot be met, a development approval will be sought. In complying with the self-assessable codes, the impact to fish passage is expected to be minimal.</p>	<p>- Chapter 14 Surface Water, Section 14.7 Mitigation Measures, Table 14.5</p>
<p>PO2 Development maintains or enhances the community access to fisheries resources and fish habitats, through for example fishing access and linkages between commercial fisheries and infrastructure, services and facilities.</p>	<p>As per response to PO1</p>	<p>- Chapter 14 Surface Water, Section 14.7 Mitigation Measures, Table 14.5</p>
<p>PO3 Development that has the potential to impact on the operations and productivity of commercial or recreational fisheries mitigates any adverse impacts due to adjustment of fisheries.</p> <p>Editor's note: The Guideline on fisheries adjustment provides advice for proponents on relevant fisheries adjustment processes and is available by request from the Department of Agriculture and Fisheries.</p>	<p>As per response to PO1</p>	<p>- Chapter 14 Surface Water, Section 14.7 Mitigation Measures, Table 14.5</p>

Performance Outcomes	Coopers Gap Compliance with the SDAP Performance Outcomes	Relevant section(s) of the EIS that demonstrate compliance
PO4 When the purpose of a waterway barrier is no longer relevant, or the design life of the structure is complete and the structure is not intended to be re-lifed, the waterway barrier will be removed.	As per response to PO1	- Chapter 14 Surface Water, Section 14.7 Mitigation Measures, Table 14.5
PO5 Development demonstrates appropriate rights and an overriding public need for the development, including consideration of any impacts beyond the footprint of the constructed development. Editor's note: For example, dams and weirs affect fish habitats up and downstream from the structure by pooling and restricting water flows.	As per response to PO1	- Chapter 14 Surface Water, Section 14.7 Mitigation Measures, Table 14.5
PO6 Development minimises stream crossings.	As per response to PO1	- Chapter 14 Surface Water, Section 14.7 Mitigation Measures, Table 14.5
PO7 Development avoids non-essential hardening or unnatural modification of channels.	As per response to PO1	- Chapter 14 Surface Water, Section 14.7 Mitigation Measures, Table 14.5
PO8 Impacts on water quality in declared <u>fish habitat</u> areas are minimised.	N/A The Project Site is not identified as a declared fish habitat area.	N/A
PO9 Development resulting in drainage or disturbance of acid sulfate soil is managed to prevent impacts on <u>fisheries resources</u> and <u>fish habitats</u> .	A desk based review of the Australian Soil Resource Information System (ASRIS) found the Study Area to have a 'low' to 'extremely low' potential for acid sulfate soils to occur.	- Chapter 16 Topography, Geology and Soils, Section 16.4.5 Contaminated land
All development – environmental offsets		
PO10 Impact to fish passage or legally secured offset areas for fish passage is avoided, or mitigated and an environmental offset is provided for any significant residual	The Project is declared a 'coordinated project' under the SDPWO Act for which an EIS is required to be submitted to the Coordinator-General. The Coordinator-General has the ability to condition environmental offsets as part of the EIS evaluation, and there is the requirement under	N/A

Performance Outcomes	Coopers Gap Compliance with the SDAP Performance Outcomes	Relevant section(s) of the EIS that demonstrate compliance
impact.	the Environmental Offsets Act to potentially provide offsets when obtaining an authority for a prescribed activity that has an SRI on a prescribed matter.	
Incorporation of fish ways		
PO11 Where the <u>waterway barrier works</u> will be a barrier to <u>fish</u> movement, provisions are made for adequate <u>fish</u> movement by incorporating a fish way or fish ways for the works.	As per response to PO1	- Chapter 14 Surface Water, Section 14.7 Mitigation Measures, Table 14.5
PO12 Any fish way proposed as part of the development is demonstrated to be a feasible and reliable solution that will provide adequate <u>fish</u> passage. Editor's note: Further information about the importance of fish passage and design considerations can be found in the book From sea to source: International guidance for the restoration of fish migration highways.	As per response to PO1	
PO13 Lateral (upstream and downstream) and longitudinal <u>fish</u> movement is provided for.	As per response to PO1	
PO14 Any <u>fish way</u> is capable of operating whenever there is flow in the <u>waterway</u> (inflow or release), the dam is above dead storage level, and the <u>fish way</u> will be operational for as long as the <u>waterway</u> barrier is in position.	As per response to PO1	
PO15 Any <u>fish way</u> , and all associated componentry are designed to be durable, reliable and adequately protected from damage from high flow and flood events, to prevent or minimise non-operation.	As per response to PO1	
PO16 Any <u>fish way</u> is located in a position and manner that maximise the attraction and movement of <u>fish</u> , while also enabling access	As per response to PO1	

Performance Outcomes	Coopers Gap Compliance with the SDAP Performance Outcomes	Relevant section(s) of the EIS that demonstrate compliance
for monitoring, maintenance and operating purposes.		
PO17 The seasonal and flow-related biomass of the <u>fish</u> community at the location of the <u>waterway barrier works</u> has been surveyed, and has been catered for in the design of the <u>fish way</u> .	As per response to PO1	
PO18 Fish ways and other means of <u>fish</u> passage at <u>waterway barrier works</u> cater for the whole <u>fish</u> community taking into account species, size classes, life-stages and swimming abilities.	As per response to PO1	
PO19 Development does not increase the risk of mortality, <u>disease</u> or injury, or compromise the health and productivity in <u>fish</u> .	As per response to PO1	
Inherent barrier design and provision of fish passage		
PO20 <u>Fish</u> passage is provided for: (1) in the inherent design of the waterway barrier works (2) over the in-situ life of the barrier in that position through adequate construction and maintenance of the barrier.	As per response to PO1	- Chapter 14 Surface Water, Section 14.7 Mitigation Measures, Table 14.5
PO21 The use of floodgates is avoided or minimised.	As per response to PO1	
PO22 <u>Waterway</u> barriers that are bridges are designed, constructed and maintained to provide adequate <u>fish</u> passage for the site and: (1) fish passage is provided for the life of the crossing (2) hydraulic conditions (depth, velocities and turbulence) from the downstream to the	As per response to PO1	

Performance Outcomes	Coopers Gap Compliance with the SDAP Performance Outcomes	Relevant section(s) of the EIS that demonstrate compliance
<p>upstream limit of the structure allow for fish passage of all fish attempting to move through the crossing at all flows up to the drownout of the structure.</p> <p>Editor's note: For guidance on when a bridge is and is not considered to be waterway barrier work see the Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry 2014 fact sheets Maintaining Fish Passage in Queensland: What is a Waterway Barrier Work? What is not a Waterway Barrier Work?</p>		
<p>PO23 <u>Waterway</u> barriers that are culverts provide adequate <u>fish</u> passage for the site, and:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (1) fish passage is provided for the life of the crossing (2) hydraulic conditions (depth, velocities and turbulence) from the downstream to the upstream limit of the structure allow for fish passage of all fish attempting to move through the crossing at all flows up to the drownout of the structure. <p>Editor's note: For guidance see the Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry 2014 Fact Sheet Maintaining Fish Passage in Queensland: What is a Waterway Barrier Work?</p>	<p>As per response to PO1</p>	
<p>PO24 <u>Waterway</u> crossings other than bridges or culverts provide adequate <u>fish</u> passage for the site and:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (1) fish passage is provided for the life of the crossing (2) hydraulic conditions (depth, velocities and turbulence) from the downstream to the upstream limit of the structure allow for fish passage of all fish attempting to move through the crossing at all flows up to the 	<p>As per response to PO1</p>	

Performance Outcomes	Coopers Gap Compliance with the SDAP Performance Outcomes	Relevant section(s) of the EIS that demonstrate compliance
<p>drownout of the structure.</p> <p>Editor's note: For guidance on when a waterway crossing is not considered to be waterway barrier work see the Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry 2014 fact sheet Maintaining Fish Passage in Queensland: What is not a Waterway Barrier Work?</p>		
<p>PO25 All <u>waterway</u> barriers are designed, constructed and maintained to provide adequate <u>fish</u> passage for the site and <u>fish</u> passage is provided for the life of the barrier.</p>	<p>As per response to PO1</p>	

4.0 Module 7 – Water resources

4.1 Sustainable management of water resources state code

Performance Outcomes	Coopers Gap Compliance with the SDAP Performance Outcomes	Relevant section(s) of the EIS that demonstrate compliance
General		
PO1 Works do not adversely impact on the natural riverine ecosystem.	<p>The Study Area falls within the catchments of the Burnett and Condamine Rivers. The overall condition of these catchments is considered moderate, with reach conditions varying from poor to very good.</p> <p>The Project is not expected to have an adverse impact on the overall condition of the Burnett and Condamine catchments. Any impacts associated with the Project will be localised, temporary and reversible.</p> <p>The potential impacts of stormwater discharges from the Project on surface water quality and quantity arise from a range of activities associated with the construction, operation and decommissioning phases. This assessment considers that the impacts associated with the Project could be appropriately managed by implementing a range of mitigation measures during the various phases of the Project.</p>	- Chapter 14 Surface Water, Section 14.7 Mitigation measures
PO2 Works do not adversely impact other users' ability to access the resource.	As per response to PO1	
PO3 Works do not adversely impact on the physical integrity of the <u>watercourse</u> .	As per response to PO1	
<p>PO4 Works are located and constructed in a way that is consistent with any of the following to the extent they are relevant to the proposed development:</p> <p>(1) a <u>water resource plan</u></p> <p>(2) a <u>resource operations plan</u></p> <p>(3) a moratorium notice issued under the <i>Water Act 2000</i>.</p> <p>Editor's note: Moratorium notices are published on the DNRM website.</p>	As per response to PO1	

Performance Outcomes	Coopers Gap Compliance with the SDAP Performance Outcomes	Relevant section(s) of the EIS that demonstrate compliance
Artesian and subartesian water		
<p>PO5 Works maintain the natural ecosystem processes of the artesian or subartesian system.</p>	<p>The Project is not expected to have a significant impact on the overall groundwater regime within the Study Area. Potential impacts associated with the Project are considered to relate to the extraction of groundwater for construction purposes. The potential impacts of the Project activities on groundwater quality and quantity arise from a range of activities associated with the construction and operation phases. This assessment considered that the impacts associated with the Project can be appropriately managed by the implementation of a range of mitigation measures during the various phases of the Project.</p>	<p>- Chapter 15 Groundwater, Section 15.7 Mitigation measures</p>
<p>PO6 Works are to minimise impact on connectivity between artesian water or subartesian water and surface water.</p>	<p>As per response to PO5</p>	
Overland flow		
<p>PO7 Works are located and constructed in a way that minimises adverse impacts on neighbouring properties.</p>	<p>Stream crossings will be designed, constructed and maintained according to relevant industry practice, guidelines and standards, which require that any resultant afflux would not cause adverse impacts to neighbouring property owners or surface water (e.g. aquatic habitat, geomorphology and water quality). In addition, an operational management plan will be developed for the site which will detail methods for minimising sediment-laden runoff in accordance with relevant practice guidelines.</p>	<p>- Chapter 14 Groundwater, Section 14.7 Mitigation measures</p>
<p>PO8 Works are constructed and operated in accordance with a <u>certified report</u>. Editor's note: If a water licence has been granted for the proposed development a certified report is not required.</p>	<p>With respect to statutory permits relating to surface water, the construction of the Project will require a Riverine Protection Permit. With respect to statutory permits relating to Operational works under the SP Act, the construction of the Project will require an Operational Works Permit for the constructing or raising of a waterway barrier. All permits will be obtained prior to the construction and operational phases of the Project.</p>	

Performance Outcomes	Coopers Gap Compliance with the SDAP Performance Outcomes	Relevant section(s) of the EIS that demonstrate compliance
Reconfiguring existing works – N/A		
Limited catchment area – N/A		
Contaminated agricultural run-off – N/A		
Environmentally relevant activity		
PO15 Works capture no more <u>overland flow water</u> than is necessary for the operation of the environmentally relevant activity or environmental authority under the <i>Environmental Protection Act 1994</i> .	It is noted that an application for relevant ERA's will be submitted by the constructing contractor prior to construction commencing. Works will be in accordance with the imposed ERA conditions.	- Chapter 15 Groundwater, Section 15.7 Mitigation measures
Rehabilitating degraded land – N/A		
Coal seam gas water – N/A		

5.0 Module 8 – Native vegetation clearing

5.1 Queensland vegetation management state code

5.1.1 General

Performance Outcomes	Coopers Gap Compliance with the SDAP Performance Outcomes	Relevant section(s) of the EIS that demonstrate compliance
Clearing to reasonably avoid and minimise impacts		
<p>PO1 Clearing only occurs where the applicant has demonstrated that the development has first reasonably avoided, and then reasonably minimised the impacts of development.</p>	<p>The Project is located in a highly cleared landscape where much of the original vegetation and habitat has been removed for grazing and cropping. The Project Site largely avoids areas of ecological significance, which has been achieved through a process of site verification and design refinement.</p> <p>Decisions on the final location of infrastructure (micro-siting) during detailed design and construction will potentially allow for the further protection of species, habitat and features of localised conservation significance.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Chapter 2 Project Description, Section 2.3 Design considerations and refinement - Chapter 12 Flora and Fauna <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Section 12.6.1.1 Potential impacts to flora o Section 12.7 Mitigation Measures
Clearing on land in particular circumstances		
<p>PO2 Clearing in an area must not be inconsistent with or impact on any of the following unless a better environmental outcome can be achieved:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) a declared area, or (2) an exchange area, or (3) unlawfully cleared area, or (4) a restoration notice, or (5) an enforcement notice under the Sustainable Planning Act 2009 issued for a vegetation clearing offence, or (6) a compliance notice containing conditions about the restoration of vegetation, or (7) a Land Act notice, or (8) a trespass notice if the trespass related act under the Land Act 1994 for the notice 	<p>As per response to PO1</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Chapter 12 Flora and Fauna

Performance Outcomes	Coopers Gap Compliance with the SDAP Performance Outcomes	Relevant section(s) of the EIS that demonstrate compliance
<p>is the clearing of vegetation on the relevant land, or</p> <p>(9) an area on a PMAV shown to be category A where the chief executive of the VMA reasonably believes that a vegetation clearing offence is being, or has been, committed in relation to the area.</p>		
Clearing on land that is an environmental offset area – N/A		
No clearing of vegetation as a result of the material change of use or reconfiguration of a lot – N/A		
Clearing that could already be done under an exemption – N/A		

5.1.2 Public safety, relevant infrastructure and coordinated projects

Performance Outcomes	Coopers Gap Compliance with the SDAP Performance Outcomes	Relevant section(s) of the EIS that demonstrate compliance
<p>PO1 Clearing is limited to the extent that is necessary:</p> <p>(1) for establishing a necessary fence, firebreak, road or vehicular track, or for constructing necessary built infrastructure (each relevant infrastructure), where the clearing cannot reasonably be avoided or minimised, or</p> <p>(2) as a natural and ordinary consequence of other assessable development for which a development approval as defined under the repealed <i>Integrated Planning Act 1997</i> was given, or a development application as defined under that Act was made, before 16 May 2003, or</p> <p>(3) to ensure public safety, or</p> <p>(4) for a coordinated project and any associated ancillary works—other than a coordinated project that involves high</p>	<p>The Project is located in a highly cleared landscape where much of the original vegetation and habitat has been removed for grazing and cropping. The Project Site largely avoids areas of ecological significance, which has been achieved through a process of site verification and design refinement.</p> <p>Decisions on the final location of infrastructure (micro-siting) during detailed design and construction will potentially allow for the further protection of species, habitat and features of localised conservation significance.</p>	<p>- Chapter 12 Flora and Fauna</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Section 12.6.1.1 Potential impacts to flora o Section 12.7 Mitigation Measures

Performance Outcomes	Coopers Gap Compliance with the SDAP Performance Outcomes	Relevant section(s) of the EIS that demonstrate compliance
value agriculture clearing, or irrigated high value agriculture clearing.		
Wetlands		
<p>PO2 Maintain the current extent of vegetation associated with any natural wetland to protect:</p> <p>(1) water quality by filtering sediments, nutrients and other pollutants</p> <p>(2) aquatic habitat</p> <p>(3) terrestrial habitat.</p>	<p>No referable or significant wetlands occur within the Study Area. Many small to medium sized watercourses (stream order 1, 2 and 3) occur within the Study Area and intersect the Project Site (Figure 12.4, Volume 2).</p>	<p>- Chapter 12 Flora and Fauna, Section 12.5.7 Wetlands and watercourses</p>
Watercourses and drainage features		
<p>PO3 Maintain the current extent of vegetation associated with any watercourse or drainage feature to protect:</p> <p>(1) bank stability by protecting against bank erosion</p> <p>(2) water quality by filtering sediments, nutrients and other pollutants</p> <p>(3) aquatic habitat</p> <p>(4) terrestrial habitat.</p>	<p>Construction activities within and/or adjacent to waterways will be minimised as much as feasibly possible to minimise disturbance to those waterways.</p> <p>A riverine protection permit (as required under section 266 of the Water Act) will be obtained prior to any excavation or placement of fill within a watercourse unless the works can be undertaken in accordance with the Riverine protection permit exemption requirements (DNRM, 2013). The application will provide detail as to how the proposed works will comply with applicable guidelines.</p> <p>Best practice principles will be adopted when excavating or placing fill in a watercourse.</p>	<p>- Chapter 12 Flora and Fauna, Section 12.5.7 Wetlands and watercourses</p>
Connectivity (public safety and relevant infrastructure)		
<p>PO4 In consideration of vegetation on the subject lot(s) and in the landscape adjacent to the subject lot(s), vegetation is retained that:</p> <p>(1) is of sufficient size and configured in a way that maintains ecosystem functioning</p> <p>(2) remains in the landscape despite threatening processes.</p>	<p>As per response to PO1</p>	<p>- Chapter 12 Flora and Fauna, Section 12.6.2.2 Fauna connectivity</p>

Performance Outcomes	Coopers Gap Compliance with the SDAP Performance Outcomes	Relevant section(s) of the EIS that demonstrate compliance
Connectivity (coordinated projects)		
<p>PO5 In consideration of vegetation on the subject lot(s) and in the landscape adjacent to the subject lot(s), vegetation is retained that:</p> <p>(1) is of sufficient size and configured in a way that maintains ecosystem functioning</p> <p>(2) remains in the landscape despite threatening processes</p> <p>(3) or where this is not reasonably possible, maintain the current extent of vegetation.</p>	<p>At the landscape scale, the Brigalow Belt Biodiversity Planning Assessment (BPA) is identified as a State significant fauna corridor approximately 10 km wide between Bunya Mountains to the southeast of the Study Area and Diamondy State Forest to the northwest.</p> <p>The Project Site extends up to 6 km into the corridor, but the degree of encroachment is less than 3 km in most areas. The Study Area does not contain significant forested areas, and so while the BPA corridor may represent the shortest distance between Bunya Mountains National Park and Diamondy State Forest it may not provide the most important link between these areas and/or there is the potential for other connectivity paths within the wider area.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Chapter 12 Flora and Fauna, Section 12.6.2.2 Fauna connectivity - Figure 12.3, Volume 2
Soil Erosion		
<p>PO6 Clearing does not result in:</p> <p>(1) accelerated soil erosion including, but not limited to - mass movement, gully erosion, rill erosion, sheet erosion, tunnel erosion, stream bank erosion, wind erosion, or scalding</p> <p>(2) any associated loss of chemical, physical or biological fertility— including, but not limited to water holding capacity, soil structure, organic matter, soil biology, and nutrients within or outside the lot(s) that are the subject of the application.</p>	<p>Construction work activities within and/or adjacent to waterways will be minimised as much as feasibly possible to minimise disturbance to those waterways and adjacent riparian areas.</p> <p>Any topsoil retained for rehabilitation activities will be stockpiled on site in a manner that conserves the native seedbank, soil structure and nutrient value. This will include instating a temporary cover crop on stockpiles that are to be stored for a significant period of time.</p> <p>It is expected that implementation and maintenance of standard erosion and sediment controls will minimise the likelihood of material migrating off site.</p> <p>On completion of construction activities, a land rehabilitation program will be established progressively to reinstate a suitable soil profile and vegetative cover in areas no longer required to be maintained as cleared as part of the operational footprint. Consideration will be given to the capability and co-land use opportunities for the Project Site. Operational monitoring of any erosion will be included as part of the overall site maintenance program.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Chapter 16 Topography, Geology and Soils <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Section 16.7.1 Erosion and stability o Section 16.7.2 Contaminated land

Performance Outcomes	Coopers Gap Compliance with the SDAP Performance Outcomes	Relevant section(s) of the EIS that demonstrate compliance
Salinity		
<p>PO7 Clearing does not contribute to land degradation through:</p> <p>(1) waterlogging, or</p> <p>(2) the salinisation of groundwater, surface water or soil.</p>	<p>The Project is not expected to have a significant impact on the overall groundwater regime within the Study Area.</p> <p>The construction contractor will be responsible to develop and ensure suitable procedures are in place in regards to erosion and sediment control procedures, a Materials Handling Plan, emergency response and spill response procedures will be contained within a site specific Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP).</p>	<p>- Chapter 15 Groundwater, Section 15.7 Mitigation measures</p>
Conserving endangered and of concern regional ecosystems		
<p>PO8 Maintain the current extent of endangered regional ecosystems and of concern regional ecosystems.</p>	<p>The Project will cause only a very minor impact on the local and sub-regional extent of the affected REs.</p>	<p>- Chapter 12 Flora and Fauna</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Section 12.5.4.1 Regional Ecosystems o Table 12.12
Essential Habitat		
<p>PO9 Maintain the current extent of essential habitat.</p>	<p>No essential habitat has been mapped within the Study Area by the Department of Natural Resources and Mines (DNRM). Essential regrowth habitat for the koala has been identified (refer to Figure 12.5, Volume 2) as part of the koala assessment</p>	<p>- Chapter 12 Flora and Fauna, Section 12.5.6 Essential Habitat</p>
Acid sulfate soils		
<p>PO10 Clearing activities do not result in disturbance of acid sulfate soils or changes to the hydrology of the location that will either:</p> <p>(1) aerate horizons containing iron sulfides, or</p> <p>(2) mobilise acid or metals.</p>	<p>A desk based review of the ASRIS found the Study Area to have a 'low' to 'extremely low' potential for acid sulfate soils to occur.</p>	<p>- Chapter 16 Topography, Geology and Soils, Section 16.6.2 potential contamination impacts</p>

6.0 Module 9 – Queensland Heritage

6.1 Queensland heritage place state code

Performance Outcomes	Coopers Gap Compliance with the SDAP Performance Outcomes	Relevant section(s) of the EIS that demonstrate compliance
State heritage place (except an archaeological State heritage place)		
PO1 Development does not destroy or substantially reduce the cultural heritage significance of a State heritage place unless there is no prudent and feasible alternative to carrying out the development.	While there has been no detailed exploration of pre-colonial Aboriginal life in the Study Area itself, research has indicated that low intensity use of the site began around 4300 years ago. The small stone artefact assemblage within the Study Area suggests transient usage by male hunting parties, with the small flakes and backed blades associated with hunting tool repair dominating the collection. Given the extent of the Project, and the involvement of multiple Aboriginal Parties, a Cultural Heritage management Plan (CHMP) under Section 7 of the Aboriginal Cultural heritage Act (ACH Act) will be developed and negotiated for the Project.	- Chapter 19 Cultural Heritage, Section 18.7.1
Archaeological State heritage place		
PO2 Development does not have a detrimental impact on any archaeological artefact on an archaeological State heritage place.	In terms of historic (non-Indigenous) heritage, the region in and around the Study Area was first explored in 1827. The Study Area was initially opened for selection as a part of the New England pastoral district in 1839 and by the 1840s, colonial settlement had occurred approximately 25 km south west of the Study Area. By 1860, pastoralists were turning to cattle, primarily dairy, as there was less chance of disease and they were generally 'more suitable to the area'. A search of Commonwealth, State and local heritage registers did not identify any recorded historical sites within the Study Area. The closest historical heritage site is the State and locally listed Wylarah Homestead, which is located approximately 10 km to the north of the Study Area.	- Chapter 19 Cultural Heritage, Section 18.7.2

7.0 Module 20 – Wind farm development

7.1 Wind farm state code

Performance Outcomes	Coopers Gap Compliance with the SDAP Performance Outcomes	Relevant section(s) of the EIS that demonstrate compliance
Aviation, integrity & efficiency		
PO1 The safety, operational integrity and efficiency of air services and aircraft operations are not adversely affected by the location, siting, design and operation of the development.	As the proposed turbines will be located more than 30 km from a licenced aerodrome but will be higher than 45 m AGL, they must be reported to the Royal Australia Air Force Aeronautical Information Service (RAAF AIS). This action will occur once the layout is confirmed at the completion of the detailed design process and prior to construction.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Chapter 8 Aviation - Chapter 13 Transport, Section 13.6.10 Airport Impacts - Appendix J Aviation Advisory Report
PO2 Development includes lighting and marking measures to ensure the safety, operational integrity and efficiency of air services and aircraft operations.	<p>In accordance with the recommendations of the SGS Hart advisory report and the Queensland Wind Farm State Code and Planning Guidelines, consultation with CASA, AirServices Australia and the Department of Defence is ongoing to determine the potential risk to aviation operations and to identify appropriate risk mitigation (which could include obstacle lighting, marking of met masts and/ or other risk mitigation strategies as appropriate).</p> <p>Risk mitigation will be developed having regard to the limited aviation operations which occur in the vicinity of the Project and the associated low risk rating.</p>	<p>Chapter 8 Aviation, Section 8.6.1 Obstacle marking and lighting</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Appendix J Aviation Advisory Report
Electromagnetic interference		
PO3 Development is designed, located and sited to avoid, or minimise and mitigate, electromagnetic interference to pre-existing television, radar and radio transmission and	<p>No impacts on telecommunications systems were identified through consultation with relevant stakeholders. The closest telecommunications link to the Project has been identified as the Telstra Exchange Terminal at Cooranga North, which is approximately 1.8 km from the nearest proposed turbine. No impacts on this receptor are expected.</p> <p>Point to multipoint type fixed licences are located near to the Project site. The nearest licence is at Mt Mowbullen near Wengenville, around 17.5 km south east of the Project, and is operated by the</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Chapter 7 EMI, Section 7.6.3 – 7.6.10 - Appendix L EMI Assessment

Performance Outcomes	Coopers Gap Compliance with the SDAP Performance Outcomes	Relevant section(s) of the EIS that demonstrate compliance
	<p>BoM. Previous consultation with potentially affected operators of point to multi-point type fixed licences in the vicinity of the Project has been undertaken. For the majority of licences, the operator responded indicating that no impacts were foreseen or the GH full EMI assessment determined that the likely impacts would be negligible.</p> <p>There are no foreseeable impacts to other licence types, emergency services, meteorological radar, trigonometrical stations or radio-frequency identification systems.</p>	
Shadow flicker		
<p>PO4 Development avoids or minimises shadow flicker impacts on existing or approved sensitive land uses.</p>	<p>An assessment to determine annual duration of shadow flicker at sensitive receptors in the vicinity of the Project has been undertaken in accordance with the Queensland Wind Farm Planning Guidelines.</p> <p>The assessment of theoretical shadow flicker durations shows that seven of the sensitive receptors are predicted to experience some of level of theoretical shadow flicker within 50 m of the receptor location. Six sensitive receptors are predicted to be affected by theoretical shadow flicker durations of greater than the Queensland Wind Farm State Code and Planning Guidelines recommended limits of 30 hours per year or 30 minutes per day within 50 m of the receptor location.</p> <p>However, all sensitive receptors for which the theoretical modelling of annual shadow flicker indicates exceedances of the limit are landowners hosting wind turbines on their properties and have signed a deed of release.</p> <p>All sensitive receptors for which the modelling of predicted actual annual shadow flicker indicates exceedances of the limit are participating landowners and have signed a deed of release.</p> <p>If shadow flicker presents a problem, mitigation strategies to reduce the duration of shadow flicker experienced at a sensitive receptor</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Chapter 6 Shadow Flicker - Appendix K Shadow Flicker Assessment

Performance Outcomes	Coopers Gap Compliance with the SDAP Performance Outcomes	Relevant section(s) of the EIS that demonstrate compliance
	<p>could include (in hierarchical order):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Installation of screening structures and/ or planting of trees to block shadows cast by the turbines - Use of turbine control strategies which shut down turbines when shadow flicker is likely to occur. <p>Shadow flicker provisions will be included in the Deed of Release with landowners hosting wind turbines on their properties where the assessment indicates that shadow flicker impacts could be experienced at a sensitive receptor. In addition, AGL will consult with landowners hosting wind turbines on their properties who may experience shadow flicker impacts to identify feasible and reasonable management and mitigation measures.</p>	
Flora and fauna		
<p>PO5 Development ensures that impacts on flora, fauna and associated ecological processes are avoided, or minimised and mitigated, through effective siting, design and operation of the development.</p>	<p>The Project Site and Study Area has been assessed through desktop and on-site surveys to determine the likely impacts to flora and fauna, and the required mitigation measures to manage those impacts.</p> <p>The Project is located in a highly cleared landscape where much of the original vegetation and habitat has been removed for grazing and cropping. The Project Site largely avoids areas of ecological significance, which has been achieved through a process of site verification and design refinement.</p> <p>Decisions on the final location of infrastructure (micro-siting) during detailed design and construction will potentially allow for the further protection of species, habitat and features of localised conservation significance.</p> <p>Impacts on threatened bat species and bird populations are not considered to be significant. However, there is the potential for occasional mortalities to occur. Ongoing monitoring during operation of the Project will help to determine whether further mitigation is</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Chapter 2 Project Description - Chapter 12 Flora and Fauna, Section 12.7 Mitigation Measures - Appendix D Flora and Fauna Assessment

Performance Outcomes	Coopers Gap Compliance with the SDAP Performance Outcomes	Relevant section(s) of the EIS that demonstrate compliance
	required.	
Traffic and access		
PO6 Development provides suitable vehicular access, manoeuvring areas and parking for the ongoing operation and maintenance activities associated with the wind farm.	During the operational phase, the expected impact on the regional road network will be limited to the movement of operational and maintenance workforce. It is anticipated that only a small workforce will be required during the operational phase of the Project to provide general maintenance of the Project infrastructure. This workforce has been assumed to travel to the Project Site each day via private vehicles. Suitable vehicular access, manoeuvring areas and parking for the ongoing operation and maintenance activities associated with the wind farm will be proved at the detailed design phase.	- Chapter 13 Traffic and Transport, Section 13.6.5 Operational phase impact assessment
Stormwater Management		
PO7 Development avoids, or minimises and mitigates, adverse impacts on water quality objectives to achieve no worsening to receiving waters during the operation of the wind farm.	The proposed infrastructure will result in only a very small increase in the proportion of impervious area in the catchment and therefore there will be a very small increase in the runoff volume. It is not expected that this will significantly impact the peak flood and volume generated, or timing of the catchment especially considering the large size of the receiving environment catchments compared with the Study Area. Mitigation measures to control stormwater discharge from site are not considered necessary given the small volume discharged in the context of the receiving environment catchments. There will be no formal infrastructure on-site for directing stormwater discharges. Stormwater will be discharged diffusely across the site (predominantly via vegetated surfaces), which will assist in reducing any impacts to stream water quality and geomorphology.	- Chapter 14- Surface Water, Section 14.7 Mitigation Measures
Watercourses and drainage features		
PO8 Development avoids or minimises the clearing of vegetation within any watercourse or drainage feature to protect: (1) bank stability by protecting against bank erosion (2) water quality	Construction activities within and/or adjacent to waterways will be minimised as much as feasibly possible to minimise disturbance to	- Chapter 14 Surface Water, Section 14.7 Mitigation Measures

Performance Outcomes	Coopers Gap Compliance with the SDAP Performance Outcomes	Relevant section(s) of the EIS that demonstrate compliance
objectives by filtering sediments, nutrients and other pollutants (3) aquatic habitat (4) terrestrial habitat.	<p>those waterways.</p> <p>A riverine protection permit (as required under section 266 of the Water Act) will be obtained prior to any excavation or placement of fill within a watercourse unless the works can be undertaken in accordance with the Riverine protection permit exemption requirements (DNRM, 2013). The application will provide detail as to how the proposed works will comply with applicable guidelines.</p> <p>Best practice principles will be adopted when excavating or placing fill in a watercourse.</p>	
Character, scenic amenity and landscape values		
PO9 Development avoids, or minimises and mitigates, adverse impacts on the character, scenic amenity and landscape values of the locality and region through effective siting and design.	<p>Given that the wind turbines are potentially visible within at least 17 km (depending on weather conditions), the proposition of providing and maintaining off site planting to manage all views of the Project is not practical. The mitigation framework has therefore been focussed on managing the impact of construction activities, managing the visual amenity of nearby residents adversely affected by the Project (e.g. tailored off site mitigation for specific residences, if required through the consultation process), post construction site rehabilitation activities (e.g. reinstating temporary access roads and storage areas), and providing advice for the decommissioning of the Project.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Chapter 5 Landscape and Visual Assessment, Section 5.7 Mitigation Measures
Separation distances		
PO10 Wind turbines are adequately separated from existing or approved sensitive land uses on non-host lots.	<p>Wind turbines have been setback at least 1,500 metres from existing or approved sensitive land uses on non-host lots. Where wind turbines are within 1,500 metres of existing or approved sensitive land uses on non-host lots, written agreements (deed of releases) from all affected non-host lot owners have been obtained accepting the reduced setback.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Chapter 2 Project Description - Figure 2.3 - Chapter 5 Landscape and Visual Assessment, Section 5.7 Mitigation Measures - Chapter 11 Land Use and Planning, Section 11.4.1

Performance Outcomes	Coopers Gap Compliance with the SDAP Performance Outcomes	Relevant section(s) of the EIS that demonstrate compliance
		Land Use
Acoustic amenity – host lots		
<p>PO11 The predicted acoustic level at all noise affected existing or approved sensitive land uses does not exceed the criteria stated in Table 1</p>	<p>A noise impact assessment was conducted for the operation of the Project in accordance with the requirements of the Queensland Wind Farm State Code and supporting Planning Guideline 2016. Operational noise limits were defined from the operational outcomes of the Queensland Wind Farm State Code and background noise levels measured on site prior to construction of the Project.</p> <p>A noise model of the Project Site was created to predict noise levels at the nearest sensitive receptors to the Project. A noise-compliant wind turbine layout was generated and has formed the basis of the Project Site. The noise limits contained within the Queensland Wind Farm State Code are expected to be complied with during operation of the Project, based on the results of noise predictions. On this basis, the current 'noise-compliant' wind turbine layout can be considered to protect the existing environmental values in the area from impacts by noise and vibration from the Project.</p> <p>Compliance measurements will be undertaken at a selected number of the potentially most affected sensitive receivers following the commissioning of the Project. In lieu of a compliance methodology within the Queensland Wind Farm State Code a basic methodology has been proposed in this assessment. A preliminary Compliance Management Plan has been developed to incorporate the compliance measurement methodology. This is provided in Appendix F, Volume 3. Testing will be undertaken once all noise sources associated with the Project are in operating mode, i.e. all turbines have been commissioned and are operating correctly.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Chapter 4 Noise and Vibration <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Section 4.6 Mitigation Measures o Section 4.7 Residual Impacts - Appendix F Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment
Acoustic amenity – non-host lots		
<p>PO12 The predicted acoustic levels at all noise affected existing or approved sensitive land uses does not exceed the criteria stated in Table 2. OR Where the acoustic levels stated in Table</p>	<p>As per response to PO11</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Chapter 4 Noise and Vibration <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Section 4.6

Performance Outcomes	Coopers Gap Compliance with the SDAP Performance Outcomes	Relevant section(s) of the EIS that demonstrate compliance
2 cannot be achieved at noise affected existing or approved sensitive land uses: (1) individual written agreements (deed of releases) from non-host lot owners are provided, and (2) the predicted acoustic level at all noise affected existing or approved sensitive land uses does not exceed the criteria stated in Table 1.		Mitigation Measures <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Section 4.7 Residual Impacts - Appendix F Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment
Construction Management		
PO13 Construction activities associated with the development avoid, or minimise and mitigate, adverse impacts on environmental values, water quality objectives, amenity, local transport networks and road infrastructure.	The Project commitments have been structured to highlight approaches to prevent, mitigate, and monitor potential impacts during the construction phase. These mitigation and management measures will be further refined during the detailed design stage of the Project so that site and location-specific issues are captured and fully relevant to the final design of the Project. It will be at this stage that a detailed CEMP can be prepared to manage the potential impacts associated with the construction phase.	- Chapter 20 Project Commitments