



Report and recommendations of the Environmental Protection Authority



Buckland Project
– inquiry under section 46 of the
Environmental Protection Act 1986
to amend Ministerial Statement 960

BC Pilbara Iron Ore Pty Ltd

Report 1678

May 2020

Inquiry under section 46 of the *Environmental Protection Act 1986*

The Minister for Environment has requested that the Environmental Protection Authority (EPA) inquire into and report on the matter of changing the implementation condition 3 (Time Limit for Proposal Implementation) of Ministerial Statement 960 relating to the Buckland Project.

Section 46(6) of the *Environmental Protection Act 1986* requires the EPA Report to include:

- (a) a recommendation on whether or not the implementation conditions to which the inquiry relates, or any of them, should be changed
- (b) any other recommendations that it thinks appropriate.

The following is the EPA's report to the Minister pursuant to s. 46(6) of the *Environmental Protection Act 1986*.



Dr Tom Hatton
Chairman

27 May 2020

ISSN 1836-0483 (Print)
ISSN 1836-0491 (Online)
Assessment No. 2243

Contents

1. The proposal	1
2. Requested changes to conditions.....	3
3. Inquiry into changing conditions.....	4
4. Inquiry findings	5
4.1 Flora and Vegetation.....	5
4.2 Terrestrial Fauna.....	7
5. Conclusions and recommendations	10
References.....	11
Appendix 1: Identified Decision-Making Authorities and recommended environmental conditions.....	12

1. The proposal

The Buckland Project is to develop and operate an iron ore mine, processing facilities and supporting infrastructure, and a 176 km haul road from the mine site to the customer delivery point near Cape Preston. The proposal includes mining below the watertable at Bungaroo South with associated dewatering of the aquifer. The proposal is located about 45 kilometres (km) south-southeast of Pannawonica in the Shire of Ashburton. The proponent for the proposal is BC Pilbara Iron Ore Pty Ltd.

The Environmental Protection Authority (EPA) assessed the proposal at the level of Assessment on Proponent Information (API), and published its report in December 2013 (Report 1496). In this report, the EPA considered the following key environmental factors required detailed evaluation in its Report and Recommendations to the Minister for the Environment:

- Inland Waters Environmental Quality
- Hydrological Processes
- Flora and Vegetation
- Terrestrial Fauna
- Offsets (Integrating Factor).

In applying the EPA *Statement of Environmental Principles, Factors and Objectives* (EPA 2020b) these factors are now represented by:

- Inland Waters
- Flora and Vegetation
- Terrestrial Fauna.

The EPA concluded in Report 1496 that the proposal could be managed to meet the EPA's environmental objectives, provided the proposal is implemented consistent with the EPA's recommended conditions.

The then Minister for Environment approved the proposal for implementation, subject to the implementation conditions of Ministerial Statement (MS) 960 (12 February 2014).

The proposal was also referred to the Australian Government Department of Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities (DSEWPaC) for a decision as to whether it was a 'controlled action' under the *Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999* (EPBC Act). The proposal was determined to be 'not a controlled action if undertaken in a particular manner', with the referral decision outlining measures that must be taken to avoid significant impacts on listed threatened species and communities (EPBC 2013/6867; DSEWPaC 2013)

Previously approved changes to the proposal or conditions

Changes to the proposal were approved under s. 45C of the *Environmental Protection Act 1986* (EP Act) on 21 September 2015 (Attachment 1 to MS 960). The changes moved the location of the mine village, increased the clearing within the mine development envelope by 48 hectares (ha), added a Central Services Facility requiring 71 ha of clearing, and increased the clearing for the haul road from 1,400 ha to 1,434 ha.

There have been no changes to the implementation conditions applying to the proposal since the issue of MS 960.

2. Requested changes to conditions

Condition 3-1 of MS 960 states that the proponent shall not commence implementation of the proposal after the expiration of five years from the date of the statement (being 12 February 2014) and that any commencement within that five-year period must be substantial.

Condition 3-2 of MS 960 states that any commencement of implementation of the proposal, within five years of the date of the statement, must be demonstrated as substantial by providing the CEO with written evidence, on or before the expiration of five years from the date of the statement.

The proponent has not yet substantially commenced implementation of the proposal. BCI Minerals Limited, on behalf of the proponent BC Pilbara Iron Ore Pty Ltd, requested changes to condition 3 (Time Limit for Proposal Implementation) in order to extend the authorised timeframe for substantial commencement of the proposal by five years, to 12 February 2024. The proponent has not proposed any changes to the proposal, or to any other conditions of MS 960.

In response to the proponent's request, the Minister for Environment requested that the EPA inquire into and report on the matter of changing the implementation conditions relating to the Buckland Project. This report satisfies the requirements of the EPA's inquiry.

3. Inquiry into changing conditions

The EPA typically recommends the Minister sets conditions on significant proposals that require them to be substantially commenced within a specified timeframe. Extending this timeframe requires the Minister to change the relevant conditions under s. 46 of the EP Act, and provides for the EPA to review and consider the appropriateness of the implementation conditions relating to the proposal.

The EPA has discretion as to how it conducts its inquiry. In determining the extent and nature of this inquiry, the EPA had regard to information such as:

- the currency of the EPA's assessment of the proposal (Report 1496)
- MS 960
- information provided by the proponent.

In conducting this inquiry, the EPA reviewed the information provided by the proponent and considered the original assessment of the proposal detailed in Report 1496. In considering whether it was appropriate to recommend an extension of the authorised timeframe for substantial commencement of the proposal, the EPA considered whether there was any change to, or new information relating to, the key environmental factors relevant to the proposal. The EPA also considered whether any new key environmental factors had arisen since its original assessment of the proposal.

In addition to the considering the above, the EPA has also considered:

- any changes in environmental, scientific or technological knowledge that may have arisen since the initial assessment.
- whether the proposal is being implemented using best practice and contemporary methods so that the EPA objectives for the key environmental factors are met.

EPA procedures

The EPA followed the procedures in the *Environmental Impact Assessment (Part IV Divisions 1 and 2) Administrative Procedures 2016* (State of Western Australia 2016) and the *Environmental Impact Assessment (Part IV Divisions 1 and 2) Procedures Manual* (EPA 2020a).

4. Inquiry findings

The EPA considers that the following are the key environmental factors relevant to the change to conditions:

- Flora and Vegetation
- Terrestrial Fauna.

This determination is based on the length of time since the original biological surveys were conducted and the possibility that the conservation status of individual species may have changed in this period. The factor of Inland Waters is considered unlikely to have changed significantly since the issue of MS 960.

4.1 Flora and Vegetation

The EPA's environmental objective for this factor is *to protect flora and vegetation so that biological diversity and ecological integrity are maintained.*

Conclusions from EPA Report 1496

The original proposal included direct impacts to flora and vegetation through clearing of up to 650 ha within the mine development envelope, and up to 1,400 ha within the haul road development envelope. Indirect impacts may also occur through groundwater drawdown from dewatering, and surface discharge of surplus water. The majority of the proposal is within the Hamersley Interim Biogeographic Regionalisation for Australia (IBRA) subregion, with a portion of the haul road in the Roebourne IBRA subregion.

At the time of the assessment, no Declared Rare Flora species listed under the *Wildlife Conservation Act 1950* (WC Act) or Threatened species listed under the *Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999* (EPBC Act) had been recorded in either the mine development envelope or the haul road development envelope. None of the vegetation units identified were considered rare or restricted, or to match the descriptions of Threatened Ecological Communities (TECs) or Priority Ecological Communities (PECs).

Four species recorded in the mine and/or haul road development envelopes were listed as Priority 3 (P3) or Priority 4 (P4): *Indigofera sp.* Bungaroo Creek (P3), *Sida sp.* Barlee Range (P3), *Triodia sp.* Robe River - now known as *Triodia pisolitica* (P3), and *Rhynchosia bungarensis* (P4). All species were considered well represented outside the proposal area.

At the time of the assessment only a desktop study had been conducted for the Stage 2 North West Coastal Highway to Cape Preston section of the haul road. This section of the haul road will be developed later in the project life to service the long-term production rate of 8 million tonnes per annum. The EPA recommended condition 7 (Flora and Vegetation) to ensure the elements of the Stage 2 haul road are located to minimise impacts to conservation significant flora species and communities.

The EPA acknowledged that the proponent had designed the proposal to minimise clearing and mitigate impacts to significant environmental values. The EPA considered, however, that in the context of cumulative impacts from development proposals in the Pilbara IBRA region the proposal would result in a significant residual impact relating to the clearing of up to 2,050 ha of ‘good’ to ‘excellent’ condition native vegetation. The EPA recommended condition 8 (Residual Impacts and Risk Management Measures) requiring the proponent to contribute funds to a ‘government-established conservation offset fund or an alternative offset arrangement’ for the clearing of ‘good’ to ‘excellent’ condition native vegetation within the Hamersley IBRA subregion. The EPA’s recommended condition 8 did not require offsets for the portion of clearing within the Roebourne IBRA subregion, as this clearing was not considered to be significant in a cumulative context.

EPA Report 1496 stated that, having particular regard to:

- a) no DRF, threatened species, TECs or PECs being recorded in the surveyed areas for the mine area and haul road
- b) the measures that the proponent has committed to take to avoid, minimise and rectify impacts to flora and vegetation
- c) the likely level of restoration of ecological values and functions that would be achieved through best practice rehabilitation
- d) the significant residual impact associated with the clearing of the portion of up to 2,050 ha of ‘good to excellent’ condition native vegetation that is located within the Hamersley IBRA subregion,

the EPA considered that the proposal could be managed to meet the EPA’s objective for Flora and Vegetation provided that:

- elements of the proposal were limited to the authorised extent defined in Schedule 1 of the recommended environmental conditions
- condition 7 (Flora and Vegetation) was imposed requiring the proponent to develop and implement a Vegetation Management Plan for the Stage 2 section of the haul road
- condition 8 (Residual Impacts and Risk Management Measures) was imposed to counterbalance the significant residual impacts of the clearing of the portion of ‘good to excellent’ condition native vegetation that is located within the Hamersley IBRA subregion.

Assessment of the requested change to conditions

The EPA considers that the following current environmental policy and guidance is relevant to its assessment of the proposed changes to conditions:

- *Environmental Factor Guideline – Flora and Vegetation* (EPA 2016a)
- *WA Environmental Offsets Policy* (Government of Western Australia 2011)
- *WA Environmental Offsets Guidelines* (Government of Western Australia 2014).

The current approved proposal includes the changes approved under s. 45C (Attachment 1 to MS 960, 21 September 2015), which increased the total area of clearing by 153 ha to 2,203 ha.

No further flora and vegetation surveys have been conducted for the mine or Stage 1 of the haul road since the publication of MS 960. However, the proponent is not proposing any further changes to the proposal that would change the potential impacts to Flora and Vegetation, or any changes to the implementation conditions of MS 960 relating to the management of impacts to Flora and Vegetation.

There has been no change in conservation status for the four Priority flora previously recorded within the proposal development envelopes.

The EPA is satisfied that its objectives for this factor can be met, and the potential impacts of the proposal can be managed through existing implementation condition 1 (Proposal Implementation) and condition 7 (Flora and Vegetation).

Residual Impacts and Risk Management Measures (Offsets)

The proposal as currently approved requires clearing of up to 2,203 ha of ‘good’ to ‘excellent’ condition native vegetation within the Pilbara IBRA region, including the loss of habitat for conservation significant fauna species. As stated in its advice to the Minister under s. 16(e) of the EP Act (EPA 2014), the EPA is concerned that, without intervention, the increasing cumulative impacts of development and land use within the region will significantly impact on biodiversity and environmental values.

Consistent with this advice, and the *WA Environmental Offsets Guidelines*, the EPA recommended a condition (condition 8 of MS 960) be set on the proposal requiring the proponent to contribute funds to ‘a government-established conservation offset fund or an alternative offset arrangement providing an equivalent outcome as determined by the Minister’.

Since the original assessment and publication of MS 960, the Pilbara Environmental Offsets Fund has been established to receive funds from proponents, and standardised wording has been developed for conditions requiring offsets for clearing of ‘good’ to ‘excellent’ condition vegetation within the Pilbara IBRA region. The contemporary wording clarifies the obligations of proponents and provides for a consistent approach between proposals for contributions to the fund. The EPA recommends condition 8 of MS 960 is updated to use the contemporary wording.

4.2 Terrestrial Fauna

The EPA’s environmental objective for this factor is *to protect terrestrial fauna so that biological diversity and ecological integrity are maintained.*

Conclusions from EPA Report 1496

The main potential impacts of the proposal on terrestrial fauna are through clearing of habitat and changes to the creek flow regimes.

Fauna surveys conducted for the original assessment recorded six conservation significant vertebrate fauna species within the mine site and/or haul road development envelope; northern quoll (Endangered under the WC Act and EPBC Act), Pilbara leaf-nosed bat (Vulnerable under the WC Act and EPBC Act), rainbow

bee-eater (Schedule 5 WC Act – Migratory birds), bush stone-curlew (P4), long-tailed dunnart (P4) and western pebble-mound mouse (P4).

No confirmed short range endemic (SRE) invertebrates were recorded in the mine or haul road development envelopes. Several taxa considered likely or potential SREs were identified, however all were either also recorded outside the development envelopes, or recorded in habitats considered well represented outside of the envelopes.

Vertebrate fauna and SRE invertebrate fauna habitats (including for conservation significant species) identified within the proposal area were not considered restricted, and were also present in adjacent areas likely with similar fauna assemblages to those within the proposal area.

The referral decision under the EPBC Act (EPBC 2013/6867; DSEWPac 2013) limits the clearing of northern quoll denning habitat within the mine development envelope to 12.83 ha, and requires the proponent to develop a specific Northern Quoll Management Strategy including avoidance and mitigation measures.

Having particular regard to:

- a) the design of the proposal to avoid, minimise and rectify potential impacts on fauna in the mine area and haul road corridor
- b) the significant residual impact of the loss of habitat for conservation significant fauna species
- c) the proponent's proposed management measures for the northern quoll and other conservation significant fauna
- d) the Australian Government requirements to limit the clearing of northern quoll habitat and develop a Northern Quoll Management Strategy to ensure potential impacts to the northern quoll are minimised,

the EPA considered that the proposal could be managed to meet the EPA's objective for terrestrial fauna provided that condition 8 (Residual Impacts and Risk Management Measures) was imposed to counterbalance the significant residual impact of the loss of habitat for conservation significant fauna species.

Assessment of the proposed change to conditions

The EPA considers that the following current environmental policy and guidance is relevant to its assessment of the proposal for this factor:

- *Environmental Factor Guideline – Terrestrial Fauna* (EPA 2016b).

No further terrestrial fauna studies have been carried out since the publication of MS 960. However, the proponent is not proposing any changes to the proposal that would change the potential impacts to terrestrial fauna, or any changes to the conditions of MS 960 relating to the management of impacts to terrestrial fauna.

Since the original assessment the *Biodiversity Conservation Act 2016* (BC Act) has replaced the WC Act as the legislation providing for the listing of threatened native flora and threatened native fauna. There has been no change in conservation status for four of the six conservation significant vertebrate fauna species previously

recorded; northern quoll, Pilbara leaf-nosed bat, long tailed dunnart, and western pebble-mound mouse. The other two species, rainbow bee-eater and bush stone-curlew, no longer have formal conservation status.

The EPA is satisfied that its objectives for this factor can be met, and the potential impacts of the proposal can be managed through existing implementation condition 1 (Proposal Implementation) and condition 8 (Residual Impacts and Risk Management Measures), updated to contemporary wording as recommended in Appendix 1.

5. Conclusions and recommendations

Change to condition 3

The proponent has requested changes to condition 3 in order to extend the Time Limit for Proposal Implementation. The EPA considers it appropriate to extend the Time Limit for Proposal Implementation by five years to 12 February 2024.

Change to condition 8

The EPA considers it appropriate to update condition 8 (Residual Impacts and Risk Management Measures) to contemporary wording requiring the proponent to contribute funds to the Pilbara Environmental Offset Fund. The contemporary wording clarifies the obligations of the proponent and provides for a consistent approach between proposals for contributions to the Fund.

Conclusions

In relation to the environmental factors, and considering the information provided by the proponent and relevant EPA policies and guidelines, the EPA concludes that:

- there are no changes to the proposal associated with the request to change conditions
- there is no significant new or additional information that changes the conclusions reached by the EPA, under any of the key environmental factors, during its original assessment of the proposal detailed in Report 1496 (December 2013)
- no new significant environmental factors have arisen since the EPA's original assessment of the proposal
- the impacts to the key environmental factors are considered manageable, based on the requirements of the original conditions retained in Ministerial Statement 960, and the imposition of the attached recommended conditions.

Recommendations

Having inquired into this matter, the EPA submits the following recommendations to the Minister for Environment under s. 46 of the EP Act:

1. While retaining the environmental requirements of the original conditions of Ministerial Statement 960, it is appropriate to change implementation conditions 3 and 8, and replace them with new implementation conditions.
2. After complying with s. 46(8) of the EP Act, the Minister may issue a statement of decision to change conditions 3 and 8 of Statement 960 in the manner provided for in the attached recommended Statement (Appendix 1).

References

DSEWPaC 2013, Notification of Referral Decision, Buckland Iron Ore Mining Project, WA (EPBC 2013/6867) Australian Government Department of Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities, Canberra, ACT.

EPA 2013, Buckland Project, Report and recommendations of the Environmental Protection Authority, Environmental Protection Authority (Report 1496), Perth, WA.

EPA 2014, *Cumulative environmental impacts of development in the Pilbara Region – Advice of the Environmental Protection Authority to the Minister for Environment under Section 16 (e) of the Environmental Protection Act 1986*, Environmental Protection Authority, Perth, WA.

EPA 2016a, *Environmental Factor Guideline – Flora and Vegetation*, Environmental Protection Authority, Perth, WA.

EPA 2016b, *Environmental Factor Guideline – Terrestrial Fauna*, Environmental Protection Authority, Perth, WA.

EPA 2020a, *Environmental Impact Assessment (Part IV Divisions 1 and 2) Procedures Manual*, Environmental Protection Authority, Perth, WA.

EPA 2020b, *Statement of Environmental Principles, Factors and Objectives*, Environmental Protection Authority, Perth, WA.

Government of Western Australia 2011, *WA Environmental Offsets Policy*, Government of Western Australia, Perth, WA.

Government of Western Australia 2014, *WA Environmental Offsets Guidelines*, Western Australia 2014, Perth, WA.

State of Western Australia 2016, Western Australia Government Gazette, No. 223, 13 December 2016.

Appendix 1: Identified Decision-Making Authorities and recommended environmental conditions

Identified Decision-Making Authorities

The following decision-making authorities have been identified for the purposes of s. 45 as applied by s. 46(8) of the *Environmental Protection Act 1986*:

Decision-Making Authority	Legislation (and Approval)
1. Minister for Water	<i>Rights in Water and Irrigation Act 1914</i> (Water abstraction licence and water reinjection licence)
2. Minister for Environment	<i>Biodiversity Conservation Act 2016</i> (Taking of flora and fauna)
3. Minister for Aboriginal Affairs	<i>Aboriginal Heritage Act 1972</i> (s. 18 approval)
4. Minister for Mines and Petroleum	<i>Mining Act 1978</i> (Grant of mining lease and general lease for haul road)
5. Minister for State Agreement	State Agreement Act
6. Chief Executive Officer, Department of Water and Environmental Regulation	<i>Environmental Protection Act 1986</i> (Works approval and licence)
Department of Mines, Industry Regulation and Safety	
7. Executive Director, Resource and Environmental Compliance	<i>Mining Act 1978</i> (Mining proposal)
8. State Mining Engineer	<i>Mines Safety and Inspection Act 1994</i> (Mine safety)
9. Chief Dangerous Goods Officer	<i>Dangerous Goods Safety Act 2004</i> (Dangerous goods)

Note: In this instance, agreement is only required with DMAs 1 to 5 since these DMAs are Ministers.

Recommended Environmental Conditions

STATEMENT TO CHANGE THE IMPLEMENTATION CONDITIONS APPLYING TO A PROPOSAL

(Section 46 of the *Environmental Protection Act 1986*)

BUCKLAND PROJECT

Proposal: To develop and operate an iron ore mine, processing facilities and supporting infrastructure, 45 km south-south-east of Pannawonica in the Shire of Ashburton, and a 176 km haul road from the mine site to the customer delivery point near Cape Preston.

Proponent: BC Pilbara Iron Ore Pty Ltd
Australian Company Number 107 492 517

Proponent Address: Level 2, 1 Altona Street
West Perth WA 6872

Report of the Environmental Protection Authority: 1678

Preceding Statement/s Relating to this Proposal: 960

Pursuant to section 45 of the *Environmental Protection Act 1986*, as applied by section 46(8), it has been agreed that the implementation conditions set out in Ministerial Statement No. 960, be changed as specified in this Statement.

Condition 3 of Ministerial Statement 960 is deleted and replaced with:

3 Time Limit for Proposal Implementation

3-1 The proponent shall not commence implementation of the proposal after 12 February 2024, and any commencement, prior to this date, must be substantial.

3-2 Any commencement of implementation of the proposal, on or before 12 February 2024, must be demonstrated as substantial by providing the CEO with written evidence, on or before 12 February 2024.

Condition 8 of Ministerial Statement 960 is deleted and replaced with:

8 Residual Impacts and Risk Management Measures

8-1 The proponent shall contribute funds to the **Pilbara Environmental Offsets Fund** calculated pursuant to condition 8-2, to achieve the objective of counterbalancing the significant residual impacts to 'Good' to 'Excellent' condition native vegetation, including the loss of denning/shelter habitat for

northern quoll and foraging habitat for Pilbara leaf-nosed bat, subject to any reduction approved by the CEO under condition 8-10.

8-2 The proponent's contribution to the **Pilbara Environmental Offsets Fund** shall be paid biennially, with the amount to be contributed calculated based on the clearing undertaken in each year of the biennial reporting period in accordance with the rates in condition 8-3. The first biennial reporting period shall commence from ground disturbing activities of the environmental values identified in condition 8-3.

8-3 Calculated on the 2018-2019 financial year, the contribution rates are:

- (1) \$816 AUD (excluding GST) per hectare of 'Good' to 'Excellent' condition native vegetation cleared within the **Mine Development Envelope** within the Hamersley IBRA subregion; and
- (2) \$816 AUD (excluding GST) per hectare of 'Good' to 'Excellent' condition native vegetation cleared within the **Haul Road Development Envelope** and **Central Services Facility Envelope** within the Hamersley IBRA subregion.

8-4 From the commencement of the 2018-2019 financial year, the rates in condition 8-3 will be adjusted annually each subsequent financial year in accordance with the percentage change in the CPI applicable to that financial year.

8-5 Prior to ground disturbing activities of the environmental values identified in condition 8-3, the proponent shall prepare and submit an Impact Reconciliation Procedure to the CEO.

8-6 The Impact Reconciliation Procedure required pursuant to condition 8-5 shall:

- (1) state that clearing calculations for the first biennial reporting period will commence from ground disturbing activities in accordance with condition 8-2 and end on the second 30 June following commencement of ground disturbing activities;
- (2) state that clearing calculations for each subsequent biennial reporting period will commence on 1 July of the required reporting period, unless otherwise agreed by the CEO;
- (3) include a methodology to calculate the amount of clearing undertaken during each year of the biennial reporting period for each of the environmental values identified in condition 8-3;
- (4) include a methodology for calculating the amount of temporary vegetation clearing within the **Haul Road Development Envelope** within the Hamersley IBRA subregion that has commenced rehabilitation within twelve (12) months of final commissioning of the haul road;

- (5) identify that any areas cleared within the **Haul Road Development Envelope** within the Hamersley IBRA subregion that have not commenced rehabilitation within twelve (12) months of final commissioning of the haul road are to be included in the area of clearing subject to condition 8-2;
 - (6) indicate the timing and content of the Impact Reconciliation Reports; and
 - (7) be prepared in accordance with *Instructions on how to prepare Environmental Protection Act 1986 Part IV Impact Reconciliation Procedures and Impact Reconciliation Reports* (or any subsequent revisions).
- 8-7 The proponent shall not commence ground disturbing activities for the environmental values identified in condition 8-3, unless otherwise agreed by the CEO, until the CEO has confirmed in writing that the Impact Reconciliation Procedure satisfies the requirements of condition 8-6.
- 8-8 The proponent shall submit Impact Reconciliation Reports in accordance with the Impact Reconciliation Procedure approved under condition 8-7.
- 8-9 The Impact Reconciliation Reports required pursuant to condition 8-8 shall provide the location and spatial extent of the clearing undertaken within the **Mine Development Envelope, Central Services Facility Envelope and Haul Road Development Envelope** during each year of each biennial reporting period.
- 8-10 The proponent may apply in writing to seek the written approval of the CEO to reduce all or part of the contribution payable under condition 8-2 where:
- (1) a payment has been made to satisfy a condition of an approval under the *Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999* in relation to the proposal;
 - (2) the payment is made for the purpose of counterbalancing impacts of the proposal on matters of national environmental significance; and
 - (3) the payment is made for the purpose of counterbalancing the significant residual impacts to the environmental values identified in condition 8-3.

Abbreviations and definitions

Acronym or Abbreviation	Definition or Term
Central Services Facility Envelope	The area delineated in Figure 2 and defined by the geographic coordinates in Table 5 of Ministerial Statement 960.
CEO	The Chief Executive Officer of the Department of the Public Service of the State responsible for the administration of section 48 of the Environmental Protection Act 1986, or his delegate.
CPI	The All Groups Consumer Price Index numbers for Perth compiled and published by the Australian Bureau of Statistics.
Haul Road Development Envelope	The area delineated in Figure 2 and defined by the geographic coordinates in Tables 6 and 7 of Ministerial Statement 960.
IBRA	Interim Biogeographic Regionalisation for Australia.
Mine Development Envelope	The area delineated in Figure 1 and defined by the geographic coordinates in Table 4 of Ministerial Statement 960.
Pilbara Environmental Offset Fund	The special purpose account that has been created pursuant to section 16(1)(d) of the <i>Financial Management Act 2006</i> by the Department of Water and Environmental Regulation.