Form

Referral of a proposal under s. 38 of the EP Act

PART A: PROPONENT AND REFERRER INFORMATION AND PROPOSAL DESCRIPTION			
Referrer information			
Who is referring this proposal?		✓ Proponent ☐ Decision-making authority ☐ Community member/third party	
Name David Pozzari		**Signature**	
Position	Environment and Heritage Manager (West Pilbara)	Organisation	Pilbara Ports Authority
Email	David.Pozzari@pilbaraports.com.au	Phone	08 9159 6541
Address	1	Mof Rd	
	Burrup Peninsula Dampier	WA	6713
Date	28/04/2022		
Does the referrer request that the EPA treat any part of the proposal information in the referral as confidential? *Provide confidential information in a separate attachment.*		☐ Yes ✓ No	
Does the referrer confirm that they consent to receive correspondence electronically?		✓ Yes ☐ No	
Referral declaration for proponent and Authorised representative: I, David Pozarri declare that I am authorised to refer this proposal on behalf of Pilbara Ports Authority and further declare that the information contained in this form is true and not misleading. Date:28/04/2022			
Proponent information			
Name of the proponent/s *Include Trading Name if relevant*		Pilbara Ports Authority	
Australian Company Number(s) ☐ **OR** Australian Business Number(s) ✓		94 987 448 870	
Pre-referral discussions			
Have you had pre-referral discussions with the EPA (including the EPA Services of DWER)?		✓ Yes	

If so, provide name, date, and overview of discussions.	Hans Jacob and Kevin McAlpine, 10 December 2021. Purpose was to provide an overview of scope of works, EIA approach and approvals pathway and receive feedback any issues that may impact the assessment and Project construction or schedule. ☐ No
Proposal information	
Proposal name	Dampier Cargo Wharf Extension and Landside Redevelopment Project
What is the proposal? (Include general description in the *Instructions and template: How to identify the content of a proposal)*	The Proposal is for the construction and operation of a southern wharf extension to the Dampier Cargo Wharf at the Port of Dampier. The Proposal incorporates the development of a new (adjoining) southern section of wharf and associated mooring dolphin, dredged berth pocket and vessel manoeuvring area. The Proposal will enable larger vessels (up to Panamax class) to access the terminal and facilitate new trades and products being handled at the Port.
Have you provided electronic spatial data, maps, and figures in the appropriate format?	✓ Yes ☐ No
What type of proposal is being referred? *For significant amendment or derived proposal, provide the associated existing Ministerial statement number/s* *For a proposal under an assessed planning scheme, provide the scheme number and name*	✓ significant proposal. *Choose which type of significant proposal* ✓ new proposal ☐ significant amendment (proposal only) ☐ significant amendment (conditions only) ☐ significant amendment (proposal and conditions) ☐ strategic proposal ☐ derived proposal ☐ proposals of a prescribed class ☐ proposal under an assessed planning scheme
Proposal content: *Complete the corresponding template (Proposal Content Document) from the Instructions and template: How to identify the content of a proposal for the type of proposal identified above. The completed form* ***must be*** *submitted with the referral.*	

Alternatives	There is currently no multi-user bulk solid export capacity in the Port. The need for a new multi-user facility has been recognised by PPA, to support new and existing trades in the Pilbara region and proposed industrial developments in the Burrup SIA. Preliminary investigations and studies and were conducted to assess a range of options for a new multi-user facility at the Port: **Option 1:** *Do nothing* – this will not enable new and existing trades to be accommodated and does not provide export capability for proposed industrial developments in the Burrup SIA. For this reason, this option was not considered further. **Option 2:** *Retrofit existing general cargo wharf DCW for bulk materials handling* - this option was considered but determined to be operationally unviable for the DCW efficiently support multi-product bulk solids export and general cargo throughput. The DCW structure and associated berth pockets is not designed for the size of vessels which may be required to facilitate bulk solid export and there would be significant and costly engineering challenges in installing ship-loading and materials handling infrastructure onto the existing DCW to function as a bulk solid handling berth. For these reasons, this option was not considered further. **Option 3**: *Modify or extend existing Dampier Bulk Liquids to accommodate bulk solids export* – the DBLB was designed to accommodate the trade of bulk liquids from the Burrup SIA, and currently enables the export of anhydrous ammonia and import of diesel products. This option would see the DBLB modified or extended northwards (as contemplated in the Dampier Port Development Plan 2010-2020) to enable bulk solid export infrastructure (i.e. conveyor, transfer stations and shiploader). This option presented a number of engineering and operational challenges and initial cost estimates provided to be significantly more expensive. It was also recognised that this option could only accommodate bulk solid export, rather than offering potentially other uses (e.g. general cargo). For these reasons, this option was not considered further. **Option 4**: *Develop the Dampier Marine Services Facility (**DMSF**) and incorporate bulk solids export capacity*. The DMSF was approved by the EPA under Ministerial Statement 868 (**MS868**) but has only been partially implemented, that is, no dredging has occurred to date. The DMSF was designed as an expansion to and eventual replacement of the DCW but is not planned to accommodate bulk solids export facilities. To facilitate bulk solids export from the DMSF via the Burrup Services Corridor, a new service corridor would need to be created through undeveloped land that has known heritage sites and values. The DMSF would need to be substantially revised to accommodate multi-users and multi-products.

	The DMSF option required substantial capital investment, long lead times and potential impacts on heritage values. The DMSF involved a dredging area of up to 47 ha and the dredging of approximately 2.2 Mm^3 of material to reclaim 22 ha of land to create the new land backed wharf and lay down areas. The EPA approved up to 5 ha of direct loss to coral habitat for the DMSF, as no dredging has been undertaken no actual loss of coral has occurred. The volume of dredging required and predicted loss of coral habitat for the Project is considerably less than that approved for the DMSF. The Project also does not impact on any terrestrial environmental or heritage factors. For these reasons, the DMSF option was not considered further. **Option 5:** *Develop the DCW Extension and Landside Redevelopment Project* - this option was considered to provide the lowest environmental impact and while meeting requirements for port customers and users and a better investment outcome for the State and Commonwealth. Multiple design iterations were considered; the current design layout/location is optimal in terms of cost, operational viability, no impact on terrestrial environmental or heritage factors, and achieving State and PPA strategic initiatives, specifically IWA Priority List 'Pilbara Port Capacity' initiative. The extension of the existing DCW and new multi-user land backed facility at the Port will enable bulk carriers, cruise ships and general cargo vessels to berth in Dampier Port, enhancing opportunities to support new trades and increase the capacity of existing products being handled at the port.

PART B: ASSESSMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS	
Environmental factors	
What are the likely significant environmental factors for this proposal?	✓ Benthic Communities and Habitat ☐ Coastal Processes ✓ Marine Environmental Quality ✓ Marine Fauna ☐ Flora and Vegetation ☐ Landforms ☐ Subterranean Fauna ☐ Terrestrial Environmental Quality ☐ Terrestrial Fauna ☐ Inland Waters ☐ Air Quality ☐ Greenhouse Gas Emissions ☐ Social Surroundings ☐ Human Health
*For **each** of the environmental factors identified above, complete the following table, or provide the information in a supplementary report*	

Potential environmental impacts – for each environmental factor		
1	**EPA policy and guidance**	The following EPA guidance has been considered in evaluating potential impacts on the following factors: **BENTHIC COMMUNITIES AND HABITAT:** • EPA (2016). Environmental Factor Guideline: Benthic Communities and Habitats, EPA,Western Australia. • EPA (2016). Technical Guidance – Protection of Benthic Communities and Habitats, EPA, Western Australia • EPA (2016). Technical Guidance – Environmental Impact Assessment of Marine Dredging Proposals, EPA, Western Australia **MARINE ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY** • EPA (2016). Environmental Factor Guideline: Marine Environmental Quality, EPA, Western Australia • EPA (2016). Technical Guidance – Protecting the Quality of Western Australia's Marine Environment, EPA, Western Australia • EPA (2016). Technical Guidance – Environmental Impact Assessment of Marine Dredging Proposals, EPA, Western Australia. **MARINE FAUNA** • Environmental Protection Authority (2016). *Environmental Factor Guideline: Marine Fauna*, EPA, Western Australia • Environmental Protection Authority (2010). *Environmental Assessment Guideline 5, Protecting Marine Turtles from Light Impacts* • Department of the Environment (DoE). (2013). *Matters of National Environmental Significance. Significant impact guidelines 1.1*. • Commonwealth of Australia, (2020) *National Light Pollution Guidelines for Wildlife including Marine Turtles, Seabirds and Migratory Shorebirds.*

2	**Receiving environment**	The Port is bounded by the western coastline of the Burrup Peninsula to the east and Dampier Archipelago to the west. The marine waters between these boundaries are shallow in bathymetry, with depths ranging from 5-20 m lowest astronomical tide. The dominant habitat (by area) on the seabed within the development envelope is soft sediment largely composed of sand and silt. This habitat is typically bare however in patches there may occur seasonal macroalgae and seagrass as well as filter feeder and infauna communities. With its variety of conditions, the greater Port area supports a wide range of marine benthic communities and habitats including coral, limited seagrass, macroalgae, mangrove and mixed communities (unconsolidated sediment with filter feeder and infauna communities). The fringing and subtidal coral communities provide habitat for a range of species including diverse corals, fish and invertebrates. Intertidal areas generally feature mudflats, sand/gravel beaches and rocky shores.

3	**Likely environmental impacts**	**BENTHIC COMMUNITIES AND HABITAT:** • Direct loss of benthic communities and habitats by removal or burial in the immediate vicinity of the development during construction and ongoing maintenance dredge operations. • Indirect impacts on benthic communities and habitats from the effects of sediments introduced to the water column by the dredging and disposal. **MARINE ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY:** • Dredging and disposal activities have the potential to: a. Increase turbidity, SSC and deposition rates b. Alter the physical characteristics of adjacent sediments c. Mobilise contaminants contained within the sediments d. Reduce water clarity and light over quite large areas. • There is potential for a hydrocarbon release into the marine environment from a vessel spill and or bunkering operations during construction and during operational phases. **MARINE FAUNA:** • During the construction phase, the following activities have the potential to adversely affect Marine Fauna in the vicinity of the Project. a) Underwater noise from piling, dredging and rock blasting activities b) Light pollution originating from construction vessels including those associated with spoil ground dumping c) Loss of marine fauna habitat due to direct removal or disturbance of benthic habitat from dredging or rock blasting d) Temporary, localised turbidity increase from dredging e) Entrainment of marine fauna by dredge.

		f) Injury from vessel strike g) Threats to biosecurity due to the introduction of marine pest species from construction vessels resulting in decline in local marine fauna populations • During the operational phase, the following activities have the potential to adversely affect the marine fauna in the vicinity of the Project. a) Injury from vessel strike b) Threats to biosecurity due to the introduction of marine pest species from operational vessels resulting in decline in local marine fauna populations.

4	**Application of the mitigation hierarchy**	**BENTHIC COMMUNITIES AND HABITAT** Implementation of Dredge Environmental Management Plan (DEMP) including: • use of backactor dredge in preference to cutter suction dredge (CSD) if possible. • real time monitoring of dredge position (lowers risk) and hydrographic survey to ensure dredging within proposed boundaries. • Dredge Plume Validation Program within DEMP designed to generate new information to improve predictive modelling of future dredging activity within the Port. All monitoring results from the DEMP will be made publicly available on the Department of Water and Environmental Regulation (DWER) Index of Marine Surveys for Assessment (IMSA). **MARINE ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY** Implement water quality monitoring program and tiered monitoring and management framework within DEMP. • All vessels will be required to have a Shipboard Oil Pollution Emergency Plan (SOPEP) and SOPEP equipment to prevent release of hazardous materials into the marine environment, and to respond when such releases do happen. • Standard operational management practices regulated by PPA and response measures within the PPAs Port of Dampier Marine Pollution Contingency Plan. Compliance with the PPA Port of Dampier Port Handbook for discharge of oils/wastes from ships, including PPA Incident Reporting requirements. **MARINE FAUNA** • Underwater noise modelling and assessment • Marine fauna desktop survey • DEMP and Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) including: a) Underwater noise management procedures

		b) Marine fauna observation and exclusion zones. c) MFO recording and reporting of marine fauna observations, injury or death d) Scheduling of significant noise generating activities to avoid impact to marine fauna.

5	**Assessment and significance of residual impacts**	The assessment of residual impacts has been undertaken with a high degree of confidence based on contemporary EIA guidance, best available science, actual impacts from previous dredging projects in the Port, desktop studies including modelling for underwater noise and dredging and field-based sampling and validation. Following application of management and mitigation measures, residual impacts from the Project construction and operational phases are not likely to significantly impact BCH, MEQ or Marine Fauna.

6	**Likely environmental outcomes**	**BENTHIC COMMUNITIES AND HABITATS** If this Project is approved and implemented it will result in the loss of approximately 0.8 ha, or approximately 1% of the coral habitat existing in LAU1 prior to industrial development. Approximately 58.8 ha of healthy and resilient coral habitat will remain within LAU1 which equates to approximately 80% of the coral that existed prior to European habitation. PPA consider this a good outcome for what is a highly modified Port environment that has undergone many significant dredging projects and is exposed to chronic disturbance and turbidity from vessel propwash and frequent resuspension of fine sediment from severe weather events. Considered within this context, the predicted irreversible impact to coral habitat and cumulative loss from the Project is not considered to pose a significant risk to ecological integrity and biological diversity within the LAU or the broader Port environment **MARINE ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY** PPA considers that potential impacts to MEQ from the Project would be minor and temporary for the duration of construction activities which is expected to be less than 18 months. The receiving environment has a degree of resilience to turbidity as the waters are naturally turbid. The dredge material is also likely to be clean due to the low levels of contaminants recorded in the sediment quality assessment. PPA has committed to protecting EVs and maintaining ecosystem integrity as per the established Port and Mermaid Sound LEPs and considers there is a high level of confidence that the proposed water quality monitoring program and contingency management measures within the DEMP for the Project will achieve this. Based on no predicted long-term impacts to MEQ it is considered that the Project will not result in significant impacts to MEQ and the EPA's Objective can be met.

		MARINE FAUNA Based on the nature and magnitude of potential impacts and the avoidance and minimisation measures proposed the following environmental outcomes for Marine Fauna (including listed Threatened and Migratory species under the EPBC Act) are to be achieved by the Project: • No impacts to important habitats (i.e., nesting, nursery, foraging or breeding areas), for any conservation significant marine fauna species • The number of individuals affected is expected to be low and not significant in terms of local populations • No reduction in populations of species of local and regional importance • No reduction in the biodiversity of marine fauna in the DE or surrounds Suitable habitat for all other identified threatened, and migratory MNES species will continue to be available in the surrounding local and regional area. With the proposed management measures PPA considers that the Project will not result in significant impacts to Marine fauna and the EPA's Objective can be met.
Holistic impact assessment		
Outline the holistic impact assessment for the Proposal.		PPA recognises the high degree of connectivity and interrelatedness between BCH, MEQ and Marine Fauna. The maintenance of MEQ is recognised as critical to the protection of BCH. Importantly, apart from small, localised and temporary impacts during construction, no long-term impacts to MEQ are expected from this Project. PPA also recognises that critical BCH often support Marine Fauna. Due to the majority of the BCH found in the surrounding environment being bare sediment and the predicted small direct loss and no indirect loss of coral habitat as a result of the Project, significant impacts to BCH that is critical to

	support conservation significant marine fauna are also unlikely. Underwater noise, which is a key potential impact identified from the proposed piling, has the potential to impact Marine Fauna. To address this a detailed modelling and impact assessment of the likely effects of piling and other construction generated underwater noise to sensitive receptors was undertaken. Following avoidance and mitigation strategies being implemented, it is predicted that temporary increases in noise levels can be managed without significant impact to Marine Fauna. The combined effects on the marine environment as a whole are no greater than the effects on individual factors (BCH, MEQ, Marine Fauna). Furthermore, any potential impacts to these factors have been effectively mitigated through the development of a comprehensive set of monitoring and management plans to be implemented during dredging (Appendix E) and construction (Appendix F) of the Project.
Cumulative environmental impact assessment	
Outline the relevant cumulative environmental impacts of the Proposal (based on scoping).	**BENTHIC COMMUNITIES AND HABITAT** PPA keep an ongoing overview of the status of BCH within established LAUs for the Port and have undertaken an assessment of historic loss of BCH for each LAU (consistent with EPA technical guidance). The objective of this is to provide a common framework for cumulative impacts to BCH within the Port and to become the custodian of BCH data, including cumulative losses, for these LAUs. The historical loss of coral habitat within LAU1 is 18.7%. In relation to the assessment of this Project, the cumulative loss is expected to increase by 1.1% to 19.8%. Approximately 80% of healthy and resilient coral habitat that existed prior to European habitation will remain within LAU1. PPA consider this a good outcome for what is a highly modified Port environment that has undergone many significant dredging projects and is exposed to chronic disturbance and turbidity.

	The PPA's approved DMSF, which has not been fully implemented, is the only possible future project within the Port that possibly needs considered in relation to cumulative impacts. If the DMSF is implemented this would increase the cumulative loss of coral in LAU1 to 26.6%. Although this is a slightly greater cumulative loss of coral this is not considered to change the evaluation of potential consequences from the cumulative impact. Based on the predicted small direct loss and no indirect loss of coral habitat it is considered that the Project will not contribute to cumulative loss of BCH such that biological diversity and ecological integrity are at risk at either a local or regional scale. PPA considers that the EPA's Objective for BCH can be met. **MARINE ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY** The EQMF provides a basis for considering cumulative effects to MEQ and the EIA of Port developments in the long-term. PPA has developed a MEQSAP (O2 Marine 2019) in the context of the EQMF, as defined in the EPA's Technical Guidance (EPA 2016). The objective of this approach is to allow PPA and other Port users to manage project specific impacts as well as cumulative impacts across the Port to ensure the existing MEQ is protected. This Port's MEQSAP is used to address cumulative effects from all the Port users on MEQ. While it is not a definitive assessment of the discharges or contaminant sources in an area, cumulative effects are addressed by monitoring and managing the quality of the receiving marine environment rather. There have been a number of capital and maintenance dredging programs undertaken by PPA and other proponents to facilitate expansion projects in the Port. However, only a relatively small proportion of the broader Port area is heavily utilised and this inner Port area continues to maintain an acceptable level of environmental quality for the protection of all EVs and EQOs. PPA considers that potential impacts to MEQ from the Project would be minor and temporary. Based on no predicted long-term

	impacts to MEQ it is considered that the Project will not contribute significant adverse cumulative effects to MEQ. **MARINE FAUNA** The Project is estimated to result in an increase of 1 or 2 shipping vessels per week or ~80 vessels per year for the Port. PPA will ensure all direct and indirect impacts as a consequence of the expansion of the Port's capacity, including the cumulative effect of additional shipping movements from the Perdaman Urea Project and any third party users of the infrastructure, will be assessed as required under both the WA EP Act and/or the Commonwealth EPBC Act. This will include relevant EPBC Act controlled action triggers for the Commonwealth marine area and listed marine species, such as whales and other migratory species, and their application to shipping movements associated with the Port expansion work. Total Vessel movements within the Port ranged from 10,521 in 2018/2019, 10,064 in 2019/2020 and 9,178 in 2020/2021. In this context a predicted increase of ~80 vessels per year is not significant and would be overshadowed by the typical shipping numbers associated with existing and future proposed industries. It is therefore considered that the incremental risk to Marine Fauna associated with shipping movements is unlikely to be significant.
Consultation	

Outline the outcomes of consultation on the Proposal and its likely environmental effects.	Industry, Community and Government consultation for the Project has mostly been through the Port's established Technical Advisory and Consultative Committee (TACC). The main objective of the TACC is to support the implementation of effective, transparent, and timely engagement with stakeholders who may have an interest or be affected by dredging programs within the Port. The TACC is representative of industry, community and government at all levels and provides PPA and Port stakeholders with a forum to share information on dredging and disposal activities / projects and provide a forum for communication and resolution of any issues that may arise. PPA also has an established Dampier Community Consultation Committee (DCCC) forum for the Port of Dampier, which is also used to facilitate information sharing and consultation between PPA and the local community. PPA is also engaging with the Murujuga Aboriginal Corporation (MAC) prior to and during implementation of the Project to identify any heritage and cultural issues that may be impacted by the Project. Through extensive consultation as mentioned above, harmful environmental effects are not expected and any environmental issues that may arise will be rapidly identified, resolved and mitigated through monitoring protocols established in relevant and associated environmental management plans.
Supporting documents	
Dampier Cargo Wharf Extension and Landside Redevelopment Project EIA Referral Supporting Document. Appendix A. Marine Water Quality Baseline Report Appendix B. Sampling and Analysis Plan Implementation Report Appendix C. Benthic Communities and Habitat Cumulative Assessment Report Appendix D. Dredge Plume Monitoring Report Appendix E. Marine Fauna Desktop Assessment Report Appendix F. Underwater Noise Modelling Report Appendix G. Dredge Environmental Management Plan Appendix H. Construction Environmental Management Plan	

Has the referrer provided survey information according to the *Instructions and Form: IBSA Data Packages* and/or the *Instructions and form: IMSA Data Packages*	✓ Yes in discussion with DWER's Marine Ecosyste m Branch ☐ No
Conclusion	
Do you consider the proposal may have a significant effect on the environment?	The project does not expect any significant effect on the environment as the Project avoids and minimises impact to high-value and sensitive environmental receptors primarily through utilising the existing Port location and expanding facilities in an area that is already subject to disturbance. The established spoil grounds, selected for their low environmental value, also have sufficient buffer to avoid impacts to any sensitive environmental receptors. Furthermore, any potential significant impacts to key environmental factors (BCH, MEQ, Marine Fauna) have been effectively mitigated through the development of a comprehensive set of monitoring and management plans to be implemented during dredging (Appendix E) and construction (Appendix F) of the Project.

PART B: ASSESSMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS FOR SIGNIFICANT AMENDMENTS ONLY	
Type of significant amendment	☐ significant amendment to the approved proposal ☐ significant amendment to the implementation conditions ☐ significant amendment to both the proposal and the implementation conditions
Information of the approved proposal	
Combined effects of the approved proposal and significant amendment	
Analysis of existing implementation conditions	
Previous changes to the Proposal and or implementation conditions	
Compliance	

Environmental Performance	
Control of implementation of significant amendment	

PART B: ASSESSMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS FOR A PROPOSAL UNDER AN ASSESSED SCHEME ONLY	
What new environmental issues are raised by the proposal that were not assessed during the assessment of the planning scheme?	
How does the proposal not comply with the assessed scheme and/or the environmental conditions in the assessed planning scheme?	

PART B: ASSESSMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS FOR DERIVED PROPOSALS ONLY	
Demonstrate how the proposal will meet the environmental outcomes defined through the assessment of the strategic proposal	
Provide an analysis of the existing implementation conditions of the related strategic proposal in relation to the derived proposal	

PART C: OTHER APPROVALS AND REGULATION	
Decision-making authorities and their approvals	
Provide a table list of the decision-making authorities, associated legislation or agreement regulating the activity and the specific approval required. (Example table at the end of form)	The DAWE is the primary Determining Authority for the assessment of any approvals under the Sea Dumping Act which relates to the offshore disposal of dredged sediments at the Port. No other Decision Making Authorities are applicable or relevant to the Project which is entirely within PPA controlled land or waters. PPA have operational oversight of the Port and associated waters and lands in accordance with the powers vested to PPA under the Port Authorities Act 1999. PPA is

	responsible for planning, developing, authorising, co-ordinating and controlling a range of Port activities and services across its four operational ports in the Pilbara.
Provide a summary of the statutory decision-making processes you consider can mitigate the potential impacts of the proposal on the environment. (Note: this should be a summary of the information provided in Part B section 2.4).	The Environmental Protection Act 1986 (EP Act) is the primary legislation that governs environmental impact assessment (EIA) and environmental protection in WA. EIA in WA is conducted by the Environmental Protection Authority (EPA) which has prepared administrative procedures for the purposes of establishing the practices of EIA. Proposals likely to have a significant impact on the environment are required to be referred to the EPA under Section 38 of the EP Act. Any actions that are likely to have a significant impact on Matters of National Environmental Significance (MNES); which include internationally important flora, fauna, ecological communities and heritage places; are required to be assessed under the Commonwealth Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999 (EPBC Act). In Australia, ocean disposal of dredged material within and outside of State and Territory waters is regulated by the DAWE under the Commonwealth Environment Protection (Sea Dumping) Act 1981 (Sea Dumping Act) and the National Assessment Guidelines for Dredging 2009 (NAGD).
Tenure and Local Government approvals	
Location of proposal: a) street address, lot number, suburb, and nearest road intersection; or b) if remote, the nearest town and distance and direction from that town to the proposal site.	The Dampier Cargo Wharf is located on the western side of the Burrup Peninsula between the Woodside King Bay Supply Base and the Woodside Pluto Terminal. The wharf is approximately 6 kilometres North east of Dampier.
Name of the Local Government Authority in which the proposal is located.	City of Karratha
Is rezoning of any land required before the proposal can be implemented? If yes, please provide details.	☐ Yes ✓ No
What is the current land use on the property, and the extent (area in hectares) of the property?	Cargo Wharf
Does the proponent have the legal access required for the implementation of all aspects of the proposal?	✓ Yes ☐ No

***If yes**, provide details of legal access authorisations / agreements / tenure.* ***If no**, what authorisations / agreements / tenure is required and from whom?*	Landside area of the Project Footprint is within Lot 471 which is owned by Pilbara Ports Authority
Commonwealth Government approvals	
Does the proposal involve an action that may be or is a controlled action under the *Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999* (EPBC Act)?	✓ Yes ☐ No
Has the proposed action been referred? If yes, when was it referred and what is the reference number (EPBC No.)?	✓ Yes ☐ No Date: _29 April 2022_____ EPBC No.: _*01129*_____
If referred, has a decision been made on whether the proposed action is a controlled action? If 'yes', check the appropriate box and provide the decision in an attachment.	☐ Yes ✓ No ☐ Decision – controlled action ☐ Decision – not a controlled action
If the proposal is determined to be a controlled action, do you request that this proposal be assessed under a Bilateral Agreement or as an accredited assessment?	☐ Yes - Bilateral ☐ No ✓ Yes - Accredited
Is approval required from other Commonwealth Government/s for any part of the proposal? *If yes, describe.*	✓ Yes ☐ No Approval: Sea Dumping Permit under Sea Dumping Act
Decision-making authority referrals <u>ONLY</u>	
What approval/s, under your authority, are required for this proposal? *Please provide details.*	

Example Table: Other approvals

Decision-making authority	Legislation or Agreement regulating the activity	Approval required (and specify which proposal element the approval is related to)	Whether and how statutory decision-making process can mitigate impacts on the environment? (Yes/No and summary of reasons. Include a separate line item for each relevant impact, and discuss how the EPA's factor objective will be met)