



Environmental Protection Authority

EPA Referral Form

Form for the referral of a proposal to the Environmental Protection Authority under Section 38 of the *Environmental Protection Act 1986*

| Referrer information | | | |
|--|---------------|--|------------|
| Who is referring this proposal? | | <input type="checkbox"/> Proponent <input type="checkbox"/> Decision-making authority <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Community member/third party | |
| Name: [REDACTED] | | Signature: [REDACTED] | |
| Position | CEO | Organisation | [REDACTED] |
| Email | [REDACTED] | | |
| Address | [REDACTED] | [REDACTED] | |
| | [REDACTED] | WA | [REDACTED] |
| Date | 25 March 2021 | | |
| 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 organisations, proponents and decision-making authorities: I Helen Langley (<i>full name</i>) declare that I am authorised to refer this proposal on behalf of Ngadju Conservation Aboriginal Corporation and further declare that the information contained in this form is true and not misleading. | | | |
| Part A: Proponent and proposal description | | | |
| Proponent information | | | |
| Name of the proponent/s (including Trading Name if relevant) | | Pantoro South Pty Ltd, Pantoro Limited | |
| Australian Company Number(s) <input type="checkbox"/> OR Australian Business Number(s) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | | 73 633 003 737 | |
| Contact for the proposal (if different from the referrer) <i>Please include: name, physical address, phone, and email.</i> | | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No Pantoro Ltd, 1187 Hay Street, West Perth WA, 6000 | |

| | |
|--|---|
| <p>Does the proponent have the legal access required for the implementation of all aspects of the proposal?</p> <p><i>If yes, provide details of legal access authorisations / agreements / tenure.</i></p> <p><i>If no, what authorisations / agreements / tenure is required and from whom?</i></p> | <p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p> |
| <p>Proposal type</p> | |
| <p>What type of proposal is being referred?</p> <p>For a change to an approved proposal please state the Ministerial Statement number/s (MS No./s) of the approved proposal</p> <p>For a derived proposal please state the Ministerial Statement number (MS No.) of the associated strategic proposal</p> | <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> significant – new proposal</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> significant – change to approved proposal (MS No./s: _____)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> proposal under an assessed planning scheme</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> strategic</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> derived (Strategic MS No.: _____)</p> |
| <p>For a significant proposal:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Why do you consider the proposal may have a significant effect on the environment and warrant referral to the EPA? | <p>The proposal by Pantoro South Pty Ltd is significant as the mining company and its joint partners, have processing plants, tailing dumps, tyre dumps, access and haul roads, mine rubbish dumps, open pits, shafts, underground mines, and drill holes and lines on tenements directly to the east, north and south of Norseman. This long-term mining activity has incrementally and cumulatively degraded and destroyed the environment.</p> <p>The Central Norseman Gold project opened in 1935. The mining project has left a historical legacy of disturbed and degraded country next to the town of Norseman. The project has 146 near contiguous tenements.</p> <p>There has been no attempt at remediation or rehabilitation of the mining disturbances nor any attempts to remediate the air and noise pollution in the town of Norseman from the tailing dumps and the mining activity. Weeds are prevalent and mining rubbish litters the tenements.</p> <p>The Norseman Restart Phase 1 – Norseman Gold Project proposal describes two new open mine pits and associated infrastructure: the Scotia mine to the south and the Cobbler mine to the north west. The Scotia mine is directly located next to Lake Dundas.</p> <p>The site of the proposed Cobbler mine is to the NW of Norseman on Lake Cowan is situated at one of the only undisturbed areas at the southern end of Lake Cowan. The works area of the mine is 3.5 km² which will have significant impact on the culture, environment and</p> |

| | |
|--|---|
| | <p>amenity of the area for the Ngadju people and the people of Norseman. The mine will be 80 metres deep and 620 metres wide. The development area of the Cobbler mine will include tyre landfill and widened access roads through significant country for both Priority and Threatened species and Aboriginal Heritage.</p> <p>The Cobbler mine is 4 km NW of the centre of Norseman and 2.5 km NW of the periphery of town and the hospital. However, given the project area is 3.5km² the mine is directly contiguous to townsite and the hospital will overlook the mine. The tenement use is community and Indigenous land use. The residents of Norseman – Indigenous and non-indigenous – are deeply concerned about the Cobbler mine and the effect it will have on their quality of life due to the proximity of the mine to the town, and their enjoyment of the environment, amenity and culture of the only untouched area of the southern part of Lake Cowan.</p> |
| <p>For a proposal under an assessed planning scheme, provide the following details:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Scheme name and number <p>For the Responsible Authority:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What new environmental issues are raised by the proposal that were not assessed during the assessment of the planning scheme? • How does the proposal not comply with the assessed scheme and/or the environmental conditions in the assessed planning scheme? | |
| Proposal description | |
| Title of the proposal | Norseman Gold Project |
| Name of the Local Government Authority in which the proposal is located. | Shire of Dundas |
| <p>Location:</p> <p>a) street address, lot number, suburb, and nearest road intersection; or</p> <p>b) if remote the nearest town and distance and direction from that town to the proposal site.</p> | Norseman – 4 km NW of the centre of Norseman and 2.5 km NW of the periphery of town and the hospital. However, given the project area is 3.5km ² the mine directly abuts the townsite |
| <p>Proposal description – including the key characteristics of the proposal</p> <p><i>Provide as an attachment to the form</i></p> | See Pantoro South Pty Ltd W6472/2020/1 Works Approval under the <i>Environmental Protection Act 1986</i> and also Mining Proposal lodged DIMRS January 4 2021 |

| | |
|--|---|
| Have you provided electronic spatial data, maps and figure in the appropriate format? <i>Refer to instructions at the front of the form</i> | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No |
| What is the current land use on the property, and the extent (area in hectares) of the property? | Indigenous land use, and community use 3.5km ² |
| Have you had pre-referral discussions with the EPA at DWER Services? If so, quote the reference number and/or the DWER contact. | No |

Part B: 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

| | | |
|---|--|---|
| 1 | EPA Factor | Flora and Vegetation |
| 2 | EPA policy and guidance - What have you considered and how have you applied them in relation to this factor? | Environmental Factor Guideline: Flora and Vegetation has been considered as it identifies Threatened and Priority species as a significant consideration. The guidelines also state that 'Flora and vegetation may hold spiritual, cultural, and/or economic values.' |
| 3 | Consultation – Outline the outcomes of consultation in relation to the potential environmental impacts | No known consultation |
| 4 | Receiving environment – Describe the current condition of the receiving environment in relation to this factor. | The receiving environment for the Cobbler mine is undisturbed except for Pantoro drill lines. The area of the wider Norseman Gold project is severely degraded to the east, south and north of the town with incremental impacts for over 85 years. |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 5 | Proposal activities – Describe the proposal activities that have the potential to impact the environment | The mine pit, mine access road, associated infrastructure disturbance and trye landfill will have direct and indirect impacts on a sensitive environment. |
| 6 | Mitigation – Describe the measures proposed to manage and mitigate the potential environmental impacts. | No known mitigation proposed |

7

Impacts – Assess the impacts of the proposal and review the residual impacts against the EPA objective.

The proposal will cause a decline in the extent and condition of vegetation and may precede the loss of species. It will specifically cause a decline in the extent and condition of

Eucalyptus websteriana subsp. *Norsemanica* a Priority One species, which also has spiritual significance to the Ngadju people and is a bush tucker mallee. Other Threatened and Priority species found in the development area are Threatened species *Daviesia macrocarpa*, and *Eucalyptus platydisca* an endemic species; P1 species *Eucalyptus jimberlanica*, *Bossiaea aurantiaca*, *Beyeria lechenaultii* (Pale Turpentine Bush), *Grevillea phillipsiana*, *Micromyrtus papillosa*, *Philotheca nutans*; P2 species *Acacia kerryana*, *Aotus* sp. *Dundas*; and P3 species *Allocasuarina eriochlamys* subsp. *Grossa*, *Eucalyptus brockwayi* (Dundas Mahogany), *Notisia intonsa*, *Pityrodia chrysocalyx*, *Chrysocephalum apiculatum* subsp. *Norsemanense*, *Eremophila purpurascens*.

Populations of Threatened and Priority species have been incrementally fragmented and isolated over the project life and the new mines proposed could cause species loss. As such a comprehensive assessment of the whole of the project area is required.

The mining proposal will also have impacts on the substrate and will disturb the soil causing either temporary or permanent damage to flora and vegetation in the footprint of the mine on the land adjacent to Lake Cowan.

Opuntoid cacti is a weed of national significance and is already widespread in the rubbish dumps in the Norseman Gold tenements. The weed has spread incrementally over the 85 years of the project and has not been remediated. The cumulative effect of the invasive weed spread in the Great Western Woodlands will be significantly increased if the new mine should go ahead.

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| | | |
| 8 | Assumptions - Describe any assumptions critical to your assessment e.g. particular mitigation measures or regulatory conditions. | <i>Environmental Protection Act 1986 (WA)</i> |
| Potential environmental impacts Social Surroundings | | |
| 1 | EPA Factor | Social Surroundings |
| 2 | EPA policy and guidance - What have you considered and how have you applied them in relation to this factor? | <p>Guidance for the Assessment of Environmental Factors. Assessment of Aboriginal Heritage No. 41 April 2004</p> <p>Environment Factor Guideline Flora and Vegetation.</p> <p>Consideration has been given to EPA specific advice to proponents to undertake an adequate Aboriginal Heritage survey; Inform and consult with Aboriginal people in regard to environmental impacts as they affect heritage matters; demonstrate that any concerns raised by Aboriginal people have been dealt with.</p> <p>The Environment Factor Guideline Flora and Vegetation takes into account spiritual significance of vegetation.</p> |
| 3 | Consultation – Outline the outcomes of consultation in relation to the potential environmental impacts | <p>No consultation. WMC Resources prepared the <i>Report of an Aboriginal Heritage Field Inspection (Ngadju People) of Central Gold Corporation and St. Ives Gold Buldania Tenements Near Norseman, Western Australia</i>. The report prepared by WMC Resources Community Relations Officer, John Gleason, documents Aboriginal heritage field inspections 25 – 27 May 1999. In the report Mr Gleason discounts the information provided by the only female Ngadju participant and her information on the women’s dreaming story. This heritage report written over 20 years ago provides the basis for Pantoro’s decisions regarding Aboriginal Heritage. It is now standard practice for heritage reports to be prepared by independent consultants employed by PBCs and not by mining company representatives.</p> |

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| 4 | Receiving environment – Describe the current condition of the receiving environment in relation to this factor. | The receiving environment is undisturbed except for drilling works on the Lake by Pantoro. The receiving environment is used by the Ngadju people and specifically Ngadju women for customary and spiritual use. The area of the wider Norseman Gold project is severely degraded to the south, east and north of the town with incremental impacts for over 85 years. |
| 5 | Proposal activities – Describe the proposal activities that have the potential to impact the environment | The mine pit, mine access road, waste sediment dumps and associated infrastructure disturbance and trye landfill will have direct and indirect impacts on a sensitive environment. |
| 6 | Mitigation – Describe the measures proposed to manage and mitigate the potential environmental impacts. | No known mitigation proposed |

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| 7 | <p>Impacts – Assess the impacts of the proposal and review the residual impacts against the EPA objective.</p> | <p>We are concerned that the footprint of the mine will impact the spiritual significance of Lake Cowan as the place of men’s and women’s dreaming stories. The area of the mine site is on Warranypana, the long ground. As well as women’s sites the southern end of Lake Cowan contains burial sites and men’s ceremonial and initiation areas.</p> <p>The mine will be situated directly on the site of a women’s dreaming story and the access road is directly in the perimeter of a registered women’s site and also a women’s traditional bush tucker area. It will specifically cause a decline in the extent and condition of <i>Eucalyptus websteriana</i> subsp. <i>Norsemana nica</i> a Priority One species, which also has spiritual significance to the Ngadju people and is a bush tucker mallee. Furthermore, we are deeply concerned that the mine will impact the ceremonial spring at the registered site.</p> <p>The proposal will impact a registered Aboriginal Heritage site, and a lodged Aboriginal Heritage site. Furthermore the mine dewatering, may affect a registered Ngadju women’s spring which we are in the process of having tested by hydrogeologists. In addition, the Ngadju women use the site of the mine for customary use to harvest bush tucker. Besides concerns that the bush tucker area will be damaged, we are also aware that the mine will cut off all access that the Ngadju people have to the women’s bush tucker site.</p> |
| 8 | <p>Assumptions - Describe any assumptions critical to your assessment e.g. particular mitigation measures or regulatory conditions.</p> | <p><i>Native Title Act 1993 (Cth), Aboriginal Heritage Act 1972 (WA), Environmental Protection Act 1986 (WA)</i></p> |
| <p>Potential environmental impacts Landform</p> | | |
| 1 | <p>EPA Factor</p> | <p>Landforms</p> |

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| 2 | EPA policy and guidance - What have you considered and how have you applied them in relation to this factor? | Environmental Factor Guideline: Landforms. We have considered that the landform (Lake Cowan) supports significant amenity, cultural or heritage values linked to its defining physical features. |
| 3 | Consultation – Outline the outcomes of consultation in relation to the potential environmental impacts | No consultation |
| 4 | Receiving environment – Describe the current condition of the receiving environment in relation to this factor. | The receiving environment is undisturbed except for Pantoro’s drill lines at the Cobbler Mine site. The area of the wider Norseman Gold project is severely degraded to the east and north of the town with incremental impacts for over 85 years. |
| 5 | Proposal activities – Describe the proposal activities that have the potential to impact the environment | The mine pit, mine access road, waste dumps, and associated infrastructure and tyre landfill will impact the environment of the lake |
| 6 | Mitigation – Describe the measures proposed to manage and mitigate the potential environmental impacts. | No mitigation proposed |

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| 7 | Impacts – Assess the impacts of the proposal and review the residual impacts against the EPA objective. | <p>Lake Cowan has been severely degraded in other areas to the north by the Norseman Gold Project and there has been no remediation of these areas. If the Cobbler mine proceeds it will destroy the last stretch of pristine area in the southern part of Lake Cowan. The works area of the mine is 3.5 km² and the pit is 80 metres deep, which will have significant impact on the environment of the area and destroy the amenity, culture and heritage for the Ngadju people and the people of Norseman.</p> <p>This is a sensitive environment and there will significant residual impact. The mine development will severely degrade the landform of Lake Cowan by the presence of a pit, landfill, dumps, and tyre landfill. The works area of the mine is 3.5 km² and the pit is 80 metres deep, which will have significant impact on the salt lake and on the land adjacent to the lake.</p> <p>The Norseman Gold project over 85 years has incrementally degraded the salt lakes and hills around Norseman causing significant cumulative impacts.</p> |
| 8 | Assumptions - Describe any assumptions critical to your assessment e.g. particular mitigation measures or regulatory conditions. | <i>Native Title Act 1993 (Cth), Aboriginal Heritage Act 1972 (WA), Environmental Protection Act 1986 (WA)</i> |
| Potential environmental impacts Terrestrial fauna | | |
| 1 | EPA Factor | Landforms |
| 2 | EPA policy and guidance - What have you considered and how have you applied them in relation to this factor? | Environmental Factor Guideline: Terrestrial Fauna. We have considered that the proposed activities will directly and indirectly have cumulative impacts on Threatened species habitat. |
| 3 | Consultation – Outline the outcomes of consultation in relation to the potential environmental impacts | No consultation |

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| 4 | Receiving environment – Describe the current condition of the receiving environment in relation to this factor. | The receiving environment is undisturbed except for Pantoro’s drill lines at the Cobbler Mine site. The area of the wider Norseman Gold project is severely degraded to the south, east and north of the town with incremental impacts for over 85 years. |
| 5 | Proposal activities – Describe the proposal activities that have the potential to impact the environment | The mine pit, mine access road, waste dumps, and associated infrastructure and tyre landfill will impact habitat. |
| 6 | Mitigation – Describe the measures proposed to manage and mitigate the potential environmental impacts. | No mitigation proposed |
| 7 | Impacts – Assess the impacts of the proposal and review the residual impacts against the EPA objective. | The Ngadju Rangers have found evidence of nest mounds and have sighted Threatened species Malleefowl <i>Leipoa ocellata</i> in mallee country close to the Norseman Gold tenements. We are concerned that there has been incremental impacts on Malleefowl habitat in the Norseman Gold Project area over the life of the project. We are further concerned that the footprint of the Cobbler mine will be on Mallee country which further destroy habitat for Malleefowl. As such we refer the project to the EPA so that a comprehensive environmental assessment can be undertaken. |
| 8 | Assumptions - Describe any assumptions critical to your assessment e.g. particular mitigation measures or regulatory conditions. | <i>Native Title Act 1993 (Cth), Aboriginal Heritage Act 1972 (WA), Environmental Protection Act 1986 (WA), Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999 (Cth)</i> |

Part C: Other approvals and regulation

State and Local Government approvals

Is rezoning of any land required before the proposal can be implemented?

Yes

No

If yes, please provide details.

If this proposal has been referred by a decision-making authority, what approval(s) are required from you?

Please identify other approvals required for the proposal:

| Proposal activities e.g. clearing, dewatering, mining, processing, dredging | Land tenure/access e.g. Crown land, Mining lease, specify legislation for access if relevant | Type of approval e.g. Native Vegetation Clearing Permit, licence, mining proposal, | Legislation regulating the activity e.g. EP Act 1986 – Part V, RiWI Act 1914, Mining Act 1979 |
|--|--|---|--|
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |

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: _____

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 the 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?

Yes

No

If yes, describe.

Approval:

