Jupiter Wind Farm

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

October 2016

Volume 2 Annexes A to C

EPYC PTY LTD

ERM REFERENCE
0223522 RPT1 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

Table of Contents

Annex A

Secretary's Environmental Assessment Requirements and Supplementary SEARs

Environmental Assessment Requirements

Section 78A (8A) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979
Schedule 2 of the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Regulation 2000*

Application Number	SSD 13_6277
Development	**Jupiter Wind Farm**
Location	Southeast of Tarago NSW, within Goulburn Mulwaree and Palerang Local Government Areas
Proponent	EPYC Pty Ltd
Date of Issue	2 March 2016
General Requirements	The Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) must meet the minimum form and content requirements of Schedule 2 of the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Regulation 2000* and include the following: 1. the information required under clause 6, including but not limited to: • the description of the development, for both the wind farm and associated infrastructure, should include: → construction, operation and decommissioning details; → a site plan at an adequate scale with dimensions, showing the development's location, orientation, site coverage, access roads and entrances to public roads; → the location and dimensions of all project components including the wind turbines (including map coordinates in latitude/longitude and maximum AHD heights) and the proposed external cladding materials, wind monitoring/ or met masts, underground/ overhead cabling between turbines, electrical substation and transmission line linking the wind farm to the grid, including identification of whether the transmission lines are aboveground or underground, temporary concrete batching plant(s), construction compounds, access roads/road upgrades (including internal access tracks), road crossings and obstacle lighting; → supporting maps/plans clearly identifying existing environmental features (e.g. watercourses, vegetation), infrastructure and land use (including nearby residences and approved residential developments or subdivisions), the number of turbines within 2km of a dwelling or approved dwelling, and the location/siting of the development (including associated infrastructure) in the context of this existing environment; → a timeline identifying the development's proposed construction and operation components, their envisaged lifespan and arrangements for decommissioning. Include a Decommissioning and Rehabilitation Plan with proposed funding arrangements and confirming that the Proponent is responsible for decommissioning; and → resourcing requirements (including, but not limited to, water supply and gravel). 2. the content listed in clause 7, including, but not limited to: • a summary of the EIS; • a statement of the objectives of the development, including a description of the strategic need, justification, objectives and outcomes. This should include: → a strategic assessment of the need, scale, scope and location for the project in relation to predicted electricity demand, predicted transmission constraints and the strategic direction of the region and the State in relation to electricity supply, demand and electricity generation technologies, and its role within the

Commonwealth's Renewable Energy Target Scheme. The EIS must clearly demonstrate that the existing transmission infrastructure has sufficient capacity to accommodate the project;

→ a justification for the development taking into consideration the objects of the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979* (EP&A Act); and

→ a clear demonstration of quantified and substantiated greenhouse gas benefits, taking into consideration sources of electricity that could realistically be replaced and the extent of their replacement, with reference to the Department of Environment, Climate Change and Water *NSW wind farm greenhouse gas savings tool* (www.environment.nsw.gov.au/climatechange/greenhousegassavingstool.htm);

- an analysis of feasible alternatives to the carrying out of the development, having regard to its objectives, including an assessment of the environmental costs and benefits of the development relative to alternatives and the consequences of not carrying out the development, the suitability of the chosen option and whether or not the development is in the public interest. This should include:
  - → an analysis of the suitability of the project with respect to potential land use conflicts with existing and future surrounding land uses (including rural residential development, building entitlements and subdivision potential), land of significant scenic or visual value, land of high agricultural value, mineral resources (including mining leases/exploration licences, known mineral resources and any areas with high potential for the discovery of mineral resources within or in the vicinity of the site and demonstrate how impacts will be avoided or minimised), forestry, conservation areas and Crown land, taking into account local and strategic land use objectives and the potential for social and economic impacts on the local community. The analysis of site suitability shall consider any Environmentally Sensitive Area Mapping held by Goulburn Mulwaree Council and Palerang Council; and
  - → description of the alternatives considered (location and/or design) for all project components, and justification for the preferred project demonstrating its benefits on a local and strategic scale and how it achieves stated objectives and any measures to offset residual impacts (for example community enhancement programmes);
- an identification of how relevant planning, land use and development matters (including relevant strategic and statutory matters) have been considered in the impact assessment (direct, indirect and cumulative impacts) and/or in developing management/ mitigation measures, including section 79C of the EP&A Act, applicable State Environmental Planning Policies (SEPP), Local Environmental Plans, the nature and extent of any prohibitions that apply to the development including clear delineation between the different Local Environmental Plans (LEPs)/ Council areas and demonstration that the site is suitable for the proposed use in accordance with SEPP 55 – Remediation of Land and Goulburn Mulwaree Development Control Plan (DCP) particularly Clause 6.3;
- consideration of impacts on community facilities within local towns including Bungendore and Braidwood, as a result of demands imposed by construction and operation stage workers; and
- detail how the principles of ecologically sustainable development will be incorporated in the design, construction and ongoing operation phases of the development.

The EIS must consider the minimum form and content requirements of the Draft *NSW Planning Guidelines: Wind Farms (*as updated*)*, including procedures for consulting with the community and stakeholders, and meeting assessment requirements.

The EIS must demonstrate that the wind farm will be capable of meeting relevant Building Code of Australia (BCA) standards and other relevant codes / manufacturers' specifications for the construction of wind farms.

	Notwithstanding the key issues specified below, the EIS must include an environmental risk assessment to identify the potential environmental impacts associated with the development. Where relevant, the assessment of the key issues below, and any other significant issues identified in the risk assessment, must include: • adequate baseline data; • consideration of potential cumulative impacts due to other development in the vicinity. Particular consideration should be given to other nearby existing and proposed wind farms, including Woodlawn, Capital I, Capital II, and Collector wind farms, and Capital Solar Farm and • measures to avoid, minimise and if necessary, offset the predicted impacts, including detailed contingency plans for managing any significant risks to the environment.
Key issues	The EIS must address the following specific matters for both the wind farm and associated infrastructure: **Landscape and Visual Impacts** - the EIS must: → provide a comprehensive assessment of the visual impacts of all components of the project (including turbines, transmission lines, sub-stations, and any other ancillary infrastructure) on landscape values, scenic vistas, rural townships, non-associated residences (including approved but not yet developed dwellings or subdivisions with residential rights), significant public viewing locations, and any cumulative impacts associated with surrounding proposed, approved or operational wind farms in the locality; → identify a zone of visual influence for the wind farm (no less than 10 km); → assess the impact of shadow "flicker", blade "glint", and night lighting from the wind farm; and → utilise recognised tools (such as photomontages and wireframes) at representative locations to adequately assess the visual impacts of the project, particularly for non-associated residences within 3 km of a proposed turbine; → provide detailed consideration of the feasibility and effectiveness of the proposed mitigation measures, including consultation with all landowners of non-associated residences within 3 km of a proposed turbine where significant visual impacts are predicted to identify potential approaches to mitigate any adverse impacts, including consideration of negotiated agreements; **Noise and Vibration Impacts** - the EIS must: → include a comprehensive noise assessment of all phases and components of the project taking into account cumulative impacts from surrounding approved or operational wind farms in the locality including: turbine operation, the operation of the electrical substation, corona and / or aeolian noise from the transmission line, construction noise (focusing on high noise-generating construction scenarios and works outside of standard construction hours), traffic noise during construction and operation, and vibration generating activities (including blasting) during construction and/ or operation. The assessment must identify noise / vibration sensitive locations (including approved but not yet developed dwellings), baseline conditions based on monitoring results, the levels and character of noise (e.g. tonality, impulsiveness, low frequency etc) generated by noise sources, noise/ vibration criteria, modelling assumptions and worst case and representative noise/ vibration impacts; → in relation to wind turbine operation, determine the noise impacts under operating meteorological conditions (i.e. wind speeds from cut in to rated power), including impacts under meteorological conditions that exacerbate impacts (including varying atmospheric stability classes). The probability of such occurrences must be quantified; → include monitoring to ensure that there is adequate wind speed/profile data and ambient background noise data that is representative for all sensitive receptors;

	→ provide justification for the nominated average background noise level used in the assessment process, considering any significant difference between daytime and night time background noise levels at background noise levels higher than 30 dB(A); → consider special audible characteristics, including tonality, amplitude modulation, and low frequency noise (apply penalties where relevant), and identify any risks with respect to tonal, low frequency or infrasound; → clearly outline the noise mitigation, monitoring and management measures that would be applied to the project. This must include an assessment of the feasibility, effectiveness and reliability of proposed measures and any residual impacts after these measures have been incorporated; → if any noise agreements with residents are proposed for areas where noise criteria cannot be met, provide sufficient information to enable a clear understanding of what has been agreed and what criteria have been used to frame any such agreements; and → include a contingency strategy that provides for additional noise attenuation should higher noise levels than those predicted result following commissioning and/or should noise agreements with landowners not eventuate. The assessment must be undertaken consistent with the following guidelines: → Wind Turbines: the South Australian Environment Protection Authority's *Wind Farms _Environmental Noise Guidelines (2009)* with a base criteria of 35 dB(A) or background plus 5 dB, whichever is greater; → Low Frequency Noise: predictions are to be assessed by comparison to a level of 60 dB(C) at any relevant receiver or the proposed criteria in assessment of low frequency noise disturbance (UK Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs, 2005); → Tonality: *ISO 1996.2: 2007 Acoustics — Description, measurement and assessment of environmental noise – Determination of environmental noise levels;* → Substation: *NSW Industrial Noise Policy* (EPA, 2000); → Site Establishment and Construction: *Interim Construction Noise Guidelines* (DECC, 2009); → Traffic Noise: *NSW Road Noise Policy* (DECCW 2011) → Vibration: *Assessing Vibration: A Technical Guideline* (DECC, 2006). **Biodiversity** - the EIS must: → include an ecological assessment considering terrestrial and aquatic ecosystems in local waterways (particularly tributaries of the Shoalhaven River incorporating the threatened fish species Macquarie Perch Macquaria australascia), including groundwater dependent ecosystems, consistent with Guidelines for Threatened Species Assessment (DEC, 2005); Why Do Fish Need to Cross the Road? Fish Passage Requirements for Waterway Crossings (Fisheries NSW), and taking account of Natural England Technical Information Note TIN051: Bats and Onshore Wind Turbines Interim Guidance (Natural England, 2012). → provide justification for site selection of the proposed turbine locations taking into account the potential to use areas of lower habitat value within the site; → identify threatened species, populations and communities listed under both State and Commonwealth legislation that have the potential to occur on site with particular reference to species identified by the Office of Environment and Heritage (OEH) letter received by the Department on 13 January 2014 particularly Eastern Bentwing bats with specific reference to the Mount Fairy bat staging cave and including the Endangered Ecological Communities (EECs) *White Box Yellow Box Blakely's Red Gum Grassy Woodland and Derived Native Grassland Box Gum Woodland; Natural Temperate Grassland of the Southern Tablelands of New South Wales (NSW) and the Australian Capital Territory (ACT); White Box Yellow Box Blakely's Red Gum Woodland*

	(Box Gum Woodland); Tablelands Snow Gum, Black Sallee, Candlebark and Ribbon Gum Grassy Woodland in the South Eastern Highlands, Sydney Basin, South East Corner and NSW South Western Slopes Bioregion; Tablelands Basalt Forest in the Sydney Basin and South Eastern Highlands Bioregions; Montane Peatlands and Swamps of the New England Tableland, NSW North Coast, Sydney Basin, South East Corner, South Eastern Highlands and Australian Alps Bioregions; and threatened flora species including the 19 identified in the DGR Request (particularly Buttercup Doubletail (*Diuris aequalis*)), threatened fauna species including the 43 identified in the DGR Request (particularly Glossy Black Cockatoo (*Cathyptorhyncus*) & the koala (*Phascolarctos cinereus*)), and the 23 migratory bird species that are identified in the DGR Request including those associated with nearby waterbodies such as Lake Bathurst, The Morass and Lake George; → map existing vegetation by vegetation/ community type and include details on existing site conditions, including whether the vegetation comprises a highly modified or over-cleared landscape and the types and quality of habitat resources available. Vegetation mapping should consider any Environmentally Sensitive Area Mapping held by Goulburn Mulwaree Council and Palerang Council and any areas subject to an agreement with Upper Shoalhaven Catchment Management Authority; → provide details of the survey methodology employed including survey effort and representativeness for each species targeted and clear justification for species that were discounted from requiring field surveys or further assessment; → demonstrate a design philosophy of impact avoidance on ecological values, and in particular, ecological values of high significance; → provide a worst case estimate of native vegetation to be cleared (in hectares), including quantifying impacts (in hectares) by vegetation type and threatened species habitat (as relevant); → assess the significance of impacts to native vegetation, listed threatened species, populations and communities and their habitats with consideration to local and region-based ecological implications, including edge effects, habitat connectivity and distribution of species. The assessment must consider impacts to in-stream and riparian ecology from works close to waterways and/ or waterway crossings. In addition, impact of the project on birds and bats from blade strikes, low air pressure zones at the blade tips (barotrauma), and alteration to movement patterns resulting from the turbines must be assessed, including demonstration of how the project has been sited to avoid and/ or minimise such impacts. This must include consideration of the Eastern Bentwing-Bat (*Miniopterus schreibersii)* Wee Jasper to coastal areas migration routes, and the Mount Fairy 'dispersal stopover' cave; → consider effects, including the effects of multiple wind farms in the vicinity on bird/bat strike, movement patterns and loss of habitat; → include details of how flora and fauna impacts would be managed during construction and operation including adaptive management, rehabilitation/ regeneration measures and maintenance protocols; → demonstrate how the project (with the incorporation of all proposed measures to avoid, mitigate and/ or offset impacts) achieves a biodiversity outcome consistent with "maintain or improve" principles. Sufficient details must be provided of the specific areas and management proposed to offset the impacts of the project on biodiversity, and how the offset areas will be secured in perpetuity; and → address the risk of weed spread, both noxious and environmental weeds, and identify mitigation measures. **Heritage Impacts** – the EIS must include an assessment of impacts on Aboriginal and historic heritage. The EIS must: → include sufficient information to demonstrate the likely impacts of the project on Aboriginal heritage values/items (archaeological and cultural) and outline

	proposed mitigation measures (including consideration of the effectiveness and reliability of the measures) in accordance with the *Guide to Investigating, Assessing and Reporting on Aboriginal Cultural Heritage in NSW (*OEH, 2011) and the *Code of Practice for the Archaeological Investigation of Aboriginal Objects in NSW* (DECCW, 2010). . The assessment must be undertaken by suitably qualified heritage consultants and demonstrate effective consultation with Aboriginal communities in determining and assessing impacts, developing options and selecting options and mitigation measures (including the final proposed measures) be undertaken and documented in accordance with the *Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Consultation Requirements for Proponents* (DECCW, 2010); and → provide sufficient information to demonstrate the likely impacts of the project on historic heritage values (including heritage vistas) and, where impacts to State or local historic heritage items are proposed, outline proposed mitigation and management measures (including consideration of the effectiveness and reliability of the measures) generally consistent with the guidelines in the *NSW Heritage Manual*. Where impacts to State or local historic heritage items are proposed, a statement of heritage significance must be included. **Traffic and Transport** – the EIS must assess the construction and operational traffic impacts of the development including: → details of traffic volumes (both light and heavy vehicles) and transport routes during construction and operation; → assess the potential traffic impacts of the project on road network function (including intersection level of service) and safety, and including impact on existing transport including school bus routes and freight operations as well as implications for other road users; → assess the capacity of the existing road network to accommodate the type and volume of traffic generated by the project (including over-mass /over-dimensional traffic) during construction and operation, differentiating between various raw material deliveries and staff and contractors, including full details of any required upgrades to roads, bridges, site access provisions (for safe access to the public road network) or other road features; → details of measures to mitigate and/or manage potential impacts, including construction traffic control, road dilapidation surveys and measures to control soil erosion and dust generated by traffic volumes; → details of access roads within the site including how these would connect to the existing public road network (i.e. site access) and ongoing operational maintenance requirements for on-site roads; → indicative details of the location of works in the road reserve; → consideration of relevant RMS and Council traffic/road policies; and → consideration of necessary road upgrade and / or maintenance contributions to the relevant Council to address impacts on the local road network. **Hazard/Risks** – the EIS must include an assessment of the following: → Aviation Safety: potential impacts on aviation safety, including cumulative effects of multiple wind farms in the vicinity, potential wake/turbulence issues, the need for aviation hazard lighting, considering nearby aerodromes and aircraft landing areas, defined air traffic routes, aircraft operating heights, approach/departure procedures, radar interference, communication systems, and navigation aids. The assessment shall be prepared in accordance with *National Airports Safeguarding Framework Guideline D:* Managing Wind Turbine Risk to Aircraft. Aerodromes within 30km of the turbines should be identified and impacts on obstacle limitation surfaces addressed. Assess the impact of the turbines on the safe and efficient aerial application of agricultural fertilisers and pesticides in the vicinity of the turbines and transmission line. An Aviation Impact Statement (AIS) prepared by an appropriately qualified person including the associated height and co-ordinates for each turbine;

	→ Telecommunications: identify possible effects on telecommunications systems, assess impacts and mitigation measures including undertaking a full engineering assessment to examine the potential impacts as well as analysis and agreement on the implementation of suitable options to avoid potential disruptions to radio communication services; which may include the installation and maintenance of alternative sites; → Health: consider and document health issues, focusing on neighbours with dwellings within 1.5 km of proposed wind turbines. Identify potential hazards and risks associated with electric and magnetic fields and demonstrate the application of the principles of Prudent Avoidance; → Bushfire Hazards: identify potential hazards and risks associated with bushfires/use of bushfire prone land, including the risks that a wind farm will cause bush fire and any potential impacts on the aerial fighting of bush fires incorporating options to switch off turbines during bushfire, and demonstrating compliance with *Planning for Bush Fire Protection 2006*; and → Blade throw: assess blade throw risks. **Water Supply, Water Quality and Hydrology** – The EIS must: → identify water demands, and determine whether an adequate and secure water supply is available for the project; → identify water sources (surface and groundwater), water disposal/discharge methods and water storage structures in the form of a water balance; → include the statutory (licensing) context of the water supply sources; → assess potential environmental impacts associated with the use of the identified water sources including impacts on groundwater and implications for existing licensed users/basic landholder rights; → assess potential environmental impacts associated with any proposed discharges, and proposed monitoring methodology where required; → assess the potential to intercept groundwater, including predicted dewatering volumes, zone of drawdown and associated impact, water quality and disposal methods; → assess potential risks to surface and groundwater quality risks, demonstrating clear consideration of the principle of achieving neutral or beneficial effect on water quality in the drinking water catchment, consistent with the State Environmental Planning Policy (Sydney Drinking Water Catchment) 2011, including a framework for the avoidance, mitigation, management and monitoring of water quality impacts; → where the project involves crossing or works within 40 metres of waterways, identify likely impacts to the waterways, how the waterways are proposed to be crossed and be designed in accordance with the NSW Office of Water *Guidelines for Controlled Activities* (2010); → describe the measures to minimise hydrological, water quality, upland salinity, aquatic and riparian impacts, including monitoring and contingency requirements to address surface and groundwater impacts; and → identify how works within steep gradient land or highly erosive soil types will be managed during construction and operation, including in relation to access roads.
Consultation	During the preparation of the EIS, you must consult with relevant local, State and Commonwealth Government authorities, service providers, community groups and affected landowners. In particular you must consult with: • Goulburn Mulwaree Council; • Palerang Council; • Water NSW; • Local Aboriginal Land Council; • Office of Environment and Heritage • Environment Protection Authority; • NSW Trade and Investment Department (Resources & Energy);

	• Department of Primary Industries (Catchments and Lands (Crown Lands), Fisheries NSW, Agriculture NSW, and DPI Water); • NSW Roads and Maritime Services; • NSW Rural Fire Service; • Air Services Australia; • Civil Aviation Safety Authority; • Department of Defence; • NSW Government Telco Authority and other registered communications licensees (including emergency services); • Aerial Agricultural Association of Australia; • Royal Flying Doctor Service; • Operators of non-regulated aerodromes; • NSW Farmers Association; • relevant service providers; • relevant minerals stakeholders (including exploration and mining title holders); and • the public, including community groups and adjoining and affected landowners (including "associated" and "non associated" properties). A comprehensive, detailed and genuine community consultation and engagement process must be undertaken. This process must ensure that the community is both informed of the proposal and is actively engaged in issues of concern to them, and is given ample opportunity to provide its views on the proposal. Sufficient information must be provided to the community so that it has a good understanding of what is being proposed and of the impacts. There should be a particular focus on those non wind farm associated community members who live in proximity to the site, and in particular neighbours located within 3 km of a wind turbine. The EIS must describe the consultation process and the issues raised, and identify where the design of the development has been amended in response to these issues. Where amendments have not been made to address an issue, a short explanation should be provided. The EIS must: • demonstrate effective consultation with stakeholders, and that the level of consultation with each stakeholder is commensurate with their degree of interest/concern or likely impact; • clearly describe the consultation process undertaken for each stakeholder/group including details of the dates of consultation and copies of any information disseminated as part of the consultation process (subject to confidentiality); • describe the issues raised during consultation and how and where these have been addressed in the EIS; and • provide details of the status of the community consultative committee required to be formed by the Applicant, consistent with the provisions of the *Draft NSW Planning Guidelines: Wind Farms* (as updated).
Further consultation after 2 years	If you do not lodge a development application and EIS for the development within 2 years of the issue date of these requirements, you must consult further with the Department in relation to the preparation of the EIS.

Planning Services
Resource Assessments

Contact: Nicole Brewer
Tel: (02) 9228 6374
Email: nicole.brewer@planning.nsw.gov.au

Our Ref: 13/12736

Mr Ibrahim Eid
Project Manager
EPYC Pty Ltd
Level 5, 44 Miller Street
NORTH SYDNEY NSW 2060

Dear Mr Eid

Jupiter Wind Farm (SSD 13_6277)
Supplementary Environmental Assessment Requirements

As you are aware, the Jupiter Wind Farm has been determined to be a controlled action under the *Environment Protection Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999*. The Commonwealth Department of the Environment has provided the NSW Department of Planning and Environment with input on the Secretary's Environmental Assessment Requirements (SEARs).

The Department provides the Commonwealth's requirements as a supplement to the SEARs issued on 31 January 2014 and updated on 3 June 2014. The additional matters should be considered in the Environmental Impact Statement for the project.

If you wish to discuss the matter further please contact Nicole Brewer on 9228 6374.

Yours sincerely

10/9/15.

Steve O'Donoghue
A/Director, Resource Assessments
(as nominee of the Secretary)

Guidelines for preparing Assessment Documentation relevant to the *Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999* (EPBC Act)

These Guidelines are intended to inform the development of Assessment Documentation for projects assessed under an assessment bilateral agreement. If a separate chapter is not provided in the Assessment Documentation, the Table at Attachment 1 detailing where the information is located must be completed.

References:

- *Environment Protect and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999* - section 51-55, section 96A(3)(a)(b), 101A(3)(a)(b), section 136, section 527E;
- Environment Protect and Biodiversity Conservation Regulations 2000 - Division 3.2, 3.02(a)(b)(ii)(iii), Division 5.2, Schedule 4;
- Bilateral Agreements - Item 18.1, Item 18.5, Schedule 1; and
- Policy - *Environment Protect and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999* Environmental Offsets Policy October 2012

1 BACKGROUND AND DESCRIPTION OF THE ACTION

The Assessment Documentation must provide background to the action and describe in detail all components of the action for example (but not limited to), the construction, operation and (if relevant) decommissioning components of the action. This must include the precise location of all works to be undertaken (including associated offsite works and infrastructure), structures to be built or elements of the action that may have impacts on matters of national environmental significance (MNES).

The description of the action must also include details on how the works are to be undertaken (including stages of development and their timing) and design parameters for those aspects of the structures or elements of the action that may have relevant impacts.

The Assessment Documentation must include how the action relates to any other actions (of which the proponent should reasonably be aware) that have been, or are being, taken or that have been approved in the region affected by the action.

The Assessment Documentation must also provide details on the current status of the action, alternatives to the action, as well as the consequences of not proceeding with the action.

2 THE ENVIRONMENT INCLUDING MNES

The Assessment Documentation must include a description of the environment and management practices of the proposal site and the surrounding areas and other areas that may be affected by the action. Include all relevant MNES protected by controlling provisions of Part 3 of the EPBC Act (see Attachment 2 for MNES specific to the project):

(a) A description of the World Heritage values of the World Heritage property relevant to the action.

    a. Including Outstanding Universal Value, relevant plans

(b) A description of the National Heritage values of the National Heritage Place relevant to the action.

   a. Including any relevant plans

(c) A description of the ecological character of the Ramsar Wetland relevant to the action.

   a. Including any relevant plans

(d) Listed threatened species and communities (including suitable habitat) that are or are likely to be present in the vicinity of the site, including the following details:

   i. Details of the scope, timing/effort (survey season/s) and methodology for studies or surveys used to provide information on the listed species/community/habitat at the site (and in areas that may be impacted by the project). Include details of:

      - best practice survey guidelines are applied; and
      - how they are consistent with (or a justification for divergence from) published Australian Government guidelines and policy statements.

   ii. Include any relevant plans/agreements

(e) Listed migratory species (including suitable habitat) that are or are likely to be present in the vicinity of the site, including the following details:

   i. Details of the scope, timing/effort (survey season/s) and methodology for studies or surveys used to provide information on the listed species/habitat at the site (and in areas that may be impacted by the project). Include details of:

      a. best practice survey guidelines are applied;
      b. how these are consistent with (or a justification for divergence from) published Australian Government guidelines and policy statements.

   ii. Include any relevant plans/agreements

(f) A description of the environment relevant to the nuclear action.

(g) A description of the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park environment relevant to the action.

   a. Including Outstanding Universal Value

(h) A description of the water resource environment relevant to the coal seam gas development or large coal mining development.

   a. Refer to the Independent Expert Scientific Committee's (IESC) Information Guidelines for Proposals Relating to the Development of Coal Seam Gas and Large Coal Mines where there is a Significant Impact on Water Resources, available at http://www.iesc.environment.gov.au/publications/information-guidelines-independent-expert-scientific-committee-advice-coal-seam-gas
   b. Note: Advice will be requested from the IESC in regards to the proposal.

(i) A description of the environment relevant for part of the Commonwealth Marine (for actions outside the Commonwealth marine area that may impact the environment in the Commonwealth marine area).

a. Note: whole of the environment must be considered –refer to the Significant Impact Guidelines 1.2 – Actions on, or impacting upon, Commonwealth land and Actions by Commonwealth Agencies.

(j) A description of the environment relevant for Commonwealth Land (for actions outside Commonwealth Land that may impact on the environment on Commonwealth Land).

a. Note: whole of the environment must be considered –refer to the Significant Impact Guidelines 1.2 – Actions on, or impacting upon, Commonwealth land and Actions by Commonwealth Agencies.

3 IMPACTS

(a) The Assessment Documentation must include a description of all of the relevant impacts of the action on MNES (identified in Section 2). Impacts during the construction, operational and (if relevant) the decommissioning phases of the project must be addressed, and the following information provided:

i. a description of the relevant impacts of the action;

ii. a detailed analysis of the nature and extent of the likely direct, indirect and consequential impacts relevant to MNES, including likely short-term and long-term impacts – refer to the Significant Impact Guidelines 1.1 - Matters of National Environmental Significance for guidance on the various types of impact that need to be considered;

iii. a statement whether any relevant impacts are likely to be unknown, unpredictable or irreversible;

iv. any technical data and other information used or needed to make a detailed assessment of the relevant impacts;

v. an explanation of how Indigenous stakeholders' views of the action's impacts to biodiversity and cultural heritage have been sought and considered in the assessment. Including where relevant, how guidelines published by the Commonwealth in relation to consulting with Indigenous peoples for proposed actions that are under assessment have been considered and applied; and

vi. where the proposal is a coal seam gas development or large coal mining development and likely to significantly impact on a water resource – refer to the IESC's Information Guidelines for Proposals Relating to the Development of Coal Seam Gas and Large Coal Mines where there is a Significant Impact on Water Resources, available at http://www.iesc.environment.gov.au/publications/information-guidelines-independent-expert-scientific-committee-advice-coal-seam-gas

(b) The Assessment Documentation should identify and address cumulative impacts, where potential project impacts are in addition to existing impacts of other activities (including known potential future expansions or developments by the proponent and other proponents in the region and vicinity).

(c) The Assessment Documentation should also provide a detailed assessment of any likely impact that this proposed action may facilitate on the relevant MNES at the local, regional, state and national scale.

4 AVOIDANCE AND MITIGATION MEASURES / ALTERNATIVES

Avoidance and Mitigation Measures

The Assessment Documentation must provide information on all proposed avoidance and mitigation measures to manage the relevant impacts of the action on MNES.

The Assessment Documentation also must take into account relevant agreements and plans that cover impacts on MNES including but not limited to:

- any recovery plan, conservation advice for the species or community;
- any threat abatement plan for a process that threatens the species;
- any wildlife conservation plan for the species;
- any management plan for a Ramsar wetland;
- any management plan for a World Heritage property and National Heritage place;
- any Marine Bioregional Plans;
- any Strategic Assessment;
- Outstanding Universal Value; and
- the IESC Information Guidelines for Proposals Relating to the Development of Coal Seam Gas and Large Coal Mines where there is a Significant Impact on Water Resources available at http://www.iesc.environment.gov.au/publications/information-guidelines-independent-expert-scientific-committee-advice-coal-seam-gas.

The Assessment Documentation must include, and substantiate, specific and detailed descriptions of the proposed avoidance and mitigation measures, based on best available practices and must include the following elements:

(a) A consolidated list of avoidance and mitigation measures proposed to be undertaken to prevent or minimise for the relevant impacts of the action on MNES, including:

i. a description of proposed avoidance and mitigation measures to deal with relevant impacts of the action, including mitigation measures proposed to be taken by State/Territory governments, local governments or the proponent;

ii. assessment of the expected or predicted effectiveness of the mitigation measures, including the scale and intensity of impacts of the proposed action and the on-ground benefits to be gained through each of these measures;

iii. a description of the outcomes that the avoidance and mitigation measures will achieve;

iv. any statutory or policy basis for the mitigation measures; and

v. the cost of the mitigation measures.

(b) A detailed outline of a plan for the continuing management, mitigation and monitoring of relevant MNES impacts of the action, including a description of the outcomes that will be achieved and any provisions for independent environmental auditing.

Where appropriate, each project phase (construction, operation, decommission) must be addressed separately. It must state the environmental outcomes, performance criteria, monitoring, reporting, corrective action, contingencies, responsibility and timing for each environmental issue.

(c) the name of the agency responsible for endorsing or approving each mitigation measure or monitoring program.

Alternatives

The Assessment Documentation must include any feasible alternatives to the action to the extent reasonably practicable, including:

(a) if relevant, the alternative of taking no action;

(b) a comparative description of the impacts of each alternative on the triggered MNES protected by controlling provisions of Part 3 of the EPBC Act for the action; and

(c) sufficient detail to make clear why any alternative is preferred to another.

Short, medium and long-term advantages and disadvantages of the options must be discussed.

5 RESIDUAL IMPACTS / OFFSETS

The Assessment Documentation must provide details of:

(a) the likely residual impacts on MNES that are likely to occur after the proposed activities to avoid and mitigate all impacts are taken into account.

i. Include the reasons why avoidance or mitigation of impacts is not reasonably achieved; and

ii. Identify the significant residual impacts on MNES.

Offset Package (if relevant)

The Assessment Documentation must include details of an offset package proposed to be implemented to compensate for the residual significant impact of the project, as well as an analysis about how the offset meets the requirements in the Department's *Environment Protect and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999* Environmental Offsets Policy October 2012 (EPBC Act Offset Policy), or an endorsed state offsets policy (see www.environment.gov.au/protection/environment-assessments/bilateral-agreements/condition-setting-assessment). .

The offset package can comprise a combination of direct offsets and other compensatory measures, so long as it meets the requirements of the EPBC Act Offset Policy, or an endorsed offsets policy. Offsets should align with conservation priorities for the impacted protected matter and be tailored specifically to the attribute of the protected matter that is impacted in order to deliver a conservation gain.

Offsets should compensate for an impact for the full duration of the impact.

Offsets must directly contribute to the ongoing viability of the MNES impacted by the project and deliver an overall conservation outcome that improves or maintains the viability of the MNES as compared to what is likely to have occurred under the status quo, that is if neither the action not the offset had taken place.

Note offsets do not make an unacceptable impact acceptable and do not reduce the likely impacts of a proposed action. Instead, offsets compensate for any residual significant impact.

The Assessment Documentation must provide:

(a) Details of the offset package to compensate for significant residual impacts on MNES; and

(b) An analysis of how the offset package meets the requirements of the EPBC Act Offsets Policy, a discussion on the feasibility and the workings outlined in Attachment 3; or

(c) Details of how the offset meets an endorsed state offsets policy.

6 ENVIRONMENTAL RECORD OF PERSON(S) PROPOSING TO TAKE THE ACTION

The information provided must include 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:

(a) the person proposing to take the action; and

(b) for an action for which a person has applied for a permit, the person making the application.

If the person proposing to take the action is a corporation, details of the corporation's environmental policy and planning framework must also be included.

7 ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL MATTERS

The economic and social impacts of the action, both positive and negative, must be analysed. Matters of interest include:

(a) details of any public consultation activities undertaken, and their outcomes;

(b) details of any consultation with Indigenous stakeholders.

(c) projected economic costs and benefits of the project, including the basis for their estimation through cost/benefit analysis or similar studies;

(d) employment opportunities expected to be generated by the project (including construction and operational phases).

Economic and social impacts should be considered at the local, regional and national levels. Details of the relevant cost and benefits of alternative options to the proposed action, as identified in Section 4 above, should also be included.

Identification of affected parties is required, including a statement mentioning any communities that may be affected and describing their views.

8 INFORMATION SOURCES PROVIDED IN THE ASSESSMENT DOCUMENTATION

For information given in the Assessment Documentation, state:

(a) the source of the information;

(b) how recent the information is;

(c) how the reliability of the information was tested;

(d) what uncertainties (if any) are in the information; and

(e) what guidelines, plans and/or policies did you consider.

9 CONCLUSION

An overall conclusion as to the environmental acceptability of the proposal on each MNES, including:

(a) a discussion on the consideration with the requirements of the EPBC Act, including the objects of the EPBC Act, the principles of ecologically sustainable development and the precautionary principle;

(b) reasons justifying undertaking the proposal in the manner proposed, including the acceptability of the avoidance and mitigation measures; and

(c) if relevant, a discussion of residual impacts and any offsets and compensatory measures proposed or required for significant residual impacts on MNES, and the relative degree of compensation and acceptability.

Attachment 1 – Reference Table for EPBC Act Assessment Documentation

Table 1: Assessment Requirements addressed in proponent Assessment Documentation (e.g. EIS)
[only include this table if a separate chapter on MNES is not applied]

Assessment Requirements Section no.	Requirement	Section in Assessment Documentation
1	Background and Description	
2	The Environment including MNES	
(a)	World Heritage	

ATTACHMENT 2 – Controlling provisions for Jupiter Wind Farm (EPBC 2015/7518)

The Jupiter Wind Farm was determined to be a controlled action under section 75 of the *Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999* (EPBC Act) on 8 Spetember 2015.

The controlled action is likely to have a direct and indirect impact on matters of national environment significance, in particular, listed threatened species and ecological communities (sections 18 and 18A) and migratory species (sections 20 and 20A).

Relevant matters of national environmental significance that have been identified as having the potential to be impacted by the proposed action are listed threatened species, including but not limited to:

- White box-yellow box-Blakely's red gum grassy woodland and derived native grassland ecological community – critically endangered

  The proposed action involves clearing a minimum of 3.39 ha of the community and potentially impacting additional areas of derived native grassland that meets the requirements of the EPBC Act listed ecological community. Based on the information provided in the referral the Department has concerns that areas mapped as derived native grasslands abutting mapped areas of the EC could be the EPBC listed community. Thus the quantum of impact could be higher. This potential discrepancy is only of critical importance if the proponent relies on the EPBC offsets calculator to determine the offset requirements for the EPBC listed community. If the proponent uses accredited approaches such as the NSW Framework for Biodiversity Assessment (FBA) or BioBanking Assessment Methodology (BBAM) then these should be used to determine the impacts and offsets for the NSW listed EEC.

- Swift Parrot (*Lathamus discolour*) – endangered

  The abundance of Swift Parrots in NSW fluctuates markedly between regions and years and the species could migrate in large numbers through the site or occasionally utilise the area for feeding. The species population is declining and loss of adult birds through blade strike could contribute to the long-term decrease in the population and interfere with the recovery of the species.

- Curlew Sandpiper (*Calidris ferruginea*) – critically endangered

  The species is declining and loss of adult birds through blade strike could contribute to the long-term decrease in the size of the population and interfere with the recovery of the species.

- Hoary Sunray (*Leucochrysum albicans var. tricolor*) – endangered

  The proposed action involves clearing of an unknown number of individuals or estimated proportion of local subpopulation. Thus there is insufficient information to determine the significance of impacts to this species. As this species is not listed under NSW threatened species legislation, any significant residual impacts to this species and/or its habitat will require offsetting using the EPBC offsets calculator.

- The following listed migratory species,

  Sharp-tailed Sandpiper (*Calidris acuminata*)

  Common Sandpiper (*Actitis hypoleucos*)

  There are known sites of significance nearby at Lake George and Lake Bathurst and the loss of adults birds through blade strike has the potential to seriously disrupt the lifecycle of an ecologically significant proportion of the population.

Attachment 3 - Offset calculator and workings (remove tables if irrelevant)

[Inset calculator spreadsheet]

Table 1 - EPBC Act Offsets Assessment Guide – *Area of Community* or *Area of Habitat*

Threatened species or ecological community	**Listing status**
Insert species or community	*Insert listing status*

Impact Site - *Area of Habitat* or *Area of Community*

Size (ha)	*Insert the area in ha of the proposed impact*	
Description	*Insert a brief description of the impact site*	
Guide component	*Assessed value*	*Discussion*
Quality	*1 - 10*	*Outline the basis for the quality score on the impact site. This should include an outline of the **condition**, **context** and **stocking rates** for the site and relative weightings for each of these features if a published quality framework is not available.* *Include specific references to justify the assessed value.*

Offset Site - *Area of Habitat* or *Area of Community*

Size (ha):	*Insert the area in ha of the proposed offset*
Description	*Insert a brief description of the proposed offset*

Averted loss Component		
Guide component	*Assessed value*	*Discussion*
Time over which loss is averted	*0 – 20 years (max)*	*Describe the duration of the proposed offset.* *Include specific references to justify the assessed value.*
Risk of loss without offset: (0 – 100%)	*0 – 100%*	*Outline the key information for calculating risk of loss. Information should provide a greater understanding about the level of development intent on the target site and the likelihood of this leading to measurable impacts in the foreseeable future. Key risk of loss indicators include: background rates of loss; geophysical, economic or social data that indicates likely destruction of the offset site; zoning, leases and broad planning instruments that demonstrate possible development intent; and development applications / approvals over the offset site.*

		Degradation to the quality of a site due to current management practices and use should not be incorporated into the risk of loss. These factors should be incorporated in the 'future quality' scores. *Include specific references to justify the assessed value.*
Guide component	*Assessed value*	*Discussion*
Risk of loss with offset (0 – 100%)	*0 – 100%*	*Outline information regarding tenure treatments that reduce any risks referred to in the* ***Risk of loss without offset****.* *Where relevant, this should include information on the legal mechanism that is being used to secure the offset and the types of anthropogenic activities that this legal mechanism will prevent. For example, a conservation covenant may protect a site from timber extraction, but may not treat the risk of the site being used for mineral resource extraction. The difference between the* ***Risk of loss without offset*** *and this value is a function of the legal mechanism to reliably reduce the risk posed to a site.* *Include specific references to justify the assessed value.*
Confidence (Risk related)	*0 – 100%*	*Outline the confidence in the risk of loss scores. Confidence is a measure of certainty and probability of success. Where there is high uncertainty as to the basis of a risk assessment, confidence should be low. The opposite applies for robust evidence and high certainty.* *Include specific references to justify the assessed value.*

Quality Improvement Component		
Guide component	*Assessed value*	*Discussion*
Time until ecological benefit	*0 – 200+*	*Describe the time it will take for the quality to change from the start quality to the proposed future quality with offset.* *Include specific references to justify the assessed value.*
Start quality (0 – 10)	*0 – 10*	*Outline the basis for the quality score on the offset site at present. This should outline the* ***condition****,* ***context*** *and* ***stocking rates*** *for the site and relative weightings for each where a published quality framework is not available.* *Include specific references to justify the assessed value.*

Future quality without offset (0 – 10)	*0 – 10*	*Outline the basis for the future quality without offset score on the offset site over the time until ecological benefit. This is an assessment of the value of the site in the absence of the offset occurring. This score could remain static or could capture natural degradation impacts on habitat where there are known degrading threats – such as increasing prevalence of ferals and weeds.* *Development impacts from clearing of a site should be captured in the averted loss component.* *Include specific references to justify the assessed value.*
Future quality with offset (0 – 10)	*0 – 10*	*Outline the future quality score on the offset site over the* ***time until ecological benefit*** *as a direct result of the proposed offset. This improvement should outline how the habitat on the offset site will be maintained or improved, noting the* ***condition***, ***context*** *and* ***stocking rates*** *for the site. Quality improvements may result from management interventions such as weed control, erosion control or revegetation.* *Include specific references to justify the assessed value.*
Confidence (Quality related)	*0 – 100%*	*Outline the confidence in the quality improvement being realised. Confidence scores are a measure of evidence, certainty and probability of success. Where there is limited evidence of a management action being effective or high uncertainty as to an ecological outcome, confidence should be low. The opposite applies for robust evidence and high certainty.* *Include specific references to justify the assessed value.*

Summary

Final % of impact offset	*Insert the % of impact offset score.*
Cost of offset ($)	*Insert the value of the proposed offset. Include specific references to justify the cost.*
Other compensatory measures (if proposed)	*Outline any other compensatory measures that are proposed by the proponent, including information on how these address key priorities for threatened species or ecological communities.* *Where these measures involve the funding by the proponent of a third party, include a brief description of how this funding will be managed – including governance arrangements, relevant milestone and timeframes etc.* *Include specific references to justify the assessed value.*

References

Provide a consolidated list of all references used as sources in the tables above.

Table 2 - EPBC Act Offsets Assessment Guide – *Number of Individuals/Features*

Threatened species	**Listing status**
Insert species	*Insert listing status*

Impact – *Number of Individuals/Features*

Impact	*Insert the number of individual/features that will be impacted*
Source	

Offset – *Number of Individuals/Features*

Description	*Insert a brief description of the proposed offset*	
Guide component	*Assessed value*	*Discussion*
Time horizon	*0 – 200+*	*Describe the time it will take for the proposed number of individuals/features to be created under the proposed offset* *Include specific references to justify the assessed value.*
Start value	*0 – 200+*	*Identify the number of individuals/features on the offset site at present, if any.* *Include specific references to justify the assessed value.*
Future value without offset	*0 – 200+*	*Identify the number of individuals/features on the offset site, if any, without the proposed offset, at the nominated time horizon. Outline the basis for this score. This score could remain static or could capture natural degradation impacts on habitat where there are known degrading threats – such as increasing prevalence of invasive species.* *Include specific references to justify the assessed value.*
Future value with offset	*0 – 200+*	*Identify the future number of individuals/features on the offset site at the nominated time horizon, as a direct result of the proposed offset. Outline how this increase will occur. The increase may result from propagation, captive breeding and release programs or other management interventions.* *Include specific references to justify the assessed value.*
Confidence	*0 – 100%*	*Outline the confidence in the proposed increase in individuals/features on the offset site at the nominated time horizon being realised. Confidence scores are a measure of evidence, certainty and probability of success. Where there is limited evidence of an action being effective or high*

		uncertainty as to an ecological outcome, confidence should be low. The opposite applies for robust evidence and high certainty. *Include specific references to justify the assessed value.*

Summary

Final % of impact offset	*Insert the % of impact offset score*
Cost of offset ($)	*Insert the value of the proposed offset*
Other compensatory measures (if proposed)	*Outline any proposed other compensatory measures that are proposed by the proponent, including information on how these address key priorities for the relevant threatened species.* *Where these measures involve the funding by the proponent of a third party, include a brief description of how this funding will be managed – including governance arrangements, relevant milestone and timeframes etc.* *Include specific references to justify the assessed value.*

References

Provide a consolidated list of all references used as sources in the tables above.

Table 3 - EPBC Act Offsets Assessment Guide – *Condition of habitat*

Threatened species or Ecological Community	**Listing status**
Insert species or ecological community	*Insert listing status*

NB: The 'condition of habitat' row does not currently account for differences in area between the impact site and the offset site. Where the impact site is of a different size to the offset site, the final offset requirement should be calculated by multiplying the '% of impact offset' score by the ratio of the offset site area to impact site area (eg where the impact site is 200ha and the offset site is 100ha, the '% of impact offset' score should be multiplied by 50%).

Impact – *Change in condition (% benchmark)*

Impact	*Insert the condition at the impact site which is predicted as a result of the proposed action, as a % of the site's original condition (ie the condition benchmark)*
Source	

Offset – *Change in condition (% benchmark)*

Description	*Identify the projected increase in condition resulting from the proposed offset. Insert a brief description of how this increase in quality will be achieved.*	
Guide component	*Assessed value*	*Discussion*
Time horizon	*0 – 200+*	*Describe the time it will take for the proposed increase of quality at the offset site to be realised.* *Include specific references to justify the assessed value.*
Start value	*0 – 100+ %*	*Outline the start condition of the offset site as a % of the condition benchmark.* *Include specific references to justify the assessed value.*
Future value without offset	*0 – 100+ %*	*Outline the modelled future condition of the offset site at the time horizon as a % of the condition benchmark in the absence of any offset occurring.* *Include specific references to justify the assessed value.*
Future value with offset	*0 – 100+ %*	*Outline the modelled future condition of the offset site at the time horizon as a % of the condition benchmark with the offset being implemented.* *Include specific references to justify the assessed value.*
Confidence	*0 – 100%*	*Outline the confidence in the modelled changes in condition at the offset site being realised over the nominated time horizon. Confidence scores are a measure of evidence, certainty and probability of success. Where there is limited evidence of an action being effective or high uncertainty as to an ecological outcome, confidence should be low. The opposite applies for robust evidence and high certainty.* *Include specific references to justify the assessed value.*

Summary

Final % of impact offset	*Insert the % of impact offset score*
Cost of offset ($)	*Insert the value of the proposed offset*
Other compensatory measures (if proposed)	*Outline any proposed other compensatory measures that are proposed by the proponent, including information on how these address key priorities for threatened species or ecological communities.* *Where these measures involve the funding by the proponent of a third party, include a brief description of how this funding will be managed – including governance*

	arrangements, relevant milestone and timeframes etc. *Include specific references to justify the assessed value.*

References

Provide a consolidated list of all references used as sources in the tables above.

EPBC Act Offsets Assessment Guide – *Birth rate/mortality rate*

Threatened species	**Listing status**
Insert species	*Insert listing status*

Impact – *Birth rate/mortality rate*

Impact	*Insert the projected % change in rate for the impacted population*
Source	

Table 4 - Offset – *Birth rate/mortality rate*

Description	*Insert a brief description of how the % change in rate will be achieved for the offset. Where the % change in rate will be affecting a different population from the impacted population, it is important to demonstrate that any difference in the relative sizes of the two populations has been adequately considered in quantifying the required scale of the offset (eg a reduction in birth rate of 10% for a population of 2000 would be equivalent to a reduction of 20% for a population of 1000).*	
Guide component	*Assessed value*	*Discussion*
Time horizon	*0 – 200+*	*Specify the amount of time required before the projected % change in rate is achieved.* *Include specific references to justify the assessed value.*
Start value	*1-100+%*	*Identify the existing rate for the population to be affected by the proposed offset. The percentage in this cell should represent the existing offset rate as a function of the population.* *Include specific references to justify the assessed value.*

Future value without offset	*1-100+%*	*Identify the rate for the targeted population without the proposed offset, at the nominated time horizon. Outline the basis for this score. This score could remain static or could capture natural degradation impacts on habitat where there are known degrading threats – such as increasing prevalence of invasive species.* *Include specific references to justify the assessed value.*
Future value with offset	*1-100+%*	*Identify the future rate on the offset site at the nominated time horizon, as a result of the proposed offset. Outline how this change will occur.* *Include specific references to justify the assessed value.*
Confidence	*0 – 100%*	*Outline the confidence in the change in rate being realised for the offset population at the nominated time horizon. Confidence scores are a measure of evidence, certainty and probability of success. Where there is limited evidence of an action being effective or high uncertainty as to an ecological outcome, confidence should be low. The opposite applies for robust evidence and high certainty.* *Include specific references to justify the assessed value.*

Summary

Final % of impact offset	*Insert the % of impact offset score*
Cost of offset ($)	*Insert the value of the proposed offset*
Other compensatory measures (if proposed)	*Outline any proposed other compensatory measures that are proposed by the proponent, including information on how these address key priorities for the relevant threatened species.* *Where these measures involve the funding by the proponent of a third party, include a brief description of how this funding will be managed – including governance arrangements, relevant milestone and timeframes etc.* *Include specific references to justify the assessed value.*

References

Provide a consolidated list of all references used as sources in the tables above.