

Roy Hill Revised Proposal - MS 1189

Proposal Content Document

Table 1: General proposal content description

Proposal title	Revised Proposal for the Roy Hill Iron Ore Mine
Proponent name	Roy Hill Iron Ore Pty Ltd
Short description	The revised proposal is to mine and process iron ore from on the southern slopes of the Chichester Range and to develop and operate associated infrastructure 110 km north of Newman in the Pilbara region of Western Australia.

Table 2: Proposal content elements

Element	Location and description	Maximum extent, capacity or range
Physical elements		
Indicative Disturbance Footprint	Figures 1a and 1b	No more than 17,395 ha
Location of Disturbance Footprint	Figures 1a and 1b	<p>Within the development envelope</p> <p>Not within the Flora Exclusion Area</p> <p>Not within the Ghost Bat Exclusion Area</p> <p>Not within the Heritage Exclusion Area except for the purposes of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An access road • Rehabilitation of existing disturbed areas • Environmental monitoring activities <p>Not within the sheet flow buffer area except for the purpose of South-West Injection Borefield infrastructure</p>
Overburden	N/a	3,330 Mt overburden to be used as pit infill, used for construction of infrastructure and stored in out of pit dumps
In-pit tailings storage facilities	Figure 3	Only in mine pits shown in Figure 3
Borefields	Figure 2	Within the indicative borefield envelopes
Surface Water Diversion structures	N/a	Permanent surface water diversion structures, rather than reinstatement of creeks following

Element	Location and description	Maximum extent, capacity or range
		backfill of mine pits and decommissioning of mine infrastructure.
Evaporation ponds and SWIB recharge basins	Figure 4	Avoid the drainage lines (watercourse) shown in Figure 4
Operational elements		
Mineral resources	N/a	1 Bt Marra Mamba Ore, 1 Bt Detrital Ore
Depth of pits	N/a	No more than 120 m below ground level
Mine pit dewatering volumes	N/a	No more than 626 GL
Excess water used for dust suppression	N/a	No more than 7.4 GL in total
Disposal of excess water to evaporation ponds	N/a	No more than 540 ha
Excess water disposal by reinjection basins, and aquifer injection at: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • South-West Injection borefield • Remote MAR borefield • Southern borefield • Stage 1 borefield • Mine borefield 	Figure 2 Figures 1a and 1b	No more than 508 GL
Volume of water supply from Southern Borefield	N/a	No more than 150 GL
Greenhouse gas emissions		
Average annual emissions		
Scope 1		450,000 tCO ₂ equivalent per annum ¹
Scope 2		288,000 tCO ₂ equivalent per annum ²
Scope 3		N/a
Life of mine emissions (2022-2032)		
Scope 1		4.39 MtCO ₂ -e ³
Scope 2		3.17 MtCO ₂ -e ⁴
Scope 3		N/a
Rehabilitation		

Element	Location and description	Maximum extent, capacity or range	
<p>After completion of activities, rehabilitation of cleared and disturbed areas will be undertaken to meet closure criteria in accordance with the Mine Closure Plan.</p> <p>Where practicable, progressive rehabilitation will be undertaken over the life of the mine.</p> <p>Areas disturbed through the implementation of the Proposal will be designed to be safe and non-polluting and will be constructed so the final shape, size, stability, are comparable with the natural landforms in the area.</p>			
Commissioning			
<p>Commissioning of the infrastructure and operational elements will be undertaken subject to the operational limits above.</p>			
Decommissioning			
<p>Mine infrastructure and landforms will be decommissioned in accordance with the Mine Closure Plan, this will include permanent surface water diversions.</p>			
Other elements which affect extent of effects on the environment			
Proposal time	Maximum project life/ life of mine	2032	No change

Note:

- 1 Value as per Table ESO-2 (referred to as stand-in PCD of original MS1189) and as approved in MS1189.
- 2 Table ESO-2 was silent on Scope 2 GHG emissions. The value included was assessed in EPA Report 1716 as an unabated level.
- 3 This value represents the net (abated) GHG emissions for the LOM as per Condition 9-1 of MS1189.
- 4 This value represents the net GHG emissions of Scope 2 (refer to Note 2) at 288,000 tCO₂ under an 11 year LOM.





Figure 1a: Development Envelope (North)

S:\Projects\EIA\38\2019_1551422096079_RevisedProposal\Final\RoyHillIronOreMine\3_AssessmentRevisedProposalRoyHill_Report_Figures_PriorityFloraExclusion_V3.mxd



S:\Projects\EIA\382019_1551422096079_RevisedProposalForTheRoyHillIronOreMine\3_Assessment\RevisedProposaRoyHill_Report_Figures_Rorfeld_V1.mxd

Figure 1b: Development Envelope (South)





Figure 2: Indicative borefield envelopes

S:\Projects\EIA\38\2019_1551422096079_RevisedProposalofTheRoyHillIronOreMine\3_Assessment\RevisedProposaRoyHill_Report_Figure2_InlandWaterBorefield_V2.mxd



S:\Projects\EIA\38\2019_1551422096079_RevisedProposalofTheRoyHillIronOreMine\3_Assessment\RevisedProposaRoyHill_Report_Figure14_TSP's_V1.mxd

Figure 3: Indicative In-pit tailings storage facilities





Figure 4: Drainage line (watercourse) avoidance – Evaporation pond and recharge basins



S:\Projects\EIA\38\2019_1551422096079_RevisedProposalForTheRoyHillIronOreMine\3_Assessment\RevisedPropoal\RoyHill_Report_Figure12_GroundwaterDrawdown_V2.mxd

Figure 5: Regional monitoring bores RHPZ0292S and RHPZ0293S




Figure 6(a): Fauna habitats (development envelope north)





Figure 6(b): Fauna habitats (development envelope south)



S:\Projects\EIA\638\2019_1551422096079_Revise\Proposa\Fof\TheRoyHillIronOreMine\3_Assessment\Revised\Proposa\RoyHill_Report_Figure15_Eremophila_V1.mxd

Figure 7: Local records extent - *Eremophila pilosa*