



Environmental Protection Authority

Public record pursuant to s. 39 of the *Environmental Protection Act 1986*

Proposal title: Belisama Gas Project

Proposal description: The proposal is to construct and operate a Central Processing Facility (CPF) and associated infrastructure, including a buried central flowline and gas export pipeline in the Mid-West region of Western Australia (WA).. Gas produced from nearby developments, which are separate to this proposal, will be transported via the buried central flowline for processing at the CPF. Processed gas will be exported via a gas export pipeline from the CPF to the Dampier Bunbury Natural Gas Pipeline (DBNGP). The Development Envelope is 1,326.9 hectares (ha), with an estimated Disturbance Footprint of 291.5 ha, including approximately 5.7 ha of remnant native vegetation.

Proposal location: Approximately 350 km north of Perth in the Mid-West region of Western Australia.

APP number: APP-0035082

Date referral received: 12/01/2026

Date more information received: 17/04/2026,
03/06/2026

Referrer: Department of Planning, Lands and Heritage

Proponent: Hancock Energy (PBN) Pty Ltd

Potential significant effects:

There are potential impacts on: **flora and vegetation** from the clearing of 5.7 ha of remnant native vegetation; **terrestrial fauna** from the clearing of habitat; **inland waters** from altered groundwater and surface water regimes and quality; **terrestrial environmental quality** from impacts to soil quality; **air quality** from plant atmospheric emissions; **social surroundings** from construction and operation impacts to Aboriginal cultural heritage and amenity (noise and dust); **greenhouse gas emissions** from construction and operation of the proposal.

Environmental factors: Flora and vegetation, terrestrial fauna, terrestrial environmental quality, inland waters, terrestrial environmental quality, air quality, greenhouse gas emissions and social surroundings.

Public comment on referral information:

Does the proposal need further assessment due to its potential significant impacts?

Yes 227 No 2

If the proposal requires further assessment, should the EPA include further opportunities for public review?

Yes 226 No 2

Total submissions: 229

Decision: s. 38G(1) – Not assess

Summary of reasons pursuant to s. 38G(1)(c)

The EPA has decided not to assess the proposal because:

- The EPA considers the likely environmental effects of the proposal are not so significant or unmitigated to warrant formal assessment under Part IV of the *Environmental Protection Act 1986* (EP Act).
- The EPA considers that the likely environmental effects of the proposal can be mitigated by other statutory decision-making processes to achieve consistency with the EPA's factor objectives.
- The EPA's decision has been made on the basis of the proponent implementing the proposal in accordance with the Proposal Content Document (PCD) and management outlined in the referral supporting documents and attachments available on the [EPA](#)

[website](#). Changes to expected implementation content and/or management which are likely to result in significant environmental effects have not been considered as part of the decision for this proposal, and may result in a new referral being required for that different proposal.

- The EPA notes that the proposal design comprises a 1,326.9 ha development envelope, with an indicative disturbance footprint of 291.5 ha, including approximately 5.7 ha remnant native vegetation. No threatened flora, threatened ecological communities (TECs) or priority ecological communities (PECs) have been recorded within the development envelope. A number of Department of Biodiversity, Conservation and Attractions (DBCAs) listed priority flora species have been recorded within the development envelope including *Banksia fraseri* var. *crebra* (Priority 3), *Stylidium drummondianum* (Priority 3), *Stylidium torticarpum* (Priority 3), *Thryptomene nitida* (Priority 3) and *Banksia scabrella* (Priority 4). The EPA considers that the likely impacts to flora and vegetation can be effectively managed and regulated through the Native Vegetation Clearing Permit (NVCP) process under Part V, Division 2 of the EP Act, and/or an Environment Plan and other requirements under the Petroleum, Geothermal Energy and Greenhouse Gas Storage (Environment) Regulations 2012, Petroleum and Greenhouse Gas Pipelines (Environment) Regulations 2012 and Petroleum and Geothermal Energy and Greenhouse Gas Storage (Resource Management and Administration) Regulations 2015.
- The EPA notes that no conservation significant fauna were recorded in the development envelope. However, habitat for Carnaby's cockatoo (*Zanda latirostris*; Endangered under the EPBC Act and BC Act) is considered likely to occur within the development envelope. The proposal may clear up to 0.2 ha of low to-moderate quality and 2.2 ha of very low-quality black cockatoo foraging habitat. Potential habitat may be present for the black-striped snake (*Neelaps calonotos*; Priority 3) and southern Whiteface (*Aphelocephala leucopsis*; Vulnerable under the EPBC Act). The EPA considers that the likely impacts on Terrestrial Fauna can be effectively managed through a NVCP process under Part V, Division 2 of the EP Act, and/or an Environment Plan and other requirements under the Petroleum, Geothermal Energy and Greenhouse Gas Storage (Environment) Regulations 2012, Petroleum and Greenhouse Gas Pipelines (Environment) Regulations 2012 and Petroleum and Geothermal Energy and Greenhouse Gas Storage (Resource Management and Administration) Regulations 2015.
- The EPA notes that scope 1 and 2 greenhouse gas emissions for the proposal are below the 100,000 tonnes carbon dioxide equivalent (tCO₂-e) per annum threshold that would typically warrant further assessment by the EPA.
- The EPA notes the proposal estimated groundwater demand of 0.3 GL per annum during construction and operation. The EPA has confidence that the impacts to Inland Waters can be managed through the assessment processes under the Rights in Water and Irrigation Act 1914 (RIWI Act), including a s.5C licence (amendment) to take surface water or groundwater and s.26D licence for the construction or modification of a well, the works approval and licensing processes under Part V (Division 3) of the EP Act, and an Environment Plan and other requirements under the Petroleum, Geothermal Energy and Greenhouse Gas Storage (Environment) Regulations 2012, Petroleum and Greenhouse Gas Pipelines (Environment) Regulations 2012 and

Petroleum and Geothermal Energy and Greenhouse Gas Storage (Resource Management and Administration) Regulations 2015.

- The EPA considers that potential impacts from the proposal to Terrestrial Environmental Quality can be regulated through the works approval and licensing processes under Part V (Division 3) of the EP Act, and/or an Environment Plan and other requirements under the *Petroleum, Geothermal Energy and Greenhouse Gas Storage (Environment) Regulations 2012*, *Petroleum and Greenhouse Gas Pipelines (Environment) Regulations 2012* and *Petroleum and Geothermal Energy and Greenhouse Gas Storage (Resource Management and Administration) Regulations 2015*.
- The EPA considers that potential impacts to Air Quality can be regulated through the works approval and licensing processes under Part V (Division 3) of the EP Act.
- The EPA has considered the remote location of the proposal and potential impacts to amenity (dust and noise). The EPA notes that the proposal is not likely to impact registered Aboriginal cultural heritage sites. However, Sand Plain Creek and an unnamed tributary were identified as culturally sensitive waterways that require appropriate management. The proponent advised that a Cultural Heritage Management Plan will be developed with Yamatji Southern Regional Corporation (YSRC) to address management of sensitive waterways (including horizontal directional drilling), protocols for unexpected finds, use of heritage monitors during initial ground disturbance, and any additional survey requirements. The EPA is satisfied that the mechanisms provided under the *Aboriginal Heritage Act 1972* (AH Act) are adequate to manage potential impacts to Aboriginal cultural heritage in a manner consistent with its objectives.
- The EPA has considered cumulative impacts within the region with other proposals, and considers that they are not likely extensive, and the proposal's cumulative environmental outcome is likely to be consistent with EPA objectives.
- The EPA does not consider that the proposal impacts will combine or interact in a holistic way which requires assessment by the EPA.
- Given the EPA's decision to 'not assess' this proposal, there will be further opportunity for the public to comment on aspects of the proposal during the public comment period for applications under Part V of the EP Act.

Taking into account decision-making processes under the Petroleum, Geothermal Energy and Greenhouse Gas Storage (Environment) Regulations 2012, Petroleum and Greenhouse Gas Pipelines (Environment) Regulations 2012 and Petroleum, Geothermal Energy and Greenhouse Gas Storage (Resource Management and Administration) Regulations 2015

- The proposal may be assessed by the Department of Mines, Petroleum and Exploration (DMPE) under the *Petroleum, Geothermal Energy and Greenhouse Gas Storage (Environment) Regulations 2012*, *Petroleum and Greenhouse Gas Pipelines (Environment) Regulations 2012*, *Petroleum, Geothermal Energy and Greenhouse Gas Storage (Resource Management and Administration) Regulations 2015*, and may require an Environment Plan, Emergency Response Plan, and an Oil Spill Contingency Plan. The development and approval of an Environment Plan are guided by the objectives of the *Petroleum, Geothermal Energy and Greenhouse Gas Storage (Environment) Regulations 2012* and *Petroleum and Greenhouse Gas Pipelines (Environment) Regulations 2012*. An Environment Plan must demonstrate that environmental risks and impacts associated with petroleum and/or geothermal

activities are reduced to as low as reasonably practicable (ALARP). Consistent with these objectives, and supported by defined performance criteria and monitoring, all identified impacts will be managed to ALARP.

- The EPA considers that potential impacts relating to its objectives for flora and vegetation, terrestrial fauna, terrestrial environmental quality and inland waters can be effectively managed through this process.

Taking into account decision-making processes under Part V Division 2 (Clearing) of the EP Act

- Given the EPA's decision to 'not assess' this proposal under Part IV of the EP Act, the proposal will require a NVCP under Part V, Division 2 of the EP Act. The NVCP application may be assessed by DMPE as per delegations under section 20 of the EP Act and the Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) between the DWER and DMPE.
- In assessing the NVCP application, DMPE will consider the ten Clearing Principles outlined in Schedule 5 of the EP Act, and how the proponent has applied the mitigation hierarchy and whether any conditions should be prescribed to manage potential impacts. The NVCP process includes opportunities for public input including an appeals process whereby anyone can appeal a decision to grant or refuse a NVCP or the conditions of a NVCP.

Taking into account decision-making processes under Part V Division 3 (Prescribed premises) of the EP Act, and the Environmental Protection Regulations 1987 (EP Regulations)

- The proposal will require gas processing facility and sewage facilities which will require a works approval and licence under Part V, Division 3 of the EP Act if the premise exceeds the production or design capacity specified in Schedule 1 of the EP Regulations.
- In assessing the works approval, DWER will consider how the proponent has applied the mitigation hierarchy, and what conditions should be prescribed in the licence to manage potential impacts to the environment from premise emissions and discharges.
- The process includes opportunities for public input including an appeals process whereby anyone can appeal the conditions of a works approval or licence.

Taking into account decision-making process under the Rights in Water and Irrigation Act 1914 (RIWI Act)

- The proposal will require an amendment to a section 5C licence to take surface water or groundwater and a section 26D licence for the construction or modification of a well under the RIWI Act. The EPA objectives for inland waters can be met through assessment and approval processes under the RIWI Act.

Taking into account decision-making process under the Dangerous Goods Safety Act 2004

- The proposal will require a Dangerous Goods licence regulated by the Department of Local Government, Industry Regulation and Safety will be required.

Taking into account decision-making process under the Health Act 1911 and Health (Treatment of Sewage and Disposal of Effluent and Liquid Waste) Regulations 1974

- The proposal requires an onsite wastewater treatment system and may require approval under the *Health Act 1911*.

Taking into account decision-making processes under the Aboriginal Heritage Act 1972 (AH Act)

- No other registered or listed heritage sites occur within the proposal area, however culturally sensitive waterways were identified during field surveys for the proposal. The EPA considers the proponent has taken reasonable steps to consult with the Traditional Owners and has committed to engage in relation to the proposal Cultural Heritage Management Plan. If impacts to a site are required, the EPA is satisfied the processes provided for under the AH Act can mitigate potential impacts to registered ACH sites to be consistent with the EPA objectives.

Public advice

The EPA publishes the following public advice for the benefit of other decision-making authorities to ensure that their statutory decision-making processes achieve and assure environmental outcomes consistent with the EPA's environmental factor objectives:

- The proponent's Proposal Content Document specifications are material to the EPA's decision not to assess the proposal.
- The EPA supports the assessment and regulation under Part V Division 2 (Clearing) of the EP Act and the processes under the *Petroleum, Geothermal Energy and Greenhouse Gas Storage (Environment) Regulations 2012*, *Petroleum and Greenhouse Gas Pipelines (Environment) Regulations 2012* and *Petroleum and Geothermal Energy and Greenhouse Gas Storage (Resource Management and Administration) Regulations 2015* to ensure the environmental outcome to protect flora and vegetation and terrestrial fauna so that biological diversity and ecological integrity is maintained is achieved.
- The EPA supports the assessment and regulation of inland waters under the licences under the RIWI Act, the processes under the *Petroleum, Geothermal Energy and Greenhouse Gas Storage (Environment) Regulations 2012*, *Petroleum and Greenhouse Gas Pipelines (Environment) Regulations 2012* and *Petroleum and Geothermal Energy and Greenhouse Gas Storage (Resource Management and Administration) Regulations 2015* and Part V (Division 3) of the EP Act to ensure the environmental outcome to maintain the hydrological regimes and quality of groundwater and surface water so that environmental values are protected is achieved.
- The EPA supports the assessment and regulation of terrestrial environmental quality through Part V (Division 3) of the EP Act and an Environment Plan and other requirements under the *Petroleum, Geothermal Energy and Greenhouse Gas Storage (Environment) Regulations 2012* and *Petroleum and Greenhouse Gas Pipelines (Environment) Regulations 2012* to ensure the environmental outcome to maintain the quality of land and soils so that environmental values is achieved.
- The EPA supports the assessment and regulation of air quality under Part V (Division 3) of the EP Act to ensure the environmental outcome to maintain air quality and minimise emissions so environmental values are protected.
- The EPA supports the assessment and regulation of social surroundings under Part V of the EP Act and provisions of the AH Act to ensure the objective to protect social surroundings from significant harm is achieved

Material information considered by the EPA in this decision

The EPA has considered the following material information in making its decision:

- Additional information and referral documentation received from the proponent (s38F Notice response received on 17 April 2026)
- Referral supporting documentation (dated 17 April 2026) and supporting appendices:
 - Appendix C1 - Belisama Conventional Gas Project Flora and Vegetation Survey
 - Appendix C2 - Basic and Targeted Terrestrial Fauna Survey for the Belisama Conventional Gas Project
 - Appendix C3 - Belisama Conventional Gas Review of Black Cockatoo Assessment
 - Appendix C4 - Belisama Gas Project Inland Waters Assessment
 - Appendix C5 - Belisama Conventional Gas Project Air Quality Assessment
 - Appendix C6 - Belisama Conventional Gas Project Greenhouse Gas Assessment Technical Report Case 1
 - Appendix C7 - Belisama Conventional Gas Project Greenhouse Gas Assessment Technical Report Case 2
 - Appendix C8 - Belisama Conventional Gas Project Independent Peer Review Greenhouse Gas Estimate
 - Appendix C9- Geotechnical Investigation by Test Pitting – Belisama Gas Project
 - Appendix C10 - Belisama Gas Project Visual Impact Assessment
 - Appendix C11 - Environmental Noise Assessment – Belisama Gas Development Project
 - Appendix D1 – Belisama CEMP
 - Appendix D2 - Belisama Gas Project – Stormwater Management Plan
 - Appendix D3 - Belisama Gas Project – Technical Monitoring Guideline Groundwater and Surface Water
 - Appendix E - YSRC Letter of Support.
- Information and advice from DWER and DMPE about their statutory decision-making processes.
- EP Act s 3, s 4, Part IV, Admin Procedures, EPA factor and technical guidance.

Appeals: There are no rights of appeal under the EP Act in respect of this decision.



Darren Walsh

Chair

Delegate of the Environmental Protection Authority

Date: 27/6/2026