



Environmental Protection Authority

Environmental Protection Act 1986

Section 40(2)(a)

NOTICE REQUIRING INFORMATION FOR ASSESSMENT

PERSON TO WHOM THIS NOTICE IS GIVEN

Electrostate Malinda Pty Ltd (Australian Company Number: 610 194 977)
Level 2, 18 Richardson Street
WEST PERTH WA 6005

PROPOSAL TO WHICH THIS NOTICE RELATES:

Yinnetharra Lithium Project
Application No. APP-0035099
Assessment No. 2600

Pursuant to section 40(2)(a) of the *Environmental Protection Act 1986*, I, as a delegate of the Environmental Protection Authority (EPA), require that you provide the EPA with the following information for its assessment, with additional detail provided in the attached comments sheet (Attachment 1).

1. General

The referral package includes documents that are inconsistent with EPA guidance and contains inconsistencies and contradicting information in places. In addition, supporting documents include proposal elements that are not identified in the Proposal Content Document (PCD).

As outlined in the EPA's [Instructions and template: How to identify the content of a proposal](#), the PCD must include all proposal elements, and physical elements must be defined or shown on a figure or map.

It is important to note that the proposal content cannot be identified in other information (such as supplementary reports) provided at or during the referral or assessment stage. To change a proposal during assessment, an application under section 43A of the *Environmental Protection Act 1986* (EP Act) is required.

2. Flora and Vegetation

The baseline environmental values and the risk of impacts to conservation significant flora and vegetation are not well understood due to survey limitations. Further information and/or investigations completed in accordance with [EPA Technical](#)

[Guidance - Flora and Vegetation survey](#) is required to assess the extent of potential impacts.

3. Terrestrial Fauna

Additional information and/or further investigation is required to fully understand the baseline environmental values and extent of potential direct, indirect and cumulative impacts to conservation significant fauna.

4. Subterranean Fauna

The proposal includes activities that may directly and/or indirectly impact subterranean fauna and their habitats. Consideration of subterranean fauna in the environmental impact assessment process in accordance with the EPA's [Environmental Factor Guideline - Subterranean Fauna](#) is required.

A complete understanding of subterranean fauna environmental values related to the whole proposal is not known. Targeted surveys are required to be conducted in accordance with [Technical Guidance - Subterranean fauna surveys for EIA](#). Final proposal design details should be considered, and hydrogeological studies are to be completed to determine the extent of potential direct, indirect and cumulative impacts to subterranean fauna.

5. Terrestrial Environmental Quality

Consideration of terrestrial environmental quality in the environmental impact assessment process is required, with further information and investigations completed in accordance with the EPA's [Guideline -Terrestrial Environmental Quality](#) to inform the EPA's assessment.

6. Inland Waters

There is uncertainty regarding surface water and groundwater connectivity within the proposed development envelope. Further information is required to conceptualise the hydrological and hydrogeological regimes to identify and mitigate potential impacts to surface water and groundwater features within and downstream of the proposal.

7. Greenhouse Gas Emissions

The estimated Scope 1 Greenhouse Gas Emissions and emissions intensities for the proposal are expected to be higher than the best practice emissions intensities and most of the other projects that the proposal has been compared against. Further information is required to demonstrate that Scope 1 emissions have been minimised as far as practicable.

8. Social Surroundings

Potential direct and indirect impacts to Aboriginal cultural heritage is not fully understood with Aboriginal heritage surveys and consultation with the Yingarrda Aboriginal Corporation and Wajari Yamaji Aboriginal Corporation ongoing. Targeted information is required to be provided in accordance with the EPA's [Technical Guidance EIA of Social Surroundings - Aboriginal Cultural Heritage](#).

The stakeholder engagement register does not detail outcomes from consultation with all stakeholders. The outcomes from consultation are required to demonstrate reasonable steps were taken to consult with those who are likely to be significantly affected through implementation of the proposal.

The tailings characterisation study classifies tailings from the proposal as hazardous based on the concentration of respirable crystalline silica present. An assessment of the potential impacts on human health is required to consider sensitive receptors (for example, accommodation villages/camps and Aboriginal cultural heritage sites accessed for cultural use).

9. All environmental factors

The EPA requires that an Environmental Review Document (ERD) be submitted, incorporating the additional information outlined above and in Attachment 1. The ERD is to be prepared consistent with the requirements of [Environmental Impact Assessment Practice Guide Assessment of Proposals in Western Australia under Part IV of the Environmental Protection Act 1986](#) and the [Instructions on how to prepare an Environmental Review Document](#).

Please advise by **6 July 2026** when a response to this Notice might be provided.

Response should be sent via the Environment Online Portal where possible, by responding to the Request For Information (RFI) task in which this letter was received. Alternatively, by email to EOsupport@dwer.wa.gov.au quoting the RFI number RFI-0001341 in the subject line, or by post to the Environmental Protection Authority, Locked Bag 10, Joondalup DC, Perth WA 6919. Please quote the RFI number RFI-0001341 on any further correspondence.

The EPA will not proceed with its assessment of the proposal until you have provided the requested information, and it is considered to be adequate, or if you advise the EPA that the further information is not available and/or cannot be obtained.

Yours sincerely



Darren Walsh
CHAIR

10 June 2026

Att 1: Document Review and Comments Sheet

Attachment 1: Document Review and Comments Sheet

Environmental Factor	Comment	Request for Information
Flora and Vegetation	<p>Appendix 1 identifies limitations to the survey adequacy, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Below-average rainfall preceding one or more of the surveys. • Constrained intensity and completeness of the surveys due to limited access with vegetation type and condition mapping inferred and extrapolated from aerial imagery. • No prior surveys within the area. • The proportion of specimens that could not be identified due to poor material and/or lack of diagnostic characteristics is high (37%). • The report concludes, additional populations of significant flora species could be identified through subsequent targeted surveys. <p>The Referral Supporting Document (RSD) also states, “<i>The distribution and abundance of Priority Flora species are considered approximate</i>” (Section 5.4.2.1).</p>	<p>Provide maps that clearly identify the areas that were surveyed and the areas that were inferred and extrapolated from aerial imagery.</p> <p>Undertake further assessment of the likelihood of occurrence, undertake additional flora and vegetation surveys in unsurveyed areas (particularly for vegetation units that support priority flora species (including P4) within the development envelope (DE), implement an exclusion zone in unsurveyed areas, or provide justification if these are not required.</p>
	<p>Statements made regarding distribution and ranges require evidence to substantiate the impact assessment. For example, the RSD states the implementation of the proposal would clear 97.52% of the local population of <i>Isotropis forrestii</i> (P1) and determines the species’ occurrence range extends beyond the survey area, has broad distribution range and is not geographically restricted to the local area</p>	<p>Identify and describe the flora species identified by the studies and surveys. Describe the significant flora and provide an analysis of local and regional context, (refer to the Environmental Factor Guideline - Flora and Vegetation for definition of significant flora).</p> <p>Provide maps showing the recorded locations of significant flora in relation to the proposal and species distribution.</p>

Environmental Factor	Comment	Request for Information
	<p>near the DE and therefore the impact is not considered significant.</p>	<p>Undertake further surveys/investigations to verify the statements made.</p> <p>Identify and describe the vegetation present in the study area.</p> <p>Describe significant vegetation and provide an analysis of local and regional context (refer to the Environmental Factor Guideline - Flora and Vegetation for definition of significant vegetation).</p> <p>Provide maps showing the extent of all vegetation, and significant vegetation, in the study area, the DE, direct and indirect impact areas, and in the local and regional contexts.</p>
	<p>The information provided in the RSD doesn't describe and/or quantify all impacts to flora and vegetation.</p> <p>An indicative disturbance footprint is proposed that allows flexibility within the DE, although detail related to the potential impacts within the entire DE is not provided. In addition, the proposal design is preliminary, with information related to some proposal elements absent.</p> <p>Impacts related to changes in hydrological regimes are not discussed as an indirect impact to flora and vegetation and there is no cumulative impact assessment provided (for any of the preliminary environmental factors). Refer to the EPA's guideline for Cumulative Impact Assessment and see further comments below under 'General'.</p>	<p>Describe and quantify the extent of potential direct, indirect and cumulative impacts, including percentages, to all vegetation and significant flora and vegetation that may occur following implementation of the proposal during both construction and operations, in a local and regional context.</p> <p>Provide tables with quantitative assessments of impact:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. For significant flora, this includes: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. number of individuals and populations in a local and regional context ii. numbers and proportions of individuals and populations directly or potentially indirectly impacted, and iii. numbers/proportions/populations currently protected within the conservation estate (where known). b. For all vegetation units (noting threatened and priority ecological communities and significant vegetation) this includes: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. area (in hectares) and proportions directly or potentially indirectly impacted, and ii. proportions/hectares of the vegetation unit currently protected within conservation estate (where known).

Environmental Factor	Comment	Request for Information
	<p>Mitigation</p> <p>The executive summary identifies the implementation of 'exclusions zones'. However, there is only one identified exclusion zone.</p> <p>An Exclusion Zone is identified in the PCD, although it is not clear if this exclusion zone would protect environmental values from indirect impacts or if there are any access limitations to the area (for example, if access is required for cultural reasons or monitoring works).</p>	<p>Provide detail of the environmental values within the exclusion zone/s.</p> <p>For example, include proportions/area in hectares of significant vegetation units; quantify the number of plants of the species (for example, <i>Acacia Curryana</i> (P1), <i>Isotropis forrestii</i> (P1) and/or <i>Dodonaea amplisemina</i> (P4)) that occur within the exclusion zone rather than stating 'a significant number'.</p> <p>Consider options to avoid impacts to P4 species. Also note, the red/pink symbology in Figure 5-2 does not allow the species to be easily determined from the figure.</p> <p>Provide maps with symbology that is easily distinguishable.</p> <p>Discuss if the environmental values within the exclusion zone may potentially be impacted by indirect impacts. For example, changes in hydrological regimes.</p> <p>Define the exclusion zone/s in terms of access for cultural reasons or monitoring works and clarify if there are any access restrictions to the exclusion zone/s.</p>
	<p>Rehabilitation</p> <p>"Progressive rehabilitation to restore natural ecosystems" is identified in Table 3-1 of the RSD and is also stated as a measure to minimise potential impacts to significant flora and vegetation.</p> <p>There are no details provided regarding how progressive rehabilitation would occur. For example, what seed bank would be used, what types and volumes of rehabilitation materials are available and where they would be sited, what trials would occur, reference sites to be used, or requirements for monitoring of rehabilitation for success.</p>	<p>In accordance with the EPA's Instructions - How to prepare an ERD refer to the information requirements under 'Rehabilitate'.</p> <p>Discuss the proposed approach to rehabilitation and waste rock landform (WRL) / integrated waste landform (IWL) design, including the identification of relevant stakeholders involved.</p> <p>See also Terrestrial Environmental Quality (TEQ) regarding further detail required.</p>

Environmental Factor	Comment	Request for Information
Terrestrial Fauna	<p>Survey adequacy</p> <p>Appendix 12 – Aquatic Ecology Assessment was rejected by the Index of Surveys for Assessments (ISA) due to spatial data inadequacies. In addition, the RSD only shows two sampling sites within the DE that are not located within identified watercourse lines. The results from the survey may not adequately represent the aquatic fauna assemblage within the DE.</p> <p>Two aquatic macroinvertebrate fauna species were recorded adjacent to the DE. The presence of these species in the greater landscape has not been verified, and <i>Ozestheria</i> cf. <i>packardi</i> lineage Q has not previously been identified outside New South Wales.</p> <p>Section 5 of Appendix 6 provides a peer review of the Stantec (2024) Vertebrate and Invertebrate Fauna Survey and identifies inadequacies related to survey methodology in addition to issues with habitat mapping. Habitat mapping provided in the RSD is based on the information from Stantec (2024).</p> <p>The following issues were identified in the peer review:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Avifauna observation and methodology is not adequate. • Mapping of major and minor drainage lines as fauna habitats excluded many of the smaller drainage lines, potentially not mapping critical habitat for Southern Whiteface. • Labelling of fauna habitat types was based on a mix of geographical and geological features with those based on vegetation and relief, but the detailed 	<p>Update the ISA submission ISA-0001322 with adequate spatial data.</p> <p>Justify the sampling effort for aquatic fauna within the DE.</p> <p>Provide maps that clearly identify the areas that were surveyed and the areas that were inferred and extrapolated from aerial imagery.</p> <p>Provide a map of the survey effort applied in relation to the study area, terrestrial fauna habitats, and DE, identifying the direct and indirect impact areas.</p> <p>Provide evidence to substantiate the impact assessment for SRE species and species that have only been identified within the DE.</p> <p>Update the fauna habitat mapping based on fixing the inadequacies identified in the peer review by Terrestrial Ecosystems (2026) or justify the use of the Stantec (2024) fauna habitat mapping.</p> <p>Provide further information, undertake further assessment of the likelihood of occurrence, and if required undertake additional terrestrial fauna surveys in unsurveyed areas, implement an exclusion zone in unsurveyed areas, or provide justification if these are not required.</p>

Environmental Factor	Comment	Request for Information
	<p>descriptions provide information on geographical and vegetation for each habitat type.</p> <p>Statements made regarding Short Range Endemic (SRE) species distribution and ranges not being restricted requires evidence to substantiate the impact assessment.</p>	
	<p>Fauna habitat and fauna assemblages</p>	<p>Identify and describe the terrestrial fauna habitats identified by the studies and surveys. Noting the inadequacies of the fauna habitat mapping conducted by Stantec (2024) as identified by Terrestrial Ecosystems (2026) in Appendix 6).</p> <p>Describe significant fauna habitats, including but not limited to: SRE invertebrate microhabitats, refugia, breeding areas, key foraging habitat, movement corridors and linkages, (refer to the Environmental Factor Guideline - Terrestrial Fauna for definition of significant fauna habitat).</p> <p>Describe life histories of aquatic and semi-aquatic/riparian fauna relevant to hydrological regimes (i.e. ecological water requirements, or the characteristics of critical habitats and related connectivity), including location of aquatic refuge habitats during the dry season.</p> <p>Provide maps showing the extent of terrestrial fauna habitats in relation to the proposal and species distributions.</p> <p>Identify and describe the fauna assemblages present and likely to be present within the development envelope that may be impacted by the proposal.</p> <p>Identify significant or restricted fauna and describe in detail their known ecology, likelihood of occurrence, habitats and known threats, (refer to the Environmental Factor Guideline - Terrestrial Fauna for definition of significant fauna habitat).</p>

Environmental Factor	Comment	Request for Information
		Map the locations of significant/restricted fauna records in relation to the terrestrial fauna habitats, the study area, the development envelope, and direct and indirect impact areas.
	<p>The information provided in the RSD does not describe and/or quantify all impacts to terrestrial fauna.</p> <p>Note, the indirect impacts due to altered hydrological regimes does not consider dewatering or proposed groundwater abstraction and there is no cumulative impact assessment.</p>	Describe and quantify the extent of potential direct, indirect and cumulative impacts, including percentages, to habitats and significant species that may occur following implementation of the proposal during both construction and operations, in a local and regional context.
	<p>Appendix 6 provides contradictory information regarding Southern Whiteface. The report identifies Southern Whiteface moves readily into surrounding areas with little to no consequence for clearing. However, also states, '<i>Little is known about the movement behaviour and activity/foraging area of Southern Whiteface in Western Australia</i>'.</p> <p>A recommendation from the report includes, '<i>Better quantification of the extent, distance, and frequency with which Southern Whiteface shifts its activity areas would be useful for determining potential future impacts</i>'.</p> <p>Determining potential impacts of the current proposal should not be based on lack of evidence.</p> <p>The RSD includes reference to the Department of Climate Change, Energy, the Environment and Water (DCCEEW) recommended mitigation measures for Southern Whiteface to focus on avoiding clearing of suitable habitat (Section 6.4.3.1). However, the proposal would clear suitable habitat for Southern Whiteface.</p>	<p>Update the Southern Whiteface impact assessment based on scientific data and facts.</p> <p>Explain how clearing of suitable habitat for Southern Whiteface meets the recommended mitigation measures.</p> <p>Assess the risk of not referring the proposal under the <i>Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999</i> (EPBC Act), given Southern Whiteface is a Matter of National Environment Significance (MNES).</p>

Environmental Factor	Comment	Request for Information
	<p>Appendix 4 Table C1 provides justification of the unlikely presence of <i>Pezoporus occidentalis</i> (Night Parrot) based on outdated information and not the recommended guideline for considering night parrot presence and habitat usage (Department of Biodiversity, Conservation and Attractions [DBCA], 2024) (Threatened and priority fauna resources Department of Biodiversity, Conservation and Attractions).</p> <p>“The dominant vegetation type within the Survey Area comprised <i>Acacia xiphophylla</i> over <i>Acacia synchronicia</i>, <i>Senna</i> sp. Meekatharra (E. Bailey 1-26) and <i>Eremophila cuneifolia</i> open shrubland over <i>Sclerolaena densiflora</i> scattered herbs (AxAsSmEcuSd), accounting for 1,297.69 ha (11.57% of the Survey Area)”, (Stantec 2024: Exec Summary and page 53 of RSD).</p>	<p>Compare the identified flora and vegetation from the studies with the Night Parrot potential habitat usage in accordance with the most recent DBCA information and guidelines.</p> <p>Provide an assessment based on the most recent DBCA information and guidelines (see DBCA - Night Parrot - Threatened and priority fauna resources).</p>
Subterranean Fauna	<p>Subterranean fauna taxonomic groups were recorded within a survey area for the proposed pits and immediately adjacent areas but were not identified as occurring outside of the surveyed area.</p> <p>There is limited information provided in the RSD for subterranean fauna and critical habitats, in addition to limited hydrogeological information or information to define population extent and distribution or characterise the full extent of supporting habitats.</p>	<p>Consider subterranean fauna in the environmental impact assessment process in accordance with the EPA’s Environmental Factor Guideline - Subterranean-Fauna.</p>
	<p>The report relied upon for the impact assessment related to subterranean fauna (Bestolias Consulting, 2024 (Appendix 3) states:</p>	<p>In accordance with the EPA’s Technical Guidance - Subterranean fauna surveys for EIA, a detailed survey includes sampling inside</p>

Environmental Factor	Comment	Request for Information
	<p><i>“This report does not provide a formal environmental impact assessment (EIA) because the full extent of the proposed footprint has not yet been finalised, plus additional exploration drilling of neighbouring prospects that is currently ongoing have not yet been assessed for subterranean fauna.”</i></p>	<p>and outside the impact areas that may be directly or indirectly impacted.</p> <p>Conduct targeted surveys for significant or restricted fauna or unsurveyed areas that may be impacted.</p> <p>Provide a map of the survey effort applied in relation to the study area, subterranean fauna habitats, and DE, identifying the direct and indirect impact areas.</p> <p>Provide an impact assessment based on the final proposal design and information from additional targeted surveys and exploration drilling of neighbouring prospects and associated subterranean fauna investigations.</p>
	<p>The survey area for the Bestolias (2024) report does not cover the entire DE and focuses on the impacts to subterranean fauna in relation to the location of the proposed pits. The information provided in the RSD identifies habitats considered to host subterranean fauna assemblages with no extensive studies completed in the area.</p> <p><i>“Within the Gascoyne bioregion, the palaeodrainage channel calcrete habitats, as well as associated alluvial and colluvial aquifer systems, are considered to host diverse stygofauna and troglifauna assemblages, however, these have not yet been as extensively studied as many Pilbara and Yilgarn subterranean fauna assemblages.”</i> (Bestolias, 2024: Appendix 3).</p> <p><i>“Studies of the Gifford Creek stygofauna PEC found that most of the recorded stygofauna diversity (abundance and species richness) occurred within the</i></p>	<p>Identify and describe the subterranean fauna habitats that may be impacted directly and indirectly by the proposal during construction and operations. Describe the significance of these values in a local and regional context. Include relevant geological and hydrogeological information to determine habitat suitability and connectivity, including inside and outside the impact areas.</p> <p>Provide figures and maps showing the extent of subterranean fauna habitats in relation to the proposal and species distributions (including information on the location of the proposed borefield in relation to subterranean fauna habitats).</p> <p>Identify and describe the fauna assemblages present and likely to be present within the DE that may be impacted by the proposal.</p> <p>Identify significant or restricted fauna and describe their known ecology, likelihood of occurrence, habitats and potential threats.</p>

Environmental Factor	Comment	Request for Information
	<p><i>calcrete and associated surficial alluvial/ colluvial aquifer habitat</i>", (Appendix 3 Section 6).</p> <p><i>"The locations of the proposed borefield avoids the calcrete areas within the paleochannel aquifers where stygofauna PEC may occur"</i> (RSD Section 11).</p>	<p>Map the locations of significant/restricted fauna records in relation to the subterranean fauna habitats, the study area, the DE, and direct and indirect impact areas.</p>
	<p>A subterranean fauna impact assessment was not provided in the RSD.</p>	<p>Describe and quantify the extent of potential direct, indirect and cumulative impacts, including percentages, to subterranean fauna and their habitat as a result of implementation of the proposal during both construction and operations, in a local and regional context.</p> <p>Provide a table of the proportional extents of each habitat within the study area and the DE, and the predicted amount to be directly impacted and remaining. Consider any local or regional cumulative impacts.</p>
	<p>Detailed design of the proposal, hydrological and hydrogeological assessments are planned (RSD Section 7.4.1.1).</p> <p>Rockwater (2024) details proposed paleochannel test bore drilling is prioritised for the Gascoyne paleochannel (tributary) and provides opportunity for further stygofauna sampling.</p> <p>Rockwater (2024) identified knowledge gaps are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no groundwater chemistry data from the paleochannel aquifer. • No aquifer parameter data from the Gascoyne paleochannel priority areas 1a and 1b is available; a more detailed understanding of the formation permeability, storativity and 	<p>Provide further information and/or undertake onsite investigations to detail the extent of subterranean fauna habitats and the predicted groundwater drawdown from proposed groundwater abstraction and mine dewatering in relation to subterranean fauna habitats.</p>

Environmental Factor	Comment	Request for Information
	heterogeneity is recommended to understand long term sustainable yields and reduce water risk to the Yinnetharra Project.	
Terrestrial Environmental Quality	A search of the Atlas of Australian Acid Sulfate Soils (ASS) dataset indicates that the DE is located within an area mapped as having ASS in inland lakes, waterways, wetlands and riparian zones. While a Baseline Soil Assessment has been undertaken (Appendix 2), it did not include an ASS investigation. Given the proposal's proximity to major watercourses and the numerous minor watercourses within the DE, there is a risk of impacts relating to the release of ASS.	Undertake an ASS investigation for the proposal, giving consideration to the Identification and investigation of acid sulfate soils and acidic landscapes (DWER 2015) and the National acid sulfate soils sampling and identification methods manual (Water Quality Australia 2018). Based on the results of the investigation, discuss the risks associated with potential disturbance of ASS. Outline proposed mitigation measures to manage risks associated with the disturbance of ASS, where appropriate.
	Rehabilitation of the IWL, WRL and mine pits post-closure has been proposed (RSD Section 8.4.3). Details regarding backfilling of pits is not provided and the approximate volume of topsoil required for rehabilitation has not been stated. A Baseline Soil Assessment has been undertaken (Appendix 2) and recommended that further investigations are conducted to confirm volume and suitability of on-site materials for rehabilitation.	Provide further information and undertake additional on-site investigations. Undertake a site soils investigation to assess the suitability and volume of topsoils and subsoils required for harvesting and re-use, as well as for encapsulating and neutralising potentially acid forming (PAF) materials. Confirm that near surface materials have non-saline seepage. Clarify the expected volume of topsoil and subsoil expected to be required for rehabilitation. If on-site material is unlikely to be adequate for rehabilitation, discuss where rehabilitation material will be sourced from. Refer to the EPA's Instructions - How to prepare an ERD Section 3.4 Mitigation Hierarchy – Rehabilitate.
	Appendix 8 identified that approximately 2.5% of waste rock is classified as PAF and will require management. Further information on how PAF will be managed has not been provided.	Discuss how PAF in waste rock will be managed. State whether on-site material is likely to be suitable for managing PAF material in waste rock.

Environmental Factor	Comment	Request for Information
	<p>The RSD did not identify TEQ as a Preliminary Key Environmental Factor.</p> <p>Information related to TEQ Environmental values is required.</p>	<p>Identify local and regional values that could be affected by impacts to TEQ and assess the potential for significant impacts to these values from implementation of the proposal, giving regard to both potential direct and indirect impacts (and all phases of the proposal, including post-closure land use).</p>
	<p>The referral supporting studies identified:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High baseline concentrations of metals/metalloids (for example, selenium, arsenic, cobalt and lead) in soils within the DE (Appendix 2) • Elevated concentrations of metals/metalloids (for example manganese and nickel) in tailings above recommended levels and risk of elevated concentrations for lithium (Appendix 7) • Liquid/solid ratio leachate results indicate potential for consistent, low-level leaching of lithium, phosphorus and rubidium (Appendix 7) • Tailings are classified as a hazardous substance based on a high concentration of respirable crystalline silica (Appendix 7). See Terrestrial Environmental Quality for further comments. • PAF in waste rock that requires management (Appendix 8) • Water leachate characterisation testing of waste rock and low-grade ore identified all samples exceeded the Livestock Drinking Water Guidelines for fluoride and lithium (RSD Appendix 8). 	<p>Assess the potential impacts to identified values from implementation of the proposal, giving regard to indirect impacts that could result from:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WRL/IWL leachate impacting soils and migrating to groundwater and/or surface waters. • Sediment transport (from exposed surfaces or soil stockpiles) in surface water runoff. • Uptake and bioaccumulation of contaminants of potential concern (CoPC) in vegetation/pastures post closure, impacting local food webs via livestock grazing, wildlife and insect attack (noting current research has demonstrated that lithium can be readily leached from non-acid forming rock and taken up by vegetation and often rubidium co-leaches with lithium and biomagnifies in aquatic food webs). <p>Identify CoPC and develop site-specific soil guideline values for CoPC that could be generated by the proposal. This could be developed statistically based on the assessment of natural background levels of CoPC in soil, in areas not previously disturbed by mining.</p> <p>Assess the potential contamination pathways for WRL/IWL leachate including to soils, groundwater, surface waters and vegetation.</p>

Environmental Factor	Comment	Request for Information
	It should not be assumed that non-acid forming wastes are geochemically benign.	
	<p>The RSD did not identify TEQ as a Preliminary Key Environmental Factor.</p> <p>A discussion of the mitigation of impacts on TEQ is required.</p>	<p>Describe measures to avoid or minimise impacts on TEQ (and associated values) for all implementation phases of the proposal, including measures to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Avoid or minimise clearing and disturbance. • Minimise leachate generation, monitor leachate seepage, and recapture leachate. • Avoid and minimise release of chemicals and hydrocarbons from storage and handling areas. • Minimise erosion and stabilise soils (especially on WRL/IWLs). • Identify and manage contaminated soils and ASS should they be encountered. • Minimise uptake and bioaccumulation of CoPC in vegetation/pastures post closure. <p>Demonstrate application of the EPA's mitigation hierarchy, prioritising the avoidance of impacts to environmental values and achievement of positive environmental outcomes in the first instance (i.e. WRL/IWL design to avoid leachate generation). Refer to the Australian Government's Leading Practice Sustainable Development Program for the Mining Industry - Preventing Acid and Metalliferous Drainage.</p>
	Mine Closure Plan (MCP)	Provide a MCP for the proposal, prepared in accordance with the Department of Mines, Petroleum and Exploration (DMPE) Guidelines Prepare a Mine Closure Plan .
Inland Waters	The RSD does not adequately identify Inland Waters environmental values, nor assess the potential impacts on these values.	Identify local and regional inland waters values and assess the potential for significant impacts to these values from

Environmental Factor	Comment	Request for Information
		<p>implementation of the proposal, giving regard to potential direct, indirect and cumulative impacts.</p> <p>Noting for cumulative impacts, the Lyon paleochannel tributary aquifer was developed for the Yangibana process water supply (Appendix 11).</p> <p>Include figure/s for all inland water values (with labels), highlighting those identified as having the potential to be directly or indirectly impacted by the proposal. Delineate where crossings will require alteration of drainage lines or watercourses.</p> <p>For aquatic and semi-aquatic/riparian fauna relevant to hydrological regimes (see comments under Terrestrial Fauna).</p> <p>Identify and assess the potential for CoPC to contaminate waterways and bioaccumulate in aquatic fauna. Refer to TEQ requirements above for information required to support the assessment of potential impacts to inland waters.</p>
	<p>The hydrology assessment provided with the RSD (Appendix 10) is based on a mine site and infrastructure layout that is different to the PCD provided.</p> <p><i>“The proposed diversion and levee designs will need to be updated and optimised in the next phase of the project when higher resolution LiDAR data is available.”</i> (Appendix 10 Section 4.2.1.1)</p>	<p>Update the hydrology assessment based on the proposal redesign and recommendations from Appendix 10.</p> <p>Confirm the proposed surface water management infrastructure would be located within the proposal DE. The current information provided in Figure 4-7 of Appendix 10 indicates the infrastructure is potentially located outside the current proposed DE and is not included in the indicative footprint as shown in the PCD.</p> <p>Provide updated information related to surface water management that includes all elements of the proposal referred and considers updated information based on recommendations in Appendix 10.</p> <p>Note - if elements are not included in the indicative footprint and/or are located outside the proposed DE an update to the proposal would be required (See General comments).</p>

Environmental Factor	Comment	Request for Information
	<p>Baseline surface water quality, flow and sediments of waterways with the potential to be impacted from the proposal are not detailed in the RSD.</p> <p>The RSD shows sample locations for surface water taken from the Aquatic Ecology Survey (Appendix 12), with only two sample locations within the DE and are not located within identified drainage lines (Figure 8-6 of RSD).</p>	<p>Provide groundwater, surface water and sediment quality data in raw format (spreadsheets) from monitoring/studies/investigations to establish a baseline for the proposal.</p> <p>Include a map of sampling locations and include proposed locations for ongoing monitoring.</p>
	<p>Appendix 11 does not conclusively identify intended water resources for the proposal. It was also noted that while the conservative maximum estimate was for three (3) gigalitres (GL) per annum, supporting information regarding risks posed by abstraction were presented under the reduced 1.5 GL scenario.</p> <p>RSD Section 7.4.1.1 details “<i>The works completed to date are preliminary and based on the availability of regional data and historic drill records.</i>”</p>	<p>Undertake an assessment of risk posed by abstraction under the maximum proposed scenario for water abstraction.</p> <p>Provide a H3 level Hydrogeological Report (Operational policy no.5.12 - Hydrogeological reporting of groundwater well licence) to support the proposed groundwater abstraction.</p>
	<p>Due to limited hydrogeological investigations, it is unclear if there is connectivity between surface and groundwater systems as well as the broader tributary system. As a result, it is unclear if the proposal has the potential to disturb systems through altered recharge, potential spills or seepage; or erosion and sedimentation.</p>	<p>Provide a clear conceptualisation of hydrogeology for the proposal area including connectivity between surface and groundwater as well as the broader landscape. (Refer to Environmental Factor Guideline- Inland Waters).</p>
	<p>Drainage lines proposed for realignment around the proposed DE boundary appear to be connected downstream to an ephemeral waterbody where aquatic fauna (<i>Ozestheria cf. packardi</i> lineage Q and <i>Triops</i> sp. Biologic TRIO004’) were recorded. It is unclear if this alteration will result in altered recharge of this habitat or</p>	<p>Provide an overview of surface hydrological regimes and connectivity within the proposed DE and the broader landscape and assess the risk of indirect impacts posed by alteration of systems associated with inland waters.</p>

Environmental Factor	Comment	Request for Information
	pose increased risk from impacts such as sedimentation that would affect the species present. It is also unclear if connectivity with this habitat means the species recorded are SRE or capable of dispersion further from the proposal area.	
	Vegetation in the vicinity of the proposal has the potential to be either Ground water dependent or sheet flow dependant. It is noted that priority flora species recorded are known to occur in areas where water gathers toward drainage lines	Provide an assessment of potential indirect impacts posed to vegetation and habitat as a result of altered surface or subsurface hydrology.
	Final landform and closure outcomes have not been included. The proposal indicates the mine pit may not be backfilled at completion of the project, potentially resulting in the formation of a pit mine lake over time (see TEQ comments above).	Provide an outline of intended final landforms at closure of the project as well as an assessment of potential risk posed by final landforms to inland waters (refer to Environmental Factor Guideline- Inland Water for information regarding pit mine lakes and waste structures). For mining proposals, rehabilitation, decommissioning and closure measures and outcomes may be provided in a MCP or Mining Development and Closure Plan (MDCP). Refer to Instructions - How to prepare an ERD Section 3.4.
Greenhouse Gas Emissions	As outlined in the EPA's Environmental Factor Guideline: Greenhouse Gas Emissions (EPA GHG Guideline), the EPA requires either Safeguard Mechanism confirmation or benchmarking and best practice review to conduct its assessment in relation to Greenhouse Gas Emissions. Section 4.1.2 of the Greenhouse Gas Assessment Summary Report (Appendix 13) briefly discusses the Safeguard Mechanism but does not include the information required by the EPA outlined in the EPA GHG Guideline.	In accordance with the EPA's information requirements outlined in the EPA's Environmental Factor Guideline: Greenhouse Gas Emissions , provide further information on either Safeguard Mechanism confirmation or benchmarking and best practice review.

Environmental Factor	Comment	Request for Information
	<p>Similarly, some benchmarking and best practice information is provided in Section 3 of Appendix 13, however a pathway for reducing Scope 1 emissions over the life of the proposal has not been provided, and it is unclear whether Greenhouse Gas emissions offsets have been considered.</p> <p>Further information is required for the EPA to conduct its assessment.</p>	
	<p>Table 21 of Appendix 13 shows that the emissions intensities of the proposal, in relation to both lithium ore and electricity, are higher than the default best practices emissions intensities specified in the Safeguard Mechanism Rule. The proposal's average emissions intensities are also higher than most of the other projects considered as part of the benchmarking comparison, as outlined in Appendix 13, Table 20.</p> <p>It is unclear why the proposal's emissions intensities are higher than the best practices emissions intensities and comparable projects.</p>	<p>Outline why proposal emissions intensities are higher than best practices emissions intensities.</p> <p>Further apply the mitigation hierarchy to demonstrate that emissions intensities have been minimised as far as practicable or provide justification for why further minimisation of emissions intensities has not been proposed.</p>
	<p>The Scope 1 GHG Emissions estimates in Appendix 13 include emissions associated with fuel consumption from product haulage to port. However, a port, or the distance to it, has not been specified.</p>	<p>Outline which port has been used in the calculations for fuel consumption from product haulage to port, and the distance from the proposal to that port.</p>
Social Surroundings	<p>Consultation with Yingarrda Aboriginal Corporation and Wajari Yamaji Aboriginal Corporation is recorded in Appendix 14. However, the outcome of discussion appears limited, and it is unclear if any concerns have been raised or addressed.</p> <p>Aboriginal heritage surveys are ongoing, therefore the potential significance of the recorded heritage sites is</p>	<p>Provide clarification regarding the nature of the Aboriginal heritage sites, potential impacts, management, summary of the consultation process (including the information provided to inform the consultation regarding the proposal and its physical or biological impacts on Aboriginal Cultural Heritage [ACH] values) and outcomes from consultation with the Traditional Owners,</p>

Environmental Factor	Comment	Request for Information
	not clear, nor is the potential for impacts through clearing, indirect changes to the landscape or potential access issues.	<p>Knowledge Holders and representatives of the determined Native Title Parties.</p> <p>Consult with the Department of Planning, Lands and Heritage (DPLH) regarding matters under the <i>Aboriginal Heritage Act 1972</i>.</p> <p>Provide targeted information regarding ACH and site investigations in an Environmental Impact Assessment Statement for ACH values report (refer to Section 3 of Technical Guidance EIA of Social Surroundings - Aboriginal Cultural Heritage) and append the report to the ERD.</p>
	An Exclusion Zone is proposed in the middle of the DE, south of the proposed WRL, designed to avoid impacts to sites of cultural significance. It is not clear if this exclusion zone would protect environmental values from indirect impacts or if there are any access limitations to the area (for example, if access is required for cultural reasons or monitoring works).	<p>Discuss the potential indirect impacts to ACH values within the exclusion zone. For example, impacts from changes in hydrological regimes, potential runoff/seepage from the proposed WRL.</p> <p>Define the exclusion zone in terms of access for cultural reasons or monitoring works and clarify if there are any access restrictions to the exclusion zone.</p>
	The Tailings characterisation study (Appendix 7) refers to concentrations of respirable crystalline silica at concentrations classified as a hazardous substance (inhalation carcinogen).	<p>Identify all sensitive receptors (mine site accommodation villages / camps are considered sensitive receptors, and further information is required to determine if there are any ACH sites that are sensitive receptors).</p> <p>Provide proposed management measures addressing risk posed by tailings (refer to Environmental Factor Guidance- Air Quality regarding air quality for human health and particulates).</p>
	The RSD provides limited information regarding sensitive receptors. The location of the accommodation village is not shown on Figure 2-3, and it is unclear if there are any Aboriginal heritage site locations that would be classified as sensitive receptors.	<p>Provide further information regarding sensitive receptors, including the proposed accommodation camp and any other identified sensitive receptors.</p> <p>Assess the risk of impact to all sensitive receptors.</p>

Environmental Factor	Comment	Request for Information
General	<p>As outlined in the EPA's Instructions and template: How to identify the content of a proposal, the PCD must include all proposal elements, and physical elements must be defined or shown on a figure/map.</p> <p>Figure 2-3 of the RSD shows the indicative site layout but does not show/identify the location of all proposed infrastructure outlined in Table 1 of the PCD, such as the accommodation village and airstrip.</p> <p>In addition, the RSD references a potential solar farm, but this is not listed in the PCD or shown on RSD Figure 2-3.</p> <p>Please note, the proposal content cannot be identified in other information (such as supplementary reports) provided at or during the referral or assessment stage.</p>	<p>Confirm if a solar farm is included in the proposal and PCD.</p> <p><i>If an amendment to the PCD is required to capture missing elements of the proposal, such as the solar farm, a section 43A application is required separately to this RFI.</i></p> <p>Provide a figure that clearly shows the location of all physical elements of the proposal (note a solar farm is shown on Figure 4-7 of Appendix 10).</p> <p>See also Inland Waters comments related to surface water management infrastructure.</p>
	<p>In accordance with the EPA's Instructions - How to prepare an ERD, the assessment of each environmental factor is required to include a cumulative impact assessment.</p>	<p>Provide a draft ERD that includes a Cumulative Impact Assessment for each Preliminary Environmental Factor in accordance with the EPA's Guideline for Cumulative Impact Assessment.</p>
	Residual impacts	<p>Predict the residual impacts from the proposal on all Preliminary Key Environmental Factors after considering and applying the mitigation hierarchy.</p> <p>Where significant residual impacts remain, identify whether offsets are proposed.</p>
	Environmental Outcomes	<p>Refer to the EPA's Instructions - How to prepare an ERD - Dec 25.pdf to identify the expected environmental outcomes. For guidance, see the EPA's Interim Guidance - Outcomes and Outcomes-based conditions.pdf.</p>