# Swallow Tail Battery Energy Storage System

## EPBC Act Significant Impact Assessments

PREPARED FOR
AMPYR Australia Pty Ltd

DATE
06 March 2026

REFERENCE
0755542

## DOCUMENT DETAILS

| | |
|---|---|
| DOCUMENT TITLE | Swallow Tail Battery Energy Storage System |
| DOCUMENT SUBTITLE | EPBC Act Significant Impact Assessments |
| PROJECT NUMBER | 0755542 |
| DATE | 6 March 2026 |
| VERSION | 02 |
| AUTHOR | Miranda Crossley |
| CLIENT NAME | AMPYR Australia Pty Ltd |

## DOCUMENT HISTORY

| | | | | ERM APPROVAL TO ISSUE | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| VERSION | REVISION | AUTHOR | REVIEWED BY | NAME | DATE | COMMENTS |
| Draft | 01 | Miranda Crossley | Joanne Woodhouse, Sophie Butcher | Megan Lawson | 30 September 2025 | Working Draft for client review |
| Final | 02.1 | Miranda Crossley | | | 26 January 2026 | Final for Submission |
| Final | 02.1 | Miranda Crossley | | | 6 February 2026 | Final for Resubmission of Referral |

SIGNATURE PAGE

# Swallow Tail Battery Energy Storage System

## EPBC Act Significant Impact Assessments

0755542

**Miranda Crossley**
Ecologist

**Joanne Woodhouse**
Consulting Director

**Sophie Butcher**
Project Manager

**Megan Lawson**
Partner

Environmental Resources Management

Australia Pty Ltd

Level 14, 207 Kent Street

Sydney NSW 2000

T +61 2 8584 8888

F +61 2 9299 7502

# CONTENTS



## LIST OF TABLES

## ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

| Acronym | Description |
|---|---|
| AOO | Area of Occupancy |
| BAM | Biodiversity Assessment Method |
| BAM-C | Biodiversity Assessment Method Calculator |
| BC Act | NSW *Biodiversity Conservation Act 2016* |
| BDAR | Biodiversity Development Assessment Report |
| BESS | Battery Energy Storage System |
| CEEC | Critically Endangered Ecological Community |
| Development Footprint | The 56.00 hectares (ha) Development Footprint, or "Disturbance Footprint" is the area of land that would be subject to impact during the construction, operation and decommissioning of Project infrastructure. The Development Footprint has been refined to exclude the northern section of the Project Area, demonstrating avoidance of native vegetation and minimising the extent of clearing of a Critically Endangered Ecological Community (CEEC). The location has also been proposed to avoid environmental impacts as far as possible. |
| DoE | Department of Environment |
| EOO | Extent of Occurrence |
| EPBC Act | Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999 |
| ERM | Environmental Resources Management Australia Pty Ltd |
| MNES | Matters of National Environmental Significance |
| PCT | Plant Community Type |
| PMST | Protected Matters Search Tool |
| Project Area | The Project Area comprises 144.15 hectares (ha) on land that is currently used for low intensity agricultural purposes. The Project Area corresponds largely to Lot 39 DP 750005 which has been secured by the Applicant through a lease agreement, the access road easement and the transmission line corridor extending southwards toward the Bannaby South Substation. |
| SPRAT | Species Profile and Threats Database |

# 1. BACKGROUND

Environmental Resources Management Australia Pty Ltd (ERM) was engaged by AMPYR Australia Pty Ltd (the Proponent) to prepare an *Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999* (EPBC Act) referral for the proposed Swallow Tail Battery Energy Storage System (BESS) (the Project). Additionally, an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) is being prepared by ERM on behalf of the proponent to assess the environmental impacts relating to the Project.

AMPYR Australia Pty Ltd, the Proponent, is undertaking development activities, incurring development costs and managing policies in relation to the development of the Project. However, the Project will ultimately be built by STBESS ProjectCo Pty Ltd as trustee for the STBESS Project Trust.

This assessment is not intended as a standalone report. The likelihood of occurrence assessment and Significant Impact Assessments (SIA) (**Section 3**) have been prepared to support the EPBC Act online referral only. A detailed impact assessment, supported by the full suite of targeted surveys, will be prepared as part of the environmental Impact Statement (EIS) phase.

# 2. METHODOLOGY

A likelihood of occurrence assessment was undertaken, informed by desktop sources and the results of initial field surveys only.

Desktop sources identified 56 threatened species and three ecological communities listed under the EPBC Act (otherwise referred to as entities), that may occur or are likely to occur, within an approximate 10 kilometre squared ($km^2$) buffer centered around the Project Area.

The Project Area comprises 144.15 hectares (ha) on land that is currently used for low intensity agricultural purposes. The Project Area is largely located on Lot 39 DP 750005 which has been secured by the Applicant through a lease agreement, the access road easement and the transmission line corridor extending southwards toward the Bannaby South Substation. Other lots within the Project Area are as follows:

- Lot 401 DP 1265813
- Lot 402 DP 1265813
- Lot 38 DP750005
- Lot 41 DP750005
- Lot 121 DP750005
- Lot 2 DP1096390
- Lot 42 DP133021
- Lot 30 DP750005
- Lot 4 DP1256207

The lots are shown on Figure 1-1 in the LCA (Holocene Ecology, 2025).The 56.00 ha Development Footprint is the area of land that would be subject to impact during the construction, operation and decommissioning of Project infrastructure. The Development Footprint has been refined to exclude the northern section of the Project Area, demonstrating avoidance of native vegetation and minimising the extent of clearing of a Critically Endangered Ecological Community (CEEC). The location has also been proposed to avoid environmental impacts as far as possible.

Therefore, following the desktop search, a criterion for whether entities were considered to have a known, likely or potential likelihood of occurrence has been developed and is provided in a separate attachment (ERM, 2025). The likelihood of occurrence approach refines the desktop generated list using site-specific (where known at this early stage of the assessment) and specific-species habitat information.

Further, the likelihood of occurrence assessment considers whether each species has been retained for further assessment under the EPBC Act. This has been included in the 'Retained for further assessment column' in **Table 2-1**. Several species (or their habitats) may occur within the Project Area, however, impacts are expected to be negligible for those species with higher mobility and / or resilience (such as several bird and bats species). As such, while species may have a potential or higher likelihood of occurrence, they have not been retained for further assessment due to the nature of impacts expected. Furthermore, species that have been subject to targeted surveys and have not been identified have also been excluded from further assessment, such as the Southern Greater Glider (*Petauroides volans*) and the Koala (*Phascolarctos cinereus*).

One threatened species listed under the EPBC Act has been identified within the Project Area during field surveys, the Diamond Firetail (*Stagonopleura guttata*).

The species retained for further assessment have been summarised in **Table 2-1** and have been subject to SIA prepared in accordance with the *Significant impact guidelines 1.1 Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999* (SIG 1.1) (Cwth DoE, 2013).

> *SIG 1.1 defines an important population as a population that is necessary for a species' long-term survival and recovery. This may include populations identified as such in recovery plans, and/or that are:*
>
> - *Key source populations either for breeding or dispersal,*
> - *Populations that are necessary for maintaining genetic diversity, and/or*
> - *Populations that are near the limit of the species range.*
>
> *Under the Significant Impact Guidelines 1.1, habitat critical to the survival of a species or ecological community refers to areas that are necessary:*
>
> - *For activities such as foraging, breeding, roosting, or dispersal,*
> - *For the long-term maintenance of the entity,*
> - *To maintain genetic diversity and long term evolutionary development, and/or*
> - *For the reintroduction of populations or recovery of the entity.*

TABLE 2-1 LIKELIHOOD OF OCCURRENCE ASSESSMENT – SPECIES RETAINED FOR FURTHER ASSESSMENT

| ***Scientific Name*** | **Common Name** | **EPBC Act Listing** | **Habitat Description** | **Likelihood of Occurrence within Development Footprint** | **Retained for further assessment** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Threatened Ecological Community (TEC)** | | | | | |
| White Box-Yellow Box-Blakely's Red Gum Grassy Woodland and Derived Native Grassland | | Critically Endangered | The ecological community is known to occur on hilly to undulating landscapes in areas with soils of moderate fertility derived from a range of lithologies, including alkaline and acid volcanics, granites, sediments, serpentinites and metamorphic. It generally occurs in areas where average rainfall is between 400 - 900 millimeters (mm) per annum, on moderate to highly fertile soils at altitudes of 170 – 1,200 metres (m). | **Known**: The community was identified during field investigations. | **Yes**: The Project would result in impacts on the known Critically Endangered Ecological Community (CEEC). |
| **Frog** | | | | | |
| *Litoria booroolongensis* | Booroolong Frog | Endangered | The species requires permanent or near-permanent streams with some fringing vegetation cover such as ferns, sedges or grasses. Adults occur on or near cobble banks and other rock structures within stream margins. The species will shelter under rocks or amongst vegetation near the ground on the stream edge and will sometimes bask in the sun on exposed rocks near flowing water during summer. Eggs are laid in submerged rock crevices and tadpoles grow in slow-flowing connected or isolated pools. | **Potential**: Suitable habitat (stream with fringing vegetation cover and rocky margins present). No records in the locality. Project Area is within the known distribution. The species is associated with PCTs 3303, 3373 and 3486. | **Yes**: Suitable habitat present in the form of rocky cobbles along a creek with near-permanent water flows. Targeted surveys conducted in November 2025 and no identification of the species. |

| ***Scientific Name*** | **Common Name** | **EPBC Act Listing** | **Habitat Description** | **Likelihood of Occurrence within Development Footprint** | **Retained for further assessment** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Bird** | | | | | |
| *Melanodryas cucullata cucullata* | South-eastern Hooded Robin, Hooded Robin (south-eastern) | Endangered | The South-eastern Hooded Robin prefers dry eucalypt and acacia woodlands and shrublands characterised by an open understorey, with some grassy areas and a complex ground layer. They tend to avoid woodlands with tall trees or dense tree cover, although they may occasionally occur in tall, dense heaths with scattered open areas. | **Potential:** Suitable habitat present (eucalypt and acacia woodlands, grassy areas). The Project Area is within the known distribution and there are several records within 10 km of the Project Area.<br>No records within 1 km of the Project Area. The species is associated with PCTs 330s, 3373 and 3486. | **Yes**: Suitable habitat is present within the Project Area. While the species is highly mobile, it has a relatively small home range and requires additional assessment as part of the EIS. |
| *Stagonopleura guttata* | Diamond Firetail | Vulnerable | Diamond firetails occur in eucalypt, acacia or casuarina woodlands, open forests and other lightly timbered habitats, including farmland and grassland with scattered trees. They prefer areas with relatively low tree density, few large logs, and little litter cover but high grass cover. | **Known**: The species was identified during ecological surveys and suitable habitat is available. | **Yes**: The Project has the potential to impact habitats used by this species. |
| *Climacteris picumnus victoriae* | Brown Treecreeper (south-eastern) | Vulnerable | Found in eucalypt woodlands (including Box-Gum Woodland) and dry open forest of the inland slopes and plains inland of the Great Dividing Range. The species mainly inhabits woodlands dominated by stringybarks or other rough-barked eucalypts, usually with an open grassy understorey, sometimes with one or more shrub species, also found in mallee and River Red Gum (*Eucalyptus camaldulensis*) Forest bordering wetlands with an open | **Potential**: Suitable habitat (eucalypt (box-gum) woodlands with open grassy understorey present). Project Area is within the known distribution although there are no records in the locality. The species is associated with PCT 3303, 3373 and 3486. | **Yes**: The Brown Treecreeper is an ecosystem credit species under the Biodiversity Assessment Method Calculator (BAM-C) and it is assumed to occur within associated PCTs present. The species is associated with all PCTs (3303, 3373 and 3486) |

| ***Scientific Name*** | **Common Name** | **EPBC Act Listing** | **Habitat Description** | **Likelihood of Occurrence within Development Footprint** | **Retained for further assessment** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | understorey of acacias, saltbush, lignum, cumbungi and grasses. Usually not found in woodlands with a dense shrub layer. Fallen timber is an important habitat component for foraging. Hollows in standing dead or live trees and tree stumps are essential for nesting. When foraging in trees and on the ground, they peck and probe for insects, mostly ants, amongst the litter, tussocks and fallen timber, and along trunks and lateral branches. | | present in the Development Footprint.<br>Breeding habitat (hollows) would be investigated as part of the EIS phase. |
| *Callocephalon fimbriatum* | Gang-gang Cockatoo | Endangered | Occurs within a variety of forest and woodland types. Usually frequents forested areas with old growth attributes required for nesting and roosting purposes. Also utilises less heavily timbered woodlands and urban fringe areas to forage but appears to favour well-timbered country through which it habitually flies as it moves about. | **Known**: Marginally suitable habitat exists (remnant woodland and open forests present). The species was identified during targeted surveys in January 2026. The species is associated with PCTs 3303, 3373 and 3486. | **Yes**: The species is highly mobile and is unlikely to be dependent on any of the resources present. However, during surveys in January 2026, the species was identified and has therefore been retained for assessment. |
| **Insect** | | | | | |
| *Keyacris scurra* | Key's Matchstick Grasshopper | Endangered | Key's Matchstick Grasshopper is usually found in native grasslands and grassy woodlands, but it has also been recorded in other vegetation associations containing a native grass understory (especially kangaroo grass *Themeda triandra*) and known food plants (particularly Asteraceae). | **Potential**: Suitable habitat present (native grasslands and grassy woodlands). Project Area is within the known distribution although there are no records in the locality. The species is associated with PCT 3373. | **Yes**: Targeted surveys conducted in September 2025 where the species was not identified.<br>Additional information will be provided as part of the EIS.<br>Based on information available, there has been no presence of Kangaroo Grass reported within the |

| ***Scientific Name*** | **Common Name** | **EPBC Act Listing** | **Habitat Description** | **Likelihood of Occurrence within Development Footprint** | **Retained for further assessment** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | Project Area although several Asteraceae species have been identified (more commonly exotic). |
| **Mammal** | | | | | |
| *Dasyurus maculatus maculatus (SE mainland population)* | Spotted-tailed Quoll, Spotted-tail Quoll, Tiger Quoll (southeastern mainland population) | Endangered | The Spotted-tailed Quoll prefers mature wet forests with high rainfall and unlogged or minimally disturbed forests. It inhabits a wide range of environments, including temperate and subtropical rainforests in mountainous regions, wet sclerophyll forests, lowland forests, open and closed eucalypt woodlands, inland riparian zones, River Red Gum forests, dry 'rainshadow' woodlands, sub-alpine woodlands, coastal heathlands, and occasionally open country, grazing lands, and rocky outcrops. Predominantly nocturnal, the quoll rests in dens found in hollow logs, tree hollows, rock outcrops, or caves during the day. It requires abundant food sources, such as birds and small mammals, and large, contiguous areas of vegetation for foraging. Although primarily terrestrial, it is moderately arboreal, with about 11% of its movement occurring in trees. | **Potential:** Suitable habitat is present as the species is found in a wide range of environments including woodlands and forests. Project Area is within the known distribution although there are no records in the locality. The species is associated with PCTs 3303, 3373 and 3486. | **Yes:** The species is found in various habitats and may use the site for foraging as part of its large home range. |
| **Plant** | | | | | |
| *Diuris aequalis* | Buttercup Doubletail | Endangered | The Buttercup Doubletail is an orchid found in ranges and tablelands in South Eastern New south Wales (NSW) | **Potential**: Suitable habitat exists within the areas of open woodland | **Yes**: The species could occur in small areas of the Project Area, |

| ***Scientific Name*** | **Common Name** | **EPBC Act Listing** | **Habitat Description** | **Likelihood of Occurrence within Development Footprint** | **Retained for further assessment** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | (especially on the Great Dividing Range) in fragmented populations. The species has been recorded in forest, low open woodland with grassy understory and secondary grassland. It grows on gravelly clay-loam soils on gently undulating terrain. | with grassy understorey and grasslands. The species is associated with PCT 3373 and the Project Area is within the known distribution although there are no records in the locality. | associated with PCT 3373 where less disturbance has occurred. Targeted surveys in November 2025 confirmed no observations within the Development Footprint. |
| *Pomaderris cotoneaster* | Cotoneaster Pomaderris | Endangered | The species typically thrives in environments characterised by shallow soils and outcropping rock, often near cliff lines or along riverbanks. It favours dry, shrubby open forests situated on north-west to south-west facing slopes. Specimens have been observed in various specific habitats, including at the base of cliffs amidst tall open forest dominated by *Eucalyptus fastigata*, on alluvial terraces surrounded by tall open forests of *Eucalyptus cypellocarpa* and *Eucalyptus muelleriana*, and in rocky riparian sites within stands of *Eucalyptus viminalis*. It also grows on rocky river beds and on dry south-westerly facing slopes above rivers, where it coexists with a diverse range of vegetation including *Westringia* species, *Grevillea lanigera, Prostanthera* species*, Eucalyptus radiata, Olearia* species, *Kunzea ericoides*, and *Acacia pravissima*. While some riparian sites show slight invasion by willow (*Salix*) and blackberry (*Rubus fruticosus* agg.), most locations remain remote and maintain predominantly weed-free vegetation. | **Potential**: Marginally suitable habitat is available due to the noted presence of *Olearia sp* and *Eucalyptus viminalis*, however optimal habitat would include more rocky forested slopes in steep gullies. The closest records are over 6 km away in substantially different habitat (dense vegetation in and near Wollondilly River Nature Reserve and Guula Ngurra National Park). The Project Area is within the known distribution. | **Yes**: The species has a reduced likelihood of occurrence given the modified nature of the habitats. However, at this early stage of the assessment process, it has been retained for assessment and targeted surveys are planned for November 2025. Targeted surveys in November 2025 confirmed no observations within the Development Footprint. |

| ***Scientific Name*** | **Common Name** | **EPBC Act Listing** | **Habitat Description** | **Likelihood of Occurrence within Development Footprint** | **Retained for further assessment** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| *Pomaderris brunnea* | Rufous Pomaderris, Brown Pomaderris | Vulnerable | The Brown Pomaderris is found in a very limited area around the Colo, Nepean and Hawkesbury Rivers. This species grows in open forest, often in association with *Eucalyptus amplifolia, Angophora floribunda, Acacia parramattensis, Bursaria spinosa,* and *Kunzea ambigua*. | **Potential**: Marginally suitable habitat is present (Some clay soils, *Bursaria spinosa* is dominant and presence of St Paul's Creek in Project Area). No records in the locality. The Project Area is within the known distribution. | **Yes**: The species may occur and areas of potential habitat may be impacted by the Project. Targeted surveys in September 2025 confirmed no observations within the Development Footprint. |
| **Reptile** | | | | | |
| *Aprasia parapulchella* | Pink-tailed Worm-lizard | Vulnerable | This species inhabits sloping, open woodlands with native grassy ground layers, particularly dominated by Kangaroo Grass (*Themeda australis*). It prefers well-drained sites with rocky outcrops or partially-buried rocks and is commonly found beneath small rocks. The species spends significant time in burrows beneath these rocks, often constructed by ants and termites. It also occurs in other habitats, such as disturbed ant nests in chenopod shrubland on the Hay Plains and mallee woodland in the West Wyalong population. | **Potential**: Suitable habitat is present in the form of open woodlands and native grassy ground layers with three rocky areas noted during recent surveys. The species is associated with PCTs 3373 and 3486, and the Project Area is within the known distribution. | **Yes**: The species may occur where rocky habitat is present. The species would be assessed as part of the EIS. |
| *Delma impar* | Striped Legless Lizard | Vulnerable | This species primarily inhabits Natural Temperate Grassland but can also be found in grasslands with a high exotic component, as well as secondary grassland near Natural Temperate Grassland and occasionally in open Box-Gum Woodland. Its habitat features perennial, tussock-forming grasses like Kangaroo Grass (*Themeda australis*), | **Potential**: Marginally suitable habitat is present in the form of grasslands and box-gum woodland. No records in the locality although the Project Area is within the known distribution. The species is associated with PCT 3373. | **Yes**: The species could occur in areas of the Project Area associated with PCT 3373. Targeted surveys involving placing 10 tile grids occurred between October 2025 and January 2026. |

| ***Scientific Name*** | **Common Name** | **EPBC Act Listing** | **Habitat Description** | **Likelihood of Occurrence within Development Footprint** | **Retained for further assessment** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | spear-grasses (Austrostipa spp.), and poa tussocks (*Poa* spp.), with occasional wallaby grasses (*Austrodanthonia* spp.). It may also occur in modified grasslands with significant exotic grasses and areas with surface rocks used for shelter, including dried cowpats. The species actively hunts spiders, crickets, moth larvae, and cockroaches. It lays two papery eggs in early summer and seeks refuge below ground or under rocks or logs during winter. | | |

# 3. SIGNIFICANT IMPACT ASSESSMENTS

## 3.1 CRITICALLY ENDANGERED AND ENDANGERED ECOLOGICAL COMMUNITIES

### 3.1.1 WHITE BOX-YELLOW BOX-BLAKELY'S RED GUM GRASSY WOODLAND AND DERIVED NATIVE GRASSLAND

#### 3.1.1.1 COMMUNITY BACKGROUND

The White Box-Yellow Box-Blakely's Red Gum Grassy Woodland and Derived Native Grassland is listed as a CEEC under the EPBC Act (referred hereafter as Box Gum Grassy Woodland CEEC). The CEEC is associated with PCT 3373 Goulburn Tableland Box-Gum Grassy Forest confirmed present within the Development Footprint.

The Box Gum Grassy Woodland CEEC is characterised by a species-rich understorey of native tussock grasses, herbs and scattered shrubs (where shrub cover comprises less than 30% cover), and a dominance or prior dominance of White Box (*Eucalyptus albens*) and/or Yellow Box (*E. melliodora*) and / or Blakely's Red Gum (*E. blakelyi*) trees (TSSC, 2006).

The community also exists as a listed community under the NSW *Biodiversity Conservation Act 2016* (BC Act) as 'White Box – Yellow Box – Blakely's Red Gum Grassy Woodland and Derived Native Grassland in the NSW North Coast, New England Tableland, Nandewar, Brigalow Belt South, Sydney Basin, South Eastern Highlands, NSW South Western Slopes, South East Corner and Riverina Bioregions'. This community has different diagnostic criterion. This report only considers the CEEC as listed under the EPBC Act.

#### 3.1.1.2 PRESENCE

A Land Category Assessment (LCA) report (Holocene Ecology, 2025) has been submitted which considers the presence and extent of the Box Gum Grassy Woodland CEEC. Following determination of this referral, it is anticipated that there are some sections of exotic grassland that would be considered 'Category 1 – Exempt land' where it has been subject to historical clearing and management for grazing. 'Category 1 – Exempt land' would be excluded from assessment under the Biodiversity Assessment Method (BAM).

Since submission of the LCA report, the Project has been subject to several design iterations and design refinement. Avoiding and minimising direct impacts to the CEEC has been a high priority in finalising the Development Footprint. As such, the residual direct impacts to the CEEC impact areas have been substantially reduced from earlier designs.

The presence of the EPBC Act form of the CEEC is determined by the *White Box - Yellow Box - Blakely's Red Gum Grassy Woodland and Derived Native Grassland Conservation Advice* (Cwth DCCEEW, 2023c), which defines the EPBC Act form of the community into three condition classes. These condition classes and there presence within the Project Area and Development Footprint is outlined in **Table 3-1.**

The Project Area consists of 23.22 ha of the CEEC of which 2.56 ha is within the Development Footprint. The woodland and some derived native grassland vegetation zones of PCT 3373 would conform to the CEEC. Some grassland zones do not conform to the definition of the CEEC.

TABLE 3-1 PCT 3373 VEGETATION ZONES AND CEEC CONDITION CLASS PRESENCE WITHIN PROJECT AREA

| Condition Class (Cwth DCCEEW, 2023c) | Vegetation Zones in Project Area | Justification for CEEC Condition Class | Extent of Class in Project Area | Extent of Class in Development Footprint |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Class A: Good quality understorey and mature overstorey both present | VZ7<br>VZ8 | • Canopy present<br>• Less than 75 metres in distance between canopy<br>• Over 10 mature trees per hectare<br>• Important species present<br>• Over 12 native non-grass species in each plot | 2.07 ha | 0.73 ha |
| Class B: Good quality understorey present. Characteristic trees may be absent | VZ3<br>VZ5<br>VZ6 | • No canopy present<br>• Most vegetation plots contained over eight important species<br>• Most plots contained at least 12 native non-grass species | 8.67 ha | 1.11 ha |
| Class C: Allows for a lower diversity in the understorey in areas where there is regeneration and/or tree density may be relatively dense | VZ9 – Canopy present<br>VZ10 – dense canopy present | • Over 20 non-native grasses<br>• Over 10 important species present<br>• Less diversity in the understorey | 12.48 ha | 0.72 ha |
| Not listed as CEEC | VZ4 | • Less than 10 native non-grass species in each plot<br>• Less than 3 important species in each plot | 11.73 ha | 5.68 ha |

#### 3.1.1.3 ASSESSMENT

A significant impact assessment for the Box Gum Grassy Woodland CEEC in accordance with the SIG 1.1 is provided in **Table 3-2.**

TABLE 3-2 SIGNIFICANT IMPACT ASSESSMENT FOR THE BOX GUM GRASSY WOODLAND CEEC

| Criteria | Description | Criteria triggered? |
|---|---|---|
| *An action is likely to have a significant impact on a critically endangered or endangered species if there is a real chance or possibility that it will:* | | |
| Reduce the extent of an ecological community | As of 2006, an estimate of 250,729 ha represents the current extent of the TEC within NSW (TSSC, 2006). During the 2009 to 2016 period an average of 395 ha of Grass Woodland was lost annually | Potential |

| Criteria | Description | Criteria triggered? |
|---|---|---|
| | across NSW to agriculture-related activities and a further 155 ha annual lost due to infrastructure developments (Tozer & Simpson, 2020). Approximately 2.56 ha of the Development Footprint is considered the CEEC.<br><br>Disturbance to the patches of potential and confirmed CEEC would reduce the extent of the CEEC. | |
| Fragment or increase fragmentation of an ecological community, for example by clearing vegetation for roads or transmission lines | The existing patch of the CEEC is already partially fragmented and does not form part of a large continuous patch. The design of the Project has been amended to avoid direct impact to larger patches of the CEEC.<br><br>The Project is unlikely to result in further fragmentation to the CEEC. | Unlikely |
| Adversely affect habitat critical to the survival of an ecological community | No Critical Habitat as defined under section 207A of the EPBC Act However, the Conservation Advice (Cwth DCCEEW, 2023c) suggests that all areas of the ecological community that meet the minimum condition criteria outlined in Section 2.4 of the Conservation Advice should be considered critical to the survival of the CEEC.<br><br>The Development Footprint contains 2.56 ha that would be directly impacted by the Project, only 0.73 ha of which is Class A<br><br>While this extent is limited to disturbed woodland and grassland condition CEEC, the Project has the potential to adversely affect habitat critical to the survival of the CEEC. | Potential |
| Modify or destroy abiotic (non-living) factors (such as water, nutrients, or soil) necessary for an ecological community's survival, including reduction of ground water levels, or substantial alteration of surface water drainage patterns | Hydrological impacts as a result of the Project have not been explored as part of this assessment and would be considered in the EIS. However, given the nature of the Project and the limited area of impact to surface water and groundwater, it is not considered likely that there will be a significant impact to abiotic factors necessary for this CEEC.<br><br>Mitigation measures would also be included to minimise any changes to surface water or groundwater hydrology that could impact the CEEC. | Unlikely |
| Cause a substantial change in the species composition of an occurrence of an ecological community, including causing a decline or loss of functionally important species, for example through regular burning or flora or fauna harvesting | No regular burning or flora and fauna harvesting is included as part of the Project.<br><br>Outside the Development Footprint, biosecurity mitigation measures would be implemented to reduce the likelihood of changes to the community composition.<br><br>The Project is unlikely to cause a substantial change in the species composition in areas of regained vegetation. | Unlikely |

| Criteria | Description | Criteria triggered? |
|---|---|---|
| Cause a substantial reduction in the quality or integrity of an occurrence of an ecological community, including, but not limited to:<br>• assisting invasive species, that are harmful to the listed ecological community, to become established, or<br>• causing regular mobilisation of fertilisers, herbicides or other chemicals or pollutants into the ecological community which kill or inhibit the growth of species in the ecological community, or | The loss of functionally important tree species from the proposed Project is not considered to be at a substantial level (2.56 ha) and is unlikely to reduce the quality or integrity of retained areas of the ecological community.<br><br>The Project is not anticipated to involve any activities that have the potential to result in increased disruption to the growth of species in the CEEC.<br><br>It is anticipated that the Project operation would include a weed and pest management plan which would minimise the risk of weed incursions within the locality.<br><br>It is unlikely that there would be a substantial reduction in the quality or integrity of an occurrence of an CEEC. | Unlikely |
| Interfere with the recovery of an ecological community. | The primary recovery actions proposed or underway for this TEC include as outlined in the National Recovery Plan (NSW DCCEEW, 2021):<br>• Achieving no net loss in extent and condition of the ecological community throughout its geographic distribution;<br>• Increasing protection of sites with high recovery potential;<br>• Increasing landscape functionality of the ecological community through management and restoration of degraded sites;<br>• Increasing transitional areas around remnants and linkages between remnants; and bringing about enduring changes in participating land manager attitudes and behaviours towards environmental protection and sustainable land management practices to increase extent, integrity and function of Box-Gum Grassy Woodland.<br>While limited in extent, the Project would result in a net loss in the extent of the CEEC. | Potential |
| **Significant impact: Likely** | | |

## 3.2 CRITICALLY ENDANGERED AND ENDANGERED SPECIES

### 3.2.1 BOOROOLONG FROG

#### 3.2.1.1 SPECIES BACKGROUIND

The Booroolong Frog (*Litoria booroolongensis*) is listed as Endangered under the EPBC Act.

The species requires permanent, or near permanent river environment with rocky structures (bedrock or cobble). Adults are found on or near rock structures within stream margins (NSW OEH, 2017). The species will shelter under rocks or amongst vegetation near the ground on the stream edge and will sometimes bask in the sun on exposed rocks near flowing water during summer.

Suitable breeding habitat consists of rocky structures in shallow water along the riparian zone, and non-breeding habitat is any habitat within the riparian zone (generally within 50 m of the high-water mark). Females lay eggs in submerged rock crevices and tadpoles grow in slow-flowing connected or isolated pools. The species is reliant on permanent running water and does not occupy ephemeral streams, or streams that have dried during severe drought. There is approximately 950 m of waterway within the Project Area that may provide suitable habitat attributes for this species (**Figure 3-1**). Aural-visual surveys were conducted in November 2025 with call-playback undertaken every 50 metres in suitable habitat within the Project Area. The species was not identified. Further, St Pauls Creek has been largely excluded from the Development Footprint following design refinement.

FIGURE 3-1 CREEKLINE CONTAINING WATER, POOLS AND ROCKS

The Conservation Advice (NSW Threatened Species Scientific Committee , 2021) describes five locations (or subpopulations) as:

1. Glenn Innes, NSW;
2. Namoi catchment (Cockburn River and Peel River), Hunter catchment (Isis River), and Manning catchment (Barnard River);
3. Central West catchment (Sewell's Creek, Upper and lower Fish River, and Turon River) and Lachlan catchment (Abercrombie River);
4. Murrumbidgee catchment (Goobragandra River, Yarrangobilly River, Macpherson Swamp, and Mountain, Brungle, Bombowlee, Gilmore, Adelong, Yaven Yaven, Umbango, and Jounama creeks); and
5. Murray catchment (Tooma River and Jingelic, Horse, Mannus, McCabe, Maragle, Burrowye, and Koetong creeks.

The majority of extant populations of the Booroolong Frog are along the western flowing streams on the Southern Tablelands. Based on habitat connectivity, 28 local populations are currently known across the range of the Booroolong Frog (NSW OEH, 2012).

While there have been some BioNet records of the species within 50 km of the Project Area, none of these records are within the last 20 years (DPE, 2025) and the Project Area is not located within the above noted catchment areas or local populations. The closest records within the last 20 years are near Oberon (over 60 km away).

The species is considered highly detectable via the spotlight surveys along rocky sections of the stream (Hunter & Smith, 2013) indicating the absence of records would likely support the absence of the species within the broader locality. While surveys have confirmed the species is not present, the SIA has assumed a reduced likelihood of occurrence based on the lack of surrounding records and the absence of any nearby important populations.

#### 3.2.1.2 ASSESSMENT

A SIA for the Booroolong Frog in accordance with the SIG 1.1 is provided in **Table 3-3**

TABLE 3-3 SIGNIFICANT IMPACT ASSESSMENT FOR THE BOOROOLONG FROG

| Criteria | Description | Criteria triggered? |
|---|---|---|
| *An action is likely to have a significant impact on a critically endangered or endangered species if there is a real chance or possibility that it will:* | | |
| Lead to a long-term decrease in the size of a population | The Project Area is not located within close proximity to the 28 local populations as outlined within the National Recovery Plan. The closest records within the last 20 years are near Oberon (over 60 km away).<br><br>The species occupies streams varying in lengths from 0.1 km to 40 km. Given the lack of any recent records within 60km, the species is likely absent from the Project Area (to be confirmed via targeted survey).<br><br>The species has not been identified and the Project is not expected to lead to a long-term decrease in the size of a population. Design | Unlikely |

| Criteria | Description | Criteria triggered? |
|---|---|---|
| | refinement has also largely excluded the riparian zones (along St Pauls Creek) from the Development Footprint. | |
| Reduce the area of occupancy of the species | While the species exists across a large Extent of Occurrence (EOO), the Area of Occupancy (AOO) is limited to specific habitats along creeks and rivers where species has been recorded (NSW OEH, 2012).<br><br>The Project Area is not within the known habitat extents of the 28 local populations and would not reduce the AOO of the species. | Unlikely |
| Fragment an existing population into two or more populations | Suitable habitat along St Pauls Creek would be mostly avoided and would not be directly impacted during construction and operation of the Project. The species was not identified during targeted surveys and as such no populations have been identified.<br><br>The Project Area is not within the known habitat extents of the 28 local populations and the project would not fragment any existing populations. | Unlikely |
| Adversely affect habitat critical to the survival of a species | Habitat critical to the survival of the species has been defined within the National Recovery Plan for the species and includes rocky sections of permanent streams occupied by the species (NSW OEH, 2012).<br><br>The species is not likely to occupy the site (to be confirmed via targeted survey) and the Project Area is not within the known habitat extents of the 28 local populations. Habitat critical to the survival of the species is not expected to be adversely affected. | Unlikely |
| Disrupt the breeding cycle of a population | Breeding is known to occur in spring and early summer, from October through to early January. Egg deposition sites are typically in shallow, slow-flowing sections of stream or isolated rock pools along the stream margins.<br><br>The species is not likely to occupy the site (to be confirmed via targeted survey) and the Project Area is not within the known habitat extents of the 28 local populations. The Project is considered unlikely to disrupt the species breeding cycle. | Unlikely |
| Modify, destroy, remove, isolate or decrease the availability or quality of habitat to the extent that the species is likely to decline | The Project may disturb suitable habitat in the form of 950 m along a creekline. However, mitigation measures would be put in place to reduce potential impacts to St Pauls Creek and associated habitats.<br><br>Targeted surveys are planned for spring 2025 to further confirm the presence or absence of the species within the Development Footprint. | Unlikely |

| Criteria | Description | Criteria triggered? |
|---|---|---|
| | It is unlikely that the Project's expected level of disturbance would decrease the availability or quality of habitat to the extent that the species is likely to decline, considering it is not located near any known local populations. | |
| Result in invasive species that are harmful to a critically endangered or endangered species becoming established in the endangered or critically endangered species' habitat | Predation of eggs and tadpoles by introduced fish and weed invasion of streamside habitats, particularly by willows is listed as two of the key threats impacting this species.<br><br>Activities during construction and operation would adopt and follow biosecurity measures that will aim to avoid introduction or exacerbation of invasive species in the Development Footprint. | Unlikely |
| Introduce disease that may cause the species to decline, or | Booroolong Frog populations are known to be impacted by Chytridiomycosis (NSW OEH, 2012).<br><br>There is no evidence to suggest the construction and / or operational activities would introduce a disease, such as Chytridiomycosis, that would cause the species to be at risk of illness and subsequent population decline. Precautions would be taken to avoid the spread of disease and would be detailed in a Biosecurity Management Plan. | Unlikely |
| Interfere with the recovery of the species. | The overall objective of the species recovery plan is to minimise the probability of extinction of the species in the wild, and to increase the probability of populations becoming self-sustaining and viable in the longer term. It is considered unlikely that the Project would interfere with the above objectives and recovery of the species. | Unlikely |
| **Significant impact: Unlikely** | | |

## 3.2.2 SOUTH-EASTERN HOODED ROBIN

### 3.2.2.1 SPECIES BACKGROUND

The South-eastern Hooded Robin (*Melanodryas cucullata cucullata*) is listed as Endangered under the EPBC Act.

The species prefers lightly wooded country, usually open eucalypt woodland, acacia scrub and mallee, often in or near clearings or open areas. They also require structurally diverse habitats featuring mature eucalypts, saplings, some small shrubs and a ground layer of moderately tall native grasses (Cwth DCCEEW, 2023a).

Breeding habitat is considered to include territories, ranging from around 10 ha during the breeding season, to 30 ha in the non-breeding season (Cwth DCCEEW, 2023a).

There is potential for the South-eastern Hooded Robin to utilise the native habitat which is present within the Development Footprint in the form of 8.25 ha of PCT 3373 Goulburn Tableland Box-Gum Grassy Forest, 1.40 ha of PCT 3303 and 15.76 ha of PCT 3486 Wollondilly-Shoalhaven Slopes Grassy Open Forest.

Most of the native PCTs to be impacted are in derived native grassland condition. Only 4.77 ha of associated PCTs consists of vegetation in woodland or scattered tree form. An additional 25.39 ha of exotic vegetation (largely grassland) is also subject to removal within the Development Footprint.

The likelihood of occurrence assessment identified that the South-eastern Hooded Robin is likely to occur within the Project Area. Diurnal bird surveys occurred in August 2025 across 2 ha and in January 2026. While the South-eastern Hooded Robin was not a target species, no individuals of this species were identified.

While there have been some Bionet records of the species with 10 km of the Project Area, only two records are within the last five years (DPE, 2025). There are no records within 1 km of the Project Area (DPE, 2025).

The Significant Impact Assessment has considered the absence of the species following diurnal bird surveys and extensive vegetation surveys (that would have likely revealed the species had it been present). Further, the species is unlikely to be reliant on habitat present within the Development Footprint.

### 3.2.2.2 ASSESSMENT

A significant impact assessment for the South-eastern hooded Robin in accordance with the SIG 1.1 is provided in **Table 3-4**

TABLE 3-4 SIGNIFICANT IMPACT ASSESSMENT FOR THE SOUTH-EASTERN HOODED ROBIN

| Criteria | Description | Criteria triggered? |
|---|---|---|
| *An action is likely to have a significant impact on a critically endangered or endangered species if there is a real chance or possibility that it will:* | | |
| Lead to a long-term decrease in the size of a population | In 2021, there was estimated to be 68,000 mature individuals in the wild, representing a decline of >50% over the previous ten years. | Unlikely |

| Criteria | Description | Criteria triggered? |
|---|---|---|
| | Decline of the species has been partially attributed to ongoing threats such as increased predation from introduced mammals, invasive weeds, and competition with noisy miners (*Manorina melanocephala*). Over-grazing by domestic stock, introduced rabbits, and overabundant kangaroos can also negatively affect the subspecies by preventing regeneration of native vegetation.<br><br>Removal of 25.41 ha of habitat associated with PCTs 3303, 3373 and 3486 will contribute to the loss of suitable habitat although it is unlikely to increase the identified pressures. The Project is not located within the extent of any known local population and is unlikely to lead to a long-term decrease in the size of a population. | |
| Reduce the area of occupancy of the species | The south-eastern subspecies AoO is estimated at 30,000 $km^2$ (Cwth DCCEEW, 2023a). The estimated disturbance to suitable habitat from the Project is 40.87 ha (<0.001%) and is unlikely to cause substantial reduction to the AoO of the species. | Unlikely |
| Fragment an existing population into two or more populations | No targeted surveys for the species have occurred. However, it was not identified during diurnal bird surveys and there have not been any BioNet records within 1 km of the Project Area.<br><br>The Hooded Robin has a relatively small home range of approximately 18 ha (NSW Scientific Committee, 2008) and the Project is anticipated to disturb up to 4.77 of suitable habitat within an agricultural landscape. However, the Project Area is not within the known habitat extent of any known local population and therefore would not fragment any existing populations into two or more populations. | Unlikely |
| Adversely affect habitat critical to the survival of a species | Habitat critical for the survival of the species includes areas that have the following:<br>• Dry eucalypt and acacia woodlands and shrublands remnants with an open understorey, some grassy areas and a complex ground layer, often in or near clearings or open areas<br>• Structurally diverse habitats featuring; mature eucalypts, saplings, some small shrubs, and a ground layer of moderately tall native grasses<br>• Standing dead or living trees and tree stumps are also essential for nesting, roosting and foraging<br>• Moderately deep to deep soils, rocks and fallen timber which provides essential foraging habitat.<br><br>The Project is expected to remove 25.41 ha of suitable habitat. However, the species has not been identified within the Project Area and is not within the known habitat extent of any known local population. The species is unlikely to be reliant on habitats present within the Development Footprint. Due to the size of the habitat to the removed, it is unlikely that the Project will affect critical habitat for the species. | Unlikely |
| Disrupt the breeding cycle of a population | The subspecies form monogamous pairs and occupy territories during the breeding season (July-November) | Unlikely |

| Criteria | Description | Criteria triggered? |
|---|---|---|
| | and non-breeding season. Birds generally return to the same breeding site where they typically rear several broods each season. They nest in a small neat cup of bark and grasses in a tree fork or crevice no higher than 6m above the ground.<br><br>The species has not been identified within the Project Area and is not within the known habitat extent of any known local population. The level of disturbance to suitable woodland breeding habitat is considered unlikely to disrupt the species breeding cycle. | |
| Modify, destroy, remove, isolate or decrease the availability or quality of habitat to the extent that the species is likely to decline | The species has not been identified within the Project Area and is not within the known habitat extent of any known local population. It is unlikely that the Project will result in a reduction in area or quality of habitat to the extent that the species is likely to decline. | Unlikely |
| Result in invasive species that are harmful to a critically endangered or endangered species becoming established in the endangered or critically endangered species' habitat | The Conservation Advice (Cwth DCCEEW, 2023a) lists invasive mammals such as cats (*Felis catus*), foxes (*Vulpes vulpes*), rabbits (*Oryctolagus cuniculus*) and invasive weeds as key threats to the subspecies.<br><br>The Project is not expected to result in an increase of invasive species that are harmful to the South-eastern Hooded Robin. | Unlikely |
| Introduce disease that may cause the species to decline, or | There is currently limited evidence of diseases causing detrimental effects on the South-eastern Hooded Robin population in NSW.<br><br>It is not anticipated that the Project will introduce disease to the species. Precautions would be taken to avoid the spread of disease and would be detailed in a Biosecurity Management Plan (BMP). | Unlikely |
| Interfere with the recovery of the species. | There is no Recovery Plan developed for this species, and thus no specific recovery objectives. The species Conservation Advice lists several research, conservation and management actions that aim to stabilise or increase populations across its range.<br><br>It is considered unlikely that the proposed Project will interfere with the recovery of the species. | Unlikely |
| Conclusion: **Unlikely** | | |

## 3.2.3 KEY'S MATCHSTICK GRASSHOPPER

### 3.2.3.1 SPECIES BACKGROUND

Key's Matchstick Grasshopper (*Keyacris scurra*) is listed as Endangered under the EPBC Act.

Key's Matchstick Grasshopper is usually found in native grasslands and grassy woodlands, but it has also been recorded in other vegetation associations containing a native grass understory (especially Kangaroo Grass *Themeda triandra*) and known food plants (particularly Asteraceae) (NSW TSSC, 2022).

There is approximately 8.25 ha of PCT 3373 within the Development Footprint suitable for Key's Matchstick Grasshopper. Approximately 54 km of transects targeting the Key's Matchstick Grasshopper have been undertaken (simultaneously with targeted flora transects) in September 2025. The species was not identified. Field verified vegetation mapping has been undertaken for much of the Development Footprint and no Kangaroo Grass was identified. However, several species from the family Asteraceae (both exotic and native) were identified.

The likelihood of occurrence assessment considered Key's Matchstick Grasshopper to have a potential likelihood of occurrence within the Project Area.

There have not been BioNet records within 10 km of the Project Area (DPE, 2025). The closest records are approximately 40 km away from the Project Area. As the species is flightless, they do not disperse large distances, usually between 200 and 300 m within its lifetime (ACT City and Environment Directorate, 2025), which suggests observations are indicative of resident populations (rather than dispersing individuals). The significant impact assessment assumes a reduced likelihood of occurrence due to absence during targeted surveys.

### 3.2.3.2 ASSESSMENT

A significant impact assessment for Key's Matchstick Grasshopper in accordance with the SIG 1.1 is provided in **Table 3-5**

TABLE 3-5 SIGNIFICANT IMPACT ASSESSMENT FOR KEY'S MATCHSTICK GRASSHOPPER

| Criteria | Description | Criteria triggered? |
|---|---|---|
| *An action is likely to have a significant impact on a critically endangered or endangered species if there is a real chance or possibility that it will:* | | |
| Lead to a long-term decrease in the size of a population | There is no adopted recovery plan for Key's Matchstick Grasshopper. The species is within the most northeastern area of the species' known distribution and BioNet records indicate that there is a resident population approximately 40 km from the Project Area. The species has very limited dispersal ability, and its habitat is already heavily fragmented. The species has not been identified during targeted surveys within the Project Area despite the 54 km of transects conducted.<br><br>Given their very limited ability to disperse substantial distances, no population is expected to occur within the Project Area.<br><br>The distribution for the species is highly restricted with the AoO approximately 124 km$^2$ (NSW TSSC, 2022). It is considered unlikely that the proposed | Unlikely |
| Reduce the area of occupancy of the species | | Unlikely |
| Fragment an existing population into two or more populations | | Unlikely |

| Criteria | Description | Criteria triggered? |
|---|---|---|
| | Project will lead to long-term decrease in the size of an important population, reduce the area of occupancy of an important population, or fragment an existing important population. | |
| Adversely affect habitat critical to the survival of a species | Key critical habitat for the species includes:<br>• Wide range of natural grasslands and woodlands with a grassy to open shrubby understorey and varying tree cover; and<br>• Structural heterogeneity is generally important.<br><br>The Project will result in the potential disturbance of 8.25 ha of vegetation associated PCT 3373. Vegetation surveys have identified that grasslands include a high proportion of exotic groundcover species and surveys to date have not identified Kangaroo Grass, although they have identified several species in the family Asteraceae.<br>The species was not identified during targeted surveys. It is therefore unlikely that the Project will impact habitat critical to the survival of the species. | Unlikely |
| Disrupt the breeding cycle of a population | The species is understood to only produce a single generation per year (NSW TSSC, 2022).<br>The Project is situated within the species' most northeastern known distribution with the closest resident population being approximately 40 km away. However, the species has not been identified in targeted surveys to date.<br><br>The species is not likely to occupy the site (to be confirmed via targeted survey) and the Project is unlikely to disrupt the breeding cycle of an important population. | Unlikely |
| Modify, destroy, remove, isolate or decrease the availability or quality of habitat to the extent that the species is likely to decline | There is potential for Key's Matchstick Grasshopper to occur in grassland, woodland and forest habitat across the Development Footprint with associated PCT 3373. However, the species has not been identified during targeted surveys to date. It is unlikely that the Project will modify, destroy, remove, isolate or decrease the availability or quality of habitat to the extent that the species is likely to decline. | Unlikely |
| Result in invasive species that are harmful to a critically endangered or endangered species becoming established in the endangered or critically endangered species' habitat | In accordance with the species conservation advice, weed invasion is one of the main threats to this species.<br><br>It is not anticipated that the Project will introduce disease to the species. Precautions would be taken to avoid the spread of disease and would be detailed in a BMP. | Unlikely |

| Criteria | Description | Criteria triggered? |
|---|---|---|
| Introduce disease that may cause the species to decline, or | There is currently limited evidence of diseases causing detrimental effects on Key's Matchstick Grasshopper populations in NSW.<br><br>It is not anticipated that the Project will introduce disease to the species. Precautions would be taken to avoid the spread of disease and would be detailed in a Biosecurity Management Plan. | Unlikely |
| Interfere with the recovery of the species. | There is no Recovery Plan developed for this species, and thus no specific recovery objectives. The species Conservation Advice lists several research, conservation and management actions that aim to stabilise or increase populations across its range.<br><br>It is considered unlikely that the proposed Project will interfere with the recovery of the species. | Unlikely |
| Conclusion: **Unlikely** | | |

## 3.2.4 SPOTTED-TAILED QUOLL

### 3.2.4.1 SPECIES BACKGROUND

The Spotted-tailed Quoll (*Dasyurus maculatus maculatus*) is listed as Endangered under the EPBC Act.

The Spotted-tailed Quoll prefers mature wet forests with high rainfall and unlogged or minimally disturbed forests. It inhabits a wide range of environments, including temperate and subtropical rainforests in mountainous regions, wet sclerophyll forests, lowland forests, open and closed eucalypt woodlands, inland riparian zones, River Red Gum forests, dry 'rainshadow' woodlands, sub-alpine woodlands, coastal heathlands, and occasionally open country, grazing lands, and rocky outcrops. Predominantly nocturnal, the quoll rests in dens found in hollow logs, tree hollows, rock outcrops, or caves during the day. It requires abundant food sources, such as birds and small mammals, and large, contiguous areas of vegetation for foraging. Although primarily terrestrial, it is moderately arboreal, with about 11% of its movement occurring in trees (Cwth DCCEEW, 2025).

The likelihood of occurrence assessment considered the Spotted-tailed Quoll to have a potential likelihood of occurrence within the Project Area.

There is approximately 4.77 ha of suitable habitat within the Project Area for the Spotted-tailed Quoll associated with woodland and forested areas. This has been reduced from the 38.33 ha of treed vegetation within the Project Area. The species was not triggered for assessment under the BAM-C as the species is an 'ecosystem credit' and as such surveys are not required under the NSW BC Act. However, cameras were deployed in December 2025 targeting terrestrial (non-climbing) and arboreal mammals. A total of 61 cameras have been deployed and were collected in January 2026. This survey effort has further suggested the species may be absent. The species was not identified during spotlighting efforts targeting other nocturnal mammals in August nor November 2025.

There have not been any BioNet records within 10km of the Project Area (DPE, 2025). The closest BioNet record is approximately 20 km away dated 2018 and 2020. The Spotted-tailed Quolls disperse long distances; however, females remain close to maternal home range and are unlikely to disperse more than 10 km.

### 3.2.4.2 ASSESSMENT

A significant impact assessment for the Spotted-tailed Quoll in accordance with the SIG 1.1 is provided in **Table 3-6**.

TABLE 3-6 SIGNIFICANT IMPACT ASSESSMENT FOR THE SPOTTED-TAILED QUOLL

| Criteria | Description | Criteria triggered? |
|---|---|---|
| *An action is likely to have a significant impact on a critically endangered or endangered species if there is a real chance or possibility that it will:* | | |
| Lead to a long-term decrease in the size of a population | The Spotted-tailed Quoll distribution and population has declined 25-50% for the NSW population since European colonisation (NSW TSSC, 2020). The species AoO is estimated to be approximately 2,512 km$^2$. | Unlikely |
| Reduce the area of occupancy of the species | | Unlikely |

| Criteria | Description | Criteria triggered? |
|---|---|---|
| | The suitable habitat within the Development Footprint is approximately 4.77 ha. However, if present, the species would mostly likely use the riparian habitat along the central vegetated riparian corridor (St Pauls Creek) for movement. Design refinement has largely excluded direct impact along this corridor. Therefore, this reduces the potential extent of impact that the Project may have on the species, its population and the area of occupancy.<br><br>The Project is unlikely to decrease the size of any local population or lead to a long-term decrease in the species' population size. | |
| Fragment an existing population into two or more populations | The Project Area is situated in a largely fragmented agricultural landscape. Higher quality habitat for the species exists in adjacent areas outside the Project Area. During operation of the Project, the transmission line (southern section of the Development Footprint) would not prohibit movement between adjacent areas of suitable habitat.<br><br>No populations have been identified within 10 km of the Project Area within the last 20 years. It is unlikely that the proposed Project would contribute to the fragmentation of existing populations for this wide-ranging species. | Unlikely |
| Adversely affect habitat critical to the survival of a species | The species Conservation Advice has not defined habitat critical to the survival of this species. However, the National Recovery Plan for the species suggests habitat critical for the survival of the species consists of large patches of forested areas with adequate denning resources and availability of medium-sized mammalian prey (Department of Environment, Land, Water and Planning, 2016).<br><br>While the species may utilise the Project Area, habitat would not be considered critical: forested areas are limited and the riparian corridor has been avoided. No populations have been identified within 10 km of the Project Area within the last 20 years and the Project is unlikely to adversely affect habitat critical to the survival of the species. | Unlikely |
| Disrupt the breeding cycle of a population | Spotted-tailed Quolls typically breed between April and July, with an average litter size of five maturing at about one year of age. The young are kept in a rudimentary pouch until they are large enough to be left behind in the den.<br>The Project has the potential to remove habitat that may provide marginal foraging grounds adjacent to breeding habitat. However, no suitable breeding habitat or evidence of the species has been identified to date (camera surveys underway to inform the EIS). The project is unlikely to disrupt the breeding cycle of any local population. | Unlikely |

| Criteria | Description | Criteria triggered? |
|---|---|---|
| Modify, destroy, remove, isolate or decrease the availability or quality of habitat to the extent that the species is likely to decline | One of the main threats to the species is the loss, fragmentation and degradation of suitable habitat. Design refinement has excluded the riparian habitats. The remaining suitable habitat to be impacted is approximately 4.77 ha and has already been largely disturbed.<br><br>The Project is unlikely to further decrease the availability or quality of habitat to the extent that the species is likely to decline. | Unlikely |
| Result in invasive species that are harmful to a critically endangered or endangered species becoming established in the endangered or critically endangered species' habitat | The species conservation advice highlights the threat posed by invasive foxes (*Vulpes vulpes crucigera*) and feral cats (*Felis catus*), which prey on quolls and compete with them for food. Feral cats also spread diseases which affect quolls. Mortality of the Spotted-tailed Quoll has been associated with 1080 baiting, notably where population sizes are smaller or more isolated (NSW TSSC, 2020). As such. the Project would not involve the use of 1080 baiting, and no Project-related management plans would include or implement 1080 baiting.<br><br>It is considered unlikely that the proposed Project will result in the spread of invasive species. | Unlikely |
| Introduce disease that may cause the species to decline, or | Diseases are not a primary threat to Spotted-tail Quolls however ectoparasite infestations, 1080 poisoning and disease transmission from feral cats can affect quolls.<br><br>It is not anticipated that the Project will introduce disease to the species. Precautions would be taken to avoid the spread of disease and would be detailed in a Biosecurity Management Plan. | Unlikely |
| Interfere with the recovery of the species. | The National Recovery Plan (Department of Environment, Land, Water and Planning, 2016) identifies habitat loss, fragmentation and degradation of suitable habitat as a main threat to the species. In addition, timber harvesting, poison baiting, competition and predation from introduced carnivores, deliberate killing, road mortality, bushfire, poisoning by Cane Toads, and climate change.<br><br>The strategy for recovery will be to focus on reducing the impact of threatening processes throughout the species' range and subsequently halt the current decline in its distribution and abundance.<br><br>It is considered unlikely that the proposed Project will interfere with the above objectives and recovery of the species. | Unlikely. |
| Conclusion: **Unlikely** | | |

## 3.2.5 BUTTERCUP DOUBLETAIL

### 3.2.5.1 SPECIES BACKGROUND

The Buttercup Doubletail (*Diuris aequalis*) is listed as Endangered under the EPBC Act.

The Buttercup Doubletail is an orchid found in ranges and tablelands in South Eastern NSW (especially on the Great Dividing Range) in fragmented populations. The species has been recorded in forest, low open woodland with grassy understory and secondary grassland. It grows on gravelly clay-loam soils on gently undulating terrain. The species distribution overlaps with the EPBC Act listed Box Gum Grassy Woodland CEEC.

The species is associated with PCT 3373 which is present on site. Approximately 8.25 ha of suitable habitat occurs within the Development Footprint. Approximately 54 km of parallel field traverses have been undertaken in November 2025. The parallel field traverse survey technique involves searching along a grid of parallel traverses 5 m apart, across areas of suitable habitat. The species was not identified.

The likelihood of occurrence assessment considered the Buttercup Doubletail to have a potential likelihood of occurrence within the Project Area, noting the species was absent during targeted surveys.

There have not been any BioNet records within 10 km of the Project Area (DPE, 2025). The closest and most recent BioNet record of the species was approximately 20 km away dated 2021.

### 3.2.5.2 ASSESSMENT

A significant impact assessment for the Buttercup Doubletail in accordance with the SIG 1.1 is provided in **Table 3-7**

TABLE 3-7 SIGNIFICANT IMPACT ASSESSMENT FOR THE BUTTERCUP DOUBLETAIL

| Criteria | Description | Criteria triggered? |
|---|---|---|
| *An action is likely to have a significant impact on a critically endangered or endangered species if there is a real chance or possibility that it will:* | | |
| Lead to a long-term decrease in the size of a population | It is estimated that there are approximately 2000 plants in total from 20 known populations (NSW OEH, 2025).<br><br>There is suitable habitat available within the Development Footprint associated with PCT 3373. However, no individuals have been identified during targeted surveys across the Development Footprint.<br><br>It is considered unlikely that the Project would lead to long-term decrease in the size of any local population. | Unlikely |
| Reduce the area of occupancy of the species | The AoO is estimated to be 132 $km^2$ (NSW TSSC, 2021).<br><br>As the species has not been identified, it is considered unlikely that the proposed Project will result in a reduction of the AoO for the species. | Unlikely |

| Criteria | Description | Criteria triggered? |
|---|---|---|
| Fragment an existing population into two or more populations | Targeted surveys for the species in November 2025 did not identify any populations. As such, the Project is not expected to fragment an existing population. | Unlikely |
| Adversely affect habitat critical to the survival of a species | The Conservation Advice (NSW TSSC, 2021) has no defined habitat critical to the survival of the species. In the event the species is identified, the Project is unlikely to adversely affect habitat critical to the survival of the species. | Unlikely |
| Disrupt the breeding cycle of a population | Little is known about the ecology and biology of this species. As targeted surveys for the species did not identify the species, there are not expected to be any disruptions to the breeding cycle of a population. | Unlikely |
| Modify, destroy, remove, isolate or decrease the availability or quality of habitat to the extent that the species is likely to decline | The main threats to the species are habitat fragmentation and removal of native grassland areas.<br><br>There is suitable habitat is present in moderate to poor condition where no individuals were identified. This Project is unlikely to decrease the availability or quality of habitat to the extent that the species is likely to decline. | Unlikely |
| Result in invasive species that are harmful to a critically endangered or endangered species becoming established in the endangered or critically endangered species' habitat | Invasive grasses such as *Anthoxanthum odoratum* are a threat to the species which has not been identified in the Project Area in vegetation surveys to date.<br><br>It is anticipated the Project will include the development and implementation of a weed and pest management plan. | Unlikely |
| Introduce disease that may cause the species to decline, or | There is currently limited evidence of diseases causing detrimental effects on the species in NSW.<br><br>It is not anticipated that the Project will introduce disease to the species. Precautions would be taken to avoid the spread of disease and would be detailed in a Biosecurity Management Plan. | Unlikely |
| Interfere with the recovery of the species. | Management sites have been implemented for the recovery of the species. Two of these sites are within the locality of the LGA of the Project, however these sites are approximately 40 km from the Project.<br><br>It is considered unlikely that the proposed Project will interfere with the recovery of the species. | Unlikely |
| Conclusion: **Unlikely** | | |

## 3.2.6 COTONEASTER POMADERRIS

### 3.2.6.1 SPECIES BACKGROUND

The Cotoneaster Pomaderris (*Pomaderris cotoneaster*) is listed as Endangered under the EPBC Act.

The species typically thrives in environments characterised by shallow soils and outcropping rock, often near cliff lines or along riverbanks. It favours dry, shrubby open forests situated on north-west to south-west facing slopes. Specimens have been observed in various specific habitats, including at the base of cliffs amidst tall open forest dominated by *Eucalyptus fastigata*, on alluvial terraces surrounded by tall open forests of *Eucalyptus cypellocarpa* and *Eucalyptus muelleriana*, and in rocky riparian sites within stands of *Eucalyptus viminalis*. It also grows on rocky river beds and on dry south-westerly facing slopes above rivers, where it coexists with a diverse range of vegetation including *Westringia* species, *Grevillea lanigera*, *Prostanthera* species, *Eucalyptus radiata*, *Olearia* species, *Kunzea ericoides*, and *Acacia pravissima*. While some riparian sites show slight invasion by willow (*Salix*) and blackberry (*Rubus fruticosus agg*.), most locations remain remote and maintain predominantly weed-free vegetation.

There is 15.76 ha of marginally suitable habitat available within the Development Footprint associated with PCT 3486 and 1.40 ha associated with PCT 3303. This habitat is present in moderate to poor condition and does not include the preferred rocky forested slopes in steep gullies although associated species, *Olearia* sp and *Eucalyptus viminalis* have been identified in the Project Area.

Parallel field traverses were completed in November 2025 across areas of suitable habitat. Despite 54 km of transecting, the species was not identified. Further, as the species is a shrub that grows to 4 m, it is likely that, if present, it would have been noted during initial vegetation surveys which included BAM plots and a random meander transect. One *Pomaderris* sp. was observed during initial vegetation surveys, however, it was confirmed the species was not threatened.

There have been 125 BioNet records of the species within 10 km of the Project Area, however there are no records within 1 km of the Project Area. The closest records are approximately 7 km away in substantially different habitats.

### 3.2.6.2 ASSESSMENT

A significant impact assessment for the Cotoneaster Pomaderris in accordance with the SIG 1.1 is provided in **Table 3-8**

TABLE 3-8 SIGNIFICANT IMPACT ASSESSMENT FOR THE COTONEASTER POMADERRIS

| Criteria | Description | Criteria triggered? |
|---|---|---|
| *An action is likely to have a significant impact on a critically endangered or endangered species if there is a real chance or possibility that it will:* | | |
| Lead to a long-term decrease in the size of a population | There are at least 3,200 known plants in the wild, although accurate counts of all populations are not available (DAWE, 2021). | Unlikely |

| Criteria | Description | Criteria triggered? |
|---|---|---|
| | The suitable habitat present within the Project Area is in moderate to poor condition and does not include the preferred rocky forested slopes in steep gullies. No populations of the Cotoneaster Pomaderris were identified during targeted surveys. It is considered unlikely that Project will lead to long-term decrease in the size of the species population. | |
| Reduce the area of occupancy of the species | As the species was not identified, it is considered unlikely that the Project will result in a reduction of the area of occupancy. | Unlikely |
| Fragment an existing population into two or more populations | Targeted surveys for the species in November 2025 did not identify any populations. As such, the Project is not expected to fragment an existing population. | Unlikely |
| Adversely affect habitat critical to the survival of a species | No Critical Habitat has been defined under section 207A of the EPBC Act. However, the Conservation Advice outlines that all habitat is considered critical to the survival of the species (DAWE, 2021).<br><br>The Project is not expected to adversely affect habitat critical to the survival of the species as no individuals would be directly impacted. | Unlikely |
| Disrupt the breeding cycle of a population | Little is known about the ecology and biology of this species. This habitat present within the Development Footprint is in moderate to poor condition and the Project is not expected to disrupt the breeding cycle of a population. | Unlikely |
| Modify, destroy, remove, isolate or decrease the availability or quality of habitat to the extent that the species is likely to decline | The main threats to the species are climate change, invasive weeds and genetic threats arising from small fragmented subpopulations.<br><br>There is 17.16 ha of marginally suitable habitat available within the Development Footprint associated. This habitat is present in moderate to poor condition. This Project is unlikely to decrease the availability or quality of habitat to the extent that the species is likely to decline. | Unlikely |
| Result in invasive species that are harmful to a critically endangered or endangered species becoming established in the endangered or critically endangered species' habitat | Invasive species that may threaten Pomaderris Cotoneaster include feral herbivores and competition with weeds.<br><br>It is anticipated the Project will include the development and implementation of a weed and pest management plan. | Unlikely |
| Introduce disease that may cause the species to decline, or | There is currently limited evidence of diseases causing detrimental effects on the species in NSW.<br><br>It is not anticipated that the Project will introduce disease to the species. Precautions would be taken to avoid the spread of disease and would be detailed in a Biosecurity Management Plan. | Unlikely |
| Interfere with the recovery of the species. | The Recovery Plan for the species (DAWE, 2021) outlines the following objectives:<br>• Conducting further survey | Unlikely |

| Criteria | Description | Criteria triggered? |
|---|---|---|
| | • Determining habitat critical to the survival of Pomaderris cotoneaster and monitoring known populations<br>• Removing threatening weeds<br>• Erecting a protective barrier at Badgerys Lookout<br>• Enhancing populations where practicable<br>• Investigating genetic diversity<br>• Obtaining management agreements for populations on non-reserve tenure<br>• Providing information to affected parties<br>• Ensuring adequate data management<br>• Co-ordinating recovery actions<br><br>It is considered unlikely that the Project would interfere with the recovery of the species | |
| Conclusion: **Unlikely** | | |

## 3.2.7 GANG-GANG COCKATOO

### 3.2.7.1 SPECIES BACKGROUND

The Gang-gang Cockatoo (*Callocephalon fimbriatum*) is listed as Endangered under the EPBC Act.

The species primarily occupies temperate eucalypt forests and woodlands across south-eastern Australia and is an altitudinal migrant. During summer months, Gang-gang Cockatoos predominantly inhabit mature wet sclerophyll forests, typically dominated by eucalypts with a dense shrubby understory of acacia, wattle, and banksia, often within secluded valleys. The species has also been recorded in more open eucalypt assemblages, subalpine snow gum woodland, temperate rainforest, and occasionally regenerating forest. Tall open forests dominated by species such *as Eucalyptus pilularis, Angophora costata,* and *Syncarpia glomulifera* are frequently utilised, while *Eucalyptus piperita* open forest may be used occasionally.

In winter months, the species tends to move to lower, drier altitudes and occupies more open eucalypt forest and woodland assemblages. Gang-gang Cockatoos rely heavily on arboreal foraging within eucalypt canopies and, to a lesser extent, the understory, particularly during periods of acacia seeding. The species has a broad diet, feeding on flower buds, seed pods, blossoms, fruits, seeds, and occasionally insect larvae. While native vegetation, particularly eucalypts and acacias, forms the core of the diet, the species may opportunistically utilise introduced species when occupying suburban environments (DAWE, 2022).

Breeding occurs primarily between October and January, with Gang-gang Cockatoos nesting in hollows within large, mature trees. Nesting, roosting, and loafing habitats are strongly associated with old growth forest and woodland assemblages containing suitable hollow-bearing trees. Preferred nest hollows occur within tree trunks or large limbs, or within dead spouts of living eucalypts, typically around 7.5 m above ground (DAWE, 2022). Breeding aggregations are reliant on the availability of suitable hollow-bearing trees, often with multiple nests occurring within a few hundred metres of one another. Stands of trees that are likely to develop hollows in future years are also considered an important component of habitat critical to the species' survival.

There is 4.77 ha of suitable foraging and potential breeding habitat available within the Development Footprint associated with PCTs 3303, 3486 and PCT 3373. This habitat occurs primarily as woodland and scattered tree assemblages and is present in moderate to poor condition.

A pair of Gang-gang Cockatoos were detected investigating a hollow during a targeted survey in the Project Area on 8 January 2026.

Vegetation clearing may impact foraging resources. However, the extent of vegetation clearing is limited and represents a small proportion of available habitat within the broader landscape. The Project Area does not comprise habitat critical to the survival of the species, and no active nesting sites or concentrations of suitable hollow-bearing trees have been identified.

There is potential direct impact to breeding habitat as the Project as hollow bearing trees are located within the Development Footprint.

Indirect impacts during construction may include noise, light, dust, runoff and erosion. The species is highly mobile and therefore only marginal negative impacts on connectivity are expected and populations would not be fragmented.

Gang-gang Cockatoos are highly mobile, wide-ranging birds with demonstrated seasonal and inter-annual movements in response to food availability. Given this mobility, individuals displaced from the Project Area are expected to readily utilise surrounding foraging habitat within the region. As such, while some adverse impact may occur at a localised scale, the Project is unlikely to interfere with the species' lifecycle, reduce its area of occupancy, fragment an important population, or adversely affect habitat critical to its survival.

#### 3.2.7.2 ASSESSMENT

A significant impact assessment for the Cotoneaster Pomaderris in accordance with the SIG 1.1 is provided in **Table 3-9**.

TABLE 3-9 SIGNIFICANT IMPACT ASSESSMENT FOR THE GANG-GANG COCKATOO

| Criteria | Description | Criteria triggered? |
|---|---|---|
| *An action is likely to have a significant impact on a critically endangered or endangered species if there is a real chance or possibility that it will:* | | |
| Lead to a long-term decrease in the size of a population | The Project may result in the temporary displacement of individual Cockatoos due to limited vegetation clearing. However, the species is highly mobile, occurs across a broad geographic range, and utilises habitat opportunistically in response to food availability. The extent of clearing is small relative to available habitat in the surrounding landscape, and no breeding sites were identified. As such, the action is not expected to result in a long-term decrease in population size. | Unlikely |
| Reduce the area of occupancy of the species | While a small amount of foraging habitat will be removed, the Gang-gang Cockatoo occupies extensive areas of suitable habitat across south-eastern Australia and routinely moves between habitats seasonally and inter-annually. The limited clearing extent is unlikely to measurably reduce the species' area of occupancy. | Unlikely |
| Fragment an existing population into two or more populations | The action will not create barriers to movement for Gang-gang Cockatoos. The species is capable of flying across the landscape and regularly undertakes seasonal and altitudinal movements. Habitat connectivity at the landscape scale will be maintained. | Unlikely |
| Adversely affect habitat critical to the survival of a species | No Critical Habitat for the Gang-gang Cockatoo has been identified in the Conservation Advice for this species or is listed under section 207A of the EPBC Act.<br>The Project would result in the removal of suitable habitat that forms part of the broader habitat used by Gang-gang Cockatoos across their seasonal range. The removal of breeding and foraging resources has the potential to adversely affect habitat used by the species, particularly at a local scale. | Potential |

| Criteria | Description | Criteria triggered? |
|---|---|---|
| Disrupt the breeding cycle of a population | Although no breeding aggregations were confirmed, a male and female Gang-gang Cockatoo were observed in the vicinity of a hollow suitable for breeding. Additionally, this species relies on foraging habitat during the breeding season to successfully rear their young. The removal of foraging resources has the potential to indirectly disrupt breeding activities by reducing food availability in the local area. However, this effect is expected to be minor given the limited clearing extent and availability of surrounding habitat. | Potential |
| Modify, destroy, remove, isolate or decrease the availability or quality of habitat to the extent that the species is likely to decline | Habitat modification would occur through limited vegetation clearing. While this may adversely affect individual birds on a local scale, the extent of impact is small relative to available habitat in the surrounding landscape, and is not expected to result in a decline in the species. | Unlikely |
| Result in invasive species that are harmful to a critically endangered or endangered species becoming established in the endangered or critically endangered species' habitat | Vegetation clearing has the potential to increase habitat openness and edge effects, which may facilitate increased activity of invasive predators such as feral cats (*Felis catus*) and foxes (*Vulpes vulpes*). These species are known predators of birds and may pose an increased risk to Gang-gang Cockatoos, particularly during the breeding season. However, any increase in invasive species pressure is expected to be localised and limited in extent.<br><br>It is considered unlikely that the Project would result in the spread of invasive species. It is also anticipated the Project would include the development and implementation of weed and pest management plan. | Unlikely |
| Introduce disease that may cause the species to decline, or | The proposal does not involve activities that are expected to introduce disease to the species. | Unlikely |
| Interfere with the recovery of the species. | While some localised adverse impacts may occur, the proposal will not remove critical breeding habitat, significantly reduce foraging availability at a landscape scale, or prevent seasonal movement between habitats. Accordingly, the action is not expected to interfere with the recovery of the species. | Unlikely |
| Conclusion: **Unlikely** | | |

## 3.3 VULNERABLE SPECIES

### 3.3.1 DIAMOND FIRETAIL

#### 3.3.1.1 SPECIES BACKGROUND

The Diamond Firetail (*Stagonopleura guttata*) is listed as Vulnerable under the EPBC Act.

The Diamond Firetail occurs in eucalypt, acacia or casuarina woodlands, open forests and other lightly timbered habitats, including farmland and grassland with scattered trees. The species prefers areas with relatively low tree density, few large logs, and little litter cover but high grass cover (Cwth DCCEEW, 2023b).

Diamond Firetails build bottle-shaped nests from green grass blades and stems, lined with fine grasses and feathers. To ensure the safety of eggs and nestlings, the species often builds nests into the base of large stick-nests belonging to birds of prey such as the Whistling Kite (*Haliastur sphenurus*), White-bellied Sea-eagle (*Haliaeetus leucogaster*), Wedge-tailed Eagle (*Aquila audax*), Brown Falcon (*Falco berigora*), Nankeen Kestrel (*Falco cenchroides*) or the Square-tailed Kite (*Lophoictinia isura*). Prickly shrubs including boxthorn, hakeas, rose bushes and sea urchin hakea (*Hakea petiolaris*) are also utilised for nest protection (Cwth DCCEEW, 2023b).

The Diamond Firetail is associated with PCT 3373 and PCT 3486 which are present on site, accounting for approximately 24.01 ha of suitable habitat within the Development Footprint.

Diurnal bird surveys were undertaken across 2 ha in August 2025. While the Diamond Firetail was not a target species, the species was identified during surveys flying between trees and nearby grassland.

There are 16 BioNet records within 10 km of the Project Area, with one record approximately 200 m west (DPE, 2025). Approximately 20 individuals were identified during ecological surveys (Holocene Ecology, 2025).

Direct clearing to vegetation in the Development Footprint may impact foraging habitat. There is potential direct impact to breeding habitat as the bird roosts in dense shrubs.

Indirect impacts during construction may include noise, light, dust, runoff and erosion. The species is highly mobile and therefore only marginal negative impacts on connectivity are expected and populations would not be fragmented.

#### 3.3.1.2 ASSESSMENT

A significant impact assessment for the Diamond Firetail in accordance with the SIG 1.1 is provided in **Table 3-10**

TABLE 3-10 SIGNIFICANT IMPACT ASSESSMENT FOR THE DIAMOND FIRETAIL

| Criteria | Description | Criteria triggered? |
|---|---|---|
| *An action is likely to have a significant impact on a critically endangered or endangered species if there is a real chance or possibility that it will:* | | |
| Lead to a long-term decrease in the size of an important population of a species | There is no adopted or made recovery plan for Diamond Firetail. While not defined, the roughly linear dispersal of Diamond Firetail individuals along Wollondilly River suggests this may be a population | Unlikely |

| Criteria | Description | Criteria triggered? |
|---|---|---|
| Reduce the area of occupancy of an important population | necessary for maintaining genetic diversity, as there is potential for southern individuals to become isolated from those north of Wombeyan Caves Road (DPE, 2025). As such, the population within the locality has been identified as an 'important population' for the purpose of this assessment.<br><br>The Project design has been refined to minimise the extent of woodland habitat within the Development Footprint, and exclude the riparian zone along St Pauls Creek, minimising potential impacts on Diamond Firetails within the locality.<br><br>It is considered unlikely that the Project would lead to a long-term decrease in the size or area of occupancy of an important population. Due to the mobility of the species, the Project is not expected to fragment an existing important population into two or more populations although this will be further addressed within the EIS. | Unlikely |
| Fragment an existing important population into two or more populations | | Unlikely |
| Adversely affect habitat critical to the survival of a species | Key critical habitat for the species listed under the Conservation Advice (Cwth DCCEEW, 2023b) includes:<br>• Eucalypt, Acacia or Casuarina woodlands, open forests and other lightly timbered habitats;<br>• Low tree density, few large logs, and little litter cover but high grass cover for foraging, roosting and breeding; and<br>• Drooping she-oak (*Allocasuarina verticillata*) within the Mt Lofty Ranges.<br><br>The Project will result in the potential disturbance of 24.01 ha of potential critical habitat for the species. Management and mitigation measures will be further addressed within the EIS phase. | Potential |
| Disrupt the breeding cycle of an important population | The population within the locality has been identified as an 'important population' for the purpose of this assessment.<br><br>A flock of approximately 20 Diamond Firetails was identified in the Project Area. Groups separate into small colonies to breed, between August and January. Nests are globular structures built either in the shrubby understorey, or higher up, especially under hawk's or raven's nests.<br><br>There is potential to disrupt the breeding cycle of an important population if stick nests are present within the Development Footprint and cannot be avoided through detailed design. This will be further assessed within the EIS. | Potential |
| Modify, destroy, remove or isolate or decrease the availability or quality of habitat to the extent that the species is likely to decline | The Project will result in the potential disturbance of 24.01 ha of known habitat for the species. Management and mitigation measures will be further addressed within the EIS phase.<br><br>Habitats will be avoided where possible through detailed design and given the high mobility of the species, the Project is not expected to modify, destroy, remove or isolate or decrease the availability or quality | Unlikely |

| Criteria | Description | Criteria triggered? |
|---|---|---|
| | of habitat to the extent that the species is likely to decline. | |
| Result in invasive species that are harmful to a vulnerable species becoming established in the vulnerable species' habitat | In accordance with the species Conservation Advice (Cwth DCCEEW, 2023b), the main invasive species threat to the Diamond Firetail are rabbits (*Oryctolagus cuniculus*). Rabbits are known to cause habitat fragmentation by removing the shrub layer.<br><br>It is considered unlikely that the Project would result in the spread of invasive species. It is also anticipated the Project would include the development and implementation of weed and pest management plan. | Unlikely |
| Introduce disease that may cause the species to decline, or | There is currently limited evidence of diseases causing detrimental effects on the Diamond Firetail population in NSW. Precautions would be taken to avoid the spread of disease and would be detailed in a Biosecurity Management Plan. | Unlikely |
| Interfere substantially with the recovery of the species. | There is no Recovery Plan developed for this species, and thus no specific recovery objectives. The species Conservation Advice lists several research, conservation and management actions that aim to stabilise or increase populations across its range.<br><br>It is considered unlikely that the proposed Project would interfere substantially with the recovery of the species. | Unlikely |
| **Conclusion: Unlikely** | | |

## 3.3.2 BROWN TREECREEPER

### 3.3.2.1 SPECIES BACKGROUND

The Brown Treecreeper (south-eastern) (*Climacteris picumnus victoriae*) is listed as Vulnerable under the EPBC Act.

The species is found in eucalypt woodlands (including Box-Gum Woodland) and dry open forest of the inland slopes and plains inland of the Great Dividing Range, mainly inhabiting stringybark or other rough-barked eucalyptus dominated woodlands usually with an open grassy understorey, and sometimes with one or more shrub species (DPE, 2025). The Brown Treecreeper may also be found in mallee and River Red Gum (*Eucalyptus camaldulensis*) Forest bordering wetlands with an open understorey of acacias, saltbush, lignum, cumbungi and grasses, and has also been recorded, though less commonly, on the coastal ranges and plains in similar woodland habitats. The species is usually not found in woodlands with a dense shrub layer.

Essential breeding habitat consists of hollows in standing dead or live trees and tree stumps (DPE, 2025). Breeding occurs in territories ranging from 1.1 to 10.7 ha in size. There is potential for the species to utilise habitat associated with PCTs 3303, 3373 and PCT 3486, which account for 38.33 ha of the Project Area. However, design refinement has minimised impacts to native biodiversity and up to approximately 4.77 ha of woodland and scattered tree habitat is expected to be cleared within the Development Footprint.

The Likelihood of Occurrence assessment identified the Brown Treecreeper (south-eastern) as having the potential to occur within the Project Area. The species is highly detectable audibly and has not been identified during ecological surveys to date.

There are no BioNet records within 10 km of the Project Area (DPE, 2025). Diurnal bird surveys occurred in August 2025, December 2025 and January 2026. While the Brown Treecreeper was not a target species, it was not identified. The nearest Brown Treecreeper (south-eastern) population is approximately 20 km northeast, within the Nattai National Park. The species is unlikely to be dependent upon potential habitat within the Project Area, and any instances of records within the site are likely incidental.

The Significant Impact Assessment has considered the absence of the species following diurnal bird surveys and extensive vegetation surveys (that would have likely revealed the species had it been present). Further, the species is unlikely to be reliant on habitat present within the Development Footprint. However, there is low risk of potential future habitat for the Brown Treecreeper.

### 3.3.2.2 ASSESSMENT

The significant impact assessment for the Brown Treecreeper is provided in **Table 3-11.**

TABLE 3-11 SIGNIFICANT IMPACT ASSESSMENT FOR THE BROWNTREE CREEPER

| Criteria | Description | Criteria triggered? |
|---|---|---|
| *An action is likely to have a significant impact on a critically endangered or endangered species if there is a real chance or possibility that it will:* | | |
| Lead to a long-term decrease in the size of an | The estimated AoO for the species is 30,000 km$^2$, noting the reliability is low (Cwth DCCEEW, | Unlikely |

| Criteria | Description | Criteria triggered? |
|---|---|---|
| important population of a species<br>Reduce the area of occupancy of an important population<br>Fragment an existing important population into two or more populations | 2023b). Habitat loss and fragmentation are considered a threat to the species, especially as the species has low dispersal distances when compared to other avian species.<br><br>Any individuals that occur within the Project Area are likely to be incidental visitors and not dependent upon the Project Area for breeding or foraging. The design has been refined to minimise the extent of woodland habitat within the Development Footprint, further minimising potential impacts from fragmentation.<br><br>It is considered unlikely that the Project would lead to a long-term decrease in the size of an important population of this species, a reduction in the area of occupancy or fragmentation of an existing important population into two or more populations. | |
| Adversely affect habitat critical to the survival of a species | No Critical Habitat has been defined under section 207A of the EPBC Act. However, habitat critical to the survival of the Brown Treecreeper (south-eastern) listed under the Conservation Advice (Cwth DCCEEW, 2023b) includes areas with:<br>• Relatively undisturbed grassy woodland with native understorey;<br>  ◦ Habitat structure should be quite open at ground level so birds are able to feed on or near the ground and maintain vigilance against predators<br>  ◦ Moderate levels of disturbance by fire and / or grazing are most likely to create the required degree of openness<br>• Large living and dead trees essential for foraging and as roosting and nesting sites;<br>• Fallen timber which provides essential foraging habitat; and<br>• Hollows in standing dead or live trees and tree stumps are essential for nesting.<br><br>Any known or likely habitat is considered habitat critical to the survival of the subspecies, including areas not currently occupied due to recent disturbance which might be suitable in the future (Cwth DCCEEW, 2023b).<br><br>The Project will result in the potential disturbance of 4.77 ha of suitable habitat for the species, including hollow bearing trees identified within the Development Footprint during site surveys. This is not considered to be critical habitat. Management and mitigation measures will be further addressed within the EIS phase. | Unlikely |
| Disrupt the breeding cycle of an important population | As no individuals have been identified within or nearby the Project Area, and the nearest population of Brown Treecreepers (south-eastern) is within a well-connected National Park, it is considered unlikely that the Project | Unlikely |

| Criteria | Description | Criteria triggered? |
|---|---|---|
| | will disrupt the breeding cycle of an important population. | |
| Modify, destroy, remove or isolate or decrease the availability or quality of habitat to the extent that the species is likely to decline | Due to the proximity of well-connected woodland habitat within the Nattai National Park, Blue Mountains National Park, Guula Ngurra National Park, Wollondilly River Nature Reserve and other green spaces, any modification, destruction, removal, isolation or decrease in availability or quality of habitat is unlikely to cause the species to decline. | Unlikely |
| Result in invasive species that are harmful to a vulnerable species becoming established in the vulnerable species' habitat | As woodland birds predominantly foraging on the ground, Brown Treecreepers are vulnerable to predation by foxes (*Vulpes vulpes*) and cats (*Felis catus*). However, there are no known cases of predation on the species by cats and foxes, possibly due to alarm calling and group vigilance (Cwth DCCEEW, 2023b).<br><br>European rabbits (*Oryctolagus cuniculus*) also create pressure on the species by way of resource competition, land degradation and alteration of the vegetation's structure and composition (Cwth DCCEEW, 2023b). Further, the species can be negatively affected by the grazing pressure of overabundant kangaroos, preventing regeneration.<br><br>The Project is not expected to involve an increase in invasive species that may be harmful to the Brown Treecreeper. It is also anticipated the Project would include the development and implementation of weed and pest management plan. | Unlikely |
| Introduce disease that may cause the species to decline, or | There is no evidence of diseases with detrimental effects on the Brown Treecreeper.<br><br>Precautions would be taken to avoid the spread of disease and would be detailed in a Biosecurity Management Plan. | Unlikely |
| Interfere substantially with the recovery of the species. | There is no Recovery Plan developed for this species, and thus no specific recovery objectives. The species Conservation Advice lists several research, conservation and management actions that aim to stabilise or increase populations across its range.<br><br>It is considered unlikely that the proposed Project will interfere substantially with the recovery of the species. | Unlikely |
| **Conclusion: Unlikely** | | |

### 3.3.3 PINK-TAILED WORM-LIZARD

#### 3.3.3.1 SPECIES BACKGROUND

The Pink-tailed Worm-lizard (*Aprasia parapulchella*) is listed as Vulnerable under the EPBC Act.

Within NSW, the Pink-tailed Worm-lizard is only known from the Central and Southern tablelands, and the South Western Slopes of NSW (TSSC, 2015). This species inhabits sloping, open woodlands with native grassy ground layers, particularly dominated by Kangaroo Grass (*Themeda australis*). It prefers well-drained sites with rocky outcrops or partially-buried rocks and is commonly found beneath small rocks. The species spends significant time in burrows beneath these rocks, often constructed by ants and termites. It also occurs in other habitats, such as disturbed ant nests in chenopod shrubland on the Hay Plains and mallee woodland in the West Wyalong population.

Suitable habitat is present within the Project Area and includes three rocky areas located within PCTs 3373 and 3486. Assessment of this species within the EIS will be undertaken via an expert report. Capital Ecology has been approached to undertake site assessment and reporting. The expert report will be included as an appendix in the Biodiversity Development Assessment Report (BDAR). Any species polygons generated by this expert report would be included within the BAM-C.

There are no BioNet records of the species within 10 km of the Project Area, and the closest record of the species within the last 10 years is approximately 30 km away (DPE, 2025). At this early stage of the assessment and based on the lack of surrounding records, the significant impact assessment assumes a reduced likelihood of occurrence noting that an expert report is being prepared to confirm the presence or absence of the species.

#### 3.3.3.2 ASSESSMENT

A significant impact assessment for the Pink-tailed Worm Lizard in accordance with the SIG 1.1 is provided in **Table 3-12**

TABLE 3-12 SIGNIFICANT IMPACT ASSESSMENT FOR THE PINK-TAILED WORM-LIZARD

| Criteria | Description | Criteria triggered? |
|---|---|---|
| *An action is likely to have a significant impact on a critically endangered or endangered species if there is a real chance or possibility that it will:* | | |
| Lead to a long-term decrease in the size of an important population of a species | Specific population numbers are difficult to determine, the population density is apparently quite low expect in favorable habitats (ACT Government, 2017).<br><br>The suitable habitat within the Development Footprint would be defined as part of the EIS however it is considered unlikely that an important population occurs within or nearby the Project Area.<br><br>It is considered unlikely that the Project would decrease the size, reduce the occupancy or fragment any important population. | Unlikely |
| Reduce the area of occupancy of an important population | | Unlikely |
| Fragment an existing important population into two or more populations | | Unlikely |
| Adversely affect habitat critical to the survival of a species | It is considered unlikely that the potential habitat mapped within the Development Footprint is habitat critical to the survival of this species. | Unlikely |

| Criteria | Description | Criteria triggered? |
|---|---|---|
| | Suitable habitat includes three rocky areas located within PCTs 3373 and 3486. This habitat is present in moderate condition only and the Project is not expected to adversely affect habitat critical to the survival of the species. | |
| Disrupt the breeding cycle of an important population | The breeding ecology for this species is poorly understood, however it is thought that two eggs are laid inside ant nests during summer and the young first appear in March (TSSC, 2015).<br><br>Excessive earthworks may interfere with the species ability to disperse, find mates, and successfully breed, if the species is present.<br><br>These potential impacts are detrimental but it is considered unlikely that an important population occurs within the Project site. The Project is therefore unlikely to disrupt the breeding cycle of an important population. Further assessment would be conducted as part of the EIS phase. | Unlikely |
| Modify, destroy, remove or isolate or decrease the availability or quality of habitat to the extent that the species is likely to decline | The habitat present within the Development Footprint has historically been subject to disturbance and is largely fragmented. This potential habitat within the Project Area is unlikely to be impacted to the point where the species will experience decline. | Unlikely |
| Result in invasive species that are harmful to a vulnerable species becoming established in the vulnerable species' habitat | Feral cats (*Felis catus*) and Red foxes (*Vulpes vulpes*) as predators of this species (DPE, 2025).<br><br>It is considered unlikely that the proposed Project will result in the spread of invasive species. It is also anticipated the Project would include the development and implementation of weed and pest management plan. | Unlikely |
| Introduce disease that may cause the species to decline, or | There is not any evidence of any diseases being detrimental to the Pink-tailed Worm-lizard.<br><br>Precautions would be taken to avoid the spread of disease and would be detailed in a Biosecurity Management Plan. | Unlikely |
| Interfere substantially with the recovery of the species. | There is no Recovery Plan for this species, and thus no specific recovery objectives. The species Conservation Advice lists several research, conservation and management actions that aim to stabilise or increase populations across its range.<br><br>It is considered unlikely that the proposed Project will interfere substantially with the above objectives and recovery of the species. | Unlikely |
| Conclusion: **Unlikely** | | |

## 3.3.4 STRIPED LEGLESS LIZARD

### 3.3.4.1 SPECIES BACKGROUND

The Striped Legless Lizard (*Delma impar*) is listed as Vulnerable under the EPBC Act.

This species primarily inhabits Natural Temperate Grassland but can also be found in grasslands with a high exotic component, as well as secondary grassland near Natural Temperate Grassland and occasionally in open Box-Gum Woodland. Its habitat features perennial tussock-forming grasses like Kangaroo Grass (*Themeda australis*), spear-grasses (*Austrostipa* spp.), and poa tussocks (*Poa* spp.), with occasional wallaby grasses (*Austrodanthonia* spp.) (Cwth DCCEEW, 2025b). It may also occur in modified grasslands with significant exotic grasses and areas with surface rocks used for shelter, including dried cowpats. The species actively hunts spiders, crickets, moth larvae, and cockroaches. It lays two papery eggs in early summer and seeks refuge below ground or under rocks or logs during winter (Cwth DCCEEW, 2025c).

Approximately 13.96 ha of highly degraded, fragmented habitat is present within the Development Footprint associated with PCT 3373 (grasslands nearby grassy box-gum woodland). Habitat surveys combined with artificial cover surveys have been conducted and completed in Spring 2025 and Summer 2026. The Striped Legless Lizard was not recorded.

There have been no BioNet records of the species within 50 km of the Project Area (DPE, 2025). The closest records within the last 20 years are near Yass (over 140 km away from the Project Area). The significant impact assessment assumes a reduced likelihood of occurrence noting that targeted surveys are partially completed.

### 3.3.4.2 ASSESSMENT

A significant impact assessment for the Striped Legless Lizard in accordance with SIG 1.1 is provided in **Table 3-13**

TABLE 3-13 SIGNIFICANT IMPACT ASSESSMENT FOR THE STRIPED LEGLESS LIZARD

| Criteria | Description | Criteria triggered? |
|---|---|---|
| *An action is likely to have a significant impact on a critically endangered or endangered species if there is a real chance or possibility that it will:* | | |
| Lead to a long-term decrease in the size of an important population of a species | The Project Area does not fall within any of the listed important populations within the species Conservation Advice and there are no known records within 50 km of the Project Area, although the species is known to be cryptic (Cwth TSSC, 2015).<br><br>No individuals have been recorded during targeted searches and artificial cover surveys. Therefore, no population is present within the Development Footprint.<br><br>It is considered unlikely that the Project would decrease the size, reduce the occupancy or fragment any important population. | Unlikely |
| Reduce the area of occupancy of an important population | | Unlikely |
| Fragment an existing important population into two or more populations | | Unlikely |

| Criteria | Description | Criteria triggered? |
|---|---|---|
| Adversely affect habitat critical to the survival of a species | Habitat critical to the survival of the Striped Legless Lizard should include more than one of the following characteristics:<br>• Provides breeding habitat;<br>• Provides foraging habitat;<br>• Provides refuge from disturbance events;<br>• Provides for long term protection from development; and<br>• Has connectivity value and contributes to the evolutionary potential of the species in the wild across its natural geographical range.<br><br>As the species was absent, the 6.80 ha of highly degraded, fragmented habitat is present within the Development Footprint associated with PCT 3373 in a grassland condition is unlikely to the defined as critical habitat. | Unlikely |
| Disrupt the breeding cycle of an important population | Females lay two eggs per year between December and January. They lay their eggs under rocks, in soil cavities or within soil cracks. They sometimes lay their eggs in clutches of up to 36 eggs with other Striped Legless Lizards (Cwth TSSC, 2015). Eggs hatch between January and February, after approximately 50 days.<br><br>As no population was identified during targeted surveys, the Project is therefore unlikely to disrupt the breeding cycle of an important population. | Unlikely |
| Modify, destroy, remove or isolate or decrease the availability or quality of habitat to the extent that the species is likely to decline | The habitat present within the Development Footprint has historically been subject to disturbance and is largely fragmented. This potential habitat within the Project Area is unlikely to be impacted to the point where the species will experience decline, especially considering its low likelihood of occurrence. | Unlikely |
| Result in invasive species that are harmful to a vulnerable species becoming established in the vulnerable species' habitat | The Conservation Advice details predation by feral predators such as cats and foxes, and habitat degradation via weed invasion as two main threats to the species (Cwth DCCEEW, 2021). Exotic species including African lovegrass (*Eragrostis curvula*) and Serrated tussock (*Nassella trichotoma*) outcompete natural grasses and degrade suitable habitat.<br><br>It is considered unlikely that the Project would result in the spread of invasive species that are harmful to the Striped Legless Lizard. It is also anticipated the Project would include the development and implementation of weed and pest management plan. | Unlikely |
| Introduce disease that may cause the species to decline, or | The species' Conservation Advice (Cwth DCCEEW, 2021) does not list any diseases that are detrimental to the Striped Legless Lizard.<br><br>Precautions would be taken to avoid the spread of disease and would be detailed in a Biosecurity Management Plan. | Unlikely |
| Interfere substantially with the recovery of the species. | A Recovery Plan is no longer required as of 28/03/2022 as threats and recovery actions are largely being addressed via existing mechanisms (Cwth DCCEEW, 2025c). | Unlikely |

| Criteria | Description | Criteria triggered? |
|---|---|---|
| | The species Conservation Advice lists several research, conservation and management actions that aim to stabilise or increase populations across its range.<br><br>It is considered unlikely that the proposed Project will interfere substantially with the above objectives and recovery of the species. | |
| Conclusion: **Unlikely** | | |

## 3.3.5 RUFOUS POMADERRIS

### 3.3.5.1 SPECIES BACKGROUND

Rufous Pomaderris (*Pomaderris brunnea*) is listed as Vulnerable under the EPBC Act.

There is limited information about the habitat of Rufous Pomaderris. Within NSW, the species occurs in moist woodland or forest on clay and alluvial soils of flood plains and creek lines in relatively damp habitats, as well as on ridgetops and plateau in relatively dry habitats (Cwth DCCEEW, 2021). The species has also been found in association with *Eucalyptus amplifolia*, *Angophora floribunda*, *Acacia parramattensis*, *Bursaria spinosa*, and *Kunzea ambigua* (Cwth DCCEEW, 2021).

There are no BioNet records within 10 km of the Project Area (DPE, 2025). There are very few records of the species in the wider region, with the nearest observation approximately 6 km from the Project Area. Rufous Pomaderris is not associated with any of the PCTs located on site.

Rufous Pomaderris has not been identified on site during BAM plots nor targeted transecting. Approximately 54 km of threatened flora transects were conducted in September 2025. The species was not identified.

### 3.3.5.2 ASSESSMENT

A significant impact assessment for the Rufous Pomaderris in accordance with the SIG 1.1 is provided in **Table 3-14**

TABLE 3-14 SIGNIFICANT IMPACT ASSESSMENT FOR THE RUFOUS POMADERRIS

| Criteria | Description | Criteria triggered? |
|---|---|---|
| *An action is likely to have a significant impact on a critically endangered or endangered species if there is a real chance or possibility that it will:* | | |
| Lead to a long-term decrease in the size of an important population of a species | There is insufficient data to describe important populations of the species, and as such, all populations are considered important (Cwth DCCEEW, 2021).<br><br>Rufous Pomaderris has not been observed on site during targeted flora surveys and records are limited within NSW.<br><br>In the unlikely event the species is identified to be present, there is a potential that the Project would result in a decrease in population size, reduce the area of occupancy, and / or fragment an existing important population. However, mitigation measures would be put in place to reduce potential impacts and any residual impacts will be assessed during the EIS phase. | Unlikely |
| Reduce the area of occupancy of an important population | | |
| Fragment an existing important population into two or more populations | | |
| Adversely affect habitat critical to the survival of a species | The Conservation Advice states that all habitat for this species is considered important, due to a lack of data (Cwth DCCEEW, 2021).<br><br>There are no PCTs associated with the species present within the Project Area it is unlikely that | Unlikely |

| Criteria | Description | Criteria triggered? |
|---|---|---|
| | the Project will adversely affect habitat critical to the species' survival.<br><br>Management and mitigation measures will be further addressed within the EIS phase, where required. | |
| Disrupt the breeding cycle of an important population | There is limited information on the reproductive ecology of Rufous Pomaderris, however any significant impacts to the species' critical habitat would likely disrupt the population's breeding cycle.<br><br>There are no PCTs associated with the species present within the Project Area and the species was not identified during flora transects. It is therefore unlikely that the Project will disrupt the breeding cycle of an important population, if present.<br><br>Management and mitigation measures will be further addressed within the EIS phase, where required. | Unlikely |
| Modify, destroy, remove or isolate or decrease the availability or quality of habitat to the extent that the species is likely to decline | Land clearing is a major threat to Rufous Pomaderris (Cwth DCCEEW, 2021).<br><br>Areas of suitable habitat along St Pauls Creek have largely been excluded from the Development Footprint and the EIS will address potential indirect impacts such as sedimentation, erosion and runoff within the retained habitats.<br><br>It is unlikely that the Project would result in a reduction in area or quality of habitat to the extent that the species is likely to decline. | Unlikely |
| Result in invasive species that are harmful to a vulnerable species becoming established in the vulnerable species' habitat | Weeds are a known threat to Rufous Pomaderris, with several NSW subpopulations experiencing increased competition from Cape Ivy (*Delairea odorata*), African Olive (*Olea europaea*), African Lovegrass (*Eragrostis curvula*) (Cwth DCCEEW, 2021). Weed threats to most subpopulations are poorly known, however, due to a lack of data.<br><br>It is not expected that the Project would introduce invasive species. It is also anticipated the Project would include the development and implementation of weed and pest management plan. | Unlikely |
| Introduce disease that may cause the species to decline, or | There is currently limited evidence of diseases causing detrimental effects on the Rufous Pomaderris.<br><br>Precautions would be taken to avoid the spread of disease and would be detailed in a Biosecurity Management Plan. | Unlikely |
| Interfere substantially with the recovery of the species. | There is no Recovery Plan currently in place for this species, and thus no specific recovery objectives. The species Conservation Advice lists several research, conservation and management | Unlikely |

| Criteria | Description | Criteria triggered? |
|---|---|---|
| | actions that aim to stabilise or increase populations across its range.<br><br>It is considered unlikely that the proposed Project would interfere substantially with the recovery of the species. | |
| **Conclusion: Unlikely** | | |

# 4. REFERENCES

ACT City and Environment Directorate. (2025, July 1). *Key's Matchstick Grasshopper (Keyacris scurra)*. Retrieved from ACT Government - Environment: https://www.act.gov.au/environment/animals-and-plants/act-threatened-species/keys-matchstick-grasshopper-keyacris-scurra

ACT Government. (2017). *Action Plan Pink-tailed Worm-lizard Aprasia parapulchella.* Canberra: ACT Government.

Cwth DCCEEW. (2021). *Conservation Advice for Pomaderris brunnea (Rufous Pomaderris).* Canberra.

Cwth DCCEEW. (2021, October 10). *National Recovery Plan for the Striped Legless Lizard (Delma impar) 1999-2003, updated 2021*. Retrieved from Australian Government Department of Climate Change, Energy, the Environment and Water: https://www.dcceew.gov.au/environment/biodiversity/threatened/recovery-plans/striped-legless-lizard-delma-impar-1999-2003

Cwth DCCEEW. (2023a). *Conservation Advice for Melanodryas cucullata cucullata (hooded robin (south-eastern))*. Retrieved from https://www.environment.gov.au/biodiversity/threatened/species/pubs/67093-conservation-advice-31032023.pdf

Cwth DCCEEW. (2023b). *Conservation Advice for Climacteris picumnus victoriae (Brown Treecreeper (south-eastern)).* Canberra.

Cwth DCCEEW. (2023b). *Conservation Advice for Stagonopleura guttata (diamond firetail).* Canberra.

Cwth DCCEEW. (2023c). *Conservation Advice for the White Box-Yellow Box-Blakely's Red Gum Grassy Woodland and Derived Native Grassland.*

Cwth DCCEEW. (2025). *Species Profile and Threats Database*. Retrieved from Dasyurus maculatus maculatus (SE mainland population) — Spot-tailed Quoll, Spotted-tail Quoll, Tiger Quoll (southeastern mainland population) SPRAT Profile: http://www.environment.gov.au/cgi-bin/sprat/public/publicspecies.pl?taxon_id=75184

Cwth DCCEEW. (2025b). *Delma impar — Striped Legless Lizard, Striped Snake-lizard*. Retrieved from Species Profile and Threats Database: https://www.environment.gov.au/cgi-bin/sprat/public/publicspecies.pl?taxon_id=1649

Cwth DCCEEW. (2025c). *Delma impar — Striped Legless Lizard, Striped Snake-lizard*. Retrieved from Species Profile and Threats Database: https://www.environment.gov.au/cgi-bin/sprat/public/publicspecies.pl?taxon_id=1649

Cwth DoE. (2013). *MNES Significant Impact Guidelines 1.1 EPBC Act.* Canberrra: Department of Environment Commonwealth of Australia. Retrieved from https://www.dcceew.gov.au/sites/default/files/documents/nes-guidelines_1.pdf

Cwth TSSC. (2015). *Conservation Advice for Delma impar.*

DAWE. (2021). *Conservation Advice for Pomaderris cotoneaster (Cotoneaster Pomaderris).* Canberra: Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment.

DAWE. (2021). *National recovery plan for the Cotoneaster Pomaderris (Pomaderris cotoneaster).* Canberra: Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment.

DAWE. (2022). *Conservation Advice for Callocephalon fimbriatum (Gang-gang Cockatoo).* Canberra: Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment. .

DEH. (2006). *White Box-Yellow Box-Blakely's Red Gum grassy woodlands and derived grasslands Policy Statement.* Commonwealth Department of Environment and Heritage.

Department of Environment, Land, Water and Planning. (2016). *National Recovery Plan for the Spotted-tailed Quoll Dasyurus maculatus.* Canberra: Australian Government.

DPE. (2025). *BioNet Atlas*. Retrieved September 7, 2025, from Species Sighting Search: https://atlas.bionet.nsw.gov.au/UI_Modules/ATLAS_/atlasreport.aspx

ERM. (2025). *Likelihood of Occurrence Assessment - Swallow Tail BESS.* Sydney: Prepared for AMPYR Australia Pty Ltd.

ERM. (2025b). *Swallow Tail Battery Energy Storage System Land Categorisation Assessment Report.* Sydney: Prepared for AMPYR.

Holocene Ecology. (2025). *Swallow Tail BESS Land Category Assessment.*

Hunter, D., & Smith, M. J. (2013). MULTISCALE HABITAT ASSESSMENT FOR THE ENDANGERED BOOROOLONG FROG (LITORIA BOOROOLONGENSIS): IMPLICATIONS FOR THREATENED SPECIES MANAGEMENT IN THE RURAL LANDSCAPE OF SOUTHEASTERN AUSTRALIA. *Herpetological Conservation and Biology, 8*(1), 122-130.

NSW DCCEEW. (2021). *White Box-Yellow Box-Blakely's Red Gum Grassy Woodland and Derived Native Grassland National Recovery Plan.* Canberra: Cwth DCCEEW.

NSW OEH. (2012). *National Recovery Plan for Booroolong Frog (Litoria booroolongensis).* Hurstville: Office of Environment and Heritage (NSW).

NSW OEH. (2017, December 1). *Booroolong Frog - threatened species profile*. Retrieved from NSW OEH: https://threatenedspecies.bionet.nsw.gov.au/profile?id=10484

NSW OEH. (2023, December 01). *Threatened species search - South-eastern Hooded Robin*. Retrieved from NSW Office of Environment & Heritage: https://threatenedspecies.bionet.nsw.gov.au/profile?id=10519#:~:text=Often%20perches%20on%20low%20dead,November%2C%20often%20rearing%20several%20broods.

NSW OEH. (2025, June 3). *Buttercup Doubletail - Threatened Species Profile*. Retrieved from NSW Office of Environment & Heritage: https://threatenedspecies.bionet.nsw.gov.au/profile?id=10235

NSW Scientific Committee. (2008). *Hooded Robin Melanodryas cucullata cucullata – Populations in Eastern Bioregions Review of Current Information in NSW.* Hurstville: NSW Scientific Committee.

NSW Threatened Species Scientific Committee . (2021). *Conservation Advice Litoria booroolongensis Booroolong Frog.* Retrieved from http://www.environment.gov.au/biodiversity/threatened/species/pubs/1844-conservation-advice-19102021.pdf

NSW TSSC. (2020). *Conservation Advice Dasyurus maculatus maculatus (southeastern mainland population) Spotted-tailed Quoll, south eastern mainland.* Canberra: Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment.

NSW TSSC. (2021). *Conservation Advice Diuris aequalis Buttercup Doubletail.* Canberra: Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment.

NSW TSSC. (2022). *Conservation Advice Keyacris scurra Key's matchstick grasshopper.* Canberra: Department of Climate Change, Energy, the Environment and Water.

Threatened Species Scientific Committee. (2015). *Conservation Advice Aprasia parapulchella Pink-tailed worm-lizard.* Department of the Environment .

Tozer, M., & Simpson, C. (2020). *Conservation Assessment of White Box – Yellow Box – Blakely's Red Gum Grassy Woodland and Derived Native Grassland.* Sydney: NSW Threatened Species Scientific Committee.

TSSC. (2006). *Advice to the Minister for the Environment and Heritage from the Threatened Species Scientific Committee (TSSC) on Amendments to the List of Ecological Communities under the Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999 (EPBC Act).* Department of Environment, Water, Heritage and the Arts.

TSSC. (2006). *Commonwealth Listing Advice on White Box-Yellow Box-Blakely's Red Gum Grassy Woodland and Derived Native Grassland. .* Canberra: Australian Government Department of Climate Change, Energy, the Environment and Water.

TSSC. (2015). *Conservation Advice for Aprasia parapulchella.* Department of the Environment.

# APPENDIX A BIONET ATLAS SEARCH

Data from the BioNet Atlas website, which holds records from a number of custodians. The data are only indicative and cannot be considered a comprehensive inventory, and may contain errors and omissions. Species listed under the Sensitive Species Data Policy may have their locations denatured (^ rounded to 0.1°C; ^^ rounded to 0.01°C. Copyright the State of NSW through the Department of Planning, Industry and Environment. Search criteria : Licensed Report of all Valid Records of Threatened (listed on BC Act 2016) ,Commonwealth listed ,CAMBA listed ,JAMBA listed or ROKAMBA listed Entities in selected area [North: -34.32 West: 149.95 East: 150.16 South: -34.54] recorded since 01 Jan 2005 until 07 Sep 2025 returned a total of 1,421 records of 30 species.
Report generated on 7/09/2025 7:08 PM

| Kingdom | Class | Family | Species Code | Scientific Name | Exotic | Common Name | NSW status | Comm. status | Records | Info |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Animalia | Aves | Accipitridae | 0226 | *Haliaeetus leucogaster* | | White-bellied Sea-Eagle | V,P | | 2 | |
| Animalia | Aves | Accipitridae | 0225 | *Hieraaetus morphnoides* | | Little Eagle | V,P | | 3 | |
| Animalia | Aves | Falconidae | 0238 | *Falco subniger* | | Black Falcon | V,P | | 1 | |
| Animalia | Aves | Cacatuidae | 0268 | *Callocephalon fimbriatum* | | Gang-gang Cockatoo | E1,P,3 | E | 46 | |
| Animalia | Aves | Cacatuidae | 8862 | ^^*Calyptorhynchus lathami lathami* | | South-eastern Glossy Black-Cockatoo | V,P,2 | V | 66 | |
| Animalia | Aves | Psittacidae | 0302 | *Neophema pulchella* | | Turquoise Parrot | V,P,3 | | 4 | |
| Animalia | Aves | Strigidae | 0248 | *Ninox strenua* | | Powerful Owl | V,P,3 | | 7 | |
| Animalia | Aves | Tytonidae | 0250 | *Tyto novaehollandiae* | | Masked Owl | V,P,3 | | 4 | |
| Animalia | Aves | Acanthizidae | 0504 | *Pyrrholaemus sagittatus* | | Speckled Warbler | V,P | | 8 | |
| Animalia | Aves | Meliphagidae | 8303 | *Melithreptus gularis gularis* | | Black-chinned Honeyeater (eastern subspecies) | V,P | | 1 | |
| Animalia | Aves | Neosittidae | 0549 | *Daphoenositta chrysoptera* | | Varied Sittella | V,P | | 6 | |
| Animalia | Aves | Artamidae | 8519 | *Artamus cyanopterus cyanopterus* | | Dusky Woodswallow | V,P | | 21 | |
| Animalia | Aves | Petroicidae | 8367 | *Melanodryas cucullata cucullata* | | South-eastern Hooded Robin | E1,P | E | 3 | |
| Animalia | Aves | Petroicidae | 0380 | *Petroica boodang* | | Scarlet Robin | V,P | | 23 | |
| Animalia | Aves | Petroicidae | 0382 | *Petroica phoenicea* | | Flame Robin | V,P | | 2 | |
| Animalia | Aves | Estrildidae | 0652 | *Stagonopleura guttata* | | Diamond Firetail | V,P | V | 16 | |
| Animalia | Mammalia | Phascolarctidae | 1162 | *Phascolarctos cinereus* | | Koala | E1,P | E | 912 | |
| Animalia | Mammalia | Burramyidae | 1150 | *Cercartetus nanus* | | Eastern Pygmy-possum | V,P | | 7 | |
| Animalia | Mammalia | Petauridae | 1136 | *Petaurus australis* | | Yellow-bellied Glider | V,P | V | 1 | |
| Animalia | Mammalia | Petauridae | 1137 | *Petaurus norfolcensis* | | Squirrel Glider | V,P | | 5 | |
| Animalia | Mammalia | Pseudocheiridae | 1133 | *Petauroides volans* | | Southern Greater Glider | E1,P | E | 24 | |
| Animalia | Mammalia | Pteropodidae | 1280 | *Pteropus poliocephalus* | | Grey-headed Flying-fox | V,P | V | 4 | |
| Animalia | Mammalia | Vespertilionidae | 1353 | *Chalinolobus dwyeri* | | Large-eared Pied Bat | E1,P | E | 5 | |
| Animalia | Mammalia | Vespertilionidae | 1372 | *Falsistrellus tasmaniensis* | | Eastern False Pipistrelle | V,P | | 7 | |
| Animalia | Mammalia | Vespertilionidae | 1357 | *Myotis macropus* | | Southern Myotis | V,P | | 1 | |
| Animalia | Mammalia | Vespertilionidae | 1361 | *Scoteanax rueppellii* | | Greater Broad-nosed Bat | V,P | | 3 | |
| Animalia | Mammalia | Miniopteridae | 3330 | *Miniopterus orianae oceanensis* | | Large Bent-winged Bat | V,P | | 8 | |
| Plantae | Flora | Proteaceae | 8997 | *Persoonia mollis subsp. revoluta* | | | V,P | V | 91 | |
| Plantae | Flora | Rhamnaceae | 5576 | *Pomaderris cotoneaster* | | Cotoneaster Pomaderris | E1 | E | 125 | |
| Plantae | Flora | Solanaceae | 14044 | *Solanum armourense* | | | E1 | | 15 | |

ERM HAS OVER 140 OFFICES ACROSS THE FOLLOWING COUNTRIES AND TERRITORIES WORLDWIDE

Argentina
Australia
Belgium
Brazil
Canada
China
Colombia
Denmark
France
Germany
Hong Kong
India
Indonesia
Ireland
Italy
Japan
Kazakhstan
Kenya
Malaysia
Mexico
Mozambique
Netherlands
New Zealand
Panama
Peru
Poland
Portugal
Romania
Singapore
South Africa
South Korea
Spain
Switzerland
Taiwan
Thailand
UAE
UK
US
Vietnam

**ERM's Sydney Office**
Level 14
207 Kent Street
Sydney NSW 2000

T: +61 02 8584 8888
**www.erm.com**