

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** Stephanie Myles**Signature****Position**

Lead, Permitting

OrganisationNewmont Boddington
Gold Pty Ltd**Email****Phone****Address**

Level 5 / 500

Hay Street

Subiaco

WA

6008

Date

19/06/2025

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, Stephanie Kay Myles declare that I am authorised to refer this proposal on behalf of Newmont Boddington Gold Pty Ltd and further declare that the information contained in this form is true and not misleading.

Date: 19/06/2025

Proponent information**Name of the proponent/s***Include Trading Name if relevant*

Newmont Boddington Gold Pty Ltd

Australian Company Number(s)

☒

101 199 731

OR

Australian Business Number(s)

☐**Pre-referral discussions****Have you had pre-referral discussions with the EPA (including the EPA Services of DWER)?**☒ Yes☐ No

<p><i>If so, provide name, date, and overview of discussions.</i></p> <p><i>Meeting date: 13/02/2025</i></p> <p><i>EPA Services attendees: Simon Weighell, Annarie Boer and Robert Hughes.</i></p> <p><i>Newmont attendees: David Laan, Jarrod Riley, Stephanie Myles and Linda Kirchner (consultant)</i></p>	<p>A pre-referral meeting was held on 13 February 2025 between Newmont Boddington (David Laan, Jarrod Riley, Stephanie Myles and Linda Kirchner (consultant)) and EPA Services Representatives (Simon Weighell, Annarie Boer and Robert Hughes).</p> <p>Newmont Boddington introduced the Proposal, the preliminary key environmental factors, potential impacts, mitigation hierarchy, anticipated environmental outcomes and management measures. Key discussion points included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposal overview: Newmont Boddington confirmed that it will submit a comprehensive referral under section 38 of the <i>Environmental Protection Act 1986 (EP Act)</i>. This Proposal includes, but is not limited to, additional disturbance necessary for the safe construction and operation of RDA2 (tailings dam). • Regulatory context: The RDA2 inundation footprint was originally approved under Ministerial Statement 971 (MS 971 or the Approved Proposal) in 2014. • Environmental considerations: Preliminary environmental factors discussed included flora and vegetation, terrestrial fauna, inland waters, and social surroundings. • Survey work: Updates were provided on completed surveys and ongoing assessments relevant to the Proposal. • Approval pathway considerations including Assessment on Referral Information (ARI) and Public Environmental Review (PER).
Proposal information	
Proposal name	Newmont Boddington Life of Mine Extension Amendment Proposal
What is the proposal? (Include general description in the Instructions and template: How to identify the content of a proposal)	Proposal comprises additional footprint which will be required to ensure the safe construction and operation of RDA2 (future tailings dam). The inundation footprint of RDA2 is approved under MS971.

		<p>The Proposal footprint comprises an additional 1,560 ha of disturbance, of which 528 ha is native vegetation. The remaining area consists of pre-disturbed land.</p> <p>The implementation of this Proposal requires additional footprint to the Approved Proposal and comprises, but is not limited to, the following activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ bauxite preservation and stockpiling as required ▪ expansion of the access road from Albany Highway ▪ access and perimeter roads ▪ pipeline and powerline corridors ▪ surface water management infrastructure ▪ construction laydowns ▪ office and workshop areas ▪ access road from the mine ▪ rehabilitation material (topsoil and gravel) stockpiles ▪ footprint for the F1/F3 RDA closure spillway construction ▪ potential discharge of treated water to the environment, and ▪ other associated infrastructure for the Proposal and Approved Proposal.
<p>Have you provided electronic spatial data, maps, and figures in the appropriate format?</p>		<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p>
<p>What type of proposal is being referred?</p> <p><i>For significant amendment or derived proposal, provide the associated existing Ministerial statement number/s</i></p> <p><i>For a proposal under an assessed planning scheme, provide the scheme number and name</i></p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> significant proposal. <i>Choose which type of significant proposal</i></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> new proposal</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> significant amendment (proposal only)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> significant amendment (conditions only)</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> significant amendment (proposal and conditions)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> strategic proposal</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> derived proposal</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> proposals of a prescribed class</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> proposal under an assessed planning scheme</p>	
<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>		

Alternatives	<p>An alternative future tailings storage option was reassessed over 2021-2023 with the expansion of the existing approved F1/F3 and R4 RDAs. This was discounted in 2023 due to fatal flaws associated with construction interfaces and potential encroachment of the tailings dam footprint into the South Dandalup Drinking Water Catchment. This is considered an incompatible land use.</p> <p>The footprint of this Proposal which enabled optimised schedule and cost (due to shorter haulage of bauxite and rehabilitation materials to stockpile locations) resulted in disturbance of over 900 ha of native vegetation. This footprint was revised to reduce native vegetation clearing to critical infrastructure only (e.g. surface water management structures) and stockpiling activities were restricted to pre-disturbed land.</p> <p>See Section 3.3 of the Referral supporting document.</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 – flora and vegetation

1	EPA policy and guidance	See Section 8.2 of the Referral Supporting Document.
2	Receiving environment	See Section 8.3 of the Referral Supporting Document.
3	Likely environmental impacts	See Section 8.12 of the Referral Supporting Document.
4	Application of the mitigation hierarchy, including other statutory decision-making processes	See Section 8.13 of the Referral Supporting Document.

5	Assessment and significance of residual impacts	See Section 8.14 of the Referral Supporting Document.
6	Likely environmental outcomes	See Section 8.15 of the Referral Supporting Document.
Potential environmental impacts – terrestrial fauna		
1	EPA policy and guidance	See Section 9.2 of the Referral Supporting Document.
2	Receiving environment	See Section 9.3 of the Referral Supporting Document.
3	Likely environmental impacts	See Section 9.6 of the Referral Supporting Document.
4	Application of the mitigation hierarchy, including other statutory decision-making processes	See Section 9.7 of the Referral Supporting Document.
5	Assessment and significance of residual impacts	See Section 9.7.2 of the Referral Supporting Document.
6	Likely environmental outcomes	See Section 9.9 of the Referral Supporting Document.
Potential environmental impacts – inland waters		
1	EPA policy and guidance	See Section 10.2 of the Referral Supporting Document.
2	Receiving environment	See Section 10.3 of the Referral Supporting Document.
3	Likely environmental impacts	See Section 10.5 of the Referral Supporting Document.
4	Application of the mitigation hierarchy, including other statutory decision-making processes	See Section 10.6 of the Referral Supporting Document.
5	Assessment and significance of residual impacts	See Section 10.6.2 of the Referral Supporting Document.
6	Likely environmental outcomes	See Section 10.8 of the Referral Supporting Document.
Potential environmental impacts – social surroundings		
1	EPA policy and guidance	See Section 11.2 of the Referral Supporting Document.
2	Receiving environment	See Section 11.4 of the Referral Supporting Document.
3	Likely environmental impacts	See Section 11.5 of the Referral Supporting Document.

4	Application of the mitigation hierarchy, including other statutory decision-making processes	See Section 11.6 of the Referral Supporting Document.
5	Assessment and significance of residual impacts	See Section 11.6.5 of the Referral Supporting Document.
6	Likely environmental outcomes	See Section 11.7 of the Referral Supporting Document.
Holistic impact assessment		
See Section 15 of the Referral Supporting Information Document for the preliminary holistic impact assessment.		
Cumulative environmental impact assessment		
<p>Cumulative impact of the Proposal and the Approved Proposal (which combined form the Revised Proposal) is discussed in the following sections relating to key environmental factors:</p> <p>Flora and Vegetation – Section 8</p> <p>Terrestrial Fauna – Section 9</p> <p>Inland Waters – Section 10</p> <p>Social Surroundings – Section 11</p> <p>Newmont Boddington t has undertaken the cumulative impact assessment (of successive, incremental and interactive impacts on the environment) of this Proposal with past, present and reasonably foreseeable future activities within 40 km of the Proposal. Please refer to Section 16.</p>		
Consultation		
In the Referral Supporting Information Document, key stakeholders for the Proposal are listed in Table 5-1 and key consultations conducted to date with stakeholders regarding the Proposal are summarised in Table 5-3.		
Supporting documents		
Please refer to Referral Supporting Information Document and Appendices.		
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="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Conclusion		
<p>A preliminary environmental impact assessment (EIA) is presented in the Referral Supporting Information Document. This assessment concludes there is potential for a significant residual impact on terrestrial fauna with the reduction in available habitat in the local region as a result of the Proposal, as well as to social surroundings regarding Aboriginal cultural sites. Preliminary mitigations are also proposed and additional survey work is planned for completing in 2025.</p> <p>A detailed EIA will be presented in the Environmental Review Document.</p>		

PART B: ASSESSMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS FOR SIGNIFICANT AMENDMENTS ONLY

Type of significant amendment	<input type="checkbox"/> significant amendment to the approved proposal <input type="checkbox"/> significant amendment to the implementation conditions <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> significant amendment to both the proposal and the implementation conditions
Information of the approved proposal	<p>MS971 was approved for the Newmont Boddington Life of Mine Extension Study in 2014. The proposal was for the continuation of the existing operations and for an expansion of the existing operations at the Newmont Boddington Goldmine and included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Pit expansion (widening and deepening) ▪ Increased ore production resulting in increased waste quantities ▪ Increase to existing stockpiles and development of ancillary infrastructure ▪ Expansion of waste rock dumps ▪ Construction of a new residue disposal area, and ▪ Construction of new water storage areas. <p>MS971 provides approval of a 12,856 ha Development Envelope, and for a disturbance footprint of 6,923 ha which includes no more than 5,435 ha of native vegetation, within the Development Envelope.</p>
Combined effects of the approved proposal and significant amendment	<p>The Revised Proposal (inclusive of Approved Proposal and this Proposal) would result in a Development Envelope of 14,182 ha, and a disturbance footprint of 8,483 ha within the Development Envelope, which includes clearing of no more than 5,963 ha of native vegetation.</p> <p>Approximately two thirds of the additional 1,560 ha of disturbance footprint will be on pre-disturbed land.</p>

<p>Analysis of existing implementation conditions</p>	<p>The following management plans are conditioned under MS971:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Condition 6-2 - Weed and Disease Monitoring and Management Plan (WDMMP) ▪ Condition 7-2 - Groundwater and Groundwater Dependent Vegetation Monitoring and Management Plan (GGDVMMP) ▪ Condition 8-2 - Bibbulmun Track Management Plan (has not triggered time dependent conditions), and ▪ Condition 9-2- Offset Management Plan (OMP). <p>Noting a Terrestrial Fauna Management Plan (TFMP) and a Black Cockatoo Management Plan (BCMP) was conditioned under EPBC 2012/6370.</p> <p>It is anticipated conditions regarding management plans will be amended as a result of assessment of the Revised Proposal. The Proponent has provided draft updates of the WDMMP, TFMP, BCMP and an Offset Management Strategy as part of the referral submission. However, it is anticipated conditions relating to these plans will be amended under approval of the Revised Proposal and reflect more modern Ministerial Statement outcome based conditions and environmental factor based management plans rather than plans for individual potential impacts. For example a Flora and Vegetation Management Plan would discuss mitigations and outcomes for various potential impacts to flora and vegetation inclusive of weeds, forest disease and changes in groundwater.</p>
--	---

<p>Previous changes to the Proposal and or implementation conditions</p>	<p>Two s45c applications have been made regarding MS971 since it was originally approved in 2014.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ S45c (approved May 2019) increased the Development Envelope authorised extent from 11,712 ha to 12,856 ha, and amended the disturbance footprint with the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Movement of future RDA2 west so facility did not sit on Gringer Creek and minor change to inundation shape of this facility ○ Minor changes to clearing footprint around D6 dam on Hotham Farm, and ○ Commitment to exclude remnant vegetation patches on Hotham Farm from future clearing under MS971. ▪ S45c (approved April 2024): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Increased the authorised extent of clearing of non-native vegetation (plantation), and ○ Changes to the disturbance footprint. <p>Since approval of MS971 the following approved activities have commenced:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Pit expansion (widening and deepening) ▪ Increased ore production resulting in increased waste quantities ▪ Increase to existing stockpiles and development of ancillary infrastructure ▪ Expansion of waste rock dumps, and ▪ Construction of a new water storage area (D6 dam). <p>The current disturbance footprint for the operation is 4,540.5 ha against an authorised extent of 6,923 ha with native vegetation clearing of 4,158 ha against an authorised extent of 5,435 ha.</p> <p>Regarding construction of a new residue disposal area (RDA2), work continues on collection of baseline information and development of final dam design. Plantation harvesting within the RDA2 footprint has been ongoing and clearing activities within the authorised extent are planned to commence in 2026.</p>
---	--

<p>Compliance</p>	<p>The last compliance assessment report (CAR) regarding MS971 was submitted in June 2024. The following non-compliances/potential non-compliances were reported:</p> <p><u>Condition 4-5</u></p> <p>The Proponent reported an over-clearing event in February 2024 where 0.21 ha of native vegetation outside of the authorised extent was cleared during expansion of the north pit and waste rock dump.</p> <p>An investigation report was provided to DWER in April 2024 which included root causes and mitigation actions.</p> <p><u>Condition 7-3 – GGDVMMP</u></p> <p>Newmont advised in the 2024 CAR a disconnect between triggers in the GGDVMMP and the Regional Borefield Management Procedure had been identified. A hydrogeologist and vegetation consultant were engaged to review the disconnect and advise on a pathway forward to improve the monitoring triggers present in the approved GGDVMMP. The review of the GGDVMMP is provided as Appendix B6 with the referral. Newmont is currently progressing plans for implementation of the recommendations in the review.</p> <p><u>Condition 10-1 – Legacy offset</u></p> <p>The Proponent is outside of the 2-year timeframe provided in MS971 for implementation of this legacy offset. Progress of this landswap has occurred due administrative issues with numerous third parties and delays in Revenue WA’s stamp duty assessment for the transaction. Newmont is working with Landgate to resolve remaining issues. There has been no environmental impact as a result of this delay. The Proponent continues to hold and manage this land wholly for offset purposes pending transfer of title.</p> <p><u>WDMMP</u></p> <p>The 2024 CAR reported a potential non-compliance against the WDMMP objective for no increase in spread of forest disease. However, one forest disease infestation has increased in size in proximity with the D1 dam which could be attributable to a change in water storage capacity and a higher water mark in vegetation fringing the facility.</p>
--------------------------	---

<p>Environmental Performance</p>	<p>Environmental performance against the conditions of MS971 is discussed in the CAR submitted in June 2024.</p> <p>However, performance of the approved proposal against the environmental factors relevant to this requested amendment are summarised below:</p> <p><u>Flora and Vegetation</u> – <i>to protect flora and vegetation so that biological diversity and ecological integrity are maintained</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Refer to chapter 10 of the referral supporting document regarding discussion on flora and vegetation ▪ The current native vegetation clearing footprint for the operation is 4,158 ha against an authorised extent of 5,435 ha ▪ Weed and forest disease monitoring and management has continued as per the WDMMP and GGDVMMP ▪ Implementation of the Boddington Site Disturbance Permit Application and Assessment process ▪ Previously CAR declared identification of improvement opportunities with implementation of WDMMP and GGDVMMP. Revised draft WDMMP and review of GGDVMMP submitted with this referral. <p><u>Terrestrial Fauna</u> – <i>to protect terrestrial fauna so that biological diversity and ecological integrity are maintained</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Refer to chapter 11 of the referral supporting document regarding discussion on terrestrial fauna ▪ The current native vegetation clearing footprint for the operation is 4,158 ha against an authorised extent of 5,435 ha ▪ Ongoing implementation of TFMP and BCMP ▪ Implementation of the Boddington Site Disturbance Permit Application and Assessment process ▪ Fauna surveys ongoing to further understand habitat requirements for conservation significant fauna ▪ Implementation of a 470 ha restoration biodiversity offset on Hotham Farm, and ▪ Continued planning for implementation of protective mechanism over 2000 ha of high quality Jarrah forest.
---	---

	<p>Inland Waters – <i>to maintain the hydrological regimes and quality of groundwater and surface waters so that environmental values are protected</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Refer to chapter 12 of the referral supporting document regarding discussion on inland waters ▪ Ongoing implementation of GGDVMMMP ▪ Monitoring in accordance with licence L8306/2008/3 as a minimum ▪ Assessment of impact of current mining operations on groundwater (BigDog, 2025, Appendix D4). <p>Social Surroundings – <i>to protect social surroundings from significant harm</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Refer to chapter 13 of the referral supporting document regarding discussion on social surroundings ▪ The current native vegetation clearing footprint for the operation is 4,158 ha against an authorised extent of 5,435 ha ▪ Ongoing implementation of the following site management plans and procedures: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Air quality ○ Noise and vibration ○ Cultural Heritage Management Plan ○ Chance find procedure, and ○ Complaints and grievances procedure. ▪ Sustained engagement with key stakeholders via the Community Reference Group, Relationship Committee, Local Emergency Management Committee and BGM Environmental Management and Liaison Group.
Control of implementation of significant amendment	<p>Newmont Boddington is requesting a revised Ministerial Statement for the Boddington operation to include the Revised Proposal. It is likely the conditions will be amended to reflect current outcomes based conditions and management plan guidelines.</p> <p>Many of the existing mitigation controls and monitoring protocols will be incorporated into revised management plans.</p> <p>It is expected the Revised Proposal will be appropriately mitigated under conditions of the amended Ministerial Statement.</p>

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 Table 1 included here.

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)

Discussion on statutory decision-making processes which can be considered to mitigate potential impacts is discussed in the relevant key environmental factors sections of the Referral Supporting Document. However, this information is consolidated for ease of review in Table 2 included in this referral form.

Tenure and Local Government approvals

Location of proposal:

- street address, lot number, suburb, and nearest road intersection; or
- if remote, the nearest town and distance and direction from that town to the proposal site.

The Proposal is located in the Shire of Boddington, approximately 130 km south of Perth and 13 km north-west of the main township of Boddington.

Access to site is via Gold Mine Road, Boddington.

Name of the Local Government Authority in which the proposal is located.

Shire of Boddington

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 majority of the land included in this Proposal is currently used as a blue gum and pine tree plantation.

This land is covered by Worsley Alumina's State Agreement; the *Alumina Refinery (Worsley) Agreement Act 1973* (Worsley State Agreement).

Does the proponent have the legal access required for the implementation of all aspects of the proposal?

If yes, provide details of legal access authorisations / agreements / tenure.

☒ Yes ☐ No

Newmont is the freehold land owner of the land under the Proposal.

Works will be conducted under *Mining Act* tenure which has not yet been obtained.

Commonwealth Government approvals

Does the proposal involve an action that may be or is a controlled action under the *Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999* (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

Date: Referral not yet submitted

	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 ✓ 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 a Bilateral Agreement or as an accredited assessment?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes - Bilateral ✓ 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 ✓ 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>	Not applicable

Table 1: Other decision-making authorities, associated legislation regulating the activity and specific approval required

Decision-making authority	Legislation or Agreement regulating the activity	Approval required (and specify which proposal element the approval is related to)
Minister for Environment Department of Biodiversity, Conservation and Attractions (DBCA)	<i>Biodiversity Conservation Act</i>	<i>Fauna taking (relocation) licence</i> and where this pertains to threatened fauna, authorization from the Minister for Environment or delegate is required under Section 40. <i>Flora taking (biological assessment) licence</i> is considered unlikely but will be required if threatened flora species are detected from survey.
Department of Water and Environmental Regulation (DWER)	Part V <i>Environmental Protection Act</i>	Works Approval and licence
DWER	<i>Rights in Water and Irrigation Act 1914</i>	Section 17 permit to interfere with a bed and banks
Minister for Department of Planning, Lands and Heritage (DPLH) DPLH	<i>Aboriginal Heritage Act 1972</i>	Section 16 consent to enter, excavate, examine or remove anything from an Aboriginal heritage site. Section 18 consent for disturbance of Aboriginal heritage site.
Minister for Mines and Petroleum, Department of Energy, Mines, Industry Regulation and Safety (DEMIRS)	<i>Mining Act 1978</i>	Application and approval of tenure for mining activities. Mining Proposal and Mine Closure Plan approval.

Table 2: Other statutory decision-making process which can mitigate potential impacts on the environment for key environmental factors addressed under referral for Newmont Boddington

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><u>Flora and Vegetation</u></p> <p>Clearing of 528ha of native vegetation including 157 ha Excellent, 327ha Very Good to Excellent and 37 ha Very Good condition in the Northern Jarrah Forest IBRA region.</p> <p>Clearing of individuals of Priority Flora species.</p> <p>Dust deposition affecting photosynthesis and transpiration rates of flora.</p> <p>Establishment or spread of weed species /populations. Introduction or spread of dieback</p>	<p>The Proponent considers there is no processes by other decision making processes which can substantially regulate for the flora and vegetation environmental factor other than Part V of the EP Act being able to regulate for dust emissions.</p>	<p>Other decision-making processes relevant to flora and vegetation are limited to Part V of the EP Act regulating for dust emissions against current guidelines.</p>	<p>Regulation for dust emissions can assist in negating the impact of dust emissions from the Proposal.</p> <p>However, the Proposal does contribute to the cumulative clearing of good to excellent condition vegetation in the Northern Jarrah Forest IBRA Bioregion.</p>	<p>The most relevant decision-making process regarding flora and vegetation is considered the EIA process under Part IV of the EP Act.</p> <p>Conditions regarding limit of the authorized extent for clearing and native vegetation clearing are expected to be established.</p> <p>Outcomes based conditions are expected to form the basis of a Flora and Vegetation Management Plan. Management plan will address potential impacts of weeds, forest disease and dust generation on flora and vegetation.</p>	<p>Newmont will continue to engage with the WA EPA and EPA Services branch of DWER through the EIA process.</p> <p>Provision of draft management plans to DBCA and other key external stakeholders for review and feedback.</p>

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>Terrestrial Fauna</p> <p>Loss of fauna habitat and/or fauna individuals/species records from native vegetation clearing.</p> <p>Injury, Mortality or Displacement of Fauna due to Vehicles and Machinery strike.</p> <p>Fragmentation of fauna habitats due to native vegetation clearing.</p> <p>Alterations to fauna behaviour as a result of increased light spill, noise, vibration and dust.</p> <p>Increased competition or predation from feral animals.</p>	<p>The Proponent considers there to be limited regulation by other decision-making processes regarding the terrestrial fauna environmental factor.</p> <p>Part V of the EP Act can regulate dust and noise emissions which may have benefit to terrestrial fauna.</p>	<p>Limited regulation by other decision-making processes.</p> <p>Regulation by other decision-making processes for terrestrial fauna impacts is limited to dust and noise emissions being regulated under Part V of the EP Act.</p>	<p>Instrument/s issued under Part V of the EP Act to comply with Noise Regulations and relevant DWER guidance for air quality.</p> <p>This level of regulation is unlikely to result in an outcome consistent with the EPA objective for Terrestrial Fauna.</p>	<p>Proponent assessment highlights appropriate conditions should be established through Part IV assessment and new Ministerial Statement for Revised Proposal.</p> <p>Conditions regarding limit of the authorized extent for clearing and native vegetation clearing are expected to be established.</p> <p>Biodiversity offset conditions are expected as a result of this Proposal to address residual significant impact to habitat loss for conservation significant species.</p> <p>Outcomes based conditions are expected to form the basis of a Flora and Vegetation Management Plan. Management plan will address potential impacts of weeds, forest disease</p>	<p>Newmont will continue to engage with the WA EPA and EPA Services branch of DWER through the EIA process.</p> <p>Provision of draft management plans to DBCA and other key external stakeholders for review and feedback.</p>

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>Habitat degradation as a result of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Introduction or spread of dieback • Establishment or spread of weed species / populations 				and dust generation on flora and vegetation.	
<p><u>Inland Waters</u></p> <p>Alteration to surface water catchment flow and quality.</p> <p>Alteration to hydrological regimes of surface water systems should discharge of treated water to the environment be required.</p>	<p>Part V of the EP Act can substantially regulate for inland waters environmental factor.</p> <p>Under Part V, DWER regulate prescribed premises through a works approval and licence process to prevent, control, abate and mitigate pollution or environmental harm.</p> <p>Instruments under Part V can stipulate monitoring</p>	<p>The Proponent understands preparatory works are not considered part of a prescribed premise under Part V of the EP Act but that the general provisions of the EP Act still apply in terms of preventing pollution to the environment. The Proponent will manage preparation works under a</p>	<p>The following elements of the Revised Proposal can be managed and mitigated via a Part V EP Act instrument as well as Mining Act approvals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Construction of a prescribed premises (tailings dam) ▪ Implementation of pollution control structures ▪ Implementation of monitoring programs. 	<p>Instruments issued under Part V of the EP Act, and approvals under the Mining Act, will condition for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Construction of a prescribed premises (tailings dam) ▪ Implementation of pollution prevention structures and mechanisms 	<p>Newmont will continue to engage with the WA EPA and EPA Services branch of DWER through the EIA process.</p> <p>Newmont will continue engagement with the Resource Industries branch of DWER regarding future applications and amendments for instruments under Part V of the EP Act.</p> <p>Newmont will continue to engage with DEMIRS on tenure applications, planned mining</p>

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)
Alteration to local groundwater aquifers from implementation of the Revised Proposal.	<p>regimes for surface water and groundwater as well as condition regarding potential future discharge of treated water to the environment.</p> <p>Activities will also be conducted under Mining Act tenure and regulation will be required by DEMIRS. This will include Mining Proposal (or future Mining Development and Closure Proposal) and Mine Closure Plan submissions and approvals. These processes are in place to ensure mineral exploration and development activities achieve DEMIRS' key environmental objective to ensure, <i>'Resource industry activities are designed, operated, closed decommissioned and rehabilitated in an</i></p>	<p>construction environmental management plan (CEMP). The instruments in place to manage resource industry activities under DEMIRS are applicable for all phases of mine site development inclusive of exploration, construction, operation, rehabilitation and closure.</p>	<p>for surface water and groundwater, and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Future discharge of treated water to the Hotham River. <p>Regulation under these decision-making processes is likely to result in an acceptable environmental outcome to minimise impact to inland waters in a manner consistent with the EPA objective as well as the objectives for the relevant decision-making authority.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Implementation of monitoring programs for surface water and groundwater, and Future discharge of treated water to the Hotham River. It is likely that Licence will specify location of surplus discharge, discharge rate limit, monitoring locations and parameters, triggers, reporting and compliance requirements. <p>Under Part V of the EP Act, compliance reporting will be required under a Part V instrument to DWER.</p> <p>Annual compliance reporting is also required for all activities on Mining Act tenure as well as payment under the Mine</p>	proposal/MDCP and MCP submissions.

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)
	<i>ecologically sustainable manner, consistent with agreed environmental outcomes and post-mining land-uses without unacceptable liability to the State’.</i>			Rehabilitation Fund (MRF) under the Mining Rehabilitation Fund Act (MRF Act).	
<u>Social Surroundings</u> Impacts to sites of Aboriginal cultural heritage value Impact to local air quality from the generation of PM from cleared areas, burning of waste vegetation, vehicle and equipment exhaust, use of unsealed roads and creation of stockpiles Noise emissions from construction and operational	Where required, the Proponent will obtain and comply with approvals under the AH Act. Part V of the EP Act provides for instruments which will condition for air and noise emissions. Under Part V, DWER regulate prescribed premises through a works approval and licence process to prevent, control, abate and mitigate pollution or environmental harm. Mine closure and rehabilitation is regulated under Mining Act. MCP	The AH Act provides for protection of Aboriginal heritage, regardless of whether DPLH holds information on a site. However, consents under section 16 or 18 of the AH Act only apply to registered sites. Where there is Aboriginal heritage identified which does not meet criteria for registration as a site under the AH Act,	The AH Act will largely be limited to direct physical disturbance to Aboriginal sites and may be limited in considering other physical or biological intangible impacts to Aboriginal cultural heritage. This is considered to partially meet the EPA objective for social surroundings. Aspects such as dust and noise related to the Revised Proposal can be managed and mitigated via a Part V EP Act instrument. Final landform design and integration into the surrounding landscape will be addressed through a Mine	Consents obtained under the AH Act will include conditions to which the Proponent will need to comply. These are anticipated to relate to implementation of a Construction Cultural Heritage Management Plan and other terms which form part of the consent of the GKBAC. The provisions of the Environmental Protection (Noise) Regulations 1997 (WA) (Noise Regulations) are applicable, and Newmont Boddington notes that noise can be	Newmont will continue to engage with the WA EPA and EPA Services branch of DWER through the EIA process. Newmont will continue to engage with GKBAC and GKBAC CAC regarding conducting heritage surveys, heritage survey recommendations, CHMP development and consent for AH Act applications under section 16 and 18 of the Act. Newmont will engage with DPLH regarding future applications under the AH Act. Newmont will continue to engage with the Resource Industries branch of DWER regarding future applications and amendments for

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>activities impacting sensitive receptors</p> <p>Reduced visual amenity experience for recreational users of the Bibbulmun Track from vegetation clearing.</p> <p>Physical or biological change to the environment, including hydrology, which may impact values associated with sites of significant cultural heritage.</p>	<p>will be developed for the Proposal and will address the potential impacts on surrounding landscape and rehabilitation of mine landforms.</p>	<p>the Proponent will seek consent and agreement from the GKBAC regarding how works can proceed.</p> <p>Part V of the EP Act provides for instruments which will condition for air and noise emissions as required during construction and operation of a prescribed premises.</p> <p>The Proponent understands preparatory works are not considered part of a prescribed premise under Part V of the EP Act but that the general provisions of the EP Act still apply in terms of preventing</p>	<p>Closure Plan under the Mining Act.</p>	<p>regulated under the Noise Regulations, if required.</p> <p>Under a works approval and licence process, conditions are likely to reflect noise and dust management regulations and guidelines as appropriate.</p> <p>Mine closure and rehabilitation is regulated under Mining Act. A Mine Closure Plan (MCP) MCP will be developed for the Proposal and will address the potential impacts on surrounding landscape and rehabilitation of mine landforms. Under Mining Act approvals tenement conditions are expected to reflect similar conditions for dust and noise management as well as long term rehabilitation and closure planning.</p>	<p>instruments under Part V of the EP Act.</p> <p>Newmont will continue to engage with DEMIRS on tenure applications, planned mining proposal/MDCP and MCP submissions.</p>

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>pollution to the environment.</p> <p>The Proponent will manage preparation works under a CEMP.</p> <p>The Mining Act can ensure integration of mining activities into the surrounding landscape primarily in rehabilitation and closure.</p>			