Condition	Observation	Finding	Recommendation	Project Response	Timeframe for implementation
C14	The Proponent must: a) minimise erosion and control sediment generation; and b) ensure all land disturbances have appropriate drainage and erosion, and sediment controls designed, installed and maintained in accordance with Managing Urban Stormwater - Soils and Construction Volume 1 (Landcom, 2004) and Managing Urban Stormwater - Soils and Construction Volume 2C Unsealed Roads (DECC, 2008); 	Appropriate erosion and sediment (surface water management) controls were in place at all sites inspected during this IEA. Routine environmental inspections are undertaken (monthly, weekly and pre-rain) and these are recorded on standard checklists. The weekly environmental checklist includes confirmation of the operation and maintenance of vehicle wash facilities and other devices including shaker / rumble grids. An external ERSED specialist undertakes additional inspections and provides advice to the project. The management of erosion and sediment control is being undertaken in general accordance with the approved management plan. Generally, sediment tracking onto public roads from the Camps was acceptable (at the time of this IEA site inspection). However, significant sediment and gravel tracking on to the Cobb Highway were observed. There were no controls in place at this location to minimise sediment tracking and no sweeper available to clean the impacted area. Elecnor provided a copy of a receipt for hire of a sweeper for that camp, however the sweeper was not on-site at the time of the site inspection.	In order to minimise the tracking and sediment and mud onto sealed public roads from major site access points and camps, it is recommended that: 1. The procedure for vehicle washdown, including heavy vehicles be reviewed with the aim of reducing the tracking of sediment for vehicles that have not been cleaned onto public roads. 2. Develop a standard approach to the assessment of sediment accumulation at site access points and provide a trigger for road sweeping based on sediment load. 3. Consideration be given to the installation of shaker / rumble grids at all significant site access points, including construction camps where construction traffic accesses public roads.	All construction camps have washdowns, which include both rumble grids and vehicle washbays. Rock gravel is installed at the entry points. As Camp 4 was in the construction phase, the washdown had not yet been installed, however other measures were in place such as the street sweeper. Any potential vehicle tracking onto roads is constantly monitored by the environmental team, not just during the weekly inspections, but daily when accessing and egressing the camp sites. Where sediment build up through tracking is identified, the concern will be raised immediately with the construction team. During prestart meetings, all personnel are directed to use washbays by the Superintendent or Supervisors. An external soil conservationist is also engaged to regularly review erosion and sedimentation on the project. To date, the project has never received a complaint in relation to tracking of sediment onto a public road (whether from the public or any of the councils). The controls at Camp 4 will be reviewed and upgraded if the washbay, rock or rumble grid have not yet been installed. If the street sweeper is to be used (i.e., controls not yet installed), then use of the streetsweeper will be reviewed and increased to address any potential tracking.	Installation of additional controls - by 31 January 2025. Review use of streetsweeper (if additional controls not yes installed) - by 17 January 2025.
D2	The Proponent must review and, if necessary, revise the strategies, plans or programs required under this approval to	Two reportable (Heritage) incidents occurred in the latter stages of the last audit period. A review of the associated management plan	Ensure that following the submission of an incident report to DPHI that a review of all relevant plans	There were two events that related to heritage during the latter stage of the previous reporting period, however only one was an incident - this related	Complete on 24 December 2024

Condition	Observation	Finding	Recommendation	Project Response	Timeframe for implementation
	the satisfaction of the Planning Secretary within 3 months of the submission of an incident report under condition E6;	<ul> <li>(heritage) should have been undertaken during this audit period.</li> <li>The Auditor was provided with a copy of the "updates Register", and while the register indicates that the HMP was revised, the revision work was related to updating the plan to the current SecureEnergy plan template.</li> <li>No evidence was available to verify that the Heritage Management Plan was reviewed as a result of the reportable incidents that occurred during the last audit period.</li> </ul>	is undertaken and those reviews documented.	<ul> <li>to PAD29. The second event related to PEC-E-75 and was reported as a non- compliance.</li> <li>The PAD29 incident triggered the requirement to review, and if necessary, revise the HMP under condition D2.</li> <li>The project maintains two registers relating to the update of management plans. These are: <ol> <li>the Management Plan Review Register; and</li> <li>the PEC East CEMP and subplan updates register.</li> </ol> </li> <li>The HMP was reviewed within three months of the incident and this was detailed within the 'PEC East CEMP and subplan updates register'. The register notes that the review of the HMP and results of the investigation of the PAD29 incident determined that an update to the plan was not required.</li> <li>The PEC East CEMP and subplan updates register has been updated to include further detail to assist with providing evidence of the review. It also now includes the review register in separate tabs, so that these registers directly correlate with one another.</li> </ul>	