**Workshop Ecology 18/2/2026**

| Present | Agreed Actions | Completed / Response |
|---|---|---|
| **Santana**<br>Damian Spring<br>Cheryl Low<br>Mary Askey<br>Mark Chrisp<br>Joshua Leckie<br>Matt Baber<br>Keith Barber<br>Graham Ussher<br>Zac Milner<br>Jeroen Luring<br>David Norton<br>**DOC**<br>Pene Wiliams<br>Marie Payne<br>Max Crowe<br>Dean van Meirlo<br>Liz Williams<br>**CODC**<br>Ann Rodgers<br>Fiona Garrett<br>Mike Harding<br>**ORC**<br>Shay McDonald<br>Rebecca Teel<br>Trudy Anderson | Provision of aerial imagery of Ardgour and Bendigo, vector data (vegetation) and point / plot locations from veg surveys. Make available to all participants in workshop. | Vegetation shapefiles sent to ORC, CODC, DOC 9/03/2026<br><br>Access to share folder given to ORC, CODC, DOC containing photos, drone images and data10/03/2026 |
| | MGL to provide non-vascular report as soon as available | The Non-Vascular Report is currently in its final peer review stage and will be distributed to ORC, CODC, and DOC once complete. |
| | MGL to provide Spring Annual report or 2025 spring survey data to workshop participants as soon as practicable | Santana received information 9/03/2026 from a third party that we could not use their data. The data from the 2025 Spring survey was sent to DOC, ORC, CODC on 9/03/2026 without the third-party data. Hence, the final report of the Spring Survey 2025 cannot be shared with the public or regulators as it contains the third-party data. |
| | Offset model appendix C to AEE to be circulated to EPA and agencies | The AEE report with Appendix C uploaded to EPA FTA portal 10/03/2026. |
| | Provision of further information on Ardgour Rise / Willow Concessions to clarify values and impacts | RMA Ecology<br>We have not visited the Willows Concessions area and cannot comment further on the values within this area beyond what has been provided in the ecological values reports.<br><br>The proposed Ardgour Rise is approximately 13 km long, 2 km of which traverses through 'Mixed depleted herbfield (cushionfield) and grassland'. Approximately 1.5 km of this |

| Present | Agreed Actions | Completed / Response |
|---|---|---|
| | | 'Mixed depleted herbfield (cushionfield) and grassland', and an additional 0.5 km of other vegetation communities was subject to targeted botanical survey including for Threatened species as shown in Figures 10 and 21 of the Vegetation Values Assessment. On Thursday 19 February 2026, we walked a 650 m portion of the proposed Ardgour Rise where it traverses through 'Mixed depleted herbfield (cushionfield) and grassland'. Most of the area that we assessed was dominated by exotic species including horehound (*Marrubium vulgare*), haresfoot trefoil (*Trifolium arvense*), and sheep's bur (*Acaena agnipila* var. *aequispina*), but there was also considerable diversity of native species including common scabweed (*Raoulia australis*), *Raoulia beauverdii, Colobanthus brevisepalus*, rock fern (*Cheilanthes sieberi* subsp. *sieberi*), grass convolvulus (*Convolvulus waitaha*), slender chickweed (*Stellaria gracilenta*), alpine crane's bill (*Geranium brevicaule*), desert poa (*Poa maniototo*), and yellow oxalis (*Oxalis exilis*).<br><br>There is suitable habitat for spring annuals, and although we did not find any along 1.5 km of the most appropriate habitat in 2024, this is not to say that they do not exist in these locations (see limitations of the spring annual survey in Section 3.4.2. of the Vegetation Values Assessment).<br><br>There was generally a similar composition of species and suitability for spring annuals uphill and downhill of the proposed route, although a higher dominance of native species was occasionally found on the crest of the ridge uphill of the proposed route which is already being avoided in the location assessed on Thursday 19 February 2026. |
| | Identify biodiversity outcomes in relation to the Ardgour restoration area and sanctuary areas and how it relates to the offsetting calculation used | The AEE report with Appendix C uploaded to EPA FTA portal 10/03/2026 contains the offsetting calculations. |

<table>
<tr><th>Present</th><th>Agreed Actions</th><th>Completed / Response</th></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>Addressing inaccuracies with respect to vegetation mapping outside disturbance footprint specifically the misidentification of cushion field on Mt Moka</td><td>RMA Ecology<br>During the workshop, we discussed how one area mapped as 'Mixed depleted herbfield (cushionfield) and grassland' on Mount Moka is not representative of that vegetation community as it is mapped elsewhere. We acknowledge that this is the case. Vegetation communities were mapped most carefully within the DDF, and also in areas of the ESA which were most similar to the vegetation communities within the DDF, i.e., those at similar altitudes.<br><br>The Mt Moka area within the ESA that we mapped as 'Mixed depleted herbfield (cushionfield) and grassland' is 47.27 ha. Changing this area to a different vegetation community would result in the changes to the proportional loss of this vegetation community as shown in the table below.
<table>
<tr><th>Vegetation community</th><th>Area within ESA</th><th>Proportion within ESA</th><th>Area within DDF</th><th>Proportion within DDF</th></tr>
<tr><td>Mixed depleted herbfield (cushionfield) and grassland (original assessment)</td><td>552.69 ha</td><td>10.26 %</td><td>103.82 ha</td><td>17.01 %</td></tr>
<tr><td>Mixed depleted herbfield (cushionfield) and grassland (excluding Mt Moka)</td><td>505.42 ha</td><td>9.38 %</td><td>103.82 ha</td><td>20.54 %</td></tr>
</table>
</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>Provision of further information wetland delineations</td><td>RMA Ecology<br>On Thursday 19 February 2026, we investigated several areas that had been queried regarding their potential status as wetlands but had not been mapped as such in the Wetland Values Assessment.<br><br>These areas included the valley downstream of the constructed pond in lower Rise and Shine Creek, and the valley upstream and downstream of the constructed pond in lower Shepherds Creek.</td></tr>
</table>

| Present | Agreed Actions | Completed / Response |
|---|---|---|
| | | In the valley downstream of the constructed pond in lower Rise and Shine Creek, we assessed the valley bottom up to 100 m downstream of the boundary of the DDF and detected no wetlands beyond those already mapped and included in the Wetland Values Assessment.<br><br>In the valley upstream and downstream of the constructed pond in lower Shepherds Creek, we detected (on Thursday 19 February 2026) approximately 0.1 ha of wetlands downstream of the pond which were 2-6 m wide and were on a small floodplain adjacent to the stream. We assessed this area for wetlands during our very extensive surveys two years ago in 2024 and can confirm that these areas were not wetland and did not meet the definition of a natural inland wetland then. It is not unusual for marginal wetland communities to change to a non-wetland plant community seasonally or between years (we have seen that happen naturally on other sites). We do not think that there is value in re-mapping wetlands across the site, or any value in selectively choosing these small wetland areas to add to the total already mapped, as there are likely to be other areas that have changed status from wetland to non-wetland also in the intervening two years.<br><br>In any case, the 0.1 ha of wetland now mapped at the downstream of the constructed pond in lower Shepherds Creek comprises less than 1 % of mapped wetlands, and does not make a measurable difference to the magnitude of impact, importance of the impact, or the scale, type and location of the offsetting proposed to address unavoidable effects on wetlands across the project site. |