

Form

Request to amend a referred proposal under s.38C of the EP Act

Part A: Proponent information and proposal description			
1. Proponent information			
Name of the proponent/s (including Trading Name if relevant)		Marri WF Pty Ltd as trustee for the Marri WF Unit Trust	
Australian Company Number(s) ✓ OR Australian Business Number(s) ✓		684 707 551 36 684 707 551	
Who is requesting to amend a proposal?		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Proponent <input type="checkbox"/> Authorised representative (an authorisation from the proponent should be provided).	
Name Linden Blair		Signature	
Position	Head Of Power Development (West Coast)	Organisation	Marri WF Pty Ltd as trustee for the Marri WF Unit Trust
Email	linden.blair@alintaenergy.com.au	Phone	+61 455 983 779
Address	Level 18 Raine Square	300 Murray Street	
	Perth	WA	6000
Date	30 April 2026		
Does the referrer request that the EPA treat any part of the proposal information in the referral as confidential? <i>Provide confidential information in a separate attachment.</i>		<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	
Does the referrer confirm that they consent to receive correspondence electronically?		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
Referral declaration for proponent and Authorised representative:			
I, Linden Blair, declare that I am authorised to refer this request on behalf of on behalf of Marri WF Pty Ltd as trustee for the Marri WF Unit Trust, and further declare that the information contained in this form is true and not misleading.			
Date: 30 April 2026			
Provide details for purposes of the assessment, if different from the above. <i>Include: [Removed], physical address, phone, email.</i>		Bryce Skarratt Planning and Environment Manager Alinta Energy Level 18 Raine Square	

	<p>Murray Street, Perth 6000 Bryce.skarratt@alintaenergy.com.au +61 407 077 275</p>
2. Pre-request discussions	
<p>Have you had pre-referral discussions with the EPA (including the EPA Services of DWER)?</p> <p><i>If so, provide name, date, and overview of discussions.</i></p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p>Meetings were held with these agencies on the following dates pre-referral:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 30 January 2025 • 10 February 2025 • 8 September 2025 <p>These meetings were used by Alinta to provide an overview of the Proposal, outline proposed studies and the subsequent findings of these studies.</p> <p>Key areas of discussion included key listed threatened species (Carnaby’s Black Cockatoo) and noise.</p>
3. Proposal information	
<p>Title of the proposal</p>	<p>Marri Wind Farm</p>
<p>Description of the proposed amendment/s</p>	<p>The Marri Wind Farm is a renewable energy generation project located in the Shire of Dandaragan approximately 110 km north of Perth in Western Australia.</p> <p>The Proposal includes infrastructure capable of generating and delivering up to a maximum of 550 MW of renewable energy from turbines able to generate up to 2,000 GWh annually, or 10% of the current SWIS demand. The engineered design includes up to a maximum of 82 turbines with a maximum tip height of 275 m. These are to be positioned within the 12,483.55 hectare (ha) Development Envelope.</p> <p>The Development Envelope has been amended to account for 0.98 ha of potentially impacted vegetation located outside of the previous Development Envelope.</p> <p>Original: 12,473.12 ha Revised: 12,483.55 ha</p> <p>The overall area of the Development Envelope has increased by 10.43 ha.</p>

Proposal content document (PCD)	Please see attached PCD
Have you provided electronic spatial data, maps, and figures in the appropriate format of the referred proposal before any change request?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Part B: Assessment of amendments	
1. Reasons and content for the proposed amendment	
Reasons for the proposed amendment/s	<p>The Proposal is being amended as follows.</p> <p>Amended Development Envelope</p> <p>Adjustment to the Development Envelope to include the additional 0.98 hectares (ha) of potentially impacted vegetation located outside of the previous Development Envelope. This has been added to the Development Envelope to facilitate access at key locations.</p> <p>Indicative Disturbance Footprint</p> <p>Adjustment to the Indicative Disturbance Footprint is increased by 0.76 ha based on a more detailed analysis of the construction area.</p> <p>Clearing of native vegetation</p> <p>The clearing area has been refined based on more detailed analysis of the field survey data.</p>
Describe the content of the proposed amendment/s to the proposal	<p>The general proposal description has not changed from the original referral.</p> <p>Amended Development Envelope</p> <p>1.1.1 Original: 12,472 ha 1.1.2 Revised: 12,483.55 ha</p> <p>The overall area of the Development Envelope has increased by 10.43 ha.</p> <p>Whilst the overall area of the Development Envelope has been increased (as above), the boundary of the Development Envelope has been amended to permit access by construction related traffic to the Development Envelope at four locations.</p> <p>Indicative Disturbance Footprint</p> <p>Adjustment to the Indicative Disturbance Footprint is increased by 0.76 ha based on a more detailed analysis of the construction area.</p> <p>Clearing area Flora and Vegetation</p> <p>Original: 84 ha</p>

Revised: 7.02 ha

The proposed clearing within the Indicative Disturbance Footprint (maximum disturbance area) has been more accurately calculated to capture the actual impact of the Proposal on areas of native vegetation.

The majority of the Development Envelope is occupied by degraded to completely degraded agricultural land (88.58% of surveyed DE), approximately 15% of this is characterised/described as *Agricultural land with low to mid isolated trees* (Ag(Cc)). It is this area (Ag(Cc)) that has been re-analysed to more accurately reflect the clearing required for the Proposal.

The previous calculation of clearing required for the Proposal (Indicative Disturbance Footprint) **included** the total land occupied by agricultural lands with scattered native trees (approximately 80 ha). The clearing areas provided within the updated RSD reflect a more accurate calculation of native vegetation clearing within the Ag(Cc) areas through estimated canopy cover of the scattered native trees. The area of these trees has been mapped using the most current digital imagery available.

Therefore, the total native vegetation that will be cleared as a result of the Proposal is 7.02 ha which comprises:

- Up to 2.94 ha of scattered native trees within the Ag(Cc) lands.
- 4.08 ha of native vegetation. This includes the 0.168 ha of TEC.

Clearing of Fauna Habitat

Original: 0.170 ha (TEC)

Revised: 5.02 ha (Fauna habitat)

The clearing area has been revised to reflect more accurately the nature of the habitat being cleared and to capture the actual impact to areas of habitat across the Development Envelope.

The original impact assessment was based on the TEC providing the only fauna habitat within the Development Envelope. The clearing of fauna habitat provided within the updated RSD more accurately reflects the extent of fauna habitat throughout the Indicative Disturbance Footprint, which includes, but is not limited to, the area of TEC.

	<p>During the RFI period the data associated with ongoing BBUS surveys has become available and this has been reflected in the updated RSD. Updated data regarding the potential nesting trees (PNTs) within the Indicative Disturbance Footprint has also been included.</p> <p>The fauna habitat to be impacted includes PNTs specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 63 individual isolated PNTs, including 62 trees with evidence of some level of foraging activity (further classified as recent, intermediate, active or old foraging). • Two trees within the Indicative Disturbance Footprint were identified as having possible hollows. These trees are located on the edge of the Indicative Disturbance Footprint and will be avoided where possible during construction. • No trees with suitable hollows were identified within the Indicative Disturbance Footprint.
Provide a consolidated updated Proposal content document	Please see attached the revised Proposal Content Document (PCD).
Alternatives to the proposed amendment/s	There are no changes to the alternatives presented in the original referral.
2. Regulatory information	
Proposal referral date	<i>30 April 2026</i>
Status of the referral	<p>The referred proposal was released for public comment from 11-17 November 2025.</p> <p>In Stage 1, Level of Assessment. This application is made in support of the information being provided under s38F to inform the request for information issued by the EPA (27 November 2025).</p>
Changes to decision making authorities or processes (if required)	There are no changes to the Decision Making Authorities as listed in the original proposal. The revised Development Area will be incorporated in the relevant planning submissions for the Shire of Dandaragan as the relevant local government authority.
3. Identification of environmental factors and environmental effects	
Environmental factors	<p>Flora and vegetation</p> <p>Terrestrial fauna</p>
Environmental effects	There are no negative environmental effects to the listed factors associated with the amendments covered by this application. The Development Envelope has been modified to enable construction vehicle access at locations across the Proposal. There are no

	<p>additional impacts are anticipated as result of this modification of the Development Envelope. The methodology for calculating extent of clearing of native vegetation and defining fauna habitat have been refined and this has resulted in a change to native vegetation clearing and fauna habitat areas as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The area of clearing of native vegetation has been defined more accurately using areas of scattered trees in agricultural land and has been, as a result, reduced significantly. • Fauna habitat has been defined based on use by conservation significant fauna, rather than area of TEC.
Mitigation hierarchy	Application of the mitigation hierarchy has resulted in the reduction of the area of native vegetation and fauna habitat to be impacted through clearing activities.
Residual Impacts	<p>The residual impact is now estimated to be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clearing of up to 7.02 ha of native vegetation consisting of 4.08 ha of native vegetation and 2.94 ha of scattered native trees within the Ag(Cc) lands. • Clearing of 0.168 of Banksia Woodland TEC (included within the 7.02 ha of clearing). • Clearing of up to 5.02 ha of fauna habitat • Clearing of up to 63 PNT. <p>The significance of the environmental impact and associated environmental outcomes has been refined.</p>
Specify if additional information is required	NA
4. Consultation	
Consultation undertaken	<p>The EPA/DWER has been consulted on the following dates during the completion of the RFI process.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3 December 2025 • 15 January 2026 • 9 February 2026 • 1 April 2026
Outcomes of consultation	The EPA/DWER has provided further guidance and commentary on the RFI requirement and the s38C (this application) process for consideration and action by Alinta Energy.
Part C: Additional information (provide if required)	
1. Additional surveys, investigations and other information	
Discuss and provide additional information that has been obtained	A Technical Memorandum summarising the first seven rounds of data from the Bird and Bat Utilisation Survey (BBUS) has been prepared and included in the analysis of impacts.

	The Bird and Bat Management Plan has been updated utilising the above information and presented as a Preliminary Bird and Bat Management Plan.
--	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

2. Discussion of significance	
Change to the significance of the residual impact/s	The amendments to the Development Envelope outlined have not resulted in any change to the significance of the residual impacts of the Proposal to flora and vegetation or fauna.
Significant effect on the environment	The amendments to the Development Envelope outlined have not resulted in any change to the significance of the effects on the environment.
Environmental outcomes	The amendments to the Development Envelope outlined have not resulted in any change to environmental outcomes.
Character of the proposed amendment/s	The amendments to the Development Envelope outlined have not resulted in any change to character of the proposal.

Example Table: Other approvals

Decision-making authority. If DMA's are changing from the original referred proposal, please provide detail.	Legislation or Agreement regulating the activity	Approval required (and specify which proposal element the approval is related to)	Whether and how statutory decision-making process can mitigate impacts on the environment? (Yes/No and summary of reasons)
NO CHANGE	NO CHANGE	NO CHANGE	NO CHANGE