

Thursday 4 April 2024

Assessable Prospecting Operation Application Decision Briefing and Review of Environmental Factors document Boona Gap Homestead Auger Drilling | APO0001521

| Decision Maker | Monique Meyer |
|---------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Prepared by | Marianne Bonnay |
| Title | EL 8833 (1992) |
| Authorised Representative | |
| Project name | Boona Gap Homestead Auger Drilling |
| Activity type | Complying Exploration Activity |

Issue

has sought an activity approval in respect of Boona Gap Homestead Auger Drilling, within EL 8833 (1992), at Boona Gap EL8833.

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

This exploration activity approval is being sought under EL 8833 (granted 18/4/2019 & expiry 18/4/2025) to undertake assessable prospecting operations.

The current security deposit held for EL 8833 is \$20,000.

This application replaces the application APO0001496 which expired on 31 January 2024 and previously approved on 8/11/2023.

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.

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 Boona Gap Homestead Auger Drilling* 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 applicant has indicated that the rehabilitation liability for the Boona Gap Homestead Auger Drilling and any outstanding rehabilitation liabilities will not exceed \$30,000. An assessment of the security deposit required to secure funding for the fulfilment of obligations in relation to Boona Gap Homestead Auger Drilling (if approved) is not necessary. This assessment under s.261BC of the Mining Act 1992 has determined that no change to the security deposit is required.

Assessment of Impacts (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.

Additional terms (if approved)

No additional terms are required.

Summary

Based on the information provided in the *APPLICATION TO UNDERTAKE ASSESSABLE PROSPECTING OPERATIONS Boona Gap Homestead Auger Drilling* 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 Boona Gap Homestead Auger Drilling and determines that the
 activity is 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

| Criteria | Air Impacts: Air quality impacts (including impacts on nearby sensitive receptors). | | | |
|-------------------|---|--|--|--|
| Potential impacts | Particulates and emissions from vehicle exhausts, plant and machinery. Wind erosion and dust from disturbed soils during construction and operations. Dust from vehicles travelling over tracks. Dust generation from operating plant and machinery. Air quality impacts on nearby sensitive receivers. | | | |

Activities must comply with CEA Location Restrictions, Impact Thresholds and Criteria.

Activities must comply with (Exploration Code of Practice: Environmental Management) as per the commitment in the application (APO). Relevant requirements of this Code include:

- a. Activities must comply with cumulative AQ criteria.
- b. Emissions from the activities should not result in cumulative PM10 levels exceeding 50ug/m3 (24hr) or 30 ug/m3 (annual average) at any occupied residence.
- c. Emissions from the activities should not result in cumulative PM2.5 emissions exceeding 25 ug/m3 (24hr) or 8 ug/m3 (annual average) at any occupied residence.
- d. Vehicle speeds limited to minimise dust.
- e. Roads watered during high traffic periods.
- f. Surface disturbance managed in accordance with Blue Book.

Impacts of any drilling limited to immediate vicinity of drilling due to controls set out in title conditions (Exploration Code of Practice: Environmental Management). Impacts negligible due to nature of drilling activities.

All disturbed areas to be rehabilitated in accordance with title conditions (Exploration Code of Practice: Rehabilitation). Rehabilitation to occur as soon as practicable after completion of activity (including sealing of any boreholes).

AIR

Dust emissions from drilling operations and vehicle movements on unsealed surfaces have the potential to impact sensitive receivers near to the drill sites. SRL Ops will inform nearby residents of the potential dust emissions from the auger drilling program, and implement the following management measures, as required, to minimise the potential for air quality imapcts to occur: * cease drilling immediately if dust emissions are visible from a distance of more than 250m from the

auger rig.

* limit vehicle speeds to 40km/h on formed tracks and 20km/h on unformed tracks.

With these measures in place, no significant air quality impacts are expected to occur. No venting, flaring or re-use of gases will occur as part of the drilling program.

| Duration | Short term | | |
|---|--|--|---|
| Application ranking | | | |
| 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? | N/A | 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 f | or ranking |
| Do the operations comply with standards, plans, policies? | Yes | | |
| Criteria | Air Impacts: Greenhouse or ozone impacts. | | |
| Potential impacts Proposed management controls | Emissions from combustion of fuel associate construction, operations and rehabilitation. Fugitive emissions of gases or vapour from a Activities must comply with CEA Location Reexploration activities cannot be a CEA. CO2 emissions from activities are extremely emissions and impact. Restrictions on use of ozone depleting substance and impact. All disturbed areas to be rehabilitated in accepractice: Rehabilitation). Rehabilitation to or (including sealing of any boreholes). AIR Dust emissions from drilling operations and potential to impact sensitive receivers near to the potential dust emissions from the auger of management measures, as required, to mini * cease drilling immediately if dust emissions auger rig. * limit vehicle speeds to 40km/h on formed to With these measures in place, no significant flaring or re-use of gases will occur as part of | Fugitive methodrilling operations estrictions, Impactions and incompanded in the second of the drill sites. So the drill sites. So the drill sites are visible from the acks and 20km/rair quality impactions. | ane emissions from intercepted seams. s and the operation of flares. It Thresholds and Criteria. Petroleum Insequential in context of global Iso limits ozone depletion. Iso conditions (Exploration Code of practicable after completion of activity Ints on unsealed surfaces have the SRL Ops will inform nearby residents of and implement the following all for air quality imapcts to occur: In a distance of more than 250m from the in on unformed tracks. Its are expected to occur. No venting, |

| Duration | Medium term atmospheric residence. | | |
|--|---|--|--|
| Application ranking | modalii toim atmoobiione rociacinos. | | |
| 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? | Low |
| Can the impacts be reversed? | Yes | Ranking of potential significance | Low |
| Can the impacts be mitigated? | Partly | Justification f | or ranking |
| Do the operations comply with standards, plans, policies? | Yes | | |
| Criteria | Air Impacts: Additional impacts on areas with | <u> </u> | <u> </u> |
| Proposed management controls | Potential for temperature inversions in winte possible from exposed soils. Particulate generation from operating machinery, vehicl Activities must comply with CEA Location Re | emissions from ver | vehicles and machinery. Dust racks, etc. |
| Duration | commitment in the application (APO). Releval Activities must comply with cumulative AC b. Emissions from the activities should not re (24hr) or 30 ug/m3 (annual average) at any c. Emissions from the activities should not re ug/m3 (24hr) or 8 ug/m3 (annual average) at d. Vehicle speeds limited to minimise dust. e. Roads watered during high traffic periods. f. Surface disturbance managed in accordant Impacts of any drilling limited to immediate v. Code of Practice: Environmental Manageme. All disturbed areas to be rehabilitated in accipractice: Rehabilitation). Rehabilitation to occincluding sealing of any boreholes). AIR Dust emissions from drilling operations and potential to impact sensitive receivers near the potential dust emissions from the auger management measures, as required, to mini * cease drilling immediately if dust emissions auger rig. * limit vehicle speeds to 40km/h on formed to With these measures in place, no significant flaring or re-use of gases will occur as part of the speeds to the potential of the potential flaring or re-use of gases will occur as part of the potential to the potential of the potential to speeds to 40km/h on formed to the potential of | criteria. esult in cumulativoccupied residentesult in cumulativoccupied residentesult in cumulativot any occupied residentesult in cumulativot any occupied residentesult in cumulativot any occupied resident (impacts negliativo de residentesult) and compacts and some sulting program, mise the potentiation are visible from racks and 20km/lair quality impacts | e PM10 levels exceeding 50ug/m3 ice. e PM2.5 emissions exceeding 25 esidence. bk. due to controls set out in Exploration gible due to nature of drilling activities). conditions (Exploration Code of tracticable after completion of activity and son unsealed surfaces have the SRL Ops will inform nearby residents of and implement the following all for air quality imapcts to occur: a distance of more than 250m from the in on unformed tracks. |
| Duration | Short term | | |
| Application ranking 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? | Low |
| Can the impacts be reversed? | Yes | Ranking of potential significance | Low |
| Can the impacts be mitigated? | Partly | Justification f | or ranking |
| Do the operations comply with standards, plans, policies? | Yes | | 4 |
| Criteria | Water Impacts: Impacts from the use of surfa | ace or groundwa | ter. |

| Potential impacts | or use of farm dams through landholder agre through produced water in drilling / deep exc contamination and/or depressurisation of gro depressurisation effects on surface water. | Generally minimal Beements). No Cavation operatio Dundwater syster | surface water use (must be licensed use of groundwater but potential loss ns. Interception, cross |
|--|---|---|--|
| Bronocod management centrals | surface water or aquifers. | actrictions Impac | at Threeholds and Critoria |
| Proposed management controls | Activities must comply with CEA Location Re | estrictions, impac | t Thresholds and Criteria. |
| | Activities must comply with Exploration Code commitment in the application (APO). Releva. Activities must implement all measures to or quantity. b. Activities must not cause adverse impacts water supplies used by livestock). | ant requirements prevent causing | s of this Code include: any adverse impacts on water quality |
| | Water used for access track watering must be consent of owner). | oe obtained from | licensed source or farm dams (with |
| | Boreholes to be constructed, operated and conditions, Departmental Guidelines and Co | | |
| | Nearest surface water source is approximate The auger drilling program will be located ou disturbance, therefore no significant sedimen Notwithstanding, erosion and sediment cont accordance with the series Managing Urban (Landcom, 2004). It is expected that minima GW Given the shallow nature of the auger drilling groundwater sources. Intersection of significant groundwater is not program. In the event that groundwater is in be implemented as required: * Drilling operations will cease until temporal transportable panels and a plastic liner, will it is Produced water will be collected and suspersond the surface of the water will be permitted to flow to see the produced water will be permitted to flow to see in the produced water will be produced to flow the produced water will be intersecting ground and the hole rehabilitated in accordance with | utside of waterfrontation or erosion measures will Stormwater: Soil water will be ready, the program is anticipated to outersected, the force, above ground be erected. Ended sediment a quality, discharge urface water drailurality to be discharted to a disposal water will be aballowed. | nt land and will involve minimal impacts are expected. be implemented, as required, in its and Construction including Volume 1 quired for the auger drilling program. It is not expected to impact on accur during the proposed auger drilling llowing produced water procedure will sumps, constructed from hay bales or allowed to settle. It is a to land adjacent to the drill site. No nage lines. It is a suitably it facility. Indoned if groundwater is intersected, |
| | | | |
| Duration Application replains | Short term | | |
| Application ranking 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? | Low |
| Can the impacts be reversed? | Yes | Ranking of potential significance | Low |
| Can the impacts be mitigated? | Fully | Justification f | or ranking |
| Do the operations comply with | Yes | | |
| standards, plans, policies? | Water Impacts: Impacts from storage of water | er | |
| | | | Water used for exploration |
| Potential impacts | Negligible and only localised impacts from so temporarily not available for ecological, stock minimal redirection of flow and changes to flow runoff can be sediment laden. Generally farm dams through landholder agreements). produced water in drilling / deep excavation | k, domestic or irr ow rates and vol minimal surface No use of gr | igation purposes. Generally |

Activities must comply with CEA Location Restrictions, Impact Thresholds and Criteria.

Activities must comply with the Exploration Code of Practice: Environmental Management as per the commitment in the application (APO). Relevant requirements of this Code include:

- a. Activities must implement all measures to prevent causing any adverse impacts on water quality or quantity.
- b. Activities must not cause adverse impacts to livestock (including any adverse impacts on surface water supplies used by livestock).

All management and storage of produced water must comply with the title conditions. In addition, the Exploration Code of Practice: Produced Water Management, Storage and Transfer applies to i. petroleum exploration which requires the management of produced water, or

ii. activities which require produced water to be stored on site (excluding the management of incidental groundwater mixed with drilling fluids that can be temporarily contained in drilling sumps or above ground tanks).

Any impacts subject to compensation and landholder access arrangements (e.g. any impacts on land use from storage or water). SW

Nearest surface water source is approximately 1900m away to the east of the auger drilling area. The auger drilling program will be located outside of waterfront land and will involve minimal disturbance, therefore no significant sedimentation or erosion impacts are expected. Notwithstanding, erosion and sediment control measures will be implemented, as required, in accordance with the series Managing Urban Stormwater: Soils and Construction including Volume 1 (Landcom, 2004). It is expected that minimal water will be required for the auger drilling program. GW

Given the shallow nature of the auger drilling, the program is not expected to impact on groundwater sources.

Intersection of significant groundwater is not anticipated to occur during the proposed auger drilling program. In the event that groundwater is intersected, the following produced water procedure will be implemented as required:

- * Drilling operations will cease until temporary, above ground sumps, constructed from hay bales or transportable panels and a plastic liner, will be erected.
- * Produced water will be collected and suspended sediment allowed to settle.

and the hole rehabilitated in accordance with government guidelines.

- * The water will be tested, and if of suitable quality, discharged to land adjacent to the drill site. No produced water will be permitted to flow to surface water drainage lines.
- * If the produced water is not of a suitable quality to be discharged, it will be collected by a suitably licensed waste water contractor and transported to a disposal facility.

 Drilling of the auger hole intersecting groundwater will be abandoned if groundwater is intersected,

| Duration | Short term | | |
|-------------------------------------|---|-------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Application ranking | | | |
| What is the confidence in | High | Are further | No |
| predicting impacts? | | studies | |
| | | required on | |
| | | impacts or | |
| | | mitigation? | |
| How resilient is the environment to | High Resilience | What is the | Low |
| cope with impacts? | | level of | |
| | | public | |
| | | concern? | |
| Can the impacts be reversed? | Yes | Ranking of | Low |
| | | potential | |
| | | significance | |
| Can the impacts be mitigated? | Fully | Justification for | or ranking |
| Do the operations comply with | Yes | | - |
| standards, plans, policies? | | | |
| Criteria | Water Impacts: Impacts from changes to natural water bodies, wetlands or runoff patterns. | | |
| Potential impacts | Negligible and only localised changes to surface flows rates and volumes. Surface runoff can be sediment laden. Generally minimal surface water use (must be licensed or use of farm dams | | |
| | , | ` | amination and/or depressurisation of |
| | groundwater systems in drilling operations. | | • |

Activities must comply with CEA Location Restrictions, Impact Thresholds and Criteria. Proposed management controls Activities must comply with Exploration Code of Practice: Environmental Management as per the commitment in the application (APO). Relevant requirements of this Code include: a. Activities must implement all measures to prevent causing any adverse impacts on water quality or quantity. b. All sediment and erosion controls (including drainage from roads/access tracks) to be managed in accordance with Blue Book. c. Existing access tracks to be used/upgraded wherever possible. All management and storage of produced water must comply with the title conditions. In addition, the Exploration Code of Practice: Produced Water Management, Storage and Transfer applies to i. petroleum exploration which requires the management of produced water, or ii. activities which require produced water to be stored on site (excluding the management of incidental groundwater mixed with drilling fluids that can be temporarily contained in drilling sumps or above ground tanks). SW Nearest surface water source is approximately 1900m away to the east of the auger drilling area. The auger drilling program will be located outside of waterfront land and will involve minimal disturbance, therefore no significant sedimentation or erosion impacts are expected. Notwithstanding, erosion and sediment control measures will be implemented, as required, in accordance with the series Managing Urban Stormwater: Soils and Construction including Volume 1 (Landcom, 2004). It is expected that minimal water will be required for the auger drilling program. Duration Short term Application ranking What is the confidence in High Are further No predicting impacts? studies required on impacts or mitigation? How resilient is the environment to High Resilience What is the Low cope with impacts? level of public concern? Can the impacts be reversed? Yes Ranking of Low potential significance Fully Justification for ranking Can the impacts be mitigated? Do the operations comply with standards, plans, policies? Criteria Water Impacts: Impacts from aquifer interference, including changes to inter-aquifer connectivity. **Potential impacts** No use of groundwater but potential loss through produced water in drilling / deep excavation Interception, cross contamination and/or depressurisation of groundwater systems in drilling operations. Groundwater depressurisation effects on surface water. Mobilisation of pollutants (such as hydrocarbons) in surface water or aquifers. Proposed management controls Activities must comply with CEA Location Restrictions, Impact Thresholds and Criteria. Activities must comply with (Exploration Code of Practice: Environmental Management) as per the commitment in the application (APO). Relevant requirements of this Code include: a. Activities must implement all measures to prevent causing any adverse impacts on water quality or quantity. b. Activities must minimise cross connection of aquifers or groundwater sources. c. Activities must minimise any depressurisation of aquifers or groundwater sources. d. Coal and petroleum title holders must prepare and implement and Groundwater Monitoring & Modelling Plan in consultation with NSW Office of Water. Boreholes to be constructed, operated and decommissioned in accordance with authority/title conditions, Departmental Guidelines and Codes of Practice to protect groundwater/aquifers.

Given the shallow nature of the auger drilling, the program is not expected to impact on groundwater sources.

Intersection of significant groundwater is not anticipated to occur during the proposed auger drilling program. In the event that groundwater is intersected, the following produced water procedure will be implemented as required:

- * Drilling operations will cease until temporary, above ground sumps, constructed from hay bales or transportable panels and a plastic liner, will be erected.
- * Produced water will be collected and suspended sediment allowed to settle.
- * The water will be tested, and if of suitable quality, discharged to land adjacent to the drill site. No produced water will be permitted to flow to surface water drainage lines.
 * If the produced water is not of a suitable quality to be discharged, it will be collected by a suitably
- * If the produced water is not of a suitable quality to be discharged, it will be collected by a suitably licensed waste water contractor and transported to a disposal facility.

Drilling of the auger hole intersecting groundwater will be abandoned if groundwater is intersected, and the hole rehabilitated in accordance with government guidelines.

| Duration | Short term | | |
|--|--|---|--|
| Application ranking | Short term | | |
| 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? | Low |
| Can the impacts be reversed? | Yes | Ranking of potential significance | Low |
| Can the impacts be mitigated? | Fully | Justification f | or ranking |
| Do the operations comply with standards, plans, policies? | Yes | | |
| Criteria | Water Impacts: Impacts from changes to floo | | |
| Potential impacts | Negligible and only localised changes to dra sediment laden. | | |
| Proposed management controls | Activities must comply with CEA Location Restrictions, Impact Thresholds and Cri Activities must comply with (Exploration Code of Practice: Environmental Manager commitment in the application (APO). Relevant requirements of this Code include a. Activities must implement all measures to prevent causing any adverse impacts or quantity. b. All sediment and erosion controls (including drainage from roads/access tracks) accordance with Blue Book. c. Existing access tracks to be used/upgraded wherever possible. | | |
| | All management and storage of produced wathe Exploration Code of Practice: Produced i. petroleum exploration which requires the mii. activities which require produced water to incidental groundwater mixed with drilling flu or above ground tanks). SW Nearest surface water source is approximate The auger drilling program will be located ou disturbance, therefore no significant sedimen Notwithstanding, erosion and sediment contraccordance with the series Managing Urban (Landcom, 2004). It is expected that minimal | Water Management of p be stored on site ids that can be to ely 1900m away to tistide of waterfrontation or erosion of measures will Stormwater: Soi | ent, Storage and Transfer applies to roduced water, or excluding the management of emporarily contained in drilling sumps to the east of the auger drilling area. In land and will involve minimal impacts are expected. be implemented, as required, in Is and Construction including Volume 1 |
| Duration | Short term | | |
| Application ranking What is the confidence in predicting impacts? | High | Are further studies required on impacts or | No |
| How resilient is the environment to cope with impacts? | High Resilience | mitigation? What is the level of public concern? | Low |
| Can the impacts be reversed? | Yes | Ranking of potential significance | Low |
| Can the impacts be mitigated? | Fully | Justification f | or ranking |
| Do the operations comply with standards, plans, policies? | Yes | | |
| Criteria | Water Impacts: Impacts from changes in sur | face or groundwa | ater quality and quantity. |
| Potential impacts | removed. Generally minimal surface wat landholder agreements). No use of groun | ent laden from ar er use (must be landwater but pote erception, cross of s. Groundwater de bydrocarbons) ion from vehicle w | eas where vegetation has been licensed or use of farm dams through ntial loss through produced water in contamination and/or depressurisation lepressurisation effects on surface n surface water or aquifers. |

Activities must comply with CEA Location Restrictions, Impact Thresholds and Criteria.

Activities must comply with (Exploration Code of Practice: Environmental Management) as per the commitment in the application (APO). Relevant requirements of this Code include:

- a. Activities must implement all measures to prevent causing any adverse impacts on water quality or quantity.
- b. Activities must minimise cross connection of aquifers or groundwater sources.
- c. Activities must minimise any depressurisation of aquifers or groundwater sources.
- d. Coal and petroleum title holders must prepare and implement and Groundwater Monitoring & Modelling Plan in consultation with NSW Office of Water.
- e. All sediment and erosion controls to be in accordance with Blue Book to minimise off-site impacts. SW

Nearest surface water source is approximately 1900m away to the east of the auger drilling area. The auger drilling program will be located outside of waterfront land and will involve minimal disturbance, therefore no significant sedimentation or erosion impacts are expected.

Notwithstanding, erosion and sediment control measures will be implemented, as required, in accordance with the series Managing Urban Stormwater: Soils and Construction including Volume 1 (Landcom, 2004). It is expected that minimal water will be required for the auger drilling program.

Given the shallow nature of the auger drilling, the program is not expected to impact on groundwater sources.

Intersection of significant groundwater is not anticipated to occur during the proposed auger drilling program. In the event that groundwater is intersected, the following produced water procedure will be implemented as required:

- * Drilling operations will cease until temporary, above ground sumps, constructed from hay bales or transportable panels and a plastic liner, will be erected.
- * Produced water will be collected and suspended sediment allowed to settle.
- * The water will be tested, and if of suitable quality, discharged to land adjacent to the drill site. No produced water will be permitted to flow to surface water drainage lines.
- * If the produced water is not of a suitable quality to be discharged, it will be collected by a suitably licensed waste water contractor and transported to a disposal facility.

Drilling of the auger hole intersecting groundwater will be abandoned if groundwater is intersected, and the hole rehabilitated in accordance with government guidelines.

| Duration | Short term | | | |
|---|---|--|---|--|
| Application ranking | | | | |
| 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? | Low | |
| Can the impacts be reversed? | Yes | Ranking of potential significance | Low | |
| Can the impacts be mitigated? | Fully | Justification for ranking | | |
| Do the operations comply with standards, plans, policies? | Yes | | | |
| Criteria | Soil & Stability Impacts: Degradation of soil acidification). | quality (including | contamination, salinisation or | |
| Potential impacts | Soil erosion and sediment laden runoff from disturbed areas / areas where vegetation has beer removed. Mobilisation of pollutants (such as hydrocarbons) in soils. Inappropriate disposal of drilling wastes / overflow from drilling sumps. Exposure of acid sulfate soils. Soil compaction from construction/operations. Impacts on land with high agricultural capability. SOIL/TOPO Area mapped as no acid sulphate soil risk and rudosols and chromosols soil types. No Strateg Agricultural Land present in proposed drilling area. Land capability 4 and 7. Land zoning RU1. Topography is generally flat with a creekline running through the proposed drilling area. All dril sites will be located outside of waterfront land. Vegetation cover consists of a crop; however the | | g sumps. chromosols soil types. No Strategic ability 4 and 7. Land zoning RU1. the proposed drilling area. All drill | |

| Proposed management controls Duration | Activities must comply with CEA Location Remust comply with (Exploration Code of Practicommitment in the application (APO). Releving the vegetation clearing and surface disturbance, pollution/contamination of land or water. drainage from roads/access tracks) to be material access tracks to be used/upgraded wherever the comply with the title conditions. In add Management, Storage and Transfer applies management of produced water, or ii. activity (excluding the management of incidental ground temporarily contained in drilling sumps or above the produced water. The condition of th | tice: Environment vant requirements b. Prevent cau b. All sediment anaged in accord repossible. d. C. All manage lition, the Exploration i. petroleum vities which requirement dove ground tankens (Exploration Capparation Ca | tal Management) as per the s of this Code include: a. Minimising using any land degradation or and erosion controls (including lance with Blue Book. c. Existing controls on sumps and management of ment and storage of produced water a exploration which requires the re produced water to be stored on site with drilling fluids that can be s). All disturbed areas to be Code of Practice: Rehabilitation). |
|---|--|--|---|
| Application ranking | | | T |
| What is the confidence in predicting impacts? | High | Are further studies required on impacts or mitigation? | No |
| How resilient is the environment to | High Resilience | What is the | Low |
| cope with impacts? | | level of | |
| | | public concern? | |
| Can the impacts be reversed? | Yes | Ranking of potential significance | Low |
| Can the impacts be mitigated? | Fully | Justification f | or ranking |
| Do the operations comply with | Yes | | |
| standards, plans, policies? | Cail 9 Ctability Impacts Impacts on land with | high ogrioultur | d conchility |
| Potential impacts | Soil & Stability Impacts: Impacts on land with | | |
| | Areas used for exploration activities, access tracks, etc temporarily not available for agricultural production. Temporary loss of use of land. Mobilisation of pollutants (such as hydrocarbons) in soils, air or waters. Inappropriate disposal of drilling wastes / overflow from drilling sumps. Use of pesticides, herbicides, fertilisers or other chemicals have the potential to build up residues the environment, including in soils and water. Short term noise, air quality and visual impacts. Soil erosion and sediment laden runoff from disturbed areas, that could lead to soil or water contamination or land degradation. Exposure of acid sulfate soils. Spread of weeds, pest animals and animal/plant diseases. Disruption to agricultural / livestock operations. SOIL/TOPO Area mapped as no acid sulphate soil risk and rudosols and chromosols soil types. No Strategic Agricultural Land present in proposed drilling area. Land capability 4 and 7. Land zoning RU1. Topography is generally flat with a creekline running through the proposed drilling area. All drill sites will be located outside of waterfront land. Vegetation cover consists of a crop; however the crop will be stripped prior to auger drilling activities. | | ave the potential to build up residues in that could lead to soil or water chromosols soil types. No Strategic ability 4 and 7. Land zoning RU1. the proposed drilling area. All drill over consists of a crop; however the |
| Proposed management controls | Activities must comply with CEA Location Remust comply with (Exploration Code of Practicommitment in the application (APO). Relevant potential impacts on the environment (included diseases, etc - and use of above-ground sursite and subject to compensation and landhouse rehabilitated in accordance with title concentration and landhouse rehabilitation to occur as soon as practicable boreholes). | tice: Environmen vant requirements ling livestock pro mps required on l older access arra ditions (Exploratio | tal Management) as per the softhis Code include minimising tection, control of weeds, pest animals, BSAL. Impacts limited to activity angements. All disturbed areas to on Code of Practice: Rehabilitation). |
| Duration | Short term | | |
| Application ranking | | | |

| 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? | Low |
| Can the impacts be reversed? | Yes | Ranking of potential significance | Low |
| Can the impacts be mitigated? | Fully | Justification f | or ranking |
| Do the operations comply with standards, plans, policies? | Yes | | |
| Criteria | Soil & Stability Impacts: Loss of soil from win | nd or water erosion | on. |
| Potential impacts | Increased risk of erosion where vegetation h | nas been remove | d. |
| | Potential erosion of disturbed areas. SOIL/TOPO Area mapped as no acid sulphate soil risk a Agricultural Land present in proposed drilling Topography is generally flat with a creekline sites will be located outside of waterfront lan crop will be stripped prior to auger drilling ac | g area. Land capa running through d. Vegetation co | ability 4 and 7. Land zoning RU1. the proposed drilling area. All drill |
| Proposed management controls | Activities must comply with CEA Location Restrictions, Impact Thresholds and Criteria. Activities must comply with (Exploration Code of Practice: Environmental Management) as per the commitment in the application (APO). Relevant requirements of this Code include: a. Minimising vegetation clearing and surface disturbance. b. Prevent causing any land degradation or pollution/contamination of land or water. c. All sediment and erosion controls (including drainage from roads/access tracks) to be managed in accordance with Blue Book. d. Existing access tracks to be used/upgraded wherever possible. All disturbed areas to be rehabilitated in accordance with title conditions (Exploration Code of Practice: Rehabilitation). Rehabilitation to occur as soon as practicable after completion of activity (including sealing of any boreholes). | | |
| Duration | Short term | aring ocaling or ar | ly bereficies). |
| Application ranking | | | |
| 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? | Low |
| Can the impacts be reversed? | Yes | Ranking of potential significance | |
| Can the impacts be mitigated? | Fully | Justification f | or ranking |
| Do the operations comply with standards, plans, policies? | Yes | | |
| Criteria | Soil & Stability Impacts: Loss of structural in | tegrity of the soil. | |
| Potential impacts | Soil compaction from access traffic, use of p | lant and machine | ery. |
| | Soil erosion from disturbed areas / areas who Mobilisation of pollutants (such as hydrocart SOIL/TOPO Area mapped as no acid sulphate soil risk a Agricultural Land present in proposed drilling Topography is generally flat with a creekline sites will be located outside of waterfront lar crop will be stripped prior to auger drilling actions. | pons) in soils. Ind rudosols and of grarea. Land cape running through id. Vegetation co | chromosols soil types. No Strategic ability 4 and 7. Land zoning RU1. the proposed drilling area. All drill |

| Proposed management controls | Activities must comply with CEA Location I must comply with (Exploration Code of Pra commitment in the application (APO). Relevegetation clearing and surface disturbance pollution/contamination of land or water. drainage from roads/access tracks) to be naccess tracks to be used/upgraded where chemicals to significantly reduce risk to soi accordance with title conditions (Exploration occur as soon as practicable after complet ripping of any access tracks which need to Impact generally limited due to low traffic need to the state of t | ctice: Environment evant requirement e. b. Prevent cat b. All sediment an anaged in accord yer possible. d. Cls. All disturbe in Code of Practication of activity (inclube rehabilitated composition of activity (inclube rehabilitated composition of activity (inclube rehabilitated composition of activity (included). | tal Management) as per the s of this Code include: a. Minimising using any land degradation or and erosion controls (including lance with Blue Book. c. Existing controls on sumps and management of d areas to be rehabilitated in a: Rehabilitation to be uding sealing of any boreholes). Deep an remediate compaction impacts. |
|--|--|--|--|
| Duration | Short term | | · |
| Application ranking 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? | Low |
| Can the impacts be reversed? | Yes | Ranking of potential significance | Low |
| Can the impacts be mitigated? | Fully | Justification f | or ranking |
| Do the operations comply with | Yes | | |
| standards, plans, policies? | Ocil 9 Otaliilita kana t | | also forms land all days |
| Criteria | Soil & Stability Impacts: Increased land ins | tability with high ri | sks from land slides or subsidence. |
| Potential impacts | Minimal potential impacts. | | |
| Proposed management controls | Negligible impacts from induced seismicity extraction of groundwater, etc. SOIL/TOPO Area mapped as no acid sulphate soil risk Agricultural Land present in proposed drillin Topography is generally flat with a creeklin sites will be located outside of waterfront lacrop will be stripped prior to auger drilling a Activities must comply with CEA Location F | and rudosols and ng area. Land cap e running through and. Vegetation contivities. | chromosols soil types. No Strategic ability 4 and 7. Land zoning RU1. the proposed drilling area. All drill over consists of a crop; however the |
| Proposed management controls | must comply with (Exploration Code of Pra commitment in the application (APO). Relevegetation clearing and surface disturbance pollution/contamination of land or water. from roads/access tracks) to be managed imanage instability risks). d. Existing acce Controls on sumps and management of ch disturbed areas to be rehabilitated in accor Rehabilitation). Rehabilitation to occur as a sealing of any boreholes). | ctice: Environment evant requirement e. b. Prevent cau c. All sediment an accordance with the stracks to be us emicals to signific dance with title co | tal Management) as per the s of this Code include: a. Minimising using any land degradation or and erosion controls (including drainage a Blue Book (includes controls to ed/upgraded wherever possible. e. antly reduce risk to soils. All inditions (Exploration Code of Practice: |
| Duration | Short term | | |
| Application ranking What is the confidence in predicting impacts? | High | Are further studies required on | No |
| | | impacts or | |
| How resilient is the environment to cope with impacts? | High Resilience | mitigation? What is the level of public concern? | Low |
| Can the impacts be reversed? | Yes | Ranking of potential significance | Low |
| Can the impacts be mitigated? | Fully | Justification f | or ranking |
| Do the operations comply with standards, plans, policies? | Yes | | |
| | Noise & Vibration Impacts: Results in incre | ased noise or vibr | ation |
| Criteria | Noise & Vibration Impacts: Results in incre | ased noise or vibr | ation. |

| Potential impacts | Noise from vehicles, plant and machinery re | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--|--|--|---------------------------|--|
| | receivers, such as residences, educational e animal boarding/training establishments, into | | | worship, sion drilling | |
| | | | cause vibration impacts . | Shots | |
| | have vibration and overpressure impacts wh | | | Vibroseis | |
| | machinery has vibration impacts which may | impact vibration | sensitive sites. | | |
| Proposed management controls | Activities must comply with CEA Location Re | estrictions, Impac | ct Thresholds and Criteria. | | |
| | Activities must comply with (Exploration Cod | de of Practice: En | vironmental Management) | as per the | |
| | commitment in the application (APO). Relev | vant requirements | s of this Code include: | | |
| | a. Implementing all practicable measures to | ensure noise lev | els meet acceptable criteria | a for | |
| | sensitive receivers. b. Notifying potentially affected landholders | at loast 24brs pri | or to dotanating explosives | | |
| | c. Compliance with Interim Construction Noi | | | | |
| | agreements. | | | | |
| | d. Ground vibration thresholds limited to 5 m | nm/s (peak partic | e velocity) at any residence | e/sensitive | |
| | receiver. | om/o for any itam | of Aboriainal / Furances b | a rita a a | |
| | e. Ground vibration thresholds limited to 3 m significance or cliff line greater than 4m in he | | of Aboriginal / European ne | entage | |
| | f. Vibrating machinery not to be used within | | e receivers, item/place of A | boriginal / | |
| | European heritage significance or any cliff li | ne greater than 4 | m in height. | • | |
| | Impacts limited to immediate vicinity of explo | oration activity | | | |
| | TIME/NOISE | Impacts limited to immediate vicinity of exploration activity. TIME/NOISE | | | |
| | Monday to Sunday 7am to 6pm | | | | |
| | 4/4/24 to 30/6/24 | | | | |
| | This drilling is within close proximity to the la | | | | |
| | consented to this drilling occurring within this residence is within 33m. | s distance. The o | closest auger drilling noie to | o tne | |
| | SRL Ops wil inform any nearby residents of potential noise emissions from the exploration site | | | | |
| | during the auger drilling program, and will implement the following management measures, as | | | | |
| | required, to minimise the potential for noise impacts to occur: | | | | |
| | * install noise barriers at the drill site. | | | | |
| | * modify the hours and/or days of operation. | | | | |
| Duration | Short term | | | | |
| Application ranking | | | | | |
| What is the confidence in | High | Are further | No | | |
| predicting impacts? | | studies | | | |
| | | required on impacts or | | | |
| | | mitigation? | | | |
| How resilient is the environment to | High Resilience | What is the | Medium | | |
| cope with impacts? | | level of | | | |
| | | public | | | |
| Can the impacts be reversed? | Yes | concern? Ranking of | Low | | |
| can the impacts be reversed? | 165 | potential | LOW | | |
| | | significance | | | |
| Can the impacts be mitigated? | Fully | Justification f | or ranking | | |
| Do the operations comply with | Yes | | | | |
| standards, plans, policies? | | | | | |
| | Naine 9 Vibration Inc 4. Aff 4. | | | | |
| Criteria | Noise & Vibration Impacts: Affects sensitive | • | | | |
| Potential impacts | Noise from vehicles, plant and machinery re | sults in unaccept | | | |
| | Noise from vehicles, plant and machinery re receivers, such as residences, educational e | sults in unaccept | nedical facilities, places of v | worship, | |
| | Noise from vehicles, plant and machinery re receivers, such as residences, educational animal boarding/training establishments, into | esults in unaccept establishments, n ensive livestock a | nedical facilities, places of vagriculture, etc. Percuss | worship, sion drilling | |
| | Noise from vehicles, plant and machinery re receivers, such as residences, educational animal boarding/training establishments, into | esults in unaccept establishments, n ensive livestock a rilling unlikely to o | nedical facilities, places of vagriculture, etc. Percussicause vibration impacts . | worship, | |

Activities must comply with CEA Location Restrictions, Impact Thresholds and Criteria.

Activities must comply with (Exploration Code of Practice: Environmental Management) as per the commitment in the application (APO). Relevant requirements of this Code include:

- a. Implementing all practicable measures to ensure noise levels meet acceptable criteria for sensitive receivers.
- b. Notifying potentially affected landholders at least 24hrs prior to detonating explosives.
- c. Compliance with Interim Construction Noise Guidelines and/or EPL and/or landholder agreements.
- d. Ground vibration thresholds limited to 5 mm/s (peak particle velocity) at any residence/sensitive receiver.
- e. Ground vibration thresholds limited to 3 mm/s for any item of Aboriginal / European heritage significance or cliff line greater than 4m in height.
- f. Vibrating machinery not to be used within 200m of sensitive receivers, item/place of Aboriginal / European heritage significance or any cliff line greater than 4m in height.

Impacts limited to immediate vicinity of exploration activity.

TIME/NOISE

Monday to Sunday 7am to 6pm

4/4/24 to 30/6/24

This drilling is within close proximity to the landholders secondary residence. The landholder has consented to this drilling occurring within this distance. The closest auger drilling hole to the residence is within 33m.

SRL Ops wil inform any nearby residents of potential noise emissions from the exploration site during the auger drilling program, and will implement the following management measures, as required, to minimise the potential for noise impacts to occur:

- * install noise barriers at the drill site.
- * modify the hours and/or days of operation.

| Duration | Short term | | |
|--|--|--|------------|
| Application ranking | | | |
| What is the confidence in predicting impacts? | High | Are further studies required on impacts or | No |
| Harris Ward to the construction | Library Davidson | mitigation? | Madan |
| How resilient is the environment to cope with impacts? | High 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? | Fully | Justification f | or ranking |
| Do the operations comply with standards, plans, policies? | Yes | | |
| Criteria | Coastal Location & Processes: Affects coast under projected climate change conditions. | · | · |
| Potential impacts | Activities along the coastline / floodways have the potential to exacerbate coastal erosion (rising sea levels and increased storm activity under projected climate change conditions could result in increased erosion along the coastline / floodways). | | |
| Proposed management controls | Activities must comply with CEA Location Restrictions, Impact Thresholds and Criteria. Activities must comply with (Exploration Code of Practice: Environmental Management) as per the commitment in the application (APO). Relevant requirements of this Code include: a. Activities must implement all measures to prevent causing any adverse impacts on water quality or quantity. b. All sediment and erosion controls (including drainage from roads/access tracks) to be managed in accordance with Blue Book. CO2 emissions from activities are extremely limited and inconsequential in context of global emissions and impact. Restrictions on use of ozone depleting substances in NSW also limits ozone depletion. All disturbed areas to be rehabilitated in accordance with title conditions (Exploration Code of Practice: Rehabilitation). Rehabilitation to occur as soon as practicable after completion of activity (including sealing of any boreholes). | | |
| Duration | Short term | | |
| Application ranking | | | |
| 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? | Low |

| Can the impacts be reversed? | Yes | Ranking of potential | Low | |
|---|---|--|--|--|
| | | significance | | |
| Can the impacts be mitigated? | Fully | Justification for ranking | | |
| Do the operations comply with standards, plans, policies? | Yes | | | |
| Criteria | Hazardous substances or chemicals: Impact transport of hazardous substances or chemicals | | h the use, generation, storage or | |
| Potential impacts | Mobilisation of pollutants (such as hydrocarb | | or waters | |
| Totolida impaoto | Inappropriate disposal of drilling wastes / over | , , | | |
| | Use of pesticides, herbicides, fertilisers or other chemicals have the potential to build up residue the environment, including in soils and water. CHEMICAL No down hole drilling fluids will be used during the auger drilling program. Other chemicals use | | | |
| | include diesel fuel, oil and grease. These chapallet where required. | | | |
| Proposed management controls | In addition, the Exploration Code of Practice applies to i. petroleum exploration which reactivities which require produced water to be groundwater mixed with drilling fluids that ca ground tanks). All disturbed areas to be (Exploration Code of Practice: Rehabilitation completion of activity. | tice: Environment vant requirements ease of chemicals /contamination on inficantly reduce emicals must concts) to be collectroproduced water: Produced Water equires the mana estored on site (and be temporarily rehabilitated in a | tal Management) as per the s of this Code include: a. Preventing s, fuels, other potential pollutants. b. if land or water. c. Controls on risk to environment. d. Use of nply with legislative requirements. e. ed, segregated and disposed of must comply with the title conditions. er Management, Storage and Transfer agement of produced water, or ii. excluding the management of incidental contained in drilling sumps or above ccordance with title conditions | |
| Duration | Short term | | | |
| Application ranking | | | T | |
| 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? | Low | |
| Can the impacts be reversed? | Yes | Ranking of potential significance | Low | |
| Can the impacts be mitigated? | Fully | Justification for ranking | | |
| Do the operations comply with standards, plans, policies? | Yes | | - | |
| Criteria Criteria | Wastes & Emissions: Impacts to the environment resulting from the generation or disposal of wastes. | | | |
| Potential impacts | Mobilisation of pollutants (such as hydrocarb drilling wastes / overflow from drilling sumps | Fugitive en e of pesticides, h | nissions of gases or vapour from drilling erbicides, fertilisers or other chemicals | |

Activities must comply with CEA Location Restrictions, Impact Thresholds and Criteria.

Activities must comply with (Exploration Code of Practice: Environmental Management) as per the commitment in the application (APO). Relevant requirements of this Code include:

- a. Preventing contamination of the environment by the release of chemicals, fuels, other potential pollutants.
- b. Preventing any land degradation or pollution/contamination of land or water.
- c. Controls on sumps and management of chemicals to significantly reduce risk to environment.
- d. Use of pesticides, herbicides, fertilisers or other chemicals must comply with legislative requirements.
- e. Wastes (including any drilling by-products) to be collected, segregated and disposed of lawfully.

All management and storage of produced water must comply with the title conditions. In addition, the Exploration Code of Practice: Produced Water Management, Storage and Transfer applies to i. petroleum exploration which requires the management of produced water, or

ii. activities which require produced water to be stored on site (excluding the management of incidental groundwater mixed with drilling fluids that can be temporarily contained in drilling sumps or above ground tanks).

All disturbed areas to be rehabilitated in accordance with title conditions (Exploration Code of Practice: Rehabilitation). Rehabilitation to occur as soon as practicable after completion of activity. WASTE

All waste products generated by site personnel, including packaging materials, would be appropriately stored and/or removed from site at the end of each shift. In accordance with the Mandatory Requirement 5.1 of the Exploration Code of Practice: Environmental Management, drilling waste generated from the drilling program would be managed in a manner that does not, as far as practicable, cause harm to the environment. Drill cuttings will be used to backfill the drill holes as they are drilled.

| | noice as they are armed. | | |
|-------------------------------------|---|-----------------|------------|
| Duration | Short term | | |
| Application ranking | | | |
| What is the confidence in | High | Are further | No |
| predicting impacts? | | studies | |
| | | required on | |
| | | impacts or | |
| | | mitigation? | |
| How resilient is the environment to | High Resilience | What is the | Low |
| cope with impacts? | | level of | |
| | | public | |
| | | concern? | |
| Can the impacts be reversed? | Yes | Ranking of | Low |
| | | potential | |
| | | significance | |
| Can the impacts be mitigated? | Fully | Justification f | or ranking |
| Do the operations comply with | Yes | | |
| standards, plans, policies? | | | |
| Criteria | Wastes & Emissions: Impacts on drinking water catchments, wetlands, natural water bodies, | | |
| | riparian zones or flood prone areas. | | |

Potential impacts

Negligible and only localised changes to drainage flows/flooding regime.

Water used for exploration temporarily not available for ecological, stock, domestic or irrigation purposes.

Surface runoff can be sediment laden from areas where vegetation has been removed.

Generally minimal surface water use (must be licensed or use of farm dams through landholder agreements).

No use of groundwater but potential loss through produced water in drilling / deep excavation operations.

Interception, cross contamination and/or depressurisation of groundwater systems in drilling operations. Groundwater depressurisation effects on surface water.

Mobilisation of pollutants (such as hydrocarbons) in surface water or aquifers.

Ford across creeks can cause stream bank erosion from vehicle wash.

Inappropriate disposal of drilling wastes / overflow from drilling sumps.

All waste products generated by site personnel, including packaging materials, would be appropriately stored and/or removed from site at the end of each shift. In accordance with the Mandatory Requirement 5.1 of the Exploration Code of Practice: Environmental Management, drilling waste generated from the drilling program would be managed in a manner that does not, as far as practicable, cause harm to the environment. Drill cuttings will be used to backfill the drill holes as they are drilled.

CHEMICAL

No down hole drilling fluids will be used during the auger drilling program. Other chemicals used will include diesel fuel, oil and grease. These chemicals will be stored within a bunded area or on a spill pallet where required.

Proposed management controls

Activities must comply with CEA Location Restrictions, Impact Thresholds and Criteria. Activities must comply with (Exploration Code of Practice: Environmental Management) as per the commitment in the application (APO). Relevant requirements of this Code include: a. Activities must implement all measures to prevent causing any adverse impacts on water quality or quantity. b. All sediment and erosion controls (including drainage from roads/access tracks) to be managed in accordance with Blue Book. All management and storage of produced water must comply with the title conditions. In addition, the Exploration Code of Practice: Produced Water Management, Storage and Transfer applies to i. petroleum exploration which requires the management of produced water, or ii. activities which require produced water to be stored on site (excluding the management of incidental groundwater mixed with drilling fluids that can be temporarily contained in drilling sumps or above ground tanks). All disturbed areas to be rehabilitated in accordance with title conditions (Exploration Code of Practice: Rehabilitation). Rehabilitation to occur as soon as practicable after completion of activity.

| | practicable after completion of activity. | | |
|---|---|--|-----------------------------------|
| Duration | Short term | | |
| Application ranking | | | |
| 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? | Low |
| Can the impacts be reversed? | Yes | Ranking of potential significance | Low |
| Can the impacts be mitigated? | Fully | Justification f | or ranking |
| Do the operations comply with standards, plans, policies? | Yes | | |
| Criteria | Wastes & Emissions: Impacts on groundwa | ter recharge area | s or areas with high water table. |

Potential impacts

ns: Impacts on groundwater recharge areas or areas with high water

No use of groundwater but potential loss through Minimal impact on recharge and salinity. produced water in drilling / deep excavation operations. Interception, cross contamination and/or depressurisation of groundwater systems in drilling operations. Groundwater depressurisation effects on surface water. Mobilisation of pollutants (such as hydrocarbons) in surface water or Inappropriate disposal of drilling wastes / overflow from drilling sumps. aguifers. Vegetation clearance in recharge areas can increase salinity. Acid drainage due to exposure of acid

sulfate soils.

Activities must comply with CEA Location Restrictions, Impact Thresholds and Criteria.

Activities must comply with (Exploration Code of Practice: Environmental Management) as per the commitment in the application (APO). Relevant requirements of this Code include: a. Activities must implement all measures to prevent causing any adverse impacts on water quality or quantity.

All management and storage of produced water must comply with the title conditions. In addition, the Exploration Code of Practice: Produced Water Management, Storage and Transfer applies to i. petroleum exploration which requires the management of produced water, or ii. activities which require produced water to be stored on site (excluding the management of incidental groundwater mixed with drilling fluids that can be temporarily contained in drilling sumps or above ground tanks).

Boreholes to be constructed, operated and decommissioned in accordance with authority/title conditions, Departmental Guidelines and Codes of Practice to protect groundwater/aquifers. Drill holes to be cased where aguifers intercepted (minimal impact on recharge and salinity). GW

Given the shallow nature of the auger drilling, the program is not expected to impact on groundwater sources.

Intersection of significant groundwater is not anticipated to occur during the proposed auger drilling program. In the event that groundwater is intersected, the following produced water procedure will be implemented as required:

- * Drilling operations will cease until temporary, above ground sumps, constructed from hay bales or transportable panels and a plastic liner, will be erected.
- * Produced water will be collected and suspended sediment allowed to settle.
- * The water will be tested, and if of suitable quality, discharged to land adjacent to the drill site. No produced water will be permitted to flow to surface water drainage lines.
- * If the produced water is not of a suitable quality to be discharged, it will be collected by a suitably licensed waste water contractor and transported to a disposal facility.

| | Drilling of the auger hole intersecting groundwater will be abandoned if groundwater is intersected, and the hole rehabilitated in accordance with government guidelines. | | |
|---|---|--|------------|
| Duration | Short term | | |
| Application ranking | | | |
| 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? | Low |
| Can the impacts be reversed? | Yes | Ranking of potential significance | Low |
| Can the impacts be mitigated? | Fully | Justification for | or ranking |
| Do the operations comply with standards, plans, policies? | Yes | | |
| Criteria | Wastes and Emissions: Impacts on coastline landforms. | , ' | ' |
| Potential impacts | Negligible and only localised impacts on unique landforms. Mobilisation of pollutants in soils, surface water or aquifers. Short term noise, air quality and visual impacts. Particulate emissions from plant and machinery; fugitive emissions of gases or vapour from drilling operations and the operation of flares. Soil erosion and sediment laden runoff from disturbed areas, that could lead to soil or water contamination or land degradation. Exposure of acid sulfate soils. Spread of weeds, pest animals and animal/plant diseases. Damage to structures and sensitive features, such as unique landforms. Activities along the coastline / floodways have the potential to exacerbate coastal erosion (rising sea levels and increased storm activity under projected climate change conditions could result in increased erosion along the coastline / floodways). | | |
| Proposed management controls | Impact limited to activity site and subject to compensation and landholder access arrangements. Activities must comply with CEA Location Restrictions, Impact Thresholds and Criteria. Activities must comply with (Exploration Code of Practice: Environmental Management) as per the commitment in the application (APO). All disturbed areas to be rehabilitated in accordance with title conditions (Exploration Code of Practice: Rehabilitation). Rehabilitation to occur as soon as practicable after completion of activity (including sealing of any boreholes). | | |
| Duration | Short term | | , |
| Application ranking | | | |
| 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 | Low | |
|---|---|--|---|--|
| | | concern? | | |
| Can the impacts be reversed? | Yes | Ranking of potential | Low | |
| | | significance | | |
| Can the impacts be mitigated? | Fully | Justification f | or ranking | |
| Do the operations comply with standards, plans, policies? | Yes | | | |
| Criteria | Wastes & Emissions: Impacts on erosion prodegrees. | one areas, areas | with slopes of greater than 18 | |
| Potential impacts | Minimal potential impacts. | | | |
| | Soil erosion and sediment laden runoff from removed. | disturbed areas | areas where vegetation has been | |
| | Mobilisation of pollutants (such as hydrocarb | oons) in soils. | | |
| | Riverbed / riparian zone disturbance from us SOIL/TOPO Area mapped as no acid sulphate soil risk ar | nd rudosols and | chromosols soil types. No Strategic | |
| | Agricultural Land present in proposed drilling Topography is generally flat with a creekline sites will be located outside of waterfront lan crop will be stripped prior to auger drilling ac | running through d. Vegetation co | the proposed drilling area. All drill | |
| Proposed management controls | Activities must comply with CEA Location Repermitted on slopes exceeding 18 degrees. Practice: Environmental Management) as perequirements of this Code include: a. Minin Prevent causing any land degradation or pol sediment and erosion controls (including dra accordance with Blue Book (includes control tracks to be used/upgraded wherever possib accordance with title conditions (Exploration occur as soon as practicable after completio | Activities muser the commitmer nising vegetation lution/contamina inage from roads to manage institute. All disturb Code of Practice | st comply with (Exploration Code of at in the application (APO). Relevant clearing and surface disturbance. b. tion of land or water. c. All s/access tracks) to be managed in ability risks). d. Existing access the dareas to be rehabilitated in the exploration of the exploration | |
| Duration | Short term | ir or douvity (irrore | ading scaling of any percholosy. | |
| Application ranking | Short term | | | |
| What is the confidence in | High | Are further | No | |
| predicting impacts? | i iigii | studies required on | | |
| | | impacts or mitigation? | | |
| How resilient is the environment to | High Resilience | What is the | Low | |
| cope with impacts? | g | level of | | |
| cope with impacts. | | public | | |
| | | concern? | | |
| Can the impacts be reversed? | Yes | Ranking of | Low | |
| can are impacto se reverseu: | | potential | | |
| | | significance | | |
| Can the impacts be mitigated? | Fully | Justification f | or ranking | |
| Do the operations comply with | Yes | | - · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | |
| standards, plans, policies? Criteria | Wastes & Emissions: Impacts on subsidence | e or slin areas | | |
| | • | • | a haan ramayad maay ingaa a sadd . f | |
| Potential impacts | Soil erosion from disturbed areas / areas wh slips. | ere vegetation ha | as been removed may increase risk of | |
| | Drilling operations unlikely to contribute to slips or subsidence. SOIL/TOPO | | | |
| | Area mapped as no acid sulphate soil risk ar Agricultural Land present in proposed drilling Topography is generally flat with a creekline sites will be located outside of waterfront lan crop will be stripped prior to auder drilling ac | g area. Land capa running through d. Vegetation co | ability 4 and 7. Land zoning RU1. the proposed drilling area. All drill | |
| | crop will be stripped prior to auger drilling activities. Activities must comply with CEA Location Restrictions, Impact Thresholds and Criteria. Activities must comply with (Exploration Code of Practice: Environmental Management) as per the commitment in the application (APO). Relevant requirements of this Code include: a. Minimising vegetation clearing and surface disturbance. b. Prevent causing any land degradation or pollution/contamination of land or water. c. All sediment and erosion controls (including drainage from roads/access tracks) to be managed in accordance with Blue Book (includes controls to manage instability risks). d. Existing access tracks to be used/upgraded wherever possible. All disturbed areas to be rehabilitated in accordance with title conditions (Exploration Code of Practice: Rehabilitation). Rehabilitation to occur as soon as practicable after completion of activity. | | | |

| Duration | Short term | | | |
|--|--|--|---------------------------------|--|
| Application ranking | Onort tollil | | | |
| 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? | Low | |
| Can the impacts be reversed? | Yes | Ranking of potential significance | Low | |
| Can the impacts be mitigated? | Fully | Justification f | or ranking | |
| Do the operations comply with standards, plans, policies? Criteria | Yes Wastes & Emissions: Impacts on areas with | acid sulphate, so | odic or highly permeable soils. | |
| Potential impacts | Vegetation removal unlikely to exacerbate a | | | |
| | Drilling activities unlikely to exacerbate acid sulfate or sodicity issues. Soil erosion and sediment laden runoff from disturbed areas / areas where vegetation has been removed. | | | |
| | SOIL/TOPO Area mapped as no acid sulphate soil risk and rudosols and chromosols soil types. No Strategic Agricultural Land present in proposed drilling area. Land capability 4 and 7. Land zoning RU1. Topography is generally flat with a creekline running through the proposed drilling area. All drill sites will be located outside of waterfront land. Vegetation cover consists of a crop; however the | | | |
| Proposed management controls | crop will be stripped prior to auger drilling activities. Activities must comply with CEA Location Restrictions, Impact Thresholds and Criteria. Activities must comply with (Exploration Code of Practice: Environmental Management) as per the commitment in the application (APO). Relevant requirements of this Code include: a. Minimising vegetation clearing and surface disturbance. b. Prevent causing any land degradation or pollution/contamination of land or water. c. All sediment and erosion controls (including drainage from roads/access tracks) to be managed in accordance with Blue Book. d. Existing access tracks to be used/upgraded wherever possible. e. Controls on sumps and management of chemicals to significantly reduce risk to soils. All disturbed areas to be rehabilitated in accordance with title conditions (Exploration Code of Practice: Rehabilitation). Rehabilitation to occur as soon as practicable after completion of activity. Impacts generally limited due to low traffic numbers and | | | |
| Duration | short term nature of exploration. Short term | | | |
| Application ranking | | | | |
| 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? | Low | |
| Can the impacts be reversed? | Yes | Ranking of potential significance | Low | |
| Can the impacts be mitigated? | Fully | Justification f | or ranking | |
| Do the operations comply with standards, plans, policies? | Yes | - Do to | | |
| Criteria | Wastes & Emissions: Impacts on areas with | salinity or potent | ual salinity problems. | |

| Potential impacts | Activities unlikely to exacerbate salinity prob | lems. | | |
|---|--|---|--|--|
| | Vegetation removal may reduce vegetation of | drawdown of wate | er table. | |
| | Spills of saline produced water. | | | |
| | Vegetation removal unlikely to exacerbate acid sulfate or sodicity issues. Soil erosion and sediment laden runoff from disturbed areas / areas where vegetation has been | | | |
| | | | | |
| | removed. SOIL/TOPO | | | |
| | Area mapped as no acid sulphate soil risk and rudosols and chromosols soil types. No Strategic Agricultural Land present in proposed drilling area. Land capability 4 and 7. Land zoning RU1. Topography is generally flat with a creekline running through the proposed drilling area. All drill sites will be located outside of waterfront land. Vegetation cover consists of a crop; however the | | | |
| Proposed management controls | crop will be stripped prior to auger drilling activities. Activities must comply with CEA Location Restrictions, Impact Thresholds and Criteria. | | | |
| | must comply with (Exploration Code of Practice: Environmental Management) as per the commitment in the application (APO). Relevant requirements of this Code include: a. Minimising vegetation clearing and surface disturbance. b. Prevent causing any land degradation or pollution/contamination of land or water. c. All sediment and erosion controls (including drainage from roads/access tracks) to be managed in accordance with Blue Book. d. Controls on sumps and management of chemicals to significantly reduce risk to soils. All disturbed areas to be rehabilitated in accordance with title conditions (Exploration Code of Practice: Rehabilitation). | | | |
| Duration | Rehabilitation to occur as soon as practicabl Short term | e alter completio | on on activity. | |
| Application ranking | Himb | A wa fourth a | No. | |
| What is the confidence in predicting impacts? | High | Are further studies | No | |
| | | required on impacts or mitigation? | | |
| How resilient is the environment to cope with impacts? | High Resilience | What is the level of public | Low | |
| Con the impacts he vavoured? | Voc | concern? | Law | |
| Can the impacts be reversed? | Yes | Ranking of potential significance | Low | |
| Can the impacts be mitigated? | Fully | Justification f | or ranking | |
| Do the operations comply with standards, plans, policies? | Yes | | | |
| Criteria | Wastes & Emissions: Impacts on areas with | degraded or con | taminated land. | |
| Potential impacts | Activity unlikely to result in any change to ex | isting contamina | ted soils or migration of contaminants. | |
| | Soil erosion and sediment laden runoff from removed. | disturbed areas | / areas where vegetation has been | |
| | Mobilisation of pollutants (such as hydrocarb | oons) in soils. | | |
| | Inappropriate disposal of drilling wastes / ove | erflow from drillin | g sumps. | |
| | Exposure of acid sulfate soils. | | | |
| | Soil compaction from construction / operation | ns. | | |
| | Vegetation removal unlikely to have any imp SOIL/TOPO | | | |
| | Area mapped as no acid sulphate soil risk an Agricultural Land present in proposed drilling Topography is generally flat with a creekline sites will be located outside of waterfront lan crop will be stripped prior to auger drilling ac | g area. Land capa running through d. Vegetation co tivities. | ability 4 and 7. Land zoning RU1. the proposed drilling area. All drill over consists of a crop; however the | |
| Proposed management controls | Activities must comply with CEA Location Restrictions, Impact Thresholds and Criteria. Activities must comply with (Exploration Code of Practice: Environmental Management) as per the commitment in the application (APO). Relevant requirements of this Code include: a. Minimising vegetation clearing and surface disturbance. b. Prevent causing any land degradation or pollution/contamination of land or water. c. All sediment and erosion controls (including drainage from roads/access tracks) to be managed in accordance with Blue Book. d. Controls on sumps and management of chemicals to significantly reduce risk to soils. All disturbed areas to be rehabilitated in accordance with title conditions (Exploration Code of Practice: Rehabilitation). Rehabilitation to occur as soon as practicable after completion of activity. Impacts generally limited due to short term nature of exploration. Activity unlikely to exacerbate any existing contamination. | | | |

| Duration | Short term | | |
|-------------------------------------|--|----------------------|--|
| Application ranking | | | |
| What is the confidence in | High | Are further | No |
| predicting impacts? | | studies | |
| | | required on | |
| | | impacts or | |
| | | mitigation? | |
| How resilient is the environment to | High Resilience | What is the | Low |
| cope with impacts? | | level of | |
| | | public | |
| | | concern? | |
| Can the impacts be reversed? | Yes | Ranking of | Low |
| | | potential | |
| | | significance | |
| Can the impacts be mitigated? | Fully | Justification f | or ranking |
| Do the operations comply with | Yes | | |
| standards, plans, policies? | | | |
| Criteria | Wastes & Emissions: Impacts on areas with | degraded or con | taminated water (ground or surface). |
| Potential impacts | Activities unlikely to have any additional impacts on areas with existing degraded or contaminated | | |
| | water (ground or surface). Boreholes to be cased when aquifers intercepted. Surface runoff can | | |
| | be sediment laden from areas where vegetation has been removed. Interception, cross | | |
| | contamination and/or depressurisation of gro | oundwater syster | ns in drilling operations. Groundwater |
| | depressurisation effects on surface water. | Mobilisation of | pollutants (such as hydrocarbons) in |
| | surface water or aquifers. Inappropriate | disposal of drilling | ng wastes / overflow from drilling |
| | sumps. Excavations excluded from acid | sulfate soils. | |

Activities must comply with CEA Location Restrictions, Impact Thresholds and Criteria.

Activities must comply with (Exploration Code of Practice: Environmental Management) as per the commitment in the application (APO). Relevant requirements of this Code include:

- a. Activities must implement all measures to prevent causing any adverse impacts on water quality or quantity.
- b. Activities must minimise cross connection of aquifers or groundwater sources.
- c. Activities must minimise any depressurisation of aquifers or groundwater sources.
- d. Coal and petroleum title holders must prepare and implement and Groundwater Monitoring & Modelling Plan in consultation with NSW Office of Water.
- e. All sediment and erosion controls to be in accordance with Blue Book to minimise off-site impacts.

Boreholes to be constructed, operated and decommissioned in accordance with authority/title conditions, Departmental Guidelines and Codes of Practice to protect groundwater/aquifers.

All management and storage of produced water must comply with the title conditions. In addition, the Exploration Code of Practice: Produced Water Management, Storage and Transfer applies to i. petroleum exploration which requires the management of produced water, or

ii. activities which require produced water to be stored on site (excluding the management of incidental groundwater mixed with drilling fluids that can be temporarily contained in drilling sumps or above ground tanks).

All disturbed areas to be rehabilitated in accordance with title conditions (Exploration Code of Practice: Rehabilitation). Rehabilitation to occur as soon as practicable after completion of activity (including sealing of any boreholes).

Activities unlikely to exacerbate any existing surface or groundwater contamination.

Nearest surface water source is approximately 1900m away to the east of the auger drilling area. The auger drilling program will be located outside of waterfront land and will involve minimal disturbance, therefore no significant sedimentation or erosion impacts are expected. Notwithstanding, erosion and sediment control measures will be implemented, as required, in accordance with the series Managing Urban Stormwater: Soils and Construction including Volume 1 (Landcom, 2004). It is expected that minimal water will be required for the auger drilling program. GW

Given the shallow nature of the auger drilling, the program is not expected to impact on groundwater sources.

Intersection of significant groundwater is not anticipated to occur during the proposed auger drilling program. In the event that groundwater is intersected, the following produced water procedure will be implemented as required:

- * Drilling operations will cease until temporary, above ground sumps, constructed from hay bales or transportable panels and a plastic liner, will be erected.
- * Produced water will be collected and suspended sediment allowed to settle.

and the hole rehabilitated in accordance with government guidelines.

- * The water will be tested, and if of suitable quality, discharged to land adjacent to the drill site. No produced water will be permitted to flow to surface water drainage lines.
 * If the produced water is not of a suitable quality to be discharged, it will be collected by a suitably
- * If the produced water is not of a suitable quality to be discharged, it will be collected by a suitably licensed waste water contractor and transported to a disposal facility.

 Drilling of the auger hole intersecting groundwater will be abandoned if groundwater is intersected,

| Duration | Short term | | | |
|-------------------------------------|---|---------------------------|-----|--|
| Application ranking | | | | |
| What is the confidence in | High | Are further | No | |
| predicting impacts? | | studies | | |
| | | required on | | |
| | | impacts or | | |
| | | mitigation? | | |
| How resilient is the environment to | High Resilience | What is the | Low | |
| cope with impacts? | | level of | | |
| | | public | | |
| | | concern? | | |
| Can the impacts be reversed? | Yes | Ranking of | Low | |
| | | potential | | |
| | | significance | | |
| Can the impacts be mitigated? | Fully | Justification for ranking | | |
| Do the operations comply with | Yes | | | |
| standards, plans, policies? | | | | |
| Criteria | Vegetation: Any clearing or modification of vegetation (including impacts on wildlife corridors, remnant vegetation & habitat for species of conservation significance) | | | |

Potential impacts Vegetation removal can decrease available foraging/ sheltering/ breeding habitat for species and displace species from regular place of residence. Impacts on vegetation species and ecological communities. Vegetation removal and activities can temporarily impact wildlife corridors and remnant vegetation. Areas used for exploration activities, access tracks, etc not available for fauna habitat. Mobilisation of pollutants (such as hydrocarbons) in soils, air or waters can potentially impact fauna. Drilling sumps can be a hazard for fauna. Use of pesticides, herbicides, fertilisers or other chemicals have the potential to build up residues in the environment, including in soils and water. Short term noise and air quality impacts. Soil erosion and sediment laden runoff from disturbed areas, that could lead to soil or water contamination or land degradation. Exposure of acid sulfate soils. Spread of weeds, pest animals and animal/plant diseases. DISTURBANCE EA Block number 614- Unit P Surface disturbance 8sqm SEED search on 7/11/23- confirming finding on 19/1/23 for APO0001341- Land zoning RU1. Endangered "Large-leafed Monotaxis" observed just outside title boundary - within veg area approx 1.2km NW of proposed activity area. Given only proposing slashing exotic weeds and native grasses, considered low risk. Site photos indicate clear areas, mature veg can be avoided. Steeper areas within vegetated area - along W of proposed activity area. Site photos indicate proposed drilling locations generally flat to slight slope. No other issues of environmental sensitivity. No areas of critical habitat or areas of outstanding biodiversity value have been identified within the proposed auger drilling area. No MNES are likely to be impacted by the proposed auger drilling. Please refer to attached search results. No threatened species or ecological communities or their habitats are likely to be affected by the proposed auger drilling program. Please refer to attached search results. TNV map. Close to but not within category 2- sensitive regulated land, and for some part of the EL steep and highly erodible land. Note- application is not included in these zones. **Proposed management controls** Activities must comply with CEA Location Restrictions, Impact Thresholds and Criteria. Activities must comply with (Exploration Code of Practice: Environmental Management) as per the commitment in the application (APO). Relevant requirements of this Code include: a. Minimise extent of vegetation clearing and surface disturbance to as low as practicable. b. Prevent adverse impacts to fauna caused by vegetation clearing, including relocation of resident fauna. All disturbed areas to be Access track widths unlikely to pose significant barrier to fauna. rehabilitated in accordance with title conditions (Exploration Code of Practice: Rehabilitation). Rehabilitation to occur as soon as practicable after completion of activity Duration Short term Application ranking What is the confidence in High Are further predicting impacts? studies required on impacts or mitigation? How resilient is the environment to High Resilience What is the Low cope with impacts? level of public concern? Can the impacts be reversed? Yes Ranking of Low potential significance Can the impacts be mitigated? Fully Justification for ranking Do the operations comply with Yes standards, plans, policies? Criteria 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.

| Potential impacts | No impacts. | | |
|---|---|------------------------------|---|
| | CEA impact thresholds apply. An activity cannot be a CEA if it: | | |
| | 1. occurs on land declared as areas of outstanding biodiversity value / critical habitat, | | |
| | 2. has a significant effect on threatened species or ecological communites, or their habitats. | | |
| | DISTURBANCE | | |
| | EA Block number 614- Unit P | | |
| | Surface disturbance 8sqm SEED search on 7/11/23- confirming finding | on 19/1/23 for A | PO0001341- Land zoning RU1 |
| | Endangered "Large-leafed Monotaxis" obser | | |
| | 1.2km NW of proposed activity area. Given of | | |
| | grasses, considered low risk. Site photos ind | | |
| | areas within vegetated area – along W of pro drilling locations generally flat to slight slope | | |
| | BIONET/MNES | . 140 011101 100000 | of chimerina sensitivity. |
| | No areas of critical habitat or areas of outsta | nding biodiversit | y value have been identified within the |
| | proposed auger drilling area. | | :::: Di |
| | No MNES are likely to be impacted by the presults. | oposed auger dr | illing. Please refer to attached search |
| | No threatened species or ecological commu | nities or their hab | pitats are likely to be affected by the |
| | proposed auger drilling program. Please ref | er to attached se | arch results. |
| | TNV map. Close to but not within category 2 | | |
| | steep and highly erodible land. Note- applica | ition is not includ | ed in these zones. |
| Proposed management controls | N/A | | |
| Duration | N/A | | |
| Application ranking | | | |
| What is the confidence in predicting impacts? | N/A | Are further studies | N/A |
| predicting impacts? | | required on | |
| | | impacts or | |
| | | mitigation? | |
| How resilient is the environment to | N/A | What is the | Low |
| cope with impacts? | | level of public | |
| | | concern? | |
| Can the impacts be reversed? | N/A | Ranking of | |
| | | potential | |
| Can the impacts be mitigated? | N/A | significance Justification f | or ranking |
| Do the operations comply with | N/A | Justilication | or ranking |
| standards, plans, policies? | | | |
| Criteria | Threatened Flora Species: Any adverse effe | | |
| Potential impacts | a viable local population of the species is like No impacts. | ely to be placed a | at risk of extinction. |
| 1 otomiai impaoto | Tro impacts. | | |
| | CEA impact thresholds apply. An activity ca | | |
| | 1. occurs on land declares as areas of outsta | | |
| | has a significant effect on any threatened DISTURBANCE | species or ecoid | ogical communities, or their nabitats. |
| | EA Block number 614- Unit P | | |
| | Surface disturbance 8sqm | | |
| | SEED search on 7/11/23- confirming finding | | |
| | Endangered "Large-leafed Monotaxis" obser 1.2km NW of proposed activity area. Given of | | |
| | grasses, considered low risk. Site photos inc | , , , | S . |
| | areas within vegetated area – along W of pro | | |
| | drilling locations generally flat to slight slope | . No other issues | of environmental sensitivity. |
| | BIONET/MNES No areas of critical habitat or areas of outsta | nding biodiversit | v value have been identified within the |
| | proposed auger drilling area. | ag za | , |
| | No MNES are likely to be impacted by the pr | oposed auger dr | illing. Please refer to attached search |
| | results. | nitios or thoir bak | pitate are likely to be affected by the |
| | No threatened species or ecological commul proposed auger drilling program. Please ref | | |
| | TNV map. Close to but not within category 2 | | |
| | steep and highly erodible land. Note- applica | ition is not includ | ed in these zones. |
| Droposed management controls | N/A | | |
| Proposed management controls Duration | N/A N/A | | |
| Application ranking | | | |
| | • | | |

| What is the confidence in | N/A | Are further | N/A |
|-------------------------------------|---|------------------------|---|
| predicting impacts? | | studies | |
| | | required on | |
| | | impacts or | |
| | | mitigation? | |
| How resilient is the environment to | N/A | What is the | Low |
| cope with impacts? | | level of | |
| | | public | |
| | | concern? | |
| Can the impacts be reversed? | N/A | Ranking of | |
| | | potential | |
| | | significance | |
| Can the impacts be mitigated? | N/A | Justification f | or ranking |
| Do the operations comply with | N/A | | |
| standards, plans, policies? | | | |
| Criteria | Areas of outstanding biodiversity value/Critic | | |
| | outstanding biodiversity value under the Biod | | ation Act 2016 b. areas declared |
| | critical habitat under the Fisheries Managem | | |
| Potential impacts | Potential impacts limited due to CEA impact | | |
| | occur on land declared as areas of outstand | | |
| | not permitted to have a significant impact on | | |
| | communities (or their habitats). (Also refer | to flora and faun | a impact tables). |
| Proposed management controls | N/A | | |
| Duration | N/A | | |
| Application ranking | N1/A | | T 21/2 |
| What is the confidence in | N/A | Are further | N/A |
| predicting impacts? | | studies | |
| | | required on | |
| | | impacts or mitigation? | |
| How resilient is the environment to | N/A | What is the | N/A |
| cope with impacts? | IN/A | level of | IN/A |
| cope with impacts: | | public | |
| | | concern? | |
| Can the impacts be reversed? | N/A | Ranking of | |
| Can the impacts be reversed: | N/A | potential | |
| | | significance | |
| Can the impacts be mitigated? | N/A | Justification f | or ranking |
| Do the operations comply with | N/A | Jastilloution 1 | or ramang |
| standards, plans, policies? | 14/7 | | |
| Criteria Criteria | Endangered ecological community or critical | lv endangered e | cological community. Whether the |
| | | | se effect on the extent of the ecological |
| | community such that its local occurrence is I | | |
| | to substantially and adversely modify the cor | | |
| | occurrence is likely to be placed at risk of ex | | , |
| | , | | |

| Potential impacts | Vegetation removal and activities can tempo | rarily impact eco | logical communities | |
|---|---|---|----------------------|--|
| Potential impacts | vegetation removal and activities can tempo | rarily impact eco | logical communities. | |
| | Areas cleared for exploration activities, acce | eas cleared for exploration activities, access tracks, etc not available for flora / fauna habitat. | | |
| | Use of pesticides, herbicides, fertilisers or other chemicals have the potential to build up residues in the environment, including in soils and water. | | | |
| | Soil erosion and sediment laden runoff from disturbed areas, that could lead to soil or water contamination or land degradation. | | | |
| | Spread of weeds, pest animals and animal/plant diseases. | | | |
| | Removal of vegetation, barriers created by access tracks, etc can interrupt movement of fauna species. DISTURBANCE EA Block number 614- Unit P Surface disturbance 8sqm SEED search on 7/11/23- confirming finding on 19/1/23 for APO0001341– Land zoning RU1. | | | |
| | Endangered "Large-leafed Monotaxis" observed just outside title boundary – within veg area approx 1.2km NW of proposed activity area. Given only proposing slashing exotic weeds and native grasses, considered low risk. Site photos indicate clear areas, mature veg can be avoided. Steeper areas within vegetated area – along W of proposed activity area. Site photos indicate proposed drilling locations generally flat to slight slope. No other issues of environmental sensitivity. BIONET/MNES No areas of critical habitat or areas of outstanding biodiversity value have been identified within the proposed auger drilling area. No MNES are likely to be impacted by the proposed auger drilling. Please refer to attached search results. No threatened species or ecological communities or their habitats are likely to be affected by the proposed auger drilling program. Please refer to attached search results. TNV map. Close to but not within category 2- sensitive regulated land, and for some part of the EL steep and highly erodible land. Note- application is not included in these zones. | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| Proposed management controls | Activities must comply with CEA Location Restrictions, Impact Thresholds and Criteria. Activities must comply with (Exploration Code of Practice: Environmental Management) as per the commitment in the application (APO). Relevant requirements of this Code include: a. Minimise extent of vegetation clearing and surface disturbance to as low as practicable. b. Prevent adverse impacts to fauna caused by vegetation clearing, including relocation of resident fauna. c. Access track widths unlikely to pose significant barrier to fauna. All disturbed areas to be rehabilitated in accordance with title conditions (Exploration Code of Practice: Rehabilitation). Rehabilitation to | | | |
| Duration | occur as soon as practicable after completion | ii oi activity. | | |
| Application ranking | | | | |
| 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? | Low | |
| Can the impacts be reversed? | Yes | Ranking of potential significance | Low | |
| Can the impacts be mitigated? | Fully | Justification for | or ranking | |
| Do the operations comply with standards, plans, policies? | Yes | - Jaounioution I | vi ramany | |
| Criteria | Habitat of a threatened species or ecological | l community | | |

Potential impacts Potential impacts limited due to CEA impact threshold restrictions. CEAs are not permitted to occur in areas of outstanding biodiversity value or critical habitat. CEAs are not permitted to have a significant impact on threatened fauna or flora species or ecological communities (or their habitats). (Also refer to flora and fauna impact tables). DISTURBANCE EA Block number 614- Unit P Surface disturbance 8sqm SEED search on 7/11/23- confirming finding on 19/1/23 for APO0001341- Land zoning RU1. Endangered "Large-leafed Monotaxis" observed just outside title boundary – within veg area approx 1.2km NW of proposed activity area. Given only proposing slashing exotic weeds and native grasses, considered low risk. Site photos indicate clear areas, mature veg can be avoided. Steeper areas within vegetated area - along W of proposed activity area. Site photos indicate proposed drilling locations generally flat to slight slope. No other issues of environmental sensitivity. BIONET/MNES No areas of critical habitat or areas of outstanding biodiversity value have been identified within the proposed auger drilling area. No MNES are likely to be impacted by the proposed auger drilling. Please refer to attached search results No threatened species or ecological communities or their habitats are likely to be affected by the proposed auger drilling program. Please refer to attached search results. TNV map. Close to but not within category 2- sensitive regulated land, and for some part of the EL steep and highly erodible land. Note- application is not included in these zones. **Proposed management controls** N/A Duration N/A Application ranking What is the confidence in Are further N/A N/A predicting impacts? studies required on impacts or mitigation? How resilient is the environment to N/A What is the Low cope with impacts? level of public concern? Can the impacts be reversed? N/A Ranking of

Habitat of protected aquatic species or those with conservation status.

potential significance

Justification for ranking

Can the impacts be mitigated?

Do the operations comply with standards, plans, policies?

Criteria

N/A

Potential impacts Negligible and only localised changes to drainage flows/flooding regime. Water used for exploration not available for ecological purposes. Surface runoff can be sediment laden from areas where vegetation has been removed. Generally minimal surface water use (must be licensed or use of farm dams through landholder No use of groundwater but potential loss through produced water in drilling / deep excavation operations. Interception, cross contamination and/or depressurisation of groundwater systems in drilling operations. Groundwater depressurisation effects on surface water. Mobilisation of pollutants (such as hydrocarbons) in surface water or aquifers. Ford across creeks can cause stream bank erosion from vehicle wash. Inappropriate disposal of drilling wastes / overflow from drilling sumps. DISTURBANCE EA Block number 614- Unit P Surface disturbance 8sqm SEED search on 7/11/23- confirming finding on 19/1/23 for APO0001341- Land zoning RU1. Endangered "Large-leafed Monotaxis" observed just outside title boundary – within veg area approx 1.2km NW of proposed activity area. Given only proposing slashing exotic weeds and native grasses, considered low risk. Site photos indicate clear areas, mature veg can be avoided. Steeper areas within vegetated area - along W of proposed activity area. Site photos indicate proposed drilling locations generally flat to slight slope. No other issues of environmental sensitivity. BIONET/MNES No areas of critical habitat or areas of outstanding biodiversity value have been identified within the proposed auger drilling area. No MNES are likely to be impacted by the proposed auger drilling. Please refer to attached search No threatened species or ecological communities or their habitats are likely to be affected by the proposed auger drilling program. Please refer to attached search results TNV map. Close to but not within category 2- sensitive regulated land, and for some part of the EL steep and highly erodible land. Note- application is not included in these zones. **Proposed management controls** Activities must comply with CEA Location Restrictions, Impact Thresholds and Criteria. Activities must comply with (Exploration Code of Practice: Environmental Management) as per the commitment in the application (APO). Relevant requirements of this Code include: a. Activities must implement all measures to prevent causing any adverse impacts on water quality or quantity. b. All sediment and erosion controls (including drainage from roads/access tracks) to be managed in accordance with Blue Book. c. No significant impact on any threatened species, threatened populations, threatened ecological communities, or their habitats. d. No removal of vegetation in waterfront land. All disturbed areas to be rehabilitated in accordance with title conditions (Exploration Code of Practice: Rehabilitation). Rehabilitation to occur as soon as practicable after completion of activity. Duration Short term Application ranking What is the confidence in Are further High No predicting impacts? studies required on impacts or mitigation? How resilient is the environment to High Resilience What is the Low cope with impacts? level of public concern? Can the impacts be reversed? Yes Ranking of Low potential significance Can the impacts be mitigated? Justification for ranking Fully Do the operations comply with standards, plans, policies? Criteria 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

| the environment, including in soils and water. Soil erosion and sediment laden runoff from disturbed areas, that could lead to soil or water contamination or land degradation. Spread of weeds, pest animals and animal/plant diseases. DISTURBANCE EA Block number 614- Unit P Surface disturbance 8sqm SEED search on 7/11/23- confirming finding on 19/1/23 for APO0001341- Land zoning RU1. Endangered "Large-leafed Monotaxis" observed just outside title boundary – within veg area app 1.2km NW of proposed activity area. Given only proposing slashing exotic weeds and native grasses, considered low risk. Site photos indicate clear areas, mature veg can be avoided. Steep areas within vegetated area – along W of proposed activity area. Site photos indicate proposed diffling locations generally flat to slight slope. No other issues of environmental sensitivity. BIONET/MNES No areas of critical habitat or areas of outstanding biodiversity value have been identified within a proposed auger drilling area. No MNES are likely to be impacted by the proposed auger drilling. Please refer to attached sear results. No threatened species or ecological communities or their habitats are likely to be affected by the proposed auger drilling program. Please refer to attached search results. TNV map. Close to but not within category 2- sensitive regulated land, and for some part of the Esteep and highly erodible land. Note- application is not included in these zones. Proposed management controls Activities must comply with (Exploration Code of Practice: Environmental Management) as per the commitment in the application (APO). Relevant requirements of this Code include: a. Minimise extent of vegetation clearing and surface disturbance to as low as practicable. b. Prevent adveing impacts to fauna caused by vegetation clearing, including relocation of resident fauna. All | | | | | |
|--|------------------------------|---|--------------------------------------|---|--|
| Mobilisation of pollutants (such as hydrocarbons) in soils, air or waters can potentially impact fau Use of pesticides, herbicides, fertilisers or other chemicals have the potential to build up residued the environment, including in soils and water. Soil erosion and sediment laden runoff from disturbed areas, that could lead to soil or water contamination or land degradation. Spread of weeds, pest animals and animal/plant diseases. DISTURBANCE EA Block number 614-Unit P Surface disturbance 8sqm SEED search on 7/11/23- confirming finding on 19/1/23 for APO0001341- Land zoning RU1. Endangered "Large-leafed Monotaxis" observed just outside title boundary within veg area appt 1.2km NW of proposed activity area. Site photos indicate clear areas, mature veg can be avoided. Steep areas within vegetated area along W of proposed activity area. Site photos indicate proposed drilling locations generally flat to slight slope. No other issues of environmental sensitivity. BIONETMINES No areas of critical habitat or areas of outstanding biodiversity value have been identified within proposed auger drilling area. No MNES are likely to be impacted by the proposed auger drilling. Please refer to attached search results. No threatened species or ecological communities or their habitats are likely to be affected by the proposed auger drilling program. Please refer to attached search results. TNV map. Close to but not within category 2 sensitive regulated land, and for some part of the E steep and highly erodible land. Note-application is not included in these zones. Proposed management controls Activities must comply with CEA Location Restrictions, Impact Thresholds and Criteria. Active must comply with (Exploration Code of Practice: Environmental Management) as per the commitment in the application (and included in these zones. Proposed management controls High Resilience High Resilience High Resilience What is the confidence in predicting impacts to faunt in accordance with little conditions (Exploration Code of | Potential impacts | Vegetation removal can harm threatened sp | ecies or reduce l | ocal abundance of species. | |
| Use of pesticides, herbicides, fertilisers or other chemicals have the potential to build up residue: the environment, including in soils and water. Soil erosion and sediment laden runoff from disturbed areas, that could lead to soil or water contamination or land degradation. Spread of weeds, pest animals and animal/plant diseases. DISTURBANCE EA Block number 614- Unit P Surface disturbance 8sqm SEED search on 7/11/23- confirming finding on 19/1/23 for APO0001341- Land zoning RU1. Endangered "Large-leafed Monotaxis" observed just outside title boundary — within veg area app 1.2km NW of proposed activity area. Given only proposing slashing voice weeds and native grasses, considered low risk. Site photos indicate clear areas, mature veg can be avoided. Steep 1.2km NW of proposed activity area. Shotos indicate proposed drilling locations generally flat to slight slope. No other issues of environmental sensitivity. BIONET/MINES No areas of critical habitat or areas of outstanding biodiversity value have been identified within 1 proposed auger drilling area. No MNES are likely to be impacted by the proposed auger drilling. Please refer to attached sear results. No threatened species or ecological communities or their habitats are likely to be affected by the proposed auger drilling program. Please refer to attached sear results. TNV map. Close to but not within category 2- sensitive regulated land, and for some part of the E steep and highly eredible land. Note application is not included in these zones. Proposed management controls Activities must comply with (Exploration Code of Practice: Environmental Management) as per the commitment in the application (APO). Relevant requirements of this Code include: a. Minimise extent of vegetation clearing and surface disturbance to as low as practicable after completion of activity. Short term What is the environment to cope with impacts? High Proposed Propose | | Areas cleared for exploration activities, access tracks, etc not available for flora habitat. | | | |
| the environment, including in soils and water. Soil erosion and sediment laden runoff from disturbed areas, that could lead to soil or water contamination or land degradation. Spread of weeds, pest animals and animal/plant diseases. DISTURBANCE EA Block number 614- Unit P Surface disturbance 8sqm SEED search on 71/14/23- confirming finding on 19/1/23 for APO0001341- Land zoning RU1. Endangered "Large-leafed Monotaxis" observed just outside title boundary within veg area appr. 1.2m NW of proposed activity area. Given only proposing slashing excite weeds and native grasses, considered low risk. Site photos indicate clear areas, mature veg can be avoided. Site grasses, considered low risk. Site photos indicate clear areas, mature veg can be avoided. Site grasses, considered low risk. Site photos indicate clear areas, mature veg can be avoided. Site grasses within vegetated area - along W of proposed activity area. Site photos indicate proposed drilling locations generally flat to slight slope. No other issues of environmental sensitivity. BIONET/MNES No areas of critical habitat or areas of outstanding biodiversity value have been identified within 1 proposed auger drilling area. No MNES are illeity to be impacted by the proposed auger drilling. Please refer to attached search results. No threatened species or ecological communities or their habitats are likely to be affected by the proposed auger drilling program. Please refer to attached search results. TNV map. Close to but not within category 2- sensitive regulated land, and for some part of the E steep and highly erodible land. Note-application is not included in these zones. Proposed management controls Activities must comply with (Exploration Code of Practice: Environmental Management) as per the commitment in the application (APO). Relevant requirements of this Code include: a. Minimise extent of vegetation dearing and surface disturbance to as low as practicable. b. Prevent adve impacts of funa can always a practicable after completion of activity. | | Mobilisation of pollutants (such as hydrocart | oons) in soils, air | or waters can potentially impact fauna. | |
| contamination or land degradation. Spread of weeds, pest animals and animal/plant diseases. DISTURBANCE EA Block number 614- Unit P Surface disturbance 8sqm SEED search on 77/11/23- confirming finding on 19/1/23 for APO0001341- Land zoning RU1. Endangered "Large-leafed Monotaxis" observed just outside title boundary – within veg area app 1.2mm NW of proposed activity area. Given only proposing slashing exotic weeds and native grasses, considered low risk. Site photos indicate clear areas, mature veg can be avoided. Steep areas within vegetated area – along W of proposed activity area. Ble photos indicate proposed diffling locations generally flat to slight slope. No other issues of environmental sensitivity. BIONET/MNES No areas of critical habitat or areas of outstanding biodiversity value have been identified within 1 proposed auger drilling area. No MNES are likely to be impacted by the proposed auger drilling. Please refer to attached sear results. No threatened species or ecological communities or their habitats are likely to be affected by the proposed auger drilling program. Please refer to attached search results. TNY map. Close to but not within category 2- sensitive regulated land, and for some part of the E steep and highly erodible land. Note- application is not included in these zones. Proposed management controls Activities must comply with CEA Location Restrictions, Impact Thresholds and Criteria. Activ must comply with (Exploration Code of Practice: Environmental Management) as per the commitment in the application (APO). Relevant requirements of this Code include: a. Minimise extent of vegetation clearing and surface disturbance to as low as practicable. b. Prevent advertised areas to be retabilisated in accordance with title conditions (Exploration Code of Practice: Environmental Management) as per the commitment to the environment to read the proposed active and the proposed auger and proposed active and prop | | Use of pesticides, herbicides, fertilisers or other chemicals have the potential to build up residues in the environment, including in soils and water. | | | |
| DISTURBANCE EA Block number 614- Unit P Surface disturbance 8sqm SEED search on 7/11/23-confirming finding on 19/1/23 for APO0001341- Land zoning RU1. Endangered "Large-leafed Monotaxis" observed just outside little boundary – within veg area app 1.2km NW of proposed activity area. Given only proposing slashing acotto weeds and native grasses, considered low risk. Site photos indicate clear areas, mature veg can be avoided. Steep areas within vegetated area – along W of proposed activity area. Site photos indicate proposed drilling locations generally flat to slight slope. No other issues of environmental sensitivity. BIONET/MNES No areas of critical habitat or areas of outstanding biodiversity value have been identified within 1 proposed auger drilling area. No MNES are likely to be impacted by the proposed auger drilling. Please refer to attached search results. No threatened species or ecological communities or their habitats are likely to be affected by the proposed auger drilling program. Please refer to attached search results. TNV map. Close to but not within category 2- sensitive regulated land, and for some part of the E steep and highly erodible land. Note- application is not included in these zones. Proposed management controls Activities must comply with (Exploration Code of Practice: Environmental Management) as per the commitment in the application (APO). Relevant requirements of this Code include: a. Minimise extent of vegetation clearing and surface disturbance to as low as practicable. b. Prevent adve impacts to fauna caused by vegetation clearing, including ecotion of resident fauna. All disturbed areas to be rehabilitation to occur as soon as practicable after completion of activity. Duration Application ranking What is the confidence in predicting impacts? High Resilience High Resilience Yes Ranking of potential significance Pully Do the operations comply with tandards, plans, policies? Criteria Barriers to movement of fauna: Any potential to endanger, displace or disturb fauna | | | | | |
| No areas of critical habitat or areas of outstanding biodiversity value have been identified within the proposed auger drilling area. No MNES are likely to be impacted by the proposed auger drilling. Please refer to attached sear results. No threatened species or ecological communities or their habitats are likely to be affected by the proposed auger drilling program. Please refer to attached search results. TNV map. Close to but not within category 2- sensitive regulated land, and for some part of the E steep and highly eroldible land. Note- application is not included in these zones. Proposed management controls Activities must comply with CEA Location Restrictions, Impact Thresholds and Criteria. Activities must comply with (Exploration Code of Practice: Environmental Management) as per the commitment in the application (APO). Relevant requirements of this Code include: a. Minimise extent of vegetation clearing and surface disturbance to as low as practicable. b. Prevent adverting impacts to fauna caused by vegetation clearing, including relocation of resident fauna. All disturbed areas to be rehabilitation to occur as soon as practicable after completion of activity. Duration Application ranking What is the confidence in predicting impacts? What is the confidence in predicting impacts? High Are further studies required on impacts or mittigation? High Resilience What is the level of public concern? Can the impacts be reversed? Yes Ranking of Low potential significance Can the impacts be mitigated? Fully Do the operations comply with standards, plans, policies? Criteria Barriers to movement of fauna: Any potential to endanger, displace or disturb fauna (including fa | | DISTURBANCE EA Block number 614- Unit P Surface disturbance 8sqm SEED search on 7/11/23- confirming finding on 19/1/23 for APO0001341- Land zoning RU1. Endangered "Large-leafed Monotaxis" observed just outside title boundary – within veg area approx 1.2km NW of proposed activity area. Given only proposing slashing exotic weeds and native grasses, considered low risk. Site photos indicate clear areas, mature veg can be avoided. Steeper areas within vegetated area – along W of proposed activity area. Site photos indicate proposed drilling locations generally flat to slight slope. No other issues of environmental sensitivity. BIONET/MNES No areas of critical habitat or areas of outstanding biodiversity value have been identified within the proposed auger drilling area. No MNES are likely to be impacted by the proposed auger drilling. Please refer to attached search results. No threatened species or ecological communities or their habitats are likely to be affected by the | | | |
| TNV map. Close to but not within category 2- sensitive regulated land, and for some part of the Esteep and highly erodible land. Note-application is not included in these zones. Proposed management controls Activities must comply with CEA Location Restrictions, Impact Thresholds and Criteria. Activities must comply with (Exploration Code of Practice: Environmental Management) as per the commitment in the application (APO). Relevant requirements of this Code include: a. Minimise extent of vegetation clearing and surface disturbance to as low as practicable. b. Prevent adverting impacts to fauna caused by vegetation clearing, including relocation of resident fauna. All disturbed areas to be rehabilitated in accordance with title conditions (Exploration Code of Practice Rehabilitation). Rehabilitation to occur as soon as practicable after completion of activity. Short term Application ranking What is the confidence in predicting impacts? High Are further studies required on impacts or mittigation? High Resilience What is the environment to cope with impacts? Can the impacts be reversed? Yes Ranking of potential significance Can the impacts be mitigated? Do the operations comply with standards, plans, policies? Criteria Barriers to movement of fauna: Any potential to endanger, displace or disturb fauna (including fa | | | | | |
| must comply with (Exploration Code of Practice: Environmental Management) as per the commitment in the application (APO). Relevant requirements of this Code include: a. Minimise extent of vegetation clearing and surface disturbance to as low as practicable. b. Prevent adversimpacts to fauna caused by vegetation clearing, including relocation of resident fauna. All disturbed areas to be rehabilitated in accordance with title conditions (Exploration Code of Practice). Rehabilitation). Rehabilitation to occur as soon as practicable after completion of activity. Duration | | TNV map. Close to but not within category 2- sensitive regulated land, and for some part of the EL | | | |
| Duration Application ranking What is the confidence in predicting impacts? High Are further studies required on impacts or mitigation? How resilient is the environment to cope with impacts? Can the impacts be reversed? Can the impacts be mitigated? Do the operations comply with standards, plans, policies? Criteria Are further studies required on impacts by a function of policity and the prediction of prediction for ranking studies. Are further studies required on impacts or mitigation? Are further studies required on impacts or mitigation? Ranking of potential significance Justification for ranking Barriers to movement of fauna: Any potential to endanger, displace or disturb fauna (including faunce) | Proposed management controls | must comply with (Exploration Code of Practice: Environmental Management) as per the commitment in the application (APO). Relevant requirements of this Code include: a. Minimise extent of vegetation clearing and surface disturbance to as low as practicable. b. Prevent adverse impacts to fauna caused by vegetation clearing, including relocation of resident fauna. All disturbed areas to be rehabilitated in accordance with title conditions (Exploration Code of Practice: | | | |
| Application ranking What is the confidence in predicting impacts? High Are further studies required on impacts or mitigation? How resilient is the environment to cope with impacts? Can the impacts be reversed? Can the impacts be mitigated? Do the operations comply with standards, plans, policies? Criteria Pligh Are further studies required on impacts be neturated? What is the level of public concern? Ranking of potential significance Justification for ranking Yes Barriers to movement of fauna: Any potential to endanger, displace or disturb fauna (including fauna) | Duration | | or do pradadable | and completion of delivity. | |
| High Are further studies required on impacts or mitigation? | | | | | |
| High Resilience High Resilience What is the level of public concern? Can the impacts be reversed? Can the impacts be mitigated? Do the operations comply with standards, plans, policies? Criteria High Resilience What is the level of public concern? Ranking of potential significance Justification for ranking Service of Sanking of potential to endanger, displace or disturb fauna (including faunce) | What is the confidence in | High | studies required on impacts or | No | |
| Can the impacts be mitigated? Do the operations comply with standards, plans, policies? Criteria potential significance Justification for ranking Yes Barriers to movement of fauna: Any potential to endanger, displace or disturb fauna (including fauna) | | High Resilience | What is the level of public | | |
| Do the operations comply with standards, plans, policies? Criteria Yes Barriers to movement of fauna: Any potential to endanger, displace or disturb fauna (including fauna) | Can the impacts be reversed? | Yes | Ranking of potential | Low | |
| standards, plans, policies? Criteria Barriers to movement of fauna: Any potential to endanger, displace or disturb fauna (including fa | | Fully | Justification f | or ranking | |
| | standards, plans, policies? | | | | |
| | Criteria | | | | |

Potential impacts Vegetation removal can decrease available foraging/ sheltering/ breeding habitat for species and displace species from regular place of residence. Access tracks can act as a barrier to movement of small fauna species. Fauna crossing access tracks may be killed or injured if hit by vehicles. Vegetation removal can remove connective corridors used for wildlife movement. Areas used for exploration activities, access tracks, etc not available for fauna habitat. Mobilisation of pollutants (such as hydrocarbons) in soils, air or waters can potentially impact fauna. Drilling sumps can be a hazard for fauna. Use of pesticides, herbicides, fertilisers or other chemicals have the potential to build up residues in the environment, including in soils and water. Short term noise and air quality impacts. Soil erosion and sediment laden runoff from disturbed areas, that could lead to soil or water contamination or land degradation. Spread of weeds, pest animals and animal/plant diseases. DISTURBANCE EA Block number 614- Unit P Surface disturbance 8sqm SEED search on 7/11/23- confirming finding on 19/1/23 for APO0001341- Land zoning RU1. Endangered "Large-leafed Monotaxis" observed just outside title boundary – within veg area approx 1.2km NW of proposed activity area. Given only proposing slashing exotic weeds and native grasses, considered low risk. Site photos indicate clear areas, mature veg can be avoided. Steeper areas within vegetated area - along W of proposed activity area. Site photos indicate proposed drilling locations generally flat to slight slope. No other issues of environmental sensitivity. **BIONET/MNES** No areas of critical habitat or areas of outstanding biodiversity value have been identified within the proposed auger drilling area. No MNES are likely to be impacted by the proposed auger drilling. Please refer to attached search No threatened species or ecological communities or their habitats are likely to be affected by the proposed auger drilling program. Please refer to attached search results. TNV map. Close to but not within category 2- sensitive regulated land, and for some part of the EL steep and highly erodible land. Note- application is not included in these zones. Proposed management controls Activities must comply with CEA Location Restrictions, Impact Thresholds and Criteria. Activities must comply with (Exploration Code of Practice: Environmental Management) as per the commitment in the application (APO). Relevant requirements of this Code include: a. Minimise extent of vegetation clearing and surface disturbance to as low as practicable. b. Prevent adverse impacts to fauna caused by vegetation clearing, including relocation of resident fauna. disturbed areas to be rehabilitated in accordance with title conditions (Exploration Code of Practice: Rehabilitation). Rehabilitation to occur as soon as practicable after completion of activity. Duration Short term Application ranking What is the confidence in Are further High No predicting impacts? studies required on impacts or mitigation? How resilient is the environment to High Resilience What is the Low cope with impacts? level of public concern? Can the impacts be reversed? Yes Ranking of Low potential significance Can the impacts be mitigated? Fully Justification for ranking Do the operations comply with Yes standards, plans, policies? Criteria Ecological & Biosecurity Impacts: Any threat to the biological diversity or ecological integrity of an

ecological community

Potential impacts Vegetation removal can decrease available foraging/ sheltering/ breeding habitat for species and displace species from regular place of residence. Areas used for exploration activities, access tracks, etc not available for flora / fauna habitat. Mobilisation of pollutants (such as hydrocarbons) in soils, air or waters can potentially impact fauna / Drilling sumps can be a hazard for fauna. Use of pesticides, herbicides, fertilisers or other chemicals have the potential to build up residues in the environment, including in soils and water. Soil erosion and sediment laden runoff from disturbed areas, that could lead to soil or water contamination or land degradation. Exposure of acid sulfate soils. Spread of weeds, pest animals and animal/plant diseases. Fauna crossing access tracks may be killed or injured if hit by vehicles. Surface disturbance may result in removal of/damage to seed stock. DISTURBANCE EA Block number 614- Unit P Surface disturbance 8sqm SEED search on 7/11/23- confirming finding on 19/1/23 for APO0001341- Land zoning RU1. Endangered "Large-leafed Monotaxis" observed just outside title boundary – within veg area approx 1.2km NW of proposed activity area. Given only proposing slashing exotic weeds and native grasses, considered low risk. Site photos indicate clear areas, mature veg can be avoided. Steeper areas within vegetated area - along W of proposed activity area. Site photos indicate proposed drilling locations generally flat to slight slope. No other issues of environmental sensitivity. **BIONET/MNES** No areas of critical habitat or areas of outstanding biodiversity value have been identified within the proposed auger drilling area. No MNES are likely to be impacted by the proposed auger drilling. Please refer to attached search No threatened species or ecological communities or their habitats are likely to be affected by the proposed auger drilling program. Please refer to attached search results. TNV map. Close to but not within category 2- sensitive regulated land, and for some part of the EL steep and highly erodible land. Note- application is not included in these zones. Proposed management controls Activities must comply with CEA Location Restrictions, Impact Thresholds and Criteria. Activities must comply with (Exploration Code of Practice: Environmental Management) as per the commitment in the application (APO). Relevant requirements of this Code include: a. Minimise extent of vegetation clearing and surface disturbance to as low as practicable. b. Prevent adverse impacts to fauna caused by vegetation clearing, including relocation of resident fauna. Setbacks from steep slopes/cliffs to limit impact of shots on cave dwelling fauna. Noise impacts / disruption to fauna are temporary. Vehicle movements are limited and unlikely to have significant injury/mortality impacts. All disturbed areas to be rehabilitated in accordance with title conditions (Exploration Code of Practice: Rehabilitation). Rehabilitation to occur as soon as practicable after completion of activity. Duration Short term Application ranking What is the confidence in High Are further Nο predicting impacts? studies required on impacts or mitigation? How resilient is the environment to High Resilience What is the Low cope with impacts? level of public concern? Can the impacts be reversed? Ranking of Yes Low potential significance Can the impacts be mitigated? Partly Justification for ranking Do the operations comply with standards, plans, policies? Criteria 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

| Potential impacts | Mobilisation of pollutants (such as hydrocart flora. | oons) in soils, air | or waters can potentially impact fauna / |
|---|--|---|--|
| | Use of pesticides, herbicides, fertilisers or other chemicals have the potential to build up residues in the environment, including in soils and water. | | |
| | Spread of weeds, pest animals and animal/plant diseases. | | |
| | Surface disturbance may result in removal of/damage to seed stock. | | |
| | Weed growth in disturbed areas. DISTURBANCE EA Block number 614- Unit P Surface disturbance 8sgm | | |
| | | | |
| | · | | |
| Proposed management controls | Activities must comply with CEA Location Restrictions, Impact Thresholds and Criteria. Activities must comply with (Exploration Code of Practice: Environmental Management) as per the commitment in the application (APO). Relevant requirements of this Code include: a. Minimise extent of vegetation clearing and surface disturbance to as low as practicable. b. Prevent adverse impacts to fauna caused by vegetation clearing, including relocation of resident fauna. c. Requirement to prevent introduction and spread of weeds, pest animals & animal and plant diseases (required to implement "come clean, go clean" protocols). All disturbed areas to be rehabilitated in accordance with title conditions (Exploration Code of Practice: Rehabilitation). Rehabilitation to occur as soon as practicable after completion of activity (includes weed growth management). Legislative requirement for landholder access arrangements which may include additional mitigation measures to manage land. | | |
| Duration | Short term | | |
| Application ranking | | | |
| What is the confidence in predicting impacts? | High | Are further studies | No |
| predicting impacts: | | required on impacts or | |
| How we discuss to the construction of the | High Decilions | mitigation? | Law |
| How resilient is the environment to cope with impacts? | High Resilience | What is the level of public | Low |
| Can the impacts be reversed? | Yes | Ranking of potential | Low |
| Can the impacts be mitigated? | Fully | significance Justification f | or ranking |
| Do the operations comply with standards, plans, policies? | Yes | | og |
| Criteria Criteria | | | |
| Potential impacts | Plant and machinery comprises a potential ignition source. | | |
| Proposed management controls | Activities must comply with CEA Location Restrictions, Impact Thresholds and Criteria. Activities must comply with (Exploration Code of Practice: Environmental Management) as per the commitment in the application (APO). Relevant requirements of this Code include undertaking a risk assessment and implementing suitable controls to manage risks (e.g. implementation of controls on activities during Extreme or Catastrophic Fire Conditions will largely negate risk). Activities must comply with WHS legislative requirements. Any existing/proposed access tracks can be used as firebreaks in event of fire. | | |
| Duration | Short term | | |
| Application ranking | | | |
| What is the confidence in predicting impacts? | High | Are further studies required on impacts or | No |
| | | mitigation? | |
| How resilient is the environment to cope with impacts? | High Resilience | What is the level of public | Medium |
| Can the impacts be reversed? | Yes | concern? Ranking of potential significance | Low |
| Can the impacts be mitigated? | Fully | Justification f | or ranking |
| | · uny | | |
| Do the operations comply with standards, plans, policies? Criteria | Yes Community Resources: Any degradation of i | | |

| Potential impacts | Limited potential for any significant increase | in demand for re | sources. |
|--|---|--|--|
| | Negligible potential for degradation of infrastructure, such as roads and bridges. ACCESS Existing tracks will be utilised for the drilling program. REHABILITATION | | |
| | | | |
| | Holes will be backfilled as drilling occurs. Follow up inspections after the drilling program will identify any issues or weed control required. | | |
| | DISTURBANCE EA Block number 614- Unit P | | |
| Proposed management controls | Surface disturbance 8sqm Negligible impacts likely. Activities must comply with CEA Location Restrictions, Impact | | |
| • | Negligible impacts likely. Activities must comply with CEA Location Restrictions, impact Thresholds and Criteria. Activities must comply with (Exploration Code of Practice: Environmental Management) as per the commitment in the application (APO) including protection of all elements of the environment, culture and heritage. All disturbed areas to be rehabilitated in accordance with title conditions (Exploration Code of Practice: Rehabilitation). Rehabilitation to occur as soon as practicable after completion of activity (includes weed growth management). Legislative requirement for landholder access arrangements and compensation. | | |
| Duration | Short term | | |
| Application ranking What is the confidence in | Litale | A f | l Ni- |
| predicting impacts? | High | Are further studies required on impacts or | No |
| | 11: 1 5 3: | mitigation? | |
| 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? | Fully | Justification f | or ranking |
| Do the operations comply with standards, plans, policies? | Yes | | |
| Criteria | Community Resources: Any diversion of resources: | ources to the det | riment of other communities or natural |
| Potential impacts | Limited potential for any significant diversion of resources to the detriment of other communities or natural systems. Negligible impacts and only localised changes. Areas used for exploration activities, temporarily removed from natural systems and / community use. ACCESS Existing tracks will be utilised for the drilling program. REHABILITATION Holes will be backfilled as drilling occurs. Follow up inspections after the drilling program will identify any issues or weed control required. DISTURBANCE EA Block number 614- Unit P Surface disturbance 8sqm | | |
| | | | |
| Proposed management controls | Negligible impacts likely. Activities must comply with CEA Location Restrictions, Impact Thresholds and Criteria. Activities must comply with (Exploration Code of Practice: Environmental Management) as per the commitment in the application (APO). Relevant requirements of this Code include protection of all elements of the environment, culture and heritage. All disturbed areas to be rehabilitated in accordance with title conditions (Exploration Code of Practice: Rehabilitation). Rehabilitation to occur as soon as practicable after completion of activity. (includes weed growth management). Legislative requirement for landholder access arrangements and compensation. | | |
| Duration | Short term | | |
| Application ranking | N/A | Ara fouther | 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 | |

| Can the impacts be mitigated? | N/A | Justification for ranking | | |
|--|---|--|-----------------------------|--|
| Do the operations comply with standards, plans, policies? | N/A | | | |
| Criteria | Natural Resources: Any disruption, depletion | or destruction o | f natural resources. | |
| Potential impacts | Limited potential for any significant diversion of resources to the detriment of other communities natural systems. | | | |
| | Negligible impacts and only localised change | es. | | |
| | Areas used for exploration activities, temporarily removed as a natural resource. | | | |
| | Vegetation removal may remove potential tir | ial timber resources. | | |
| | No significant impacts on other natural resources other than positive in terms of increased knowledge of geological resources. ACCESS Existing tracks will be utilised for the drilling program. | | | |
| | REHABILITATION Holes will be backfilled as drilling occurs. Follow up inspections after the drilling program will identify any issues or weed control required. | | | |
| | DISTURBANCE EA Block number 614- Unit P | | | |
| Duan and management a set of | Surface disturbance 8sqm | | Landing Destrictions Invest | |
| Proposed management controls | Negligible impacts likely. Thresholds and Criteria. Activities must comply with CEA Location Restrictions, Impact Activities must comply with (Exploration Code of Practice: Environmental Management) as per the commitment in the application (APO). Relevant requirements of this Code include protection of all elements of the environment (water, land, soil, air), culture and heritage. All disturbed areas to be rehabilitated in accordance with title conditions (Exploration Code of Practice: Rehabilitation). Rehabilitation to occur as soon as practicable after completion of activity. Legislative requirement for landholder access arrangements and compensation limit any potential impacts. | | | |
| Duration | N/A | | | |
| Application ranking | | | | |
| What is the confidence in predicting impacts? | N/A | Are further studies required on impacts or mitigation? | No | |
| How resilient is the environment to | N/A | What is the | Low | |
| cope with impacts? | | level of public concern? | | |
| Can the impacts be reversed? | N/A | Ranking of | Low | |
| cuit inc impuoto so reversou : | | potential significance | | |
| Can the impacts be mitigated? | N/A | Justification for ranking | | |
| Do the operations comply with standards, plans, policies? | Yes | | | |
| Criteria | 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). | | | |
| Potential impacts | Limited potential for any significant disruption of existing activities (or reduction of future activities) given temporary nature of exploration. | | | |
| | Negligible impacts and only localised & temporary changes. | | | |
| | Areas used for exploration activities, temporarily removed as a natural resource but no long term impacts on future availability of forestry, agricultural land, soils or water resources. | | | |
| | Vegetation removal may remove potential timber resources. ACCESS | | | |
| | Existing tracks will be utilised for the drilling program. REHABILITATION I takes will be best filled as drilling accura. Fallow up inspections often the drilling program will | | | |
| | Holes will be backfilled as drilling occurs. Follow up inspections after the drilling program will identify any issues or weed control required. DISTURBANCE EA Block number 614- Unit P | | | |
| | Surface disturbance 8sqm | | | |

| Duration Application ranking What is the confidence in predicting impacts? | Thresholds and Criteria. Activities must Environmental Management) as per the cor requirements of this Code include protection air), culture and heritage. All disturbed a conditions (Exploration Code of Practice: Record Code of Practice) | comply with (Exp nmitment in the a n of all elements of areas to be rehab ehabilitation). Ref Legislative require | of the environment (water, land, soil, ilitated in accordance with title |
|--|---|--|--|
| | | impacts or mitigation? | |
| 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 | Low |
| Can the impacts be mitigated? | N/A | Justification f | or ranking |
| Do the operations comply with | Yes | | |
| standards, plans, policies? | | | |
| Criteria | Natural Resources: Any use which results in | n the degradation | of any area reserved for conservation |
| Potential impacts | purposes. CEA activity not permitted in areas reserved | for concentation | nurnoege |
| Proposed management controls | N/A | i for conservation | purposes. |
| Duration | N/A | | |
| Application ranking | IV/A | | |
| What is the confidence in | N/A | Are further | N/A |
| predicting impacts? | | studies required on impacts or mitigation? | |
| 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 | |
| Can the impacts be mitigated? | N/A | Justification f | or ranking |
| Do the operations comply with | N/A | | |
| standards, plans, policies? Criteria | Sensitive Land Impacts: Impacts on National acquired under the National Parks and Wild | | r areas reserved or dedicated or |
| Potential impacts | Activity not permitted in these areas. | | |
| Proposed management controls | N/A | | |
| Duration | N/A | | |
| Application ranking What is the confidence in | N/A | Are foutber | N/A |
| 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 | |
| Can the impacts be mitigated? | N/A | Justification f | or ranking |
| Do the operations comply with | N/A | | |
| standards, plans, policies? | | | |

| Criteria | Sensitive Land Impacts: Land subject to a 'co | onservation agre | ement' under the National Parks and | |
|---|--|---|---|--|
| Criteria | Wildlife Act 1974 and/or the Biodiversity Con | | | |
| | agreement (established under the now repea | | | |
| | Biodiversity Stewardship agreement establis | | | |
| | Wildlife Refuge agreement established unde | | | |
| | conservation agreements that continue to have effect even where legislation has been repealed: Trust agreements under the now repealed Nature Conservation Trust Act 2001 □ Prope | | | |
| | vegetation plans made under the now-repea | | | |
| | property agreements under the repealed Nati | | | |
| Potential impacts | Activity not permitted in these areas. | <u> </u> | | |
| Proposed management controls | N/A | | | |
| Duration | N/A | | | |
| Application ranking What is the confidence in | N/A | Are further | N/A | |
| predicting impacts? | N/A | studies | IN/A | |
| promoung improve | | required on | | |
| | | impacts or | | |
| | | mitigation? | | |
| How resilient is the environment to cope with impacts? | N/A | What is the level of | N/A | |
| cope with impacts? | | public | | |
| | | concern? | | |
| Can the impacts be reversed? | N/A | Ranking of | | |
| | | potential | | |
| | N/A | significance | <u> </u> | |
| Can the impacts be mitigated? Do the operations comply with | N/A N/A | Justification for | ог галкіпд | |
| standards, plans, policies? | N/A | | | |
| Criteria | Sensitive Land Impacts: Impacts on aquatic | reserves or mari | ine parks declared under the Marine | |
| | Estate Management Act 2014. Impacts on C | oastal Zone as d | lefined in the Coastal Management Act | |
| D (() () | 2016. | | | |
| Potential impacts Proposed management controls | Activity not permitted in these areas. N/A | | | |
| Duration Controls | N/A | | | |
| Application ranking | 1477 | | | |
| What is the confidence in | N/A | Are further | N/A | |
| | 1477 | Ale lululei | 11// | |
| predicting impacts? | | studies | IV/A | |
| predicting impacts? | | studies required on | N/A | |
| predicting impacts? | | studies required on impacts or | N/A | |
| predicting impacts? How resilient is the environment to | N/A | studies required on | N/A | |
| | | studies required on impacts or mitigation? What is the level of | | |
| How resilient is the environment to | | studies required on impacts or mitigation? What is the level of public | | |
| How resilient is the environment to cope with impacts? | N/A | studies required on impacts or mitigation? What is the level of public concern? | | |
| How resilient is the environment to | | studies required on impacts or mitigation? What is the level of public concern? Ranking of | | |
| How resilient is the environment to cope with impacts? | N/A | studies required on impacts or mitigation? What is the level of public concern? | | |
| How resilient is the environment to cope with impacts? Can the impacts be reversed? Can the impacts be mitigated? | N/A | studies required on impacts or mitigation? What is the level of public concern? Ranking of potential | N/A | |
| How resilient is the environment to cope with impacts? Can the impacts be reversed? Can the impacts be mitigated? Do the operations comply with | N/A | studies required on impacts or mitigation? What is the level of public concern? Ranking of potential significance | N/A | |
| How resilient is the environment to cope with impacts? Can the impacts be reversed? Can the impacts be mitigated? Do the operations comply with standards, plans, policies? | N/A N/A N/A N/A | studies required on impacts or mitigation? What is the level of public concern? Ranking of potential significance Justification fo | N/A or ranking | |
| How resilient is the environment to cope with impacts? Can the impacts be reversed? Can the impacts be mitigated? Do the operations comply with standards, plans, policies? Criteria | N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A Sensitive Land Impacts: Fishing grounds and | studies required on impacts or mitigation? What is the level of public concern? Ranking of potential significance Justification for | or ranking n breeding or nursery areas. | |
| How resilient is the environment to cope with impacts? Can the impacts be reversed? Can the impacts be mitigated? Do the operations comply with standards, plans, policies? | N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A Sensitive Land Impacts: Fishing grounds and Negligible and only localised changes to drain | studies required on impacts or mitigation? What is the level of public concern? Ranking of potential significance Justification for | or ranking n breeding or nursery areas. ling regime. Surface runoff can be | |
| How resilient is the environment to cope with impacts? Can the impacts be reversed? Can the impacts be mitigated? Do the operations comply with standards, plans, policies? Criteria | N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A Sensitive Land Impacts: Fishing grounds and | studies required on impacts or mitigation? What is the level of public concern? Ranking of potential significance Justification for | or ranking n breeding or nursery areas. ling regime. Surface runoff can be lived. Generally minimal surface | |
| How resilient is the environment to cope with impacts? Can the impacts be reversed? Can the impacts be mitigated? Do the operations comply with standards, plans, policies? Criteria | N/A N/A N/A N/A Negligible and only localised changes to dra sediment laden from areas where vegetation water use (must be licensed or use of farm of cross contamination and/or depressurisation | studies required on impacts or mitigation? What is the level of public concern? Ranking of potential significance Justification for d commercial fish inage flows/flood has been remove | or ranking In breeding or nursery areas. Ing regime. Surface runoff can be ved. Generally minimal surface dholder agreements). Interception, systems in drilling operations. | |
| How resilient is the environment to cope with impacts? Can the impacts be reversed? Can the impacts be mitigated? Do the operations comply with standards, plans, policies? Criteria | N/A N/A N/A N/A Negligible and only localised changes to dra sediment laden from areas where vegetation water use (must be licensed or use of farm of cross contamination and/or depressurisation Groundwater depressurisation effects on sur | studies required on impacts or mitigation? What is the level of public concern? Ranking of potential significance Justification for d commercial fish inage flows/flood has been remove | or ranking In breeding or nursery areas. Ing regime. Surface runoff can be ved. Generally minimal surface dholder agreements). Interception, systems in drilling operations. Mobilisation of pollutants (such as | |
| How resilient is the environment to cope with impacts? Can the impacts be reversed? Can the impacts be mitigated? Do the operations comply with standards, plans, policies? Criteria | N/A N/A N/A N/A Negligible and only localised changes to dra sediment laden from areas where vegetation water use (must be licensed or use of farm d cross contamination and/or depressurisation Groundwater depressurisation effects on sur hydrocarbons) in surface water or aquifers. | studies required on impacts or mitigation? What is the level of public concern? Ranking of potential significance Justification for d commercial fish inage flows/flood has been removal dams through lan of groundwater face water. Ford across | or ranking In breeding or nursery areas. Ing regime. Surface runoff can be ved. Generally minimal surface dholder agreements). Interception, systems in drilling operations. Mobilisation of pollutants (such as creeks can cause stream bank erosion | |
| How resilient is the environment to cope with impacts? Can the impacts be reversed? Can the impacts be mitigated? Do the operations comply with standards, plans, policies? Criteria Potential impacts | N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A Sensitive Land Impacts: Fishing grounds and Negligible and only localised changes to dra sediment laden from areas where vegetation water use (must be licensed or use of farm of cross contamination and/or depressurisation Groundwater depressurisation effects on sur hydrocarbons) in surface water or aquifers. from vehicle wash. Inappropriate disposa | studies required on impacts or mitigation? What is the level of public concern? Ranking of potential significance Justification for d commercial fish inage flows/flood has been remove all of groundwater if face water. Ford across of | n breeding or nursery areas. ling regime. Surface runoff can be ved. Generally minimal surface dholder agreements). Interception, systems in drilling operations. Mobilisation of pollutants (such as creeks can cause stream bank erosion es / overflow from drilling sumps. | |
| How resilient is the environment to cope with impacts? Can the impacts be reversed? Can the impacts be mitigated? Do the operations comply with standards, plans, policies? Criteria | N/A N/A N/A N/A Negligible and only localised changes to dra sediment laden from areas where vegetation water use (must be licensed or use of farm d cross contamination and/or depressurisation Groundwater depressurisation effects on sur hydrocarbons) in surface water or aquifers. | studies required on impacts or mitigation? What is the level of public concern? Ranking of potential significance Justification for d commercial fish inage flows/flood has been remov lams through lan of groundwater face water. Ford across al of drilling waste estrictions, Impace | n breeding or nursery areas. ling regime. Surface runoff can be ved. Generally minimal surface dholder agreements). Interception, systems in drilling operations. Mobilisation of pollutants (such as creeks can cause stream bank erosion es / overflow from drilling sumps. et Thresholds and Criteria. Activities | |
| How resilient is the environment to cope with impacts? Can the impacts be reversed? Can the impacts be mitigated? Do the operations comply with standards, plans, policies? Criteria Potential impacts | N/A N/A N/A N/A Negligible and only localised changes to drasediment laden from areas where vegetation water use (must be licensed or use of farm docross contamination and/or depressurisation Groundwater depressurisation effects on sur hydrocarbons) in surface water or aquifers. from vehicle wash. Inappropriate dispose Activities must comply with CEA Location Remust comply with (Exploration Code of Pract commitment in the application (APO). Relev | studies required on impacts or mitigation? What is the level of public concern? Ranking of potential significance Justification for d commercial fish inage flows/flood has been removelams through lan of groundwater if face water. Ford across is all of drilling waste estrictions, Impactice: Environment frant requirements | n breeding or nursery areas. ling regime. Surface runoff can be ved. Generally minimal surface dholder agreements). Interception, systems in drilling operations. Mobilisation of pollutants (such as creeks can cause stream bank erosion es / overflow from drilling sumps. Lt Thresholds and Criteria. Activities tal Management) as per the sof this Code include: a. Activities | |
| How resilient is the environment to cope with impacts? Can the impacts be reversed? Can the impacts be mitigated? Do the operations comply with standards, plans, policies? Criteria Potential impacts | N/A N/A N/A N/A Negligible and only localised changes to drasediment laden from areas where vegetation water use (must be licensed or use of farm of cross contamination and/or depressurisation Groundwater depressurisation effects on sur hydrocarbons) in surface water or aquifers. from vehicle wash. Inappropriate dispose Activities must comply with CEA Location Remust comply with (Exploration Code of Pract commitment in the application (APO). Relevents implement all measures to prevent cause. | studies required on impacts or mitigation? What is the level of public concern? Ranking of potential significance Justification for d commercial fish inage flows/flood has been removed dams through land of groundwater of face water. In Ford across of all of drilling waste estrictions, Impact tice: Environment and requirements using any adverse | or ranking In breeding or nursery areas. Ing regime. Surface runoff can be wed. Generally minimal surface dholder agreements). Interception, systems in drilling operations. Wobilisation of pollutants (such as creeks can cause stream bank erosion es / overflow from drilling sumps. et Thresholds and Criteria. Activities tal Management) as per the soft this Code include: a. Activities impacts on water quality or quantity. | |
| How resilient is the environment to cope with impacts? Can the impacts be reversed? Can the impacts be mitigated? Do the operations comply with standards, plans, policies? Criteria Potential impacts | N/A N/A N/A N/A Negligible and only localised changes to drasediment laden from areas where vegetation water use (must be licensed or use of farm of cross contamination and/or depressurisation Groundwater depressurisation effects on sur hydrocarbons) in surface water or aquifers. Inappropriate dispose Activities must comply with CEA Location Remust comply with (Exploration Code of Pract commitment in the application (APO). Relevents implement all measures to prevent caus b. All sediment and erosion controls (including the controls of the control of | studies required on impacts or mitigation? What is the level of public concern? Ranking of potential significance Justification for d commercial fish inage flows/flood has been remove dams through land of groundwater of face water. Ford across of all of drilling waste estrictions, Impact ice: Environment want requirements using any adverse ong drainage from | n breeding or nursery areas. ling regime. Surface runoff can be wed. Generally minimal surface dholder agreements). Interception, systems in drilling operations. Wobilisation of pollutants (such as creeks can cause stream bank erosion es / overflow from drilling sumps. et Thresholds and Criteria. Activities tal Management) as per the s of this Code include: a. Activities impacts on water quality or quantity. | |
| How resilient is the environment to cope with impacts? Can the impacts be reversed? Can the impacts be mitigated? Do the operations comply with standards, plans, policies? Criteria Potential impacts | N/A N/A N/A N/A Sensitive Land Impacts: Fishing grounds and Negligible and only localised changes to dra sediment laden from areas where vegetation water use (must be licensed or use of farm of cross contamination and/or depressurisation Groundwater depressurisation effects on sur hydrocarbons) in surface water or aquifers. from vehicle wash. Inappropriate disposal Activities must comply with CEA Location Remust comply with (Exploration Code of Pract commitment in the application (APO). Relevents implement all measures to prevent cau b. All sediment and erosion controls (including accordance with Blue Book. c. No significa | studies required on impacts or mitigation? What is the level of public concern? Ranking of potential significance Justification for d commercial fish inage flows/flood has been remove dams through land of groundwater of face water. A Ford across of all of drilling waste estrictions, Impact itice: Environment vant requirements sing any adverse ng drainage from nt impact on any | or ranking In breeding or nursery areas. Ing regime. Surface runoff can be lived. Generally minimal surface dholder agreements). Interception, systems in drilling operations. Mobilisation of pollutants (such as creeks can cause stream bank erosion les / overflow from drilling sumps. Let Thresholds and Criteria. Activities at Management) as per the soft his Code include: a. Activities are impacts on water quality or quantity. In roads/access tracks) to be managed in threatened species, threatened | |
| How resilient is the environment to cope with impacts? Can the impacts be reversed? Can the impacts be mitigated? Do the operations comply with standards, plans, policies? Criteria Potential impacts | N/A N/A N/A N/A Negligible and only localised changes to dra sediment laden from areas where vegetation water use (must be licensed or use of farm of cross contamination and/or depressurisation Groundwater depressurisation effects on sur hydrocarbons) in surface water or aquifers. from vehicle wash. Inappropriate disposa Activities must comply with CEA Location Remust comply with (Exploration Code of Pract commitment in the application (APO). Relevents implement all measures to prevent cau b. All sediment and erosion controls (including accordance with Blue Book. c. No significal populations, threatened ecological communications.) | studies required on impacts or mitigation? What is the level of public concern? Ranking of potential significance Justification for d commercial fish inage flows/flood has been remove dams through land of groundwater of face water. Ford across of estrictions, Impact itee: Environment vant requirements using any adverse ng drainage from nt impact on any ties, or their habi | or ranking In breeding or nursery areas. Ing regime. Surface runoff can be lived. Generally minimal surface dholder agreements). Interception, systems in drilling operations. Mobilisation of pollutants (such as creeks can cause stream bank erosion les / overflow from drilling sumps. Let Thresholds and Criteria. Activities at Management) as per the soft his Code include: a. Activities are impacts on water quality or quantity. In roads/access tracks) to be managed in threatened species, threatened | |
| How resilient is the environment to cope with impacts? Can the impacts be reversed? Can the impacts be mitigated? Do the operations comply with standards, plans, policies? Criteria Potential impacts | N/A N/A N/A N/A Negligible and only localised changes to dra sediment laden from areas where vegetation water use (must be licensed or use of farm of cross contamination and/or depressurisation Groundwater depressurisation effects on sur hydrocarbons) in surface water or aquifers. from vehicle wash. Inappropriate disposa Activities must comply with CEA Location Remust comply with (Exploration Code of Pract commitment in the application (APO). Relevents implement all measures to prevent cau b. All sediment and erosion controls (includir accordance with Blue Book. c. No significate populations, threatened ecological communicate waterfront land. All disturbed areas to be (Exploration Code of Practice: Rehabilitation) | studies required on impacts or mitigation? What is the level of public concern? Ranking of potential significance Justification for d commercial fish inage flows/flood has been remove dams through land of groundwater of face water. M Ford across of all of drilling waste estrictions, Impact ice: Environment rant requirements sing any adverse ing drainage from nt impact on any ties, or their habit rehabilitated in a | n breeding or nursery areas. In gregime. Surface runoff can be ved. Generally minimal surface dholder agreements). Interception, systems in drilling operations. Mobilisation of pollutants (such as creeks can cause stream bank erosion es / overflow from drilling sumps. et Thresholds and Criteria. Activities tal Management) as per the soft this Code include: a. Activities e impacts on water quality or quantity. roads/access tracks) to be managed in threatened species, threatened tats. d. No removal of vegetation in accordance with title conditions | |
| How resilient is the environment to cope with impacts? Can the impacts be reversed? Can the impacts be mitigated? Do the operations comply with standards, plans, policies? Criteria Potential impacts Proposed management controls | N/A N/A N/A N/A Negligible and only localised changes to drasediment laden from areas where vegetation water use (must be licensed or use of farm of cross contamination and/or depressurisation Groundwater depressurisation effects on sur hydrocarbons) in surface water or aquifers. from vehicle wash. Inappropriate disposa Activities must comply with CEA Location Remust comply with (Exploration Code of Pract commitment in the application (APO). Relevent must implement all measures to prevent caut b. All sediment and erosion controls (includir accordance with Blue Book. c. No significate populations, threatened ecological community waterfront land. All disturbed areas to be (Exploration Code of Practice: Rehabilitation completion of activity. | studies required on impacts or mitigation? What is the level of public concern? Ranking of potential significance Justification for d commercial fish inage flows/flood has been remove dams through land of groundwater of face water. M Ford across of all of drilling waste estrictions, Impact ice: Environment rant requirements sing any adverse ing drainage from nt impact on any ties, or their habit rehabilitated in a | n breeding or nursery areas. In gregime. Surface runoff can be ved. Generally minimal surface dholder agreements). Interception, systems in drilling operations. Mobilisation of pollutants (such as creeks can cause stream bank erosion es / overflow from drilling sumps. et Thresholds and Criteria. Activities tal Management) as per the soft this Code include: a. Activities e impacts on water quality or quantity. roads/access tracks) to be managed in threatened species, threatened tats. d. No removal of vegetation in accordance with title conditions | |
| How resilient is the environment to cope with impacts? Can the impacts be reversed? Can the impacts be mitigated? Do the operations comply with standards, plans, policies? Criteria Potential impacts | N/A N/A N/A N/A Negligible and only localised changes to dra sediment laden from areas where vegetation water use (must be licensed or use of farm of cross contamination and/or depressurisation Groundwater depressurisation effects on sur hydrocarbons) in surface water or aquifers. from vehicle wash. Inappropriate disposa Activities must comply with CEA Location Remust comply with (Exploration Code of Pract commitment in the application (APO). Relevents implement all measures to prevent cau b. All sediment and erosion controls (includir accordance with Blue Book. c. No significate populations, threatened ecological communicate waterfront land. All disturbed areas to be (Exploration Code of Practice: Rehabilitation) | studies required on impacts or mitigation? What is the level of public concern? Ranking of potential significance Justification for d commercial fish inage flows/flood has been remove dams through land of groundwater of face water. M Ford across of all of drilling waste estrictions, Impact ice: Environment rant requirements sing any adverse ing drainage from nt impact on any ties, or their habit rehabilitated in a | n breeding or nursery areas. In gregime. Surface runoff can be ved. Generally minimal surface dholder agreements). Interception, systems in drilling operations. Mobilisation of pollutants (such as creeks can cause stream bank erosion es / overflow from drilling sumps. et Thresholds and Criteria. Activities tal Management) as per the soft this Code include: a. Activities e impacts on water quality or quantity. roads/access tracks) to be managed in threatened species, threatened tats. d. No removal of vegetation in accordance with title conditions | |

| What is the confidence in | | | |
|--|---|--|---|
| predicting impacts? | High | Are further studies required on | No |
| | | impacts or | |
| | | mitigation? | |
| How resilient is the environment to cope with impacts? | High Resilience | What is the level of | Low |
| | | public concern? | |
| Can the impacts be reversed? | Yes | Ranking of potential | Low |
| | | significance | |
| Can the impacts be mitigated? | Fully | Justification for | or ranking |
| Do the operations comply with standards, plans, policies? | Yes | | |
| Criteria | Sensitive Land Impacts: Impacts on other so set aside under the Forestry Act 2012 for conspecial management (and other) zones. b. declared to be a 'controlled area' or a 'special management (and other) zones. | nservation values Drinking water c al area' under the | s. This includes flora reserves and atchment protection areas - land Water NSW Act 2014, or a 'special |
| | area' under the Water Management Act 200 defined under the Water Management Act 20 | | r Act 1991. c. Waterfront land as |
| Potential impacts | N/A CEA Location restrictions prevent acti | | nsitive locations. |
| Proposed management controls | N/A | | |
| Duration | N/A | | |
| Application ranking | | | |
| What is the confidence in | N/A | Are further | N/A |
| predicting impacts? | | studies | |
| F. C 6 6 | | required on | |
| | | impacts or | |
| | | mitigation? | |
| How resilient is the environment to | N/A | What is the | N/A |
| cope with impacts? | | level of | |
| | | public | |
| | | concern? | |
| Can the impacts be reversed? | N/A | Ranking of | |
| | | | |
| | | potential | |
| | | potential significance | |
| Can the impacts be mitigated? | N/A | | or ranking |
| Do the operations comply with | N/A N/A | significance | or ranking |
| Do the operations comply with standards, plans, policies? | N/A | significance Justification fo | |
| Do the operations comply with | N/A Sensitive Land Impacts: Impacts on land res | significance Justification for | ed within the meaning of the Crown |
| Do the operations comply with standards, plans, policies? | N/A Sensitive Land Impacts: Impacts on land res Lands Act 1989/Crown Lands Management | significance Justification for | ed within the meaning of the Crown |
| Do the operations comply with standards, plans, policies? Criteria | N/A Sensitive Land Impacts: Impacts on land res Lands Act 1989/Crown Lands Management environmental protection purposes. | significance Justification for | ed within the meaning of the Crown |
| Do the operations comply with standards, plans, policies? Criteria Potential impacts | N/A Sensitive Land Impacts: Impacts on land res Lands Act 1989/Crown Lands Management environmental protection purposes. Activity not permitted in area. | significance Justification for | ed within the meaning of the Crown |
| Do the operations comply with standards, plans, policies? Criteria Potential impacts Proposed management controls | N/A Sensitive Land Impacts: Impacts on land res Lands Act 1989/Crown Lands Management environmental protection purposes. Activity not permitted in area. N/A | significance Justification for | ed within the meaning of the Crown |
| Do the operations comply with standards, plans, policies? Criteria Potential impacts Proposed management controls Duration | N/A Sensitive Land Impacts: Impacts on land res Lands Act 1989/Crown Lands Management environmental protection purposes. Activity not permitted in area. | significance Justification for | ed within the meaning of the Crown |
| Do the operations comply with standards, plans, policies? Criteria Potential impacts Proposed management controls Duration Application ranking | N/A Sensitive Land Impacts: Impacts on land res Lands Act 1989/Crown Lands Management environmental protection purposes. Activity not permitted in area. N/A N/A | significance Justification for dedicate Act 2016 for pres | ed within the meaning of the Crown servation of the environment or other |
| Do the operations comply with standards, plans, policies? Criteria Potential impacts Proposed management controls Duration Application ranking What is the confidence in | N/A Sensitive Land Impacts: Impacts on land res Lands Act 1989/Crown Lands Management environmental protection purposes. Activity not permitted in area. N/A | significance Justification for dedicate Act 2016 for pres | ed within the meaning of the Crown |
| Do the operations comply with standards, plans, policies? Criteria Potential impacts Proposed management controls Duration Application ranking | N/A Sensitive Land Impacts: Impacts on land res Lands Act 1989/Crown Lands Management environmental protection purposes. Activity not permitted in area. N/A N/A | significance Justification for erved or dedicate Act 2016 for pres Are further studies | ed within the meaning of the Crown servation of the environment or other |
| Do the operations comply with standards, plans, policies? Criteria Potential impacts Proposed management controls Duration Application ranking What is the confidence in | N/A Sensitive Land Impacts: Impacts on land res Lands Act 1989/Crown Lands Management environmental protection purposes. Activity not permitted in area. N/A N/A | significance Justification for erved or dedicate Act 2016 for pres Are further studies required on | ed within the meaning of the Crown servation of the environment or other |
| Do the operations comply with standards, plans, policies? Criteria Potential impacts Proposed management controls Duration Application ranking What is the confidence in | N/A Sensitive Land Impacts: Impacts on land res Lands Act 1989/Crown Lands Management environmental protection purposes. Activity not permitted in area. N/A N/A | significance Justification for erved or dedicate Act 2016 for pres Are further studies required on impacts or | ed within the meaning of the Crown servation of the environment or other |
| Do the operations comply with standards, plans, policies? Criteria Potential impacts Proposed management controls Duration Application ranking What is the confidence in predicting impacts? | N/A Sensitive Land Impacts: Impacts on land res Lands Act 1989/Crown Lands Management environmental protection purposes. Activity not permitted in area. N/A N/A N/A | significance Justification for erved or dedicate Act 2016 for pres Are further studies required on impacts or mitigation? | ed within the meaning of the Crown servation of the environment or other |
| Do the operations comply with standards, plans, policies? Criteria Potential impacts Proposed management controls Duration Application ranking What is the confidence in predicting impacts? How resilient is the environment to | N/A Sensitive Land Impacts: Impacts on land res Lands Act 1989/Crown Lands Management environmental protection purposes. Activity not permitted in area. N/A N/A | significance Justification for erved or dedicate Act 2016 for pres Are further studies required on impacts or mitigation? What is the | ed within the meaning of the Crown servation of the environment or other |
| Do the operations comply with standards, plans, policies? Criteria Potential impacts Proposed management controls Duration Application ranking What is the confidence in predicting impacts? | N/A Sensitive Land Impacts: Impacts on land res Lands Act 1989/Crown Lands Management environmental protection purposes. Activity not permitted in area. N/A N/A N/A | significance Justification for erved or dedicate Act 2016 for press Are further studies required on impacts or mitigation? What is the level of | ed within the meaning of the Crown servation of the environment or other |
| Do the operations comply with standards, plans, policies? Criteria Potential impacts Proposed management controls Duration Application ranking What is the confidence in predicting impacts? How resilient is the environment to | N/A Sensitive Land Impacts: Impacts on land res Lands Act 1989/Crown Lands Management environmental protection purposes. Activity not permitted in area. N/A N/A N/A | significance Justification for erved or dedicate Act 2016 for press Are further studies required on impacts or mitigation? What is the level of public | ed within the meaning of the Crown servation of the environment or other |
| Do the operations comply with standards, plans, policies? Criteria Potential impacts Proposed management controls Duration Application ranking What is the confidence in predicting impacts? How resilient is the environment to cope with impacts? | N/A Sensitive Land Impacts: Impacts on land res Lands Act 1989/Crown Lands Management environmental protection purposes. Activity not permitted in area. N/A N/A N/A | Are further studies required on impacts or mitigation? What is the level of public concern? | ed within the meaning of the Crown servation of the environment or other |
| Do the operations comply with standards, plans, policies? Criteria Potential impacts Proposed management controls Duration Application ranking What is the confidence in predicting impacts? How resilient is the environment to | N/A Sensitive Land Impacts: Impacts on land res Lands Act 1989/Crown Lands Management environmental protection purposes. Activity not permitted in area. N/A N/A N/A | Are further studies required on impacts or mitigation? What is the level of public concern? | ed within the meaning of the Crown servation of the environment or other |
| Do the operations comply with standards, plans, policies? Criteria Potential impacts Proposed management controls Duration Application ranking What is the confidence in predicting impacts? How resilient is the environment to cope with impacts? | N/A Sensitive Land Impacts: Impacts on land res Lands Act 1989/Crown Lands Management environmental protection purposes. Activity not permitted in area. N/A N/A N/A | Are further studies required on impacts or mitigation? What is the level of public concern? Ranking of potential | ed within the meaning of the Crown servation of the environment or other |
| Do the operations comply with standards, plans, policies? Criteria Potential impacts Proposed management controls Duration Application ranking What is the confidence in predicting impacts? How resilient is the environment to cope with impacts? | N/A Sensitive Land Impacts: Impacts on land res Lands Act 1989/Crown Lands Management environmental protection purposes. Activity not permitted in area. N/A N/A N/A | Are further studies required on impacts or mitigation? What is the level of public concern? | ed within the meaning of the Crown servation of the environment or other N/A N/A |
| Do the operations comply with standards, plans, policies? Criteria Potential impacts Proposed management controls Duration Application ranking What is the confidence in predicting impacts? How resilient is the environment to cope with impacts? Can the impacts be reversed? | N/A Sensitive Land Impacts: Impacts on land res Lands Act 1989/Crown Lands Management environmental protection purposes. Activity not permitted in area. N/A N/A N/A N/A | Are further studies required on impacts or mitigation? What is the level of public concern? Ranking of potential significance | ed within the meaning of the Crown servation of the environment or other N/A N/A |
| Do the operations comply with standards, plans, policies? Criteria Potential impacts Proposed management controls Duration Application ranking What is the confidence in predicting impacts? How resilient is the environment to cope with impacts? Can the impacts be reversed? Can the impacts be mitigated? Do the operations comply with | N/A Sensitive Land Impacts: Impacts on land res Lands Act 1989/Crown Lands Management environmental protection purposes. Activity not permitted in area. N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A | Are further studies required on impacts or mitigation? What is the level of public concern? Ranking of potential significance | ed within the meaning of the Crown servation of the environment or other N/A N/A |
| Do the operations comply with standards, plans, policies? Criteria Potential impacts Proposed management controls Duration Application ranking What is the confidence in predicting impacts? How resilient is the environment to cope with impacts? Can the impacts be reversed? Can the operations comply with standards, plans, policies? | N/A Sensitive Land Impacts: Impacts on land res Lands Act 1989/Crown Lands Management environmental protection purposes. Activity not permitted in area. N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A | significance Justification for Justification for erved or dedicate Act 2016 for press Are further studies required on impacts or mitigation? What is the level of public concern? Ranking of potential significance Justification for | ed within the meaning of the Crown servation of the environment or other N/A N/A or ranking |
| Do the operations comply with standards, plans, policies? Criteria Potential impacts Proposed management controls Duration Application ranking What is the confidence in predicting impacts? How resilient is the environment to cope with impacts? Can the impacts be reversed? Can the operations comply with standards, plans, policies? | N/A Sensitive Land Impacts: Impacts on land rest Lands Act 1989/Crown Lands Management environmental protection purposes. Activity not permitted in area. N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A | significance Justification for Justification for erved or dedicate Act 2016 for press Are further studies required on impacts or mitigation? What is the level of public concern? Ranking of potential significance Justification for | ed within the meaning of the Crown servation of the environment or other N/A N/A or ranking |
| Do the operations comply with standards, plans, policies? Criteria Potential impacts Proposed management controls Duration Application ranking What is the confidence in predicting impacts? How resilient is the environment to cope with impacts? Can the impacts be reversed? Can the impacts be mitigated? Do the operations comply with standards, plans, policies? Criteria | N/A Sensitive Land Impacts: Impacts on land rest Lands Act 1989/Crown Lands Management environmental protection purposes. Activity not permitted in area. N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A Sensitive Land Impacts: Impacts on land ide | significance Justification for Justification for erved or dedicate Act 2016 for press Are further studies required on impacts or mitigation? What is the level of public concern? Ranking of potential significance Justification for | ed within the meaning of the Crown servation of the environment or other N/A N/A or ranking |
| Do the operations comply with standards, plans, policies? Criteria Potential impacts Proposed management controls Duration Application ranking What is the confidence in predicting impacts? How resilient is the environment to cope with impacts? Can the impacts be reversed? Can the impacts be mitigated? Do the operations comply with standards, plans, policies? Criteria Potential impacts | N/A Sensitive Land Impacts: Impacts on land rest Lands Act 1989/Crown Lands Management environmental protection purposes. Activity not permitted in area. N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A Sensitive Land Impacts: Impacts on land idequader the Wilderness Act 1987. | significance Justification for Justification for erved or dedicate Act 2016 for press Are further studies required on impacts or mitigation? What is the level of public concern? Ranking of potential significance Justification for | ed within the meaning of the Crown servation of the environment or other N/A N/A or ranking |
| Do the operations comply with standards, plans, policies? Criteria Potential impacts Proposed management controls Duration Application ranking What is the confidence in predicting impacts? How resilient is the environment to cope with impacts? Can the impacts be reversed? Can the impacts be mitigated? Do the operations comply with standards, plans, policies? Criteria Potential impacts Proposed management controls | N/A Sensitive Land Impacts: Impacts on land rest Lands Act 1989/Crown Lands Management environmental protection purposes. Activity not permitted in area. N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A Sensitive Land Impacts: Impacts on land ide under the Wilderness Act 1987. Activity not permitted in these areas. | significance Justification for Justification for erved or dedicate Act 2016 for press Are further studies required on impacts or mitigation? What is the level of public concern? Ranking of potential significance Justification for | ed within the meaning of the Crown servation of the environment or other N/A N/A or ranking |
| Do the operations comply with standards, plans, policies? Criteria Potential impacts Proposed management controls Duration Application ranking What is the confidence in predicting impacts? How resilient is the environment to cope with impacts? Can the impacts be reversed? Can the impacts be mitigated? Do the operations comply with standards, plans, policies? Criteria Potential impacts Proposed management controls Duration | N/A Sensitive Land Impacts: Impacts on land rest Lands Act 1989/Crown Lands Management environmental protection purposes. Activity not permitted in area. N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A Sensitive Land Impacts: Impacts on land ide under the Wilderness Act 1987. Activity not permitted in these areas. N/A | significance Justification for Justification for erved or dedicate Act 2016 for press Are further studies required on impacts or mitigation? What is the level of public concern? Ranking of potential significance Justification for | ed within the meaning of the Crown servation of the environment or other N/A N/A or ranking |
| Do the operations comply with standards, plans, policies? Criteria Potential impacts Proposed management controls Duration Application ranking What is the confidence in predicting impacts? How resilient is the environment to cope with impacts? Can the impacts be reversed? Can the impacts be mitigated? Do the operations comply with standards, plans, policies? Criteria Potential impacts Proposed management controls Duration | N/A Sensitive Land Impacts: Impacts on land rest Lands Act 1989/Crown Lands Management environmental protection purposes. Activity not permitted in area. N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A Sensitive Land Impacts: Impacts on land ide under the Wilderness Act 1987. Activity not permitted in these areas. N/A | significance Justification for Justification for erved or dedicate Act 2016 for press Are further studies required on impacts or mitigation? What is the level of public concern? Ranking of potential significance Justification for | ed within the meaning of the Crown servation of the environment or other N/A N/A or ranking |
| Do the operations comply with standards, plans, policies? Criteria Potential impacts Proposed management controls Duration Application ranking What is the confidence in predicting impacts? How resilient is the environment to cope with impacts? Can the impacts be reversed? Can the impacts be mitigated? Do the operations comply with standards, plans, policies? Criteria Potential impacts Proposed management controls Duration Application ranking | N/A Sensitive Land Impacts: Impacts on land rest Lands Act 1989/Crown Lands Management environmental protection purposes. Activity not permitted in area. N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A Sensitive Land Impacts: Impacts on land ide under the Wilderness Act 1987. Activity not permitted in these areas. N/A N/A | Are further studies required on impacts or mitigation? What is the level of public concern? Ranking of potential significance Justification for the public concern. | ed within the meaning of the Crown servation of the environment or other N/A N/A or ranking ess or declared a wilderness area |
| Do the operations comply with standards, plans, policies? Criteria Potential impacts Proposed management controls Duration Application ranking What is the confidence in predicting impacts? How resilient is the environment to cope with impacts? Can the impacts be reversed? Can the impacts be mitigated? Do the operations comply with standards, plans, policies? Criteria Potential impacts Proposed management controls Duration Application ranking What is the confidence in | N/A Sensitive Land Impacts: Impacts on land rest Lands Act 1989/Crown Lands Management environmental protection purposes. Activity not permitted in area. N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A Sensitive Land Impacts: Impacts on land ide under the Wilderness Act 1987. Activity not permitted in these areas. N/A N/A | Are further studies required on impacts or mitigation? What is the level of public concern? Ranking of potential significance Justification for putified as wildern | ed within the meaning of the Crown servation of the environment or other N/A N/A or ranking ess or declared a wilderness area |
| Do the operations comply with standards, plans, policies? Criteria Potential impacts Proposed management controls Duration Application ranking What is the confidence in predicting impacts? How resilient is the environment to cope with impacts? Can the impacts be reversed? Can the impacts be mitigated? Do the operations comply with standards, plans, policies? Criteria Potential impacts Proposed management controls Duration Application ranking What is the confidence in | N/A Sensitive Land Impacts: Impacts on land rest Lands Act 1989/Crown Lands Management environmental protection purposes. Activity not permitted in area. N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A Sensitive Land Impacts: Impacts on land ide under the Wilderness Act 1987. Activity not permitted in these areas. N/A N/A | Are further studies required on impacts or mitigation? What is the level of public concern? Ranking of potential significance Justification for the public concern? Are further studies required on impacts or mitigation? What is the level of public concern? Aranking of potential significance Justification for the public concern significance for the public concern? | ed within the meaning of the Crown servation of the environment or other N/A N/A or ranking ess or declared a wilderness area |

| How resilient is the environment to cope with impacts? | N/A | What is the level of public | N/A |
|---|--|--|--|
| | | concern? | |
| Can the impacts be reversed? | N/A | Ranking of potential significance | |
| Can the impacts be mitigated? | N/A | Justification for | or ranking |
| Do the operations comply with | N/A | Justilication | or ranking |
| standards, plans, policies? | IV/A | | |
| Criteria | Sensitive Lands: Impacts on wetlands of inte Convention on Wetlands and those designa Important Wetlands of Australia. | | |
| Potential impacts | Activity not permitted in these areas. | | |
| Proposed management controls | N/A | | |
| Duration | N/A | | |
| Application ranking | | | |
| What is the confidence in | N/A | Are further | N/A |
| predicting impacts? | | studies required on impacts or | |
| | | mitigation? | |
| How resilient is the environment to | N/A | What is the | N/A |
| cope with impacts? | | level of | |
| copo mini impuoto: | | public | |
| | | concern? | |
| Can the impacts be reversed? | N/A | Ranking of | |
| • | | potential | |
| | | significance | |
| Can the impacts be mitigated? | N/A | Justification for | or ranking |
| Do the operations comply with | N/A | | - |
| standards, plans, policies? Criteria | Canaltiva Land Impacts Impacts on land ide | ntified in an anyi | commental planning instrument as being |
| Criteria | Sensitive Land Impacts: Impacts on land ide of biodiversity / conservation significance or management. Includes Coastal Wetlands ar Planning Policy (Resilience and Hazards) 20 | zoned for enviror nd Littoral rainfore | nmental conservation, protection and/or |
| Potential impacts | Activity not permitted in these areas. | - | |
| Proposed management controls | N/A | | |
| Duration | N/A | | |
| Application ranking | | | |
| What is the confidence in predicting impacts? | N/A | Are further studies required on | N/A |
| | | impacts or mitigation? | |
| How resilient is the environment to | N/A | What is the | N/A |
| cope with impacts? | | level of | |
| | | public | |
| | | concern? | |
| Can the impacts be reversed? | N/A | Ranking of | |
| | | potential | |
| 0 11 1 11 11 11 | A I / A | significance | |
| Can the impacts be mitigated? Do the operations comply with standards, plans, policies? | N/A N/A | Justification for | or ranking |
| Criteria Standards, plans, policies : | Sensitive Land Impacts: Impacts on Aborigin | | Alexander and a Alexander alexander and |
| | objects under the National Parks and Wildlif | e Act 1974 b. A | |
| Potential impacts | objects under the National Parks and Wildlif identified in an environmental planning instru | e Act 1974 b. A | |
| Potential impacts Proposed management controls | objects under the National Parks and Wildlif identified in an environmental planning instructivity not permitted in these areas. | e Act 1974 b. A | |
| Proposed management controls | objects under the National Parks and Wildlif identified in an environmental planning instructivity not permitted in these areas. N/A | e Act 1974 b. A | |
| Proposed management controls Duration | objects under the National Parks and Wildlif identified in an environmental planning instructivity not permitted in these areas. | e Act 1974 b. A | |
| Proposed management controls Duration Application ranking | objects under the National Parks and Wildlif identified in an environmental planning instructivity not permitted in these areas. N/A N/A | e Act 1974 b. A ument. | reas of Aboriginal cultural significance |
| Proposed management controls Duration | objects under the National Parks and Wildlif identified in an environmental planning instructivity not permitted in these areas. N/A | Are further studies required on impacts or | |
| Proposed management controls Duration Application ranking What is the confidence in | objects under the National Parks and Wildlif identified in an environmental planning instructivity not permitted in these areas. N/A N/A | Are further studies required on impacts or mitigation? What is the level of public | reas of Aboriginal cultural significance |
| Proposed management controls Duration Application ranking What is the confidence in predicting impacts? How resilient is the environment to | objects under the National Parks and Wildlif identified in an environmental planning instructivity not permitted in these areas. N/A N/A N/A | Are further studies required on impacts or mitigation? What is the level of | reas of Aboriginal cultural significance |

| Can the impacts be mitigated? | N/A N/A | Justification f | or ranking |
|---|--|---|--|
| Do the operations comply with standards, plans, policies? | | | |
| Criteria | Sensitive Land Impacts: Impacts on heritage and internationally recognised heritage sites Commonwealth Heritage List) b. Items liste conservation areas identified in an environm | or areas (World ed on State Herita | Heritage List, National Heritage List of age c. Heritage items and |
| Potential impacts | CEA activities not permitted in these areas. | | |
| Proposed management controls | N/A | | |
| Duration | N/A | | |
| Application ranking | | | |
| What is the confidence in | N/A | Are further | N/A |
| predicting impacts? | | studies required on impacts or mitigation? | |
| 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 | |
| Can the impacts be mitigated? | N/A | Justification f | or ranking |
| Do the operations comply with standards, plans, policies? | N/A | | - |
| Criteria | Sensitive Land Impacts: Impacts on communates 1993 (for which a plan of management has been sense to the sense of the sens | | d under the Local Government Act |
| Potential impacts | Activity not permitted in these areas. | , , , , , , , | |
| Proposed management controls | N/A | | |
| Duration | N/A | | |
| Application ranking | | | |
| What is the confidence in | N/A | Are further | N/A |
| predicting impacts? | | studies | |
| | | required on | |
| | | impacts or | |
| | | mitigation? | |
| How resilient is the environment to | N/A | What is the | N/A |
| cope with impacts? | | level of | |
| | | public | |
| | | concern? | |
| Can the impacts be reversed? | N/A | Ranking of | |
| | | potential | |
| 0 - 4 - 1 | N1/A | significance | |
| Can the impacts be mitigated? | N/A | Justification f | or ranking |
| Do the operations comply with | N/A | | |
| standards, plans, policies? Criteria | Sensitive Land Impacts: Impacts on bushfire | propo orogo | |
| | · | <u>'</u> | |
| Potential impacts | Plant and machinery may be an ignition soul | | |
| Proposed management controls | Activities must comply with CEA Location Remust comply with (Exploration Code of Practicommitment in the application (APO). Relevisk assessment and implementing suitable controls on activities during Extreme or Cata Activities must comply with WHS legislative can be used as firebreaks in event of fire. | tice: Environmen vant requirements controls to mana estrophic Fire Col | tal Management) as per the s of this Code including undertaking a ge risks (e.g. implementation of |
| Duration Application replication | Short term | | |
| Application ranking What is the confidence in | High | Are further | No |
| predicting impacts? | ngii | studies required on impacts or mitigation? | INO |
| How resilient is the environment to cope with impacts? | High Resilience | What is the level of public concern? | Medium |
| Can the impacts be reversed? | Yes | Ranking of | Low |
| oun the impacts be reversed: | 100 | potential significance | |
| Can the impacts be mitigated? | Fully | Justification f | or ranking |
| Do the operations comply with | Yes | Justinication I | or ranking |
| standards, plans, policies? | 100 | | |
| standards, pians, poncies ! | I | I | |

| | 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). | | | |
|---|--|---|--|--|
| Potential impacts | Limited potential for any significant change in the demographic structure of the community. Negligible impacts and only localised changes in demand for community resources. Minimal increase in demand for accommodation, food, mechanical and fuel supplies, etc. Not large | | | |
| | enough to warrant significant changes in supply. ACCESS Existing tracks will be utilised for the drilling program. | | | |
| | Negligible impacts likely due to low personne Generally positive for suppliers of services a | | | |
| | Short term | | | |
| Application ranking | | | | |
| 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? | Low | |
| Can the impacts be reversed? | Yes | Ranking of potential significance | Low | |
| Can the impacts be mitigated? | Fully | Justification for | or ranking | |
| Do the operations comply with standards, plans, policies? | Yes | | - | |
| | Social Impacts: Any environmental impact that may cause substantial change or disruption to the community (including loss of facilities or loss of community identity). | | | |
| | Environmental impacts from activities not of disruption to community. Areas used for exploration activities, temportuse. Short term noise, air quality and visual impact ACCESS Existing tracks will be utilised for the drilling | arily removed fro | | |
| Proposed management controls | Activities must comply with CEA Location Remust comply with (Exploration Code of Pract commitment in the application (APO). Relev potential impacts on all aspects of the environment areas to be rehabilitated in accordance with Rehabilitation). Rehabilitation to occur as so sealing of any boreholes). | estrictions, Impac tice: Environment ant requirements onment (including title conditions (E | tal Management) as per the s of this Code include minimising water, land, air). All disturbed exploration Code of Practice: | |
| | Short term | | | |
| Application ranking | | | | |
| 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? | Low | |
| Can the impacts be reversed? | Yes | Ranking of potential significance | Low | |
| Can the impacts be mitigated? | Partly | | or ranking | |
| | Partly Justification for ranking Yes | | | |
| standards, plans, policies? | Social Impacts: Any impacts which result in | | | |

| Potential impacts | Impacts from activities not of a nature to cau community. | t or long term change or disruption to | | |
|-------------------------------------|---|--|--------------------------------------|--|
| | Limited potential to significantly impact on individuals or communities - short term impacts only. Areas used for exploration activities, temporarily removed from natural systems and / community use. Short term noise, air quality and visual impacts. | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | ACCESS Existing tracks will be utilised for the drilling | program. | | |
| Proposed management controls | Activities must comply with CEA Location Restrictions, Impact Thresholds and Criteria. must comply with (Exploration Code of Practice: Environmental Management) as per the | | | |
| | commitment in the application (APO). Relevelements of the environment (water, land, so | | | |
| | be rehabilitated in accordance with title cond | litions (Exploratio | n Code of Practice: Rehabilitation). | |
| | Rehabilitation to occur as soon as practicable requirement for landholder access arrangement | | | |
| | Compensation under Mining Act available to | | | |
| | WHS legislative requirements. | | | |
| Duration | Short term | | | |
| Application ranking | | | | |
| What is the confidence in | High | Are further | No | |
| predicting impacts? | | studies required on | | |
| | | impacts or | | |
| | | mitigation? | | |
| How resilient is the environment to | High Resilience | What is the | Low | |
| cope with impacts? | | level of public | | |
| | | concern? | | |
| Can the impacts be reversed? | Yes | Ranking of | Low | |
| · | | potential | | |
| | | significance | | |
| Can the impacts be mitigated? | Fully | Justification for | or ranking | |
| Do the operations comply with | Yes | | | |
| standards, plans, policies? | | | | |
| Criteria | Social Impacts: Any impacts on the health, s caused by factors such as pollution, odour, r | | | |
| Potential impacts | Activities not of a nature to cause any signifi | | | |
| P | impacts. Limited potential to significantly | impact on individ | duals or communities - short term | |
| | impacts only. Short term and temporary | noise, air quality | and visual impacts. | |

Proposed management controls

Activities must comply with CEA Location Restrictions, Impact Thresholds and Criteria.

Activities must comply with (Exploration Code of Practice: Environmental Management) as per the commitment in the application (APO). Relevant requirements of this Code include protection of all elements of the environment (water, land, soil, air), culture and heritage.

All disturbed areas to be rehabilitated in accordance with title conditions (Exploration Code of Practice: Rehabilitation). Rehabilitation to occur as soon as practicable after completion of activity.

Legislative requirement for landholder access arrangements and compensation limit any potential impacts.

Compensation under Mining Act available to mitigate compensation. Activities must comply with WHS legislative requirements.

TIME/NOISE

Monday to Sunday 7am to 6pm

4/4/24 to 30/6/24

This drilling is within close proximity to the landholders secondary residence. The landholder has consented to this drilling occurring within this distance. The closest auger drilling hole to the residence is within 33m.

SRL Ops wil inform any nearby residents of potential noise emissions from the exploration site during the auger drilling program, and will implement the following management measures, as required, to minimise the potential for noise impacts to occur:

- * install noise barriers at the drill site.
- * modify the hours and/or days of operation.

AIR

Dust emissions from drilling operations and vehicle movements on unsealed surfaces have the potential to impact sensitive receivers near to the drill sites. SRL Ops will inform nearby residents of the potential dust emissions from the auger drilling program, and implement the following management measures, as required, to minimise the potential for air quality imapets to occur:

- * cease drilling immediately if dust emissions are visible from a distance of more than 250m from the auger rig.
- * limit vehicle speeds to 40km/h on formed tracks and 20km/h on unformed tracks.

With these measures in place, no significant air quality impacts are expected to occur. No venting, flaring or re-use of gases will occur as part of the drilling program.

| Duration | Short term | | | |
|---|---|--|------------|--|
| Application ranking | | | | |
| What is the confidence in predicting impacts? | N/A | Are further studies required on impacts or mitigation? | No | |
| How resilient is the environment to cope with impacts? | N/A | What is the level of public concern? | Low | |
| Can the impacts be reversed? | Yes | Ranking of potential significance | Low | |
| Can the impacts be mitigated? | Fully | Justification for | or ranking | |
| Do the operations comply with standards, plans, policies? | Yes | | | |
| Criteria | 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? | | | |
| Potential impacts | Negligible potential to effect a locality, place or building having aesthetic, anthropological, archaeological, architectural, cultural, historical, scientific or social significance or other special value due to location restrictions of a CEA. Short term and temporary impacts only. | | | |

Proposed management controls

Negligible impacts likely due to low impact of complying exploration activities and temporary nature of exploration.

Activities must comply with CEA Location Restrictions, Impact Thresholds and Criteria.

Activities must comply with (Exploration Code of Practice: Environmental Management) as per the commitment in the application (APO).

Impacts limited to immediate vicinity of exploration activity.

TIME/NOISE

Monday to Sunday 7am to 6pm

4/4/24 to 30/6/24

This drilling is within close proximity to the landholders secondary residence. The landholder has consented to this drilling occurring within this distance. The closest auger drilling hole to the residence is within 33m.

SRL Ops wil inform any nearby residents of potential noise emissions from the exploration site during the auger drilling program, and will implement the following management measures, as required, to minimise the potential for noise impacts to occur:

* install noise barriers at the drill site.

* modify the hours and/or days of operation.

AIR

Dust emissions from drilling operations and vehicle movements on unsealed surfaces have the potential to impact sensitive receivers near to the drill sites. SRL Ops will inform nearby residents of the potential dust emissions from the auger drilling program, and implement the following management measures, as required, to minimise the potential for air quality imapots to occur:

* cease drilling immediately if dust emissions are visible from a distance of more than 250m from the auger rig.

* limit vehicle speeds to 40km/h on formed tracks and 20km/h on unformed tracks.

With these measures in place, no significant air quality impacts are expected to occur. No venting, flaring or re-use of gases will occur as part of the drilling program.

| Duration | Short term | | |
|---|---|--|--|
| Application ranking | | | |
| What is the confidence in predicting impacts? | High | Are further studies required on impacts or | No |
| How resilient is the environment to cope with impacts? | High Resilience | mitigation? 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 f | or ranking |
| Do the operations comply with standards, plans, policies? | Yes | | |
| Criteria | Social Impacts: Impacts on communities with | n strong sense of | identity. |
| Potential impacts Proposed management controls | Community likely to include members who have concerns about possible future mining following any exploration program. Short term and temporary impacts only. Short term impacts on the community and predominantly limited to immediate site. | | |
| | Subject to landholder agreement and any converse All disturbed areas to be rehabilitated in accordance: Rehabilitation). Rehabilitation to one AHIMS AHIMS search indicates no objects of Aborigon The proposed activity is not located: * within 200m of waters * located within a sand dune system * located on a ridge top, ridge line or headlar * located within 200m below or above a cliff of within 20m of a cave, rock shelter, or a cave HERITAGE No items of historic cultural or natural heritage program area. Please refer to attached sear | ompensation. ordance with title cur as soon as program of the cultural heritand face, or the mouth. | conditions (Exploration Code of racticable after completion of activity. tage located on this lot/DP (3/752073). |
| Duration | Short term | | |
| Application ranking | | | |

| What is the confidence in predicting impacts? | Medium | 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? | Low |
| Can the impacts be reversed? | Yes | Ranking of potential significance | Low |
| Can the impacts be mitigated? | Partly | Justification f | or ranking |
| Do the operations comply with standards, plans, policies? | Yes | | |
| Criteria | Social Impacts: Impacts on disadvantaged c | communities. | |
| Potential impacts | No negative impacts predicted. | | |
| Proposed management controls | Short term impacts on the community and properties agreement and any compensation accordance with title conditions (Exploration occur as soon as practicable after completion) | n. All disturbe Code of Practice | ed areas to be rehabilitated in |
| Duration | Short term | | |
| Application ranking What is the confidence in | High | Are further | No |
| predicting impacts? | ngii | 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? | Low |
| Can the impacts be reversed? | Yes | Ranking of potential significance | Low |
| Can the impacts be mitigated? | Fully | Justification f | or ranking |
| Do the operations comply with | Yes | | |
| standards, plans, policies? Criteria | Economic Impacts: Any impacts which may | affect economic a | activity (positive or negative), including |
| Potential impacts | a decrease to net economic welfare. No significant impacts predicted. Minima mechanical and fuel supplies, etc. Not large | | nand for accommodation, food, ant significant changes in supply. |
| Proposed management controls | Negligible impacts likely due to low personne Generally positive for suppliers of services a | el numbers and t | emporary nature of exploration. |
| Duration | Short term | | |
| Application ranking What is the confidence in | High | Are further | No |
| predicting impacts? | ngii | 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? | Low |
| Can the impacts be reversed? | Yes | Ranking of potential significance | Low |
| Can the impacts be mitigated? | Fully | Justification f | or ranking |
| Do the operations comply with standards, plans, policies? | Yes | | |
| Criteria | Economic Impacts: Any impacts that result in | | <u>-</u> |
| Potential impacts | Activities not of a scale to warrant changes in result in increased income for some supplier | s. | Temporary increase in demand will |
| Proposed management controls | Negligible impacts likely due to low personne Generally positive for suppliers of services a | | |
| Duration Application replies | Short term | | |
| Application ranking What is the confidence in | High | Ara filutha | No |
| 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? | Low | | | |
|---|--|--|---|--|--|--|
| Can the impacts be reversed? | Yes | Ranking of potential significance | Low | | | |
| Can the impacts be mitigated? | Partly | Justification f | or ranking | | | |
| Do the operations comply with | Yes | | | | | |
| standards, plans, policies? | | | | | | |
| Criteria | expenditure base. | Economic Impacts: Any impacts which result in a change to the public sector revenue or expenditure base. | | | | |
| Potential impacts | Rehabilitation security bond covers any futu exploration may lead to significant mining in impacts from exploration. | vestment. Lin | nited long term negative economic | | | |
| Proposed management controls | Small increase in public revenue associated | with exploration, | including taxes from wages. | | | |
| Duration | Short term | | | | | |
| Application ranking | | | T | | | |
| What is the confidence in predicting impacts? | High | Are further studies required on impacts or mitigation? | No | | | |
| How resilient is the environment to | High Resilience | What is the | Low | | | |
| cope with impacts? | riigiri kesiileriee | level of public concern? | 2011 | | | |
| Can the impacts be reversed? | Yes | Ranking of potential significance | Low | | | |
| Can the impacts be mitigated? | No | Justification f | or ranking | | | |
| Do the operations comply with standards, plans, policies? | Yes | | - | | | |
| Criteria | Heritage Impacts: Any impacts on a locality, heritage significance. | place, landscape | e, building or archaeological relic of | | | |
| Potential impacts | Damage to structures and sensitive features locality, places, landscapes or buildings. Potential for temporary impact on aesthetics | Short term noise | etential to significantly impact on e, air quality and visual impacts. | | | |
| Proposed management controls | Activities must comply with CEA Location Reductivities must comply with (Exploration Coccommitment in the application (APO). Relevation potential impacts on all aspects of the environgment (Aboriginal and Non-Indigenous heritage). All disturbed areas to be rehabilitated in accommitment proposed areas to be rehabilitation to occommit (including sealing of any boreholes). AHIMS AHIMS search indicates no objects of Aboriging The proposed activity is not located: * within 200m of waters * located within a sand dune system * located within a sand dune system * located within 200m below or above a cliff * within 20m of a cave, rock shelter, or a cave of the complex of the | de of Practice: Envant requirements onment (including ordance with title ocur as soon as paginal cultural heriond face, or we mouth. | evironmental Management) as per the sof this Code include minimising water, land, air), culture and heritage conditions (Exploration Code of tracticable after completion of activity tage located on this lot/DP (3/752073). | | | |
| Duration | Snort term | | | | | |
| Application ranking | N/A | Ara fuutha- | No | | | |
| What is the confidence in predicting impacts? | N/A | 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? | Low | | | |
| Can the impacts be reversed? | Yes | Ranking of potential significance | Low | | | |
| Can the impacts be mitigated? | Partly | Justification f | UI TATIKITIY | | | |

| Do the operations comply with | Yes | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|
| standards, plans, policies? | | | | |
| Criteria | Aesthetic Impacts: Any impacts on the visual or scenic landscape, including lighting, venting or flaring of gas. | | | |
| Potential impacts | Limited potential to significantly impact on visual or scenic landscape. Short term noise, air quality and visual impacts. Potential for temporary impact on aesthetics of a locality. Lighting during night time operations and use of access tracks by vehicles at night may affect local amenity. | | | |
| Proposed management controls | Activities must comply with CEA Location Restrictions, Impact Thresholds and Criteria. Activities must comply with (Exploration Code of Practice: Environmental Management) as per the commitment in the application (APO). Relevant requirements of this Code include minimising potential impacts on all aspects of the environment (including water, land, air), culture and heritage (Aboriginal and Non-Indigenous heritage). All disturbed areas to be rehabilitated in accordance with title conditions (Exploration Code of Practice: Rehabilitation). Rehabilitation to occur as soon as practicable after completion of activity (including sealing of any boreholes). | | | |
| Duration | Short term | | | |
| Application ranking | | | | |
| 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? | Low | |
| Can the impacts be reversed? | N/A | Ranking of potential significance | Low | |
| Can the impacts be mitigated? | Fully | Justification f | or ranking | |
| Do the operations comply with standards, plans, policies? | Yes | | | |
| Criteria | Aesthetic Impacts: Areas or items of high ae | sthetic or scenic | value. | |
| Potential impacts | Limited potential to significantly impact on action and visual impacts. Potential for temporal night time operations and use of access trace Exploration activities, including any removal on visual amenity. | ary impact on aes ks by vehicles at | sthetics of a locality. Lighting during night may affect local amenity. | |
| Proposed management controls | Short term impacts predominantly limited to Location Restrictions, Impact Thresholds and Code of Practice: Environmental Manageme Relevant requirements of this Code include environment (including water, land, air), culture heritage). All disturbed areas to be rehabled to forestimate the code of Practice: Rehabilitation). Rehabilitation activity (including sealing of any boreholes). | d Criteria. Acent) as per the cominimising potenure and heritage bilitated in accord | tial impacts on all aspects of the (Aboriginal and Non-Indigenous lance with title conditions (Exploration | |
| Duration | Short term | | | |
| Application ranking | C.I.C. Collin | | | |
| 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? | Low | |
| Can the impacts be reversed? | Yes | Ranking of potential significance | Low | |
| Can the impacts be mitigated? | Partly | Justification f | or ranking | |
| Do the operations comply with standards, plans, policies? | Yes | | | |
| Criteria Criteria | Cultural Impacts: Any disturbance of the gro | und surface or ar | ny culturally modified trees (e.g. a scar | |
| | tree). | | | |

Proposed management controls Activities must comply with CEA Location Restrictions, Impact Thresholds and Criteria. Activities cannot occur on land declared an Aboriginal Place and activities must not harm Aboriginal Objects. Activities must comply with (Exploration Code of Practice: Environmental Management) as per the commitment in the application (APO). Relevant requirements of this Code include minimising potential impacts on all aspects of the environment (including water, land, air), culture and heritage (Aboriginal and Non-Indigenous heritage). All disturbed areas to be rehabilitated in accordance with title conditions (Exploration Code of Practice: Rehabilitation). Rehabilitation to occur as soon as practicable after completion of activity (including sealing of any boreholes). AHIMS search indicates no objects of Aboriginal cultural heritage located on this lot/DP (3/752073). The proposed activity is not located: * within 200m of waters * located within a sand dune system * located on a ridge top, ridge line or headland * located within 200m below or above a cliff face, or * within 20m of a cave, rock shelter, or a cave mouth. Duration Short term Application ranking What is the confidence in Are further High Nο predicting impacts? studies required on impacts or mitigation? How resilient is the environment to High Resilience Medium What is the cope with impacts? level of public concern? Can the impacts be reversed? Yes Ranking of Low potential significance Can the impacts be mitigated? Fully Justification for ranking Do the operations comply with standards, plans, policies? Cultural Impacts: Any impacts on known Aboriginal objects or Aboriginal places. Criteria **Potential impacts** Potential for impact on Aboriginal objects and places through Short term ground disturbance. ground disturbance, excavations, vegetation clearing, etc. Activities must comply with CEA Location Restrictions, Impact Thresholds and Criteria. Activities **Proposed management controls** cannot occur on land declared an Aboriginal Place and activities must not harm Aboriginal Objects. Activities must comply with (Exploration Code of Practice: Environmental Management) as per the commitment in the application (APO). Relevant requirements of this Code include minimising potential impacts on all aspects of the environment (including water, land, air), culture and heritage (Aboriginal and Non-Indigenous heritage). All disturbed areas to be rehabilitated in accordance with title conditions (Exploration Code of Practice: Rehabilitation). Rehabilitation to occur as soon as practicable after completion of activity (including sealing of any boreholes). AHIMS AHIMS search indicates no objects of Aboriginal cultural heritage located on this lot/DP (3/752073). The proposed activity is not located: * within 200m of waters * located within a sand dune system * located on a ridge top, ridge line or headland * located within 200m below or above a cliff face, or * within 20m of a cave, rock shelter, or a cave mouth. Duration Short term Application ranking What is the confidence in High Are further No predicting impacts? studies required on impacts or mitigation? How resilient is the environment to High Resilience What is the Medium cope with impacts? level of public concern? Can the impacts be reversed? Yes Ranking of Low

potential significance

Justification for ranking

Can the impacts be mitigated? Fully

| Do the operations comply with standards, plans, policies? | Yes | | | |
|--|---|---|--------------------------------------|--|
| Criteria | Cultural Impacts: Affects areas where the landscape features indicate the likely presence of Aboriginal objects. | | | |
| Potential impacts | | | poriginal objects and places through | |
| Proposed management controls | Activities must comply with CEA Location Restrictions, Impact Thresholds and Criteria. Activities cannot occur on land declared an Aboriginal Place and activities must not harm Aboriginal Objects. Activities must comply with (Exploration Code of Practice: Environmental Management) as per the commitment in the application (APO). Relevant requirements of this Code include minimising potential impacts on all aspects of the environment (including water, land, air), culture and heritage (Aboriginal and Non-Indigenous heritage). All disturbed areas to be rehabilitated in accordance with title conditions (Exploration Code of Practice: Rehabilitation). Rehabilitation to occur as soon as practicable after completion of activity (including sealing of any boreholes). AHIMS AHIMS search indicates no objects of Aboriginal cultural heritage located on this lot/DP (3/752073). The proposed activity is not located: * within 200m of waters * located within a sand dune system | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | * located on a ridge top, ridge line or headlar * located within 200m below or above a cliff * within 20m of a cave, rock shelter, or a cav | face, or | | |
| Duration | Short term | | | |
| Application ranking What is the confidence in | High | Are further | No | |
| predicting impacts? | ngii | 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? | Yes | Ranking of potential significance | Low | |
| Can the impacts be mitigated? Do the operations comply with | Fully Yes | Justification for ranking | | |
| standards, plans, policies? Criteria | Cultural Impacts: Affects areas subject to native title claims, indigenous land use agreements or joint management arrangements. | | | |
| Potential impacts | Condition of exploration title/authority prohibits exploration on any land or waters on which Native Title has not been extinguished, unless the prior consent of the Minister has been obtained. | | | |
| Proposed management controls | Condition of exploration title/authority prohibits exploration on any land or waters on which Native Title has not been extinguished, unless the prior consent of the Minister has been obtained. | | | |
| Duration Application ranking | Short term | | | |
| What is the confidence in predicting impacts? | High | Are further studies required on impacts or | No | |
| How resilient is the environment to cope with impacts? | High Resilience | mitigation? What is the level of public | Low | |
| Can the impacts be reversed? | Yes | concern? Ranking of potential significance | Low | |
| Can the impacts be mitigated? | Fully | Justification for | or ranking | |
| Do the operations comply with standards, plans, policies? | Yes | | | |
| Criteria | Cultural Impacts: Impacts on Aboriginal com | munities or areas | s subject to land rights claims. | |
| Potential impacts | Condition of exploration title/authority prohibits exploration on any land or waters on which Native Title has not been extinguished, unless the prior consent of the Minister has been obtained. Activities must comply with CEA Location Restrictions, Impact Thresholds and Criteria. Activities cannot occur on land declared an Aboriginal Place and activities must not harm Aboriginal Objects. Any impacts are short term and temporary. | | | |

| Proposed management controls | Condition of exploration title/authority prohibits exploration on any land or waters on which Nati | | |
|--|---|---|--|
| | Title has not been extinguished, unless the prior consent of the Minister has been obtained. Activities must comply with CEA Location Restrictions, Impact Thresholds and Criteria. Activities cannot occur on land declared an Aboriginal Place and activities must not harm Aboriginal Object | | |
| | | | |
| Duration | | | |
| Duration | Short term | | |
| Application ranking What is the confidence in | I II ale | A wa fountle au | NI- |
| predicting impacts? | High | Are further studies | No |
| predicting impacts? | | | |
| | | required on impacts or | |
| | | mitigation? | |
| How resilient is the environment to | High Resilience | What is the | Low |
| cope with impacts? | Tilgit Nesillerice | level of | LOW |
| cope with impacts: | | public | |
| | | concern? | |
| Can the impacts be reversed? | Yes | Ranking of | Low |
| can the impacto so reversed i | 100 | potential | 2011 |
| | | significance | |
| Can the impacts be mitigated? | Fully | Justification f | or ranking |
| Do the operations comply with | Yes | - Guotinioution i | or ranking |
| standards, plans, policies? | 165 | | |
| Criteria | Cultural Impacts: Impacts on areas or items | of high anthrono | logical, archaeological, architectural |
| | cultural, heritage, historical, recreational or | | J, siegiesi, sierikootafui, |
| Potential impacts | Short term and temporary impacts only. | | |
| Proposed management controls | Activities must comply with CEA Location R | estrictions Impac | et Thresholds and Criteria |
| · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | , tournassast sop.,a. 52, t 255aus | | |
| | Activities must comply with (Exploration Co | do of Practice: En | vironmental Management) as per the |
| | commitment in the application (APO). Rele | | |
| | potential impacts on all aspects of the envir | | |
| | | | |
| | (Aboriginal and Non-Indigenous heritage). | Aboriginal of Euro | pean hemage objects/items/areas to |
| | be demarcated and avoided. | | |
| | All distants of some As to some brillians of the source | | |
| | All disturbed areas to be rehabilitated in acc | | |
| | Practice: Rehabilitation). Rehabilitation to occur as soon as practicable after completion of act (including sealing of any boreholes). AHIMS AHIMS search indicates no objects of Aboriginal cultural heritage located on this lot/DP (3/75/2 The proposed activity is not located: * within 200m of waters | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | * located within a sand dune system | | |
| | * located within a sand dune system * located on a ridge top, ridge line or headla | | |
| | * located within a sand dune system * located on a ridge top, ridge line or headla * located within 200m below or above a cliff | face, or | |
| | * located within a sand dune system * located on a ridge top, ridge line or headla * located within 200m below or above a cliff * within 20m of a cave, rock shelter, or a ca | face, or | |
| | * located within a sand dune system * located on a ridge top, ridge line or headla * located within 200m below or above a cliff * within 20m of a cave, rock shelter, or a ca HERITAGE | face, or ve mouth. | |
| | * located within a sand dune system * located on a ridge top, ridge line or headla * located within 200m below or above a cliff * within 20m of a cave, rock shelter, or a ca HERITAGE No items of historic cultural or natural herita | face, or ve mouth. ge were identified | d within the proposed auger drilling |
| | * located within a sand dune system * located on a ridge top, ridge line or headla * located within 200m below or above a cliff * within 20m of a cave, rock shelter, or a ca HERITAGE No items of historic cultural or natural herita program area. Please refer to attached sea | face, or ve mouth. ge were identified | d within the proposed auger drilling |
| | * located within a sand dune system * located on a ridge top, ridge line or headla * located within 200m below or above a cliff * within 20m of a cave, rock shelter, or a ca HERITAGE No items of historic cultural or natural herita | face, or ve mouth. ge were identified | d within the proposed auger drilling |
| Application ranking | * located within a sand dune system * located on a ridge top, ridge line or headla * located within 200m below or above a cliff * within 20m of a cave, rock shelter, or a ca HERITAGE No items of historic cultural or natural herita program area. Please refer to attached sea N/A | face, or ve mouth. ge were identified irches. | |
| Application ranking What is the confidence in | * located within a sand dune system * located on a ridge top, ridge line or headla * located within 200m below or above a cliff * within 20m of a cave, rock shelter, or a ca HERITAGE No items of historic cultural or natural herita program area. Please refer to attached sea | face, or ve mouth. ge were identified arches. Are further | d within the proposed auger drilling |
| Application ranking | * located within a sand dune system * located on a ridge top, ridge line or headla * located within 200m below or above a cliff * within 20m of a cave, rock shelter, or a ca HERITAGE No items of historic cultural or natural herita program area. Please refer to attached sea N/A | face, or ve mouth. ge were identified arches. Are further studies | |
| Application ranking What is the confidence in | * located within a sand dune system * located on a ridge top, ridge line or headla * located within 200m below or above a cliff * within 20m of a cave, rock shelter, or a ca HERITAGE No items of historic cultural or natural herita program area. Please refer to attached sea N/A | Are further studies required on | |
| Application ranking What is the confidence in | * located within a sand dune system * located on a ridge top, ridge line or headla * located within 200m below or above a cliff * within 20m of a cave, rock shelter, or a ca HERITAGE No items of historic cultural or natural herita program area. Please refer to attached sea N/A | Are further studies required on impacts or | |
| Application ranking What is the confidence in predicting impacts? | * located within a sand dune system * located on a ridge top, ridge line or headla * located within 200m below or above a cliff * within 20m of a cave, rock shelter, or a ca HERITAGE No items of historic cultural or natural herita program area. Please refer to attached sea N/A High | face, or ve mouth. ge were identified riches. Are further studies required on impacts or mitigation? | No |
| Application ranking What is the confidence in predicting impacts? How resilient is the environment to | * located within a sand dune system * located on a ridge top, ridge line or headla * located within 200m below or above a cliff * within 20m of a cave, rock shelter, or a ca HERITAGE No items of historic cultural or natural herita program area. Please refer to attached sea N/A | Are further studies required on impacts or | |
| Application ranking What is the confidence in predicting impacts? | * located within a sand dune system * located on a ridge top, ridge line or headla * located within 200m below or above a cliff * within 20m of a cave, rock shelter, or a ca HERITAGE No items of historic cultural or natural herita program area. Please refer to attached sea N/A High | face, or ve mouth. ge were identified riches. Are further studies required on impacts or mitigation? | No |
| Application ranking What is the confidence in predicting impacts? How resilient is the environment to | * located within a sand dune system * located on a ridge top, ridge line or headla * located within 200m below or above a cliff * within 20m of a cave, rock shelter, or a ca HERITAGE No items of historic cultural or natural herita program area. Please refer to attached sea N/A High | Are further studies required on impacts or mitigation? What is the | No |
| Application ranking What is the confidence in predicting impacts? How resilient is the environment to cope with impacts? | * located within a sand dune system * located on a ridge top, ridge line or headla * located within 200m below or above a cliff * within 20m of a cave, rock shelter, or a ca HERITAGE No items of historic cultural or natural herita program area. Please refer to attached sea N/A High | Are further studies required on impacts or mitigation? What is the level of | No |
| Application ranking What is the confidence in predicting impacts? How resilient is the environment to | * located within a sand dune system * located on a ridge top, ridge line or headla * located within 200m below or above a cliff * within 20m of a cave, rock shelter, or a ca HERITAGE No items of historic cultural or natural herita program area. Please refer to attached sea N/A High | Are further studies required on impacts or mitigation? What is the level of public | No |
| Application ranking What is the confidence in predicting impacts? How resilient is the environment to cope with impacts? | * located within a sand dune system * located on a ridge top, ridge line or headla * located within 200m below or above a cliff * within 20m of a cave, rock shelter, or a ca HERITAGE No items of historic cultural or natural herita program area. Please refer to attached sea N/A High | Are further studies required on impacts or mitigation? What is the level of public concern? | No Medium |
| Application ranking What is the confidence in predicting impacts? How resilient is the environment to cope with impacts? | * located within a sand dune system * located on a ridge top, ridge line or headla * located within 200m below or above a cliff * within 20m of a cave, rock shelter, or a ca HERITAGE No items of historic cultural or natural herita program area. Please refer to attached sea N/A High | Are further studies required on impacts or mitigation? What is the level of public concern? Ranking of | No Medium |
| Application ranking What is the confidence in predicting impacts? How resilient is the environment to cope with impacts? | * located within a sand dune system * located on a ridge top, ridge line or headla * located within 200m below or above a cliff * within 20m of a cave, rock shelter, or a ca HERITAGE No items of historic cultural or natural herita program area. Please refer to attached sea N/A High | Are further studies required on impacts or mitigation? What is the level of public concern? Ranking of potential | No Medium |
| Application ranking What is the confidence in predicting impacts? How resilient is the environment to cope with impacts? Can the impacts be reversed? | * located within a sand dune system * located on a ridge top, ridge line or headla * located within 200m below or above a cliff * within 20m of a cave, rock shelter, or a ca HERITAGE No items of historic cultural or natural herita program area. Please refer to attached sea N/A High N/A | Are further studies required on impacts or mitigation? What is the level of public concern? Ranking of potential significance | No Medium |
| How resilient is the environment to cope with impacts? Can the impacts be reversed? Can the impacts be mitigated? | * located within a sand dune system * located on a ridge top, ridge line or headla * located within 200m below or above a cliff * within 20m of a cave, rock shelter, or a ca HERITAGE No items of historic cultural or natural herita program area. Please refer to attached sea N/A High N/A N/A Fully | Are further studies required on impacts or mitigation? What is the level of public concern? Ranking of potential significance | No Medium |
| Application ranking What is the confidence in predicting impacts? How resilient is the environment to cope with impacts? Can the impacts be reversed? Can the impacts be mitigated? Do the operations comply with | * located within a sand dune system * located on a ridge top, ridge line or headla * located within 200m below or above a cliff * within 20m of a cave, rock shelter, or a ca HERITAGE No items of historic cultural or natural herita program area. Please refer to attached sea N/A High N/A N/A Fully | Are further studies required on impacts or mitigation? What is the level of public concern? Ranking of potential significance Justification f | No Medium Low or ranking |

| Potential impacts | Limited potential for any major changes in land use due to short term and temporary nature of | | | | |
|---|--|---------------------------------|--|--|--|
| | exploration. Negligible impacts and limited to immediate vicinity of site. | | | | |
| | Areas used for exploration activities, temporarily removed from existing land use/s but no long term | | | | |
| | impacts (e.g. temporary impacts on productive rural industries, including agriculture). | | | | |
| | Vegetation removal may remove potential tir REHABILITATION | mber resources. | | | |
| | HEHABILITATION Holes will be backfilled as drilling occurs. Follow up inspections after the drilling program will identify any issues or weed control required. DISTURBANCE EA Block number 614- Unit P | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| Dunnand management acretical | Surface disturbance 8sqm | | | | |
| Proposed management controls | Minimal impacts likely and limited to immediate site of the activity. Activities must comply with CEA Location Restrictions, Impact Thresholds and Criteria. Activities must comply with (Exploration Code of Practice: Environmental Management) as per the commitment in the application (APO). All disturbed areas to be rehabilitated in accordance with title conditions (Exploration Code of Practice: Rehabilitation). Rehabilitation to occur as soon as practicable after | | | | |
| | completion of activity. Legislative requirement for landholder access arrangements and compensation limit any potential impacts. | | | | |
| Duration | Short term | | | | |
| Application ranking What is the confidence in | High | Are further | No | | |
| predicting impacts? | Tilgii | studies | NO | | |
| | | required on impacts or | | | |
| How resilient is the environment to | High Resilience | mitigation? What is the | Low | | |
| cope with impacts? | 3 | level of | | | |
| | | public concern? | | | |
| Can the impacts be reversed? | Yes | Ranking of | Low | | |
| | | potential significance | | | |
| Can the impacts be mitigated? | No | Justification f | or ranking | | |
| Do the operations comply with | Yes | | | | |
| standards, plans, policies? Criteria | Transportation Impacts: Substantial impacts | | | | |
| Potential imports | pedestrian) which alter present patterns of circulation or movement. | | | | |
| Potential impacts | Short term additional traffic during exploration activity, primarily during set-up/construction stage. ACCESS Existing tracks will be utilised for the drilling program. | | | | |
| Proposed management controls | Short term additional traffic during exploration activity, primarily during set-up/construction stage. | | | | |
| Duration | Limited to immediate site. Subject to landholder agreement and any compensation. Short term | | | | |
| Duration Application ranking | Short term | | | | |
| What is the confidence in | High | Are further | No | | |
| predicting impacts? | | studies required on | | | |
| | | impacts or | | | |
| How resilient is the environment to | High Resilience | mitigation? What is the | Low | | |
| cope with impacts? | Trigit Nesilierice | level of | LOW | | |
| | | public | | | |
| Can the impacts be reversed? | Yes | concern? Ranking of | Low | | |
| | | potential | | | |
| Can the impacts be mitigated? | Fully | significance Justification f | or ranking | | |
| Do the operations comply with | Yes | oustineation i | orranking | | |
| standards, plans, policies? Criteria | Transportation Impacts: Impacts associated | with direct or ind | iract additional traffic | | |
| Potential impacts | Transportation Impacts: Impacts associated with direct or indirect additional traffic. | | | | |
| . Storitur impuoto | Short term additional traffic during exploration activity, primarily during set-up/construction stage. ACCESS Existing tracks will be utilised for the drilling program. | | | | |
| | Existing tracks will be utilised for the drilling | | Short term additional traffic during exploration activity, primarily during set-up/construction stage. Limited to immediate site. Subject to landholder agreement and any compensation. | | |
| Proposed management controls | Short term additional traffic during exploration | n activity, primar | | | |
| Proposed management controls Duration Application ranking | Short term additional traffic during exploration | n activity, primar | | | |

| What is the confidence in predicting impacts? | High | Are further studies required on impacts or | No | |
|--|---|---|--|--|
| How resilient is the environment to cope with impacts? | High Resilience | mitigation? What is the level of public | Low | |
| Can the impacts be reversed? | Yes | concern? Ranking of potential significance | Low | |
| Can the impacts be mitigated? | Fully | | or ranking | |
| Can the impacts be mitigated? Do the operations comply with standards, plans, policies? | Yes | Justification for ranking | | |
| Criteria | Consistency with applicable local strategic parategic plans. | | nts, regional strategic plans or district | |
| Potential impacts | Temporary and short term impact on the land | | | |
| Proposed management controls | Exploration comprises development that doe associated local, regional and district plans. local strategic planning statements, regional impacts likely and limited to immediate site or relevant legislation, including Mining Act 199 landholder agreement and any compensation accordance with title conditions (Exploration occur as soon as practicable after completion). | There will be no strategic plans of the activity. 2 and Petroleum . All disturbe Code of Practice | conflict or inconsistency with applicable or district strategic plans. Minimal Impacts are compensable under (Onshore) Act 1991. Subject to ed areas to be rehabilitated in Exceptablication). Rehabilitation to | |
| Duration | Short term - until land is rehabilitated. | IT OF ACTIVITY (ITICIC | during sealing of arry borenoles). | |
| Application ranking | Onort tomi - until land is reliabilitated. | | | |
| 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? | Low | |
| Can the impacts be reversed? | Uncertain | Ranking of potential significance | Low | |
| Can the impacts be mitigated? | Fully | Justification for | or ranking | |
| Do the operations comply with standards, plans, policies? | Yes | | | |
| Criteria | Matters of National Environmental Significan Environmental Protection and Biodiversity Co | onservation Act 1 | 1999: | |
| Potential impacts | N/A as activities must comply with CEA Location Restrictions, Impact Thresholds and Criteria. Cannot impact on MNES. BIONET/MNES No areas of critical habitat or areas of outstanding biodiversity value have been identified within the proposed auger drilling area. No MNES are likely to be impacted by the proposed auger drilling. Please refer to attached search results. No threatened species or ecological communities or their habitats are likely to be affected by the proposed auger drilling program. Please refer to attached search results. TNV map. Close to but not within category 2- sensitive regulated land, and for some part of the EL steep and highly erodible land. Note- application is not included in these zones. | | | |
| Proposed management controls | N/A | | | |
| Duration | N/A | | | |
| Application ranking | NI/A | A wa formation | NI/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 | Low | |
| | | concern? | | |
| Can the impacts be reversed? Can the impacts be mitigated? | N/A | concern? Ranking of potential significance Justification for | | |

| Do the operations comply with standards, plans, policies? | N/A | | |
|---|--|--------------------------|--|
| Criteria | Cumulative Impacts: Cumulative environmer | ı ntal effects with o | ther existing or likely future activities. |
| Potential impacts | Only short term and temporary impacts. | | |
| , | , | | |
| | No significant additional impacts on the environment from past, current and relevant future projects. | | |
| | ACCESS | | |
| | Existing tracks will be utilised for the drilling program. REHABILITATION Holes will be backfilled as drilling occurs. Follow up inspections after the drilling program will identify any issues or weed control required. DISTURBANCE EA Block number 614- Unit P | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| Proposed management controls | Surface disturbance 8sqm Short term impacts predominantly limited to immediate site. Subject to landholder agreement | | |
| Troposed management controls | and any compensation. Activities must comply with CEA Location Restrictions, Impact | | |
| | Thresholds and Criteria. Activities must comply with (Exploration Code of Practice: | | |
| | Environmental Management) as per the commitment in the application (APO). Relevant | | |
| | requirements of this Code include minimising all impacts on the environment. All disturbed areas to be rehabilitated in accordance with title conditions (Exploration Code of Practice: Rehabilitation). Rehabilitation to occur as soon as practicable after completion of activity (including sealing of any | | |
| | | | |
| | boreholes). | | |
| Duration | Short term | | |
| Application ranking | | | |
| What is the confidence in | High | Are further | No |
| predicting impacts? | | studies required on | |
| | | impacts or | |
| | | mitigation? | |
| How resilient is the environment to | High Resilience | What is the | Low |
| cope with impacts? | | level of | |
| | | public concern? | |
| Can the impacts be reversed? | Yes | Ranking of | Low |
| can the impacts be reversed: | 100 | potential | |
| | | significance | |
| Can the impacts be mitigated? | Fully | Justification f | or ranking |
| Do the operations comply with | Yes | | |
| standards, plans, policies? | | l | |

© 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. version: APO_CEA_brief v3.6