


Form

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 (print): Pilbara Energy Generation Pty Ltd | | Signature  | |
| Position | Jarrold Pittson General Manager, Environment and Closure | Organisation | Pilbara Energy Generation Pty Ltd |
| Email | primaryenvironmentapprovals@fortescue.com | Phone | 08 6218 8888 |
| Address | 256 St Georges Tce | | |
| | Perth | WA | 6000 |
| Date | 01/03/2025 | | |
| 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 | |
| Does the referrer confirm that they consent to receive correspondence electronically? | | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No | |
| Referral declaration for proponent and Authorised representative: I, Jarrold Pittson , declare that I am authorised to refer this proposal on behalf of Pilbara Energy Generation Pty Ltd , and further declare that the information contained in this form is true and not misleading. Date: 28/02/2025 | | | |
| Proponent information | | | |
| Name of the proponent/s <i>Include Trading Name if relevant</i> | | Pilbara Energy Generation Pty Ltd | |
| Australian Company Number(s) <input type="checkbox"/> | OR | ABN 31 631 303 305 | |
| Australian Business Number(s) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | | | |

| Pre-referral discussions | |
|---|---|
| <p>Have you had pre-referral discussions with the EPA (including the EPA Services of DWER)?</p> <p><i>If so, provide name, date, and overview of discussions.</i></p> <p>Meeting Date: 16 01 2024</p> <p>EPA and GED attendees: Tania Ashworth, Samara Rogers ,Koby Anderson</p> <p>Fortescue attendees: Jarrod Pittson, Lazaro Roque-Albelo, Rikki Hughes and Jacob Azzarello</p> <p>Meeting Date: 30 10 2024</p> <p>EPA Services (EPAS) attendees: Sam Rycken, Helen Lafuente</p> <p>Fortescue attendees: Mathew Dowling; Sofie Springer, Jacob Azzarello</p> | <p>✓ Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p>Meeting Date: 16 01 2024</p> <p>Preliminary key environmental factors (flora and vegetation, terrestrial fauna and social surroundings), sensitive receptors identified, surveys outcomes discussed and ongoing work.</p> <p>Proposed approval pathway of “Assessed on Referral Information” (ARI) was discussed and how to minimise requests for further information.</p> <p>Date: 30 10 2024</p> <p>Meeting held at EPA premises to provide an overview on the Proposal:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Proposal Content (scope), - Identified preliminary key environmental factors & other factors. - Key information describing receiving environment. - Approval and development timelines. |
| Proposal information | |
| Proposal name | Turner River Solar Hub |
| What is the proposal? (Include general description in the Instructions and template: How to identify the content of a proposal) | <p>The Proposal is for the development of the Turner River Solar Hub (the Proposal) in the Western Pilbara region, approximately 25 km -west of Fortescue’s existing North Star Magnetite Project and 120 km south of Port Hedland. The Proposal has an indicative disturbance footprint of 1,108.2 hectare (ha) and is located within a 1,416.6 ha Development Envelope (DE). The DE is separated across two distinct areas approximately 3.7 km apart, and linked via an existing unsealed access road, adjacent to Fortescue’s mainline rail. The Proposal includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Installation of a solar farm including solar PV modules with a total capacity up to 644 MW, substations and switchyards and associated battery energy storage. |

| | |
|--|---|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 220 kV overhead transmission spur lines to integrate the solar farm into Fortescue’s existing Pilbara Energy Connect System. • 33 kV distribution lines linking the PV arrays to the substation. • Linear supporting infrastructure such as roads and corridors for overhead electrical reticulation. • Other ancillary infrastructure such as laydown areas, site offices and workshops and concrete batching. |
| 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> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> significant proposal. <i>Choose which type of significant proposal</i> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> new proposal <input type="checkbox"/> significant amendment (proposal only) <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. | |

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| <p>Alternatives</p> | <p>The Proposal has been subject to an iterative site selection process that assessed potential site locations and layouts using the hierarchy of risk management (avoid, minimise, mitigate) to reduce the Proposal’s environmental risk profile.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Location alternatives were assessed against underlying tenure, avoidance of known Aboriginal cultural heritage areas, environmental values and proximity to Fortescue’s existing infrastructure. 2. Fortescue has previously considered alternative power supply sources. The greenhouse gas emissions associated with these alternatives are at odds with the Paris Agreement 2016, which aims to limit global warming to less than 2°C compared to pre-industrial levels. 3. Alternative power options to the Proposal include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extension of Fortescue River Gas Pipeline to provide gas-fired power generation specifically to FMG’s Chichester Hub and North Star operations. • Small scale solar farm infill in and around mining operations, constrained by mining and operational factors • Utilisation of existing third-party power generation infrastructure. <p>See Section 2.1.1 of the Environmental Review Document.</p> |
| | |

| <p>PART B: ASSESSMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS</p> | |
|---|---|
| <p>Environmental factors</p> | |
| <p>What are the likely significant environmental factors for this proposal?</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Benthic Communities and Habitat <input type="checkbox"/> Coastal Processes <input type="checkbox"/> Marine Environmental Quality <input type="checkbox"/> Marine Fauna <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Flora and Vegetation <input type="checkbox"/> Landforms <input type="checkbox"/> Subterranean Fauna <input type="checkbox"/> Terrestrial Environmental Quality <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Terrestrial Fauna <input type="checkbox"/> Inland Waters <input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality <input type="checkbox"/> Greenhouse Gas Emissions <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Social Surroundings <input type="checkbox"/> Human Health |
| <p><i>For each of the environmental factors identified above, complete the following table, or provide the information in a supplementary report</i></p> | |
| <p>Potential environmental impacts – Flora and Vegetation</p> | |

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| 1 | EPA policy and guidance | See Sections 7.1 and 7.2 of the Environmental Review Document |
| 2 | Receiving environment | See Section 7.4 of the Environmental Review Document |
| 3 | Likely environmental impacts | See Section 7.5 of the Environmental Review Document |
| 4 | Application of the mitigation hierarchy, including other statutory decision-making processes | See Section 7.7 of the Environmental Review Document |
| 5 | Assessment and significance of residual impacts | See Section 7.6 and 7.8 of the Environmental Review Document |
| 6 | Likely environmental outcomes | See Section 7.9 of the Environmental Review Document |
| Potential environmental impacts – Terrestrial Fauna | | |
| 1 | EPA policy and guidance | See Sections 8.1 and 8.2 of the Environmental Review Document |
| 2 | Receiving environment | See Section 8.4 of the Environmental Review Document |
| 3 | Likely environmental impacts | See Section 8.5 of the Environmental Review Document |
| 4 | Application of the mitigation hierarchy, including other statutory decision-making processes | See Section 8.7 of the Environmental Review Document |
| 5 | Assessment and significance of residual impacts | See Section 8.6 and 8.8 of the Environmental Review Document |
| 6 | Likely environmental outcomes | See Section 8.9 of the Environmental Review Document |
| Potential environmental impacts – Social Surroundings | | |
| 1 | EPA policy and guidance | See Sections 9.1 and 9.2 of the Environmental Review Document |
| 2 | Receiving environment | See Section 9.4 of the Environmental Review Document |
| 3 | Likely environmental impacts | See Section 9.5 of the Environmental Review Document |
| 4 | Application of the mitigation hierarchy, including other statutory decision-making processes | See Section 9.7 of the Environmental Review Document |
| 5 | Assessment and significance of residual impacts | See Section 9.6 and 9.8 of the Environmental Review Document |
| 6 | Likely environmental outcomes | See Section 9.9 of the Environmental Review Document |
| Holistic impact assessment | | |

| | |
|---|--|
| See Section 12 of the Environmental Review Document | |
| Cumulative environmental impact assessment | |
| Refer to the following sections of the Environmental Review Document Flora and Vegetation – Section 7.6.3 Terrestrial Fauna – 8.6.3 | |
| Consultation | |
| Key Stakeholders for the Proposal are listed in Table 4-1 and a stakeholder consultation register is provided in Table 4-2 in the Supporting Document. | |
| Supporting documents | |
| See document entitled ‘Turner River Solar Hub – Section 38 Referral Environmental Review Document’ (548PG-5670-RP-EN-0001) | |
| 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 type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No |
| Conclusion | |
| A detailed environmental impact assessment will be presented within the Environmental Review Document (ERD). The Proposal has the potential to significantly impact the environment. However, the assessment will demonstrate that the Proposal can be implemented in a manner that meets the EPA’s objectives through the application of the mitigation hierarchy. | |

| | |
|---|---|
| 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) | Refer to Table 3-2 of the Supporting Document. |
| 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) | Refer to Table 3-2 of the Supporting Document. |
| 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 approximately 120 km south of Port Hedland and 25 km west of Fortescue’s existing North Star Magnetite Project and adjacent to existing Fortescue’s North Star Junction 100MW solar farm. The closest main highway is Great Northern Highway, located approximately 4 km west of the southern development envelope. Also refer to Table 2-4 of the Environmental Review Document for tenement details. |

| | |
|--|--|
| Name of the Local Government Authority in which the proposal is located. | Town of Port Hedland |
| Is rezoning of any land required before the proposal can be implemented? If yes, please provide details. | <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? | The Proposal is located within the Kangan pastoral station (Lease N049839) which is managed under the <i>Land Administration Act 1997</i> Large sections of the Proposal area are included within amended purpose clearing permits issued to Roy Hill Infrastructure Pty Ltd and IB Operations Pty Ltd. One expired purpose permit held by Atlas Iron Limited also extends across part of the Proposal area The Fortescue tenements within the DE and their associated tenure status are listed in Table 2 4 of the Environmental Review Document. |
| 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 type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Fortescue holds mining tenements, issued pursuant to the Mining Act, across the DE as listed in Table 2-4 of the Environmental Review Document. Additional tenure will be sought for remaining areas as required. |
| 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 type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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. | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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 <input checked="" 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: |

