Form

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

PART A: PROPONENT AND REFERRER INFORMATION AND PRO	POSAL
DESCRIPTION	

Referrer information				
Who is referring this proposal?		✓ Proponent	 ✓ Proponent □ Decision-making authority 	
			y member/third	
Name (print)		Signature	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
Kian Rex - Marine Produce Australia Pty Ltd		Idea		
Position	Operations & Production Manager	Organisation	Marine Pro Australia P	
Email	Kian.rex@barramundi. com	Phone	+61 8 9115	5 1851
Address	1 Darkan Avenue			
	North Coogee		WA	6163
Date	4/05/2022			
	r request that the EPA treat any p		□ Yes	
	ation in the referral as confidentia		✓ No	
Provide confidential information in a separate attachment.				
Does the referrent correspondence	<pre>confirm that they consent to rec electronically?</pre>	eive	✓ Yes	
			🗆 No	
Referral declaration for proponent and Authorised representative: I, Kian Rex declare that I am authorised to refer this proposal on behalf of Marine Produce Australia and further declare that the information contained in this form is true and not misleading. Date: 4/05/2022				
Proponent information				
Name of the proponent/s Include Trading Name if relevant		Marine Produ	ice Australia Pt	y Ltd
Australian Company Number(s)		70 091 805 48	30	
Australian Business Number(s)				
Pre-referral discussions				

Have you had pre-referral disc		✓ Yes
(including the EPA Services of DWER)?		□ No
If so, provide name, date, and overview of discussions.		Yes, two pre-referral meetings have been held. The first occurred on the 26 th May 2020, and discussed MPAs proposed plan and the technical studies required to support the Proposal. The EPA officers in attendance were:
		Kevin McAlpine, Hans Jacob and Gordon Motherwell.
		The second meeting occurred on the 22 nd March 2022, and discussed the results of the technical studies completed, as well as any other information required before submission to the EPA. The EPA officers in attendance were:
		Kevin McAlpine, Hans Jacob, and Leanne Thompson
Proposal information		
Proposal name		Ocean Barramundi Expansion Project
What is the proposal? (Include general description in the <u>Instructions and template: How to identify</u> <u>the content of a proposal</u>)		MPA propose to expand its barramundi farm operations to 13 sites spread across the Buccaneer Archipelago, in the Kimberley region.
		The proposed expansion will be staged over a 10-year period. Each stage consists of the construction of one nursery site, supplying 4–5 ocean-based lease areas, each of which will contain 12 sea-cages.
Have you provided electronic	spatial data, maps.	✓ Yes
and figures in the appropriate	•	
What type of proposal is being referred?For significant amendment or derived proposal, provide the associated existing Ministerial statement number/sFor a proposal under an assessed planning scheme, provide the scheme number	 ✓ 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 <u>Instructions and template</u>: 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	Alternative options for expansion of MPAs Cone Bay barramundi
	farming operations within the existing Kimberley Aquaculture
	Development Zone have been studied. The original plan was to
	use the north-east site of the aquaculture lease for expansion.
	Bathymetry and metocean data collected at the north-east region
	of the lease area indicated that establishing operations at this
	location would be challenging. A pilot study, including installation
	of sea-cages north-east of the existing sea-cages, confirmed that
	the current speeds of up to 18 knots experienced in this area were
	too strong to keep the sea-cages in place with the mooring-grid
	system, and no other mooring system would be feasible in this
	situation either. For MPA to meet the current and future demand
	for high quality barramundi product, but also ensure the
	environmental sustainability of their operations, they must move
	to deeper waters where current speeds remain suitable but water
	depths allow for significant dilution of waste material from the
	sea-cages.
	MPAs proposed nursery locations have been sited such that they
	maximise the use of current infrastructure, while allowing MPA to
	still move to land-based operations which reduce the
	environmental footprint while allowing MPA to be more
	and a straight and have an light any other any any any straight to
	self-sufficient and less reliant on other nursery operations to

PART B: ASSESSMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS		
Environmental factors		
What are the likely significant environmental factors for this proposal? For each of the environmental factors identified ab information in a supplementary report	 ✓ 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 	
Potential environmental impacts – for each environmental factor		

1	EPA policy and guidance	Refer to Sections 5-11 of the attac	ched
2	Receiving environment	Supporting Document – S38 Refer Supporting Report.	ral
3	Likely environmental impacts		
4	Application of the mitigation hierarchy		
5	Assessment and significance of residual impacts		
6	Likely environmental outcomes		
Holis	tic impact assessment		
Refer	to Section 15 of the attached Supporting Docu	ment – S38 Referral Supporting Rep	oort.
Cum	ulative environmental impact assessment		
Refer to Sections 5-11 of the attached Supporting Document – S38 Referral Supporting Report, and Section 16.			
Consultation			
Refer	Refer to Section 3 of the attached Supporting Document – S38 Referral Supporting Report.		
Supporting documents			
 Marine Produce Australia Pty Ltd – Ocean Barramundi Expansion Project Proposal Content Document 			
 Marine Produce Australia Pty Ltd – Ocean Barramundi Expansion Project Supporting Document and Attachments 			
Has the referrer provided survey information according to the <i>Instructions and Form:</i> ✓ Yes			✓ Yes
IBSA Data Packagesand/or the Instructions and form: IMSA Data PackagesImage: No			🗆 No
Conclusion			
Do you consider the proposal may have a significant effect on the environment? No, significant effects will be mitigated through the implementation of an environmental management and monitoring plan			

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	NA
Combined effects of the approved proposal and significant amendment	ΝΑ
Analysis of existing implementation conditions	ΝΑ

Previous changes to the Proposal and or implementation conditions	NA
Compliance	NA
Environmental Performance	NA
Control of implementation of significant amendment	NA

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?	NA
How does the proposal not comply with the assessed scheme and/or the environmental conditions in the assessed planning scheme?	NA

PART B: ASSESSMENT OF
PROPOSALS ONLYENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACTSIMPACTSFOR
DERIVEDDemonstrate how the proposal will
meet the environmental outcomes
defined through the assessment of the
strategic proposalNAImplementationImplementationProvide an analysis of the existing
implementation conditions of the
related strategic proposalNAImplementationImplementationProvide an analysis of the existing
implementation conditions of the
related strategic proposalNAImplementationImplementation

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)	See Ocean Barramundi Expansion S38 Referral Supporting Report Table 2.2	
Provide a summary of the statutory decision- making processes you consider can mitigate the potential impacts of the proposal on the	See Ocean Barramundi Expansion S38 Referral Supporting Report Table 2.2	

the information provided in Part B section 2.4).	
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 ocean-based aspect of the Proposal is located within the Buccaneer Archipelago at 13 distinct areas, and is currently listed as Crown Land considering it lies within the West Australian State Waters.
	The land-based aspects of the Proposal have the following details:
	 Broome Tropical Aquaculture Park Nursery – Lots 4, 5 and 6 Murakami Road, Broome. Currently tenure is under the Shire of Broome / Broome Port, with the BTAP site managed by the Department of Primary Industries and Regional Development.
	 Arrowpearling Base Nursery – Dampier Peninsula, WA, 6725. Closest town is Beagle Bay, with the nursery site lying ~35 kms west along Beagle Bay Road of the town.
	 Ardyaloon Nursery – Adjacent to H37G+46 Ardyaloon, WA, 6725, across from the Ardyaloon Trochus Hatchery and Aquarium.
Name of the Local Government Authority in which the proposal is located.	For the ocean-based lease areas, the Local Government Authority is the Shire of Derby. For the land-based nursery sites, the Local Government Authority is the Shire of Broome.
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?	The ocean-based aspects of the Proposal are on Unallocated Crown Land. The area within the Development Envelopes are used intermittently by Traditional Owners, and vessel-based recreational fishers and tourists. The total area of the Development Envelopes of the ocean-based aspects of the Proposal is 1213 ha.
	The proposed nursery at the BTAP site is currently not used for anything, having previously been operated as a tourist aquaculture facility. The proposed nurseries at Ardyaloon and Arrowpearling Base are also on land that is not currently being used. The total

	area of the Development Envelopes of the land-based projects of the Proposal, including areas allocated for the construction and operation of outfalls, is 8 ha.
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</i> / agreements / tenure. <i>If no, what authorisations / agreements / tenure is</i> required and from whom?	 ☐ Yes ✓ No MPA must obtain a lease under the <i>Fish</i> <i>Resources Management Act 1994</i> as administered by the Department of Primary Industries and Regional – Fisheries Branch for both the ocean-based and land-based aspects of the Proposal.
Commonwealth Government approvals	
Does the proposal involve an action that may be or is a controlled action under the <i>Environment</i> <i>Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999</i> (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 (Proposal has been submitted under the EPBC Act at the same time that it has been submitted under the EP Act). 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.	 □ 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:
Decision-making authority referrals ONLY	
What approval/s, under your authority, are required for this proposal? <i>Please provide details</i> .	NA

Example Table: Other approvals

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)
See Ocean Barramundi Expansion S38 Referral Supporting Report Table 2.2			