

Form

Request to amend a referred proposal under s.38C of the EP Act

Part A: Proponent information and proposal description			
1. Proponent information			
Name of the proponent/s (including Trading Name if relevant)		Bellevue Gold Ltd	
Australian Company Number(s) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> OR Australian Business Number(s) <input type="checkbox"/>		110 493 686	
Who is requesting to amend a proposal?		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Proponent <input type="checkbox"/> Authorised representative (an authorisation from the proponent should be provided).	
Name (print)		Signature	
Position	Alan Tandy	Organisation	Bellevue Gold Limited
Email	atandy@bellevuegold.com	Phone	6373 9000
Address	Ground Floor	24 Outram Street	
	West Perth	WA	6005
Date	9/12/21		
Does the referrer request that the EPA treat any part of the proposal information in the referral as confidential? <i>Provide confidential information in a separate attachment.</i>		<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	
Referral declaration for proponent and Authorised representative: I, Alan Tandy of Bellevue Gold Limited declare that I am authorised to refer this request on behalf of the proponent, and further declare that the information contained in this form is true and not misleading.			
Provide contact details for purposes of the assessment, if different from the above. <i>Include: name, physical address, phone, email.</i>		As above	
2. Pre-request 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	

3. Proposal information	
Title of the proposal	Recommendation of Operations at the Bellevue Gold Project.
Description of the proposed amendment/s	Redesign of TSF to avoid a heritage site. Inclusion of up to three wind turbines for power generation.
Proposal content document	Supplied with this s38 form.
Have you provided electronic spatial data, maps, and figures in the appropriate format of the referred proposal before any change request?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Part B: Assessment of amendments	
1. Reasons and content for the proposed amendment	
Reasons for the proposed amendment/s	The Bellevue Gold Project has been amended for two reasons. Firstly, since making the initial referral, a heritage site (violet range) has become registered within the Project development envelope. The footprint of the Project has been altered to totally avoid this site. Secondly, the Project has used the revision of the Project to add in solar and wind infrastructure critical to meet the company's net zero emissions goal.
Describe the content of the proposed amendment/s to the proposal	The size and shape of the TSF has been amended to avoid a newly registered site. The previous TSF was designed for ten years of storage and has a larger footprint. The redesign allows for eight years of storage mostly within the same footprint, avoiding the areas impacted by the Violet Range Heritage Site.
Provide a consolidated updated Proposal content document	This will be provided separately.
Alternatives to the proposed amendment/s	An alternative to the proposed amendment was to seek s18 consent and impact the site. This is not the preferred option, and Bellevue is committed to no direct impacts to any heritage site.
2. Regulatory information	
Proposal referral date	Initially 6/10/21.
Status of the referral	Submitted.
Changes to decision making authorities or processes (if required)	None.
3. Identification of environmental factors and environmental effects	

Environmental factors	There are no changes to environmental factors.
Environmental effects	There are no new environmental impacts.
Mitigation hierarchy	The change to the proposal is the mitigation. The impact to the site has been avoided.
Residual Impacts	None.
Specify if additional information is required	None.
4. Consultation	
Consultation undertaken	<p>Consultation has occurred with the local traditional owners, and the DPLH. A field survey was undertaken when the site was registered, to determine the location and accuracy of the site. The TO group have confirmed that the site is NOT a site and that the mapping is incorrect. Regardless, Bellevue has taken the decision to move and redesign infrastructure to avoid this site.</p> <p>The Project will continue to work with DPLH to greater inform them as to the location of sites of significance and to enable them to make an accurate shape and buffer for the site. The local TO group confirmed that the site does not exist on Bellevue tenure, and that the DPLH mapping is incorrect.</p>
Outcomes of consultation	<p>Bellevue is confident that the site is in the incorrect location, and that it does not impact the Project tenements. Regardless, the Project has redesigned the TSF to avoid the site due to not wanting to have any impacts on registered sites.</p>
Part C: Additional information (provide if required)	
1. Additional surveys, investigations and other information	
Discuss and provide additional information that has been obtained	Further heritage survey reports and details of consultation have been provided.

2. Discussion of significance	
Change to the significance of the residual impact/s	No change from the original proposal. The changes specified in the amended referral are minor and will lead to less impacts. The TSF has been altered to avoid a previously unregistered site, and there will now be no impacts to this site. The addition of the wind and solar power generation will have minor clearing impacts, but there will be remediated at the conclusion of processing. There will be no residual impacts associated with these.
Significant effect on the environment	The Project does not have a significant impact. The change to the Proposal further reduces any impact. The referral document specifies why the Project does not believe the proposal is of significance. Bellevue believes that the approvals pathway can be managed under Part V of the EP act rather than requiring formal EPA assessment.
Environmental outcomes	For all the identified Key Environmental Factors the impacts are described as not significant. There is no cumulative impact associated with the implementation and operation of the Proposal.
Character of the proposed amendment/s	Addition of solar and wind infrastructure to reduce GHG emissions. Change of Project footprint to avoid a newly registered heritage site.

Example Table: Other approvals

Decision-making authority. If DMA's are changing from the original referred proposal, please provide detail.	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)
No change to the original proposal			