

Appendix A

Summaries of Responses and Index

| Submission No. | Summarised Comment | Reference EIS Guidelines | Reference Draft EIS | Reference Supplement |
|----------------|--|--------------------------|---------------------|----------------------|
| 1 | <i>Aboriginal Areas Protection Authority (AAPA)</i> | | | |
| | The AAPA have noted that the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Heritage Act 1984 and the Aboriginal Land Rights (Northern Territory) Act 1976 are Commonwealth, not Northern Territory legislation. Also, the Northern Territory Aboriginal Sacred Sites Act 1989 should be added to the list of relevant legislation. | 2 (j) | 1.9.1 | 3.1 |
| | Currently, the AAPA has not received an application for Authority Certificates for the proposed works from Matilda. AAPA has conducted preliminary discussions with the TLC on issuing Authority Certificates, however currently, no reports have been received. Proof of an Authority Certificate is required before the project can commence. | 2 (j) | 20.1.2 | 3.2 |
| 2 | <i>Department of Health and Community Services (DHCS)</i> | | | |
| | DHCS Tiwi Health Services (Environmental Health Officer) would like to be informed of Matilda's monitoring of groundwater levels and quality before and during the project. | 4.3.1, 4.3.3 | 8.4 | 6.2 |
| | DHCS state that the 1987 code (<i>Code of Practice on Radiation Protection in the Mining and Milling of Radioactive Ores</i>) does not apply to mines based on assay results but does apply based on radiation dose. The assay results do not show, without other evidence, that radiation dose would be less than 1 mSv above background. However, the assay results would imply that the separated mineral would be defined as radioactive under the Radiation (Safety Control) Act and the new Radiation Protection Act. If it can be shown that no significant radiation dose is received, Matilda can re-apply for exemption. | 2(j) | ES-23, 14.2 | 11.2 |
| | DHCS state that Paragraph 4 of ES-23 (need to apply for a licence to possess, sell and handle radioactive material and appoint a Radiation Safety Officer) is correct. | 2(j) | ES-23, 14.2 | 11.2 |

Appendix A

Summaries of Responses and Index

| Submission No. | Summarised Comment | Reference EIS Guidelines | Reference Draft EIS | Reference Supplement |
|----------------|--|--------------------------|---------------------|----------------------|
| | DHCS state that the Executive Summary implies that the radiation dose to members of the public could exceed 1 mSv per year above background. The dose to the critical group could be 0.5 mSv. Therefore, the radiation dose limit for members of the public could be exceeded through this operation. Exemptions as described on page 20 of the current Code of Practice for Radiation Protection and Radioactive Waste Management in Mining and Milling Processing, clause 3.5.1, third paragraph suggest that this operation would not automatically be exempt. However, in the longer term, it could be shown that it might be inherently safe and Matilda could re-seek exemption. | 4.6.2 | ES-23, 14.3 | 11.1 |
| | DHCS suggests that radon decay product monitoring is not necessary, as radon decay products are unlikely to contribute to the effective radiation dose. However, modelling for the pathways for external gamma exposure and for long-lived radionuclides in inhalable dust, both of which may contribute sufficiently to radiation dose, were not included in the Draft EIS and should be included in the monitoring program. | 4.6.3 | 14.4 | 11.1 |
| | DHCS comments that the radiation risk factors from the different radiation exposure pathways may not be understood. | 4.6.2 | 14.3 | 11.1 |
| | DHCS refer Matilda to Environmental Health Attachment – Information Bulletin No. 6 Requirements for Mining, Construction & Bush Camps | 2.1(g), 5.1 | 2, 25 | 2.8 |
| | DHCS Tiwi Health Services is interested in Matilda's local employment strategy. | 4.11.2 | 1.6.1, 2.7, 19.3 | 12.1 |
| | DHCS points out that the Foods Act (2004) was omitted from the list of relevant legislation. | 2 | 1.9.1 | 3.1 |
| | DHCS would like to know how the community may lodge complaints about dust emissions and noise, and how Matilda would monitor and assess complaints. | 4.5.3 | 25.8 | 10.1 |

Appendix A

Summaries of Responses and Index

| Submission No. | Summarised Comment | Reference EIS Guidelines | Reference Draft EIS | Reference Supplement |
|----------------|--|--------------------------|---------------------|----------------------|
| | DHCS noted that biting insect trapping had been conducted in November, with the results of the survey revealing low levels of biting midges, indicating biting midges are not expected to cause anything more than a minor nuisance problem at both mining prospects. | 4.12 | 18.2, 18.4 | 9.1 |
| | DHCS has noted that <i>Verrallina funerea</i> will only cause a potential, not considerable risk for Ross River Virus (RRV) and Barmah Forest Virus (BFV) transmission, as this species is not known to be a major vector of arboviruses compared to <i>Ochlerotatus vigilax</i> and <i>Culex annulirostris</i> . | 4.12 | 18.4 | 9.2 |
| | DHCS note that adult mosquito trapping in November 2005 revealed a low risk of malaria transmission at both mining prospects, and adult mosquito trapping in January 2006 revealed a moderate risk of malaria transmission at the Andranangoo Creek West mining prospect, and a low risk at the Lethbridge Bay West prospect. This supports the statement by Warchot and Whelan (2005) that a potential risk for malaria transmission is likely to occur for extended periods of the year at both mining prospects. The DCHS conclude that the mosquito trap results reveal that there is likely to be a potential malaria transmission risk for most months of the year at both mining prospects. | 4.12 | 18.4 | 9.2 |
| | DHCS has noted that Matilda should commit to ensuring that disturbed areas are appropriately recontoured or drained to prevent water ponding and mosquito breeding. | 4.12(c), 5.1 | 21.2.2, 25.12 | 14.1 |
| 2a | Letter from DHCS (Radiation Protection) 5/12/05 | | | |
| | DHCS has informed Matilda that based on the application seeking exemption from the <i>Radiation (Safety Control) Act</i> , the operation is not exempt, and will not be exempted at this time, and the <i>Code of Practice for the Safe Transport of Radioactive Material (2001)</i> does not apply for the operation. A licence will be required under the <i>Radiation (Safety Control) Act</i> , and a Radiation Safety Officer will need to be appointed. A condition of the licence will be that the operation is in accordance with the <i>Code of Practice for Radiation Protection and Radioactive Waste Management in Mining and Mineral Processing (2005)</i> . A Radiation Management Plan is required for the operation. NT Worksafe can provide information on the <i>Radioactive Ores and Concentrates (Packaging and Transport) Act</i> . | 4.6, 2(j) | 14.2, 25.11 | 11.2 |

Appendix A

Summaries of Responses and Index

| Submission No. | Summarised Comment | Reference EIS Guidelines | Reference Draft EIS | Reference Supplement |
|----------------|---|--------------------------|---------------------|----------------------|
| 3 | <i>Department of Planning and Infrastructure (DPI)</i> | | | |
| | DPI has noted that although the loading and unloading of goods and ore at Port Melville will be controlled by PenSyl PL's management, procedures and guidelines, no further information has been provided in the Draft EIS. DPI has also noted that there is no Environmental Management Plan proposed for the port operations. | 2.1, 5.1 | 2.5.2 | 2.2 |
| | DPI has noted that no information has been provided on PenSyl PL or its management, procedures and guidelines for the operations at Port Melville. | 2.1, 5.1 | Table 22.2, 2.5.2 | 2.2 |
| | DPI have stated that while the potential for spillage of mineral sands has been identified in Table 23.4 as an example of an Extreme and High Risk Event, there is no further discussion on the topic, and preventative measures have not been proposed for the mineral sand loading operations at Port Melville. | 5.2 | Table 23.4 | 2.2 |
| | DPI has noted that the <i>Marine Act</i> and the <i>Marine Pollution Act</i> have been omitted from the list of relevant legislation. | 2 (j) | 1.9.1 | 3.1 |
| | DPI have stated that the guidelines issued for the project did not require any specific assessment of port operations. Accordingly, DPI reserves the right to provide additional comment in relation to port operations. | 2.1 | 2.5.2 | 2.2 |
| | DPI states that the Draft EIS adequately identifies and assesses the environmental and related impacts associated with the development of the Andranangoo Creek West and Lethbridge Bay West mineral sands deposits. The various management strategies proposed are adequate to manage and mitigate those impacts. | All | All | 2.5 |

Appendix A

Summaries of Responses and Index

| Submission No. | Summarised Comment | Reference EIS Guidelines | Reference Draft EIS | Reference Supplement |
|----------------|---|--------------------------|-------------------------|----------------------|
| 4 | <i>Department of Primary Industry, Fisheries and Mines (DPIFM)</i> | | | |
| | DPIFM have asked whether consideration has been made to assess the impacts of the haul road(s) in relation to fauna injuries/fatalities, and the effects of dust. | 4.4.2, 4.5.2 | 2.5.1, 10.3, 12.3.1 | 2.3 |
| | DPIFM believes that consideration should be given to the development of a water budget for process and waste water for a worst case (1 in 3 year, 72 hour) rainfall event in saturated conditions. DPIFM believes that this would assist Matilda to quantify potential excess water generated by the extraction and dewatering of sands in such conditions. Subsequently, the feasibility and requirements to implement the control strategy to irrigate excess water would be better anticipated for extreme events. | 4.3.3 | 2.2, 7.3, 7.4, 8.3, 8.4 | 2.7 |
| | DPIFM have asked if the estimated 7ML per year of untreated water considers potential issues impacting on recovery of water such as infiltration losses, actual storage capacities, slurry densities, and sand filled sumps. | 2.1 | 2.3, 8.3, 8.4 | 2.7 |
| | DPIFM have stated that due to the high probability of cyclonic activity in the region, all site infrastructure including sea containers should be built and operated in accordance with the relevant cyclone coding. | 2.1 | 2.1, 2.8, 2.2, 3 | 2.4 |
| | As the grinding of samples prior to ASS testing can make available the calcium carbonate from shells, therefore skewing the potential acid results, DPIFM would like clarification of the sampling procedure. | 4.2.2 | 5.1.3 | 4.4 |
| | DPIFM have noted that sampling and analyses infers that the risk of disturbing potential ASS in the resource area is low, and that sediments proximal to wetlands and mangroves have higher probability to oxidise to acid conditions. The depth of extraction relative to the groundwater table has also been discussed with regard to ASS risk. | 4.2.2 | 5.1.3 | 4.4 |

Appendix A

Summaries of Responses and Index

| Submission No. | Summarised Comment | Reference EIS Guidelines | Reference Draft EIS | Reference Supplement |
|----------------|--|--------------------------|---------------------|----------------------|
| | DPIFM have noted that the EIS does not mention if there are organic humic layers that may be disturbed by the mining activities that can generate acid upon exposure. It is also noted that a reference to whether samples collected during exploration contain any humus, and a strategy to recognise and manage such sediments should they be encountered would be beneficial, particularly if in the event that recently deposited sediments need to be disturbed below the lowest historical standing water table level. | 4.2.1, 4.2.2 | 5.1.1 | 4.5 |
| | DPIFM have asked what height above sea level the infrastructure at both sites will be constructed, and if it is sufficient for storm surge protection. | 2.1, 4.2.2 | 2.5.4, 2.5.5, 6.1 | 2.4 |
| | DPIFM have mentioned that the EIS should address options to manage septic waste if ground conditions become unstable to receive this waste stream due to flooding. It was also mentioned that groundwater contamination is also a risk if the evapo-transpiration potential at soakage trenches is exceeded by groundwater recharge, surface flow during rain, and septic inputs. It is suggested that the potential issues associated with managing sewage in areas that have extreme rainfall events and elevated water tables be addressed, as they can be problematic. | 4.3.2 | 7.3.2, 17.1.2 | 6.1 |
| | DPIFM have asked if hydrocarbon monitoring is proposed as part of the water monitoring program, as systematic small spillages have a high probability of occurring around refuelling areas. | 5.1 | 7.4.3, 25.6 | 5.3, 6.2 |
| | DPIFM have recommended that consideration be given to identifying the source of elevated TDS from groundwater bore 1(P). If the elevated TDS is found to be due to Fe ²⁺ , this analyte should be included in future monitoring programs. | 4.3.1, 4.3.2 | 8.1.6, 8.3.3 | 6.2 |
| | DPIFM believe that consideration should be given to the cost-benefit of clearing a small portion of vine thicket at Lethbridge for the extraction of the resource. Also, the rehabilitation strategies should recognise the different fire regimes that maintain vine thickets and the surrounding woodland. Replanted vine thicket would need to become sufficiently established and protected to prevent the opportunity for a 'fire penetration point' to impact on the natural vine thicket habitat. | 4.4 | 9.1.3, 21 | 7.2 |

Appendix A

Summaries of Responses and Index

| Submission No. | Summarised Comment | Reference EIS Guidelines | Reference Draft EIS | Reference Supplement |
|----------------|--|--------------------------|---------------------|----------------------|
| | DPIFM have suggested that Matilda align their weed management plan with the Tiwi Islands Land Council 5 year weed management and control plan. | 5.1 | 9.1.5, 9.4, 25.10 | 7.3 |
| | DPIFM ask if consideration has been given for a collective waste management strategy, whereby consumable wastes and camp wastes are managed in a consistent manner. | 4.9.2 | 2.4, 17.1.2, 25.7 | 2.6 |
| | DPIFM have noted that the mosquito <i>Aedes aegypti</i> have been recorded in the Tiwi Islands, albeit rarely, and that it may be worth noting this mosquito when considering potential sources and impacts from biting insects. | 4.12 | 18.2, 18.4, 25.12 | 9.2 |
| | DPIFM suggest that the proposed use of active control measures for biting insects should be adequately explored. Options related to relocation of facilities, improved personnel management and other aspects should be considered prior to chemical controls. | 4.12 | 18.2, 18.4, 25.12 | 9.3 |
| | DPIFM state that the use of octo-plugs is not recommended as per the Minerals and Energy advisory note "Capping and Plugging of Drill Holes". The use of plugs in general in a sand environment is not 'best practice' and other options should be explored for rehabilitation of drill holes. | 2.1(h) | 21.2.2 | 14.5 |
| 5 | <i>The Environment Centre of the Northern Territory (ECNT)</i> | | | |
| | The ECNT does not support the proposed mining operations on the Tiwi Islands and believes they should be rejected by government. The ECNT believes that this project would set a precedent for sand mining on the Tiwi Islands coast which would result in a large number of mines being developed with substantial cumulative impacts over a very large area. The ECNT also believe that there are too many risks to many important values, and too many questions as to the long-term cost-benefit of the mines to the local island communities, for the project to proceed. | All | All | 3.3 |

Appendix A

Summaries of Responses and Index

| Submission No. | Summarised Comment | Reference EIS Guidelines | Reference Draft EIS | Reference Supplement |
|----------------|--|--------------------------|----------------------|----------------------|
| | The ECNT state that the mines would operate in locations with serious inherent problems and risks: very close to (or on top of) fragile coastal, beach, dune and wetland environments and in a region prone to cyclones, storms and high tides. A combination of high tides and storm surges or cyclonic activity would see these low-lying mines inundated with potentially serious erosion and contamination implications. | 4.2.2, 4.2.3 | 3, 6.1, 6.3 | 4.2 |
| | The ECNT feel that both mining location could cause significant impacts on fresh and salt water regimes, as much of the identified resource is less than 200m from either beach or wetlands. At Lethbridge mine, the deposit is between a large wetland and the beach, in a narrow stretch of lowland. In the case of Andranangoo Ck, the proposed mining is in a mostly very narrow belt of old shoreline/dunes between the 'tertiary uplands', wetlands, and the beach. In both cases, mining in these locations could cause significant impacts on water regimes involving both fresh and saline water. | 4.3 | 7.3, 7.4, 8.3, 8.4 | 5.4 |
| | The ECNT would like clarification of the term "in general" with regard to the width of the buffers between the mining operations and the beaches where turtles may nest and areas of sensitivity such as mangroves or rivers. ECNT states that the use of the term "in general" is unacceptably vague. The ECNT believe that ecologically based, mandatory and enforceable minimum buffer widths are required to protect beach areas, wetlands, vine thickets, mangroves, riparian areas and other sensitive and high conservation value ecological communities. The ECNT note that under the NT 2002 Land Clearing Guidelines, minimum recommended buffer widths are 200m for wetlands, 100m for creeks, and 250m for rivers. The ECNT believe that these widths should be complied with on the Tiwi Islands. | 2.1 (d), 4.4.3 | 2.2, 9.4, 10.4, 11.4 | 4.3 |
| | The ECNT believe that a proposed 50m buffer between the mining operations and wetlands (described in the Draft EIS as 'damp plains' and 'brackish swamps') is not adequate. | 4.3, 4.4 | 7.1, 7.4, 9.4 | 5.4 |
| | The ECNT feel that the Draft EIS is unacceptably vague in identifying and describing the hydrological connection between the wetlands and the coast, and that these important connections need to be well understood and documented before any approval is considered. | 4.3.1 | 8.1.2, 9.1.2 | 5.4 |

Appendix A

Summaries of Responses and Index

| Submission No. | Summarised Comment | Reference EIS Guidelines | Reference Draft EIS | Reference Supplement |
|----------------|--|--------------------------|---------------------|----------------------|
| | The ECNT have stated that the EIS is unacceptably vague in its assessment of impacts upon each of the seven identified vegetation communities. The Centre believes that the potential impact of proposed operations on each of these vegetation communities requires further clarification and evaluation. The Centre also believes that mining should not be permitted in or near vine thicket, mangroves, wetlands or riparian areas. | 4.4.2, 4.4.3 | 9, 10.1.2 | 7.5 |
| | The ECNT believe that mining should not go ahead until all acid sulphate issues have been identified and resolved, and when it has been established that there is no significant risk of ASS impacts. | 4.2.2 | 5.1.3 | 4.4 |
| | The ECNT refers to the Draft EIS Section 9.1.4, which it says states there have been inadequate surveys of rare and threatened flora species, and that Matilda will undertake further studies after mining commences. The ENCT believes that the results of such studies would be questionable, especially if critical habitats have already been destroyed. | 4.4.1 | 9.1.4 | 7.6 |
| | The ECNT believe that there has been inadequate discussion of drawdown impacts from groundwater use on all ecosystems including vine thickets, wetlands and mangroves. | 4.3.2 | 9.3 | 6.3 |
| | The ECNT note that groundwater drawdown at Andranangoo will be 0.4m at 100m distance from production bores, and there will be a lowering of water levels at a nearby spring at an earlier time in the dry season, whilst the sand mining operations occur. The ECNT have asked if the nearby wetlands/damplands will be affected by the groundwater drawdown at Andranangoo. | 4.3.2, 4.3.3 | 8.3.2, 8.3.3 | 6.3 |
| | The ECNT state that at Lethbridge, the groundwater drawdown effect is predicted to extend 1.5 to 2km from the borefield (Fig. 8.9), and that within 50m of the production bores the drawdown is likely to be between 0.9 and 1.6 m. The ECNT have asked if there will be any significant impacts on the wetlands/damplands habitat at Lethbridge due to their close proximity (50m) to the borefield. Also, only preliminary groundwater modelling has been undertaken at the Lethbridge site, and potential impacts at Lethbridge are not discussed in detail in the Draft EIS. | 4.3.2, 4.3.3 | 8.3, 9.3, 10.3 | 6.3 |

Appendix A

Summaries of Responses and Index

| Submission No. | Summarised Comment | Reference EIS Guidelines | Reference Draft EIS | Reference Supplement |
|----------------|--|--------------------------|---------------------|----------------------|
| | The ECNT believe that more information is required on the potential impacts of drawdown on all ecosystems and vegetation types, including vine thickets, wetlands and mangroves. | 4.3.2, 4.3.3 | 8.3, 9.3, 10.3 | 6.3 |
| | The ECNT have asked if there is any saltwater intrusion into groundwater during storm surges or unusually high tides, and if this will be exacerbated as a result of the mining operations. | 4.2, 4.3 | 6, 8.1.6 | 6.3 |
| | The ECNT is very concerned about possible radiation contamination of the environment and radiation impacts on workers. The ECNT believes that notwithstanding Matilda's claim that radiation levels from the mine are low and expected worker exposure levels are acceptable, this matter needs careful independent consideration prior to any approval being given. | 4.6.2, 4.6.3 | 14.3, 14.4 | 11.1 |
| | The ECNT recommends that the proposed mines not be approved. | NA | NA | 3.3 |
| | The ECNT believes that no more than one sand mine should operate at any one time. Before a second mine commences, an open and transparent audit of the first mine should be conducted and published, with non-conformances penalised and approval for the second mine withheld if serious breaches are found. | NA | 1.9 | 3.3 |
| | The ECNT recommend that strong conditions be placed on the mining operations and Matilda that are clear, legally binding and enforceable. | NA | 1.9 | 3.3 |
| | The ECNT recommend that a substantial cash rehabilitation bond be held by the Northern Territory Government. | 2.1(h) | 21.6 | 14.6 |
| | The ECNT have stated that Matilda should remain legally and financially responsible for mine site rehabilitation for several years after any given mine has closed. | 2.1(h) | 21.7 | 14.6 |

Appendix A

Summaries of Responses and Index

| Submission No. | Summarised Comment | Reference EIS Guidelines | Reference Draft EIS | Reference Supplement |
|----------------|--|--------------------------|---------------------|----------------------|
| | The ECNT believe that no ambiguity should exist as to the requirement for legally enforceable buffer widths at each of the project sites and the width of those buffers. | 2.1 | 2.2, 9.4, 10.4 | 4.3 |
| | The ECNT believe that the adequacy of the proposed buffers should be independently reviewed and increased. | 2.1 | 2.2, 9.4, 10.4 | 4.3 |
| | The ECNT believe that all wetlands should be protected from the impacts of mining, and a protective buffer of at least 100m be placed around all wetlands in the vicinity of the mines. | 2.1 | 2.2, 9.4, 10.4 | 4.3 |
| | The ECNT have recommended that acid sulphate risks should be clearly established prior to commencement of operations. If it is established that there is risk of significant acid sulphate impact, the Centre believe that mining should not proceed. | 4.2.1, 4.2.2 | 5.1.3, 5.4, 5.5 | 4.4 |
| | The ECNT have recommended that the size of trucks and number of truck movements between the mines and the port are kept to a minimal level to reduce impacts on the environment. | 2.1 | 2.5, 2.6 | 2.3 |
| | The ECNT propose careful monitoring to ensure that the claimed economic benefits to the Tiwi Island community are real and delivered. | 2(i) | 1.6.1, 19.3, 19.4 | 12.4 |
| | The ECNT believe that any proposals for further mines should be subject to a full EIS, and only considered by the Government upon completion of the Matilda project, and auditing and reporting has been undertaken. | NA | 1.9 | 3.3 |
| | The ECNT has expressed major concerns regarding mining mineral sands on the Tiwi Islands, and notes that Matilda has identified other deposits on the Islands. In addition other companies may have identified, or be seeking to identify, further exploitable deposits. | NA | NA | 3.3 |

Appendix A

Summaries of Responses and Index

| Submission No. | Summarised Comment | Reference EIS Guidelines | Reference Draft EIS | Reference Supplement |
|----------------|--|--------------------------|---------------------|----------------------|
| | The ECNT state that the most serious problem that could emerge is multiple mines operating simultaneously across hundreds of kilometres of Tiwi coastal environment with widespread impacts and chronic lack of resources for thorough ongoing independent monitoring of those mines and mining impacts and compliance auditing. | NA | NA | 3.3 |
| | The ECNT have noted that approximately 110 ha of clearing for mining, roads and infrastructure, and consider that this is significant. | 2.1 | 2.1 | 7.2 |
| | The ECNT have asked if the impacts of excess water from the concentrate dewatering cyclone discharged behind the active mining zone have been identified. | 2.1 | 2.2 | 5.1 |
| | The ECNT express concern that any excess water would be discharged behind the active mining zone, from where it would rapidly seep back into the watertable. | 2.1 | 2.3 | 6.1 |
| | The ECNT have asked if there is a limit on the number of production bores to be established. | 2.1 | 2.3 | 2.7 |
| | The ECNT have asked if the impacts of utilising 7ML of groundwater for processing and mining activities, and 7.3ML for dust suppression, have been identified. | 4.3.3 | 2.3, 8.3 | 2.7 |
| | The ECNT have asked if Matilda have examined the use of dry/compostable toilets and other waste treatment options other than what was outlined in the EIS. | 4.9.2 | 17.1.2 | 2.6 |
| | The ECNT notes that five generators are proposed. | 4.5 | 13.3 | 2.10 |
| | The ECNT supports the strongest measures to prevent the introduction or spread of all exotic species and diseases. | 4.4.3(a) | 25.1 | 8.4 |

Appendix A

Summaries of Responses and Index

| Submission No. | Summarised Comment | Reference EIS Guidelines | Reference Draft EIS | Reference Supplement |
|----------------|--|--------------------------|---------------------|----------------------|
| 6 | <i>Environment Protection Agency (EPA)</i> | | | |
| | The EPA has asked if pit dewatering will be required in periods of high seasonal rainfall, and if it will be possible to stay above the watertable if a high rainfall wet season occurs. | 4.3.2, 4.3.3 | 7.4.2, 8.1.5, 8.3 | 6.1 |
| | The EPA has asked if the resultant post-mine soil level equates to a depression that would affect the drainage characteristics of the area. Also, to what extent would the soil type (sand?) negate the effects of such topographical changes. | 4.2.2, 4.2.3 | 5.3, 5.4 | 4.1 |
| | The EPA has asked how high the resultant landforms will be after mining, relative to the year's highest High Tide levels. | 4.2.2 | 5.3 | 4.1 |
| | The EPA have asked for a high resolution topographical map of the mine and camp areas with an overlay of the proposed mining areas and buffer zones; mine infrastructure; bores; landform features; maximum Spring high tide levels and an accurate scale. | 2.1(a) | 2 | 4.1 |
| | The EPA has asked if the 200m turtle buffer extends beyond the highest tide level. | 4.2.2 | 11.4, 11.5 | 4.3, 8.7 |
| | The EPA would like clarification on the proposal to divert flows from an existing spring at Andranangoo. The Draft EIS states a 50m buffer from waterways. Diverting this waterway is not a 50m buffer from waterways. | 4.3.2, 4.3.3 | ES-12, 7.4, 25.5 | 4.3 |
| | The EPA asks if the end-of-wet season flora survey has occurred, and if more listed or endangered species are discovered, how their destruction will be avoided. The EPA also recommends the examination of the sensitivity of vegetation immediately inland of the mine areas to smothering, as a result of sand dune destabilisation. | 4.4.2, 4.4.3 | 9.1.4, 9.3, 9.4 | 7.4 |
| | The EPA has asked if the listed threatened species (<i>Cycas armstrongii</i>) located at both sites could be recovered or transplanted successfully, and if this is planned. | 4.4.2, 4.4.3 | 9.1.4, 9.3, 9.4 | 7.6 |

Appendix A

Summaries of Responses and Index

| Submission No. | Summarised Comment | Reference EIS Guidelines | Reference Draft EIS | Reference Supplement |
|----------------|--|--------------------------|---------------------|----------------------|
| | The EPA would like the incorporation of an animal rescue and relocation measures into the Fauna EMP to operate in conjunction with any tree felling operations. | 4.4.2, 4.4.3 | 10.4, 25.2 | 8.3 |
| | The EPA would like procedures in the Fauna EMP to manage road injuries and deaths caused by haulage during night hours (dusk to dawn). | 4.4.2, 4.4.3 | 10.4, 25.2 | 8.2 |
| | The EPA have asked if there is a proposed management plan for feral dogs and buffalos, and have suggested that restrictions should be placed on bringing potential pests into the camp, such as cats and dogs. | 4.4.3 | 25.1, 10.4 | 8.4 |
| | The EPA note that even though <1% of the concentrate sands will be of size <10 µm, this still may represent a large amount of potentially airborne particles being handled and stockpiled each day, particularly for the freshly dug and stockpiled material, since at this stage in the process fine sand appears more likely to be/become dry and airborne prior to being slurried. The EPA have asked for description of the expected level of risk to mine personnel to inhalation of inhalable silica dust from windblown sand particles, and management measures to be incorporated to prevent such exposure. The EPA stated that cabins on the loaders would also help protect the morning and night-shift drivers from the mosquitoes and biting midges. | 4.5.2, 4.5.3 | 12.3, 12.4, 25.8 | 10.2 |
| | The EPA has asked for Matilda's Hydrocarbon Management Guidelines, referred to at ES-25, and p25-9. | 4.8 | ES-25, 25.6 | 2.9 |
| | The EPA would like Matilda to outline the measures to manage any conflict that may arise between the Traditional Owners and the proponent, including the possibility of halting operations mid-way through mining operations. | 4.11.2 | 19.3, 19.4 | 12.5 |
| | The EPA have asked how the potential benefits and impacts of increasing access to the remote areas of the island in which the mining activities will occur will be managed in a culturally appropriate manner. | 4.11.2 | 19.3, 19.4 | 12.4 |

Appendix A

Summaries of Responses and Index

| Submission No. | Summarised Comment | Reference EIS Guidelines | Reference Draft EIS | Reference Supplement |
|----------------|---|--------------------------|---------------------|----------------------|
| | The EPA have asked for discussion regarding leaving infrastructure for future use by the local community, along with the increased requirements for schooling and health care in a newly established population centre. | 4.11.2 | 19.3, 19.4 | 12.4 |
| | The EPA has asked why the Government Revenue has been calculated as post profit, rather than a percentage of gross. | 4.11.2 | 19.3 | 12.6 |
| | The EPA have asked what interaction has been undertaken with the NT Police regarding their capacity to staff the proposed police station to be built by the Tiwi Land Council, and associated costs. | 4.11.2 | 19.1.7 | 12.7 |
| | The EPA has asked how the roads and bores will be maintained after mine closure, and who will cover the financial responsibility of such maintenance. | 2.1 (h) | 21.3.6 | 14.4 |
| | The EPA has asked if the skills gained by the local community that are employed by Matilda are going to be accredited qualifications for use after mine closure. | 4.11.2 | 19 | 12.1 |
| | The EPA have requested evidence that the revegetation effort is likely to be able to successfully restore ecosystems to a state similar to the original condition. | 2.1(h) | 21 | 14.3 |
| | The EPA has asked how long the revegetation effort will be maintained. | 2.1(h) | 21 | 14.3 |
| | The EPA have asked what support systems are in place to assist the local community who will be subcontracted to undertake the rehabilitation operation, such as expertise and resources, to ensure quality control. | 2.1(h) | 21 | 14.3 |
| | The EPA has asked for a description of the management procedures aimed at preventing the introduction of weed seeds into the mine site. | 4.4.3 | 25.1 | 7.3 |

Appendix A

Summaries of Responses and Index

| Submission No. | Summarised Comment | Reference EIS Guidelines | Reference Draft EIS | Reference Supplement |
|----------------|---|--------------------------|------------------------|----------------------|
| | The EPA has asked for details of how haul road and mine access is planned to avoid areas of weed infestation around Pickertaramoor. | 4.4.3 | 25.1 | 7.3 |
| | The EPA has asked for a description of the proposed weed control methods for the construction of the Lethbridge haul road. | 4.4.3 | 25.1 | 7.3 |
| | The EPA has stated that a Draft Rehabilitation and Mine Closure Plan and an indication of the level of the security to be lodged should be submitted as part of the assessment process, and have stated that the bond should be sufficient to cover failure of the initial rehabilitation and time blowouts. | 2.1(h) | 21.3 | 14.6 |
| | The EPA has asked about the extent of non-revegetated, cleared land that will remain at the camp sites after the mine closes. | 2.1(h) | 21.2.2 | 14.4 |
| | The EPA have recommended the examination of measures for keeping vehicles off revegetated areas, fragile dunes and beaches in the lease area after mine closure. | 2.1(h) | 21 | 14.3 |
| | The EPA have recommended the examination of the potential impacts upon turtle and bird nesting areas and populations from the creation of new vehicle access points into sensitive dune areas and beaches. | 4.4.2, 4.4.3 | 10.3, 10.4, 11.3, 11.4 | 8.2 |
| | The EPA has recommended the inclusion of actions Matilda will undertake to minimise greenhouse gas emissions. The Agency has also recommended that these actions be included in the Mining Management Plan, and for Matilda to join the Commonwealth Government's Greenhouse Challenge Plus Program. The EPA has also advised that the NTG has committed to the mandatory public reporting of greenhouse gas emissions by major industry. Implementation of this commitment is being investigated, and it may be that Matilda will be captured by this commitment in the future. | 4.5.5 | App F, 12.3.2 | 10.3 |
| | The EPA have recommended that the Fire Management Plan is developed in consultation with the Bushfires Council, and that this plan be developed with an objective to minimise greenhouse gas emissions through strategic early dry season controlled burning. | 4.7 | App F, 15.4, 25.9 | 10.3 |

Appendix A

Summaries of Responses and Index

| Submission No. | Summarised Comment | Reference EIS Guidelines | Reference Draft EIS | Reference Supplement |
|----------------|---|--------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------|
| | The EPA's Environmental Management -Operations Unit do not have any comments on the Draft EIS. The waste, hazardous materials and water management sections (and EMPs) of the EIS have been satisfactorily covered. | 4.3, 4.8, 4.9, 5.1 | 7, 8, 17, 16, 25.4 - 25.7 | 2.5 |
| 7a | <i>Department of Natural Resources, Environment and the Arts (NRETA) Heritage Conservation Services (HCS)</i> | | | |
| | HCS considers that Matilda has adequately complied with all recommendations previously made by HCS in the original NOI and the Draft EIS. | 4.10 | 20 | 13.1 |
| | HCS notes that Matilda has included the results of the January 2005 archaeological and heritage/historical surveys in the Draft EIS. | 4.10.1 | 20.1 | 13.1 |
| | HCS notes that Matilda has acknowledged the correct procedure for applying for permission from the Minister to disturb the one site of local archaeological significance. | 4.10.3 | 20.4 | 13.1 |
| | HCS notes that Matilda have acknowledged that a Cultural and Heritage Management Plan should be prepared to manage any Aboriginal or archaeological and ethnographic sites that may be identified in future works. The Management Plan will include a response mechanism to mitigate the loss of any subsurface archaeological material that may be located during mining operations. | 4.10.3 | 20.4 | 13.1 |
| | HCS notes that Matilda plans to advise all employees and contractors on the existence of Aboriginal archaeological and ethnographic sites that may be discovered, and that they should be avoided. | 4.10.3 | 20.4 | 13.1 |
| | HCS considers that there are no further heritage issues associated with Matilda's Draft EIS for the Mineral Sands Mining Project on Melville Island. | 4.10 | 20 | 13.1 |

Appendix A

Summaries of Responses and Index

| Submission No. | Summarised Comment | Reference EIS Guidelines | Reference Draft EIS | Reference Supplement |
|----------------|---|--------------------------|---------------------|----------------------|
| 7b | <i>NRETA Advisory and Regulatory Services (ARS)</i> | | | |
| | NRETA state that follow up surveys at Andranangoo apparently only covered the camp and infrastructure areas and not the mineralised areas. Similarly there was no follow up survey of the camp and infrastructure areas or the mineralised area at Lethbridge. ARS note that in response to the possibility that species of annual plants may have been missed, Matilda has undertaken to further monitor areas of proposed disturbance over time. | 4.4.1 | 9 | 7.4 |
| | NRETA state that the Draft EIS does not indicate whether any further flora surveys have been conducted during the current wet season, nor does it provide any details of the proposed monitoring program. | 4.4.1, 4.4.3 | 9, 25.1 | 7.4 |
| | NRETA have noted that as the fauna surveys were carried out in the dry season, frogs may not have been adequately surveyed. | 4.4.1 | 10 | 8.5 |
| | NRETA have recommended that, in relation to Figure 11.1, maps should explicitly indicate where the proposed 200m turtle buffer intersects mineral zones, and explicitly indicate that no mining will take place within these intersections. | 4.4.2, 4.4.3 | 11.1 | 4.3, 8.7 |
| | NRETA have stated that the establishment of 15m wide fire breaks around the camp and processing areas is not consistent with best practice and will cause unnecessary damage to vegetation, increase the potential for weed invasion and soil erosion, and will require an increase in the effort, costs and time for rehabilitation. NRETA suggest that a cheaper, easier and less damaging approach is back-burning from an established (cleared and slashed rather than graded) "control line" under appropriate conditions. The cleared / slashed line does not need to be any wider than that necessary to provide for vehicle access. | 4.7 | 15.3 | 4.6 |
| | NRETA have recommended that buffer widths around water bodies should be based on stream order with 50m being the bare minimum for first order (unbranched) drainage lines. Buffer widths around sensitive vegetation communities should be at least 100m. | 4.4.3 | 7.4.1, 7.4.2, 7.4.3 | 4.3 |

Appendix A

Summaries of Responses and Index

| Submission No. | Summarised Comment | Reference EIS Guidelines | Reference Draft EIS | Reference Supplement |
|----------------|---|--------------------------|-------------------------------|----------------------|
| | NRETA note that the water issues expected from the mining operation are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Potential flooding and drainage of the mining area, and more frequent flooding due to lowering the landform in the mining area by approximately 150 mm. - Increase in the volume of runoff due to removal of vegetation. - Increase in the amount of erosion caused by removal of vegetation, and in the area of the drains around and downstream of the mining area, which could impact on nearby receiving environments. - Potential water quality issues arising from deposition of eroded sediments into nearby waterways. - Water quality impacts. | 4.3.3 | 7.3 | 5.2 |
| | NRETA states that the Draft EIS has detailed a number of management measures to prevent or minimise the potential impacts (pages 7-16 to 7-24), and these are acceptable. However the design criteria for flooding and drainage of the mining area is based on a 5 year ARI, and no indication has been made of any flood management measures in the mining area during a major flood (50 and 100 year ARI). | 4.3.3 | 7.4 | 5.2 |
| | NRETA note there are no groundwater issues associated with the operation. These issues have been adequately addressed in the Draft EIS. | 4.3.3 | 8 | 6.1 |
| | NRETA have noted that the Draft EIS has identified weeds in the area of operation and haulage roads, and these issues have been addressed in Table 25.10 Pests, Weeds and Diseases EMP. | 4.3.3 | 9.1.5, 25.10 | 7.3 |
| 8 | <i>Museum and Art Gallery of the Northern Territory (MAGNT)</i> | | | |
| | MAGNT believe that the EIS has failed to 'identify and assess' the impact of the mining operation on freshwater swamps and springs, invertebrate fauna, and the seed bank in the top soil. | 4.3.1(b(i)) | 7.1.1, 7.1.2, 7.3, 7.4, 10, 9 | 8.6 |
| | MAGNT believe that the fauna survey is deficient as it was undertaken over a short period in the dry season; it was probably impacted by Cyclone Ingrid which had passed through recently; and very likely affected by the construction of the Andranangoo haul road which was under construction at the time of the survey. The bias of the survey was wholly vertebrate and it fails to describe freshwater and litter faunal communities. | 4.4.1 | 9 | 8.5 |

Appendix A

Summaries of Responses and Index

| Submission No. | Summarised Comment | Reference EIS Guidelines | Reference Draft EIS | Reference Supplement |
|----------------|---|--------------------------|---------------------|----------------------|
| | MAGNT believe that the flora survey was adequate and more thorough and incisive than the faunal survey. It is noted that the follow-up late wet season survey called for by the consultant (page 9-1) because of the unusually dry wet season of 2004/05 was not undertaken. The number of plant species recorded (15.4% of the total Tiwi flora) is an indication that many of the wet season annual/ephemeral plants at the sites must have been missed (Vol. 1, page ES-15). | 4.4.1 | 10, ES-15 | 7.4 |
| | MAGNT have stated that as freshwater swamps and springs, invertebrate fauna, seed banks, and litter faunal communities have not been addressed, it is impossible to 'develop and describe management strategies'. | 4.4.3 | 9.4, 10.4 | 7.1, 8.1 |
| | MAGNT state that it is clear the areas to be mined are strongly affected by standing and flowing groundwater. It is noted that many of the plants listed as rare or threatened on the Tiwi islands (Vol. 2, Appendix C1, Table 3, after Woinarski et al. 2003) occur in swamps and swampy ground, like those of the genera <i>Cyperus</i> , <i>Eleocharis</i> , <i>Utricularia</i> , <i>Scleria</i> , <i>Crinum</i> , <i>Stylidium</i> and <i>Xyris</i> . MAGNT believe that both the vertebrate and invertebrate fauna of permanent swamps and springs, seasonal wetlands, and vine thickets have not been addressed in the Draft EIS. This is despite the fact that invertebrates form a crucial part of the food chain in these habitats, are sensitive to environmental disturbance, and are good indicators for habitat restoration. | 4.4.1, 4.4.1(b(i)) | 10, 10.1.2 | 8.6 |
| | MAGNT believe that the fauna section of the EIS is inadequate for several reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - invertebrate fauna of swamps and springs can be highly localised and endemic, and vulnerable to destruction (compare with mound spring faunas of SA that offer excellent parallels). - the fauna survey was only undertaken in the Dry season. - invertebrate fauna were not sampled. - the possibility of locally rare or endemic invertebrates is not addressed. - <i>Amphidromus cognatus</i>, <i>Trochomorpha melvillensis</i>, and the butterfly <i>Ogyris iphis doddi</i>, species that are specifically listed in the Guidelines, and are also listed as vulnerable under the TPWC Act 2000, were not surveyed. | 4.4.1, 4.4.1(b(i)) | 10 | 8.5 |

Appendix A

Summaries of Responses and Index

| Submission No. | Summarised Comment | Reference EIS Guidelines | Reference Draft EIS | Reference Supplement |
|----------------|---|--------------------------|---------------------|----------------------|
| | The MAGNT states that the Draft EIS relies on the statement that only 0.015% of the island's coastal vine thicket habitat of the snail species lies within the proposed mining area, and similarly that the Eucalypt woodland habitat of the NT endemic butterfly is widespread. The consultants responsible for the Fauna survey were formally provided with information on the land snails by the Curator of Molluscs at MAGNT, yet these snails (and others pointed out at the same time as occurring on the Tiwi islands like species of the genera <i>Xanthomelon</i> and <i>Parglogenia</i>) were apparently never surveyed during the course of faunal sampling. The failure to properly survey for these species is a significant omission. | 4.4.1(b(i)) | 10 | 8.5 |
| | MAGNT have noted that the fauna survey undertaken a decade ago by the museum was mentioned in the EIS only in passing, even though a new species of dragonfly, <i>Huonia melvillensis</i> , was described as a result of that survey. | 4.4.1(b(i)) | 10 | 8.5 |
| | MAGNT believe that the biting insects survey was inadequate because: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - It was only undertaken in the Dry season. - There is no indication that any existing swamp or spring was surveyed in daylight. - The brief survey undertaken (one night at each site, neither corresponding with a full moon) detected four species of mosquito that "will pose a high risk" for disease. Additional species of mosquito, which may act as vectors for disease, may be identified during wet season surveys. | 4.12(a) | 18, 18.4 | 9.1 |
| | MAGNT have asked for clarification on the depth of slot mining at the sites. | 2.1 | ES-3, 2.2 | 2.1 |
| | MAGNT believe that the plans for land clearance and revegetation (ES-4) are inadequate because: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The native hardwood timber could be salvaged to augment existing timber and woodchip industry on Melville Island, and value-add to the Melville economy; - Decaying vegetation, especially <i>Melaleuca</i> and <i>Eucalyptus</i> logs, when respread, are prone to hot-burn fires which will remove any regrowth. - Many of the plants included in the faunal survey have short periods of viability in the soil (especially <i>Casuarina equisetifolia</i>), and so will be non-viable when the top soil is respread. - Insufficient details are provided for plans to harvest, maintain, grow-out, and respread the seeds from existing vegetation. - Catastrophic, stochastic events like cyclones, floods, storm surges, tsunamis and fires, could destroy any regrowth. | 2.1, 4.4.3 | ES-4, 2.2, 21 | 14.3 |

Appendix A

Summaries of Responses and Index

| Submission No. | Summarised Comment | Reference EIS Guidelines | Reference Draft EIS | Reference Supplement |
|----------------|--|--------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------|
| | MAGNT state that in similar sites that have been mined for sands around Darwin (most conspicuously Casuarina Coastal Reserve), stochastic events, motile sand, plus the appearance of opportunistic weedy grasses (Buffel Grass, Mission Grass), <i>Sida</i> spp., <i>Lantana camera</i> , <i>Passiflora foetida</i> , <i>Calopogium muncoides</i> , <i>Crotalaria goreenensis</i> and <i>Hyptis suaveolens</i> , (all of which are present on Melville Island) unless controlled will ensure the original vegetation never returns, particularly the Melaleuca woodland. Some of the existing plants are notoriously hard to re-establish from seeds and/or seedlings without enormous attention (e.g., <i>Pouteria sericea</i> , <i>Syzygium suborbiculare</i>). MAGNT note also that the generic name is misspelt " <i>Syzygium</i> " throughout the section on Flora. | 2.1, 4.4.3 | 21, 25.10, Spelling Sec 9 | 14.2 |
| | MAGNT have stated that the Draft EIS gives no support to the claim that the stockpiling and respreading of topsoil and brush cover will facilitate the revegetation of mined sands with the original species composition. | 2.1, 4.4.3 | 2.2,21, ES-16 | 14.3 |
| 9a | <i>Tiwi Land Council (TLC) - Robert Tipungwuti (Chairman)</i> | | | |
| | The TLC have discussed the Matilda Draft EIS and was assured that the documents were on public display at the Land Council Office and at Milikapiti, and that members and landowners had advice of the Draft EIS and their entitlement to read it and comment upon it. A summary of the Draft EIS was discussed at landowner group meetings through February, and a number of Tiwi Landowners have already been involved in collection of data for the study and have contributed information related to impacts and risks to the marine environment and to sites of significance. None are perceived or considered a risk. | 6 | 19, 22 | 12.3 |
| | The TLC note that at none of the TLC meetings has there been any adverse comment, information or consideration suggesting anything but a minor manageable impact upon land and coastal areas owned by the Tiwi people. Management Meeting 143 attended by six important landowners complimented Matilda on the thoroughness of the Draft EIS and requested TLC Environment Officer Kate Hadden to respond in these terms. The Meeting also noted the continuing close consultation between Matilda, affected landowners and the TLC over a period of several years and resolved to write to Minister Scrymgour expressing disappointment with perceptions of her support and encouragement of the Matilda project, the Marine Harvest Project and of significant forestry on the Islands. | 6 | 19, 22 | 12.3 |

Appendix A

Summaries of Responses and Index

| Submission No. | Summarised Comment | Reference EIS Guidelines | Reference Draft EIS | Reference Supplement |
|----------------|--|--------------------------|---------------------|----------------------|
| 9b | <i>Tiwi Land Council (TLC) - Kate Hadden, Secretary, Land & Resource Management</i> | | | |
| | The TLC note that representatives of Matilda first met with the Council in 2003. Numerous subsequent discussions were held with TLC members and Traditional Owners, who approved the proposal for exploration and, subsequently, mining of the above areas. Agreements between Matilda and the Tiwi Land Council have since been negotiated to the satisfaction of Traditional Owners. | 6 | 22 | 12.3 |
| | The TLC note that Traditional Owners anticipate a range of benefits from the proposal including: 1. Income stream from land rental and other payments; 2. Upgrades of existing roads, providing improved access to traditional country; 3. Provision of water bores in country customarily used by Tiwi people; 4. Provision of other permanent infrastructure, such as sheds that can be used either by Traditional Owners, as future tourist facilities or long term bases for studies and research; 5. Significant additional business for the Tiwi owned international port, Port Melville, with flow on outcomes for employment and training; 6. Direct employment and training (some of which has already been carried out during the exploration phase); 7. Opportunities for developing commercial contract services such as seed collecting, nursery establishment and operation, and rehabilitation; 8. Support towards larger scale natural resource management programs on the Tiwi Islands. | 6 | 22 | 12.4 |
| | The TLC state that the Tiwi Vision for the future is of an independent and resilient society built on the orderly and well managed utilisation of natural resources. A key objective of the Tiwi Islands Natural Resource Management Strategy 2004 is to develop a range of resource development options that are consistent with other natural resource management objectives. The TLC and Traditional Owners support considered and careful planning to ensure that economic developments do not deny the rights of future generations to enjoy the cultural and natural resource values of their land. Traditional Owners strongly support this development, as it fits within their overall vision for the Tiwi Islands. | 6 | 22 | 12.3 |
| | The TLC state that the existing access tracks are degraded and actively eroding, creating significant off-site sedimentation. The proposal to upgrade the tracks, widen the road and improve drainage will be beneficial to broader conservation outcomes. | 2.1 | 1.4.3, 2.5.1 | 2.3 |

Appendix A

Summaries of Responses and Index

| Submission No. | Summarised Comment | Reference EIS Guidelines | Reference Draft EIS | Reference Supplement |
|----------------|---|--------------------------|---------------------|----------------------|
| | The TLC state that <i>Eucalyptus</i> open forest is the most widely represented habitat type on the Tiwi Island, and reserves in the NT within Cobourg National Park. The total extent of clearing this habitat type under the proposal is quite small. A significant proportion of the clearing (road access) comprises a narrow strip on either side of an already cleared linear alignment. Potential impacts on flora and fauna represented in this habitat are therefore unlikely to be significant. | 4.4.2 | 9.1.3 | 7.2 |
| | The TLC state that should the project be successful, Matilda has committed to support the development of a Tiwi ranger programme. Such a programme will increase the overall capacity for biodiversity management throughout the region. Matilda has also offered the use of their base camps and local operational support for any survey or research work undertaken. This is significant because the proposed sites are in remote areas. | 4.11 | 22 | 12.2 |
| | TLC notes the advice of Matilda's consultants that the location of the mineral deposits and proposed controls will mitigate impacts on sea turtles populations (Guinea 2005). | 4.3.3 | 11.4 | 8.7 |
| | The TLC in partnership with WWF Australia has recently completed a project for sea turtles conservation on the Tiwi Islands. This included gathering baseline data, which was hampered by minimal on-ground resources and the remoteness of most Tiwi Island beaches. Advice from WWF Australia is that it would take many years to determine the relative significance of nesting beaches on the Tiwi Islands. The locations of the current proposal are along two remote beaches, and Matilda has committed to carrying out surveys of nesting activity for the period of operations. This information will be passed on to the TLC to be included in broader long-term studies including assessments of significance of the entire region. | | | 8.7 |
| | The TLC states that from research so far, the greatest threat to turtle hatchling success on the Tiwi Islands is predation of most by feral dogs. During field surveys for the Matilda project, all of the nests in both areas had been predated upon. Provision of base camp facilities will allow targeted baiting of nearby stretches of beach during critical nesting times, a strategy which has already proved successful in other areas on the Tiwi Island, and is recommended by NRETA. | 4.4.3 | 25.10 | 8.7 |

Appendix A

Summaries of Responses and Index

| Submission No. | Summarised Comment | Reference EIS Guidelines | Reference Draft EIS | Reference Supplement |
|----------------|---|--------------------------|---------------------|----------------------|
| | The TLC has identified that the major threat to biodiversity conservation on the Tiwi Islands is the introduction of pest plants and animals. The TLC has strict quarantine procedures in place, and Matilda has agreed to comply with these. | 4.4.3 | 25.10 | 7.3, 8.4 |
| | The TLC notes that no communities are near the proposed project areas, so there will not be any impacts on community residents. | 6 | 19, 22 | 12.4 |
| | The TLC considers that, given the commitments Matilda has made to a Tiwi Ranger programme, the improved access and provision of base facilities in remote areas, and the small and short term foot print of the development, the project will add to the capacity for natural resource management on the Tiwi Islands. The TLC trusts that the EPA will take these matters into account during its assessment of the Draft EIS. | 6 | 22.2 | 12.2 |