

Ecological Clearance Report

Habitat Management Services
ABN-42 057 792 293 ACN-057 792 293
tanyaw@hbtmgt.com
PO Box 882, PANTON HILL VIC 3759



To: Daisy Lippiatt

From: Michael Cincotta

Client Company: TasVic Greenlink – Marinus Project

Cc: Emily Nimmo

Date of Report: 22nd January 2026

Document No: 1175-ECO-CLR-001-1.0

Project No and Name: 1175 – Marinus Link

Subject: Pre Clearance Report – Early Works Access point

Report Type	
Report Type	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Pre Clearance <input type="checkbox"/> Post Clearance Report
1. HMS Staff Details	
Select HMS Staff Name and Position	Michael Cincotta – Senior Biodiversity Projects Coordinator Emily Nimmo - Ecologist
HMS Staff Qualifications	Michael – Bachelor of Conservation Biology and Ecology (Botany major) – La Trobe University Emily – Bachelor of Wildlife and Conservation Biology
HMS Permits	WSIAEC Approvals: 05.25 Wildlife Permit No. 10011486 (to 05.05.28) Flora Permit No. 10011038 (to 04.03.27)
Has the Onsite Ecologist read and signed the approved SWMS?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Date of Inspection	22 nd January 2026.
3. HMS Contact Information	
General enquiries: Tanya White; tanyaw@hbtmgt.com	Michael Cincotta: E: michaelc@hbtmgt.com M: 0491 023 531



4. Site Information

Inspection Site Address

Waratah Road, Sandy Point.

Map of Inspected Area and Location of Flora and/or Fauna found onsite (including relocation site where applicable)



Map 1. Pre Clearance area (blue outline). Map provided by client. Not to scale.



5. Inspection Methodology	
Details of inspection methods used	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Ground based assessment <input type="checkbox"/> Pole Camera utilised for observation. <input type="checkbox"/> Elevated Work Platform utilised to inspect fauna/fauna habitat. <input type="checkbox"/> Other
6. Findings	
Fauna/Fauna Habitat Found onsite (Species and Number/s) and if salvaged/ left in situ.	<p>A pre-clearance inspection was undertaken across the proposed disturbance footprint in accordance with the requirements of EPBC Approval 2021/9053, with the aim to identify any Matters of National Environmental Significance (MNES), their habitat, and/or potential signs of activity that may be affected by the proposed clearing works.</p> <p>Ecologists systematically traversed the entire area assessing the presence of any potential fauna, flora, ecological vegetation classes (EVCs) and any microhabitat features that are relevant to the protected matters listed under Condition 2 of the approval.</p> <p>The assessment found that the majority of the site comprised of degraded pasture (with severe cattle pugging) and was dominated by exotic grasses and invasive weeds. Approximately 95% of the site consisted of pasture grass and the remaining portion to the south contained a drainage line and a low-lying estuarine wetland community (EVC 10). The drainage line includes a small bridge where spoil piles, rocks, construction debris and dense weed cover can create minor microhabitat opportunities for small herpetofauna.</p> <p>Additional microhabitats such as sandy rises, moist depressions, coarse woody debris, fence lines, water troughs and other infrastructure were inspected for fauna shelter or basking potential opportunities (for species such as reptiles). The drainage channel and associated ephemeral pools provide limited but locally important habitat for waterbirds, amphibians and potentially fish species. These features were extensively surveyed and dip-netted during the pre-clearance assessment. Fauna observations included one immature Blotched Blue-tongue Lizard (<i>Tiliqua nigrolutea</i>), a single adult Common Eastern Froglet (<i>Crinia signifera</i>), one wombat burrow of uncertain activity on the western fenceline. A total of 14 common farmland bird species were also recorded across paddocks and the drainage line.</p>



	<p>Consistent with EPBC preclearance survey objectives, the site was then assessed for its capacity to support any MNES protected under Conditions 2 and 4–7 of EPBC Approval 2021/9053. No EPBC listed species, ecological communities or regulated habitats were detected. In addition, the degraded pasture, ephemeral drainage features and small disturbed estuarine wetland do not provide the structural, hydrological or ecological characteristics required by the listed MNES.</p> <p>No roosting or foraging habitat suitable for the Grey-headed Flyingfox (<i>Pteropus poliocephalus</i>) occur due to the absence of tall canopy vegetation.</p> <p>Freshwater floodplain habitat for River Swamp Wallaby grass (<i>Amphibromus fluitans</i>) is lacking, with no individuals detected.</p> <p>EPBC listed orchids—including Eastern Spider Orchid, Thick lipped Spider Orchid, Dense Leek Orchid, Green striped Greenhood and Leafy Greenhood require intact native heathy, grassy or sandy communities, none of which occur within the pastured dominated footprint.</p> <p>The site also lacks the dense coastal heath, wet heath or swampy vegetation associated with the Swamp Antechinus (<i>Antechinus minimus maritimus</i>).</p> <p>No elements of the Gippsland Red Gum Grassy Woodland and Associated Native Grassland ecological community are present.</p> <p>The inland setting, absence of beaches, dunes, estuarine mudflats or extensive reedbeds means there is no suitable habitat for Eastern Hooded Plover, Eastern Curlew or Australasian Bittern.</p> <p>The Growling Grass Frog (<i>Litoria raniformis</i>) was not detected, and the ephemeral drainage pools lack the permanent waterbodies and emergent vegetation required for breeding.</p> <p>No Strzelecki Gum (<i>Eucalyptus strzeleckii</i>) individuals or suitable canopy elements were identified within the footprint.</p> <p>Collectively, these findings confirm that no MNES listed under EPBC 2021/9053 occur within the site and hence, the proposed works will</p>
--	---



	<p>not result in the clearing of any EPBC listed species, designated habitat or ecological community.</p>
<p>Flora found, salvaged and method of salvage/left in situ (where applicable) include declaration i.e., FFG, EPBC or CaLP Act and if WONS)</p>	<p>There were several weeds present that are listed on the Catchment and Land Protection (CaLP) Act 1994. These weeds include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Blackberry <i>Rubus grabowski</i> ▪ Fennel <i>Foeniculum vulgare</i> ▪ Spear Thistle <i>Cirsium vulgare</i> ▪ Variegated Thistle <i>Silybum marianum</i> <p>While on site, the ecologists confirmed with the site supervisor that all soil and organic matter that was to be grubbed will remain on site to be reused during the project (with the associated approvals to do so).</p> <p>One FFG protected species was observed within the Estuarine Wetland – Red Azolla <i>Azolla rubra</i>.</p>
<p>Fauna/Fauna Habitat Management Advice Provided to Client or to be noted by client</p>	<p>The majority of fauna observed during the preclearance survey were common farmland bird species that are highly mobile and able to move away from plant and machinery during grubbing activities. There is a very low likelihood that reptiles would inhabit the pasture areas as these lack structural cover and the site does not contain deep cracking soils that would otherwise provide suitable refuge. However, due to the difficulty of reliably confirming the absence of small amphibians within dense ground level vegetation in the estuarine wetland, an ecologist will be required on site during all grubbing works within both this zone and the drainage channel. The ecologist will supervise vegetation removal works and will capture and relocate any fauna encountered, as required. This will also be in line with the relevant permits and approvals held by HMS.</p> <p>Although Burrowing Crayfish chimneys were recorded immediately north of the area within a roadside swale, no Burrowing Crayfish chimneys were detected within the preclearance footprint.</p> <p>To protect sensitive habitat within the drainage line, sediment control measures must be installed along the edge of and within the southern drainage line prior to any grubbing works commencing within and around the drain. An ecologist should</p>



also be present during the removal of the existing bridge infrastructure on the southern drainage line.

If water is present within the drainage line pools on either side of the existing bridge, dewatering will be required to allow the construction of a new bridge/culvert. Dewatering must be undertaken using a pump fitted with a fine mesh intake cover to prevent the entrainment of aquatic or semiaquatic fauna. The mesh aperture must be sufficiently small to ensure fauna cannot be drawn into the pump.

During grubbing works within and around the drainage line, an ecologist must remain on site to supervise the works to ensure that fauna sensitive practices are followed and that any fauna encountered can be salvaged and relocated to a suitable habitat nearby (and within the conditions of HMS permits and approvals). Before the wombat burrow can be removed, a trail camera should be installed to determine patterns of use. If the burrow is found to be active, a one-way gate must be fitted to allow the wombat to exit. Once the burrow is confirmed vacant, it should be excavated in 30–40 cm increments until the end of the burrow can be confidently determined to be empty.

7.Photos of Fauna/Fauna Habitat and Flora (where applicable) Found Onsite



Figure 1. Wombat Burrow



Figure 2. Blotched Blue Tongue



Figure 3. Common Eastern Froglet ruts.

8. Follow-Up

Is an ecologist required on site for future works?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Reason for Follow-Up Inspection	To supervise the grubbing of the Estuarine wetland, drainage line, dewatering the drainage line pools and removing the existing culvert infrastructure.
Is any equipment required for Follow-Up Inspection?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> NA
Type of equipment required for Follow-Up inspection	Frog hygiene kit, nets, buckets, disposable gloves, dewatering pump cover (all HMS supplied).
Any access requirements (i.e., entry only through locked gate, TFPC required etc.)	N/A
Recommended Date and Time (i.e. Morning) of Follow-Up Inspection	Whenever grubbing/dewatering occurs.

9. Reporting and Review

Further comments/conclusions	Slashing of the pasture can occur without ecological supervision because this area is highly degraded, offers very limited fauna habitat and is unlikely to support reptiles or amphibians. Slashing does not disturb soil or ground level refuges, so the likelihood of fauna harm is low. However, an ecologist must be present for any
------------------------------	---



	grubbing works of the Estuarine Wetland or the drainage channel as these areas contain denser vegetation and microhabitats where small amphibians or other fauna may be present. Ecological supervision is also required during any dewatering, as standing water may support aquatic or semiaquatic species that need to be detected and safely relocated.
Date report completed	22 nd January 2026
On-site Ecologist Signature	
Peer Reviewer Name and Title	Tanya White: Managing Director & Principal Zoologist/Ecologist
Peer Reviewer Signature	

DISCLAIMER:

Habitat Management Services has taken all necessary measures to ensure that an accurate document has been prepared. However, the company accepts no liability for any damages or loss incurred as a result of the content and recommendations contained within the report. This is the case for this project where no detailed flora and fauna studies were conducted and timing of the year for many annual species is not considered optimal. Habitat Management Services takes no liability for these species not being detected.

COPYRIGHT © HABITAT MANAGEMENT SERVICES:

This document is subject to copyright. Unless otherwise agreed to in writing, it may only be used for those purposes for which it was commissioned. The use or reproduction of this report without the consent from the Managing Director of Habitat Management Services is an infringement of copyright.