Monthly Environmental Monitoring Report

Yancoal Mount Thorley Warkworth

December 2024

CONTENTS

Figures

Tables

Revision History

Version No.	Version Details	Date
1.0	Final	8/05/2025

1.0 INTRODUCTION

This report has been compiled to provide a monthly summary of environmental monitoring results for Mount Thorley Warkworth (MTW). This report includes all monitoring data collected for the period 1 December to 31 December 2024.

2.0 AIR QUALITY

2.1 Meteorological Monitoring

Meteorological data is collected at MTW's 'Charlton Ridge' meteorological station (refer to **Figure 3**).

2.1.1 Rainfall

Rainfall for the reporting period is summarised in **Table 1**. The year-to-date monthly rainfall totals, 2024 monthly rainfall totals and historical average monthly rainfall trend are shown in **Figure 1**.

Table 1: Monthly Rainfall MTW

2024	Monthly Rainfall (mm)	Cumulative Rainfall (mm)
December	18.2	590



Figure 1: Rainfall Trend YTD

Note: The historical average monthly rainfall is calculated from 2007 to 2023 monthly totals

2.1.2 Wind Speed and Direction

Winds from the South were dominant during the reporting period as shown in **Figure 2.**



Figure 2: Charlton Ridge Wind Rose – December 2024



Figure 3: Air Quality Monitoring Locations

2.2 Depositional Dust

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

During the reporting period, the Warkworth monitoring location 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 result at Warkworth (6.7 g/m2) is contaminated, as such the result will be included in the annual average calculation.

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.

An annual assessment of MTW's compliance with the Long-Term Impact Assessment Criteria will be provided in the 2024 Annual Review Report.



Figure 4: Depositional Dust – December 2024

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 (PM_{10}). 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 PM_{10} Results

Figure 5 shows the individual PM_{10} results at each monitoring station against the short-term impact assessment criteria of 50µg/m³.

There were no exceedances of the short term (24hr) PM10 impact assessment criteria during December 2024.



Figure 5: Individual PM10 Results – December 2024

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

An assessment of MTW's compliance with the Long-Term Impact Assessment Criteria will be provided in the 2024 Annual Review Report.



Figure 6: Annual Average PM_{10} – December 2024

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 assessment of MTW's compliance with the Long-Term Impact Assessment Criteria will be provided in the 2024 Annual Review Report.



Figure 7: Annual Average Total Suspended Particulates – December 2024

2.3.3 Real Time PM_{10} Results

MTW maintains a network of real time PM_{10} monitors. The real time air quality monitoring stations continuously log information and transmit data to a central database, generating internal alerts 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 PM_{10} result and the annual PM_{10} average.

On 13 December 2024, the Warkworth TEOM (66.3 µg/m³) exceeded the short term (24hr) criteria. The measurement was assessed for MTW's potential contribution based on meteorological conditions and background PM_{10} levels on the day resulting in a maximum estimated contribution of 29.6 µg/m³, less than a 45% contribution to the result. Accordingly, no further action is required (as per the approved Air Quality Monitoring Programme).

On 27 December 2024, the Warkworth TEOM (56.7 µg/m³) exceeded the short term (24hr) criteria. The measurement was assessed for MTW's potential contribution based on meteorological conditions on the day resulting in a maximum estimated contribution of 9.3 µg/m³, less than a 17% contribution to the result. Accordingly, no further action is required (as per the approved Air Quality Monitoring Programme).

Data from the Wambo Road monitor was not available on 3 December due to equipment issues.

2.3.4 Real Time Alarms for Air Quality

During December, the real time monitoring system generated 198 automated air quality related alerts, including 16 alerts for adverse meteorological conditions and 182 alerts for elevated PM_{10} levels.



Figure 8: Real Time PM_{10} daily 24hr average (line graphs) and YTD annual average (column graphs) – December 2024

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 record background water quality and to monitor the potential impact of mining on the river system. Other Hunter River tributaries are also monitored.

3.1.1 Surface Water Monitoring results

Figure 9 to **Figure 11** show the long-term surface waste trend (2021 – current) within MTW mine dams. **Figure 12** to **Figure 14** show the long-term surface water trend (2021 – current) in surrounding watercourses.



Figure 9: Site Dams Electrical Conductivity Field Trend – December 2024



Figure 10: Site Dams pH Field Trend – December 2024



Figure 11: Site Dams Total Suspended Solids Trend – December 2024



Figure 12: Watercourse pH Field Trend – December 2024



Figure 13: Watercourse Electrical Conductivity Field Trend – December 2024



Figure 14: Watercourse Total Suspended Solids Trend – December 2024

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 triggers are summarised in **Table 2**.

Table 2: Surface Water Trigger Tracking – December 2024

Site	Date	Trigger Limit	Action Taken in Response
W2	12/12/2024	TSS – 50mg/L (ANZECC criteria)	Watching Brief*. No MTW site sources of sediment identified.
W5	13/02/2024 21/03/2024 2/12/2024	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 (pool of water). Note: Result is not considered to be a valid representation given that there was no flow at the time of sampling. Additionally, TSS returned to within trigger level for subsequent sampling on 24/04/2024, 7/05/2024, 24/06/2024, 17/07/2024, 21/08/2024, and 23/09/2024. No follow up required. Elevated TSS on 2/12/2024 also unlikely to be associated with MTW mining related impacts. Elevated TSS results most likely attributable to sampling from water with no flow (pool of water). Note: Result is not considered to be a valid representation given that there was no flow at the time of sampling. Additionally, TSS returned to within trigger level for sampling on 13/02/2025.
WW5	21/03/2024	TSS – 50mg/L (ANZECC criteria)	Elevated TSS associated with high runoff due to rain event (24.4mm between 17/03/2024 – 20/03/2024), resulting in mobilisation of sediment. TSS returned to within trigger level for subsequent sampling round on 24/06/2024. No follow up required.
W4	05/04/2024	TSS – 50mg/L (ANZECC Criteria)	Elevated TSS considered associated with runoff due to rainfall event, resulting in mobilisation of sediment. No MTW site sources of sediment identified. TSS returned to within trigger level for subsequent sampling round on 7/05/2024. No follow up required.
W14	07/05/2024	TSS – 50mg/L (ANZECC criteria)	Watching Brief* Elevated TSS considered associated with runoff due to rainfall event, resulting in mobilisation of sediment. No MTW site sources of sediment identified. No follow up required.
W15	07/05/2024	TSS – 50mg/L (ANZECC criteria)	Watching Brief* Elevated TSS considered associated with runoff due to rainfall event, resulting in mobilisation of sediment. No MTW site sources of sediment identified. No follow up required.
W27	07/05/2024	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 (pool of water).
WW5	24/06/2024	EC – 95th Percentile	Watching Brief* Subsequent monitoring on 23/09/2024 and 2/12/2024 unable to be completed due to the sample location having insufficient water to complete sampling.
W1	23/09/2024 02/12/2024	EC – 95th Percentile	Watching Brief*
W2	23/09/2024	EC – 95th Percentile	Watching Brief*
W3	23/09/2024 02/12/2024	EC – 95th Percentile	Watching Brief*

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

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.

No HRSTS discharge occurred during 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 64** show the long-term water quality trends (2021 - current) for groundwater bores monitored at MTW.



Figure 16: Bayswater Seam Electrical Conductivity Field Trend – December 2024



Figure 17: Bayswater Seam pH Field Trend – December 2024



Figure 18: Bayswater Seam Standing Water Level Trend – December 2024



Figure 19: Blakefield Seam Electrical Conductivity Field Trend – December 2024



Figure 20: Blakefield Seam pH Field Trend – December 2024



Figure 21: Blakefield Seam Standing Water Level Trend – December 2024



Figure 22: Bowfield Seam Electrical Conductivity Field Trend – December 2024



Figure 23: Bowfield Seam pH Field Trend - December 2024



Figure 24: Bowfield Seam Standing Water Level Trend – December 2024



Figure 25: Redbank Seam Electrical Conductivity Field Trend – December 2024



Figure 26: Redbank Seam pH Field Trend – December 2024



Figure 27: Redbank Seam Standing Water Level Trend – December 2024



Figure 28: Shallow Overburden Electrical Conductivity Field Trend – December 2024



Figure 29: Shallow Overburden pH Field Trend – December 2024



Figure 30: Shallow Overburden Standing Water Level Trend – December 2024



Figure 31: Vaux Seam Electrical Conductivity Field Trend – December 2024



Figure 32: Vaux Seam pH Field Trend – December 2024



Figure 33: Vaux Seam Standing Water Level Trend – December 2024



Figure 34: Wambo Seam Electrical Conductivity Field Trend – December 2024



Figure 35: Wambo Seam pH Field Trend – December 2024



Figure 36: Wambo Seam Standing Water Level Trend – December 2024



Figure 37: Warkworth Seam Electrical Conductivity Field Trend – December 2024



Figure 38: Warkworth Seam pH Field Trend – December 2024



Figure 39: Warkworth Seam Standing Water Level Trend – December 2024



Figure 40: Wollombi Alluvium 1 Electrical Conductivity Field Trend – December 2024



Figure 41: Wollombi Alluvium 1 pH Field Trend – December 2024



Figure 42: Wollombi Alluvium 2 Electrical Conductivity Field Trend – December 2024



Figure 43: Wollombi Alluvium 2 pH Field Trend – December 2024



Figure 44: Wollombi Alluvium Standing Water Level Trend – December 2024



Figure 45: Woodlands Hill Seam Electrical Conductivity Field Trend – December 2024



Figure 46: Woodlands Hill Seam pH Field Trend – December 2024



Figure 47: Woodlands Hill Seam Standing Water Level Trend - December 2024



Figure 48: Aeolian Warkworth Sands Electrical Conductivity Field Trend – December 2024



Figure 49: Aeolian Warkworth Sands pH Field Trend - December 2024



Figure 50: Aeolian Warkworth Sands Standing Water Level Trend – December 2024



Figure 51: Hunter River Alluvium 1 Electrical Conductivity Field Trend – December 2024



Figure 52: Hunter River Alluvium 1 pH Field Trend – December 2024



Figure 53: Hunter River Alluvium 2 Electrical Conductivity Field Trend - December 2024



Figure 54: Hunter River Alluvium 2 pH Field Trend – December 2024



Figure 55: Hunter River Alluvium 3 Electrical Conductivity Field Trend – December 2024



Figure 56: Hunter River Alluvium 3 pH Field Trend – December 2024



Figure 57: Hunter River Alluvium 4 Electrical Conductivity Field Trend – December 2024



Figure 58: Hunter River Alluvium 4 pH Field Trend – December 2024



Figure 59: Hunter River Alluvium 5 Electrical Conductivity Field Trend – December 2024



Figure 60: Hunter River Alluvium 5 pH Field Trend – December 2024



Figure 61: Hunter River Alluvium Standing Water Level Trend – December 2024



Figure 62: Whynot Seam Electrical Conductivity Field Trend – December 2024



Figure 63: Whynot Seam pH Field Trend – December 2024



Figure 64: Whynot Seam Standing Water Level Trend – December 2024

3.3.1 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 56**.

Current internal groundwater triggers are summarised in **Table 3**

Table 3: Groundwater Trigger Tracking – December 2024

Site	Date	Trigger Limit	Action Taken in Response
OH787	26/03/2024	EC – 95th Percentile	EC was above the 95th percentile for one sample event on 26/03/2024. Q2 sampling in June could not be completed due to the monitoring site being inaccessible due to wet weather. Q3 monitoring returned to below 95th percentile for subsequent monitoring on 19/09/2024 and 10/12/2024. No further action required.
OH788	26/03/2024	EC – 95th Percentile	EC was above the 95th percentile for one sample event on 26/03/2024, but returned to below 95th percentile for subsequent monitoring on 26/06/2024 and 19/09/2024. No further action required.
OH1138(1)	10/04/2024	EC – 95th Percentile	Watching Brief* EC was above the 95th percentile for one sample event on 10/04/2024, but returned to below 95th percentile for subsequent monitoring year to date. No further action required.
MTD605P	12/11/2024	EC – 95th Percentile	Watching Brief*
PZ9S	20/06/2024 19/09/2024	pH – 95th Percentile	pH was above the 95th percentile for two sample events, but returned to within the 95th percentile for subsequent monitoring 10/12/2024.
PZ7S	29/02/2024 27/05/2024 21/11/2024	pH – 5th Percentile	Watching Brief* pH was below the 5th percentile for sample event on 29/04/2024, 27/05/2024, but returned to below 5th percentile for subsequent monitoring on 15/08/2024. pH was again below the 5th percentile for sample event on 21/11/2024.
OH1126	19/03/2024 20/06/2024	pH – 5th Percentile	pH was below the 5th percentile for sample event on 19/03/2024 /2024, 20/06/2024, but returned to above 5th percentile for subsequent monitoring 18/09/2024.
MB15MTW01D	07/02/2024 21/05/2024 14/08/2024 21/11/2024	pH – 5th Percentile	Investigation previously completed. The consultant identified in their report that "it is likely the trigger values derived for shallow overburden bores do not accurately represent in-situ groundwater water quality for MB15MTW01D". MB15MTW01D is part of a larger dataset from the shallow overburden seam. The 5th percentile of the seam is currently 6.3 while the 5th percentile of MB15MTW01D is 5.5. The result is consistent with previous results for this bore since 2021 and within sample location trigger levels. No further investigation required.

Site	Date	Trigger Limit	Action Taken in Response
OH1137	10/12/2024	pH – 95th Percentile	Watching Brief* EC was above the 95th percentile for one sample event on 10/12/2024, but returned to below 95th percentile for subsequent monitoring on 13/02/2025. No further action required.
WOH2156B	15/02/2024 28/05/2024 15/08/2024 18/11/2024	pH – 5th Percentile	Consultant engaged to undertake investigation.
* = Watching brief established pending outcomes of subsequent monitoring events. No specific actions required.			



Figure 65: 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 72**.

4.1 Blast Monitoring Results

During December 2024, 20 blasts were initiated at MTW. **Figure 9** to **Figure 14** 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 at WML or MTO
120	0%
Ground Vibration (mm/s)	**Comments**
5	5% of the total number of blasts in a 12 month period at WML or MTO
10	0%

During the reporting period one blast at the Warkworth monitoring location exceeded the 115dB(L) (permissible for 5% of blasts in 12 month period) threshold for air blast overpressure. No blast exceeded the 5 mm/s criteria for ground vibration.



Figure 66: Abbey Green Blast Monitoring Results – December 2024



Figure 67: Bulga Village Blast Monitoring Results – December 2024



Figure 68: MTIE Blast Monitoring Results – December 2024



Figure 69: Wambo Road Blast Monitoring Results – December 2024



Figure 70: Warkworth Blast Monitoring Results – December 2024



Figure 71: Wollemi Peak Road Blast Monitoring Results – December 2024



Figure 72: MTW Blast 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. The purpose of the noise surveys is to quantify and describe the acoustic environment around the site and compare results with specified limits. Real time noise monitoring also occurs at five sites surrounding MTW. Noise monitoring locations are displayed in **Figure 73**.

5.1 Attended Noise Monitoring Results

Attended monitoring was conducted at receiver locations surrounding MTW on the night of 12 December 2024. 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 **Tables 5** and **6**.

Table 5: $L_{Aeq,\ 15\ minute}$ Warkworth Impact Assessment Criteria – December 2024

Location	Date and Time	Wind Speed (m/s)	Stability Class	Criterion dB(A)	Criterion Applies?[1]	WML L_{Aeq} dB[2,3,4]	Exceedance[3,4]
Bulga RFS	12/12/2024 23:39	1.8	E	37	Yes	<30	Nil
Bulga Village	12/12/2024 22:12	2.9	D	38	Yes	34	Nil
Gouldsville	12/12/2024 21:25	2.5	D	38	Yes	IA	Nil
Inlet Road	12/12/2024 21:34	2.9	D	37	Yes	34	Nil
Inlet Road West	12/12/2024 21:00	2.5	D	35	Yes	33	Nil
Long Point	12/12/2024 21:00	2.9	D	35	Yes	IA	Nil
South Bulga	13/12/2024 0:36	2.4	D	35	Yes	IA	Nil
Wambo Road	12/12/2024 22:42	2.4	D	38	Yes	34	Nil

Notes:
1. Noise criteria apply during all meteorological conditions except the following: 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;
2. Site-only LAeq,15minute attributed to WML, including modifying factors if applicable;
3. Bold results in red indicate exceedance of relevant criterion; and
4. NA in exceedance column means atmospheric conditions outside conditions specified in consent, therefore criterion was not applicable.

Table 6: $L_{A1,\ 1\ minute}$ Warkworth - Impact Assessment Criteria – December 2024

Location	Date and Time	Wind Speed (m/s)	Stability Class	Criterion dB(A)	Criterion Applies?[1]	WML $L_{A1,\ 1min}$ dB[2,3,4]	Exceedance[3,4]
Bulga RFS	12/12/2024 23:39	1.8	E	47	Yes	<35	Nil
Bulga Village	12/12/2024 22:12	2.9	D	48	Yes	38	Nil
Gouldsville	12/12/2024 21:25	2.5	D	48	Yes	IA	Nil
Inlet Road	12/12/2024 21:34	2.9	D	47	Yes	38	Nil
Inlet Road West	12/12/2024 21:00	2.5	D	45	Yes	36	Nil
Long Point	12/12/2024 21:00	2.9	D	45	Yes	IA	Nil
South Bulga	13/12/2024 0:36	2.4	D	45	Yes	IA	Nil
Wambo Road	12/12/2024 22:42	2.4	D	48	Yes	40	Nil

Notes:
1. Noise criteria apply during all meteorological conditions except the following: 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;
2. Site-only LA1,1minute attributed to WML;
3. Bold results in red indicate exceedance of relevant criterion; and
4. NA in exceedance column means atmospheric conditions outside conditions specified in consent, therefore criterion was not applicable.

5.1.2 MTO Noise Assessment

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

Table 7: $L_{Aeq,\ 15minute}$ Mount Thorley - Impact Assessment Criteria – December 2024

Location	Date and Time	Wind Speed (m/s)	Stability Class	Criterion dB	Criterion Applies?[1]	MTO L_{Aeq} dB[2,3,4]	Exceedance[3,4]
Bulga RFS	12/12/2024 23:39	1.8	E	37	Yes	32	Nil
Bulga Village	12/12/2024 22:12	2.9	D	38	Yes	<35	Nil
Gouldsville	12/12/2024 21:25	2.5	D	35	Yes	IA	Nil
Inlet Road	12/12/2024 21:34	2.9	D	37	Yes	<30	Nil
Inlet Road West	12/12/2024 21:00	2.5	D	35	Yes	<30	Nil
Long Point	12/12/2024 21:00	2.9	D	35	Yes	IA	Nil
South Bulga	13/12/2024 0:36	2.4	D	36	Yes	<35	Nil
Wambo Road	12/12/2024 22:42	2.4	D	38	Yes	<30	Nil

Notes:
1. Noise criteria apply during all meteorological conditions except the following: 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;
2. Site-only LAeq,15minute attributed to MTO, including modifying factors if applicable;
3. Bold results in red indicate exceedance of relevant criterion; and
4. NA in exceedance column means atmospheric conditions outside conditions specified in consent, therefore criterion was not applicable.

Table 8: $L_{A1,\ 1Minute}$ Mount Thorley - Impact Assessment Criteria – December 2024

Location	Date and Time	Wind Speed (m/s)	Stability Class	Criterion dB	Criterion Applies?[1]	MTO $L_{A1,\ 1min}$ dB[2,3,4]	Exceedance[3,4]
Bulga RFS	12/12/2024 23:39	1.8	E	47	Yes	36	Nil
Bulga Village	12/12/2024 22:12	2.9	D	48	Yes	<35	Nil
Gouldsville	12/12/2024 21:25	2.5	D	45	Yes	IA	Nil
Inlet Road	12/12/2024 21:34	2.9	D	47	Yes	<30	Nil
Inlet Road West	12/12/2024 21:00	2.5	D	45	Yes	<30	Nil
Long Point	12/12/2024 21:00	2.9	D	45	Yes	IA	Nil
South Bulga	13/12/2024 0:36	2.4	D	46	Yes	35	Nil
Wambo Road	12/12/2024 22:42	2.4	D	48	Yes	<30	Nil

Notes:
1. Noise criteria apply during all meteorological conditions except the following: 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;
2. Site-only LA1,1minute attributed to MTO;
3. Bold results in red indicate exceedance of relevant criterion; and
4. NA in exceedance column means atmospheric conditions outside conditions specified in consent, therefore criterion was not applicable.

5.1.3 NPfI Low Frequency Assessment

In accordance with the requirements of the EPA's Noise Policy for Industry (NPfI), the applicability of the low frequency modification factor corrections 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 – December 2024

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]
Bulga RFS	12/12/2024 23:39	<30	Yes	No	No	NA	No	NA	Nil
Bulga Village	12/12/2024 22:12	34	Yes	No	No	NA	No	NA	Nil
Gouldsville	12/12/2024 21:25	IA	Yes	No	No	NA	No	NA	Nil
Inlet Road	12/12/2024 21:34	34	Yes	No	No	NA	No	NA	Nil
Inlet Road West	12/12/2024 21:00	33	Yes	No	No	NA	No	NA	Nil
Long Point	12/12/2024 21:00	IA	Yes	No	No	NA	No	NA	Nil
South Bulga	13/12/2024 0:36	IA	Yes	No	No	NA	No	NA	Nil
Wambo Road	12/12/2024 22:42	34	Yes	No	No	NA	No	NA	Nil

Notes:
1. NA denotes 'not applicable
2. Yes/No denote modifying factor was or was not applied.
3. Bold results indicate that application of NPfI modifying factor/s is required.

Table 10: Mount Thorley Operations Low Frequency Noise Assessment – December 2024

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]
Bulga RFS	12/12/2024 23:39	32	Yes	No	No	NA	No	NA	Nil
Bulga Village	12/12/2024 22:12	<35	Yes	No	No	NA	No	NA	Nil
Gouldsville	12/12/2024 21:25	IA	Yes	No	No	NA	No	NA	Nil
Inlet Road	12/12/2024 21:34	<30	Yes	No	No	NA	No	NA	Nil
Inlet Road West	12/12/2024 21:00	<30	Yes	No	No	NA	No	NA	Nil
Long Point	12/12/2024 21:00	IA	Yes	No	No	NA	No	NA	Nil
South Bulga	13/12/2024 0:36	<35	Yes	No	No	NA	No	NA	Nil
Wambo Road	12/12/2024 22:42	<30	Yes	No	No	NA	No	NA	Nil

Notes:
1. NA denotes 'not applicable
2. Yes/No denote modifying factor was or was not applied.
3. Bold results indicate that application of NPfI modifying factor/s is required.
.



Figure 73: 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 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 are provided in **Table 11**.

Table 11: Supplementary Attended Noise Monitoring Data – December 2024

No. of assessments	No. of assessments > trigger	No. of nights where assessments > trigger	% greater than trigger
578	2	2	0.35

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

6.0 OPERATIONAL DOWNTIME

During December, a total of 191 hours of equipment downtime was logged in response to environmental events such as dust, noise and adverse meteorological conditions. Operational downtime by equipment type is shown in **Figure 74**.



Figure 74: Operational Downtime by Equipment Type – December 2024

7.0 REHABILITATION

During December 2024, 7.2 Ha of land was released, 2.5 Ha was bulk shaped, 9.6 Ha was composted, 1.9 Ha was topsoiled, and 36.4 Ha was rehabilitated.



Figure 75: Rehabilitation YTD – December 2024

8.0 ENVIRONMENTAL INCIDENTS

There were no reportable environmental incidents during the reporting period.

9.0 COMPLAINTS

Fourteen complaints were received during the reporting period. Details of these complaints are shown in **Table 12**.

Table 12: Complaints Summary YTD

	Noise	Dust	Blast	Lighting	Other	Total
January	1	3	5	2	0	11
February	3	4	1	0	0	8
March	3	1	2	0	0	6
April	7	2	1	5	0	15
May	8	1	5	0	2	16
June	2	1	3	0	0	6
July	1	2	2	1	0	6
August	5	1	3	0	1	10
September	0	6	0	3	1	10
October	2	8	5	3	0	18
November	8	10	6	3	0	27
December	5	5	4	0	0	14
Total	45	44	37	17	4	147

Appendix A: Meteorological Data

Table 13: Meteorological Data – Charlton Ridge Meteorological Station – December 2024

Date	Air Temperature		Relative Humidity		Wind Direction	Wind Speed	Rainfall
	Maximum (°C)	Minimum (°C)	Maximum (%)	Minimum (%)	Average (°)	Average (m/sec)	total (mm)
1/12/2024	33	16	100	42	228	2.2	0.4
2/12/2024	37	15	100	20	215	1.9	0.0
3/12/2024	31	19	91	45	240	2.2	0.0
4/12/2024	31	19	100	50	161	2.2	0.0
5/12/2024	32	19	93	47	146	2.1	0.0
6/12/2024	36	19	100	40	210	1.6	0.0
7/12/2024	37	21	99	33	249	2.2	0.0
8/12/2024	39	18	97	22	205	3.8	0.0
9/12/2024	26	18	96	68	138	2.2	0.0
10/12/2024	35	18	96	20	164	2.3	0.0
11/12/2024	32	15	92	28	131	2.0	0.0
12/12/2024	36	15	96	13	212	2.5	0.0
13/12/2024	39	17	83	12	194	2.7	0.0
14/12/2024	37	20	84	26	155	2.5	0.0
15/12/2024	38	19	98	26	153	2.5	0.0
16/12/2024	36	21	90	32	137	2.9	0.0
17/12/2024	41	18	100	18	200	3.4	7.8
18/12/2024	21	14	100	52	165	4.4	1.0
19/12/2024	28	13	92	27	151	3.2	0.0
20/12/2024	31	11	96	24	158	2.1	0.0
21/12/2024	36	13	95	19	177	2.8	0.0
22/12/2024	34	19	89	36	150	2.7	0.0
23/12/2024	33	15	99	6	220	3.3	0.0
24/12/2024	32	12	88	13	172	2.4	0.0
25/12/2024	33	12	87	22	163	2.1	0.0
26/12/2024	39	15	87	16	179	2.2	0.0
27/12/2024	38	19	97	27	238	3.2	7.6
28/12/2024	32	17	100	24	145	2.4	1.4
29/12/2024	34	14	91	12	171	2.5	0.0
30/12/2024	32	18	86	34	140	3.7	0.0
31/12/2024	30	18	90	44	159	2.5	0.0