PurposE OF THIS FORM

Section 38(1) of the Environmental Protection Act 1986 (EP Act) provides that where a development proposal is likely to have a significant effect on the environment, a proponent may refer the proposal to the Environmental Protection Authority (EPA) for a decision on whether or not it requires assessment under the EP Act. This form sets out the information requirements for the referral of a proposal by a proponent.

Proponents are encouraged to familiarise themselves with the EPA's General Guide on Referral of Proposals [see Environmental Impact Assessment/Referral of Proposals and Schemes] before completing this form.

A referral under section 38(1) of the EP Act by a proponent to the EPA must be made on this form. A request to the EPA for a declaration under section 39B (derived proposal) must be made on this form. This form will be treated as a referral provided all information required by Part A has been included and all information requested by Part B has been provided to the extent that it is pertinent to the proposal being referred. Referral documents are to be submitted in two formats – hard copy and electronic copy. The electronic copy of the referral will be provided for public comment for a period of 7 days, prior to the EPA making its decision on whether or not to assess the proposal.

ChECKLIST

Before you submit this form, please check that you have:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Completed all the questions in Part A (essential).</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed all applicable questions in Part B.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Included Attachment 1 – location maps.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Included Attachment 2 – additional document(s) the proponent wishes to provide (if applicable).</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Included Attachment 3 – confidential information (if applicable).</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enclosed an electronic copy of all referral information, including spatial data and contextual mapping but excluding confidential information.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Following a review of the information presented in this form, please consider the following question (a response is optional).

Do you consider the proposal requires formal environmental impact assessment?

☑ Yes    ☐ No    ☐ Not sure

If yes, what level of assessment?

☐ Assessment on Proponent Information    ☑ Public Environmental Review

PROPOSAL DECLARATION (to be completed by the proponent)

I, Shaun Grein (full name) declare that I am authorised on behalf of FMG Iron Bridge Limited (being the person responsible for the proposal) to submit this form and further declare that the information contained in this form is true and not misleading.

Signature: [Signature]

Name (print): Shaun Grein

Position: Manager, Environmental Studies

Company: Fortescue Metals Group Ltd

Date: 2/10/12
**PART A - PROPOSENT AND PROPOSAL INFORMATION**  
(All fields of Part A must be completed for this document to be treated as a referral)

1 **PROPOSENT AND PROPOSAL INFORMATION**

1.1 **Proposent**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Name</strong></th>
<th>FMG Iron Bridge Limited</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FMG Iron Bridge Limited is a majority owned subsidiary of Fortescue Metals Group Limited.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Joint Venture parties (if applicable)</strong></th>
<th>Not applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| **Australian Company Number (if applicable)** | ABN: 78 150 848 025  
|                                              | ACN: 150 848 025 |

| **Postal Address** | PO Box 6915  
|                   | East Perth WA 6892 |

| **Key proposent contact for the proposal:** | Sean McGunnigle  
|                                             | Manager, Environmental Approvals  
|                                             | 87 Adelaide Terrace  
|                                             | East Perth WA 6004  
|                                             | 6218 8895  
|                                             | smcgunnigle@fmgl.com.au |

| **Consultant for the proposal (if applicable):** | Sinclair Knight Merz (SKM) |
|                                                |                           |

| **1.2 Proposal** |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Title</strong></th>
<th>North Star Magnetite Project (the Project)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**General**  
The Project will involve mining of a magnetite ore deposit and development of support infrastructure.

The Project’s magnetite ore deposit is located approximately 110km south of Port Hedland in the Pilbara region of Western Australia (Figure 1).

FMG Iron Bridge Limited is a majority owned subsidiary company of Fortescue Metals Group Limited. All further references to ‘Fortescue’ in this document refers to both FMG Iron Bridge Limited and Fortescue Metals Group Limited.
The resource estimate for the Project is 2.1 billion tonnes. It is estimated that the Project will have an export tonnage of up to 15 million tonnes per annum (Mtpa) of magnetite product. It is expected that the Project will have a life of mine of approximately 45 years. The Project has an overall footprint of approximately 5300 hectares.

**Mine**

Mining will be carried out using traditional open pit mining methods. Waste and ore will be removed in a series of progressive cutbacks using drill and blast and truck and shovel open pit mining methods.

Waste rock will be transported to a waste rock dump (WRD) site to the east of the pit. The ore will be trucked to a semi-mobile crushing plant and then conveyed to the process plant for further grinding and magnetic separation.

Products produced by the process plant are dry process rejects, wet tailings and magnetite product. Dry process rejects will be deposited in a dedicated landform. Wet tailings will be deposited in a dedicated Tailings Storage Facility (TSF).

Hydrogeological studies indicate that groundwater seepage into the pit will be minimal and can be managed through in pit dewatering from sumps.

Magnetite product will be mixed with water to produce a slurry, which will be transported to Port Hedland via a slurry pipeline. For the purpose of this referral, the slurry pipeline terminates at the boundary to the Port Hedland Port Authority Precinct. Approval for the remainder of the slurry pipeline and other infrastructure such as filter plant will be sought as part of land side operations of an Outer Harbour Port Facility Proposal.

Infrastructure to be installed at the mine includes, but is not limited to:

- WRD and dry process rejects landform;
- TSF and water decant;
- Ore stockpiles, including Run of mine (ROM) pad;
- Process plant;
- Slurry pipeline and gas pipeline;
- 110MW Gas Fired Power Station and power reticulation around site;
- Roads and borrow pits;
- Water processing, ponds and reticulation;
- Bulk fuel storage;
- Workshops and maintenance facilities;
- Laydown and storage facilities;
- Explosives and chemical storage.
- Camp and administration buildings.

A general layout of the Project's Mining Area is depicted in Figure 2.

**Water Supply**
The construction water supply will be sourced from existing licensed bores within Fortescue's rail corridor, or other borefields if required.

Operational water supply will be sourced from a dedicated borefield within the Canning Basin. Water will be delivered to site via a 190km water pipeline (see Figure 3). The Canning Basin borefield will be powered by a small (6MW) power station.

**Power Supply**
Power distribution assets are not located within a reasonable distance of the Project area. Fortescue proposes to construct a gas-fired 120MW power station at the mine site. The gas for the power station would be delivered from the existing PEPL pipeline at Port Hedland to site via a new buried pipeline.

If a commercially viable third party power provider can be secured prior to commencement of Project construction, power may be sourced from Port Hedland via a new 100km long overhead high-voltage transmission line from site to connect to the North West Integrated System (NWIS). Such a transmission line would occupy the same footprint as the gas pipeline.

**Other Elements**

- Fortescue will seek separate approval for a dedicated outer harbour port facility for the shipping of magnetite product
produced by the Project. This will include a land based component including stockpiles, conveyors, filter plant and infrastructure corridors and a marine based component including a jetty, wharf and berth pockets.

| Extent (area) of proposed ground disturbance. | 5300 hectares |
| Timeframe in which the activity or development is proposed to occur (including start and finish dates where applicable). | Construction is proposed to commence in second half of 2013, with ore processing commencing in 2015. The mine will be operational for approximately 45 years. |
| Details of any staging of the proposal. | There is no staging of the proposal |
| Is the proposal a strategic proposal? | No. |
| Is the proponent requesting a declaration that the proposal is a derived proposal? If so, provide the following information on the strategic assessment within which the referred proposal was identified: | No. |
| • title of the strategic assessment; and |
| • Ministerial Statement number. |
| Please indicate whether, and in what way, the proposal is related to other proposals in the region. | The North Star Hematite Project, which sits within the footprint of the North Star Magnetite Project, was referred to the EPA on 2 July 2012. On 6 August, the EPA advertised its determination on the Hematite Project as ‘Not Assessed – Managed Under Part V’. The Hematite Project is a stand-alone project, as evidenced by its separate referral to the EPA and is not Stage 1 of the North Star Magnetite Project. The Hematite Project may still be in operation during the first 12-18 months of the Magnetite Project (during construction and early operations).

Fortescue will seek separate approval for an Outer Harbour Port Facility for ongoing long term export of the magnetite product. |
| Does the proponent own the land on which the proposal is to be established? If not, what other arrangements have been established to access the land? | The ore body sits within granted Mining Leases M45/1180, M45/1181, M45/1182, M45/1183 and pending Mining Lease M45/1196.

Other areas required for mining operations sit within pending Mining Lease M45/1226. |
| The infrastructure corridor to Great Northern |
| What is the current land use on the property, and the extent (area in hectares) of the property? | The magnetite ore deposit is located within Unallocated Crown Land (UCL), subject to the Njamal Native Title Claim. Infrastructure such as the access road, slurry pipeline, gas pipeline, water supply pipeline and Canning Basin borefield occur within the following pastoral leases (see Figure 4):

- Wallareenya
- Kangan
- indée
- Boodarie
- Pardoo
- Muccan
- Coongan
- Strelley
- De Grey
- Wallal
- Pardoo |

## 1.3 Location

| Name of the Shire in which the proposal is located. | Shire of East Pilbara, Town of Port Hedland |
| For urban areas:  
  - street address;  
  - lot number;  
  - suburb; and  
  - nearest road intersection. |  
| For remote localities:  
  - nearest town; and  
  - distance and direction from that town to the proposal site. | The Project ore deposit and mining area is located approximately 110km south of Port Hedland. |
| Electronic copy of spatial data - GIS or CAD, geo-referenced and conforming | See attached CD |
to the following parameters:

- GIS: polygons representing all activities and named;
- CAD: simple closed polygons representing all activities and named;
- datum: GDA94;
- projection: Geographic (latitude/longitude) or Map Grid of Australia (MGA);
- format: Arcview shapefile, Arcinfo coverages, Microstation or AutoCAD.
### 1.4 Confidential Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does the proponent wish to request the EPA to allow any part of the referral information to be treated as confidential?</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If yes, is confidential information attached as a separate document in hard copy?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 1.5 Government Approvals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Is rezoning of any land required before the proposal can be implemented? If yes, please provide details.</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is approval required from any Commonwealth or State Government agency or Local Authority for any part of the proposal? If yes, please complete the table below.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency/Authority</th>
<th>Approval required</th>
<th>Application lodged Yes / No</th>
<th>Agency/Local Authority contact(s) for proposal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Department of Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities</td>
<td>Approval under <em>Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999</em> (EPBC Act) for potential impact on Matters of National Significance.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>David Calvert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Water</td>
<td>Approval under the <em>Rights in Water and Irrigation Act 1914</em> for construction and operation of groundwater bores to supply water for the Project.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Hamid Mohsenzadeh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Environment and Conservation</td>
<td>Works Approvals and Licences under Part V of the <em>Environmental Protection Act 1986</em> for prescribed activities.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Suzy Roworth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Mines and Petroleum</td>
<td>Approval under the <em>Mining Act 1978</em>.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Danielle Risbey</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PART B - ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND PROPOSED MANAGEMENT

2. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

Describe the impacts of the proposal on the following elements of the environment, by answering the questions contained in Sections 2.1-2.11:

2.1 flora and vegetation;
2.2 fauna;
2.3 rivers, creeks, wetlands and estuaries;
2.4 significant areas and/ or land features;
2.5 coastal zone areas;
2.6 marine areas and biota;
2.7 water supply and drainage catchments;
2.8 pollution;
2.9 greenhouse gas emissions;
2.10 contamination; and
2.11 social surroundings.

These features should be shown on the site plan, where appropriate.

For all information, please indicate:

(a) the source of the information; and
(b) the currency of the information.

2.1 Flora and Vegetation

2.1.1 Do you propose to clear any native flora and vegetation as a part of this proposal?

[A proposal to clear native vegetation may require a clearing permit under Part V of the EP Act (Environmental Protection (Clearing of Native Vegetation) Regulations 2004)]. Please contact the Department of Environment and Conservation (DEC) for more information.

(please tick)  ✓ Yes  If yes, complete the rest of this section.
☐ No  If no, go to the next section

2.1.2 How much vegetation are you proposing to clear (in hectares)?

Approximately 5300 ha will be disturbed to construct and operate the Project. The Project area has been divided into zones based on intended use, within which disturbance will occur. Indicative clearing includes:

Pit Zone – 470 ha
TSF Zone – 1395 ha
WRD Zone – 990 ha
Process Waste Zone – 300 ha
Process Plant Zone – 85 ha
Power Station Zone – 30ha
Low Grade Stockpile Zone – 320 ha
Administration and other infrastructure Zone – 45 ha
Camp Zone – 30 ha
Access Road and Infrastructure Corridor Zone (includes slurry pipeline and gas pipeline to power station) – 745 ha
Canning Basin Borefield and Water Supply Pipeline Zone– 890 ha

Clearing for the project will be undertaken progressively over the life of the Project.

2.1.3 Have you submitted an application to clear native vegetation to the DEC (unless you are exempt from such a requirement)?

☐ Yes ✔ No

If yes, on what date and to which office was the application submitted of the DEC?

Should the Project be approved under Section 38 of the Environmental Protection Act 1986, it will be exempt from a clearing permit as the clearing of native vegetation will be assessed as part of the formal assessment.

2.1.4 Are you aware of any recent flora surveys carried out over the area to be disturbed by this proposal?

✔ Yes ☐ No

If yes, please attach a copy of any related survey reports and provide the date and name of persons / companies involved in the survey(s).

If no, please do not arrange to have any biological surveys conducted prior to consulting with the DEC.

Fortescue has completed Level 2 flora and vegetation surveys of the Project area, including the mine, infrastructure and water pipeline alignments components. The results of these assessments will be provided as part of the environmental impact assessment documentation.

2.1.5 Has a search of DEC records for known occurrences of rare or priority flora or threatened ecological communities been conducted for the site?

✔ Yes ☐ No

If you are proposing to clear native vegetation for any part of your proposal, a search of DEC records of known occurrences of rare or priority flora and threatened ecological communities will be required. Please contact DEC for more information.
2.1.6 Are there any known occurrences of rare or priority flora or threatened ecological communities on the site?

✓ Yes ☐ No If yes, please indicate which species or communities are involved and provide copies of any correspondence with DEC regarding these matters.

A search of DEC records did not identify any Declared Rare or Priority listed flora species within the proposed mining area, however some Priority species are known to occur within the broader area such as *Pityrodia* sp. Marble Bar (P1), *Acacia glaucochaenia* (P3) and *Acacia levata* (P3). A detailed description, including the results of the Level 2 Flora and Vegetation Survey and impact assessment for conservation significant flora species will be presented in the environmental impact assessment documentation.

2.1.7 If located within the Perth Metropolitan Region, is the proposed development within or adjacent to a listed Bush Forever Site? (You will need to contact the Bush Forever Office, at the Department for Planning and Infrastructure)

☐ Yes ☐ No If yes, please indicate which Bush Forever Site is affected (site number and name of site where appropriate).

Not applicable.

2.1.8 What is the condition of the vegetation at the site?

The detailed flora and vegetation assessment for the Project will include an assessment of vegetation condition and will be discussed within the environmental impact assessment documentation.

2.2 Fauna

2.2.1 Do you expect that any fauna or fauna habitat will be impacted by the proposal?

(please tick) ✓ Yes ☐ No If yes, complete the rest of this section. If no, go to the next section.

2.2.2 Describe the nature and extent of the expected impact.

Expected impacts include the loss of fauna habitat through the clearing of vegetation and modification of the environment as a result of mining and support infrastructure. Fauna species may also be directly impacted from vehicle/machinery strikes, noise, vibration and light associated with the mining operations. Other potential impacts may result from the following:

- Potential for increased fire frequency events;
- Changes to groundwater quality;
- Changes in surface hydrology;
- Increased light spill;
- Feral animal introduction; and
- Pest populations.
The environmental impact assessment documentation for the Project will discuss any impacts identified and include avoidance and/or mitigation measures.

2.2.3 Are you aware of any recent fauna surveys carried out over the area to be disturbed by this proposal?

✓ Yes     □ No  If yes, please attach a copy of any related survey reports and provide the date and name of persons / companies involved in the survey(s).

If no, please do not arrange to have any biological surveys conducted prior to consulting with the DEC.

Fortescue has completed Level 2 vertebrate fauna assessments of the Project, including targeted surveys for fauna species listed as Matters of National Environmental Significance under the EPBC Act. The results of these assessments will be provided in the environmental impact assessment documentation for the Project.

2.2.4 Has a search of DEC records for known occurrences of Specially Protected (threatened) fauna been conducted for the site?

✓ Yes     □ No  (please tick)

A search of the DEC threatened fauna database was undertaken as part of the fauna assessment, with the results to be presented in the environmental impact assessment documentation. Potential conservation significant fauna of the proposed mining area, based on preliminary research is shown below:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Species</th>
<th>Conservation Status</th>
<th>EPBC Act</th>
<th>WC Act</th>
<th>DEC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northern Quoll</td>
<td>Endangered</td>
<td>Schedule 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Dasyurus hallucatus</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pilbara Leaf-nosed Bat</td>
<td>Vulnerable</td>
<td>Schedule 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Rhinoniceris aurantius</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pilbara Olive Python</td>
<td>Vulnerable</td>
<td>Schedule 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Liasis olivaceus barroni</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilby</td>
<td>Vulnerable</td>
<td>Schedule 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Macrotis lagotis</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rainbow Bee-eater</td>
<td>Migratory</td>
<td>Schedule 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Merops ornatus</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood Sandpiper</td>
<td>Migratory</td>
<td>Schedule 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Tringa glareola</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White-bellied Sea-eagle</td>
<td>Migratory</td>
<td>Schedule 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Haliaeetus leucogaster</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Great Egret</td>
<td>Migratory</td>
<td>Schedule 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Ardea modesta</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fork-tailed Swift</td>
<td>Migratory</td>
<td>Schedule 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Apus pacificus</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oriental Plover</td>
<td>Migratory</td>
<td>Schedule 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Charadrius veredus</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peregrine Falcon</td>
<td>Schedule 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Falco peregrinus</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A blind snake</td>
<td>Priority 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Rampholyphlops ganei</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A skink</td>
<td>Priority 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Ctenotus nigrilineatus</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spectacled Hare-wallaby</td>
<td>Priority 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Lagorchestes conspicillatus leichardti</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brush-tailed Mulgara</td>
<td>Priority 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Dasycercus blythi</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long-tailed Dunnart</td>
<td>Priority 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Sminthopsis longicaudata</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grey Falcon</td>
<td>Priority 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Falco hypoleucos</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghost Bat</td>
<td>Priority 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Macrodema gigas</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Pebble-mound Mouse</td>
<td>Priority 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Pseudomys chapmani</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short-tailed Mouse</td>
<td>Priority 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Leggadina lakedownensis</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bush-stone Curlew</td>
<td>Priority 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Burhinus grallarius</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Species</td>
<td>Priority</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Star Finch (Western)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Neochmia ruficauda subclarescens</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australian Bustard</td>
<td></td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Ardeotis australis</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A skink</td>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Notoctincus butleri</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.2.5 Are there any known occurrences of Specially Protected (threatened) fauna on the site?

✓ Yes    □ No  If yes, please indicate which species or communities are involved and provide copies of any correspondence with DEC regarding these matters.

Level 2 Fauna surveys were completed in 2011 to identify whether conservation significant fauna occur within the Project area and surrounding areas. In particular, these surveys identified individuals and suitable habitat for three State (*Wildlife Conservation Act 1950*) and Commonwealth (EPBC Act) listed conservation significant fauna species from the Project area:

- Northern Quoll (*Dasyurus hallucatus*) (EPBC Act - Endangered)
- Pilbara Leaf-nosed Bat (*Rhinonicterus aurantius*) (EPBC Act - Vulnerable)
- Pilbara Olive Python (*Lialis olivaceus barroni*) (EPBC Act - Vulnerable)

Detailed results of this survey will be presented in the Project environmental impact assessment documentation.

2.3 Rivers, Creeks, Wetlands and Estuaries

2.3.1 Will the development occur within 200 metres of a river, creek, wetland or estuary?

(please tick)  ✓ Yes  If yes, complete the rest of this section.

□ No  If no, go to the next section.

2.3.2 Will the development result in the clearing of vegetation within the 200 metre zone?

✓ Yes    □ No  If yes, please describe the extent of the expected impact.

The proposed water supply and slurry pipelines and access road will cause disturbance to vegetation within drainage lines.

Water will be delivered to the Project via a 190km pipeline. The route for this pipeline is depicted in Figure 3. The pipeline makes several river crossings including the Shaw and De Grey Rivers. The final alignment of the pipeline across the De Grey River will be determined following consultation with key stakeholders including pastoralists and traditional owners.
The water supply pipeline, gas pipeline and slurry pipeline will be buried as far as practicable. Directional drilling will be used where these pipelines cross major water courses such as the Turner, Shaw and De Grey Rivers to avoid impact to riparian vegetation and reduce the risk of erosion during flood events. The access road into the Project mining area will cross the Turner River. The impact of these activities will be discussed within the environmental impact assessment documentation.

2.3.3 Will the development result in the filling or excavation of a river, creek, wetland or estuary?

✓ Yes  ☐ No  If yes, please describe the extent of the expected impact.

A number of minor ephemeral drainage lines occur in the Project’s mining area. Surface water will be controlled and diverted around Project infrastructure. This diversion of water will be done in such a way as to maintain the natural flow of surface water to downstream ephemeral watercourses.

The access road into the Project mining area will cross the Turner River and will require some fill to provide a trafficable surface. However, at this time, no culverts are planned for the Turner River crossing, which only flows following intense rainfall events. Downstream flows are not expected to be significantly disrupted by the road crossing.

2.3.4 Will the development result in the impoundment of a river, creek, wetland or estuary?

✓ Yes  ☐ No  If yes, please describe the extent of the expected impact.

The construction of the TSF has the potential to impound a minor, local drainage line at the top of its catchment. This will be further investigated during surface water studies to be conducted over the mine area.

2.3.5 Will the development result in draining to a river, creek, wetland or estuary?

☐ Yes  ✓ No  If yes, please describe the extent of the expected impact.

2.3.6 Are you aware if the proposal will impact on a river, creek, wetland or estuary (or its buffer) within one of the following categories? (please tick)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conservation Category Wetland</th>
<th>☐ Yes</th>
<th>✓ No</th>
<th>☐ Unsure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Protection (South West Agricultural Zone Wetlands) Policy 1998</td>
<td>☐ Yes</td>
<td>✓ No</td>
<td>☐ Unsure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perth’s Bush Forever site</td>
<td>☐ Yes</td>
<td>✓ No</td>
<td>☐ Unsure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Protection (Swan &amp; Canning Rivers) Policy 1998</td>
<td>☐ Yes</td>
<td>✓ No</td>
<td>☐ Unsure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The management area as defined in s4(1) of the *Swan River Trust Act 1988* □ Yes  ✓ No  □ Unsure

Which is subject to an international agreement, because of the importance of the wetland for waterbirds and waterbird habitats (e.g. Ramsar, JAMBA, CAMBA) □ Yes  ✓ No  □ Unsure

### 2.4 Significant Areas and/or Land Features

#### 2.4.1 Is the proposed development located within or adjacent to an existing or proposed National Park or Nature Reserve?

□ Yes  ✓ No  **If yes**, please provide details.

#### 2.4.2 Are you aware of any Environmentally Sensitive Areas (as declared by the Minister under section 51B of the EP Act) that will be impacted by the proposed development?

□ Yes  ✓ No  **If yes**, please provide details.

#### 2.4.3 Are you aware of any significant natural land features (e.g. caves, ranges etc) that will be impacted by the proposed development?

✓ Yes  □ No  **If yes**, please provide details.

Approximately 300ha of suitable dry season roosting cave habitat for the Pilbara Leaf-nosed Bat has been identified from within the Project area. The majority of this habitat is located along a north-south orientated ridge located both within and outside of the mining footprint. This will be discussed within the environmental impact assessment documentation.

### 2.5 Coastal Zone Areas (Coastal Dunes and Beaches)

#### 2.5.1 Will the development occur within 300 metres of a coastal area?

(please tick) □ Yes  If **yes**, complete the rest of this section.

✓ No  If **no**, go to the next section.

#### 2.5.2 What is the expected setback of the development from the high tide level and from the primary dune?

#### 2.5.3 Will the development impact on coastal areas with significant landforms including beach ridge plain, cuspate headland, coastal dunes or karst?

□ Yes  □ No  **If yes**, please describe the extent of the expected impact.

#### 2.5.4 Is the development likely to impact on mangroves?
2.6 Marine Areas and Biota

2.6.1 Is the development likely to impact on an area of sensitive benthic communities, such as seagrasses, coral reefs or mangroves?
☐ Yes  ☐ No  If yes, please describe the extent of the expected impact.

2.6.2 Is the development likely to impact on marine conservation reserves or areas recommended for reservation (as described in A Representative Marine Reserve System for Western Australia, CALM, 1994)?
☐ Yes  ☑ No  If yes, please describe the extent of the expected impact.

2.6.3 Is the development likely to impact on marine areas used extensively for recreation or for commercial fishing activities?
☐ Yes  ☑ No  If yes, please describe the extent of the expected impact, and provide any written advice from relevant agencies (e.g. Fisheries WA).

2.7 Water Supply and Drainage Catchments

2.7.1 Are you in a proclaimed or proposed groundwater or surface water protection area?
(You may need to contact the Department of Water (DoW) for more information on the requirements for your location, including the requirement for licences for water abstraction. Also, refer to the DoW website)
☐ Yes  ☑ No  If yes, please describe what category of area.

2.7.2 Are you in an existing or proposed Underground Water Supply and Pollution Control area?
(You may need to contact the DoW for more information on the requirements for your location, including the requirement for licences for water abstraction. Also, refer to the DoW website)
☐ Yes  ☑ No  If yes, please describe what category of area.

2.7.3 Are you in a Public Drinking Water Supply Area (PDWSA)?
(You may need to contact the DoW for more information or refer to the DoW website. A proposal to clear vegetation within a PDWSA requires approval from DoW.)

☐ Yes ☑️ No  If yes, please describe what category of area.

☐ YES  • DE (CAY)  • G · DE (CAY)  • PDWSA

2.7.4 Is there sufficient water available for the proposal?

(Please consult with the DoW as to whether approvals are required to source water as you propose. Where necessary, please provide a letter of intent from the DoW)

☑️ Yes  ☐ No  (please tick)

Construction Water Supply

Existing Bores

Early water requirements for the Project will be sourced from existing bores located along Fortescue’s mainline railway. These bores are approved by groundwater licences (GWL) 162068 and 162172. Other borefields will be considered if required.

Operational Water Supply

Operational water supply for the Project will be sourced from a borefield located at the Canning Basin (see Figures 1 and 3).

In recent years, there have been a number of studies undertaken to assess the water distribution and supply in the Pilbara. These studies include:

- The DoW’s study, ‘Integrated Water Supply in the Pilbara, (2009)’
- Pilbara Coast Water Supply study (Haig, DoW, 2009)
- Detailed groundwater modelling was undertaken by Aquaterra on behalf of the DoW to determine the potential of the West Canning Basin as a water supply source and enable the DoW to support regional water management objectives (Aquaterra, 2010).

A number of studies have attempted to quantify the volume of water in storage in the western and central portions of the south western Canning Basin (Leech (1979) and Aquaterra (2010)). Final volumes of water which can be extracted on a continuous long term basis from the south western Canning Basin have not been formally adopted by the Department of Water. The Department of Water is pursuing an allocation policy which allows for each proponent to define the impact of their proposed water extraction on the already granted allocation.

To this end, Fortescue is undertaking a comprehensive exploration program for a potential borefield in the eastern sections of the south western Canning Basin, where there is unlikely to be any impact on existing groundwater users. Fortescue has developed an operating strategy to ensure that the required allocation is achieved. Detailed results of baseline surveys of the proposed borefield and pipeline alignment survey will be presented in the environmental impact assessment documentation.
2.7.5 Will the proposal require drainage of the land?

☐ Yes  ✔ No  

If yes, how is the site to be drained and will the drainage be connected to an existing Local Authority or Water Corporation drainage system? Please provide details.

2.7.6 Is there a water requirement for the construction and/or operation of this proposal?

(please tick)  ✔ Yes  If yes, complete the rest of this section.

☐ No  If no, go to the next section.

2.7.7 What is the water requirement for the construction and operation of this proposal, in kilolitres per year?

Construction water requirements are anticipated to be approximately 7200kL per day for a construction period of up to 3 years (~2.5GLpa).

Operational water requirements are anticipated to be up to 14GLpa.

2.7.8 What is the proposed source of water for the proposal? (e.g. dam, bore, surface water etc.)

Construction water supply – existing bores located along Fortescue's railway.

Operational water supply – Canning Basin borefield.

2.8 Pollution

2.8.1 Is there likely to be any discharge of pollutants from this development, such as noise, vibration, gaseous emissions, dust, liquid effluent, solid waste or other pollutants?

(please tick)  ✔ Yes  If yes, complete the rest of this section.

☐ No  If no, go to the next section.

2.8.2 Is the proposal a prescribed premise, under the Environmental Protection Regulations 1987?

(Refer to the EPA's General Guide for Referral of Proposals to the EPA under section 38(1) of the EP Act 1986 for more information)

✔ Yes  ☐ No  If yes, please describe what category of prescribed premise.

Some activities to be undertaken as part of the Project are currently prescribed under the Environmental Protection Regulations 1987 e.g. ore processing, wastewater treatment, power generation.

2.8.3 Will the proposal result in gaseous emissions to air?
✓ Yes  □ No  If yes, please briefly describe.

The Project will cause gaseous emissions as a result of power generation by the power station and operating mining fleet. Gaseous emissions will be presented in the Project environmental impact assessment documentation.

2.8.4 Have you done any modelling or analysis to demonstrate that air quality standards will be met, including consideration of cumulative impacts from other emission sources?

✓ Yes  □ No  If yes, please briefly describe.

Fortescue has completed an air quality study for the Project’s mining area focussing on dust emissions. Studies have also been completed on the expected emissions from the power station. Details from these studies will be presented in the Project environmental impact assessment documentation.

2.8.5 Will the proposal result in liquid effluent discharge?

✓ Yes  □ No  If yes, please briefly describe the nature, concentrations and receiving environment.

The Project will produce wastewater from ablutions, laundry and kitchen facilities. A wastewater treatment plant will be installed for the treatment of this effluent.

Effluent will also be produced from residue slurry from ore processing and liquid effluent from machinery wash down facilities and workshops. A small amount of waste water will be generated by the power station. Settlement ponds, sumps and oily water separators will be employed for the management of wastewater from these activities.

2.8.6 If there is likely to be discharges to a watercourse or marine environment, has any analysis been done to demonstrate that the State Water Quality Management Strategy or other appropriate standards will be able to be met?

□ Yes  ✓ No  If yes, please describe.

There is potential for liquid wastes such as hydrocarbons to be accidentally released into the environment. The impact of any spill will depend on the volume and toxicity of the material released. Management strategies for accidental spills will be discussed in the environmental impact assessment documentation.

2.8.7 Will the proposal produce or result in solid wastes?

✓ Yes  □ No  If yes, please briefly describe the nature, concentrations and disposal location/ method.

General wastes produced by personnel at the mine area will be contained within a landfill site, located within the mine area.

Mine

Mine construction may result in the production of general waste such as scrap metal, plastics, drums and containers. These will be safely disposed of according
to their properties (landfill, incineration, recycling). Opportunities for recycling material will be investigated.

Overburden and waste rock will also be produced from mining operations, and dry process rejects and wet tailings will be produced from processing of ore. Hard rock waste will be stored in a waste rock dump adjacent to the main pit. Dry process rejects will be stored in a dedicated landform. Wet tailings will be pumped to a TSF north of the mine where water will be decanted for pumping back to the process plant. A breakdown of volumes and area is provided below:

**Tailing Storage Facility (TSF)**
The TSF will be a valley fill design. This is described below:

- Approximately 540Mt of tailings (400Mm$^3$) will be deposited within the TSF during the life of mine.
- An embankment wall approximately 77m high at final height will be constructed across a valley. This will be constructed in lifts at intervals during the life of mine.
- The catchment area upstream of the embankment wall is 1920 ha.
- The area to be disturbed by tailings deposition upstream of the embankment wall is approximately 1395 ha.
- Therefore total area of the catchment upstream of the embankment wall that will not be impacted by the TSF is 525 ha.

**Waste Dumps**
Mining will produce approximately 913Mt of waste rock and overburden, which will be deposited within a designated waste rock dump. Construction of the waste rock dump will require the removal of approximately 990ha of vegetation and topsoil.

**Dry Process Rejects**
Processing of magnetite ore will produce 180Mt of dry process rejects. This material will either be stored within the waste rock dump, or within a designated landform depending on its characteristics. Approximately 300 ha have been designated for this landform.

### 2.8.8 Will the proposal result in significant off-site noise emissions?

- [ ] Yes
- [x] No

If yes, please briefly describe.

Blasting and excavation activities are unlikely to result in any significant off-site noise impacts to the social environment during the construction and operation of the Project. The proposed power station will also be a source of noise emissions. Fortescue has completed noise studies for the Project's mining area and expected noise emissions from the power station. Details from these studies will be presented in the Project environmental impact assessment documentation.

### 2.8.9 Will the development be subject to the Environmental Protection (Noise) Regulations 1997?
✓ Yes □ No If yes, has any analysis been carried out to demonstrate that the proposal will comply with the Regulations?
Please attach the analysis.

Fortescue has completed noise studies for the Project's mining area and expected noise emissions from the power station. Details from this study will be presented in the Project environmental impact assessment documentation.

2.8.10 Does the proposal have the potential to generate off-site, air quality impacts, dust, odour or another pollutant that may affect the amenity of residents and other “sensitive premises” such as schools and hospitals (proposals in this category may include intensive agriculture, aquaculture, marinas, mines and quarries etc.)?
✓ Yes □ No If yes, please describe and provide the distance to residences and other “sensitive premises”.

The Project mine area is located approximately 110 km south of Port Hedland. The amenity of Port Hedland residents, including sensitive premises such as schools and hospitals, will not be impacted by any dust, odour or noise emissions as a result of mining operations. The Project has a residential component, located at least 3km from any mining, processing and power generation activities. Fortescue has completed dust, air quality and noise studies for the Project, including construction of the slurry pipeline and water supply pipeline and operation of the power station. Details from these studies will be presented in the Project environmental impact assessment documentation.

A component of the magnetite ore is silica. Much of this silica will be removed from the final product through the crushing and magnetic separation process. Studies are currently ongoing to determine the size fraction of the silica at various stages of the mining process. This will be discussed within the environmental impact assessment documentation.

Potential dust emissions as a result of the handling of magnetite ore product at the Outer Harbour will be subject to a separate Outer Harbour Port Facility proposal.

2.8.11 If the proposal has a residential component or involves “sensitive premises”, is it located near a land use that may discharge a pollutant?
✓ Yes □ No □ Not Applicable
If yes, please describe and provide the distance to the potential pollution source.

The proposed construction and permanent camp is located approximately 4 km west of the pit zone and approximately 3 km west of the process plant zone and power station.

Fortescue has completed noise studies for the Project, including construction of the slurry pipeline and water supply pipeline and operation of the process plant and
power station. Details from this study will be presented in the Project environmental impact assessment documentation.

Fortescue has completed air quality studies for the Project’s mining area, focussing on dust emissions from mining and ore processing and expected emissions from the power station. Details from these studies will be presented in the Project environmental impact assessment documentation.

2.9 Greenhouse Gas Emissions
2.9.1 Is this proposal likely to result in substantial greenhouse gas emissions (greater than 100 000 tonnes per annum of carbon dioxide equivalent emissions)?

✓ Yes  □ No  If yes, please provide an estimate of the annual gross emissions in absolute and in carbon dioxide equivalent figures.

The majority of greenhouse gas emissions associated with the project will be generated by the power station. Should an alternative energy source be identified, greenhouse gas emissions associated with the Project are not likely to be significant. Greenhouse gas emissions for the Project will be calculated and presented within the Project environmental impact assessment documentation.

2.9.2 Further, if yes, please describe proposed measures to minimise emissions, and any sink enhancement actions proposed to offset emissions.

Fortescue will develop a Greenhouse Gas Management Plan to minimise and mitigate greenhouse gas emissions from the Project, and will consider carbon reduction technologies, energy supply options and mine planning/design initiatives to increase energy efficiencies and reduce greenhouse gas emissions from the Project.

2.10 Contamination
2.10.1 Has the property on which the proposal is to be located been used in the past for activities which may have caused soil or groundwater contamination?

□ Yes  ✓ No  □ Unsure  If yes, please describe.

According to the DEC Contaminated Sites Database, the Project’s mining area is not a contaminated site.

2.10.2 Has any assessment been done for soil or groundwater contamination on the site?

□ Yes  ✓ No  If yes, please describe.

2.10.3 Has the site been registered as a contaminated site under the Contaminated Sites Act 2003? (on finalisation of the CS Regulations and proclamation of the CS Act)

□ Yes  ✓ No  If yes, please describe.
2.11 Social Surroundings

2.11.1 Is the proposal on a property which contains or is near a site of Aboriginal ethnographic or archaeological significance that may be disturbed?

✓ Yes    ☐ No    ☐ Unsure

If yes, please describe.

Aboriginal heritage surveys will be conducted for the Project. Fortescue will comply with the Aboriginal Heritage Act 1972.

2.11.2 Is the proposal on a property which contains or is near a site of high public interest (e.g. a major recreation area or natural scenic feature)?

☐ Yes    ✓ No

If yes, please describe.

2.11.3 Will the proposal result in or require substantial transport of goods, which may affect the amenity of the local area?

✓ Yes    ☐ No

If yes, please describe.

Large machinery, mining fleet and operational supplies (fuel, food, consumables) must be transported to site via Great Northern Highway. Fortescue will liaise with Main Roads regarding the use of Great Northern Highway and other local roads. All iron ore product produced by the project will be transported to Port Hedland for shipping via the slurry pipeline, which will be buried.

3. PROPOSED MANAGEMENT

3.1 Principles of Environmental Protection

3.1.1 Have you considered how your project gives attention to the following Principles, as set out in section 4A of the EP Act? (For information on the Principles of Environmental Protection, please see EPA Position Statement No. 7, available on the EPA website)

1. The precautionary principle. ✓ Yes

Technical and biological surveys and investigations have been used to assess preliminary potential impacts and management for the Project. An environmental risk assessment for the Project will be undertaken following the completion of all of the detailed baseline and technical studies. Key risks and specific mitigation/management measures will be identified during the risk assessment for inclusion in the EIA document.

2. The principle of intergenerational equity ✓ Yes.

The Project will be managed so that the health, diversity and productivity of the environment is maintained and/or enhanced for the benefit of future generations. In addition, a rehabilitation programme utilising the knowledge gained from Fortescue’s rehabilitation experience at its existing operations will be implemented. Fortescue will mine closure planning over the life of the Project.
3. The principle of the conservation of biological diversity and ecological integrity.  ✔ Yes

A suite of baseline biological studies have been undertaken for the Project and a preliminary impact assessment has commenced. Studies that have commenced include Level 2 flora and vegetation and Level 2 vertebrate fauna surveys, a subterranean fauna survey and a short-range endemic invertebrate fauna survey. The results of these studies will be used to develop mitigation and management measures to minimise impacts to the biological diversity of the area.

4. Principles relating to improved valuation, pricing and incentive mechanisms.  ✔ Yes

Objectives for each of the relevant environmental factors for the Project will be established and addressed during the environmental impact assessment process.

5. The principle of waste minimisation.  ✔ Yes

Fortescue will integrate a waste hierarchy (i.e. avoid, reuse, reduce, recycle, treat, dispose) for waste minimisation related to the Project.

3.1.2 Is the proposal consistent with the EPA’s Environmental Protection Bulletins/Position Statements and Environmental Assessment Guidelines/Guidance Statements (available on the EPA website)?

✔ Yes □ No

The following EPA position and guidance statements are relevant to this Project and have been considered in this referral document and/or will be considered in further detail during the environmental assessment of the Project:

- EPA Position Statement No. 2 – Environmental Protection of Native Vegetation in Western Australia.
- EPA Position Statement No. 3 – Terrestrial Biological Surveys as an Element of Biodiversity Protection.
- EPA Position Statement No. 4 – Environmental Protection of Wetlands.
- EPA Position Statement No. 5 – Environmental Protection and Ecological Sustainability of the Rangelands in Western Australia.
- EPA Position Statement No. 7 – Principles of Environmental Protection.
- EPA Position Statement No. 8 – Environmental Protection in Natural Resource Management.
- EPA Position Statement No. 9 – Environmental Offsets.
- EPA Guidance Statement No. 18 – Prevention of Air Quality Impacts from Land Development Sites.
• EPA Guidance Statement No. 20 - Sampling of Short Range Endemic Invertebrate Fauna for Environmental Impact Assessment in Western Australia.
• EPA Guidance Statement No. 33 – Environmental Guidance for Planning and Development.
• EPA Guidance Statement No. 41 - Assessment of Aboriginal Heritage.
• EPA Guidance Statement No. 51 - Terrestrial Flora and Vegetation Surveys for Environmental Impact Assessment in Western Australia.
• EPA Guidance Statement No. 54 - Consideration of Subterranean Fauna in Groundwater and Caves during Environmental Impact Assessment in Western Australia.
• EPA Draft Guidance Statement No. 54a - Sampling Methods and Survey Considerations for Subterranean Fauna in Western Australia (Technical Appendix to Guidance Statement 54).
• EPA Guidance Statement No. 55 - Implementing best practice in proposals submitted to the environment impact assessment process.
• EPA Guidance Statement No. 56 - Terrestrial Fauna Surveys for Environmental Impact Assessment in Western Australia.

3.2 Consultation

3.2.1 Has public consultation taken place (such as with other government agencies, community groups or neighbours), or is it intended that consultation shall take place?

✓ Yes ☐ No If yes, please list those consulted and attach comments or summarise response on a separate sheet.

Fortescue has undertaken consultation about the Project with the Office of the Environmental Protection Authority, Department of Sustainability, Environment, Water, Populations and Communities, the Department of Mines and Petroleum, the Department of Water, the Department of Environment and Conservation and the Port Hedland Port Authority.

Fortescue has undertaken consultation with the Njamal Native Title Group. Fortescue have implemented a community consultation strategy for the Project to ensure relevant stakeholders are consulted. Stakeholders include Local Governments of the Town of Port Hedland and the Shire of East Pilbara, Non-government Organisations and local Community interest groups.

Details of the consultation undertaken for the Project will be presented in the environmental impact assessment documentation.
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