

## Approval notice and statement of reasons


### *Petroleum (Environment) Regulations 2016 (NT) (Regulations)*

|   |  |
|---|--|
| Interest holder   | Peak Helium Pty Ltd<br>ABN 65654263804   |
| Petroleum interest(s)   | Exploration Permit 134 (EP134)   |
| Environment management plan (EMP) title   | Onshore Petroleum Projects Environment Management Plan EP134 – now referred to as the 2021 Seismic Exploration Environment Management Plan EP134   |
| EMP document reference  | 2021 Seismic Exploration Environment Management Plan EP134, dated December 6 2021 (PRK1-6)   |
| Regulated activity  | Exploration activities for the Amadeus basin, which include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A two dimensional (2D) seismic survey over eight survey lines for a total length of 120 km</li> <li>• Selective vegetation clearing along seismic lines (8 ha)</li> <li>• Maintenance works of existing access tracks</li> <li>• Rehabilitation of seismic survey lines</li> </ul> |
| Is the EMP a new plan submitted under reg 6 or a revision of a current plan submitted in accordance with reg 18, or regs 15 and 17?       | This is a new plan submitted under reg 6.  |
| Was the regulated activity referred <sup>1</sup> for consideration whether environmental impact assessment was required?                  | No   |
| Was environmental impact assessment <sup>2</sup> required?  | N/A  |
| Has an environmental approval <sup>3</sup> been issued for the regulated activity?  | N/A  |
| Has an Authority Certificate under the <i>Northern Territory Aboriginal Sacred Sites Act 1989</i> been issued for the regulated activity? | Yes<br>Authority Certificate C2021/080   |
| Date an EMP compliant with reg 8 was first submitted under reg 6  | 2 September 2021   |
| Date within which the EMP was published for comment under reg 8A, if applicable   | N/A  |
| Date further information was required and submitted under reg 10, if applicable   | Letter 1: 21 October 2021 info required<br>28 October 2021 submitted<br>NTEPA2020/0061 -001 ~0019<br>Letter 2: 3 November 2021 info required<br>5 November 2021 submitted<br>NTEPA2020/0061 -001 ~0022<br>Letter 3: 26 November 2021 info required   |

<sup>1</sup> This means a referral under the *Environment Protection Act 2019 (NT) (EP Act)* and/or the *Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999 (Cth) (EPBC Act)*.

<sup>2</sup> This means a requirement for an environmental impact assessment to be conducted under the EP Act and/or the EPBC Act.

<sup>3</sup> This means an approval granted under the EP Act and/or the EPBC Act.

|   |  |
|---|--|
|   | 30 November 2021 submitted<br>NTEPA2020/0061 -001 ~0039<br>Letter 4: 6 December 2021 info required<br>7 December 2021 submitted<br>NTEPA2020/0061 -001 ~0044 |
| Date of resubmission notice under reg 11(2)(b), if applicable   | 19 November 2021<br>NTEPA2020/0061 -001 ~0023  |
| Date EMP was resubmitted under reg 11(3), if applicable   | 22 November 2021   |
| Date a notice setting out a proposed timetable for consideration of the EMP was issued under reg 11(2A), or reg 11(3)(c), if applicable   | N/A  |
| Proposed timetable given in notice under reg 11(2A), or reg 11(3)(c), if applicable   | N/A  |
| Where provided under s29B of the Northern Territory Environment Protection Authority Act 2012 (NT) (NT EPA Act), the dates the Northern Territory Environment Protection Authority (NT EPA) was requested to, and provided, advice on EMP | Date of Minister's request for advice:<br>25 February 2019<br>Date of NT EPA Advice: 15 December 2021<br>NTEPA2020/0061 -006 ~0001                           |
| Date of decision  | 15/12/ 2021  |
| Decision maker  | <br>Signature<br><br>Hon Eva Dina Lawler MLA,<br>Minister for Environment |

## 1 Approval notice

1. I approve the part of the EMP that relates to activities to take place on EP134 under reg 11(2)(a)(i)
2. The approval is subject to the following conditions:

**Condition 1:** The interest holder must provide an annual report to the department on its environmental performance, via [onshoregas.depws@nt.gov.au](mailto:onshoregas.depws@nt.gov.au), in accordance with item 11(1)(b) in schedule 1 of the Petroleum (Environment) Regulations 2016, noting:

- i. each report must align with the template and Onshore Petroleum Annual Environment Performance Report Guideline prepared by the department for this purpose;
- ii. the first report must incorporate interest holder performance during the 12 month period from the date of the approval (the reporting period), and be provided within 90 days of the end of the reporting period;
- iii. a report must be provided each year until such time a notification is made to the Minister under regulation 14 that the activity is complete, or until the EMP is revised and re-approved; and
- iv. reports must accurately reflect outcomes of inspections, audits and regulatory compliance notices.

**Condition 2:** To support clause A.3.9 of the Code of Practice: Onshore Petroleum Activities in the Northern Territory the interest holder must, within 90 days of the

## 1 Approval notice

approval date, provide to the department via [onshoregas.depws@nt.gov.au](mailto:onshoregas.depws@nt.gov.au), an updated rehabilitation plan, which:

- i. aligns with the DEPWS Rehabilitation Plan Guide for Surface Disturbance;
- ii. includes a timeframe for establishment of reference sites for each vegetation type cleared during conduct of the regulated activity;
- iii. includes a commitment to provide to the department via [onshoregas.depws@nt.gov.au](mailto:onshoregas.depws@nt.gov.au) an annual rehabilitation report 90 days after the anniversary of the approval date each year, that :
  - summarises progressive rehabilitation progress
  - summarises the outcomes of annual rehabilitation monitoring of cleared areas against reference sites
  - summarises maintenance activities and corrective actions taken to improve rehabilitation outcomes
  - includes geospatial files for areas under rehabilitation
- iv. includes a commitment to commence progressive rehabilitation no later than 12 months following cessation of the regulated activity at each location cleared of vegetation;
- v. includes the requirement to continue annual monitoring of rehabilitated areas until comparison with analogue sites indicates defined success criteria are met.

**Condition 3:** For the avoidance of doubt, the interest holder must not undertake any regulated activity described in this EMP on land outside of EP134.

## 2 Material considered

1. The following material has been taken into account in making this decision:
  - a. 2021 Seismic Exploration EP134 EMP, dated 2 September 2021 revised on 6 December 2021 (PRK1-6)
  - b. The principles of ecologically sustainable development referenced in reg 5A and the approval criteria set out in reg 9(1).
  - c. The NT EPA advice provided at my request under s29B of the NT EPA Act.
  - d. The Authority Certificate issued under the *Northern Territory Aboriginal Sacred Sites Act 1989*.
  - e. The Code of Practice: Onshore Petroleum Activities in the Northern Territory (Code) as set out in reg 4A.

## 3 Statement of reasons

1. The EMP meets the approval criterion in reg 9(1)(a), because it contains all the information required by Schedule 1 of the Regulations. reg 9(1)(a)
2. I have taken into account the approval criterion in reg 9(1)(b) by noting the nature and scale of the regulated activity and bearing it in mind during my consideration of the impacts and risks. In particular, I note that: reg 9(1)(b)
  - a. The nature of the regulated activity is as follows:
    - i. a two dimensional (2D) seismic survey over eight survey lines for a total length of 120 km x 5 m
    - ii. vegetation clearing along seismic lines (8 ha)
    - iii. maintenance works of existing access tracks
    - iv. rehabilitation of seismic survey lines
  - b. The scale of the regulated activity is as follows:
    - i. the total footprint of the regulated activity is 60 ha
    - ii. vegetation clearing (8 ha) is equivalent to approximately 7% of the total footprint area
    - iii. the estimated groundwater usage is 0.1 ML
    - iv. peak traffic movements for the regulated activity is 10 light vehicles per day during the seismic program, 12 truck movements during mobilisation and demobilisation, and four truck movements during seismic line clearing and acquisition
    - v. peak workforce will be 30 person on site during operations where required (accommodated off-site)
    - vi. generation of approximately 201 tonnes of carbon dioxide equivalent (tCO<sub>2</sub>-e), comprising approximately 40 tCO<sub>2</sub>-e from seismic line preparation, 50 tCO<sub>2</sub>-e from the seismic survey, and 23 tCO<sub>2</sub>-e from seismic line rehabilitation, and 88 tCO<sub>2</sub>-e from land clearing
    - vii. rehabilitation will commence upon completion of the seismic activities
3. The approval criteria in reg 9(1)(c) requires that I be satisfied that the activity will be carried out in a manner by which the environmental impacts and environmental risks reg 9(1)(c)

of the activity will be reduced to a level that is both: (i) as low as reasonably practicable; and (ii) acceptable. In assessing whether the EMP meets the approval criteria, I note that my decision is a prescribed decision (under reg 5A) for s 6A of the Act, and as such requires me to consider and apply the principles of ecologically sustainable development. In accordance with reg 12(3), I provide the following information about how the EMP meets the approval criteria, and the manner in which I have taken into account the principles of ecologically sustainable development when considering whether or not the plan meets the approval criteria.

4. The principles of ecologically sustainable development are defined at section 18-24 of the *Environment Protection Act 2019*, and I address each in turn:
  - a. The decision-making principle (s 18 *Environment Protection Act 2019*) requires effective integration of long-term and short-term environmental and equitable considerations, and for processes to provide for community involvement in relation to decisions and actions that affect the community. Related to this, I note the following:
    - i. The regulated activity is low impact and of short duration (seven weeks) and forms one component of a broader helium exploration program in the region. The regulated activity will inform decision-making about longer-term regulated activities.
    - ii. Public consultation on the EMP was not required under the Petroleum (Environment) Regulations 2016, as the EMP does not propose drilling and hydraulic fracturing activities. The public was made aware that the EMP was under assessment via the department's website.
    - iii. Next, I have considered short-term and long-term environmental impacts of carrying out the regulated activity. Environmental impacts include direct and indirect effects on the physical, biological, economic, cultural and social aspects of the environment, and may include cumulative impacts or occur over time.
    - iv. The information before me suggests short-term environmental impacts are manageable with the proposed mitigations in place.
    - v. The information before me suggests long-term environmental impacts are negligible.
    - vi. There is no particular contest between economic, social and environmental considerations that requires further mention.
    - vii. Taking an integrated view of long-term and short-term environmental and equitable considerations, I am satisfied that the considerations on balance and taken together support approval of the EMP.
  - b. The precautionary principle (s 19 *Environment Protection Act 2019*) applies when there are threats of serious or irreversible environmental damage, and requires that lack of full scientific certainty should not be used as a reason for postponing measures to prevent environmental degradation. I am satisfied that the regulated activity does not pose a threat of serious or irreversible environmental damage.

The regulated activity will be conducted in compliance with the Code, and the EMP provides measurable performance standards to ensure that environmental outcomes are met. The EMP outlines the interest holder's investigations into the physical, biological and cultural environment and demonstrates a sound understanding of the environment at the location, providing a satisfactory scientific basis to assess potential environmental impacts and risks for the activity, and to identify measures to avoid or minimise those impacts and risks. The risk assessment clearly classifies the hierarchy of controls for the mitigations

applied to each risk. Uncertainty in relation to the environmental features was assessed, with no areas of environmental uncertainty identified.

- i. I have carefully evaluated the proposed precautionary measures against the risk-weighted consequences of impacts given the options available, and with a view to avoiding serious or irreversible damage to the environment wherever practicable. The EMP combined with the conditions I have imposed mitigates risks of serious or irreversible damage due to lack of full scientific certainty to a level that is both as low as reasonably practicable and acceptable.
- c. The principle of evidence-based decision-making (s 20 *Environment Protection Act 2019*) requires decisions to be made on the best available evidence in the circumstances that is relevant and reliable. I am of the view that the evidence before me satisfies this requirement for the following reasons: I am satisfied that the best available evidence has been obtained because:
  - i. The EMP was developed by environmental consultants with experience in the Finke bioregion, including an ecologist and archaeologist.
  - ii. The interest holder employed a comprehensive process to obtain relevant information including baseline assessments, archaeological assessment, stakeholder engagement and consultation with relevant government agencies.
  - iii. The EMP has undergone review and assessment by a multi-disciplinary team in DEPWS and NT government agencies, which has informed my decision on the EMP.
  - iv. The interest holder has amended the EMP to address areas of uncertainty or requiring clarification.
  - v. No concerns regarding the sufficiency of information to support the EMP are apparent from the comments of stakeholders, interested persons, or the internal assessments. On the contrary, they indicate and I am satisfied that the information before me is comprehensive.
  - vi. I believe the information regarding the proposed regulated activity adequately provides the best available evidence in the circumstances that is relevant and reliable to the evidence-based decision-making process.
- d. The principle of intergenerational and intra-generational equity (s 21 *Environment Protection Act 2019*) requires that the present generation should ensure that the health, diversity and productivity of the environment is maintained or enhanced for the benefit of present and future generations. I have given consideration to the impact on present and future generations as follows:
  - i. This criterion requires me to turn my mind to whether the benefits of the proposal disproportionately burden present or future generations, or particular groups or communities of present or future generations.
  - ii. I have considered whether the health, diversity and productivity of the environment is maintained or enhanced for the benefit of each of these relevant groups.
  - iii. The environmental burdens of the regulated activity will not disproportionately affect particular stakeholders.

- iv. The greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions from the activity is approximately 201 tCO<sub>2</sub> e, generated from diesel combustion. This is less than 0.001% of the 2019 NT estimated GHG emissions (20.6 million tCO<sub>2</sub>-e).<sup>4</sup>
  - v. I consider that cumulative emissions are not significant when considered in context of 2019 NT and Australian emissions, which were approximately 21 and 519 million tonnes respectively.
  - vi. Cultural values relating to sacred sites will be protected through the application of Authority Certificates issued to the interest holder under the *Northern Territory Aboriginal Sacred Sites Act 1989* and measures for reporting on discovery of archaeological sites during civil maintenance activities.
  - vii. Interactions between the regulated activity and pastoral operations have been assessed; the interest holder is committed to regular engagement with pastoralists on the progress of activities.
  - viii. Accordingly I do not believe that the carrying out of the regulated activity in accordance with the EMP would have an effect contrary to the principle of inter or intra-generational equity.
- e. The principle of sustainable use (s 22 *Environment Protection Act 2019*) requires that natural resources should be used in a manner that is sustainable, prudent, rational, wise and appropriate. In applying this principle, I have considered the following:
- i. I note the findings of the Scientific Inquiry into Hydraulic Fracturing (HFI) in the NT that states: "... in the short to medium term, the Australian National Energy Market is likely to require higher levels of flexible, gas-fired generation, which can provide a reliable, low emissions substitute for ageing coal-fired generation, and essential security services to complement variable renewable electricity generation."<sup>5</sup>
  - ii. I note the NT Government's commitment to implementing all the recommendations of the HFI, including working with the Australian Government to seek to ensure that there is no net increase in lifecycle GHG emitted in Australia from any onshore petroleum produced in the NT.
  - iii. The interest holder does not require a groundwater extraction licence for the proposed activity as groundwater take from an existing bore is expected to be well below the 5 ML per year threshold. The land access agreement includes permission of bore owners to use production bores within the permit area.
  - iv. No additional groundwater extraction licences are currently required for the regulated activity. Any future consideration of groundwater use will include an application for an extraction licence.
  - v. Accordingly, I am satisfied that the concept of sustainable use of natural resources has been taken into account.
- f. The principle of biological diversity and ecological integrity (s 23 *Environment Protection Act 2019*) requires that biological diversity and ecological integrity should be conserved and maintained. I have applied this principle as follows:

---

<sup>4</sup> Source: DISER 2020. State Greenhouse Gas Inventory. <https://ageis.climatechange.gov.au/SGGI.aspx>.

<sup>5</sup> Refer section 9.7.4 of the *Scientific Inquiry into Hydraulic Fracturing in the Northern Territory*; p 233. Available at: <https://frackinginquiry.nt.gov.au/inquiry-reports?a=494286>

- i. I believe the information I have regarding the existing biodiversity and ecosystems that are to be affected by the regulated activity; the effects that are likely; and the mitigation measures reasonably available, is sufficient.
- ii. The Land Condition Assessment has been informed by previous baseline field surveys of the project footprint. These surveys are supplemented by field assessments, a detailed desktop analysis and anecdotal evidence.
- iii. No threatened vegetation communities were listed or likely to occur within the area of the activity.
- iv. The project footprint adjoins the Karinga Creek paleo-drainage system Site of Conservation Significance (SOCS). This system provides vital migratory stop-over grounds for migratory shorebirds, including internationally significant records of Banded Stilt, Red-capped Plover, and Sharp-tailed Sandpiper. The Karinga Creek paleo-drainage system provides important temporary salt pans and lakes, which support a diverse assemblage of flora and fauna species in an otherwise arid landscape.
- v. No habitats of importance (salt lakes and clay pans) in the SOCS will be impacted by the activities in the EMP. The seismic activities will be conducted outside of a 2 km buffer around the habitats of importance. Minor maintenance and works may be required for some sections of track within the SOCS. Maintenance of the tracks will be only undertaken so as to reduce potential impacts of the vehicles transiting the site.
- vi. The EMP identifies 33 fauna species listed as threatened under the *Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999* (EPBC Act) and/or the *Territory Parks and Wildlife Conservation Act 1976* (TPWC Act). An assessment of the likelihood of occurrence indicates three listed threatened species that are likely to occur based on habitat suitability and previous records. These include the Desert Quandong *Santalum acuminatum* (Vulnerable TPWC Act); Princess Parrot *Polytelis alexandrae* (Vulnerable EPBC Act, Vulnerable TPWC Act); and the Itjaritjari/Southern Marsupial Mole *Notoryctes typhlops* (Vulnerable TPWC Act). The remaining species (including all migratory species) were assessed as having a low or no likelihood of occurring within the project footprint.
- vii. The DEPWS Flora and Fauna Division is satisfied that the regulated activity does not pose a significant risk to threatened species, important habitats or significant vegetation types. The mitigation controls identified in the EMP are adequate to reduce risks associated with potential impacts on biodiversity, such as noise, vehicle strike, dust, erosion and spills to be as low as reasonably practicable.
- viii. The EMP outlines measures to minimise impacts on affected environmental values, including the management of threatening processes such as weeds and fire. Where relevant, management measures for the threatening process are consistent with the requirements of the Code, NT Land Clearing Guidelines and Weed Management Planning Guideline: Onshore Petroleum Projects. Specific examples of mitigation controls include fire extinguishers fitted to all vehicles; regular clean-out of vehicle engine bays; all machinery and equipment to be certified weed free by a suitably qualified person prior to arrival at site; and all tracks and seismic lines be inspected by the dedicated weeds officer prior to declaring them open for use. The conservation of biological diversity and ecological integrity is vital to the achievement of ecologically sustainable development. Given the fundamental nature of this consideration, I have given central importance to the conservation of

- biodiversity and ecological integrity in weighing whether I am satisfied the approval criterion in reg 9(1)(c) has been met.
- ix. It is often the case that the conservation of biological diversity and ecological integrity is vital to the achievement of ecologically sustainable development. By their nature, ecosystems are complex and interdependent systems and this needs to be considered in relation to what preserves their integrity. Biological diversity also represents a wealth of potential natural resources that may provide options for present and future generations. I have born this in mind when considering the weight to be given to the evidence before me regarding the potential impacts of the regulated activity on biodiversity and ecological integrity.
  - x. The measures to conserve and maintain biological diversity and ecological integrity in the EMP are appropriate, given the nature and scale of the regulated activity.
  - xi. If carried out in accordance with the EMP, the risks of the regulated activity to the conservation of biological diversity and ecological integrity are considered to be mitigated to an acceptable level.
- g. The principle of improved valuation, pricing and incentive mechanisms (s 24 *Environment Protection Act 2019*) requires that environmental factors should be included in the valuation of assets and services, through application of the 'polluter pays' principles, consideration of full life cycle costs of providing goods and services, and pursuing environmental goals in the most cost-effective way. I have applied the principle as follows:
- i. The pollution and waste that will be generated by the regulated activity in the general course of its operation includes: liquid waste (e.g. sewage and waste water), solid waste and hazardous waste (e.g. lubricants, batteries and aerosols).
  - ii. I am satisfied that both hazardous and non-hazardous waste will be disposed of by the interest holder in accordance with the requirements of the *Waste Management and Pollution Control Act 1998* (NT) and the *Radiation Protection Act 2004* (NT) at its own cost, as outlined in the Waste Management Plan (Appendix G).
  - iii. In relation to full life cycle costs, it is expected that the regulated activity will have a life cycle of five years and at the end of this cycle the interest holder will take action to remove any residual pollution and waste as detailed by the EMP.
  - iv. The Spill Management Plan (Appendix H) includes commitments to immediately remediate spills and leaks, so as to reduce the risk of long-term contamination of the environment and avoid environmental impact legacies.
  - v. If the interest holder fails to remediate the impacts, an environmental rehabilitation bond has been provided by the interest holder, which is considered to be adequate to cover the resulting costs.
  - vi. With these measures are in place, I am satisfied that the EMP ensures that environmental costs are not left as externalities to be paid for by Territory taxpayers or the local community. They will be fairly paid for by those who stand to benefit from the regulated activity, such as the interest holder, and consumers who choose to purchase the interest holder's products. To the extent there are some costs to the Territory, I am satisfied that this is appropriate given the broader economic benefits.

- vii. In relation to options to pursue environmental goals in relation to the regulated activity, I have taken into account that these goals should be pursued in the most cost-effective way.
- viii. I believe approval of the EMP with the conditions I have imposed is consistent with the principle of improved valuation, pricing and incentive mechanisms.
- h. The NT EPA did not require the EMP to be referred under the *Environment Protection Act 2019*, as the regulated activity does not have the potential to cause a significant impact on the environment. reg 9(3)
- i. The NT EPA reviewed the EMP for the regulated activity against the approval criteria in regulations 9(3)(a) and 9(3)(c) of the Regulations and other matters the NT EPA considered relevant, and has provided advice about the EMP.
- i. The NT EPA has provided the following in relation to the regulated activity and the EMP:
  - i. In accordance with my request under s 29B of the NT EPA Act, the NT EPA reviewed the EMP against the approval criteria in regulation 9(1) of the Regulations and other matters the NT EPA considered relevant, and has provided advice about the EMP. Relevantly:
    - (1) The NT EPA recommended that should the EMP be approved, it be subject to two conditions. The NT EPA's recommendations have informed the conditions of this approval. All conditions are outlined in section 1 (2) of this Approval Notice.
    - (2) The NT EPA concluded that the EMP for the regulated activity, subject to the recommended approval conditions, is appropriate for the nature and scale of the regulated activity and demonstrates that the regulated activity can be carried out in a manner that environmental impacts and environmental risks of the activity will be reduced to a level that is as low as reasonably practical and acceptable.
  - ii. I have considered the NT EPA's advice and recommendations and these have been incorporated where relevant into this statement of reasons and the conditions in the Approval Notice.
- j. The existing environment along with its particular values and sensitivities is appropriately identified in Section 4 of the EMP, and to the extent I do not agree or there is some uncertainty, I have imposed conditions to address the relevant risk or risks. reg 9(1)(c)
- k. I agree with the risk assessment set out in Section 6 and Appendix C of the EMP, and to the extent I do not agree I have imposed a condition or conditions to address the relevant risk or risks.
- l. The interest holder's risk assessment is applicable to activities in all seasons and the outcomes are reflected in the EMP that includes, for example; a Weed Management Plan (Appendix E); Bushfire Management Plan (Appendix F); Waste Management Plan (Appendix G); Rehabilitation Plan (Appendix I); Stakeholder Engagement (Appendix J); Spill Management Plan (Appendix H); and an Erosion and Sediment Control Plan (Appendix D).
- m. The anticipated environmental impacts are appropriately identified in Section 6 and Appendix C of the EMP. The regulated activity are a continuation of current activities and cumulative effects have been identified and assessed. In EMPs for subsequent stages (if they proceed) the interest holder will need to continue to address cumulative effects.

- n. The EMP demonstrates how the interest holder will comply with relevant requirements of the Code in undertaking these regulated activity. This includes reference to applicable Australian and international standards that have been adopted for regulated activity, as applicable. The EMP cross references relevant sections of the Code that apply to the mitigation and management measures to enable the reviewer to identify and confirm that the proposed activities comply with the Code, as applicable. The EMP provides management plans that meet the requirements of the Code.
- o. I am satisfied that the interest holder has conducted ongoing stakeholder engagement in accordance with the Regulations. The EMP provides details of stakeholder engagement that meets Regulation 7 and Schedule 1, Clause 9 of the Regulations (Section 5 and Appendix J). The Stakeholder engagement log (Appendix J) demonstrate that stakeholders did not raise objections about environmental impacts of the proposed activity that required specific changes from the interest holder. The EMP provides details of written feedback and input from stakeholders as part of the stakeholder engagement records. The risk assessment in the EMP details the potential environmental impacts of the activity and proposed environmental outcomes to manage impacts on social and cultural surroundings.
- p. I recognise the importance the community places on the protection of water, human health management of chemicals and waste, stakeholder engagement, social impacts and regulation and compliance. The EMP appropriately identifies the risks and potential impacts from the regulated activity and commits to mitigation and management measures to address these risks and potential impacts.
- q. There are no environmental impacts or environmental risks relating to the proposed regulated activity that I consider to be unacceptable.
- r. Overall, having regard to the above, I am satisfied that the EMP is appropriate for the nature and scale of the activity, and demonstrates that the regulated activity is to be carried out in manner by which the environmental impacts and environmental risks are reduced to a level that is:
  - i. as low as reasonably practicable; and
  - ii. acceptable.