

### 3 STAKEHOLDER CONSULTATION

Community involvement is an integral component of the environmental and social aspects of any future development in the Port Hedland area. With numerous expansion and development activities in and around Port Hedland, the dissemination of information to stakeholders and their involvement in the decision-making process is vital in facilitating the progression of these developments. BHPBIO's approach to community involvement is described in the company's 'Sustainable Development Policy' (BHPBIO 2005b) which states that wherever the company operates BHPBIO will:

*"Engage regularly, openly and honestly with people affected by our operations and take their views and concerns into account in our decision making".*

BHPBIO recognises that developments within Port Hedland have the potential to impact the local community and environment and therefore considers it critical that community and government stakeholders are adequately briefed on the project and associated implications so as to allow for an informed assessment of the potential impacts.

#### 3.1 CONSULTATION PLAN

In January 2008, BHPBIO released the "Expansion in the Pilbara: Community Engagement and Communication Plan" (BHPBIO 2008a). This plan is designed to inform stakeholders and provide an opportunity for discussion and mechanisms for feedback through established, ongoing communications channels.

It draws on the principles of BHPBIO's existing HSEC policies and protocols, communication and engagement plans for associated projects and data gathered through previous expansion projects. It also reflects information gathered from relevant stakeholders about how they wish to be engaged on BHPBIO's growth plans and EPA guidelines on community consultation.

The scope of the plan is predominately targeted towards the effective engagement of Pilbara communities, but also includes processes to facilitate existing communication and engagement processes with other stakeholder groups such as State and Commonwealth departments and indigenous communities.

As part of this ongoing plan, BHPBIO has developed a community engagement and communication process which presents the approach BHPBIO is adopting in addressing the social and community issues associated with the growth projects.

#### 3.2 SOCIAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT

BHPBIO has conducted extensive Social Impact Assessments (SIA) since 2004 together with regular community focussed surveys and has collected significant data on issues of community interest and concern during periods of rapid expansion. This data has highlighted consistent, reoccurring themes including:

1. Accommodation / Housing;
2. Indigenous Issues (i.e. community development and employment and training);
3. Service Provision (i.e. health, education and childcare);
4. Social Issues;
5. Local Employment Opportunities;
6. Township Amenity;
7. Work Arrangements;
8. Environmental – dust, noise, water;
9. Operational – road and rail traffic; and
10. Regional Sustainability.

## REFERRAL DOCUMENT

---

The SIA process is an ongoing monitored management system with a twelve monthly review. Whilst previous Social Impact Assessments have highlighted exiting areas of concern to the community the ongoing dialogue with the community, embedded in the approach to community consultation and social impact assessment, will identify emerging issues early in the project lifecycle and allow for effective management, mitigation or benefit opportunities to be addressed.

BHPBIO values the feedback provided by the communities in which it operates and this data helps inform decision making on management plans and community investment. BHPBIO contributes to community development projects designed to support these focus areas and reduce impacts of existing growth projects and prevent further impacts through effective mitigation.

BHPBIO is committed to working with the communities in which it operates to ensure social services such as health, education and amenity are effective. Some of the programs that assist in facilitating this process include the Pilbara Education Partnership with the Department of Education, Pilbara Health partnership with the Department of Health and the Local Government Sustainability Partnership with the relevant shires in the Pilbara.

BHPBIO is also undertaking a peer review of the existing community consultation activities and social impact assessments utilised for the RGP5 project. The peer review will benchmark existing community consultation activities against global best practice and make recommendations for areas of improvement to effectively manage social impacts associated with the RGP5 project and future expansion plans.

### 3.3 KEY STAKEHOLDERS

The public engagement program for BHPBIO's expansion projects involves consultation with a range of stakeholders representing the following main groups:

- Members of the public;
- Business associations;
- Contactors and partners;
- Conservation groups;
- Kariyarra native title claimant group;
- Local community groups;
- Non-Government organisations (NGOs); and
- Local Council, State and Commonwealth government departments.

BHPBIO has identified a list of stakeholders who have an interest in the proposed Harriet Point Dredging Program, and who may be affected by the project. Key project stakeholders include, but are not limited to:

- Communities of Port Hedland, South Hedland and Wedgefield, particularly recreational marine enthusiasts;
- Traditional Owners;
- Care for Hedland;
- Regional Health Executive Council;
- Environmental Protection Authority;
- Department of Environment and Conservation;
- Commonwealth Department of the Environment and Water, Heritage and the Arts;
- Australian Maritime Safety Authority (AMSA);

## REFERRAL DOCUMENT

---

- Department of Industry and Resources (DoIR);
- Department for Planning and Infrastructure (DPI)
- Landcorp;
- Town of Port Hedland (ToPH);
- Pilbara Development Commission;
- Pilbara Dialogue – Growth Forum;
- Port Hedland Chamber of Commerce and Industry;
- Port Hedland Port Authority;
- Fisheries WA;
- Neighbouring onshore industries;
- Tourism operators;
- Representatives of the Kariyarra native title claimant group
- Fishing operators.

### 3.4 COMMUNICATION AND STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT

Specific engagement tailored to particular approval requirements is underpinned by regular communication with stakeholders on the broader subject of growth (including specific emerging impacts). Stakeholders have been categorised in accordance with the level of impact the activity will have on them and the level of interest expressed towards the activity. There are three methods of communication:

- Ongoing communication primarily via personal interaction;
- Ongoing consultation via existing community groups, NGOs and community forums; and
- Regular routine updates via media advertorials and editorials, electronic tools tailored to Port Hedland audiences such as DVD's, internet and email distribution.

All growth communication tools and mechanisms include the capacity for feedback (i.e. provision of email address, telephone number or response sheet for formal tools and discussion component in personal interactions). All feedback is recorded, evaluated and appropriate action taken where required. For all consultation activities, there is a strong BHPBIO staff presence participating actively in the process.

Project briefing meetings have been held with relevant community stakeholders and representatives from the following State government agencies:

- Department of Environment and Conservation – Regional Office (Karratha);
- Department of Environment and Conservation – Marine Ecosystems Branch;
- Department of Environment and Conservation – Environmental Management Branch;
- Department of Water – Regional Office (Karratha);
- Environmental Protection Authority Service Unit;
- Department of Indigenous Affairs – Priority Projects Unit; and
- Department of the Environment, Water Heritage and the Arts.

## REFERRAL DOCUMENT

---

Consultation on BHPBIO's growth plans and specifically the inner harbour expansion began in late 2007.

**Table 3.1** provides a summary of queries and comments raised during these briefings, as well as cross-references to sections of this ERD where additional information is provided.

## REFERRAL DOCUMENT

**Table 3.1 – Summary of Key Queries and Comments Raised During Consultation with State and Local Government Agencies, Non Government Organisations and Other Stakeholders (To date).**

Themes	Stakeholder	Summary of Queries/ Comments Raised	Mitigation Plan and Strategies
Marine Fauna – Turtles	Joint meeting with the Karratha Regional Offices of DEC and DOW 7 <sup>th</sup> February 2008	<i>Query:</i> Consideration of turtles and turtle behaviour should be evaluated (e.g. lighting, plume, dredging and other boat movements).	The risk of the proposed dredging impacting on turtles has been assessed and is considered minor risk. For further information please refer to <b>Section 9</b> .
	DEC – Environmental Management Branch 8 <sup>th</sup> February 2008	<i>Query:</i> Address whether the proposed dredging and spoil disposal will impact on juvenile turtle habitat.	
Spoil Use	Joint meeting with the Karratha regional Offices of DEC and DOW 7 <sup>th</sup> February 2008	<i>Query:</i> Provide information on what the intended future use of spoil disposal locations will be.	The final landuse of the DMMA has been determined as a key environmental factor for this proposal. Further details on potential impacts and management of the DMMA following completion of dredging is provided in <b>Section 8</b> .
	Town of Port Hedland - Councillor 10 <sup>th</sup> March 2008	<i>Comment:</i> Concerns raised included odour, dust and whether spoil could be used by the community in the future.	Upon completion of the project consideration will be given to future use of dredge material.
Noise	Joint meeting with the Karratha regional Offices of DEC and DOW 7 <sup>th</sup> February 2008	<i>Query:</i> Water noise should be considered in the approvals submission.	Noise is considered within <b>Section 9</b> .
	Town of Port Hedland Staff 8 <sup>th</sup> July 2008	<i>Comment:</i> Continuous level of “humming” noise is preferred over peak noise.	Noise modelling has indicated dredging will have minimal impact on sensitive receptors. A letter drop and hotline will be established to inform and provide an opportunity for community comment.
Water Use	Joint meeting with the Karratha regional Offices of DEC and DOW 7 <sup>th</sup> February 2008	<i>Query:</i> Water use should be considered in the approvals submission.	Water usage is considered in Section 8 as a component of the final land use.
Dust	Joint meeting with the Karratha regional Offices of DEC and DOW 7 <sup>th</sup> February 2008	<i>Query:</i> Dust should be considered in the approvals submission.	Dust is considered within <b>Section 9</b> .  BHPBIO is committed to managing dust impacts on community with short, medium and long term perspectives

## REFERRAL DOCUMENT

Themes	Stakeholder	Summary of Queries/ Comments Raised	Mitigation Plan and Strategies
	Town of Port Hedland (Special Meeting - Councillors and Administration) 13 <sup>th</sup> March 2008	<i>Query:</i> Current Dust strategy effectiveness?	taking into account discussions with all stakeholders and the outcomes of studies currently being undertaken by government. BHPBIO also has existing programs to manage dust and associated impacts including; the Clear Air Taskforce team; Cleaning and partnership with Town of Port Hedland Greening programme for West End; sustainability.
Benthic Primary Producer Habitat (Mangroves )	Marapikarrinya Native Title Claimant Group 22 <sup>nd</sup> January 2008	<i>Query:</i> Involvement of Native Title Claimant Group in Offsets Program.	BHPBIO are currently examining a whole of expansion projects approach to mangroves offsets. BHPBIO are committed to engaging with the Native Title Claimant Group and will explore opportunities for involvement in the program.
	DEC – Environmental Management Branch. Joint meeting with the Karratha regional Offices of DEC and DOW 7 <sup>th</sup> February 2008	<i>Query:</i> Direct and indirect impacts on BPPH need to be evaluated, particularly mangroves.	Indirect and direct impacts on BPPH have been defined further <b>Section 8</b> and the Mangrove Management Plan.
	DEC – Environmental Management Branch 8 <sup>th</sup> February 2008	<i>Query:</i> Cumulative impacts on mangroves need to be determined and the proposed management unit needs to be clearly defined.	In accordance with EPA Guidance Statement 29, the Port Hedland Industrial Management unit is defined as category F area and cumulative loss has been determined for this category. For further information please refer to <b>Section 8</b> .
	DEC Marine Ecosystems Branch 3 <sup>rd</sup> July 2008	<i>Query:</i> Consider re-establishing mangroves where impact cannot be avoided.	BHPBIO has minimised impact on mangrove habitat as part of the Harriet Point Dredging Program. For further information please refer to <b>Section 8</b> . Various options are being considered for development of a mangrove offsets package, including mangrove re-establishment package. This package will take into account BHPBIO's growth program and associated developments within the Port Hedland area.
		<i>Query:</i> Potential for indirect impact on mangroves at DMMA A due to changes in groundwater flow patterns should be described (e.g. hydraulic head resulting in high saline water being 'pushed' into the creek system).	Existing soil salinities across DMMA and in the mangroves of the creek channel will be assessed and the potential impact of hypersaline groundwater intrusion will be investigated and modelled to determine the potential threat. It is expected that hypersaline soil conditions are limited to surface layers where evaporative stress is highest and do not extend deeper into sediments where intrusion of tidal water driven groundwater flow is regular. Refer to <b>Section 6</b> .

## REFERRAL DOCUMENT

Themes	Stakeholder	Summary of Queries/ Comments Raised	Mitigation Plan and Strategies
	Care for Hedland Meeting 8 <sup>th</sup> July 2008	<i>Query:</i> Impact on mangroves by the proposal?	Indirect and direct impacts on BPPH have been defined further in <b>Section 8</b> and the Mangrove Management Plan.
Terrestrial Flora and Fauna	DEC – Environmental Management Branch 8 <sup>th</sup> February 2008 and 11 June 2008)	<i>Query:</i> Determine if there is any flora or fauna of significance in the proposed spoil disposal locations?	Flora and fauna surveys have been conducted. No flora or fauna of significance were observed. For further information please refer to <b>Sections 5</b> and <b>9</b> .
		<i>Query:</i> Will the spoil disposal locations result in the loss of significant fauna habitat (particularly birds)?	
PASS	DEWHA – Ports and Marine Section 14 <sup>th</sup> February 2008	<i>Query:</i> Explain why sea dumping has been determined as the preferred option for disposal of PASS material.	PASS material will be disposed offshore to the PHPA Spoil Ground 'I'. The options evaluation process is defined in <b>Section 2</b> which outlines the process used to determine the preferred dredge material management locations.
	Marapikurrinya Pty Ltd part of the Kariyarra native title claimant group 22 <sup>nd</sup> January 2008	<i>Query:</i> Will PASS have an impact on the surrounding Environment?	The risk of potential impacts resulting from the dredging of PASS material will be minimised by disposing of the PASS material offshore. The PASS material transported to Spoil Ground 'I' will be kept under saturated conditions therefore minimising for the potential to result in PASS oxidation.  There is only a minor risk to land, resulting from small amounts of residual PASS material being contained within non ASS, in the DMMA. This is due to the fact that it will be dispersed within larger volumes of calcarenite materials. Any oxidation of PASS and acid generation would be small and potentially neutralised within the DMMA. Sampling is proposed to verify this. For further information, please refer to the ASS Management Plan and <b>Section 8</b> for further details.
Heritage	Department of Indigenous Affairs – Priority Projects Unit 15 <sup>th</sup> February 2008	<i>Query:</i> Need to understand if there are any indirect impacts on sites of heritage significance and what management measures are to be taken to minimise these impacts.	Indirect impact such as dust and surface water flows were considered in the site selection of DMMA. DMMA A, B1 and B2 were selected as they were considered to pose lower risk to indirect impacts to heritage sites. For further information please refer to <b>Section 9</b> .  Two potential ethnographic sites and several archaeological sites have been recorded during surveys conducted in late

## REFERRAL DOCUMENT

Themes	Stakeholder	Summary of Queries/ Comments Raised	Mitigation Plan and Strategies
			2007 early 2008 with representatives of the Kariyarra native title claimant group. Following consultations with representatives of the Kariyarra native title claimant group an application was lodged with DIA on 20 June 2008 seeking Ministerial approval to conduct the proposed works notwithstanding the potential to impact the potential ethnographic and archaeological sites. In due course the application will be considered by the ACMC and a recommendation made to the responsible Minister.
Spoil Disposal Location	EPA Service Unit. DEC – Environmental Management Branch 28 <sup>th</sup> February 2008	<i>Query:</i> Spoil reclamation – this includes consideration for longer-term beneficial uses?	The final landuse of the DMMA has been determined as a key environmental factor for this proposal. Upon completion of the project consideration will be given to future use of dredge material. Further details on potential impacts and management of the DMMA following completion of dredging is provided in <b>Section 8</b> . <b>Section 2</b> outlines results of option assessment process.
	Joint meeting with the Karratha regional Offices of DEC and DOW 7 <sup>th</sup> February 2008		
	Personal Communications with Town of Port Hedland CEO 14 <sup>th</sup> April 2008	<i>Query:</i> Amount of dredged material to spoil locations and final use?	
Mitigation	DEC Marine Ecosystems Branch 5 <sup>th</sup> March 2008 and 3 <sup>rd</sup> July 2008	<i>Query:</i> Need to demonstrate in submissions where consideration has been given to avoiding and/or minimising impact to mangrove communities.	DMMA were designed to ensure minimal loss of mangroves, specifically 'closed canopy' areas. For further information please refer to <b>Section 8</b> .
	DEC Marine Ecosystems Branch 3 <sup>rd</sup> July 2008	<i>Query:</i> Need to ensure that size of footprint for DMMA is minimised.	Footprint of DMMA A has been minimised as far as practicable. This has been achieved through disposal of PASS material offshore and maximum volumes will be transported to DMMA B1 and B2.
Monitoring	DEC Marine Ecosystems Branch 5 <sup>th</sup> March 2008	<i>Query:</i> The Sampling and Analysis Plan (SAP) should consider the National Ocean Disposal Guidelines for Dredged Material as well as the receiving environment and associated potential impacts (i.e. toxicity and/or bioavailability testing).	A Sampling and Analysis Plan has been completed for sea dumping of PASS and demonstrates consideration of the National Ocean Disposal Guidelines for Dredged Material. The SAP was provided as part of the Sea Dumping Application to DEWHA.



## REFERRAL DOCUMENT

Themes	Stakeholder	Summary of Queries/ Comments Raised	Mitigation Plan and Strategies
	DEC Marine Ecosystems Branch 3 <sup>rd</sup> July 2008	<i>Query:</i> Include parameters such as ammonia, hydrogen sulphide, arsenic and chromium.	These parameters are included in the proposed monitoring program.  Water quality parameters for discharge from DMMA need to be maintained within the 20 <sup>th</sup> and 80 <sup>th</sup> percentile of background water quality of the receiving environment. Dissolved oxygen needs to be maintained less than the 60 <sup>th</sup> percentile saturation.
Dredge Spoil Pipeline	Care for Hedland Community Environmental Group 11 <sup>th</sup> March 2008	<i>Query:</i> Location of the dredge spoil pipeline?	<b>Figure 2.5</b> shows the location of the dredging pipelines and discharge locations.
Social Modelling	Town of Port Hedland (Special Meeting - Councillors and Administration) 13 <sup>th</sup> March 2008	<i>Query:</i> Request for any social modelling data.	Workforce modelling completed and expects to brief local Government in July 2008.
		<i>Query:</i> Policy on Fly In Fly Out (FIFO) verses residential.	BHPBIO would prefer residential but there is still some requirement for FIFO. Social impact assessment has commenced and expected data on workforce numbers and impact on local services will be presented in July 2008. A more comprehensive study and report is due to be completed by September 2008.
Services - Community Investment	Pilbara Development Commission - Growth Forum 19 <sup>th</sup> March 2008	<i>Query:</i> Investment into community and strain on government services.	BHPBIO contributing to and supporting the creation of a "Vision" for the Pilbara. Work is being led by the Pilbara Development Commission. BHPBIO has an extensive existing community investment program that includes significant investment to delivery of services in the region (Health, Education, Police, Childcare, Indigenous etc).
Water Quality	DEC Marine Ecosystems Branch 5 <sup>th</sup> March 2008	<i>Query:</i> Terrestrial spoil disposal and return water quality needs to be evaluated to determine potential impacts. Consideration of the turbidity plume and potential eco-toxicity associated with the overflow water from the spoil reclamation areas.	Elutriate testing was completed in the 0.5 m samples. Results are within required levels for discharge. All sediment results were less than the NODGDM screening levels. For further information please refer to <b>Section 4</b> includes a discussion of the sampling results.

## REFERRAL DOCUMENT

Themes	Stakeholder	Summary of Queries/ Comments Raised	Mitigation Plan and Strategies
		<i>Issue:</i> Hydrodynamic modelling will need to be undertaken to determine any impacts associated with reclamation activities behind C Berth (Finucane Island). There is the potential that there may be increased velocity of currents within the harbour resulting in scouring and/or increased turbidity.	Modelling has been completed and the results are outlined in <b>Section 9</b> .
	DEC Marine Ecosystems Branch 3 <sup>rd</sup> July 2008	<i>Query:</i> Need to establish a suitable reference site for water quality monitoring to understand impacts of discharge from DMMA A.	Water quality will be monitored at various locations that may be effected by the plume (impact sites), at various reference sites and at the DMMA discharge points. Details of the monitoring program and location of sites is outlined in <b>Section 7</b> of the <b>DMP</b> .
		<i>Query:</i> How will DMMA's be managed to ensure appropriate water quality discharge? Will they have in-built sedimentation ponds? Having multiple DMMA's potentially provides flexibility to redirect dredge water between DMMA's to ensure water quality criteria are achieved.	
	Town of Port Hedland Staff 8 <sup>th</sup> July 2008	<i>Query:</i> comparison between FMG and BHPBIO water quality standards.	
	Town of Port Hedland 14 <sup>th</sup> April 2008	<i>Query:</i> Management of water turbidity, crustaceans and mangroves.	
Turbidity Plume	Care for Hedland Meeting 8 <sup>th</sup> July 2008	<i>Query:</i> Will the dredge plume be of similar size to FMGs?	For further information on the plume modelling results please refer to <b>Section 8</b> .
Mosquitoes	Town of Port Hedland 8 <sup>th</sup> July 2008	<i>Query:</i> Drainage to avoid mosquito breeding.	An expert within the company will tour the site to review risk areas.
Crustacean Management	Town of Port Hedland 8 <sup>th</sup> July 2008	<i>Query:</i> Heavy metal contamination needs to be considered for impacts.	Heavy metal accumulation is not considered an issue. Results from sediment sampling have shown that levels of heavy metals are not a concern. For further information on the sediment results please refer to <b>Section 4</b> and <b>Section 8</b> .
		<i>Query:</i> Investigate the requirement for a Crustacean Plan.	

**REFERRAL DOCUMENT**

Themes	Stakeholder	Summary of Queries/ Comments Raised	Mitigation Plan and Strategies
Access for Recreation	Port Hedland Port Authority 8 <sup>th</sup> July 2008	<i>Query:</i> Access to dumped defunct barges – recreational diving occurs in front of PHPA Spoil Ground “1”.	Community consultation is ongoing to seek input from relevant stakeholders such as Town of Port Hedland and recreational boat users to gather ideas that meet community recreational needs and expectations.
		<i>Query:</i> Clarify boundaries between BHPBIO and PHPA and how this relates to access to recreational areas near B2.	
		<i>Query:</i> Long term plans for public access to harbour need consideration.	