



Mr Victor Kuss
Executive Director
Southern Pacific Petroleum NL
PO Box 7101
Riverside Centre
BRISBANE QLD 4001

Department of the Environment and Heritage

Dear Mr Kuss

I refer to my previous letters to SPP of 28 May 2003, 8 February 2002 and 17 December 2002, indicating that Environment Australia required further information before formal assessment of the Stuart Oil Shale Stage 2 Project under the *Environment Protection (Impact of Proposals) Act 1974* (EPIP Act) can commence. I also refer to a response of 25 February 2003 from Mr Jim Schmidt, General Manager of SPP providing responses to requests for information.

Sufficient information to undertake an assessment has been received in respect of the following issues:

- Air Toxics
- Fauna Habitat
- Criteria Pollutants

In respect of leachate and dioxins, thank you for providing the leachate report and the further report on developments in dioxin and furan management for the project. As you are aware information, as outlined in the letter of 16 May 2002 from Denis Cook, the Acting Deputy Director General, of the Queensland Department of State Development is awaited.

In respect to our questions on the greenhouse gas emissions of the project, the Australian Greenhouse Office has provided the following responses in respect of our previous questions.

- Q 84a *Technical details on the methodology used, assumptions made and references used relating to the calculation of emissions (including data from experience in Stage 1 plant).*

The assessment under consideration is for Stage 2 of the Stuart Oil Shale project. SPP has been asked to provide information in support of the emissions estimates made in the EIS, i.e. emissions data for Stage 1 and estimates for Stage 2 of the project. The additional information has not been provided.

- Q84c *Details to enable verification of stated greenhouse gas abatement from individual mitigation measures, including an explanation of the process by which mitigation measures will be selected and implemented, is required, as is evidence to support the claim that during Stage 2 "a reduction to as low as 40kgC/boe may be possible".*



SPP have not provided the requested information.

A further question Q71b relates to the health effects of hydrocarbons:

It is not appropriate to base consideration of health effects exclusively on a composite category of hydrocarbons. Individual compounds should be identified and their impact assessed. There is no justification provided for selecting hydrocarbons for individual consideration. The report refers to ambient monitoring for hydrocarbons. The results of this monitoring for hydrocarbons and a discussion of chronic health effects of hydrocarbons are required.

This question is associated with the outcomes of the health risk assessment being undertaken by Queensland and hence we do not expect SPP to be able to make a full response until that study has been finalized.

I trust that this clarifies the situation with regard to the remaining outstanding information. Should you wish to discuss the matter further please contact Mr Malcolm Forbes, Assistant Secretary, Environment Assessment and Approvals Branch on 6274 1444.

Yours sincerely



Gerard Early
First Assistant Secretary
Approvals and Wildlife Division

24 June 2003

cc Queensland Department of State Development
cc Queensland EPA