Title of Proposal - Clearing of Vegetation for High Value Agriculture, Byrne Valley Station, Kirknie, Queensland

Section 1 - Summary of your proposed action

Provide a summary of your proposed action, including any consultations undertaken.

1.1 Project Industry Type

Agriculture and Forestry

1.2 Provide a detailed description of the proposed action, including all proposed activities.

The Heatley Cattle Company proposes to clear 232ha of vegetation on Byrne Valley Station, Lot 4 SP117921 within the Burdekin Shire Council Area which is located south west of Home Hill in Queensland (refer to Figure 1). The proposed clearing will occur in stages to produce forage, grain and/or legume crops to supplement the Byrne Valley livestock. The proposed action is solely in relation to clearing vegetation that has the potential to support two listed threatened species as outlined in correspondence from the Commonwealth Department of the Environment and Energy (DoEE) to the Heatley Cattle Company on August 5, 2016. These two species are the Bare-rumped Sheathtail Bat as well as the Black-throated Finch.

The Byrne Valley Station has been undertaking sustainable cattle production for the last 55 years and this action will follow the same sustainable practices as their current operation. The property forms part of a larger integrated and sustainable grazing operation that includes the adjoining Rangemore Station. Stock are bred on Rangemore and later transferred to Byrne Valley where they are sent to pasture in low densities. At a suitable age, individuals are transferred into holding paddocks (prior to sale) where their diet is supplemented with fodder, grown on Byrne Valley.

The utilisation of this mixed grazing approach reduces land grazing pressure and allows paddocks to be spelled and regenerate. This has resulted in the re-establishment of native grass across Byrne Valley and importantly provides the ability to maintain economically sustainable yields. The proposed development forms part of a planned expansion of the existing operation and is critical to the ongoing success of the business. Without this development, a return to more traditional grazing methods would be required.

The current, and intended, sustainable farming practices do and will continue to, incorporate the following practices that are aimed at minimising impacts to the wider environment include: zero fertiliser usage; zero to minimal water run off; zero to minimal erosion and sediment run off; minimal water logging; and zero salinization. These proposed works will utilise minimum till and contour farming to further minimise any potential degradation issues. Further, all current land utilised for fodder production is annually shut down and spelled for approximately 4 months during the wet season and this practice will continue. Further, clearing will be undertaken using dozers in an ecologically sustainable manner and following the wet season to ensure minimal

disturbance to the land, minimal impacts to surface water features and minimal erosion and sediment related impacts.

The proposed clearing area was assessed by HamAg Consulting to determine the suitability of the area to support the proposed action, with the results outlined in the Land Suitability Report (refer to Attachment 1_Land Suitability Report). The report concluded that the proposed clearing site would be suitable for high value cropping which can be enhanced by following the recommendations described within the and as provided by the 'conditions of development approval' within the decision notice.

Slope within the clearing area varies from 0 to 1% with most sites having no slope. Additionally, soils are well drained and buffer zones between waterways and any cleared land will be maintained to help minimise any erosion and sedimentation impacting upon the Burdekin Catchment and downstream World Heritage values. Importantly, the area slopes to the north and away from the Burdekin River and a natural contour occurs on the upper bank of the River that prevents sediment and from entering the River. Other erosion control measures such as ensuring adequate ground cover and any clearing and tilling of soil will occur outside of the Wet Season. These and further measures to control erosion are outlined below under "Operational Schedule", "Farming Practices", "Current Approval Conditions to Minimise Environmental and Erosion Impacts" and discussed in more detail in below and Attachment 2_Clearing Protocol and ESC Management.

Suitable Crops
As outlined in the Land Suitability Report and Queensland's Department of State Development DSD approval to clear remnant vegetation decision notice (refer to Attachment 3_Decision Notice Approval), the approved clearing activity must only occur to develop the land to produce sorghum, wheat and/or legumes.

Clearing Stages
The proposed clearing will be undertaken in stages as determined by farming practices and schedules, length of the wet season(s) and to a lesser degree, availability of machine and personnel.

Equipment Used
Clearing will be undertaken by primarily dozers and chains. Forage crops will be sown using standard air seeders and where relevant (i.e. grain crops), harvested using combine harvesters.

Operation Schedule
When undertaking clearing activities, methods will be employed that avoid where possible and minimise soil compaction and erosion. Following clearing and prior to sowing, the management measures outlined in the Land Suitability Report will be adhered to in order to maximise the production of the soils and to minimise erosion.

The approximate timing of clearing and ground preparation for sowing forage crops is outlined below:
• Pull timber after wet season (typically after April) or when it is dry enough to get clearing equipment safely onto the land;

• Undertaking clearing activities at this time of year offers maximum ground cover that will minimise erosion and sediment transport that also occurs in low rainfall periods;
• Felled timber will be burned during the early dry season to avoid the more intense dry periods later in the year;
• The ground will be prepared during September-December using disc plough or similar method;
• Preparation during this time coincides with periods of little or minimal rainfall which minimises erosion potential;
• Install contours as required;
• Weed management will coincide with the first showers of rain (at least 50mm); and
• Cultivation will also coincide with the first rains with planting undertaken using a large minimum or zero till planter.

Farming Practices
Following initial clearing, ground preparation and planting, conventional farming practices that are currently be utilised for the existing operation will be implemented such as:
• Zero fertiliser usage;
• Zero to minimal water run off;
• Zero to minimal erosion and sediment run off;
• minimal water logging through contouring;
• Zero salinization; and
• Spelling areas used for fodder production for four months during the wet season.

1.3 What is the extent and location of your proposed action? Use the polygon tool on the map below to mark the location of your proposed action.

Area	Point	Latitude	Longitude
Indicative proposed clearing area	1	-19.905024954441	147.23402127586
Indicative proposed clearing area	2	-19.905105657435	147.23410710654
Indicative proposed clearing area	3	-19.918743872074	147.23299130759
Indicative proposed clearing area	4	-19.918985959935	147.23651036582
Indicative proposed clearing area	5	-19.911077564776	147.23796948752
Indicative proposed clearing area	6	-19.925118728774	147.24166020713
Indicative proposed clearing area	7	-19.926974651394	147.24020108543
Indicative proposed clearing area	8	-19.929072624633	147.23908528648

Area	Point	Latitude	Longitude
Indicative proposed clearing area	9	-19.931331949281	147.23874196372
Indicative proposed clearing area	10	-19.935527752203	147.23496541343
Indicative proposed clearing area	11	-19.939158645555	147.2329054769
Indicative proposed clearing area	12	-19.935447064736	147.23033055625
Indicative proposed clearing area	13	-19.928830552219	147.22741231284
Indicative proposed clearing area	14	-19.905024954441	147.23402127586

1.5 Provide a brief physical description of the property on which the proposed action will take place and the location of the proposed action (e.g. proximity to major towns, or for off-shore actions, shortest distance to mainland).

The Byrne Valley Station property occupies an area of 11,588ha and is located at 4048 Kirknie Road, Home Hill, QLD, 4806. The project area encompasses a single Lands Lease on Lot 4 SP117921. Byrne Valley Station forms part of an integrated and sustainable cattle operation including the adjoining Rangemore Station. The nearest towns are Kirknie to the north east and Mulgrave to the west which are both located approximately 13km from Byrne Valley Station, see **Figure 1** and **Figure 2**. The nearest larger population center is Home Hill located approximately 35km to the north east with Ayr a further 10km to the north. Byrne Valley Station is well positioned to meet the needs of the beef export trade via the location of both these population centers as well as Townsville which is just under 100km to the north west. Townsville offer facilities for the cattle export industry.

The project area is dominated by soils characterised as fine sandy loams to fine sandy clay loams to a depth of 40-50cm which overlay light to medium clays for 20-30cm followed by sandy loams to sandy clay loams to approximately 1.3-1.4m. These soils represent Land Suitability Classes 1-2 for the proposed crops. A description of the land, soils and climate that describe the suitability of the proposed activity is included in the Land Clearing Suitability Assessment (**Attachment 1_Land Suitability Report**) which was submitted to the DSD in Far North Queensland. in support of a development application for vegetation clearing. The reference number for this submission is: SDA-0415-019831.

1.6 What is the size of the proposed action area development footprint (or work area)

including disturbance footprint and avoidance footprint (if relevant)?

232

1.7 Is the proposed action a street address or lot?

Lot

1.7.2 Describe the lot number and title. Lot 4 SP117921

1.8 Primary Jurisdiction.

Queensland

1.9 Has the person proposing to take the action received any Australian Government grant funding to undertake this project?

No

1.10 Is the proposed action subject to local government planning approval?

Yes

1.10.1 Is there a local government area and council contact for the proposal?

Yes

1.10.1.0 Council contact officer details

1.10.1.1 Name of relevant council contact officer.

Shane Great

1.10.1.2 E-mail

1.10.1.3 Telephone Number

07 47839800

1.11 Provide an estimated start and estimated end date for the proposed action.

Start date 12/2017

End date 11/2019

1.12 Provide details of the context, planning framework and State and/or Local government requirements.

The clearing application for high value agriculture on Byrne Valley Station was sought through Queensland's DSD (previously the Department of State Development, Infrastructure and Planning). The decision notice approving the land clearing including approval conditions was received on 26th May 2015 (**refer to Attachment 3_Decision Notice Approval**). The DSD approved clearing covered four main clearing areas (A1, A2, A3 and A4). Following approval, DSD notified the DoEE of the approval. DoEE formally contacted the Heatley Cattle Company to advise of potential Matters of National Environmental Significance (MNES) that may be triggered by the clearing. DoEE subsequently engaged two separate consultants (**see Attachment 5_NRA Survey Report and Attachment 6_Redleaf Survey Report for the reports**) to undertake assessments on the likelihood of MNES being triggered.

Byrne Valley Station was firstly assessed by DoEE officers in May 2015 and a Principal ecologist from NRA with a second field visit undertaken in June 2016 by Redleaf Environmental (Redleaf) who were also commissioned by DoEE. The purpose of the site visits were to identify potential habitat for species protected under the *Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999* (EPBC Act) and to determine whether significant impacts were likely to occur to MNES from the clearing. This site visit identified that areas in the "northern portion" and "southern portion" of the proposed area to be cleared (identified as A1, A2 and A4 in the issued decision notice DSD and **Figure 2**) held limited habitat values for EPBC Act threatened species; therefore, the EPBC Act does not apply to these areas, and the owner was advised they could undertake clearing in these areas without the need for further assessment or approval under the Act. However, it was noted that there was potential for part of the proposed clearing (area A3) to have a significant impact on matters of national environmental significance.

DoEE noted that the Redleaf and NRA reports identified the potential for the A3 area to provide habitat for listed threatened species. The Redleaf report identified the presence of the Bare-rumped Sheathtail Bat (BRSB) adjoning area A3, and potential habitat for the Black-throated Finch (BTF). Therefore, DoEE determined that the clearing of area A3 (refer to **Figure 2**) may result in a significant impact on the BRSB as well as the BTF and as such, suggested that referral for these two species only, would be required.

Base Consulting ecologists undertook a tree hollow survey and commissioned BAMM to assist with the detailed ecological assessment for the both the BRSB and BTF (**refer to Attachment 7_BAAM Survey Report**). The Base/BAMM targeted survey (**refer to Attachment 7_BAAM Survey Report**) was designed to build on the Redleaf survey and to assess the presence of potential roost sites via tree hollows within the area. The Base/BAMM field assessment was carried out over five days between May 5-9 2017.

Queensland's DSD is the agency that has approved the previous clearing application (SDA-0415-019831). Apart from this referral to the DoEE, no other approvals under State or Commonwealth legislation are required.

1.13 Describe any public consultation that has been, is being or will be undertaken, including with Indigenous stakeholders.

As the proposed works have been approved (**refer to Attachment 3_Decision Notice Approval**), public consultation has been undertaken in accordance with the requirements of the development application process.

1.14 Describe any environmental impact assessments that have been or will be carried out under Commonwealth, State or Territory legislation including relevant impacts of the project.

No environmental impact assessment or environmental impact statement are required.

1.15 Is this action part of a staged development (or a component of a larger project)?

Yes

1.15.1 Provide information about the larger action and details of any interdependency between the stages/components and the larger action.

As outlined in correspondence from DoEE to the Heatley Pastoral Company on the 5th of August 2016, DoEE confirmed the area outlined in section 1.1 and section 1.2 encompasses the entirety of this action as three of the associated areas that were included in the DSD decision notice and approved for clearing (A1, A2 and A4) have limited value for threatened species and could be cleared without approval under the EPBC Act. DoEE confirmed that only area A3 as highlighted in the decision notice (**refer to Attachment 3_Decision Notice Approval**) has the potential to provide habitat for listed threatened species.

1.16 Is the proposed action related to other actions or proposals in the region?

No

Section 2 - Matters of National Environmental Significance

Describe the affected area and the likely impacts of the proposal, emphasising the relevant matters protected by the EPBC Act. Refer to relevant maps as appropriate. The interactive map tool can help determine whether matters of national environmental significance or other matters protected by the EPBC Act are likely to occur in your area of interest. Consideration of likely impacts should include both direct and indirect impacts.

Your assessment of likely impacts should consider whether a bioregional plan is relevant to your proposal. The following resources can assist you in your assessment of likely impacts:

• Profiles of relevant species/communities (where available), that will assist in the identification of whether there is likely to be a significant impact on them if the proposal proceeds;

• Significant Impact Guidelines 1.1 – Matters of National Environmental Significance;

• Significant Impact Guideline 1.2 – Actions on, or impacting upon, Commonwealth land and Actions by Commonwealth Agencies.

2.1 Is the proposed action likely to have ANY direct or indirect impact on the values of any World Heritage properties?

Yes

2.1.1 Impact table

Properties	Impact
Great Barrier Reef	Water quality via erosion and sedimentation. Impacts are expected to be absent of minimal as outlined in section 5.2

2.1.2 Do you consider this impact to be significant?

No

2.2 Is the proposed action likely to have ANY direct or indirect impact on the values of any National Heritage places?

No

2.3 Is the proposed action likely to have ANY direct or indirect impact on the ecological character of a Ramsar wetland?

No

2.4 Is the proposed action likely to have ANY direct or indirect impact on the members of any listed species or any threatened ecological community, or their habitat?

Yes

2.4.1 Impact table

Species	Impact
Bare-rumped Sheathtail Bat (Saccolaimus saccolaimus nudicluniatus)	Clearing of vegetation and potential impacts to foraging habitat. Impacts are not expected to be significant as outlined in section 5.2
Black-throated Finch (Poephila cincta)	Clearing of vegetation but impacts unlikely due to the absence of the species and the species habitat requirements as outlined in section 5.2.

2.4.2 Do you consider this impact to be significant?

Yes

2.5 Is the proposed action likely to have ANY direct or indirect impact on the members of any listed migratory species, or their habitat?

No

2.6 Is the proposed action to be undertaken in a marine environment (outside Commonwealth marine areas)?

No

2.7 Is the proposed action to be taken on or near Commonwealth land?

No

2.8 Is the proposed action taking place in the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park?

No

2.9 Is the proposed action likely to have ANY direct or indirect impact on a water resource related to coal/gas/mining?

No

2.10 Is the proposed action a nuclear action?

No

2.11 Is the proposed action to be taken by the Commonwealth agency?

No

2.12 Is the proposed action to be undertaken in a Commonwealth Heritage Place Overseas?

No

2.13 Is the proposed action likely to have ANY direct or indirect impact on a water resource related to coal/gas/mining?

No

Section 3 - Description of the project area

Provide a description of the project area and the affected area, including information about the following features (where relevant to the project area and/or affected area, and to the extent not otherwise addressed in Section 2).

3.1 Describe the flora and fauna relevant to the project area.

The proposed clearing area encompasses 232ha of Eucalyptus Woodland currently classified as Least Concern under Queensland's *Vegetation Management Act 1999* (VM Act) with a No Concern at Present Biodiversity Status. Current Queensland Department of Natural Resources and Mines (DNRM) mapping indicates there is a single Least Concern Regional Ecosystem (RE) that covers the clearing area (RE 11.3.30/11.3.35) that are not considered as a Threatened Ecological Community (TEC).

The majority of the clearing area occurs within the Townsville Plains subregion (BBN1) of the Brigalow Belt bioregion. To a lesser extent, a small portion of the clearing areas in the east falls in the Bogie River Hills subregion (BBN2). Both these subregions as well as the surrounding subregions are dominated by Eucalyptus woodlands comprising Eucalyptus and Corymbia sp.

Closer analysis of the clearing area shows the vegetated polygon has undergone a range of historical disturbance. The northern third of the area represents land that has undergone thinning and clearing with aerial imagery showing cleared / sparely vegetated areas (non remnant) and locations with younger regrowth. Areas closer to the Burdekin River display less disturbance and maintain a higher density of older specimens.

The proposed clearing encompasses approximately 2% of the Byrne Valley Station's 11,588ha. Approximately 10,199ha or 88% of the property is currently mapped as remnant vegetation under the VM Act with much of the area having a VM Act classification of Least Concern and a Biodiversity Status of No Concern at Present. Hence, there is significant available vegetation and fauna habitat within the remainder of the Byrne Valley Station as well as extensive tracks of similar Eucalyptus and Corymbia woodland to the west, south, south west and north east of the project area. These extensive areas of vegetation are protected under the QLD Vegetation Management framework and cannot be cleared. **Figure 3** highlights areas of additional BRSB habitat within the immediate vicinity of the subject site.

Listed Threatened Species

As outlined in the correspondence from DoEE to the Heatley Cattle Company on August 5, 2016, the only MNES of interest to this action are two threatened species listed under sections 18 and 18A of the EPBC Act: The Bare-rumped Sheathtail Bat and the Black-throated Finch. All other 18 listed species included in the Protected Matters Report as having the potential to occur within 10km of the project area (six birds, five mammals, three reptiles, one fish and three plants) have been discounted as having the potential to occur by ecologists commissioned by DoEE and outlined in the August 5 correspondence.

Following the NRA and Redleaf ecological assessments (**refer to Attachment 5_NRA Survey Report** and **Attachment 6_Redleaf Survey Report**), Base Consulting Group (Base) were commissioned by the Heatley Cattle Company to undertake a detailed ecological assessment aimed at further assessing the presence of the Bare-rumped Sheathtail Bat (BRSB) and the Black-throated Finch (BTF) and to assess the availability of habitat within the clearing area for both species. Base Consulting ecologists undertook a tree hollow survey and commissioned BAMM to assist with the detailed ecological assessment for the both the BRSB and BTF (**refer to Attachment 7_BAAM Survey Report**). Desktop searches using the Atlas of Living Australia and Queensland's Wildnet (Wildlife Online) database were also undertaken to determine previous occurrences of both species to the project area.

Bare-rumped Sheathtail Bat

The Bare-rumped Sheathtail Bat (BRSB) was confirmed as being present in the project area during surveys undertaken by Redleaf and Base/BAMM in June 2016 and May 2017, respectively as outlined below.

The Redleaf field assessment (**refer to Attachment 6_Redleaf Survey Report**) was carried out over three nights in early June 2016 and involved targeted searches for the BRSB using echolocation call analysis and standard bird survey techniques for the BTF. As outlined in the Redleaf report, echolocation call surveys were undertaken over three nights at two primary locations (refer to Map 1 in **Attachment 6_Redleaf Survey Report**): 1) to the south west of the clearing area within the Burdekin River floodplain; and 2) on the eastern boundary of the clearing area adjacent to an existing farm dam. Results from the echolocation call analysis revealed the presence of at least a single BRSB individual at both locations on all three survey nights. The Redleaf report was not able to assess whether the echolocation calls were from a single individual flying over the site or multiple individuals nor whether the species is roosting within the clearing area or foraging. In addition, the Redleaf survey was unable to positively identify actual roost sites so determination could not be made on whether the BRSP was roosting in the study area or elsewhere in the general area. However, it is known that this species moves between roosts on a regular basis and there the report outlined that there is

likely an abundance of roosts in the survey area and surrounds.

The Base/BAMM targeted survey (**refer to Attachment 7_BAAM Survey Report**) was designed to build on the Redleaf survey and to assess the presence of potential roost sites via tree hollows within the area. The Base/BAMM field assessment was carried out over five days between May 5-9 2017. The field assessment utilised echolocation call analysis using specialised SM2BAT detectors that were deployed at 12 separate locations over four nights within primarily the clearing area. Eleven bat species in total were recorded with the BRSB recorded at two locations on a single night (May 7). The locations where the BRSB were recorded were to the north of the clearing area within a sparsely vegetation habitat and adjacent to the powerline easement along the western boundary of the clearing area. Analysis of the bat detection data showed that there were few sequences (bat passes) at either of the two locations which suggests that the area is not being heavily utilised by the species. In addition, the lack of regular recordings indicates that the BRSB is unlikely to be using the clearing area for roosting purposes but more likely for foraging. The lack of recordings within the subject area strongly suggests the site is not regularly or widely used.

The Base/BAMM survey was the most comprehensive assessment of the for BRSB in the area and the results indicate that the species is somewhat limited in its use of the subject area. Of interest is that the results of the Base/BAMM survey and those of the Redleaf recorded the species within disturbed non-remnant areas with no recordings of the species within the more intact old growth portions of the subject area. Given that the BRSB roost in tree hollows where they are known to aggregate in relatively large numbers, the low number of sequences recorded (bat passes) at both locations and the complete absence of records elsewhere within the clearing area indicates this area of Byrne Valley Station is unlikely to be used currently as important roosting habitat, despite numerous suitable hollows being present.

Bare-rumped Sheath-tailed Bats are known to forage over forests, woodlands and cleared areas. The site investigations identified that there are significant areas of potential foraging habitat in the broader landscape. Hence, it is considered that the proposed actions would not result in a significant impact to this species resulting from the loss of foraging or roosting habitats.

With regard to foraging habitats the study area is a very small portion of a wide landscape which holds potential or the species to forage over. Based on the known recoded locations for the species on the site it is clear they are utilising the open pastoral areas and these environments do not prevent successful foraging. Hence, the species would not lose any key or important foraging habitats as a result of the proposed actions.

It is noted that the BRSB records on Byrne Valley Station and surrounds are at the most southerly known distributional limit of the species range. Whilst the clearing may result in a reduction in roosting habitat toward its most southerly known extent, there are large vegetated areas to the south and west of the subject site as well as other parts of Byrne Valley Station. Hence, it is very unlikely the species is restricted to the project area or dependent on it for its persistence in the local landscape. In particular, there are potentially suitable roosting habitats available in the wider area around the flanks of the adjacent range and also along Alligator Creek within Byrne Valley Station.

Black-throated Finch

Black-throated Finch (BTF) field assessments were undertaken during the field assessments for the BRSB in June 2016 and May 2017 by Redleaf and Base/BAMM, respectively. The survey undertaken by Redleaf (**refer to Attachment 6_Redleaf Survey Report**) was undertaken in accordance with the EPBC survey guidelines and consisted of walking traverses in likely habitat and watching waterholes at dusk. Five sites were surveyed with one site located in Alligator Creek approximately 1km to the west of the project area and was included as it contained a several pools of water along the upper reaches of the creek. The remaining survey sites were located near a large dam on the western boundary of the clearing area and within the project area at an ephemeral pool in a small creek (refer to Map 3 in **Attachment 6_Redleaf Survey Report**). The Redleaf survey failed to locate any BTF; however, they suggested that some of the area contained potentially suitable habitat for the BTF.

The Base/BAMM field assessment was undertaken in accordance with the EPBC survey guidelines and undertaken daily by targeting potential water sources in accordance with the recommended technique for dry season surveys. Watering points were watched daily for at least three hours after first light, with opportunistic observations undertaken throughout the day and typically for one hour during mid-day, one hour mid-afternoon and one hour later afternoon. Each water source location was surveyed for a minimum of two separate days with the main likely water source or the main farm dam on the eastern boundary of the clearing area surveyed daily for the five days. Observations were undertaken with uninterrupted views of the water source. Targeted searchers through the subject area and surrounds were ongoing throughout the survey period and as a minimum were undertaken for at least 3 hours per day of the survey period.

The Base/BAMM survey, whilst identifying potential habitat, failed to locate any BTF. Black-throated finches predominantly feed on fallen grass seed, and require year-round access to a variety of grass species and foraging habitat and dietary preferences are thought to vary seasonally with changing food availability (NRA 2007a). During the breeding season

(February–May in the Townsville region) when seeding grasses are abundant, finches preferentially forage in small areas near to the nesting site (NRA 2007b). However, during dry periods, individuals must forage over larger distances and larger foraging areas are required to support resident BTF finch populations. The presence of grass species which produce seed early in the wet season (typically early flowering perennials) are likely to be essential for the survival of the black-throated finch (southern).

Perennial grasses which are thought to dominate the Black-throated Finch's (southern) diet include: *Urochloa mosambicensis*, *Enteropogon acicularis*, *Panicum decompositum*, *Panicum effusum*, *Dichanthium sericeum*, *Alloteropsis semialata*, *Eragrostis sororia* and *Themeda triandra* (Mitchell 1996; NRA 2007a). Additional species eaten by the Black-throated Finch (southern) include: Schizachyrium sp, Echinopogon sp, Sorghum sp and Paspalum sp (Mitchell 1996; NRA 2007b). These known or thought to be utilised grass species by the BTF does not include Black Spear Grass (*Heteropogon contortus*) which currently dominates the understory of the clearing area and the dominance of this non-preferred feeding resource severely limits the availability of BTF habitat within the project area.

It is noted that the Redleaf and Base/BAMM surveys were undertaken outside of the wet season with both conducted in similar seasons (i.e. early dry season) in June and May, respectively. Hence, the survey effort has not been able to account for seasonal variability of potential feeding resources. Nevertheless, despite considerable and targeted survey effort, it has not been recorded onsite. Further, there are no records of BTF within the Byrne Valley Station and very few historical records within the wider landscape. Taking into consideration the lack of local records of the BTF, lack of preferred feeding resources and that the species has not been recorded onsite despite targeted surveys, it is unlikely that the BTF is present in the project area.

The broader landscape contains areas of potential BTF habitat and if the species happens to occasionally visit the habitats within Byrne Valley Station, the removal of this low-value feeding resource from the via clearing for this action is unlikely to result in any significant impact on the species or its ability to persist in the broader area, if indeed it does occur there.

A summary of the likelihood of occurrence of each species is provided below in Table 1 in Attachment 8_Additional Ecological Information

3.2 Describe the hydrology relevant to the project area (including water flows).

The site of the proposed activity is situated in the Lower Burdekin River drainage sub-basin of the Burdekin drainage basin. The clearing area is bordered to the south and west by the Burdekin River. There are no waterways within the proposed clearing area; however, small 3rd and 4th order streams occur immediately to the east and north of the clearing area which are fed by 1st and 2nd order streams that primarily originate approximately 1km to the north and north east within the hilly terrain of Mount Louisa. The 1st and 2nd order streams are defined as those streams at the source of the drainage system and are less likely to have any impacts on downstream systems due to filtering of potential contaminants. Due to the proximity of these streams to the clearing area, it is expected the 3rd and 4th order streams will have similar water quality and impacts to the lower order streams.

3.3 Describe the soil and vegetation characteristics relevant to the project area.

As outlined in the Land Suitability Report, the clearing area is dominated by 6Dbc classified soils which are characteristic soils of the Lower Burdekin River. These soils are categorised as Class A Agricultural Land which is described as Crop Land that suitable for current and potential crops with limitations to production that range from none to moderate levels. Class A is the highest Agricultural Land classification and the most suited to crop land.

Within the clearing area, these soils have a fine sandy loam to fine sandy clay loam texture to 40-50cm which overlay a light to medium clay for 20-30cm followed by sandy loam to sandy clay loam to approximately 1.3-1.4m. The pH of these soils is neutral and ranges from 5.5-6.5 at a depth of 70-80cm, 6.5- 7.0 at 90cm and 6.5-7.5 for the balance of the profile death to 1.4m.

Vegetation is deribed in sections 3.1 and 3.3.

3.4 Describe any outstanding natural features and/or any other important or unique values relevant to the project area.

There are no outstanding natural features within the proposed activity area.

3.5 Describe the status of native vegetation relevant to the project area.

This site is largely remnant native vegetation with some disturbance from cattle grazing. The area is encompassed by Least Concern remnant vegetation under Queensland's DNRM vegetation mapping (refer to Table 2 in Attachment 8_Additional Information). In addition, approximately 90% of Byrne Valley Station is covered by remnant vegetation. The current pastures are in good condition with little overgrazing due to the current sustainable grazing practices.

3.6 Describe the gradient (or depth range if action is to be taken in a marine area) relevant to the project area.

Elevations across the clearing area range from approximately 39m in the south to 44m in the north with an average slope of <1%. The east-west gradient is essentially flat with an average slope of <0.5%. Hence, the area comprises flat to gently undulating lands that slopes away from the Burdekin River. Therefore, flows across the site are typically slow and gentle minimising erosion, sedimentation and the transportation of other potential contaminants across the site.

3.7 Describe the current condition of the environment relevant to the project area.

The proposed activity area is in good condition with minimal to no erosion and good cover of crops, pastures and woodlands. Currently, the proposed site is entirely encompassed by remnant vegetation as outlined in section 3.5. The wider Byrne Valley Station is well managed with a high emphasis in sustainable farming practices. Similar to most cattle stations and larger farms, there are some weed species and feral animals that are typical of the wider area.

3.8 Describe any Commonwealth Heritage Places or other places recognised as having heritage values relevant to the project area.

A search of the Australian Heritage Database on 4/8/2017 for coordinates; west 147.13.42, north 19.54.27, east 147.14.28 and south 19.56.16 revealed there were no World, National or Commonwealth Heritage Places located within the proposed site.

3.9 Describe any Indigenous heritage values relevant to the project area.

As per the search described in 3.8 there were no indigenous heritage values listed for the proposed activity area.

3.10 Describe the tenure of the action area (e.g. freehold, leasehold) relevant to the project area.

The project area encompasses a single Lands Lease (leasehold) on Lot 4 SP117921

3.11 Describe any existing or any proposed uses relevant to the project area.

Byrne Valley Station is currently used for cattle grazing as well as high value dryland cropping. As outlined in the Land Suitability Report, this land is well suited for and approved for growing sorghum, wheat and/or legumes through Queensland's DSD.

Section 4 - Measures to avoid or reduce impacts

Provide a description of measures that will be implemented to avoid, reduce, manage or offset any relevant impacts of the action. Include, if appropriate, any relevant reports or technical advice relating to the feasibility and effectiveness of the proposed measures.

Examples of relevant measures to avoid or reduce impacts may include the timing of works, avoidance of important habitat, specific design measures, or adoption of specific work practices.

4.1 Describe the measures you will undertake to avoid or reduce impact from your proposed action.

The proposed clearing of remnant vegetation for this action is 232ha of Least Concern vegetation currently mapped as a mixed polygon under DNRM mapping. Vegetation clearing has the potential to impact foraging habitat for the BRSB and potentially, low-value foraging habitat for the BTF should it occur in the area.

Clearing of remnant vegetation in the area may lead to erosion and increases in sedimentation of waterways including the Burdekin River as well as water logging and general land degradation. However, it is the full intent of the proponent to manage the area the subject of this action in the same responsible and sustainable manner as they do for their current farming practice. In addition, all works will be undertaken in accordance with the current DSD approval conditions as outlined in the decision notice included in **Attachment 3_Decision Notice Approval**.

There is also some potential for the establishment and spread of pest plant and animal species which impact on native fauna species and their habitat. Clearing of vegetation may also result in fauna mortality, particularly less mobile or slow-moving species. It is expected that potential impacts on fauna species can be appropriately managed through implementation of standard fauna control strategies to avoid or minimise environmental harm.

A range of mitigation measures will be implemented to avoid and reduce impacts associated wth the proposed activity.

Current Approval Conditions to Minimise Environmental and Erosion Impacts

Any activity will firstly be undertaken in accordance with the corresponding approval conditions of that activity, including those conditions already imposed by Queensland's DSD as outlined below:

- Clearing of vegetation is limited to the area approved and shown on the Referral Agency Response (Vegetation) Plan (refer to page 11 of **Attachment 3_Decision Notice Approval**);

- Erosion and sediment control measures must be implemented to prevent land degradation. The erosion and sediment controls must include, but not be limited to;

  - Avoiding clearing vegetation and other soil disturbances during or immediatrly prior to the wet season

  - Practicing minimum or zero tillage

  - Establishing a suitable crop to be used as fallow cover.

- Land degradation through water logging or salinization resulting from clearing native vegetation must be prevented. Drainage and soil improvement measures as outlined in section 3 of the Land Suitability Report must include but not be limited to using conditioners such as gypsum.

Clearing and Erosion and Sediment Control

In addition to the above appoval conditons, several additional mitigation measures will be implement including those outlined below:

- Clearing boundaries will be clearly marked to ensure clearing activities do not encroach into adjacent non-approved areas;

- Clearing will be staged and undertaken in a way to minimise the impacts of erosion and to ensure tree regrowth is kept to a minimum;

- Un-cleared buffer zones of 100m will be maintained around major waterways;

- Clearing will not encroach on any established creeks or riparian zones;

- Clearing will not be performed during the wet season to minimise erosion;

- Any large hollow bearing trees will not be immediately cleared. These trees will be left in place for at least 24 hours to allow any resident animals time to vacate unharmed;

- Cleared areas will be promptly sown with suitable pasture grass and legume species prior to the wet season to minimise erosion and minimise tree regrowth;

- Suitable pasture cover during non cropping periods will minimise erosion;

- Sow cleared areas before wet season with suitable pasture species to establish good ground cover;

- Maintain sufficient ground cover during the wet season; and

- Once a cropping rotation is established pastures will be grown and minimum till practices adopted to ensure good ground cover.

Weed and Pest Control

Weed issues can be reduced by washing down any contracting machinery prior to entering the property. In addition, proponents will proactively remove and/or treat any weeds to ensure the chance of weeds spreading is minimised.

Animal pests such as pigs will be controlled by routine monitoring followed-up by suitable control measures. Fencing will be performed before any cropping to stop cattle and to stop pests and macropods damaging crops.

4.2 For matters protected by the EPBC Act that may be affected by the proposed action, describe the proposed environmental outcomes to be achieved.

Although the BRSB listed threatened species was confirmed as being present and there is potential, but limited and low quality habitat for the BTF, the proponent does not anticipate there would be significant impact to either species. Importantly, the BTF has not been found on-site and the the presence of the BRSB is most likley due to individuals foraging in the area rather roosting individuals or popualtions. Further, no essential habitat for listed species is mapped for any listed fauna species near the project area.

The survey results indicate that the BRSB is somewhat limited in its use of the subject area. Of interest is that the results of the Base/BAMM survey and those of the Redleaf recorded the species within disturbed non-remnant areas with no recordings of the species within the more intact old growth portions of the subject area. Given that the BRSB roost in tree hollows where they are known to aggregate in relatively large numbers, the low number of sequences recorded (bat passes) at both locations and the complete absence of records elsewhere within the

clearing area indicates this area of Byrne Valley Station is unlikely to be used currently as important roosting habitat, despite numerous suitable hollows being present.

Bare-rumped Sheath-tailed Bats are known to forage over forests, woodlands and cleared areas. The site investigations identified that there are significant areas of potential foraging habitat in the broader landscape. Hence, it is considered that the proposed actions would not result in a significant impact to this species resulting from the loss of foraging or roosting habitats. With regard to foraging habitats of the BRSB, the study area is a very small portion of a wide landscape which holds potential or the species to forage over. Based on the known recoded locations for the species on the site it is clear they are utilising the open pastoral areas and these environments do not prevent successful foraging. Hence, the species would not lose any key or important foraging habitats as a result of the proposed actions.

The proposed environmental outcomes aimed at minimising impacts to fauna that are likely to be affected by this activity include:

- Minimising habitat fragmentation by only undertaking clearing in the approved areas;

- Ensure that adequate ground cover is maximised following clearing to maximise sedimentation control;

- Ensure large trees and stags that may be suitable for animal roosts are checked for occupancy before removal;

- Ensure proponents can clearly identify the trees identified above before commencing clearing;

- Ensure weeds and pests are kept to minimum.

The proposed activity constitutes clearing of remnant vegetation that equates to only 2% of that remaining on Byrne Valley Station. In addition, there are extensive tracks of similar Eucalyptus and Corymbia woodland to the west, south, south west and north east of the project area.

Section 5 – Conclusion on the likelihood of significant impacts

A checkbox tick identifies each of the matters of National Environmental Significance you identified in section 2 of this application as likely to be a significant impact.

Review the matters you have identified below. If a matter ticked below has been incorrectly identified you will need to return to Section 2 to edit.

5.1.1 World Heritage Properties

No

5.1.2 National Heritage Places

No

5.1.3 Wetlands of International Importance (declared Ramsar Wetlands)

No

5.1.4 Listed threatened species or any threatened ecological community

Listed threatened species and communities - Yes

5.1.5 Listed migratory species

No

5.1.6 Commonwealth marine environment

No

5.1.7 Protection of the environment from actions involving Commonwealth land

No

5.1.8 Great Barrier Reef Marine Park

No

5.1.9 A water resource, in relation to coal/gas/mining

No

5.1.10 Protection of the environment from nuclear actions

No

5.1.11 Protection of the environment from Commonwealth actions

No

5.1.12 Commonwealth Heritage places overseas

No

5.2 If no significant matters are identified, provide the key reasons why you think the proposed action is not likely to have a significant impact on a matter protected under the EPBC Act and therefore not a controlled action.

Correspondence from DoEE to the Heatley Cattle Company on August 5, 2016 stated that MNES only concerned two listed threatened species: the BRSB as well as the BTF. As such, only these two species and no other MNES have been assessed in this referral. When considering if this proposed vegetation clearing activity would be a controlled action, the significance of impacts relating to the clearance of vegetation associated with proposed activity was considered. The significant impact criteria outlined in the EPBC Act Significant Impact Guidelines 1.1 – Matters of National Environmental Significance (DoEE, 2013) was used to assess whether impacts from the proposed vegetation clearing may be considered a significant impact to the BRSB and BTF

It is not envisaged that the proposed action will have a significant impact on either the BRSB or the BTF. The BTF has not been confirmed as occurring on site despite detailed surveys being undertaken in June 2016 and May 2017. The May 2017 survey confirmed the potential foraging habitat is of low quality and does not contain the known key food resources for this species.

The BRSB has been detected as occurring on the site. The locations where the BRSB were recorded were to the north of the clearing area within a sparsely vegetated habitat and adjacent to the powerline easement along the western boundary of the clearing area. Analysis of the echolocation data showed that there were few sequences (bat passes) at either of the two locations where the BRSB was recorded in May 2017. This suggests that the area is not being heavily utilised by the species. In addition, the lack of regular recordings indicates that the BRSB is unlikely to be using the proposed activity area for roosting purposes but more likely for foraging and the lack of recordings within the subject area strongly suggests the site is not regularly or widely used.

The Base/BAMM survey was the most comprehensive assessment of the for BRSB in the area and the results indicate that the species is somewhat limited in its use of the subject area. Of interest is that the results of the Base/BAMM survey and those of the Redleaf recorded the species within disturbed non-remnant areas with no recordings of the species within the more intact portions of the subject area. Given that the BRSB roost in tree hollows where they are known to aggregate in relatively large numbers, the low number of sequences recorded using the bat detectors and the complete absence of records elsewhere within the proposed clearing area indicates this area of Byrne Valley Station is unlikely to be used currently as important roosting habitat, despite numerous suitable hollows being present. Hence, it is very unlikely the species is restricted to the project area or dependent on it for its persistence in the local landscape. In particular, there are potentially suitable roosting habitats available in the wider area around the flanks of the adjacent range and along Alligator Creek within Byrne Valley Station.

Bare-rumped Sheath-tailed Bats are known to forage over forests, woodlands and cleared areas. With regard to foraging habitats of the BRSB, the study area is a very small portion of a wide landscape which holds potential or the species to forage over. Based on the known recoded locations for the species on the site it is clear they are utilising the open pastoral areas and these environments do not prevent successful foraging. Hence, the species would not lose any key or important foraging habitats as a result of the proposed actions.

In addition, the proposed clearing encompasses approximately 2% of the Byrne Valley Station’s 11,588ha. Approximately 10,199ha or 88% of the property is currently mapped as remnant vegetation under the VM Act. Hence, there is significant available vegetation and fauna habitat within the remainder of the Byrne Valley Station as well as extensive tracks of similar Eucalyptus and Corymbia woodland to the west, south, south west and north east of the project area.

Significant Impact Assessment

Black-throated Finch

An assessment of the significance of impacts of the proposed activity on the BTF, in accordance with the Commonwealth’s Significant Impact Guidelines, is provided in Table 3 in Attachment 8_Additional Ecological Information. The assessment demonstrates that the development will not have a significant impact on the BTF.

Bare-rumped Sheathtail Bat

An assessment of the significance of impacts for the BRSB, in accordance with the Commonwealths Significant Impact Guidelines, is provided in Table 4 in Attachment

*_Additional Ecological Information. The assessment demonstrates that the proposed activity will not have a significant impact on the BRSB.

The BRSB roost in tree hollows where they are known to aggregate in relatively large numbers, the low number of sequences recorded using the bat detectors and the complete absence of records elsewhere within the proposed clearing area indicates this area of Byrne Valley Station is unlikely to be used currently as important roosting habitat, despite numerous suitable hollows being present. Hence, it is very unlikely the species is restricted to the project area or dependent on it for its persistence in the local landscape. With regard to foraging habitats of the BRSB, the study area is a very small portion of a wide landscape which holds potential or the species to forage over. Based on the known recoded locations for the species on the site it is clear they are utilising the open pastoral areas and these environments do not prevent successful foraging. Hence, the species would not lose any key or important foraging habitats as a result of the proposed actions

Concluson of Impact Significance

The EPBC Act Significant Impact Guidelines 1.1 – Matters of National Environmental Significance (DoE, 2013) was used to assess if clearing for the proposed activity would result in any significant impacts to the BRSB and BTF. No BTFs have been found in the project or wider area. Although the BRSB has been found to occur, it is most probable that their activity is associated with foraging in the area. As such, no significant impacts were identified for these two species where the activity would significantly impact on an important population.

The assessment of significance demonstrates that there will be no significant residual impacts likely to occur to the BRSB and BTF. Whilst suitable habitat for the BRSB exists within and adjacent to the disturbance area, the extensive suitable habitat that exists within Byrne Valley Station and within the wider area, confirms that clearing associated with this activity will not result in a significant residual impact to habitat availability.

Section 6 – Environmental record of the person proposing to take the action

Provide details of any proceedings under Commonwealth, State or Territory law against the person proposing to take the action that pertain to the protection of the environment or the conservation and sustainable use of natural resources.

6.1 Does the person taking the action have a satisfactory record of responsible environmental management? Please explain in further detail.

Yes. The Heatley Cattel Company has a long history of sustainabel farming practices and land management, particulary vegetation management and retention. Currently, remnant vegetation covers 88% or 10,199ha of Byrne Valley Station. Sections 1.2 and 1.5 outline the sustainable farming practices employed.

6.2 Provide details of any past or present proceedings under a Commonwealth, State or Territory law for the protection of the environment or the conservation and sustainable use of natural resources against either (a) the person proposing to take the action or, (b) if a permit has been applied for in relation to the action – the person making the application.

None

6.3 If it is a corporation undertaking the action will the action be taken in accordance with the corporation's environmental policy and framework?

No

6.4 Has the person taking the action previously referred an action under the EPBC Act, or been responsible for undertaking an action referred under the EPBC Act?

No

Section 7 – Information sources

You are required to provide the references used in preparing the referral including the reliability of the source.

7.1 List references used in preparing the referral (please provide the reference source reliability and any uncertainties of source).

Reference Source	Reliability	Uncertainties
Atlas of Living Australia – Species Occurrence Database	High	Provided on the webpage
BAMM Ecological Consultants (2017), EPBC Targeted Survey Results – Byrne Valley Station.	High	Provided in the report
Commonwealth Department of the Environment and Energy, Matters of National Environmental Significance - Protected Matters Search Tool.	Moderate to High	Provided in the report
Commonwealth Department of the Environment and Energy, Australian Heritage Database.	High	Provided on the webpage
Commonwealth Department of the Environment and Energy, Correspondence Letters to Heatley Cattle Company.	n/a	n/a
HamAg Consulting (2015), Land Suitability Report for Heatley Cattle Company.	High	Provided in the report
Mitchell, D. F., (1996), Foraging ecology of the black-throated finch Poephila cincta cincta, MSc thesis, James Cook University of North Queensland, Townsville	High	Provided in the report
Natural Resource Assessment (NRA) (2007a), Review of the ecology, threats and management requirements of the Black-throated Finch (Poephila cincta cincta) to support assessment processes under the Environment Protection and Biodiversity	High	Provided in the report

Reference Source	Reliability	Uncertainties
Conservation Act 1999. Report to the Department of the Environment and Water Resources, Canberra.		
Natural Resource Assessment (NRA) (2007b), Black-throated Finch (Poephila cincta cincta) Species Information. Report to the Department of the Environment and Heritage, available at http://www.environment.gov.au/cgi-bin/sprat/public/publicspecies.pl?taxon_id=64447	High	Provided in the report
Natural Resource Assessment (NRA) (2016), Commonwealth Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999, Threatened & Migratory Species. Lot 4 on Plan SP117921, Kirknie, Queensland.	Moderate	Provided in the report
Redleaf Environmental (2016), MNES ground survey, Kirknie.	Moderate	Provided in the report
Queensland Department of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Partnerships, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Cultural Heritage Database and Register.	High	Provided on the webpage
Queensland Department of Environment and Heritage, Wetlandinfo.	High	Provided on the webpage
Queensland Department of Natural Resources and Mines, Regional Ecosystems Mapping Tool.	Moderate	Provided on relevant reports

Section 8 – Proposed alternatives

You are required to complete this section if you have any feasible alternatives to taking the proposed action (including not taking the action) that were considered but not proposed.

8.0 Provide a description of the feasible alternative?

Alternatives to the clearing sites were considered; however, there are no operational alternatives for this activity that provide for the value on return for producing high value cattle feed while simultaneously minimising environmental impacts. Detailed soil assessments have been undertaken by HamAg Consultants to ensure the area was suitable for high value cropping (**refer to Attachment 1_Land Suitability Report**).

Alternatives to the location were considered over the years; however, as mentioned elsewhere, the proposed location offers the best land and soil conditions for high value agriculture.

8.1 Select the relevant alternatives related to your proposed action.

8.27 Do you have another alternative?

No

Section 9 – Contacts, signatures and declarations

Where applicable, you must provide the contact details of each of the following entities: Person Proposing the Action; Proposed Designated Proponent and; Person Preparing the Referral. You will also be required to provide signed declarations from each of the identified entities.

9.0 Is the person proposing to take the action an Organisation or an Individual?

Organisation

9.2 Organisation

9.2.1 Job Title

Owner

9.2.2 First Name

Don

9.2.3 Last Name

Heatley

9.2.4 E-mail

byrnevalley@bigpond.com

9.2.5 Postal Address

PO Box 150
Home Hill QLD 4806
Australia

9.2.6 ABN/ACN

ABN

89298587959 - A.M HEATLEY & J.M HEATLEY & L.A HEATLEY & The Trustee For HEATLEY FAMILY TRUST

9.2.7 Organisation Telephone

0408 181 251

9.2.8 Organisation E-mail

byrnevalley@bigpond.com

9.2.9 I qualify for exemption from fees under section 520(4C)(e)(v) of the EPBC Act because I am:

Small business

9.2.9.1 You must provide the Date/Income Year that you became a small business entity:

Sun, 01/01/2012

Small Business Declaration

I have read the Department of the Environment and Energy's guidance in the online form concerning the definition of a small a business entity and confirm that I qualify for a small business exemption.

Signature:..... Date: 21-11-17

9.2.9.2 I would like to apply for a waiver of full or partial fees under Schedule 1, 5.21A of the EPBC Regulations

No

9.2.9.3 Under sub regulation 5.21A(5), you must include information about the applicant (if not you) the grounds on which the waiver is sought and the reasons why it should be made

Person proposing the action - Declaration

I, Don Heatley, declare that to the best of my knowledge the information I have given on, or attached to the EPBC Act Referral is complete, current and correct. I understand that giving false or misleading information is a serious offence. I declare that I am not taking the action on behalf of or for the benefit of any other person or entity.

Signature:..... Date: 21-11-17

I, Don Heatley, the person proposing the action, consent to the designation of Heatley Cattle Co. as the proponent of the purposes of

the action describe in this EPBC Act Referral.

Signature:..... Date: 21-11-17

9.3 Is the Proposed Designated Proponent an Organisation or Individual?

Organisation

9.5 Organisation

9.5.1 Job Title

Owner

9.5.2 First Name

Don

9.5.3 Last Name

Heatley

9.5.4 E-mail

byrnevalley@bigpond.com

9.5.5 Postal Address

PO Box 150
Home Hill QLD 4806
Australia

9.5.6 ABN/ACN

ABN

89298587959 - A.M HEATLEY & J.M HEATLEY & L.A HEATLEY & The Trustee For HEATLEY FAMILY TRUST

9.5.7 Organisation Telephone

0408 181 251

9.5.8 Organisation E-mail

byrnevalley@bigpond.com

Proposed designated proponent - Declaration

I, Don Heatley of Heatley Cattle Co., the proposed designated proponent, consent to the designation of myself as the proponent for the purposes of the action described in this EPBC Act Referral.

Signature:..... Date: 21-11-17

9.6 Is the Referring Party an Organisation or Individual?

Organisation

9.8 Organisation

9.8.1 Job Title

Director - Principal Environmental Scientist

9.8.2 First Name

Ross

9.8.3 Last Name

Marshall

9.8.4 E-mail

rossmarshall@basecg.com.au

9.8.5 Postal Address

44 Browne Street
New Farm QLD 4005
Australia

9.8.6 ABN/ACN

ABN

76137438914 - BASE CONSULTING GROUP PTY LTD

9.8.7 Organisation Telephone

0430 171 990

9.8.8 Organisation E-mail

rossmarshall@basecg.com.au

Referring Party - Declaration

I, Ross Marshall, I declare that to the best of my knowledge the information I have given on, or attached to this EPBC Act Referral is complete, current and correct. I understand that giving false or misleading information is a serious offence.

Signature:…… Date: 20/11/2017

Appendix A - Attachments

The following attachments have been supplied with this EPBC Act Referral:

1. atatchment_8_additional_ecological_information.pdf
2. attachment_1_land_suitability_report.pdf
3. attachment_2_esc_management_protocols_byrne_valley_hva_rev1.pdf
4. attachment_3_decision_notice_approval.pdf
5. attachment_4_project_coordinates.pdf
6. attachment_5_nra_ecological_survey.pdf
7. attachment_6_redleaf_ecoloigcal_survey.pdf
8. attachment_7_byrne_valley_epbc_targeted_survey_advice_letter_final.pdf
9. clearing_area_3.kml
10. figure_1_-_site_context_plan.pdf
11. figure_2_clearing_area_plan_v2.pdf
12. figure_3_-_potential_brsb_habitat.pdf