



Environmental Protection Authority

EPA Referral Form

Form for the referral of a proposal to the Environmental Protection Authority under Section 38 of the *Environmental Protection Act 1986*

Referrer information			
Who is referring this proposal?		<input type="checkbox"/> Proponent <input type="checkbox"/> Decision-making authority <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Community member/third party	
Name [REDACTED]		Signature [REDACTED]	
Position	CCWA Citizen Science Volunteer	Organisation	Conservation Council, WA
Email	[REDACTED]		
Address	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	
	[REDACTED]	WA	[REDACTED]
Date	19/8/2020		
Does the referrer request that the EPA treat any part of the proposal information in the referral as confidential? <i>Provide confidential information in a separate attachment.</i>		<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	
Referral declaration for organisations, proponents and decision-making authorities: I,, (full name) declare that I am authorised to refer this proposal on behalf of..... and further declare that the information contained in this form is true and not misleading.			
Part A: Proponent and proposal description			
Proponent information			
Name of the proponent/s (including Trading Name if relevant)		The GM Giacci Family Trust (08) 9791 5600 26 Stirling Street, Bunbury WA 6230 PO Box 1263, Bunbury 6231	
Australian Company Number(s) <input type="checkbox"/>			
OR Australian Business Number(s) <input type="checkbox"/>			
Contact for the proposal (if different from the referrer) <i>Please include: name, physical address, phone, and email.</i>		<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

<p>Does the proponent have the legal access required for the implementation of all aspects of the proposal?</p> <p><i>If yes, provide details of legal access authorisations / agreements / tenure.</i></p> <p><i>If no, what authorisations / agreements / tenure is required and from whom?</i></p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</p>
<p>Proposal type</p>	
<p>What type of proposal is being referred?</p> <p>For a change to an approved proposal please state the Ministerial Statement number/s (MS No./s) of the approved proposal</p> <p>For a derived proposal please state the Ministerial Statement number (MS No.) of the associated strategic proposal</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> significant – new proposal</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> significant – change to approved proposal (MS No./s: _____)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> proposal under an assessed planning scheme</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> strategic</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> derived (Strategic MS No.: _____)</p>
<p>For a significant proposal:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Why do you consider the proposal may have a significant effect on the environment and warrant referral to the EPA? 	<p>The proposed action has potential to cause significant impact to the environment. The consultant's works and excavation plan for the site within Lot 4 Binningup Rd, attached, do not demonstrate measures that will adequately protect the conservation values of underlying hydrologic and geomorphic linkages of the Yalgorup wetlands system against direct/indirect or offsite impacts to the environment, which include significant Impact on localised and downstream hydrology, inland waters, pollution (Dust & Noise) impact on social surrounds. Site works have potential to directly impact Threatened fauna Herpetofauna, protected under IUCN, EPBC & WA B.C. Act. Significant offsite impact to Threatened or Protected species Western Ringtail Possum, Black Cockatoo, Quenda along transport route. None of these offsite or indirect impacts have been addressed in applicants reports - https://www.harvey.wa.gov.au/wp-content/uploads/sites/161/2020/03/Proposed-Extractive-Industry-Lot-4-Binningup-Road.pdf</p>
<p>For a proposal under an assessed planning scheme, provide the following details:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Scheme name and number <p>For the Responsible Authority:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> What new environmental issues are raised by the proposal that were not assessed during the assessment of the planning scheme? 	<p>Shire of Harvey's Local Planning Scheme No1</p> <p>The Greater Bunbury Region Scheme(GBRS)</p> <p>The proposal fails to address Significant impact on Biodiversity values, the sensitivity and quality of the environment which is likely to be impacted; has failed to assess impacts to whole of landscape values and ecosystem function of this environment. Fails to demonstrate a level of confidence in the predicted hydrological impacts and proposed mitigation measures as outlined.</p> <p>Public interest, a community survey received</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How does the proposal not comply with the assessed scheme and/or the environmental conditions in the assessed planning scheme? 	<p>359 submissions which raised significant impacts to environmental, health and amenity for this proposal. Petition was presented in Parliament by Robyn Clarke MLA, contained 700 names of people opposed to the location for the Quarry.</p> <p>Failure to comply with, EPA Guidance statement No 3- EPA Guidelines Separation Distancing to Sensitive Premises</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - State Heritage listed Property – 125m - Resource Enhancement Wetlands - 130m <p>State Planning Policy 2.5 Rural Planning “raw material located within area of Significant Biodiversity Values” require referral under EP Act.”</p>
<p>Proposal description</p>	
<p>Title of the proposal</p>	<p>Limestone Quarry Proposal, Lot4 Binningup Road, Binningup</p>
<p>Name of the Local Government Authority in which the proposal is located.</p>	<p>Shire of Harvey</p>
<p>Location:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 	<p>The subject site is located within the south-eastern portion of Lot 4 on Deposited Plan 24320, Volume 1853, Folio 291. The site is owned by Coast Pastoral Company Pty Ltd. The applicant’s details are as follows: The GM Giacci Family Trust (08) 9791 5600 26 Stirling Street, Bunbury WA 6230 PO Box 1263, Bunbury 6231</p>
<p>Proposal description – including the key characteristics of the proposal</p> <p><i>Provide as an attachment to the form</i></p>	<p>This proposal is for a 26ha limestone extraction quarry, on Lot 4 Binningup Road, Binningup. As stated in the Proponents report <i>-This application is made for a five year period however, the exact life of the project is difficult to estimate as it will be dependent on supply and demand trends. The available volume of limestone (insitu volume of approximately 120,000 m3) is to be extracted in seven stages</i></p> <p>Further processing as part of the proposal includes limestone screening and crushing machinery and facilities onsite. As described in the consultant’s Report - https://www.harvey.wa.gov.au/wp-content/uploads/sites/161/2020/03/Proposed-Extractive-Industry-Lot-4-Binningup-Road.pdf</p> <p>Please find the proponents description of the proposal, however we maintain the works description is ill -defined for EPA assessment. The proposals description should also include details of laydown areas and transportation</p>

	route within the properties, to Springhill Road. This transport route, and some elements of this proposal, we believe are detailed in further reports, however the details of these actions are not clearly described in the current Works and Excavation Plan by consultants Accendo, Australia.
Have you provided electronic spatial data, maps and figure in the appropriate format? <i>Refer to instructions at the front of the form</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
What is the current land use on the property, and the extent (area in hectares) of the property?	Property area is 115 ha. It has previously been cleared and is currently comprised of pasture for cattle grazing. Extraction site area 26ha
Have you had pre-referral discussions with the EPA at DWER Services? If so, quote the reference number and/or the DWER contact.	-Pre-referral discussion with- Carey Johnstone, Senior Hydrologist re EPA referral -Minister for Water, Policy Officer re Proposals Potential Impact to Environment -DBCA Bunbury re: Fringing vegetation. Peter Hanley provided advice re Fauna protection & Transport Management Plan. Springhill Homestead State Heritage listed , consider for Geotechnical survey, structural integrity of underlying limestone

Part B: Environmental impacts

Environmental factors

What are the likely significant environmental factors for this proposal?	<input type="checkbox"/> Benthic Communities and Habitat <input type="checkbox"/> Coastal Processes <input type="checkbox"/> Marine Environmental Quality <input type="checkbox"/> Marine Fauna <input type="checkbox"/> Flora and Vegetation <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Landforms - Yalgorup Wetlands System <input type="checkbox"/> Subterranean Fauna <input type="checkbox"/> Terrestrial Environmental Quality <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Terrestrial Fauna –Herpetofauna –listed species <input type="checkbox"/> Inland Waters <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Air Quality – Dust exceeding regulations <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Greenhouse Gas Emissions –pollution noise, vibration, dust, diesel emissions <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Social Surroundings- Geoheritage, recreation, Springhill Homestead(Heritage listed) amenity of local area impacted <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Human Health – quarrying operations within town boundary . no licence to disrupt public amenity
--	--

For each of the environmental factors identified above, complete the following table, or provide the information in a supplementary report

Potential environmental impacts		
1	EPA Factor	Terrestrial Fauna
2	EPA policy and guidance - What have you considered and how have you applied them in relation to this factor?	<p>Proposed actions fail to protect terrestrial fauna and will significantly impact the ecological integrity, survival and persistence for Threatened Species incl;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Lerista Lineata Threatened WA BC Act. Endangered IUCN Red List -Coastal Plains Skink. Priority WA B.C Vulnerable IUCN (EPA S.E.A Dawesville to Binningup Report 1359) -Proposed actions fail to protect Threatened Species WRP & Carnaby's Black Cockatoo, from risk of direct/indirect /offsite impact to WRP and Carnaby's Black Cockatoo observed on Lot 4 and roadside vegetation.
3	Consultation – Outline the outcomes of consultation in relation to the potential environmental impacts	<p>DBCA, Bunbury advise they have not been consulted for recommendations by applicant or Shire. DBCA provided comment Consultant should be required to provide fauna survey and Road Transport Management Plan to manage/mitigate risk of fauna injury or fatalities onsite and offsite</p>

4	Receiving environment – Describe the current condition of the receiving environment in relation to this factor.	Lot4 is an alluvial plain, susceptible to inundation. Years of uncontrolled clearing has left uplands formations on adjoining lots fragmented with remnant Tuart/Jarrah woodlands. Revegetation of buffers should be a condition of this proposal. The owners of Lot 4, the Payton's had Vegetation surveyed in 2014, by Eco Edge Consultants. Eco Edge Consultant observed Western Ringtail possum activity and Tuarts with breeding sized hollows for Black Cockatoos or WRP. We recommend boundary requires a vegetated buffer protection against direct/indirect impact and management plans if Quarry proposal is to proceed. (attach map) Lot 4 s/west boundary vegetation of Tuart, jarrah, Melaleuca, Coastal Peppermint, has been surveyed by Eco Edge consultant in 2014, identifying WRP activity and Tuart with Black cockatoo breeding sized hollows- the 7.2 ha woodland within 100m of the extraction site, is of conservation value habitat, recommended for protection. (see attached Eco Edge Report) provides habitat and ecological linkages to Geomorphic Wetlands of the Swan Coastal Plain.
5	Proposal activities – Describe the proposal activities that have the potential to impact the environment	Activities include limestone Extraction over 26ha site crushing & screening operations and limestone transported on unsealed roads across Lot2, Lot 5 & Lot 4 via partly sealed Springhill Rd
6	Mitigation – Describe the measures proposed to manage and mitigate the potential environmental impacts.	Shire of Harvey are assessing the proposed limestone Quarry, with DWER consultation. DBCA advise they have not been consulted for fauna assessment or advice on above
7	Impacts – Assess the impacts of the proposal and review the residual impacts against the EPA objective .	Ecological linkages will be impacted which trigger Principle for the conservation of threatening species biological diversity and ecological integrity
8	Assumptions - Describe any assumptions critical to your assessment e.g. particular mitigation measures or regulatory conditions.	Rigorous onsite and spring surveys required, DBCA to inform on appropriate mitigation& regulatory conditions
<i>For each of the environmental factors identified above, complete the following table, or provide the information in a supplementary report</i>		
Potential environmental impacts		
1	EPA Factor	Landforms –Yalgorup Plain

2	EPA policy and guidance - What have you considered and how have you applied them in relation to this factor?	The proposed actions will pose significant risk to the integrity and distinctive physical limestone formations of the Yalgorup Plain, will be impacted Prof Semeniuk provided - <i>Information as to the geoheritage values of the Yalgorup Plain and information on the hydrology and how quarrying will significantly impact on hydrology and the biodiversity values. Prof V. Semeniuk (report attached)</i>
3	Consultation – Outline the outcomes of consultation in relation to the potential environmental impacts	Prof V. Semeniuk SEA Dawesville to Binningup EPA Report 1359 Waterways Conservation Act 1950 Dept of Water
4	Receiving environment – Describe the current condition of the receiving environment in relation to this factor.	Proposed 26ha site, within on Lot 4 Binningup Rd, lies within an alluvial plain, with geomorphic and hydrological linkages to Yalgorup Wetlands system. This chain of wetlands runs from Lake Preston to Leschenault Estuary. The hydrology in this system is complex and little research has been undertaken. There is an absence for any site-specific groundwater monitoring data for the site as presented by the applicant. Lot 4 is on the Parkfield Drain, which is protected under The Waterways Conservation Act 1950. Drainage across the subject site flows in an east to west direction towards the Parkfield Drain. The site displays surface water during winter and spring when elevated groundwater levels are experienced, surface water flows via the Parkfield drain, south to discharge into the northern catchment of Leschenault Estuary The western boundary of the extraction site is bordered by the Parkfield agricultural drain, with a Multiple Use (MU) wetland (UFI No. 15718) displaying Vasse complex vegetation directly to the west of Parkfield Drain. There is a Resource Enhancement (RE) wetland (UFI
5	Proposal activities – Describe the proposal activities that have the potential to impact the environment	<i>Quarrying will significantly impact on hydrology and the biodiversity values. Prof V. Semeniuk (report attached)</i>
6	Mitigation – Describe the measures proposed to manage and mitigate the potential environmental impacts.	Applicant has failed to address potential offsite impacts

7	Impacts – Assess the impacts of the proposal and review the residual impacts against the EPA objective .	Potential impact to integrity of distinctive physical landforms triggers Principle for the conservation of biological diversity and ecological integrity for conservation values
8	Assumptions - Describe any assumptions critical to your assessment e.g. particular mitigation measures or regulatory conditions.	The site is within Waterways Conservation Act, 1950

For **each** of the environmental factors identified above, complete the following table, or provide the information in a supplementary report

Potential environmental impacts		
1	EPA Factor	Hydrological Processes
2	EPA policy and guidance - What have you considered and how have you applied them in relation to this factor?	The applicant must be able to demonstrate proposed predicted outcomes are achievable.
3	Consultation – Outline the outcomes of consultation in relation to the potential environmental impacts	Contact with DWER Senior Hydrologist, advised quarrying flood plain land formation not ideal location due to complexity of hydrological processes Letter sent to Minister for Water re: actions pose potential for significant impact to environment
4	Receiving environment – Describe the current condition of the receiving environment in relation to this factor.	Proposed site, Lot 4 Binningup Rd lies within an alluvial plain, susceptible to inundation, and part of Yalgorup System of geomorphic wetlands chain that runs Lake Preston to Leschenault Estuary. Lot 4 is located entirely within a declared 'Waterways Management Area' under the Waterways Conservation Act 1976 (WWC Act); Advises all surface water drainage should be appropriately managed. Advises that the whole of Lot 4 (including the extraction area) is declared under the WWC Act for the specific purpose of protecting the Leschenault Estuary because of its vulnerability to degradation; Advises that the Leschenault Estuary Water Quality Improvement Plan, 2012 provides an ample basis to argue strongly for the protection of the Estuary and its environs; Advises that the proposal is within the catchment and in close proximity to the Parkfield Drain which discharges into the northern end of the Leschenault Estuary
5	Proposal activities – Describe the proposal activities that have the potential to impact the environment	Extraction of limestone within alluvial plain has potential to negatively alter water chemistry
6	Mitigation – Describe the measures proposed to manage and mitigate the potential environmental impacts.	The applicant must be able to demonstrate proposed predicted outcomes are achievable.

7	Impacts – Assess the impacts of the proposal and review the residual impacts against the EPA objective .	The proposal poses potential to significantly impact environment values, onsite and offsite therefore it is at odds with EPA Principle of the conservation of biological diversity and ecological integrity
8	Assumptions - Describe any assumptions critical to your assessment e.g. particular mitigation measures or regulatory conditions.	DWER conditions must be managed and rigorously monitored by the applicant. An independent audit and reporting regime must be conducted by DWER authorised consultant

For each of the environmental factors identified above, complete the following table, or provide the information in a supplementary report

Potential environmental impacts		
1	EPA Factor	Air Quality
2	EPA policy and guidance - What have you considered and how have you applied them in relation to this factor?	Potential for significant impact to surrounding businesses, community health and outdoor recreation areas
3	Consultation – Outline the outcomes of consultation in relation to the potential environmental impacts	DWER advised Dust will be a major impact to control or suppress in such a high wind alluvial plain with no natural inhibitors - screening
4	Receiving environment – Describe the current condition of the receiving environment in relation to this factor.	Complaint from neighbouring property due to ongoing extracted lime dust. Increasing Quarrying activities risk particulate matter exceeding WA Dept of Health recommendations.
5	Proposal activities – Describe the proposal activities that have the potential to impact the environment	Dust and noise from extraction and transporting operation have potential to impact State Heritage listed, Springhill Homestead, 125m from site and residential property 650m from the site
6	Mitigation – Describe the measures proposed to manage and mitigate the potential environmental impacts.	Lot 4's land formation of low lying alluvial plain experiences high winds, often culminating in dust storms over neighbouring and surrounding homes. Dust is known to be a major health risk in quarrying operations and along transportation routes. This requires rigorous monitoring and management. The proposed Quarrying location to the s/eastern boundary of the town results in particulates carried by N/E and S/W winds into the town – baseline monitoring, seasonal studies required to determine existing air quality, particulates and directional impacts.

7	Impacts – Assess the impacts of the proposal and review the residual impacts against the EPA objective.	Potential impact of Dust, noise on, social surrounds. Principle significant impacts may result in serious or irreversible damage to human health
8	Assumptions - Describe any assumptions critical to your assessment e.g. particular mitigation measures or regulatory conditions.	EPA Separation Distances between Industrial and sensitive land uses. Closest receptor Springhill Homestead 125 - Compliance issue Noise and dust monitoring offsite – applicant has refused to comply, dust monitoring to be visual only

Potential environmental impacts		
1	EPA Factor	Pollution
2	EPA policy and guidance - What have you considered and how have you applied them in relation to this factor?	The significant impact of site works, crushing & screening within proximity for Shire’s recreational areas, public open space, community hall, State Heritage listed Springhill Homestead and residents homes proposed actions affect the amenity of the area
3	Consultation – Outline the outcomes of consultation in relation to the potential environmental impacts	Shire surveyed residents within 1km 356 submissions which raised significant impacts to environment, health and amenity
4	Receiving environment – Describe the current condition of the receiving environment in relation to this factor.	Shire’s planning - Zoning General Farming and Rural under GBRs. The proposed site lies within an alluvial flood plain.
5	Proposal activities – Describe the proposal activities that have the potential to impact the environment	Site operations will significantly impact air quality emitting dust (silica) and noise during crushing, screening and transportation. Hydrocarbons will be used on site, diesel emissions emitted from machinery onsite and transport Crushed limestone releases silica into the atmosphere, related diseases i.e silicosis lung cancer.
6	Mitigation – Describe the measures proposed to manage and mitigate the potential environmental impacts.	The applicant must be able to demonstrate proposed predicted outcomes are achievable.
7	Impacts – Assess the impacts of the proposal and review the residual impacts against the EPA objective.	The proposal fails the Precautionary Principle significant impacts may result in serious or irreversible damage to human health
8	Assumptions - Describe any assumptions critical to your assessment e.g. particular mitigation measures or regulatory conditions.	The Report’s mitigation measures, amount to visual reporting, this fails to comply with regulatory monitoring conditions

Potential environmental impacts		
1	EPA Factor	Social Surrounds
2	EPA policy and guidance - What have you considered and how have you applied them in relation to this factor?	The significant impact of site works, crushing & screening within proximity for Shire's recreational areas, public open space, community hall, State Heritage listed Springhill Homestead and residents homes proposed actions affect the amenity of the area
3	Consultation – Outline the outcomes of consultation in relation to the potential environmental impacts	Brod Meredith- Dept of Planning Kath La Nauze- DPLH –Heritage values Architect –re Heritage Homestead
4	Receiving environment – Describe the current condition of the receiving environment in relation to this factor.	EPA Guidance statement No 3- EPA Guidelines Separation Distancing to Sensitive Premises RE Wetlands - 130m State Heritage listed Property – 125m
5	Proposal activities – Describe the proposal activities that have the potential to impact the environment	Proposed Quarrying activities on land adjacent to Shire owned community recreation areas and public open space The site is 125m from State Heritage Listed Springhill Homestead
6	Mitigation – Describe the measures proposed to manage and mitigate the potential environmental impacts.	Vegetated buffers recommended to screen site works, absorb sound, act as visual barriers, windbreak to control mobilized dust
7	Impacts – Assess the impacts of the proposal and review the residual impacts against the EPA objective.	The Principle of intergeneration equity applied. The applicant must be able to demonstrate proposals predicted effect on surrounds are achievable.
8	Assumptions - Describe any assumptions critical to your assessment e.g. particular mitigation measures or regulatory conditions.	Monitoring and management regime to assess proposed action how they affect physical or biological surrounds

Potential environmental impacts		
1	EPA Factor	Human Health
2	EPA policy and guidance - What have you considered and how have you applied them in relation to this factor?	The significant impact of site works, crushing & screening within proximity for Shire's recreational areas, public open space, community hall, State Heritage listed Springhill Homestead and residents homes all affect the amenity of the area
3	Consultation – Outline the outcomes of consultation in relation to the potential environmental impacts	Shire of Harvey survey of residents within 1km received -356 opposed.

Potential environmental impacts		
4	Receiving environment – Describe the current condition of the receiving environment in relation to this factor.	EPA Guidance statement No 3- EPA Guidelines Separation Distancing to Sensitive Premises Resource Enhancement Wetlands - 130m State Heritage listed Property – 125m
5	Proposal activities – Describe the proposal activities that have the potential to impact the environment	Proposed Quarrying activities on land adjacent to Shire owned community recreation areas and public open space
6	Mitigation – Describe the measures proposed to manage and mitigate the potential environmental impacts.	The applicant must Demonstrate proposed predicted levels and outcomes are achievable
7	Impacts – Assess the impacts of the proposal and review the residual impacts against the EPA objective.	The Principle of intergeneration equity applied Close proximity to recreation and residential areas , concern for Binningup residents potentially impacted by silica related symptoms i.e silicosis lung cancer
8	Assumptions - Describe any assumptions critical to your assessment e.g. particular mitigation measures or regulatory conditions.	Monitoring and management according to EPA regulations

Part C: Other approvals and regulation			
State and Local Government approvals			
Is rezoning of any land required before the proposal can be implemented? If yes, please provide details.		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No Zoned Rural under GBRs. SoH Planning has discretion to allow Extractive Industry with conditions	
If this proposal has been referred by a decision-making authority, what approval(s) are required from you?		Lot 4 is located within a proclaimed Groundwater Area under the 'Rights in Water and Irrigation (RIWI) Act 1914' and therefore any groundwater abstraction, including dewatering, is subject to licensing by DWER	
Please identify other approvals required for the proposal:			
Proposal activities	Land tenure/access	Type of approval	Legislation regulating the activity
e.g. clearing, dewatering, mining, processing, dredging	e.g. Crown land, Mining lease, specify legislation for access if relevant	e.g. Native Vegetation Clearing Permit, licence, mining proposal,	e.g. <i>EP Act 1986 – Part V, RiWI Act 1914, Mining Act 1979</i>
Extractive Quarrying	Private land owner - Coast Pastoral, Payton Family	Works Approval for crushing & screening under Part IV EP Act	Part IV EP Act
Limestone extraction		EIL	Shire of Harvey Extractive Policy 2017
Commonwealth Government approvals			

Part C: Other approvals and regulation	
State and Local Government approvals	
Does the proposal involve an action that may be or is a controlled action under the <i>Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999</i> (EPBC Act)?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Has the proposed action been referred? If yes, when was it referred and what is the reference number (EPBC No.)?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Date: _____ EPBC No.: _____
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.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Decision – controlled action <input type="checkbox"/> Decision – not a controlled action
If the proposal is determined to be a controlled action, do you request that this proposal be assessed under the bilateral agreement or as an accredited assessment?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes - Bilateral <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes - Accredited
Is approval required from other Commonwealth Government/s for any part of the proposal? <i>If yes, describe.</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Approval: