

*Environmental Protection Act 1986*

Section 45C

**NOTICE OF DECISION TO CONSENT TO AMEND IMPLEMENTATION  
CONDITIONS WITHOUT INQUIRY OR ASSESSMENT**

**PERSON TO WHOM THIS NOTICE IS GIVEN**

Onslow Salt Pty Ltd

**PROPOSAL TO WHICH THIS NOTICE RELATES**

Onslow Solar Salt Project.

**MINISTERIAL STATEMENT and ANY APPROVED CHANGES**

Ministerial Statement 168 (MS 168) issued 14 August 1991.

Ministerial Statement 401 (MS 401) issued 21 November 1995.

Ministerial Statement 451 (MS 451) issued 16 June 1997.

s. 45C changes issued on 12 February 2013.

**DECISION**

Pursuant to s. 45C (1) (c) and s. 45C(5)(a) and (c) of the *Environmental Protection Act 1986* (EP Act), the Chair acting as delegate for the Minister for Environment gives approval to the following amendments of the implementations conditions:

- Increase the extent of the condenser ponds by 9 ha to 8,009.0 ha, material pits and quarries by 13.6 ha to 302.3 ha, and wash water extent by 250 m<sup>3</sup> per hour to 500 m<sup>3</sup> per hour.
- Remove the limits and extents on ship size (dead weight tonnage) and ship loading rate and clarify the development envelope and disturbance footprint extents.
- Remove completed or unnecessary conditions and commitments from Ministerial Statements 401 and 451.
- Consolidate, amend, and contemporise retained conditions and commitments of Ministerial Statements 401 and 451.
- Consolidate and contemporise MS 168, MS 401 and MS 401 into a new, standalone Ministerial Statement.
- Replace the introduction to refer to a Proposal Content Document for the purposes of describing the approved proposal.

A summary of the consideration of changes to the conditions of MS 401 and MS 451, amended proposal content document, and a figure are attached.

## SUMMARY OF REASONS

- The increased extent of the condenser ponds is due to improved spatial analysis and accuracy in defining the spatial extent.
- The increased extent of the pits and quarries is unlikely to result in significant new or additional environmental impacts, as the additional disturbance is located within already disturbed areas.
- The increased volume of wash water is unlikely to result in significant new or additional environmental impacts as all wash water is required to be contained within the existing wash pad area and collected in existing settlement ponds for recycling.
- Removing the limits and extents on ship size and ship loading rate, is unlikely to result in any new or additional significant environmental impacts as both elements are constrained by the existing infrastructure limits (e.g. constructed jetty, constructed shipping channels).
- Defining the development envelope and disturbance footprint extents is consistent with current EPA instructions. These extents were not clearly defined in previous and historical approval documents.
- The removal of conditions and proponent commitments from Ministerial Statement 401 and 451 are not expected to result in a significant adverse effect on any environmental factors. Further detail is provided in Attachment 1.
- The inclusion of contemporary wording for conditions on values of flora and vegetation, inland waters, marine environmental quality, rehabilitation and decommissioning, and social surroundings will ensure the proposal achieves environmental outcomes consistent with the EPA's current expectations.
- There are no new environmental factors likely to be significantly affected as a result of the amendments.
- The amended proposal, if implemented, is unlikely to have a significant effect on the environment and is therefore not considered a significant amendment. In considering this, the effects of the amendments on their own, the effect of the amendments in the context of the existing approved proposal, cumulative impacts, and holistic impacts have been considered.
- Consolidating the implementation conditions is necessary and desirable to standardise the requirements across Ministerial Statements 168, 401 and 451.
- The amended proposal will be substantially the same character as the existing approved proposal.

## OTHER ADVICE:

Any future proposed amendments to the proposal that may adversely impact on groundwater will need to be considered by the EPA and may require additional groundwater monitoring conditions.

Any channel blasting or dissolution of bitters with seawater from Middle Creek is to be referred to the EPA for consideration on whether assessment is required.

**EFFECT OF THIS NOTICE:**

1. The proposal as amended in accordance with this notice is taken to be able to be implemented under s. 45 of the EP Act.

**RIGHTS OF APPEAL:**

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

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Darren Walsh', with a large, stylized loop at the end.

**Darren Walsh**  
**Delegate of the Environmental Protection Authority**  
CHAIR

19 September 2025

**Attachment 1 – Consideration of proposed amendments**

**Attachment 2 – Amended proposal content document and figures showing the new approved proposal**

## Attachment 1 – Consideration of proposed amendments

**Table 1 – Consolidation and removal of conditions of Ministerial Statements 401 and 451.**

| Ministerial Statement Condition             | Requested amendment  | Consideration of the requested amendment   |
|---|--|--|
| <b>1 Proponent Commitments</b>              | Delete condition and all proponent commitments.  | <p>Condition 1 relates to the implementation of the commitments P1 to P29. The proponent has requested to delete all commitments as they have been completed, can be managed under contemporary conditions, or can be managed under other regulatory processes.</p> <p>The EPA has reviewed each proponent commitment and considers that they are either duplicates of existing requirements, no longer relevant, or can be incorporated into contemporary conditions as discussed below. Table 2 below considers each proponent commitment in further detail.</p> <p>Condition 1 has been deleted.</p>  |
| <b>2 Implementation</b>                     | Consolidate and replace with contemporary wording.                                     | <p>Condition 2 requires the proponent to implement the proposal in accordance with that detail as set out in its initial application documents. The modern requirements of this condition are now addressed through a Proposal Content Document, as referenced in the introduction of a Ministerial Statement, and by the limits and extents included in condition A1-1. The requirements of condition 2 for (implementation of the proposal) are still relevant as the proposal is still subject to the limits and extents of the approved proposal, as amended by s45C on 12 February 2013.</p> <p>As the proponent has requested to contemporise the entirety of Ministerial Statement 401 and 451, including consolidating both statements into one, new condition A1-1 has been included with contemporary wording and formatting.</p> <p>Condition 2 has been replaced with new condition A1-1.</p>  |
| <b>3 Environmental Management Programme</b> | Delete condition 3-1. Consolidate and replace condition 3-2 with contemporary wording. | <p>Condition 3-1 relates to the preparation of an environmental management programme (EMP). The proponent submitted two EMPs; the Construction Phase EMP (submitted 7 July 1997) which addressed the preconstruction and construction phases, and the Operational Phase EMP (submitted December 2000) addressed the commissioning and operation phases. The Construction Phase EMP was approved by the former Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) on the 8 July 1997 (reference: 2015-1448429807456). The Operations Phase EMP was approved by the former DEP on the 11 January 2001 (reference: 2015-0001224035), and therefore condition 3-1 is no longer relevant.</p> <p>Condition 3-2 relates to the implementation of the EMP, which remains relevant to ensure that monitoring and management provisions associated with operation of the proposal are captured. As the Operations Phase EMP was prepared and approved to address the conditions of Ministerial Statements 401 and 451, it is appropriate to update the Operations Phase EMP to address current Ministerial Statement conditions. Updating the Operations Phase EMP will also allow the proponent to remove monitoring requirements that are now redundant. As such, condition 3-2 has been replaced with new condition B2-3 to reflect contemporary wording and formatting.</p> <p>Condition 3-1 has been deleted. Condition 3-2 has been deleted and replaced with new condition B2-3.</p> |

| Ministerial Statement Condition                  | Requested amendment  | Consideration of the requested amendment   |
|--|--|--|
| <b>4 Rehabilitation Plan for Disturbed Areas</b> | Deleted condition 4-1.<br>Consolidate and replace condition 4-2 with contemporary wording. | <p>Condition 4-1 relates to the preparation of a rehabilitation plan prior to the commencement of construction. This rehabilitation plan was incorporated into the Constructions Phase EMP, approved by the former DEP on 8 July 1997 (reference: 2015-1448429807456). These provisions were then carried across to the Operations Phase EMP to address any existing or future quarries and borrow pits, and therefore, condition 4-1 can be deleted.</p> <p>Regarding condition 4-2, the proponent has requested to incorporate rehabilitation measures into the Mine Closure Plan as required under the <i>Mining Act 1978</i>. The EPA considers that rehabilitation efforts are still relevant, including progressive rehabilitation of borrow pits, quarries, access tracks, and areas impacted by erosion or flooding events. As guided by the EPA's current expectations on rehabilitation, clear outcome-based conditions have been included in the new Ministerial Statement to update the requirements to contemporary wording. The proponent will be required to address these outcomes within the Mine Closure Plan as required under the <i>Mining Act 1978</i>.</p> <p>Condition 4-1 has been deleted. Condition 4-2 has been replaced with new condition B3-3.</p>  |
| <b>5 Flood Studies</b>                           | Consolidate and replace with contemporary wording.   | <p>The proponent requested to delete conditions 5 and 7 and commitments 3, 5, 6, and 7 in relation to erosion and flood monitoring and management. This request was based on the lack of significant erosion or flooding events over the life of the proposal.</p> <p>The EPA, on advice from the Department of Water and Environmental Regulation (DWER), has considered that although no significant detrimental impacts have been observed/reported since operations commenced in 1999, this does not exclude the potential for adverse effects to occur in the future. For example, since construction of the proposal, the largest rainfall event was associated with Cyclone Dominic in January 2008 and resulted in 275 mm of rain over 72 hours. However, larger rainfall events have been recorded in the area, such as Cyclone Bobby in February 1995 resulting in 430 mm over 72 hours. In addition, climate predictions for the future suggest increases to rainfall intensities in extreme events. As such, the requirement to monitor and manage flooding and erosion events have been retained, albeit with contemporary wording. The requirements to monitoring the diversion of flood waters have been retained in new condition B2-2(1), while the requirement to remediate impacts caused by erosion and/or flooding has been retained in new condition B3-2(2).</p> <p>It is noted that the Onslow racetrack, as referenced in commitment 7, is longer operational and has been decommissioned. Commitment 7 is therefore no longer relevant.</p> <p>Condition 5 has been replaced with new condition B2-2(1).</p> |
| <b>6 Public Road Access</b>                      | Delete condition.  | <p>Condition 6 relates to the maintenance of public access to Onslow during construction. The proposal is no longer in the construction phase and the former DEP advised the proponent on 12 December 2000 that condition 6 is no longer required (reference: 2015-0001224056).</p> <p>Condition 6 has been deleted.</p>   |
| <b>7 Erosion Control</b>                         | Consolidate and replace  | Refer to the discussion against condition 5 above.   |

| Ministerial Statement Condition           | Requested amendment  | Consideration of the requested amendment   |
|---|--|--|
|   | with contemporary wording.   | <p>The EPA considers that remediating impacts from the erosion or flooding remains relevant and the requirements of condition 7 are maintained, albeit with contemporary wording and formatting. The EPA has included new condition B3-2(2) to address the requirements of condition 7.</p> <p>Condition 7 has been replaced with new condition B3-2(2).</p>   |
| <b>8 Faunal Survey</b>                    | Delete condition.  | <p>Condition 8 and commitment 8 relate to conducting a fauna survey of areas which would be isolated by flooding of ponds during construction. The former DEP considered on 8 July 1997 that the requirements of condition 8-1 had satisfactorily been met (reference 2015-1448429807456) and considered on 8 December 2000 that condition 8-3 was no longer required (reference: 2015-0001224056). In regard to condition 8-2, which requires the relocation of vertebrate fauna if found on islands, this relocation can be adequately managed under the Biodiversity Conservation Act 2016. As such, the EPA considers that condition 8-2 can be adequately managed under other statutory processes.</p> <p>Condition 8 has been deleted.</p>   |
| <b>9 Mangroves and Related Ecosystems</b> | <p>Consolidate and replace condition 9-1 and 9-3 with contemporary wording.</p> <p>Delete condition 9-2.</p> | <p>Condition 9-1 relates to the construction and management of the project so that there are no significant indirect impacts on mangroves or algal mats. The proponent reported in its 2020 Annual Environmental Report that no significant impacts have been detected on mangrove or algal mat communities to date. However, this does not mean adverse impacts will not occur in the future. The requirement to ensure there are no significant adverse impacts on the mangroves or algal mats remains relevant but can be contemporised to reflect the EPA's current expectations in condition setting. The EPA has maintained and contemporised the requirements of condition 9-1 in new condition B1-1.</p> <p>Condition 9-2 relates to the preparation of a growth monitoring and rehabilitation plan for mangroves prior to the completion of pond construction. This plan was incorporated into the Operations Phase EMP and the former DEP found on 11 January 2001 that the plan adequately addressed the requirements of condition 9-2 (reference: 2015-0001224035), and therefore, condition 9-2 is no longer relevant.</p> <p>Condition 9-3 relates to the monitoring of mangroves, and subsequent implementation of the rehabilitation plan required by condition 9-2 if significant adverse impacts are observed. The EPA considers that the requirements of this condition also remain relevant. Where adverse impacts are observed the proponent will be required to revise the Operations Phase EMP, under condition C3-2(2), to include a rehabilitation plan for adversely impacted mangroves or algal mats.</p> <p>Condition 9-1 has been deleted and replaced with condition B1-1. Condition 9-2 has been deleted. Condition 9-3 has been deleted and replaced with condition C3-2(2).</p> |
| <b>10 Monitoring of Bitterns</b>          | Amend condition to remove monitoring of  | <p>Proponent initially requested to amend condition 10 and delete condition 19 to remove the requirement to monitor potential impacts of bitterns on the nearby prawning area. The proponent instead requested to only monitor the 'nearshore marine environment' and provided the justification that there have been no observed adverse impacts to date, and there is no current prawning industry within the impact area. In considering advice received from the former Department of Primary Industries and Regional Development (DPIRD), the EPA considers that</p>  |

| Ministerial Statement Condition     | Requested amendment                                | Consideration of the requested amendment  |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|
|                                     | impacts to the prawning fishery.                   | <p>monitoring the dilution of bitterns is important to assist in identifying fish kill events, adverse impacts on the prawn resource, and impacts on other fish species and fisheries more broadly. As such, it would not be appropriate to reduce the current level of monitoring. As such, the requirements of condition 10 have been retained, albeit replaced with contemporary wording and formatting.</p> <p>Condition 10 has been replaced with new condition C3-2(1), noting that the monitoring will be included in the Operations Phase EMP.</p>  |
| <b>11 Dilution of Bitterns</b>      | Consolidate and replace with contemporary wording. | <p>Condition 11 requires the proponent to ensure that the discharge channel in Middle Creek is managed appropriately to ensure the ocean tides can adequately dilute discharged bitterns. This requirement is still considered relevant; however, the wording can be updated to reflect a contemporary outcome-based condition.</p> <p>Condition 11 has been deleted and replaced with condition B2-1(1). The monitoring of the dilution of bitterns will be incorporated into the revised Operations Phase EMP.</p>  |
| <b>12 Pumping from Middle Creek</b> | Delete condition.                                  | <p>Condition 12 relates to a caveat that if the proponent wishes to pump seawater from Middle Creek, the activity will need to be referred to the EPA for consideration or assessment. The proponent has requested to delete condition 12 on the basis that they are not, and will not, pump from Middle Creek. It is noted that if the proponent wishes to pump from Middle Creek in the future, this activity will need to be referred to the EPA for consideration under section 45C or 40AA of the EP Act. The EPA advises that this is considered a more appropriate approach, rather than retaining this condition in the revised Ministerial Statement.</p> <p>Condition 12 has been deleted.</p>  |
| <b>13 Noise Management</b>          | Delete condition.                                  | <p>Condition 13 and commitment 11 relate to the implementing noise control measures. The proponent conducted noise monitoring between 1998 and 2010 to determine the potential noise impacts on the Town of Onslow. In November 2013, the former Office of the EPA determined that this monitoring adequately determined that the proposal was not significantly contributing to noise levels and that noise monitoring could cease (reference 2013-0000356603). It is noted that the proponent is still required to maintain compliance with the Environmental Protection (Noise) Regulations 1997.</p> <p>Condition 13 has been deleted.</p>  |
| <b>14 Onslow's Groundwater</b>      | Delete condition.                                  | <p>The proponent requested to delete condition 14 and commitment 12, which relate to the preparation and implementation of a groundwater monitoring program. The proponent conducted 12 years of groundwater monitoring, where the groundwater sampled within the Onslow townsite remained consistently fresh for that period and was not affected by saline intrusion. The former Office of the EPA determined in November 2013 that the requirements of condition 14 and commitment 12 were met and that groundwater monitoring could cease (reference: 2013-0000409972).</p> <p>The EPA advises that if the proponent wishes to alter the proposal to undertake activities that may impact groundwater quality, aside from the activities already authorised, the proponent must refer this activity to the EPA for consideration or assessment.</p> <p>Condition 14 has been deleted.</p> |

| Ministerial Statement Condition     | Requested amendment  | Consideration of the requested amendment  |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|
| <b>15 Vegetation on the Islands</b> | Amend condition to allow for natural revegetation to occur, and for rehabilitation to be considered through the Mine Closure Plan. | <p>Condition 15-1 requires the proponent to monitor the vegetation on shores of island created by filling of ponds, and where vegetation is killed by saline intrusion, the proponent must rehabilitate the area with salt-tolerant species under condition 15-2. The proponent requested to consolidate and update the wording of this condition to allow for rehabilitation efforts to be primarily managed through the proponent's Mine Closure Plan, as required under the <i>Mining Act 1978</i>. The EPA considers that this approach is appropriate and consistent with current EPA expectations, provided that native vegetation is monitored for impacts from saline intrusion. The requirements of condition 15-1 and 15-2 have been incorporated into new condition C3-3 to ensure the proponent monitors the effects of saline intrusion on island and condition B3-2(3) to ensure the proponent rehabilitates native vegetation that is impacted by saline intrusion.</p> <p>The proponent also requested to amend the wording of condition 15 to allow for natural rehabilitation to occur, rather than the proponent being required to remove and replace native salt-tolerant species that have naturally recolonised salt-affected islands. The EPA considers that this approach is appropriate, provided the proponent monitors the progress of natural revegetation and implements rehabilitation efforts in a timely manner if natural revegetation does not occur.</p> <p>Condition 15-1 and 15-2 have been replaced with new conditions C3-3 and B3-2(3), respectively.</p> |
| <b>16 Dredging Impacts</b>          | Delete condition.  | <p>Condition 16 and 17 and commitments 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, and 19 relate to dredging and channel blasting for the construction of the shipping channel. As the shipping channel has been construction and dredging is no longer proposed, these conditions and commitments are no longer relevant. The former DEP advised the proponent on 12 December 2000 that condition 16 and 17 and commitments 17 and 18 are no longer required (reference: 2015-0001224056) and therefore can be deleted. As commitments 14, 15, 16, and 19 also relate to dredging, they can also be deleted.</p> <p>If the proponent wishes to conduct further dredging, the proponent must refer this proposed activity to the EPA for consideration or assessment. It is noted that if the proponent wishes to conduct maintenance dredging, it would be required to seek approval under the <i>Environmental Protection (Sea Dumping) Act 1981</i>.</p> <p>Condition 16 has been deleted.</p>   |
| <b>17 Beadon Creek</b>              | Delete condition.  | <p>Refer to the discussion against condition 16 above.</p> <p>Condition 17 has been deleted.</p>  |
| <b>18 Oilspill Plan</b>             | Delete condition.  | <p>Condition 18 and commitment 20 relate to the storage of fuel and the preparation of an oil spill contingency plan and a ballast plan. The proponent has requested to delete condition 18 and commitment 20 on the basis that other regulatory processes can manage any potential risks. The proponent initially incorporated the requirements of condition 18 into the Operations Phase EMP, and the former DEP advised on 11 January 2001 that the requirements of condition 18 had been met (reference: 2015-0001224035). Since this time, other regulatory processes have emerged that can now adequately manage the potential impacts associated with oil spills.</p>  |



| Ministerial Statement Condition                                      | Requested amendment                                | Consideration of the requested amendment   |
|--|--|--|
|  |  | <p>In regard to the potential impacts from pollution from both accidental or routine discharges, the proponent is required to implement minimisation and management measures under both state and federal legislation to act in accordance with the International Convention for the Prevention of Pollution from Ships (MARPOL). The Commonwealth legislation giving effect to MARPOL is the <i>Protection of the Sea (Prevention of Pollution from Ships) Act 1983</i>, the <i>Navigation Act 2012</i>, and various Marine Orders. For Western Australia, the proponent is also required to adhere to the <i>Pollution of Waters by Oil and Noxious Substances Act 1987</i>. The potential impacts of invasive marine species through ballast water and/or biofouling are minimised through the requirements under the <i>Commonwealth Biosecurity Act 2015</i>, <i>Fish Resource Management Act 1994</i>, and in accordance with International Maritime Organisation requirements. Subject to the proponent's adherence to both state and federal legislation, the EPA considers that there is unlikely to be any significant impacts from oil spills or ballast water.</p> <p>Condition 18 has been deleted.</p> |
| <b>19 Potential Impacts on Onslow Community and Fishing Industry</b> | Delete condition.                                  | <p>Refer to the discussion against condition 10 above.</p> <p>The EPA, on advice from DPIRD, considers that identifying and resolving impacts on the prawn fishery remains relevant. The requirements of condition 19 are therefore retained, albeit with contemporary wording and formatting.</p> <p>Condition 19 has been deleted and replaced with new condition B2-1(2).</p>   |
| <b>20 Decommissioning Plans</b>                                      | Consolidate and replace with contemporary wording. | <p>Condition 20 relates to the preparation and implementation of decommissioning plans at least six months prior to closure, or three months prior to any temporary suspensions of operations. The proponent initially requested that this condition be update with contemporary wording, however, the preparation and approval of a decommissioning plan is more appropriately regulated under the <i>Mining Act 1978</i>. The proponent is required to prepare a Mine Closure Plan to the requirements of the Department of Mines, Petroleum and Exploration (DMPE), and submit to DMPE every three years. The proponent's Preliminary Mine Closure Plan (reference: 2018-1518058298757) states that the plan will be updated if any temporary suspension of operations is forecasted. The EPA does not consider that further regulation under the EP Act is required and therefore condition 20 is no longer relevant.</p> <p>Condition 20 has been deleted.</p>  |
| <b>21 Proponent</b>  | Consolidate and replace with contemporary wording. | <p>Condition 21 is related to the proponent's requirement to seek approval from the Minister for Environment to transfer ownership of the proposal. This requirement is now a statutory requirement under s38I of the EP Act, and therefore, is no longer relevant to include as a standalone condition. However, the requirement to change the proponent's name, physical address, or postal address is not captured under s38I of the EP Act and therefore remains relevant. Standard condition D3 includes this requirement in contemporary wording.</p> <p>Condition 21 has been replaced with new condition D3.</p>   |

| Ministerial Statement Condition           | Requested amendment   | Consideration of the requested amendment  |
|---|---|---|
| <b>22 Time Limit on Approval</b>          | Delete condition.   | Condition 22 relates to time limit for implementation of the proposal. This condition is no longer required, as the proposal has substantially commenced (reference: 2014-0001020481).<br><br>Condition 22 has been deleted.  |
| <b>23 Compliance Auditing</b>             | Consolidate and replace with contemporary wording.  | Condition 23 relates to the preparation of periodic compliance reports that are to be submitted to DWER for consideration. This requirement remains relevant, and various standard conditions in Part D provide the contemporary wording for this requirement.<br><br>Condition 23 has been replaced with new conditions in Part D.   |
| <b>24 Environmental Management System</b> | Delete condition 24-1.<br><br>Consolidate and replace condition 24-2 with contemporary wording. | Condition 24-1 relates to the development of an environmental management system that incorporates best practice management principles. This environmental management system was approved on 12 December 2000 (reference: 2015-0001224056), and therefore, the requirements of condition 24-1 have been met. The general provisions contained in the Environmental Management System remain relevant to meeting environmental objectives, however, the EPA considers that these provisions can be captured by standard conditions in Part C and Part D of the new Ministerial Statement.<br><br>Condition 24-2 relates to the implementation of the environmental management system, as prepared and approved under condition 24-1. The EPA considers that the provisions contained within this management system, including the requirement to act in accordance with best practice environmental management principles, remains relevant. EPA Services notes that the provisions as contained in the environmental management system are broad requirements related to the achievement of various outcomes and objectives. Current expectations of best practice management have also changed since the environmental management system was approved. As such, the modernised requirements of condition 24-2 have been incorporated across standard conditions in Part C and Part D.<br><br>Condition 24-1 has been deleted, and condition 24-2 has been replaced with standard conditions in Part C and Part D. |

**Table 2 – Consolidation and removal of proponent's commitments under Ministerial Statements 401 and 451.**

| Proponent's Environmental Management Commitments |  | Requested amendment | Consideration of the proposed amendment   |
|--|--|---------------------|---|
| <b>General</b>                                   | 1 A suitably qualified environmental supervisor will be on-site at all times during the construction and commissioning phases of the project, to prepare and carry out | Delete commitment.  | Construction and commissioning phases have been completed, and induction programs can be managed through the proponent's internal |

| Proponent's Environmental Management Commitments |   | Requested amendment                                | Consideration of the proposed amendment   |
|--|---|--|---|
|  | environmental induction programmes for construction and operations workers and to ensure that work is performed in an environmentally acceptable manner.  |  | documents. Commitment 1 is no longer required and has been deleted.   |
|  | 2 Prior to the commencement of any site works it is the Proponent's intention to prepare a record of the current physical and biological environment by means of landsat images, aerial photographs, videos, still colour photographs, site surveys, soil samples, levels and the like, as considered appropriate by the Proponent. These records will serve as a reference for claims made of any damage which has resulted from works carried out by the Proponent. | Delete commitment.                                 | The former DEP confirmed that a baseline survey was undertaken, and baseline data was collected prior to commencement of site works (reference: 2015-0001224056). Commitment 2 no longer required and has been deleted.   |
| Flooding and erosion                             | <b>Road access</b><br>Uralla, Peedamulla Roads<br>3 The Proponent believes its works will have no impact on these gravel roads which are closed in flood time for a considerable number of days. However, the Proponent undertakes that it will reasonably do such things as are necessary to ameliorate or eliminate any impact that has been caused as a result of the project.   | Consolidate and replace with contemporary wording. | The proponent initially requested that this commitment be deleted. As discussed against condition 3 in Table 1 above, the EPA considers that the rehabilitation of areas adversely affected by flooding or erosion should be retained.<br><br>The requirements of commitment 3 are retained, albeit with contemporary wording, and consolidated under new condition B3-2(2).  |
|  | 4 Water Corporation pipeline<br>In conjunction with the Water Corporation, a controlled-access road will be maintained along the pipeline which will be dependent on the resolution of public liability insurance, security, ongoing maintenance and operational matters. All access to bunds and sea walls will be fenced off (Section 8.3.2.7) which will prevent access to sensitive coastal areas.  | Delete commitment.                                 | The proponent initially requested that this commitment be deleted. The EPA considers this request to be reasonable, and that the potential impacts associated with removing this commitment are considered negligible, and the maintenance of this access road can be adequately managed through the proponent's internal documents. It is noted that if the access road is no longer required, the proponent will be required to rehabilitate the area as required by new condition B3-2(1).<br><br>Commitment 4 has been deleted. |
|  | <b>Pastoral</b><br>5 If as a result of the Proponent's works, floodwaters backup in natural creeks and cause loss of pasture, stock, fences or other damage to pastoral property outside the  | Replace with contemporary wording.                 | The proponent initially requested that this commitment be deleted. As discussed against condition 3 in Table 1 above, the EPA considers   |

| Proponent's Environmental Management Commitments |   | Requested amendment                                | Consideration of the proposed amendment  |
|--|---|--|--|
|  | Proponent's leases, the Proponent will discharge its legal obligations to compensate the pastoral leaseholder for the loss incurred.  |  | that the rehabilitation of areas adversely affected by flooding or erosion should be retained.<br>The requirements of commitment 3 are retained, albeit with contemporary wording, and consolidated under new condition B3-2(2).   |
|  | <b>Erosion</b><br>6 If detrimental scouring occurs in creek beds, creek walls or the salt flats or along the edges of islands as a direct result of the Proponent's works, the Proponent will repair and/or stabilise such erosion by stone pitching, regrading or redesign as appropriate to the reasonable satisfaction of the Minister for the Environment.  | Consolidate and replace with contemporary wording. | The proponent initially requested that this commitment be deleted. As discussed against condition 3 in Table 1 above, the EPA considers that the rehabilitation of areas adversely affected by flooding or erosion should be retained.<br>The requirements of commitment 3 are retained, albeit with contemporary wording, and consolidated under new condition B3-2(2). |
|  | <b>Racetrack</b><br>7 The Proponent commits to monitoring the situation in the area of the existing Onslow race track to determine if its works are increasing the incidence of flooding. If this can be proved the Proponent undertakes to carry out such remedial works as may be reasonably necessary e.g. a bund around the racetrack.  | Delete commitment.                                 | The proponent has advised that the Onslow racetrack has been decommissioned. Commitment 7 is no longer required and has been deleted.  |
|  | <b>Indigenous animals</b><br>8 The Proponent has committed to carrying out a faunal survey of areas which will be isolated by flooding of the ponds before work commences. If isolated islands within the ponds become over-populated or fauna is endangered as a result of the Proponent's work, the Proponent will undertake a study by experts of the situation to determine which animals can survive under the new conditions and which animals may need to be removed by the Proponent to the mainland or larger islands and put into effect remedial management practices. | Delete commitment.                                 | Refer to discussion against condition 8 in Table 1 above. Commitment 8 is no longer required and has been deleted.   |
| <b>Beadon Creek</b>                              | 9 The Proponent has initiated a growth monitoring programme in the Beadon Creek catchment. If significant damage is occurring or seems likely to occur to mangroves as a result of the Proponent's works, the Proponent undertake to carry out a study by experts to determine the nature of the problem and its possible remedies and to   | Consolidate and replace with                       | Refer to discussion against condition 9 in Table 1 above. The proponent will continue to monitor and   |

| Proponent's Environmental Management Commitments |  | Requested amendment                                | Consideration of the proposed amendment   |
|--|--|--|---|
|  | <p>prepare and implement a plan for rehabilitation of those mangroves and algal mats to the satisfaction of the Minister, for example:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 restriction of pumping at high tide;</li> <li>2 irrigate creek headwaters with seawater from the creek or the first evaporation pond to promote mangrove growth</li> <li>3 propagate mangroves in irrigated areas; and</li> <li>4 construct a flood channel to allow inland floodwaters to flow through the condenser ponds to Beadon Creek. The Proponent undertakes to carry out the most appropriate remedy to the extent reasonably necessary.</li> </ol>  | contemporary wording.                              | rehabilitate mangroves and algal mat communities through new conditions B1-1 and C3-2(2).   |
| <b>Discharge of bitterns</b>                     | <p>10 Bitterns will be discharged in a controlled manner into Middle Creek at half tide or higher via a channel with an invert level below the mangrove root zone. The proponent shall undertake a monitoring programme, to the satisfaction of the Environmental Protection Authority, to demonstrate that the discharge strategy is environmentally acceptable or, if significant damage is occurring, or seems likely to occur, prepare and implement a revised discharge strategy and rehabilitation plan to the satisfaction of the Minister for the Environment.</p>   | Consolidate and replace with contemporary wording. | Refer to discussion against condition 10 and 11 in Table 1 above. The proponent will continue to monitor bitterns discharge into Middle Creek through new conditions B2-1 and C3-2(1) respectively.   |
| <b>Noise</b>                                     | <p>11 Noise will be maintained at or below statutory levels for residential areas through construction of bunds, work practice and design of machines. Noise will be monitored in the early stages of operation and, if unacceptable levels are detected, the Proponent will take action to reduce emissions to acceptable levels. Noise levels will be monitored continuously by an automatic recorder near Clarke Place during the early stages of full scale operation to ensure that the acceptable standards and predictions are being met. The recordings will be displayed in the Supervisor's office for his attention if needed. Continuous monitoring shall be for a period of 12 months whereupon the need will be reviewed and continued if necessary as agreed with the Environmental Protection Authority.</p> | Delete commitment.                                 | Refer to discussion against condition 13 in Table 1 above. The former Office of the EPA confirmed that noise monitoring can cease (reference: 2013-0000356603). Commitment 11 has been deleted.       |
| <b>Groundwater regime (Onslow)</b>               | <p>12 The Proponent will install groundwater monitoring sites within the townsite of Onslow and continue to monitor these sites for a minimum period of 10 years from when the ponds are filled and take whatever action is necessary to maintain Onslow's gardens against saltwater encroachment from the ponds, to the satisfaction of the Environmental Protection Authority.</p>   | Delete commitment.                                 | Refer to discussion against condition 12 in Table 1 above. The former Office of the EPA confirmed that groundwater monitoring can cease (reference: 2013-0000409972). Commitment 12 has been deleted. |

| Proponent's Environmental Management Commitments |   | Requested amendment                                | Consideration of the proposed amendment   |
|--|---|--|---|
|  | 13 Island foreshores will be monitored for the effects of rising saline groundwaters and areas where vegetation has been subsequently lost as a result of increased salinity will 'be rehabilitated by planting with salt tolerant species.   | Consolidate and replace with contemporary wording. | Refer to discussion against condition 15 in Table 1 above. The proponent will be required to monitor and rehabilitate the impacts of saline intrusion on islands through new conditions B3-2(3) and C3-3. |
| Marine impacts                                   | <b>Dredging</b><br>14 No dredging will be carried out within 800 metres of Wards Reef. No spoil will be dumped on or within 500 metres of Wards Reef. The proponent will monitor the effect of suspended sediment arising from the dredging and dumping operation on Wards Reef. If the reef is shown to be adversely affected, the dredging operation will be stopped or relocated to another area until an alternative dredging plan is approved. | Delete commitment.                                 | Refer to discussion against condition 16 in Table 1 above. The proponent has completed dredging. Commitment 14 has been deleted.  |
|  | 15 No channel blasting will be undertaken near Wards Reef without further environmental assessment by the EPA.  | Delete commitment.                                 | Refer to discussion against condition 16 in Table 1 above. The proponent has completed dredging. Commitment 15 has been deleted.  |
|  | 16 The Proponent is committed to monitoring the dredging operation with the aim of minimising the impact on environmentally sensitive areas and the adjacent trawling grounds.  | Delete commitment.                                 | Refer to discussion against condition 16 in Table 1 above. The proponent has completed dredging. Commitment 16 has been deleted.  |
|  | 17 Specifications will provide for spoil to be kept within the designated areas and heights specified in the 1997 Section 46 report and during subsequent assessment procedures. The project supervisors and dredge master will be educated on the importance and relevance of the specifications.  | Delete commitment.                                 | Refer to discussion against condition 16 in Table 1 above. The former DEP confirmed this commitment is no longer required (reference: 2015-0001224056). Commitment 17 has been deleted.                   |
|  | 18 If material from the spoil banks is shown to be contributing to siltation at the mouth of Beadon Creek then the Proponent will: remove such accumulation due to its works; take reasonable steps to prevent such accumulation from occurring.  | Delete commitment.                                 | Refer to discussion against condition 16 in Table 1 above. The former DEP confirmed this commitment is no longer required (reference: 2015-0001224056). Commitment 18 has been deleted.                   |
|  | 19 The Proponent will monitor the stability of spoil disposal sites and the sedimentation rate on Ward's Reef, and if significant impacts on the sedimentation rate on adjacent coral reefs is detected, the proponent will consult the Department of Environmental Protection to develop practical strategies to alleviate such impacts.   | Delete commitment.                                 | Refer to discussion against condition 16 in Table 1 above. The proponent has completed dredging. Commitment 19 has been deleted.  |

| Proponent's Environmental Management Commitments |   | Requested amendment   | Consideration of the proposed amendment   |
|--|---|---|---|
|  | <p><b>Shipping</b></p> <p>20 Fuel will be stored and conveyed according to standard regulations. A tug/workboat with boom and skimmer and line boat permanently stationed at Onslow will be equipped to deal with marine spills. The Proponent confirms its undertaking in the ERMP to construct all fuel facilities with the most up-to-date protection measures. In addition:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 an oil spill contingency plan to deal with both offshore and onshore spills consistent with the then current industry standards will be in place together with all such equipment needed before the construction of the trestleway.</li> <li>2 a ballast plan consistent with the then current industry standards also will be in place before any salt carrying ships are allowed to use the Proponent's jetty.</li> </ol>  | Delete commitment.  | Refer to discussion against condition 18 in Table 1 above. The potential impacts associated with oil spills and ballast water can be adequately managed under other regulatory processes. Commitment 20 has been deleted.   |
| <b>Construction</b>                              | <p>21 The Proponent's environmental management programme will take into account the potential problems associated with the disposal of rubbish and the behaviour of personnel arising from its construction camp.</p>   | Delete commitment.  | The potential impacts associated with the rubbish disposal can be adequately managed under existing Part V license conditions relating to waste management (L7180/1997/11). Commitment 21 has been deleted.   |
|  | <p>22 A condition of the Construction Contract will specify that personnel are to keep to designated tracks and to extract material only from selected sites to reduce the impact of vehicles and quarrying on the countryside.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 All access to bunds and seawalls will be fenced off which will prevent access to sensitive coastal areas.</li> <li>2 All quarry sites will be made safe, rehabilitated and fenced off apart from those portions required for maintenance.</li> <li>3 Borrow pits will be left in a safe, stable and rehabilitated condition as soon as possible after use, with walls battered and topsoil respread so as to encourage revegetation.</li> <li>4 Noise and dust emissions will be managed and movement of vehicles on local roads will be minimised.</li> <li>5 Roads and carparks in the vicinity of the stockpile/washplant will be sealed if necessary.</li> </ol> | Delete commitments 22.1, 22.4, 22.5, 22.6, and 22.12. Consolidate and replace commitments 22.2, 22.3, 22.7, 22.8, 22.9, 22.10, and 22.11 with contemporary wording. | Commitment 22 includes prescriptive requirements in relation to minimising adverse impacts when sourcing constructing materials from quarries and borrow pits and rehabilitating these sites after use. The proponent requested to delete commitment 22, however, some of the requirements of condition 22 remain relevant where impacts extended beyond the construction phase (such as using and rehabilitating quarry sites during the operational phase).<br><br>22.1 The former DEP confirmed that this commitment is no longer required (reference: 2015-0001224056). Commitment 22.1 has been deleted. |

| Proponent's Environmental Management Commitments   | Requested amendment | Consideration of the proposed amendment   |
|--|---------------------|---|
| <p>6 The haul road will be sheeted with gravel and watered.</p> <p>7 A part-time community worker will be engaged to assist the new workforce integrate with locals.</p> <p>8 Consultation with local Aboriginal people will be ongoing during construction near known sites which will be fenced in parts where they could be accidentally damaged by Contractors plant and personnel.</p> <p>9 Light emissions will be managed through design so as to have minimal impact on Back Beach and the adjacent residential area. (Section 8.3.2.2).</p> <p>10 A tree and shrub planting programme will be initiated for the areas affected by the Project.</p> <p>11 If the Bindi Bindi community wishes to supply and maintain the trees they will be contracted to do so.</p> <p>12 The Proponent will, subject to agreement, contribute towards the cost of upgrading the water supply main in conjunction with the Water Corporation.</p> |                     | <p>22.2 Refer to discussion against condition 4 in Table 1 above. Rehabilitation of quarries can be consolidated and managed under new condition B3-2(1).</p> <p>22.3 Refer to discussion against condition 4 in Table 1 above. Rehabilitation of borrow pits can be consolidated and managed under new condition B3-2(1).</p> <p>22.4 Refer to discussion against condition 13 in Table 1 above. The former Office of the EPA confirmed that noise monitoring can cease (reference: 2013-0000356603). Dust emissions can be adequately managed under existing Part V license conditions (L7180/1997/11). Commitment 22.4 has been deleted.</p> <p>22.5 The former DEP confirmed that this commitment is no longer required (reference: 2015-0001224056). Commitment 22.5 has been deleted.</p> <p>22.6 The sheeting of haul roads with gravel and use of dust suppression techniques can be adequately managed under existing Part V license conditions (L7180/1997/11). Commitment 22.6 has been deleted.</p> <p>22.7 Consultation with the relevant Traditional Owners can be consolidated and managed under new condition B4-3 and B4-4.</p> <p>22.8 Consultation with the relevant Traditional Owners can be consolidated and managed under new condition B4-3 and B4-4. Management of potential direct impacts to Aboriginal sites can be adequately managed under the <i>Aboriginal Heritage Act 1972</i>.</p> |



| Proponent's Environmental Management Commitments |  | Requested amendment                                | Consideration of the proposed amendment   |
|--|--|--|---|
|  |  |  | <p>22.9 Adverse impacts from light emissions can be consolidated and managed under new condition B4-2(2).</p> <p>22.10 Rehabilitation of areas affected by the proposal can be consolidated and managed under new condition B3.</p> <p>22.11 Consultation with the relevant Traditional Owners can be consolidated and managed under new condition B4-3 and B4-4.</p> <p>22.12 The proponent has advised that this commitment has been completed and is no longer required. Commitment 22.12 has been deleted.</p>  |
| Social   | <p><b>Access to jetty</b></p> <p>23 The Proponent confirms its undertaking in the ERMP that the public may use the jetty at their own risk from 6.00 am to 10.00 pm whenever the jetty is not required for reasonable operational purposes. The existing level of access to Back Beach will not be restricted.</p>                       | Consolidate and replace with contemporary wording. | <p>The proponent has requested to delete commitment 23 and 24 on the basis that regulatory and public insurance requirements have changed considerably over the past 32 years, and that Commonwealth maritime security requirements mean that it is not possible to grant unrestricted access to the jetty for members of the public. Removing public access to the operational jetty is considered reasonable, however, the requirement to maintain access to Back Beach should be retained, albeit with contemporary wording. Access to Back Beach will be maintained under new condition B4-1(1).</p> <p>Commitment 23 has been deleted and consolidated in new condition B4-1(1).</p> |
|  | <p>24 The Proponent in conjunction with the Shire will maintain third party insurance for use of the jetty and assist in maintaining Local Authority by-laws on and near the jetty. If the public consistently abuse the privilege offered or damage the Proponent's property, the rights of access will be restricted or withdrawn.</p> | Delete commitment.                                 | <p>Refer to discussion against commitment 23 above. Commitment 24 has been deleted.</p>   |

| Proponent's Environmental Management Commitments |   | Requested amendment                                | Consideration of the proposed amendment   |
|--|---|--|---|
|  | <p><b>Local community consultation</b></p> <p>25 The Proponent is committed to ongoing community consultation, and formal liaison and monitoring processes to be established by the Proponent to the satisfaction of the Environmental Protection Authority to monitor, review and manage the social impact of the project throughout its life.</p>   | Consolidate and replace with contemporary wording. | <p>The proponent initially requested to delete commitments 25 and 26, which requires the proponent to consult with the community about the monitoring and management of social impacts of the proposal, as this consultation could be managed through the proponent's internal procedures. Through discussion with the proponent, it was considered that consultation on impacts to social values should be retained, albeit with contemporary wording.</p> <p>Monitoring and management of adverse impacts to social surroundings values, and the commitment to ongoing consultation, can be adequately managed under new condition B4-2(1), B4-3, and B4-4.</p> |
|  | <p>26 Reporting on this liaison, monitoring and management of the social impacts will be part of the Proponent's monitoring reports to the Environmental Protection Authority.</p>  | Consolidate and replace with contemporary wording. | <p>Commitment 26 relates to the reporting of the consultation as described against commitment 25 above. Reporting against the conditions is a standard process included in Part C and Part D of modern Ministerial Statements.</p> <p>Commitment 26 can be adequately managed under standard conditions in Part C and Part D.</p>   |
|  | <p>27 The Proponent will specifically:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 employ a person, in conjunction with DET, to liaise with the Aboriginal community to establish an Aboriginal Employment Action Plan;</li> <li>2 create specific employment training strategies for the local community and provide opportunities for training courses in conjunction with DET. (NB. DET has committed itself to providing a community based resource person to liaise with the person in 1 above);</li> <li>3 make provision to train at least two unskilled workers at all times in specific skills and tasks and provide for formal industrial training.</li> </ol> | Consolidate and replace with contemporary wording. | <p>Refer to discussion against commitment 25 above. The proponent will be required to consult with the Traditional Owners for the life of the proposal under new condition B4-3 and B4-4.</p>   |

| Proponent's Environmental Management Commitments |   | Requested amendment   | Consideration of the proposed amendment  |
|--|---|---|--|
| <b>Environmental Management Programme</b>        | <p><b>Report</b></p> <p>28 Prior to the start of construction of each phase of the proposal, the Proponent will prepare, submit and subsequently implement an Environmental Management Programme (EMP) that addresses, where appropriate, the monitoring, management, auditing and reporting requirements of the following issues:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 impacts associated with onshore and offshore construction;</li> <li>2 fauna survey and relocation plan for islands isolated by salt ponds;</li> <li>3 ongoing monitoring in Beadon, Middle and Four Mile Creek systems to safeguard the mangrove and algal mat environments;</li> <li>4 the mouth of Beadon Creek to maintain present access levels;</li> <li>5 noise levels in Onslow arising from the processing facilities;</li> <li>6 oilspill contingency plan to minimise impacts from onshore and offshore spills;</li> <li>7 groundwater salinity and levels in the town of Onslow and on susceptible islands;</li> <li>8 community consultation, monitoring and liaison; and</li> <li>9 areas under rehabilitation;</li> </ol> <p>to the satisfaction of the Environmental Protection Authority.</p> | <p>Delete commitments 28.1, 28.2, 28.5, 28.6, and 28.7.</p> <p>Consolidate and replace commitments 28, 28.3, 28.5, 28.8, and 28.9 with contemporary wording</p> | <p>28 Refer to discussion against condition 3 in Table 1 above. The proponent is currently implementing the Operations Phase EMP and will continue to be required to revise the EMP under new condition B2-3.</p> <p>28.1 Impacts associated with construction of the proposal are no longer relevant. Commitment 28.1 has been deleted.</p> <p>28.2 Refer to discussion against condition 8 in Table 1 above. The fauna survey and relocation plan is no longer required. Commitment 28.2 has been deleted.</p> <p>28.3 Refer to discussion against condition 9 in Table 1 above. Monitoring of impacts mangroves and algal mates can be adequately addressed under new condition B1-1 and C3-2(2).</p> <p>28.4 The requirement to maintain public access to the mouth of Beadon Creek remains relevant. The EPA has consolidated the requirements of condition 28.4 into new condition B4-1(1).</p> <p>28.5 Refer to discussion against condition 13 in Table 1 above. Noise monitoring and management are no longer required. Commitment 28.5 has been deleted.</p> <p>28.6 Refer to discussion against condition 18 in Table 1 above. Potential impacts associated with oil spills can be adequately managed through other regulatory processes. Commitment 28.6 has been deleted.</p> <p>28.7 Refer to discussion against condition 14 in Table 1 above. Monitoring of groundwater is no longer required. Commitment 28.7 has been deleted.</p> |

| Proponent's Environmental Management Commitments |  | Requested amendment                                | Consideration of the proposed amendment  |
|--|--|--|--|
|  |  |  | <p>28.8 Refer to discussion against commitment 25 above. Monitoring, management, and consultation can be adequately managed under new condition B4-3 and B4-4.</p> <p>28.9 Refer to discussion against commitment 4 above. Rehabilitation can be adequately managed under new condition B3-3.</p>  |
|  | <p><b>Monitoring manual</b></p> <p>29 The Proponent will keep on-site a Monitoring Manual which will contain separate sections as above for each phase of the project, the relevant baseline data, the monitoring commitments in detail, standard forms and frequencies for various tests required, management procedures necessary for different circumstances and reporting requirements.</p> <p>The Manual will be designed to introduce new employees to the environmental requirements and commitments of the project. It will be available at all times to visitors from the Environmental Protection Authority or other government agencies needing such information.</p> | Consolidate and replace with contemporary wording. | <p>Commitment 29 relates to the preparation of a monitoring manual that includes baseline data, monitoring commitments, and other relevant management measures. The proponent requested to revise this commitment with contemporary wording; however, the EPA considers that this commitment can be deleted. The monitoring manual was incorporated into the environmental management system, which, as discussed in Table 3 above, was approved on 12 December 2000 (reference: 2015-0001224056). Preparing a specific monitoring manual is no longer the EPA's current expectations, and therefore commitment 29 can be deleted. It is noted that the proponent will still be required to undertake monitoring efforts to report on compliance against Ministerial Statement conditions, however, the preparation of a specific monitoring manual is no longer required. Commitment 29 has been deleted.</p> |

## Proposal Content Document- s45c change to implementation conditions

**Table 1:** General proposal content description

|                          |  |
|--------------------------|--|
| <b>Proposal title</b>    | Onslow Solar Salt Project  |
| <b>Proponent name</b>    | Onslow Salt Pty Ltd  |
| <b>Short description</b> | The solar salt field produces crystalline salt by evaporating seawater pumped from Beadon Creek, near the town of Onslow in the Pilbara region of Western Australia (Figure 1). As water is evaporated, the resultant brine increases in density through a series of condenser ponds. Maiden brine is transferred to the crystallisers where the salt is crystallised from solution. Raw salt is harvested then hauled, washed and stockpiled prior to being exported via a trestled load-out facility to a dredged approach channel that accommodates shipping. Bitterns, reject brines from the process, are discharged in a controlled manner through Middle Creek. |

**Table 2:** Proposal content elements

| Proposal element   | Location / description | Maximum extent, capacity or range   |
|--|------------------------|---|
| <b>Physical elements</b>   |                        |   |
| Development envelope   | Figure 1               | 23,266.3 ha   |
| Disturbance footprint  | Figure 1               | 10,200.1 ha   |
| Condenser ponds  | Figure 1               | 8,009.0 ha  |
| Crystalliser ponds   | Figure 1               | 1,040.0 ha  |
| Materials pits and quarries  | Figure 1               | 302.3 ha  |
| Access and haul roads  | Figure 1               | 222.0 ha  |
| Workshops and plant  | Figure 1               | 38.4 ha   |
| Jetty length (area)  | Figure 1               | 1.25 km (3.8 ha given 30 m width)   |
| Dredge channel   | Figure 1               | 9.6 km (length), 10.8 m (depth), 120 m (width) (115.2 ha)                 |
| Seawater Intake Pump   | Figure 1               | 12 m <sup>3</sup> /sec  |
| Settling Ponds   | Figure 1               | 5.0 ha  |
| <b>Construction elements</b>   |                        |   |
| Construction is complete   | -                      | Construction is complete  |
| <b>Operational elements</b>  |                        |   |
| Stockpile volume   | Figure 1               | 1,000,000 m <sup>3</sup>  |
| Bitterns discharge   | Figure 1               | 22,500 m <sup>3</sup> per day   |
| Power consumption  | -                      | 3 MW  |
| Average annual greenhouse gas emissions from all plant and equipment | -                      | 12,114 tonnes of carbon dioxide equivalent (CO <sub>2</sub> -e) per year. |
| Annual Salt Production   | -                      | 3.5 million tonnes (dry) per annum  |

| Proposal element   | Location / description      | Maximum extent, capacity or range |
|--|-----------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| <b>Proposal elements with greenhouse gas emissions</b>   |                             |                                   |
| <b>Construction elements:</b>  |                             |                                   |
| Construction is complete   | Construction is complete    |                                   |
| <b>Operation elements:</b>   |                             |                                   |
| All plant and equipment  | 12,114 t CO <sub>2</sub> -e |                                   |
| <b>Rehabilitation</b>  |                             |                                   |
| Progressive rehabilitation of materials sourcing areas throughout the life of the approved proposal.<br>Implementation of the Preliminary Mine Closure Plan at least 6 years prior to closure. |                             |                                   |
| <b>Commissioning</b>   |                             |                                   |
| Commissioning is complete  |                             |                                   |
| <b>Decommissioning</b>   |                             |                                   |
| Commenced at least 6 years prior to closure in accordance with the approved proposal's Preliminary Mine Closure Plan.  |                             |                                   |
| <b>Other elements which affect extent of effects on the environment</b>  |                             |                                   |
| Proposal time  | Maximum project life        | No set limit (nominally 50 years) |
|  | Construction phase          | Construction is complete          |
|  | Operations phase            | No set limit (nominally 50 years) |
|  | Decommissioning phase       | At least 6 years prior to closure |

## Attachments

Figure 1: Onslow Salt Development Envelope and Infrastructure

Figure 2: Onslow Salt Mining Tenure & Infrastructure