

Matthew Sprott - Drayton South Offsets meet EPBC Offset Requirements
[SEC=UNCLASSIFIED]

From: "Jenkins, Mark" <Mark.Jenkins@environment.gov.au>
To: 'Daniel Sullivan' <dsullivan@hansenbailey.com.au>
Date: 5/2/2014 12:53 PM
Subject: Drayton South Offsets meet EPBC Offset Requirements [SEC=UNCLASSIFIED]
CC: 'Matthew Sprott' <Matthew.Sprott@planning.nsw.gov.au>

Daniel

Thank you for your email of 2 May 2014. I have reviewed the revised proposed offsets for the Drayton South Coal Project and the attached map and assumptions, rationale and source reference for each species and also the White Box Grassy Woodland EC.

The proposed offsets meet the requirements of the EPBC Offsets Policy and the EPBC Offsets Calculator.

I will forward this email to Matthew Sprott from the NSW Department of Planning and Environment.

Regards

Mark Jenkins
EPBC Assessment Officer
NSW Section
02 6274 1558

From: Daniel Sullivan [mailto:dsullivan@hansenbailey.com.au]
Sent: Friday, 2 May 2014 9:18 AM
To: Jenkins, Mark
Subject: FW: DoE Calculator

Hi Mark,

As discussed yesterday please see attached and below in the email from our senior ecologists at Cumberland Ecology the revised DoE calculations for the Drayton South offset package which now incorporates additional woodland areas to account for the required habitat for threatened species.

Should require anything further in this regard please give me a call.

Regards,
Daniel Sullivan
Senior Environmental Scientist

HANSEN BAILEY
Tel: (02) 6575 2004
Fax: (02) 6575 2001
Mobile: 0428 772 568
Email : dsullivan@hansenbailey.com.au

From: Cecilia Phu [<mailto:Cecilia.Phu@cumberlandecology.com.au>]
Sent: Friday, 2 May 2014 8:29 AM

To: Daniel Sullivan
Cc: David Robertson
Subject: DoE Calculator

Hi Daniel,

As requested, I have re-run the EPBC offsets guide on the Drayton South revised offset package with due consideration of the comments provided by Mark Jenkins from DoE. The key changes to the calculations include:

- Increasing the area of the offset property to be included in the offset package from 50% to approximately 79% so as to capture more existing woodland;
- Removing the "Part 2" component of the calculations; that is, excluding grassland rehabilitation from the offset calculations for threatened species and Condition C Box Gum Woodland (to further clarify, grassland rehabilitation is still part of the formal offset package and will be managed for conservation, but is not factored into the calculation of MNES offsets);
- Increasing the time to ecological benefit for threatened species from 0 to 10 years;
- Increasing the time to ecological benefit for Box Gum Woodland **Derived Native Grassland** (Condition B) to 20 years as a conservative approach (assuming that the contributing offset component comprises rehabilitation of existing Condition B Derived Native Grassland to Condition C Box Gum Woodland).

A summary of the results are provided in Table 1 below. I also attach copies of the spreadsheets and assumption tables for your consideration and a figure showing the proportion of the offsite property that is being proposed for inclusion in the offset.

Table 1
Summary of Results of Commonwealth Biodiversity Offset Assessment

Matters of National Environmental Significance	Actual Impact (ha)	Direct Offset Required (ha)	Actual Offset (ha)	Adjusted Offset (ha)	% of Impact Offset	90% Minimum Met	F
Box Gum Woodland 'Condition B'	7	3.5	668	35.91	1026.08	yes	
Box Gum Woodland 'Condition C'	13	7.8	516	52.09	667.88	yes	
Swift Parrot	324	194.4	986	199.83	102.79	yes	
Regent Honeyeater	324	194.4	986	199.83	102.79	yes	
Greater Long-eared Bat	324	194.4	986	230.81	118.73	yes	

I would like to comment that we have observed widespread regeneration of canopy species in pasture areas of the offsite property (particularly in the back paddocks), as well as evidence of ringbarking of saplings where the owner is/has been actively maintaining pasture for stock grazing. We feel that this, in combination with the diverse nature of the understorey, is a promising indication of the regenerative potential of the property and we are optimistic about its prospects for conservation improvement under well considered management.

If you have any further questions regarding this assessment, please do not hesitate to call.

Regards,

Cecilia Phu | Senior Project Manager/Ecologist

Cumberland Ecology | Sydney - Brisbane
t 02 9868 1933

e cecilia.phu@cumberlandecology.com.au