EnergyAustralia Yallourn Pty Ltd

Declared Mine Rehabilitation Plan

Stakeholder and Community Consultation Register

EnergyAustralia
LIGHT THE WAY

PROJECT	Yallourn Declared Mine Rehabilitation Plan	**DATE**	29 September 2025
GROUP	Community Engagement	**STATUS**	FINAL
AUTHOR/S	EnergyAustralia Yallourn	**REVISION**	0
COMPANY	EnergyAustralia Yallourn Pty Ltd ABN 47 065 325 224	**FILE NUMBER**	
FILE NAME	Yallourn DMRP Stakeholder and Community Consultation Register		

Table of Contents

Abbreviations

Term/ Acronym	Definition
ADWG	Australian Drinking Water Guidelines
ANCOLD	Australian National Committee on Large Dams
BWE	Bulk Water Entitlement
CGRSWS	Central and Gippsland Region Sustainable Water Strategy
CMS	Consultation Management System
Community	A group of people who are living / working / commuting / frequenting an area or region who are affected by activities undertaken in that area or region.
CSEP	Community and Stakeholder Engagement Plan
CWA	Concerned Waterways Alliance
DEECA	Department of Energy, Environment and Climate Action
DMRP	Declared Mine Rehabilitation Plan
EA	EnergyAustralia
EAY	EnergyAustralia Yallourn
EES	Environmental Effects Statement
EGCMA	East Gippsland Catchment Management Authority
EPA	Environment Protection Authority
EPBC	Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999
FLoW	Friends of Latrobe Water
FOGL	Friends of the Gippsland Lakes
FoS	Factor of Safety
FPIC	Free, Prior and Informed Consent
GLaWAC	Gunaikurnai Land and Waters Aboriginal Corporation
GLP	Great Latrobe Park
LVRRS	Latrobe Valley Regional Rehabilitation Strategy
MLRA	Mine Land Rehabilitation Authority
MNES	Matters of National Environmental Significance
MRD	Morwell River Diversion
MRSDA	Mineral Resources (Sustainable Development) Act 1990
MRSDMIR	Mineral Resources (Sustainable Development) (Mineral Industries) Regulations 2019
MTB	Mountain Bike
PCB	Polychlorinated Biphenyl
PFAS	Per- and Polyfluoroalkyl Substances
RVAC	Resources Victoria Approvals Coordination
The Project	The rehabilitation of the Yallourn mine
Site	Yallourn Mine
SRW	Southern Rural Water
Stakeholder	Individuals or groups that are likely to affect, or be affected, by a proposed project.
SWOP	Saline Waste Outfall Pipeline
UNDRIP	United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples
WGCMA	West Gippsland Catchment Management Authority
WQ/WB	Water Quality / Water Balance
YNOC	Yallourn North Open Cut

Introduction

EAY's plan for a pit lake at Yallourn has been under consideration for a long time. Since it was first proposed as the rehabilitation solution in the early to mid-1990s by the State Electricity Commission of Victoria (SECV), subsequent modelling and investigations by industry experts and EAY have supported this solution.

To meet regulatory obligations, EAY developed a 485-page DMRP and will submit a final plan to the Victorian government for assessment in September 2025. The DMRP documents the plan to make the mine site safe, stable, and sustainable by filling the mine voids with water. This will create a lake that locals and visitors can enjoy, while also serving as a home for wildlife.

Legislative requirements

As a declared mine licensee, EAY has a duty to consult with the community during mine closure and rehabilitation under the Mineral Resources (Sustainable Development) Act 1990 (MRSDA) and the *Mineral Resources (Sustainable Development) (Mineral Industries) Regulations 2019* (MRSDMIR). This duty to consult includes specific requirements for the DMRP, including a 60-day public exhibition period, evidence of consultations, and copies of any submissions received.
This public exhibition was held between 18 June to 18 August 2025.

Related documents

Further Information relating to community and stakeholder engagement can be found in the following documents:

- Declared Mine Rehabilitation Plan - as exhibited during the 60-day period
- Yallourn Stakeholder and Community Engagement Plan (CSEP) -provides a strategic framework with guidelines for community and stakeholder engagement related to the DMRP (Appendix D of DMRP).
- DMRP Engagement Summary Report - provides a summary of all engagement activities conducted, and feedback received in the 60-day period (Appendix G of DMRP).
- Copies of submissions - as submitted to the Department Head with the DMRP (Appendix F of DMRP).

Purpose of the EAY DMRP Stakeholder and Community Consultation Register

This EAY DMRP Stakeholder and Community Consultation Register has been developed to document how EAY has reviewed community and stakeholder submissions received during the 60-day public exhibition period. In particular, this register demonstrates compliance with:

- Reg 64H(3) *The declared mine licensee must consider any submissions that are received on or before the date specified in subregulation (2)(c)*
- Reg. 64J(a)(i) *that sets out the matters raised within the consultations and the declared mine licensee's response to those matters.*

Register

Table 1 Survey and in-person

#	Submission Form	Consultation Manager Event #	Stakeholder Category	Stakeholder Group Name	Feedback / Comment	Modification to DMRP	No change to DMRP
001	Survey Form	3436	Community Group / not for profit	Also listed Energy Industry, Individual	"A trail around the outside of the lake, connecting to Morwell, Newborough, and Yinnar via Hazelwood, via rail trails, shared pathways and multi-use trails and bike paths"	Added new section 9.3.1 to DMRP to capture feedback on land uses and how EAY can assist in the supporting these.	NA
002	Survey Form	3436	Business or small business	Also listed Energy Industry	"I can see the power of work that has gone into it, and am excited by the opportunity it presents"	NA	NA
003	Survey Form	3436	Other	NA	"It's a lovely document'	NA	NA
004	Survey Form	3436	Industry association	NA	"Great plan, lots of work and effort. Should leave a positive legacy for the site "	NA	NA
005	Survey Form	3436	Individual	NA	"No suggestions at the moment. The plan seems logical"	NA	NA
006	Survey Form	3436	Individual	NA	"Hoping there is water activities walking paths and gardens "	Added new section 9.3.1 to DMRP to capture feedback on land uses and how EAY can assist in the supporting these.	NA
007	Survey Form	3436	Individual	NA	"Park lands created engaging local workforce."	Added new section 9.3.1 to DMRP to capture feedback on land uses and how EAY can assist in the supporting these.	NA
008	Survey Form	3436	Energy Industry	NA	"I'd like to see the recreational areas surrounding the proposed lake turned into rallycross/racing tracks, walking/running tracks, or golf courses"	Added new section 9.3.1 to DMRP to capture feedback on land uses and how EAY can assist in the supporting these.	NA
009	Survey Form	3436	Industry association	NA	"No suggestions as I am not an expert in rehabilitation but would like to congratulate the team on presenting a great webinar. Information was clear & easy to understand and nice to see the original plan created 30+ years ago was and is still the best option"	NA	NA
010	Survey Form	3436	Individual	NA	"There are patches of tree plantings on the plan. By connecting these to existing and planned plantings and regeneration activities, wildlife can use these plantings. Plantings should commence immediately. In the 25 years it will take for the hole to fill with water native plantings could have a real chance to establish and develop into small ecosystems."	NA	EAY aims to create vegetation corridors between existing conservation blocks and bio-link areas, leading to overall environmental improvement.
011	Survey Form	3436	Individual	NA	"I also note no public amenity at all until after the estimated minimum 25 years for the hole to fill. Could there not be a positive use for part of the site?"	Added new section 9.3.1 to DMRP to capture feedback on land uses and how EAY can assist in the supporting these.	NA
012	Survey Form	3436	Individual	NA	"Would like to see a little more detail regarding access to the lake for the community and visitors- i.e. roads, paths, bike tracks, boat ramp? etc and how this may link to - i.e. the Hazelwood area."	NA	EAY is committed to providing a safe, stable and sustainable landform. Further development works are dependent on the future landowner / manager.

#	Submission Form	Consultation Manager Event #	Stakeholder Category	Stakeholder Group Name	Feedback / Comment	Modification to DMRP	No change to DMRP
013	Survey Form	3436	Individual	NA	"As this are including the other sites will hold masses of water, has the weather impact been assessed - i.e. possible higher levels and incidents of heavy fog, particularly in winter."	NA	The creation of a micro-climate for the region has not been raised as a concern in the Yallourn rehabilitation risk assessment but could make an interesting research project.
014	Survey Form	3436	Government (local, state, federal)	NA	"No. Thank you for the opportunity to provide feedback"	NA	NA
016	In-person	3092	State Government	DEECA	List of appendices to be added to table of contents	Added list of Appendices to Table of Contents	NA
017	In-person	3097	Individual	NA	No bike paths in Morwell River wetlands, Biolink from Witts Gully, Biolink everywhere around site, permanent offset protection	NA	EAY are unable to provide comment regarding bike tracks in the Morwell River wetlands as this be dependent on the future landowner/manager. Strzelecki-Alpine Bio-link is discussed in Section 9.2 Post Mining Landuse. Whilst not included as an Appendix, EAY has a Conservation Strategy that shows potential areas for existing conservation zones to be linked with the Bio-link areas.
018	In-person	3097	Individual	NA	Whole of catchment carp strategy. Could turn into fertiliser for rose garden	NA	A whole of catchment carp strategy is not within the scope of the DMRP. Pest species such as carp are listed in the Risk Assessment Actions section of the DMRP. The West Gippsland Catchment Management Authority (WGCMA) has a program called "Transformation of the Latrobe: Pathways for the Latrobe River System" which includes carp control initiatives (https://wgcma.vic.gov.au/project/latrobe/)
019	In-person	3093	Individual	NA	General discussion about issues and desirability of early Environment Effects Statement.	NA	EAY have not referred the project for review and therefore a decision has not been made as to whether an Environmental Effects Statement (EES) is required. Information about the EES process is contained in the Regulatory Context chapter.
020	In-person	3156	Energy Industry	Engie	Captions on Figure 7-4 and 7-5 in the DMRP need to be swapped as they do not match the relevant plant species	Corrections made to Figure 7 -4 and Figure 7-5	NA
030	Survey Form	3436	Energy Industry	NA	"Good to promote the end design with locals as a public place for recreation"	NA	NA

#	Submission Form	Consultation Manager Event #	Stakeholder Category	Stakeholder Group Name	Feedback / Comment	Modification to DMRP	No change to DMRP
031	Survey Form	3436	Community Group / not for profit	Gippsland MTB Inc	"Gippsland MTB Inc Support the Yallourn DMRP as it provides opportunity for recreational benefit for the community. Gippsland MTB Inc funded, developed and manage the $2m mountain bike trails at Haunted Hills Bike Park, adjacent the Yallourn Mine. Over 100K visitors have used the mountain bike trails since they commenced operation in 2021. (free for public use). Latrobe City Council manages the land and leases a portion of the land from EnergyAustralia. Gippsland MTB Inc would like to expand the trail network east towards the rehabilitated mine to expand the trail offering and to connect into the tracks and trails of the Latrobe Valley Inter-township Trail Network that connect to the proposed Gippsland Odyssey Trail that has been planned for the Gippsland Region by Destination Gippsland. This could be easily done by linking trails around the mine and would result in a great outcome for the community, to connect the towns of Morwell and Newborough together by a shared pathway, free from motorised vehicles that make it safe for pedestrians and cyclists."	Added new section 9.3.1 to DMRP to capture feedback on land uses and how EAY can assist in the supporting these.	EA has received a number of requests for long-term access to the site for community recreation. EA has not yet made a decision on these requests. Yallourn currently facilitates community access and hosts a variety of community groups including mountain biking, rifle shooting and tracks and trails. Our vision for a rehabilitated site is that it continues to create opportunities to support community recreation.
032	Survey Form	3436	Community Group / not for profit	NA	"The Draft Declared Mine Rehabilitation Plan needs to go beyond the minimum requirements for stability and water management. I urge EnergyAustralia to set out a bigger vision, one that includes a clear pathway for reclaiming the land for future social, cultural, and economic use. Rehabilitation should not just make the site safe, but restore its value to the community, supporting opportunities such as public open space, cultural projects, tourism, or habitat restoration. Without this forward-looking plan, we risk missing the chance to transform a former industrial site into a place that benefits people and Country for generations."	NA	EAYs vision is to *transform the Yallourn site into a landscape that enables ongoing prosperity and amenity for all. One that is an example of what can be achieved when business, government, communities, and custodians of the land work together.* Whilst EAY are not responsible for delivering the repurposing of the site, we will continue to collaborate with relevant stakeholders and community to understand the longer term vision for the site and how we can prepare the landform for future land uses.
033	Survey Form	3436	Agriculture/farming	Also listed Research, Individual	"I am a soil scientist. Consider use of tree planting to minimise land movement. Consider planting industrial hemp as a means of cleaning toxins from soil. The hemp can be made into building materials to sequester carbon and toxic chemicals in a safe manner for hundreds of years. By cleaning toxins from soil with useful crops then land can be returned to market gardens or similar. i would like to chance to put forward this view."	NA	This comment is aimed more around offering their professional services when considering land stabilisation and contaminated land remediation. We have responded by email and will likely setup a meeting in the future to learn more about other projects they have been involved in to see what could be implemented here.

#	Submission Form	Consultation Manager Event #	Stakeholder Category	Stakeholder Group Name	Feedback / Comment	Modification to DMRP	No change to DMRP
034	Survey Form	3436	Energy Industry	NA	"How will EnergyAustralia fix the fire service pond and station drain pond contaminant before filling the mines"	NA	Monitoring and modelling do not show contamination; further modelling will be completed as part of KG03 and KG17
035	Survey Form	3436	Energy Industry	Also listed Business or small business, Individual	"My family was raised at Morwell River and I would really love to see some of the heritage and history of this settlement brought back. We recently visited and there are still orchards there and some remaining historical components. As much as I understand the communities vision of rehabilitating the area into something new, I am hoping we also do not forget our rich history of the past. "	Added new section 9.3.1 to DMRP to capture feedback on land uses and how EAY can assist in the supporting these.	NA
036	Survey Form	3436	Agriculture/farming	Also listed Energy Industry	"Government should provide fair financial support for rehab water volume for their contribution to the current proposed pit lake size - e.g. equivalent to the % of total volume dirt/coal mined under SECV vs that post privatisation."	NA	EAY appreciates the support provided by the individual and will continue to engage with relevant government agencies regarding water pricing.
037	Survey Form	3436	Individual	NA	"Fire safety of the bush area on Coach Road - back burn or clean up. Fire safety threat to Yallourn Heights & Monash Views residential \ housing areas"	NA	This comment is based on current conditions rather than being related to mine rehabilitation. The information has been passed to relevant group at Yallourn to review.
038	Survey Form	3436	Community Group / not for profit	NA	"Agree water is the best option for stability and security but will require careful management especially regarding the Latrobe River and Morwell River. Conservation/wetland areas essential. Want to see appropriate areas developed to provide economic uses and jobs for local people."	NA	The DMRP sets out the vision to transform the site into a landscape that enables ongoing prosperity whilst being safe, stable and sustainable.
039	Survey Form	3436	Prefer not to say	NA	"Would be good if people could use it for activities. A nice pathed walk way and walking trail. If done badly will negatively affect the community if done well will uplift the town"	Added new section 9.3.1 to DMRP to capture feedback on land uses and how EAY can assist in the supporting these.	NA
040	Survey Form	3436	Prefer not to say	NA	"Dont close the mine. Keep the coal for us and burn it here."	NA	EnergyAustralia are committed to closing the Yallourn Mine in mid-2028.
042	Survey Form	3436	Individual	NA	I am looking forward to having the lake recreational area for families to utilise, my main concerns are for the nearby farmers and any potential contamination of land and water from the demolition of the plant.	NA	All potentially contaminated areas are investigated and managed in accordance with statutory guidelines and legislation to ensure that the land supports the respective post mining land use.

#	Submission Form	Consultation Manager Event #	Stakeholder Category	Stakeholder Group Name	Feedback / Comment	Modification to DMRP	No change to DMRP
043	Survey Form	3436	Community Group / not for profit	Also listed Individual	I am concerned that the plan requires a large amount of water with considerable restrictions and hence will take a very long time before the area can be fully utilised by the community. I don't support taking additional water from the local environment due to the impact on downstream agriculture and environment such as Gippsland Lakes. There doesn't appear to be consideration of using additional water such as could be provided by the desalination plant. A related concern is that the resultant pit lakes will be safe to use for recreation such as fishing, boating etc.	NA	EAY are undertaking detailed technical studies, which combine government policy such as the Latrobe Valley Regional Rehabilitation Strategy (LVRRS). These studies detail how water can be used from the Latrobe River system for mine rehabilitation and the quality of the final lake. EAYs investigations into alternative water sources match the outcomes of the LVRRS review which concluded “while a manufactured water supply for mine rehabilitation is feasible, it remains complex and expensive.”
044	Survey Form	3436	Individual	NA	Appears to be a sensible solution	NA	NA
045	Survey Form	3436	Energy Industry	Also listed Research, Other	Plant out MRD riparian zone and levee banks with shallow rooted species of local provenance (sedges, grasses, forbs, shrubs etc). Good opportunity to create a translocation zone for fauna that live in the town pit before inundation.	NA	This is effectively the plan. Exact species to be confirmed. Plantings on the MRD will be restricted by geotechnical considerations.

Table 2 Advance Morwell (Event ID 3252)

#	Feedback / Comment	Modification to DMRP	No change to DMRP
021	"Advance Morwell supports the proposed rehabilitation of the Yallourn mine site, particularly the transformation of the mine voids into an interconnected lake system. This initiative represents a responsible and forward-thinking approach to mine closure and land repurposing, with significant potential benefits for Morwell and the broader Latrobe Valley". [list of reasons for support are within the submission] "Advance Morwell believes that the Yallourn DMRP aligns with our vision for a thriving, sustainable Morwell. We encourage EnergyAustralia and the Victorian Government to continue engaging with local stakeholders including Advance Morwell and to prioritise initiatives that maximise community benefit."	NA	EAY will continue to engage with Advance Morwell as per the DMRP Community and Stakeholder Engagement Plan.

Table 3 Concerned Waterways Alliance (CWA) (Event ID 3378)

#	Feedback / Comment	Modification to DMRP	No change to DMRP
184	The draft DMRP proposes to rehabilitate the Yallourn open-cut coal mine via a 665 GL pit lake (Lake Yallourn). CWA welcomes the opportunity to comment but urges a shift away from a single, water-intensive solution. We recommend a hybrid approach that first exhausts non- water-intensive options (strategic backfill, engineered landforms, dry covers and revegetation) and only then considers highly conditional use of water sources to fill a pit lake. The provision of alternative, manufactured water sources should be considered and all externalities accounted for in considering costs.	NA	EAY have completed considerable work in this space, along with the Latrobe Valley Regional Rehabilitation Strategy (LVRRS), with the lake being the preferred solution to provide stability for the site. We do not believe that any further analysis of the options will provide benefit to our rehabilitation planning. EAY are undertaking detailed technical studies, which combine government policy such as the Latrobe Valley Regional Rehabilitation Strategy (LVRRS). These studies detail how water can be used from the Latrobe River system for mine rehabilitation and the quality of the final lake. EAYs investigations into alternative water sources match the outcomes of the LVRRS review which concluded “while a manufactured water supply for mine rehabilitation is feasible, it remains complex and expensive.”
185	Key Point: Protecting the Latrobe River, the Gippsland Lakes Ramsar site and existing users by limiting new consumptive demand by the mine operator and accounting for loss of existing return flows and future evaporative losses.	NA	No response as the comment appears to be directed at government decision making
186	Key Point: Addressing long-standing geotechnical and flood risks associated with the Morwell River Diversion (MRD) via rerouting or robust reconstruction and flood-relief spillways before lake filling can be contemplated.	NA	Feedback noted. Timing of the spillway construction and commissioning timing is noted in Ch. 17 Knowledge Gaps (KG15).
187	Key Point: Demonstrating that any water access granted for mine rehabilitation is genuinely sustainable, time-limited, climate-contingent and transparently priced—consistent with regional strategies and public expectations, and impacts are thoroughly assessed	NA	No response as the comment appears to be directed at government decision making
188	Key Point: Publishing clear, measurable closure criteria, independent verification pathways and adequate financial assurance for post-closure performance and contingencies.	NA	The DMRP acknowledges in the knowledge gap section that more work is needed on the closure criteria
189	Suggested principle: Avoid irreversible commitments that depend on an uncertain future water.	NA	The DMRP (in particular the Disclaimer) make it clear that the environmental and financial conditions relating to the access of water can result in a change to the rehabilitation outcome
190	Suggested principle: Minimise ongoing management by favouring passive stability and fire risk controls.	NA	The 'Sustainable Project Principle" states that "The rehabilitated mine land will remain in a condition that requires minimal intervention to support the nominated post mining land uses…."

#	Feedback / Comment	Modification to DMRP	No change to DMRP
191	Suggested principle: Respect environmental flow requirements and planned increase to environmental allocations and enhance the health of the Lower Latrobe wetlands and Gippsland Lakes.	NA	EAY will align any bulk water entitlement application with the water access conditions presented in the Latrobe Valley Regional Rehabilitation Strategy (LVRRS) Amendment and comply with any conditions of an issued entitlement.
192	Suggested principle: Ensure Traditional Owners are partners in deciding future land and water use.	NA	EAY will continue to engage with GLaWAC on rehabilitation outcomes including discussions related to 'Pathways to Partnership'.
193	Key Concern 1. Scale of water use and permanent losses. Recommendation: Ensure there is no net reduction in water resources available to the Latrobe system by adjusting its bulk entitlement application to account for the loss of return flows.	NA	No response as the comment appears to be directed at government decision making
194	Key Concern 1. Scale of water use and permanent losses. Recommendation: Model whole-of-system impacts (including the Gippsland Lakes) for median and dry climate sequences.	NA	No response as the comment appears to be directed at government decision making
195	Key Concern 1. Scale of water use and permanent losses. Recommendation: Publicly commit to halting take in dry years and sharing reductions at least proportionally with other users.	NA	No response as the comment appears to be directed at government decision making
196	Key Concern 2 MRD. Recommendation: Undertakes a transparent options assessment with whole-of-life costs and risks: rerouting the Morwell River away from the void or fully upgrading the MRD to contemporary standard	NA	Feedback noted. Options for MRD have been considered over the history of Yallourn rehabilitation planning and are reflected in the proposed MRD design. Historical rehabilitation plans are presented in DMRP Ch. 3.5.
197	Key Concern 2 MRD. Recommendation: If the current alignment is maintained, commits to flood-relief spillways sized for climate-adjusted design events	Added Alluvium 2025 – Regional hydrologic impact assessment (Flood Study) to Appendix C.	Spillway sizing presented in the DMRP considers climate scenarios adopting SSP5-8.5 for multiple AEPs, results presented in Ch 8, Table 8-4.
198	Key Concern 2 MRD. Recommendation: Publishes a conservative emergency action plan with responsibilities after licence relinquishment.	NA	Emergency Response Plan is a supporting document as per Section 14.3
199	Key Concern 3 Water Quality and Geochemistry: Pit lakes can stratify and develop poor water quality if inflows are low or of marginal quality. The DMRP should disclose full inputs, assumptions and uncertainty for water-quality and geochemical models (including acidity, salinity, metals/metalloids, and sulfate reduction dynamics) and set precautionary acceptance criteria for any off-site discharges. It should undertake a full analysis of the potential for, and consequences of, stratification in the water body, and potential corrective actions and who will fund them.	NA	Stratification / Hydrodynamic modelling is currently underway and noted as a key knowledge gap (KG03, KG17 & KG21) Further WQ modelling will also be conducted (KG23) to improve accuracy of current knowledge, with the results informing agreed closure criteria KG25
200	Key Concern 3 Water Quality and Geochemistry: The DMRP should adopt conservative water-quality objectives aligned to intended beneficial uses (e.g., recreation/ecology) and publish calibration/validation details and sensitivity analyses for water-quality models.	NA	This is covered by knowledge Gaps KG03, KG17, KG25
201	Key Concern 3 Water Quality and Geochemistry: Greater attention is required to the issue of potential contamination by heavy metals. Some metals are predicted to reach concentrations close to ANZG freshwater protection guidelines. Manganese could pose a particular problem if stratification occurs resulting in anoxic conditions that cause it to become soluble. Subsequent mixing could bring soluble manganese to the surface where it could stain the water and be toxic to fish. Mercury rates only a passing mention even though it is present in Latrobe Valley coal and has potentially contaminated the catchment through deposition. It has the potential to bioaccumulate in fish and can be dangerous even at the modelled low level of 0.2 µg/L.	NA	Impacts of stratification/mixing are being completed as part of the Stratification / Hydrodynamic works and noted as a key knowledge gap KG03, KG17 & KG21 Mercury was not modelled because it is below instrumental detection limits in the data used for the various source terms.

#	Feedback / Comment	Modification to DMRP	No change to DMRP
202	Key Concern 3 Water Quality and Geochemistry: We ask that the final plan includes a commitment to monitor bio accumulative toxins (mercury, plus any PFAS or other industrial remnants) in biota, in addition to levels in the water. If fishing and recreation are intended uses, the lake must meet edible fish standards over time, rather than raw water quality standards only.	Noted in Chapter 15.5.2 monitoring will be expanded to include the fauna within the lake water bodies, and for potential bioaccumulation of toxins within the biota,	NA
203	Key Concern 3 Water Quality and Geochemistry: The aspiration for a recreational lake raises the issue of eutrophication and the potential for algal blooms. Recent experience in the Gippsland Lakes and elsewhere shows just how devastating these blooms can be for marine and freshwater ecosystems. The DMRP mentions a planned next stage of modelling for nutrients (KG04), which we suggest includes an assessment of the potential for algal blooms and potential nutrient reduction measures such as pre- screening inflows, upstream catchment actions to reduce nutrients, creating treatment wetlands at entry points, or aerating to avoid the stratification that favours certain cyanobacteria.	Knowledge Gap chapter contains item KG26 to review whether the lake could support algal growth and to undertake an environmental risk assessment which would identify control actions. For clarity, reviewing potential nutrient reduction measures has been added to the DMRP.	NA
204	Key Concern 4 Geotechnical Stability: CWA supports passive stability measures, but requests clearer linkage between design acceptance criteria, climate-adjusted loading, and post-closure monitoring. The adopted design- intent period should be matched with transparent inspection, trigger-action plans, and provision for major maintenance.	NA	Planning or regulatory requirements often govern the level of technical information we must provide, leading to highly technical documents. Although we have worked hard to make the information more accessible, we appreciate the community's feedback and will incorporate it into future work.
205	Key Concern 4 Geotechnical Stability: Publish factor-of-safety and probability-of-failure targets by domain and phase.	NA	Factor of Safety by domains and phases of rehabilitation are presented in Table 8-37 of the DMRP. The justification on adopted geotech design criteria and discussion in consideration of industry literature and guidelines are presented in Ch 8.9.4.2.4 of DMRP.
206	Key Concern 4 Geotechnical Stability: Commit to independent verification of buttressing, batter reshaping and erosion controls.	NA	A third-party review of the geotechnical methodology used in the feasibility level rehabilitation design, as presented in the DMRP, is to be conducted.
207	Key Concern 4 Geotechnical Stability: Align triggers for intervention with conservative deformation and pore-pressure thresholds.	NA	Post-closure monitoring requirements will be an outcome of the detailed design phase and included in the post-closure monitoring and management plan (KG31).
208	Recommendation: CWA recommends that the use of manufactured water (recycled water, storm water and—if economically and environmentally justified—desalinated water) needs to be fully explored.	NA	EAYs investigations into alternative water sources match the outcomes of the LVRRS review which concluded "while a manufactured water supply for mine rehabilitation is feasible, it remains complex and expensive."
209	If any surface water is accessed, it must be under a transparent entitlement with strict, climate- contingent rules and a price reflecting scarcity and opportunity cost.	NA	The specific water access conditions will be determined by the Minister for Water when issuing any bulk water entitlements.
210	We note that the DMRP flags conditions for a new bulk entitlement licence: restricting daily extraction volumes, limiting the months when extractions can occur, and no access to run of the river flows when levels fall below a certain limit, as in the Table below. However, questions remain as to whether surface water extractions are warranted at all given the dire need of the Latrobe River and the Gippsland Lakes systems for increased flows.	NA	EAY will align any bulk water entitlement application with the water access conditions presented in the Latrobe Valley Regional Rehabilitation Strategy (LVRRS) Amendment and comply with any conditions of an issued entitlement.
211	Evaporative losses from the pit lake must be treated as a real cost to the system, offset with investments that improve river health.	NA	Water costing and subsequent allocation of those funds is not a component of the DMRP process.

#	Feedback / Comment	Modification to DMRP	No change to DMRP
212	Further it is essential that substitution away from environmental water does not occur and that we ensure no there is no diminution of planned environmental outcomes.	NA	A regional water balance study was completed considering the proposed rehabilitation design with a particular focus on the influence to water balance from proposed MRD remediation design. The results of this study support the Yallourn Mine rehabilitation design and demonstrates that there are no adverse influences on regional water balance. The study further confirms that proposed MRD remediation design allows all environmental flows to pass through MRD, along with flood flows up to the design levels. Detailed regional water quality investigations including water balance and water quality impact assessments is noted as a knowledge gap (KG15, Chapter 17).
213	There is also the question of how the volumes accessed from the Latrobe River should be priced. As the CWA discussed in our recent submission on the Economic Value and Pricing of Surface Water for Mine Rehabilitation in the Latrobe Valley, the National Water Commission 2009 Waterlines report declared: 'The Victorian Government established a price of $1500 per ML for water from its currently unallocated share in Blue Rock Dam which is regarded as the cost of water for maintenance and supply by Southern Rural Water'.	NA	Water costing and subsequent allocation of those funds is not a component of the DMRP process.
214	The CWA believes the draft DMRP is misaligned with several key regional and state policies that govern mine rehabilitation, water resources, and environmental protection. Specifically, the plan's heavy reliance on water and pit lake outcomes appears to conflict with the Latrobe Valley Regional Rehabilitation Strategy (LVRRS) and the Central & Gippsland Region Sustainable Water Strategy (CGRSWS), as well as broader climate adaptation strategies.	NA	EAY have completed considerable work in this space, along with the Latrobe Valley Regional Rehabilitation Strategy (LVRRS), with the lake being the preferred solution to provide stability for the site. We do not believe that any further analysis of the options will provide benefit to our rehabilitation planning.
215	The draft DMRP […] still relies on a plan conceived in the 1990s, updated with technical tweaks, but not fundamentally challenged by the new reality of water scarcity. Aligning with LVRRS would mean demonstrating that the pit lake option is truly sustainable when all externalities are considered.	NA	EAY have completed considerable work in this space, along with the Latrobe Valley Regional Rehabilitation Strategy (LVRRS), with the lake being the preferred solution to provide stability for the site. We do not believe that any further analysis of the options will provide benefit to our rehabilitation planning.
216	(summarised by EA) Granting a new bulk entitlement for mine rehabilitation before the CGRSWS action to "develop a vision and plan for the water future of the Latrobe Valley" is complete seems grossly premature	NA	No response as the comment appears to be directed at government decision making
217	CWA recommends a Commonwealth assessment under the water trigger, together with a State EES, to create a rigorous, transparent pathway to safeguard water resources, Ramsar values, and threatened species in the Gippsland Lakes and Lower Latrobe Wetlands.	NA	As per Table 4-6 of the DMRP, EAY continue to review if the rehabilitation project triggers the requirement for EPBC Act approval due to the water trigger or the potential for a significant impact of any other Matters of National Environmental Significance (MNES).
218	Establish an open data portal for hydrology, groundwater, geotechnical, and water-quality time-series.	Modified section 14.4.2 of the DMRP to include the below statements The aspiration for the Common Data Environment is that. • It will be accessible by different stakeholder groups (including the general public) with varying levels of access granted to the different stakeholder groups. • It will support real time access to key rehabilitation data	NA
219	Set aside adequate financial assurance to fund monitoring, maintenance, and corrective works after rehabilitation works are complete.	NA	Chapter 16 commits to this "If post closure maintenance is required due to unacceptable monitoring, or unplanned events, the Post Closure Fund contribution by EAY will be used for financial assistance."
220	Formalise Traditional Owner partnership arrangements in governance and monitoring design.	NA	EAY is engaging with GLaWAC in relation to 'Pathways to Partnership'

#	Feedback / Comment	Modification to DMRP	No change to DMRP
221	Recommendation 1. Adopt a hybrid rehabilitation pathway that first minimises water demand and only then—if all conditions are met—progresses to staged lake development.	NA	No response as the comment appears to be directed at government decision making
222	Recommendation 2. Commit to MRD risk reduction: reroute or rebuild plus climate-robust spillways, with transparent emergency planning, independent peer review and community consultation.	NA	Feedback noted. Options for MRD have been considered over the history of Yallourn rehabilitation planning and are reflected in the proposed MRD design. Historical rehabilitation plans are presented in DMRP Chapter 3.5.
223	Recommendation 3. Apply strict, climate-contingent water access rules with transparent pricing and accounting; treat evaporation as a cost and account for the loss of existing return flows.	NA	No response as the comment appears to be directed at government decision making
224	Recommendation 4. Provide whole-of-system hydrologic and water-quality assessments for median and dry climate sequences, including impacts on the Gippsland Lakes.	Alluvium 2025 Regional Hydrological Impact Assessment report - on regional water balance & water quality has been added to Appendix C of DMRP.	Detailed assessment of the downstream water quality impacts is noted in the knowledge gap, Chapter 17, KG15.
225	Recommendation 5. Publish full methods and uncertainty for water-quality modelling; adopt precautionary objectives aligned to intended beneficial uses.	NA	The full WB/WQ modelling report (RGS 2025) was available for the 60 day consultation period. The report details the modelling methods and limitations. Further modelling works are also underway.
226	Recommendation 6. Set conservative operating levels and triggers to protect baseflows and connected ecosystems.	NA	No response as the comment appears to be directed at government decision making
227	Recommendation 7. Establish independent oversight, open data and fit-for-purpose financial assurance throughout the post-closure period.	NA	To be considered as part of KG31

Table 4 DEECA Water Resources Strategy Division (Event ID 3165)

#	Feedback / Comment	Modification to DMRP	No change to DMRP
022	"EnergyAustralia's Yallourn draft DMRP proposes water-based rehabilitation and acknowledges the need for various approvals under the Water Act 1989, including, but not limited to various water entitlements and works licences. I therefore encourage you to engage with relevant regulators — including Southern Rural Water and West Gippsland Catchment Management Authority — in a timely and coordinated way."	NA	These stakeholders are listed in the DMRP Community and Stakeholder Engagement Plan. Engagement will occur as required.
023	"I note the draft DMRP states that EnergyAustralia Yallourn plans to apply to the Minister for Water for a bulk water entitlement for mine rehabilitation by the end of 2026. I encourage you to continue to work with the Department of Energy, Environment and Climate Action on progressing timely rehabilitation planning."	NA	These stakeholders are listed in the DMRP Community and Stakeholder Engagement Plan. Engagement will occur as required.
024	"Finally, I note that EnergyAustralia Yallourn has not included the referenced appendices in your draft DMRP, nor any technical reports relating to surface water. Please consider making these available to ensure that the community is appropriately informed during the public exhibition period."	NA	Key appendices were available on the website during the public exhibition period, however these were not part of the main DMRP PDF due to the large file size.

Table 5 DEECA, Resources Victoria Approvals Coordination (RVAC) (Event ID 3289)

#	Feedback / Comment	Modification to DMRP	No change to DMRP
025	Refine definition and incorporation of rehabilitation domains "Suggestion: Define rehabilitation domain as a physical area or aspect with similar rehabilitation activities and objectives. Example list of domain could then be Voids , Morwell river diversion, Ash disposal and overburden dumps (excludes area within voids), Infrastructure offices and roads, Surface water (whole of site), Groundwater (whole of site), Land undisturbed by mining. Comment: The document currently define rehabilitation domain must on a physical area and defines aspects are for whole of site environmental consideration. By using the rehabilitation domain definition above the rehabilitation domain then provide a link between end land uses, rehabilitation activities and the objectives and closure criteria. This provide cohesion through the document to clarify how the closure criteria will deliver a landform capable of supporting the end land use(s).The rehabilitation domain can be update and or broken into sub domain in the future. This also set up a structure to allow for relinquishment of discrete area of the site in the future."	Redefined the rehabilitation domains, removed references to aspects and linked domains to end land uses. Feedback accepted and changes made in Section 3.7 of the DMRP	NA
026	Refine rehabilitation objectives "Suggestion: (1) Group objective against rehabilitation domain. (2) For each domain consider the landform and proposed land use(s) to confirm all objectives have been capture (for surface water domain objective will be site specific but cover whole of site but for the void their will be site and domain specific.) This should help identify some missing objective. (3) Review wording of objective to ensure they are state an aim/desired outcome Comment: Currently the rehabilitation objectives in table 6-2 are linked to the closure principle by aspects. There appear to be some gaps such as developing an objective(s) for groundwater and ground movement outside of voids. Review and refine wording of objective to make sure it is setting an expectation and not describing an activity e.g. "Exposed coal is managed appropriately to manage the risk of fire in the long term." doesn't say what the aim or objective for managing exposed coal re-phrase to something like " Long term management requirement for exposed coal leave the risk of fire from exposed coal similar to surrounding land fire risk"	Refined rehabilitation objectives and linked them to the rehabilitation domains. Feedback accepted and changes made in Chapter 6 of the DMRP	NA

#	Feedback / Comment	Modification to DMRP	No change to DMRP
027	Refine Closure Criteria in DMRP "Suggestions: (1) Group closure criteria against rehabilitation domain and objectives with a number system. (2) Remove measurement and time columns. (3) Review and update closure criteria to be SMART. Comment: Because the objective table is separate to the closure criteria and one is linked to aspects and the other to landuse it difficult to corollate the table and be confident all objective have closure criteria and that the closure criteria if met support the vision and proposed land uses. The measurement and time columns can be removed, they are not required to demonstrate criteria are SMART. SMART is about making sure each criteria can be clearly interpreted. e.g. if a criteria is about doing something such as build drainage as per surface water drainage design - if met this is inherently time bound as it is done or not. Its specific and measurable (assuming design is detailed) etc Not all of the closure criteria are SMART suggestion reviewing and updating. For example "No gullies greater than 30cm erosion depth. Rilling trend improving." The first sentence is SMART the second is not."	Refined closure criteria and linked them to rehab objectives, domains and end land use.	NA
028	Add detail and clarity to knowledge gaps and implementation plan "Suggestion: (1) Expand the table in milestones section 14.2 The level of detail should show activities, assessments designs and approvals need to implement the proposed activities these should be time bound (either by date or activity). (2) Consider numbering knowledge gaps and approval and or bringing into implementation chapter. (3) Knowledge gap need to address the purpose and outcome of each gap Comment: The implementation plan need to convey how the rehabilitation plan is feasible to implement where and how knowledge gap will be address and be a piece to hold the licensee accountable for progressing rehabilitation planning. Recognise that too much detail would be prescriptive so more detail on what is needed and known to be need in the coming 3-5 is appropriate."	Included a knowledge gap to "Review and expand on the implementation plan to include details of activities and approvals (where required)"	NA
029	Opportunities to reduce volume of DMRP to provide a more concise document "Suggestion: (1) Review the technical studies chapter to provide more concise summaries Comment: Appreciate there is a balance between too much and not enough and there is personal judgment in what to include in some aspects. Having said that i think there is definitely an opportunity to reduce the volume of the technical studies chapter. It is reasonable to assume technical reviewers will read the supporting or appendicised report and that the DMRP is a summary. For example the 8.3 the groundwater assessment appear to be a whole summary report within the DMRP. Aspect that should be summarised in the DMRP in regards to assessments are purpose, methodology, assumptions and findings/recommendation. Aspect like the regional setting for a modelling can be left in the report. "	NA	EAY considers the technical studies section in the DMRP necessary for the reader to understand the context. Future reviews of the DMRP will seek to simplify this chapter where possible but will not commit to wholesale changes.

Table 6 Destination Gippsland (Event ID 3389)

#	Feedback / Comment	Modification to DMRP	No change to DMRP
041	(summarised by EAY). Destination Gippsland "support the draft plan, in particular the vision to make the mine site safe, stable and sustainable by filling the mine voids with water with a view to creating a lake that locals and visitors can enjoy and wildlife calls home". Destination Gippsland Toward 2030 Destination Management Plan (DMP), outlines the opportunity presented by the closure for Tourism, in particular an 'Adventure Hub' for recreational and tourism purposes.	Added new section 9.3.1 to DMRP to capture feedback on land uses and how EAY can assist in the supporting these.	EA has received a number of requests for long-term access to the site for community recreation. EA has not yet made a decision on these requests. Yallourn currently facilitates community access and hosts a variety of community groups including mountain biking, rifle shooting and tracks and trails. Our vision for a rehabilitated site is that it continues to create opportunities to support community recreation.

Table 7 Environment Victoria (Event ID 3381)

#	Feedback / Comment	Modification to DMRP	No change to DMRP
108	Issue to address 1. Independent assessment of Morwell River Diversion (MRD) risks The MRD's collapse in 2012 and further damage in 2021 demonstrate its vulnerability (ABC News,2012; EnergyAustralia, 2021). EnergyAustralia's own feasibility studies acknowledge the diversion may not survive over time, even in a reduced form (EnergyAustralia, 2025b). Rehabilitation designs must therefore be based on independent failure-mode analysis and best-practice engineering standards. Any new structure should be built to maintain or enhance environmental flows under a range of hydrologic and climate futures (West Gippsland CMA, 2023).	NA	The MRD is being redesigned as a rural levee to endure a 100 year design intent period. This includes lake fill to remove hydraulic gradient between the river and the void, reshaping and surface treatment of the embankment, and installation of spillways to reduce flood loading and overtopping events. Maintaining environmental flows through the MRD is the main driver behind the MRD redesign.
109	Issue to address 2. Protecting Morwell River flows and the Latrobe system The plan anticipates replacing the MRD with a smaller levee designed to carry only minimal "environmental flows" (EnergyAustralia, 2025b). Given the uncertainty over its stability, even these reduced flows cannot be guaranteed. The Morwell River now effectively serves as the headwaters of the Durt'Yowan (Latrobe River), and loss of its seasonal high flows and floods would deprive the system of fresh water, nutrients and sediment needed to sustain wetlands, aquatic life and to flush the salt wedge from Lake Wellington (West Gippsland CMA, 2023). Without enforceable guarantees, most of the Morwell River's mean annual runoff risks being diverted into the mine pit, with only occasional trickles reaching the Latrobe in very wet years (Friends of Latrobe Water, 2025). This would have potentially irreversible impacts on the Latrobe River, the Ramsar-listed Gippsland Lakes, and on irrigators and other downstream users (?) dependent on secure water supply (West Gippsland CMA, 2023).	NA	The DMRP presents the environmental flows that will be maintained within the Morwell River. EAY will consider any feedback from DEECA on the environmental flows presented.

#	Feedback / Comment	Modification to DMRP	No change to DMRP
110	Issue to address 3. Scale of water demand The DMRP proposes using around 665 GL of water to fill the mine void (EnergyAustralia, 2025b) —more than the volume of Sydney Harbour (Bureau of Meteorology, 2016) — at a time when climate projections indicate up to 30% less water in the catchment (DEECA, 2022). Relying on this volume from a stressed river system risks unacceptable harm to river health and Ramsar-listed wetlands (West Gippsland CMA, 2023). Alternatives such as recycled or desalinated water were dismissed largely on cost grounds, assuming surface water costs just $11.55/ML (EnergyAustralia, 2025b). With the Victorian Government now consulting on charging a price that reflects the economic value of water (DEECA, 2025), alternatives become more viable. Committing to climate-independent sources would safeguard rivers, protect cultural flows, and future-proof the project (West Gippsland CMA, 2023).	NA	EAY are undertaking detailed technical studies, which combine government policy such as the Latrobe Valley Regional Rehabilitation Strategy (LVRRS). These studies detail how water can be used from the Latrobe River system for mine rehabilitation and the quality of the final lake. EAYs investigations into alternative water sources match the outcomes of the LVRRS review which concluded "while a manufactured water supply for mine rehabilitation is feasible, it remains complex and expensive."
111	Issue to address 4. Stronger safeguards and oversight As drafted, the plan lacks binding commitments to protect environmental flows, integrate adaptive climate planning, and ensure transparent oversight. Clear allocation of responsibilities between EnergyAustralia and government, robust compliance mechanisms, and genuine inclusion of Traditional Owners and local communities will be essential to building trust and delivering the project in line with EnergyAustralia's stated values (EnergyAustralia, 2025a).	NA	Environmental flows are protected through the water take conditions nominated in 3.7.4. Climate planning is an integral part of the Technical Studies completed and a key design consideration.
112	Recommendation: Guarantee the Morwell River's seasonal high flows and floods reach the Latrobe before any flood harvesting into the pit is permitted (Friends of Latrobe Water, 2025).	NA	The DMRP presents the environmental flows that will be maintained within the Morwell River. EAY will consider any feedback from DEECA on the environmental flows presented.
113	Recommendation: Make surface water a last resort, with conditions that protect ecological and cultural flows (West Gippsland CMA, 2023).	NA	No response as the comment appears to be directed at government decision making
114	Recommendation: Re-assess water source options using a realistic, policy-aligned river water price (DEECA, 2025).	NA	EAYs investigations into alternative water sources match the outcomes of the LVRRS review which concluded "while a manufactured water supply for mine rehabilitation is feasible, it remains complex and expensive."
115	Recommendation: Undertake independent MRD failure-mode analysis and build to best-practice standards (EnergyAustralia, 2025b).	NA	Modes of failure were explored in the causation investigations of the June 2021 Mine Incident. The learnings from that are considered in the current assessment and have been factored into the proposed MRD remediated design. Ch 8.12.2.4 of DMRP discusses the Failure Mechanisms that influence the proposed MRD design.
116	Recommendation: Lock in environmental flows as a non-negotiable constraint (DEECA, 2022).	NA	No response as the comment appears to be directed at government decision making
117	Recommendation: Commit to transparent governance with genuine inclusion of Traditional Owners and the broader community (EnergyAustralia, 2025a).	EnergyAustralia is committed to providing honest, substantive, and comprehensive information about all our operational sites and major projects including the DMRP. Our community engagement approach ensures that this information is provided to key stakeholders.	NA

Table 8 8Friends of Latrobe Water (FLoW) (Event ID 3373)

#	Feedback / Comment	Modification to DMRP	No change to DMRP
228	The draft Declared Mine Rehabilitation Plan (DMRP) is a partisan document and there appears to be a significant attempt to put a good gloss on all issues such that the potential risks are diminished or deliberately underweighted. This seems to give the community a rosy view of the outcome when in fact a very different scenario is also possible or probable	NA	EAY will consider this comment when undertaking future reviews of the DMRP.
229	The plan to reduce the existing levee structure to a much smaller rural levee to only allow environmental passing flow means less to the Latrobe River System which has profound implications for water accounting of the Latrobe system that is yet to be fully identified, acknowledged or understood.	NA	As per Section 8.6: A regional water balance study was completed considering the proposed rehabilitation design with a particular focus on the influence to water balance from proposed MRD remediation design. The results of this study supports the Yallourn Mine rehabilitation design and demonstrates that there are no adverse influences on regional water balance. The study further confirms that proposed MRD remediation design allows all environmental flows to pass through MRD, along with flood flows up to the design levels.
230	A new EES process must be undertaken in a rigorous manner.	NA	As per Table 4-6 of the DMRP. EAY continue to work with the Victorian Government to agree on the most appropriate approval pathway beyond the finalisation of the DMRP.
231	The DMRP document is heavily caveated at the beginning that seriously devalues the veracity of the contents and information provided. One is left to wonder as to the total worth of the document as to any viable outcome – are they simply a bunch of desires that may never be realised???	NA	The wording as proposed recognises that while the DMRP reflects the overall goal of rehabilitation, the legislative intention is that it will be an iterative document that is to be updated over time. As at today, the DMRP needs to make assumptions about a range of matters (including environmental conditions) that are outside of EnergyAustralia's control (and so can only estimate), though they can have an impact on delivery of the DMRP. The disclaimer ultimately reflects and acknowledges that, so that it is clear to readers of the document.
232	The technical studies simply do not support pit lake option as the optimal safe, stable, and sustainable solution for the Yallourn mine site.	NA	EAY are confident that the technical studies are providing the information required to plan the rehabilitation of the mine.
233	EAY want to drown the coal to reduce the risk of a coal fire because the steep mined batters on many sides precludes covering the faces with overburden/topsoil. They have a real risk of unstable batters and fire risk yet creating full pit lakes risks collapse of the MRD. What will be the trade-off? This relates to the critical loss of Morwell River flows to the Latrobe River.	NA	Full pit lake provides stabilising support for the MRD. The selection of final lake level compliments both, the geotechnical stability of mined out batters and MRD. Refer to sections 8.12, 8.9.2, PSM 2025 - Appendix C.
234	There are critical omissions with the Alluvium Technical Risk Report for water access (Alluvium and Harc 2023) which underpins the Latrobe Valley Regional Rehabilitation Strategy (LVRRS) guidance amendment and the conditions set for miners to when and how they take water from the river system. That report failed to consider the critical loss of Morwell River inflows to the Latrobe River via changed flow conditions with the MRD. Therefore, the Alluvium and Harc 2023 report is not credible and the LVRRS Guidance Amendments are flawed because flows in the Latrobe River system are over-stated. This paragraph in the DMRP is a concern as EAY explicitly implies Alluvium and Harc 2023 are under-stating water flows which therefore overstates environmental risks, whereas EAY state the risk is low. This is what happens when government and consultants do not use or been made aware of all the facts as facts matter.	NA	No response from EAY as this comment appears to be directed at DEECA and the LVRRS water access study.
235	The DMRP is flawed as it does not discuss the structural integrity of the MRD in a precise, comprehensive and considered way, particularly under a drowned lake scenario.	NA	Feedback noted. Detailed discussions on MRD are presented in the DMRP (multiple chapters). Detailed technical discussion on current state and evidence based design is presented sections Ch 8.6, 8.12, 11.5, 12.3 & PSM 2025 (Appendix C).

#	Feedback / Comment	Modification to DMRP	No change to DMRP
236	The MRD's long-term structural integrity must be maintained to protect flow connectivity and ecosystem links to the Latrobe River and Gippsland Lakes.	NA	Feedback noted. Detailed discussions on MRD are presented in the DMRP (multiple chapters). Detailed technical discussion on current state and evidence based design is presented in sections 8.6, 8.12, 11.5, 12.3 & PSM 2025 (Appendix C).
237	Seddon 2013 emphasised basically, the construction of the MRD did not follow correct procedural compliance to construct a levee of this size. Are EAY making the same mistakes again as evidenced in this DMRP The defence mechanisms hypothesised in the DMRP are, themselves, pathways to MRD batter failures.	NA	The area noted in Seddon 2013 was extensively remediated with multiple liner systems. This area has been tested over the years. The causation assessment for June 2021 Mine Incident validated the reliability of this area. The technical assessments presented in the DMRP have factored these performance assessments. Detailed technical discussion on current state and evidence based design is presented in sections 8.6, 8.12, 11.5, 12.3 & PSM 2025 (Appendix C). The DMRP notes that proposed MRD design will require ongoing management, section 8.12. The management measures are discussed in Chapter 15, which note that the detailed and staged maintenance and management protocols will need to be developed in the future. This will form part of the closure criteria, as noted in Chapter 17.
238	The reliance on lime for stabilisation in the absence of full geochemistry material analysis and evaluation is irresponsible as geotechnical and geomechanically reviewed design plans are linked specifically to that disciplines field of expertise which are to compliment and provide supportive evidence how each can function as one. Shortcuts are not acceptable when potential for failure is high and impacts outside of mine licence boundary are totally foreseeable. Landloch 2022 noted erosion may become an issue across the site if soils have not had gypsum incorporated. Sodicity degrades soil properties by weakening the bond between soil particles, prevent dispersion of soil particles and accelerates erosion which can cause gullies and tunnels to name a few. It is not stated if gypsum will be applied across the site.	NA	Feedback noted. Source of these quoted figures cannot be verified in the DMRP. Technical assessments and derived design for MRD articulate the existing conditions of the materials in MRD and provide evidence based solutions for remediation and long-term management of the structure. Detailed technical discussion on current state and evidence based design is presented in sections 8.6, 8.12, 11.5, 12.3 & PSM 2025 (Appendix C).
239	The arrangement put forward in the DRMP will almost certainly bring about the failure of the MRD through the side caste weir arrangement leading to catastrophic failure. It appears that no soil science expertise (as distinct from geotechnical) has been engaged to provide advice. The design of the side caste weirs seems imprudent. – The cross section of the proposed MRD treatment at these overflow points gives very little confidence the designers understand the risks of the proposed design – Failure of the MRD is foreseeable but is not discussed at all. There should be no side casting into the township or East Field pits at all – except through a sustainable hard engineered structure. The current HDPE pipeline overbank structure to the Yallourn Fire pit from the Morwell River flood plain is noted and if considered a long-term viable structure retained. This is not discussed or analysed and is barely rated as a risk under risk management. The three side caste weirs must be deleted, and the levee profiling subjected to independent review by eminent soil scientists, structural and geotechnical experts.	NA	Spillway sizing presented in the DMRP considers climate scenarios adopting SSP5-8.5 for multiple AEPs, results presented in Ch 8, Table 8-4. Detailed flood study presented in Alluvium 2025 - (Appendix C). of DMRP. Detailed technical discussion on current state and evidence based design is presented in sections 8.6, 8.12, 11.5, 12.3 & PSM 2025 (Appendix C). The DMRP notes that proposed MRD design will require ongoing management, section 8.12. The management measures are discussed in Chapter 15, which note that the detailed and staged maintenance and management protocols will need to be developed in the future. This will form part of the closure criteria, as noted in Chapter 17.

#	Feedback / Comment	Modification to DMRP	No change to DMRP
240	There is no discussion on the performance of the MRD as an engineered earthen structure under ponded water conditions. There has been some discussion on overall settlement of the structure in a dry form but nothing as a drowned structure. This is a serious omission. It is suspected that slumping will increase under saturation conditions	NA	These factors are well considered and discussed in detail. Detailed technical discussion on current state and evidence based design is presented in sections 8.6, 8.12, 11.5, 12.3 & PSM 2025 (Appendix C).
241	The discussion of wave impact on the structure does not consider the erosion and dispersion of the sodic soils under wave conditions as the lake fills to various levels. Is the proposed rock beaching going to be applied continually as the lake fills? If not significant erosion of the batters is likely.	NA	The DMRP shows that the study is in its early stages and that more work will be done in the coming years.
242	the MRD must be made sustainable and be retained to see the conveyance of a minimum 100 Year ARI event for the Morwell catchment (minus any flood skimming upstream for both Hazelwood and the Yallourn township fields), without structural failure.	Added words in DMRP to capture the following in CH 8.6.3: The spillway system is activated only when Morwell River flows exceed 6,000 ML/day, which is significantly above the hydrologic design flow requirement of 3,200 ML/day. The design flow of 3,200 ML/day includes environmental flow provisions necessary to flush saltwater from the Latrobe River estuary, supporting current offtakes for the Dowd Morass and Heart Morass in the lower Latrobe River region. Importantly, the environmental flow requirement at Thoms Bridge is 1,500 ML/day, which is comfortably met under the proposed design.	Feedback noted. The remediated design provides confidence in improving reliability of MRD to carry unrestricted flows well above the environmental flow requirements, minimising any adverse water quality influences, see section 8.6.6.2. Spillway system is only engaged for Morwell River flows over 6000 ML/day (well over the hydrologic design flow requirements of 3200 ML/Day). The 3200 ML/day flows include environmental flows that are required to ensure the flushing of the Latrobe River estuary of salt water at the current offtakes for the watering of the Dowd Morass and the Heart Morass on the lower Latrobe River region. Notably, environmental flows required for Latrobe at Thoms Bridge are 1500 ML/day which well are achieved with the proposed design. See section 8.6.3 & Alluvium 2025 (Appendix C)
243	The proposed approach of lowering the existing MRD levees is counter intuitive to the sustainable retention of the MRD through the mine as regular over topping, will surely accelerate and bring about catastrophic failures of the whole MRD structure. This will result in total loss of the integrity of a connection of the Morwell River through to the Latrobe River. The levees must be retained and have clear freeboard against the projected floods.	NA	Technical assessments clearly articulate the reasoning for lowering the levee embankments, being linked to sustainable outcome for the Morwell River passing the MRD. These factors are well considered and discussed in detail. Detailed technical discussion on current state and evidence based design is presented in sections 8.6, 8.12, 11.5, 12.3 & PSM 2025 (Appendix C).
244	The proposed treatment of the conveyor tunnel conduit with inserting of HDPE in a back fill proposal, in the final arrangement is liable to collapse failure. A more robust method of grouting of pipelines for structural integrity must be provided.	NA	Detailed design of the tunnels to service the flow interconnections between the west and east pits are noted in knowledge gaps, Chapter 17, KG06
245	The true threats and risks to mine batters from slumping, especially the proposed reshaping of the MRD have not been identified so the seismic modelling is unreliable.	NA	Consideration to stability of the shallow geology has been presented in section 8.9. Peripheral catchment study and derived design consider technical properties, historical performance, seasonal influences and industry practices, refer to section 8.7 and elaborate details presented in PSM 2025, Appendix C. Seismic assessments are undertaken in line with industry guidelines and practices, design principles set out in the DMRP.
246	The SEC is on record of expressing concern about the need to surcharge the overburden on the western batters of the YTF to mitigate a radial slip failure risk of the western batters from the fault line of the Haunted Hills – this appears to have been not completed. The risk of an underwater subsidence has not been evaluated in the DRMP. The unconsolidated overburden/fill placed on the YTF has never been dressed or finished and is uneven and subject to through runoff and also groundwater disturbances. Concern is expressed about the stability of this material as in drowned conditions - it will slump.	NA	Technical investigations and assessments have extensively considered these factors. Additional stabilising buttressing is presented for this area of the mine. Refer to section 8.9, Figure 8-82 and PSM 2025 - Appendix C.

#	Feedback / Comment	Modification to DMRP	No change to DMRP
247	No connection to the void should be provided for the Latrobe River flood – except via the far north east interface with the Latrobe River and this must only be via an engineered structure similar to that at Hazelwood.	NA	Feedback noted. This is the current standing of the rehabilitation design proposed in the DMRP.
248	Under the DMRP, MRD levee integrity is to discharge floodwaters into the Yallourn Township Field (YTF) and provide flood protection via construction of 3 spillways. This is contentious and there are ways of improving the structural integrity of the MRD. However, EAY may not want to invest in the MRD or part of a prearranged deal!	NA	Technical assessments clearly articulate the reasoning for lowering the levee embankments, being linked to sustainable outcome for the Morwell River passing the MRD. These factors are well considered and discussed in detail. Detailed technical discussion on current state and evidence based design is presented in sections 8.6, 8.12, 11.5, 12.3 & PSM 2025 (Appendix C).
249	Whilst overtopping of the banks towards the southern end has been mooted as being key, it is FLoW's position that the MRD should be treated with chemical fixation methods to lower dispersibility and slaking of the embankment. Once the mine pit lake forms, the dispersive and slaking material of the MRD formation will inevitably disperse, erode and totally fail. Under this scenario, which is highly foreseeable, low flows up to the 2year ARI and environmental flows will cease connection to the Latrobe River. EAY and its contractors were publicly forthcoming that their design approach to the MRD when the Maryvale and East Fields were progressed would save up to $80M – but at what cost long-term? There is still a case for the creation of an eastern diversion channel around the Mine as originally projected.	NA	Feedback noted. Source of these quoted figures cannot be verified in the DMRP. Technical assessments and derived design for MRD articulate the existing conditions of the materials in MRD and provide evidence based solutions for remediation and long-term management of the structure. Detailed technical discussion on current state and evidence based design is presented in sections 8.6, 8.12, 11.5, 12.3 & PSM 2025 (Appendix C).
250	There is a substantial lack of detailed analysis and scientific interrogation of likely water quality of such a deep and poorly mixed Lake. There are many assertions as to outcomes without the necessary independent supportive information.	NA	These assumptions can be tested through the Technical Studies for water quality and hydrodynamic modelling (refer to Knowledge Gaps chapter)
251	No mention is made of the fact that the lake will suffer from differential stratification, and the lower levels will be anoxic leading to poor redox conditions and liberation of metal species in acidic conditions. The acidic conditions are liable to be the result of sulphate reduction in the stratified and anoxic lake.	NA	These assumptions can be tested through the Technical Studies for water quality and hydrodynamic modelling (refer to Knowledge Gaps chapter)
252	The notion of lime treatment is a bit farcical as no discussion is made to the likely amounts of lime needed to treat the whole lake – it will be huge!!! Who is going to add lime into perpetuity?	NA	EAY does not expect long-term lime treatment requirements due to acidity/alkalinity accounting. It is possible that some treatment is required in 2029/30 around the initial fill period
253	No mention is made of the likely Mercury and Nickel contamination issues from the coal and if the lake takes catchment waters. The EPA has recorded the presence of Mercury and Nickel in the catchments.	Added note explaining that Mercury was not modelled because it was below instrumental detection limits for all the various source terms.	Nickel is included already included in the WB/WQ section (section 8.9)
254	It is foreseeable that the Lake will not be conducive to supporting a sustainable invertebrate and fish assemblage and may be essentially abiotic. There is no substantive analysis to support the claims that the lake will be a viable ecosystem and have high recreational values.	NA	These assumptions can be tested through the Technical Studies for water quality and hydrodynamic modelling (refer to Knowledge Gaps chapter)
255	If the lake receives large volumes of catchment water the lake is likely to progress to Eutrophic state over time – progressively cycling into green, then blue green as it matures and accumulates	NA	These assumptions can be tested through the Technical Studies for water quality and hydrodynamic modelling (refer to Knowledge Gaps chapter) Stratification / Hydrodynamic modelling is currently underway and noted as a key knowledge gap KG03 & KG17

#	Feedback / Comment	Modification to DMRP	No change to DMRP
256	There is little discussion of the likely performance of the overburden dumps and uncompleted fills of the Yallourn Township Field (YTF). It is foreseeable that all fill and batter cover material will contribute to a highly turbid Lake.	NA	Progressive rehabilitation has been effective in stabilising overburden dumps with Township Lake (Section 7.3) showing compliance with EPA turbidity limits. If left untreated and unvegetated a highly turbid lake is foreseeable, however vegetation and erosion protection assist in preventing a highly turbid lake. Turbidity, is included in the Rehabilitation Monitoring program Closure criteria will be established to ensure the lake / discharge water quality requirements are satisfactory and met KG25
257	The presence of significant amounts of vegetation (particularly in the Township field will contribute to anoxia when drowned.	Added Knowledge Gap (KG34) to capture this project.	NA
258	In 2012, EAY received an emergency discharge licence under Section 30A (Environment Protection Act 1970) from the Victorian EPA to discharge water from the Township Field Fire Services Pond (FSP) to the Latrobe River up to the end of August 2021. The interesting point of the EPA discharge licence is that the failure of the MRD structure resulted in a large volume of water entering the Yallourn Coal Mine that needed to be discharged to Latrobe River via an EPA emergency discharge licence – why? Because the surface water that was discharged via a coal pit is deemed of poor quality to achieve water quality objectives to protect environmental values of waters for the Latrobe River. Not OK then but OK in the future under the DMRP to discharge waters via a flooded coal pit when there is clear evidence of ongoing deterioration of water quality.	NA	Water quality modelling in section 8.8.3 shows only limited exceedances of ecological guidelines with exceedances driven by background water quality, not lake geochemistry. Modelling shows the lake will capable of supporting many beneficial uses including discharge to the Latrobe River. Historical emergency discharges were required to allow discharge in different locations to the prescribed licence point, and to account for highly turbid river water quality that entered the mine from the flood, not the existing mine conditions
259	The only poorly executed reactive option is to provide dilution from upstream flows to reduce and disperse pollutants concentrations in the mixing zone of the Latrobe River. The point is dilution requirements are essential from coal pit discharged waters to the Latrobe River to meet Water Quality Objectives. Low flows result in incomplete mixing that has not been addressed in the DMRP. The 2012 ecological risk assessments for the emergency discharges note turbidity as problematic. The longer the duration that turbidity is elevated the higher the likelihood of environmental impact and the longer the recovery time needed. Additional dilution from downstream tributaries further reduces any risk to Lake Wellington. The whole mine site catchment area is riddled with stagnant water, contaminated soils & sediment loading from decades of coal mining and demolition materials with diesel and fuel/chemical storages, PFAS, PCBs Polychlorinated bi-f-nals (PCBs) which are carcinogens from substations, asbestos fibres, thousands of tons of coal ash, naturally occurring radioactive elements and heavy metals like mercury, selenium, cadmium, manganese. This is the makeup of the future recreation lake for swimming, boating, aquatic life. Much is made of the proposition that the Pit Lake will form a wonderful community asset when full!	NA	Turbidity, PFAS, Heavy Metals are included in the Rehabilitation Monitoring program. Further WQ modelling will also be conducted (KG23) to improve accuracy of knowledge, with the results informing agreed closure criteria KG25
260	There is mention of coal ash in relation to risks but it was hard to discern if there is a specific section on management of coal ash dumps and contaminated land rehabilitation. Section 11.5.9 Yallourn North Open Cut (YNOC) notes the following which should be in this plan given the need for priority of works/tasks checklist and clarity of DMRP's interaction with other regulatory processes.	NA	Rehabilitation of the YNOC will be carried out as per EPA requirements. Of note, the YNOC area is outside the area of the mine that will be converted to a lake.

#	Feedback / Comment	Modification to DMRP	No change to DMRP
261	The Morwell River must not end in a terminal Lake for the Morwell River, as there will be very little transfer of flows or critical organic matter connectivity into the Latrobe River systems. No amount of works on the Latrobe River will be able to offset or rehabilitate for the loss of organic matter (fine and coarse) plus fish, invertebrates and mammals needed for the maintenance of downstream reach ecosystems. The Morwell River provides important coarse particulate organic matter and must continue to do so.	NA	The DMRP presents plans to maintain the connection of the Morwell River with the Latrobe River. EAY understands the value of the Morwell River and factors this into rehabilitation planning.
262	There has been no review or analysis of the flow contributions to the Latrobe River system and indeed Gippsland Lakes from Morwell River. In the event of a Lake forming at the end of the Morwell River, the impact on the already over diverted Latrobe River flow balance will be marked and lead to increased saline intrusion into Lake Wellington and the Lower Latrobe and Thomson Rivers and that of adjacent Ramsar Wetlands	NA	Spillways were set at elevations that ensure that flow rates in the Latrobe and Morwell River exceed 3,200 ML/day before any water is captured by the pit lake. This flow rate is approximately that required to ensure the flushing of the Latrobe River estuary of salt water at Dowd Morass and the Heart Morass on the lower Latrobe River (per Environmental Water Requirements Report: Latrobe environmental water requirements investigation)
263	The diversion of a significant portion of the Morwell River Mean Annual flows into a pit lake will have a significant impact on the ecosystem and sustainability of Gippsland Lakes and the Ramsar wetlands and in particular the need to purge marine water from Lake Wellington. There has been no discussion of this foreseeable outcome – a major omission and one that will require a full EES and also a water trigger under the EPBC Act.	NA	The proposed design for the remediated MRD can cater for the design flows with no adverse impacts to downstream users. The overall water quality impacts were assessed to have minimal impacts but require further detailed analysis as part of detailed design.
264	The base and flows up to 5 Year ARI must pass through unimpeded as this ensures connectivity of food webs and energetics critically needed by the Latrobe River and Lake Wellington for the maintenance of ecosystems. There should be no diversions into either the Township Fire Pond or the Maryvale/Eastfield area before this is achieved	NA	Spillways were set at elevations that ensure that flow rates in the Latrobe and Morwell River exceed 3,200 ML/day before any water is captured by the pit lake. This flow rate is approximately that required to ensure the flushing of the Latrobe River estuary of salt water at Dowd Morass and the Heart Morass on the lower Latrobe River (per Environmental Water Requirements Report: Latrobe environmental water requirements investigation)
265	The loss of the majority of the Mean Annual Runoff of the Morwell River catchment through to the Latrobe River will see a substantial reduction in flows down the Latrobe River and also to the Gippsland Lakes. This threatens the Ramsar status of the Lakes and wetlands and constitutes a reportable action under the Ramsar Agreement. (Changed water regimes—alterations to the frequency, duration or season of inundation including river regulation, water extraction, drainage or changes to the catchment flow that interrupt the natural ebb and flow of the wetland system). The diversion of the majority of the flows of the Morwell River will also present a water trigger under the EPBC Act. A new referral must be made under this Act.	NA	Spillways were set at elevations that ensure that flow rates in the Latrobe and Morwell River exceed 3,200 ML/day before any water is captured by the pit lake. This flow rate is approximately that required to ensure the flushing of the Latrobe River estuary of salt water at Dowd Morass and the Heart Morass on the lower Latrobe River (per Environmental Water Requirements Report: Latrobe environmental water requirements investigation)
266	It is proposed to seek a new Bulk Entitlement from the Latrobe Water systems to provide 27GL/year of water to fill the lake. This should not occur. There are more critical and higher value/best uses of potable water in the Latrobe system including potable supply, maintaining the ecosystem and providing for controlled access for irrigation for food supply. The Minister for Water must not accede to such an application and must consider higher and better uses plus also consider price of water be it from the BWE or flood skimming and a low peak extraction rate far less than proposed by EAY. Seasonal diversion limits and controls must apply.	NA	The Minister for Water will make the decision of whether a bulk water entitlement from the Latrobe River system will be accepted.

#	Feedback / Comment	Modification to DMRP	No change to DMRP
267	Consideration must also be given to the externalities of the significant (total?) water take from the Morwell River for the Lake Proposal and hence in the overall Latrobe River system. - What if the MRD fails catastrophically and the Morwell River terminates in a pit lake? - Will this mean that the Thomson Bulk Entitlement must be reconsidered to increase the base flow by >100% to offset the flow losses from the Morwell River such that impact of a pit lake proposal on the Gippsland Lakes and the Ramsar wetlands is reduced. - This then affects the BWE balance of the Thomson with Melbourne having a reduced take for potable water. This is likely to impact on the price of water for Melbourne and the gross yield, potentially resulting in more Desal water being needed at a higher cost.	NA	EAY do not have responsibility over the price or management of bulk water entitlements.
268	The Pit Lake proposal will impact on the fisheries and will be felt as a loss of Tourism for the Gippsland Lakes ecosystem and its fishery– this will result in significant decline in the regional economy.	NA	These assumptions can be tested through the Technical Studies for water quality and hydrodynamic modelling (refer to Knowledge Gaps chapter)
269	It is apparent that the EGCMA are not alert to the prospect of the MRD failing and its consequences.	NA	EGCMA are a listed stakeholder and were included in the DMRP email campaigns. EAY will engage with EGCMA as required.
270	Knowledge gaps exist on all 3 coal mines increasing groundwater extraction concurrently in a predicted drying climate with less rainfall for the already flow stressed Latrobe River system and reduced connectivity with groundwater systems, stream leakage and reduced baseflow discharges to wetlands	NA	The DMRP notes the purpose of groundwater extraction is to support mine stability. The extent of this requirement is predominantly linked to weight balance management with details presented in section 8.11
271	The true threats and risks to mine batters from slumping, especially the proposed reshaping of the MRD have not been identified so the seismic induced modelling is unreliable.	NA	Consideration to stability of the shallow geology has been presented in section 8.9. Peripheral catchment study and derived design consider technical properties, historical performance, seasonal influences and industry practices, refer to section 8.7 and elaborate details presented in PSM 2025, Appendix C. Seismic assessments are undertaken in line with industry guidelines and practices, design principles set out in the DMRP.
272	The DMRP Triggered seismicity section has irresponsibly ignored the very coincidental 2012 Moe/Thorpdale earthquake which occurred 2 weeks after a catastrophic failure of the MRD resulting in a sudden mass volume release of water (6 billions litres) entering the pit onto an unstable subsurface. The role this weight of water on pore pressure has strangely evaded further review from the preliminary investigation.	Added further details to Knowledge Gap KG20, Ch 17.	The occurred seismic event mentioned has been well considered. section 8.10 of DMRP present the seismic assessments and provides links to details of the assessment in PSM 2025, Appendix C. Further details added to Knowledge Gap KG20, Ch 17.
273	The DMRP has not given informed stakeholders any confidence its development is well considered. Certainly does not meet community expectations the cost burden in the near future will not be borne by tax payers with the Latrobe River system being the trade-off. The cumulative risks to the surface and subsurface of the natural regional boundary has been greatly understated. EAY have not demonstrated statutory obligation can be met nor the that the post-mining landform will not result in a decline or decreased economic value of broader environmental values	NA	The comment has been noted and EAY trusts that as our rehabilitation planning progresses we can build further stakeholder confidence in these areas.

Table 9 9Friends of the Gippsland Lakes (FOGL) (Event ID 3377)

#	Feedback / Comment	Modification to DMRP	No change to DMRP
274	New Victorian EES aligned with ANCOLD and ARR2019 practice. (What FOGL seeks: Assessment Standards)	NA	As per Table 4-6 of the DMRP. EAY continue to work with the Victorian Government to agree on the most appropriate approval pathway beyond the finalisation of the DMRP.
275	Independent expert review of all soil, hydraulic, hydrogeological, and limnological models, with full publication of assumptions and data. (What FOGL seeks: Assessment Standards)	NA	Rehabilitation of the YNOC will be carried out as per EPA requirements. Of note, the YNOC area is outside the area of the mine that will be converted to a lake.
276	Abandon "overtop into the pit" approach. (What FOGL seeks: MRD Redesign and Risk Controls)	NA	Feedback noted however the current plans presented in the DMRP are backed by sound geotechnical studies.
277	Rebuild diversion for non-overtopping conveyance (≥1% AEP) with engineered spillways, cut-offs, filters, and seepage controls. (What FOGL seeks: MRD Redesign and Risk Controls)	NA	Feedback noted however the current plans presented in the DMRP are backed by sound geotechnical studies.
278	Treat conduits as high-risk; remediate with structural backfill and filter diaphragms. (What FOGL seeks: MRD Redesign and Risk Controls)	NA	Detailed design of the tunnels to service the flow interconnections between the west and east pits are noted in knowledge gaps, Chapter 17, KG06
279	Guarantee Morwell–Latrobe connectivity for baseflows and seasonal freshes up to at least 5-year ARI. (What FOGL seeks: Flow protection and Ramsar Safeguards)	NA	Feedback noted. The remediated design provides confidence in improving reliability of MRD to carry unrestricted flows well above the environmental flow requirements, minimising any adverse water quality influences, see section 8.6.6.2. Spillway system is only engaged for Morwell River flows over 6000 ML/day (well over the hydrologic design flow requirements of 3200 ML/Day). The 3200 ML/day flows include environmental flows that are required to ensure the flushing of the Latrobe River estuary of salt water at the current offtakes for the watering of the Dowd Morass and the Heart Morass on the lower Latrobe River region. Notably, environmental flows required for Latrobe at Thoms Bridge are 1500 ML/day which well are achieved with the proposed design. See section 8.6.3 & Alluvium 2025 (Appendix C)
280	Reject any option that withholds these flows to accelerate pit filling. (What FOGL seeks: Flow protection and Ramsar Safeguards)	NA	No response as the comment appears to be directed at government decision making
281	Very-low-reliability, high-flow-only entitlements, with cease-to-pump triggers tied to environmental targets and Ramsar indicators. (What FOGL seeks: Conditional Water Access)	NA	No response as the comment appears to be directed at government decision making
282	Telemetry on all pumping points; public dashboard and annual audits. (What FOGL seeks: Conditional Water Access)	NA	No response as the comment appears to be directed at government decision making
283	Full-cost pricing reflecting externalities, with revenues hypothecated to environmental recovery and Traditional Owner cultural-water projects. (What FOGL seeks: Conditional Water Access)	NA	Water costing and subsequent allocation of those funds is not a component of the DMRP process.
284	Rehabilitation bonds and long-term stewardship funds maintained until stability and water quality are independently verified. (What FOGL seek: Liability and Financial Safeguards)	NA	No response from EAY as this comment appears directed to government decision making processes.
285	Embed Victoria's new trailing-liability regime: regulator call-back powers, parent- company guarantees, and adequate tail insurance. (What FOGL seek: Liability and Financial Safeguards)	NA	No response from EAY as this comment appears directed to government decision making processes.
286	Enforce licence conditions retaining proponent liability for downstream harm (salinity dieback, bloom-related fish kills). (What FOGL seek: Liability and Financial Safeguards)	NA	EAY will comply with any conditions imposed on the DMRP.
287	A credible, lawful, and socially acceptable rehabilitation outcome must be breach- averse, flow-protective, and transparent. Anything less risks de facto river capture, degraded Ramsar values, and perpetual public liability. Rehabilitation must also ensure the costs of failure remain with those responsible, not with the community. (Conclusion)	NA	This statement aligns with our Objectives, especially those in Table 6-2: Physical Stability which protect embankments and improve downstream hydrological performance

#	Feedback / Comment	Modification to DMRP	No change to DMRP
288	Embedding full-cost pricing, stringent MRD redesign, Ramsar-aligned flow safeguards, and enforceable liability frameworks—including Victoria's trailing-liability regime— provides the only defensible pathway. With these measures in place, Yallourn's closure can move from being a long-tail liability to a genuine opportunity: protecting the Latrobe River, restoring the Gippsland Lakes, and leaving a positive legacy for future generations. (Conclusion)	NA	EAY is responsible for the cost of rehabilitation and post closure management. Flow safeguards are proposed by the LVRRS and adopted by EAY to protect the downstream wetlands.
289	We note with concern that the Yallourn DMRP is heavily caveated – it contains broad disclaimers that its forward-looking statements are not guaranteed and may be based on limited data or assumptions (EnergyAustralia Yallourn, 2025, p.ii). Such caveats undermine confidence in the plan's credibility. (Introduction)	NA	The wording as proposed recognises that while the DMRP reflects the overall goal of rehabilitation, the legislative intention is that it will be an iterative document that is to be updated over time. As at today, the DMRP needs to make assumptions about a range of matters (including environmental conditions) that are outside of EnergyAustralia's control (and so can only estimate), though they can have an impact on delivery of the DMRP. The disclaimer ultimately reflects and acknowledges that, so that it is clear to readers of the document.
290	FOGL submits that a fresh, comprehensive environmental assessment is warranted. Notably, the Hazelwood mine rehabilitation triggered the federal EPBC Act "water trigger" due to likely significant impacts on water resources, establishing a presumption that similar referrals will be required for Yallourn's closure. (introduction)	NA	As per Table 4-6 of the DMRP, EAY continue to review if the rehabilitation project triggers the requirement for EPBC Act approval due to the water trigger or the potential for a significant impact of any other Matters of National Environmental Significance (MNES).
291	"no reduction in entitlements" is not a sufficient test: access must be conditioned so that event-scale ecological functions—including mandated freshes, rising-limb embargoes, and minimum annual fresh counts—are delivered before any pumping window opens, and any approved take demonstrably avoids further degrading an already flow-stressed system. (Risks of maintaining status quo in environmental flows)	NA	No response from EAY as this comment appears directed to government decision making processes.
292	Accordingly, section 40 requires a precautionary approach: no new mine-related entitlements can be consistent with the Act unless proponents demonstrate—through robust hydrological and ecological evidence—that they will not worsen the current deficit or prejudice the recovery of environmental flows. To do otherwise would be to sanction a licence in the knowledge that the statutory tests of environmental protection and water preservation cannot be met. (Section 40 Obligations in a flow deficit system)	NA	No response as the comment appears to be directed at government decision making
293	Rather than reinforcing the diversion, the DMRP proposes modifications that could increase the risk of failure. FOGL is alarmed by plans to lower the MRD levees and install "side-cast" spillway weirs along the diversion route (EnergyAustralia, 2025, sec.4). The intent is ostensibly to allow controlled overflow into mine voids during high flows. However, overtopping cohesive earthen levees—especially where dispersive clays are present—presents well documented risks to structural integrity and stability, as outlined in detail below. (DMRP proposals affecting MRD Integrity, 1.2)	NA	Technical assessments and derived design for MRD articulate the existing conditions of the materials in MRD and provide evidence based solutions for remediation and long-term management of the structure. Detailed technical discussion on current state and evidence based design is presented in sections 8.6, 8.12, 11.5, 12.3 & PSM 2025 (Appendix C).
294	In short, the DMRP should eliminate overtopping at the MRD and adopt breach-averse design as a matter of public safety and environmental duty. Put simply, earthen levees built from dispersive clays should be designed to avoid overtopping, not to accommodate it. (DMRP proposals affecting MRD Integrity, 1.2.1)	NA	Technical assessments and derived design for MRD articulate the existing conditions of the materials in MRD and provide evidence based solutions for remediation and long-term management of the structure. Detailed technical discussion on current state and evidence based design is presented in sections 8.6, 8.12, 11.5, 12.3 & PSM 2025 (Appendix C).

#	Feedback / Comment	Modification to DMRP	No change to DMRP
295	Installing low, side-cast weirs along the diversion to permit overflow into the pit will concentrate overtopping flows and accelerate headcut migration. Laboratory and field evidence after Hurricane Katrina, as well as controlled EFA flume work, show that localized overtopping points trigger rapid erosion and mass wasting on the landward faces of levees (Briaud et al., 2008; Hanson et al., 2005). Where soils are plastic and/or poorly compacted, critical shear thresholds are low and breach growth is fast, making "sacrificial overtopping" strategies unsafe unless the overflow is conveyed via engineered, armoured spillways designed to pass the design flood (not side-cast cuts through earthen embankments). (DMRP proposals affecting MRD Integrity, 1.2.2)	NA	Technical assessments and derived design for MRD articulate the existing conditions of the materials in MRD and provide evidence based solutions for remediation and long-term management of the structure. Detailed technical discussion on current state and evidence based design is presented in sections 8.6, 8.12, 11.5, 12.3 & PSM 2025 (Appendix C). Detailed design of spillways will consider all loading factors, hydrologic & geological factors, noted in Chapter 17, KG14.
296	FOGL therefore questions the proposed liner-centric fix: liners can leave annular pathways and contact defects unaddressed, whereas pressure grouting plus engineered backfill/filter transitions directly eliminate preferential flow paths and restore filter compatibility—essential to suppress piping risk (Fell et al., 2003; Foster et al., 2000; Lee et al., 2022). In short, a long-term fix should be designed to eliminate preferential flow paths and provide filter compatibility—not merely "plug" a void. (DMRP proposals affecting MRD Integrity, 1.2.3)	NA	Technical assessments and derived design for MRD articulate the existing conditions of the materials in MRD and provide evidence based solutions for remediation and long-term management of the structure. Detailed technical discussion on current state and evidence based design is presented in sections 8.6, 8.12, 11.5, 12.3 & PSM 2025 (Appendix C).
297	The defensible standard is clear: build the MRD strategy around conservative setbacks from mapped structures, and verify with kinematic/limit-equilibrium and numerical modelling under saturated and flood-load cases (Stead & Wolter, 2015). (DMRP proposals affecting MRD Integrity, 1.2.5)	NA	Feedback noted.
298	1.3 MRD Design Implication: The lowest-cost "overtop into the pit" option preferred by the DMRP should be abandoned in favour of (i) full-containment flood conveyance along the MRD for its design AEP, and (ii) any required emergency spillways built as robust, armoured hydraulic structures tied into competent foundation, with independent geotechnical and soil-erodibility verification.	NA	Technical assessments and derived design for MRD articulate the existing conditions of the materials in MRD and provide evidence based solutions for remediation and long-term management of the structure. Detailed technical discussion on current state and evidence based design is presented in sections 8.6, 8.12, 11.5, 12.3 & PSM 2025 (Appendix C).
299	1.3 MRD Design Implication: In practice, this requires: Non-overtopping design standard: Size the MRD to pass ≥1% AEP without crest exceedance, test sensitivity to rarer events (e.g., 0.2% AEP), and maintain residual freeboard after allowance for wave run-up, settlement and hydraulic uncertainty (Hanson, Cook, & Hunt, 2005; Briaud, Chen, Govindasamy, & Storesund, 2008).	NA	Technical assessments and derived design for MRD articulate the existing conditions of the materials in MRD and provide evidence based solutions for remediation and long-term management of the structure. Detailed technical discussion on current state and evidence based design is presented in sections 8.6, 8.12, 11.5, 12.3 & PSM 2025 (Appendix C).
300	1.3 MRD Design Implication: In practice, this requires: Armoured, engineered spillways only: Where an emergency outlet is necessary, use RCC or concrete-lined chutes/rock chutes with geotextile underlays, properly keyed into non-erodible foundation and fitted with energy dissipation—never unprotected earthen crests or side-cast notches (Hanson et al., 2005; Briaud et al., 2008).	NA	Technical assessments and derived design for MRD articulate the existing conditions of the materials in MRD and provide evidence based solutions for remediation and long-term management of the structure. Detailed technical discussion on current state and evidence based design is presented in sections 8.6, 8.12, 11.5, 12.3 & PSM 2025 (Appendix C).
301	1.3 MRD Design Implication: In practice, this requires: Erosion and piping controls: Provide a continuous cutoff (low-permeability core or wall), chimney and blanket filters, and toe drains designed for filter compatibility to prevent backward erosion and piping; identify and treat dispersive soils (replacement or chemical treatment) only after pinhole/crumb and erosion-function testing confirms adequacy (Sherard, Dunnigan, Decker, & Steele, 1976; Wan & Fell, 2004).	NA	Technical assessments and derived design for MRD articulate the existing conditions of the materials in MRD and provide evidence based solutions for remediation and long-term management of the structure. Detailed technical discussion on current state and evidence based design is presented in sections 8.6, 8.12, 11.5, 12.3 & PSM 2025 (Appendix C).

#	Feedback / Comment	Modification to DMRP	No change to DMRP
302	1.3 MRD Design Implication: In practice, this requires: Conduit remediation: Treat the conveyor tunnel and any penetrations as high- risk seepage paths—pressure-grout voids, structurally backfill, and install filter diaphragms/collars; do not rely on liner-only fixes that can leave annular leakage pathways (Fell, Wan, Cyganiewicz, & Foster, 2003; Foster, Fell, & Spannagle, 2000; Lee, Ryu, Heo, Shim, & Lee, 2022).	NA	Detailed design of the tunnels to service the flow interconnections between the west and east pits are noted in knowledge gaps, CH 17, KG06
303	1.3 MRD Design Implication: In practice, this requires: Slope stability under lake filling: Undertake coupled transient seepage– stability modelling (unsaturated to saturated) for staged filling, storm sequences and groundwater rebound; instrument with piezometers and inclinometers and adopt conservative trigger/action levels (Iverson, 2000; Lu & Godt, 2008).	NA	Technical assessments and derived design for MRD articulate the existing conditions of the materials in MRD and provide evidence based solutions for remediation and long-term management of the structure. Detailed technical discussion on current state and evidence based design is presented in sections 8.6, 8.12, 11.5, 12.3 & PSM 2025 (Appendix C).
304	1.3 MRD Design Implication: In practice, this requires: Independent assurance and operations: Require third-party peer review (soil mechanics, hydraulics), construction QA (compaction, material reactivity), a surveillance and maintenance plan, and an updated Emergency Action Plan tied to hydrometric triggers that prioritise downstream environmental flows before any pit takes.	NA	Feedback noted. Technical assessments and derived design for MRD articulate the existing conditions of the materials in MRD and provide evidence based solutions for remediation and long-term management of the structure. Detailed technical discussion on current state and evidence based design is presented in sections 8.6, 8.12, 11.5, 12.3 & PSM 2025 (Appendix C).
305	To avoid regulatory arbitrage and protect Ramsar assets, approvals should mandate: No-uncontrolled inflow covenants: Physical separation and controls (gates/structures) such that any pit inflow is intentional, metered, and subject to entitlement/pricing. (Section 1.3.1 Public interest and governance safeguard)	NA	Feedback noted. The remediated design provides confidence in improving reliability of MRD to carry unrestricted flows well above the environmental flow requirements, minimising any adverse water quality influences, see section 8.6.6.2. Spillway system is only engaged for Morwell River flows over 6000 ML/day (well over the hydrologic design flow requirements of 3200 ML/Day). The 3200 ML/day flows include environmental flows that are required to ensure the flushing of the Latrobe River estuary of salt water at the current offtakes for the watering of the Dowd Morass and the Heart Morass on the lower Latrobe River region. Notably, environmental flows required for Latrobe at Thoms Bridge are 1500 ML/day which well are achieved with the proposed design. See section 8.6.3 & Alluvium 2025 (Appendix C)
306	To avoid regulatory arbitrage and protect Ramsar assets, approvals should mandate: Hard performance limits: Zero diversion to pit below defined environmental- flow thresholds; cease-to-take in dry periods consistent with LVRRS/SWS principles (DELWP, 2020a; DELWP, 2022). (Section 1.3.1 Public interest and governance safeguard)	NA	EAY will align any bulk water entitlement application with the water access conditions presented in the Latrobe Valley Regional Rehabilitation Strategy (LVRRS) Amendment and comply with any conditions of an issued entitlement.
307	Geotechnical investigation and design should be carried out to AS 1726:2017 (scope, subsurface model, groundwater regime) and use Australian soil dispersion/erodibility tests—e.g., AS 1289.3.8.1 Emerson Class—to identify and treat dispersive materials before service. (Standards Australia, 2017a,2017b). (section 1.4.1 seepage and piping)	NA	Feedback noted. Planning or regulatory requirements often govern the level of technical information we must provide, leading to highly technical documents. Although we have worked hard to make the information more accessible, we appreciate the community's feedback and will incorporate it into future work, where relevant. PSM 2025, Appendix C provide details around industry standards considered and adopted, along with finer details of extensive ground investigations that have informed the proposed geotechnically reliable rehabilitation design.

#	Feedback / Comment	Modification to DMRP	No change to DMRP
308	Because lake level will rise in stages, the design must include a program for staged raising of armour and crest protection to maintain performance throughout filling, not just at final level (Standards Australia, 2005). (Section 1.4.2 wave and shoreline attack)	NA	Feedback noted. Refer to Chapter 17, Knowledge gap KG20
309	Hydraulic sizing and freeboard should be based on Australian Rainfall and Runoff 2019 (ARR 2019) with appropriate AEPs, non-stationarity checks, and joint probability where relevant; dam/levee-safety checks should align with ANCOLD's acceptable flood capacity / consequence category guidance to ensure consistency with Australian tolerability criteria (Geoscience Australia, 2019; ANCOLD, 2000; ANCOLD, 2012). (section 1.4.3 Hydrology and design events)	NA	Feedback noted. Lake level fluctuations have been considered across all technical studies on geotechnical performance of mine batters, MRD, water quality, hydrology and hydraulics. Technical outcomes are presented across Chapter 8 of DMRP and further technical details are presented in Appendix C.
310	1.4.4 Policy implication: Approval should therefore require: (i) a saturated-adjacency design package (3-D/2-D seepage, staged filling envelopes, unsaturated-to-saturated strength transitions, dispersion/erodibility verification to AS 1289); (ii) a shoreline protection design to AS 4997 with provisions for staged raising and materials to AS 2758.4 and AS 3706; and (iii) independent review against ANCOLD risk, consequence and dam-safety guidance, with site investigations to AS 1726 and flood estimation to ARR 2019.	NA	Feedback noted. No response from EAY as this comment appears directed to government decision making processes. Legal approvals required are noted in DMRP, Chapter 4, Table 4-6.
311	MRD concluding remarks: FOGL therefore recommends a breach-averse redesign built on established Australian practice: Non-overtopping conveyance as the design default, with verified freeboard and capacity to safely pass ≥1% AEP (1-in-100) flood without crest exceedance, sized using ARR 2019 and consequence-appropriate safety checks consistent with ANCOLD guidance.	NA	Technical assessments and derived design for MRD articulate the existing conditions of the materials in MRD and provide evidence based solutions for remediation and long-term management of the structure. Detailed technical discussion on current state and evidence based design is presented in sections 8.6, 8.12, 11.5, 12.3 & PSM 2025 (Appendix C).
312	MRD concluding remarks: FOGL therefore recommends a breach-averse redesign built on established Australian practice: Strengthening rather than lowering: raise or reinforce levees and foundations where required; identify and treat dispersive/erodible materials; provide cut-offs, chimney/blanket filters and toe drains to maintain filter compatibility and suppress piping.	NA	Technical assessments and derived design for MRD articulate the existing conditions of the materials in MRD and provide evidence based solutions for remediation and long-term management of the structure. Detailed technical discussion on current state and evidence based design is presented in sections 8.6, 8.12, 11.5, 12.3 & PSM 2025 (Appendix C).
313	MRD concluding remarks: FOGL therefore recommends a breach-averse redesign built on established Australian practice: Any hydrologic connection between river and pit to occur only via a controlled, gated and armoured structure (not unprotected earthen weirs), keyed into competent foundation and subject to independent geotechnical/soil-erodibility verification and operational rules that prioritise downstream environmental flows.	NA	Technical assessments and derived design for MRD articulate the existing conditions of the materials in MRD and provide evidence based solutions for remediation and long-term management of the structure. Detailed technical discussion on current state and evidence based design is presented in sections 8.6, 8.12, 11.5, 12.3 & PSM 2025 (Appendix C).
314	MRD concluding remarks: FOGL therefore recommends a breach-averse redesign built on established Australian practice: Independent peer review, construction QA, and instrumented surveillance (piezometers, inclinometers) with conservative trigger–action response levels embedded in an updated Emergency Action Plan.	NA	Technical assessments and derived design for MRD articulate the existing conditions of the materials in MRD and provide evidence based solutions for remediation and long-term management of the structure. Detailed technical discussion on current state and evidence based design is presented in sections 8.6, 8.12, 11.5, 12.3 & PSM 2025 (Appendix C).

#	Feedback / Comment	Modification to DMRP	No change to DMRP
315	To protect downstream ecological processes and account for the Latrobe's chronic water deficits (circa 129 GL p.a.), FOGL submits that all flows up to at least the 5-year ARI (≈20% AEP) should pass unimpeded to the Latrobe; the DMRP provides no such assurance. (2.1 Loss of freshwater inflows)	NA	Feedback noted. The remediated design provides confidence in improving reliability of MRD to carry unrestricted flows well above the environmental flow requirements, minimising any adverse water quality influences, see section 8.6.6.2. Spillway system is only engaged for Morwell River flows over 6000 ML/day (well over the hydrologic design flow requirements of 3200 ML/Day). The 3200 ML/day flows include environmental flows that are required to ensure the flushing of the Latrobe River estuary of salt water at the current offtakes for the watering of the Dowd Morass and the Heart Morass on the lower Latrobe River region. Notably, environmental flows required for Latrobe at Thoms Bridge are 1500 ML/day which well are achieved with the proposed design. See section 8.6.3 & Alluvium 2025 (Appendix C)
316	Management implication: Maintaining through-flows from the Morwell into the Latrobe - particularly for baseflows and moderate events—preserves both material subsidies (CPOM, organisms) and hydrologic functions (salinity flushing, nursery habitat formation). Any scheme that intercepts these flows at the pit margin compromises food webs and erodes the ecological character of the Ramsar-listed wetlands downstream (Hale et al., 2020; DELWP, 2022). (Section 2.2 Degraded habitat connectivity and food webs)	NA	A regional water balance study was completed considering the proposed rehabilitation design with a particular focus on the influence to water balance from proposed MRD remediation design. The results of this study supports the Yallourn Mine rehabilitation design and demonstrates that there are no adverse influences on regional water balance. The study further confirms that proposed MRD remediation design allows all environmental flows to pass through MRD, along with flood flows up to the design levels. Detailed regional water quality investigations including water balance and water quality impact assessments is noted as a knowledge gap (KG15, Chapter 17).
317	FOGL is therefore concerned that diverting Morwell River water would raise salinity in these upstream components by reducing the frequency and magnitude of flushing events. (Section 2.3 Altered salinity regimes)	NA	As per Section 8.6: Spillways were set at elevations that ensure that flow rates in the Latrobe and Morwell River exceed 3,200 ML/day before any water is captured by the pit lake. This flow rate is required to ensure the flushing of the Latrobe River estuary of salt water at the current offtakes for the watering of the Dowd Morass and the Heart Morass on the lower Latrobe River.
318	Accordingly, any rehabilitation scheme that relies on intercepting Morwell flows should be referred for federal assessment (EPBC Act) in addition to state approvals. (Section 2.3 Altered salinity regimes)	NA	As per Table 4-6 the rehabilitation project will likely involve referrals under the Environment Effects Act (Vic) and Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act (Cth)
319	Proposals that divert Morwell flows into a pit lake cut across those principles, increase salinity risks, and elevate the likelihood of MNES impacts - warranting EPBC referral and stringent conditions to protect downstream ecological character (Hale et al., 2020; DELWP, 2022; Ramsar Convention Secretariat, 2016).(Section 2.3.1 Policy implication)	NA	As per Table 4-6 of the DMRP, EAY continue to review if the rehabilitation project triggers the requirement for EPBC Act approval due to the water trigger or the potential for a significant impact of any other Matters of National Environmental Significance (MNES).
320	Australia's policy architecture increasingly recognises blue-carbon value—through national methods for coastal wetland crediting and active restoration pilots (Blue Carbon Lab, 2023; Clean Energy Regulator, 2022). Approving a rehabilitation scheme that undercuts these sinks by capturing river flows into a pit lake would be inconsistent with that policy trajectory and with the Latrobe Valley Regional Rehabilitation Strategy principle that any water for rehabilitation must not negatively impact environmental values (Hale et al., 2020; Department of Environment, Land, Water and Planning [DELWP], 2022). (Section 3.3 Policy alignment and EPBC Act consideration)	NA	The DMRP presents plans to maintain the connection of the Morwell River with the Latrobe River. EAY understands the value of the Morwell River and factors this into rehabilitation planning.
321	FOGL therefore considers EPBC referral by EnergyAustralia to be necessary for the Yallourn DMRP. (section 3.4.2 Victorian Policy expectation)	NA	As per Table 4-6 of the DMRP, EAY continue to review if the rehabilitation project triggers the requirement for EPBC Act approval due to the water trigger or the potential for a significant impact of any other Matters of National Environmental Significance (MNES).

#	Feedback / Comment	Modification to DMRP	No change to DMRP
322	FOGL supports a joint EPBC–EES pathway that embeds Gunaikurnai participation at each stage. (section 3.4.7 Traditional Owner policy alignment)	NA	EAY will undertake environmental assessment processes as required.
323	Proceeding with the DMRP without an EPBC referral and assessment would risk non-compliance with the EPBC Act's referral obligations (EPBC s.68) and would be inconsistent with current State policy signals. A Commonwealth assessment under the water trigger, informed by the IESC, together with a State EES, offers the rigorous, transparent pathway required to safeguard water resources, Ramsar values, and threatened species for the Gippsland Lakes and Lower Latrobe Wetlands. (DCCEEW, 2023; Resources Victoria, 2024; Hale et al., 2020). (Section 3.4.8 FOGL position).	NA	As per Table 4-6 the rehabilitation project will likely involve referrals under the Environment Effects Act (Vic) and Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act (Cth)
324	In conclusion of this section, the DMRP poses clear risks to blue carbon values and invokes high-level legal and policy safeguards (EPBC Act, Ramsar Convention, state water strategy commitments). We expect DEECA and the proponent to fully comply with these safeguards, including undertaking proper referrals, rather than treating the rehabilitation as a foregone conclusion. "Water is life" is not just a slogan but a policy reality now – Traditional Owner voices and environmental science both insist that water must be allocated to Country and nature before indulgence to an expired mine (Victorian Government, 2022). (Section 3.4.8 FOGL position).	NA	EAYs Bulk Water Entitlement submission will have a separate consultation project to address and balance these items
325	4.1 Access timing and flow thresholds. Key issues: High-flow only: Extraction permitted only when flows exceed the 80th–90th percentile (naturalised) at defined gauges. Window limited to winter–spring, and only after environmental obligations are demonstrably met.	NA	No response as the comment appears to be directed at government decision making
326	4.1 Access timing and flow thresholds. Key issues: Seasonal fresh protection (FMDT): Guarantee the frequency, magnitude, duration, and timing of winter–spring freshes. No pumping on the rising limb or early recession of specified fresh events (June–Nov). Regulator sets a minimum annual fresh count using naturalised flow percentiles; event rules published in advance. Compliance enforced via telemetry and annual audits; non-compliance triggers automatic curtailment the following year.	NA	No response as the comment appears to be directed at government decision making
327	4.2 Cease-to-pump and environment triggers. Key issues: Baseflow minima: Immediate cease-to-pump when monthly EWR targets are not met at the licensee's controlling gauge(s).	NA	No response as the comment appears to be directed at government decision making
328	4.2 Cease-to-pump and environment triggers. Key issues: System-health triggers: Automatic suspension if: Lake Wellington salinity exceeds specified thresholds; Wetland water level/vegetation/fish indicators fall below benchmarks; Fish passage indicators signal obstruction.	NA	No response as the comment appears to be directed at government decision making
329	4.2 Cease-to-pump and environment triggers. Key issues: MRD connectivity condition: Loss of Morwell–Latrobe connectivity (≥ 5-year ARI) or MRD breach/decommissioning = immediate suspension pending independent review.	NA	No response as the comment appears to be directed at government decision making
330	4.3 Volume caps and reliability. Key issues: Strict annual cap: Modest relative to Latrobe flows; zero unless environmental water recovery demonstrably improves system reliability.	NA	No response as the comment appears to be directed at government decision making
331	4.3 Volume caps and reliability. Key issues: Adaptive caps: Ratchet down with climate indices and storage triggers; zero in drought/low-storage years.	NA	No response as the comment appears to be directed at government decision making
332	4.3 Volume caps and reliability. Key issues: Very-low reliability class: Mine access is curtailed first under scarcity; conditions codified in the licence.	NA	No response as the comment appears to be directed at government decision making

#	Feedback / Comment	Modification to DMRP	No change to DMRP
333	4.4 Flood harvesting controls. Key issues: Eligibility: Only after required freshes are delivered downstream and outside declared no-take windows.	NA	No response as the comment appears to be directed at government decision making
334	4.4 Flood harvesting controls. Key issues: Accounting: All flood take metered and debited against the annual cap—no "bonus" volume.	NA	No response as the comment appears to be directed at government decision making
335	4.4 Flood harvesting controls. Key issues: Pricing: Charged at a volumetric rate (never zero).	NA	No response as the comment appears to be directed at government decision making
336	4.4 Flood harvesting controls. Key issues: MRD dependency: Suspended if MRD fails, as floodwaters would not reliably reach extraction points.	NA	No response as the comment appears to be directed at government decision making
337	4.5 Offsets and "no net loss." Key issues: offset pathways: Purchase and retire equivalent entitlements for environmental delivery; or Substitute with recycled/manufactured water to reduce river take.	NA	No response as the comment appears to be directed at government decision making
338	4.5 Offsets and "no net loss." Key issues: Redirect savings: Any retired power-station licences or efficiency gains are returned to the environment, not reallocated to mines.	NA	No response as the comment appears to be directed at government decision making
339	4.6 Protecting Morwell River flows. Key issues: Connectivity rule: No take that reduces Morwell inflows to the Latrobe up to at least the 5-year ARI.	NA	Feedback noted. The remediated design provides confidence in improving reliability of MRD to carry unrestricted flows well above the environmental flow requirements, minimising any adverse water quality influences, see sections 8.6.6.2. Spillway system is only engaged for Morwell River flows over 6000 ML/day (well over the hydrologic design flow requirements of 3200 ML/Day). The 3200 ML/day flows include environmental flows that are required to ensure the flushing of the Latrobe River estuary of salt water at the current offtakes for the watering of the Dowd Morass and the Heart Morass on the lower Latrobe River region. Notably, environmental flows required for Latrobe at Thoms Bridge are 1500 ML/day which well are achieved with the proposed design. See section 8.6.3 & Alluvium 2025 (Appendix C)
340	4.6 Protecting Morwell River flows. Key issues: Licence review/voidance: Automatic review - and potential voidance - if MRD status changes (breach, lowering, or decommissioning) that could enable river capture.	NA	No response as the comment appears to be directed at government decision making
341	4.7 Metering, monitoring, and transparency. Key issues: Telemetry: Certified real-time meters at all extraction points; live data feed to the regulator and a public dashboard.	NA	EAY will comply with any conditions imposed on the DMRP such as monitoring requirements.
342	4.7 Metering, monitoring, and transparency. Key issues: Continuous monitoring: Salinity in Lake Wellington; Wetland water levels/vegetation/fish indicators; Flow at critical gauges.	NA	EAY will comply with any conditions imposed on the DMRP such as monitoring requirements.
343	4.7 Metering, monitoring, and transparency. Key issues: Audits: Annual independent audits with public release; non-compliance tied to penalties and curtailment.	NA	No response as the comment appears to be directed at government decision making
344	4.8 No adverse impact on existing users. Key issues. Non-deterioration test: Licence must not reduce the reliability of existing entitlements or environmental water.	NA	No response as the comment appears to be directed at government decision making
345	4.8 No adverse impact on existing users. Key issues: Modelling burden: Proponent provides independently reviewed hydrological modelling showing no downgrade under climate stressors and MRD scenarios.	NA	No response from EAY as this comment appears directed to government decision making processes.
346	4.9 Water quality and rehabilitation duties. Key issues: Discharge standards: Enforceable water-quality limits for any future releases (e.g., pit-lake overflows).	NA	EAY will comply with any conditions imposed on the DMRP.
347	4.9 Water quality and rehabilitation duties. Key issues: Mandatory treatment: Acidic/contaminated mine water must be treated to meet standards before any release or reuse.	NA	EAY will comply with any conditions imposed on the DMRP.

#	Feedback / Comment	Modification to DMRP	No change to DMRP
348	4.10 Sunset clauses and review. Key issues: Time-limited: Licence expires after the initial fill or a fixed term (e.g., five years post-closure), whichever is sooner.	NA	No response as the comment appears to be directed at government decision making
349	4.10 Sunset clauses and review. Key issues: Mandatory review: ~5-year statutory review to tighten, suspend, or revoke if adverse impacts are observed.	NA	No response as the comment appears to be directed at government decision making
350	4.11 No compensation for curtailment. Key issues: Licence condition: No financial compensation if access is curtailed/suspended to protect environmental or third-party users.	NA	No response as the comment appears to be directed at government decision making
351	4.11 No compensation for curtailment. Key issues: Risk allocation: Curtailment risk is borne entirely by the licence holder.	NA	No response from EAY as this comment appears directed to government decision making processes.
352	4.12 Adaptive management. Key issues: Adjustable settings: Ability to tighten thresholds, triggers, and volumes based on monitoring and audit results.	NA	No response as the comment appears to be directed at government decision making
353	4.12 Adaptive management. Key issues: Precautionary bias: Conditions may be relaxed only where strong evidence shows no material harm.	NA	No response as the comment appears to be directed at government decision making
354	The DMRP provides no such defensible, coupled modelling, leaving decision-makers without a transparent forecast of pH, alkalinity, sulfide, dissolved metals, MeHg risk, and gas production over decadal horizons. (Johnson & Hallberg, 2005; Akcil & Koldas, 2006; Herrell, 2022; Hydrocomputing, n.d.; MBS Environmental, 2012.) (Section 5.1 Stratification and anoxia)	NA	Refer to the water quality technical study (chapter 8.9) Stratification / Hydrodynamic modelling is currently underway and noted as a key knowledge gap (KG03,17 & 21) Further WQ modelling will also be conducted (KG23) to improve accuracy of current knowledge, with the results informing agreed closure criteria KG25
355	A Yallourn pit lake of tens of metres depth should be assumed to be chronically stratified and hypoxic/anoxic at depth, with elevated risks of metal mobilisation, MeHg production, H_2S hazards and CH_4 emissions, unless—and until—the proponent demonstrates, via independent, peer-reviewed modelling and monitoring, that these risks are controlled by proven, life-of-asset measures. In the absence of such evidence, the precautionary position is that a full pit lake is not a low- risk or low-maintenance outcome for water quality. (Boehrer & Schultze, 2008; Lund, 2015; Herrell, 2022.) (5.1.1 Policy Implication)	NA	EAY has identified KG03 for hydrodynamic modelling of the pit lake as a knowledge gap. This work will attempt to address these concerns.
356	In short, the DMRP's implicit assumption of a clear-water, recreation-grade lake lacks evidentiary support given the trophic status of inflows and the closed-basin hydrology (Boon et al., 2015; Hale et al., 2020). (5.2 Eutrophication)	NA	Nutrient modelling is being completed as part of the Stratification / Hydrodynamic works and noted as a key knowledge gap KG03,17 & 21 Further WQ modelling will also be conducted (KG23) to improve accuracy of current study, with the results informing agreed closure criteria KG25
357	FOGL's position is that any approval must require independently peer-reviewed nutrient budgets and coupled hydrodynamic–water-quality modelling (e.g., AED/CE-QUAL-W2), demonstration of load management and mixing/oxygenation contingencies, and a binding governance plan for life-of-asset water-quality stewardship (Hipsey et al., 2013; Hale et al., 2020). (5.2 Eutrophication)	NA	KG03 and KG17 will address these concerns. Review by EAY and Government experts will be completed with further peer review determinations made after.
358	Unless all shorelines are engineered with armouring and filter layers appropriate to wave climate and fetch, progressive bank erosion and sediment inputs are likely - requirements reflected in Australian maritime design guidance but not addressed in detail in the DMRP (Standards Australia, 2005; Hale, Boon, Lloyd, Vietz, & Jempson, 2020). (Section 5.3 Turbidity and sedimentation) (Section 5.3 Turbidity and Sedimentation)	NA	The DMRP shows that we have undertaken preliminary studies to understand the wave impact and that more studies are planned to better understand which treatment is suitable to which areas

#	Feedback / Comment	Modification to DMRP	No change to DMRP
359	Given the nutrient-enriched, turbid character of Latrobe/Morwell inflows and the absence of a natural outflow to export sediments and solutes, the expectation should be for a long-term, highly turbid, brown, low- transparency water body rather than a clear, recreation-standard lake (Boon et al.,2015; Hale et al., 2020). (Section 5.3 Turbidity and Sedimentation)	NA	Turbidity and colour are included in the rehabilitation monitoring program. Closure criteria will be established to ensure the lake / discharge water quality requirements are satisfactory and met KG 25. Nutrient modelling is also being completed as part of the Stratification / Hydrodynamic works and per knowledge gaps KG03,17 & 21
360	Managing such conditions typically requires ongoing shoreline stabilisation, engineered mixing/oxygenation, and active catchment-load controls - measures that entail enduring governance and funding beyond initial closure (Lund, 2015; McCullough et al., 2010). (Section 5.3 Turbidity and Sedimentation)	NA	EAY will continue with technical studies that will inform the landform design.
361	The DMRP does not provide an ecological risk assessment to demonstrate how the proposed lake would avoid these outcomes. (Section 5.4 Aquatic ecology)	NA	Ecological risk assessments will be completed after relevant studies as per the Knowledge Gaps chapter.
362	On the balance of current science and experience, FOGL's assessment is that a Yallourn pit lake is more likely to constitute a perpetual management obligation than a thriving ecosystem or reliable recreational amenity (Boehrer & Schultze, 2008; Lund, 2015; Paerl & Otten, 2013). (Section 5.4 Aquatic ecology)	NA	EAY is committed to providing a safe, stable and sustainable landform that meets the vision presented in the DMRP.
363	Though not the focus of our submission, we note community concerns such as: the stability of pit walls (especially given past mine batter collapses in Latrobe Valley, potential for land subsidence affecting nearby roads or the Morwell township if groundwater regimes change, and safety hazards of a deep lake (drowning risk, unstable shores). The DMRP should transparently address these. For water quality specifically, we recommend a robust monitoring and adaptive management plan if the lake goes ahead, with clear accountability. For instance, if pH falls or metals rise, who will act and pay for remediation? Without clear answers, FOGL has low confidence in the "lake as panacea" narrative. (Section 5.5 Community and safety).	Added new KG39 - review public safety hazards and propose acceptable design controls	Stability of pit walls has been assessed with FoS improved for the majority of areas compared to the end of mining stability, table 8-37. Land subsidence is expected to stop once groundwater pumping ceases. Have added KG39 to address safety concerns. KG25 and 32 will address future water quality monitoring
364	In summary, FOGL urges that alternative rehabilitation options be reconsidered or at least comparatively evaluated. A full pit lake may not be the optimal outcome environmentally. Possibilities include creating a shallower wetland or series of wetlands (requiring less water and perhaps promoting a treatment wetland effect), partial backfilling before lake formation to reduce depth, or hybrid options that maintain a smaller water body plus reconnect a managed river channel. These alternatives might better support biodiversity and pose fewer water quality risks. (5.6 Closing remarks)	NA	EAY have completed considerable work in this space, along with the Latrobe Valley Regional Rehabilitation Strategy (LVRRS), with the lake being the preferred solution to provide stability for the site. We do not believe that any further analysis of the options will provide benefit to our rehabilitation planning.
365	At minimum, the final approval should impose conditions for water quality standards and ongoing management to be met (under EPA oversight) before any "handover" of the lake to public use, preferably paid via a trust fund established by Energy Australia. (5.6 Closing remarks)	NA	EAY will comply with any conditions imposed on the DMRP.
366	Post-closure, an MRD failure that irreversibly diverts the river into a terminal pit lake would trigger additional costs—emergency response, stabilisation works, and long-term ecological remediation for the Latrobe–Gippsland Lakes system. Without enforceable, ring-fenced financial assurance and clear post-closure accountability, these liabilities can fall back on the public (Resources Victoria, 2024). (6.0 Cost burdens)	NA	Whilst EAY is confident in the MRD Engineering Studies and works proposed to ensure long-term integrity, the Rehabilitation Bond and Post Closure Fund will be appropriately designed to account for this scenario.

#	Feedback / Comment	Modification to DMRP	No change to DMRP
367	Aligning with contemporary policy expectations that mining operators should internalise rehabilitation water costs—even paying full market rates—and not diminish environmental values (ABC News, 2025; Resources Victoria, 2024), any approval must require the proponent to internalise costs and demonstrably drive down risk. (6.0 Cost burdens)	NA	No response as the comment appears to be directed at government decision making
368	FOGL recommended safeguards 1 Strengthened Financial Assurance. Maintain or increase rehabilitation bonds or equivalent securities until independent verification confirms MRD stability and pit-lake water quality; establish a dedicated long-term stewardship fund for ongoing water-quality monitoring and incident response (Resources Victoria, 2024).	NA	No response from EAY as this comment appears directed to government decision making processes.
369	FOGL recommended safeguards 2 Ecological Offsets and Improvements. Make river-water access contingent on delivering a net ecological benefit, through entitlement retirement or substitution with manufactured/recycled water (DELWP, 2022).	NA	No response from EAY as this comment appears directed to government decision making processes.
370	FOGL recommended safeguards 3 Full-Cost Water Pricing. Price bulk water access to include externalities (e.g., lost ecosystem services, water-quality risk), with revenues ring-fenced for Lake and river health programs. This aligns with expectations that mine rehabilitation water should be priced at full, market-based rates (ABC News, 2025; DELWP, 2022).	NA	Water costing and subsequent allocation of those funds is not a component of the DMRP process.
371	FOGL recommended safeguards 4 Downstream Liability Retention. Include licence conditions retaining proponent liability for downstream ecological harms (e.g., salinity-induced dieback, bloom-related fish kills) linked to MRD failure or pit-lake operations, with enforceable remediation triggers (Resources Victoria, 2024).	NA	No response from EAY as this comment appears directed to government decision making processes.
372	FOGL recommended safeguards 5 Explicit Trailing-Liability Provisions. Embed Victoria's trailing-liability scheme into the approval framework, ensuring the State's call-back powers apply to former licensees and related parties (post-5 May 2022), regardless of ownership changes or closure timelines (Victorian Government, 2022; Resources Victoria, 2022; Resources Victoria, 2024).	NA	No response from EAY as this comment appears directed to government decision making processes.
373	FOGL recommended safeguards 6 Transfer & Closure Conditions. Require parent-company guarantees or letters of credit, valid run-off (tail) insurance (with no cross-insured clauses), and regulator vetoes on licence transfers, unless it can be demonstrated that financial assurances and obligations remain intact.	NA	No response from EAY as this comment appears directed to government decision making processes.
374	FOGL's position is that Yallourn rehabilitation planning should be co-designed with GLaWAC and aligned with Water is Life: any water allocation decisions must demonstrably maintain or improve cultural flows and values, not diminish them. In practical terms, this means safeguarding flow regimes that support culturally significant species, wetlands and practices; embedding Traditional Owner objectives in environmental-flow rules; and ensuring that any mine-related water use neither reduces water available for Country nor transfers long-term risks to Traditional Owners and the wider community (Hale et al., 2020; Victorian Government, 2022). (section 7.1 Traditional Owners' Voice on Water).	NA	EAY will continue to engage with GLaWAC on rehabilitation outcomes including discussions related to 'Pathways to Partnership'.
375	FOGL welcomes DEECA's current formal engagement on the DMRP and EnergyAustralia's stated engagement principles, but emphasizes that commitments must translate into tangible practices that build trust. (Section 7.2 Community concerns)	NA	EnergyAustralia is committed to providing honest, substantive, and comprehensive information about all our operational sites and major projects including the DMRP. Our community engagement approach ensures that this information is provided to key stakeholders.

#	Feedback / Comment	Modification to DMRP	No change to DMRP
376	7.4 Effective community engagements: Publish plain-language summaries alongside full technical reports, with an open “data room” for models, assumptions, and monitoring datasets.	NA	Planning or regulatory requirements often govern the level of technical information we must provide, leading to highly technical documents. Although we have worked hard to make the information more accessible, we appreciate the community’s feedback and will incorporate it into future work.
377	7.4 Effective community engagements: Fund independent expert reviews (selected with community and Traditional Owner input) to test hydrology, geotechnical design, water quality, and ecological risk assessments; publish all review findings and proponent responses.	NA	EAY is committed to effective community engagement through the CSEP and has published many reports which shape the DMRP. EAY will continue to be transparent on findings and will participate in Government review recommendations
378	7.4 Effective community engagements: Establish a standing joint advisory committee—comprising GLaWAC, local councils, catchment managers, community groups, and independent experts— to guide design choices, set monitoring priorities, and review performance.	NA	This function is completed by the existing Environment Review Committee. Further engagement will continue throughout the rehabilitation period in accordance with the CSEP
379	7.4 Effective community engagements: Create an open environmental performance dashboard (flows, salinity, algal alerts, bank stability, compliance actions) with annual public audits and adaptive-management updates.	Modified section 14.4.2 of the DMRP to include the below statements The aspiration for the Common Data Environment is that. • It will be accessible by different stakeholder groups (including the general public) with varying levels of access granted to the different stakeholder groups. • It will support real time access to key rehabilitation data	NA
380	7.4 Effective community engagements: Develop, consult on, and publish an Access and Safety Plan for any post-mining waterbody or parkland (including clear rules for closures during hazard events), and a Cultural Heritage Management Plan co-designed with Traditional Owners.	NA	Supporting documents will be developed as the project progresses.
381	7.4 Effective community engagements: Co-design naming, interpretation, and public-realm elements with Gunaikurnai representatives to ensure Country is respected and stories are accurately told.	NA	EAY will continue to engage with GLaWAC on rehabilitation outcomes including discussions related to 'Pathways to Partnership'. Note that we have consulted with GLaWAC on the appropriate names for places and natural features to use within the DMRP and have acted upon the advice provided.
382	7.4 Effective community engagements: Implement a formal grievance and escalation pathway, including timelines for response, independent mediation options, and a clear link to regulatory enforcement where issues persist.	NA	EAY has existing systems in place for managing complaints and enquiries.
383	FOGL’s position is straightforward: a credible rehabilitation process must be transparent, independently scrutinised, and co-governed with Traditional Owners and the broader community. Only then will the DMRP earn durable confidence and deliver outcomes that the region can live with—and live off—for generations. (7.4 Effective community engagement)	NA	EAY believes this position is consistent with the DMRP and CSEP
384	We call on the government and EnergyAustralia to uphold “Water is Life” in practice by revising the DMRP in collaboration with Traditional Owners and community stakeholders. (7.4 Effective community engagement)	NA	EAY will align bulk water applications with the conditions of the LVRRS which considered Traditional Owner values.
385	Resolve Morwell River Diversion (MRD) governance, ownership, and engineering assurance first. Establish an independent expert review panel for technical oversight; secure Morwell–Latrobe connectivity capable of passing baseflows and winter–spring freshes under future climate scenarios. (8.1 Key Recommendations Preconditions and Assessment Pathway)	NA	No response from EAY as this comment appears directed to government decision making processes.
386	Treat an EPBC referral and a Victorian EES as standard safeguards for proposals with potential Ramsar/water-trigger implications; design for no significant impact with enforceable suspension triggers tied to Ramsar indicators. (8.1 Key Recommendations Preconditions and Assessment Pathway)	NA	No response from EAY as this comment appears directed to government decision making processes.

#	Feedback / Comment	Modification to DMRP	No change to DMRP
387	Re-assess system water availability under contemporary climate sequences before considering any new consumptive access. Require that a formal Section 40 (Water Act 1989, Vic) decision record be prepared, explicitly documenting how environmental values, Ramsar obligations, public uses, Traditional Owner rights, and existing entitlement reliabilities are preserved. Any proposal that fails to satisfy these criteria cannot lawfully proceed: granting an entitlement that exacerbates the 129 GL/year environmental water deficit or compromises the Environmental Water Reserve would be inconsistent with Section 40 and open to legal challenge. (8.1 Key Recommendations Preconditions and Assessment Pathway)	NA	No response from EAY as this comment appears to be directed at the Minister for Water when reviewing and assessing water take applications.
388	Set a policy floor of $2,500–$3,000/ML benchmarked to the long-run marginal cost of manufactured supply (advanced recycled/desalinated water). (8.2 Key Recommendations Pricing architecture)	NA	Water costing and subsequent allocation of those funds is not a component of the DMRP process.
389	Integrate Total Economic Value: include ecological services, cultural values, recreation/tourism and option/existence values; publish the valuation method, ranges and uncertainties. (8.2 Key Recommendations Pricing architecture)	NA	Water costing and subsequent allocation of those funds is not a component of the DMRP process.
390	Apply scarcity/risk multipliers that rise as environmental shortfalls and storage constraints tighten; include an MRD-assurance levy. (8.2 Key Recommendations Pricing architecture)	NA	Water costing and subsequent allocation of those funds is not a component of the DMRP process.
391	Hypothecate all net revenues to a Latrobe–Lakes Restoration Fund for environmental water recovery, wetland/ecosystem works, and Traditional Owner cultural-water outcomes; report publicly. (8.2 Key Recommendations Pricing architecture)	NA	Water costing and subsequent allocation of those funds is not a component of the DMRP process.
392	Review and index (CPI + scarcity factor) annually/biennially; avoid low initial water prices that encourage extraction. (8.2 Key Recommendations Pricing architecture)	NA	Water costing and subsequent allocation of those funds is not a component of the DMRP process.
393	Very low-reliability, high-flow-only access: permitted only when flows exceed the 80th–90th percentile (naturalised) at key gauges and when Environmental Water Reserve obligations are met. (8.3 Key Recommendations Access rules)	NA	No response as the comment appears to be directed at government decision making
394	Seasonal fresh protection (FMDT): guarantee frequency, magnitude, duration and timing of winter–spring freshes; no pumping on the rising limb and early recession of defined freshes (June–November); minimum annual fresh count set by the regulator using naturalised percentiles. (8.3 Key Recommendations Access rules)	NA	No response as the comment appears to be directed at government decision making
395	Hard cease-to-pump triggers: no take below monthly EWR base-flow thresholds; suspend extraction if Lake Wellington salinity, wetland indicators, or fish- passage metrics exceed thresholds. (8.3 Key Recommendations Access rules)	NA	No response as the comment appears to be directed at government decision making
396	MRD dependency: if Morwell–Latrobe connectivity is impaired (e.g., MRD breach/decommissioning or failure to pass ≥5-year ARI events), automatically suspend access pending review. (8.3 Key Recommendations Access rules)	NA	No response as the comment appears to be directed at government decision making
397	Impose strict annual caps that are small relative to system flows; adaptive caps tighten with climate indices and drop to zero in drought/low-storage years. (8.4 Key Recommendations Volume caps, reliability, compensation)	NA	No response as the comment appears to be directed at government decision making
398	Class the entitlement as very low-reliability and explicitly subordinated to environmental and existing users' needs. (8.4 Key Recommendations Volume caps, reliability, compensation)	NA	No response as the comment appears to be directed at government decision making

#	Feedback / Comment	Modification to DMRP	No change to DMRP
399	No compensation: curtailments or suspensions to protect environmental/cultural values and existing users do not attract financial compensation. (8.4 Key Recommendations Volume caps, reliability, compensation)	NA	No response as the comment appears to be directed at government decision making
400	Eligibility only after the required winter–spring freshes are delivered downstream and outside no-take windows. (8.5 Key Recommendations flood harvesting controls)	NA	No response as the comment appears to be directed at government decision making
401	Fully metered (telemetry) and debited against the annual cap—no double- dipping; always priced (never zero). (8.5 Key Recommendations flood harvesting controls)	NA	No response as the comment appears to be directed at government decision making
402	Automatically suspended if MRD connectivity is compromised (as floods would not reach regulated decision points). (8.5 Key Recommendations flood harvesting controls)	NA	No response as the comment appears to be directed at government decision making
403	Require one-for-one (or greater) offsets for any river water taken (e.g., purchase/retire entitlements for environmental use or substitute with recycled/manufactured water). (8.6 Key Recommendations off-sets and no -net-loss)	NA	No response as the comment appears to be directed at government decision making
404	Ensure any savings from retired power-station licences are returned to the environment, not reallocated to mines. (8.6 Key Recommendations off-sets and no -net-loss)	NA	This is not a component of the DMRP process and is outside EAY control.
405	Undertake mandatory early engagement with GLaWAC; complete cultural impact assessments where relevant. (8.7 Key Recommendations Traditional Owner Rights)	NA	Engagement with GLaWAC on rehabilitation plans is already a regulatory requirement.
406	Recognise that environmental improvements are cultural gains; ring-fence a defined share of pricing revenue for Traditional Owner-led cultural-water projects and joint wetland management. (8.7 Key Recommendations Traditional Owner Rights)	NA	This is not a component of the DMRP process and is outside EAY control.
407	Align approvals with the Water is Life roadmap and progress toward Treaty outcomes. (8.7 Key Recommendations Traditional Owner Rights)	NA	No response from EAY as this comment appears to be directed at the Minister for Water when reviewing and assessing water take applications.
408	Install telemetry on all extraction points; maintain a public dashboard of flows, pumping, salinity, and wetland levels; require independent annual audits. (8.8 Key Recommendations Monitoring)	NA	No response as the comment appears to be directed at government decision making.
409	Establish a five-year independent review cycle with public consultation; empower the Minister to tighten or halt access if indicators deteriorate. (8.8 Key Recommendations Monitoring)	NA	No response from EAY as this comment appears to be directed at the Minister for Water when reviewing and assessing water take applications.
410	Constitute an oversight committee (Traditional Owners, community, CMA, independent scientists) to guide the Restoration Fund and review performance. (8.8 Key Recommendations Monitoring)	NA	No response from EAY as this comment appears directed to government decision making processes.
411	Prefer and incentivise non-river sources (advanced recycled/desalinated water, stormwater harvesting, partial saline options, on-site optimisation); require proponents to demonstrate why alternatives cannot feasibly substitute for any requested river volume. (8.9 Key Recommendations Alternative Supplies)	NA	This is not a component of the DMRP process.
412	Consider targeted rebates or grants for verified substitution that reduces pressure on the Morwell/Latrobe system while delivering net environmental benefit. (8.9 Key Recommendations Alternative Supplies)	NA	This is not a component of the DMRP process.
413	Demonstrate explicit alignment with CGRSWS objectives, the LVRRS principles (tightened to reflect MRD risks), climate-adaptation and biodiversity strategies, and DTF user-pays/public-interest pricing principles. (8.10 Key Recommendations Policy Coherence)	NA	The DMRP is shaped by these policies, but we do not intend to show explicit alignment. Government will consider these policies against our DMRP as part of the approval process
414	Apply a high bar for approvals: proceed only where high-confidence evidence shows no compromise to environmental and cultural outcomes—and preferably a net improvement. (8.10 Key Recommendations Policy Coherence)	NA	This is not a component of the DMRP process.

#	Feedback / Comment	Modification to DMRP	No change to DMRP
415	Where MRD assurance and event-based protections cannot be satisfied, defer or decline access and re-assess the resource under contemporary climate scenarios. (8.10 Key Recommendations Policy Coherence)	NA	No response as the comment appears to be directed at government decision making
416	Require that all approvals for mine rehabilitation incorporate robust financial assurance mechanisms—including rehabilitation bonds sized to credible worst- case scenarios, dedicated stewardship funds for long-term monitoring, and enforceable licence conditions retaining proponent liability for downstream harm. (8.11 Key Recommendations Liability, Financial Assurance)	NA	No response from EAY as this comment appears directed to government decision making processes.
417	Embed the Victorian trailing-liability regime within approval conditions so that former title-holders and related parties remain legally accountable if latent failures emerge post-closure. This should include explicit regulator call-back powers, parent-company guarantees, and mandatory run-off (tail) insurance to ensure liabilities cannot be orphaned through corporate restructuring or asset transfer. (8.11 Key Recommendations Liability, Financial Assurance)	NA	No response from EAY as this comment appears directed to government decision making processes.
418	Conclusion: The Morwell River Diversion (MRD) is structurally vulnerable, especially if subjected to overtopping or saturation from a pit lake. These vulnerabilities are further heightened by climate uncertainties and risk. Past failures (2012) show the dire consequences of MRD collapse. The DMRP's design modifications (lowered levees, side weirs) would be likely to precipitate eventual failure, which could permanently divert the river into the mine void. This risk must be eliminated through redesign – maintaining a robust diversion channel capable of passing at least a 1-in-100 year flood without breaching.	NA	Technical assessments and derived design for MRD articulate the existing conditions of the materials in MRD and provide evidence based solutions for remediation and long-term management of the structure. Detailed technical discussion on current state and evidence based design is presented in Ch 8.6, 8.12, 11.5, 12.3 & PSM 2025 (Appendix C).
419	Conclusion: Failure or misuse of the MRD would drastically reduce freshwater inflows to the Ramsar-listed Gippsland Lakes system. This would lead to degraded wetland habitats, loss of biodiversity, and increased salinity in Lake Wellington and connected wetlands. Such an outcome threatens Australia's obligations under the Ramsar Convention and triggers the EPBC Act water trigger, necessitating federal assessment.	NA	A regional water balance study was completed considering the proposed rehabilitation design with a particular focus on the influence to water balance from proposed MRD remediation design. The results of this study supports the Yallourn Mine rehabilitation design and demonstrates that there are no adverse influences on regional water balance. The study further confirms that proposed MRD remediation design allows all environmental flows to pass through MRD, along with flood flows up to the design levels. Detailed regional water quality investigations including water balance and water quality impact assessments is noted as a knowledge gap (KG15, Chapter 17).
420	Conclusion: The plan's approach to filling a terminal pit lake raises severe water quality and ecological concerns. A Yallourn pit lake is likely to stratify and develop anoxic, acidic bottom waters liberating metals, to experience eutrophication and harmful algal blooms, and to support minimal aquatic life. Claims that it will be a beneficial recreation or ecological asset are not backed by evidence. Long-term management and liability issues remain unaddressed.	NA	EAY is committed to providing a safe, stable and sustainable landform that meets the vision presented in the DMRP. Ongoing technical studies will contribute to the knowledge base and assist in identifying management actions.

#	Feedback / Comment	Modification to DMRP	No change to DMRP
421	Conclusion: The Gippsland Lakes region's economy – including fishing, tourism, and recreation – would suffer from any decline in lake/wetland health. Reduced flows mean fewer fish and waterbirds, harming fisheries and nature-based tourism. Conversely, robust environmental flows are an investment in the region's sustainable economy. The costs of getting this wrong (emergency interventions, lost business, environmental repair) far outweigh the costs of adopting a precautionary, environmentally sound approach now.	NA	A regional water balance study was completed considering the proposed rehabilitation design with a particular focus on the influence to water balance from proposed MRD remediation design. The results of this study supports the Yallourn Mine rehabilitation design and demonstrates that there are no adverse influences on regional water balance. The study further confirms that proposed MRD remediation design allows all environmental flows to pass through MRD, along with flood flows up to the design levels. Detailed regional water quality investigations including water balance and water quality impact assessments is noted as a knowledge gap (KG15, Chapter 17).
422	Conclusion: Traditional Owners and local communities have clearly voiced that water must be managed for the benefit of rivers, wetlands, and people, not sacrificed to expediency. The Gunaikurnai principle that "water is life" and the Joint Statement's warning about rivers on the brink should guide decision-makers. Any rehabilitation plan must respect Traditional Owner rights, include them in decision-making, and avoid further cultural harm by degrading Country's water.	NA	Our plan is aiming to strike the right balance between water extraction and protecting the stability of the river systems in the long term. Direct engagement with GLaWAC has been occurring and will continue
423	Conclusion: In sum, if any use of Latrobe water proceeds, it must do so only after MRD integrity and event-based protections for winter–spring freshes are secured; at prices that reflect true social value; under very low-reliability, high-flow-only rules; and with transparent telemetry, hard cease-to-pump triggers, and no-compensation curtailment. Revenues should be allocated for environmental water recovery, wetland restoration, and Traditional Owner–led projects so that any authorised take delivers measurable, local benefits and a net-positive legacy.	NA	EAY will continue to progress technical studies to ensure the rehabilitation of the Yallourn mine provides a safe, stable and sustainable landform.
424	Conclusion: FOGL appreciates the opportunity to present this submission. We are "independent advocates for the Gippsland Lakes," and our aim is to ensure that decisions made in 2025 do not become regrets in the decades to come. The Latrobe Valley is undergoing a historic transition – we have the chance to transform a landscape of extraction into one of restoration. Let Yallourn's legacy be more than a toxic and lifeless pit lake; let it include thriving wetlands, a flowing river, and empowered communities**.**	NA	EAY will continue to engage with community and stakeholders to achieve beneficial outcomes.
425	Conclusion: We trust that DEECA and EnergyAustralia will give full and balanced consideration to the scientific evidence, policy obligations, and community values outlined in this submission, and will engage openly with stakeholders to ensure the DMRP is strengthened accordingly. Friends of Gippsland Lakes remains committed to supporting this process in a constructive capacity and stands ready to assist in safeguarding the Gippsland Lakes for present and future generations.	NA	EnergyAustralia is committed to providing honest, substantive, and comprehensive information about all our operational sites and major projects including the DMRP. Our community engagement approach ensures that this information is provided to key stakeholders.

Table 1010 Gippsland Lakes Recreational Fishing Alliance (Event ID 3387)

#	Feedback / Comment	Modification to DMRP	No change to DMRP
138	The current Victorian government proposal provides for an unrealistic and extremely long-time frame to fill the mine void with bulk entitlement surface water. The twenty-five-year fill time frame will burden the project's budget with high on going annual site maintenance costs during this phase	NA	EAY are in favour of filling the void as fast as is reasonably practical and safe, however, there needs to be ongoing work with the government to find a sustainable rate and cost of water.
139	The current proposed rehabilitation plan offers no positive economic, social, or ecological outcomes for the Victorian community.	NA	EAY is committed to providing a safe, stable and sustainable landform. Further development works are dependent on the future landowner.
140	The Morwell River should be allowed to resume its previous course through the Yallourn mine site and create a run of river freshwater lake and wetland. Flood events, that have typically affected the Yallourn mine site throughout its operating history, would provide most of the water required. The envisaged project outcome would be to create a Morwell River freshwater Lakes and wetland that has the Morwell River acting as its natural headwater. This 'new' waterway would be managed to provide habitat for the exclusive use of the catchments native fish and wildlife. The project would be planned to contribute a valuable and unique tourism and local amenity asset to the region. The money saved by allowing floodwaters and the Morwell River to fill the mine complex would be repurposed to fund the 'Morwell River Lakes and wetlands' project.	NA	Directing the river into the void/lake would cut off sediment load and fish passage between the Morwell and Latrobe Rivers. Hence, it is preferred to maintain flow through to Latrobe River.
141	Water quality, water volumes, and noxious species such as Carp have severely depleted freshwater native fish stocks in the Latrobe River. These depleted fish resources no longer offer any local amenity and are insufficient to attract any recreational angling tourism for the local economy. It would be envisaged that the 'Morwell River Lakes and Wetlands' project would have an annual operating budget to maintain Carp at or below 10% of total fish biomass in the Morwell River and the lake project area. We believe that Carp control and the native fish recovery initiative could provide a unique opportunity for first nations organisations to manage and oversee a natural resource management recovery project.	NA	Maintaining connection to the Latrobe River is the best option for native fish migration. First nations peoples are being directly consulted via GLaWAC.
142	Having the Morwell River as the natural headwater of the 'Morwell River Lakes and Wetlands' project provides the project with several potential benefits. 1. A natural headwater provides the necessary water chemistry to create and sustain the food web of this proposed waterway. 2. The Morwell River has the potential to provide much higher water quality to the project than Latrobe River water. 3. By including the Morwell River, the project area has habitat diversity, which allows a greater number of native fish and animals to be restored and protected	NA	Diverting the Mowell River into the lake is not the preferred option for environmental reasons.

Table 1111 Great Latrobe Park (GLP) (Event ID 3342)

#	Feedback / Comment	Modification to DMRP	No change to DMRP
047	Table 4-4 - Do EAY intend to monitor themselves against all of table 4-4: Summary of Guidance Documents for Yallourn Rehabilitation?	NA	As per the DMRP: "The inclusion of a document in Table 4 4 does not translate to EAY formally complying with every aspect of the document, rather the information has been used to guide effective rehabilitation planning and implementation."
048	Table 6-2 - GLP would like to see a public engagement prior to removal of any or all infrastructure for aspects that may be of value in post rehabilitation (repurposed) land use. This would be made easier with a repurposing plan identified prior to demolition.	NA	Infrastructure removal within the mine footprint is a prior rehabilitation commitment and critical path activity. Repurposing will be explored for infrastructure outside the mine footprint and this will include appropriate consultation.
049	Table 6-2 - The reference to “Downstream hydrological performance is improved during the closure and rehabilitation phase through to post closure compared to baseline.” is unclear.	Reworded this objective to read "Hydrological conditions downstream show improvement throughout the closure and rehabilitation phases, continuing into post-closure, when compared to baseline conditions"	NA
050	Table 6-2 - “Overburden material will not become a source of problematic mine drainage in the future.” What is meant by the term problematic remains unclear?	Changed "problematic" to "contamination to"	NA
051	Table 6-2 - Watercourses – “Surface runoff or seepage from the rehabilitated mine site does not have an unacceptable impact on downstream receptors.” To whom is it unacceptable?	NA	NA
052	Figure 9-2 - GLP would like to see EAY investigate potential for capturing the history of its operations in such a manner that memorializes this history and the people who have offered service to the State. Ideally this would be conducted in conjunction with the State who owned the business for 75 years. An appropriate outcome may be a tourist attraction that captures this history and the pride that once existed. Please help protect this history.	Added new section 9.3.1 to DMRP to capture feedback on land uses and how EAY can assist in the supporting these.	NA
053	Chapter 10-1 - Claiming “complete transparency” and seeking community support for acquiring such a large volume of water whilst providing the community with only 1 alternative i.e. fill to RL +37m AHD seems at variance and unlikely to build community trust. At some point EAY should provide a logical argument as to why Lake Yallourn requires a certain volume of water.	NA	EAY acknowledges that a concise discussion of why the level of +37RL was adopted would be beneficial to the reader. Currently this information is contained through sections 3.5, 8.9 and 8.12 of the DMRP.
054	Chapter 11 - There are 11 pages of risks that have been assessed. If you really want public input you need to provide a summary of the most significant risks through a new smaller table or a colour scheme in the existing table. Otherwise, this is too much information for the public to absorb (especially after wading through the previous 400 pages)	Table 11-9 in the DMRP has been updated to provide additional details on the high risk events.	Sections 11.7 and 11.8 of the DMRP aim to summarise the risk assessment results and high risk events, with an overall summary in Table 11-9.
055	Chapter 12 - It is GLP’s view that the DMRP should not be approved until after options analysis has been disclosed and all logical arguments run. It is considered that this version of the DMRP has done little to improve community trust or confidence on where these processes are taking the Latrobe Valley	NA	EAY have completed considerable work in this space, along with the Latrobe Valley Regional Rehabilitation Strategy (LVRRS), with the lake being the preferred solution to provide stability for the site. We do not believe that any further analysis of the options will provide benefit to our rehabilitation planning.
056	Page 425 GLP would like to know what is the long term (>100 year) vision for the MRD and what is the design intent period?	NA	The design intent period is 100 years post lake full (3.7.2). Beyond this period is outside the scope of the DMRP.
057	Figure 12-2 - There is considerable grass planting on both internal and external areas of the MRD from which presumably animals will be excluded from grazing due to potential damage. If so, is there a very long-term maintenance plan or plantings proposed?	NA	Figure 12.2 is a feasibility level design. The exact flora to be planted along the proposed levee is to be determined in future studies. It is not expected to be agricultural grazing land.
058	GLP would argue that the benchmarks identified should have already been the subject of public consultation so that transparency could be ensured. Given outstanding technical questions, we propose that that approval of the DMRP should not occur until after answers to these many technical questions are provided to the public.	NA	The DMRP is legislated as an iterative process and EAY commits to improving closure criteria for future DMRP approval. Approval of the current DMRP is important as it gives EAY confidence that the plan is conceptually acceptable, enabling us focus on future work with confidence. We acknowledge further work is required to define closure criteria.

#	Feedback / Comment	Modification to DMRP	No change to DMRP
059	GLP sees that sustainability in the context of mine rehabilitation is "meeting the requirements of safety and stability with the minimum of human intervention and resource input for the long-term." This has implications on what the water level needs to be as the higher the water level the greater the on-going evaporation and make up requirements. As such, the "trade-off "of increased stability of the MRD and batters versus the height of Lake Yallourn needs to be better defined. Our challenge to EAY is to demonstrate these aspects simply for the public to understand.	NA	Planning or regulatory requirements often govern the level of technical information we must provide, leading to highly technical documents. Although we have worked hard to make the information more accessible, we appreciate the community's feedback and will incorporate it into future work.
060	GLP also considers the artesian aquifer waters to be a resource of potentially greater benefit than surface water. There is no reference to the temperature profile of the artesian waters currently pumped by EAY and seeks EAY's insights into sustainable yields and uses of this resource.	NA	No change to DMRP. EAY's groundwater licence conditions permit extraction for the purpose of maintaining stability in the mine. Future additional purposes are not currently proposed by EAY, however groundwater could become a future top-up water source.
061	GLP also believes that the public would benefit from a table showing lake surface areas and water volumes by RL in m AHD. Whether that is contained in the DMRP or the EES is for Yallourn and Regulators to determine.	Included new Table 9-2	NA
062	S8.3.2.5 - does not EAY also discharge Power Station water via the Saline Waste Outfall Pipeline?	Edit noted in Ch 8.3.2.5 - Concept Water Balance.	Figure 8-17 shows the discharge from SWOP but was not noted in the text of the report. DMRP edited.
063	Page 172 - Mr Chris Fraser, formerly a Senior Manager, with the SECV, presented a paper to a Canadian Conference where it was stated that the M1/MFAS aquifer started with a head of RL 61. This is confirmed in a document prepared by Robin Friday, of Golder and Associates, in Fig 3 of the report entitled Report to SECV, Review of Aquifer Dewatering at Morwell Open Cut dated 6 July 1990. Pre-mining levels of the M2/TFAS at Morwell Open Cut remain unknown but this system became interconnected to the M1/MFAS around 1972. This means that the M2/TFAS is unlikely to rise much above the M1/MFAS due to likely substantial leakage between the 2 units, both naturally and due to the thousands of boreholes that interconnect them.	NA	Noted. No response required as this comment is based on information sharing.
064	S8.3.4.1 page 207 - GLP believe that the number of scenarios modelled is too limited. GLP also expects that EAY would identify the RL of natural balance assuming that runoff is allowed to accumulate, supported by artesian dewatering until sufficient weight is applied that pumping can cease. This RL will also have consequential effects on MRD and batter stability and likely water quality – but these should be modelled and published so that a holistic view can be formed on the volume and value of water involved. Similarly, a sensitivity scenario should also be modelled and published e.g. RL +32m AHD. GLP considers these to be the minimum number of scenarios to be considered and presented.	NA	The natural weight balance forms part of the rehabilitation design and technical findings are presented in Chapter 8.11. Detailed assessment of incremental lake level's influence on weight balance is noted as a Knowledge Gap (KG12)
065	S8.3.5 p210 - There is no provision of sensitivity testing and advice on which parameters the results are most sensitive to or discussion on how reliable the data is on those key parameters. This is true for all of the modelling presented within the document.	NA	Process of selecting input parameters to modelling has been progressively presented in section 8.3.2 Conceptual Groundwater Model, then presenting technical justifications for the Numerical Groundwater model (section 8.3.3). Section 8.3.3.4 presents the justification of hydrogeological parameter supported by model calibration. The sensitivity analysis in consideration of the rehabilitation scenarios are presented in section 8.3.4.

#	Feedback / Comment	Modification to DMRP	No change to DMRP
066	S8.3.5 p210 - "The best rehabilitation option for groundwater recovery and passive management is the full pit lake. However, this will be supported by ongoing pumping during filling and decommissioning of pumping bores once the filling has been completed." These installations may have a potential broader community benefit which should be investigated before they are decommissioned. GLP expects EAY to make financial provision for future decommissioning if they were deemed of value to the community.	NA	EAY's groundwater licence conditions permit extraction for the purpose of maintaining stability in the mine. Future additional purposes are not currently proposed by EAY, however groundwater could become a future top-up water source.
067	S8.3.7 Page 214 The possibility that pumping can cease earlier should be included as part of the sensitivity analysis. GLP acknowledges that there may be sensitivities to what is occurring outside of EAY's boundary but we believe blanket treatment of the artesian resource in this manner lies against the interests of the Latrobe Valley and all Victorians. GLP's view is that appropriate monitoring of borehole and piezometer networks can provide adequate warning of any need to increase artesian pumping. GLP believes that minimising extraction of artesian ground water is critical for several reasons: 1. Protection of the heat value within the artesian ground water resource, 2. To minimise difference between the increasing surface water level within the mine void and the artesian water levels because of the potential to promote water movement between the water bodies when large differentials in head exist. 3. The same argument applies with surface ground settlements being larger when artesian water levels are lower, and 4. If large differences in head exist when pumping eventually ceases the rebound in artesian water levels is likely to result in rebound of ground levels creating potential for instability, particularly under the MRD, years after rehabilitation has ceased.	NA	Detailed assessment of the weight balance and pumping requirements and decommissioning schedule is ongoing (section 8.1.3). However, the fuller the lake, the more confinement and reduced potential for rebound and heave of the floor once the pumps are turned off.
068	P214 - "it is highly likely that the groundwater levels in the confined aquifer would ultimately recover to levels above the RL 37 m pit lake level. This means the pit lake would act as a local sink to the groundwater system over the long term, with seepage of small quantities of groundwater occurring under the influence of small upward vertical hydraulic gradients. " GLP agrees with this.	NA	No response required
069	S 8.7.2.5 Page 246 – "the hydrologic flow estimation approach has focused on storm parameters for events up to 1:10,000 AEP" On page 236 the MRD and Latrobe River design criteria were set at 1:2,000 ARI. There has been no attempt to rationalise adoption of these differing standards, especially as the more costly fix may have the lower design standard. There should be some justification provided especially as the SECV adopted 1:10,000 ARI for streams and conducted sensitivity for PMF.	NA	Feedback noted. The adopted return events for storm water infrastructures and major hydraulic structures such as the MRD have been assessed at a scalable difference in risk profiles (sections 11.5.2.2, 11.5.4). Further, these are validated with industry design standards, literature, local site conditions. Refer to sections 8.7, 8.12 & PSM 2025 - Appendix C
070	S8.7.2.5 - Modelling of PMF should be undertaken to understand the likely consequences as these are likely to be faced by these structures at some time in the future even if it is after EAY have vacated the site.	NA	Feedback noted. The adopted return events for storm water infrastructures and major hydraulic structures such as the MRD have been assessed at a scalable difference in risk profiles (sections 11.5.2.2, 11.5.4). Further, these are validated with industry design standards, literature, local site conditions. Refer to sections 8.7, 8.12 & PSM 2025 - Appendix C

#	Feedback / Comment	Modification to DMRP	No change to DMRP
071	S8.7.2.6 Page 247 – "The design of each down batter drain is unique as each drain needs to consider a specific combination of:" This also needs to include underlying coal joint orientation and degree of joint activation as these are important aspects to consider.	NA	This is covered under "Geotechnical stability"
072	Table 8-12, Page 260 No sensitivity analyses regarding fill levels or water quality.	NA	Noted as a knowledge gap KG22
073	S8.8.3.1.4 -"The relatively narrow concept operating level of lake (i.e. 1m) results in the need to periodically top-up the pit from external water sources." Rationale for operating range set to 1m?	NA	Noted in DMRP section 8.3.3.4 - The requirement, availability and source of top up water for the lakes. i.e. further work will be required to optimise the lake operating level and peripheral catchment diversions (KG22 and KG32 in Table 17 1)
074	S8.8.3.1.4 Page 273 - GLP's definition of sustainability is supportive of increasing local catchment and reducing water take from Latrobe River dams. Taking water locally makes no difference to the Gippsland Lakes but does reduce monitoring and future top-up costs, so why the 30% reduction?	Words added to Ch 8.8.3.1.4 of DMRP as noted in Additional comments.	The 30% decrease noted is comparative to the catchments adopted in the previous published rehabilitation plans. The current refinement of the peripheral catchments presented in the DMRP have been drawn from detailed site and surroundings evaluation of the terrains. Increasing catchments reporting to the pit in this scenario is not considered as increase in sustainability but instead puts more water into the river system. The peripheral catchment and surface drainage design shows some of the existing drainage pathways being maintained as per current flow paths, which will continue to report to the Morwell River system. See section 8.7, where Figure 8-65 shows the existing drainage paths and Figure 8-66 shows the proposed drainage paths for rehabilitation.
075	Table 8-24, Page 275 - Model estimated pH for the YTF and YEF pits for Scenario 2 after application of solubility controls and atmospheric equilibrium. Does the current pH of Lake Placid capture some of these iron rich waters?	NA	The iron concentrations in Lake Placid are low. Iron is likely overstated in the current modelling due to measuring colloidal iron, particularly in groundwater bores Further work is required to refine the WQ model accuracy and is noted in KG23
076	Table 8-25 - Summary of model estimated TDS and major ion water qualities for each of the project scenarios at select years. Page 276 – There are other appropriate standards to compare results rather than just Livestock Drinking Water	NA	Other guidelines tend to exclude TDS and most major ions (e.g. Australian Drinking Water Guidelines) so Livestock Drinking Water guidelines seem applicable. The results presented include ADWG, freshwater aquatic ecosystem and livestock.
077	S8.11.3 Findings, Page 323 – Given that +17m lake level achieves weight balance, water above this level is being requested to offset batter profiling and batter stabilization works. Given the State is seeking to charge for water access maybe it may be less expensive to conduct the physical work. Accordingly, GLP seeks to understand arguments in pursuing only 1 option i.e. fill to RL +37m.	NA	Creation of a lake is the strongly preferred due to the stability benefits it provides to the MRD and batters. Weight balance is just one part of the puzzle. The cost to (re)construct an MRD that can endure the 100 year design intent period with an RL+17m lake, and the additional volume batter buttressing that would be required, would far exceed the current proposed water costs.
078	8.12.3 Findings - MRD Stability, Page 342 – This discussion is silent on possible impacts from artesian aquifer rebound. If artesian aquifer rebound is progressively allowed to occur by maintaining aquifer levels just below increasing lake water levels, floor rebound is likely to counteract collapse settlement. The current proposal of continuing to operate artesian dewatering until sudden cessation will increase stress loadings of the materials increasing the chance of instability.	NA	Feedback noted. The site Weight Balance assessment is presented in section 8.11 and considers site topographic features. Planning or regulatory requirements often govern the level of technical information we must provide, leading to highly technical documents. Although we have worked hard to make the information more accessible, we appreciate the community's feedback and will incorporate it into future work.

#	Feedback / Comment	Modification to DMRP	No change to DMRP
079	10.1 Introduction, Page 371 – "The CSEP is founded on the principle that timely provision of information, complete transparency, strong relationships with stakeholders and regular engagement with communities is critical to the successful delivery of the rehabilitation of the mine and minimising potential impacts on the community and stakeholders." This document does not provide complete transparency. GLP is prepared to support a well-argued and well-supported case for rehabilitation. This document does not provide that well-argued and well-supported case. There are too many unanswered questions starting with why only 1 case has been analysed.	NA	EnergyAustralia is committed to providing honest, substantive, and comprehensive information about all our operational sites and major projects including the DMRP. Our community engagement approach ensures that this information is provided to key stakeholders. EnergyAustralia has continued with the plan that the Victorian Government developed for mine rehabilitation, which considered a number of different cases for rehabilitation, ultimately landing on pit lakes as the preferred option.
080	Chapter 15 Monitoring and Maintenance Contains sound processes and understanding for the various phases that rehabilitation entail.	NA	No response required
081	It was pleasing to see the proactive trialing of solutions for future learnings and the comprehensive monitoring that is planned to be undertaken. GLP acknowledge and support these positive aspects of the DMRP.	NA	No response required
082	Whilst the matters under consideration are complex, we encourage EAY to find better and more concise ways to present this information for public digestion.	NA	Planning or regulatory requirements often govern the level of technical information we must provide, leading to highly technical documents. Although we have worked hard to make the information more accessible, we appreciate the community's feedback and will incorporate it into future work
083	Persuasive arguments for why the mine void needs to be filled to RL +37m AHD are not provided in this document and ongoing failure to provide any alternative details and provide coherent and logical arguments to support EAY's position risks damaging public confidence in EAY's public standing. It also, raises questions about motives and ultimately social licence to operate. We therefore encourage EAY to provide more robust evidence to support its position.	NA	EAY values the honest feedback and will consider this in our communications.

Table 1212 Gunaikurnai Land and Waters Aboriginal Corporation (GLaWAC) (Event ID 3333)

#	Feedback / Comment	Modification to DMRP	No change to DMRP
084	However, safe, stable and sustainable final landforms are only a starting point, not the end game. From a Gunaikurnai perspective, there is a fundamental lack of strategic direction when it comes to coal mine remediation planning. The regulatory system currently operates on a mine by-mine approach, without regard for the cumulative damage inflicted across the broader cultural and ecological landscape.	NA	Cumulative impact assessments are outside of DMRP scope. EAY will refer the project under the Environment Effects Act 1978 for determination of whether an Environment Effects Statement (EES) is required. Cumulative impacts could be assessed under the EES process if this forms part of the scoping requirements.
085	Coal mine remediation offers a historic opportunity: • To heal not only landscapes, but relationships. • To embed Gunaikurnai cultural knowledge and practices into future work on Wurruk. • To realise economic independence for our communities.	Following text added to Section 10.3.4: EAY will continue to engage with GLaWAC through the 'Pathways to Partnership' process on how to restore cultural values through the integration of traditional knowledge into the rehabilitation works program as well as into other facets of the project.	NA
086	We must heal not just the mine voids, but also the waterways, lakes, aquifers, ecosystems, animals, plans, skies and communities that have been impacted by mining.	NA	Acknowledged in existing Objectives, Table 6-2
087	For Gunaikurnai, the idea of 'safe, stable and sustainable' should be interpreted holistically. 'Safe, stable and sustainable' is not just about the footprint of the mine void, mine walls and mine lands, but about the footprints that mining leaves on all connected Country – including the rivers, lakes, and humans as part of Country. It is about the health of mob, about the wealth of coming generations, about the healing of all Country.	Added a knowledge gap to "Review Safe, Stable and Sustainable definition to have a holistic view which considers the impact mining leaves on all connected Country (river, lakes and human aspects) "	NA
088	Gunaikurnai people hold the right to Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC) under the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP), to which Australia is a signatory. We expect that: • mine operators follow the minimum requirements for operationalising FPIC as articulated by the International Responsible Mining Assurance (IRMA) standard • FPIC must guide all decision making about mine remediation. • Gunaikurnai people must be decision makers, not merely participants. • Consent must be genuinely obtained before any remediation plans are approved.	Following text added to Section 10.3.4: EAY will continue to engage with GLaWAC through the 'Pathways to Partnership' process on how to restore cultural values through the integration of traditional knowledge into the rehabilitation works program as well as into other facets of the project.	NA
089	Position 1.1: Gunaikurnai water Country values, aspirations and objectives should be upheld through mine remediation.	NA	Water extraction for rehabilitation does not align with the Gunaikurnai Water is Life Statement. However, the key objective of our plan is to create safe, stable, and sustainable conditions for the landform and adjacent river systems. Without river extraction, we risk harming the river systems that Gunaikurnai people value most. Our plan aims to strike the right balance between safety, stability, and water extraction, returning water to areas which were once floodplains and reinstating groundwater to areas where it has been extracted
090	Position 1.2: Gunaikurnai water sovereignty in the Durt'Yowan must be realised through water returns and our participation in waterway monitoring, restoration and management, as detailed in the Gunaikurnai Nation Statement of the 'Water is Life Traditional Owner Access to Water Roadmap.'	NA	Water extraction for rehabilitation does not align with the Gunaikurnai Water is Life Statement. However, the key objective of our plan is to create safe, stable, and sustainable conditions for the landform and adjacent river systems. Without river extraction, we risk harming the river systems that Gunaikurnai people value most. Our plan aims to strike the right balance between safety, stability, and water extraction, returning water to area which were once floodplains and reinstating groundwater to areas where it has been extracted. A stable river system enables the improvements in monitoring, restoration, and management that GLaWAC value.

#	Feedback / Comment	Modification to DMRP	No change to DMRP
091	Position 1.3: The overall health of the Durt'Yowan (Latrobe River) catchment should be improved through ensuring: water from mine land into the catchment is of the highest quality with no contamination risk; environmental flows down to the Ramsar-listed wetlands and Gippsland Lakes are prioritised; waterway rehabilitation is invested in; and water bulk entitlements and licences are dynamic to account for climate change impacts.	NA	Acknowledged in existing Objectives, Table 6-2. Section 3.7.4 shows the proposed water access conditions which protect the environment in dry conditions.
092	Position 1.4: Alternative water sources, stabilisation methods, and engineering solutions should be studied and considered to achieve the best possible outcomes for Country and community.	NA	EAYs investigations into alternative water sources match the outcomes of the LVRRS review which concluded "while a manufactured water supply for mine rehabilitation is feasible, it remains complex and expensive." Engineering studies by EAY and Government have informed the DMRP, giving the highest likelihood of safe and stable landforms being achieved.
093	Position 2.1: Gunaikurnai cultural heritage must be identified, protected and restored during remediation works.	NA	The proposed works under this DMRP may be subject to assessment and approval under the Aboriginal Heritage Act (AH Act). EAY will give particular consideration to whether any proposed works or actions trigger a requirement for a Cultural Heritage Management Plan (CHMP), or any other permits or agreements under the AH Act.
094	Position 2.2: Cultural values must be restored to the landscape by overlaying Gunaikurnai traditional knowledge in remediation planning and design.	Following text added to Section 10.3.4: EAY will continue to engage with GLaWAC through the 'Pathways to Partnership' process on how to restore cultural values through the integration of traditional knowledge into the rehabilitation works program as well as into other facets of the project.	NA
095	Position 3.1: Remediation authorities, studies and plans should examine the cumulative impacts of all three mines on all connected Country beyond the mine lease sites, such as the Durt'Yowan (Latrobe River) catchment, Ramsar-listed Gippsland Lakes, and aquifers	NA	Cumulative impact assessments are outside of DMRP scope. EAY will refer the project under the Environment Effects Act 1978 for determination of whether an Environment Effects Statement (EES) is required. Cumulative impacts could be assessed under the EES process if this forms part of the scoping requirements.
096	Position 3.2: Remediation should safeguard keystone species and species of cultural significance to the Gunaikurnai, including Boran (pelicans), Tuk (musk duck), Noy Yang (eels), Balagen (platypus), Rakali (Australian water-rat), Kine (black bream), Koortgan (duck) and Gidai (swans).	EAY have added these species to Section 5.8.3	NA
097	Position 3.3: Remediation should safeguard sensitive, vulnerable, and endangered species such as the Australian Bass, Golden Bell Frog, the Australasian Bittern, Growling Grass Frog, and the Australian Grayling.	EAY have added these species to Section 5.8.3	NA
098	Position 3.4: Coal mine remediation must manage areas of potential contamination, such as coal ash deposits, following the highest social and environmental standards.	NA	EAY will undertake environmental assessments and remediation as per regulatory requirements.
099	Position 4.1: Mining companies should involve Gunaikurnai mob in healing Country by providing employment, training, procurement and business development opportunities during remediation.	Section 10.3.4 has been updated to include reference to the GLaWAC Pathways to Partnership document.	Existing section 1.3.3 outlining EnergyAustralia Reconciliation Action Plan is aligned with the GLaWAC position
100	Position 4.2: Mining companies could return areas of land back to Traditional Owners following remediation. Such land may be areas of cultural sensitivity, areas of high ecological value, or land with significant economic potential. Returned land could be jointly managed with GLaWAC partners in some instances. Traditional owners should not be burdened with contaminated or unsafe land. Land returns should be made following adequate and participatory remediation.	NA	EAY will continue to engage with GLaWAC on rehabilitation outcomes including discussions related to 'Pathways to Partnership'. EA has not commenced formal discussions on final mine land ownership and funding arrangements. This will occur at a later date, in consultation with all relevant stakeholders.

#	Feedback / Comment	Modification to DMRP	No change to DMRP
101	Position 4.3: A mechanism is established and supported to build wealth to enable future Gunaikurnai development opportunities on returned land. This could be in the form of an Aboriginal Future Fund. Future developments will be guided by self-determination. A range of community ideas were captured through the Federation University/CRC-TiME Indigenous community conversations.	NA	EAY will continue to engage with GLaWAC about future land determinations and opportunities
102	Position 4.4: Economic compensation for water used in mine remediation is negotiated, accounting for past and future harm to Country and the Durt'Yowan catchment.	NA	Water costing and subsequent allocation of those funds is not a component of the DMRP process.
103	Position 4.5: Mine companies can help GLaWAC build its Natural Resource Management (NRM) business capacity through facilitating access to facilities, plant, equipment, training pathways and contracts.	NA	EAY will continue working with GLaWAC on future agreements.
104	Position 4.6: Mining companies could source native vegetation stock and services through the Gippsland Seed Bank, a joint venture between GLaWAC, Habitat Creations and the MLRA.	NA	This can be considered however this is commercial in nature. EAY currently engage contractors to collect native seed from the site and propagate the seeds at a local plant farm (Section 5.8.2 of DMRP).
105	Position 4.7: As mining comes to an end, industry can collaborate with GLaWAC in renewable energy projects. GLaWAC aspires to participate in the transition to renewable energy to secure economic development and energy security for Gunaikurnai mob.	NA	This is beyond scope of mine rehabilitation and the DMRP. EAY is engaging with GLaWAC on a broad range of economic opportunities in relation to 'Pathways to Partnership'
106	Position 5.1: Dedicated funding to support GLaWAC roles in remediation, including River Rangers, community engagement and policy	NA	Funding arrangements are outside of DMRP scope. EAY is engaging with GLaWAC on a broad range of economic opportunities in relation to 'Pathways to Partnership'
107	Position 5.2: Long term agreements with mine operators and the State Government to ensure a Gunaikurnai voice at the table to guide future use of remediated lands and waters.	NA	EAY will continue working with GLaWAC on future agreements.

Table 13 13ID Ecological Management (Event ID 3388)

#	Feedback / Comment	Modification to DMRP	No change to DMRP
436	Past Conservation Efforts: (background as per submission) The recorded return and persistence of native fauna reflects the value of long-term habitat restoration, the effectiveness of the conservation areas, the importance of adaptive management in responding to disturbance and the value of on-going monitoring. These outcomes demonstrate that well-planned rehabilitation, in conjunction with conservation can deliver lasting biodiversity benefits within an active mining landscape, an achievement for which EAY deserves recognition.	NA	EAY will continue with conservations efforts and engage technical experts as required to ensure our efforts providing lasting benefits.
437	Post Mining Landform and Land Use - Lake Yallourn: Limited surveys have been completed within the Lake Yallourn footprint, and therefore additional surveys should be undertaken to determine fauna species presence and the habitat types being utilized.	Added Knowledge Gap (KG33) to undertake a review of potential impacts to flora and fauna during lake filling and identify potential management options	NA
438	Post Mining Landform and Land Use - Lake Yallourn: How fauna will be managed as the lake level rises should be detailed in a Fauna Management Plan to provide mitigation strategies for potentially trapped fauna, including fauna movement and dispersal to suitable habitat. This could include addressing issues such as dispersal strategies, shaping of suitable landforms and creation of additional habitat, such as small wetlands, above the high-water mark that can be colonized.	Added Knowledge Gap (KG33) to undertake a review of potential impacts to flora and fauna during lake filling and identify potential management options.	NA

#	Feedback / Comment	Modification to DMRP	No change to DMRP
439	Post Mining Landform and Land Use - Lake Yallourn: These ecological risks (noted above) are particularly relevant during the filling process, when proactive management will be critical to prevent future irreversible ecological impacts. It is recommended that the following be incorporated into the detailed design and any Lake Operations Plans: - Designing the lake edge with habitat complexity that favour native species (e.g. shallow vegetated margins, woody debris, varied bathymetry); -Pest exclusion measures (e.g. screened inflows, physical barriers); - Protocols to prevent entrapment of riverine species during inflows; - Early-detection and rapid-response protocols for pest species; - Strategies to manage nutrient inputs and reduce HAB risk; and -Specific ecological risk management measures tailored to the extended filling phase.	Added Knowledge Gap (KG33) to undertake a review of potential impacts to flora and fauna during lake filling and identify potential management options.	NA
440	Post Mining Landform and Land Use - Lake Yallourn: To address the loss of riparian and emergent vegetation establishment during and initially post filling, floating ecosystems positioned along the shorelines could enhance biodiversity by providing refuge, breeding, and roosting areas for waterbirds, reptiles, and amphibians, as well as fish feeding and spawning sites. Incorporating predator-proof designs would help protect vulnerable species, while these structures could also reduce wave fetch, minimise erosion, and improve overall shoreline stability.	Added Knowledge Gap (KG33) to undertake a review of potential impacts to flora and fauna during lake filling and identify potential management options.	NA
441	Post Mining Landform and Land Use - Lake Yallourn: The impact of Lake Yallourn on groundwater availability and soil saturation remains uncertain, and further research is needed to understand the effects on the broader groundwater-dependent ecosystems (GDEs) and implications on Strzelecki gum itself. It is recommended that the following be incorporated into the GDE program or considered as additional investigations: -Investigate historic groundwater data from the period of previous extended flooding events and compare to the dates of known tree fall events to determine what length of time and depth of inundation contributed to the tree fall events, so that it can be considered in future planning; - Evaluate the proposed changes to hydrological conditions of the site once Lake Yallourn is full on the Strzelecki gum population in the Morwell West Drain and the Morwell River; and -Ensure Strzelecki gum populations are thoroughly monitored to ensure no Significant Impacts occur. Additional closure criteria are recommended to incorporate the above into the DMRP (see below).	NA	Further review of Groundwater Dependent Ecosystems (GDE) is captured in the Knowledge Gaps chapter. EAY will consider ID Ecological Management's feedback when developing the scope of works.
442	Post Mining Landform and Land Use - Morwell River Diversion: The DMRP proposes retaining the Morwell River Diversion (MRD) between the two final pit lakes which will continue the connection of the Morwell River, retain low and high flow channels, and spill larger events to the pit lakes via engineered spillways. This reduces catastrophic failure risk and better supports ecological processes in the short to medium term. However, information is lacking on the expected end of life for the MRD and ecological implications of failure.	NA	Technical assessments and derived design for MRD articulate the existing conditions of the materials in MRD and provide evidence based solutions for remediation and long-term management of the structure. Detailed technical discussion on current state and evidence based design is presented in sections 8.6, 8.12, 11.5, 12.3 & PSM 2025 (Appendix C).

#	Feedback / Comment	Modification to DMRP	No change to DMRP
443	Post Mining Landform and Land Use - Morwell River Diversion: Further detail will be required on maintaining baseflows; preventing loss of benthic processes; providing full fish passage functionality across the operating flow range; and removing existing impediments such as the triple culverts in the MRD, replacing them with fish and fauna friendly structures, for the retained connection of the MRD between the Morwell and Latrobe Rivers.	NA	Technical reviews are underway, or included in the Knowledge Gaps.
444	Post Mining Landform and Land Use - Morwell River Diversion: Currently within the draft DMRP, fish passage is primarily addressed in relation to potential MRD failure and the design of water off-take infrastructure. It does not explicitly set out the broader requirement to design the mine rehabilitation, the two lakes, and the Morwell River to ensure fish passage is achieved as an integrated, whole-of-system outcome. We recommend this requirement be made explicit, including consideration of fish passage in all final designs and monitoring programs, and embedding it as a binding design criterion with measurable performance targets to confirm ecological functionality. This should also be linked to closure criteria and cover the removal of significant existing barriers where they constrain connectivity. We acknowledge that the DMRP includes a knowledge gap specific to KG16; Review of fish passage structures on spillways, which will address this issue. Additional closure criteria are recommended to incorporate the above into the DMRP (see below).	NA	EAY acknowledges that further work on fish passage is required as captured in the Knowledge Gaps chapter of the DMRP. We will consider ID Ecological Management's feedback when scoping these works given they have expertise in this field.
445	Post Mining Landform and Land Use - Conservation Land Use Access to most of these sites [CMP areas] by the general public would be considered a threat and have the potential to negatively impact their status as conservation areas.	Added new section 9.3.1 to DMRP to capture feedback on land uses and how EAY can assist in the supporting these.	NA
446	Post Mining Landform and Land Use - Conservation Land Use: Continued maintenance works within the CMP sites will need to focus on their long-term protection and continued maintenance. Key future works required within these sites include: - Meeting on-going maintenance commitments once the active management period has ended for Landowner Agreement sites such as pest plant and animal management targets, including a suitable monitoring regime. This work is required in perpetuity, regardless of landowner; - Annual monitoring and reporting to DEECA for current Landowner Agreement sites (only until 10 year active management phase is completed); - Monitoring of CMP sites that have achieved maintenance phase to ensure they are maintained relative to their 10 year completion status; - On-title protection for EAY CMP sites that are freehold land for their on-going future protection first committed to in the 2012 CMP, prior to the cessation of the mining license; and - EPBC annual monitoring and reporting (until expiration of the approval).	NA	EAY will continue with current management of conservation land.
447	Post Mining Landform and Land Use - Conservation Land Use Conservation areas can also provide habitat creation and conservation planning opportunities tailored toward specific threatened and/or priority species (such as growling grass frog (*Litoria raniformis*)). The potential to partner with universities or other local organizations to re-introduce species into restored ecosystems once environment is stable and established should be explored.	Ongoing Consultation section of the DMRP updated to include intention to seek partnerships were appropriate.	NA

#	Feedback / Comment	Modification to DMRP	No change to DMRP
448	Post Mining Landform and Land Use - Conservation Land Use Revegetation activities that are designed to support conservation areas, such as supplementary planting for lack of structure and connection corridors should also be implemented as detailed in the EAY's Conservation Strategy (see comments below). Additional closure criteria are recommended to incorporate the above actions into the DMRP (see below).	NA	Planning of revegetation with consideration of the Conservation Strategy is already contained in the DMRP.
449	Post Mining Landform and Land Use - Conservation Land Use The current closure criteria for Conservation Land Use should include these requirements in the *Measurement* component and the *Timeframes* expanded to highlight the commitment that is in place for future landholders to maintain vegetation quality and manage threats in perpetuity. A suggested rework of this closure criteria is provided below. **Objective:** Maintain and improve biodiversity values and habitat quality within conservation areas. **Criteria:** Existing ecological and biodiversity commitments are met; and Habitat quality scores for flora and fauna remain stable or improved. **Measurement:** Conduct biodiversity assessments, including flora and fauna monitoring and compare results to baseline data collected prior to closure. **Timeframe**: As per existing commitments specified in approval documents and as part of an assessment program conducted every three years.	Modified Table 6-2 and Table 13-1 to reflect recommended objectives, criteria, measurement and timeframe.	NA
450	Post Mining Landform and Land Use - Environment & Recreation Whilst the Conservation Strategy is mentioned in the DMRP, there is no information on implementation of the corridors it identifies, their location or revegetation requirements. Given the CMP sites are included in the Conservation Land Use, connecting corridors may fit better in the Environment & Recreation Land Use.	NA	Habitat corridors will be part of the environment land use areas. KG28 aims to show the detail designation of where corridors will be located
451	Post Mining Landform and Land Use - Environment & Recreation Outside of the corridors recommended in the Conservation Strategy, additional revegetation for mixed uses should also be considered. Clear objectives for these plantings should be identified such as ground stabilization, water filtration, salinity remediation, integration with recreational activities, provision of shade and shelter, landscape aesthetics or future use (i.e. shelterbelts and wood lots), and consideration given to working with traditional owners to look at restoring culturally significant plant species back into these areas or incorporated into recreational areas such as along walking tracks.	NA	This is a component of KG28, using this criteria to appropriately plan for revegetation
452	Post Mining Landform and Land Use - Environment & Recreation Revegetation activities should use locally sourced native species and incorporate diverse structural layers such as canopy, understory, and groundcover within conservation corridors. Outside of these areas, structural layers will change with the required use (i.e. open canopy for shade / recreation with no shrub, ground layer installed). Management of these areas should be adaptive, responding to changes in climate and site conditions by monitoring which species are thriving and adjusting planting strategies accordingly. It is recommended that a site revegetation plan is completed that specifies species to use in revegetation areas, to ensure that potentially invasive ornamentals (such as willows, silver birch, poplars, oyster plant, agapanthus, etc.) are not used, even for horticultural reasons within the site.	NA	The DMRP notes that revegetation works will occur with consideration of relevant EVC and proposed land use.

#	Feedback / Comment	Modification to DMRP	No change to DMRP
453	Post Mining Landform and Land Use - Environment & Recreation The current closure criteria for Environment and Recreation with the objective for rehabilitated landforms mentions a Vegetation Monitoring Program in the Timeframe column is not defined nor mentioned elsewhere throughout the DMRP. A suggested rework of this closure criteria is provided below. **Objective**: Rehabilitated landforms are congruent with the surrounding landscape as far as practicable **Criteria:** Plant density, species selection and diversity to be consistent with the Conservation Strategy, EVC's and identified revegetation targets designated for Open Woodland, Closed Woodland and Wetland. **Measurement:** Conduct revegetation monitoring and progression against the Conservation Strategy actions. **Timeframe:** As part of a Vegetation Monitoring Program. Additional closure criteria are recommended to incorporate the Conservation Strategy into the DMRP (see below).	Included the criteria and measurement to the corresponding objective in the DMRP	NA
454	Post Mining Landform and Land Use - Agriculture The DMRP identifies various activities currently undertaken annually as part of current agricultural leases including: fencing repair and construction; weed and pest control. It is recommended that future lease agreements include mandatory control targets and fencing expectations that should align with regulatory requirements and best practice, for example, frequency of fence inspections and timeliness of repairs; *Catchment & Land Protection Act 1994* listed weeds present and control targets.	NA	EAY always encourage ID Ecological Management to call through damage to fence lines to prevent stock intrusion into conservation zones. Our current lease is designed to gradually improve the agricultural infrastructure across the term of the lease. These works are ongoing.
455	**Additional DMRP Closure Criteria for consideration** **End Land Use:** Lake Yallourn **Objective:** Ensure adequate fauna management protocols are maintained during lake filling that protect and maintain biodiversity values in surrounding habitats. **Criteria**: Functional dispersal corridors identified and habitat/landform in place to facilitate fauna movement. No decline in habitat quality scores in adjacent rehabilitation / conservation areas due to concentrated grazing. **Measurement:** Baseline and ongoing fauna surveys (including amphibians, reptiles, threatened species). Fauna Management Plan implemented prior to flooding. Population density monitoring of key species. Condition assessments of created habitat. Visual/camera monitoring of dispersal pathways and fence integrity. **Timeframe**: Baseline surveys and dispersal infrastructure in place before lake filling. Annual monitoring during filling. Annual monitoring for 3 years post-filling or until criteria are met.	NA	EAY will need to further review these criteria to determine whether we would commit to this objective and criteria.

#	Feedback / Comment	Modification to DMRP	No change to DMRP
456	**Additional DMRP Closure Criteria for consideration** **End Land Use:** Lake Yallourn **Objective:** Establish a stable, pest-minimised aquatic habitat that supports native species and avoids long-term ecological degradation. Criteria: Prevent or minimize native riverine species from entering Lake system. Pest fish species remain below detection thresholds or within acceptable ecological limits. Riparian/emergent vegetation established along ≥50% of shoreline within 5 years of final water level. Floating ecosystems or equivalent installed where natural riparian establishment is limited. **Measurement:** Inflow monitoring for pest and native species entrapment. Pest species monitoring within Lake (netting, electrofishing, eDNA). Vegetation mapping of Lake edges (aerial imagery, on-ground). **Timeframe:** Inflows monitored during high flow events. Pest exclusion and created habitat design measures in place before significant water rise. Pest fish and water quality monitoring during filling and 5 years post-final level. Vegetation establishment assessment at years 3 and 5 post-final water level.	NA	EAY will need to further review these criteria to determine whether we would commit to this objective and criteria.
457	**Additional DMRP Closure Criteria for consideration** **End Land Use:** MRD **Objective:** Ensure functional fish passage and ecological connectivity between the Morwell and Latrobe Rivers, whilst the MRD is operational**.** **Criteria:** Continuous fish passage between the Morwell and Latrobe Rivers across the full operating flow range (low to high flow). No physical barriers to native fish migration, breeding, and dispersal within the MRD reach and associated lake outlets. Existing barriers (e.g., triple culverts in MRD) removed or replaced with fish- and fauna-friendly structures. Engineered spillways and off-take structures designed to allow for aquatic fauna movement. Baseflows maintained to support benthic processes and habitat continuity. **Measurement:** Baseline and post-construction fish passage monitoring. Implement outcomes from KG16: Review of fish passage structures on spillways. Verification that baseflows meet ecological thresholds for benthic health. Independent ecological audit confirming performance against fish passage targets. **Timeframe:** Fish passage designs incorporated into final rehabilitation and lake system designs before commencement of major earthworks. Barrier removal or replacement completed prior to or during commissioning of final river-lake system. Post-closure fish passage and ecological connectivity monitoring at years 1, 3, and 5, or until targets are met.	NA	EAY will need to further review these criteria to determine whether we would commit to this objective and criteria.

#	Feedback / Comment	Modification to DMRP	No change to DMRP
458	**Additional DMRP Closure Criteria for consideration** **End Land Use:** Conservation Land Use **Objective:** Maintain and protect CMP sites in perpetuity, in accordance with existing commitments under the EAY CMP, EPBC Offset Management Plan, DEECA leases, and on-title agreements. Criteria: All CMP sites maintain ecological condition relative to their 10-year completion status. All pest plant and animal control targets for Landowner Agreement sites met in perpetuity. On-title protection mechanisms in place for all freehold CMP sites, as committed to in the 2012 CMP. No unauthorised public access resulting in measurable negative ecological impacts. Supplementary revegetation completed in identified areas to improve structure, connectivity, and corridor function, as per the EAY Conservation Strategy. **Measurement:** Annual monitoring and reporting to DEECA for Landowner Agreement sites during active management phase. EPBC Offset monitoring and reporting until expiration of approval. Post-10-year monitoring to confirm CMP sites maintain condition relative to their 10-year completion status. Photopoint monitoring, vegetation condition assessments, and pest plant/animal surveys. **Timeframe:** Active management phase: monitoring and reporting as per EPBC and Landowner Agreement commitments. Maintenance phase: site inspections and ecological monitoring every 2–3 years in perpetuity. On-title protection confirmed prior to closure sign-off.	NA	EAY will need to further review these criteria to determine whether we would commit to this objective and criteria.
459	**Additional DMRP Closure Criteria for consideration** **End Land Use:** Conservation Land Use **Objective:** Ensure GDE's and Strzelecki Gum are not negatively impacted by ground water changes due to Lake Yallourn during filling, operation, and post-closure **Criteria:** No net decline in Strzelecki Gum condition or GDE floristic/structural scores relative to baseline. Recruitment present (seedlings/saplings) of Strzelecki gum. No increase in tree toppling incidents attributable to lake-induced saturation. Natural floodplain wetting–drying timing and duration maintained. **Measurement:** Strzelecki gum health and stability assessments. GDE vegetation condition assessment (such as Habitat Hectare or equivalent) Photopoint monitoring, vegetation condition assessments. **Timeframe:** Minimum 3 years pre-closure data. Filling Phase -bi-annual vegetation surveys. Post-Filling - Vegetation surveys every 5years (or until regulator agrees criteria are demonstrably stable).	NA	EAY will need to further review these criteria to determine whether we would commit to this objective and criteria.

#	Feedback / Comment	Modification to DMRP	No change to DMRP
460	**Additional DMRP Closure Criteria for consideration** **End Land Use:** Environment and Recreation Land Use **Objective:** Implement the EAY Conservation Strategy to enhance connectivity between CMP sites creating functional biodiversity corridors that support long-term species movement and ecosystem resilience. **Criteria:** All four identified corridors (Maryvale, Marretts Road, DeCampo Drive, Latrobe River) established based on the 2021 Conservation Strategy recommendations. Revegetation completed along all corridor sections requiring planting, with nominal corridor width of 100 m unless constrained by land use or approvals. Supplementary planting completed in sections with only partial native vegetation to achieve structural diversity targets. At least 70% of corridor length supports continuous or near-continuous native vegetation cover within 10 years of planting completion. **Measurement:** Baseline mapping and condition assessment of corridor vegetation. Monitoring of revegetation success rates (survival, growth, and structural diversity). Fauna utilisation surveys (e.g., koala monitoring, bird surveys, trail cameras) at years 5 and 10. **Timeframe:** Corridor works initiated within 3 years of closure plan approval. Revegetation completed within 5 years of project commencement. Annual monitoring during establishment phase (years 1–5), then every 3 years until year 10. As part of Vegetation Monitoring Program.	NA	EAY will need to further review these criteria to determine whether we would commit to this objective and criteria.
461	Monitoring: The monitoring framework should incorporate: Pest flora and fauna species monitoring with defined control triggers related to regulatory requirements (i.e. CaLP Act 1979) or best practice	Added Knowledge Gap (KG36) to undertake a review of the flora and fauna monitoring program.	NA
462	Monitoring: The monitoring framework should incorporate: Early-warning indicators for algal blooms (e.g. chlorophyll-a, cyanobacteria cell counts)	NA	Captured in Knowledge Gap KG26
463	Monitoring: The monitoring framework should incorporate: Fish passage performance monitoring, benthic processes, and floodplain connectivity	Added additional wording to Knowledge Gap KG16 to include potential monitoring programs as an outcome of the fish ladder study.	NA
464	Monitoring: The monitoring framework should incorporate: Strzelecki gum and GDE health assessments pre, during and post fill of Lake Yallourn	Added Knowledge Gap (KG37) to develop a proposed monitoring framework.	NA
465	Monitoring: The monitoring framework should incorporate: Baseline and on-going fauna presence and utilisation surveys	Added Knowledge Gap (KG36) to undertake a review of the flora and fauna monitoring program	NA
466	Monitoring: The monitoring framework should incorporate: Condition assessments for native vegetation	Added Knowledge Gap (KG36) to undertake a review of the flora and fauna monitoring program	NA
467	Monitoring: The monitoring framework should incorporate: Revegetation success rates	Added Knowledge Gap (KG36) to undertake a review of the flora and fauna monitoring program	NA
468	Monitoring: The monitoring framework should incorporate: Photopoint monitoring to document change	Added Knowledge Gap (KG36) to undertake a review of the flora and fauna monitoring program	NA
469	Monitoring: Opportunities could also be pursued to engage local schools, Landcare groups, and residents in community science and citizen ecology programs, fostering ongoing environmental monitoring while building community connection and a sense of ownership for the site.	NA	EAY acknowledges the benefits of the suggested programs and will consider these in future.

#	Feedback / Comment	Modification to DMRP	No change to DMRP
470	The following knowledge gaps have been identified within the draft DMRP: Conduct further research on the potential impacts of Lake Yallourn and other hydrological modifications on groundwater availability, soil saturation, and the health of Strzelecki gum populations and associated GDE's	Added Knowledge Gap (KG37) to develop a proposed monitoring framework.	NA
471	The following knowledge gaps have been identified within the draft DMRP: Fauna management as part of loss of habitat associated with the filling of Lake Yallourn	Added Knowledge Gap (KG33) to undertake a review of potential impacts to flora and fauna during lake filling and identify potential management options.	NA
472	The following knowledge gaps have been identified within the draft DMRP: Defined fish passage barrier removal and incorporation of fish- and fauna-friendly structures as part of MRD reinstatement	NA	EAY acknowledges that further work on fish passage is required as captured in the Knowledge Gaps chapter of the DMRP.
473	The following knowledge gaps have been identified within the draft DMRP: Investigation into options for maintaining ecological value during the extended filling stage (10–25 years), recognising that rapid water-level rise will likely prevent establishment of fringing emergent aquatic or riparian vegetation	Added Knowledge Gap (KG33) to undertake a review of potential impacts to flora and fauna during lake filling and identify potential management options.	NA
474	The following knowledge gaps have been identified within the draft DMRP: Aquatic vegetation establishment trials to establish and promote native habitat resilience under projected final lake levels	NA	EAY sees this being part of detailed design informed by future closure criteria, rather than a change to the DMRP. Aquatic vegetation has been established successfully through progressive rehabilitation, and we expect future success based on works completed and the knowledge of local vegetation experts such as ID Ecological Management.
475	The following knowledge gaps have been identified within the draft DMRP: A Vegetation Monitoring Program is referenced in the DMRP but no detail provided.	NA	Detail to be provided by KG36 (review of flora and fauna monitoring).

Table 1414 Individual - Hildebrant (Event ID 3343)

#	Feedback / Comment	Modification to DMRP	No change to DMRP
126	The power stations have disrupted the natural flow patterns of all rivers and drained them of critical environmental flows. Consequently, Durt'Yowan (Latrobe River) is in a perilous condition due to chronic lack of environmental flows which is multiplying the increasing stress suffered by the Ramsar Gippsland Lakes, its ecosystems and biodiversity. This situation is completely unacceptable; it is neither safe nor sustainable. It is a breach of Australia's treaty obligations to the Ramsar Convention on Wetlands. Although the technical studies may support the pit lake option as the "optimal safe, stable, and sustainable solution" for the mine site, this option will have significant and lasting effects on the ecological integrity of the river system which sustains the Gippsland Lakes's foodchain vital for the critically endangered Burrunan dolphins and other species, including the fish we eat. More than likely, it will bitterly disappoint those who have fallen for the fake "Lake Geneva" dream.	NA	As per Section 8.6: A regional water balance study was completed considering the proposed rehabilitation design with a particular focus on the influence to water balance from proposed MRD remediation design. The results of this study supports the Yallourn Mine rehabilitation design and demonstrates that there are no adverse influences on regional water balance. The study further confirms that proposed MRD remediation design allows all environmental flows to pass through MRD, along with flood flows up to the design levels.
127	No one can say future seismic activity over fifty years or more will not exceed historic tolerances. This presents a risk to the pit lake infrastructure and the regional waterways system right to the Gippsland Lakes	NA	The same limitation applies to all natural hazards. Standard engineering practice is to use historical data, in combination with accepted hazard assessment methods, to estimate potential future events. The design incorporates conservatism by adopting larger seismic events where consequences are greater (e.g. in proximity to the railway).

#	Feedback / Comment	Modification to DMRP	No change to DMRP
128	The Morwell River functions as the natural headwaters of Durt'Yowan. The MRD, which converted a section of the Morwell into an industrial drain, has been a disaster for the health of the Durt'Yowan and its role in the regional waterways system and the Gippsland Lakes. EAY anticipates future collapse of the MRD due to "dynamic responses linked to stress changes"…[which will continue] "for or a significant period into mine rehabilitation"...[and lead to] the progressive deterioration of the structure" Its mitigation measure post closure is to have the MRD function as a "rural levee running through the middle of two lakes…[the levels of which will be] at approximately the level of the MRD low flow channel." What impacts this will have on water quality exiting the MRD due to MRD flows mixing with pit lake water are not discussed.	NA	Pit water quality modelling considers the influence of flood flows (that exceed design levels) into the pit lake, see Ch 8.8 of DMRP. The remediated design provides confidence in improving reliability of MRD to carry unrestricted flows well above the environmental flow requirements, minimising any adverse water quality influences, see section 8.6.6.2. The spillway system is activated only when Morwell River flows exceed 6,000 ML/day, which is significantly above the hydrologic design flow requirement of 3,200 ML/day. The design flow of 3,200 ML/day includes environmental flow provisions necessary to flush saltwater from the Latrobe River estuary, supporting current offtakes for the Dowd Morass and Heart Morass in the lower Latrobe River region. Importantly, the environmental flow requirement at Toms Bridge is 1,500 ML/day, which is comfortably met under the proposed design.
129	The lack of any plan for ensuring the quality and quantity of environmental flows to Durt'Yowan is concerning. The perception is that the DRMP completely under-values the critical role of environmental water in the region's socioeconomic prosperity.	NA	EAY understands the value of the Morwell River and factors this into rehabilitation planning. Water quality and quantity is captured in relevant technical studies.
130	A drier climate, calculated to reduce surface environmental water flows, will affect groundwater recharge. Therefore, the DRMP must consider that changes to groundwater volumes will occur. What the climate will be like 50 years' time is really a matter of guesswork but, if the world is unable to significantly reduce emissions (which seems likely), the climate will be increasingly unstable with repeated bouts of extreme drought, flood and possibly cyclonic events. Consequently, historical rainfall records and 2025 projections are unreliable predictors of conditions half a century away. The DRMP does recognise climate uncertainty and some of the adverse effects of the pit lake option. How they are to be avoided, minimised or managed is not fully articulated.	NA	Climate planning is an integral part of the Technical Studies completed and a key design consideration.

#	Feedback / Comment	Modification to DMRP	No change to DMRP
131	Trop states: "prior to geochemical modelling, hydrodynamic models need to be incorporated to account for mixing dynamics of the lake. Ideally, all the models need to be coupled to give a better understanding of the water quality. Such coupling needs to become the industry standard, but still require research and development (Schultze et al., 2022) and the collection of specific, relevant 'hard' data." Environmental risks listed include: • Contamination of pit-lake water • Poor pit-lake water quality pollutes Morwell River and Latrobe River • Chemical risk from water quality in pit lake.16 Yet, the DRMP only assures us, without evidence, that the pit lake water quality will be perfectly acceptable. The fact that "overall" the quality of the treated mine water currently discharged to the Morwell River is "well-managed…with effective treatment processes in place to ensure compliance with regulatory standards and minimal impact on the receiving waters" is not indicative of pit lake water quality into the 50-year future. The DRMP admits the pit lake will be contaminated with various toxins, e.g. flocculants, ash slurry and acidic wastewater.18 High acidity and high metal concentration are likely to be present. The control strategy is to use lime or "some equivalent treatment train to meet water quality requirements and/or guidelines (e.g. above pH 6). However, other treatments are more suitable for small projects, such as garden soils. The large quantities of lime needed to reduce acidity in such a body of water will be very expensive and possibly unobtainable. The feasibility of creating a "non-polluting" pit lake that is safe for recreational use, e.g. fishing or swimming seems unrealistic.	NA	Stratification / Hydrodynamic modelling is currently underway and noted as a key knowledge gap (KG03, KG17 & KG21). Additional information regarding the WQ modelling is presented with the technical studies section 8.9. Further WQ modelling will also be conducted (KG15) to improve accuracy of current knowledge, with the results informing agreed closure criteria KG25.
132	The risk assessment process outlined in the DRMP is thorough; but realistic solutions proposed are unconvincing.	NA	EAY will continue to undertake technical studies and revise the risk assessments through the life of the project.
133	The only proposal since the inception of rehabilitation plans for the three coal mines has been to fully fill the pit voids. Partial fill is a recent concession in response to the need to protect the health of the regional waterways system from total collapse. Either way, this is a very unsatisfactory solution, especially for the environment but also for the Latrobe Valley communities. But: The full pit lake option is the very worst outcome for the river system and the Gippsland Lakes.	NA	EAY have completed considerable work in this space, along with the Latrobe Valley Regional Rehabilitation Strategy (LVRRS), with the lake being the preferred solution to provide stability for the site. We do not believe that any further analysis of the options will provide benefit to our rehabilitation planning.
134	The DRMP displays a mindset stuck in the thinking of the mid-twentieth century. Its lack of imagination is uninspiring and, frankly, quite depressing. Other options must be explored. Given our evolving technological capacity, new engineering solutions are possible. Perhaps the voids could be reused for solar generation to utilise the existing transmission infrastructure, create jobs and enliven the social and economic life of the Valley. As it stands, transforming a dirty mine pit into a pristine Lake Geneva is a fanciful dream.	NA	EAY will continue to review the DMRP with respect to evolving technology and engineering solutions. Whilst EAY are not responsible for repurposing the site, we do want to leave the site in a condition that allows for beneficial future land uses.
135	The DRMP acknowledges that decades of groundwater pumping have depressurised aquifers and disrupted the natural groundwater flow directions. The potential for ongoing subsidence is real and can be exacerbated by seismic events.	NA	The initial LVRRS contains the following commentary on land subsidence "If groundwater extraction for mine stability control can be stopped following mine rehabilitation, land surface rebound is expected. The magnitude of the rebound is expected to be less than the subsidence that has occurred and it is anticipated that this rebound would occur gradually over many decades and relatively evenly across the region."

#	Feedback / Comment	Modification to DMRP	No change to DMRP
136	The vast mine chasms are a cautionary reminder of how the benefits enjoyed over the past 50 years come at huge expense to future generations. We are now those future generations, charged with solving the problems the State Government never examined when it dug up the Valley for electricity. Inevitably, the generations to come will bear the consequences of decisions made today. So, our governments must ensure that mine rehabilitation does not result in even more environmental destruction.	NA	We will continue to work with the Victorian Government to achieve acceptable environmental outcomes from the mine rehabilitation.
137	It is essential that the risks associated with Yallourn's DRMP be assessed in the context of the cumulative effects of all the declared mine rehabilitation plans. Any water diverted to mine rehabilitation must not compromise the health of our rivers and the Lakes. Clean freshwater is the lifeblood of our communities, Traditional Owners and the other species who share Gippsland's bounty. Therefore, it is a fundamental imperative that the life source of Durt'Yowan and the mighty Gippsland Lakes is vigilantly protected and enhanced in perpetuity.	NA	EAY understands the value of the river system and factors this into rehabilitation planning. Cumulative impact assessments are outside of DMRP scope. EAY will refer the project under the Environment Effects Act 1978 for determination of whether an Environment Effects Statement (EES) is required. Cumulative impacts could be assessed under the EES process if this forms part of the scoping requirements.

Table 1515 Individual - McDonald (Event ID 3380)

#	Feedback / Comment	Modification to DMRP	No change to DMRP
046	Whatever use the Yallourn Energy property is put to post the proposed cessation of coal extraction for electricity generation purposes at W Station; that use must not inhibit any future coal extraction & or industrial activity recommencing on the property, particularly in regard to coal extraction if it becomes politically acceptable again in future	NA	EnergyAustralia are committed to closing the Yallourn Mine in mid-2028.

Table 1616 Individual - Seymour (Event ID 3346)

#	Feedback / Comment	Modification to DMRP	No change to DMRP
143	**(Summarised by EA)** This submission raises concern for the stability of the YTF Western Batters. The individual has historical knowledge of the site from the time of the SECV and is concerned that a buttress which was designed in the 1980's was never implemented due to restrictions in the conveyor length at that time. He has also inspected aerial photography and has not been able to identify the buttressing, leading to concern for stability of the batters.	NA	The plans shown appear preliminary (from 1988). The design has since changed and these batters are buttressed, by both the internal overburden stacker dump and a constructed buttress at the toe. The DMRP does not show these stability sections, but they were included in the appendices (PSM4487-200R).

Table 1717 Individual - redacted (Event ID 2947)

#	Feedback / Comment	Modification to DMRP	No change to DMRP
015	"I was looking at your summary of the rehab plan and I noticed that you are going to flood the land where all the Kangaroos and wildlife live. I am worried about where all the animals are going to go. There is a highway very close by and the wildlife might retreat to that danger zone. Has this been given any thought and consideration? I am thinking it would be a better idea to re-home the wildlife to a different site or maybe a passage under the highway (you've got a train line to)."	Whilst EAY has already commenced scoping this work, it has been added a specific Knowledge Gap (KG33) to the DMRP.	

Table 1818 Latrobe City Council (Event ID 3404)

#	Feedback / Comment	Modification to DMRP	No change to DMRP
428	Recommendation 1: Support the Use of Environmental Effects Statements (EES) in Assessing All Rehabilitation Proposals (details as per submission)	NA	As per Table 4-6 of the DMRP. EAY continue to work with the Victorian Government to agree on the most appropriate approval pathway beyond the finalisation of the DMRP.
429	Recommendation 2: Transfer Land Ownership to State and Federal Governments. Responsibility for ongoing land management should not be financial responsibility of council. Any transfer of land must be supported by a sustainable funding model.	NA	Noted. EA has not commenced formal discussions on final mine land ownership and funding arrangements. This will occur at a later date, in consultation with all relevant stakeholders.
430	Recommendation 3: Apply a Legacy Project or Initiative that will benefit the Latrobe City Community (details as per submission)	NA	Section 9.3.2 raises this as part of engagement re tracks and trails. EAY is keen to discuss this and other projects further through repurposing, but this is outside of this DMRP scope.
431	Recommendation 4: Further Investigate the Cumulative Impacts of Water (details as per submission)	NA	Access to water for mine rehabilitation has been assessed via the Latrobe Valley Regional Rehabilitation Strategy (LVRRS) Amendment. Cumulative impacts could be further explored if the project requires an Environment Effects Statement (EES) to be completed.
432	Recommendation 5: Apply an Interrelationships Model between Mine Rehabilitation Plans (details as per submission)	NA	EAY has built strong relationships with the other Latrobe Valley Declared Mines and participated in regional planning through the Integrated Mine Research Group and LVRRS. The LVRRS is the forum where this regional model is currently applied, and we consider it fit for purpose.
433	Recommendation 6: Support the Government's Proposed Recommendation for a Bulk Water Entitlement Fee (details as per submission)	NA	Water costing and subsequent allocation of those funds is not a component of the DMRP process.
434	Recommendation 7: Consider Council's Request to Maintain a Portion of the Mine Licence Land 3005 for a Proposed Centre of Automotive Futures (CAAF) (details as per submission)	Added new section 9.3.1 to DMRP to capture feedback on land uses and how EAY can assist in the supporting these.	EA has received a number of requests for long-term access to land within the mining licence and has not yet made a decision on these requests.
435	Recommendation 8: Consider Council's Request to Maintain a Portion of Land for the Inter- Township Trail Network Project (details as per submission)	Added new section 9.3.1 to DMRP to capture feedback on land uses and how EAY can assist in the supporting these.	EA has received a number of requests for long-term access to the site for community recreation. EA has not yet made a decision on these requests. Yallourn currently facilitates community access and hosts a variety of community groups including mountain biking, rifle shooting and tracks and trails. Our vision for a rehabilitated site is that it continues to create opportunities to support community recreation.

Table 1919 Latrobe Valley Field Naturalists Club (Event ID 3341)

#	Feedback / Comment	Modification to DMRP	No change to DMRP
118	The re-purposed mine lands provide our community with an opportunity to: - create a wonderful bird sanctuary in the wetland areas - showcase the diversity of local ecosystems and the associated flora and fauna - protect and enhance habitat for locally indigenous plants, animals and vegetation communities - Link natural areas through the wider landscape for the benefit of the natural environment and the people and other animals that live here.	Added new section 9.3.1 to DMRP to capture feedback on land uses and how EAY can assist in the supporting these.	NA
119	Harvest carp from the wetlands and waterways to be processed into fertiliser for local parks and gardens, especially the well known rose garden in Morwell as well as community and private gardens and community compost projects.	NA	A whole of catchment carp strategy is not within the scope of the DMRP. Pest species such as carp are listed in the Risk Assessment Actions section of the DMRP. The West Gippsland Catchment Management Authority (WGCMA) has a program called "Transformation of the Latrobe: Pathways for the Latrobe River System" which includes carp control initiatives (https://wgcma.vic.gov.au/project/latrobe/)
120	Establish self guided walks in some areas with significant indigenous vegetation.	Added new section 9.3.1 to DMRP to capture feedback on land uses and how EAY can assist in the supporting these.	NA
121	We would like to see waterways with gaps in their vegetation cover planted to locally indigenous vegetation of a type suited to their specific Ecological Vegetation Class (EVC). We'd also like to see other potential wildlife and vegetation corridors reserved to achieve a more connected natural environment. Note: these corridors need to be well designed so that they are wide enough and diverse enough for small birds to traverse them safely. (Single or double rows of Eucalypts don't achieve this. They just provide additional territory for Noisy Miners, an aggressive and territorial native honeyeater, to extend their range at the expense of other birds.)	NA	As per Section 5.8.2 Flora and 9.3.3 Conservation, EAY will undertake revegetation activities that complement the existing the conservation blocks and align with the Conservation Strategy.
122	The wetlands at and around Morwell Bridge support many different water birds and waders. Some of these are listed species in danger of becoming extinct. We would like to see these areas protected from invasive species including people, and especially people with dogs. Deer are also an increasing problem, and deer control needs to be in place. The mine lands generally have significant remnant vegetation and old trees with tree hollows. We would like to see all of the old trees, and all of the offsets that have been planted in response to the loss of other native vegetation protected in perpetuity.	NA	We will consider this feedback when looking at walking path location and design. We understand the significance of the wetlands habitat and we are also wary that opening these areas to the public could result in damage.
123	If a bike path is to be constructed through the mine lands between Yallourn North and Morwell, we strongly recommend that any sections that unavoidably traverse the wetlands area should be fenced. We also strongly prefer that any bike track doesn't follow the course of the Morwell River. Among other things we think there is a Nankeen Night Heron rookery in that area. If noisy recreation vehicle facilities are to be constructed or allowed in the mine land area, it would be best to site these well away from bird habitat and in particular away from any known bird nesting sites .	NA	We will consider this feedback when looking at walking path location and design. We understand the significance of the wetlands habitat and we are also wary that opening these areas to the public could result in damage.

Table 2020 Latrobe Valley Sustainability Group (LVSG) (Event ID 3340)

#	Feedback / Comment	Modification to DMRP	No change to DMRP
124	The ecological health of the Gippsland Lakes needs to be the prime consideration of the management of the Latrobe River catchment and the other catchments in the Gippsland Lakes. In diverting water into the pits, there needs to be certain protocols regarding the syphoning off of water for this purpose. Some firm rules need to be established. 1. That the amount of water for the mines should occur with reference to the minimum flow requirements for the downstream ecology to be maintained and improved. 2. In times of reduced rainfall, the inflow into the pit lakes should be reduced and stopped completely in extremely dry conditions and not resumed until sufficient rainfall has fallen over the catchment. 3. That not all flood water is captured for pit filling. In a natural setting, the rivers involved have periods of high and low flows. The ecology of the river systems in the catchment has evolved around this regime of high and low flow regimes. This should be maintained to mimic nature as much as possible. 4. Reference to First Nations peoples use of water must also be taken into account.	NA	Comment appears to be directed at government decision making. A regional water balance study was completed considering the proposed rehabilitation design with a particular focus on the influence to water balance from proposed MRD remediation design. The results of this study supports the Yallourn Mine rehabilitation design and demonstrates that there are no adverse influences on regional water balance. The study further confirms that proposed MRD remediation design allows all environmental flows to pass through MRD, along with flood flows up to the design levels.
125	While some people in the community with strong environmental backgrounds may favour a high price to be charged for mine pit rehabilitation, there also needs to be some pragmatic considerations to be taken into account. These would include • The capacity of the companies involved to pay for something that does not produce an income now or into the future will need to be financed out of profits elsewhere in their businesses • The idea of punishing the present owners of the power stations for carbon pollution and the bad health outcomes of the past is counter-productive to getting the rehab done in an acceptable time frame • While we do not want public money to pay for any part of the rehabilitation, there should be recognition of the fact that Victorians over multiple generations benefitted from a cheaper price for electricity than if the cost of rehab had been factored in and that this occurred when the generators were publicly owned in the days of the old SEC. • The present generator owners bought these businesses when there were very different conditions at play in the NEM with very little renewable energy in the system. • Today, these companies, AGL, Energy Australia and to a lesser extent Alinta Energy are reorientating their business models towards working in a renewable energy supplied electricity grid. • By imposing too high a price for water to fill the voids, then this may reduce their capacity to invest in truly carbon reducing strategies for their operations overall. • The price for water for pit filling water should be calculated in line with what prices are being charged for irrigation for agriculture, household and businesses supplies. • The price for pit-filling water needs to be at about the same level, not substantially higher than what other users are paying.	NA	EAY appreciates that LVSG understand the implications that unreasonable water costing could have on the overall project outcomes. EAY will continue to liaise with relevant stakeholders on securing a reasonable price for the future bulk water entitlement.

Table 2121 West Gippsland Catchment Management Authority (WGCMA) (Event ID 3383)

#	Feedback / Comment	Modification to DMRP	No change to DMRP
144	There is a need for a detailed, all-encompassing cumulative impact assessment of the potential ecological impacts of filling all three mines in the Latrobe Valley with water sourced from the Latrobe and Morwell Rivers and from groundwater sources. (Concept 1. The need to thoroughly investigate the cumulative impact of filling all three mines with water from the Durt'yowan/Latrobe River catchment).	NA	EAY will align any bulk water entitlement application with the water access conditions presented in the Latrobe Valley Regional Rehabilitation Strategy (LVRRS) Amendment and comply with any conditions of an issued entitlement.
145	Assessment of impacts on an individual mine basis risks creating a scenario where the cumulative impacts of mine rehabilitation are not well understood and may surpass critical ecological thresholds, leading to irreparable losses. (Concept 1. The need to thoroughly investigate the cumulative impact of filling all three mines with water from the Durt'yowan/Latrobe River catchment).	NA	Access to water for mine rehabilitation has been assessed via the Latrobe Valley Regional Rehabilitation Strategy (LVRRS) Amendment. Cumulative impacts could be further explored if the project requires an Environment Effects Statement (EES) to be completed.
146	While the WGCMA notes the limitations of each entity (Energy Australia Yallourn, Engie Hazelwood and AGL Loy Yang) to assess cumulative impacts within formal regulatory processes, we suggest that this be done by an independent third party outside of the DMRP and EES framework. As the DMRPs are released and approved, the specific rehabilitation plans can then be assessed in their entirety, rather than individually. (Concept 1. The need to thoroughly investigate the cumulative impact of filling all three mines with water from the Durt'yowan/Latrobe River catchment).	NA	No response from EAY as this comment appears to be directed at DEECA.
147	The WGCMA supports the intent to maintain the MRD through a pit lake, however we note that there are substantial ongoing risks associated with the maintenance and potential failure of the MRD, including the levee banks, low flow channel and floodplain. Failure of the MRD is likely to see the Morwell River enveloped within the pit lake. (Concept 2. The critical requirement for ongoing stability of the Morwell River Diversion (MRD) through the future pit lake.)	NA	The risk profile for the MRD over the course of rehabilitation and design intent period is considered and captured in the Risk Assessment chapter (Ch 11.5.2.2). The DMRP notes that proposed remediated MRD design will require ongoing management, Ch 8.12. The management measures are discussed in Ch 15, which note that the detailed and staged maintenance and management protocols will need to be developed in the future. This will form part of the closure criteria, as noted in Ch 17.
148	Deep pit lakes are likened to "aquatic deserts" that, should they become directly connected to the river, are unsuitable for migratory fish, platypus, eels and other native fauna and they also impede geomorphological and hydrological processes that provide essential ecosystem functionality both upstream and downstream throughout the catchment. (Concept 2. The critical requirement for ongoing stability of the Morwell River Diversion (MRD) through the future pit lake.)	NA	EAY understands the value of the Morwell and Latrobe Rivers and factors this into rehabilitation planning. The Knowledge Gaps chapter outlines the further work to be completed for the pit lake and regional water quality.
149	Structural failure risk has been acknowledged by the inclusion of works to reshape levees along the MRD, and the inclusion of spillways to divert high flows into the pit (Concept 2. The critical requirement for ongoing stability of the Morwell River Diversion (MRD) through the future pit lake.)	NA	Unsure of the issue raised here. Comment noted and acknowledged.
150	Of critical importance is the need to clearly establish and identify who will be responsible for the ongoing maintenance, monitoring and mitigation measures to avoid major environmental damage. (Concept 2. The critical requirement for ongoing stability of the Morwell River Diversion (MRD) through the future pit lake.)	NA	Future responsibilities will be dependent on who manages or owns the land. This is not yet known and therefore responsibility cannot be assigned.

#	Feedback / Comment	Modification to DMRP	No change to DMRP
151	The WGCMA notes and supports the proposal to remove existing barriers to fish passage in the MRD, however it is understood that the construction of the spillways is likely to have potential future impacts on fish passage. We note that the risk assessment identified fragmentation and impacts to fish passage as a high risk. Further detail of the proposed mitigation options is required to give certainty that the proposed spillways will not result in an unacceptable risk to fish passage and ecological connectivity. (Concept 3. The need to maintain ecological and geomorphic connectivity between the Morwell River and Durt'yowan/Latrobe River and downstream reaches and wetlands.)	NA	EAY acknowledges that further work on fish passage is required as captured in the knowledge gaps chapter of the DMRP.
152	The risk assessment identifies several medium risks in phase 4 handover (impact of poor water quality discharging to the Latrobe, impact to fish passage during flood events and low baseflows), however there is limited detail regarding mitigation measures for these risks. The DMRP must clearly articulate all identified mitigation measures or confirm an alternate approvals mechanism to identify detailed mitigation measures for these risks. To assist with the provision of fish passage throughout the project lifecycle, from current form to final, the WGCMA recommend that Energy Australia engage with the Arthur Rylah Institute to ensure appropriate consideration is given to support native fish species. (Concept 3. The need to maintain ecological and geomorphic connectivity between the Morwell River and Durt'yowan/Latrobe River and downstream reaches and wetlands.)	NA	EAY acknowledges that further work on fish passage is required as captured in the knowledge gaps chapter of the DMRP. We will consider engaging with the Arthur Rylah Institute given they have considerable expertise in this field.
153	There is currently insufficient detail within the technical assessments and risk assessment. The Expert Panel conducting the risk assessment has not been identified, so the level of expertise and breadth of subject matter specialists on the panel is unknown. The DMRP references several supporting documents that are not currently available for review, including *The Latrobe River system: Regional hydrologic assessment of Energy Australia Yallourn mine closure scenarios*. (Alluvium Consulting Australia Pty Ltd, 2025). Access to this information would give more confidence in the information provided. (Concept 3. The need to maintain ecological and geomorphic connectivity between the Morwell River and Durt'yowan/Latrobe River and downstream reaches and wetlands.)	A list of attendees for the risk assessments has been added to Chapter 11 (Risk Identification and Management (11.5.1 Background Information).	EAY will review which technical reports are shared during future public exhibition periods to help build community confidence in our rehabilitation planning.
154	The WGCMA have ongoing concerns about the potential impacts to downstream environments, including the potential impact on the downstream flow regime (comprising flow volume, timing, and frequency of flows). (Concept 3. The need to maintain ecological and geomorphic connectivity between the Morwell River and Durt'yowan/Latrobe River and downstream reaches and wetlands.)	NA	As per Section 8.6: A regional water balance study was completed considering the proposed rehabilitation design with a particular focus on the influence to water balance from proposed MRD remediation design. The results of this study supports the Yallourn Mine rehabilitation design and demonstrates that there are no adverse influences on regional water balance. The study further confirms that proposed MRD remediation design allows all environmental flows to pass through MRD, along with flood flows up to the design levels.
155	Many previous studies have identified that under current (baseline) conditions, the risk of significant ecological change is already high. Therefore, even small increases in risk could prove to be the tipping point and cross ecological thresholds. Without appropriate mitigation measures, this is the classic 'death by 1000 cuts' principle that the water allocation framework is designed to prevent. (Concept 3. The need to maintain ecological and geomorphic connectivity between the Morwell River and Durt'yowan/Latrobe River and downstream reaches and wetlands.)	NA	EAY will continue to undertake technical studies and revise the risk assessments through the life of the project.

#	Feedback / Comment	Modification to DMRP	No change to DMRP
156	While the WGCMA acknowledges and accepts the documented need to manage stability of the MRD through the construction of spillways to divert high flow from the MRD into the pit lake, it is unclear from the DMRP if Energy Australia Yallourn plans to harvest (i.e. retain) these high flows from the Morwell River within the pit lake or if all water diverted from the Morwell River will be returned to the Latrobe River via the outlet in the Yallourn East Field. If the latter is proposed, the mechanism to achieve this return of flow while the lake is filling must be identified. (Concept 4. The proposed diversion/extraction of water from the Morwell River through flood harvesting, and the need to clarify and agree to minimum passing flow requirements)	Expanded KG14 to include: This includes completing an approval process with WGCMA and SRW.	EAY has not made a decision on whether spillway flows would be retained. We commit to a future approval process with WGCMA and SRW being the basis for a decision.
157	If flood harvesting to contribute to pit lake filling is proposed, the WGCMA notes that there is currently no policy mechanism for the 'take' of above-cap water (flood harvesting) within the *Water Act 1989*. The DMRP is currently silent on this issue (Concept 4. The proposed diversion/extraction of water from the Morwell River through flood harvesting, and the need to clarify and agree to minimum passing flow requirements)	Updated text in Table 4-6 to be clear that we are still working through this concept.	NA
158	The Morwell River provides an important contribution of flows to downstream environments such as the Latrobe floodplain, Lower Latrobe Wetlands and Gippsland Lakes. The Latrobe system is already recognised to be at high risk of flow stress with a 129 gigalitre shortfall to meet environmental water objectives. High flow events are critical for maintaining the ecological health of these systems and any take of water above current allocation caps represents a substantial ecological risk that needs to be mitigated if flood harvesting policies are to be progressed. (Concept 4. The proposed diversion/extraction of water from the Morwell River through flood harvesting, and the need to clarify and agree to minimum passing flow requirements)	NA	As per Section 8.6: A regional water balance study was completed considering the proposed rehabilitation design with a particular focus on the influence to water balance from proposed MRD remediation design. The results of this study supports the Yallourn Mine rehabilitation design and demonstrates that there are no adverse influences on regional water balance. The study further confirms that proposed MRD remediation design allows all environmental flows to pass through MRD, along with flood flows up to the design levels.
159	There are potential downstream water quality risks of a connected system. Given the risks of contaminants and potential for blue-green algae blooms in the pit lakes, these risks do not appear to have been adequately addressed. (Concept 4. The proposed diversion/extraction of water from the Morwell River through flood harvesting, and the need to clarify and agree to minimum passing flow requirements)	NA	Knowledge Gap chapter contains item KG26 to review whether the lake could support algal growth and to undertake an environmental risk assessment.
160	The WGCMA notes that proposed Spillway 1 will be the first to activate once flow in the Morwell River exceeds the 5% Annual Exceedance Probability (AEP) flow in the Morwell River. It is understood that this passing flow was chosen as it is the flow required to flush the Latrobe River estuary and fringing wetlands of saltwater incursion from Lake Wellington, however the DMRP does not refer to any other ecological impact of extracting Morwell River flows about the proposed passing flow of 3,500 megalitres per day. (Concept 4. The proposed diversion/extraction of water from the Morwell River through flood harvesting, and the need to clarify and agree to minimum passing flow requirements)	NA	Detailed regional water quality investigations including water balance and water quality impact assessments is noted as a knowledge gap (KG15, Chapter 17).

#	Feedback / Comment	Modification to DMRP	No change to DMRP
161	There is a need for a comprehensive investigation to identify the impact of this water extraction on critical environmental values such as triggers for fish migration, long-term sediment transport and water quality. The DMRP needs to identify and clearly articulate the process whereby this assessment will be completed and independently reviewed to ensure that there are no adverse ecological impacts downstream of the proposed Morwell River spillways. (Concept 4. The proposed diversion/extraction of water from the Morwell River through flood harvesting, and the need to clarify and agree to minimum passing flow requirements)	NA	A regional water balance study was completed considering the proposed rehabilitation design with a particular focus on the influence to water balance from proposed MRD remediation design. The results of this study supports the Yallourn Mine rehabilitation design and demonstrates that there are no adverse influences on regional water balance. The study further confirms that proposed MRD remediation design allows all environmental flows to pass through MRD, along with flood flows up to the design levels. Detailed regional water quality investigations including water balance and water quality impact assessments is noted as a knowledge gap (KG15, Chapter 17).
162	The DMRP nominates both 3,200 megalitres per day and 3,500 megalitres per day as the proposed passing flow through the Morwell River before the spillways become activated. Please amend the DMRP to clarify and consistently refer to the nominated passing flow. (Concept 4. The proposed diversion/extraction of water from the Morwell River through flood harvesting, and the need to clarify and agree to minimum passing flow requirements)	Words added to section 8.6.3, summarising 3200 ML/day as the enviro flows at Lower Latrobe, 1500 ML/day at Thoms Bridge and spillways in Morwell River not engaged until 6000 ML/day.	NA
163	The WGCMA notes the proposed harvesting of Morwell River flood flows by Engie Hazelwood upstream of the proposed Yallourn diversions. We understand that Engie Hazelwood and Energy Australia Yallourn have each nominated a different minimum passing flow for the Morwell River. Further investigation is required to determine the appropriate minimum passing flow, consider the cumulative impact of both mine operators harvesting flood flows, and to establish operating rules to ensure that waterway health is protected. (Concept 4. The proposed diversion/extraction of water from the Morwell River through flood harvesting, and the need to clarify and agree to minimum passing flow requirements)	NA	EAY will liaise with Engie regarding this technical study.
164	The rehabilitation plan for Yallourn mine identifies a range of infrastructure that will require ongoing monitoring and maintenance to ensure safety and structural integrity is maintained. (Concept 5. The need to identify and clarify the entity who will ultimately be responsible for the ongoing monitoring and maintenance of the site post-rehabilitation).	NA	A decision has not been made on who would perform the future monitoring and maintenance; however it will be funded by EAY. Knowledge Gap KG31 aims to address this item.
165	Assets such as the MRD, spillway structures, pipes through the conveyor tunnels and local catchment drainage infrastructure will all need regular inspections and maintenance in perpetuity. It is unclear from the DMRP who will be responsible for this ongoing role. The WGCMA seeks clarification of the future roles and responsibilities for management of the site and surrounding land, particularly relating to the MRD and associated infrastructure (Concept 5. The need to identify and clarify the entity who will ultimately be responsible for the ongoing monitoring and maintenance of the site post-rehabilitation).	NA	A decision has not been made on who would perform the future monitoring and maintenance; however it will be funded by EAY. Knowledge Gap KG31 aims to address this item.
166	The WGCMA understands the importance of the mine rehabilitation process and the need to create a safe, stable and sustainable solution for the future benefit of the Gippsland community (Concept 6. Partnership opportunities to enhance waterway resilience and improve ecological, cultural, social and economic wealth of the region for the benefit of generations to come.)	NA	No response required

#	Feedback / Comment	Modification to DMRP	No change to DMRP
167	We are confident that it is possible to achieve mine rehabilitation goals whilst rehabilitating and preparing the riverine ecosystem to thrive in the future. To this end, we have developed a strategy, Transformation of the Latrobe, to improve the long-term health of Durt'yowan/Latrobe River and prepare the river for future water recovery post mine rehabilitation. (Concept 6. Partnership opportunities to enhance waterway resilience and improve ecological, cultural, social and economic wealth of the region for the benefit of generations to come.)	NA	EAY will engage with the WGCMA on the Transformation of the Latrobe project and review how rehabilitation planning can support this strategy.
168	The WGCMA is well placed to provide information on investment priorities, and we are ready to work with our existing and emerging partners to implement the agreed actions. Further information on some of the priorities included in the WGCMA's Transformation of the Latrobe strategy is available via the short fact sheet on our website – Priority Projects for Investment. (Concept 6. Partnership opportunities to enhance waterway resilience and improve ecological, cultural, social and economic wealth of the region for the benefit of generations to come.)	NA	Providing financial support to the Transformation of the Latrobe strategy is outside the scope of the DMRP.
169	The WGCMA looks forward to working together with Energy Australia and all mine operators to help achieve the community's aspirations and ensure the Gippsland environment is resilient and healthy in the long-term. We would welcome the opportunity to discuss these ideas further and potentially explore partnership opportunities with Energy Australia (Concept 6. Partnership opportunities to enhance waterway resilience and improve ecological, cultural, social and economic wealth of the region for the benefit of generations to come.)	NA	EAY welcomes the opportunity to work with the WGCMA to deliver beneficial outcomes for the river systems.
170	DMRP 3.7.4 Water to fill Lake Yallourn – This section articulates the limits of the bulk entitlement (BE) and where water can be sourced but it does not mention anything about the proposed take of water from the Morwell River or surrounding local drainage lines, nor ground water from aquifer depressurisation. This section should clearly articulate all water sources proposed for lake filling.	Added to 3.7.4 In addition to the new BWE, water contributing to lake fill includes rainfall, local catchment runoff, and deep aquifer depressurisation.	NA
171	DMRP Fig 3-8 shows the MRD as a low-risk surface water domain – what are the criteria for this?	NA	Low risk for MRD surface water domain in Figure 3-8 is a factor of its smaller catchment size, considering local catchment (different from regional flows that pass through MRD). This is discussed in section 8.12.2.3 of DMRP.
172	DMRP Chapter 4 Regulatory Context – This section of the report is silent on the proposed diversion of flows outside of the BE (i.e. access to Morwell River high flows through the spillways) and the process Energy Australia envisages to obtain Ministerial approval to access flood flow harvesting. It would be useful to acknowledge the existing limitations of the water allocation framework, and the proposed mechanism to address this.	Additional text added to Table 4-6: The need for other forms of water entitlements, such as a take and use licence, are impacted by whether EAY can obtain a BWE on acceptable terms for pit filling purposes. Further consideration is being given to whether such licences may be needed, and what form they may take. As such, EAY expects to be in a position to identify and confirm the need for other water entitlements around the end of 2026.	NA
173	DMRP 5.2.1 Rainfall – Should be 1 in 200 year ARI not AEP.	Changed AEP to ARI	NA
174	DMRP 5.2.2 Evaporation – It would be useful to understand what these evaporation figures are in terms of a water volume i.e. how much water is expected to evaporate from the lake annually?	Added a cross reference to Section 8.8.3.1 which has detailed evaporation information including volumes.	See Tables 8-17 and 8-18 for evaporation volumes
175	DMRP Table 6-2 Key Rehabilitation Objectives – The 'take' of water for pit lake filling has not been identified as an aspect that needs to be considered sustainably. Please confirm why this has been omitted from this table?	NA	Table 6-2 has been modified to capture information by "domain" rather than "aspect". Take of water is captured in technical studies and relevant objectives.

#	Feedback / Comment	Modification to DMRP	No change to DMRP
176	DMRP Chapter 8 – Clearer delineation between technical work would aid the reader.	NA	Planning or regulatory requirements often govern the level of technical information we must provide, leading to highly technical documents. Although we have worked hard to make the information more accessible, we appreciate the feedback and will incorporate it into future work
177	DMRP Table 8-7 Spillway Configuration – It would be useful to include the capacity of the spillways in terms of a possible maximum and mean volume across a range of events.	Ch17, KG14 edited to clarify the inclusions in detailed design of spillways.	NA
178	DMRP 8.7.2.5 Design Hydrologic Likelihood vs AEP – Please explain why the design life has been limited to 100 years. The structures intended operational period is in perpetuity, and so the design life is much greater than 100 years.	NA	Section 3.7.2.2 describes our position, being that only a low level of modelling certainty can occur beyond 100 years, especially considering future climate change scenarios. Importantly, we expect the landform to operate beyond this period, it just cannot be modelled accurately.
179	DMRP Table 8-17 & 8-18 – Please explain why the MRD spillways contribution increases for post mine filling and Latrobe River pumped water is not included. Does this mean that top up water will be sourced from the Morwell River rather than the Latrobe River? This may be explained in the cited *Lake balance and water quality report* (RGS, 2025) however this has not been provided.	NA	These tables show total volumes of inflows plus outflows. Increase in MRD spillways contribution for post-filling is primarily a factor of increased outflows following lake full. Top-up water source is yet to be confirmed and has been identified as a gap, Ch.17, KG13, KG 32.
180	DMRP 8.8.3.4 Key Knowledge Gaps (Water Quality) – There is no mention of other physical and chemical properties of the water (aside from temperature). Thermal stratification is likely to cause dissolved oxygen stratification. What is the risk if a flood picks up the low DO water and sends it downstream?	NA	Covered in KG17 & KG21
181	DMRP 11.5.7 Water Access/Delivery – The DMRP has not assessed the risk that the permission to harvest Morwell River flows may not be given. If Morwell River flows cannot be diverted, the risk to the structural integrity of the MRD will need to be identified and an alternative mitigation strategy proposed.	NA	The risks to MRD if the design changes were not accepted/approved have been presented in section 11.5.2.2. This is interlinked with the ability to divert excess flows that exceed design flows into the pit.
182	DMRP 11.7 Environment Risks Assessed (page 402) – Please provide further detail and context, and a citation to support the statement "EA's take only equates to 2-3% of actual passing flows." Is this the total impact over the rehabilitation period?	NA	DMRP section 11.7 makes reference to Alluvium & HARC 2023 where this 2-3% of actual passing flows is documented. The DMRP notes the disagreement to this percentage.
183	DMRP Chapter 17 Knowledge Gaps – Table 17-1 identifies an Action Plan to address the current known knowledge gaps. Please explain the ongoing review and approvals process, including if and when the community will be able to review the new documentation, linked to these future actions.	NA	Section *14.1 Project Timeframes* and *14.7 DMRP Review* show a DMRP update in 2028. This DMRP will likely undergo the regulatory required 60-day public exhibition phase unless EAY are informed otherwise.

Table 2222 Wellington Shire Council (Event ID 3384)

#	Feedback / Comment	Modification to DMRP	No change to DMRP
426	As the plan progresses it is essential that the downstream impacts to water quality and quantity are assessed adequately and based on best practice and robust science, with appropriate mitigation and monitoring established in order protect downstream aquatic and terrestrial ecology, wetland function and protection of Ramsar convention wetlands, as well as recreational, cultural and amenity values. The protection of these values is integral to Wellington Shire from biodiversity, social, cultural, business and tourism perspectives.	NA	Downstream considerations will be captured through Technical Studies listed in the DMRP.
427	From an economic development perspective Council would strongly encourage the use of local (Gippsland-based) trades to undertake the works involved in facilitating the rehabilitation process.	NA	EAY will engage contractors and consultants as per existing policies and procedures. We intend to utilise the local workforce where appropriate.

EnergyAustralia Pty Ltd ABN 99 086 014 968.
Locked Bag 14060, Melbourne, Vic. 8001

EnergyAustralia
LIGHT THE WAY