

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 (print)

Dr Jeffrey Bremer

Signature



Position

Deputy Chair

Organisation

Jarrahdale Forest
Protectors Inc

Email

Jeff.Bremer2020@gmail.com

Phone

[REDACTED]

Address

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Date

9/7/2024

Does the referrer request that the EPA treat any part of the proposal information in the referral as confidential?

☐ Yes

☒ No

Provide confidential information in a separate attachment.

Does the referrer confirm that they consent to receive correspondence electronically?

☒ Yes

☐ No

Referral declaration for proponent and Authorised representative:

I, Jeffrey Bremer. declare that I am authorised to refer this proposal on behalf of Jarrahdale Forest Protectors Inc. and further declare that the information contained in this form is true and not misleading.

Date: 30/6/2024

Proponent information

Name of the proponent/s

Include Trading Name if relevant

This referral is being submitted by an organisation that is not the proponent

The proponent is Alcoa of Australia Limited

Australian Company Number(s)

☐

OR

Australian Business Number(s)

☒

93 004 879 298

Pre-referral discussions

Have you had pre-referral discussions with the EPA (including the EPA Services of DWER)? <i>If so, provide name, date, and overview of discussions.</i>		<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Proposal information		
Proposal name		Alcoa Clearing Permit Application to clear native vegetation (CPS 10626/1)
What is the proposal? (Include general description in the Instructions and template: How to identify the content of a proposal)		Alcoa's Clearing Permit Application to DEMIRS (CPS 10620/1) Application date: 30/5/2024
Have you provided electronic spatial data, maps, and figures in the appropriate format?		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No Electronic media available from DEMIRS
What type of proposal is being referred? <i>For significant amendment or derived proposal, provide the associated existing Ministerial statement number/s</i> <i>For a proposal under an assessed planning scheme, provide the scheme number and name</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> significant proposal. <i>Choose which type of significant proposal</i> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> new proposal <input type="checkbox"/> significant amendment (proposal only) <input type="checkbox"/> significant amendment (conditions only) <input type="checkbox"/> significant amendment (proposal and conditions) <input type="checkbox"/> strategic proposal <input type="checkbox"/> derived proposal <input type="checkbox"/> proposals of a prescribed class <input type="checkbox"/> proposal under an assessed planning scheme	
<p>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.</p> <p>The referrer is not the proponent and unable to supply information in the standard template format. The proponent's supporting information can be found on the DWER FTP site here: https://ftp.dwer.wa.gov.au/permit/10626/</p> <p>In addition to our covering letter to this referral, and public comments on application 1062/6 (Appendix 1 of our letter) a short form summary is provided below.</p> <p>The proposal being referred is in the form of a Clearing Permit Application CPA 10626/1 which seeks permission to clear "up to 20 hectares" of vegetation in 46 locations in the proposed Myara North mine envelope "approximately 20 hectares". The proposal is for the purpose of conducting geotechnical investigations that will entail digging of 100 test pits and installation of 16 water bores. The application is related to an existing referral which is under assessment by the entitled : <i>Pinjarra Alumina Refinery Revised Proposal</i> (Assessment number: 2253) . The proponent's own preclearance surveys identified</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 13 conservation significant fauna species to be occurring or likely to occur within the region, with 6 significant species identified in a preclearance survey comprising 1 endangered species, 2 vulnerable species, 2 priority-4 species and 1 conservation dependant species. 		

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 17 threatened and 49 priority flora species are found in the Myara North area of which 2 priority species were found in the preclearance survey as close as 50m to planned work areas. • That not all 46 of the proposed locations were subjected to a preclearance environmental survey. • No survey of subterranean fauna was conducted <p>Also, in our public-comment submission to DEMIRS we stated that</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The presence of threatened fauna species (Endangered and Vulnerable) are grounds for refusing the permit until such time as the EPA has made a determination of the overarching referral (Assessment number: 2253) • In our covering letter to this referral firm I, we also state that <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) The presence of the threatened species and the uncertainty associated with small cumulative impacts associated with heavy machinery and risk of die back, invokes the precautionary principle outline in Section 4A(1) of the EP Act and the permit application should therefore be classified as a “<i>significant proposal</i>” and either rejected as above or referred as a new significant proposal. <p>And provide</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (b) An evaluation of “Considerations of Significance” addressing all 12 considerations listed in the EPA’s Statement of environmental principles, factors, objectives and aims of EIA. indicates that the permit application meets the criteria to have it classified as a <i>significant proposal</i> 	
Alternatives	n/a

PART B: ASSESSMENT OF 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Flora and Vegetation <input type="checkbox"/> Landforms <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Subterranean Fauna <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Terrestrial Environmental Quality <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Terrestrial Fauna <input type="checkbox"/> Inland Waters <input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality <input type="checkbox"/> Greenhouse Gas Emissions <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Social Surroundings <input type="checkbox"/> 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	Flora and Vegetation: To protect flora and vegetation so that biological diversity and ecological integrity are maintained.

		<p>Subterranean Fauna: To protect subterranean fauna so that biological diversity and ecological integrity are maintained.</p> <p>Terrestrial Environmental Quality: To maintain the quality of land and soils so that environmental values are protected.</p> <p>Terrestrial Fauna: To protect terrestrial fauna so that biological diversity and ecological integrity are maintained</p> <p>Social Surroundings: To protect social surroundings from significant harm</p>
2	Receiving environment	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Flora and Vegetation: Mature Jarrah Forest (in most of the areas, particularly those within 1~2 km of the Reservoir Protection Zone (PZ) of Serpentine dam) Subterranean Fauna: The proponent proposes to dig 100 test pits to a depth of 3m. No preclearance survey of subterranean fauna has been carried out, nor plans made for reporting on subterranean fauna during the planned operation. Terrestrial Environmental Quality: Particularly in the Southern parts of Balmoral Road, and areas close to the RPZ of Serpentine Dam, the forest represents some of the best mature Jarrah Forests in the Darling range, with high visual beauty and a high level of biodiversity providing nesting, foraging and range for threatened species of fauna, and likely threatened species of flora although no threatened flora species were reported in the preclearance survey. Terrestrial Fauna: As above 13 conservation significant fauna species were found to be occurring or likely to occur within the region, with six significant species identified in a preclearance survey comprising 1 endangered species, 2 vulnerable species, 2 priority-4 species and 1 conservation dependant species. Being mature, biodiverse forest, most

		<p>of which has been untouched for at least 70 years it is not surprising that it is one of the last refuges for threatened species.</p> <p>5. Social Surroundings: The areas in and around Balmoral Road include the historical remains of the old WW2 Prisoner of War camp. This is a valued location by the community for recreational visits and considered culturally significant by the Jarrahdale Heritage Society Similarly, as mentioned in 3 above, the forest areas being impacted are aesthetically beautiful and visited often by locals and out of town visitors for picnics and bushwalking. These works will block public access and leave the area disturbed for a minimum of several years afterwards. If mining under EPA assessment 2253 is not approved, the proposed works will be a pointless and unnecessary social impact and therefore Section 41A(1) of the Act should be upheld.</p>
3	Likely environmental impacts	<p>1. Flora and Vegetation: Uncertain. We have not been able to assess this ourselves.</p> <p>2. Subterranean Fauna: Unknown, particularly as there have been no surveys of subterranean fauna provided for Myara North in the proponent's proposal.</p> <p>3. Terrestrial Environmental Quality: Many of the geological test pits will be in the vicinity of the Southern End of Balmoral Road which is known as a beautiful area for bushwalking and picnics. We have identified 6.4 hectares (9 football fields) of clearing footprint within a 300 m radius of Balmoral Road, with some of it fronting on the road itself. Any decision to proceed with clearing in 2024 will not only cause damage and possibly irreversible damage that will be highly distressing to anyone who knows the area. However, if the related proposal (Assessment: 2253) were subsequently refused then the damage would not only be without purpose, but violate the precautionary</p>

		<p>principle and the responsibility of the regulator to choose a decision pathway that minimises harm to biodiversity and integrity of the environment.</p> <p>4. Terrestrial Fauna: Owing to the fragile circumstances of threatened species, particularly the Baudin's Cockatoo, but also the Forest red Tailed Cockatoo(Vulnerable) and the Chuditch (Vulnerable) Quokka (Vulnerable) and Brush-Tailed Phascogale (Conservation Dependant) the cumulative impact of small disturbances to range, nesting and foraging are not so easily determined but in combination with small impacts elsewhere have the potential to have severe consequences.</p> <p>5. Social Surroundings: Refer to our answer to "Social Surroundings" in Section 2</p>
4	Application of the mitigation hierarchy, including other statutory decision-making processes	<p>The proponent's application of the EPA's mitigation hierarchies are found in their supporting document. In short it is simply a proposal to "minimise environmental harm" while fully preparing for infrastructure works that will later see 8,323 hectares of forest destroyed in 10 years.</p> <p>By contrast, the referrer's suggested application of the EPA's 4-part mitigation hierarchy for Environmental Factors is suggested as follows.</p> <p>1. Avoid – avoid the adverse environmental impact altogether. Ideally JFP would like to see the area declared a National Park and protected from bauxite mining. However as the areas is already subject to (a) a proposal to clear 8,323 hectares of forest for mining under assessment by the EPA (Assessment No. 2253) , and (b) the current proposal /application for a clearing permit that we are now referring as a <i>significant proposal</i>, we suggest the following time-tabled approach</p> <p>(i) The assessment by DEMIRS of the clearing permit application CPS 10626/1 should continue to its conclusion. We believe and expect</p>

		<p>that the application should be refused until such time as the EPA makes a determination on (Assessment 2253) and the minister agrees. If it is refused because it is deemed a <i>significant proposal</i> then the current third party referral is superseded and requires no further action. in the sense of Section 37B(1) of the Act then we presume the DEMIRS referral would take precedence.</p> <p>(ii) If the application to clear vegetation is approved with conditions, even if the conditions include a delay until a determination of Assessment number 2253, then we respectfully request that this referral of the application as a <i>significant proposal</i> be considered for assessment under Part IV of the EP Act.</p> <p>We see this step as a mitigation that adds an appropriate layer of protection and review to processes that are likely to have cumulative impact on threatened species.</p> <p>(iii) Separate to the above – a higher and much more important measure of mitigation is a determination of the overarching proposal (Assessment number 2253) that mining in the Northern Jarrah Forest be denied in order to protect and conserve the biodiversity of the NJF. This in our opinion would uphold the first three principles of the Act which are</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The precautionary principle 2. The principle of intergenerational equity 3. The principle of the conservation of biological diversity and ecological integrity <p>(iv) Finally while not strictly part of this referral, our organisation still believes the most appropriate mitigation and protection for the area is to have the Myara North and Holyoake mining areas declared as part of the 400,000 hectares of conservation estate promised by the WA government in 2022 . The Myara North and Holyoake</p>
--	--	--

		<p>areas were identified as high value conservation areas by Martin et al (2022)¹ that should be added to the conservation the promised reserves</p> <p>(v). Jarrahdale Forest Protectors will continue to advocate for the above change in conservation status directly to the Minister.</p> <p>2. Minimise – limit the degree or magnitude of the adverse impact.</p> <p>JFP does not accept that any of the proponent’s mitigations to minimise impacts to strip mining (and any preliminary works) is consistent with the three principles outlined above. This is especially so where the overarching plan is to clear native forest on a vast scale in a world biodiversity hotspot where threatened species are in population decline.</p> <p>For this reason we believe reclassification to <i>significant proposal</i> is entirely appropriate, especially as the proponent’s own survey has identified threatened species foraging and living in the impacted area.</p> <p>3. Rehabilitate repair, rehabilitate or restore the impacted site as soon as possible.</p> <p>The clearing permit proposal simply suggests refilling the excavated test pits, and as far as we are aware have not addressed rehabilitation.</p> <p>Our organisation maintains that the work is unnecessary at this time and the potential for harm to threatened fauna both directly and by spread of dieback in foraging areas is not amenable to meaningful rehabilitation.</p> <p>This risk of irreversible harm through small cumulative impacts on MNES fauna has not yet been addressed by the proponent. Rather their proposal implicitly assumes that small cumulative impacts will not lead to irreversible harm. We do not think the proponent has provided a scientific risk-based assessment for that as would normally be required under the application of the precautionary principle to any impact on</p>
--	--	--

		<p>threatened species. (Section 4A(1) of the Act)</p> <p>4. Offsets</p> <p>We do not believe that offsets are proposed by the proponent and would in any case be inappropriate when dealing with endangered or threatened species habitat.</p>
--	--	---

¹ Martin D.J. The Beeliar Group and Leeuwin Group “Defining and Creating New Protected Areas inn the South West Forests Beyond 2024 . October 2022. Leeuwin Group Index of Papers ([221006_Beyond2024_DJM.pdf](#))

5	<p>Assessment and significance of residual impacts</p>	<p>1. Flora and Vegetation:</p> <p>Possibility of cumulative impact leading to population decline in MNES species. Many threatened species of flora are difficult to find or can be seasonally dormant. While the overall impact is expected to be negative, the referrer does not have enough information to scientifically assess the residual impacts, however dieback spread and the likelihood of threatened species being present remain as a risk of significant residual impact</p> <p>2. Subterranean Fauna</p> <p>This cannot be determined as no surveys of subterranean fauna were conducted.</p> <p>3. Terrestrial Environmental Quality</p> <p>With between 40 to 50 test pits and 6.4 hectares of clearings and heavy vehicle impacts on the understory in high quality forest in the Balmoral area, it is highly likely that the visual aesthetic of the area and possibly the biodiversity will suffer significant residual impacts. Impacts that will be wholly unnecessary if the overarching proposal for mining of Myara North is refused on environmental grounds and /or the already documented threat of contamination it represents to contamination the Perth's drinking water supply².</p> <p>4. Terrestrial Fauna</p> <p>As mentioned above, where endangered species are concerned, the risk of heavy machinery operation and die back spread on nesting, foraging and habitat <u>may be</u> significant if the cumulative impact is added to existing and ongoing impacts to the Baudin's cockatoo and other threatened fauna. It is an unnecessary risk at this stage of the project cycle and under the precautionary principle we strongly recommend that a delay and/or stop to geotechnical investigation at least until there is a determination of Assessment 2253 is the not only the best mitigation but a proportionate and fair approach.</p>
---	---	---

		5. Social Surroundings: Refer to our answer to “Social Surroundings” in Section 2
6	Likely environmental outcomes	1. Terrestrial Flora and Vegetation The referrer is not able to determine a likely outcome of the proposed clearing operation with any scientific certainty. 2. Subterranean Fauna Cannot be determined as no surveys of subterranean fauna were conducted by the proponent. 3. Terrestrial Environmental Quality Lasting damage to these pristine forest areas is likely with more effects on the visual landscape of a much-loved area for bushwalkers and nature lovers. 4. Terrestrial Fauna As mentioned above, in the case of endangered species there is uncertainty about the environmental outcomes of any cumulative impacts, but the potential remains for severe environmental outcomes for MNES species known to live and forage in the area. We do not believe that likely environmental outcomes can be determined with any scientific certainty with regard to the impacts on MNES species. Certainly it is simply wishful thinking to assert that no harm will occur and these statements should be justified by the proponent by an appropriate risk based analysis 5. Social Surroundings: Refer to our answer to “Social Surroundings” in Section 2
Holistic impact assessment		
Outline the holistic impact assessment for the Proposal. The referrer is not the proponent and is unable to provide this.		
Cumulative environmental impact assessment		

² [Catchment Risk Assessment Alcoa 2023 – 2027MMP](#). | Water Corporation Report released under Freedom of Information Act

Outline the relevant cumulative environmental impacts of the Proposal (based on scoping).

The referrer is not the proponent and is unable to provide this. As far as we are aware the proponent has not done a cumulative impact assessment on this proposal

Consultation

Outline the stakeholder identification and consultation process, and outcomes of consultation on the Proposal and its likely environmental effects.

As far as we are aware the proponent originally made referral to DWER under REF 10276/1 in July 2023, and a [determination notice](#) was issued on 24th August 2023 saying the referral did “*not satisfy all of the criteria specified in s.51DA(4) of the EP Act*” and that a clearing permit would be required.

The proponent then subsequently applied for a clearing permit CPS 10626/1 on the 30th May 2024. JFP having been made aware of the application, then made a public submission to DEMIRS on the 21st June 2024. On the 20th June 2024 (1 day prior to the submission date for public comments to DEMIRS) we received legal advice that the presence of MNES species and likely impacts on foraging and nesting may mean that the clearing permit should be classified as a *significant proposal*. However there was no time to accommodate this advice in our submission and in any case the email was only read carefully on Monday 24th June. We therefore have taken the course of notifying the EPA via this third party referral under Section 38(1) of the Act.

Supporting documents

Provide a list of the supporting documents

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

☒ No

The **proponent for the clearing permit** has provided the following IBSA documents IBSA-2022-0054; IBSA-2022-0051; IBSA-2024-0180; IBSA-2024-0181; IBSA-2024-0182; IBSA-2024-0184; IBSA-2024-0186. These have not been seen by the referrer.

Conclusion

Do you consider the proposal may have a significant effect on the environment? YES

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)

Decision-making authority	Legislation or Agreement regulating the activity	Approval required (and specify which proposal element the approval is related to)
DEMIRS	Environmental Protection Act 1986 (The EP Act) Sections 4A(1), 37B(1) 41A(1), 41A(3)	Approval or refusal of clearing permit for works that are implementing a proposal (Assessment 2253) that is still undergoing assessment. Approval: could occur under Section 41A(3) if it is determined that the works are minor or preliminary Refusal: Could be on a range of environmental grounds and/or that the proposal is a <i>significant proposal</i> . It is not clear to the referrer if the DMA has discretion to approve the clearing permit but impose conditions (based on the precautionary principle) that the work cannot commence until the assessment has been determined by the EPA and approved by the Minister for Environment.
EPA	As above and especially 4A(1) and 37B(1)	Determination is required as to whether the proposal provided in the clearing permit application is a <i>significant proposal</i> . It is not clear to the referrer whether the EPA can delay determination until a decision on approval/refusal of the clearing permit is made by DEMIRS. We will await advice from the EPA.

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). (Example table at the end of form)

Environmental impact	How is the impact regulated by other decision- making process(es)?	Limit(s) of the decision-making process(es) to regulate the impact eg time limits, excluded operations	Likely environmental outcome of decision-making process(es), and consistency with EPA objective	Conditions, enforcement, and review process required by decision-making process(es)	Stakeholder engagement in decision-making process(es)
<p>1. Disturbance of nesting and foraging on endangered and Vulnerable Animal species and possible collapse of numbers owing to cumulative impacts, and</p> <p>2. Unknown impacts on subterranean flora</p>	<p>(a) Action by DEMIRS By applying Section 41A(1) of the Act the clearing permit would be denied based on the precautionary principle (Section 4A(1) owing to possible significant impacts on endangered species and/or lack of survey data on subterranean fauna.</p> <p>(b) Action by the EPA If the EPA makes a determination on this referral, or DEMIRS refers the matter to the EPA as a <i>significant proposal</i> an assessment would proceed under Part IV of the EP Act</p>	<p>The decision would delay and/or prevent the proposed clearing by one of the following</p> <p>(a) Refusal by DEMIRS of the clearing permit on the grounds of it being a <i>significant proposal</i></p> <p>(b) Approval by DEMIRS, but with conditions that it could not be implemented until Assessment 2253 is determined by the EPA and approved by the Minister</p> <p>(c) After a decision by DEMIRS on (a) or (b) the EPA can still determine that the permit application is a <i>significant proposal</i> and requires the proponent to respond appropriately submit an ERD</p>	<p>These decisions (a),(b) or (c) would apply the precautionary principle and be consistent with the EPA's primary objective to protect the environment and uphold the following principles</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The precautionary principle 2. The principle of intergenerational equity 3. The principle of conservation of biodiversity and ecological integrity <p>These in turn uphold EPA Objectives to protect terrestrial flora and fauna, and subterranean fauna so that biological diversity and ecological integrity are maintained</p>	<p>Enforcement and review by DEMIRS would simply be the application of Section 41A(1) of the Act i.e. no work on a proposal until the assessment process is complete or outright refusal on the grounds it is a <i>significant proposal</i></p> <p>In the referrer's opinion the proponent's engineering design and construction schedule (due to be complete in 2028) would not be adversely affected by waiting for determination on Assessment 2253.</p> <p>Review processes by the EPA and any subsequent enforcement would follow Part IV of the EP Act in the event that application CPS 10626/1 is determined to be a <i>significant proposal</i>.</p>	<p>At this stage the impacted community of Jarrahdale has had no say on this latest development which was applied for on the 30/5/2024 and is intended to be by the applicant in July and August 2024. Other stakeholder engagement with agencies and the proponent are described in Section B part 6 – consultation (above)</p>

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.	(a) Various locations with a cluster of clearings at the southern end of Balmoral Road (b) Nearest town is Jarrahdale. The above-mentioned cluster of clearing footprints are approximately 12km from the town centre
Name of the Local Government Authority in which the proposal is located.	Shire of Serpentine-Jarrahdale
Is rezoning of any land required before the proposal can be implemented? If yes, please provide details.	<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?	Nominally State Forest but we believe it should be included as part of the 5 million million ha of conservation areas and National Parks promised by the Government ³ in 2019, and the 400,000 hectares ⁴ of protected areas promised after the cessation of logging in 2021. The proposed Myara North and Holyoake mine areas are part of forest areas recommended addition to the 400,000 hectare conservation network by Martin et al(2022) ⁵
Does the proponent have the legal access required for the implementation of all aspects of the proposal? <i>If yes, provide details of legal access authorisations / agreements / tenure.</i> <i>If no, what authorisations / agreements / tenure is required and from whom?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No They still require either a clearing permit issued by DEMIRS or more appropriately a determination of the current assessment for Myara North under the <i>Pinjarra Alumina Refinery Revised Proposal</i> (Assessment number: 2253)
Commonwealth 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No As threatened species are affected, the action may fall under the MNES provisions of the EBPC Act and a referral was made by CCWA on the 24 th June 2024

³ <https://www.dbca.wa.gov.au/management/parks/plan-our-parks> promised 5 million ha of parks in 5 years in 2019. So far as of June 2021 the figure stands at 2.5 million hectares. See [WA Govt announcement Sept 2023](#)

⁴ See WA Govt announcement Sept 2022. As far as we can tell only 9,000 hectares have been declared and only 30% of the 400,000 ha areas of State Forest have been identified for “priority consideration” under the FMP. (See <https://www.hikewest.org.au/progress-in-protecting-wa-forests-fact-or-fiction/>)

⁵ Martin D.J. The Beeliar Group and Leeuwin Group “Defining and Creating New Protected Areas inn the South West Forests Beyond 2024 . October 2022. Leeuwin Group Index of Papers ([221006 Beyond2024 DJM.pdf](#))

<p>Has the proposed action been referred? If yes, when was it referred and what is the reference number (EPBC No.)?</p>	<p> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No </p> <p>Date: 24/6/2024</p> <p>EPBC No.: <u>Not known</u></p> <p>A referral letter was sent by CCWA to Minister Plibersek on the 25/6/2024.</p>
<p>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.</p>	<p> <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No </p> <p> <input type="checkbox"/> Decision – controlled action </p> <p> <input type="checkbox"/> Decision – not a controlled action </p>
<p>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?</p>	<p> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes - Bilateral <input type="checkbox"/> No </p> <p> <input type="checkbox"/> Yes - Accredited </p>
<p>Is approval required from other Commonwealth Government/s for any part of the proposal?</p> <p><i>If yes, describe. :</i></p> <p>We are uncertain regarding the status of the EBPC referral at this stage</p>	<p> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No </p> <p>Approval:</p>
<p>Decision-making authority referrals <u>ONLY</u></p>	
<p>What approval/s, under your authority, are required for this proposal? <i>Please provide details.</i></p>	