

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

Proposal title: Roe Gold Project

Proposal description: The proposal is to construct and operate an open cut and underground gold mine approximately 150 kilometres (km) east of the City of Kalgoorlie Boulder in the eastern Goldfields region of Western Australia (WA). The proposal is located on the western margin of Lake Roe and will comprise associated ore stockpiles, waste rock landforms, mining related and general supporting infrastructure and a 50 km service corridor. Mining will occur below groundwater level requiring dewatering of the open pit and underground mines. The proposal will mine an estimated 7.85 million tonnes of ore over a 9 year mine life. The mined ore will be transported offsite for processing at the Rebecca processing hub (processing is not part of the proposal). The Development Envelope is 1,543 hectares (ha) with a Disturbance Footprint of 557.7 ha.

Proposal location: Approximately 150 kilometres (km) east of the City of Kalgoorlie in the Goldfields region of Western Australia.

APP number: APP-0034135 - Roe Gold Project

Date referral received: 10 March 2026

Date more information received: 21 April 2026

Referrer: Lake Roe Gold Mining Pty Ltd

Proponent: Lake Roe Gold Mining Pty Ltd

Potential significant effects:

There are potential impacts on **flora and vegetation** from the clearing of native vegetation; **terrestrial fauna** from the clearing of habitat; **inland waters** from altered groundwater and surface water regimes and quality; **terrestrial environmental quality** from impacts to soil quality; **social surroundings** from construction and operation impacts to Aboriginal cultural heritage.

Environmental factors: flora and vegetation, terrestrial fauna, inland waters, terrestrial environmental quality and social surroundings.

Public comment on referral information:

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

Yes 1 No 0

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

Yes 1 No 0

Total submissions:

1

Decision: s. 38G(1) – Not assess

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

The EPA has decided not to assess the proposal because:

- The EPA considers the likely environmental effects of the proposal are not so significant or unmitigated to warrant formal assessment under Part IV of the *Environmental Protection Act 1986* (EP Act).
- The EPA considers that the likely environmental effects of the proposal can be mitigated by other statutory decision-making processes to achieve consistency with the EPA's factor objectives.

- The EPA's decision has been made on the basis of the proponent implementing the proposal in accordance with the Proposal Content Document (PCD) and management outlined in the referral supporting documents and attachments available on the [EPA website](#). Changes to expected implementation content and/or management which are likely to result in significant environmental effects have not been considered as part of the decision for this proposal, and may result in a new referral being required for that different proposal.
- The EPA notes that the proposal design comprises the clearing of 557.7 ha within a 1,543 ha development envelope. No threatened flora, threatened ecological communities (TECs), priority ecological communities (PECs) or conservation areas have been recorded within the development envelope. Two Department of Biodiversity, Conservation and Attractions (DBCA) listed priority flora species *Calandrinia quartzitica* (Priority 1) and *Eremophila arachnoides* subsp. *tenera* (Priority 3) have been recorded but impacts are proposed to be avoided and nevertheless can be regulated through the Native Vegetation Clearing Permit (NVCP) process under Part V, Division 2 of the EP Act.
- The EPA notes that no conservation significant fauna were recorded in the development envelope but habitat for conservation significant fauna may be present, including for *Aphelocephala leucopsis* (southern whiteface), *Leipoa ocellata* (malleefowl) and migratory species. The EPA considers that the likely impacts on Terrestrial Fauna can be effectively managed through a NVCP, and the Mining Development and Closure Proposal (MDCP) and Mine Closure Plan (MCP) required under the *Mining Act 1978* (Mining Act).
- The EPA notes that dewatering will be required for open pit and underground mining (with a peak dewatering rate of up to approximately 30-32 litres per second). The EPA has confidence that the impacts to Inland Waters can be managed through the assessment processes under the *Rights in Water and Irrigation Act 1914* (RIWI Act), including a s.5C licence to take groundwater, the MDCP and MCP processes under the Mining Act, and the works approval and licensing processes under Part V (Division 3) of the EP Act.
- The EPA considers that potential impacts from the proposal to Terrestrial Environmental Quality can be regulated through the MDCP and MCP processes under the Mining Act and works approval and licensing processes under Part V (Division 3) of the EP Act.
- The EPA has considered the remote location of the proposal and potential impacts to amenity (dust and noise), noting the sensitive receptors are situated more than 30 km from the proposal. The proposal is located in the Kakarra Native Title claim area and the Yindi pastoral lease. Surveys identified Aboriginal cultural heritage sites and values within the development envelope but outside the proposed areas of disturbance. The proponent has advised that the sites will be avoided and no direct impacts to Aboriginal heritage sites are proposed. The proponent advised that continued engagement with Traditional Owners will be undertaken in accordance with the Native Title Mining Agreement and heritage management plan. The EPA is satisfied that the mechanisms provided under the *Aboriginal Heritage Act 1972* are adequate to manage potential impacts to Aboriginal cultural heritage in a manner consistent with its objectives.

- The EPA has considered cumulative impacts within the region with other proposals, and considers that they are not likely extensive, and the proposal's cumulative environmental outcome is likely to be consistent with EPA objectives.
- The EPA does not consider that the proposal impacts will combine or interact in a holistic way which requires assessment by the EPA.
- Given the EPA's decision to 'not assess' this proposal, there will be further opportunity for the public to comment on aspects of the proposal during the public comment period for applications under Part V of the EP Act.

Taking into account decision-making processes under the Mining Act 1978

- Since the proposal is located on mining tenure, a MDCP is required and will be assessed by the Department of Mines, Petroleum and Exploration (DMPE). The MDCP must include a comprehensive risk assessment which identifies environmental impacts and risks, evaluates those impacts and risks, and details management/mitigation strategies. The MDCP must also include detailed information regarding environmental and closure outcomes.
- A MDCP must demonstrate the following DMPE objectives can be met:
 - Flora, vegetation and fauna: *To protect flora and vegetation, subterranean fauna and terrestrial fauna so that biological diversity and ecological integrity are maintained.*
 - Inland waters: *To maintain the hydrological regimes, quality and quantity of groundwater and surface water so that environmental values are protected.*
 - Terrestrial environmental quality: *To maintain the quality of land and soils so that environmental values are protected; and*
 - *Mining activities are rehabilitated and closed in a manner to make them physically safe to humans and animals, geo-technically stable, geo-chemically non-polluting/non-contaminating, and capable of sustaining an agreed post-mining land use, with consideration for cultural values and without unacceptable liability to the State.*
- The EPA considers that potential impacts relating to its objectives for flora and vegetation, terrestrial fauna, terrestrial environmental quality and inland waters can be effectively managed through this process.

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

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

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

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

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

- Dewatering of the mine pits will require a section 5C licence to take groundwater under the RIWI Act. The EPA objectives for inland waters can be met through assessment and approval processes under the RIWI Act.

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

- Diesel fuel for power supply and the mining fleet will be transported to site and stored in self-bunded tanks (compliant with AS 1940:2017). A Dangerous Goods licence regulated by the Department of Local Government, Industry Regulation and Safety will be required.

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

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

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

- The proposal is located within the Kakarra Native title area. The EPA considers the proponent has taken reasonable steps to consult with the Traditional Owners and has committed to engage in relation to the proposal heritage management plan and the Native Title Mining Agreement.
- Anthropological and cultural heritage surveys have been completed, and all known Aboriginal Cultural Heritage sites and other cultural values are proposed to be avoided. The EPA notes the proponent has advised that although there are sites in the development envelope, no direct impacts to known Aboriginal heritage sites or values are expected from the proposal. In the unlikely event that impacts to a site are required, the EPA is satisfied the processes provided for under the AH Act can mitigate potential impacts to registered ACH sites to be consistent with the EPA objectives.

Public advice

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

- The proponent's Proposal Content Document specifications are material to the EPA's decision not to assess the proposal.
- The EPA supports the assessment and regulation under Part V Division 2 (Clearing) of the EP Act and the MDCP and MCP processes under the Mining Act to ensure the environmental outcome to protect flora and vegetation and terrestrial fauna so that biological diversity and ecological integrity is maintained is achieved.
- The EPA supports the assessment and regulation of inland waters under the licences under the RIWI Act, the MDCP and MCP processes under the Mining Act and Part V (Division 3) of the EP Act to ensure the environmental outcome to maintain the hydrological regimes and quality of groundwater and surface water so that environmental values are protected is achieved.
- The EPA supports the assessment and regulation of terrestrial environmental quality under the MDCP and MCP processes under the Mining Act and Part V (Division 3) of the EP Act to ensure the environmental outcome to maintain the quality of land and soils so that environmental values is achieved.
- The EPA supports the assessment and regulation of social surroundings under MDCP and MCP processes under the Mining Act, Part V (Division 3) of the EP Act, and provisions of the AH Act to ensure the objective to protect social surroundings from significant harm is achieved

Material information considered by the EPA in this decision

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

- Referral (10 March 2026).
- Referral Supporting Documentation (3 March 2026) and appendices:
 - Appendix A: Roe Gold Project Bombora Hydrogeological Dewatering Assessment
 - Appendix B: Bombora Project Lake Roe Flood Depth Assessment
 - Appendix C: Haul Road- Surface Water Environmental Assessment
 - Appendix D: Lake Roe Hydraulic Behaviour Desk Study
 - Appendix E: Preliminary Risk and Discharge Assessment for Lake Roe
 - Appendix F: Haul Road Detailed Flora and Basic Fauna Survey
 - Appendix G: Lake Roe Project Detailed Flora Survey
 - Appendix H: Lake Roe Project Short Range Endemic (SRE) Invertebrate Survey and Assessment
 - Appendix I: Short Range Endemic Habitat Mapping for the Roe Gold Project Haul Road
 - Appendix J: Lake Roe Gold Project Subterranean Fauna Level 1 Assessment
 - Appendix K: Basic Vertebrate Fauna Survey Roe Haul Road
 - Appendix L: Basic Vertebrate Fauna Survey Lake Roe Gold Project
 - Appendix M: Lake Roe Project - Kopai Crescent and Bombora Waste Characterisation

- Appendix N: Lake Roe Gold Project Baseline Aquatic Ecology Study
- Appendix O: Aboriginal Cultural Heritage (ACH) Survey Report 2025 (Confidential)
- Appendix P: Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Survey 2024 (Confidential)
- Appendix Q: Anthropological Heritage Survey (Confidential)
- Appendix R: Roe Gold Project, Consolidated Aquatic Ecology Study of Lake Roe, Peripheral Wetlands and Regional Lakes
- Appendix S: Stakeholder Engagement Register.
- Information and advice from DWER and DMPE about their statutory decision-making processes.
- EP Act s 3, s 4, Part IV, Admin Procedures, EPA factor and technical guidance.

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



Darren Walsh

Chair

Delegate of the Environmental Protection Authority

Date: 21/6/2026