PART B – AEIS

11. TERRESTRIAL FAUNA

11.1. Boggomoss Snail

The Boggomoss Snail was listed as an Endangered species under the NC Act after publication of the EIS. It was assessed in the EIS in Chapter 28 as a Critically Endangered species under the EPBC Act. For sake of continuity and simplicity, the species is also assessed in **Chapter 28** of Part B of the AEIS. Similarly questions posed by submitters with relation to the Boggomoss Snail have been addressed in **Chapter 28**.

11.2. Koala

Since publication of the EIS, the Koala has been listed as a Vulnerable species under the EPBC Act. In accordance with Section 158A of the EPBC Act, as the species was listed after the proposed action was determined to be a Controlled Action, it is not required to be included in the assessment.

11.3. Fauna movement related to above ground sections of pipeline

A submitter requested additional discussion regarding mitigation options to promote fauna passage at areas potentially disrupted by the above-ground section of pipeline. Since publication of the EIS, the proposed pipeline alignment has been amended to minimise potential impacts within the region. As such, **Section 2.2.5** of Part B of the AEIS notes that it is not intended that any sections of pipeline will be located above ground (this statement does not include pump stations, balancing storages or other items of above ground infrastructure as described in Section 2.3.2.3 of the EIS). Consequently, potential impacts to fauna passage associated with above ground sections of pipeline have been avoided.

11.4. Changing habitat and thereby the regional species mix

A submission questioned the possibility that the habitat change created by the water storage area would lead to a change in the surrounding species mix and potentially impact on nearby protected areas. This submission was developed specifically in response to information provided in the Executive Summary. Detailed discussion was provided in Chapter 11, particularly Section 11.2.1, of the EIS. The EIS noted that changes to the local species mix in the vicinity of the water storage area were possible because the water body would favour some species, particularly birds, over others. Similarly the inundation of the current riverine vegetation would result in a loss of habitat favoured by some species. It was noted that current protected areas such as Precipice National Park or Taroom Town Common would not be directly impacted by the Project. **Section 9.1** of Part B of the AEIS also notes that Lake Murphy and the Palm Tree and Robinson Creek Wetlands will not be impacted and will continue to provide habitat for a wide range of local species.

The EIS (Chapter 11) developed mitigation strategies related to provision of alternative habitat via mitigation (e.g. rehabilitation or revegetation of surrounding habitat, pest and weed control) and provision of offsets. This is further discussed in **Chapter 10** of Part B of the AEIS. It is considered that the scale of change, coupled with the implementation of the detailed mitigation measures, will not lead to a substantive change in the regional species mix.

11.5. Success of catching and relocating fauna

A submission questioned the ability to find, catch and relocate fauna and also the carrying capacity of the habitat into which any such fauna would relocate. Section 11.2.1.1 of the EIS provided the fauna relocation strategy and it primarily relies on allowing fauna to move of their own volition where that is viable rather than capturing them. Capture and physical relocation will be required in some cases and will refer to the draft Queensland *Code of Practice for the welfare of wild animals affected by landclearing and other habitat impacts and wildlife spotter/catchers* (2009) and other procedures commonly employed by qualified and approved spotter-catchers. It is noted that the Code of Practice is informal and not Government Policy.

With regard to carrying capacity of surrounding habitat, it is possible that existing habitat may not be currently at its potential capacity because that capacity may have been reduced through land clearing (reducing the number of roosting or nesting sites),or the presence of feral predators such as foxes, pigs or cats . In accordance with the *Nature Conservation (Wildlife Management) Regulation 2006*, where the Project will interfere with the breeding place of a threatened species, SunWater will prepare a Species Management Program developed in accordance with the Department of Environment and Heritage Protection's Guideline: "Developing a species management program" and part of this program will include an assessment of the suitability of any relocation sites, including the carrying capacity of those sites. In Chapter 11 of the EIS SunWater committed to various measures to improve carrying capacity such as relocation of large woody debris and hollows, revegetation of the northern margin of the water storage (either as part of the buffer zone or the proposed wildlife corridor) and pest and weed control strategies. If determined as necessary, further management measures to improve carrying capacity will be included.

11.6. Correction; Grey Snake

The EIS recorded Grey Snake (Endangered under the NC Act) as Known from the inundation area as it was recorded from a road kill specimen collected from Glebe Road during field surveys. It has since been confirmed that the specimen was not a Grey Snake. The likelihood of the species being found in the impact area is therefore Likely, rather than Known.

11.7. Currency of fauna data

A submitter questioned the currency of fauna related data given the time elapsed since field surveys. As noted in Section 10.1 of the AEIS, vegetation of the study area has changed very little since surveys were undertaken so it is likely that little change has occurred in the fauna compliment. Pre-clearance surveys will confirm the species present at the time and if any species in addition to those discussed in the EIS are encountered, they will be treated in accordance with legislation and managed under the Damage Mitigation Permit or a Species Management Plan will be developed if required and submitted for approval.

This page has been intentionally left blank