Title of Proposal - Flagstone Central to Cedar Grove WWTP Conveyance Pipeline

Section 1 - Summary of your proposed action

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

1.1 Project Industry Type

Waste Management (sewerage)

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

The action involves the construction of 8.5km wastewater conveyance system to connect the existing Flagstone WWTP to the proposed Cedar Grove WWTP (Figure 1). Logan City Council (LCC) has identified that significant human population growth is expected in the area. The Greater Flagstone Pririty Development Area (PDA) is a key greenfield development front within South East Queensland, with the population forecast to increase from approximately 2,000 EP to more than 140,000 Equivalent Persons (EP) at ultimate development.

The Flagstone Central to Cedar Grove WWTP Conveyance Pipeline project (the proposed action) involves the development of a series of wastwater pipelines (i.e. rising mains and gravity mains) and pump stations along the alignment shown in Figure 1. This conveyance system facilitates the decommission of the Flagstone Waste Water Treatment Plant (WWTP) by conveying sewage from the existing Flagstone WWTP to the to be constructed Cedar Grove WWTP.

To establish the conveyance system, up to three (3) temporary construction laydown areas will be required. These areas will likely contain: a work area, a material storage area and workers' car parking. Construction laydown areas will be in areas of cleared land to avoid disturbance to existing vegetation.

Project activities will be limited to the construction footprint Right Of Way (ROW) and will include vegetation clearing and trimming, construction of the wastewater conveyance system, backfilling and reinstatement activities. The proposed ROW alignment generally follows the western boundary of a planned expansion of the existing Brisbane to Sydney railway corridor. This alignment was chosen to minimise impact on areas of environmental significance and developable land. The length of this ROW alignment is approximately 8.5 km and the average width of the alignment is 20m, with the ROW width reduced to a maxmum of 15m through areas of remnant open forest. Each of the pump stations will have a respective impact area of approximately 3,000m2.

Plans showing the full extent of the works are included as Attachmentments.
A central latitude/longitude for the project is: -27° 49' 8.28351 '' and 152° 56' 39.24936''

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
Broad general area	1	-27.847074261587	152.96207736289
Broad general area	2	-27.84715015284	152.9619915322
Broad general area	3	-27.835993568827	152.92585681235
Broad general area	4	-27.835689972275	152.92628596579
Broad general area	5	-27.832046747394	152.92757342612
Broad general area	6	-27.825670809551	152.93401072776
Broad general area	7	-27.821116338935	152.94001887595
Broad general area	8	-27.812082740325	152.94422457969
Broad general area	9	-27.80654074915	152.94585536277
Broad general area	10	-27.799252220803	152.94843028342
Broad general area	11	-27.800087389476	152.95246432578
Broad general area	12	-27.801909553392	152.95186351096
Broad general area	13	-27.821116338935	152.94576953208
Broad general area	14	-27.83364067333	152.93109248435
Broad general area	15	-27.844873392149	152.96302150046
Broad general area	16	-27.847074261587	152.96207736289

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).

Most the proposed action's 8.5km alignment is located on cleared Freehold Land. At sections the alignment will cross:

- Council Road Reserve;

- Rail Corridor; and

- Unallocated State Land.

The proposed action is located entirely within the Greater Flagstone PDA which is located approximately 40km south-west of Brisbane's CBD and 7km west of Jimboomba, within the southern part of the Logan City Council local government area.

The proposed action commences crossing under the rail corridor at the Flagstone WWTP (approximate location -27.800217° and 152.950865°) then follows the western side of the rail

corridor in a southerly direction for approximately 4.3km before again crossing the railway (approximate location -27.834503° and 152.928835°). From this point the alignment proceeds east for approximately 4.2km crossing under the Logan River (at the approximate location -27.845151° and 152.960441°) and finishing at the Cedar Grove WWTP (approximate location - 27.847590°and 152.965937°).

The action will occur at the following locations:

Street Address

Lot 907 Flagstonian Drive FLAGSTONE, QLD 4280

Lot 3 Rice Road MONARCH GLEN, QLD 4285

Lot 3 Wyatt Road KAGARU, QLD 4285

68 Wyatt Road, JIMBOOMBA, QLD 4280

Lot 24 Bushman Drive, JIMBOOMBA, QLD 4280

1342-1464 Teviot Road, JIMBOOMBA, QLD 4280

Lot on Plans

Lot 3 RP 45236

Lot 168 SL 11068

Lot 23 SP 142997

Lot 3 RP 49296

Lot 907 SP 281066

Lot 3 RP 25779

Lot 4 RP 25779

Lot 221 SP 130090

Lot 24 SP 142997

Lot 1 RP 49296

Lot 66 W 3123

Lot 896 SP 108006

Lot 201 SP 130089

Lot 299 S 311316

Lot 2 RP 25779

Lot 2 RP 47120

Lot 999 SP 254144

Lot 156 SL 11068

Lot 1 RP 25779

Lot 169 SL 11068

Lot 157 SL 11068

Lot 916 RP 819216

1.6 What is the size of the proposed action area development footprint (or work area) including disturbance footprint and avoidance footprint (if relevant)?

The total length of the project is approximately 8.5km with a total development disturbance footprint of approximately 17.5ha.

1.7 Is the proposed action a street address or lot?

Lot

1.7.2 Describe the lot number and title. Approximate central Lot: Lot 907 SP 281066

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?

No

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

Start date 05/2018

End date 05/2019

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

Commonwealth Legislation:

This EPBC Act Referral presents the only trigger against Commonwealth Legislation.

State Legislation

The project will trigger Qld N*ature Conservation Act 1992* because of the action involves the clearing mapped areas of Koala Habitat (3.5 ha) and will occur in the proximity of the State listed *Melaleuca irbyana.* A protected plant clearing permit was lodged with on the 2nd of April 2018.

Under the Vegetation Management Act, the action is exempt from requiring a vegetation clearing permit for freehold areas. Several small sections (0.17 ha) of Category B (Remnant) Vegetation located in a Road Reserve and on Leasehold Land will require approval. The vegetation clearing permit was lodged on the 27th of March 2018.

Local Legislation

The action is entirely within the Greater Flagstone PDA and falls under the Economic Development Queensland (EDQ) planning framework instead of the Planning Act 2016 and associated provisions of the Logan City Council Planning scheme.

In accordance with Section 82 of the *Economic Development Act 2012 (ED Act)*, a Material Change of Use (MCU) application was lodged with EDQ for the Pump Stations on the 29th of March 2018. All other aspects of the project of the conveyance system are classified as exempt development under the ED Act and are not assessable.

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

Impacted Stakeholders

Consultation with impacted land holders has been in the form of:

- site Meetings, including alignment walks;

- Planning and Design Workshops;

- easement and compensation discussions; and

- meetings facilitated by EDQ.

Indigenous Stakeholder Consultation

Assessments in accordance with the *Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Act 2003* Duty of Care Guideline have been undertaken. Much of the alignment has been classed as *'Areas previously subject to Significant Ground Disturbance'* (Category 4) with some small area of *'Activities causing additional surface disturbance'* (Category 5). Indigenous stakeholder meetings are at an early stage. Due to the number of stakeholders and complexity of the project, the Logan Water Infrastructure Alliance (LWIA) (operating on behalf of LCC) has decided to undertake a voluntary Cultural Heritage Management Plan, as per the *Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Act 2003.*

The two listed Cultural Heritage Parties are:

- Danggan Balun (5 Rivers); and

- Yuggera Ugarapul People.

General Community Consultation

Broader public consultation has not occurred. Broader Public consultation will commence immediately prior to works commencing. Public consultation will include the following.

- Letter box drop of fact sheet outlining the project and key contact details.

- Briefing note to the local councillor summarising the project.

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.

NA

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

No

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

Yes

1.16.1 Identify the nature/scope and location of the related action (Including under the relevant legislation).

Not Part of a Staged Development:

The proposed wastewater conveyance system that is the subject of this Referral will ultimately be connected to future upgrading of other sections of the regional wastewater conveyance and treatment network. In this respect, in the future an upgrade of section of the regional wastewater conveyance and treatment network to the north will connect to the proposed pump station SPS151 as shown in Figure 3.

Notwithstanding the fact that these networks will be connected in the future they are, in general accordance with the guidance contained in the *EPBC Policy Statement - Staged Developments—Split referrals: Section 74A of the EPBC Act*, not considered as components of a larger single action for the following reasons.

1. The two conveyance systems are not co-dependant and the proposed action (i.e. Pipeline 1 on Figure 3) can, and must due to timing issues, operate independent of future infrastructure (i.e. Pipeline 2 on Figure 3).

2. The project timings and drivers for each conveyance system are different. In this respect:

(a) Pipeline 1 is identified as critical infrastructure that needs to be built this calendar year (i.e. 2018) to replace the Flagstone WWTP which will exceed capacity in 24months;

(b) accordingly, Council has focused its detailed design resources towards finalising the design and assessment of the Pipeline 1 which allows for a high level of confidence regarding the location, nature and magnitude of potential environmental impacts associated with the construction and operation of the Pipeline 1;

(c) in contrast, Pipeline 2 will not be required until population growth and planned urban development in the catchment creates sufficient demand, which is currently forecast to be up to 5 years away;

(d) accordingly, Council has not complete detailed design and assessment for Pipeline 2, although general master planning has been completed, and as such there is a moderate level of uncertainty regarding the location, nature and magnitude of potential environmental impacts associated with the construction and operation of Pipeline 2; and

(e) if the Pipeline 2 was to be the subject of an EPBC referral at this point in time it is likely that future design changes and associated environmental impacts will occur, with the potential to require that a re-referral or reconsideration submission to be lodged.

3. Council's water and sewer networks are complex and extensively interconnected linear infrastructure networks. It is not feasible for Council to make a single referral of all new additions to the network that are required to ensure that it continues to services the needs of a growing community. Typically, the individual infrastructure projects are separate infrastructure projects for design and/or timing reasons which also means that they often need to be the subject of separate EPBC referrals.

4. The impacts on Matters of National Environmental Significance (MNES) for each of the two separate pipeline projects are substantially different. In this respect:

a.) Pipeline 1 is unlikely to have a significant impact on MNES due to the predominately cleared nature of the land traversed by the pipeline route and the ability to further minimise vegetation clearance and habitat disturbance through proposed construction techniques; whereas

b.) Pipeline 2 is identified as having a greater potential for significant impacts to MNES, primarily due to the relatively extensive presence of Koala habitat along that potential pipeline route; and

c.) the likely scale and nature of MNES impacts associated with Pipeline 2 also have a higher level of uncertainty attached to them because detailed design has not been completed for Pipeline 2.

5. The combined impact of Pipeline 1 and Pipeline 2 on MNES is not likely to be materially different from the impact of Pipeline 2 in isolation.

6. Council is concerned that if a combined Pipeline 1 and Pipeline 2 EPBC referral was submitted then the uncertainty regarding the impacts of the Pipeline 2 may result in an extended referral assessment process and/or a 'controlled action' determination. Either of these outcomes may have a substantial impact on the ability of Council to deliver the required Pipeline 1 infrastructure resulting in significant adverse community and economic impacts.

7. The Pipeline 2 project will ultimately be the subject of a separate EPBC referral to ensure that appropriate consideration is given to the potential significance of impacts to MNES and advancing the objects of the EPBC Act. However, the Pipeline 1 referral is ready for submission and assessment whilst the Pipeline 2 referral cannot be completed until a higher level of certainty regarding the Pipeline 2 pipeline design, route and impacts is available.

Related to Other Actions or Proposals in the Region

There are a number of other previously referred actions that would be serviced by the infrastructure that would be established by this proposed action, including:

- 2016/7772- Pacific International Development Corporation Pty Ltd/Residential Development/Lot 3 (S311896) Lot 200 (SP133189) Lot 1 (RP97710) Greater Flagstone Priority Development Area/Queensland/Residential development, Lots 3, 200 and 1, approx 6.5km SW Undullah, Qld.

- 2015/7530- Pioneer Fortune Pty Ltd/Residential Development/Wyatt Road, Undullah, 50 km south of Brisbane/Queensland/Greater Flagstone master planned residential development, Undullah, Qld.

- 2014/7206- Peet Flagstone City Pty Ltd/Residential Development/Flagstone West/Queensland/Flagstone West Urban Development Project, QLD.

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?

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
Threatened Flora & TECs	The likelihood of occurrence assessment

Species	Impact
	identified that EPBC Act threatened flora and TECs are unlikely to occur in areas to be impacted by the proposed action. This is based on limited suitable habitat available, and the lack of observations during ecological assessments, including targeted flora surveys.
Koala (Phascolarctos cinereus)	Koala was confirmed by field observations as occurring within areas that would be impacted by the proposed action. To the greatest extent possible the ROW has been located in areas that have previously been cleared of remnant vegetation to reduce potential impacts on flora and fauna. In addition, where the ROW is located within remnant vegetation the width has been reduced, where possible, to further minimise impacts. A total of 3.5 ha of remnant eucalypt open forest-woodland supporting preferred Koala food trees, such as Eucalyptus tereticornis, Corymbia citiodora, Eucalyptus moluccana and Eucalyptus crebra, will be impacted by the proposed action. This impact area will be distributed across the landscape as a series of narrow (<15m) bands of open forest clearance, that would easily be traversed by Koala. Spot Assessment Technique (SAT) surveys conducted within the proposed ROW indicate that the impacted habitat exhibits low utilisation rates for a Coastal (Medium-High) Koala population density area. A more detailed assessment of the impacts of the proposed action on Koala is provided in Section 5 and concludes that with the implementation of appropriated mitigation measures, the proposed action is not expected to have a significant impact on the Koala.
Grey-headed Flying-fox (Pteropus poliocephalus)	The open forest – woodland vegetation that would be impacted by the proposed action provides a seasonal forage resource for the Grey-headed Flying-fox, which was observed foraging within and adjacent to the proposed ROW. A full significant impact self-aassessment for the proposed action is provided in Section 5 and demonstrates that whilst the proposed action will result in a loss of approximately 3.5 ha of foraging habitat is not expected to significantly impact the Grey-headed Flying-fox.

Species	Impact
Other Threatened Fauna	Except for Koala and Grey-headed Flying-fox the likelihood of the remainder of the species identified by desktop assessment as 'potentially' being present in the ROW is unlikely, owing largely to disturbed nature of the broader landscape and/or the general absence of critical habitat resources. The results of the desktop and field assessment which resulted in this determination is provoded in the Ecological Assessment Report.

2.4.2 Do you consider this impact to be significant?

No

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?

Yes

2.5.1 Impact table

Species	Impact
Migratory Species	Sixteen listed migratory species are recorded by the Protected Matters Search Tool as potentially occurring within a 5km radius of the ROW. A list of these species and an assessment of their likelihood of occurrence within the impact area is provided in the Ecological Assessment Report. This assessment indicated that the likelihood of most migratory species being present in the proposed ROW is considered to be low, owing largely to the general absence of critical habitat resource, and those species that are likely to occur would not utilise the habitats that will be impacted. Whilst no migratory species were detected during ecological assessments, the below presents the potential impacts from the action to those migratory species considered 'likely' to occur in the ROW based on the results of the desktop and field ecological assessment.

Species	Impact
Fork-tailed Swift (Apus pacificus)	This species is an almost exclusively aerial, wide-ranging species. No long-term impacts to breeding, movement, or foraging are anticipated as a result of the proposed action. Impacts are likely to be indirect and limited to temporary disturbance from noise and dust during construction.
Oriental Cuckoo (Cuculus optatus)	The ROW contains suitable open forest habitat which may be used by this species as part of its non-breeding range. No long-term impacts to breeding, movement, or foraging are anticipated as a result of the proposed action. Impacts are likely to be indirect and limited to temporary disturbance from noise and dust during construction.
White-throated Needletail (Hirundapus caudacutus)	This species is an almost exclusively aerial non-breeding migratory species. No long-term impacts to breeding, movement, or foraging are anticipated as a result of the proposed action. Impacts are likely to be indirect and limited to temporary disturbance from noise and dust during construction.
Osprey (Pandion haliaetus	Suitable foraging habitat for this species is associated with the Logan River. No long-term impacts to breeding, movement, or foraging are anticipated as a result of the proposed action. Impacts are likely to be indirect and limited to temporary disturbance from noise and dust during construction.

2.5.2 Do you consider this impact to be significant?

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 any part of the environment in the Commonwealth marine area?

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.

Field surveys were undertaken along the ROW by qualified ecologists between January 2017 and October 2017 as detailed in the attached Ecological Assessment Report.

Flora

Targeted flora surveys have been undertaken along the entire length of the ROW and identified a total of 80 native and 42 non-native flora species. No threatened flora species listed under the EPBC Act were identified. Three individuals of the NC Act listed *Melaleuca irbyana* were identified adjacent to the ROW. Due to previous and ongoing disturbances within the ROW, it is highly unlikely that the ROW provides the necessary habitat to support any EPBC listed flora species.

Fauna

Remnant vegetation areas within the ROW offer very few fauna habitat resources in the form of tree hollows, fallen logs and nests. In addition, the habitat quality is negatively impacted by feral animal species such as pigs and deer (observed) and wild dogs (anecdotal) and general disturbance associated with rail and road activity. Nevertheless the ROW and surrounding lands provide habitat resources that are exploited by a diversity of native and introduced fauna species, with 26 native and 3 non-native fauna species recorded during the ecological assessment. Further details concerning those fauna species are provided in the Ecological Assessment Report.

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

The proposed ROW crosses two named waterways, these being:

- Sandy Creek (152.949/ -27.803)

- Logan River (152.96/ -27.845)

The proposed ROW will also cross 3 unnamed drainage features at the following coordinates:

- 152.943/ -27.815

- 152.941/-27.821

- 152.928/ -27.834

Sandy Creek and the other unnamed creeks generally flow in easterly direction and are tributaries of the Logan River. At each crossing points, the creeks are ephemeral and have an incised channel. The riparian zones are generally of low environmental value and have been heavily infested with weed species (See Figure 5).

Works at the unnamed waterways and Sandy Creek are ephemeral waterways and crossings will involve open trenching across the main channel in accordance with best practice and *Code for self-assessable development Temporary waterway barrier works Code number: WWBW02 April 2013*

There are no instream works planned for the Logan River crossing. The project proposes to drill under the Logan River to avoid any impacts to the riparian zone.

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

Soil: The Atlas of Australian Soils spatial dataset identifies two Australian Soil Classification Soil Types: Tenosol and Vertosol (Figure 5). From approximately 0.0km to 4.0km along the proposed ROW the soil type is mapped as Tenosols which have a weakly developed soil profile which is typically very sandy and without obvious horizons. They have very low agricultural potential. From about 4.0km to 8.5km along the proposed ROW the soil classification is mapped as Vertosols that are clay rich with strong cracking and structure.

Vegetation: The action primarily affects land that has been cleared of remnant vegetation. Due to the highly-fragmented nature of the landscape and generally small patches of vegetation, edge affects significantly negatively impact the quality of remnant vegetation. In addition, much of the ground and shrub cover is dominated by exotic species. Of particular note is the abundance of: *Lantana camara*, *Dolichandra unguis-cati* and *Sporobolus pyramidalis*, and regular dominance of species such as *Paspalum dilatatum* and *Chloris gayana*.

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 ROW. There are no other important or unique values of the environmental within or adjacent to the ROW.

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

The project area consists predominatly of cleared non-remnant areas. Where remnant native vegetation occurs within the ROW, communities are comprised of the Regional Ecosystems outlined below.

RE 12.3.3 (Endangered): *Eucalyptus tereticornis* woodland on Quaternary alluvium;

RE 12.9-10.2 (Least Concern): *Corymbia citriodora* subsp. *variegata* +/- *Eucalyptus crebra* open forest on sedimentary rocks

RE 12.9-10.7 (Of Concern): *Eucalyptus crebra* +/- *E. tereticornis*, *Corymbia tessellaris*, *Angophora* spp., *E. melanophloia* woodland on sedimentary rock

None of the above REs correspiond with TECs.

The distribution of areas of remnant vegetation is illustrated in the attached Figure 6. Whilst RE 12.9-10.17 is mapped in the ROW vegetation corresponding to RE 12.9-10.17 was not identified within the ROW

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

The ROW traverses land that has surface elevations ranging from approximately 20m to 65 m AHD, and the pipelines will be located at depths ranging from 2m to 17m below ground surface level. From approximate chainage 0.0km to 4.0km and 4.6km to 8.5km the alignment is generally located in slightly undulating hills and flat flood plains. The steepest sections will be from chainage 4.0km to 4.6km. There localised steep sections are associated with creeks and drainage features.

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

The current state of the approximate 17.5 hectare ROW can be summaries as follows:

70% moderately to highly disturbed areas characterised by vegetation clearing and agriculture;

10% moderately disturbed riparian zones;

10% vegetated areas of moderate ecological value; and

10% highly disturbed urban and infrastructure area.

Moderately to highly disturbed areas characterised by vegetation clearing and agriculture

Most the ROW traverses significantly disturbed areas (Figure 7) that have been cleared historically and maintained to ensure minimal wooded vegetation regrowth. These areas are infested with weed species and feral pigs have been observed within the southern area.

Riparian Areas

Up to five riparian zones will be crossed by the ROW. Crossing points have been selected to minimise disturbance to native riparian vegetation (Figure 8) and are generally located in highly disturbed areas supporting weed species such as Lantana (*Lantana camara)* and Wild Tobacco (*Solanum mauritianum).*

Moderate Ecological Areas

A small percentage of the ROW is considered to be of moderate ecological value (Figure 9). These areas typically support relatively small areas and narrow bands of remnant eucalypt dominated open forest, connected to larger contiguous areas of bushland to the west, that provide general habitat resources and movement opportunities for native fauna that are tolerant of the conditions typically associated with the bushland-urban interface.

Highly disturbed urban and infrastructure areas

This classification includes areas already developed for residential purposes or areas that accommodate existing road, rail or stormwater infrastructure in the vicinity of Homestead Drive and the Brisbane to Sydney Railway (Figure 10).

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

Not applicable. No Commonwealth Heritage Place or other places have been identified within or adjacent to the ROW.

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

Preliminary assessments have been conducted by the previous native title claimant group (Jagera Daran). No significant areas or locations were identified.

Since this assessment was conducted the Native title claimant groups have changed for this area. At the time of this submission, LCC has engaged with the new groups and is negotiating a new agreement.

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

The ROW traverses the following:

Lot 3 RP 45236 Freehold

Lot 168 SL 11068 Freehold

Lot 23 SP 142997 Freehold

Lot 3 RP 49296 Freehold

Lot 907 SP 281066 Freehold

Lot 3 RP 25779 Freehold

Lot 4 RP 25779 Freehold

Lot 221 SP 130090 State Lease

Lot 24 SP 142997 Freehold

Lot 1 RP 49296 Freehold

Lot 66 W 3123 Freehold

Lot 896 SP 108006 Freehold

Lot 201 SP 130089 State Lease

Lot 299 S 311316 Freehold

Lot 2 RP 25779 Freehold

Lot 2 RP 47120 Freehold

Lot 999 SP 254144	Freehold
Lot 156 SL 11068	Freehold
Lot 1 RP 25779	Freehold
Lot 169 SL 11068	Freehold
Lot 157 SL 11068	Freehold
Lot 916 RP 819216	Freehold

Refer to Figure 2

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

Existing Uses:

The current land used are varied and as follows:

- Grazing
- Unused
- Land development
- Road
- Rail
- Waste Water Treatment Plant

Proposed Uses:

The land uses along the ROW will change significantly over the coming decade. According to the current EDQ development plans (Attachment 3) for the area much of the land adjacent to the ROW will become housing developments. The proposed alignment has been selected to dovetail with these plans such that much of the ROW is sited under future roads and parks.

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.

Proposed Measures

Logan City Council and the LWIA are committed to reducing the impact of the proposed action on MNES. To achieve this the following mitigation measures will be in place to minimise impacts:

1. Avoidance - This has included:

- siting most the ROW in previously cleared and disturbed areas;

- reducing the width of the ROW in areas of high environmental value such as at Creek crossings and remnant vegetation; and- tunnelling under the Logan River.

2. Timing - The vegetation clearing will, to the extent practicable, be timed to occur outside the Queensland wet season with all erosion and sediment controls in place prior to the wet season.

3. Species Impact Management - Implement species specific management plans outlining specific mitigation measures to minimise the impacts on threatened or otherwise significant wildlife species. Impact mitigation measures will include:

- having qualified fauna spotter onsite during all vegetation clearing;

- installation and maintenance of fenced no-go zones to protect adjacent areas of vegetation to be retained;

- minimising the length of open trenching at all times to minimise the potential for fauna entrapment;

- installation and maintenance of appropriate Erosion and Sediment Control Structures Designed and certified by a CESCP;

- weed and pathogen controls;

- top soil and mulch storage and reinstatement;- regular environmental compliance audits; and- training and induction of Site Staff regarding the environmentally sensitive areas.

4. Develop a Project Specific Environmental Management Plan to be included in the project's Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP).

Effectiveness of Impact Mitigation Actions

The most effective impact mitigation action taken is the selection of a ROW alignment that minimises the extent of vegetation clearing required.

The construction mitigation measures to be adopted as part of the action are believed to be best practice in the construction industry. Council and LWIA is be regularly auditing the construction contractor against all management plans.

The rehabilitation and reinstatement plans for the action have been developed to maximise the regrowth potential of native species within the ROW following completion of construction.

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.

The following environemental outcomes are to be achieved.

- The ROW will be limited to the minimum extent necessary for safe operations and will result in the clearing of no more than 3.5ha of remnant open forest foraging habitat for Koala and Grey-headed Flying-fox.- No impact will occur to any important breeding or roosting sites for any MNES species or migratory species.

- The action will avoid direct harm or injury to Koala or Grey-headed Flying-fox through imlementation of appropriate vegetation clearaning and management during the constructon phase of development (refer to management measures above in Section 4.1) .

- The action will result in no long-term impact on the movement of threatened or migratory

species.

- No significant advserse impacts to MNES will arise as a result of the action.

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

No

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.

The proposed action will not have any impact on most MNES, with the only MNES likely to sustain any discernible impact being the Koala and Grey-headed Flying-fox. The key reasons why the proposed action is NOT LIKELY to have a significant impact on either of these MNES are as follows.

Koala: In South-east Queensland the Koala is listed as Vulnerable under the EPBC Act. An impact significance assessment in general accordance with the Matters of National Environmental Significance, Significant Impact Guidelines 1.1 (Department of the Environment 2013) and the EPBC Act Referral Guidelines for the Vulnerable Koala (combined populations of Queensland, New South Wales and the Australian Capital Territory) (Department of the Environment 2014) is provided below.

Note: Under the EPBC Act, an important population is defined as, .."*populations identified as such in recovery plans, and/or that are:*

- likely to be key source populations either for breeding or dispersal

- likely to be necessary for maintaining genetic diversity, and/or

- at or near the limit of the species range."

Criteria: *Lead to a long-term decrease in the size of an important population of a species*

Response: The Site does not support ' an important population'. Individual Koala that reside within or move through the areas of remnant and modified eucalypt dominated open forest that

are traversed by the ROW are not likely to be members of an important population, as defined in the Guideline, for the following reasons:

- those individuals are not located at or near the limit of the Koala's geographic range;

- those individuals are not known to be genetically distinct, or likely to be so, due to the high levels of Koala habitat connectivity that exist in the predominantly non-urban landscapes to the south and west of the ROW; and

- those individuals are not likely to be important to the conservation of status of Koala via the process of breeding or dispersal given the predominately urbanised landscape that occupies land to the north and east.

Notwithstanding the above, the Koala that move through the habitat traversed by the ROW potentially play a role in maintaining some level of genetic exchange between the local Koala population occupying the non-urban landscapes to the south and west and the local Koala populations that inhabit the more heavily urbanised landscapes to the north and east.

Given the small area and narrow linear nature of Koala habitat to be impacted by the proposed action, and the ability to avoid direct harm to the Koala during the construction phase of the project, it is unlikely that the action will lead to a long term decrease in the size of the local Koala population which is not considered to be an important Koala population.

***Criteria**: Reduce the area of occupancy of an important population*

***Response**:* The proposed action will not have a discernible impact on the area of habitat occupied by an important Koala population.

Greater than 2,000 ha of remnant and non-remnant eucalypt open forest / woodland suitable to support Koala occurs within a 5 km radius of the ROW. In any event the small area (3.5 ha) and linear pattern of Koala habitat disturbance associated with the proposed action will not reduce the area of occupancy of the local Koala population.

***Criteria**: Fragment an existing important population into two or more populations*

***Response**:* A large portion of the ROW and adjacent land has been previously cleared with the retention of some corridors of riparian and roadside vegetation that provide potential movement corridors for Koala. Whilst the proposed action will involve some narrow (i.e. 10m to 15m) linear clearance across these corridors this clearance will not have a significant adverse impact of the ability of Koala to move through these vegetated corridors due to:

the narrow width of initial disturbance during the construction phase and the proposed revegetation of cleared areas of forested habitat; andthe fact that the wastewater conveyance infrastructure to be located therein as below ground infrastructure.

As such the proposed action will not lead to the fragmentation of the local Koala population, which is not considered to be an important population

***Criteria**: Adversely affect habitat critical to the survival of a species*

***Response**:* An assessment of the Koala habitat values of land traversed by the ROW completed using the Koala Habitat Assessment Tool is presented in the project's Ecological Assessment Report. That assessment determined that the subject habitat satisfies the criteria for classification as habitat critical to the survival of Koala, with an overall habitat score of 6.

Consistent with the previously addressed significant impact criteria, the nature and extent of disturbance to "habitat critical to the survival of Koala" would not result in a significant impact to the local or regional Koala populations. In this respect it is noted that:

The habitat score calculated for the impact area is relatively low (i.e. 7 out of 10) with the risk of significant impacts occurring increasing as the habitat score increases.The amount of Koala habitat being cleared is relatively small (i.e. ~ 3.5 hectares) and will be distributed across the landscape. The method of clearing will be selective, in that only a narrow (i.e. 10m to 15m wide) corridor of clearance will occur with adjacent areas of habitat being retained, and rehabilitation of native vegetation will occur in ecologically sensitive areas (i.e. riparian and greenspace corridors) following establishment of the below ground infrastructure. Field surveys indicate that the habitat to be impacted is subject to low levels of utilisation by Koala.The proposed action primarily involves the establishment of below ground linear infrastructure that will not cause fragmentation of Koala habitat.

***Criteria**: Disrupt the breeding cycle of an important population*

***Response**:* The nature of the proposed action, which involves the clearance of a relatively small narrow band of Koala habitat over a short period of time to facilitate the establishment of below ground infrastructure, is not likely to disrupt the breeding cycle of the local Koala population, which is not considered to be an important population.

***Criteria**: Modify, destroy, remove or isolate or decrease the availability or quality of habitat to the extent that the species is likely to decline*

***Response**:* Given the small area of Koala habitat to be impacted by the LS304 Project, and limited impacts to primary or secondary feed trees, and the availability of these habitat resources in the locality it is unlikely the project will modify, destroy, remove or isolate or decrease the availability or quality of habitat to the extent that the species is likely to decline.

***Criteria**: Result in invasive species that are harmful to a vulnerable species becoming established in the vulnerable species' habitat*

Response: The areas of Koala habitat to be impacted is in a disturbed condition and is subject to weed and pest invasion. The Project is unlikely to contribute towards increases in the abundance or distribution of invasive species which are harmful to the Koala, particularly if a weed management plan is implemented prior to, during, and post construction.

***Criteria**: Introduce disease that may cause the species to decline*

Response: Chlamydia is a bacterial infection which affects almost all Koalas in South East Queensland. It is unlikely that this disease or any others would be increased by the proposed action which will affect a small area of habitat within an increasingly urbanised landscape.

***Criteria**: Interfere substantially with the recovery of the species - According to the EPBC Act referral guidelines impacts likely to substantially interfere with the recovery of the Koala may include:*

Response: An assessment of the proposed action against each of the impacts outlined in the EPBC Act referral guidelines for the Vulnerable Koala (combined populations of Queensland, New South Wales and the Australian Capital Territory) (Department of the Environment 2014) as likely to substantially interfere with the recovery of the Koala is provided below.

*- introducing or increasing Koala fatalities in habitat critical to the survival of the Koala, due to dog attacks, to a level that is likely to result in multiple, ongoing mortalities*The proposed action will not introduce or result in any increase Koala fatalities due to dog attack.

*- introducing or increasing Koala fatalities in habitat critical to the survival of the Koala, due to vehicle strikes, to a level that is likely to result in multiple, ongoing mortalities*The proposed action will not introduce or result in any increase Koala fatalities due to vehicular strike, as the operation of vehicles and other machinery during the construction phase of the project will occur during the daytime and at low speeds.

- facilitating the introduction or spread of disease or pathogens to an area, for example Chlamydia or Phytophthora cinnamomi to habitat critical to the survival of the Koala, that are likely to significantly reduce the reproductive output of female Koalas or reduce the carrying

*capacity of the habitat*The proposed action will not introduce or increase the prevalence of diseases or pathogens likely to adversely impact Koala or its habitat. Appropriate hygiene controls for machinery and materials will be implemented to manage the potential risk of introduction/spread of pathogens such as Die-back (Phytophthora cinnamomi) and Myrtle rust (*Uredo rangelii* or *Puccinia psidi*i) that may adverse impact Koala habitat

*- creating a barrier to movement between or within habitat critical to the survival of the Koala that is likely to result in a long-term reduction in genetic fitness or access to habitat critical to the survival of the Koala*The narrow linear nature of habitat clearance and the underground nature of the infrastructure to be established means that the proposed action will not result in any functional fragmentation of Koala habitat.

*- changing hydrology, which degrades habitat critical to the survival of the Koala, to the extent that the carrying capacity of the habitat is reduced in the long term.*The proposed action will not have any long-term impact on the hydrology of the catchments traversed by the ROW. Any changes during the construction phase of the project will be minor, localised and short-term.

Grey-headed Flying-fox: The Grey-headed Flying-fox is listed as Vulnerable under the EPBC Act. Table 5 presents an impact significance assessment in general accordance with the Matters of National Environmental Significance, Significant Impact Guidelines 1.1 (Department of the Environment 2013).

Criteria: *Lead to a long-term decrease in the size of an important population of a species*

Response: Individual Grey-headed Flying Fox that periodically exploit the forage resources available within the ROW are not likely to be members of an important population, as defined in the Guideline, for the following reasons:

- those individuals are not located at or near the limit of the species' geographic range;

- those individuals are not known to be genetically distinct, or likely to be so, due to the highly mobile and wide ranging nature of species; and

- those individuals are not likely to be of any greater importance to the conservation of status of the species, via the process of breeding or dispersal, than any other individuals of this species.

The primary food sources for Grey-headed Flying-fox are flowering Eucalyptus and related genera, rainforest fruits and some commercial fruit crops. The vegetation communities used by the Grey-headed Flying-fox do not provide a continuous foraging resources throughout the year. Consequently the Grey-headed Flying-fox has complex and wide ranging movement patterns to access this ephemeral and patchy food resources.

Given the small area and narrow linear nature of habitat to be impacted by the proposed action, and the ability to avoid direct harm to the Grey-headed Flying-fox during the construction phase of the project, it is unlikely that the action will lead to a long term decrease in the size of any Grey-headed Flying-fox population.

Criteria: *Reduce the area of occupancy of an important population*

Response: The small area (3.5 ha) and linear pattern of habitat disturbance associated with the proposed action will not have a discernible impact on the area of habitat occupied by any Grey-headed Flying-fox population.

Criteria: *Fragment an existing important population into two or more populations*

Response: The Grey-headed Flying-fox is a very mobile and wide ranging species that will not suffer any habitat fragmentation as a result of the proposed action.

Criteria: *Adversely affect habitat critical to the survival of a species*

Response: The ROW does not pass through or adjacent to any known roost sites for the Grey-headed Flying-fox. The nearest known Grey-headed Flying-fox roost sites are:

- approximately 1.75km to the east of the ROW in an area of riparian vegetation/parkland associated with Sandy Creek; and

- approximately 2km to the east of the proposed Cedar Grove WWTP.

Both of these roost/camp sites are non-permanent, relatively small (i.e. < 2,500 individuals) and not considered to be of National significance.

Criteria: *Disrupt the breeding cycle of an important population*

Response: The proposed action will not disrupt the breeding cycle of the Grey-headed Flying-fox either by way of interference with food resources or roosting sites.

Criteria: *Modify, destroy, remove or isolate or decrease the availability or quality of habitat to the extent that the species is likely to decline*

Response: The small extent and localised nature of impacts to available forage resources for the Grey-headed Flying-fox would not result in any discernible decline in this species population.

Criteria: *Result in invasive species that are harmful to a vulnerable species becoming established in the vulnerable species' habitat*

Response: There are no known invasive species that are harmful to the Grey-headed Flying-fox. The distribution and abundance of weed species and pathogens that may adversely impact the eucalypt open forests utilised by the Grey-headed Flying-fox would not be increased by the proposed action.

Criteria: *Introduce disease that may cause the species to decline*

Response: The proposed action will not introduce or increase the prevalence of Grey-headed Flying-fox pathogens such as the Australian bat Lyssavirus, Bat Paramyxovirus and Menangle Pig virus.

Criteria: *Interfere substantially with the recovery of the species*

Response: According to the Draft National Recovery Plan for the Grey-headed Flying-fox (*Pteropus policephalus*) (Commonwealth of Australia 2017), the recovery objectives for the Grey-headed Flying-fox may include:

- Identify, protect and enhance native foraging habitat critical to the survival of the Grey-headed Flying fox- Camp management- Monitor population trends- Increase public awareness and build capacity to co-exist- Decrease impact to horticulture industry- Support research- Reduce impact of electricity lines, and entanglement in barbed wire and netting

The proposed action will not involve any activities that are inconsistent with achieving the recovery objectives for the Grey-headed Flying-fox. In that respect it is noted that the proposed action:

- has been designed to minimise impacts to areas of eucalypt dominated open forest which provide forage resources for the Grey-headed Flying-fox;

- will not impact on any existing Flying-fox camps;

- will not substantially increase risks associated with overhead electricity lines, barbed wire or netting.

The other recovery objectives around camp management, increased public awareness, impacts to horticulture industry, population monitoring and supporting research are not things that the LWIA can directly contribute.

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- Logan City Council has never been fined or prosecuted for a significant environmental breach.

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.

Not Applicable – No proceedings under a Commonwealth, State or Territory law for the protection of the environment or the conservation and sustainable use of natural resources against:

9a) 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.

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?

Yes

6.3.1 If the person taking the action is a corporation, please provide details of the corporation's environmental policy and planning framework.

As an extension of the LCC, LoganWIA must adhere with all council environmental policies and frameworks. It is required to develop and implement a Code of Conduct that ensures LCC and LoganWIA upholds the laws of Local, State and Commonwealth Governments, including legislation having and environmental management focus. The preparation of this Referral and the supporting documentation are a strong indicator of LCC and LoganWIA's commitment to delivering their capital works program in a lawful and environmentally responsible manner

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?

Yes

6.4.1 EPBC Act No and/or Name of Proposal.

2010/5576

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
Refer to Section 6 of the Ecological Assessment Report for a full list of information sources used in the preparation of this referral.	High. Information sources are: a.) published reports / guidelines b.) public databses records; and c.) site specific studies spexcifically commissioned to assess the environmental condition of the ROW to inform develop design.	Acceptable. All information sources have a level of uncertainty, however no significant areas of uncertainty that would affect the conclusions of this Referral are identified.

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?

The current Flagstone WWTP has a capacity of 4,000 EP. Under current population growth estimates the Flagstone WWTP will reach capacity by late 2020. Feasibility studies have indicated the Flagstone WWTP cannot be further upgraded and a new WWTP needs to be constructed to meet the ultimate EP of 180,000. Alternatives to not building a new WWTP and conveyance system are not practical and involve tankering sewerage from the Flagstone WWTP. These have been shown as being cost prohibitive.

Alternative Locations

High level, siting studies identified the most suitable location for the new WWTP to be along the southern bank of the Logan River. As part of these studies different locations were assessed and the Cedar Grove Site was selected. Additional planning studies determined the optimum route of the wastewater conveyance pipelines to connect the exist Flagstone WWTP to the new Cedar Grove WWTP. The general location of the pump stations has been dictated by future developments and the hydraulic requirements of moving sewerage.

The specific alignment for pipelines and locations for pump station sites have been selected in full consultation with the impacted landholder, developers, and Queensland government departments, agencies and entities (incl. DES, EDQ, DTMR, and ARTC). The pipeline alignments and pump station sites has been carefully selected to ensure minimal disturbance to vegetation, this included:

- avoiding areas of high environmental or social value;- maximising the future development potential of the land;

- siting most of the alignment within open and cleared land and avoiding large areas of vegetation;

- siting of pump stations above the Q100 flood level; and- ‘snaking’ the alignment to avoid significant individual trees.

Alternative Timeframes

To meet the population growth within the area, the conveyance system must be commissioned and operational by late 2020. Due to the lead times in construction and procurement of materials, no other alternative timeframes are available.

Alternative Construction Methodologies

Much of the conveyance system will be within cleared and open areas. Here, it is proposed to use traditional construction methodologies such as trenching. The trenching methodology will include:

- clearing a 10m to 20m wide Right of Way (ROW) of vegetation under the supervision and direction of a fauna spotter catcher;- stripping the topsoil and sub soil into separate windrows;

- trenching to the required depth;- stringing out and welding of the pipe sections;- laying the pipe in the trench and back filling; and- reinstating / rehabilitating the ROW.

Major crossings, such as the Rail Line and the Logan River, will be constructed using trenchless technologies such as Horizontal Directional Drilling (HDD).

Traditional trenching is being conducted at minor creek crossings and within heavily vegetated areas. In these areas, the ROW is being reduced in width (i.e. 10m) and site specific rehabilitation plans have been prepared.

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

Water Infrastructure Manager

9.2.2 First Name

Tony

9.2.3 Last Name

Goodhew

9.2.4 E-mail

tonygoodhew@logan.qld.gov.au

9.2.5 Postal Address

PO Box 3226
Logan City DC QLD 4114
Australia

9.2.6 ABN/ACN

ABN

21627796435 - LOGAN CITY COUNCIL

9.2.7 Organisation Telephone

07 3412 5367

9.2.8 Organisation E-mail

council@logan.qld.gov.au

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

Not applicable

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: .....

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, TONY GOODHEW, 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: 18 April 2018

I, TONY GOODHEW, the person proposing the action, consent to the designation of _____ as the proponent of the purposes of the action describe in this EPBC Act Referral.

Signature:..... Date: 18 April 2018

9.3 Is the Proposed Designated Proponent an Organisation or Individual?

Organisation

9.5 Organisation

9.5.1 Job Title

Water Infrastructure Manager

9.5.2 First Name

Tony

9.5.3 Last Name

Goodhew

9.5.4 E-mail

tonygoodhew@logan.qld.gov.au

9.5.5 Postal Address

PO Box 3226
Logan City DC QLD 4114
Australia

9.5.6 ABN/ACN

ABN

21627796435 - LOGAN CITY COUNCIL

9.5.7 Organisation Telephone

07 3412 5367

9.5.8 Organisation E-mail

council@logan.qld.gov.au

Proposed designated proponent - Declaration

I, Tony Goodhew, 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: 18 April 2018

9.6 Is the Referring Party an Organisation or Individual?

Organisation

9.8 Organisation

9.8.1 Job Title

Senior Environment and Approvals Officer

9.8.2 First Name

Matthew

9.8.3 Last Name

Petersen

9.8.4 E-mail

matthew.petersen@loganwia.com.au

9.8.5 Postal Address

PO Box 1183
Beenleigh QLD 4207
Australia

9.8.6 ABN/ACN

ABN

21627796435 - LOGAN CITY COUNCIL

9.8.7 Organisation Telephone

07 3412 9773

9.8.8 Organisation E-mail

community@loganwia.com.au

Referring Party - Declaration

I, Matthew Petersen, 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: M. Pet Date: 17.04.18

Appendix A - Attachments

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

1. ecological_assessment_report_ls304_for_submission.compressed.pdf
2. figure_1-_proposed_alignment.jpg
3. figure_2-_the_proposed_alignment_with_associated_cadastral_boundaries.jpg
4. figure_3-proposed_alignment_relative_to_future_projects.jpg
5. figure_4_photographs_of_logan_river_riparian_crossing.pdf
6. figure_5-_soil_classification.jpg
7. figure_6-_mapped_remnant_vegetation.jpg
8. figure_7-_typical_example_of_highly_disturbed_areas.jpg
9. figure_8-_moderately_disturbed_riparian_zones.jpg
10. figure_9-_vegetated_areas_of_moderate_to_high_ecological_value.jpg
11. ls304_row.zip