

## ANNUAL RETURN

Information on this form is required in accordance with the conditions of your licence issued under the *Waste Management and Pollution Control Act 1998*

Failure to provide the information requested and/or the provision of false or misleading information is an offence under the legislation and you may be liable for heavy penalties.

### Section 1. Licence Details

<b>LICENCE NUMBER</b>	EPL 239-04	<b>REPORTING PERIOD</b>	1 April 2024 – 31 March 2025
-----------------------	------------	-------------------------	------------------------------

Please check your contact details including 24-hour emergency contact in [NT EPA online](#) and update if necessary. The NT EPA website will be updated using the details provided online.

Were the contact details correct? YES / NO

### Section 2. Statement of Compliance

Were all conditions of the licence complied with during the reporting period? YES / NO

If Yes, proceed to Section 4. If not, complete the table below (add more rows if required)

Details of Non-compliance				
Condition number	Date of non-compliance (dd/mm/yy)	Was NT EPA notified? (Yes / No)	If yes, date NT EPA notified (dd/mm/yy)	If yes, how was NT EPA notified? (e.g. phone, email, Pollution Hotline)
		If no, complete Section 3		
36.1	19/02/2025	Yes	4/03/2025	Email
36.1	26/02/2025	Yes	16/04/2025	Email
36.1	25/03/2025	Yes	16/04/2025	Email
36.2	26/02/2025	Yes	16/04/2025	Email
36.1	06/02/2025	Yes	16/04/2025	Email
36.1	17/12/2024	Yes	16/04/2025	Email
36.2	20/01/2025	Yes	16/04/2025	Email
36.2	4/02/2025	Yes	16/04/2025	Email

36.2	6/02/2025	Yes	16/04/2025	Email
36.2	19/02/2025	Yes	16/04/2025	Email

### Section 3. Report of Non-compliance

Please supply the following details for each non-compliance not reported to the NT EPA identified in Section 2. Use a separate page for each non-compliance.

The date and time of the non-compliance.

19/02/2025

When the non-compliance was detected and by whom.

The non-compliance for pH was detected by Kirsten Beames on the 4th of March 2025 while reviewing data.

The actual and potential causes and contributing factors to the non-compliance.

The actual cause of the non-compliance cannot be concluded however potential causes include:

- Elevated natural levels
- Farm discharges

The risk of environmental harm arising from the non-compliance.

The risk of environmental harm arising from the non-compliance is considered low for the following reasons:

- Wet season rainfall run off occurring within the Adelaide River floodplains flushing out organic material built up over the dry season.
- Increased background levels within the river this time of year due to the lower pH of rainfall.
- BOD and Chlorophyll-a levels at upstream ARUS sites were also high during the period where exceedances occurred, sometimes even higher than the monitoring site. pH was also very low upstream, which was reflected downstream at the HDB monitoring sites. This indicates exceedances may have been caused by natural levels in the river system and potential outside factors coming from upstream.
- TN and TP during these periods remained below the SSTV's, reflecting no impacts caused by increased BOD, pH or Chlorophyll-a within the river system. Typically, HDB exceedances often occur in TN or TP, indicating the exceedances this year are not expected from usual discharges from the farm.

The action(s) that have or will be undertaken to mitigate any environmental harm arising from the non-compliance.

See Response below.

Corrective actions that have or will be undertaken to ensure the non-compliance does not reoccur.

The results of all monitoring and corrective actions are continually assessed and presented in the annual Monitoring Reports required as per EPL239-04 Conditions 41 and 43.

If no action was taken, why no action was taken.

No action taken as risk was considered low as upstream results suggest exceedances are potentially due to another cause upstream, or natural levels within the river.

The date and time of the non-compliance.

26/02/2025

When the non-compliance was detected and by whom.

The non-compliance for pH was detected by Amy Pilmore on the 16th of April 2025 while reviewing data for the annual monitoring report.

The actual and potential causes and contributing factors to the non-compliance.

The actual cause of the non-compliance cannot be concluded however potential causes include:

- Elevated natural levels
- Farm discharges

The risk of environmental harm arising from the non-compliance.

The risk of environmental harm arising from the non-compliance is considered low for the following reasons:

- Wet season rainfall run off occurring within the Adelaide River floodplains flushing out organic material built up over the dry season.
- Increased background levels within the river this time of year due to the lower pH of rainfall.
- BOD and Chlorophyll-a levels at upstream ARUS sites were also high during the period where exceedances occurred, sometimes even higher than the monitoring site. pH was also very low upstream, which was reflected downstream at the HDB monitoring sites. This indicates exceedances may have been caused by natural levels in the river system and potential outside factors coming from upstream.
- TN and TP during these periods remained below the SSTV's, reflecting no impacts caused by increased BOD, pH or Chlorophyll-a within the river system. Typically, HDB exceedances often occur in TN or TP, indicating the exceedances this year are not expected from usual discharges from the farm.

The action(s) that have or will be undertaken to mitigate any environmental harm arising from the non-compliance.

See Response below.

Corrective actions that have or will be undertaken to ensure the non-compliance does not reoccur.

The results of all monitoring and corrective actions are continually assessed and presented in the annual Monitoring Reports required as per EPL239-04 Conditions 41 and 43.

If no action was taken, why no action was taken.

No action taken as risk was considered low as upstream results suggest exceedances are potentially due to another cause upstream, or natural levels within the river.

The date and time of the non-compliance.

25/03/2025

When the non-compliance was detected and by whom.

The non-compliance for pH was detected by Amy Pilmore on the 16<sup>th</sup> of April 2025 while reviewing data for the annual monitoring report.

The actual and potential causes and contributing factors to the non-compliance.

The actual cause of the non-compliance cannot be concluded however potential causes include:

- Elevated natural levels – During 3 out of 4 on the non-compliances BOD at the upstream site was higher than the downstream compliance point.
- Farm Discharges

The risk of environmental harm arising from the non-compliance.

The risk of environmental harm arising from the non-compliance is considered low for the following reasons:

- Wet season rainfall run off occurring within the Adelaide River floodplains flushing out organic material built up over the dry season.
- Increased background levels within the river this time of year due to the lower pH of rainfall.
- BOD and Chlorophyll-a levels at upstream ARUS sites were also high during the period where exceedances occurred, sometimes even higher than the monitoring site. pH was also very low upstream, which was reflected downstream at the HDB monitoring sites. This indicates exceedances may have been caused by natural levels in the river system and potential outside factors coming from upstream.
- TN and TP during these periods remained below the SSTV's, reflecting no impacts caused by increased BOD, pH or Chlorophyll-a within the river system. Typically, HDB exceedances often occur in TN or TP, indicating the exceedances this year are not expected from usual discharges from the farm.

The action(s) that have or will be undertaken to mitigate any environmental harm arising from the non-compliance.

See response below

Corrective actions that have or will be undertaken to ensure the non-compliance does not reoccur.

The results of all monitoring and corrective actions are continually assessed and presented in the annual Monitoring Reports required as per EPL239-04 Conditions 41 and 43.

If no action was taken, why no action was taken.

No action taken as risk was considered low as upstream results suggest exceedances are potentially due to another cause upstream, or natural levels within the river.

The date and time of the non-compliance.

26/02/2025

When the non-compliance was detected and by whom.

The non-compliance for Chlorophyll-a was detected by Amy Pilmore on the 16<sup>th</sup> of April 2025 while reviewing data for the annual monitoring report.

The actual and potential causes and contributing factors to the non-compliance.

The actual cause of the non-compliance cannot be concluded however potential causes include:

- Elevated natural levels
- Farm Discharges

The risk of environmental harm arising from the non-compliance.

The risk of environmental harm arising from the non-compliance is considered low for the following reasons:

- Wet season rainfall run off occurring within the Adelaide River floodplains flushing out organic material built up over the dry season.
- Increased background levels within the river this time of year due to the lower pH of rainfall.
- BOD and Chlorophyll-a levels at upstream ARUS sites were also high during the period where exceedances occurred, sometimes even higher than the monitoring site. pH was also very low upstream, which was reflected downstream at the HDB monitoring sites. This indicates exceedances may have been caused by natural levels in the river system and potential outside factors coming from upstream.
- TN and TP during these periods remained below the SSTV's, reflecting no impacts caused by increased BOD, pH or Chlorophyll-a within the river system. Typically, HDB exceedances often occur in TN or TP, indicating the exceedances this year are not expected from usual discharges from the farm.

The action(s) that have or will be undertaken to mitigate any environmental harm arising from the non-compliance.

See response below

Corrective actions that have or will be undertaken to ensure the non-compliance does not reoccur.

The results of all monitoring and corrective actions are continually assessed and presented in the annual Monitoring Reports required as per EPL239-04 Conditions 41 and 43.

If no action was taken, why no action was taken.

No action taken as risk was considered low as upstream results suggest exceedances are potentially due to natural levels within the river.

The date and time of the non-compliance.

17/12/2024

When the non-compliance was detected and by whom.

The non-compliance for BOD was detected by Amy Pilmore on the 16<sup>th</sup> of April 2025 while reviewing data for the annual monitoring report.

The actual and potential causes and contributing factors to the non-compliance.

The actual cause of the non-compliance cannot be concluded however potential causes include:

- Elevated natural levels as discharges from HDB were not occurring during this time

The risk of environmental harm arising from the non-compliance.

There is no risk of environmental harm arising from the non-compliance for the following reasons:

- HDB was not discharging during this period for over 6 months, so higher levels may be due to natural variation in the river.

The action(s) that have or will be undertaken to mitigate any environmental harm arising from the non-compliance.

See response below

Corrective actions that have or will be undertaken to ensure the non-compliance does not reoccur.

The results of all monitoring and corrective actions are continually assessed and presented in the annual Monitoring Reports required as per EPL239-04 Conditions 41 and 43.

If no action was taken, why no action was taken.

No action taken as risk was considered low as HDB was not discharging at the time of the event and upstream results suggest exceedances are potentially due to natural variation within the river.

The date and time of the non-compliance.

6/02/2025

When the non-compliance was detected and by whom.

The non-compliance for BOD was detected by Amy Pilmore on the 16<sup>th</sup> of April 2025 while reviewing data for the annual monitoring report.

The actual and potential causes and contributing factors to the non-compliance.

The actual cause of the non-compliance cannot be concluded however potential causes include:

- Elevated natural levels
- Farm Discharges

The risk of environmental harm arising from the non-compliance.

The risk of environmental harm arising from the non-compliance is considered low for the following reasons:

- Wet season rainfall run off occurring within the Adelaide River floodplains flushing out organic material built up over the dry season.
- Increased background levels within the river this time of year due to the lower pH of rainfall.
- BOD and Chlorophyll-a levels at upstream ARUS sites were also high during the period where exceedances occurred, sometimes even higher than the monitoring site. pH was also very low upstream, which was reflected downstream at the HDB monitoring sites. This indicates exceedances may have been caused by natural levels in the river system and potential outside factors coming from upstream.

- TN and TP during these periods remained below the SSTV's, reflecting no impacts caused by increased BOD, pH or Chlorophyll-a within the river system. Typically, HBD exceedances often occur in TN or TP, indicating the exceedances this year are not expected from usual discharges from the farm.

The action(s) that have or will be undertaken to mitigate any environmental harm arising from the non-compliance.

See response below

Corrective actions that have or will be undertaken to ensure the non-compliance does not reoccur.

The results of all monitoring and corrective actions are continually assessed and presented in the annual Monitoring Reports required as per EPL239-04 Conditions 41 and 43.

If no action was taken, why no action was taken.

No action taken as risk was considered low as upstream results suggest exceedances are potentially due to natural levels within the river.

The date and time of the non-compliance.

20/01/2025

When the non-compliance was detected and by whom.

The non-compliance for BOD was detected by Amy Pilmore on the 16<sup>th</sup> of April 2025 while reviewing data for the annual monitoring report.

The actual and potential causes and contributing factors to the non-compliance.

The actual cause of the non-compliance cannot be concluded however potential causes include:

- Elevated natural levels as discharges from HDB were not occurring during this time

The risk of environmental harm arising from the non-compliance.

There is no risk of environmental harm arising from the non-compliance for the following reasons:

- HDB was not discharging during this period for over 6 months, so higher levels may be due to natural variation in the river.

The action(s) that have or will be undertaken to mitigate any environmental harm arising from the non-compliance.

See response below

Corrective actions that have or will be undertaken to ensure the non-compliance does not reoccur.

The results of all monitoring and corrective actions are continually assessed and presented in the annual Monitoring Reports required as per EPL239-04 Conditions 41 and 43.

If no action was taken, why no action was taken.

No action taken as risk was considered low as upstream results suggest exceedances are potentially due to natural levels within the river.

The date and time of the non-compliance.

4/02/2025

When the non-compliance was detected and by whom.

The non-compliance for BOD was detected by Amy Pilmore on the 16<sup>th</sup> of April 2025 while reviewing data for the annual monitoring report.

The actual and potential causes and contributing factors to the non-compliance.

The actual cause of the non-compliance cannot be concluded however potential causes include:

- Elevated natural levels
- Farm Discharges

The risk of environmental harm arising from the non-compliance.

The risk of environmental harm arising from the non-compliance is considered low for the following reasons:

- HDB started discharging on the 4<sup>th</sup> of February at 9am, an hour before the non-compliance was sampled. The risk of levels being detected due to the discharge is low.
- Wet season rainfall run off occurring within the Adelaide River floodplains flushing out organic material built up over the dry season.
- Increased background levels within the river this time of year due to the lower pH of rainfall.
- BOD and Chlorophyll-a levels at upstream ARUS sites were also high during the pre-discharge period where exceedances occurred, sometimes even higher than the monitoring site. pH was also very low upstream.

The action(s) that have or will be undertaken to mitigate any environmental harm arising from the non-compliance.

See response below

Corrective actions that have or will be undertaken to ensure the non-compliance does not reoccur.

The results of all monitoring and corrective actions are continually assessed and presented in the annual Monitoring Reports required as per EPL239-04 Conditions 41 and 43.

If no action was taken, why no action was taken.

No action taken as risk was considered low as upstream results suggest exceedances are potentially due to natural levels within the river.

The date and time of the non-compliance.

6/02/2025

When the non-compliance was detected and by whom.

The non-compliance for BOD was detected by Amy Pilmore on the 16<sup>th</sup> of April 2025 while reviewing data for the annual monitoring report.

The actual and potential causes and contributing factors to the non-compliance.

The actual cause of the non-compliance cannot be concluded however potential causes include:

- Elevated natural levels
- Farm Discharges

The risk of environmental harm arising from the non-compliance.

The risk of environmental harm arising from the non-compliance is considered low for the following reasons:

- Wet season rainfall run off occurring within the Adelaide River floodplains flushing out organic material built up over the dry season.
- Increased background levels within the river this time of year due to the lower pH of rainfall.
- BOD and Chlorophyll-a levels at upstream ARUS sites were also high during the period where exceedances occurred, sometimes even higher than the monitoring site. pH was also very low upstream, which was reflected downstream at the HDB monitoring sites. This indicates exceedances may have been caused by natural levels in the river system and potential outside factors coming from upstream.
- TN and TP during these periods remained below the SSTV's, reflecting no impacts caused by increased BOD, pH or Chlorophyll-a within the river system. Typically, HDB exceedances often occur in TN or TP, indicating the exceedances this year are not expected from usual discharges from the farm.

The action(s) that have or will be undertaken to mitigate any environmental harm arising from the non-compliance.

See response below

Corrective actions that have or will be undertaken to ensure the non-compliance does not reoccur.

The results of all monitoring and corrective actions are continually assessed and presented in the annual Monitoring Reports required as per EPL239-04 Conditions 41 and 43.

If no action was taken, why no action was taken.

No action taken as risk was considered low as upstream results suggest exceedances are potentially due to another cause upstream, or natural levels within the river.

The date and time of the non-compliance.

19/02/2025

When the non-compliance was detected and by whom.

The non-compliance for BOD was detected by Amy Pilmore on the 16<sup>th</sup> of April 2025 while reviewing data for the annual monitoring report.

The actual and potential causes and contributing factors to the non-compliance.

The actual cause of the non-compliance cannot be concluded however potential causes include:

- Elevated natural levels
- Farm Discharges

The risk of environmental harm arising from the non-compliance.

The risk of environmental harm arising from the non-compliance is considered low for the following reasons:

- Wet season rainfall run off occurring within the Adelaide River floodplains flushing out organic material built up over the dry season.
- Increased background levels within the river this time of year due to the lower pH of rainfall.
- BOD and Chlorophyll-a levels at upstream ARUS sites were also high during the period where exceedances occurred, sometimes even higher than the monitoring site. pH was also very low upstream, which was reflected downstream at the HDB monitoring sites. This indicates exceedances may have been caused by natural levels in the river system and potential outside factors coming from upstream.
- TN and TP during these periods remained below the SSTV's, reflecting no impacts caused by increased BOD, pH or Chlorophyll-a within the river system. Typically, HDB exceedances often occur in TN or TP, indicating the exceedances this year are not expected from usual discharges from the farm.

The action(s) that have or will be undertaken to mitigate any environmental harm arising from the non-compliance.

See response below

Corrective actions that have or will be undertaken to ensure the non-compliance does not reoccur.

The results of all monitoring and corrective actions are continually assessed and presented in the annual Monitoring Reports required as per EPL239-04 Conditions 41 and 43.

If no action was taken, why no action was taken.

No action taken as risk was considered low as upstream results suggest exceedances are potentially due to another cause upstream, or natural levels within the river.

## Section 4. Signature and Certification

This declaration must only be signed by a person(s) with the legal authority to sign it. The ways in which the application may be signed, and the people who may sign the application, are set out in the categories below.			
<b>If the licence holder is:</b>	<b>Check</b>	<b>The application must be signed and certified by one of the following:</b>	
An individual	<input type="checkbox"/>	The individual.	
A partnership	<input type="checkbox"/>	A partner.	
A company	<input type="checkbox"/>	The common seal being affixed in accordance with the <i>Corporations Act</i> , or	
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Two directors, or	
	<input type="checkbox"/>	A director and a company secretary, or	
	<input type="checkbox"/>	If a proprietary company that has a sole director who is also the sole company secretary – by that director.	
A public authority	<input type="checkbox"/>	The Chief Executive Officer (CEO) of the public authority, or	
	<input type="checkbox"/>	By a person delegated to sign on the public authority's behalf in accordance with its legislation (Please note: a copy of the relevant instrument of delegation must be attached to this application).	
<b>I/We hereby declare that the information provided in this Annual Return and accompanying documents is to the best of my/our knowledge, true and correct.</b>			
Signature	<i>DR</i>	Signature	
Name (printed)	Dan Richards	Name (printed)	
Position	CEO	Position	
Date	06/06/2025	Date	
Seal (if signing under seal):			

Return the completed signed form to [environmentalregulation@nt.gov.au](mailto:environmentalregulation@nt.gov.au)