

27 November 2025

E DevelopmentAssessment.DLPE@nt.gov.au

Ms Kylie Fitzpatrick
Environmental Assessment Unit
Environment and Heritage Division
Department of Lands, Planning and Environment
GPO Box 3675
DARWIN NT 0801 .

T 08 8999 4446

Our Ref: DLPE2025/0293

Dear Ms Fitzpatrick

Re: Invitation to comment - NT EPA referral - Muckaty Solar Precinct - AAPowerLink (SunCable)

The information submitted for the above referral has been assessed by the relevant environmental divisions within the department and the following comments are provided:

Flora and Fauna Division

The Flora and Fauna Division have reviewed the Referral information and have provided comments in the **Attachment 1**.

The Flora and Fauna Division has considered the likelihood of threatened species and sensitive and/or significant vegetation occurring within and/or adjacent to the site and consider that the project is likely to have a significant impact on threatened species, particularly to Greater Bilby and Grey Falcon.

Mining Division

The proposed solar project is located within the Muckaty Aboriginal Land Trust. There are no granted mineral titles within the project area. An application for exploration licence (EL32788) has been submitted for an area that overlaps the southwestern section of the proposed project area.

The southeastern access corridor (Muckaty access corridor), which would connect the proposed project area to the Stuart Highway, overlaps the Bootu Creek Mine Road which connects the Bootu Creek Mine site to a rail siding. The rail siding is located in the south of the proposed project area and has been used for mining related activities in connection to the Bootu Creek Mine. The mine is currently in a period of care and maintenance, but use of both the Bootu Creek Mine Road and the rail siding are likely to recommence in the future.

Water Resources Division

Licensing and Regulation Group

The Water Resources Division has reviewed the referral and provides comment in **Attachment 2**.

Environment and Heritage Division

Heritage Branch Advice

The Heritage Branch has reviewed the referral and provides comment in **Attachment 3**.

Land Resources Division

Land Management Unit

There is a recognition within the preliminary documents that despite large areas of generally flat landform, there are areas of increased slope, and the large extent of clearing and earthworks increases the risks of erosion from wind and water.

The 1 second Shuttle Radar Topography Mission (SRTM) data indicates areas of slope within disturbance footprints up to and exceeding 5%. This increases the risk potential for erosion once the surface is disturbed.

The document 'Appendix C - Muckaty Station Flood Study' refers to '1m grid DEM for the extent of Muckaty Station. No detailed metadata was supplied with the DEM however the data is understood to comprise of aerial LiDAR or photogrammetry survey captured during December- January 2025'.

This data and any subsequently collected high resolution data should be provided to the facilitate further assessment. The data should be used to validate 1 second SRTM data in determining slopes across the project area.

Vegetation Assessment Unit

Approximately 50,000ha of native vegetation is proposed to be cleared to accommodate the solar precinct infrastructure.

The proposal is located on NT Portion 5173, which is unzoned land and subject to the Clearing of Native Vegetation Overlay. Pursuant to the *Planning Act 1999*, consent is required for the clearing of native vegetation of more than one hectare in aggregate of land on land subject to this overlay. However, if an Environmental Approval is issued under the *Environmental Protection Act 2019*, no further approval for land clearing is required under the *Planning Act 1999*.

Please contact the Vegetation Assessment Unit, Department of Lands, Planning and Environment (DLPE) by phone: 8999 3631 or email: landclearing.DLPE@nt.gov.au for further advice on submitting a land clearing application.

Weed Management Branch

A desktop assessment of the Northern Territory (NT) Weeds Database for the project area (NT Portion 5173), surrounding parcels and roads has revealed current and or previous data records of the following species:

Common Name	Botanical Name	Declared
Rubber bush	<i>Calotropis procera</i>	Class B
Parkinsonia	<i>Parkinsonia aculeata</i>	Class B
Mesquite	<i>Prosopis juliflora</i>	Class A
Buffel grass	<i>Cenchrus spp</i>	Declared
Belly ache bush	<i>Jatropha gossypifolia</i>	Class A

All land in the NT is subject to the *Weeds Management Act 2001* (WM Act). The WM Act describes the legal requirements and responsibilities that apply to all persons, owners and occupiers of land regarding declared and potential weeds. General duties described in Division 1 of the WM Act include the requirement for owners or occupiers of land to take all reasonable measures to prevent land being infested with a declared weed and to prevent a declared weed from spreading.

Mesquite and Belly ache bush are declared weeds, Class A; Parkinsonia and Rubber bush are declared weeds, Class B and all are listed in the Tennant Creek Regional Weeds Strategy 2021-2026 as either Category 1 – priority weeds for eradication or Category 2 – priority weeds for strategic control.

Guidelines for the prevention of weed spread are outlined in '*Preventing Weed Spread is Everybody's Business*¹', which highlights the areas of risk for all activities associated with weed spread. The document details the pathways through which weeds are spread and provides actions to reduce weed spread. Proponents seeking to develop land for any purpose should address these actions.

Further information regarding weed management requirements and the Weed Management Plan for the Barkly Region is available online², or alternatively contact the Weed Management Branch for further advice on (08) 8999 4567.

Environmental Regulation

Environment Operations

Based on the information provided, the proposal does not appear to trigger the licensing requirements of an Environment Protection Approval (EPA) under the *Waste Management and Pollution Control Act 1998* (NT) (WMPC Act).

All persons are required to comply with the General Environmental Duty under section 12 of the WMPC Act. Activities that require authorisation are listed in Schedule 2 of the WMPC Act. Guidelines to assist proponents to avoid environmental impacts are available on the Northern Territory Environment Protection Authority (NT EPA) website³.

The WMPC Act, administered by the NT EPA, is separate to and not reduced or affected in any way by other legislation administered by other departments or authorities. The NT EPA may take enforcement action or issue statutory instruments should there be non-compliance with the WMPC Act.

There are statutory obligations under the WMPC Act that require all persons to take all measures that are reasonable and practicable to prevent or minimise pollution or environmental harm and reduce the amount of waste. The proponent is responsible for ensuring their activities comply with the WMPC Act.

The proponent is advised to take notice of this non-exhaustive list of environmental issues that should be considered to help satisfy General Environmental Duty:

1. **Dust:** The proponent must ensure that nuisance dust and/or nuisance airborne particles are not discharged or emitted beyond the boundaries of the premises.
2. **Noise:** The proponent must ensure that noise levels from the premises comply with the latest version of the NT EPA Northern Territory Noise Management Framework Guideline⁴.

¹ https://denr.nt.gov.au/_data/assets/pdf_file/0011/257987/preventing-weed-spread.pdf

² <http://www.nt.gov.au/environment/weeds>

³ <https://ntepa.nt.gov.au/publications-and-advice/environmental-management>

⁴ https://ntepa.nt.gov.au/_data/assets/pdf_file/0004/566356/noise_management_framework_guideline.pdf

If the proposal is situated where there are existing activities nearby that may already generate noise, please see the NT EPA advice on Recommended Land Use Separation Distances⁵.

- 3. Erosion and Sediment Control (ESC):** The proponent must ensure that pollution and/or environmental harm do not result from soil erosion.

ESC measures must be employed prior to and throughout the construction stage of the development. Larger projects should plan, install and maintain ESC measures in accordance with the current International Erosion Control Association (IECA) Australasia guidelines⁶.

Where sediment basins are required by the development, the NT EPA recommends the use of at least Type B basins, unless prevented by site specific topography or other physical constraints.

Basic advice for small development projects is provided by the NT EPA document: Guidelines to Prevent Pollution from Building Sites⁷ and Keeping Our Stormwater Clean⁸.

- 4. Storage:** Where an Environmental Protection Approval or Environmental Protection Licence is required, the proponent must act in accordance with that authorisation.

If an Environment Protection Approval or Environment Protection Licence is not required, the proponent must store liquids only in secure bunded areas in accordance with VIC EPA Publication 1698: Liquid storage and handling guidelines⁹. Where these guidelines are not relevant, the storage must be at least 110% of the total capacity of the largest vessel in the area.

- 5. Site Contamination:** If the proposal relates to a change of land use or if the site is already contaminated, including as a result from historical activities such as cyclones, a contaminated land assessment may be required in accordance with the National Environment Protection (Assessment for Site Contamination) Measure (ASC NEPM). The proponent is encouraged to refer to the information provided on the NT EPA website¹⁰, and the NT Contaminated Land Guidelines¹¹.

- 6. Waste Management - Import and Export of Fill:** The proponent must ensure all fill imported or exported as part of the activity must be certified virgin excavated natural material (VENM) in accordance with the NSW EPA guidelines¹².

All imported fill material must be accompanied by details of its nature, origin, volume, testing and transportation details. All records must be retained and made available to authorised officers upon request. The proponent should also consider the following NT EPA fact sheet: Illegal Dumping - What You Need to Know¹³.

- 7. Odour or Smoke:** The proponent must ensure that nuisance odours or smoke are not emitted beyond the boundaries of the premises.

If the proposal is situated where there are existing activities nearby that may already generate odour or smoke, please see the NT EPA advice on Recommended Land Use Separation Distances¹⁴.

⁵ https://ntepa.nt.gov.au/_data/assets/pdf_file/0006/453192/guideline_recommended_land_separation_distances_oct.pdf

⁶ <https://www.austieca.com.au/publications/best-practice-erosion-and-sediment-control-bpesc-document>

⁷ https://ntepa.nt.gov.au/_data/assets/pdf_file/0010/284680/guideline_prevent_pollution_building_sites.pdf

⁸ https://ntepa.nt.gov.au/_data/assets/pdf_file/0006/284676/guideline_keeping_stormwater_clean_builders_guide.pdf

⁹ <https://www.epa.vic.gov.au/about-epa/publications/1698>

¹⁰ <https://ntepa.nt.gov.au/your-environment/contaminated-land>

¹¹ https://ntepa.nt.gov.au/_data/assets/pdf_file/0020/434540/guideline_contaminated_land.pdf

¹² <https://www.epa.nsw.gov.au/your-environment/waste/classifying-waste/virgin-excavated-natural-material>

¹³ https://ntepa.nt.gov.au/_data/assets/pdf_file/0008/285740/factsheet_illegal_dumping_what_you_need_know.pdf

¹⁴ https://ntepa.nt.gov.au/_data/assets/pdf_file/0006/453192/guideline_recommended_land_separation_distances_oct.pdf

8. **Water:** The proponent must ensure stormwater is not polluted, refer to water management in the NT EPA guidelines to Prevent Pollution from Building Sites¹⁵.

If this activity requires the discharge of waste to water or could cause water to be polluted, then a waste discharge licence under the *Water Act 1992* (NT) may be required. Please refer to the Guidelines¹⁶.

Should you have any further queries regarding these comments, please contact the Development Coordination Branch by email DevelopmentAssessment.DLPE@nt.gov.au or phone (08) 8999 4446.

Yours sincerely



Maria Wauchope
Executive Director Land Resources

¹⁵ https://ntepa.nt.gov.au/media/waste-and-pollution/pdf/guidelines/guideline_prevent_pollution_building_sites.pdf

¹⁶ https://ntepa.nt.gov.au/data/assets/pdf_file/0005/950603/guidelines-waste-discharge-licensing.pdf

Attachment 1

Submission on the referral

AAPowerLink Australia Assets Pty Ltd – Muckaty Solar Precinct

This submission is made under regulation 53 of the Environment Protection Regulations 2020

Government authority: Department of Lands, Planning and Environment–Flora and Fauna Division

Summary: The Flora and Fauna Division have reviewed the Referral and found that:

- The impact significance rating methodology was not applied consistently;
- The Terrestrial Existing Environment section inadequately, or incorrectly described Native Vegetation and Habitat Features, Significant Vegetation, Threatening Processes, Threatened Species and Migratory Species;
- The Potential Impacts section inadequately or incorrectly described Loss of Native Vegetation and Habitat, Degradation of Habitat, Injury or Direct Mortality and Lake Effect impacts;
- That Significant Impact Assessments for Threatened Species (Greater Bilby, Grey Falcon) were inadequate or incorrect, and Gouldian Finch and migratory species should be considered further; and
- The Residual Impact on Terrestrial ecosystems was not assessed consistently using the Impact significance rating methodology and would meet three criteria for a Major residual impact rating.

Section of Referral	Theme or issue	Comment
	Terrestrial Ecosystems	Based on a search of DLPE databases within a 20km radius of the project area, expert knowledge of species' habitat requirements, and information about habitats occurring within the site, classified as threatened under the <i>Territory Parks and Wildlife Conservation Act 1976</i> (TPWC Act) and/or the <i>Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999</i> (EPBC Act) that may occur within, or immediately adjacent to, the project area are listed in Table 1 . An assessment of the potential impact posed by the project to each species, based on current available information (including that provided by the applicant) is also provided.

Table 1: Threatened species that are known to occur, or have a high potential of occurring, within or adjacent to the proposed project area; their conservation status; and an assessment of the risk of impact posed by the project.

(Conservation status = VU – Vulnerable; EN – Endangered; CR – Critically Endangered; Mig – Migratory)

Common Name	Scientific Name	TPWC Act	EPBC Act	Potential impact
Greater Bilby	<i>Macrotis lagotis</i>	VU	VU	High/Significant
Grey Falcon	<i>Falco hypoleucus</i>	VU	VU	Moderate to High /Significant
Yellow-spotted Monitor	<i>Varanus panoptes</i>	VU	-	Low
Gouldian Finch	<i>Chloebia gouldiae</i>	VU	EN	Moderate
Sharp-tailed Sandpiper	<i>Calidris acuminata</i>	-	VU/Mig	Moderate
Common Greenshank	<i>Tringa nebularia</i>	-	EN/Mig	Moderate
Australian Painted Snipe	<i>Rostratula australis</i>	EN	EN	Moderate
Tassel Sedge	<i>Carex fascicularis</i>	VU	-	Nil

Greater Bilby: This species is known to occur in the general area with recent records confirmed from targeted surveys. These records are part of the broader Tanami Desert population of Greater Bilby. This population is considered to be an 'important population' under the criteria outlined in the Significant Impact Guidelines 1.1 – Matters of National Environmental Significance due to its size and being located on the edge of the species' range in the NT.

Targeted surveys for the species were undertaken within the project area which confirmed the presence of the species. Bilby sign and 'likely Bilby sign' were identified in Sandplain, Laterite Rise and Laterite Plain Land types which covers the majority of the disturbance footprint. The aerial survey was extensive across the area of interest but appears to be limited in the narrow visible survey width (approximately 4% of area) and known missed detections (25% of ground truthing surveys were missed by aerial detections). From this, it suggests that there may be a higher density of Greater Bilby persisting in the project area and disturbance footprint than described in the Ecology Report.

		<p>The referral includes a residual impact significance rating assessment in Table 7-3 (Terrestrial Ecosystems - Proposed Mitigation Measures and Summary of EIA) and a Significant Impact Assessment in Table 7-4 (Significant Impact Table for the Greater Bilby). The Flora and Fauna Division agrees with the conclusion that there is a real chance that the proposal will have a significant impact on the Tanami Desert population of the species based on the following criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• result in a reduction in-the-area of occupancy of an important population of a vulnerable species;• adversely affect habitat critical to the survival of a species; and• result in a long-term decrease in the size of an important population of a vulnerable species. <p>The Flora and Fauna Division also considers that there is also potential for the proposal to have the following significant impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• lead to a long-term decrease in the size of an important population of a species; and• result in invasive species that are harmful to a vulnerable species becoming established in the species' habitat by provision of food, water and shelter resources. <p>A long-term decrease in the size of the population is likely due to the loss of approximately 36,000ha of foraging habitat for the Tanami Desert population. The construction and operation of extensive areas of infrastructure will also alter the local microhabitat and provide shelter and possible food/water resources for invasive species (Red Fox, Feral Cat) locally. The results of surveys for invasive species were not provided with the Referral, and a review of desktop records confirms that both species do occur in the region, but their presence appears to be sporadic. This is likely due to large areas of unsuitable habitat where resources are low or unavailable. The proposal will introduce areas of shelter and potentially other resources, such as food and water which in turn, increases the risk that either/both species may become locally abundant and permanently established.</p> <p><u>Grey Falcon:</u> The Grey Falcon is listed as Vulnerable under the TPWC Act and the EPBC Act and is found in low densities across arid and semi-arid Australia. There is suitable foraging habitat and potentially suitable breeding habitat within the project area. The species should be considered to have a high likelihood of occurrence in the project area given the large spatial scale and long duration of the proposal. Over the life of the project the Flora and Fauna Division considers the Grey Falcon has a high likelihood of occurrence, with the potential for breeding habitat to occur.</p> <p>A desktop 'likelihood of occurrence' assessment was undertaken for the proposal which identified potential breeding habitat, taller trees along Burke Creek, but other riparian and ephemeral swamp areas were not within the area of impact and not assessed. There is also potential for topographically prominent trees on</p>
--	--	---

	<p>low hills and rises in the project area to be suitable nesting habitat. Due to the low fecundity of the species, active nests should be considered habitat critical to the survival of the species.</p> <p>Given the potential for the species to occur further surveys are recommended to detect active nests and ensure adequate avoidance and mitigation measures are employed to avoid disturbance. Given the low fecundity, the interference to a single nesting pair of this species has the potential to have a moderate to high impact for the species. The species is known to be disturbed by any activities within 300m of a nest and it is recommended that mitigation include a minimum 300m exclusion zone for any activities.</p> <p><u>Yellow-spotted Monitor</u>: This species generally occupies floodplain, coastal and riparian habitats in the Top End of the NT. The species is also known to occur in the vicinity of the proposal area, particularly around Lake Woods and the Mitchell Grass Plains. Surveys identified likely signs (burrows) of Yellow-spotted Monitor suggesting that individuals are present within the project area.</p> <p>The species has historically declined in the Top End and persists in low to very low densities following the arrival of cane toads. The proposal is located close to the southern limit of cane toads (Renner Springs) in the NT and this species would be relatively common in areas of suitable habitat. This species is known to also persist in modified habitats which includes agricultural landscapes and urban areas. The proposed clearing and use of the site for a solar precinct is unlikely to significantly impact the species provided it does not exacerbate the existing threat from cane toads.</p> <p><u>Gouldian Finch</u>: The Gouldian Finch was assessed by the proponent as having a likelihood of occurrence of none. There are waterholes and feeding habitat present in the project area and recent observations from a neighbouring property. Due to little or no survey effort in this area for the species in recent years, it is possible that the species has been overlooked, with potential breeding habitat in the nearby Ashburton Range as identified in comments provided by the Flora and Fauna Division on the Draft EIS for Australia Asia Powerlink Project – 5 July 2022¹⁷ (page12).</p> <p>The Flora and Fauna Division considers there is a moderate likelihood of Gouldian Finch occurring in the project area and as such, impacts to the species should be assessed using the Significant Impact Guidelines 1.1- Matters of National Environmental Significance. Further surveys using appropriate methods at a suitable time of year may be required to determine presence or absence, and to quantify the impacts to suitable habitat if present in the proposal area.</p> <p><u>Migratory Shorebirds</u>: Migratory shorebirds also listed as threatened may occur intermittently in the project area when conditions are right. Reviewing surface water frequency from Digital Earth Australia (DEA)</p>
--	--

¹⁷ https://ntepa.nt.gov.au/_resources/documents/eia/australia-asean-power-link-project/submissions-received-on-significant-variation/government-authority-submissions/4-department-environment-parks-water-security.pdf

		<p>Water Observations ephemeral wetlands in the project area shows surface water present 10% of the time series. This would likely provide suitable wetland habitat for migratory shorebirds intermittently. Open grasslands also support migratory shorebirds such as the Oriental Pratincole and Oriental Plover, but Land System mapping or National Vegetation Information System (NVIS) mapping may not be at a fine enough scale to delineate these areas.</p> <p>As migratory shorebirds, including some threatened species, have a high likelihood of occurring within the project area in ephemeral wetlands and open grasslands, the Flora and Fauna Division recommends that ephemeral wetlands are reviewed and considered habitat for migratory shorebirds, and open grassland areas are considered to support these species. Where these species are listed as threatened, they should be considered in the relevant Threatened Species sections and potential impacts assessed against the criteria in the Significant Impact Guidelines 1.1 - Matters of National Environmental Significance.</p> <p>Waterbirds undertake regional movements between waterbodies within the NT, and movements to waterbodies in other states, and move through the area during trans-continental migrations. The distance to Lake Woods is small in comparison to these movements and there is a high likelihood that waterbirds would regularly fly over the solar array. The 'Lake Effect Hypothesis' (LEH) is identified as a potential risk to waterbirds. The Referral incorrectly asserts the lack of wetland habitat in the project area as being a reason that the LEH is unlikely to be an issue. Particularly in a dry environment, and in relative proximity to other regional ephemeral lake systems, the LEH has potential to confuse overflying waterbird species, leading to collision risk with panels.</p> <p>There remains substantial uncertainty on the likely impact of the solar arrays on waterbirds and the Flora and Fauna Division supports the commitment to monitor these impacts in a rigorous way. However, the Flora and Fauna Division recommends that the proponent provide details on the potential mitigation actions that could be undertaken if waterbird mortality is recorded. Furthermore, the proponent should identify whether any of these mitigation actions could be implemented pre-emptively.</p> <p><u>Tassel Sedge</u>: A single record of the Tassel Sedge has been reviewed and found that the nearby record was entered in error and will be removed from the NT Flora Atlas for that locality. The Tassell Sedge is not likely to occur in the proposal area.</p>
	<p>Terrestrial Ecosystems Significant and/or Sensitive Vegetation/Features</p>	<p><u>Watercourses and Wetlands</u>: The Referral states there is one moderate creek in the project area (Burke Creek), the mapping shows two major creeks (Burke Creek and Tomkinson Creek, both stream order 4). Waterholes were found in Burke Creek at the time of survey, potentially providing habitat for seed eating birds such as the threatened Gouldian Finch.</p> <p>Ephemeral swamps are identified in the project area and largely excluded from the disturbance footprint. Ephemeral wetlands should be assessed for average proportion of water cover from DEA Water</p>

		<p>Observations to assess potential as habitat for waterbirds, wetland shorebirds or dry grassland favouring shorebirds.</p> <p>The Flora and Fauna Division recommends that both major creeks are assessed as potential habitat for seed eating birds such as the Gouldian Finch, and that ephemeral wetlands are reviewed for their suitability as habitat for waterbirds, wetland shorebirds and dry grassland favouring shorebirds.</p> <p><u>Riparian Vegetation and Large Trees with Hollows Suitable for Fauna:</u> Riparian habitats in the project area were identified along Burke Creek, but not along Tomkinson Creek because they were not in the area of interest for the field survey (Appendix B Ecology Assessment - Figure 1-1 Map of project area). Ephemeral swamps, drainage depressions and large, hollow-bearing trees outside the area of interest, but within the project area may have also been overlooked. Desert Bloodwoods (<i>Corymbia opaca</i> and <i>C. setosa</i>) are often found in the Redsan land system and are known to host large hollows, however frequent or intense fires may remove these resources as accurately stated in Appendix B Ecology Assessment. Areas of low fire frequency or patchy fires may still have large, hollow-bearing Desert Bloodwood trees.</p> <p>The Flora and Fauna Division recommends reviewing the presence and mapping of creeks, drainages, ephemeral swamps and drainage depressions and mapping the appropriate minimum buffer zones for these significant vegetation types according to the Northern Territory Planning Scheme Land Clearing Guidelines (NTPS LCG) to include in exclusion areas. Additional large, hollow-bearing trees may be located in the Tomkinson Creek drainage or in Redsan land systems where there has been low fire disturbance, and these should be mapped and quantified in the disturbance footprint.</p>
Vegetation	Terrestrial ecosystems	<p><u>Cumulative Impact Assessment – vegetation clearing:</u> The proposed clearing is considered unlikely to have a significant impact on the regional extent of vegetation communities and associated biodiversity values. At a property scale, there would be a reduction to 75.45% of the property remaining as intact native vegetation (from 99.76%), including between approximately 52% and 56% of the baseline areas remaining for four vegetation communities.</p> <p><u>Detailed information on cumulative vegetation loss at a range of scales:</u> A cumulative impact assessment on vegetation community extent was undertaken using NTNVIS mapping¹⁸ as a baseline, updated as far as practicable to represent current intact native vegetation cover for the area to near-present day. Clearing data was compiled from NTNVIS mapping, DLPE clearing (or permitted to be cleared) areas data and Land Use Mapping (LUMP) data¹⁹. Although there are some deficiencies in the completeness and adequacy of these mapping products, for these analyses the data represents the best available continuous and</p>

¹⁸ http://www.ntlis.nt.gov.au/metadata/export_data?type=html&metadata_id=B75510B92F680755E040CD9B2144596C

¹⁹ http://www.ntlis.nt.gov.au/metadata/export_data?type=html&metadata_id=ECEEDF0AD4826221E0532144CD9BC059

		<p>consistently attributed mapping for the NT. All area values were calculated using Geocentric Datum of Australia (GDA 1994)/Australian Albers projected coordinate system. The assessment was undertaken on 21 November 2025. The results are presented further below (Figure 1 - Cumulative Impacts Assessment results calculated at the property, bioregion, subregion and catchment scale).</p> <p>Muckaty Aboriginal Land Trust (NT Portion 5173) has a baseline area of 221,376.51ha, of which 220,845.12ha (99.76%) is intact native vegetation. The clearing application proposes to clear an additional 53,806.04ha, which would result in 74.45% of the property remaining as intact native vegetation. Six vegetation communities have been mapped within the proposed clearing area. All vegetation communities would retain at least 52% of their baseline area intact.</p> <p>NT Portion 5173 occurs within the Davenport Murchison Ranges and Tanami bioregions which currently have intact native vegetation across 99.6% and 99.86% of their extents, respectively. All six vegetation communities impacted by the proposed clearing would have at least 89% of their baseline areas within the bioregions remaining intact.</p> <p>NT Portion 5173 occurs within the Ashburton Range and Wycliffe subregions which currently have intact native vegetation across 99.09% and 99.47% of their extents, respectively. All six vegetation communities impacted by the proposed clearing would have at least 76.64% of their baseline areas within the subregions remaining intact.</p> <p>NT Portion 5173 occurs within the Wiso catchment which currently has intact native vegetation across 99.74% of its extent. All six vegetation communities impacted by the proposed clearing would have at least 94% of their baseline areas within the catchment remaining intact.</p>
--	--	--

Figure 1 - Cumulative Impacts Assessment results calculated at the property, bioregion, subregion and catchment scale. *Percentage value relative to baseline area.

Assessment level	Level name	Vegetation community	Baseline area (ha)	Current area (ha) of intact native vegetation	Current area (ha) cleared	Proposed area (ha) of additional clearing	Area (ha) that would remain intact
Property	NT Portion 5173	All vegetation communities	221,376.51	220,845.12 (99.76%)*	531.39 (0.24%)*	53,806.04	167,039.07 (75.45%)*
		U+ ^Corymbia opaca,Euc pruinosa,Corymbia papuana\^tree\6\;M Carissa lanceolata,Atalaya hemiglauca,^Acacia lysiphloia\^shrub\3\;G ^Triodia pungens,Eulalia aurea,Enneapogon polyphyllus\^hummock grass,tussock grass\1\c	61,620.41	61,298.97 (99.48%)*	321.44 (0.52%)*	12,875.66	48,423.32 (78.58%)*
		U ^Euc setosa,Acacia torulosa+/-Corymbia deserticola subsp. mesogeotica\^tree\6\;M Euc setosa,^Acacia stipuligera,Brachychiton paradoxus\^shrub\3\;G+ ^Triodia pungens,Triodia schinzii,Eragrostis eriopoda\^hummock grass,tussock grass\1\i	2,055.10	2,055.1 (100.0%)*	0.0 (0.0%)*	907.31	1,147.79 (55.85%)*
		U ^Eucalyptus pruinosa,Corymbia opaca+/-Eucalyptus setosa\^tree\6\;M+ ^Acacia stipuligera+/-Grevillea wickhamii\^shrub\4\;G ^Triodia pungens,Triodia schinzii+/-Yakirra australiensis\^hummock grass,tussock grass\1\i	34,786.72	34,739.94 (99.87%)*	46.78 (0.13%)*	15,293.41	19,446.52 (55.9%)*
		U+ ^Corymbia dichromophloia+/-Hakea chordophylla,Euc odontocarpa\^tree\6\;M ^Acacia lycopodiifolia,Acacia coriacea,Acacia dictyophleba\^shrub\4\;G ^Triodia pungens+/-Setaria apiculata+/-Digitaria brownii\^hummock grass,tussock grass\1\c	43,335.08	43,258.08 (99.82%)*	77.0 (0.18%)*	3,797.50	39,460.58 (91.06%)*
		U ^Euc pruinosa,Corymbia opaca+/-Euc setosa\^tree\6\;M ^Acacia stipuligera+/-Grevillea wickhamii\^shrub\4\;G+ ^Triodia pungens,Triodia schinzii+/-Yakirra australiensis\^hummock grass,tussock grass\1\i	34,786.72	34,739.94 (99.87%)*	46.78 (0.13%)*	15,293.41	19,446.52 (55.9%)*
		U+ Lysiphylum cunninghamii,Corymbia opaca,^Euc pruinosa\^tree\6\;M Carissa lanceolata,^Acacia lysiphloia,Atalaya hemiglauca\^shrub\3\;G ^Triodia pungens,Chrysopogon fallax,Enneapogon polyphyllus\tussock grass,^hummock grass\1\c	11,781.10	11,781.1 (100.0%)*	0.0 (0.0%)*	5,638.76	6,142.34 (52.14%)*
Bioregion	Davenport Murchison Ranges	All vegetation communities	5,805,108.12	5,782,073.91 (99.6%)*	23,034.22 (0.4%)*	1,335.32	5,780,738.59 (99.58%)*
		U+ ^Corymbia dichromophloia+/-Hakea chordophylla,Euc odontocarpa\^tree\6\;M ^Acacia lycopodiifolia,Acacia coriacea,Acacia dictyophleba\^shrub\4\;G ^Triodia pungens+/-Setaria apiculata+/-Digitaria brownii\^hummock grass,tussock grass\1\c	399,924.91	397,843.66 (99.48%)*	2,081.25 (0.52%)*	119.13	397,724.53 (99.45%)*
		U+ ^Corymbia opaca,Euc pruinosa,Corymbia papuana\^tree\6\;M Carissa lanceolata,Atalaya hemiglauca,^Acacia lysiphloia\^shrub\3\;G ^Triodia pungens,Eulalia aurea,Enneapogon polyphyllus\^hummock grass,tussock grass\1\c	2,498,448.40	2,491,803.24 (99.73%)*	6,645.16 (0.27%)*	1,216.18	2,490,587.06 (99.69%)*
	Tanami	All vegetation communities	22,981,137.26	22,949,617.91 (99.86%)*	31,519.35 (0.14%)*	52,475.65	22,897,142.26 (99.63%)*
		U+ ^Corymbia dichromophloia+/-Hakea chordophylla,Euc odontocarpa\^tree\6\;M ^Acacia lycopodiifolia,Acacia coriacea,Acacia dictyophleba\^shrub\4\;G ^Triodia pungens+/-Setaria apiculata+/-Digitaria brownii\^hummock grass,tussock grass\1\c	35,989.92	35,921.83 (99.81%)*	68.1 (0.19%)*	3,679.49	32,242.33 (89.59%)*
		U ^Euc pruinosa,Corymbia opaca+/-Euc setosa\^tree\6\;M ^Acacia stipuligera+/-Grevillea wickhamii\^shrub\4\;G+ ^Triodia pungens,Triodia schinzii+/-Yakirra australiensis\^hummock grass,tussock grass\1\i	8,078,743.95	8,065,932.14 (99.84%)*	12,811.82 (0.16%)*	15,294.55	8,050,637.58 (99.65%)*

Assessment level	Level name	Vegetation community	Baseline area (ha)	Current area (ha) of intact native vegetation	Current area (ha) cleared	Proposed area (ha) of additional clearing	Area (ha) that would remain intact
		U+ Lysiphillum cunninghamii,Corymbia opaca,^Euc pruinosa\^tree\6\;M Carissa lanceolata,^Acacia lysiphloia,Atalaya hemiglauca\^shrub\3\;G ^Triodia pungens,Chrysopogon fallax,Enneapogon polyphyllus\tussock grass,^hummock grass\1c	59,828.76	59,398.01 (99.28%)*	430.76 (0.72%)*	5,638.76	53,759.25 (89.86%)*
		U+ ^Corymbia opaca,Euc pruinosa,Corymbia papuana\^tree\6\;M Carissa lanceolata,Atalaya hemiglauca,^Acacia lysiphloia\^shrub\3\;G ^Triodia pungens,Eulalia aurea,Enneapogon polyphyllus\^hummock grass,tussock grass\1c	204,266.93	203,810.4 (99.78%)*	456.53 (0.22%)*	11,660.84	192,149.55 (94.07%)*
		U ^Euc setosa,Acacia torulosa+/-Corymbia deserticola subsp. mesogeotica\^tree\6\;M Euc setosa,^Acacia stipuligera,Brachychiton paradoxus\^shrub\3\;G+ ^Triodia pungens,Triodia schinzii,Eragrostis eriopoda\^hummock grass,tussock grass\1i	3,378,640.93	3,378,573.26 (100.0%)*	67.68 (0.0%)*	907.45	3,377,665.81 (99.97%)*
		U ^Eucalyptus pruinosa,Corymbia opaca+/-Eucalyptus setosa\^tree\6\;M+ ^Acacia stipuligera+/-Grevillea wickhamii\^shrub\4\;G ^Triodia pungens,Triodia schinzii+/-Yakirra australiensis\^hummock grass,tussock grass\1i	8,078,743.95	8,065,932.14 (99.84%)*	12,811.82 (0.16%)*	15,294.55	8,050,637.58 (99.65%)*
Subregion	Ashburton Range	All vegetation communities	1,218,620.98	1,207,474.73 (99.09%)*	11,146.25 (0.91%)*	1,335.32	1,206,139.42 (98.98%)*
		U+ ^Corymbia dichromophloia+/-Hakea chordophylla,Euc odontocarpa\^tree\6\;M ^Acacia lycopodiifolia,Acacia coriacea,Acacia dictyophleba\^shrub\4\;G ^Triodia pungens+/-Setaria apiculata+/-Digitaria brownii\^hummock grass,tussock grass\1c	387,354.14	385,272.88 (99.46%)*	2,081.25 (0.54%)*	119.13	385,153.75 (99.43%)*
		U+ ^Corymbia opaca,Euc pruinosa,Corymbia papuana\^tree\6\;M Carissa lanceolata,Atalaya hemiglauca,^Acacia lysiphloia\^shrub\3\;G ^Triodia pungens,Eulalia aurea,Enneapogon polyphyllus\^hummock grass,tussock grass\1c	363,079.44	361,302.62 (99.51%)*	1,776.82 (0.49%)*	1,216.18	360,086.43 (99.18%)*
	Wycliffe	All vegetation communities	1,600,892.89	1,592,471.38 (99.47%)*	8,421.51 (0.53%)*	52,475.65	1,539,995.73 (96.2%)*
		U+ ^Corymbia dichromophloia+/-Hakea chordophylla,Euc odontocarpa\^tree\6\;M ^Acacia lycopodiifolia,Acacia coriacea,Acacia dictyophleba\^shrub\4\;G ^Triodia pungens+/-Setaria apiculata+/-Digitaria brownii\^hummock grass,tussock grass\1c	33,834.01	33,765.92 (99.8%)*	68.1 (0.2%)*	3,679.49	30,086.42 (88.92%)*
		U ^Euc pruinosa,Corymbia opaca+/-Euc setosa\^tree\6\;M ^Acacia stipuligera+/-Grevillea wickhamii\^shrub\4\;G+ ^Triodia pungens,Triodia schinzii+/-Yakirra australiensis\^hummock grass,tussock grass\1i	626,568.72	623,033.61 (99.44%)*	3,535.11 (0.56%)*	15,294.55	607,739.06 (96.99%)*
		U+ Lysiphillum cunninghamii,Corymbia opaca,^Euc pruinosa\^tree\6\;M Carissa lanceolata,^Acacia lysiphloia,Atalaya hemiglauca\^shrub\3\;G ^Triodia pungens,Chrysopogon fallax,Enneapogon polyphyllus\tussock grass,^hummock grass\1c	59,828.76	59,398.01 (99.28%)*	430.76 (0.72%)*	5,638.76	53,759.25 (89.86%)*
		U+ ^Corymbia opaca,Euc pruinosa,Corymbia papuana\^tree\6\;M Carissa lanceolata,Atalaya hemiglauca,^Acacia lysiphloia\^shrub\3\;G ^Triodia pungens,Eulalia aurea,Enneapogon polyphyllus\^hummock grass,tussock grass\1c	50,611.66	50,447.64 (99.68%)*	164.03 (0.32%)*	11,660.84	38,786.79 (76.64%)*
		U ^Euc setosa,Acacia torulosa+/-Corymbia deserticola subsp. mesogeotica\^tree\6\;M Euc setosa,^Acacia stipuligera,Brachychiton	43,903.36	43,903.36 (100.0%)*	0.0 (0.0%)*	907.45	42,995.9 (97.93%)*

Assessment level	Level name	Vegetation community	Baseline area (ha)	Current area (ha) of intact native vegetation	Current area (ha) cleared	Proposed area (ha) of additional clearing	Area (ha) that would remain intact
		paradoxus\^shrub\3r;G+ ^Triodia pungens,Triodia schinzii,Eragrostis eriopoda\^hummock grass,tussock grass\1i					
		U ^Eucalyptus pruinosa,Corymbia opaca+/-Eucalyptus setosa\^tree\6bi;M+ ^Acacia stipuligera+/-Grevillea wickhamii\^shrub\4r;G ^Triodia pungens,Triodia schinzii+/-Yakirra australiensis\^hummock grass,tussock grass\1i	626,568.72	623,033.61 (99.44%)*	3,535.11 (0.56%)*	15,294.55	607,739.06 (96.99%)*
Catchment	Wiso	All vegetation communities	22,931,076.37	22,871,970.14 (99.74%)*	59,106.23 (0.26%)*	53,810.97	22,818,159.17 (99.51%)*
		U+ ^Corymbia dichromophloia+/-Hakea chordophylla,Euc odontocarpa\^tree\6r;M ^Acacia lycopodiifolia,Acacia coriacea,Acacia dictyophleba\^shrub\4r;G ^Triodia pungens+/-Setaria apiculata+/-Digitaria brownii\^hummock grass,tussock grass\1c	237,617.25	236,458.52 (99.51%)*	1,158.73 (0.49%)*	3,798.63	232,659.89 (97.91%)*
		U ^Euc pruinosa,Corymbia opaca+/-Euc setosa\^tree\6bi;M ^Acacia stipuligera+/-Grevillea wickhamii\^shrub\4r;G+ ^Triodia pungens,Triodia schinzii+/-Yakirra australiensis\^hummock grass,tussock grass\1i	5,236,836.52	5,227,939.97 (99.83%)*	8,896.55 (0.17%)*	15,294.55	5,212,645.42 (99.54%)*
		U+ Lysiphillum cunninghamii,Corymbia opaca, ^Euc pruinosa\^tree\6r;M Carissa lanceolata, ^Acacia lysiphloia,Atalaya hemiglauca\^shrub\3i;G ^Triodia pungens,Chrysopogon fallax,Enneapogon polyphyllus\tussock grass, ^hummock grass\1c	489,589.60	484,242.98 (98.91%)*	5,346.61 (1.09%)*	5,638.76	478,604.23 (97.76%)*
		U+ ^Corymbia opaca,Euc pruinosa,Corymbia papuana\^tree\6r;M Carissa lanceolata,Atalaya hemiglauca, ^Acacia lysiphloia\^shrub\3i;G ^Triodia pungens,Eulalia aurea,Enneapogon polyphyllus\^hummock grass,tussock grass\1c	229,939.45	229,135.93 (99.65%)*	803.52 (0.35%)*	12,877.02	216,258.91 (94.05%)*
		U ^Euc setosa,Acacia torulosa+/-Corymbia deserticola subsp. mesogeotica\^tree\6r;M Euc setosa, ^Acacia stipuligera,Brachychiton paradoxus\^shrub\3r;G+ ^Triodia pungens,Triodia schinzii,Eragrostis eriopoda\^hummock grass,tussock grass\1i	3,904,066.94	3,904,066.94 (100.0%)*	0.0 (0.0%)*	907.45	3,903,159.49 (99.98%)*
		U ^Eucalyptus pruinosa,Corymbia opaca+/-Eucalyptus setosa\^tree\6bi;M+ ^Acacia stipuligera+/-Grevillea wickhamii\^shrub\4r;G ^Triodia pungens,Triodia schinzii+/-Yakirra australiensis\^hummock grass,tussock grass\1i	5,236,836.52	5,227,939.97 (99.83%)*	8,896.55 (0.17%)*	15,294.55	5,212,645.42 (99.54%)*

Attachment 2

Submission on the referral

AAPowerLink Australia Assets Pty Ltd – Muckaty Solar Precinct

This submission is made under regulation 53 of the Environment Protection Regulations 2020

Government authority: Water Resources Division, Department of Lands, Planning & Environment

Summary:

Section of Referral	Theme or issue	Comment
Main report – section 8.	Inland water; hydrological processes	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• While the report 'Muckaty Solar Precinct Referral under the <i>Environment Protection Act 2019</i>' indicates that groundwater extraction associated with the solar precinct will be subjected to the assessment processes for Bore Work and Water Extraction Licence applications, the lack of information on location, timing and rates of extraction, or evidence confirming no presence of groundwater dependent ecosystems, means that the claimed minor residual impact and significance rating in regard to groundwater resources has not been justified.• The proposed development and associated transmission corridor intersect several waterways ranging from minor stream order 1 to 4; and 5 major non perennial waterways. If the works are likely to result in material impacts to the beds, banks, or flow of any of these waterways, the proponent may be required to submit an application to interfere with a waterway under section 41 of the <i>Water Act 1992</i>.• As significant groundwater demand is anticipated for the proposed development. A groundwater extraction licence will be necessary if water is to be used for any purpose other than stock and domestic, or road construction and maintenance.• The proposed development is likely to alter the permeability of a significant area. No typical infrastructure configuration details besides general layout has been provided for assessment. Flood modelling and flood mapping have not considered the impact of this extensive development. If the works are likely to result in material impacts to the beds, banks or flow of waterways, the proponent may be required to submit an application to interfere with a waterway under section 41 of the <i>Water Act 1992</i>.

Attachment 3

Submission on the referral

AAPowerLink Australia Assets Pty Ltd – Muckaty Solar Precinct

This submission is made under regulation 53 of the Environment Protection Regulations 2020

Government authority: Heritage Branch, Environment and Heritage Division, Department of Lands, Planning and Environment–

Summary: The Heritage Branch are satisfied that the proponent understands their obligations under the *Heritage Act 2011* and have articulated clearly the processes and commitments necessary to meet them. The Heritage Branch looks forward to working closely with the proponent going forward.

Section of Referral	Theme or issue	Comment
Main report	Scoping of archaeological surveys.	We suggest including a commitment to liaise with the Heritage Branch regarding the scoping of archaeological surveys, to ensure they are robust and fit for purpose. This is not compulsory under the <i>Heritage Act 2011</i> but can help provide greater certainty for proponents during later stages of a project.