

Thursday 23 May 2024

# Assessable Prospecting Operation Application Decision Briefing and Review of Environmental Factors

## Sulcor Mine Definition Drilling (in addition to APO0001578 & APO0001690) | APO0001755

<b>Decision Maker</b>	Monique Meyer
<b>Prepared by</b>	Marianne Bonnay
<b>Title</b>	ML 1470 (1992)
<b>Authorised Representative</b>	[REDACTED]
<b>Project name</b>	Sulcor Mine Definition Drilling (in addition to APO0001578 & APO0001690)
<b>Activity type</b>	Non-Complying Exploration Activity

### Issue

[REDACTED] has sought an activity approval in respect of Sulcor Mine Definition Drilling (in addition to APO0001578 & APO0001690), within ML 1470 (1992), at Sulcor located in the Attunga area, NSW.

Pursuant to section 2.8 of *State Environmental Planning Policy (Resources and Energy) 2021*, development for the purposes of exploration (i.e. prospecting) may be carried out without development consent.

An authority issued under the *Mining Act 1992* is subject to a condition that the authority holder must not carry out an assessable prospecting operation on land over which the authority is granted unless an activity approval has been obtained for the carrying out of the assessable prospecting operation.

As assessable prospecting operations require approval by the Minister under the *Mining Act 1992*, a duty is imposed on determining authorities under Part 5 of the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979* to:

- examine and take into account to the fullest extent possible all matters affecting or likely to affect the environmental by reason of the proposed activity; and
- if the activity is likely to significantly affect the environment, examine and consider an environmental impact statement in respect of the activity.

The Minister is the determining authority for all exploration activities subject to environmental assessment under Part 5 of the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979*.

The Decision Maker, under delegation from the Minister, is required to determine whether:

- the proposed activity is not likely to have a significant impact on the environment and is not likely to significantly affect threatened species, populations or ecological communities (or their habitats) or impact biodiversity values and can be approved,

- the proposed activity is likely to have a significant impact on the environment and therefore an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) is required,
- the proposed activity will be carried out in a declared area of outstanding biodiversity value and is likely to significantly affect threatened species, populations or ecological communities, or their habitats or impact biodiversity values, meaning a Species Impact Statement (SIS) and/or Biodiversity Development and Assessment Report (BDAR) is required, or
- there is insufficient information to make a decision.

---

## Background

### ML1470- LGA TAMWORTH

This exploration activity approval is being sought under ML1470 (granted 29/8/2000 & expiry 28/8/2042) to undertake assessable prospecting operations.

The current security deposit held for ML1470 is \$863,000.00.

This application forms part of the Sulcor Mine Definition Drilling program and previously approved exploration activities that form part of this program include:

1. APO0001578 for 17 drillholes approved on 8/11/2023.
2. APO0001690 for 3 drillholes and 7 access tracks approved on 13/3/2024.

---

## Proposed exploration activity

The proposed exploration activity (including details of the site, the existing environment, impact thresholds and impact management) are described in *APPLICATION TO UNDERTAKE ASSESSABLE PROSPECTING OPERATIONS Sulcor Mine Definition Drilling (in addition to APO0001578 & APO0001690)* report and the information provided in support of the application.

The objective of the proposed exploration activity is to carry out works on, or to remove samples from, land for the purpose of testing the resource quality and/or quantity of the land. This is consistent with the objects of the *Mining Act 1992*, including to facilitate the discovery and development of resources in NSW.

No alternatives options to the proposed activity were considered.

---

## Security

The application triggered a review of the assessed deposit to secure funding for the fulfilment of obligations if Sulcor Mine Definition Drilling (in addition to APO0001578 & APO0001690) is approved.

The applicant has indicated that the rehabilitation liability for the Sulcor Mine Definition Drilling (in addition to APO0001578 & APO0001690) and any outstanding rehabilitation liabilities will be covered by reassessed security for ML 1470 (1992). Please see the updated assessment.

---

## Assessment of Impacts (Non-complying exploration activity)

An assessment of the significance of environmental impacts associated with the proposed activity was undertaken in accordance with the Department of Planning and Environment's "*Guidelines for Division 5.1 assessments*". The results of this assessment are documented in the attached Review of Environmental Factors document.

The assessment has determined that the activity is not likely to significantly affect the environment, including threatened species or ecological communities (or their habitats), or declared areas of outstanding biodiversity value/critical habitat.

---

## Additional terms (if approved)

No additional terms are required.

---

## Summary

Based on the information provided in the *APPLICATION TO UNDERTAKE ASSESSABLE PROSPECTING OPERATIONS Sulcor Mine Definition Drilling (in addition to APO0001578 & APO0001690)* report, and the Review of Environmental Factors document, the proposed activity has been assessed as is not likely to have a significant impact on the environment and therefore an EIS is not required.

The application has been assessed and the recommendation is to Approve the activity.

---

## Certification

I, Marianne Bonnay, certify that I have reviewed and endorsed the contents of the attached Review of Environmental Factors document and, to the best of my knowledge, it is in accordance with the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979*, the Environmental Planning and Assessment Regulation 2021 and the Guidelines approved under clause 170 of the EP&A Regulation, and the information it contains is neither false nor misleading.

---

## Recommendation

The Decision Maker, under delegation from the Minister:

- Assesses the environmental impact of Sulcor Mine Definition Drilling (in addition to APO0001578 & APO0001690) and determines that the activity is not likely to have a significant impact on the environment and therefore an EIS is not required under Part 5 of the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979*.
  - Approve the activity pursuant to the *Mining Act 1992*.
-

## Review of Environmental Factors document

<b>Criteria</b>	Air Impacts: Air quality impacts (including impacts on nearby sensitive receptors).		
<b>Potential impacts</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- potential particulates and emissions from vehicle exhausts, plant and machinery.</li> <li>- potential wind erosion and dust from disturbed soils during construction and operations.</li> <li>- potential dust from vehicles travelling over tracks.</li> <li>- potential dust generation from operating plant and machinery.</li> </ul>		
<b>Proposed management controls</b>	<p>Exploration diamond core drilling within an existing ML with no impact to residential accommodation, tourism facility, educational establishment, childcare center, health services facility, place of public worship, animal boarding/training, establishment or intensive livestock agriculture. Dust will be minimized through use of water while drilling. Utilize established farm tracks with some grass overgrowth will minimize dust from vehicles. No gas emissions. Tracks with potential wind erosion will be sheeted with gravel where applicable. All disturbed areas will be rehabilitated as soon as reasonably practicable following surface disturbance, after completion of the drilling program for a period of 12 months.</p> <p>Water used in drilling will minimize dust. Water truck to be used to water down dusts on tracks. Minimize number of vehicles/plant/equipment to be used for activity. Vehicle/plant operation restricted to daylight hours and weekdays and Saturdays only.</p>		
<b>Duration</b>	8		
<b>Application ranking</b>	Negligible		
<b>What is the confidence in predicting impacts?</b>	High	<b>Are further studies required on impacts or mitigation?</b>	No
<b>How resilient is the environment to cope with impacts?</b>	Medium Resilience	<b>What is the level of public concern?</b>	Low
<b>Can the impacts be reversed?</b>	Yes	<b>Ranking of potential significance</b>	Low
<b>Can the impacts be mitigated?</b>	Partly	<b>Justification for ranking</b>	
<b>Do the operations comply with standards, plans, policies?</b>	Yes		
<b>Criteria</b>	Air Impacts: Greenhouse or ozone impacts.		
<b>Potential impacts</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- potential particulates and emissions from vehicle exhausts, plant and machinery.</li> <li>- potential wind erosion and dust from disturbed soils during construction and operations.</li> <li>- potential dust from vehicles travelling over tracks.</li> <li>- potential dust generation from operating plant and machinery.</li> </ul>		
<b>Proposed management controls</b>	<p>Exploration diamond core drilling within an existing ML with no impact to residential accommodation, tourism facility, educational establishment, childcare center, health services facility, place of public worship, animal boarding/training, establishment or intensive livestock agriculture. Dust will be minimized through use of water while drilling. Utilize established farm tracks with some grass overgrowth will minimize dust from vehicles. No gas emissions. Tracks with potential wind erosion will be sheeted with gravel where applicable. All disturbed areas will be rehabilitated as soon as reasonably practicable following surface disturbance, after completion of the drilling program for a period of 12 months.</p> <p>Water used in drilling will minimize dust. Water truck to be used to water down dusts on tracks. Minimize number of vehicles/plant/equipment to be used for activity. Vehicle/plant operation restricted to daylight hours and weekdays and Saturdays only.</p>		
<b>Duration</b>	8		
<b>Application ranking</b>	Negligible		
<b>What is the confidence in predicting impacts?</b>	High	<b>Are further studies required on impacts or mitigation?</b>	No
<b>How resilient is the environment to cope with impacts?</b>	Medium Resilience	<b>What is the level of public concern?</b>	Low

Can the impacts be reversed?	Yes	Ranking of potential significance	Low
Can the impacts be mitigated?	Partly	Justification for ranking	
Do the operations comply with standards, plans, policies?	Yes		
<b>Criteria</b>	Air Impacts: Additional impacts on areas with degraded air quality.		
<b>Potential impacts</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- potential particulates and emissions from vehicle exhausts, plant and machinery.</li> <li>- potential wind erosion and dust from disturbed soils during construction and operations.</li> <li>- potential dust from vehicles travelling over tracks.</li> <li>- potential dust generation from operating plant and machinery.</li> </ul>		
<b>Proposed management controls</b>	<p>Exploration diamond core drilling within an existing ML with no impact to residential accommodation, tourism facility, educational establishment, childcare center, health services facility, place of public worship, animal boarding/training, establishment or intensive livestock agriculture. Dust will be minimized through use of water while drilling. Utilize established farm tracks with some grass overgrowth will minimize dust from vehicles. No gas emissions. Tracks with potential wind erosion will be sheeted with gravel where applicable. All disturbed areas will be rehabilitated as soon as reasonably practicable following surface disturbance, after completion of the drilling program for a period of 12 months.</p> <p>Water used in drilling will minimize dust. Water truck to be used to water down dusts on tracks. Minimize number of vehicles/plant/equipment to be used for activity. Vehicle/plant operation restricted to daylight hours and weekdays and Saturdays only.</p>		
<b>Duration</b>	8		
<b>Application ranking</b>	Negligible		
What is the confidence in predicting impacts?	High	Are further studies required on impacts or mitigation?	No
How resilient is the environment to cope with impacts?	Medium Resilience	What is the level of public concern?	Low
Can the impacts be reversed?	Yes	Ranking of potential significance	Low
Can the impacts be mitigated?	Partly	Justification for ranking	
Do the operations comply with standards, plans, policies?	Yes		
<b>Criteria</b>	Water Impacts: Impacts from the use of surface or groundwater.		
<b>Potential impacts</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- excessive ground water usage (bore water) for drilling</li> <li>- negligence of water use, uncontrolled water from drilling to flowing onto land</li> <li>- water used for exploration not available for ecological, stock, domestic or irrigation purposes.</li> </ul>		
<b>Proposed management controls</b>	<p>Water source for drilling will be ground/bore water. Water will be recycled during drilling operations through the use of "above the ground" sumps. Use water truck to transport water to remote sites. Adhere to water usage regulations.</p> <p><b>Surface Water</b> Drilling will use above the ground sumps with water to be sourced from water bore. Where drill sites are located within reach of the standpipes water can be piped. Otherwise, water will be carted using a water truck. Water will be recycled via above ground sumps. Surface water from normal rain /storm will be allowed to take their normal course without impact from activity.</p> <p><b>Ground Water</b> Groundwater bore within ML will be used for drilling - have water license in place. Any access water from drillholes can potentially be capped off and piped to other drill sites for use. Holes with water will be kept open and be used for water monitoring for the ML. Wastewater to be recycled for drilling. Minimal effect from activity.</p>		
<b>Duration</b>	8		
<b>Application ranking</b>	Negligible		

What is the confidence in predicting impacts?	High	Are further studies required on impacts or mitigation?	No
How resilient is the environment to cope with impacts?	Medium Resilience	What is the level of public concern?	Medium
Can the impacts be reversed?	Uncertain	Ranking of potential significance	Low
Can the impacts be mitigated?	Partly	Justification for ranking	
Do the operations comply with standards, plans, policies?	Yes		
<b>Criteria</b>	Water Impacts: Impacts from storage of water		
<b>Potential impacts</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- excessive ground water usage (bore water) for drilling</li> <li>- negligence of water use, uncontrolled water from drilling to flowing onto land</li> <li>- water used for exploration not available for ecological, stock, domestic or irrigation purposes.</li> </ul>		
<b>Proposed management controls</b>	<p>Water source for drilling will be ground/bore water. Water will be recycled during drilling operations through the use of "above the ground" sumps. Use water truck to transport water to remote sites. Adhere to water usage regulations.</p> <p>Surface Water Drilling will use above the ground sumps with water to be sourced from water bore. Where drill sites are located within reach of the standpipes water can be piped. Otherwise, water will be carted using a water truck. Water will be recycled via above ground sumps. Surface water from normal rain /storm will be allowed to take their normal course without impact from activity.</p> <p>Ground Water Groundwater bore within ML will be used for drilling - have water license in place. Any access water from drillholes can potentially be capped off and piped to other drill sites for use. Holes with water will be kept open and be used for water monitoring for the ML. Wastewater to be recycled for drilling. Minimal effect from activity.</p>		
<b>Duration</b>	8		
<b>Application ranking</b>	Negligible		
What is the confidence in predicting impacts?	High	Are further studies required on impacts or mitigation?	No
How resilient is the environment to cope with impacts?	Medium Resilience	What is the level of public concern?	Low
Can the impacts be reversed?	Yes	Ranking of potential significance	Low
Can the impacts be mitigated?	Partly	Justification for ranking	
Do the operations comply with standards, plans, policies?	Yes		
<b>Criteria</b>	Water Impacts: Impacts from changes to natural water bodies, wetlands or runoff patterns.		
<b>Potential impacts</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- excessive ground water usage (bore water) for drilling</li> <li>- negligence of water use, uncontrolled water from drilling to flowing onto land</li> <li>- water used for exploration not available for ecological, stock, domestic or irrigation purposes.</li> </ul>		
<b>Proposed management controls</b>	<p>Water source for drilling will be ground/bore water. Water will be recycled during drilling operations through the use of "above the ground" sumps. Use water truck to transport water to remote sites. Adhere to water usage regulations.</p> <p>Surface Water Drilling will use above the ground sumps with water to be sourced from water bore. Where drill sites are located within reach of the standpipes water can be piped. Otherwise, water will be carted using a water truck. Water will be recycled via above ground sumps. Surface water from normal rain /storm will be allowed to take their normal course without impact from activity.</p>		
<b>Duration</b>	8		
<b>Application ranking</b>	Negligible		

What is the confidence in predicting impacts?	High	Are further studies required on impacts or mitigation?	No
How resilient is the environment to cope with impacts?	Medium Resilience	What is the level of public concern?	Low
Can the impacts be reversed?	Uncertain	Ranking of potential significance	Low
Can the impacts be mitigated?	Partly	Justification for ranking	
Do the operations comply with standards, plans, policies?	Yes		
<b>Criteria</b>	Water Impacts: Impacts from aquifer interference, including changes to inter-aquifer connectivity.		
<b>Potential impacts</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- excessive ground water usage (bore water) for drilling</li> <li>- negligence of water use, uncontrolled water from drilling to flowing onto land</li> <li>- water used for exploration not available for ecological, stock, domestic or irrigation purposes.</li> </ul>		
<b>Proposed management controls</b>	<p>Water source for drilling will be ground/bore water. Water will be recycled during drilling operations through the use of "above the ground" sumps. Use water truck to transport water to remote sites. Adhere to water usage regulations.</p> <p>Ground Water Groundwater bore within ML will be used for drilling - have water license in place. Any access water from drillholes can potentially be capped off and piped to other drill sites for use. Holes with water will be kept open and be used for water monitoring for the ML. Wastewater to be recycled for drilling. Minimal effect from activity.</p>		
<b>Duration</b>	8		
<b>Application ranking</b>	Negligible		
What is the confidence in predicting impacts?	High	Are further studies required on impacts or mitigation?	No
How resilient is the environment to cope with impacts?	Medium Resilience	What is the level of public concern?	Low
Can the impacts be reversed?	Uncertain	Ranking of potential significance	Low
Can the impacts be mitigated?	Partly	Justification for ranking	
Do the operations comply with standards, plans, policies?	Yes		
<b>Criteria</b>	Water Impacts: Impacts from changes to flooding or tidal regimes.		
<b>Potential impacts</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- excessive ground water usage (bore water) for drilling</li> <li>- negligence of water use, uncontrolled water from drilling to flowing onto land</li> <li>- water used for exploration not available for ecological, stock, domestic or irrigation purposes.</li> </ul>		
<b>Proposed management controls</b>	<p>Water source for drilling will be ground/bore water. Water will be recycled during drilling operations through the use of "above the ground" sumps. Use water truck to transport water to remote sites. Adhere to water usage regulations.</p> <p>Surface Water Drilling will use above the ground sumps with water to be sourced from water bore. Where drill sites are located within reach of the standpipes water can be piped. Otherwise, water will be carted using a water truck. Water will be recycled via above ground sumps. Surface water from normal rain /storm will be allowed to take their normal course without impact from activity.</p> <p>Ground Water Groundwater bore within ML will be used for drilling - have water license in place. Any access water from drillholes can potentially be capped off and piped to other drill sites for use. Holes with water will be kept open and be used for water monitoring for the ML. Wastewater to be recycled for drilling. Minimal effect from activity.</p>		
<b>Duration</b>	8		
<b>Application ranking</b>	Positive		

What is the confidence in predicting impacts?	High	Are further studies required on impacts or mitigation?	No
How resilient is the environment to cope with impacts?	Medium Resilience	What is the level of public concern?	Medium
Can the impacts be reversed?	Yes	Ranking of potential significance	Low
Can the impacts be mitigated?	Partly	Justification for ranking	
Do the operations comply with standards, plans, policies?	Yes		
<b>Criteria</b>	Water Impacts: Impacts from changes in surface or groundwater quality and quantity.		
<b>Potential impacts</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- excessive ground water usage (bore water) for drilling</li> <li>- negligence of water use, uncontrolled water from drilling to flowing onto land</li> <li>- water used for exploration not available for ecological, stock, domestic or irrigation purposes.</li> </ul>		
<b>Proposed management controls</b>	<p>Water source for drilling will be ground/bore water. Water will be recycled during drilling operations through the use of "above the ground" sumps. Use water truck to transport water to remote sites. Adhere to water usage regulations.</p> <p>Surface Water Drilling will use above the ground sumps with water to be sourced from water bore. Where drill sites are located within reach of the standpipes water can be piped. Otherwise, water will be carted using a water truck. Water will be recycled via above ground sumps. Surface water from normal rain /storm will be allowed to take their normal course without impact from activity.</p> <p>Ground Water Groundwater bore within ML will be used for drilling - have water license in place. Any access water from drillholes can potentially be capped off and piped to other drill sites for use. Holes with water will be kept open and be used for water monitoring for the ML. Wastewater to be recycled for drilling. Minimal effect from activity.</p>		
<b>Duration</b>	8		
<b>Application ranking</b>	Negligible		
What is the confidence in predicting impacts?	High	Are further studies required on impacts or mitigation?	No
How resilient is the environment to cope with impacts?	High Resilience	What is the level of public concern?	Medium
Can the impacts be reversed?	Uncertain	Ranking of potential significance	Low
Can the impacts be mitigated?	Partly	Justification for ranking	
Do the operations comply with standards, plans, policies?	Yes		
<b>Criteria</b>	Soil & Stability Impacts: Degradation of soil quality (including contamination, salinisation or acidification).		
<b>Potential impacts</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- potential soil erosion and sediment laden runoff from disturbed areas/areas where vegetation has been removed.</li> <li>- inappropriate disposal of drilling wastes overflow from drilling sumps.</li> <li>- activities on erosion prone areas and/or steeper slopes.</li> </ul>		



<b>Proposed management controls</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- access tracks will be mostly established farm and previous exploration tracks.</li> <li>- avoid excessive disturbances of these established tracks, unless for safety reasons, grass and soil must not be completely removed, if removed must be reinstalled as soon as practicable</li> <li>- disturbances for drill pads will be minimized as much as possible and any disturbance be done in accordance with the exploration-code-of-practice rehabilitation.</li> <li>- above the ground sumps to be used for drilling.</li> <li>- drilling fluid, cuttings / waste to be contained in sumps - waste disposed of appropriately.</li> <li>- drilling activity will be restricted to flat and gentle sloping areas, and within ML</li> <li>- minimal potential for sediment and erosion</li> <li>- where inevitable, must be managed in accordance with guidelin-eserosion-sediment control-building-sites.</li> </ul> <p>SOIL/TOPO Land Soil Capability 3 and 7 No acid sulfate soils or potential acid sulfate soils. Soils generally not amenable to erosion and dispersion - rocky, grass cover. Existing tracks fairly compacted from previous activity in the area. Overall, area of activity seems to have well compacted soils. Low relief generally Highest elevation of drilling 690m Lowest elevation of drilling 470 Mostly grassed in lower areas and sparsely vegetated Denser areas are sparse secondary growth, mainly in rocky limestone areas.</p>		
<b>Duration</b>	8		
<b>Application ranking</b>	Negligible		
<b>What is the confidence in predicting impacts?</b>	High	<b>Are further studies required on impacts or mitigation?</b>	No
<b>How resilient is the environment to cope with impacts?</b>	Medium Resilience	<b>What is the level of public concern?</b>	Low
<b>Can the impacts be reversed?</b>	Yes	<b>Ranking of potential significance</b>	Low
<b>Can the impacts be mitigated?</b>	Partly	<b>Justification for ranking</b>	
<b>Do the operations comply with standards, plans, policies?</b>	Yes		
<b>Criteria</b>	Soil & Stability Impacts: Impacts on land with high agricultural capability.		
<b>Potential impacts</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- potential soil erosion and sediment laden runoff from disturbed areas/areas where vegetation has been removed.</li> <li>- inappropriate disposal of drilling wastes overflow from drilling sumps.</li> <li>- activities on erosion prone areas and/or steeper slopes.</li> </ul>		
<b>Proposed management controls</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- access tracks will be mostly established farm and previous exploration tracks.</li> <li>- avoid excessive disturbances of these established tracks, unless for safety reasons, grass and soil must not be completely removed, if removed must be reinstalled as soon as practicable</li> <li>- disturbances for drill pads will be minimized as much as possible and any disturbance be done in accordance with the exploration-code-of-practice rehabilitation.</li> <li>- above the ground sumps to be used for drilling.</li> <li>- drilling fluid, cuttings / waste to be contained in sumps - waste disposed of appropriately.</li> <li>- drilling activity will be restricted to flat and gentle sloping areas, and within ML</li> <li>- minimal potential for sediment and erosion</li> <li>- where inevitable, must be managed in accordance with guidelin-eserosion-sediment control-building-sites.</li> </ul> <p>AIS Level 1 reviewed by RR. No issues detected.</p>		
<b>Duration</b>	8		
<b>Application ranking</b>	Negligible		
<b>What is the confidence in predicting impacts?</b>	High	<b>Are further studies required on impacts or mitigation?</b>	No

How resilient is the environment to cope with impacts?	Medium Resilience	What is the level of public concern?	Low
Can the impacts be reversed?	Uncertain	Ranking of potential significance	Low
Can the impacts be mitigated?	Partly	Justification for ranking	
Do the operations comply with standards, plans, policies?	Yes		
<b>Criteria</b>	Soil & Stability Impacts: Loss of soil from wind or water erosion.		
<b>Potential impacts</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- potential soil erosion and sediment laden runoff from disturbed areas/areas where vegetation has been removed.</li> <li>- inappropriate disposal of drilling wastes overflow from drilling sumps.</li> <li>- activities on erosion prone areas and/or steeper slopes.</li> </ul>		
<b>Proposed management controls</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- access tracks will be mostly established farm and previous exploration tracks.</li> <li>- avoid excessive disturbances of these established tracks, unless for safety reasons, grass and soil must not be completely removed, if removed must be reinstalled as soon as practicable</li> <li>- disturbances for drill pads will be minimized as much as possible and any disturbance be done in accordance with the exploration-code-of-practice rehabilitation.</li> <li>- above the ground sumps to be used for drilling.</li> <li>- drilling fluid, cuttings / waste to be contained in sumps - waste disposed of appropriately.</li> <li>- drilling activity will be restricted to flat and gentle sloping areas, and within ML</li> <li>- minimal potential for sediment and erosion</li> <li>- where inevitable, must be managed in accordance with guidelin-eserosion-sediment control-building-sites.</li> </ul> <p>SOIL/TOPO Land Soil Capability 3 and 7 No acid sulfate soils or potential acid sulfate soils. Soils generally not amenable to erosion and dispersion - rocky, grass cover. Existing tracks fairly compacted from previous activity in the area. Overall, area of activity seems to have well compacted soils. Low relief generally Highest elevation of drilling 690m Lowest elevation of drilling 470 Mostly grassed in lower areas and sparsely vegetated Denser areas are sparse secondary growth, mainly in rocky limestone areas.</p>		
<b>Duration</b>	8		
<b>Application ranking</b>	Negligible		
What is the confidence in predicting impacts?	High	Are further studies required on impacts or mitigation?	No
How resilient is the environment to cope with impacts?	Medium Resilience	What is the level of public concern?	Low
Can the impacts be reversed?	No	Ranking of potential significance	Low
Can the impacts be mitigated?	Partly	Justification for ranking	
Do the operations comply with standards, plans, policies?	Yes		
<b>Criteria</b>	Soil & Stability Impacts: Loss of structural integrity of the soil.		
<b>Potential impacts</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- potential soil erosion and sediment laden runoff from disturbed areas/areas where vegetation has been removed.</li> <li>- inappropriate disposal of drilling wastes overflow from drilling sumps.</li> <li>- activities on erosion prone areas and/or steeper slopes.</li> </ul>		

<b>Proposed management controls</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- access tracks will be mostly established farm and previous exploration tracks.</li> <li>- avoid excessive disturbances of these established tracks, unless for safety reasons, grass and soil must not be completely removed, if removed must be reinstalled as soon as practicable</li> <li>- disturbances for drill pads will be minimized as much as possible and any disturbance be done in accordance with the exploration-code-of-practice rehabilitation.</li> <li>- above the ground sumps to be used for drilling.</li> <li>- drilling fluid, cuttings / waste to be contained in sumps - waste disposed of appropriately.</li> <li>- drilling activity will be restricted to flat and gentle sloping areas, and within ML</li> <li>- minimal potential for sediment and erosion</li> <li>- where inevitable, must be managed in accordance with guidelines-erosion-sediment control-building-sites.</li> </ul> <p>SOIL/TOPO Land Soil Capability 3 and 7 No acid sulfate soils or potential acid sulfate soils. Soils generally not amenable to erosion and dispersion - rocky, grass cover. Existing tracks fairly compacted from previous activity in the area. Overall, area of activity seems to have well compacted soils. Low relief generally Highest elevation of drilling 690m Lowest elevation of drilling 470 Mostly grassed in lower areas and sparsely vegetated Denser areas are sparse secondary growth, mainly in rocky limestone areas.</p>		
<b>Duration</b>	8		
<b>Application ranking</b>	Negligible		
<b>What is the confidence in predicting impacts?</b>	High	<b>Are further studies required on impacts or mitigation?</b>	No
<b>How resilient is the environment to cope with impacts?</b>	Medium Resilience	<b>What is the level of public concern?</b>	Low
<b>Can the impacts be reversed?</b>	Uncertain	<b>Ranking of potential significance</b>	Low
<b>Can the impacts be mitigated?</b>	Partly	<b>Justification for ranking</b>	
<b>Do the operations comply with standards, plans, policies?</b>	Yes		
<b>Criteria</b>	Soil & Stability Impacts: Increased land instability with high risks from land slides or subsidence.		
<b>Potential impacts</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- potential soil erosion and sediment laden runoff from disturbed areas/areas where vegetation has been removed.</li> <li>- inappropriate disposal of drilling wastes overflow from drilling sumps.</li> <li>- activities on erosion prone areas and/or steeper slopes.</li> </ul>		
<b>Proposed management controls</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- access tracks will be mostly established farm and previous exploration tracks.</li> <li>- avoid excessive disturbances of these established tracks, unless for safety reasons, grass and soil must not be completely removed, if removed must be reinstalled as soon as practicable</li> <li>- disturbances for drill pads will be minimized as much as possible and any disturbance be done in accordance with the exploration-code-of-practice rehabilitation.</li> <li>- above the ground sumps to be used for drilling.</li> <li>- drilling fluid, cuttings / waste to be contained in sumps - waste disposed of appropriately.</li> <li>- drilling activity will be restricted to flat and gentle sloping areas, and within ML</li> <li>- minimal potential for sediment and erosion</li> <li>- where inevitable, must be managed in accordance with guidelin-eserosion-sediment control-building-sites.</li> </ul> <p>SOIL/TOPO Land Soil Capability 3 and 7 No acid sulfate soils or potential acid sulfate soils. Soils generally not amenable to erosion and dispersion - rocky, grass cover. Existing tracks fairly compacted from previous activity in the area. Overall, area of activity seems to have well compacted soils. Low relief generally Highest elevation of drilling 690m Lowest elevation of drilling 470 Mostly grassed in lower areas and sparsely vegetated Denser areas are sparse secondary growth, mainly in rocky limestone areas.</p>		

<b>Duration</b>	8		
<b>Application ranking</b>	Negligible		
<b>What is the confidence in predicting impacts?</b>	High	<b>Are further studies required on impacts or mitigation?</b>	No
<b>How resilient is the environment to cope with impacts?</b>	Medium Resilience	<b>What is the level of public concern?</b>	Low
<b>Can the impacts be reversed?</b>	No	<b>Ranking of potential significance</b>	Low
<b>Can the impacts be mitigated?</b>	Partly	<b>Justification for ranking</b>	
<b>Do the operations comply with standards, plans, policies?</b>	Yes		
<b>Criteria</b>	Noise & Vibration Impacts: Results in increased noise or vibration.		
<b>Potential impacts</b>	-noise from vehicles, drilling rigs, plant and machinery impacting on nearby sensitive receivers, such as residences, educational establishments, medical facilities, places of worship, animal boarding/training establishments, intensive livestock agriculture, etc.		
<b>Proposed management controls</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- minimize noise in accordance with POEO (Noise Control) Regulation 2017 &amp; Protection of the Environment Operations Act 1997 (POEO Act).</li> <li>- drilling to be restricted to weekdays and daylight hours only.</li> <li>- no drilling on or near places of Aboriginal/Local European heritage significance.</li> <li>- undertake noise monitoring as part of the program and report findings to authorities/council where appropriate.</li> </ul> <p>TIMING-NOISE Standard Business hours (7AM to 6PM weekdays, 8AM to 1PM Saturdays, no work Sundays and public holidays) May 2024 to 2 May 2025 Activity will take place more than 1000m away from sensitive receivers. Drilling (and associated earthworks) to be done only from Monday to Saturday to be compliant to the site DA. No work on Sundays.</p>		
<b>Duration</b>	8		
<b>Application ranking</b>	Negligible		
<b>What is the confidence in predicting impacts?</b>	High	<b>Are further studies required on impacts or mitigation?</b>	No
<b>How resilient is the environment to cope with impacts?</b>	LowResilience	<b>What is the level of public concern?</b>	Medium
<b>Can the impacts be reversed?</b>	Yes	<b>Ranking of potential significance</b>	Medium
<b>Can the impacts be mitigated?</b>	Partly	<b>Justification for ranking</b>	
<b>Do the operations comply with standards, plans, policies?</b>	Yes	Complaints from community	
<b>Criteria</b>	Noise & Vibration Impacts: Affects sensitive receptors.		
<b>Potential impacts</b>	-noise from vehicles, drilling rigs, plant and machinery impacting on nearby sensitive receivers, such as residences, educational establishments, medical facilities, places of worship, animal boarding/training establishments, intensive livestock agriculture, etc.		
<b>Proposed management controls</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- minimize noise in accordance with POEO (Noise Control) Regulation 2017 &amp; Protection of the Environment Operations Act 1997 (POEO Act).</li> <li>- drilling to be restricted to weekdays and daylight hours only.</li> <li>- no drilling on or near places of Aboriginal/Local European heritage significance.</li> <li>- undertake noise monitoring as part of the program and report findings to authorities/council where appropriate.</li> </ul> <p>TIMING-NOISE Standard Business hours (7AM to 6PM weekdays, 8AM to 1PM Saturdays, no work Sundays and public holidays) May 2024 to 2 May 2025 Activity will take place more than 1000m away from sensitive receivers. Drilling (and associated earthworks) to be done only from Monday to Saturday to be compliant to the site DA. No work on Sundays.</p>		
<b>Duration</b>	8		

<b>Application ranking</b>	Negligible		
What is the confidence in predicting impacts?	High	Are further studies required on impacts or mitigation?	No
How resilient is the environment to cope with impacts?	LowResilience	What is the level of public concern?	Medium
Can the impacts be reversed?	Yes	Ranking of potential significance	Medium
Can the impacts be mitigated?	Partly	<b>Justification for ranking</b>	
Do the operations comply with standards, plans, policies?	Yes	Complaints from community.	
<b>Criteria</b>	Coastal Location & Processes: Affects coastal processes and coastal hazards, including those under projected climate change conditions.		
<b>Potential impacts</b>	Site not a coastal environment		
<b>Proposed management controls</b>	Site not a coastal environment		
<b>Duration</b>	8		
<b>Application ranking</b>	Positive		
What is the confidence in predicting impacts?	N/A	Are further studies required on impacts or mitigation?	N/A
How resilient is the environment to cope with impacts?	N/A	What is the level of public concern?	N/A
Can the impacts be reversed?	N/A	Ranking of potential significance	Low
Can the impacts be mitigated?	N/A	<b>Justification for ranking</b>	
Do the operations comply with standards, plans, policies?	N/A		
<b>Criteria</b>	Hazardous substances or chemicals: Impacts associated with the use, generation, storage or transport of hazardous substances or chemicals.		
<b>Potential impacts</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- mobilization of pollutants (such as hydrocarbons) in soils or waters.</li> <li>- inappropriate disposal of drilling wastes/overflow from drilling sumps.</li> <li>- use of non-environmentally friendly materials for drilling</li> </ul>		
<b>Proposed management controls</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- only water and bio-degradable chemicals to be used for drilling.</li> <li>- all chemicals and water to be contained in above the ground sumps during drilling.</li> <li>- any spillages must be cleaned ASAP.</li> <li>- adhere to site MSDS for bringing chemicals onto site - harmful chemicals not allowed on site</li> </ul> <p>CHEMICAL Drilling muds are all biodegradable. Chemicals or hydrocarbon spillages will be maintained under company (Graymont) HSE procedures. Any major spillages (if occur) will be reported and managed accordingly by company and following regulator's guidelines (Exploration Code of Conduct). Other chemicals (oils, lubricants, grease etc) will be contained and their use will be strictly as per MSDS. Drillers have spill kits onsite with them.</p>		
<b>Duration</b>	8		
<b>Application ranking</b>	Negligible		
What is the confidence in predicting impacts?	High	Are further studies required on impacts or mitigation?	No
How resilient is the environment to cope with impacts?	Medium Resilience	What is the level of public concern?	Low
Can the impacts be reversed?	Yes	Ranking of potential significance	Medium
Can the impacts be mitigated?	Partly	<b>Justification for ranking</b>	

<b>Do the operations comply with standards, plans, policies?</b>	Yes	Pollute the surface water.	
<b>Criteria</b>	Wastes & Emissions: Impacts to the environment resulting from the generation or disposal of wastes.		
<b>Potential impacts</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- mobilization of pollutants (such as hydrocarbons) in soils, air or waters.</li> <li>- inappropriate disposal of drilling wastes / overflow from drilling sumps.</li> <li>- excessive use of exhaust gas from machines</li> </ul>		
<b>Proposed management controls</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- drilling wastes to be contained - water and chemicals in sumps.</li> <li>- oils and fuels spillages to be contained in accordance with Graymont and NSW standards for handling hydrocarbon spillages.</li> <li>- dispose of drilling waste appropriately.</li> <li>- only drilling activities allowed on site</li> </ul> <p>WASTE Water to be recycled. Drill holes to be backfilled with drill cuttings. Access cuttings to be used as rehab materials or disposed of in the right placed designated by the local council. Plan to have as little to no waste as possible. Any hazardous waste, restricted wastes or special wastes, will be disposed of appropriately offsite.</p>		
<b>Duration</b>	8		
<b>Application ranking</b>	Negligible		
<b>What is the confidence in predicting impacts?</b>	High	<b>Are further studies required on impacts or mitigation?</b>	No
<b>How resilient is the environment to cope with impacts?</b>	LowResilience	<b>What is the level of public concern?</b>	Medium
<b>Can the impacts be reversed?</b>	Uncertain	<b>Ranking of potential significance</b>	Low
<b>Can the impacts be mitigated?</b>	Partly	<b>Justification for ranking</b>	
<b>Do the operations comply with standards, plans, policies?</b>	Yes		
<b>Criteria</b>	Wastes & Emissions: Impacts on drinking water catchments, wetlands, natural water bodies, riparian zones or flood prone areas.		
<b>Potential impacts</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- groundwater recharge areas or areas with high water table</li> <li>- areas with acid sulfate, sodic or highly permeable soils</li> <li>- areas with salinity or potential salinity problems</li> <li>- areas with degraded or contaminated land, and</li> <li>- areas with degraded or contaminated water (ground or surface).</li> </ul>		
<b>Proposed management controls</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- drilling wastes to be contained - water and chemicals in sumps.</li> <li>- oils and fuels spillages to be contained in accordance with Graymont and NSW standards for handling hydrocarbon spillages.</li> <li>- dispose of drilling waste appropriately.</li> <li>- only drilling activities allowed on site</li> </ul> <p>WASTE Water to be recycled. Drill holes to be backfilled with drill cuttings. Access cuttings to be used as rehab materials or disposed of in the right placed designated by the local council. Plan to have as little to no waste as possible. Any hazardous waste, restricted wastes or special wastes, will be disposed of appropriately offsite.</p>		
<b>Duration</b>	8		
<b>Application ranking</b>	Negligible		
<b>What is the confidence in predicting impacts?</b>	High	<b>Are further studies required on impacts or mitigation?</b>	No
<b>How resilient is the environment to cope with impacts?</b>	LowResilience	<b>What is the level of public concern?</b>	Low
<b>Can the impacts be reversed?</b>	Uncertain	<b>Ranking of potential significance</b>	Low
<b>Can the impacts be mitigated?</b>	Partly	<b>Justification for ranking</b>	
<b>Do the operations comply with standards, plans, policies?</b>	Yes		

<b>Criteria</b>	Wastes & Emissions: Impacts on groundwater recharge areas or areas with high water table.		
<b>Potential impacts</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- groundwater recharge areas or areas with high water table</li> <li>- areas with acid sulfate, sodic or highly permeable soils</li> <li>- areas with salinity or potential salinity problems</li> <li>- areas with degraded or contaminated land, and</li> <li>- areas with degraded or contaminated water (ground or surface).</li> </ul>		
<b>Proposed management controls</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- drilling wastes to be contained - water and chemicals in sumps.</li> <li>- oils and fuels spillages to be contained in accordance with Graymont and NSW standards for handling hydrocarbon spillages.</li> <li>- dispose of drilling waste appropriately.</li> <li>- only drilling activities allowed on site</li> </ul> <p>Ground Water Groundwater bore within ML will be used for drilling - have water license in place. Any access water from drillholes can potentially be capped off and piped to other drill sites for use. Holes with water will be kept open and be used for water monitoring for the ML. Wastewater to be recycled for drilling. Minimal effect from activity.</p>		
<b>Duration</b>	8		
<b>Application ranking</b>	Negligible		
<b>What is the confidence in predicting impacts?</b>	High	<b>Are further studies required on impacts or mitigation?</b>	No
<b>How resilient is the environment to cope with impacts?</b>	Medium Resilience	<b>What is the level of public concern?</b>	Low
<b>Can the impacts be reversed?</b>	Uncertain	<b>Ranking of potential significance</b>	Low
<b>Can the impacts be mitigated?</b>	Partly	<b>Justification for ranking</b>	
<b>Do the operations comply with standards, plans, policies?</b>	Yes		
<b>Criteria</b>	Wastes and Emissions: Impacts on coastlines or dunes, alpine areas, karst features or other unique landforms.		
<b>Potential impacts</b>	N/A		
<b>Proposed management controls</b>	N/A		
<b>Duration</b>	N/A		
<b>Application ranking</b>	N/A		
<b>What is the confidence in predicting impacts?</b>	N/A	<b>Are further studies required on impacts or mitigation?</b>	N/A
<b>How resilient is the environment to cope with impacts?</b>	N/A	<b>What is the level of public concern?</b>	N/A
<b>Can the impacts be reversed?</b>	N/A	<b>Ranking of potential significance</b>	N/A
<b>Can the impacts be mitigated?</b>	N/A	<b>Justification for ranking</b>	
<b>Do the operations comply with standards, plans, policies?</b>	N/A		
<b>Criteria</b>	Wastes & Emissions: Impacts on erosion prone areas, areas with slopes of greater than 18 degrees.		
<b>Potential impacts</b>	<p>N/A</p> <p>NOTE: Low relief generally Highest elevation of drilling 690m Lowest elevation of drilling 470</p>		
<b>Proposed management controls</b>	N/A		
<b>Duration</b>	N/A		
<b>Application ranking</b>	N/A		

What is the confidence in predicting impacts?	N/A	Are further studies required on impacts or mitigation?	N/A
How resilient is the environment to cope with impacts?	N/A	What is the level of public concern?	Low
Can the impacts be reversed?	N/A	Ranking of potential significance	N/A
Can the impacts be mitigated?	N/A	Justification for ranking	
Do the operations comply with standards, plans, policies?	N/A		
<b>Criteria</b>	Wastes & Emissions: Impacts on subsidence or slip areas.		
<b>Potential impacts</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- groundwater recharge areas or areas with high water table</li> <li>- areas with acid sulfate, sodic or highly permeable soils</li> <li>- areas with salinity or potential salinity problems</li> <li>- areas with degraded or contaminated land, and</li> <li>- areas with degraded or contaminated water (ground or surface).</li> </ul>		
<b>Proposed management controls</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- drilling wastes to be contained - water and chemicals in sumps.</li> <li>- oils and fuels spillages to be contained in accordance with Graymont and NSW standards for handling hydrocarbon spillages.</li> <li>- dispose of drilling waste appropriately.</li> <li>- only drilling activities allowed on site</li> </ul> <p>Low relief generally  Highest elevation of drilling 690m  Lowest elevation of drilling 470  Mostly grassed in lower areas and sparsely vegetated  Denser areas are sparse secondary growth, mainly in rocky limestone areas.</p>		
<b>Duration</b>	8		
<b>Application ranking</b>	Negligible		
What is the confidence in predicting impacts?	High	Are further studies required on impacts or mitigation?	N/A
How resilient is the environment to cope with impacts?	Medium Resilience	What is the level of public concern?	Low
Can the impacts be reversed?	No	Ranking of potential significance	Low
Can the impacts be mitigated?	Partly	Justification for ranking	
Do the operations comply with standards, plans, policies?	N/A		
<b>Criteria</b>	Wastes & Emissions: Impacts on areas with acid sulphate, sodic or highly permeable soils.		
<b>Potential impacts</b>	SOIL Land Soil Capability 3 and 7 No acid sulfate soils or potential acid sulfate soils. Soils generally not amenable to erosion and dispersion - rocky, grass cover. Existing tracks fairly compacted from previous activity in the area. Overall, area of activity seems to have well compacted soils.		
<b>Proposed management controls</b>			
<b>Duration</b>	8		
<b>Application ranking</b>			
What is the confidence in predicting impacts?	High	Are further studies required on impacts or mitigation?	N/A
How resilient is the environment to cope with impacts?	Medium Resilience	What is the level of public concern?	Low



Can the impacts be reversed?	Uncertain	Ranking of potential significance	Low
Can the impacts be mitigated?	Partly	Justification for ranking	
Do the operations comply with standards, plans, policies?	Yes		
<b>Criteria</b>	Wastes & Emissions: Impacts on areas with salinity or potential salinity problems.		
<b>Potential impacts</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- groundwater recharge areas or areas with high water table</li> <li>- areas with acid sulfate, sodic or highly permeable soils</li> <li>- areas with salinity or potential salinity problems</li> <li>- areas with degraded or contaminated land, and</li> <li>- areas with degraded or contaminated water (ground or surface).</li> </ul>		
<b>Proposed management controls</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- drilling wastes to be contained - water and chemicals in sumps.</li> <li>- oils and fuels spillages to be contained in accordance with Graymont and NSW standards for handling hydrocarbon spillages.</li> <li>- dispose of drilling waste appropriately.</li> <li>- only drilling activities allowed on site</li> </ul> <p>SOIL/TOPO Land Soil Capability 3 and 7 No acid sulfate soils or potential acid sulfate soils. Soils generally not amenable to erosion and dispersion - rocky, grass cover. Existing tracks fairly compacted from previous activity in the area. Overall, area of activity seems to have well compacted soils.</p>		
<b>Duration</b>	8		
<b>Application ranking</b>	Negligible		
What is the confidence in predicting impacts?	High	Are further studies required on impacts or mitigation?	N/A
How resilient is the environment to cope with impacts?	Medium Resilience	What is the level of public concern?	Low
Can the impacts be reversed?	Uncertain	Ranking of potential significance	Low
Can the impacts be mitigated?	Partly	Justification for ranking	
Do the operations comply with standards, plans, policies?	Yes		
<b>Criteria</b>	Wastes & Emissions: Impacts on areas with degraded or contaminated land.		
<b>Potential impacts</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- groundwater recharge areas or areas with high water table</li> <li>- areas with acid sulfate, sodic or highly permeable soils</li> <li>- areas with salinity or potential salinity problems</li> <li>- areas with degraded or contaminated land, and</li> <li>- areas with degraded or contaminated water (ground or surface).</li> </ul>		
<b>Proposed management controls</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- drilling wastes to be contained - water and chemicals in sumps.</li> <li>- oils and fuels spillages to be contained in accordance with Graymont and NSW standards for handling hydrocarbon spillages.</li> <li>- dispose of drilling waste appropriately.</li> <li>- only drilling activities allowed on site</li> </ul> <p>SOIL/TOPO Land Soil Capability 3 and 7 No acid sulfate soils or potential acid sulfate soils. Soils generally not amenable to erosion and dispersion - rocky, grass cover. Existing tracks fairly compacted from previous activity in the area. Overall, area of activity seems to have well compacted soils.</p> <p>LANDUSE Activity area within ML. No existing crop farming. No intense animal grazing in the area. No changes (temporary or otherwise) to the current land use/s during the activity.</p>		
<b>Duration</b>	8		
<b>Application ranking</b>	Negligible		

What is the confidence in predicting impacts?	High	Are further studies required on impacts or mitigation?	N/A
How resilient is the environment to cope with impacts?	Medium Resilience	What is the level of public concern?	Low
Can the impacts be reversed?	Uncertain	Ranking of potential significance	Low
Can the impacts be mitigated?	Partly	Justification for ranking	
Do the operations comply with standards, plans, policies?	Yes		
<b>Criteria</b>	Wastes & Emissions: Impacts on areas with degraded or contaminated water (ground or surface).		
<b>Potential impacts</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- groundwater recharge areas or areas with high water table</li> <li>- areas with acid sulfate, sodic or highly permeable soils</li> <li>- areas with salinity or potential salinity problems</li> <li>- areas with degraded or contaminated land, and</li> <li>- areas with degraded or contaminated water (ground or surface).</li> </ul>		
<b>Proposed management controls</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- drilling wastes to be contained - water and chemicals in sumps.</li> <li>- oils and fuels spillages to be contained in accordance with Graymont and NSW standards for handling hydrocarbon spillages.</li> <li>- dispose of drilling waste appropriately.</li> <li>- only drilling activities allowed on site</li> </ul> <p>Surface Water Drilling will use above the ground sumps with water to be sourced from water bore. Where drill sites are located within reach of the standpipes water can be piped. Otherwise, water will be carted using a water truck. Water will be recycled via above ground sumps. Surface water from normal rain /storm will be allowed to take their normal course without impact from activity.</p> <p>Ground Water Groundwater bore within ML will be used for drilling - have water license in place. Any access water from drillholes can potentially be capped off and piped to other drill sites for use. Holes with water will be kept open and be used for water monitoring for the ML. Wastewater to be recycled for drilling. Minimal effect from activity.</p>		
<b>Duration</b>	8		
<b>Application ranking</b>	Negligible		
What is the confidence in predicting impacts?	High	Are further studies required on impacts or mitigation?	No
How resilient is the environment to cope with impacts?	Medium Resilience	What is the level of public concern?	Medium
Can the impacts be reversed?	Uncertain	Ranking of potential significance	Low
Can the impacts be mitigated?	Partly	Justification for ranking	
Do the operations comply with standards, plans, policies?	Yes		
<b>Criteria</b>	Vegetation: Any clearing or modification of vegetation (including impacts on wildlife corridors, remnant vegetation & habitat for species of conservation significance).		
<b>Potential impacts</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- the status of the species or vegetation community affected (e.g. vegetation of conservation significance, threatened species or ecological community)</li> <li>- whether the vegetation provides habitat for native species, including threatened species (e.g. hollow bearing trees, critical food resources, roosting sites, etc)</li> <li>- the nature and extent of vegetation clearing</li> <li>- the condition and size of the vegetated area to be cleared or modified</li> <li>- the likely response of the species or vegetation community to the disturbance proposed</li> </ul>		

<b>Proposed management controls</b>	<p>- minimize vegetation clearing to as little as possible by using farm tracks and previous exploration tracks and sites.</p> <p>- no known threatened species.</p> <p>-minimal drill pad ground disturbance and land clearance.</p> <p>- generally, grass and shrub vegetation, not many huge trees.</p> <p>- no big trees will be felled, and no major vegetation clearing to be done</p> <p>DISTURBANCE  Surface 1,190 sqm  Excavation 129cb  12 EAs with ROCCs  10 access tracks either new tracks outside TEC or established track within TEC.  Rehabilitation management plan provided (RMP).  Tamworth Regional Local Environment _Plan provided.</p> <p>BCS recommendation -26/2/24  PCT 547 Wild Quince - Mock Olive - Rusty Fig - Iamboto - Sweet Pittosporum dry rainforest of rocky and scree areas of the Nandewar Bioregion and New England Tableland Bioregion- This PCT is associated with the TEC Semi-evergreen Vine Thicket in the Brigalow Belt South and Nandewar Bioregions. BCS would recommend that this TEC be avoided wherever possible. If the TEC can't be fully avoided BCS would recommend that existing tracks be used wherever possible and that upgrading of these tracks be minimised to avoid further impact to the TEC. Where required, new tracks should avoid the TEC wherever possible.  TH COMMITMENTS- TH has committed to use old and existing tracks within TEC and upgrade these tracks if needed. All new tracks are avoiding TEC. Stay within existing tracks, grass to be not completely removed, no trees to be cut/felled, do not interfere with animals in area, do not interfere with nests etc., flag areas that will potentially be out of bounds regarding TECs.  MITIGATION: Test/Assessment of significance completed. Refer to attached Assessment of Significance Report dated 12/04/2024 (Sulcor Limestone Quarry, Biodiversity Technical Memo).</p>		
<b>Duration</b>	8		
<b>Application ranking</b>	Negligible		
<b>What is the confidence in predicting impacts?</b>	High	<b>Are further studies required on impacts or mitigation?</b>	No
<b>How resilient is the environment to cope with impacts?</b>	LowResilience	<b>What is the level of public concern?</b>	Medium
<b>Can the impacts be reversed?</b>	Uncertain	<b>Ranking of potential significance</b>	Medium
<b>Can the impacts be mitigated?</b>	Partly	<b>Justification for ranking</b>	
<b>Do the operations comply with standards, plans, policies?</b>	Yes	Impact on TEC- Test/Assessment of significance completed. Refer to attached Assessment of Significance Report dated 12/04/2024 (Sulcor Limestone Quarry, Biodiversity Technical Memo).	
<b>Criteria</b>	Threatened Fauna Species: Any adverse effect on the life cycle of any threatened species such that a viable local population of the species is likely to be placed at risk of extinction.		
<b>Potential impacts</b>	<p>- grass and shrubs may be cleared can impact creepy crawlies.</p> <p>- grass and shrub also a source of food for some animals.</p> <p>- if tree felling unavoidable can impact on bird nests.</p> <p>- fire ignition from machinery can cause fire and force fauna from their habitats</p>		

<b>Proposed management controls</b>	<p>- drilling only on flat areas, avoid removing grass and topsoil completely.</p> <p>- no unnecessary and excessive disturbances.</p> <p>- water fighting equipment on hand to prevent any fires onsite.</p> <p>- avoid cutting trees, move track or drill sites to less dense areas, where possible.</p> <p>- refer to assessment of significance report recently carried out on known areas of TECs to be impacted under APO00011755.</p> <p>- all drillholes will be drilled from established access tracks</p> <p>- tracks must be walked and inspected prior to disturbance.</p> <p>- demarcate clearly areas to be not disturbed to prevent trespassing these areas.</p> <p>BCS recommendation -26/2/24</p> <p>PCT 547 Wild Quince - Mock Olive - Rusty Fig - Iamboto - Sweet Pittosporum dry rainforest of rocky and scree areas of the Nandewar Bioregion and New England Tableland Bioregion- This PCT is associated with the TEC Semi-evergreen Vine Thicket in the Brigalow Belt South and Nandewar Bioregions. BCS would recommend that this TEC be avoided wherever possible. If the TEC can't be fully avoided BCS would recommend that existing tracks be used wherever possible and that upgrading of these tracks be minimised to avoid further impact to the TEC. Where required, new tracks should avoid the TEC wherever possible.</p> <p>TH COMMITMENTS- TH has committed to use old and existing tracks within TEC and upgrade these tracks if needed. All new tracks are avoiding TEC. Stay within existing tracks, grass to be not completely removed, no trees to be cut/felled, do not interfere with animals in area, do not interfere with nests etc., flag areas that will potentially be out of bounds regarding TECs.</p> <p>MITIGATION: Test/Assessment of significance completed. Refer to attached Assessment of Significance Report dated 12/04/2024 (Sulcor Limestone Quarry, Biodiversity Technical Memo).</p> <p>No threatened species have been recorded within the disturbance areas. An assessment of significance has been prepared for those species within known records within the surrounding mine site:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Squirrel Glider (<i>Petaurus norfolcensis</i>)</li> <li>• Microchiropteran bats: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Yellow-bellied Sheath-tailed Bat (<i>Saccolaimus flaviventris</i>)</li> <li>◦ Greater Broad-nosed Bat (<i>Scoteanax rueppellii</i>)</li> <li>◦ Little Bent-winged Bat (<i>Miniopterus australis</i>)</li> <li>◦ Corben's Long-eared Bat (<i>Nyctophylus corbeni</i>)</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Woodland birds <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Dusky Woodswallow</li> <li>◦ Speckled Warbler</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		
<b>Duration</b>	8		
<b>Application ranking</b>	Low Adverse		
<b>What is the confidence in predicting impacts?</b>	High	<b>Are further studies required on impacts or mitigation?</b>	No
<b>How resilient is the environment to cope with impacts?</b>	LowResilience	<b>What is the level of public concern?</b>	Medium
<b>Can the impacts be reversed?</b>	No	<b>Ranking of potential significance</b>	Medium
<b>Can the impacts be mitigated?</b>	Partly		
<b>Do the operations comply with standards, plans, policies?</b>	Yes	<b>Justification for ranking</b> Test/Assessment of significance completed. Refer to attached Assessment of Significance Report dated 12/04/2024 (Sulcor Limestone Quarry, Biodiversity Technical Memo).	
<b>Criteria</b>	Threatened Flora Species: Any adverse effect on the life cycle of any threatened species such that a viable local population of the species is likely to be placed at risk of extinction.		
<b>Potential impacts</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- grass and shrubs may be cleared can impact creepy crawlies.</li> <li>- grass and shrub also a source of food for some animals.</li> <li>- if tree felling unavoidable can impact on bird nests.</li> <li>- fire ignition from machinery can cause fire and force fauna from their habitats</li> </ul>		

<b>Proposed management controls</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- drilling only on flat areas, avoid removing grass and topsoil completely.</li> <li>- no unnecessary and excessive disturbances.</li> <li>- water fighting equipment on hand to prevent any fires onsite.</li> <li>- avoid cutting trees, move track or drill sites to less dense areas, where possible.</li> <li>- refer to assessment of significance report recently carried out on known areas of TECs to be impacted under APO00011755.</li> <li>- all drillholes will be drilled from established access tracks</li> <li>- tracks must be walked and inspected prior to disturbance.</li> <li>- demarcate clearly areas to be not disturbed to prevent trespassing these areas.</li> </ul> <p>BCS recommendation -26/2/24  PCT 547 Wild Quince - Mock Olive - Rusty Fig - Iamboto - Sweet Pittosporum dry rainforest of rocky and scree areas of the Nandewar Bioregion and New England Tableland Bioregion- This PCT is associated with the TEC Semi-evergreen Vine Thicket in the Brigalow Belt South and Nandewar Bioregions. BCS would recommend that this TEC be avoided wherever possible. If the TEC can't be fully avoided BCS would recommend that existing tracks be used wherever possible and that upgrading of these tracks be minimised to avoid further impact to the TEC. Where required, new tracks should avoid the TEC wherever possible.  TH COMMITMENTS- TH has committed to use old and existing tracks within TEC and upgrade these tracks if needed. All new tracks are avoiding TEC. Stay within existing tracks, grass to be not completely removed, no trees to be cut/felled, do not interfere with animals in area, do not interfere with nests etc., flag areas that will potentially be out of bounds regarding TECs.  MITIGATION: Test/Assessment of significance completed. Refer to attached Assessment of Significance Report dated 12/04/2024 (Sulcor Limestone Quarry, Biodiversity Technical Memo).</p> <p>Assessment of significance report dated 12/4/2024 by ERM.  The proposed exploration works have been carefully designed to avoid any impacts to recorded biodiversity values. No hollow bearing trees will be removed and impacts to native vegetation will be limited to trimming of limbs if required. No areas of potential habitat of the listed threatened species previously recorded within the mine site will be removed, modified or isolated as a result of the proposed works.  The activity is not likely to significantly affect the environment, including threatened species or ecological communities (or their habitats), or declared areas of outstanding biodiversity value/critical habitat.  The proposed activity does not trigger a referral under the EPBC Act and does not require the preparation of a Biodiversity Development Assessment Report (BDAR) or a Species Impact Statement (SIS).  The following updated assessment is based on the Test of Significance under Section 7.3 of the Biodiversity Conservation Act 2016 (BC Act). The factors addressed under this test allow a determination of whether there is likely to be a significant effect on threatened species, populations or ecological communities or their habitats as listed under the BC Act.</p>		
<b>Duration</b>	8		
<b>Application ranking</b>	Low Adverse		
<b>What is the confidence in predicting impacts?</b>	High	<b>Are further studies required on impacts or mitigation?</b>	No
<b>How resilient is the environment to cope with impacts?</b>	Medium Resilience	<b>What is the level of public concern?</b>	Medium
<b>Can the impacts be reversed?</b>	Uncertain	<b>Ranking of potential significance</b>	Medium
<b>Can the impacts be mitigated?</b>	Partly	<b>Justification for ranking</b>	
<b>Do the operations comply with standards, plans, policies?</b>	Yes	Refer to attached Assessment of Significance Report dated 12/04/2024 (Sulcor Limestone Quarry, Biodiversity Technical Memo).	
<b>Criteria</b>	Areas of outstanding biodiversity value/Critical habitat: This includes: a. declared areas of outstanding biodiversity value under the Biodiversity Conservation Act 2016 b. areas declared critical habitat under the Fisheries Management Act 1994.		
<b>Potential impacts</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- removing grass and shrubs or felling trees might impact on possible AOBV/Critical habitat in the area.</li> <li>- possibility earthworks will also impact on creeping fauna habitat.</li> </ul>		

<b>Proposed management controls</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- minimize excavation.</li> <li>- minimize removing grass, shrubs and trees.</li> <li>-restrict movement to established tracks.</li> <li>- avoid completely removing topsoil and grass, topsoil moved must be reinstalled as soon as practicable</li> </ul> <p>Assessment of significance report dated 12/4/2024 by ERM.</p> <p>The proposed exploration works have been carefully designed to avoid any impacts to recorded biodiversity values. No hollow bearing trees will be removed and impacts to native vegetation will be limited to trimming of limbs if required. No areas of potential habitat of the listed threatened species previously recorded within the mine site will be removed, modified or isolated as a result of the proposed works.</p> <p>The activity is not likely to significantly affect the environment, including threatened species or ecological communities (or their habitats), or declared areas of outstanding biodiversity value/critical habitat.</p> <p>DISTURBANCE  Surface 1,190 sqm  Excavation 129cb  12 EAs with ROCCs  10 access tracks either new tracks outside TEC or established track within TEC.</p>		
<b>Duration</b>	8		
<b>Application ranking</b>	Negligible		
<b>What is the confidence in predicting impacts?</b>	High	<b>Are further studies required on impacts or mitigation?</b>	No
<b>How resilient is the environment to cope with impacts?</b>	LowResilience	<b>What is the level of public concern?</b>	Medium
<b>Can the impacts be reversed?</b>	Uncertain	<b>Ranking of potential significance</b>	Low
<b>Can the impacts be mitigated?</b>	Partly	<b>Justification for ranking</b>	
<b>Do the operations comply with standards, plans, policies?</b>	Yes		
<b>Criteria</b>	Endangered ecological community or critically endangered ecological community: Whether the activity: ☐ is likely to have an adverse effect on the extent of the ecological community such that its local occurrence is likely to be placed at risk of extinction, or ☐ is likely to substantially and adversely modify the composition of the ecological community such that its local occurrence is likely to be placed at risk of extinction.		
<b>Potential impacts</b>	Excavating new tracks, clearing grass and shrubs could have an impact.		

<p><b>Proposed management controls</b></p>	<p>- determine prior to activity if there are areas of Endangered Ecological Community or Critically Endangered Ecological Community.  - avoid carrying out activities in these areas.  - adhere to NSW regulations regarding EEC or CEEC management  - assessment of significance undertaken (refer to report)</p> <p>BCS recommendation -26/2/24  PCT 547 Wild Quince - Mock Olive - Rusty Fig - lamboto - Sweet Pittosporum dry rainforest of rocky and scree areas of the Nandewar Bioregion and New England Tableland Bioregion- This PCT is associated with the TEC Semi-evergreen Vine Thicket in the Brigalow Belt South and Nandewar Bioregions. BCS would recommend that this TEC be avoided wherever possible. If the TEC can't be fully avoided BCS would recommend that existing tracks be used wherever possible and that upgrading of these tracks be minimised to avoid further impact to the TEC. Where required, new tracks should avoid the TEC wherever possible.  TH COMMITMENTS- TH has committed to use old and existing tracks within TEC and upgrade these tracks if needed. All new tracks are avoiding TEC. Stay within existing tracks, grass to be not completely removed, no trees to be cut/felled, do not interfere with animals in area, do not interfere with nests etc., flag areas that will potentially be out of bounds regarding TECs.  MITIGATION: Test/Assessment of significance completed. Refer to attached Assessment of Significance Report dated 12/04/2024 (Sulcor Limestone Quarry, Biodiversity Technical Memo).</p> <p>Threatened species or ecological values  Mitigation: Test/Assessment of significance completed. Refer to attached Assessment of Significance Report dated 12/04/2024 (Sulcor Limestone Quarry, Biodiversity Technical Memo).  Stay within existing tracks, grass to be not completely removed, no trees to be cut/felled, do not interfere with animals in area, do not interfere with nests etc., flag areas that will potentially be out of bounds regarding TECs.</p> <p>No threatened species have been recorded within the disturbance areas. An assessment of significance has been prepared for those species within known records within the surrounding mine site:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Squirrel Glider (Petaurus norfolcensis)</li> <li>• Microchiropteran bats: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Yellow-bellied Sheath-tailed Bat (Saccolaimus flaviventris)</li> <li>◦ Greater Broad-nosed Bat (Scoteanax rueppellii)</li> <li>◦ Little Bent-winged Bat (Miniopterus australis)</li> <li>◦ Corben's Long-eared Bat (Nyctophylus corbeni)</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Woodland birds <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Dusky Woodswallow</li> <li>◦ Speckled Warbler</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		
<p><b>Duration</b></p>	<p>8</p>		
<p><b>Application ranking</b></p>	<p>Low Adverse</p>		
<p><b>What is the confidence in predicting impacts?</b></p>	<p>High</p>	<p><b>Are further studies required on impacts or mitigation?</b></p>	<p>No</p>
<p><b>How resilient is the environment to cope with impacts?</b></p>	<p>LowResilience</p>	<p><b>What is the level of public concern?</b></p>	<p>Medium</p>
<p><b>Can the impacts be reversed?</b></p>	<p>Uncertain</p>	<p><b>Ranking of potential significance</b></p>	<p>Medium</p>
<p><b>Can the impacts be mitigated?</b></p>	<p>Partly</p>	<p><b>Justification for ranking</b></p>	
<p><b>Do the operations comply with standards, plans, policies?</b></p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Assessment of Significance Report dated 12/04/2024 (Sulcor Limestone Quarry, Biodiversity Technical Memo).</p>	
<p><b>Criteria</b></p>	<p>Habitat of a threatened species or ecological community</p>		
<p><b>Potential impacts</b></p>	<p>Excavating new tracks, cutting grass and shrubs could have an impact.</p>		

<b>Proposed management controls</b>	<p>Test/Assessment of significance completed. Refer to attached Assessment of Significance Report dated 12/04/2024 (Sulcor Limestone Quarry, Biodiversity Technical Memo). Stay within existing tracks, grass to be not completely removed, no trees to be cut/felled, do not interfere with animals in area, do not interfere with nests etc., flag areas that will potentially be out of bounds regarding TECs.</p> <p>ACCESS ML 1470 has a lot of old/established tracks from previous exploration work and tracks used by farmers. Only existing tracks that lead to exploration activities (drillholes) will be touched or used. Most existing tracks require none to minimal disturbances and excavations. Vegetation on these tracks is mainly grassland and shrubs (refer to attached photos and descriptions). All drill sites applied for in this APO are located on old/existing tracks (refer to individual descriptions of these tracks). New tracks (refer to attachments) are on farming paddocks.</p> <p>Assessment of significance report dated 12/4/2024 by ERM. The proposed exploration works have been carefully designed to avoid any impacts to recorded biodiversity values. No hollow bearing trees will be removed and impacts to native vegetation will be limited to trimming of limbs if required. No areas of potential habitat of the listed threatened species previously recorded within the mine site will be removed, modified or isolated as a result of the proposed works.</p>		
<b>Duration</b>	8		
<b>Application ranking</b>	Negligible		
<b>What is the confidence in predicting impacts?</b>	High	<b>Are further studies required on impacts or mitigation?</b>	No
<b>How resilient is the environment to cope with impacts?</b>	Medium Resilience	<b>What is the level of public concern?</b>	Medium
<b>Can the impacts be reversed?</b>	No	<b>Ranking of potential significance</b>	Medium
<b>Can the impacts be mitigated?</b>	Partly	<b>Justification for ranking</b>	
<b>Do the operations comply with standards, plans, policies?</b>	Yes	Assessment of Significance Report dated 12/04/2024 (Sulcor Limestone Quarry, Biodiversity Technical Memo).	
<b>Criteria</b>	Habitat of protected aquatic species or those with conservation status.		
<b>Potential impacts</b>	Excavating new tracks, cutting grass and shrubs could have an impact.		
<b>Proposed management controls</b>	<p>Assessment of significance undertaken.</p> <p>Test/Assessment of significance completed. Refer to attached Assessment of Significance Report dated 12/04/2024 (Sulcor Limestone Quarry, Biodiversity Technical Memo). Stay within existing tracks, grass to be not completely removed, no trees to be cut/felled, do not interfere with animals in area, do not interfere with nests etc., flag areas that will potentially be out of bounds regarding TECs.</p>		
<b>Duration</b>	8		
<b>Application ranking</b>	Negligible		
<b>What is the confidence in predicting impacts?</b>	High	<b>Are further studies required on impacts or mitigation?</b>	No
<b>How resilient is the environment to cope with impacts?</b>	Medium Resilience	<b>What is the level of public concern?</b>	Low
<b>Can the impacts be reversed?</b>	Uncertain	<b>Ranking of potential significance</b>	Low
<b>Can the impacts be mitigated?</b>	Partly	<b>Justification for ranking</b>	
<b>Do the operations comply with standards, plans, policies?</b>	Yes		
<b>Criteria</b>	Key Threatening Processes: As outlined in Schedule 4 of Biodiversity Conservation Act 2016. Includes: a. alteration, removal, clearly or degradation of habitat and native vegetation b. loss of hollow bearing trees c. removal of dead wood and dead trees d. invasion and establishment of exotic species.		



<b>Potential impacts</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- vegetation removal and activities can temporarily impact wildlife corridors and remnant vegetation.</li> <li>- areas cleared for exploration activities, access tracks, etc not available for flora habitat.</li> <li>- removal of vegetation, barriers created by access tracks, etc can interrupt movement of fauna species.</li> <li>- vegetation removal can decrease available foraging/ sheltering/ breeding habitat for species and displace species from regular place of residence.</li> </ul> <p>What is the likely level of any impacts?</p>		
<b>Proposed management controls</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- plan activity such that no one particular area is impacted for a long time.</li> <li>- limit vegetation removal and earthworks.</li> </ul> <p>Assessment of significance report dated 12/4/2024 by ERM.</p> <p>The proposed exploration works have been carefully designed to avoid any impacts to recorded biodiversity values. No hollow bearing trees will be removed and impacts to native vegetation will be limited to trimming of limbs if required. No areas of potential habitat of the listed threatened species previously recorded within the mine site will be removed, modified or isolated as a result of the proposed works.</p> <p>ACCESS ML 1470 has a lot of old/established tracks from previous exploration work and tracks used by farmers. Only existing tracks that lead to exploration activities (drillholes) will be touched or used. Most existing tracks require none to minimal disturbances and excavations. Vegetation on these tracks is mainly grassland and shrubs (refer to attached photos and descriptions). All drill sites applied for in this APO are located on old/existing tracks (refer to individual descriptions of these tracks). New tracks (refer to attachments) are on farming paddocks.</p> <p><b>DRILL HOLES</b></p> <p>Su-pd01- TRC: Relatively flat. Drill site located in clearing surrounded by open Eucalypt woodland with mixed shrub layer and grassy understory. Minor loping of shrub layer may be required.</p> <p>Su-pd05: Relatively flat. Cleared agricultural grassland with minimal shrub and canopy cover outside of impact area. Single Noloaea macrocarpa to be impacted,</p> <p>Su-pd06 TRC: Close to a track. Flat. Cleared agricultural grassland with introduced peppercorn (Schinus molle) and scattered Acacia salicina. Minor loping of Acacia salicina may be required.</p> <p>Su-pd07: Undulating area. Cleared agricultural grassland with very sparse shrub cover. Removal of single immature Eucalyptus may be required.</p> <p>Su-pd12: Rocks. Relatively flat. Cleared agricultural grassland with moderate to high grazing impacts.</p> <p>Su-pd13- TRC: Close to a track. Relatively flat. Drill site positioned on existing access track with no further widening required. Vegetation is dominated by Dodonea viscosa shrubland with scattered eucalypt canopy present beyond area of impact. Minor lopping of Dodonea shrub cover may be required.</p> <p>Su-pd14- TRC: Close to a track. Relatively flat. Drill Point positioned on existing access track with no further widening required. Vegetation is adjacent to track is agricultural grassland with scattered shrubs. Some minor lopping may be required for shrub layer.</p> <p>Su-pd15- TRC: Close to a track. On the side of undulating area. Cleared agricultural grassland on rocky outcrop. No canopy species present.</p> <p>Su-pd17: Mainly On the side of undulating area. Open agricultural grassland with scattered Dodonea viscosa shrub cover. No canopy species present. Minimal disturbance to individuals in shrub cover.</p> <p>Su-pd18: Mainly Grass and cleared area. On the side of undulating area.</p> <p>Su-pd19: Mainly Grass and cleared area. Relatively flat.</p> <p>Su-pd20: Mainly Grass and cleared area. Relatively flat.</p>		
<b>Duration</b>	8		
<b>Application ranking</b>	Low Adverse		
<b>What is the confidence in predicting impacts?</b>	High	<b>Are further studies required on impacts or mitigation?</b>	No
<b>How resilient is the environment to cope with impacts?</b>	Medium Resilience	<b>What is the level of public concern?</b>	Medium
<b>Can the impacts be reversed?</b>	Uncertain	<b>Ranking of potential significance</b>	Medium
<b>Can the impacts be mitigated?</b>	Partly	<b>Justification for ranking</b>	
<b>Do the operations comply with standards, plans, policies?</b>	Yes	Assessment of significance report dated 12/4/2024 by ERM.	
<b>Criteria</b>	Barriers to movement of fauna: Any potential to endanger, displace or disturb fauna (including fauna of conservation significance) or create a barrier to their movement.		

<b>Potential impacts</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- vegetation removal and activities can temporarily impact wildlife corridors and remnant vegetation.</li> <li>- areas cleared for exploration activities, access tracks, etc not available for flora habitat.</li> <li>- removal of vegetation, barriers created by access tracks, etc can interrupt movement of fauna species.</li> <li>- vegetation removal can decrease available foraging/ sheltering/ breeding habitat for species and displace species from regular place of residence.</li> </ul> <p>What is the likely level of any impacts?</p>		
<b>Proposed management controls</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- plan activity such that no one particular area is impacted for a long time.</li> <li>- limit vegetation removal and earthworks.</li> </ul> <p>DISTURBANCE Surface 1,190 sqm Excavation 129cb 12 EAs with ROCCs 10 access tracks either new tracks outside TEC or established track within TEC.</p> <p>ACCESS ML 1470 has a lot of old/established tracks from previous exploration work and tracks used by farmers. Only existing tracks that lead to exploration activities (drillholes) will be touched or used. Most existing tracks require none to minimal disturbances and excavations. Vegetation on these tracks is mainly grassland and shrubs (refer to attached photos and descriptions). All drill sites applied for in this APO are located on old/existing tracks (refer to individual descriptions of these tracks). New tracks (refer to attachments) are on farming paddocks.</p> <p>TRACK TP22- TRC, TP23- TRC, TP24- TRC, TP25- TRC : Old track. A few bushes on the side of the track/small trees. Relatively flat. TRACK 26: Old track, mainly grass. Relatively flat. TRACK 27- TRC: Old track, bushes/tress close to track, rocks. Relatively flat. TRACK 28- TRC: Old track, bushes /small trees on side. Going downhill. TRACK 29- TRC, 30- TRC: Old track, grass on the track, bushes /small trees on side. Relatively flat. TRACK 31- TRC: Old track, grass on the track, rocks, bushes /small trees on side. Relatively flat. TRACK 32- TRC, 33- TRC : Pre-existing exploration track. Mainly grass, rocks, sparse bushes. On the side of the hill. TRACK 34 : Pre-existing old exploration track. Mainly grass, sparse bushes. Flat area. TRACK 35- TRC, 37- TRC, 38: Pre-existing exploration old track. Mainly grass, sparse bushes, rocks. Top of the undulating landscape. TRACK 36: Pre-existing old track. Mainly grass, sparse bushes. On the side of the hill. TRACK 39- TRC, 40- TRC, 41, 42, 43- TRC, 44- TRC: Pre-existing old exploration track. Mainly grass, small rocks. Top of the undulating landscape. TRACK 45: Old track, grass on the track, sparse bushes on side. Relatively flat. TRACK 46- TRC: Old track, grass on the track, sparse bushes on side. Up hill. TRACK 47, 48- TRC: Pre-existing old exploration track. Mainly grass, sparse bushes. Relatively flat. TRACK 49, 50: Existing track leading to proposed track. Grass, flat. TRACK 51- TRC: Old track, grass on the track. Relatively flat. TRACK 52- TRC: Farm track. Mainly grass. Relatively flat. TRACK 53- TRC: Farm track. Mainly grass. A long fence line. Relatively flat. TRACK 54- TRC, 55: Flat farm track. Mainly grass. Relatively flat.</p>		
<b>Duration</b>	8		
<b>Application ranking</b>	Low Adverse		
<b>What is the confidence in predicting impacts?</b>	High	<b>Are further studies required on impacts or mitigation?</b>	No
<b>How resilient is the environment to cope with impacts?</b>	Medium Resilience	<b>What is the level of public concern?</b>	Low
<b>Can the impacts be reversed?</b>	Yes	<b>Ranking of potential significance</b>	Medium
<b>Can the impacts be mitigated?</b>	Partly	<b>Justification for ranking</b>	
<b>Do the operations comply with standards, plans, policies?</b>	Yes	Assessment of significance report dated 12/4/2024 by ERM.	
<b>Criteria</b>	Ecological & Biosecurity Impacts: Any threat to the biological diversity or ecological integrity of an ecological community.		
<b>Potential impacts</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- sumps and chemicals left overnight on the drill sites can be a threat to moving animals.</li> <li>- plant and machinery comprises a potential bushfire ignition source.</li> <li>- vegetation removal can decrease available foraging/ sheltering/ breeding habitat for species and displace species from regular place of residence.</li> <li>- areas used for exploration activities, access tracks, etc not available for flora / fauna habitat.</li> <li>- mobilisation of pollutants (such as hydrocarbons) in soils, air or waters can potentially impact fauna / flora.</li> </ul>		

<b>Proposed management controls</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- minimize excavation.</li> <li>- minimize removing grass, shrubs and trees.</li> <li>-restrict movement to established tracks.</li> <li>- avoid completely removing topsoil and grass, topsoil moved must be reinstalled as soon as practicable</li> </ul> <p>BCS recommendation -26/2/24  PCT 547 Wild Quince - Mock Olive - Rusty Fig - lamboto - Sweet Pittosporum dry rainforest of rocky and scree areas of the Nandewar Bioregion and New England Tableland Bioregion- This PCT is associated with the TEC Semi-evergreen Vine Thicket in the Brigalow Belt South and Nandewar Bioregions. BCS would recommend that this TEC be avoided wherever possible. If the TEC can't be fully avoided BCS would recommend that existing tracks be used wherever possible and that upgrading of these tracks be minimised to avoid further impact to the TEC. Where required, new tracks should avoid the TEC wherever possible.  TH COMMITMENTS- TH has committed to use old and existing tracks within TEC and upgrade these tracks if needed. All new tracks are avoiding TEC. Stay within existing tracks, grass to be not completely removed, no trees to be cut/felled, do not interfere with animals in area, do not interfere with nests etc., flag areas that will potentially be out of bounds regarding TECs.  MITIGATION: Test/Assessment of significance completed. Refer to attached Assessment of Significance Report dated 12/04/2024 (Sulcor Limestone Quarry, Biodiversity Technical Memo).</p> <p>Threatened species or ecological values  Mitigation: Test/Assessment of significance completed. Refer to attached Assessment of Significance Report dated 12/04/2024 (Sulcor Limestone Quarry, Biodiversity Technical Memo).  Stay within existing tracks, grass to be not completely removed, no trees to be cut/felled, do not interfere with animals in area, do not interfere with nests etc., flag areas that will potentially be out of bounds regarding TECs.</p>		
<b>Duration</b>	8		
<b>Application ranking</b>	Low Adverse		
<b>What is the confidence in predicting impacts?</b>	High	<b>Are further studies required on impacts or mitigation?</b>	No
<b>How resilient is the environment to cope with impacts?</b>	Medium Resilience	<b>What is the level of public concern?</b>	Medium
<b>Can the impacts be reversed?</b>	Uncertain	<b>Ranking of potential significance</b>	Medium
<b>Can the impacts be mitigated?</b>	Partly	<b>Justification for ranking</b>	
<b>Do the operations comply with standards, plans, policies?</b>	Yes	Assessment of Significance Report dated 12/04/2024 (Sulcor Limestone Quarry, Biodiversity Technical Memo).	
<b>Criteria</b>	Ecological & Biosecurity Impacts: Creates a biosecurity risk or introduces genetically modified organisms into an area. Includes impacts from the introduction of: a. mobilisation of pollutants b. animal pests, c. plant pests and diseases, d. animal diseases, e. noxious weeds, or f. genetically modified organisms.		
<b>Potential impacts</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- sumps and chemicals left overnight on the drill sites can be a threat to moving animals.</li> <li>- plant and machinery comprises a potential bushfire ignition source.</li> <li>- vegetation removal can decrease available foraging/ sheltering/ breeding habitat for species and displace species from regular place of residence.</li> <li>- areas used for exploration activities, access tracks, etc not available for flora / fauna habitat.</li> <li>- mobilisation of pollutants (such as hydrocarbons) in soils, air or waters can potentially impact fauna / flora.</li> </ul>		
<b>Proposed management controls</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- minimize excavation.</li> <li>- minimize removing grass, shrubs and trees.</li> <li>-restrict movement to established tracks.</li> <li>- avoid completely removing topsoil and grass, topsoil moved must be reinstalled as soon as practicable</li> </ul> <p>Mitigation:  Stay within existing tracks, grass to be not completely removed, no trees to be cut/felled, do not interfere with animals in area, do not interfere with nests etc., flag areas that will potentially be out of bounds regarding TECs.</p>		
<b>Duration</b>	8		
<b>Application ranking</b>	Low Adverse		
<b>What is the confidence in predicting impacts?</b>	High	<b>Are further studies required on impacts or mitigation?</b>	No

How resilient is the environment to cope with impacts?	LowResilience	What is the level of public concern?	Medium
Can the impacts be reversed?	No	Ranking of potential significance	Low
Can the impacts be mitigated?	Partly	Justification for ranking	
Do the operations comply with standards, plans, policies?	Yes		
<b>Criteria</b>	Ecological & Biosecurity Impacts: Likely to cause a significant bushfire risk.		
<b>Potential impacts</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- sumps and chemicals left overnight on the drill sites can be a threat to moving animals.</li> <li>- plant and machinery comprises a potential bushfire ignition source.</li> <li>- vegetation removal can decrease available foraging/ sheltering/ breeding habitat for species and displace species from regular place of residence.</li> <li>- areas used for exploration activities, access tracks, etc not available for flora / fauna habitat.</li> <li>- mobilisation of pollutants (such as hydrocarbons) in soils, air or waters can potentially impact fauna / flora.</li> </ul>		
<b>Proposed management controls</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- minimize excavation.</li> <li>- minimize removing grass, shrubs and trees.</li> <li>-restrict movement to established tracks.</li> <li>- avoid completely removing topsoil and grass, topsoil moved must be reinstalled as soon as practicable</li> </ul>		
<b>Duration</b>	8		
<b>Application ranking</b>	Low Adverse		
What is the confidence in predicting impacts?	High	Are further studies required on impacts or mitigation?	No
How resilient is the environment to cope with impacts?	LowResilience	What is the level of public concern?	Medium
Can the impacts be reversed?	No	Ranking of potential significance	Medium
Can the impacts be mitigated?	Partly	Justification for ranking	
Do the operations comply with standards, plans, policies?	Yes	Bushfire extending in the all area.	
<b>Criteria</b>	Community Resources: Any degradation of infrastructure or significant increase in the demand for services and infrastructure resources.		
<b>Potential impacts</b>	Activity will not degrade or significantly increase the demand for services and infrastructure resources.		
<b>Proposed management controls</b>	<p>ACCESS ML 1470 has a lot of old/established tracks from previous exploration work and tracks used by farmers. Only existing tracks that lead to exploration activities (drillholes) will be touched or used. Most existing tracks require none to minimal disturbances and excavations. Vegetation on these tracks is mainly grassland and shrubs (refer to attached photos and descriptions). All drill sites applied for in this APO are located on old/existing tracks (refer to individual descriptions of these tracks). New tracks (refer to attachments) are on farming paddocks.</p> <p>TRACK TP22- TRC,TP23- TRC, TP24- TRC, TP25- TRC : Old track. A few bushes on the side of the track/small trees. Relatively flat.</p> <p>TRACK 26: Old track, mainly grass. Relatively flat.</p> <p>TRACK 27- TRC: Old track, bushes/tress close to track, rocks. Relatively flat.</p> <p>TRACK 28- TRC: Old track, bushes /small trees on side. Going downhill.</p> <p>TRACK 29- TRC, 30- TRC: Old track, grass on the track, bushes /small trees on side. Relatively flat.</p> <p>TRACK 31- TRC: Old track, grass on the track, rocks, bushes /small trees on side. Relatively flat.</p> <p>TRACK 32- TRC, 33- TRC : Pre-existing exploration track. Mainly grass, rocks, sparse bushes. On the side of the hill.</p> <p>TRACK 34 : Pre-existing old exploration track. Mainly grass, sparse bushes. Flat area.</p> <p>TRACK 35- TRC,37- TRC, 38: Pre-existing exploration old track. Mainly grass, sparse bushes, rocks. Top of the undulating landscape.</p> <p>TRACK 36: Pre-existing old track. Mainly grass, sparse bushes. On the side of the hill.</p> <p>TRACK 39- TRC, 40- TRC, 41, 42, 43- TRC, 44- TRC: Pre-existing old exploration track. Mainly grass, small rocks. Top of the undulating landscape.</p> <p>TRACK 45: Old track, grass on the track, sparse bushes on side. Relatively flat.</p> <p>TRACK 46- TRC: Old track, grass on the track, sparse bushes on side. Up hill.</p> <p>TRACK 47, 48- TRC: Pre-existing old exploration track. Mainly grass, sparse bushes. Relatively flat.</p> <p>TRACK 49, 50: Existing track leading to proposed track. Grass, flat.</p> <p>TRACK 51- TRC: Old track, grass on the track. Relatively flat.</p> <p>TRACK 52- TRC: Farm track. Mainly grass. Relatively flat.</p> <p>TRACK 53- TRC: Farm track. Mainly grass. A long fence line. Relatively flat.</p> <p>TRACK 54- TRC, 55: Flat farm track. Mainly grass. Relatively flat.</p>		

<b>Duration</b>	8		
<b>Application ranking</b>	Negligible		
<b>What is the confidence in predicting impacts?</b>	High	<b>Are further studies required on impacts or mitigation?</b>	No
<b>How resilient is the environment to cope with impacts?</b>	High Resilience	<b>What is the level of public concern?</b>	Low
<b>Can the impacts be reversed?</b>	Yes	<b>Ranking of potential significance</b>	Low
<b>Can the impacts be mitigated?</b>	Partly	<b>Justification for ranking</b>	
<b>Do the operations comply with standards, plans, policies?</b>	Yes		
<b>Criteria</b>	Community Resources: Any diversion of resources to the detriment of other communities or natural systems.		
<b>Potential impacts</b>	Activity will not result in any diversion of resources to the detriment of other communities or natural systems.		
<b>Proposed management controls</b>	<p>Restrict activity to within the limits of the ML.</p> <p>LANDUSE Activity area within ML. No existing crop farming. No intense animal grazing in the area. No changes (temporary or otherwise) to the current land use/s during the activity.</p> <p>DISTURBANCE Surface 1,190 sqm Excavation 129cb 12 EAs with ROCCs 10 access tracks either new tracks outside TEC or established track within TEC. Rehabilitation management plan provided (RMP). Tamworth Regional Local Environment _Plan provided.</p>		
<b>Duration</b>	8		
<b>Application ranking</b>	Negligible		
<b>What is the confidence in predicting impacts?</b>	High	<b>Are further studies required on impacts or mitigation?</b>	No
<b>How resilient is the environment to cope with impacts?</b>	Medium Resilience	<b>What is the level of public concern?</b>	Low
<b>Can the impacts be reversed?</b>	Uncertain	<b>Ranking of potential significance</b>	Low
<b>Can the impacts be mitigated?</b>	Partly	<b>Justification for ranking</b>	
<b>Do the operations comply with standards, plans, policies?</b>	Yes		
<b>Criteria</b>	Natural Resources: Any disruption, depletion or destruction of natural resources.		
<b>Potential impacts</b>	Activity will not disrupt, deplete or destroy natural resources.		
<b>Proposed management controls</b>	<p>Restrict activity to within the limits of the ML.</p> <p>LANDUSE Activity area within ML. No existing crop farming. No intense animal grazing in the area. No changes (temporary or otherwise) to the current land use/s during the activity.</p> <p>DISTURBANCE Surface 1,190 sqm Excavation 129cb 12 EAs with ROCCs 10 access tracks either new tracks outside TEC or established track within TEC. Rehabilitation management plan provided (RMP). Tamworth Regional Local Environment _Plan provided.</p>		
<b>Duration</b>	8		
<b>Application ranking</b>	Negligible		

<b>What is the confidence in predicting impacts?</b>	High	<b>Are further studies required on impacts or mitigation?</b>	No
<b>How resilient is the environment to cope with impacts?</b>	Medium Resilience	<b>What is the level of public concern?</b>	Low
<b>Can the impacts be reversed?</b>	Uncertain	<b>Ranking of potential significance</b>	Low
<b>Can the impacts be mitigated?</b>	Partly	<b>Justification for ranking</b>	
<b>Do the operations comply with standards, plans, policies?</b>	Yes		
<b>Criteria</b>	Natural Resources: Any disruption of existing activities which rely on natural resources, including forestry, farming or extractive industries (or reduction of options for future activities).		
<b>Potential impacts</b>	Activity will not disrupt existing activities which rely upon natural resources, including forestry, farming or extractive industries (or will reduce options for future activities).		
<b>Proposed management controls</b>	<p>Restrict activity to within the limits of the ML.</p> <p>LANDUSE</p> <p>Activity area within ML.</p> <p>No existing crop farming.</p> <p>No intense animal grazing in the area.</p> <p>No changes (temporary or otherwise) to the current land use/s during the activity.</p> <p>DISTURBANCE</p> <p>Surface 1,190 sqm</p> <p>Excavation 129cb</p> <p>12 EAs with ROCCs</p> <p>10 access tracks either new tracks outside TEC or established track within TEC.</p> <p>Rehabilitation management plan provided (RMP).</p> <p>Tamworth Regional Local Environment _Plan provided.</p>		
<b>Duration</b>	8		
<b>Application ranking</b>	Negligible		
<b>What is the confidence in predicting impacts?</b>	High	<b>Are further studies required on impacts or mitigation?</b>	No
<b>How resilient is the environment to cope with impacts?</b>	Medium Resilience	<b>What is the level of public concern?</b>	Low
<b>Can the impacts be reversed?</b>	Uncertain	<b>Ranking of potential significance</b>	Low
<b>Can the impacts be mitigated?</b>	Partly	<b>Justification for ranking</b>	
<b>Do the operations comply with standards, plans, policies?</b>	Yes		
<b>Criteria</b>	Natural Resources: Any use which results in the degradation of any area reserved for conservation purposes.		
<b>Potential impacts</b>	Activity will not result in the degradation of any area reserved for conservation purposes.		
<b>Proposed management controls</b>	<p>Restrict activity to within the limits of the ML.</p> <p>LANDUSE</p> <p>Activity area within ML.</p> <p>No existing crop farming.</p> <p>No intense animal grazing in the area.</p> <p>No changes (temporary or otherwise) to the current land use/s during the activity.</p> <p>DISTURBANCE</p> <p>Surface 1,190 sqm</p> <p>Excavation 129cb</p> <p>12 EAs with ROCCs</p> <p>10 access tracks either new tracks outside TEC or established track within TEC.</p> <p>Rehabilitation management plan provided (RMP).</p> <p>Tamworth Regional Local Environment _Plan provided.</p>		
<b>Duration</b>	8		
<b>Application ranking</b>	Negligible		

What is the confidence in predicting impacts?	High	Are further studies required on impacts or mitigation?	No
How resilient is the environment to cope with impacts?	Medium Resilience	What is the level of public concern?	Low
Can the impacts be reversed?	Uncertain	Ranking of potential significance	Low
Can the impacts be mitigated?	Partly	Justification for ranking	
Do the operations comply with standards, plans, policies?	Yes		
<b>Criteria</b>	Sensitive Land Impacts: Impacts on National parks and other areas reserved or dedicated or acquired under the National Parks and Wildlife Act 1974.		
Potential impacts	N/A		
Proposed management controls	N/A		
Duration	N/A		
Application ranking	N/A		
What is the confidence in predicting impacts?	N/A	Are further studies required on impacts or mitigation?	N/A
How resilient is the environment to cope with impacts?	N/A	What is the level of public concern?	N/A
Can the impacts be reversed?	N/A	Ranking of potential significance	N/A
Can the impacts be mitigated?	N/A	Justification for ranking	
Do the operations comply with standards, plans, policies?	N/A		
<b>Criteria</b>	Sensitive Land Impacts: Land subject to a 'conservation agreement' under the National Parks and Wildlife Act 1974 and/or the Biodiversity Conservation Act 2016. This includes: a. Biobanking agreement (established under the now repealed Threatened Species Conservation Act 1995) or a Biodiversity Stewardship agreement established under the Biodiversity Conservation Act 2016. b. Wildlife Refuge agreement established under the Biodiversity Conservation Act 2016. c. Existing conservation agreements that continue to have effect even where legislation has been repealed: ☐ Trust agreements under the now repealed Nature Conservation Trust Act 2001 ☐ Property vegetation plans made under the now-repealed Native Vegetation Act 2003 ☐ Registered property agreements under the repealed Native Vegetation Conservation Act 1997		
Potential impacts	N/A		
Proposed management controls	N/A		
Duration	N/A		
Application ranking	N/A		
What is the confidence in predicting impacts?	N/A	Are further studies required on impacts or mitigation?	N/A
How resilient is the environment to cope with impacts?	N/A	What is the level of public concern?	N/A
Can the impacts be reversed?	N/A	Ranking of potential significance	N/A
Can the impacts be mitigated?	N/A	Justification for ranking	
Do the operations comply with standards, plans, policies?	N/A		
<b>Criteria</b>	Sensitive Land Impacts: Impacts on aquatic reserves or marine parks declared under the Marine Estate Management Act 2014. Impacts on Coastal Zone as defined in the Coastal Management Act 2016.		
Potential impacts	N/A		
Proposed management controls	N/A		
Duration	N/A		
Application ranking	N/A		

What is the confidence in predicting impacts?	N/A	Are further studies required on impacts or mitigation?	N/A
How resilient is the environment to cope with impacts?	N/A	What is the level of public concern?	N/A
Can the impacts be reversed?	N/A	Ranking of potential significance	N/A
Can the impacts be mitigated?	N/A	Justification for ranking	
Do the operations comply with standards, plans, policies?	N/A		
<b>Criteria</b>	Sensitive Land Impacts: Fishing grounds and commercial fish breeding or nursery areas.		
<b>Potential impacts</b>	Activity will not result in the degradation of any area reserved for conservation purposes.		
<b>Proposed management controls</b>	Restrict activity to within the limits of the ML.		
<b>Duration</b>	8		
<b>Application ranking</b>	Negligible		
What is the confidence in predicting impacts?	N/A	Are further studies required on impacts or mitigation?	N/A
How resilient is the environment to cope with impacts?	N/A	What is the level of public concern?	N/A
Can the impacts be reversed?	N/A	Ranking of potential significance	Low
Can the impacts be mitigated?	N/A	Justification for ranking	
Do the operations comply with standards, plans, policies?	N/A		
<b>Criteria</b>	Sensitive Land Impacts: Impacts on other sensitive lands including: a. Land within a state forest set aside under the Forestry Act 2012 for conservation values. This includes flora reserves and special management (and other) zones. b. Drinking water catchment protection areas - land declared to be a 'controlled area' or a 'special area' under the Water NSW Act 2014, or a 'special area' under the Water Management Act 2000 or Hunter Water Act 1991. c. Waterfront land as defined under the Water Management Act 2000.		
<b>Potential impacts</b>	Activity will not result in the degradation of any area reserved for conservation purposes.		
<b>Proposed management controls</b>	Restrict activity to within the limits of the ML.  PCT 547 Wild Quince - Mock Olive - Rusty Fig - Iamboto - Sweet Pittosporum dry rainforest of rocky and scree areas of the Nandewar Bioregion and New England Tableland Bioregion		
<b>Duration</b>	8		
<b>Application ranking</b>	Negligible		
What is the confidence in predicting impacts?	High	Are further studies required on impacts or mitigation?	No
How resilient is the environment to cope with impacts?	Medium Resilience	What is the level of public concern?	Low
Can the impacts be reversed?	Uncertain	Ranking of potential significance	Low
Can the impacts be mitigated?	Partly	Justification for ranking	
Do the operations comply with standards, plans, policies?	Yes		
<b>Criteria</b>	Sensitive Land Impacts: Impacts on land reserved or dedicated within the meaning of the Crown Lands Act 1989/Crown Lands Management Act 2016 for preservation of the environment or other environmental protection purposes.		
<b>Potential impacts</b>	NOTE: DH 7 (10m) and DH1 (40m) from Crown road.		
<b>Proposed management controls</b>	N/A		
<b>Duration</b>	N/A		
<b>Application ranking</b>	N/A		



What is the confidence in predicting impacts?	N/A	Are further studies required on impacts or mitigation?	N/A
How resilient is the environment to cope with impacts?	N/A	What is the level of public concern?	Low
Can the impacts be reversed?	N/A	Ranking of potential significance	N/A
Can the impacts be mitigated?	N/A	Justification for ranking	
Do the operations comply with standards, plans, policies?	N/A		
<b>Criteria</b>	Sensitive Land Impacts: Impacts on land identified as wilderness or declared a wilderness area under the Wilderness Act 1987.		
Potential impacts	N/A		
Proposed management controls	N/A		
Duration	N/A		
Application ranking	N/A		
What is the confidence in predicting impacts?	N/A	Are further studies required on impacts or mitigation?	N/A
How resilient is the environment to cope with impacts?	N/A	What is the level of public concern?	N/A
Can the impacts be reversed?	N/A	Ranking of potential significance	N/A
Can the impacts be mitigated?	N/A	Justification for ranking	
Do the operations comply with standards, plans, policies?	N/A		
<b>Criteria</b>	Sensitive Lands: Impacts on wetlands of international significance designated under the Ramsar Convention on Wetlands and those designated as a nationally important wetland in the Directory of Important Wetlands of Australia.		
Potential impacts	N/A		
Proposed management controls	N/A		
Duration	N/A		
Application ranking	N/A		
What is the confidence in predicting impacts?	N/A	Are further studies required on impacts or mitigation?	N/A
How resilient is the environment to cope with impacts?	N/A	What is the level of public concern?	N/A
Can the impacts be reversed?	N/A	Ranking of potential significance	N/A
Can the impacts be mitigated?	N/A	Justification for ranking	
Do the operations comply with standards, plans, policies?	N/A		
<b>Criteria</b>	Sensitive Land Impacts: Impacts on land identified in an environmental planning instrument as being of biodiversity / conservation significance or zoned for environmental conservation, protection and/or management. Includes Coastal Wetlands and Littoral rainforests under State Environmental Planning Policy (Resilience and Hazards) 2021.		
Potential impacts	N/A		
Proposed management controls	N/A		
Duration	N/A		
Application ranking	N/A		
What is the confidence in predicting impacts?	N/A	Are further studies required on impacts or mitigation?	N/A

How resilient is the environment to cope with impacts?	N/A	What is the level of public concern?	N/A
Can the impacts be reversed?	N/A	Ranking of potential significance	N/A
Can the impacts be mitigated?	N/A	Justification for ranking	
Do the operations comply with standards, plans, policies?	N/A		
<b>Criteria</b>	Sensitive Land Impacts: Impacts on Aboriginal heritage protection areas: a. Aboriginal places and objects under the National Parks and Wildlife Act 1974 b. Areas of Aboriginal cultural significance identified in an environmental planning instrument.		
Potential impacts	N/A NOTE: AHIMS Refer to attachment regarding Aboriginal objects in the area - 3 objects found in Sulcor, locations known- Sulcor Archaeological Survey provided. APO0001755 drillholes and tracks will not impact these locations. Commitment made with "Cultural Heritage Induction- Kamilaroi Country- February 2023" Exclusion zones apply to recorded sites.		
Proposed management controls	N/A		
Duration	N/A		
Application ranking	N/A		
What is the confidence in predicting impacts?	N/A	Are further studies required on impacts or mitigation?	N/A
How resilient is the environment to cope with impacts?	N/A	What is the level of public concern?	Medium
Can the impacts be reversed?	N/A	Ranking of potential significance	N/A
Can the impacts be mitigated?	N/A	Justification for ranking	
Do the operations comply with standards, plans, policies?	N/A		
<b>Criteria</b>	Sensitive Land Impacts: Impacts on heritage protection areas (historic or natural): a. Nationally and internationally recognised heritage sites or areas (World Heritage List, National Heritage List of Commonwealth Heritage List) b. Items listed on State Heritage c. Heritage items and conservation areas identified in an environmental planning instrument		
Potential impacts	N/A		
Proposed management controls	N/A		
Duration	N/A		
Application ranking	N/A		
What is the confidence in predicting impacts?	N/A	Are further studies required on impacts or mitigation?	N/A
How resilient is the environment to cope with impacts?	N/A	What is the level of public concern?	N/A
Can the impacts be reversed?	N/A	Ranking of potential significance	N/A
Can the impacts be mitigated?	N/A	Justification for ranking	
Do the operations comply with standards, plans, policies?	N/A		
<b>Criteria</b>	Sensitive Land Impacts: Impacts on community land classified under the Local Government Act 1993 (for which a plan of management has been prepared).		
Potential impacts	N/A NOTE: Local heritage items will not be impacted (please refer to attached memorandum from Tamworth Council)- Ref: cf/MG/DocSetID 2065450 dated 7 March 2024		
Proposed management controls	N/A		
Duration	N/A		
Application ranking	N/A		

What is the confidence in predicting impacts?	N/A	Are further studies required on impacts or mitigation?	N/A
How resilient is the environment to cope with impacts?	N/A	What is the level of public concern?	Low
Can the impacts be reversed?	N/A	Ranking of potential significance	N/A
Can the impacts be mitigated?	N/A	Justification for ranking	
Do the operations comply with standards, plans, policies?	N/A		
<b>Criteria</b>	Sensitive Land Impacts: Impacts on bushfire prone areas.		
<b>Potential impacts</b>	Activity will not result in the degradation of any area reserved for conservation purposes.		
<b>Proposed management controls</b>	Restrict activity to within the limits of the ML.		
<b>Duration</b>	8		
<b>Application ranking</b>	Negligible		
What is the confidence in predicting impacts?	High	Are further studies required on impacts or mitigation?	N/A
How resilient is the environment to cope with impacts?	LowResilience	What is the level of public concern?	Medium
Can the impacts be reversed?	No	Ranking of potential significance	Medium
Can the impacts be mitigated?	Partly	Justification for ranking	
Do the operations comply with standards, plans, policies?	N/A	Bushfire exnading to all area.	
<b>Criteria</b>	Social Impacts: Any impacts which result in a change in the demographic structure of the community, including changes to workforce or industry structure of the area/region. Including change in demand for community resources (eg community facilities, community services and labour force).		
<b>Potential impacts</b>	Activity will unlikely result in a change to the demographic structure of the community, including changes to the workforce or industry structure of the area/region.		
<b>Proposed management controls</b>	Activity is carried out under Graymont rules and regulations to avoid impact on community.		
<b>Duration</b>	8		
<b>Application ranking</b>	Negligible		
What is the confidence in predicting impacts?	High	Are further studies required on impacts or mitigation?	N/A
How resilient is the environment to cope with impacts?	High Resilience	What is the level of public concern?	Low
Can the impacts be reversed?	Yes	Ranking of potential significance	Low
Can the impacts be mitigated?	Partly	Justification for ranking	
Do the operations comply with standards, plans, policies?	N/A		
<b>Criteria</b>	Social Impacts: Any environmental impact that may cause substantial change or disruption to the community (including loss of facilities or loss of community identity).		
<b>Potential impacts</b>	Activity will not have an environmental impact that may cause substantial change or disruption to the community, including loss of facilities, reduced links to other communities or loss of community identity.		
<b>Proposed management controls</b>	Activity is carried out under Graymont rules and regulations to avoid impact on community.		
<b>Duration</b>	8		
<b>Application ranking</b>	Negligible		
What is the confidence in predicting impacts?	High	Are further studies required on impacts or mitigation?	N/A

How resilient is the environment to cope with impacts?	High Resilience	What is the level of public concern?	Low
Can the impacts be reversed?	Yes	Ranking of potential significance	Low
Can the impacts be mitigated?	Partly	Justification for ranking	
Do the operations comply with standards, plans, policies?	N/A		
<b>Criteria</b>	Social Impacts: Any impacts which result in some individuals or communities being significantly disadvantaged (e.g. change to community facilities, services or labour force).		
<b>Potential impacts</b>	Activity will not result in some individuals or communities being significantly disadvantaged, including a change in the level of demand for community resources (e.g. community facilities / services, and labour force).		
<b>Proposed management controls</b>	Activity is carried out under Graymont rules and regulations to avoid impact on community TIMING-NOISE Standard Business hours (7AM to 6PM weekdays, 8AM to 1PM Saturdays, no work Sundays and public holidays) May 2024 to 2 May 2025 Activity will take place more than 1000m away from sensitive receivers. Drilling (and associated earthworks) to be done only from Monday to Saturday to be compliant to the site DA. No work on Sundays.		
<b>Duration</b>	8		
<b>Application ranking</b>	Negligible		
What is the confidence in predicting impacts?	High	Are further studies required on impacts or mitigation?	N/A
How resilient is the environment to cope with impacts?	High Resilience	What is the level of public concern?	Low
Can the impacts be reversed?	Yes	Ranking of potential significance	Low
Can the impacts be mitigated?	Partly	Justification for ranking	
Do the operations comply with standards, plans, policies?	N/A		
<b>Criteria</b>	Social Impacts: Any impacts on the health, safety, privacy or welfare of individuals or communities caused by factors such as pollution, odour, noise, vibration, lighting, visual impacts, etc).		
<b>Potential impacts</b>	Activity will unlikely result in any impacts on the health, safety, privacy or welfare of individuals or communities because of factors such as pollution, odour, noise, vibration, lighting, visual impacts, etc.		
<b>Proposed management controls</b>	Activity is carried out under Graymont rules and regulations to avoid impact on community.  TIMING-NOISE Standard Business hours (7AM to 6PM weekdays, 8AM to 1PM Saturdays, no work Sundays and public holidays) May 2024 to 2 May 2025 Activity will take place more than 1000m away from sensitive receivers. Drilling (and associated earthworks) to be done only from Monday to Saturday to be compliant to the site DA. No work on Sundays.  AIR Water used in drilling will minimize dust. Water truck to be used to water down dusts on tracks. Minimize number of vehicles/plant/equipment to be used for activity. Vehicle/plant operation restricted to daylight hours and weekdays and Saturdays only.		
<b>Duration</b>	8		
<b>Application ranking</b>	Negligible		
What is the confidence in predicting impacts?	High	Are further studies required on impacts or mitigation?	N/A
How resilient is the environment to cope with impacts?	Medium Resilience	What is the level of public concern?	Low
Can the impacts be reversed?	Yes	Ranking of potential significance	Low

<b>Can the impacts be mitigated?</b>	Partly	<b>Justification for ranking</b>	
<b>Do the operations comply with standards, plans, policies?</b>	N/A		
<b>Criteria</b>	Social Impacts: Effect on a locality, place or building having aesthetic, anthropological, archaeological, architectural, cultural, historical, scientific or social significance or other special value for present or future generations?		
<b>Potential impacts</b>	Activity will not have any effect on a locality, place or building having aesthetic, anthropological, archaeological, architectural, cultural, historical, scientific or social significance or other special value for present or future generations.		
<b>Proposed management controls</b>	<p>Activity is carried out under Graymont rules and regulations to avoid impact on community.</p> <p>AHIMS Refer to attachment regarding Aboriginal objects in the area - 3 objects found in Sulcor, locations known- Sulcor Archaeological Survey provided. APO0001755 drillholes and tracks will not impact these locations. Commitment made with "Cultural Heritage Induction- Kamilaroi Country- February 2023 Exclusion zones apply to recorded sites. Aboriginal Site recording form provided for the 3 objects within Sulcor Mine. Archaeological reports attached. Activity not within 200m of waterway. Activity not located within a sand dune. Activity will be on ridgetop more than 200m away from known objects. Activity not located within 200m below or above a cliff face. Activity not within 20 metres of or in a cave, rock shelter, or a cave mouth and is on land that is not disturbed land.</p> <p>HERITAGE Local heritage items will not be impacted (please refer to attached memorandum from Tamworth Council)- Ref: cf/MG/DocSetID 2065450 dated 7 March 2024 Response: Based on the description above (of the proposed project), Council has no heritage objections to the proposed drilling works subject to this work proceeding with caution. If a person reasonably suspects a relic or Aboriginal object is discovered during the drilling works, the work in the area of the discovery must cease immediately and the following be notified:  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For a relic –Tamworth Regional Council and the NSW Heritage Council; or</li> <li>• For an Aboriginal object – the person who is the authority for the protection of Aboriginal objects and Aboriginal places in New South Wales under Section 85 of the National Parks and Wildlife Act 1974.</li> </ul> Site work may recommence at a time confirmed in writing by:  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For a relic – Tamworth Regional Council and the NSW Heritage Council; or</li> <li>• For an Aboriginal object – the person who is the authority for the protection of Aboriginal objects and Aboriginal places in New South Wales under Section 85 of the National Parks and Wildlife Act 1974.</li> </ul> </p>		
<b>Duration</b>	8		
<b>Application ranking</b>	Negligible		
<b>What is the confidence in predicting impacts?</b>	High	<b>Are further studies required on impacts or mitigation?</b>	No
<b>How resilient is the environment to cope with impacts?</b>	LowResilience	<b>What is the level of public concern?</b>	Medium
<b>Can the impacts be reversed?</b>	No	<b>Ranking of potential significance</b>	Medium
<b>Can the impacts be mitigated?</b>	Partly	<b>Justification for ranking</b>	
<b>Do the operations comply with standards, plans, policies?</b>	Yes	Displacement or destruction of place or building.	
<b>Criteria</b>	Social Impacts: Impacts on communities with strong sense of identity.		
<b>Potential impacts</b>	Activity will not have an environmental impact that may cause substantial change or disruption to the community, including loss of facilities, reduced links to other communities or loss of community identity.		
<b>Proposed management controls</b>	Activity is carried out under Graymont rules and regulations to avoid impact on community.		
<b>Duration</b>	8		
<b>Application ranking</b>	Negligible		
<b>What is the confidence in predicting impacts?</b>	High	<b>Are further studies required on impacts or mitigation?</b>	N/A

How resilient is the environment to cope with impacts?	Medium Resilience	What is the level of public concern?	Low
Can the impacts be reversed?	Uncertain	Ranking of potential significance	Low
Can the impacts be mitigated?	Partly	Justification for ranking	
Do the operations comply with standards, plans, policies?	N/A		
<b>Criteria</b>	Social Impacts: Impacts on disadvantaged communities.		
Potential impacts	Activity will not have an environmental impact that may cause substantial change or disruption to the community, including loss of facilities, reduced links to other communities or loss of community identity.		
Proposed management controls	Activity is carried out under Graymont rules and regulations to avoid impact on community.		
Duration	8		
Application ranking	Negligible		
What is the confidence in predicting impacts?	High	Are further studies required on impacts or mitigation?	N/A
How resilient is the environment to cope with impacts?	Medium Resilience	What is the level of public concern?	Low
Can the impacts be reversed?	Uncertain	Ranking of potential significance	Low
Can the impacts be mitigated?	Partly	Justification for ranking	
Do the operations comply with standards, plans, policies?	N/A		
<b>Criteria</b>	Economic Impacts: Any impacts which may affect economic activity (positive or negative), including a decrease to net economic welfare.		
Potential impacts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- activity will bring economic benefits to the local community.</li> <li>- bring jobs to the community.</li> </ul>		
Proposed management controls	Activity positive for the local community.		
Duration	8		
Application ranking	6		
What is the confidence in predicting impacts?	High	Are further studies required on impacts or mitigation?	N/A
How resilient is the environment to cope with impacts?	Medium Resilience	What is the level of public concern?	Low
Can the impacts be reversed?	Yes	Ranking of potential significance	Low
Can the impacts be mitigated?	Partly	Justification for ranking	
Do the operations comply with standards, plans, policies?	N/A		
<b>Criteria</b>	Economic Impacts: Any impacts that result in a decrease in the economic stability of the community.		
Potential impacts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- activity will bring economic benefits to the local community.</li> <li>- bring jobs to the community.</li> </ul>		
Proposed management controls	Activity good for the local community. LANDUSE Activity area within ML. No existing crop farming. No intense animal grazing in the area. No changes (temporary or otherwise) to the current land use/s during the activity. DISTURBANCE Surface 1,190 sqm Excavation 129cb 12 EAs with ROCCs 10 access tracks either new tracks outside TEC or established track within TEC. Rehabilitation management plan provided (RMP). Tamworth Regional Local Environment _Plan provided.		
Duration	8		

<b>Application ranking</b>	6		
<b>What is the confidence in predicting impacts?</b>	High	<b>Are further studies required on impacts or mitigation?</b>	N/A
<b>How resilient is the environment to cope with impacts?</b>	Medium Resilience	<b>What is the level of public concern?</b>	Low
<b>Can the impacts be reversed?</b>	Uncertain	<b>Ranking of potential significance</b>	Low
<b>Can the impacts be mitigated?</b>	Partly	<b>Justification for ranking</b>	
<b>Do the operations comply with standards, plans, policies?</b>	N/A		
<b>Criteria</b>	Economic Impacts: Any impacts which result in a change to the public sector revenue or expenditure base.		
<b>Potential impacts</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- activity will bring economic benefits to the local community.</li> <li>- bring jobs to the community.</li> </ul>		
<b>Proposed management controls</b>	<p>Activity positive for the local community.</p> <p>LANDUSE</p> <p>Activity area within ML.</p> <p>No existing crop farming.</p> <p>No intense animal grazing in the area.</p> <p>No changes (temporary or otherwise) to the current land use/s during the activity.</p> <p>DISTURBANCE</p> <p>Surface 1,190 sqm</p> <p>Excavation 129cb</p> <p>12 EAs with ROCCs</p> <p>10 access tracks either new tracks outside TEC or established track within TEC.</p> <p>Rehabilitation management plan provided (RMP).</p> <p>Tamworth Regional Local Environment _Plan provided.</p>		
<b>Duration</b>	8		
<b>Application ranking</b>	6		
<b>What is the confidence in predicting impacts?</b>	High	<b>Are further studies required on impacts or mitigation?</b>	N/A
<b>How resilient is the environment to cope with impacts?</b>	Medium Resilience	<b>What is the level of public concern?</b>	Low
<b>Can the impacts be reversed?</b>	Uncertain	<b>Ranking of potential significance</b>	Low
<b>Can the impacts be mitigated?</b>	No	<b>Justification for ranking</b>	
<b>Do the operations comply with standards, plans, policies?</b>	N/A		
<b>Criteria</b>	Heritage Impacts: Any impacts on a locality, place, landscape, building or archaeological relic of heritage significance.		
<b>Potential impacts</b>	<p>Activity will not cause impacts on localities, places, landscapes, buildings or archaeological relics of heritage significance.</p> <p>Local European Heritage (old kilns) will not be impacted under TRLEP 5.10 (3) (i) (Tamworth Regional Local Environmental Plan 2010)</p>		

<b>Proposed management controls</b>	<p>Restrict activity to within ML where any impact is non-existent.</p> <p>AHIMS Refer to attachment regarding Aboriginal objects in the area - 3 objects found in Sulcor, locations known- Sulcor Archaeological Survey provided. APO0001755 drillholes and tracks will not impact these locations. Commitment made with "Cultural Heritage Induction- Kamilaroi Country- February 2023 Exclusion zones apply to recorded sites. Aboriginal Site recording form provided for the 3 objects within Sulcor Mine. Archaeological reports attached. Activity not within 200m of waterway. Activity not located within a sand dune. Activity will be on ridgetop more than 200m away from known objects. Activity not located within 200m below or above a cliff face. Activity not within 20 metres of or in a cave, rock shelter, or a cave mouth and is on land that is not disturbed land.</p> <p>HERITAGE Local heritage items will not be impacted (please refer to attached memorandum from Tamworth Council)- Ref: cf/MG/DocSetID 2065450 dated 7 March 2024 Response: Based on the description above (of the proposed project), Council has no heritage objections to the proposed drilling works subject to this work proceeding with caution. If a person reasonably suspects a relic or Aboriginal object is discovered during the drilling works, the work in the area of the discovery must cease immediately and the following be notified:  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For a relic –Tamworth Regional Council and the NSW Heritage Council; or</li> <li>• For an Aboriginal object – the person who is the authority for the protection of Aboriginal objects and Aboriginal places in New South Wales under Section 85 of the National Parks and Wildlife Act 1974.</li> </ul> Site work may recommence at a time confirmed in writing by:  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For a relic – Tamworth Regional Council and the NSW Heritage Council; or</li> <li>• For an Aboriginal object – the person who is the authority for the protection of Aboriginal objects and Aboriginal places in New South Wales under Section 85 of the National Parks and Wildlife Act 1974.</li> </ul> </p>		
<b>Duration</b>	8		
<b>Application ranking</b>	Negligible		
<b>What is the confidence in predicting impacts?</b>	High	<b>Are further studies required on impacts or mitigation?</b>	No
<b>How resilient is the environment to cope with impacts?</b>	LowResilience	<b>What is the level of public concern?</b>	Medium
<b>Can the impacts be reversed?</b>	No	<b>Ranking of potential significance</b>	Medium
<b>Can the impacts be mitigated?</b>	Partly	<b>Justification for ranking</b>	
<b>Do the operations comply with standards, plans, policies?</b>	Yes	Displacement or destruction of place or site.	
<b>Criteria</b>	Aesthetic Impacts: Any impacts on the visual or scenic landscape, including lighting, venting or flaring of gas.		
<b>Potential impacts</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- activity will be carried out away from public view.</li> <li>- drill locations are not seen from the public roads.</li> <li>- activity carried out in private property.</li> </ul>		
<b>Proposed management controls</b>	<p>Activity restricted to within ML where any impact is non-existent.</p> <p>LANDUSE Activity area within ML. No existing crop farming. No intense animal grazing in the area. No changes (temporary or otherwise) to the current land use/s during the activity.</p>		
<b>Duration</b>	8		
<b>Application ranking</b>	Negligible		
<b>What is the confidence in predicting impacts?</b>	High	<b>Are further studies required on impacts or mitigation?</b>	N/A
<b>How resilient is the environment to cope with impacts?</b>	Medium Resilience	<b>What is the level of public concern?</b>	Low



Can the impacts be reversed?	Yes	Ranking of potential significance	Low
Can the impacts be mitigated?	Partly	Justification for ranking	
Do the operations comply with standards, plans, policies?	N/A		
<b>Criteria</b>	Aesthetic Impacts: Areas or items of high aesthetic or scenic value.		
Potential impacts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- activity will be carried out away from public view.</li> <li>- drill locations are not seen from the public roads.</li> <li>- activity carried out in private property.</li> </ul>		
Proposed management controls	<p>Activity restricted to within ML where any impact is non-existent.</p> <p>LANDUSE</p> <p>Activity area within ML.</p> <p>No existing crop farming.</p> <p>No intense animal grazing in the area.</p> <p>No changes (temporary or otherwise) to the current land use/s during the activity.</p>		
Duration	8		
Application ranking	Negligible		
What is the confidence in predicting impacts?	High	Are further studies required on impacts or mitigation?	N/A
How resilient is the environment to cope with impacts?	High Resilience	What is the level of public concern?	Low
Can the impacts be reversed?	Yes	Ranking of potential significance	Low
Can the impacts be mitigated?	Partly	Justification for ranking	
Do the operations comply with standards, plans, policies?	N/A		
<b>Criteria</b>	Cultural Impacts: Any disturbance of the ground surface or any culturally modified trees (e.g. a scar tree).		
Potential impacts	Lack of awareness for cultural items within the area of activity can result in breach of cultural impact under the Code of Practice for the Protection of Aboriginal Objects in New South Wales.		
Proposed management controls	<p>Personnel working in the area must be made aware of the three Aboriginal sites that occur in the area. This is done through Graymont Attunga site Cultural Heritage Induction.</p> <p>AHIMS</p> <p>Refer to attachment regarding Aboriginal objects in the area - 3 objects found in Sulcor, locations known- Sulcor Archaeological Survey provided.</p> <p>APO0001755 drillholes and tracks will not impact these locations. Commitment made with "Cultural Heritage Induction- Kamilaroi Country- February 2023 Exclusion zones apply to recorded sites.</p> <p>Aboriginal Site recording form provided for the 3 objects within Sulcor Mine.</p> <p>Archaeological reports attached.</p> <p>Activity not within 200m of waterway.</p> <p>Activity not located within a sand dune.</p> <p>Activity will be on ridgetop more than 200m away from known objects.</p> <p>Activity not located within 200m below or above a cliff face.</p> <p>Activity not within 20 metres of or in a cave, rock shelter, or a cave mouth and is on land that is not disturbed land.</p> <p>HERITAGE</p> <p>Local heritage items will not be impacted (please refer to attached memorandum from Tamworth Council)- Ref: cf/MG/DocSetID 2065450 dated 7 March 2024</p> <p>Response: Based on the description above (of the proposed project), Council has no heritage objections to the proposed drilling works subject to this work proceeding with caution. If a person reasonably suspects a relic or Aboriginal object is discovered during the drilling works, the work in the area of the discovery must cease immediately and the following be notified:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For a relic –Tamworth Regional Council and the NSW Heritage Council; or</li> <li>• For an Aboriginal object – the person who is the authority for the protection of Aboriginal objects and Aboriginal places in New South Wales under Section 85 of the National Parks and Wildlife Act 1974.</li> </ul> <p>Site work may recommence at a time confirmed in writing by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For a relic – Tamworth Regional Council and the NSW Heritage Council; or</li> <li>• For an Aboriginal object – the person who is the authority for the protection of Aboriginal objects and Aboriginal places in New South Wales under Section 85 of the National Parks and Wildlife Act 1974.</li> </ul>		

<b>Duration</b>	8		
<b>Application ranking</b>	Negligible		
<b>What is the confidence in predicting impacts?</b>	High	<b>Are further studies required on impacts or mitigation?</b>	No
<b>How resilient is the environment to cope with impacts?</b>	LowResilience	<b>What is the level of public concern?</b>	Medium
<b>Can the impacts be reversed?</b>	No	<b>Ranking of potential significance</b>	Medium
<b>Can the impacts be mitigated?</b>	Partly	<b>Justification for ranking</b>	
<b>Do the operations comply with standards, plans, policies?</b>	Yes	Displacement or destruction of place or object.	
<b>Criteria</b>	Cultural Impacts: Any impacts on known Aboriginal objects or Aboriginal places.		
<b>Potential impacts</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- the known Aboriginal objects site is more than 100m away from the nearest activity (drill site location).</li> <li>- activity site can be moved if deemed too close to the Aboriginal site.</li> <li>- AHIP not required under Code of Practice for the Protection of Aboriginal Objects in New South Wales.</li> </ul>		
<b>Proposed management controls</b>	<p>Personnel working in the area must be made aware of the three Aboriginal sites that occur in the area. This is done through Graymont Attunga site Cultural Heritage Induction.</p> <p>AHIMS</p> <p>Refer to attachment regarding Aboriginal objects in the area - 3 objects found in Sulcor, locations known- Sulcor Archaeological Survey provided.</p> <p>APO0001755 drillholes and tracks will not impact these locations. Commitment made with "Cultural Heritage Induction- Kamilaroi Country- February 2023 Exclusion zones apply to recorded sites.</p> <p>Aboriginal Site recording form provided for the 3 objects within Sulcor Mine.</p> <p>Archaeological reports attached.</p> <p>Activity not within 200m of waterway.</p> <p>Activity not located within a sand dune.</p> <p>Activity will be on ridgetop more than 200m away from known objects.</p> <p>Activity not located within 200m below or above a cliff face.</p> <p>Activity not within 20 metres of or in a cave, rock shelter, or a cave mouth and is on land that is not disturbed land.</p> <p>HERITAGE</p> <p>Local heritage items will not be impacted (please refer to attached memorandum from Tamworth Council)- Ref: cf/MG/DocSetID 2065450 dated 7 March 2024</p> <p>Response: Based on the description above (of the proposed project), Council has no heritage objections to the proposed drilling works subject to this work proceeding with caution. If a person reasonably suspects a relic or Aboriginal object is discovered during the drilling works, the work in the area of the discovery must cease immediately and the following be notified:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For a relic –Tamworth Regional Council and the NSW Heritage Council; or</li> <li>• For an Aboriginal object – the person who is the authority for the protection of Aboriginal objects and Aboriginal places in New South Wales under Section 85 of the National Parks and Wildlife Act 1974.</li> </ul> <p>Site work may recommence at a time confirmed in writing by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For a relic – Tamworth Regional Council and the NSW Heritage Council; or</li> <li>• For an Aboriginal object – the person who is the authority for the protection of Aboriginal objects and Aboriginal places in New South Wales under Section 85 of the National Parks and Wildlife Act 1974.</li> </ul>		
<b>Duration</b>	8		
<b>Application ranking</b>	Negligible		
<b>What is the confidence in predicting impacts?</b>	High	<b>Are further studies required on impacts or mitigation?</b>	No
<b>How resilient is the environment to cope with impacts?</b>	LowResilience	<b>What is the level of public concern?</b>	Medium
<b>Can the impacts be reversed?</b>	No	<b>Ranking of potential significance</b>	Medium
<b>Can the impacts be mitigated?</b>	Partly	<b>Justification for ranking</b>	
<b>Do the operations comply with standards, plans, policies?</b>	N/A	Destruction or displacement of site or object.	
<b>Criteria</b>	Cultural Impacts: Affects areas where the landscape features indicate the likely presence of Aboriginal objects.		

<b>Potential impacts</b>	Activity is not located in areas where landscape features indicate the presence of Aboriginal objects.		
<b>Proposed management controls</b>	<p>Personnel working in the area must be made aware of the three Aboriginal sites that occur in the area. This is done through Graymont Attunga site Cultural Heritage Induction.</p> <p>AHIMS</p> <p>Refer to attachment regarding Aboriginal objects in the area - 3 objects found in Sulcor, locations known- Sulcor Archaeological Survey provided.</p> <p>APO0001755 drillholes and tracks will not impact these locations. Commitment made with "Cultural Heritage Induction- Kamilaroi Country- February 2023 Exclusion zones apply to recorded sites.</p> <p>Aboriginal Site recording form provided for the 3 objects within Sulcor Mine.</p> <p>Archaeological reports attached.</p> <p>Activity not within 200m of waterway.</p> <p>Activity not located within a sand dune.</p> <p>Activity will be on ridgetop more than 200m away from known objects.</p> <p>Activity not located within 200m below or above a cliff face.</p> <p>Activity not within 20 metres of or in a cave, rock shelter, or a cave mouth and is on land that is not disturbed land.</p> <p>HERITAGE</p> <p>Local heritage items will not be impacted (please refer to attached memorandum from Tamworth Council)- Ref: cf/MG/DocSetID 2065450 dated 7 March 2024</p> <p>Response: Based on the description above (of the proposed project), Council has no heritage objections to the proposed drilling works subject to this work proceeding with caution. If a person reasonably suspects a relic or Aboriginal object is discovered during the drilling works, the work in the area of the discovery must cease immediately and the following be notified:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For a relic –Tamworth Regional Council and the NSW Heritage Council; or</li> <li>• For an Aboriginal object – the person who is the authority for the protection of Aboriginal objects and Aboriginal places in New South Wales under Section 85 of the National Parks and Wildlife Act 1974.</li> </ul> <p>Site work may recommence at a time confirmed in writing by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For a relic – Tamworth Regional Council and the NSW Heritage Council; or</li> <li>• For an Aboriginal object – the person who is the authority for the protection of Aboriginal objects and Aboriginal places in New South Wales under Section 85 of the National Parks and Wildlife Act 1974.</li> </ul>		
<b>Duration</b>	8		
<b>Application ranking</b>	Negligible		
<b>What is the confidence in predicting impacts?</b>	High	<b>Are further studies required on impacts or mitigation?</b>	No
<b>How resilient is the environment to cope with impacts?</b>	LowResilience	<b>What is the level of public concern?</b>	Medium
<b>Can the impacts be reversed?</b>	No	<b>Ranking of potential significance</b>	Medium
<b>Can the impacts be mitigated?</b>	Partly	<b>Justification for ranking</b>	
<b>Do the operations comply with standards, plans, policies?</b>	Yes	Displacement or destruction of place or object.	
<b>Criteria</b>	Cultural Impacts: Affects areas subject to native title claims, indigenous land use agreements or joint management arrangements.		
<b>Potential impacts</b>	Activity will not affect areas where native title exists or land subject to native title claims, indigenous land use agreements or joint management agreements.		
<b>Proposed management controls</b>	Personnel working in the area must be made aware of the three Aboriginal sites that occur in the area. This is done through Graymont Attunga site Cultural Heritage Induction.		
<b>Duration</b>	8		
<b>Application ranking</b>	Negligible		
<b>What is the confidence in predicting impacts?</b>	High	<b>Are further studies required on impacts or mitigation?</b>	N/A
<b>How resilient is the environment to cope with impacts?</b>	High Resilience	<b>What is the level of public concern?</b>	Medium
<b>Can the impacts be reversed?</b>	N/A	<b>Ranking of potential significance</b>	Low

<b>Can the impacts be mitigated?</b>	Partly	<b>Justification for ranking</b>	
<b>Do the operations comply with standards, plans, policies?</b>	Yes		
<b>Criteria</b>	Cultural Impacts: Impacts on Aboriginal communities or areas subject to land rights claims.		
<b>Potential impacts</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- the known Aboriginal objects site is more than 100m away from the nearest activity (drill site location).</li> <li>- activity site can be moved if deemed too close to the Aboriginal site.</li> <li>- AHIP not required under Code of Practice for the Protection of Aboriginal Objects in New South Wales.</li> </ul>		
<b>Proposed management controls</b>	<p>Personnel working in the area must be made aware of the three Aboriginal sites that occur in the area. This is done through Graymont Attunga site Cultural Heritage Induction.</p> <p>Register of Native title Claims AHIMS</p> <p>Refer to attachment regarding Aboriginal objects in the area - 3 objects found in Sulcor, locations known- Sulcor Archaeological Survey provided.</p> <p>APO0001755 drillholes and tracks will not impact these locations. Commitment made with "Cultural Heritage Induction- Kamilaroi Country- February 2023 Exclusion zones apply to recorded sites.</p> <p>Aboriginal Site recording form provided for the 3 objects within Sulcor Mine.</p> <p>Archaeological reports attached.</p> <p>Activity not within 200m of waterway.</p> <p>Activity not located within a sand dune.</p> <p>Activity will be on ridgetop more than 200m away from known objects.</p> <p>Activity not located within 200m below or above a cliff face.</p> <p>Activity not within 20 metres of or in a cave, rock shelter, or a cave mouth and is on land that is not disturbed land.</p>		
<b>Duration</b>	8		
<b>Application ranking</b>	Negligible		
<b>What is the confidence in predicting impacts?</b>	Medium	<b>Are further studies required on impacts or mitigation?</b>	No
<b>How resilient is the environment to cope with impacts?</b>	LowResilience	<b>What is the level of public concern?</b>	Medium
<b>Can the impacts be reversed?</b>	No	<b>Ranking of potential significance</b>	Medium
<b>Can the impacts be mitigated?</b>	Partly	<b>Justification for ranking</b>	
<b>Do the operations comply with standards, plans, policies?</b>	Yes	Destruction or displacement of place or object.	
<b>Criteria</b>	Cultural Impacts: Impacts on areas or items of high anthropological, archaeological, architectural, cultural, heritage, historical, recreational or scientific value.		
<b>Potential impacts</b>	Lack of awareness for cultural items within the area of activity can result in breach of cultural impact under the Code of Practice for the Protection of Aboriginal Objects in New South Wales.		

<b>Proposed management controls</b>	<p>Personnel working in the area must be made aware of the three Aboriginal sites that occur in the area. This is done through Graymont Attunga site Cultural Heritage Induction.</p> <p>AHIMS Refer to attachment regarding Aboriginal objects in the area - 3 objects found in Sulcor, locations known- Sulcor Archaeological Survey provided. APO0001755 drillholes and tracks will not impact these locations. Commitment made with "Cultural Heritage Induction- Kamilaroi Country- February 2023 Exclusion zones apply to recorded sites. Aboriginal Site recording form provided for the 3 objects within Sulcor Mine. Archaeological reports attached. Activity not within 200m of waterway. Activity not located within a sand dune. Activity will be on ridgetop more than 200m away from known objects. Activity not located within 200m below or above a cliff face. Activity not within 20 metres of or in a cave, rock shelter, or a cave mouth and is on land that is not disturbed land.</p> <p>HERITAGE Local heritage items will not be impacted (please refer to attached memorandum from Tamworth Council)- Ref: cf/MG/DocSetID 2065450 dated 7 March 2024 Response: Based on the description above (of the proposed project), Council has no heritage objections to the proposed drilling works subject to this work proceeding with caution. If a person reasonably suspects a relic or Aboriginal object is discovered during the drilling works, the work in the area of the discovery must cease immediately and the following be notified:  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For a relic –Tamworth Regional Council and the NSW Heritage Council; or</li> <li>• For an Aboriginal object – the person who is the authority for the protection of Aboriginal objects and Aboriginal places in New South Wales under Section 85 of the National Parks and Wildlife Act 1974.</li> </ul> Site work may recommence at a time confirmed in writing by:  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For a relic – Tamworth Regional Council and the NSW Heritage Council; or</li> <li>• For an Aboriginal object – the person who is the authority for the protection of Aboriginal objects and Aboriginal places in New South Wales under Section 85 of the National Parks and Wildlife Act 1974.</li> </ul> </p>		
<b>Duration</b>	8		
<b>Application ranking</b>	Negligible		
<b>What is the confidence in predicting impacts?</b>	High	<b>Are further studies required on impacts or mitigation?</b>	No
<b>How resilient is the environment to cope with impacts?</b>	LowResilience	<b>What is the level of public concern?</b>	Medium
<b>Can the impacts be reversed?</b>	No	<b>Ranking of potential significance</b>	Medium
<b>Can the impacts be mitigated?</b>	Partly	<b>Justification for ranking</b>	
<b>Do the operations comply with standards, plans, policies?</b>	Yes	Destruction or displacement of place or object.	
<b>Criteria</b>	Land Use Impacts: Any major changes in land use, including curtailment of other beneficial land uses.		
<b>Potential impacts</b>	Activity will not have any significant impact on land use.		
<b>Proposed management controls</b>	<p>- activity to keep to within old farm tracks and old exploration site, and sites need to be rehabilitated as soon as practicable. - area currently not used for agriculture purposes. LANDUSE Activity area within ML. No existing crop farming. No intense animal grazing in the area. No changes (temporary or otherwise) to the current land use/s during the activity. DISTURBANCE Surface 1,190 sqm Excavation 129cb 12 EAs with ROCCs 10 access tracks either new tracks outside TEC or established track within TEC. Rehabilitation management plan provided (RMP). Tamworth Regional Local Environment _Plan provided.</p>		
<b>Duration</b>	8		
<b>Application ranking</b>	Negligible		

What is the confidence in predicting impacts?	High	Are further studies required on impacts or mitigation?	No
How resilient is the environment to cope with impacts?	Medium Resilience	What is the level of public concern?	Low
Can the impacts be reversed?	Yes	Ranking of potential significance	Low
Can the impacts be mitigated?	Partly	Justification for ranking	
Do the operations comply with standards, plans, policies?	Yes		
<b>Criteria</b>	Transportation Impacts: Substantial impacts on existing transportation systems (road, rail, pedestrian) which alter present patterns of circulation or movement.		
<b>Potential impacts</b>	Activity will have no impact on transport.		
<b>Proposed management controls</b>	Activity occurs within ML where there are no transport services.		
	<p>ACCESS ML 1470 has a lot of old/established tracks from previous exploration work and tracks used by farmers. Only existing tracks that lead to exploration activities (drillholes) will be touched or used. Most existing tracks require none to minimal disturbances and excavations. Vegetation on these tracks is mainly grassland and shrubs (refer to attached photos and descriptions). All drill sites applied for in this APO are located on old/existing tracks (refer to individual descriptions of these tracks). New tracks (refer to attachments) are on farming paddocks.</p> <p>Refer to Assessment of Significance in attachments.</p> <p>For access tracks: 1. Flag tracks so they are clear during clearing/excavations (1day) 2. Move in with dozer and excavate/clear track, spotter onsite to ensure follow flagged route (2-3days). May use gravel to sheet track, but avoid at all cost. 3. Topsoil to be put aside for use later for rehab. 4. Drilling activities (6 weeks) 5. Rehab tracks (a) resurface track/drill site with topsoil, (b) Ensure rehab to avoid erosion, (c) re-grass if necessary (seek advise) 6. Monitor 6-8 months. 7. Complete rehab and be compliant with NSW regulation (12 months or more).</p> <p>TRACK TP22- TRC, TP23- TRC, TP24- TRC, TP25- TRC : Old track. A few bushes on the side of the track/small trees. Relatively flat.</p> <p>TRACK 26: Old track, mainly grass. Relatively flat.</p> <p>TRACK 27- TRC: Old track, bushes/tress close to track, rocks. Relatively flat.</p> <p>TRACK 28- TRC: Old track, bushes /small trees on side. Going downhill.</p> <p>TRACK 29- TRC, 30- TRC: Old track, grass on the track, bushes /small trees on side. Relatively flat.</p> <p>TRACK 31- TRC: Old track, grass on the track, rocks, bushes /small trees on side. Relatively flat.</p> <p>TRACK 32- TRC, 33- TRC : Pre-existing exploration track. Mainly grass, rocks, sparse bushes. On the side of the hill.</p> <p>TRACK 34 : Pre-existing old exploration track. Mainly grass, sparse bushes. Flat area.</p> <p>TRACK 35- TRC, 37- TRC, 38: Pre-existing exploration old track. Mainly grass, sparse bushes, rocks. Top of the undulating landscape.</p> <p>TRACK 36: Pre-existing old track. Mainly grass, sparse bushes. On the side of the hill.</p> <p>TRACK 39- TRC, 40- TRC, 41, 42, 43- TRC, 44- TRC: Pre-existing old exploration track. Mainly grass, small rocks. Top of the undulating landscape.</p> <p>TRACK 45: Old track, grass on the track, sparse bushes on side. Relatively flat.</p> <p>TRACK 46- TRC: Old track, grass on the track, sparse bushes on side. Up hill.</p> <p>TRACK 47, 48- TRC: Pre-existing old exploration track. Mainly grass, sparse bushes. Relatively flat.</p> <p>TRACK 49, 50: Existing track leading to proposed track. Grass, flat.</p> <p>TRACK 51- TRC: Old track, grass on the track. Relatively flat.</p> <p>TRACK 52- TRC: Farm track. Mainly grass. Relatively flat.</p> <p>TRACK 53- TRC: Farm track. Mainly grass. A long fence line. Relatively flat.</p> <p>TRACK 54- TRC, 55: Flat farm track. Mainly grass. Relatively flat.</p>		
<b>Duration</b>	8		
<b>Application ranking</b>	Negligible		
What is the confidence in predicting impacts?	High	Are further studies required on impacts or mitigation?	N/A
How resilient is the environment to cope with impacts?	Medium Resilience	What is the level of public concern?	Low

Can the impacts be reversed?	Yes	Ranking of potential significance	Low
Can the impacts be mitigated?	Partly	Justification for ranking	
Do the operations comply with standards, plans, policies?	Yes		
<b>Criteria</b>	Transportation Impacts: Impacts associated with direct or indirect additional traffic.		
<b>Potential impacts</b>	Activity will have no impact on transport.		
<b>Proposed management controls</b>	Activity occurs within ML where there are no transport services.  ACCESS ML 1470 has a lot of old/established tracks from previous exploration work and tracks used by farmers. Only existing tracks that lead to exploration activities (drillholes) will be touched or used. Most existing tracks require none to minimal disturbances and excavations. Vegetation on these tracks is mainly grassland and shrubs (refer to attached photos and descriptions). All drill sites applied for in this APO are located on old/existing tracks (refer to individual descriptions of these tracks). New tracks (refer to attachments) are on farming paddocks. Refer to Assessment of Significance in attachments.		
<b>Duration</b>	8		
<b>Application ranking</b>	Negligible		
What is the confidence in predicting impacts?	High	Are further studies required on impacts or mitigation?	N/A
How resilient is the environment to cope with impacts?	Medium Resilience	What is the level of public concern?	Low
Can the impacts be reversed?	Yes	Ranking of potential significance	Low
Can the impacts be mitigated?	Partly	Justification for ranking	
Do the operations comply with standards, plans, policies?	N/A		
<b>Criteria</b>	Consistency with applicable local strategic planning statements, regional strategic plans or district strategic plans.		
<b>Potential impacts</b>	Activity consistent with Regional Economic Development Strategies (REDS).		
<b>Proposed management controls</b>	Positive impact bringing jobs into the area.		
<b>Duration</b>	8		
<b>Application ranking</b>	6		
What is the confidence in predicting impacts?	High	Are further studies required on impacts or mitigation?	N/A
How resilient is the environment to cope with impacts?	High Resilience	What is the level of public concern?	Low
Can the impacts be reversed?	N/A	Ranking of potential significance	Low
Can the impacts be mitigated?	N/A	Justification for ranking	
Do the operations comply with standards, plans, policies?	Yes		
<b>Criteria</b>	Matters of National Environmental Significance: Impacts on MNES under the Commonwealth Environmental Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999:		
<b>Potential impacts</b>	Activity of very low to no impact to Matters of National Environmental Significance.		

<p><b>Proposed management controls</b></p>	<p>Activity to be restricted to areas marked out.</p> <p>BCS recommendation -26/2/24  PCT 547 Wild Quince - Mock Olive - Rusty Fig - Iamboto - Sweet Pittosporum dry rainforest of rocky and scree areas of the Nandewar Bioregion and New England Tableland Bioregion- This PCT is associated with the TEC Semi-evergreen Vine Thicket in the Brigalow Belt South and Nandewar Bioregions. BCS would recommend that this TEC be avoided wherever possible. If the TEC can't be fully avoided BCS would recommend that existing tracks be used wherever possible and that upgrading of these tracks be minimised to avoid further impact to the TEC. Where required, new tracks should avoid the TEC wherever possible.  TH COMMITMENTS- TH has committed to use old and existing tracks within TEC and upgrade these tracks if needed. All new tracks are avoiding TEC. Stay within existing tracks, grass to be not completely removed, no trees to be cut/felled, do not interfere with animals in area, do not interfere with nests etc., flag areas that will potentially be out of bounds regarding TECs.  MITIGATION: Test/Assessment of significance completed. Refer to attached Assessment of Significance Report dated 12/04/2024 (Sulcor Limestone Quarry, Biodiversity Technical Memo).</p> <p>MNES  Listed Threatened Ecological Communities (4 likely to occur in area). Mitigation: stay within existing tracks, grass to be not completely removed, no trees to be cut/felled.  Listed migratory species (10 likely to occur in area). Mitigation: stay within existing tracks, grass to be not completely removed, no trees to be cut/felled, do not interfere with animals in area, do not interfere with nests etc.</p> <p>Assessment of significance report dated 12/4/2024 by ERM.  The proposed exploration works have been carefully designed to avoid any impacts to recorded biodiversity values. No hollow bearing trees will be removed and impacts to native vegetation will be limited to trimming of limbs if required. No areas of potential habitat of the listed threatened species previously recorded within the mine site will be removed, modified or isolated as a result of the proposed works.  The activity is not likely to significantly affect the environment, including threatened species or ecological communities (or their habitats), or declared areas of outstanding biodiversity value/critical habitat.  The proposed activity does not trigger a referral under the EPBC Act and does not require the preparation of a Biodiversity Development Assessment Report (BDAR) or a Species Impact Statement (SIS).  The following updated assessment is based on the Test of Significance under Section 7.3 of the Biodiversity Conservation Act 2016 (BC Act). The factors addressed under this test allow a determination of whether there is likely to be a significant effect on threatened species, populations or ecological communities or their habitats as listed under the BC Act.  No threatened species have been recorded within the disturbance areas. An assessment of significance has been prepared for those species within known records within the surrounding mine site:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Squirrel Glider (<i>Petaurus norfolcensis</i>)</li> <li>• Microchiropteran bats: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Yellow-bellied Sheath-tailed Bat (<i>Saccolaimus flaviventris</i>)</li> <li>◦ Greater Broad-nosed Bat (<i>Scoteanax rueppellii</i>)</li> <li>◦ Little Bent-winged Bat (<i>Miniopterus australis</i>)</li> <li>◦ Corben's Long-eared Bat (<i>Nyctophylus corbeni</i>)</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Woodland birds <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Dusky Woodswallow</li> <li>◦ Speckled Warbler</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>Threatened species or ecological values  Mitigation: Test/Assessment of significance completed. Refer to attached Assessment of Significance Report dated 12/04/2024 (Sulcor Limestone Quarry, Biodiversity Technical Memo).  Stay within existing tracks, grass to be not completely removed, no trees to be cut/felled, do not interfere with animals in area, do not interfere with nests etc., flag areas that will potentially be out of bounds regarding TECs.</p>		
<p><b>Duration</b></p>	<p>8</p>		
<p><b>Application ranking</b></p>	<p>Positive</p>		
<p><b>What is the confidence in predicting impacts?</b></p>	<p>High</p>	<p><b>Are further studies required on impacts or mitigation?</b></p>	<p>No</p>
<p><b>How resilient is the environment to cope with impacts?</b></p>	<p>LowResilience</p>	<p><b>What is the level of public concern?</b></p>	<p>Medium</p>
<p><b>Can the impacts be reversed?</b></p>	<p>Uncertain</p>	<p><b>Ranking of potential significance</b></p>	<p>Medium</p>



<b>Can the impacts be mitigated?</b>	Partly	<b>Justification for ranking</b>	
<b>Do the operations comply with standards, plans, policies?</b>	Yes	BCS advice and assessment of significance complied to.	
<b>Criteria</b>	Cumulative Impacts: Cumulative environmental effects with other existing or likely future activities.		
<b>Potential impacts</b>	Activity to occur in Mining Lease area, hence, no impact.		
<b>Proposed management controls</b>	Activity to be restricted to within ML.  LANDUSE Activity area within ML. No existing crop farming. No intense animal grazing in the area. No changes (temporary or otherwise) to the current land use/s during the activity.  REHABILITATION /ROCC according to Codes of Practice.		
<b>Duration</b>	8		
<b>Application ranking</b>	Positive		
<b>What is the confidence in predicting impacts?</b>	High	<b>Are further studies required on impacts or mitigation?</b>	No
<b>How resilient is the environment to cope with impacts?</b>	Medium Resilience	<b>What is the level of public concern?</b>	Low
<b>Can the impacts be reversed?</b>	Yes	<b>Ranking of potential significance</b>	Low
<b>Can the impacts be mitigated?</b>	Partly	<b>Justification for ranking</b>	
<b>Do the operations comply with standards, plans, policies?</b>	Yes		

FORM: Brief NonCEA (v3.4)

© State of New South Wales through Regional NSW 2023. The information contained in this publication is based on knowledge and understanding at the time of writing March, 2023. However, because of advances in knowledge, users are reminded of the need to ensure that the information upon which they rely is up to date and to check the currency of the information with the appropriate officer of the Regional NSW or the user's independent adviser.