

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AUTHORITY

---

**ENVIRONMENTAL SCOPING DOCUMENT**

<b>PROPOSAL:</b>	<b>East Rockingham Waste to Energy and Materials Recovery Facility (Assessment No. 1910)</b>
<b>LOCATION:</b>	<b>26 Office Road, Rockingham</b>
<b>LOCALITY:</b>	<b>City of Rockingham</b>
<b>PROPONENT:</b>	<b>New Energy Corporation Pty Ltd</b>
<b>LEVEL OF ASSESSMENT:</b>	<b>Public Environmental Review with a 6 week public review period</b>

This scoping document is provided for the preparation of the proponent's environmental review document (Public Environmental Review). The specific environmental factors to be addressed are identified in Section 2. The generic guidelines for the format of an environmental review document are provided in Attachment 2

**The environmental review document must adequately address all elements of this scoping document prior to approval being given to commence the public review.**

**The Environmental Protection Authority expects the proponent to fully consult with interested members of the public and relevant stakeholders and to take due care in ensuring any other relevant environmental factors, which may be of interest to the public and stakeholders, are addressed. The PER should document the results of all consultation undertaken.**

## **1. Introduction**

The *Environmental Protection Act 1986* (EP Act) sets out that where a proposal is considered to have a significant environmental impact it will be subject to an assessment by the Environmental Protection Authority (EPA) under section 38 of the EP Act. This proposal is being assessed because it raises significant environmental factors.

Where a proposal is subject to Public Environmental Review (PER), the proponent is required to produce a PER document in accordance with an approved Environmental Scoping Document (ESD). The purpose of the ESD is to:

- develop proposal-specific guidelines to direct the proponent on the key environmental issues for the proposal that should be addressed in preparing the PER document; and
- identify the necessary impact predictions required for the assessment of proposal, and the information on the environmental setting required to carry out the assessment.

The EPA has determined that it will prepare and issue the ESD outlining the scope and content of the PER in relation to this proposal.

The EPA, in its formulation of the ESD, undertakes consultation with the proponent regarding the details of the proposal, its environmental setting and the environmental surveys and investigations required and expected outcomes. In addition the EPA will consult with the relevant government agencies, including DMAs. The Office of the EPA (OEPA) provides services and facilities for the EPA. In many cases the OEPA will act as a facilitator for the EPA.

The proponent will then be required to prepare a PER document in accordance with the ESD. When the EPA is satisfied that the PER document has adequately addressed all of the environmental factors and studies identified in the ESD, the proponent will be required to release the document for a public review period normally between 4 and 12 weeks.

ESDs prepared by the EPA are not subject to a public review period. The ESD will be available on the EPA website ([www.epa.wa.gov.au](http://www.epa.wa.gov.au)) upon finalisation and should be included as an appendix in the PER document.

An important aspect of the environmental impact assessment process is the review by the public. The EPA requires public input into the possible environmental impacts of this proposal and its implementation. To facilitate adequate public input, the Public Environmental Review should be made available as widely as possible and at a reasonable cost.

## **2. Specific Guidelines for the Preparation of the Environmental Review**

### **2.1 The proposal**

The proposal is for a waste to energy facility situated in the Rockingham Industrial Zone, south of the Kwinana Industrial Area. The proposal would require the clearing of approximately 10 hectares of native vegetation.

The proposal would comprise of the following components:

- waste sorting facilities to separate incoming waste into waste streams that cannot be treated on site, recyclables, those requiring further processing, and those suitable for gasification;
- gasification units;
- syngas burner;
- boiler;
- steam turbine and generator system;
- one gas scrubbing system;
- a 30 m exhaust stack; and
- administration and support facilities.

The facility would receive construction and demolition, commercial and industrial wastes, residual municipal waste from Materials Recovery Facilities and Mechanical

## ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AUTHORITY

Biological Treatment plants, contaminated recyclables, and waste which meets the criteria for a Class III landfill according to the *Landfill Waste Classification and Waste Definitions 1996 (amended December 2009)*. Commercial and Industrial waste is solid waste arising from activities within commercial and industrial sites, including but not limited to offices, retail outlets, restaurants, factories and institutions and can include organic waste (e.g. food waste), paper and cardboard, wood, plastics, metals, and glass.

The following wastes would not be directed for gasification:

- solid wastes containing significant levels of heavy metals (the contaminant concentrations specified for metals in the Department of Environment and Conservation's Waste acceptance Guidelines for Class III landfills would be used as guidance for determining the acceptability of wastes containing metal contaminants;
- scheduled wastes such as PCBs and organochlorine wastes;
- asbestos;
- highly corrosive or toxic liquids or gases such as strong acids or chlorine or fluorine; and
- explosive materials.

The gas scrubbing system would consist of lime slurry in a spray dryer to remove acidic gases, followed by activated carbon injection to absorb residual metals and a fabric baghouse to capture lime and carbon particles or equivalent approved technology.

Wastes produced by the gasification process are bottom ash, residue from the gas scrubbing process and atmospheric emissions from the stack. Waste water would also be produced and would be recycled into the process, treated and used for irrigation, disposed of to local sewage disposal facilities or treated in an on-site treatment facility.

The electricity generated by the power station would be 15 MW with approximately 13.5 MW available for export to the grid. An existing transmission line would be used for export.

The project area is indicated in the attached plan (Attachment 1).

**Table 1 Characteristics Table**

Elements	Description
<b>Waste</b>	
for gasification	Municipal solid waste residuals, construction and demolition waste, commercial and industrial waste
for off-site disposal, recycling or reuse	Concrete, rubble, glass, sand, metals, batteries, gas bottles, solid wastes containing significant levels of heavy metals, scheduled wastes, asbestos, highly corrosive or toxic liquids, explosive materials
Total waste volume	Approximately 140 000 t/a
Life of plant	25 years (estimated)

## ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AUTHORITY

<b>Native vegetation clearing</b>	Approximately 10 ha including less than 1 ha of vegetation that may be associated with a Resource Enhancement category wetland
<b>Air emissions</b>	
Odour	Emissions that will not cause unreasonable interference with the health, welfare, convenience, comfort or amenity of any person
Particulates (TSP, PM <sub>10</sub> , PM <sub>2.5</sub> ) (preliminary estimation)	TSP: 4 mg/Nm <sup>3</sup> , 0.17 g/s PM <sub>10</sub> : 3.8 mg/Nm <sup>3</sup> , 0.16 g/s PM <sub>2.5</sub> : 1.8 mg/Nm <sup>3</sup> , 0.08 g/s
Oxides of nitrogen (preliminary estimation)	181 mg/Nm <sup>3</sup> , 7.79 g/s
Carbon monoxide (preliminary estimation)	23 mg/Nm <sup>3</sup> , 0.99 g/s
Volatile organic compounds expressed as benzene (preliminary estimation)	0.0069 mg/Nm <sup>3</sup> , 0.000297 g/s
Total heavy metals, includes Sb, As, Pb, Cr, Co, Cu, Mn, Ni, V. (preliminary estimation)	0.0395 mg/Nm <sup>3</sup> , 0.0017 g/s
Acid gases (preliminary estimation)	SO <sub>x</sub> : 37 mg/Nm <sup>3</sup> , 1.59 g/s HCl: 5.6 mg/Nm <sup>3</sup> , 0.21 g/s HF: 0.30 mg/Nm <sup>3</sup> , 0.013 g/s
Dioxins and Furans (I-TEQ) (preliminary estimation)	0.00000002 mg/Nm <sup>3</sup> , 8.6 x 10 <sup>-10</sup> g/s
Scrubbing system	Stage 1 :lime slurry in a spray dryer (or equivalent approved technology) to remove acidic gases Stage 2: activated carbon injection to absorb residual metals and a baghouse to capture lime and carbon particles (or equivalent approved technology)
Exhaust stack	30 m
<b>Water requirement</b>	Up to 100 000 kL/a from recycled water or scheme water
<b>Waste water</b>	
Boiler blowdown	Used in acid gas scrubbing system
Cleaning water	Injected in the gasifiers or treated and use in the gas scrubbing system or for irrigation
Sewage/grey water	Discharged to sewer
Stormwater	Reused or treated on-site and infiltrated
<b>Process wastes</b>	
Bottom ash	Disposed of to landfill or reused
Scrubbing system residues	Mixed with bottom ash or disposed to landfill as appropriate

### Abbreviations

t/a tonnes per annum  
kL/a kilolitres per annum  
Pb lead  
Cu copper  
V vanadium

ha hectares  
Sb antimony  
Cr chromium  
Mn manganese

m metres  
As arsenic  
Co cobalt  
Ni nickel

I-TEQ International Toxic Equivalent used to express the overall toxicity of mixtures of dioxins and furans as a single number.

## ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AUTHORITY

**2.2 Environmental factors and policy documents relevant to this proposal**

The PER should give a detailed assessment of each of the environmental factors identified for this proposal. At this preliminary stage, the EPA believes the relevant environmental factors, objectives and work required is as detailed below (see Table 2).

The EPA has identified a list of relevant policy documents (see Table 2) which set out how the EPA expects the environmental factors to be considered. The EPA expects that the treatment of environmental factors will be consistent with the approaches set out in these policy documents. The EPA also considers that the proponent should assess the proposal in a local and regional context and ensure that all cumulative impacts are addressed.

The proponent should demonstrate in the PER that best available technology would be implemented to prevent, control and abate emissions to an acceptable level or explain any deviations from best available technology. For toxic air emissions the proponent should demonstrate that these would be controlled to maximum extent achievable.

**Table 2: Environmental factors relevant to the proposal**

<i>Flora and fauna</i>	
<b>EPA objective</b>	To maintain the abundance, diversity, geographic distribution and productivity of flora and fauna at species and ecosystem levels through the avoidance or management of adverse impacts and improvement in knowledge.
<b>Potential Impacts</b>	The proposal involves the clearing of approximately 10 ha of native vegetation, including less than 1 ha of vegetation that may be associated with a Resource Enhancement category wetland.
<b>Work required</b>	Provide information on flora and fauna expected on the site from other appropriate surveys conducted in the region.  Consider cumulative impacts to conservation significant flora and fauna from other activities and approved projects in the area.  Describe feral animal and pest control measures.
<b>Relevant policy/guidance documents</b>	Position Statement 2 Environmental Protection of Native Vegetation in Western Australia.  Position Statement 3 Terrestrial Biological Surveys as an Element of Biodiversity Protection.  Guidance Statement No. 51 Terrestrial Flora and Vegetation Surveys for Environmental Impact Assessment in Western Australia June 2004.  Guidance Statement No. 56 Terrestrial Fauna Surveys for Environmental Impact Assessment in Western Australia June 2004.  Checklist for documents submitted for EIA on marine and terrestrial biodiversity.
<i>Water quality</i>	
<b>EPA objective</b>	To ensure that emissions do not adversely affect environment values or the health, welfare and amenity of people and land uses by meeting statutory requirements and acceptable standards and to maintain the quality and quantity of water so that existing and potential environmental values, including ecosystem maintenance, are protected.
<b>Potential</b>	The proposal is close to wetlands and is in a proclaimed groundwater area.

**ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AUTHORITY**

<b>Impacts</b>	Contamination of ground and surface water may occur from spills on site, drainage from waste storage or inappropriate management of wastewater. Groundwater would not be extracted for use in the proposal.
<b>Work required</b>	Describe the management measures proposed to prevent any drainage of contaminated water from the proposed site to the remainder of the wetland. Describe the volumes, quality, treatment and disposal options for wastewater generated on site. Describe management measures to prevent groundwater contamination. Describe measures to prevent mosquito-borne diseases including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Liaising with the City of Rockingham;</li> <li>• Preventing mosquito access and breeding in any water holding infrastructure; and</li> <li>• Educating staff on mosquito-borne diseases.</li> </ul> Describe proposed monitoring relevant to water quality.
<b>Relevant policy/guidance documents</b>	Australian and New Zealand Guidelines for Fresh and Marine Water Quality (ANZECC and ARMCANZ, 2000).
<b>Noise</b>	
<b>EPA objective</b>	To protect the amenity of nearby residents from noise impacts resulting from activities associated with the proposal by ensuring the noise levels meet statutory requirements and acceptable standards.
<b>Potential impacts</b>	Noise and cumulative noise may impact on the surrounding residential areas and public areas. Noise may impact on neighbouring industrial premises.
<b>Work required</b>	Undertake a detailed assessment as specified by the draft EPA Guidance Statement No. 8 and demonstrate that the noise from the proposal, can be managed to comply with the Noise Regulations at residential properties and at the boundary of the proposal site. Where cumulative noise exceeds the assigned levels, demonstrate that the proposal will not significantly contribute to the level of noise.
<b>Relevant policy/guidance documents</b>	Draft Guidance Statement No. 8 Environmental Noise May 2007. Environmental Protection (Noise) Regulations 1997.
<b>Air Quality</b>	
<b>EPA objective</b>	To ensure that emissions do not adversely affect environment values or the health, welfare and amenity of people and land uses by meeting statutory requirements and acceptable standards.
<b>Potential impacts</b>	Discharge of odour, particulates (PM <sub>10</sub> , PM <sub>2.5</sub> and nano-particles), oxides of nitrogen, carbon monoxide, volatile metals, acid gases, volatile organic compounds (VOCs), polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs), dioxins and furans may impact residential areas and neighbouring premises.
<b>Work required</b>	Consult with the Air Quality Management Branch, Department of Environment and Conservation regarding modelling required and methods for predicting concentrations and for monitoring. Identify all atmospheric emissions from all potential points of discharge from the proposal. Investigate the impact of odour on residential and neighbouring premises. For the purpose of establishing background pollutant levels to be used in cumulative modelling, both existing and future sources that have been approved by the EPA or Department of Environment and Conservation should be taken into account, where practicable. Where reliance is placed on historical data, modelling should contain a higher degree of conservatism and interannual variation of historical data should be

## ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AUTHORITY

	<p>taken into account.</p> <p>Establish the background levels for particulates (PM<sub>10</sub> &amp; PM<sub>2.5</sub>) and predict the levels of PM<sub>10</sub> and PM<sub>2.5</sub> at residential areas, including the impacts of existing and proposed facilities.</p> <p>Review published literature on nano-particles and discuss the findings in relation to this project.</p> <p>Establish the background levels of oxides of nitrogen and model the expected groundlevel concentrations under normal operation, worst case conditions and during commissioning from the proposal in isolation and cumulatively with other sources in the airshed (including the 3 power stations).</p> <p>Consider the implications of the project in relation to ambient ozone concentrations within the regional airshed.</p> <p>Estimate the background levels of carbon monoxide and model the expected groundlevel concentrations from the proposal in isolation and cumulatively with other sources in the airshed if it appears that the NEPM standard may be exceeded.</p> <p>Detail the expected emissions of metals, acid gases, organic compounds, dioxins and furans under normal operation, worst case conditions and during commissioning. Describe how the expected emissions were predicted. Substantiate the predictions with reference to data from a similar plant with similar scrubbing system and accepting comparable waste streams.</p> <p>Model groundlevel concentrations of particulates, metals, acid gases, organic compounds, dioxins and furans from the proposal and cumulatively with other existing and proposed sources in the area at residential and neighbouring premises under normal operation, worst case conditions and during commissioning, as necessary.</p> <p>Compare predicted emissions and groundlevel concentrations with appropriate standards.</p> <p>Detail pollution control equipment, including its removal efficiency and expected down time. Compare efficiencies of pollution control equipment with world best practice. Show that hazardous pollutants (like dioxins) would be controlled to the Maximum Extent Achievable (MEA) (EPA Guidance Statement 55).</p> <p>Consult with the Department of Health. Undertake a preliminary health risk assessment for people occupying public areas, residential areas and neighbouring industrial premises.</p> <p>Consider the impact of deposition of toxic and/or bio-accumulating air emissions over the life of the proposal, including deposition into Cockburn Sound.</p> <p>Describe the proposed management, monitoring and validation of predictions for all air emissions.</p> <p>Describe contingency plans should the predicted results not be achieved.</p>
<p><b>Relevant policy/guidance documents</b></p>	<p>Odour Methodology Guideline, Department of Environmental Protection, Perth, Western Australia March 2002.</p> <p>Air Quality Modelling Guidance Notes, Department of Environment, March 2006.</p> <p>EPA Guidance Statement No. 55 Implementing Best Practice in proposals submitted to the Environmental Impact Assessment process, December 2003.</p> <p>European Directives 2000/76/EC and 2001/80/EC on the incineration of waste.</p> <p>National Environment Protection Measure standards and goals.</p> <p>World Health Organisation Air Quality and Health guidelines.</p> <p>A guideline for managing the impacts of dust and associated contaminants from land development sites, contaminated sites remediation and other related activities, Department of Environment and Conservation, March 2011.</p>

## ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AUTHORITY

Greenhouse gas emissions	
<b>EPA objective</b>	To minimise emissions to levels as low as practicable on an on-going basis and consider offsets to further reduce cumulative emissions.
<b>Potential impacts</b>	The proposal is expected to emit approximately 100 000 tpa of greenhouse gases.
<b>Work required</b>	<p>Describe measures undertaken to minimise greenhouse gas emissions from the proposal.</p> <p>Benchmark greenhouse gas emissions intensity of the project against comparable projects and demonstrates performance which is equal to, or better than, best practice.</p> <p>Provide robust data on net greenhouse gas emission reductions resulting from the project (including assumptions on which this estimate is based).</p> <p>Consider ongoing improvements in energy efficiency and conservation.</p>
<b>Relevant policy/guidance documents</b>	Guidance Statement No. 12 for Minimising Greenhouse Gas Emissions October 2002.
Waste	
<b>EPA objective</b>	Ensure that waste management addresses the waste hierarchy and that the disposal of waste does not impact human health, water quality or ecological systems.
<b>Potential impacts</b>	Incorrect storage and handling of waste on-site may lead to odour, groundwater and surface water contamination and ecological impacts. Incorrect disposal of wastes not suitable for gasification and process wastes may have additional environmental impacts.
<b>Work required</b>	<p>Describe how the proposal would meet the waste hierarchy of waste avoidance, recovery and safe disposal.</p> <p>Compare the environmental risks and benefits of the existing disposal method (landfill) with the proposed technology on a lifecycle basis.</p> <p>Provide detail on the composition of the proposed feedstock(s) identified by the proponent and any other potentially suitable feedstocks (see reference documents).</p> <p>Provide indicative estimates for waste composition for possible heterogeneous feedstocks using previously released waste studies (see reference documents).</p> <p>Describe the acceptance criteria and quality control for waste accepted at the site.</p> <p>Describe the acceptance criteria for feed to the gasifier.</p> <p>Describe the monitoring of feedstock for the gasifier to ensure suitable quality for gasification.</p> <p>Describe the management of waste on site, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the handling of hazardous materials during sorting;</li> <li>• procedures for the identification, segregation and disposal of all hazardous materials; and</li> <li>• procedures for waste material not accepted for gasification being moved off site for disposal.</li> </ul> <p>Describe how solid and liquid wastes generated by the proposal will be managed, tested and appropriately disposed of, including leaching tests of bottom ash.</p>
<b>Relevant policy/guidance documents</b>	<p>Waste Strategy for Western Australia, Waste Authority, March 2012.</p> <p>Landfill Waste Classification and Waste Definitions 1996 (As amended December 2009) Department Of Environment And Conservation, Western Australia.</p> <p>European Commission (2006). Reference Document on the Best Available Techniques for Waste Incineration. European Commission.</p> <p>URL ( <a href="ftp://ftp.jrc.es/pub/eippcb/doc/wi_bref_0806.pdf">ftp://ftp.jrc.es/pub/eippcb/doc/wi_bref_0806.pdf</a> )</p>



## ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AUTHORITY

European Commission (2011). Guidelines on the Interpretation of the R1 Energy Efficiency Formula for Incineration Facilities dedicated to the Processing of Municipal Solid Waste According to ANNEX II of Directive 2008/98/EC on Waste. European Commission.

URL ( <http://ec.europa.eu/environment/waste/framework/pdf/guidance.pdf> )

European Commission (2009). Reference Document on Best Available Techniques for Energy Efficiency. European Commission.

URL ( [http://eippcb.jrc.es/reference/BREF/ENE\\_Adopted\\_02-2009.pdf](http://eippcb.jrc.es/reference/BREF/ENE_Adopted_02-2009.pdf) )

Snilsberg B., Jonassen L and Sandvik K. (2004). Deliverable19: Status of thermal treatment and methods for evaluation of process efficiency in the participating countries. European Commission.

URL ( <http://doc.utwente.nl/32032/1/t0000006.pdf> )

Department of Climate Change. (2009). Technical Guidelines for the estimation of greenhouse gas emissions by facilities in Australia. Department of Climate Change, Australian Government, Canberra.

URL ( <http://www.climatechange.gov.au/government/initiatives/national-greenhouse-energy-reporting/~media/publications/greenhouse-report/nger-measurement-technical-2009.ashx> )

(Note: Chapter 5 deals specifically with waste and Chapter 5, section 5 with incineration)

Nolan ITU & TBU Environmental Engineering. (2001). Guideline for the Determining the Renewable Components in Waste for Electricity Generation. Office of Renewable Energy Regulator, Australian Government, Canberra.

URL ( [www.orer.gov.au/publications/pubs/wasteelectricitygen-jan04.pdf](http://www.orer.gov.au/publications/pubs/wasteelectricitygen-jan04.pdf) )

### *Material Recovery Facility residuals:*

APC Environmental Management. (2009). MRF Residual Waste Audit. ACT NOWaste.

URL ( [www.tams.act.gov.au/\\_data/assets/pdf\\_file/0006/220497/MRF\\_Residual\\_final.pdf](http://www.tams.act.gov.au/_data/assets/pdf_file/0006/220497/MRF_Residual_final.pdf) )

APC Environmental Management. (2007). Audit of Hume MRF Residual. Thiess Services and ACT NOWaste.

URL ( [www.tams.act.gov.au/\\_data/assets/pdf\\_file/0011/136748/Report\\_1\\_Hume\\_MRF\\_Residual\\_2007.pdf](http://www.tams.act.gov.au/_data/assets/pdf_file/0011/136748/Report_1_Hume_MRF_Residual_2007.pdf) )

APrince Consulting Environmental Management. (2007). Audit of Hume MRF Residual. ACT NOWaste. URL

( [www.tams.act.gov.au/\\_data/assets/pdf\\_file/0003/136920/Report\\_3\\_Hume\\_MRF\\_Residual\\_2005.pdf](http://www.tams.act.gov.au/_data/assets/pdf_file/0003/136920/Report_3_Hume_MRF_Residual_2005.pdf) )

### *Construction and Demolition Waste:*

NSW Department of Environment and Climate Change. (2007). Report into the Construction and Demolition Waste Stream Audit 2000-2005 Sydney Metropolitan Area – Part 2: Appendices A-E, Charts and Tables. Department of Environment and Climate Change NSW.

URL

( [http://www.environment.nsw.gov.au/resources/warr/2007320\\_consDEMOWaste\\_2.pdf](http://www.environment.nsw.gov.au/resources/warr/2007320_consDEMOWaste_2.pdf) )

NSW Department of Environment and Climate Change. (2007). Report into the Construction and Demolition Waste Stream Audit 2000-2005 Sydney Metropolitan Area – Part 1: Appendices A-E, Charts and Tables. Department of Environment and Climate Change NSW.

URL

( [http://www.environment.nsw.gov.au/resources/warr/2007320\\_consDEMOWaste\\_2.pdf](http://www.environment.nsw.gov.au/resources/warr/2007320_consDEMOWaste_2.pdf) )

### *Commercial and Industrial Waste:*

NSW Department of Environment, Climate Change and Water. (2010). Disposal based survey of the commercial and industrial waste stream in Sydney. NSW Department of Environment, Climate Change and Water.

## ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AUTHORITY

---

	<p>URL (<a href="http://www.environment.nsw.gov.au/resources/warr/105WasteSurveypt1.pdf">http://www.environment.nsw.gov.au/resources/warr/105WasteSurveypt1.pdf</a> )</p> <p>NSW Department of Environment, Climate Change and Water. (2010). Disposal based survey of the commercial and industrial waste stream in Sydney - Appendices. NSW Department of Environment, Climate Change and Water. URL(<a href="http://www.environment.nsw.gov.au/resources/warr/105WasteSurveyappend.pdf">http://www.environment.nsw.gov.au/resources/warr/105WasteSurveyappend.pdf</a> )</p> <p><i>Auto Shredder Residue:</i> GHK / BIOIS. (2006). A study to examine the benefits of the End of Life Vehicles Directive- Annex 4. European Commission. URL ( <a href="http://ec.europa.eu/environment/waste/pdf/study/annex4.pdf">http://ec.europa.eu/environment/waste/pdf/study/annex4.pdf</a> )</p>
--	---

These factors must be addressed within the environmental review document for the public to consider and make comment to the EPA. The EPA anticipates addressing these factors in its report to the Minister for the Environment.

### 2.3 Other Environmental Issues

The EPA expects the proponent to take due care in ensuring all other relevant environmental impacts which may be of interest to the public are addressed and that management is covered in the environmental review.

The EPA has identified other environmental factors which it considers to be relevant to the proposal which are considered to be significant enough to warrant attention as part of the environmental review of this proposal to the extent that the PER should show how these factors will be managed. These include but are not limited to the following;

- artificial light pollution.

This list is provided to assist with the preparation of the Environmental Review document, but during the course of the preparation of the document other factors may be found also to be relevant, and they should be included in the detailed discussion.

### 2.4 Agreed Assessment Milestones

EPA Environmental Assessment Guideline No. 6 "Timelines for EIA of Proposals" addresses the responsibilities proponents and EPA for achieving timely and effective assessment of proposals.

This timeline (Table 3) is agreed between the EPA and proponent. Proponents are expected to meet the agreed proposal assessment timeline, and in doing so, provide adequate, quality information to inform the assessment. Proponents will need to allocate sufficient time to undertake the necessary studies to the appropriate standard and incorporate the outcomes of the studies into the PER.

Where an agreed timeline is not being met by the proponent, or if adequate information is not submitted by the proponent, the timeline for subsequent steps will be re-established. Where the OEPA is unable to meet a date in the agreed timelines the proponent will be advised and the timeline adjusted.

## ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AUTHORITY

---

The EPA will report to the Minister for Environment on whether the agreed proposal assessment timeline has been met. Where the timeline has not been met, the reasons for this will be identified.

**Table 3: Agreed Milestones for the proposal**

<b>Key Stage of Proposal</b>	<b>Agreed Milestone</b>
<b>EPA approval of ESD Document</b>	<b>23 March 2012</b>
<b>Proponent submits first adequate draft of PER Document</b>	<b>23 April 2012</b>
<b>OEPA provides comment on first draft PER Document</b>	<b>6 weeks</b> <b>5 June 2012</b>
<b>Proponent submits adequate revised draft PER Document</b>	<b>(2 weeks)</b> <b>18 June 2012</b>
<b>EPA authorises release of PER Document</b>	<b>2 weeks</b> <b>2 July 2012</b>
<b>Proponent releases approved PER Document</b>	<b>9 July 2012</b>
<b>Public Review of PER Document</b>	<b>6 weeks</b> <b>20 August 2012</b>
<b>Response to Public Submissions</b>	<b>(4 Weeks)</b> <b>17 September 2012</b>
<b>OEPA assesses proposal for consideration by EPA</b>	<b>7 weeks</b> <b>5 November 2012</b>
<b>Preparation and finalisation of EPA Report (including 2 weeks consultation on draft conditions with proponent and key Government agencies)</b>	<b>5 weeks from receipt of final information</b> <b>10 December 2012</b>

## 2.5 Decision Making Authorities

At this preliminary stage, the Environmental Protection Authority (EPA) had identified the following Decision Making Authorities (DMAs) (see Table 4). These Decision Making Authorities are constrained from making any decision that could have the effect of causing or allowing the proposal to be implemented. Throughout the assessment process further DMAs may be identified.

**Table 4: Nominated Decision Making Authorities**

Decision Making Authority	Relevant Legislation
Department of Environment and Conservation	Part V of the <i>Environmental Protection Act 1986</i>
Department of Health	<i>Health Act 1911</i>
Department of Mines and Petroleum	<i>Dangerous Goods Safety Act 2004</i>
City of Rockingham	Development approval

DMAs are not prevented from parallel processing, up to the point of their decision, so that their views can inform the ministerial consultation process.

## 2.6 Preparation of the Environmental Review Document

The recommended format for the Environmental Review document is enclosed as Attachment 2.

When the EPA is satisfied with the standard of the environmental review document (see EAG 6 Section 4.3) it will provide a written sign-off, giving approval to advertise the document for public review. The review document may not be advertised for release before written approval is received.

The proponent is responsible for advertising the release and availability of the Public Environmental Review (PER) in accordance with the guidelines which will be issued to the proponent by the OEPA. The EPA must be consulted on the timing and details for advertising the document.