



Referral of a Proposal by the Proponent to the Environmental Protection Authority under Section 38(1) of the Environmental Protection Act 1986.

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 with 3 columns: Question, Yes, No. Rows include: Completed all the questions in Part A (essential), Completed all applicable questions in Part B, Included Attachment 1 – location maps, Included Attachment 2 – additional document(s) the proponent wishes to provide (if applicable), Included Attachment 3 – confidential information (if applicable), Enclosed an electronic copy of all referral information, including spatial data and contextual mapping but excluding confidential information.

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?	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Not sure
If yes, what level of assessment?	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Assessment on Proponent Information	<input type="checkbox"/> Public Environmental Review

PROPONENT DECLARATION (to be completed by the proponent)

I, WAYNE RODNEY ENNOR, (full name) declare that I am authorised on behalf of Sinosteel Midwest Corporation Ltd to submit this form and further declare that the information contained in this form is true and not misleading.

Signature 	Wayne Ennor
Environment and Approvals Manager	Sinosteel Midwest Corporation Ltd
30 August 2013	

PART A - PROPONENT AND PROPOSAL INFORMATION

(All fields of Part A must be completed for this document to be treated as a referral)

1 PROPONENT AND PROPOSAL INFORMATION

1.1 Proponent

Name	Sinosteel Midwest Corporation
Joint Venture parties (if applicable)	
Australian Company Number (if applicable)	009 224 800
Postal Address (where the proponent is a corporation or an association of persons, whether incorporated or not, the postal address is that of the principal place of business or of the principal office in the State)	7 Rheola Street West Perth WA 6005
Key proponent contact for the proposal: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• name• address• phone• email	Mr Wayne Ennor Sinosteel Midwest Corporation Rheola Street West Perth WA 6005 T: 08 9429 4888 D: 08 9429 4850 F: 08 9226 3388 E: wennor@smcl.com.au
Consultant for the proposal (if applicable): <ul style="list-style-type: none">• name• address• phone• email	Warren McGrath Eco Logical Australia Suite 1 & 2 49 Ord Street, West Perth, 6005 P: 08 9227 1070 Email: warrenm@ecoaus.com.au

1.2 Proposal

Title	Blue Hills Expansion Environmental Approvals
Description	Further expansion of the Blue Hills Project area involving the construction and operation of two new mine pits and waste rock dumps; one each at Mungada East and Mungada West. A new processing plant and additional road infrastructure will also be established. Refer to Chapter 2 of attached Environmental Review for a detailed description of the proposal.
Extent (area) of proposed ground disturbance.	63.9 ha
Timeframe in which the activity or development is proposed to occur (including start and finish dates where applicable).	Commencement in 2014 Project to run for six years
Details of any staging of the proposal.	There is no staging proposed.

Is the proposal a strategic proposal?	No
<p>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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • title of the strategic assessment; and • Ministerial Statement number. 	N/A
<p>Please indicate whether, and in what way, the proposal is related to other proposals in the region.</p>	<p>The proposal is an expansion of the Koolanooka/Blue Hills (Mungada) Direct Shipping Iron Ore Project (the DSO Project), which was approved in November 2009 by way of Ministerial Statement (MS) 811. The DSO Project involves the mining, crushing, screening of ore from three pits; one pit at the Koolanooka Iron Ore Mine (Koolanooka) and two pits (known as Mungada East and West, located on the Mungada Ridge landform) at the Blue Hills Iron Ore Mine (Blue Hills), as well as transport to the Geraldton Port. The proposal is for a new mine pit at Mungada East and a new mine pit at Mungada West and associated waste dump and other mine infrastructure.</p>
<p>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?</p>	<p>The land is leased by Sinosteel under Mining Leases M59/595 and M59/596, Miscellaneous Licence L59/62 and Prospecting Licence P59/1875.</p>
<p>What is the current land use on the property, and the extent (area in hectares) of the property?</p>	<p>The mining lease is located on Crown Land. The current land use is mining.</p> <p>Karara Station is located nearby and is approximately 109,291 ha in size and was formerly under pastoral lease, until the lease was acquired by the Department of Environmental and Conservation (DEC) for the purposes of conservation.</p> <p>The Station now forms a part of CALM Purchased Lease (CPL) 16 and is proposed for conservation. Farming and pastoral activities have now ceased.</p>

1.3 Location

Name of the Shire in which the proposal is located.	Shire of Perenjori
For urban areas: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •street address; •lot number; •suburb; and •nearest road intersection. 	
For remote localities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •nearest town; and • distance and direction from that town to the proposal site. 	Morawa 90 km west of Blue Hills Project Area
Electronic copy of spatial data - GIS or CAD, geo-referenced and conforming to the following parameters: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. 	Enclosed?: Yes. GIS data for the Proposal layout is included on the enclosed CD-ROM. GIS data for ecological information is available on request.

1.4 Confidential Information

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

1.5 Government Approvals

Is rezoning of any land required before the proposal can be implemented? If yes, please provide details.	No		
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.	Yes		
Agency/Authority	Approval required	Application lodged Yes / No	Agency/Local Authority contact(s) for proposal
Department of Mines and Petroleum	Mining Proposal	No	Daniel Endacott
Department of Environmental Regulation	Works Approval	No	Clint Joseph

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)?

The Proposal will require an additional 63.9 ha of clearing further to that required for the approved DSO Project. Efforts to avoid and minimise impact to Mungada Ridge have been undertaken, which has significantly reduced the extent of disturbance to the ridge that would have occurred with an optimal mining plan.

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?

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.

Recent vegetation and flora studies are referred to in Section 6.1 and appended to the attached Environmental Review document.

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.

Refer to Section 6.1 of attached Environmental Review.

Refer to Section 6.1 of attached Environmental Review.

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).

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

The condition of the vegetation ranges from large areas of intact and relatively undisturbed vegetation to confined areas of historical disturbance and degraded or completely degraded (along previous tracks and in small areas where historical mining related activities have taken place).

2.2 Fauna

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

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

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

2.2.2 Describe the nature and extent of the expected impact.

Refer to Section 6.2 of attached Environmental Review.

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.

Recent fauna studies are referred to in Section 6.2 and appended to the attached Environmental Review document.

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)

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.

Refer to Section 6.2 of attached Environmental Review.

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.

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.

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.

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)

Conservation Category Wetland	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Unsure
Environmental Protection (South West Agricultural Zone Wetlands) Policy 1998	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Unsure
Perth's Bush Forever site	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Unsure
Environmental Protection (Swan & Canning Rivers) Policy 1998	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Unsure
The management area as defined in s4(1) of the <i>Swan River Trust Act 1988</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> 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)	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> 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.

The proposal is located near Karara Station, which now forms a part of CALM Purchased Lease (CPL) 16 proposed for conservation.

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.

Populations of *Acacia woodmaniorum*, a listed Threatened species Declared Rare Flora — Extant) under the *Wildlife Conservation Act 1950* are found in the proposal area. The area covered by vegetation within 50 m of these populations, where the vegetation is continuous with the vegetation in which the species is found, is considered an Environmentally Sensitive Area.

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.

The proposal involved the establishment of a new mine pit and extension of haul road network on the Mungada Ridge, a Banded Ironstone Formation range landform in the Blue Hills that the EPA has previously has very recognised for its high environmental values.

2.5 Coastal Zone Areas (Coastal Dunes and Beaches)

2.5.1 Will the development occur within 300metres 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?

N/A

2.5.3 Will the development impact on coastal areas with significant landforms including beach ridge plain, cusped 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?

Yes

No

If yes, please describe the extent of the expected impact.

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?

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.

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)

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?

300 KL per year.

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

Existing groundwater bores used for current mining operation,

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.

Prescribed premise category no. 5 (Processing or beneficiation of metallic ore)

2.8.3 Will the proposal result in gaseous emissions to air?

Yes No **If yes**, please briefly describe.

Sources of gaseous emissions include exhaust from combustion of diesel fuel used in vessels, heavy and light vehicles and emissions from detonation of explosives used in blasting. These are not considered significant sources of air emissions in the local or regional context.

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.

2.8.5 Will the proposal result in liquid effluent discharge?

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

Sewage and grey water from the mine operations will be treated on-site using approved septic tank and leach drain systems as per existing operation.

Liquid effluent generated at the site includes oils and water from continued operation of existing workshops, which will be managed in accordance with relevant legislation.

Vehicles and mobile equipment will be washed down on a concrete surface that drains to a sump. Oils and sediments will be separated from the wash down water, prior to the water being re-used on site.

Hazardous waste and spilled hazardous materials will be removed from site by a licensed contractor for disposal in an approved facility in accordance with the requirements of the controlled waste regulations.

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.

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.

Types of solid waste generated by the Proposal will be as per the existing operation, which includes domestic waste, inert construction waste materials, recyclable products, organic debris including vegetation, general refuse including waste metal, cardboard and packaging, and inert waste including excess fill.

Waste will be segregated into general waste, recyclable wastes and hazardous waste.

As for the existing operation, no onsite waste disposal will be undertaken for the Proposal. Domestic and construction waste will be minimised through reuse and recycling where appropriate. General waste will be managed by a licensed Contractor and removed from site for disposal in the Morawa Shire or other approved landfill. Hazardous waste will be removed from site by a licensed contractor for disposal in an approved facility in accordance with the requirements of the controlled waste regulations.

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

Yes

No

If yes, please briefly describe.

Noise emissions will arise from continuous mining operations undertaken on a 24 hours a day basis. Noise sources include from fleet and machinery loading ore into mine trucks (using a hydraulic excavator and haul trucks). Ore is then loaded into the crushing plant by front end loaders and loaded back into trucks by front end loaders once processed, which all produce substantial noise emissions. There are no nearby residences or otherwise sensitive premises in proximity to the Proposal and hence these noise emissions are not considered significant.

Ore will continue to be transported from Blue Hills to the Koolanooka site via the upgraded existing Mt Karara/Mungada Haul Road and then along existing roads and heavy haulage routes to Geraldton Port.

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.

Noise modelling has not been undertaken for the Proposal as this aspect is not expected to be a significant issue due to this being a continuation of the existing operation and the lack of nearby sensitive premises.

The transport route follows gazetted roads as defined in the *Road Traffic Act 1974* therefore no noise amelioration is required. The noise from the heavy haulage trucks propulsion and braking systems will comply with the *EPA Draft Guidance Statement for EIA No 14 (Version 3) Road and Rail Transportation Noise*.

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".

There are no nearby residences or otherwise sensitive premises in proximity to the Proposal and hence air emissions and dust generation from mining activities are not considered significant and can be managed through implementation of the site environmental management plans.

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

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.

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

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.**

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.**

One registered Aboriginal 'Other Heritage Place' ID 24148 - Midwest Artefact Scatter 2, and one potential ethnographic site (BH11-14 Rockholes 2), occur within the Proposal area. These or any significant new sites identified during further ethnographic and archaeological survey will not be removed, damaged or altered without approval under Section 18 of 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.**

The ridges of Blue Hills area are natural scenic landforms that have high landscape, natural heritage, visual amenity and geo-heritage values. Efforts to avoid and minimise impact to the ridge have been undertaken which has significantly reduced the extent of disturbance to the Mungada Ridge that would have occurred with an optimal mining plan.

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.**

Ore will continue to be transported from Blue Hills to the Koolanooka site via the upgraded existing Mt Karara/Mungada Haul Road and then along existing roads and heavy haulage routes to Geraldton Port. This is not anticipated to affect the amenity of areas along this route.

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. | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| 2. The principle of intergenerational equity. | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| 3. The principle of the conservation of biological diversity and ecological integrity. | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| 4. Principles relating to improved valuation, pricing and incentive mechanisms. | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| 5. The principle of waste minimisation. | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No |

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

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.

Project briefings to the Office of the Environmental Protection Authority (OEPA), the Department of Mines and Petroleum and the Environmental Management Branch of the Department of Parks and Wildlife have been undertaken in regard to the nature of the Proposal and the management of potential impacts.

Sinosteel maintains communication with neighbouring mine operator, Karara Mining Ltd in regards to the existing operation and potential expansion.