

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?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Proponent <input type="checkbox"/> Decision-making authority <input type="checkbox"/> Community member/third party
Name of the referrer <i>Name of the person or organisation referring</i>	Sean McGunnigle Fortescue Metals Group
Contact details (for the EPA's assessment of this proposal) <i>Name, organisation, position, email, phone and address</i>	Sean McGunnigle Fortescue Metals Group Manager, Environment Approvals smcgunnigle@fmgl.com.au (08) 6218 8888 87 Adelaide Terrace, East Perth WA 6004
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
Declaration I, Sean McGunnigle, declare that I am authorised to refer this proposal on behalf of Fortescue Metals Group and further declare that the information contained in this form is true and not misleading.	
Proponent information	
Name of the proponent/s <i>Include Trading Name if relevant</i>	FMG Iron Bridge (Aust) Pty Ltd
Australian Company Number(s) ✓	ACN: 165 513 557
Australian Business Number(s) ✓	ABN: 88 165 513 557
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No Meeting between FMGIB and DEWR representatives Thursday, 14 April 2022. Discussion of scope of Proposed Amendment, associated environmental factors, submission content and process, field-site visit by DWER personnel.

Proposal information	
Proposal name	North Star Magnetite Project
What is the proposal? (Include general description in the Instructions and template: How to identify the content of a proposal)	
<p>This Amended Proposal seeks to amend the existing approval of the North Star Magnetite Project located approximately 110km southeast of Port Hedland in the Pilbara region of Western Australia.</p> <p>The Proposal consists of mine pits, an extension of the waste rock dump and ancillary infrastructure.</p> <p>FMGIB proposes an increased ground disturbance to that previously approved under MS 993, including the development of new pits, an extension of the waste rock dump and ancillary infrastructure (Figure 4). The proposed extension includes an increased Mining Development Envelope of approximately 1,551 ha with an indicative disturbance footprint of 594 ha.</p> <p>The proposal is located on land predominantly used for pastoral, including cattle grazing, and intercepts unallocated Crown land and Wallareenya Pastoral Station</p> <p>See attached Environmental Review Document for further information.</p>	
Have you provided electronic spatial data, maps, and figures in the appropriate format?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
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>	ü significant proposal. <i>Choose which type of significant proposal</i> <input type="checkbox"/> new proposal <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> significant amendment (proposal only) MS 993 <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
Proposal content: Complete the corresponding template (Proposal Content Document) from the Instructions and template: How to identify the content of a proposal for the type of proposal identified above. The completed form must be submitted with the referral.	

Alternatives	<p>Alternatives were considered for discrete components of the Amended Proposal including location of waste rock dumps, location of mine infrastructure and power supply.</p> <p>The siting of infrastructure is determined by the magnetite deposit and tenure. The location of a waste rock dump (WRD) in the west of the Revised Proposal Area was considered as part of the planning process. The current location of the WRD, to the east, was strategically placed to provide the best outcome for reducing the environmental impact on heritage sites and the critical habitat of the conservation significant fauna.</p> <p>If the amended Proposal should not proceed, there would be a loss of social and economic benefit at local, regional and state level. These implications would result in reduced royalties to Western Australia, and missed employment, contract and training opportunities.</p>
---------------------	---

PART B: ASSESSMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

Environmental factors

What are the likely significant environmental factors for this proposal?

- ☐ Benthic Communities and Habitat
- ☐ Coastal Processes
- ☐ Marine Environmental Quality
- ☐ Marine Fauna
- ☒ Flora and Vegetation
- ☐ Landforms
- ☐ Subterranean Fauna
- ☐ Terrestrial Environmental Quality
- ☒ Terrestrial Fauna
- ☒ Inland Waters
- ☐ Air Quality
- ☒ Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- ☒ Social Surroundings
- ☐ Human Health

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

Potential environmental impacts – for each environmental factor

	EPA Factor	Flora and Vegetation
1	EPA policy and guidance	Please refer to the attached Environmental Review Document.
2	Receiving environment	
3	Likely environmental impacts	
4	Application of the mitigation hierarchy	
5	Assessment and significance of residual impacts	

6	Likely environmental outcomes	Please see attached Environmental Review Document.
Holistic impact assessment		
<p>This Revised Proposal is an extension to the Original Proposal, which results in many of the potential impacts remaining within the immediate area of the existing mine. The key environmental factors, impacts of the Revised Proposal and Mitigation actions to address potential residual impacts are addressed in the Environmental Review Document. FMGIB acknowledges the environmental impact assessment process needs to consider the connections and interactions between the various components of the environment to assist in informing a holistic view of the whole environment. The 'Key' and 'Other' environmental factors have been considered against the EPA objectives and relevant guidelines.</p> <p>The key environmental factors identified as relevant to the Revised Proposal have not changed from those in the Original Proposal and include, Flora and Vegetation, Terrestrial Fauna, Inland Waters, Social Surroundings and Greenhouse Gases. Subterranean Fauna, Air Quality (dust), Landforms, Terrestrial Environmental Quality and Human Health were also considered as relevant but are not considered key factors. The Holistic Impact Assessment is presented in Section 9.0 of the Environmental Review Document.</p> <p>The combined effects of the Proposed Amendment and the Approved Proposal are no greater than the effects on individual factors (Flora and Vegetation, Terrestrial Fauna, Inland Waters, Social Surroundings and Greenhouse Gases). These effects have been minimised by applying the mitigation hierarchy (avoid, minimise and rehabilitate) to each factor as described in Sections 6.1.7, 6.2.6, 6.3.6, 6.4.6 and 6.5.6 of the Environmental Review Document. Based on the assessment of potential holistic impacts and proposed mitigation measures, it is considered that the EPA objectives for key factors can be met.</p> <p>FMGIB have undertaken extensive baseline surveys during the planning of the Revised Proposal to inform the EIA provided in this ERD and believes that the implementation of the proposed changes will not result in a significant detrimental effect in addition to, or different from, the effect of the Original Proposal.</p>		
Cumulative environmental impact assessment		
<p>The Environmental Review Document considers the cumulative impacts from the Approved Proposal, the Proposed Amendment and surrounding projects generally within a 50 km radius. A brief summary of cumulative impacts assessment for preliminary Key Environmental Factors follows:</p> <p><u>Flora and Vegetation</u></p> <p>Flora and vegetation values recorded within the overall Development Envelope are not considered unique to the area and are known to be widespread in the region. It is unlikely that direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts to flora and vegetation as a result of the Proposed Amendment will result</p>		

in a significant residual impact or result in outcomes which would be inconsistent with EPA guidance.

The Proposed Amendment will result in the loss of up to 10,633 individual plants, all of which are present within other surrounding projects. The Proposed Amendment will not result in more than a 10% increase in cumulative impact and overall will not result in significant impacts to conservation significant flora.

It is unlikely that clearing will result in a significant cumulative impact to associated land systems. All land systems will maintain above 80% of their current extents once all impacts from other third-party operations are considered. FMGIB also note that none of the corresponding Land Systems (discussed in Section 2.1.15 of the Environmental review Document) are listed in Table 3 of the EPA's *Advice on Cumulative Environmental Impacts in the Pilbara* (EPA, 2014) as being at risk from development while under pressures from land degradation.

The Proposed Amendment will result in the clearing of 606.9 ha of vegetation in a very good to excellent condition within the Chichester IBRA subregion. Correspondingly this will result in the direct loss of 606.9 ha of Vegetation Association VA 82 (George Ranges, described by Beard), representing a reduction of <0.1% of its regional area extent and 9% of its local area extent.

Impacts associated with the Proposed Amendment have been considered using the State-wide Vegetation Statistics (Government of Western Australia, 2019), which identifies VA 82 has over 99% of its mapped extent remaining within the Pilbara IBRA region. Direct impacts to Beard Vegetation Associations as a result of the Proposed Amendment are not considered to be significant as the Proposed Amendment will impact less than 1% of the remaining extents of VA 82. Following implementation of the Proposed Amendment and considering cumulative impacts, over 90% of its current extent will remain.

It is noted that in their referral of the Sanjiv Ridge 2 Project (Atlas Iron, 2021), Atlas Iron considered the cumulative impacts of surrounding mining leases and other significant mining projects located over 100 km from the Sanjiv Ridge Stage 2 Project. Their assessment concluded that approximately 1,100,000 ha of vegetation coinciding with VA 82 could be impacted. Assuming that, over 80% of VA 82 would still remain within the East Pilbara region.

The National Objectives and Targets for Biodiversity Conservation recognise that the retention of 30% or more of the pre-clearing extent of each ecological community is necessary if Australia's biological diversity is to be protected (Commonwealth of Australia, 2001).

Noting this and the overall scale of the Proposed Amendment, it is not expected to result in significant increase in cumulative impacts to vegetation within the Pilbara region.

Terrestrial Fauna

The Proposed Amendment has the potential to contribute to cumulative impacts to terrestrial fauna values with other operations within the Pilbara region. However, no significant impacts are expected on a regional or local scale.

Generally, all habitat types that will be affected by the Proposed Amendment occur in other project areas and will be subject to cumulative impact to the local representation of these habitat types. However, all of these habitats occur in the wider region and cumulative impacts are not expected to result in significant impacts on the distribution and abundance of fauna species.

The Proposed Amendment will not result in an increase in cumulative impacts on any specific habitat type by more than 10%. Noting this and the overall scale of the Proposed Amendment, clearing associated with the Proposed Amendment will not lead to a significant increase in cumulative impacts within the Pilbara region.

No conservation significant vertebrate fauna are considered likely to be significantly affected by clearing undertaken for the Proposed Amendment. No change to conservation status or regional distribution is expected to occur as a result of the Proposed Amendment.

Whilst some potential SRE species have been recorded from within the Proposed Amended area, no habitats in which the potential SRE fauna were located are unique to and are known to extend beyond the limits of the mapped area. Hence, impact to SRE fauna as a result of the Proposed Amendment are not significant in a regional context.

Social Surroundings

There are no significant cumulative impacts predicted for Social Surroundings values. However, the Proposed Amendment has the potential to contribute to the following cumulative impacts at a regional scale:

- Alteration of visual amenity of the local area
- Increase of dust in the local area
- Increase noise and vibration in the local area
- Alteration of surface water regimes in the local area
- Reduced economic value of productive pastoral land
- Loss of culturally significant native vegetation and fauna habitat
- Potential disturbance to sites of cultural significance or Aboriginal heritage places

No cumulative impacts to national parks, other recreational or tourism features within the vicinity are anticipated to occur as a result of the Proposed Amendment. No Commonwealth or State

listed historic heritage sites are identified within the Proposed Amendment Area (Heritage Council, 2022).

Greenhouse Gases

FMGIB estimate that the cumulative emissions of the Proposed Amendment will exceed 100,000 t CO₂-e per annum of greenhouse gas emissions as a result of the implementation of the Proposal. Current emissions from the Approved Project are estimated at 200,000 t CO₂-e per annum.

FMGIB considers that the Proposed Amendment will not have a significant or irreversible impact upon Greenhouse Gas Emissions in addition to, or different from the effect of the Approved Proposal in its implementation under existing implementation conditions. FMGIB has outlined appropriate measures to avoid, reduce and offset GHG emissions in the Greenhouse Gas Management Plan Appendix 15 of the Environmental Approval Document.

Inland Waters

Cumulative impacts, other than those associated with the Proposal, on inland water values are not anticipated to occur, as the nearest known third-party tenements are located approximately 20 km downstream of the Site.

Consultation

Consultation with decision making authorities and key stakeholders is continuous throughout the Project.

Decision making authorities include:

- Department of Water and Environmental Regulation (DWER)
- Department of Mining, Industry Regulation and Safety (DMIRS)
- Department of Biodiversity, Conservation and Attractions (DBCA)

Consultation with the Native Title claimants, the Njamal People is ongoing. Consultation will continue to develop as the Revised Proposal progresses into the construction and operational phases.

Supporting documents

A list of supporting documents is provided below:

- Section 38 Significant Amendment - North Star Magnetite Project – Environmental Review Document
- Appendix 1: Ministerial Statement 993
- Appendix 2: North Star Extension Flora and Vegetation Survey
- Appendix 3: Glacier Valley Terrestrial Vertebrate Fauna Assessment
- Appendix 4: Glacier Valley Short-Range Endemic Invertebrate Fauna Survey
- Appendix 5: Northern Quoll Management Plan
- Appendix 6: North Star Extension – Hydrological Assessment Report

- Appendix 7: North Star Extension – Mundagoora Pool Hydrological Assessment Report
- Appendix 8: Iron Bridge: Surface Water Monitoring and Aquatic Ecology Survey Baseline Report. Late Wet 2019/2020 to Late Wet 2021
- Appendix 9: Site 12 Pool Water Quality and Quantity Monitoring Plan
- Appendix 10: Preliminary Assessment of Social Surroundings Values within the proposed North Star Extension Project Area
- Appendix 11: Department of Planning, Lands and Heritage –Aboriginal Heritage Inquiry System Search Results
- Appendix 12: North Star Magnetite Extension Air Quality Assessment
- Appendix 13: North Star Expansion Subterranean Fauna Desktop Impact Assessment
- Appendix 14: LUC Procedure (100-PR-TA-0001)
- Appendix 15: North Star Greenhouse Gas Management Plan
- Appendix 16: North Star Subterranean Fauna Desktop and Survey Draft Report

Has the referrer provided survey information according to the Instructions and Form: IBSA Data Packages and/or the Instructions and form: IMSA Data Packages	<input checked="checked" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
--	---

Conclusion

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

FMGIB considers that the environmental effects of the Proposed Amendment will not have a significant or irreversible impact in addition to, or different from the effect of the Approved Proposal in its implementation under existing approval conditions (MS 993) and associated FMGIB internal systems and procedures.

PART B: ASSESSMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS FOR SIGNIFICANT AMENDMENTS ONLY

Type of significant amendment	<input checked="checked" type="checkbox"/> significant amendment to the approved proposal <input type="checkbox"/> significant amendment to the implementation conditions <input type="checkbox"/> significant amendment to both the proposal and the implementation conditions
-------------------------------	---

Information of the approved proposal	<p>The Project was referred under Part IV of the EP Act in October 2012. On 5 November 2012, the EPA published the decision to assess the Project at the level of a Public Environmental Review (PER). The EPA published its Report and Recommendations (Report 1514) in June 2014 and the Project was approved on 5 January 2015. Ministerial Statement MS 993 applies to the Approved Proposal.</p> <p>The overall North Star Magnetite Project comprises the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mine development envelope (MDE) for open cut mine pit, waste rock dumps, tailings storage facility (TSF) and associated infrastructure • Water corridor development envelope (WCDE) for Canning Basin borefield, water supply pipeline and associated infrastructure • Slurry corridor development envelope (SCDE) for slurry pipeline, natural gas pipeline, access road, and associated infrastructure • Infrastructure development envelope (ICDE) for access roads, transmission pipelines, gas pipeline and slurry pipeline.
Combined effects of the approved proposal and significant amendment	<p>The combined effects of the Proposed Amendment and the Approved Proposal as a whole are no greater than the effects on individual factors (Flora and Vegetation, Terrestrial Fauna, Inland Waters and Social Surroundings). These effects have been minimised by applying the mitigation hierarchy (avoid, minimise and rehabilitate) to each factor as described in the supporting document attached to this application. Based on the assessment of potential holistic impacts and proposed mitigation measures, it is considered that the EPA objectives for key factors can be met.</p>

Analysis of existing implementation conditions

The Proposed Amendment has been assessed against the EPA's *Statement of Environmental Principles, Factors and Objectives* (EPA, 2021b). FMGIB has considered the EP Act principles of environmental protection and undertaken an environmental impact assessment (as per the attached Environmental Review Document) to define the following key environmental factors relevant to Proposed Amendment:

- Flora and vegetation
- Terrestrial fauna
- Inland waters
- Social surroundings
- Greenhouse gas emissions

FMGIB considers that the Proposed Amendment will not have a significant or irreversible impact in addition to, or different from the effect of the Approved Proposal in its implementation under existing approval conditions for flora and vegetation, terrestrial fauna and inland waters key environmental factors. The Proposed Amendment includes some new key environmental factors not considered in implementation conditions of the Approved Proposal (social surroundings and greenhouse gas emissions) which will require additional implementation conditions.

<p>Previous changes to the Proposal and or implementation conditions</p>	<p>Following the approval of the North Star Magnetite Project (original proposal), five non-significant changes have been approved under s. 45C of the EP Act. These are summarised below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Attachment 1 MS 993 (22 August 2016) - Change to area of SCDE, additional clearing for an aerodrome in the ICDE, addition of an aerodrome to the elements in the ICDE and a change to the area of the ICDE • Attachment 2 MS 993 (8 March 2019) - Increase in groundwater abstraction from the WCDE supporting revised project characteristics (Groundwater Licence (GWL) 175700(2) approved from 29 March 2019 to 5 January 2020) • Attachment 3 to MS 993 (2 December 2019) - Decrease in ICDE and corresponding increase in MDE, addition of return water pipelines and associated infrastructure to SCDE • Attachment 4 to MS 993 (22 September 2020) - Increase in mine dewatering up to 5 Gigalitres per annum (GL/a), changes to WCDE, MDE, SCDE and ICDE • Attachment 5 to MS 993 - Increase in the clearing permitted within the SCDE from no more than 315 ha to 435 ha
---	--

<p>Compliance</p>	<p>Condition 4-6 of MS 993 requires that a Compliance Assessment Report (CAR) is to be submitted annually to EPA Services and made publicly available by 5 April each year. To date seven CAR's have been prepared for the Pre-construction and Construction phases of the Project, the most recent covers the reporting period of 9 January 2021 to 8 January 2022.</p> <p>A summary of non-compliances/potential non-compliances as presented within the five most recent CAR's is provided below:</p> <p><u>9 Jan 2017 – 8 Jan 2018</u></p> <p>Nil</p> <p><u>9 Jan 2018 – 8 Jan 2019</u></p> <p>Nil</p> <p><u>9 Jan 2019 - 9 Jan 2020</u></p> <p>Nil</p> <p><u>8 Jan 2020 – 9 Jan 2021</u></p> <p>Non-compliance with Condition 10-2 over the period 2015 – 2017 when three drill pads and associated access tracks were cleared within the mine exclusion zone.</p> <p><u>9 Jan 2021 - 8 Jan 2022</u></p> <p>Potential non-compliances with Condition 13 were reported on three separate occasions. Fauna rescue personnel were unavailable to complete scheduled trench inspections, within specified timeframes, within the Water or Slurry Corridor Envelopes.</p> <p>Since the last CAR was submitted to EPA earlier this year, there have been six potential non-compliances with Condition 13 reported within the Water or Slurry Corridor Envelopes. Five of these events were associated with inclement weather preventing access to allow trench inspections. One event occurred when there was insufficient human resource available to adequately complete trench inspections within the specified timeframes.</p>
--------------------------	---

Environmental Performance	<p>FMGIB currently operates the Approved Proposal, which was approved under Part IV of EP Act with the issue of MS 993 in 2015. Table 2 summarises FMGIB environmental performance of the Approved Proposal against the EPA's objectives for environmental factors relevant to the requested amendment and Ministerial Statement 993 implementation and environmental outcomes and/or objectives.</p>
----------------------------------	---

<p>Control of implementation of significant amendment</p>	<p>The Proposed Amendment is an extension associated directly with the Approved Proposal, North Star Magnetite Project. The Approved Proposal has been formally assessed at the level of assessment by Public Environment Review and the North Star Magnetite Project is approved under MS 993.</p> <p>In consideration of the scale of the Proposed Amendment (606.9 ha of native vegetation clearing), the broader distribution of biological values across the local area and surrounds, the application of the mitigation hierarchy to minimise effects, and the established framework of environmental management plans and environmental offsets, the effects of the Proposed Amendment to the biological values are not considered to be environmentally significant nor inconsistent with the EPA's objectives.</p> <p>The Proposed Amendment has been assessed against the EPA's <i>Statement of Environmental Principles, Factors and Objectives</i> (EPA, 2021b). FMGIB has considered the EP Act principles of environmental protection and undertaken an environmental impact assessment to define the following key environmental factors relevant to Proposed Amendment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Flora and vegetation • Terrestrial fauna • Inland waters • Social surroundings • Greenhouse gas emissions <p>Potential impacts, their mitigation and environmental outcomes for each key environmental factor are set out in Section 6 of the Environmental Review Document.</p> <p>FMGIB considers that the environmental effects of the Proposed Amendment will not have a significant or irreversible impact in addition to, or different from the effect of the Approved Proposal in its implementation under existing approval conditions for the key environmental factors assessed under the Approved Proposal. The Environmental Review Document outlines new outcomes for key environmental factors not considered in the Approved Proposal (social surroundings and greenhouse gas emissions).</p> <p>FMGIB anticipates no significant changes to any of the management plans required under MS 993 beyond extending their applicability to include the geographical area of the Proposed Amendment where applicable.</p>
--	---

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

PART B: ASSESSMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS FOR DERIVED PROPOSALS ONLY

Demonstrate how the proposal will meet the environmental outcomes defined through the assessment of the strategic proposal	N/A
Provide an analysis of the existing implementation conditions of the related strategic proposal in relation to the derived proposal	N/A

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.

Table 1:

Proposal activities e.g. clearing, dewatering, mining, processing, dredging	Decision-making authority (DMA)	Legislation or Agreement regulating the activity	Approval required (and specify which proposal element the approval is related to)
Clearing	DCCEEW (formerly DAWE)	EPBC Act 1999	Ministerial approval
Mining; including ancillary infrastructure	DMIRS	<i>Mining Act 1978</i>	Mining Proposal and Mine Closure Plan
Surface water management	DWER	<i>Rights in Water and Irrigation Act 1914</i>	s. 11/17/21A permit to interfere with bed and banks
Storage and handling of dangerous goods	DMIRS	<i>Dangerous Goods Safety Act 2004</i>	Licence to store fuel and chemicals on site
Dewatering	DWER	<i>Right in Water and Irrigation Act 1914</i>	5C licence to take water 26D licence to construct or alter a well
Disturbance of conservation significant fauna	DBCA	<i>The Biodiversity Conservation Act 2016</i>	s40 Ministerial Authorisations to take or disturb threatened species
Tailings disposal Dry rejects disposal	DWER	<i>EP Act 1978</i>	Part V approval (operating licence and/or works approval)

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).

DMAs listed in Table 1 can mitigate the potential impacts of the proposal for the activities listed.

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 proposal is located at the North Star mine area, approximately 1,230 kilometres (km) north-north east of Perth and 110 km south-south east of Port Hedland.
Name of the Local Government Authority in which the proposal is located.	Shire of East Pilbara Local Government Area (LGA)
Is rezoning of any land required before the proposal can be implemented?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes

If yes, please provide details.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
What is the current land use on the property, and the extent (area in hectares) of the property?	The primary land use is pastoral, including grazing of stock. The proposed extension includes an increased Mining Development Envelope of approximately 1,425.9 ha with an indicative disturbance footprint of 606.9 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 / agreements / tenure.</i> <i>If no, what authorisations / agreements / tenure is required and from whom?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
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
Has the proposed action been referred? If yes, when was it referred and what is the reference number (EPBC No.)?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No Date: <u>17/12/2012</u> EPBC No.: <u>2012/6689</u>
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" 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 a Bilateral Agreement or as an accredited assessment?	<input checked="" 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:
Decision-making authority referrals <u>ONLY</u>	
What approval/s, under your authority, are required for this proposal? <i>Please provide details.</i>	Refer to Table 1 above

Table 2 2: ENVIRONMENTAL PERFORMANCE AGAINST MS 993 AND RELEVANT EPA FACTOR OBJECTIVES

Environmental Factor and EPA Objective	Summary of Ministerial Statement 993 requirements	Summary of current performance of the approved proposal against EPA factor objective and/or requirements of MS 993
<p>Flora and Vegetation</p> <p><i>To protect flora and vegetation so that biological diversity and ecological integrity are maintained.</i></p>	<p>Priority 1 <i>Pityrodia</i> sp. Marble Bar Mine Infrastructure Plan within Mine Development Envelope</p> <p>Priority 1 <i>Pityrodia</i> sp. Marble Bar Regional Survey Plan</p> <p>Conservation Significant Flora and Vegetation Survey Requirements - Linear Infrastructure and Borefield Alignment Survey(s)</p> <p>Offsets</p>	<p>The Priority 1 <i>Pityrodia</i> sp. Marble Bar (now <i>Quoya zonalis</i>) Mine Infrastructure Plan required by MS 993 was approved by DWER and is currently being implemented.</p> <p>The Priority 1 <i>Pityrodia</i> sp. Marble Bar Regional Survey Plan required by MS 993 was approved by DWER and is currently being implemented.</p> <p>Up until July 2021 only 9 individuals had been disturbed which is within the 467 individuals permitted to be disturbed.</p> <p>The Conservation Significant Flora and Vegetation Survey Plan - Linear Infrastructure and Borefield Alignment approved by DWER is currently being implemented to meet the EPA Objective. Prior to any disturbance of corridor development envelopes, vegetation surveys were undertaken. Surveys were undertaken to allow for the alignment of infrastructure to minimise disturbance to conservation significant fauna. Only one Conservation Significant Flora individual (<i>Quoya zonlais</i>) was located along the mine access road. That individual has been demarcated and infrastructure designed to avoid disturbing it.</p> <p>FMGIB is committed to offsetting activities in accordance with the Project Impact Reconciliation Report (IRP). The first report for MS993 was issued on 1 April, subsequent reports will be submitted biennially. The IRP is yet to be approved by DWER, as such no contributions to the Pilbara Environmental Offset Fund have been made.</p> <p>No non-compliances or significant incidents have been recorded to date related to the implementation of the conditions relevant to this EPA objective.</p>

Environmental Factor and EPA Objective	Summary of Ministerial Statement 993 requirements	Summary of current performance of the approved proposal against EPA factor objective and/or requirements of MS 993
<p>Terrestrial Fauna</p> <p><i>To protect terrestrial fauna so that biological diversity and ecological integrity are maintained.</i></p>	<p>Pilbara Leaf-nosed Bat: The proponent shall implement the proposal in a manner that maintains the viability of the population of Pilbara Leaf-nosed Bat (<i>Rhinonictoris aurantia</i>) from Cave 13.</p> <p>Northern Quoll: Ensure that the proposal is carried out in a manner that minimises the direct and indirect impacts to the Northern Quoll (<i>Dasyurus hallucatus</i>).</p> <p>Trapped Fauna: The proponent shall ensure that open trenches associated with construction of Linear Infrastructure in the Water Corridor Development Envelope, the Slurry Corridor Development</p>	<p>FMGIB has implemented the Approved Proposal in a manner that maintains the viability of the population of Pilbara Leaf-nosed Bat (<i>Rhinonictoris aurantia</i>) from Cave 13.</p> <p>The Pilbara Leaf-nosed Bat Habitat Survey and Research Plan (NS-RP-EN-0032) has been approved by DWER and implemented to increase knowledge and conservation requirements of the species in the project area.</p> <p>A single non-compliance was identified and reported to DWER in 2020. The incident was associated with vegetation disturbance with a Mining Exclusion Zone, and subsequent monitoring indicates no impact to the PLNB population. The Project continues to work with the regulator and subject matter experts to increase knowledge of the species in the region, so that mining activities do not have a significant impact on the species.</p> <p>The Approved Proposal has been implemented in a manner that minimises direct and indirect impacts to the Northern Quoll (<i>Dasyurus hallucatus</i>). The Northern Quoll Management Plan was approved by DWER and has been implemented on the project since 2016 and includes annual monitoring of the species. Some local decline in the species has been identified, largely attributable to regional bushfires and feral cats, however an increase in the local population was recorded in 2021. Management of feral cat populations continues in the region to support the local population.</p> <p>Monitoring for trapped fauna in trenches associated with the Infrastructure Development Envelopes is undertaken on a twice daily basis, in accordance with condition 13.1 of MS993. Trapped fauna is removed, relocated and recorded as necessary.</p> <p>Non-compliances have been identified and reported to DWER on three occasions, mostly associated with logistical challenges associated with undertaking inspections within required timeframes. No non-compliances have resulted in any impact to conservation significant fauna.</p>

Environmental Factor and EPA Objective	Summary of Ministerial Statement 993 requirements	Summary of current performance of the approved proposal against EPA factor objective and/or requirements of MS 993
	Envelope and the Infrastructure Corridor Development Envelope are cleared of trapped fauna	
<p>Inland Waters</p> <p><i>To maintain the quality of groundwater and surface water so that environmental values are protected.</i></p>	<p>Ensure that mining activities do not impact the water quality or hydrological regime of Site 12 Pool, adjacent to North Star.</p>	<p>The Site 12 Pool Water Quality and Quantity Monitoring Plan required by MS 993 was approved by DWER and is being implemented to manage potential impacts to Site 12 Pool from planned mining activities.</p> <p>No significant activities have been undertaken within the Pool 12 catchment, so management activities continue to be focused on baseline monitoring of surface- and groundwater feeding the pool.</p> <p>There have been no reported non-compliances in relation to this EPA objective.</p>
<p>Greenhouse Gas Emissions.</p> <p><i>To reduce net greenhouse gas emissions in order to minimise the risk of environmental harm associated with climate change.</i></p>	<p>No requirements</p>	<p>Companywide:</p> <p>Fortescue Metals has an internal target to achieve carbon neutrality within their operations by 2030 by gradually reducing emissions from FY2020 baseline. This target includes existing operations and extends to all future operations, including FMGIB. Up until today Fortescue Metals has been meeting internal annual targets by either reducing emissions or by voluntarily surrendering offsets.</p>
<p>Social Surroundings</p> <p><i>To protect social surroundings from significant harm.</i></p>	<p>No requirements</p>	<p>During the implementation of the approved proposal, FMGIB has aimed to avoid impacting Heritage Places and places of cultural significance (where practical) and developed appropriate mitigation strategies through ongoing consultation with Nyamal People. Where FMGIB has not been able to avoid direct impact to Heritage Places, the company has obtained the relevant Heritage Approvals under the Aboriginal Heritage Act.</p>

Environmental Factor and EPA Objective	Summary of Ministerial Statement 993 requirements	Summary of current performance of the approved proposal against EPA factor objective and/or requirements of MS 993
		Engagement and consultation with Nyamal has been undertaken for the implementation of the approved proposal and is ongoing to further inform FMGIB's understanding of the potential impacts to social surroundings values within and surrounding the Proposed Amendment area. This consultation is providing information for the development of a SCHMP for the Proposed Amendment area that will aim to avoid (where possible) and minimise the impacts to social surroundings values Nyamal have identified.