

# Kin Kin Road, Sallwood Court to Turnbull Road, Strengthening and Pavement Widening Project.

Application Number: **03253**

Commencement Date:

Status: **Locked**

**04/12/2025**

---

## 1. About the project

### 1.1 Project details

#### 1.1.1 Project title \*

Kin Kin Road, Sallwood Court to Turnbull Road, Strengthening and Pavement Widening Project

#### 1.1.2 Project industry type \*

Transport - Land

#### 1.1.3 Project industry sub-type

Road

#### 1.1.4 Estimated start date \*

04/01/2027

#### 1.1.4 Estimated end date \*

01/07/2027

## 1.2 Proposed Action details

### **1.2.1 Provide an overview of the proposed action, including all proposed activities. \***

### Proposed action description

The State of Queensland represented by the Department of Transport and Main Roads (TMR) is proposing to upgrade a section of Kin Kin Road, Sallwood Court to Turnbull Road, chainage 41.78-42.37km (Refer to **Attachment 1 Project area and local context map**). The proposed works include earthworks, widening of pavement, pavement rehabilitation, upgrades to drainage networks, installation of road furniture and line marking updates for improved safety.

### Purpose of proposed action

Kin Kin Road (locally known as Pomona Kin Kin Road) is the main haul route for Kin Kin Quarry. Since the commencement of quarry operations in 2013, TMR has received ongoing community feedback regarding safety concerns with the increase in heavy vehicles using the link and the consequent degradation of Kin Kin Road. The existing cross section of Kin Kin Road features a narrow formation with limited shoulders. Residents have reported quarry trucks crossing the road centreline into oncoming traffic on curves, as traffic lanes are narrow and there is no existing curve widening. Without shoulders available to drivers, there is limited opportunity to create safe separation from heavy vehicles. The increase in heavy vehicles has also significantly degraded the condition of the pavement. The existing pavement is at the end of its design life and requires intervention.

The road comprises of a narrow sealed existing cross section (5.5-7m) amongst steep and undulating terrain with tight existing horizontal and vertical curves. The roadside environment is densely vegetated close to the existing edge of pavement.

- Kin Kin road has adequate pavement and shoulder widths south of Pomona, however sections north of Pomona have a winding undulating alignment with inadequate seal and shoulder widths in numerous sections. The roadside environment contains several hazards within the clear zone, steep batters, power poles, culvert headwalls and large trees presenting a hazard to errant vehicles.
- The pavement condition is poor in numerous locations, with severe rutting and early signs of failure observed on some sections. This is reflected in the high roughness counts recorded on Kin Kin Road. This issue is compounded by lack of stopping sight distance on horizontal curves due to embankments, vegetation and other hazards within the clear zone.
- TMR has received ongoing community concern regarding the condition of the road, in particular relating to safety concerns associated with an increase in heavy vehicles using Kin Kin Road to access Kin Kin Quarry. In response to the community concern, speed limits on the range were reduced from 100 km/h to 60 km/h in 2011.
- In 2013, the Sunshine Coast Regional Council approved an application to make Kin Kin Road the main haul route for Kin Kin Quarry. The quarry's management plan states that annual production may require up to 100 heavy vehicle trips per day, each way. This resulted in further expression of concern to the DTMR regarding the quarry and the existing condition of Kin Kin Road.
- Use of this road by quarry vehicles is expected to accelerate the rate of deterioration and intervention is likely to be required to maintain an acceptable level of service and safety for road users. The expected increase in the number of trucks on this section of road will also result in increased risk of incidents during operations, particularly when large trucks and school buses are passing each other on the tight horizontal curves.
- The State has secured separate funding for each section to allowing flexibility in response to changing economic conditions and budgets, risk management, local priorities and minimise disruptions to community.

### Proposed action activities

The scope of work for the Project includes:

- Carriage way widening and pavement rehabilitation works and drainage upgrades between chainage 41.78-42.37km (approximately 590m long)

- To achieve a minimum 8m wide cross section whilst minimising land take and earthworks, steep excavation works (up to 4m high and 1:1 steep) and embankment works (up to 8m high and 1:2 steep) have been proposed in concentrated areas of the alignment (approximately 200m long each)
- Five existing 375mm diameter culverts are proposed to be removed as part of the works and replaced with three new culverts (of generally larger size) with inlet and outlet enhancements, including new headwalls and scour protection
- To facilitate high flow volumes in a constrained space, shotcrete table drains have been adopted along one side of the carriageway, as well as a concrete table drain and batter chute system as part of the primary cutting at the start of the alignment
- Modifications to local accesses and the inclusion of guardrail has been introduced to further enhance safety.

Industry standard construction equipment is anticipated to be used during the construction phase of the Project. Site offices, stockpiles and laydown areas will be located in previously cleared areas within the existing road reserve.

The 'Project area' (i.e. proposed action) is the area along Kin Kin Road, Sallwood Court to Turnbull Road (Chainage 41.78-42.37km) where all works are likely to be undertaken and potential impacts may occur. The Project area boundary reflects the design footprint and encompasses the area expected to be cleared during construction activities.

The 'Survey area' refers to the area nominated to be surveyed by ecologists. This is generally taken to be a 100m buffer from the edge of works to adequately capture ecological attributes adjacent to the construction limits and includes the associated Project area (Refer to **Attachment 1 Project area and local context map**).

### **1.2.2 Is the project action part of a staged development or related to other actions or proposals in the region?**

Yes

### **1.2.3 Is the proposed action the first stage of a staged development (or a larger project)?**

Yes

### **1.2.5 Provide information about the staged development (or relevant larger project).**

TMR's current proposed action is to upgrade two sections of Kin Kin Road, approximately 2.2km apart, involving similar scopes of works:

- Williams Road to Western Branch Road is located at Chainage 37.8 – 39.6km, with proposed construction in 2027/2028
- Sallwood Court and Turnbull Road (this Project) is located at Chainage 41.78 – 42.37km, with proposed construction in 2027

Based on significant impact assessments undertaken, the following was determined:

- No significant impacts were determined for Sallwood Court to Turnbull Road (referred action)
- Significant impacts were identified for Williams Road to Western Branch Road (related action)

An assessment against the criteria detailed in the *EPBC Act Policy Statement – Staged Development – Split referrals: Section 74A of the EPBC Act* has been completed for the project to demonstrate why both projects are being referred as a split referral and summarised as below.

### **Criteria 1 - Determine if there is a larger action**

#### ***What is the larger action?***

Both projects, Williams Road to Western Branch Road, chainage 37.8km-39.6km and Sallwood Court to Turnbull Road, chainage 41.78km-42.37km (this Project) form part of expected upgrades to Kin Kin Road, involving widening to facilitate increased quarry traffic and safety concerns.

The roadside environment contains several hazards within the clear zone, steep batters, power poles, culvert headwalls and large trees presenting a safety hazard to errant vehicles.

Use of this road by quarry vehicles is expected to accelerate the rate of deterioration and intervention is required to maintain an acceptable level of service and safety for road users. The expected increase in the number of trucks on this section of road will also result in increased risk of incidents during operations, particularly when large trucks and school buses are passing each other on the tight horizontal curves.

#### ***Can the referred action stand alone?***

Yes.

The two projects are approximately 2.2km apart and to be delivered with separate timeframes, separate government funding sources and separate construction tenders (and thus likely separate contractors).

Pending the EPBC Act referral determination, the referred action (Sallwood Court to Turnbull Road) may be tendered for construction first, while approvals for Williams Road to Western Branch Road are being finalised. Overall, the referred action (Sallwood Court and Turnbull Road) does not require the related action (Williams Road to Western Branch Road) to be taken before or after the proposed action to be viable, therefore it is a standalone action.

#### ***Are the referred action and related actions co-dependent***

No

The two projects are not co-dependent and will be delivered as distinct packages from TMR.

Each Project will proceed under its own delivery framework, with separate contract tendering processes and timeframes, specifically:

- The referred action, Sallwood Court to Turnbull Road – scheduled for construction between in 2027
- The related action, The Williams Road to Western Branch Road project – proposed to commence between 2027 – 2028.

The separation in government funding, timeframes and procurement confirm that the two projects are operationally and financially independent and neither rely upon the completion or progression of the other.

In addition, the Project can operate independently (indefinitely) without the construction of the Williams Road to Western Branch Road Project. A planned future separate assessment and referral of Williams Road to Western Branch Road is not anticipated to influence the potential environmental impacts considered in Sallwood Court to Turnbull Road.

***What is the timeframe between the referred action and the related action?***

The proposed timeframes are shown below for the referred action and related action:

- Sallwood Court to Turnbull Road:
  - Initial Planning: 2014-2015
  - Preliminary Design: 2023
  - Detailed Design: 2024-2025
  - Estimated construction: 2027
- Williams Road to Western Branch Road
  - Initial Planning: 2014-2015
  - Preliminary Design: 2023
  - Detailed Design: 2024-2025
  - Estimated construction: 2027/2028

***What is the geographical relationship between the referred action and the related action?***

The two projects are located within two sections of Kin Kin Road, approximately 2.2km apart:

- Sallwood Court to Turnbull Road – located at chainage 41.78-42.37km
- Williams Road to Western Branch Road – located at chainage 37.8-39.6km

***Is there an overall plan or vision for the larger action and does that plan encompass the referred action?***

Both projects, Williams Road to Western Branch Road, chainage 37.8km-39.6km and Sallwood Court to Turnbull Road, chainage 41.78km-42.37km (this Project) form part of expected upgrades to Kin Kin Road, involving widening to facilitate increased quarry traffic and safety concerns. However, there is no overall plan in existence with planning documentation for a number of related actions.

Sallwood Court to Turnbull Road is not in scope of the Williams Road to Western Branch Road project (and vice versa) and therefore is not within the same planning documentation or design drawings.

***Are the actions authorised by a single local government or State/Territory permit, licence or other authorisation?***

Both the referred action (Sallwood Court to Turnbull Road) and the related action (Williams Road to Western Branch Road) will be delivered by Queensland State Government (TMR). However, they are not authorised by a single local government or state permit, licence or other authorisation.

***Will the action be financed from a single funding source?***

No, the two projects will be delivered by separate government funding. TMR has secured separate funding for each project to allow flexibility in response to changing economic conditions and budgets, risk management, local priorities and minimise disruptions to community.

Sallwood Court to Turnbull Road has its own individual project number and is funded under the Queensland Transport and Road Investment Program (QTRIP) with a budget of \$12.5 million (Investment ID 2383345) under the State Road Network Upgrades program.

Williams Road to Western Branch Road has its own individual project number and is funded under the Queensland Transport and Road Investment Program (QTRIP) with a budget of \$25.2 million (Investment ID 2383346) under the State Road Network Upgrades program.

***Criteria 2 –Determine if the Minister’s discretion not to accept the referral should be exercised***

***Can the impacts of Part 3 matters only be assessed through the consideration of a larger action***

Separate referral of the action and the related action would not result in inadequate consideration of the projects' impact on MNES.

There are considerable differences in impacts to MNES for each Project:

- The referred action, Sallwood Court to Turnbull Road – assessed as unlikely to have significant impact on any MNES. Refer to Question 4.1.4 for more details of the impacts to MNES for the referred action.
- The Williams Road to Western Branch Road project – assessed as likely to have significant impacts on MNES (Lowland Rainforest of Subtropical Australia TEC, *Xanthostemon oppositifolius* (southern penda) and Giant barred frog (*Mixophyes iteratus*)). The Project will be referred under the EPBC Act and TMR is working with Noosa Council and other major landholders to identify suitable offset sites and has established possible offset sites for the Williams Road to Western Branch Road, to offset the potential significant impacts from this project.

***Will the referral of a series of single actions result in the larger action being effectively taken without the need for an approval***

No, the projects are not co-dependent.

Each project has been designed to be independently viable as separate packages and can proceed in isolation without reliance on the other action for functionality, funding or delivery.

Based on the assessment that significant impacts on MNES are considered unlikely', the referred project is likely to be determined 'not a controlled action' under the EPBC Act; whereas the related project is expected to be determined as a 'controlled action' based on the SIA for a number of MNES, potentially requiring further assessments and/or approval by DCCEEW.

The referral of these actions as separate projects does not result in a larger action being undertaken without approval, as each action will be assessed in accordance with requirements under the EPBC Act.

***Is it preferable to assess and approve the larger action as a whole?***

Separate referral or split referral will not prevent sufficient assessment of the impacts of a larger action and that splitting the actions will not reduce the ability to achieve the objects of the EPBC Act. However, by progressing with this action, the proponent will be in a position to act on the safety concerns sooner with regards to the deteriorating condition of the road which would not be the case if the larger action was referred. The related action will still be referred and there will be an opportunity for further assessment and approval if determined necessary.

***Policy considerations***

As standalone projects, both projects are consistent with the objectives of the EPBC Act.

***Another related project:***

In addition to the referred and related projects that are discussed above, a previous project was undertaken by TMR on Kin Kin Road. This project, referred under the EPBC Act as Referral 2021/9116, involved the widening of pavement and shoulder along Kin Kin Road, Turnbull Road to Williams Road, between Chainage 39.1km to Chainage 40.35km.

The referral (2021/9116) was assessed by the Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment (DAWE), which determined on 3 February 2022 that the proposed action was not a controlled action. The construction of this Project was completed in 2023.

**1.2.6 What Commonwealth or state legislation, planning frameworks or policy documents are relevant to the proposed action, and how are they relevant? \***

## Commonwealth requirements

A self-assessment of significant impacts has been undertaken for the Project and determined that the project is unlikely to result in a significant impact to Commonwealth matters of national environmental significance (MNES). Nevertheless, in recognition of the presence of MNES within the broader survey area and the environmental sensitivity of the locality, the proponent has adopted a precautionary approach by referring the project to the Department of Climate Change, Energy, the Environment and Water (DCCEEW).

The following Commonwealth legislation is applicable:

- *Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999* (EPBC Act)
- Environmental Offsets Policy 2012 under the EPBC Act

## TMR process

The Project has broadly followed TMR's internal assessment process.

Ecological surveys were undertaken for the Project to identify vegetation communities, fauna habitat and threatened species and to support ecological impact assessment. The outcomes and assessment are detailed in the Ecological Assessment Report (EcAR) (Arup 2025) (refer to **Attachment 2 Ecological Assessment Report (Arup 2025)**).

A Significant Impact Assessment Technical Memo (Arup 2025) (Refer to **Attachment 3 Significant Impact Assessment Technical Memo (Arup 2025)**) was prepared for the project to document the results from the significant impact assessments (SIAs) undertaken against the Department of Environment's Significant Impact Guidelines 1.1 (DoE, 2013) for all MNES protected under the EPBC Act that are identified as having 'known' or 'high' likelihood of occurrence from the likelihood of occurrence assessment.

A Matters of National Environmental Significance Report (**Attachment 4 Matters of National Environmental Significance Report (Arup 2025)**) was prepared for the project to identify and assess potential impacts on MNES that are relevant to the project.

## State Planning Requirements

The following Queensland legislation is also applicable for the project:

- *Planning Act 2016* and Planning Regulation 2017 - Queensland's principal planning and development legislation. It provides a framework for integrated and coordinated assessment of new developments to ensure its impacts are managed in a way that is ecologically sustainable.
- The *Vegetation Management Act 1999* (VM Act) regulates the clearing of regulated vegetation in Queensland, such as the clearing of mapped remnant and/or high-value regrowth vegetation. Where the proposed action is 'government supported transport infrastructure', the clearing of vegetation for the infrastructure is exempt from requiring a development approval under Schedule 21, Part 1, Item 14(b) of the Planning Regulation 2017.
- *Environmental Protection Act 1994* (EP Act)- the EP Act provides for protection of Queensland's environment while allowing for development that improves the total quality of life, both now and in the future in a way that maintains the ecological processes on which life depends. TMR is subject to the general environmental duties under the EP Act. Application of TMR's Environmental Processes Manual could be expected to enable TMR to demonstrate that it meets the general environmental duty under the Act.
- *Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Act 2003* (ACH Act) – Under the ACH Act, all persons have a duty of care to take all reasonable and practical measures not to harm Aboriginal cultural heritage. A Cultural Heritage Field Agreement (CHFA) (dated 21 December 2023) was obtained for the Project between TMR and the Kabi Kabi First Nation Traditional Owners Native Title Claim Group. TMR to implement its technical specification MRTS 51 Environmental Management for project activities, which set out the process for the discovery of potential cultural heritage finds.

- *Biosecurity Act 2014* (Biosecurity Act) – this Act provides biosecurity measures for the management of restricted and invasive plants or animals. There is a general obligation under the Biosecurity Act whereby all people are responsible for taking reasonable and practical steps to prevent or minimise biosecurity risks.
- *Nature Conservation Act* (NC Act) – this Act provides for the protection of native wildlife and regulates the clearing of native plants. Protected plant clearing permit and Species Management Programs (low risk and high risk) will be required to protect and manage protected plants and animal breeding places.
- *Queensland Environmental Offsets Act 2014* (EO Act) - The purpose of environmental offsets is to compensate for unavoidable impacts to particular matters of State Environmental Significance (MSES) or local environmental significance. As such, the EO Act outlines the framework for environmental offsets, when they are required and how they are to be delivered.
- *Native Title (Queensland) Act 1993* - A native title assessment will be conducted for the project where an interest is required on land where native title has not been extinguished, the requirements of the *Native Title Act and the Native Title (Queensland) Act 1993* must be met before tenure or other project approvals can be granted.

The Project will require the following environmental approvals under the State legislation:

- Clearing permit (protected plants) for impacting threatened flora species protected under the *Queensland Nature Conservation Act 1992* (NC Act). The Clearing permit (protected plants) will be supported by a Flora Survey Report and Impact Management Plan.
- Species Management Program (SMPs) – High risk of impacts under the NC Act for managing impacts to animal breeding places of threatened fauna species.

#### **Local Council requirements**

Noosa Council is a key stakeholder in the project. However, the Project is not subject to local government planning approval.

**1.2.7 Describe any public consultation that has been, is being or will be undertaken regarding the project area, including with Indigenous stakeholders. Attach any completed consultation documentations, if relevant. \***

TMR is actively engaging with the community, stakeholders and Traditional Owners through planning and delivery phases of the project.

### **Community consultation**

- TMR has conducted two formal stakeholder consultation periods, inviting residents of Kin Kin Road to meet individually, typically at a pre-arranged venue near to the project site. These periods occurred during the initial design stage, in mid-2023, and towards the end of the detailed design stage in mid-2024. Through the detailed design process, the number of partial resumptions has been reduced from an initial estimate of 23, down to eight.
- Reactions amongst the eight impacted households range from being highly engaged and proactive, through to stakeholders who display little engagement in the process, but are willing to allow the project the access and land it requires. Most residents are keen to understand the detail, with concerns typically focused on impacts from the loss of vegetation and increased capacity for heavy haulage vehicles associated with a nearby quarry. However, there is no significant objection to the project either amongst the stakeholders impacted by partial resumptions or those with other impacts, such as driveway improvements and fence relocations.
- The TMR Property Acquisition Team continues to liaise with the impacted property owners on matters of resumptions.
- Community and key stakeholder engagement continues. A Communication and Engagement Plan has been prepared for the project outlining the consultation objectives to be implemented throughout the development and construction phase. This plan will be regularly updated to support environmental assessments, design and construction, through to practical completion of the project. Consultation and engagement will occur with impacted landowners, adjacent landowners and the wider community, government agencies, First Nations People and other relevant and interested stakeholders and community members

### **Consultation and engagement with First Nations People**

Consultation with the Kabi Kabi First Nations People commenced in 2023. Detailed cultural heritage surveys, field inspections and agreements with the Kabi Kabi Peoples Aboriginal Corporation were undertaken during the development phase. Further cultural heritage monitoring by Kabi Kabi First Nations People will occur during the construction phase.

A Cultural Heritage Field Agreement (CHFA) (dated 21 December 2023) was obtained between TMR and the Kabi Kabi First Nation Traditional Owners Native Title Claim Group

No Registered Aboriginal Cultural heritage sites were identified within the project area.

A Cultural Heritage Field Agreement (CHFA) (dated 21 December 2023) was obtained for the Project between TMR and the Kabi Kabi First Nation Traditional Owners Native Title Claim Group. Key findings from the CHFA are summarised below:

- The Parties agree that TMR may proceed with all activities necessary for or ancillary to the Project in accordance with the Management arrangements described in Table 3 of the CHFA.
- TMR will follow its internal procedure for managing discovery of potential Indigenous Cultural heritage finds – the TMR Cultural Heritage Discovery Process of ‘Find-Stop-Notify-Manage’
- Management recommendations from the CHFA require that all construction contractors and personnel and relevant stakeholders will receive appropriate cultural heritage induction in accordance with TMR’s standards.

The successful contractor must contact TMR’s Cultural Heritage Officer for advice regarding TMR cultural heritage induction.

## 1.3.1 Identity: Referring party

### **Privacy Notice:**

Personal information means information or an opinion about an identified individual, or an individual who is reasonably identifiable.

By completing and submitting this form, you consent to the collection of all personal information contained in this form. If you are providing the personal information of other individuals in this form, please ensure you have their consent before doing so.

The Department of Climate Change, Energy, the Environment and Water (the department) collects your personal information (as defined by the Privacy Act 1988) through this platform for the purposes of enabling the department to consider your submission and contact you in relation to your submission. If you fail to provide some or all of the personal information requested on this platform (name and email address), the department will be unable to contact you to seek further information (if required) and subsequently may impact the consideration given to your submission.

Personal information may be disclosed to other Australian government agencies, persons or organisations where necessary for the above purposes, provided the disclosure is consistent with relevant laws, in particular the Privacy Act 1988 (Privacy Act). Your personal information will be used and stored in accordance with the Australian Privacy Principles.

See our Privacy Policy to learn more about accessing or correcting personal information or making a complaint.

Alternatively, email us at [privacy@dcceew.gov.au](mailto:privacy@dcceew.gov.au).

**Confirm that you have read and understand this Privacy Notice \***

### **1.3.1.1 Is Referring party an organisation or business? \***

Yes

## Referring party organisation details

**ABN/ACN** 39407690291

**Organisation name** Department of Transport and Main Roads

**Organisation address** Floor 1, 50 Wisers Road, Buderim Qld 4558

## Referring party details

**Name** Thomas Gibney

**Job title** Senior Environmental Officer

**Phone** (07) 5459 1790

**Email** thomas.l.gibney@tmr.qld.gov.au

**Address** Floor 1, 50 Wisers Road, Buderim Qld 4558

## 1.3.2 Identity: Person proposing to take the action

### 1.3.2.1 Are the Person proposing to take the action details the same as the Referring party details? \*

No

### 1.3.2.2 Is Person proposing to take the action an organisation or business? \*

Yes

## Person proposing to take the action organisation details

**ABN/ACN** 39407690291

**Organisation name** Department of Transport and Main Roads

**Organisation address** Floor 1, 50 Wisers Road, Buderim QLD 4556

## Person proposing to take the action details

**Name** Graham Chambers

**Job title** Team Leader - Preconstruction - North Coast Region

**Phone** (07) 5475 2830

**Email** graham.j.chambers@tmr.qld.gov.au

**Address** Floor 1, 50 Wisers Road, Buderim QLD 4556

**1.3.2.14 Are you proposing the action as part of a Joint Venture? \***

No

**1.3.2.15 Are you proposing the action as part of a Trust? \***

No

**1.3.2.17 Describe the Person proposing the action's history of responsible environmental management including details of any proceedings under a Commonwealth, State or Territory law for the protection of the environment or the conservation and sustainable use of natural resources against the Person proposing to take the action. \***

TMR operates under the guiding principles of its Environmental Sustainability Policy (TMR 2021) and in accordance with its overarching Environmental Management System, and Environmental Processes Manual (TMR 2023), which applies a risk based approach to identify, assess and manage environmental risks through all phases of infrastructure delivery. The Environmental Processes Manual is available on the TMR website. TMR has not been subject to proceedings under the Commonwealth *Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999* (EPBC Act). Furthermore TMR has not been subject to any proceedings under State law.

TMR have previously referred a variety of actions across Queensland. Some examples include:

- 2024/09972 Direct Sunshine Coast Rail Line
- 2024/09896 Gairloch Safety Realignment (Bruce Highway)
- 2024/09886 Bruce Highway (Gympie – Maryborough), Tiaro Bypass, construct four lane bypass
- 2024/09821 Bruce Highway (Gateway Motorway to Dohles Rocks Road) Upgrade
- 2024/09800 Gateway Motorway (Bracken Ridge to Pine River) Upgrade
- 2023/09701 Warrego Highway/Mount Crosby Road Interchange Upgrade
- 2022/09439 Logan and Gold Coast Faster Rail
- 2022/09348 Loganlea Station Relocation and Park 'n' Ride Expansion
- 2022/09277 Intersection Upgrades (Sunshine Motorway/Sugar Rd and Mooloolaba Rd)
- 2022/09191 Rockhampton – Yeppoon Road Upgrade

**1.3.2.18 If the person proposing to take the action is a corporation, provide details of the corporation's environmental policy and planning framework**

TMR is not a corporation or company for the purposes of the *Commonwealth Corporations Act 2001*.

TMR operates under the guiding principles of its Environmental Sustainability Policy (TMR 2021) and Environmental Management System. The policy outlines how TMR will management impacts on natural, human and cultural environments by:

- meeting the statutory obligations of all relevant environmental and heritage legislation as a minimum standard
- considering the effects on stakeholders and long-term relationships when carrying out statutory obligations, and seeking feedback on performance
- acting as a good government agency and adopting a proactive approach to environmental and heritage management
- improving awareness of environmental and heritage management processes, standards and responsibilities among TMR's employees and contractors
- ensuring the approach to the management of environmental and heritage impacts embrace the hierarchy of "avoid, minimise and mitigate" in a financially feasible manner.

TMR undertakes works in accordance with their internal Environmental Processes Manual. This manual is based on the Plan-Do-Check-Act model in AS/NZS ISO 14001:2016 and is scalable and adaptable for all TMR projects. Further information about the TMR's environmental management is available at: <http://www.tmr.qld.gov.au/Community-and-environment/Environmental-management>

### 1.3.3 Identity: Proposed designated proponent

#### 1.3.3.1 Are the Proposed designated proponent details the same as the Person proposing to take the action? \*

Yes

## Proposed designated proponent organisation details

**ABN/ACN** 39407690291

**Organisation name** Department of Transport and Main Roads

**Organisation address** Floor 1, 50 Wisers Road, Buderim QLD 4556

## Proposed designated proponent details

**Name** Graham Chambers

**Job title** Team Leader - Preconstruction - North Coast Region

**Phone** (07) 5475 2830

**Email** graham.j.chambers@tmr.qld.gov.au

**Address** Floor 1, 50 Wisers Road, Buderim QLD 4556

## 1.3.4 Identity: Summary of allocation

---

### ✔ Confirmed Referring party's identity

The Referring party is the person preparing the information in this referral.

---

ABN/ACN	39407690291
Organisation name	Department of Transport and Main Roads
Organisation address	Floor 1, 50 Wises Road, Buderim Qld 4558
Representative's name	Thomas Gibney
Representative's job title	Senior Environmental Officer
Phone	(07) 5459 1790
Email	thomas.l.gibney@tmr.qld.gov.au
Address	Floor 1, 50 Wises Road, Buderim Qld 4558

---

### ✔ Confirmed Person proposing to take the action's identity

The Person proposing to take the action is the individual, business, government agency or trustee that will be responsible for the proposed action.

---

ABN/ACN	39407690291
Organisation name	Department of Transport and Main Roads
Organisation address	Floor 1, 50 Wises Road, Buderim QLD 4556
Representative's name	Graham Chambers
Representative's job title	Team Leader - Preconstruction - North Coast Region
Phone	(07) 5475 2830
Email	graham.j.chambers@tmr.qld.gov.au
Address	Floor 1, 50 Wises Road, Buderim QLD 4556

---

### ✔ Confirmed Proposed designated proponent's identity

The Person proposing to take the action is the individual or organisation proposed to be responsible for meeting the requirements of the EPBC Act during the assessment process, if the Minister decides that this project is a controlled action.

Same as Person proposing to take the action information.

## 1.4 Payment details: Payment exemption and fee waiver

**1.4.1 Do you qualify for an exemption from fees under EPBC Regulation 5.23 (1) (a)? \***

No

**1.4.3 Have you applied for or been granted a waiver for full or partial fees under Regulation 5.21A? \***

No

**1.4.5 Are you going to apply for a waiver of full or partial fees under EPBC Regulation 5.21A?**

No

**1.4.7 Has the department issued you with a credit note? \***

No

**1.4.9 Would you like to add a purchase order number to your invoice? \***

No

## 1.4 Payment details: Payment allocation

**1.4.11 Who would you like to allocate as the entity responsible for payment? \***

Person proposing to take the action

## 2. Location

## 2.1 Project footprint



**Project Area: 1.55 Ha Disturbance Footprint: 1.55 Ha**

## 2.2 Footprint details

### 2.2.1 What is the address of the proposed action? \*

Kin Kin Road, chainage 41.78km – 42.7km, Pinbarren in the Noosa Shire.

### 2.2.2 Where is the primary jurisdiction of the proposed action? \*

Queensland

### 2.2.3 Is there a secondary jurisdiction for this proposed action? \*

No

### 2.2.5 What is the tenure of the action area relevant to the project area? \*

The Project predominantly occurs on State-controlled road corridor

The Project is located along the existing Kin Kin Road and intersects with the following land parcels:

- Freehold tenure – Lot 1 RP 226775
- Freehold tenure – Lot 2 RP226775
- Freehold tenure – Lot 3 RP216930
- Freehold tenure – Lot 4 RP216930
- Freehold tenure – Lot 5 SP168359
- Kin Kin Road– State-controlled road corridor type parcel

## 3. Existing environment

## 3.1 Physical description

### 3.1.1 Describe the current condition of the project area's environment.

The Project is located on Kin Kin Road, in the locality of Pinbarren in the local government area of Noosa Shire Council, which is approximately 11km northwest of Cooroy (**see Figure 1-1, Attachment 2, Ecological Assessment Report**).

The adjacent land on both sides of the road corridor is zoned as 'rural' under the Noosa Shire Council Plan 2020. The surrounding environment is primarily composed of agricultural and rural land uses. The vegetation observed on site has been categorised into advanced rainforest, disturbed rainforest and native rainforest vegetation communities. The balance of the vegetation within the Project area comprises of cleared areas, paddocks or gardens dominated by exotic species.

### 3.1.2 Describe any existing or proposed uses for the project area.

The Project area is primarily situated along Kin Kin Road, which is a state-controlled road. The Project will not alter the current functional use of the road or adjacent rural properties.

The surrounding environment is primarily composed of agricultural and rural residential land parcels. The landscape is already fragmented from the road and adjacent rural properties.

### 3.1.3 Describe any outstanding natural features and/or any other important or unique values that applies to the project area.

There are large areas of vegetation present along the Project area, on both sides of the road corridor, which are interspersed with cleared areas.

The following protected areas are located within 2km of the Project area however is not anticipated to be impacted by the proposed works:

- Woondum Conservation Park – located approximately 620m west from the Project area, adjacent to Pomona Kin Kin Road
- Mount Pinbarren National Park – located approximately 1.2km west from the Project area.

Pinbarren Creek is located within 150m west of the northernmost extent of the Project area and does not intersect with the Project area boundary. One mapped drainage feature (an unnamed tributary of Pinbarren Creek) is located approximately 50m downslope and lies outside of the Project area.

No wetlands are mapped within the Project area footprint. Downstream of the Project area, Pinbarren Creek is mapped as a riverine wetland.

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

The terrain is generally steep and undulating with tight existing horizontal and vertical curves. There is no or limited shoulders along the existing road.

The elevation of the Project area is ranging from 95m AHD to the west to 140m AHD to the east.

## 3.2 Flora and fauna

**3.2.1 Describe the flora and fauna within the affected area and attach any investigations of surveys if applicable.**

Further details on the ecological assessment and field survey methods / findings are provided in **Section 3.2, page 8** of the **Attachment 2 Ecological Assessment Report (Arup 2025)** and **Section 3.4, page 10** of the **Attachment 4 Matters of National Environmental Significance Report (Arup 2025)**.

A Likelihood of Occurrence assessment has been completed for the Project and is documented in the **Appendix B, page 100** of **Attachment 2 Ecological Assessment Report (Arup 2025)**.

Significant impact assessments (SIAs) have been undertaken for the MNES identified as either known or having a high likelihood of occurrence within the Project area. The outcomes from the SIAs are documented in **Attachment 3 Significant Impact Assessment Technical Memo (Arup 2025)**.

A desktop EPBC Protected Matters Search Tool identified 24 threatened flora species, 36 threatened fauna species and four TECs, as having the potential to occur within a 2km buffer from the Project area. The EPBC Protected Matters Search Tool search results can be found in '**Appendix A Desktop Searches**' (**page 61**) of the **Attachment 4 Matters of National Environmental Significance Report (Arup 2025)**.

The key results from the ecological field surveys are summarised in this section below.

### **Ecological field survey methodology**

#### **Timing**

Ecological field surveys for the Project were conducted over the following dates:

- Flora and vegetation surveys: 28-29 September 2023, 6 October 2023 and 24-25 March 2025
- Fauna and fauna habitat surveys: 10 October 2023

The latest flora surveys were undertaken for the Project during 24-25 March 2025, including flora surveys in accordance with the Flora Survey Guidelines – Protected Plants (2020).

The fauna surveys were previously completed for the Project in October 2023 as indicated above. No updated fauna surveys were undertaken in 2025.

Details of the methods adopted are described in the following documents:

- Attachment 2 Ecological Assessment Report (Arup 2025), **Section 3.2, page 8**.
- Attachment 4 Matters of National Environmental Significance Report (Arup 2025), **Section 3.4, page 10**.

#### **Flora survey**

A flora survey in accordance with the Flora Survey Guidelines – Protected Plants (2020) for threatened flora species.

- Assessment of the suitability of the vegetation to provide habitat for threatened flora species listed under the Queensland *Nature Conservation Act 1992* (NC Act) and/or the EPBC Act
- Quaternary surveys in general accordance with Neldner et al. (2022) within remnant vegetation to confirm the mapped regional ecosystems (RE) and high value regrowth (HVR) and to characterise the floristic composition and structure of vegetation communities
- Vegetation categorisation surveys to characterise the vegetation into field validated vegetation communities based on dominant flora species and vegetation structure
- Vegetation community delineation surveys to validate the extent of the on-ground vegetation communities
- Assessment of the vegetation communities to confirm if they meet the key diagnostic characteristics and condition thresholds of TECs identified in the desktop assessment
- Recording areas with high density restricted invasive plant species listed under the *Biosecurity Act 2014*

#### **Fauna survey**

- Recording all incidental observations of all fauna species, including threatened fauna species
- Habitat assessments of the vegetation to confirm the suitability of the vegetation to provide habitat to threatened fauna species identified in the desktop assessment
- Identifying breeding habitat/places for threatened fauna (including for colonial breeding species)
- Recording restricted invasive animal species listed under the *Biosecurity Act 2014*.

### **Field survey results**

#### **Field validated vegetation communities**

The vegetation communities observed during the field survey are:

- Advanced rainforest vegetation
- Disturbed rainforest
- Native rainforest

#### **Nationally threatened flora species**

The following nationally threatened flora species have been identified within the Survey area during the flora survey, no threatened flora species have been identified within the Project area.

Refer to **Attachment 5 Field validated vegetation and threatened plants map** for the map of threatened flora species identified within the Survey area.

These flora species are assessed as having a 'known' likelihood of occurrence:

- *Macadamia integrifolia* (Macadamia nut) – vulnerable under the EPBC Act – one (1) individual observed in the Survey area (refer to **Section 4.3, page 23 of Attachment 2 Ecological Assessment Report (Arup 2025)**)
- *Macadamia ternifolia* (Small fruited Queensland nut) - vulnerable under the EPBC Act – two (2) individuals observed within the Survey area (refer to **Section 4.3, page 23 of Attachment 2 Ecological Assessment Report (Arup 2025)**)
- *Rhodamnia rubescens* (Scrub turpentine) – critically endangered under the EPBC Act – 13 individuals observed in the Survey area (refer to **Section 4.3, page 23 of Attachment 2 Ecological Assessment Report (Arup 2025)**)
- *Rhodomyrtus psidioides* (Native guava) – critically endangered under the EPBC Act – 94 individuals observed in the Survey area (refer to **Section 4.3, page 23 of Attachment 2 Ecological Assessment Report (Arup 2025)**)
- *Xanthostemon oppositifolius* (Southern penda) – vulnerable under the EPBC Act – eight (8) individuals observed in the Survey area (refer to **Section 4.3, page 23 of Attachment 2 Ecological Assessment Report (Arup 2025)**)

In addition to the above identified flora, the vegetation communities within the Survey area provide suitable habitat for the following threatened flora species and therefore these two species were assessed as having a 'high' likelihood of occurrence:

- *Baloghia marmorata* (Marbled balogia) – vulnerable under the EPBC Act (refer to **Section 4.3, page 23 of Attachment 2 Ecological Assessment Report (Arup 2025)**)
- *Floydia praealta* (Ball nut) – vulnerable under the EPBC Act (refer to **Section 4.3, page 23 of Attachment 2 Ecological Assessment Report (Arup 2025)**)

#### **Nationally threatened ecological communities**

The Lowland Rainforest of Subtropical Australia threatened ecological community (TEC), critically endangered under the EPBC Act is the only TEC identified to be potentially present on site, associated with the native rainforest vegetation community (Refer to **Attachment 6 Threatened ecological community map**).

An assessment has been undertaken to confirm if the rainforest vegetation community conforms to the key diagnostic characteristics contained in the Commonwealth Listing Advice on Lowland Rainforest of Subtropical Australia (TSSC 2011). The assessment identified that the native rainforest vegetation conforms to the key diagnostic characteristics of the Lowland Rainforest of Subtropical Australia TEC (refer to **Attachment 2 Ecological Assessment Report (Arup 2025)**).

#### **Nationally threatened fauna species**

No threatened fauna species protected under the EPBC Act were directly observed during the field surveys (refer to **Section 6.2.1, page 39 of Attachment 2 Ecological Assessment Report (Arup 2025)**). Suitable habitat for the following threatened fauna species is identified on site, and these species are assessed as having a high likelihood of occurrence:

- Black-breasted Button-quail (*Turnix melanogaster*), listed as 'vulnerable' under the EPBC Act (refer to **Section 6.2.1.1, page 41 of Attachment 2 Ecological Assessment Report (Arup 2025)**)
- Giant barred frog (*Mixophyes iteratus*), listed as vulnerable under the EPBC Act (refer to **Section 6.2.1.2, page 41 of Attachment 2 Ecological Assessment Report (Arup 2025)**).

Refer to **Attachment 7 Threatened fauna habitat map** for the suitable habitat map of black-breasted button-quail (*Turnix melanogaster*) and giant barred frog (*Mixophyes iteratus*).

#### **Invasive flora and fauna**

Within the field validated vegetation communities dominated by native species in the canopy, weeds were generally present in low densities. However, weeds were present in higher densities along the edges of these vegetation communities where road, tracks, and driveways intersected the vegetation communities. Weeds were generally common in the disturbed rainforest vegetation community.

The following restricted invasive plants listed under the *Biosecurity Act 2014* were recorded within the Survey area during the field survey (Refer to **Section 8 Biosecurity, page 51 of Attachment 2 Ecological Assessment Report (Arup 2025)** and **Attachment 8 Invasive flora map**):

- *Cinnamomum camphora* (camphor laurel)
- *Dolichandra unguis-cati* (cat's claw creeper)
- *Sphagneticola trilobata* (Singapore daisy).

No aquatic weeds were recorded during the field surveys.

As the Project area is located within close proximity to farmlands and rural properties, there were domesticated and pest fauna – such as cattle, sheep and guineafowl that were observed but have not been included in the detailed ecological assessment.

### **3.2.2 Describe the vegetation (including the status of native vegetation and soil) within the project area.**

The vegetation, which includes non-remnant, regional ecosystems (REs), and high value regrowth vegetation observed during the field surveys are categorised into three vegetation communities (refer to **Section 5.2.2, pages 26-31 of Attachment 2 Ecological Assessment Report (Arup 2025)**):

- advanced rainforest
  - observed to be present associated with the mapped extent of the mixed polygon of RE 12.11.10/12.11.3/12.11.16/12.11.2 and non-remnant areas in the Survey area
  - observed to be dominated by *Flindersia brayleyana* with co-dominant and associated rainforest species including *Elaeocarpus grandis* (blue quandong), *Araucaria cunninghamii* (hoop pine), *Grevillia robusta* (silky oak), and *Argyrodendron* sp. Kin Kin
  - the average canopy height was 18m with a range of between 15 - 22m
  - the sparse understory comprised rejuvenating canopy species as well as *Ficus coronata*, *Guioa semiglauca*, *Neolitsea dealbata* and *Tabernaemontana pandacaqui*.
  - the sparse ground layer was typically dominated by native species including *Dianella* spp., *Lomandra* spp., *Pteridium esculentum* (bracken), *Doodia aspera*.
  - due to the dominance of species not endemic to Southeast Queensland in the canopy layer, this vegetation community does not conform to any known TECs.
- native rainforest
  - observed to be present associated with the mapped extent of the mixed polygon of RE 12.11.10/12.11.3/12.11.16/12.11.2, RE 12.3.1a, and non-remnant areas in the Survey area
  - observed to be dominated by native rainforest species including *Elaeocarpus grandis* (blue quandong), *Agathis robusta* (kauri pine), *Litsea leefeana* (brown bolly gum), *Argyrodendron* sp. Kin Kin, *Flindersia schottiana* (bumpy ash), and *Xanthostemon oppositifolius* (Southern penda)
  - the average canopy height was 25m with a range of between 20 – 24m, and typically had an average canopy cover of between 70% - 90%
  - the mid-dense to dense sub-canopy/understory typically comprised rejuvenating canopy species as well as *Litsea leefeana* (brown bolly gum), *Neolitsea dealbata* (white bolly gum), *Endiandra discolour* (domatia bush), *Cryptocarya* spp., *Acmena smithii* (lilly pilly), and *Commersonia bartramia* (brown kurrajong)
  - the ground layer was typically dominated by native species including *Dianella* spp., *Lomandra* spp., *Pteridium esculentum* (bracken), *Blechnum indicum*
  - the native rainforest vegetation community conforms to the key diagnostic characteristics of the Lowland Rainforest of Subtropical Australia TEC.
- disturbed rainforest vegetation
  - observed to be present associated with the mapped extent of the mixed polygon of RE 12.11.10/12.11.3/12.11.16/12.11.2, RE 12.3.1a, and non-remnant areas in the Survey area
  - this vegetation typically comprised narrow linear strips of vegetation along the existing roads; however, it also extended along creek lines
  - observed to be dominated and/or co-dominated by the exotic species *Cinnamomum camphora* (camphor laurel), and native species including *Commersonia bartramia* (brown kurrajong), *Elaeocarpus grandis* (blue quandong), *Jagera pseudorhus* (foam bark), *Litsea leefeana* (brown bolly gum), *Lophostemon suaveolens* (swamp box), *Flindersia schottiana* (bumpy ash), *Acacia disparrima* (hickory wattle), and *Glochidion* spp.
  - the average canopy height was 12m with a range between 8m – 18m, and typically had an average canopy cover of between 70% – 90%
  - the understory was variable and typically comprised rejuvenating canopy species with *Alphitonia excelsa* (soap tree), *Allocasuarina* spp., *Ficus coronata* (sandpaper fig), and *Acmena smithii* (lilly pilly)
  - the ground layer was typically dominated by native species including *Dianella* spp., *Ottochloa* spp., *Lomandra* spp., *Pteridium esculentum* (bracken), *Entolasia stricta*, and *Parsonsia straminea* (monkey rope); however, some areas supported a heath understorey

- due to the dominance and/or co-dominance of the exotic species *Cinnamomum camphora* (camphor laurel), this vegetation community does not conform to any known TECs

The balance of the vegetation within the Survey area comprises either cleared areas, paddocks, or gardens dominated by exotic species, which have not been mapped nor discussed further due to their negligible ecological values.

Refer to **Attachment 5 Field validated vegetation and threatened plants map** for the map of field validated vegetation communities.

The Project area is generally underlain by sedimentary rock, with the mapped dominant soil type is dermosols based on the Australian Soil Classification (Refer to **Attachment 9 Australian soil classification map**). Most of the rainforest vegetation communities identified on site were observed to be present on alluvial soils and basaltically enriched soils (refer to **Table 5-5, Section 5.2.3, page 31 of Attachment 2 Ecological Assessment Report (Arup 2025)**)

## 3.3 Heritage

### 3.3.1 Describe any Commonwealth Heritage Places Overseas or other places recognised as having heritage values that apply to the project area.

#### Commonwealth Heritage Places Overseas

There are no Commonwealth Heritage places or other places with heritage values within the Project area or the surrounding 2km buffer zone.

### 3.3.2 Describe any Indigenous heritage values that apply to the project area.

Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander heritage is an important part of Australian heritage. As well as being historically important, Indigenous heritage is of continuing significance, creating and maintaining continuous links with the people and the land.

Queensland *Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Act 2003* provides for the recognition, protection, and conservation of Indigenous cultural heritage in the state. The Aboriginal Party under this Act for the area is the Kabi Kabi First Nation Traditional Owners Native Title Claim Group.

A Cultural Heritage Risk Assessment (CHRA) was completed for the Project by TMR in March 2023.

The CHRA found that the Project has variable risk allocations to cultural heritage, including:

- Low risk category 3 – in areas where significant ground and vegetation disturbance has occurred from the construction of the existing road formation. No Aboriginal or historical cultural heritage was identified within this area.
- High risk category 4 – in areas surrounding the existing road formation where vegetation clearing extents have been identified to have an impact on mapped regulated vegetation. No Aboriginal or historical cultural heritage has been identified within these areas but there is possibility that previously unidentified artefacts could be discovered. Consultation with the Aboriginal Party is required in these areas to inform appropriate mitigation measures.

A Cultural Heritage Field Agreement (CHFA) (dated 21 December 2023) was obtained for the Project between TMR and the Kabi Kabi First Nation Traditional Owners Native Title Claim Group, with Management Recommendations described in the CHFA.

## 3.4 Hydrology

### 3.4.1 Describe the hydrology characteristics that apply to the project area and attach any hydrological investigations or surveys if applicable. \*

The Project area is located within the Mary River Catchment, which is part of the Great Sandy Strait Catchment, and covers approximately 9,600 km<sup>2</sup>.

The Mary River catchment headwaters arise from the Conondale Range and flows north discharging into the Great Sandy Strait. The Mary River is dominated by grazing, forestry and residential areas, with large areas of conservation and natural areas. The main tributaries of the Mary River are Six Mile Creek, Obi Obi Creek, Wide Bay Creek and the Susan River.

The Project area does not intersect with any mapped waterway or watercourse. The Project area is approximately 150m away from Pinbarren Creek, which flows downstream to Six Mile Creek. Pinbarren Creek is a mapped high risk (red) waterway under the *Fisheries Act 1994* (QLD) and a mapped watercourse under the Water Act. No wetlands are mapped within the Project area footprint. Downstream of the Project area, Pinbarren Creek is mapped as a riverine wetland and is within the broader Survey area.

One mapped drainage feature (an unnamed tributary of Pinbarren Creek) is located approximately 50m downslope and lies outside of the Project area.

Groundwater dependent ecosystems (GDE) are ecosystems that require access to groundwater on a permanent or intermittent basis in order to maintain their communities of plants, animals, ecological processes and ecological services. No GDE is mapped within the Project area. There is GDE mapped along Pinbarren Creek however the mapping does not intersect with the Project area and will not be impacted by the project.

## 4. Impacts and mitigation

## 4.1 Impact details

**Potential Matters of National Environmental Significance (MNES) relevant to your proposed action area.**

<b>EPBC Act section</b>	<b>Controlling provision</b>	<b>Impacted</b>	<b>Reviewed</b>
S12	World Heritage	No	Yes
S15B	National Heritage	No	Yes
S16	Ramsar Wetland	No	Yes
S18	Threatened Species and Ecological Communities	Yes	Yes
S20	Migratory Species	No	Yes
S21	Nuclear	No	Yes
S23	Commonwealth Marine Area	No	Yes
S24B	Great Barrier Reef	No	Yes
S24D	Water resource in relation to large coal mining development or coal seam gas	No	Yes
S26	Commonwealth Land	No	Yes
S27B	Commonwealth Heritage Places Overseas	No	Yes
S28	Commonwealth or Commonwealth Agency	No	Yes

### 4.1.1 World Heritage

You have identified your proposed action will likely directly and/or indirectly impact the following protected matters.

A direct impact is a direct consequence of an action taken – for example, clearing of habitat for a threatened species or permanent shading on an ecological community as the result of installing solar panels.

An indirect impact is an 'indirect consequence' such as a downstream impact or a facilitated third-party action.

—

#### 4.1.1.1 Is the proposed action likely to have any direct and/or indirect impact on any of these protected matters? \*

No

#### 4.1.1.3 Briefly describe why your action is unlikely to have a direct and/or indirect impact.

\*

The closest World heritage areas of Queensland is K'gari (Fraser Island), which is approximately 60km north of the Project area. Due to the considerable distance, the action is unlikely to have a direct and/or indirect impact on this MNES.

### 4.1.2 National Heritage

You have identified your proposed action will likely directly and/or indirectly impact the following protected matters.

A direct impact is a direct consequence of an action taken – for example, clearing of habitat for a threatened species or permanent shading on an ecological community as the result of installing solar panels.

An indirect impact is an 'indirect consequence' such as a downstream impact or a facilitated third-party action.

—

#### 4.1.2.1 Is the proposed action likely to have any direct and/or indirect impact on any of these protected matters? \*

No

#### 4.1.2.3 Briefly describe why your action is unlikely to have a direct and/or indirect impact.

\*

There are no National Heritage places within or in proximity to the project area, therefore the action is unlikely to have a direct and/or indirect impact

### 4.1.3 Ramsar Wetland

You have identified your proposed action will likely directly and/or indirectly impact the following protected matters.

A direct impact is a direct consequence of an action taken – for example, clearing of habitat for a threatened species or permanent shading on an ecological community as the result of installing solar panels.

An indirect impact is an 'indirect consequence' such as a downstream impact or a facilitated third-party action.

—

**4.1.3.1 Is the proposed action likely to have any direct and/or indirect impact on any of these protected matters? \***

No

**4.1.3.3 Briefly describe why your action is unlikely to have a direct and/or indirect impact.**

\*

The proposed works will not directly impact on any watercourse within the Mary River Catchment. The Great Sandy Strait Ramsar wetland is located approximately 30km north of the Project area and as such the proposed action is unlikely to result in direct and/or indirect impacts given the considerable distance.

**4.1.4 Threatened Species and Ecological Communities**

You have identified your proposed action will likely directly and/or indirectly impact the following protected matters.

A direct impact is a direct consequence of an action taken – for example, clearing of habitat for a threatened species or permanent shading on an ecological community as the result of installing solar panels.

An indirect impact is an 'indirect consequence' such as a downstream impact or a facilitated third-party action.

### Threatened species

Direct impact	Indirect impact	Species	Common name
No	No	<i>Anthochaera phrygia</i>	Regent Honeyeater
No	No	<i>Archidendron lovelliae</i>	Bacon Wood, Tulip Siris
No	No	<i>Argynnis hyperbius inconstans</i>	Australian Fritillary
No	No	<i>Arthraxon hispidus</i>	Hairy-joint Grass
No	Yes	<i>Baloghia marmorata</i>	Marbled Balogia, Jointed Balogia
No	No	<i>Bosistoa transversa</i>	Three-leaved Bosistoa, Yellow Satinheart
No	No	<i>Botaurus poiciloptilus</i>	Australasian Bittern
No	No	<i>Calidris acuminata</i>	Sharp-tailed Sandpiper
No	No	<i>Calidris ferruginea</i>	Curlew Sandpiper
No	No	<i>Calyptorhynchus lathami lathami</i>	South-eastern Glossy Black-Cockatoo
No	No	<i>Chalinolobus dwyeri</i>	Large-eared Pied Bat, Large Pied Bat
No	No	<i>Charadrius leschenaultii</i>	Greater Sand Plover, Large Sand Plover
No	No	<i>Climacteris picumnus victoriae</i>	Brown Treecreeper (south-eastern)
No	No	<i>Coeranoscincus reticulatus</i>	Three-toed Snake-tooth Skink
No	No	<i>Coleus nitidus</i>	Nightcap Plectranthus, Silver Plectranthus
No	No	<i>Cossinia australiana</i>	Cossinia
No	No	<i>Cryptostylis hunteriana</i>	Leafless Tongue-orchid
No	No	<i>Cupaniopsis shirleyana</i>	Wedge-leaf Tuckeroo
No	No	<i>Cyclopsitta diophthalma coxeni</i>	Coxen's Fig-Parrot
No	No	<i>Dasyurus hallucatus</i>	Northern Quoll, Digul [Gogo-Yimidir], Wijingadda [Dambimangari], Wiminji [Martu]

<b>Direct impact</b>	<b>Indirect impact</b>	<b>Species</b>	<b>Common name</b>
No	No	<i>Dasyurus maculatus maculatus</i> (SE mainland population)	Spot-tailed Quoll, Spotted-tail Quoll, Tiger Quoll (southeastern mainland population)
No	No	<i>Delma torquata</i>	Adorned Delma, Collared Delma
No	No	<i>Eelseya albagula</i>	Southern Snapping Turtle, White-throated Snapping Turtle
No	No	<i>Erythroriorchis radiatus</i>	Red Goshawk
No	No	<i>Falco hypoleucos</i>	Grey Falcon
No	Yes	<i>Floydia praealta</i>	Ball Nut, Possum Nut, Big Nut, Beefwood
No	No	<i>Gallinago hardwickii</i>	Latham's Snipe, Japanese Snipe
No	No	<i>Geophaps scripta scripta</i>	Squatter Pigeon (southern)
No	No	<i>Hemiaspis damelii</i>	Grey Snake
No	No	<i>Hirundapus caudacutus</i>	White-throated Needletail
No	No	<i>Lathamus discolor</i>	Swift Parrot
No	No	<i>Litoria longburensis</i>	Wallum Sedge Frog
No	Yes	<i>Macadamia integrifolia</i>	Macadamia Nut, Queensland Nut Tree, Smooth-shelled Macadamia, Bush Nut, Nut Oak
No	Yes	<i>Macadamia ternifolia</i>	Small-fruited Queensland Nut, Gympie Nut
No	No	<i>Macrozamia pauli-guilielmi</i>	Pineapple Zamia
No	No	<i>Mixophyes fleayi</i>	Fleay's Frog
No	Yes	<i>Mixophyes iteratus</i>	Giant Barred Frog, Southern Barred Frog
No	No	<i>Numenius madagascariensis</i>	Eastern Curlew, Far Eastern Curlew
No	No	<i>Petauroides volans</i>	Greater Glider (southern and central)
No	No	<i>Petaurus australis australis</i>	Yellow-bellied Glider (south-eastern)
No	No	<i>Petrogale penicillata</i>	Brush-tailed Rock-wallaby
No	No	<i>Phaius australis</i>	Lesser Swamp-orchid
No	No	<i>Phascolarctos cinereus</i> (combined populations of Qld, NSW and the ACT)	Koala (combined populations of Queensland, New South Wales and the Australian Capital Territory)

<b>Direct impact</b>	<b>Indirect impact</b>	<b>Species</b>	<b>Common name</b>
No	No	Phyllodes imperialis smithersi	Pink Underwing Moth
No	No	Potorous tridactylus tridactylus	Long-nosed Potoroo (northern)
No	No	Pseudomugil mellis	Honey Blue Eye, Honey Blue-eye
No	No	Pteropus poliocephalus	Grey-headed Flying-fox
No	Yes	Rhodamnia rubescens	Scrub Turpentine, Brown Malletwood
No	Yes	Rhodomyrtus psidioides	Native Guava
No	No	Romnalda strobilacea	
No	No	Rostratula australis	Australian Painted Snipe
No	No	Samadera bidwillii	Quassia
No	No	Sophora fraseri	
No	No	Stagonopleura guttata	Diamond Firetail
No	No	Syzygium hodgkinsoniae	Smooth-bark Rose Apple, Red Lilly Pilly
No	No	Thesium australe	Austral Toadflax, Toadflax
No	No	Triunia robusta	Glossy Spice Bush
No	Yes	Turnix melanogaster	Black-breasted Button-quail
No	Yes	Xanthostemon oppositifolius	Penda, Southern Penda, Luya's Hardwood

### Ecological communities

<b>Direct impact</b>	<b>Indirect impact</b>	<b>Ecological community</b>
No	No	Coastal Swamp Sclerophyll Forest of New South Wales and South East Queensland
Yes	Yes	Lowland Rainforest of Subtropical Australia
No	No	Subtropical eucalypt floodplain forest and woodland of the New South Wales North Coast and South East Queensland bioregions

#### 4.1.4.1 Is the proposed action likely to have any direct and/or indirect impact on any of these protected matters? \*

Yes

**4.1.4.2 Briefly describe why your action has a direct and/or indirect impact on these protected matters. \***

Further details on the field findings and impacts on MNES are provided in **Attachment 4 Matters of National Environmental Significance Report (Arup 2025)**

Significant impact assessments (SIAs) have been undertaken for the MNES identified as either known or having a high likelihood of occurrence within the Project area. The outcomes from the SIAs are documented in **Attachment 3 Significant Impact Assessment Technical Memo (Arup 2025)**.

### Threatened ecological community

The 'critically endangered' Lowland Rainforest of Subtropical Australia TEC was the only TEC identified during the field survey and is anticipated to be directly and/or indirectly impacted by the Project. When considering impacts to TECs, the conservation advice for each TEC identifies that impacts to 'buffer zones' are required to be taken into consideration; however, they are not part of the TEC and are not an MNES (which would require an offset).

The buffer zone nominated in the conservation advice for the Lowland Rainforest of Subtropical Australia TEC is 50m.

The direct impacts to the TEC and its associated buffer zone (50m) are as below:

- Impacts to TEC within the Project area (in hectares (ha)): 0.000074 ha (<0.0001 ha)
- Impact to TEC buffer: 0.88 ha.

Potential indirect impacts to TEC and its buffer vegetation could include the following if works are not appropriately controlled:

- Alteration to local hydrology which may result in a change of species composition
- Sedimentation of ground layer flora species which may result in a change of species composition
- Alterations to nutrient loads discharged into waterways/drainage lines which lead into the TEC, which may result in a change of species composition
- Increased weed establishment and/or proliferation; which have the potential to result in the lowering of the condition thresholds of the vegetation community and the removal of Federal protection of the vegetation community
- Degradation of intact vegetation communities which has the potential of reducing patch size and has the potential of lowering of the patch size condition thresholds of the vegetation community and the removal of Federal protection of the vegetation community.

Further details are provided in **Section 5, page 15 of Attachment 4 Matters of National Environmental Significance Report (Arup 2025)**, and **Attachment 6 Threatened ecological community map**.

### Threatened flora

The Project does not result in direct impacts of any threatened flora (i.e. no threatened flora species are removed as part of the works).

The Project is anticipated to indirectly impact five threatened flora species through the removal of suitable habitat that the species could inhabit. The areas of impact to suitable habitat (in ha) are shown below:

- Known to occur
  - *Macadamia integrifolia* (macadamia nut): 0.90 ha
  - *Macadamia ternifolia* (small-fruited Queensland nut): 0.90 ha
  - *Rhodamnia rubescens* (scrub turpentine): 0.90 ha
  - *Rhodomirtus psidioides* (native guava): 0.90 ha
  - *Xanthostemon oppositifolius* (southern penda): 0.90 ha
- High likelihood of occurrence
  - *Baloghia marmorata* (marbled balogia): 0.89 ha
  - *Floydia praealta* (ball nut): 0.89 ha

If works are not appropriately controlled, other indirect impacts to threatened flora may include:

- Dust deposition from machinery and earthworks
- Edge effect from vegetation clearing and increased vulnerability
- Weed invasion
- Potential to increase the spread of myrtle rust or stress to the flora species prone to myrtle rust, especially *Rhodamnia rubescens* and *Rhodomyrtus psidioides* species.

Further details are provided in **Section 6, page 22 of Attachment 4 Matters of National Environmental Significance Report (Arup 2025)** and **Attachment 5 Field validated vegetation and threatened plants map**.

#### **Other Species:**

- Significant impacts are considered unlikely for all other EPBC Act listed threatened flora species due to moderate or low likelihood of occurrence.

Further details regarding other threatened flora listed under the EPBC Act are detailed in the Likelihood of Occurrence results detailed in **Appendix B Likelihood of Occurrence Assessment, page 78 of Attachment 4 Matters of National Environmental Significance Report (Arup 2025)**

#### **Threatened fauna**

No threatened MNES fauna is identified on site during the field surveys. Suitable habitat for the following two threatened fauna species are identified within the Survey area, however will not be directly impacted by the Project:

- Black-breasted Button-quail (*Turnix melanogaster*), listed as vulnerable under the EPBC Act
  - Giant barred frog (*Mixophyes iteratus*), listed as vulnerable under the EPBC Act

Further details are provided in **Section 7, page 38 of Attachment 4 Matters of National Environmental Significance Report (Arup 2025)** and **Attachment 7 Threatened fauna habitat map**.

The potential impacts to threatened fauna may include:

- Construction related impacts, including
  - Direct injury or mortality
  - Direct loss of suitable habitat
  - Displacement from areas of suitable habitat
  - Increased noise, light and vibration
  - Alterations of water quality including increased sedimentation of waterways (for threatened frogs)
- Habitat degradation, which may arise from:
  - Weed intrusion, including edge effects
  - Reduced dispersal opportunities and reduced patch size
  - Increased competition from invasive fauna
  - Altered hydrology and water quality affecting threatened frog habitat
  - Reduced foraging, breeding and dispersal opportunities, particularly for threatened birds
  - Permanent increases in light, noise and vibration levels during future operation after the proposed works are completed.

#### **Other Species:**

Significant impacts are considered unlikely for all other EPBC Act listed threatened flora species due to moderate or low likelihood of occurrence.

Further details regarding other threatened fauna listed under the EPBC Act are detailed in the Likelihood of Occurrence results detailed in **Appendix B Likelihood of Occurrence Assessment, page 78 of Attachment 4 Matters of National Environmental Significance Report (Arup 2025)**.

**4.1.4.4 Do you consider this likely direct and/or indirect impact to be a Significant Impact?**

\*

No

**4.1.4.6 Describe why you do not consider this to be a Significant Impact. \***

Significant impact assessments (SIAs) have been undertaken for all MNES identified as having a 'known' or 'high' likelihood of occurrence. The full SIAs are documented in the Significant Impact Assessment Technical Memo (Arup 2025), refer to **Attachment 3 Significant Impact Assessment Technical Memo (Arup 2025)**.

#### **SIA – TEC**

##### **Lowland Rainforest of Subtropical Australia TEC – critically endangered under the EPBC Act – known likelihood of occurrence**

To determine if the Project is likely to have a significant impact on the 'critically endangered' Lowland Rainforest of Subtropical Australia TEC, an SIA was completed in accordance with the Commonwealth's Significant Impact Guidelines 1.1. Given the limited extent of impacts (0.000074 ha) to the TEC, the Project is **unlikely** to result in a significant impact to the Lowland Rainforest of Subtropical Australia TEC.

Refer to **Section 5, pages 31-34 of Attachment 3 Significant Impact Assessment Technical Memo (Arup 2025)** for more details.

#### **SIA – Threatened flora**

##### ***Macadamia integrifolia* (Macadamia nut) – vulnerable under the EPBC Act – known likelihood of occurrence**

To determine if the Project is likely to have a significant impact on *Macadamia integrifolia*, an SIA against the Commonwealth's Significant Impact Guideline 1.1 (DoE, 2013) has been undertaken.

Given that there are no direct impacts to the known individual, and there is likely to be limited indirect impacts to suitable habitat for the species (0.90 ha), the Project is considered **unlikely** to have a significant impact on the vulnerable *Macadamia integrifolia*.

Refer to **Section 4.1.1, pages 5-8 of Attachment 3 Significant Impact Assessment Technical Memo (Arup 2025)** for more details.

##### ***Macadamia ternifolia* (Small-fruited Queensland nut) – vulnerable under the EPBC Act – known likelihood of occurrence**

To determine if the Project is likely to have a significant impact on *Macadamia ternifolia*, an SIA against the Commonwealth's Significant Impact Guideline 1.1 (DoE, 2013) has been undertaken.

Given no direct impacts and limited indirect impacts to suitable habitat for the species (0.90 ha), the Project is considered **unlikely** to have a significant impact on the vulnerable *Macadamia ternifolia*.

Refer to **Section 4.1.2, pages 8-12 of Attachment 3 Significant Impact Assessment Technical Memo (Arup 2025)** for more details.

##### ***Rhodamnia rubescens* (scrub turpentine) – critically endangered under the EPBC Act – known likelihood of occurrence**

To determine if the Project is likely to have a significant impact on *Rhodamnia rubescens*, an SIA against the Commonwealth's Significant Impact Guideline 1.1 (DoE, 2013) has been undertaken.

Given there will be no direct impacts to individuals, and limited direct and indirect impacts to suitable habitat for the individual (i.e. 0.90 ha), and the common occurrence of the species and its large range, the Project is considered **unlikely** to have a significant impact on the critically endangered *Rhodamnia rubescens*.

Refer to **Section 4.1.3, pages 13-16 of Attachment 3 Significant Impact Assessment Technical Memo (Arup 2025)** for more details.

##### ***Rhodomyrtus psidioides* (native guava) – critically endangered under the EPBC Act – known likelihood of occurrence**

To determine if the Project is likely to have a significant impact on *Rhodomyrtus psidioides*, an SIA against the Commonwealth's Significant Impact Guideline 1.1 (DoE, 2013) has been completed.

Given no direct impacts and limited indirect impacts to suitable habitat (0.90 ha), the Project is considered **unlikely** to have a significant impact on the critically endangered *Rhodomyrtus psidioides*.

Refer to **Section 4.1.4, pages 17-20 of Attachment 3 Significant Impact Assessment Technical Memo (Arup 2025)** for more details.

***Xanthostemon oppositifolius* (southern penda) – vulnerable under the EPBC Act – known likelihood of occurrence**

To determine if the Project is likely to have a significant impact on *Xanthostemon oppositifolius*, an SIA against the Commonwealth's Significant Impact Guideline 1.1 (DoE, 2013) has been completed.

Given no direct impacts and limited indirect impacts to suitable habitat (0.90ha), the Project is considered **unlikely** to have a significant impact on the vulnerable *Xanthostemon oppositifolius*.

Refer to **Section 4.1.5, pages 21-24 of Attachment 3 Significant Impact Assessment Technical Memo (Arup 2025)** for more details.

***Baloghia marmorata* (marbled balogia) – vulnerable under the EPBC Act – high likelihood of occurrence**

To determine if the Project is likely to have a significant impact on *Baloghia marmorata*, an SIA against the Commonwealth's Significant Impact Guideline 1.1 (DoE, 2013) has been completed.

Given the lack of direct impacts and limited impacts to potential suitable habitat (0.89 ha), the Project is considered **unlikely** to have a significant impact on the 'vulnerable' *Baloghia marmorata*.

Refer to **Section 4.2.1, pages 25-28 of Attachment 3 Significant Impact Assessment Technical Memo (Arup 2025)** for more details.

***Floydia praealta* (ball nut) - vulnerable under the EPBC Act – high likelihood of occurrence**

To determine if the Project is likely to have a significant impact on *Floydia praealta*, an SIA against the Commonwealth's Significant Impact Guideline 1.1 (DoE, 2013) has been completed.

Given the lack of direct impacts and limited impacts to potentially suitable habitat (0.89ha), the Project is considered **unlikely** to have a significant impact on the 'vulnerable' *Floydia praealta*.

Refer to **Section 4.2.2, pages 28-30 of Attachment 3 Significant Impact Assessment Technical Memo (Arup 2025)** for more details.

**SIA – Threatened fauna**

**Black-breasted Button-quail (*Turnix melanogaster*) – vulnerable under the EPBC Act – high likelihood of occurrence**

To determine if the Project is likely to have a significant impact on the *Turnix melanogaster*, an SIA against the Commonwealth's Significant Impact Guideline 1.1 (DoE 2013) has been completed. No Black-breasted Button-quails were observed within the Survey area during the field surveys.

Given that no direct sightings were recorded and limited impacts (0.000074ha) will occur to suitable habitat, the Project is considered **unlikely** to have a significant impact on the 'vulnerable' *Turnix melanogaster*.

Refer to **Section 6.1.1, pages 35-39 of Attachment 3 Significant Impact Assessment Technical Memo (Arup 2025)** for more details.

**Giant barred frog (*Mixophyes iteratus*) - vulnerable under the EPBC Act – high likelihood of occurrence**

To determine if the Project is likely to have a significant impact on *Mixophyes iteratus*, an SIA against the Commonwealth's Significant Impact Guideline 1.1 (DoE 2013) has been completed. No giant barred frogs were observed within the Survey area during the field surveys.

Given that no direct impacts are anticipated and there would be limited indirect impacts to potential suitable habitat (suitable habitat is mapped 15m from the Project area), the Project is considered **unlikely** to have a significant impact on the 'vulnerable' *Mixophyes iteratus*.

Refer to **Section 6.1.2 pages 40-45 of Attachment 3 Significant Impact Assessment Technical Memo (Arup 2025)** for more details.

#### **Other threatened fauna species**

SIAs were also undertaken in the Significant Impact Assessment Technical Memo (Arup 2025) (**Section 6.2.1, pages 45-50 of Attachment 3 Significant Impact Assessment Technical Memo (Arup 2025)**) for the following threatened fauna, which are assessed as having a 'low' likelihood of occurrence in the Project area:

- Koala (*Phascolarctos cinereus*) – endangered under the EPBC Act

No suitable habitat for koala (*Phascolarctos cinereus*) is present within the Project area and the species was assessed as having a 'low' likelihood of occurring in the Project area. No suitable habitat for the species is identified within the Survey area and as such no suitable habitat for koalas is predicted to be impacted by the Project. No koalas were observed within the Survey area during the field surveys. An SIA against the Commonwealth's Significant Impact Guidelines 1.1 (DoE, 2013) has been completed and includes reference to DCCEEW's Referral guidance for the endangered *Phascolarctos cinereus*.

Given the limited suitable habitat on site and no impacts to suitable habitat, the Project is considered **unlikely** to have a significant impact on the 'endangered' koala.

- Grey-headed flying fox (*Pteropus poliocephalus*) – vulnerable under the EPBC Act

No suitable habitat for *Pteropus poliocephalus* is present within the Project area and the species was assessed as having a 'low' likelihood of occurring in the Project area.

As no suitable habitat for the species is identified within the Survey area and as such no suitable habitat for grey-headed flying-fox is predicted to be impacted by the Project. No grey-headed flying-fox was observed within the Survey area during the field surveys. An SIA against the Commonwealth's Significant Impact Guidelines 1.1 (DoE, 2013) has been completed and includes reference to DCCEEW's National Recovery Plan for the grey-headed flying-fox.

Given the limited suitable resources on site and avoidance of impacts to suitable habitat, the Project is considered **unlikely** to have a significant impact on the 'vulnerable' *Pteropus poliocephalus*.

#### **4.1.4.7 Do you think your proposed action is a controlled action? \***

No

#### **4.1.4.9 Please elaborate why you do not think your proposed action is a controlled action.**

\*

## Summary of Significant Impact Assessment

The SIAs undertaken for all MNES (TEC, threatened flora and threatened fauna) identified that the Project is unlikely to significantly impact on any MNES (see response under Question 4.1.4.6). As no significant impacts are identified, the Project is not anticipated to be a 'controlled action'. Refer to **Attachment 3 Significant Impact Assessment Technical Memo (Arup 2025)** for more information.

SIAs have been undertaken for the following MNES, identified as 'known' or having 'high' likelihood of occurrence within the Project area

- Lowland Rainforest of Subtropical Australia TEC (0.000074ha direct impact)
- Threatened flora
  - *Baloghia marmorata* (marbled baloghia) - no direct impact to individuals, 0.89ha impact to suitable habitat
  - *Floydia praealta* (ball nut) - no direct impact to individuals, 0.89ha impact to suitable habitat
  - *Macadamia integrifolia* (Macadamia nut) – no direct impact to individuals, 0.90ha impact to suitable habitat
  - *Macadamia ternifolia* (small-fruited Queensland nut) – no direct impact to individuals, 0.90ha impact to suitable habitat
  - *Rhodamnia rubescens* (scrub turpentine) – no direct impact to individuals, 0.90ha impact to suitable habitat
  - *Rhodomirtus psidioides* (native guava) – no direct impact to individuals, 0.90ha impact to suitable habitat
  - *Xanthostemon oppositifolius* (southern penda) – no direct impact to individuals, 0.90ha impact to suitable habitat

### Threatened fauna

- Black-breasted Button-quail (*Turnix melanogaster*) – no direct sighting recorded, limited impact to suitable habitat (0.000074 ha)
- Giant barred frog (*Mixophyes iteratus*) – no direct sighting recorded, no impact to suitable habitat (suitable habitat is mapped 15m from the Project area).

In addition, SIAs were also undertaken for the following threatened MNES fauna, which were identified as having a 'low' likelihood of occurrence (refer to **Section 6.2, pages 45-50 of Attachment 3 Significant Impact Assessment Technical Memo (Arup 2025)**) in the Project area:

- Koala (*Phascolarctos cinereus*) – no impact to suitable habitat, no direct sighting recorded
- Grey-headed flying-fox (*Pteropus poliocephalus*) – no impact to suitable habitat, no direct sighting recorded

### Mitigation measures

A range of measures have been incorporated into the design to avoid or minimise impacts to the environment including MNES (refer to **Section 8, pages 45-52 of Attachment 4 Matters of National Environmental Significance Report (Arup 2025)**). In addition, the Project will require strict controls over mitigation measures for state-listed species through the approval requirements under the NC Act (SMP's for fauna, and Impact Management Plans for flora).

Refer to **Attachment 4 Matters of National Environmental Significance Report (Arup 2025)** for more detailed assessment of the MNES, impacts and mitigation measures.

**4.1.4.10 Please describe any avoidance or mitigation measures proposed for this action and attach any supporting documentation for these avoidance and mitigation measures. \***

Refer to the **Section 8, pages 45-52 of Attachment 4 Matters of National Environmental Significance Report (Arup 2025)** for more information on the avoidance and mitigation measures during design, construction and operation phase.

The Project has been designed to avoid, and where avoidance is not possible, minimise impacts on the natural environment and MNES. This section describes the key avoidance and mitigation measures that have been incorporated into the design and/or are to be implemented during planning or construction phases.

### Planning and Design

- Confirm impacts to threatened flora species
  - Survey (to sub-metre accuracy) the location of all threatened flora species within 10m of the Project area and include on design drawings
  - Due to several iterations of the proposed design to avoid the known threatened flora, the Project is not anticipated to result in direct impacts on any of the threatened flora identified on site.
  - The following design modifications have been undertaken to date to mitigate impacts to threatened flora and TEC:
    - Relocation of earthworks benching to avoid direct impacts to surveyed MNES
    - Culvert realignment to avoid outlet treatments that would have required embankment excavation directing impacting on MNES
    - Design alignment modifications and earthworks steepening (based on further geotechnical analysis) to avoid direct impacts to mapped TEC areas, remnant vegetation and threatened flora - *Rhodomyrtus psidioides* (native guava).
- Exclusion zones are to be established on design drawings for all mapped threatened flora species and TEC to avoid impacts.
- Minimise vegetation clearing and fauna habitat loss within environmentally sensitive areas.
- Prior to vegetation clearing, a suitable fauna spotter catcher is to quantify the number of hollows anticipated to be impacted by the works
- Where possible, plan to conduct works in and adjacent to defined threatened fauna breeding habitat outside of the species' peak breeding season.
- Minimise impacts to habitat quality
  - Where reasonable and practicable, incorporate water sensitive urban design measures to minimise runoff that enters waterways:
    - This should take into consideration the water quality objectives, level of risk, maintenance requirements and physical space within the corridor to accommodate treatment devices.
    - Due to the space constraints along the alignment and the objective of minimising the design footprint to avoid impacts on MNES, drainage basins and grassed swales have not been included in the design. Instead, the design has incorporated other measures to minimise runoff into the waterways, including catch drain batter chute, scour protection and planting around culvert inlets/outlets to help minimise erosion and maintain stable water flows.
- Develop relevant management plans in accordance with TMR's Technical Specification MRTS 51 Environmental Management.
- An overarching Environmental Management Plan should be developed to guide future development of a Construction Environmental Management Plan and identify measures to avoid, minimise or mitigate impacts.
- Comply with EPBC Act referral requirements and relevant state legislative requirements, such as high risk SMP to manage impacts to fauna and fauna breeding places.

### Construction

- Minimise vegetation clearing and impacts to fauna habitat through having designated no-go zones, supervised clearing by a certified and experienced fauna spotter catcher, using high visibility flagging/fencing to mark clearing extents. Where possible, relocate hollow timber, woody debris and bush rock to adjacent retained habitat areas.
- Minimise the removal of large hollow bearing trees and establish buffer zones around them during construction.
- Implement staged clearing protocols and site stabilisation or restoration.
- A vegetation clearing process should be implemented during construction to minimise impacts on flora and vegetation communities. Key measures include establishing and inspecting no-go zones, using low impact clearing measures, supervising clearing works with qualified ecologists and fauna spotters, managing invasive species, conducting timely rehabilitation and weed control using native species.
- Minimise direct impacts to fauna species
  - A suitably qualified and appropriately experienced licensed fauna spotter catcher is to be engaged at each clearing front to supervise all clearing activities and manage fauna.
  - The suitably qualified fauna spotter catcher must also specifically survey for potential black-breasted button-quail nests to minimise impacts to this threatened fauna species during construction.
  - If/when threatened fauna are found, the suitably qualified fauna spotter catcher is to mark a 'no go' buffer area around the tree, breeding place or habitat to reduce disturbance to the fauna and allow them to self-relocate.
  - Implement staged and directional clearing protocols which direct fauna into retained adjacent vegetation
  - If hollow bearing trees are felled and the hollows are unable to be cleared of fauna species, the hollow bearing tree is to be placed on the edge of the clearing near retained vegetation to allow any fauna remaining within the hollow to self-relocate
  - Where possible, undertake tree clearing outside of combined threatened fauna peak breeding season.
  - If bird nests are identified in trees to be felled, ensure they are not currently in use/ show signs of parental care. If so, determine species and if fledglings present, see if tree can be retained until they have fledged.
  - Minimise potential for the spread of chytrid fungus by implementing suitable hygiene protocols as described in the Threat abatement plan for infection of amphibians with chytrid fungus resulting in chytridiomycosis.
  - Herbicide is not to be used within 10m of a waterway or drainage line.
- Minimise indirect impacts to habitat quality
  - Avoid high risk construction activities, such as bulk earthworks, during wet weather
  - Provide dust suppression during all vegetation removal and earthworks to minimise the impacts of dust on retained vegetation and suitable breeding habitats
  - Store fuels and chemicals within bunded areas, at least 50m from waterways and drainage lines, and implement emergency control plans for spillages
  - Refuel construction vehicles and machinery in approved construction or bunded areas and at least 50m from waterways and drainage lines and ensure contingency plan management measures are available in the immediate area
  - If works areas will be left for more than 14 days, stabilise exposed areas as soon as possible to minimise run-off entering the waterways and impacting aquatic habitat and water quality.
- Habitat connectivity and fauna movement
  - Where possible in liaison with adjoining landholders, barbed wire should not be used for fencing to avoid injuries to fauna. Where it is not feasible to remove all barbed wire, the uppermost line of wire should not be barbed to minimise injury impacts to fauna.
  - The use of fauna friendly fencing should be encouraged to allow natural movements and minimise harm to wildlife.

- Comply with relevant management plans, approvals and legislative requirements
  - Implement all Management Plans developed during the planning and design phase.
  - Adhere to all approvals and associated conditions of approvals gained for the Project.
  - Monitor the effectiveness of controls and establish triggers for corrective action where potential impacts are observed.
  - Implementation of relevant sub-plans developed for the project, such as the Erosion and Sediment Control Plan, Biodiversity Management Plan, Landscape Management Plan, Vegetation Management Plan, Biosecurity Management Plan, Emergency Response Plan, Waste Management Plan, etc.
  - Offsets for Threatened Flora required under *Nature Conservation Act 1992*, if impacted. In the event the Project impacts threatened flora species, seed and/or propagation material will be collected from healthy individuals, and propagated at a ratio of 1:4, in accordance with the offset multiplier required by the Queensland Environmental Offset Policy for impacts to threatened plants. All propagated plants will be propagated by a native nursery with experience in native and threatened plant propagation. All plants will be held in the nursery for a minimum of one year, during which time a suitable receiving site will be identified.

### Operation

- Minimise vegetation clearing and impacts to fauna habitat by inspecting TMR assets, monitoring erosion risks, assessing fauna management effectiveness, evaluating landscape areas against project standards and monitor the health and conditions of threatened flora species adjacent to the Project area.
- Post-construction ecological monitoring (for a period of 6 months) of threatened flora to ensure the continued survival and health of the species following the completion of construction activities.

#### **4.1.4.11 Please describe any proposed offsets and attach any supporting documentation relevant to these measures. \***

As the Project is assessed as 'unlikely' to have significant impacts on any MNES, it is not expected that offsets under the EPBC Act will be required.

#### **4.1.5 Migratory Species**

You have identified your proposed action will likely directly and/or indirectly impact the following protected matters.

A direct impact is a direct consequence of an action taken – for example, clearing of habitat for a threatened species or permanent shading on an ecological community as the result of installing solar panels.

An indirect impact is an 'indirect consequence' such as a downstream impact or a facilitated third-party action.

Direct impact	Indirect impact	Species	Common name
No	No	<i>Actitis hypoleucos</i>	Common Sandpiper
No	No	<i>Apus pacificus</i>	Fork-tailed Swift
No	No	<i>Calidris acuminata</i>	Sharp-tailed Sandpiper
No	No	<i>Calidris ferruginea</i>	Curlew Sandpiper
No	No	<i>Calidris melanotos</i>	Pectoral Sandpiper
No	No	<i>Charadrius leschenaultii</i>	Greater Sand Plover, Large Sand Plover
No	No	<i>Cuculus optatus</i>	Oriental Cuckoo, Horsfield's Cuckoo
No	No	<i>Gallinago hardwickii</i>	Latham's Snipe, Japanese Snipe
No	No	<i>Hirundapus caudacutus</i>	White-throated Needletail
No	No	<i>Numenius madagascariensis</i>	Eastern Curlew, Far Eastern Curlew
No	No	<i>Pandion haliaetus</i>	Osprey

#### 4.1.5.1 Is the proposed action likely to have any direct and/or indirect impact on any of these protected matters? \*

No

#### 4.1.5.3 Briefly describe why your action is unlikely to have a direct and/or indirect impact.

\*

No sighting and no suitable habitat for threatened migratory species was identified within the Survey area. Refer to **Appendix B Likelihood of Occurrence Assessment, page 99 of Attachment 2 Ecological Assessment Report (Arup 2025)**, and **Section 7.5 of Attachment 3 Significant Impact Assessment Technical Memo (Arup 2025)** for more information regarding migratory species. The Project will not result in any direct or indirect impacts to migratory species.

#### 4.1.6 Nuclear

**4.1.6.1 Is the proposed action likely to have any direct and/or indirect impact on this protected matter? \***

No

**4.1.6.3 Briefly describe why your action is unlikely to have a direct and/or indirect impact.**

\*

The proposed activities involve widening of a road and do not involve any nuclear actions or impacts to nuclear actions.

**4.1.7 Commonwealth Marine Area**

You have identified your proposed action will likely directly and/or indirectly impact the following protected matters.

A direct impact is a direct consequence of an action taken – for example, clearing of habitat for a threatened species or permanent shading on an ecological community as the result of installing solar panels.

An indirect impact is an 'indirect consequence' such as a downstream impact or a facilitated third-party action.

—

**4.1.7.1 Is the proposed action likely to have any direct and/or indirect impact on any of these protected matters? \***

No

**4.1.7.3 Briefly describe why your action is unlikely to have a direct and/or indirect impact.**

\*

No Commonwealth Marine Area is located within 10km of the Project area. The proposed works will not directly impact on any watercourse within the Mary River Catchment. Given the considerable distance, the Project is unlikely to have any direct or indirect impact on Commonwealth Marine Area.

**4.1.8 Great Barrier Reef**

**4.1.8.1 Is the proposed action likely to have any direct and/or indirect impact on this protected matter? \***

No

**4.1.8.3 Briefly describe why your action is unlikely to have a direct and/or indirect impact.**

\*

The Project area is located at least 250km away from the Great Barrier Reef and therefore is unlikely to have direct or indirect impacts to GBR due to the considerable distance.

**4.1.9 Water resource in relation to large coal mining development or coal seam gas**

**4.1.9.1 Is the proposed action likely to have any direct and/or indirect impact on this protected matter? \***

No

**4.1.9.3 Briefly describe why your action is unlikely to have a direct and/or indirect impact.**

\*

The Project is not located within proximity (10km) of any water resource in relation to large coal mining development or coal seam gas and therefore is unlikely to have any direct and/or indirect impact on this MNES.

**4.1.10 Commonwealth Land**

You have identified your proposed action will likely directly and/or indirectly impact the following protected matters.

A direct impact is a direct consequence of an action taken – for example, clearing of habitat for a threatened species or permanent shading on an ecological community as the result of installing solar panels.

An indirect impact is an 'indirect consequence' such as a downstream impact or a facilitated third-party action.

—

**4.1.10.1 Is the proposed action likely to have any direct and/or indirect impact on any of these protected matters? \***

No

**4.1.10.3 Briefly describe why your action is unlikely to have a direct and/or indirect impact.**

\*

There is no Commonwealth land located within 10km of the Project area and therefore the Project is unlikely to have any direct and/or indirect impact on this MNES. The closest listed Commonwealth land to the Project area is Brisbane Airport, which is approximately 150km south of the Project area.

**4.1.11 Commonwealth Heritage Places Overseas**

You have identified your proposed action will likely directly and/or indirectly impact the following protected matters.

A direct impact is a direct consequence of an action taken – for example, clearing of habitat for a threatened species or permanent shading on an ecological community as the result of installing solar panels.

An indirect impact is an 'indirect consequence' such as a downstream impact or a facilitated third-party action.

—

**4.1.11.1 Is the proposed action likely to have any direct and/or indirect impact on any of these protected matters? \***

No

**4.1.11.3 Briefly describe why your action is unlikely to have a direct and/or indirect impact.**

\*

There is no Commonwealth heritage place located within 10km of the Project area and therefore the Project is unlikely to have any direct and/or indirect impact on this MNES. The closest Commonwealth Heritage listed place is Cooroy Post Office, located more than 15km south from the Project area.

**4.1.12 Commonwealth or Commonwealth Agency**

#### 4.1.12.1 Is the proposed action to be taken by the Commonwealth or a Commonwealth Agency? \*

No

## 4.2 Impact summary

### Conclusion on the likelihood of significant impacts

You have indicated that the proposed action will likely have a significant impact on the following Matters of National Environmental Significance:

*None*

### Conclusion on the likelihood of unlikely significant impacts

You have indicated that the proposed action will unlikely have a significant impact on the following Matters of National Environmental Significance:

- World Heritage (S12)
- National Heritage (S15B)
- Ramsar Wetland (S16)
- Threatened Species and Ecological Communities (S18)
- Migratory Species (S20)
- Nuclear (S21)
- Commonwealth Marine Area (S23)
- Great Barrier Reef (S24B)
- Water resource in relation to large coal mining development or coal seam gas (S24D)
- Commonwealth Land (S26)
- Commonwealth Heritage Places Overseas (S27B)
- Commonwealth or Commonwealth Agency (S28)

## 4.3 Alternatives

**4.3.1 Do you have any possible alternatives for your proposed action to be considered as part of your referral? \***

No

**4.3.8 Describe why alternatives for your proposed action were not possible. \***

The alternative of having a different alignment is not possible because:

- Alternative road alignments would have required extensive vegetation clearing and result in increased fragmentation of intact habitat, thereby increased impacts on the existing ecological conditions of the area.
- In contrast, the proposed design alignment follows the existing road corridor, thereby minimising land acquisition, vegetation removal and disturbance to the surrounding environment to the greatest practicable extents.

The alternative of not undertaking the action was not possible because:

- It does not address the critical need for the Project (safety concern and local access requirements), which is dictated by the following factors:
  - the existing inadequate road geometry and deteriorating pavement conditions along Kin Kin Road
  - ongoing feedback and concern from the local communities regarding increased safety risks and pavement deterioration caused by heavy vehicle movement, as a result of the road being approved as the main haulage route for Kin Kin Quarry in 2013
  - the anticipated increase in traffic volumes along the road
  - demonstrated support for the Project from local MP and community members.

Refer to **Section 8, pages 45-52 of Attachment 4 Matters of National Environmental Significance Report (Arup 2025)** for more details of the avoidance, management and mitigation measures that have been incorporated into the design and/or are to be implemented during planning, construction and operation phases.

Significant efforts have been made during the design development with the objective of avoiding direct impacts to the MNES and minimising indirect impacts. This has been done by integrating threatened flora locations, mapped TEC and known threatened fauna habitats into design drawings and documentation.

In particular, the following design modifications have been undertaken to date to avoid direct impacts and mitigate indirect impacts to threatened flora and TEC:

- Refinement of earthworks benching to avoid direct impacts to surveyed MNES, including threatened flora, mapped TEC and threatened fauna habitat
- Culvert realignment to avoid outlet treatments that would have required embankment excavation directly impacting on MNES
- Design alignment modifications and earthwork steepening (based on further geotechnical analysis) to avoid direct impacts to mapped TEC areas, remnant vegetation and threatened flora (*Rhodomirtus psidioides*).

Refer to **Section 8.1, pages 46-47 of Attachment 4 Matters of National Environmental Significance Report (Arup 2025)** for more information of the above design modifications

## 5. Lodgement

## 5.1 Attachments

## 1.2.1 Overview of the proposed action

	Type	Name	Date	Sensitivity	Confidence
#1.	Document	Attachment 1 Project location and area.pdf Project location and area map	07/11/2025	No	High

## 1.2.6 Commonwealth or state legislation, planning frameworks or policy documents that are relevant to the proposed action

	Type	Name	Date	Sensitivity	Confidence
#1.	Document	Attachment 2 - Ecological Assessment Report.pdf Ecological assessment report. This document is sensitive as it reveals and contains personal information.	28/10/2025	Yes	High
#2.	Document	Attachment 2 - Ecological Assessment Report_Redacted.pdf Ecological Assessment Report. This document is sensitive as it reveals and contains personal information.	28/10/2025	Yes	High
#3.	Document	Attachment 3 - Kin Kin Road Sallwood to Turnbull Road_SIA_Redacted.pdf Significant Impact Assessment. This document is sensitive as it reveals and contains personal information.	27/11/2025	Yes	High
#4.	Document	Attachment 3 - Kin Kin Road_Sallwood to Turnbull Road_SIA.pdf Significant Impact Assessment. This document is sensitive as it reveals and contains personal information.	27/11/2025	Yes	High
#5.	Document	Attachment 4 - MNES Report.pdf MNES Report. This document is sensitive as it reveals and contains personal information.	02/12/2025	Yes	High
#6.	Document	Attachment 4 - MNES Report_Redacted.pdf MNES Report. This document is sensitive as it reveals and contains personal information.	02/12/2025	Yes	High

## 3.1.1 Current condition of the project area's environment

	Type	Name	Date	Sensitivity	Confidence
#1.	Document	Attachment 2 - Ecological Assessment Report.pdf Ecological Assessment Report. This document is sensitive as it reveals and contains personal information.	28/10/2025	Yes	High

#2.	Document	Attachment 2 - Ecological Assessment Report_Redacted.pdf Ecological Assessment Report. This document is sensitive as it reveals and contains personal information.	27/10/2025	Yes	High
-----	----------	---	------------	-----	------

## 3.2.1 Flora and fauna within the affected area

	Type	Name	Date	Sensitivity	Confidence
#1.	Document	Attachment 2 - Ecological Assessment Report.pdf Ecological Assessment Report. This document is sensitive as it reveals and contains personal information.	28/10/2025	Yes	High
#2.	Document	Attachment 2 - Ecological Assessment Report_Redacted.pdf Ecological Assessment Report. This document is sensitive as it reveals and contains personal information.	27/10/2025	Yes	High
#3.	Document	Attachment 3 - Kin Kin Road Sallwood to Turnbull Road_SIA_Redacted.pdf Significant Impact Assessment. This document is sensitive as it reveals and contains personal information.	26/11/2025	Yes	High
#4.	Document	Attachment 3 - Kin Kin Road_Sallwood to Turnbull Road_SIA.pdf Significant Impact Assessment. This document is sensitive as it reveals and contains personal information.	27/11/2025	Yes	High
#5.	Document	Attachment 4 - MNES Report.pdf MNES Report. This document is sensitive as it reveals and contains personal information.	02/12/2025	Yes	High
#6.	Document	Attachment 4 - MNES Report_Redacted.pdf MNES Report. This document is sensitive as it reveals and contains personal information.	01/12/2025	Yes	High
#7.	Document	Attachment 5 - Field validated vegetation and threatened plants map.pdf Field validated vegetation and threatened plants	06/11/2025	No	High
#8.	Document	Attachment 6 - TEC map.pdf Threatened Ecological Communities Map	06/11/2025	No	High

#9.	Document	Attachment 7 - Threatened fauna habitat map.pdf Threatened fauna habitat map	06/11/2025	No	High
#10.	Document	Attachment 8_Invasive flora map.pdf Invasive Flora Map	06/11/2025	No	High

## 3.2.2 Vegetation within the project area

	Type	Name	Date	Sensitivity	Confidence
#1.	Document	Attachment 2 - Ecological Assessment Report.pdf Ecological Assessment Report. This document is sensitive as it reveals and contains personal information.	28/10/2025	Yes	High
#2.	Document	Attachment 2 - Ecological Assessment Report_Redacted.pdf Ecological Assessment Report. This document is sensitive as it reveals and contains personal information.	27/10/2025	Yes	High
#3.	Document	Attachment 5 - Field validated vegetation and threatened plants map.pdf Field validated vegetation and threatened plants	06/11/2025	No	High
#4.	Document	Attachment 9 - Australian Soil Classification Map.pdf Australian soil classification map	06/11/2025	No	High

## 4.1.4.2 (Threatened Species and Ecological Communities) Why your action has a direct and/or indirect impact on the identified protected matters

	Type	Name	Date	Sensitivity	Confidence
#1.	Document	Attachment 3 - Kin Kin Road Sallwood to Turnbull Road_SIA_Redacted.pdf Significant Impact Assessment. This document is sensitive as it reveals and contains personal information.	26/11/2025	Yes	High
#2.	Document	Attachment 3 - Kin Kin Road_Sallwood to Turnbull Road_SIA.pdf Significant Impact Assessment. This document is sensitive as it reveals and contains personal information.	27/11/2025	Yes	High
#3.	Document	Attachment 4 - MNES Report.pdf MNES Report. This document is sensitive as it reveals and contains personal information.	02/12/2025	Yes	High
#4.	Document				

	Attachment 4 - MNES Report_Redacted.pdf		01/12/2025	Yes		High
	MNES Report. This document is sensitive as it reveals and contains personal information.					
#5.	Document	Attachment 5 - Field validated vegetation and threatened plants map.pdf	06/11/2025	No		High
		Field validated vegetation and threatened plants map				
#6.	Document	Attachment 6 - TEC map.pdf	06/11/2025	No		High
		TEC Map				
#7.	Document	Attachment 7 - Threatened fauna habitat map.pdf	06/11/2025	No		High
		Threatened fauna habitat map				

4.1.4.6 (Threatened Species and Ecological Communities) Why you do not consider the direct and/or indirect impact to be a Significant Impact

	Type	Name	Date	Sensitivity	Confidence
#1.	Document	Attachment 3 - Kin Kin Road Sallwood to Turnbull Road_SIA_Redacted.pdf	26/11/2025	Yes	High
		Significant Impact Assessment. This document is sensitive as it reveals and contains personal information.			
#2.	Document	Attachment 3 - Kin Kin Road_Sallwood to Turnbull Road_SIA.pdf	27/11/2025	Yes	High
		Significant Impact Assessment. This document is sensitive as it reveals and contains personal information.			

4.1.4.9 (Threatened Species and Ecological Communities) Why you do not think your proposed action is a controlled action

	Type	Name	Date	Sensitivity	Confidence
#1.	Document	Attachment 3 - Kin Kin Road Sallwood to Turnbull Road_SIA_Redacted.pdf	26/11/2025	Yes	High
		Significant Impact Assessment. This document is sensitive as it reveals and contains personal information.			
#2.	Document	Attachment 3 - Kin Kin Road_Sallwood to Turnbull Road_SIA.pdf	27/11/2025	Yes	High
		Significant Impact Assessment. This document is sensitive as it reveals and contains personal information.			
#3.	Document	Attachment 4 - MNES Report.pdf	02/12/2025	Yes	High
		MNES Report. This document is			

sensitive as it reveals and contains personal information.					
#4.	Document	Attachment 4 - MNES Report_Redacted.pdf MNES Report. This document is sensitive as it reveals and contains personal information.	01/12/2025	Yes	High

4.1.4.10 (Threatened Species and Ecological Communities) Avoidance or mitigation measures proposed for this action

	Type	Name	Date	Sensitivity	Confidence
#1.	Document	Attachment 4 - MNES Report.pdf MNES Report. This document is sensitive as it reveals and contains personal information.	02/12/2025	Yes	High
#2.	Document	Attachment 4 - MNES Report_Redacted.pdf MNES Report. This document is sensitive as it reveals and contains personal information.	01/12/2025	Yes	High

4.1.5.3 (Migratory Species) Why your action is unlikely to have a direct and/or indirect impact

	Type	Name	Date	Sensitivity	Confidence
#1.	Document	Attachment 2 - Ecological Assessment Report.pdf Ecological Assessment Report. This document is sensitive as it reveals and contains personal information.	28/10/2025	Yes	High
#2.	Document	Attachment 2 - Ecological Assessment Report_Redacted.pdf Ecological Assessment Report. This document is sensitive as it reveals and contains personal information.	27/10/2025	Yes	High
#3.	Document	Attachment 3 - Kin Kin Road Sallwood to Turnbull Road_SIA_Redacted.pdf Significant Impact Assessment. This document is sensitive as it reveals and contains personal information.	26/11/2025	Yes	High
#4.	Document	Attachment 3 - Kin Kin Road_Sallwood to Turnbull Road_SIA.pdf Significant Impact Assessment. This document is sensitive as it reveals and contains personal information.	27/11/2025	Yes	High

4.3.8 Why alternatives for your proposed action were not possible

--

Type	Name	Date	Sensitivity	Confidence
#1.	Document Attachment 4 - MNES Report.pdf MNES Report. This document is sensitive as it reveals and contains personal information.	02/12/2025	Yes	High
#2.	Document Attachment 4 - MNES Report_Redacted.pdf MNES Report. This document is sensitive as it reveals and contains personal information.	01/12/2025	Yes	High

## 5.2 Declarations

## ✔ Completed Referring party's declaration

The Referring party is the person preparing the information in this referral.

---

ABN/ACN	39407690291
Organisation name	Department of Transport and Main Roads
Organisation address	Floor 1, 50 Wises Road, Buderim Qld 4558
Representative's name	Thomas Gibney
Representative's job title	Senior Environmental Officer
Phone	(07) 5459 1790
Email	thomas.l.gibney@tmr.qld.gov.au
Address	Floor 1, 50 Wises Road, Buderim Qld 4558

Check this box to indicate you have read the referral form. \*

Check this box to confirm these are the correct identification details. \*

By checking this box, I, **Thomas Gibney of Department of Transport and Main Roads**, declare that to the best of my knowledge the information I have given on, or attached to this EPBC Act Referral is complete, current and correct. I understand that giving false or misleading information is a serious offence. \*

You may receive automated notifications that aim to assist you in tracking the progress of your project. You can opt out of these notifications by updating your communication preferences on your profile.

---

## ✔ Completed Person proposing to take the action's declaration

The Person proposing to take the action is the individual, business, government agency or trustee that will be responsible for the proposed action.

---

ABN/ACN	39407690291
Organisation name	Department of Transport and Main Roads
Organisation address	Floor 1, 50 Wises Road, Buderim QLD 4556
Representative's name	Graham Chambers

Representative's job title	Team Leader - Preconstruction - North Coast Region
Phone	(07) 5475 2830
Email	graham.j.chambers@tmr.qld.gov.au
Address	Floor 1, 50 Wises Road, Buderim QLD 4556

Check this box to indicate you have read the referral form. \*

Check this box to confirm these are the correct identification details. \*

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

You may receive automated notifications that aim to assist you in tracking the progress of your project. You can opt out of these notifications by updating your communication preferences on your profile.

---

### Completed Proposed designated proponent's declaration

The Proposed designated proponent is the individual or organisation proposed to be responsible for meeting the requirements of the EPBC Act during the assessment process, if the Minister decides that this project is a controlled action.

---

Same as Person proposing to take the action information.

Check this box to indicate you have read the referral form. \*

Check this box to confirm these are the correct identification details. \*

I, **Graham Chambers of Department of Transport and Main Roads**, the Proposed designated proponent, consent to the designation of myself as the Proposed designated proponent for the purposes of the action described in this EPBC Act Referral. \*

You may receive automated notifications that aim to assist you in tracking the progress of your project. You can opt out of these notifications by updating your communication preferences on your profile.