

Volume

1

Balranald Mineral Sands Project

Commonwealth Environmental Impact Statement

Prepared for Iluka Resources Limited
July 2016

Main Report

Appendix A - Environmental Impact Statement Guidelines

Appendix B - Study Team



Volume 1

Executive summary

Table of contents

Part A Introduction, site and context, regulatory framework and consultation

Part B Environmental impact statement

Part C Commitments and justification and conclusion

References

Acronyms and abbreviations

Appendix A Environmental impact statement guidelines

Appendix B Study team

Volume 2

Appendix C Biodiversity Assessment

Volume 3

Appendix D Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment

Volume 4

Appendix E Non-Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment

Appendix F Rehabilitation and Closure Strategy

Appendix G Water Assessment

Appendix H Groundwater Dependant Ecosystems Assessment Report

Volume 5

Appendix I Balranald Mineral Sands Project Groundwater Assessment

Appendix J Surface Water Management Report

Appendix K Geochemistry Assessment

Volume 6

Appendix L Radiation Risk Assessment

Appendix M Social Assessment

Appendix N Economic Assessment

Balranald Mineral Sands Project

Commonwealth Environmental Impact Statement

Prepared for Iluka Resources Limited | 18 July 2016

Ground Floor, Suite 01, 20 Chandos Street
St Leonards, NSW, 2065

T +61 2 9493 9500

F +61 2 9493 9599




E info@emmconsulting.com.au

www.emmconsulting.com.au

Balranald Mineral Sands Project

Final

Report J12011RP14 | Prepared for Iluka Resources Limited | 18 July 2016

Prepared by	Cassandra Thompson	Jarred Kramer	Approved by	Brett McLennan
Position	Ecology Service Leader	Environmental Engineer	Position	Director
Signature			Signature	
Date	18 July 2016	18 July 2016	Date	18 July 2016

This report has been prepared in accordance with the brief provided by the client and has relied upon the information collected at the time and under the conditions specified in the report. All findings, conclusions or recommendations contained in the report are based on the aforementioned circumstances. The report is for the use of the client and no responsibility will be taken for its use by other parties. The client may, at its discretion, use the report to inform regulators and the public.

© Reproduction of this report for educational or other non-commercial purposes is authorised without prior written permission from EMM provided the source is fully acknowledged. Reproduction of this report for resale or other commercial purposes is prohibited without EMM's prior written permission.

Document Control

Version	Date	Prepared by	Reviewed by
1	13 April 2015	Cassandra Thompson and Jarred Kramer	Brett McLennan
2	24 April 2015	Cassandra Thompson and Jarred Kramer	Brett McLennan
3	14 May 2015	Brett McLennan	-
4	21 December 2015	Brett McLennan	-
Final draft	29 January 2016	Brett McLennan	-
Final	18 July 2016	Brett McLennan	-



T +61 (0)2 9493 9500 | F +61 (0)2 9493 9599

Ground Floor | Suite 01 | 20 Chandos Street | St Leonards | New South Wales | 2065 | Australia

www.emmconsulting.com.au

Table of contents



Table of contents

Executive Summary	E.1
PART A	Introduction, the project, regulatory framework and consultation
Chapter 1	Introduction
1.1	Overview
1.2	Need for the Balranald Project
1.3	Approvals required
1.4	EIS format
1.5	Key assessment requirements
1.6	EIS study team
Chapter 2	General information
2.1	Introduction
2.2	Title of action
2.3	The proponent
2.3.1	General
2.3.2	Environmental record of proponent
2.4	Objectives of the action
2.5	Location of action
2.6	Background to action
2.6.1	Overview of mineral sands
2.6.2	Iluka's mining operations in the Murray Basin
2.6.3	Resource exploration
2.6.4	Balranald Project mineral characteristics
2.6.5	Iluka's mineral processing in the Murray Basin
2.7	Relationship to other actions
2.8	Status of action
2.9	Consequences of not proceeding with action
Chapter 3	The project
3.1	Introduction
3.2	Project overview
3.3	Schedule
3.4	Construction phase
3.4.1	Site establishment
3.4.2	Gravel extraction
3.4.3	Construction of access roads
3.4.4	Accommodation facility

Table of contents *(Cont'd)*

3.4.5	Buildings, workshops and other ancillary facilities	34
3.4.6	Installation of dewatering and injection infrastructure	34
3.4.7	Establishment and commissioning of processing plant	36
3.4.8	Water supply pipeline	36
3.4.9	Construction equipment	37
3.5	Operational phase	37
3.5.1	Mine layout	38
3.5.2	Processing area	38
3.5.3	Groundwater management	40
3.5.4	Mining method, staging and sequence	46
3.5.5	Mining equipment	50
3.6	Processing plant	51
3.6.1	Pre-concentrator plant	51
3.6.2	Wet concentrator plant	52
3.6.3	Wet high intensity magnetic separation plant	52
3.6.4	Ilmenite separation plant	52
3.6.5	Product stockpiles	52
3.7	Tailings and mining by-products management	53
3.7.1	Tailings storage facility	53
3.7.2	Processing mining by-products from Hamilton mineral separation plant	53
3.7.3	Management of potentially acid forming material	55
3.8	Site water management	56
3.8.1	Water sources	57
3.8.2	Water storage infrastructure	58
3.8.3	Water demand	58
3.9	Waste management	59
3.10	Roads and transport	59
3.10.1	Mine access and internal roads	59
3.10.2	Product transport	59
3.10.3	Back-loaded processing by-product transport	59
3.11	Accommodation facility	60
3.12	Electricity and communications infrastructure	63
3.13	Workforce	63
3.14	Rehabilitation and decommissioning	63
Chapter 4	Consideration of alternatives	67
4.1	Introduction	67
4.2	Alternatives considered	67
4.3	Mining methods and handling of overburden	68
4.3.1	Dragline	68

Table of contents *(Cont'd)*

4.3.2	Dredging	69
4.3.3	Integrated mining system	69
4.4	Mining sequence	70
4.5	Mine footprint	70
4.6	Processing area location	71
4.7	Power supply	72
4.8	Gravel supply	72
4.9	Materials handling and processing	73
4.9.1	Run of mine pads	73
4.9.2	Mining by-products disposal	73
4.10	Product transport	73
4.10.1	Transport of ore from the Nepean mine	73
4.10.2	Transport of heavy mineral concentrate	74
4.10.3	Transport of ilmenite	74
4.11	Accommodation facility	74
4.12	Water management and supply	75
4.12.1	Groundwater management	75
4.12.2	Fresh water supply	76
Chapter 5	Approval framework	77
5.1	Introduction	77
5.2	Approvals obtained	78
5.3	Approvals required	78
5.3.1	Commonwealth approval	79
5.3.2	Key NSW approvals	81
5.3.3	Key Victorian approvals	83
5.4	Commonwealth legislation	83
5.4.1	Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999	83
5.4.2	Native Title Act 1993	83
5.4.3	Water Act 2007	84
5.5	NSW legislation	89
5.5.1	Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979	89
5.6	Other NSW legislation	99
5.6.1	Mining Act 1992	99
5.6.2	Protection of the Environment Operations Act 1997	99
5.6.3	Water Act 1912 and Water Management Act 2000	100
5.6.4	National Parks and Wildlife Act 1974	108
5.6.5	Threatened Species Conservation Act 1995	109
5.6.6	Native Vegetation Act 2003	109
5.6.7	Roads Act 1993	109

Table of contents *(Cont'd)*

5.6.8	Crown Lands Act 1989	109
5.6.9	Western Lands Act 1901	110
5.6.10	Heritage Act 1977	110
5.6.11	Rural Fires Act 1997	110
5.6.12	Dams Safety Act 1978	111
5.6.13	Radiation Control Act 1990	111
5.6.14	Work Health and Safety Act 2011 and Work Health and Safety (Mines) Act 2013	112
5.6.15	Pipelines Act 1967	112
5.7	Strategic policies	113
5.7.1	Draft Murray Regional Strategy	113
5.7.2	NSW 2021	114
5.7.3	Strategic Regional Land Use Policy	115
5.7.4	NSW Aquifer Interference Policy	115
5.7.5	National Water Initiative	116
5.8	Summary of licences approvals and permits	117
Chapter 6	Consultation	119
6.1	Overview	119
6.2	Iluka and stakeholder consultation	119
6.3	Consultation objectives	120
6.4	Stakeholder consultation activities	120
6.4.1	Consultation strategy	120
6.4.2	Stakeholder consultation planning overview	120
6.5	Indigenous stakeholder consultation	132
6.6	Community and service provider consultation	132
6.6.1	Landholder consultation	133
6.6.2	Community service providers	136
6.6.3	Balranald (and surrounds) community consultation	136
6.7	Project design considerations	143
6.8	Exhibition of draft environmental impact statement	145
6.9	Ongoing stakeholder engagement	163
PART B	Environmental impact statement	
Chapter 7	Existing environment	167
7.1	Geology of the project area	167
7.1.1	West Balranald deposit	167
7.1.2	Nepean deposit	169
7.2	Hydrogeology	169
7.3	Geomorphology	170

Table of contents *(Cont'd)*

7.4	Soils and topography	171
7.5	Climate	173
7.6	Surface water resources	173
7.7	Biodiversity	173
7.8	Land ownership	174
7.9	Surrounding land uses	175
7.9.1	Agriculture	175
7.9.2	Natural resources	175
7.9.3	Conservation areas	176
7.9.4	Mining	176
Chapter 8	Impact assessment approach	181
8.1	Assessment approach	181
Chapter 9	Biodiversity	185
9.1	Introduction	185
9.2	EIS Guidelines	186
9.3	Methods	187
9.3.1	Database and literature review	187
9.3.2	Field survey	188
9.4	Results	194
9.4.1	Database and literature review	194
9.4.2	Vegetation	196
9.4.3	Flora	201
9.4.4	Fauna	201
9.4.5	Commonwealth-listed species, populations and communities	202
9.5	Impact assessment	205
9.5.1	Direct impacts	205
9.5.2	Indirect impacts	206
9.5.3	Impacts to threatened biodiversity	207
9.5.4	Key threatening processes	209
9.5.5	Cumulative impacts	210
9.5.6	Willandra Lakes Region World Heritage Area	211
9.5.7	Certainty of impacts on MNES	211
9.6	Management and mitigation	211
9.6.1	Avoidance	211
9.6.2	Management and mitigation measures	212
9.6.3	Biodiversity offset strategy	215
9.7	Conclusion	221

Table of contents *(Cont'd)*

Chapter 10	Aboriginal cultural heritage	223
10.1	Introduction	223
10.2	EIS Guidelines	224
10.3	Methods	225
10.3.1	Aboriginal stakeholder consultation	225
10.3.2	Database searches	226
10.3.3	Literature review	226
10.3.4	Field survey	226
10.3.5	Assessment of significance	227
10.4	Results	229
10.4.1	Aboriginal stakeholder consultation	229
10.4.2	Database searches	237
10.4.3	Literature review	241
10.4.4	Field survey	244
10.4.5	Summary of survey results	246
10.4.6	Significance assessment	248
10.5	Impact assessment	250
10.5.1	Introduction	250
10.5.2	Aboriginal archaeological risk layers	251
10.5.3	West Balranald mine	252
10.5.4	Nepean mine	252
10.5.5	Injection borefields	252
10.5.6	Cumulative impacts	254
10.5.7	Impacts on Willandra Lakes Region World Heritage Area	255
10.6	Management and mitigation measures	256
10.6.1	Aboriginal cultural heritage management plan	256
10.6.2	Archaeological research and salvage excavation program	257
10.7	Conclusion	258
Chapter 11	Non-Aboriginal heritage	261
11.1	Introduction	261
11.2	Method	261
11.3	Results	261
11.3.1	European settlement history	261
11.3.2	Survey results	262
11.4	Impact assessment	264
11.5	Management and mitigation	264
11.6	Conclusion	264

Table of contents *(Cont'd)*

Chapter 12	Water resources	265
12.1	Introduction	265
12.2	EIS Guidelines	266
12.3	Methods	267
12.3.1	Hydrogeological numerical model	267
12.3.2	Assessment approach	267
12.3.3	Assessment criteria	267
12.3.4	Site water management	267
12.4	Results	268
12.4.1	Surface water	268
12.4.2	Groundwater	269
12.4.3	Hydrogeochemistry	272
12.4.4	High priority groundwater dependent ecosystems	273
12.4.5	Water users	275
12.4.6	Site water balance	276
12.5	Impact assessment	278
12.5.1	Surface water assessment	278
12.5.2	Groundwater assessment	280
12.5.3	Cumulative impacts	286
12.5.4	Impacts to Willandra Lakes Region World Heritage Area	287
12.6	Management and mitigation	287
12.6.1	Water management system	287
12.6.2	Surface water	288
12.6.3	Groundwater	288
12.7	Conclusion	289
Chapter 13	Geochemical	291
13.1	Introduction	291
13.2	Method	292
13.2.1	Sampling	292
13.2.2	Test work	293
13.3	Existing environment	293
13.3.1	Hydrogeology	293
13.3.2	Geochemical characterisation	294
13.4	Impact assessment	295
13.4.1	Methodology	295
13.4.2	Results	297
13.4.3	Analysis	313
13.5	Management and mitigation	313

Table of contents *(Cont'd)*

13.6	Conclusion	315
Chapter 14	Radiation	317
14.1	Introduction	317
14.2	Existing environment	317
14.3	Impact assessment	318
14.3.1	Radiation standards and limits	318
14.3.2	Classification of materials	320
14.3.3	Radiation dose delivery pathways	325
14.4	Management and mitigation	328
14.5	Conclusion	329
Chapter 15	Social	331
15.1	Introduction	331
15.2	Social environment	332
15.2.1	Key socio-economic characteristics	332
15.2.2	Community services and facilities	337
15.2.3	Stakeholder engagement	342
15.3	Impact assessment	343
15.3.1	Planning feasibility and approvals phase	343
15.3.2	Construction and operational phases	344
15.3.3	Rehabilitation and decommissioning	348
15.3.4	Summary of impacts	349
15.4	Management and mitigation	350
15.4.1	Workforce issues	350
15.4.2	Housing and accommodation	351
15.4.3	Community services	352
15.4.4	Social amenity	352
15.4.5	Rehabilitation and decommissioning	353
15.5	Conclusion	353
Chapter 16	Economics	355
16.1	Introduction	355
16.2	Economic environment	355
16.2.1	New South Wales	356
16.2.2	Region	359
16.3	Impact assessment	362
16.3.1	Assessment method	362
16.3.2	Benefit cost analysis	363
16.3.3	Economic impacts	369

Table of contents *(Cont'd)*

16.3.4 Government finance	375
16.4 Management and mitigation	376
16.5 Conclusion	376
Chapter 17 Rehabilitation and closure	379
17.1 Introduction	379
17.2 Rehabilitation objectives	379
17.3 Operational rehabilitation	380
17.3.1 Seed collection	380
17.3.2 Vegetation clearing	380
17.3.3 Surface soil stripping, stockpiling and management	380
17.3.4 Overburden removal, handling and backfilling	382
17.3.5 Acid mine drainage management implications for rehabilitation	382
17.4 Decommissioning	383
17.4.1 Mine services	383
17.4.2 Infrastructure and buildings	383
17.4.3 Roadways, car parks and hardstands	384
17.4.4 Fuel storages	384
17.4.5 Water storage infrastructure	384
17.4.6 Borrow pits	384
17.5 Post mining land use	385
17.6 Rehabilitation methods for closure	387
17.6.1 Top soil and sub soil reinstatement, compaction and remediation	387
17.6.2 Drainage and erosion control	387
17.6.3 Control of surface water inflow to void	389
17.6.4 Revegetation	389
17.6.5 Brush/timber spreading	389
17.7 Rehabilitation maintenance	389
17.7.1 Weed management	389
17.7.2 Feral species management	390
17.7.3 Infill planting and seeding	390
17.7.4 Fire control	390
17.7.5 Access	390
17.7.6 Public safety	390
17.8 Rehabilitation schedule	390
17.9 Rehabilitation criteria	390
17.10 Rehabilitation monitoring	391
17.11 Conclusion	391

Table of contents *(Cont'd)*

PART C	Commitments and justification and conclusion	
Chapter 18	Management and mitigation measures	395
18.1	Introduction	395
18.2	Avoidance	396
18.3	Consolidated list of mitigation measures	396
18.4	Cost of mitigation measures	409
18.5	Avoidance and mitigation measures relevant to Indigenous heritage	409
18.6	Effectiveness of mitigation measures	409
18.7	Environmental management strategy	409
18.8	Statutory or policy basis	410
18.9	Agencies responsible	410
18.10	Offsets	411
Chapter 19	Justification and conclusion	413
19.1	Introduction	413
19.2	Need for the Balranald Project	413
19.3	Economic justification	413
19.3.1	Benefits and costs	413
19.3.2	Economic stimulus	414
19.4	Social justification	415
19.4.1	Community support	415
19.4.2	Stronger regional economy	415
19.4.3	Arresting population decline	416
19.5	Biophysical justification	416
19.5.1	Rehabilitation	416
19.5.2	Enhanced biodiversity conservation	416
19.6	Objects of the Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999	417
19.6.1	Protection of the environment	418
19.6.2	Ecologically sustainable development	418
19.6.3	Conservation of biodiversity	419
19.6.4	Protection and conservation of heritage	420
19.6.5	Co-operative approach	420
19.6.6	Co-operative implementation of responsibilities	420
19.6.7	Recognise role of indigenous people	420
19.7	Conclusions	421
References		423
Acronyms and abbreviations		429

Appendices

A	Environmental impact statement guidelines
B	Study team
C	Biodiversity Assessment
D	Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment
E	Non-Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment
F	Rehabilitation and Closure Strategy
G	Water Assessment
H	Groundwater Dependant Ecosystems Assessment Report
I	Balranald Sands Project Groundwater Assessment
J	Surface Water Management Report
K	Geochemistry Assessment
L	Radiation Risk Assessment
M	Social Assessment
N	Economic Assessment

Tables

ES.1	Project area and disturbance area	ES.8
1.1	Technical study location in EIS	5
2.1	Iluka's environmental incidents (Australia and US)	12
2.2	Iluka's jurisdictional notices (Australia and US)	13
2.3	Project area and disturbance area	14
3.1	Gravel demand	30
3.2	Indicative material volumes over the life of the Balranald Project	47
3.3	Water storage infrastructure	58
5.1	Approvals obtained	78
5.2	Estimate surface water SDLs	86
5.3	Requirements for water sharing (Western Murray Porous Rock Groundwater Source)	105
5.4	Average availability of high and general security water from the Murrumbidgee River WSP	108
5.5	Summary of required licenses approvals and permits	117
6.1	Government consultation activities and outcomes	125
6.2	Landholder consultation activities and outcomes	134
6.3	Community consultation activities and outcomes	140
6.4	Matters raised in relation to draft EIS	146
6.5	Matters raised in relation to biodiversity assessment and BOP	161

Tables

7.1	Land systems of the project area	171
7.2	Land details in the project area	175
9.1	Summary of fauna survey effort	191
9.2	Vegetation types recorded in the disturbance area	198
9.3	Conservation significance of remnant native vegetation in the disturbance area	205
9.4	Significance of impacts to Commonwealth-listed fauna recorded or likely to occur	208
9.5	Malleefowl habitat quality across the disturbance area	208
9.6	KTPs relevant to the Balranald Project	209
9.7	Values/characteristics of the subject offset site	219
9.8	Staged offset requirement calculated by DoE for the Balranald Project using the offsets assessment guide	220
10.1	Submissions from RAPS and responses to submissions	232
10.2	AHIMS search results by land system	237
10.3	Survey coverage of the land systems	244
10.4	Artefact density per ha of surveyed land system in the Balranald Project Aboriginal Heritage Database	245
10.5	Summary of Aboriginal sites within the Balranald Project Aboriginal Heritage Database by project element	245
10.6	Summary of Aboriginal sites in the Balranald Project Aboriginal Heritage Database by site type	246
10.7	Summary of scientific significance ratings by project element	248
10.8	Summary of archaeological significance and corresponding loss of value	251
10.9	Archaeological risk layer definitions	252
10.10	Summary of the research program activities by the archaeological risk layer and archaeological subsurface excavation program locations	258
12.1	Operation phase water demands	275
12.2	Water balance (average rainfall year)	276
12.3	Overview of predicted groundwater level changes in private landholder bores	283
13.1	AMD risk classification	294
13.2	Likelihood definitions	295
13.3	Consequence definition	296
13.4	Impact rating matrix	297
13.5	Summary of geochemical overburden impacts from the Balranald Project	298
13.6	Summary of geochemical ore impacts from the Balranald Project	301
13.7	Summary of geochemical mining by-product impacts from the Balranald Project	304
13.8	Summary of geochemical pit walls, benches and floor impacts from the Balranald Project	309
13.9	Summary of geochemical product impacts from the Balranald Project	311
14.1	Dose limits for occupational exposed persons and members of the public	319
14.2	Radiation analysis for mine materials	320
14.3	Classification of mine materials	321

Tables

14.4	Summary of radiation analysis for West Balranald bores	322
14.5	Summary of radiation analysis for Nepean bores	323
14.6	Summary of radiation analysis for mining by-products	324
14.7	Classification of by-products	325
14.8	Potential dose delivery pathways of handling and stockpiling at Balranald Mine	326
14.9	Potential dose delivery pathways of transportation	327
15.1	Key socio-economic characteristics	333
15.2	Summary of potential social impacts during phases of Balranald Project	349
16.1	NSW land use	356
16.2	NSW Water Consumption 2009-2010	358
16.3	Industry gross value added for water using industries 2009–2010 (Australia)	358
16.4	Agricultural land use and value of production in region 2006	360
16.5	Employment by agricultural sectors in the region 2011	360
16.6	Employment by mining and extractive industries in the region 2011	362
16.7	Potential incremental economic benefits and costs of the Balranald Project	364
16.8	Results of BCA (present values @7% discount rate)	367
16.9	Economic impacts of construction on the regional economy	370
16.10	Economic impact of operations on the regional economy	371
16.11	Economic impact of operations on the NSW economy	372
16.12	Regional economic impacts of the Balranald Project and Displaced Agriculture	374
17.1	Summary of rehabilitation material volumes	382
17.2	Summary of overburden and ore geochemistry and storage strategies	382
17.3	Primary and secondary domains and final land use	385
18.1	Summary of management and mitigation measures	397
18.2	EMP structure and users	410

Figures

ES1	Regional context	ES.2
ES2	Location of project area	ES.3
ES3	West Balranald access road, water supply pipeline and gravel extraction areas	ES.9
ES4	West Balranald mine and gravel extraction areas	ES.10
ES5	Nepean access road and injection borefields	ES.11
ES6	Nepean mine	ES.12
1.1	Regional context	2
2.1	Location of the project area	16
2.2	Iluka's Murray Basin operations	18

Figures

3.1	Indicative project schedule	25
3.2	West Balranald access road, water supply pipeline and gravel extraction areas	26
3.3	West Balranald mine and gravel extraction areas	27
3.4	Nepean access road and injection borefield	28
3.5	Nepean mine	29
3.6	Balranald-Ivanhoe Road and West Balranald access road intersection design	33
3.7	Conceptual mine stage plan for West Balranald mine – Year 1	41
3.8	Conceptual mine stage plan for West Balranald mine – Year 4	42
3.9	Conceptual mine stage plan for West Balranald mine – Year 8	43
3.10	Conceptual mine stage plan for Nepean mine – Year 8	44
3.11	Conceptual site layout for West Balranald processing area	45
3.12	Conceptual long section of mining progression	48
3.13	Conceptual mining progression	49
3.14	Mineral processing plant process flow diagram	54
3.15	Transport route for HMC and ilmenite	62
3.16	Accommodation facility location	64
3.17	Accommodation facility conceptual layout	65
5.1	Boundary of surface water SDL resource units	87
5.2	Boundary of groundwater SDL resource units	88
7.1	Conceptual geological cross section	168
7.2	Assessment locations and landownership	177
7.3	Surrounding land use - natural features	178
7.4	Surrounding land use - other features	179
9.1	Flora quadrat locations	190
9.2	Fauna survey locations	193
9.3	Mapped vegetation types	200
9.4	Commonwealth-listed species locations	203
9.5	Malleefowl records and habitat	204
10.1	Project location relative to the Willandra Lakes Region World Heritage Area	239
10.2	Aboriginal sites in and around the project area	240
10.3	Aboriginal archaeological risk layers in the project area	253
11.1	The boundary of Paika Station	263
12.1	Ecosystems that rely on groundwater	274
12.2	Water balance schematic	277
12.3	Predicted flood extent	281
15.1	Social assessment study area	334
17.1	Post-mining land use	388

Part A

Introduction, site and context, regulatory framework and consultation



1 Introduction

1.1 Overview

Iluka Resources Limited (Iluka) proposes to develop a mineral sands mine in south-western New South Wales (NSW), known as the Balranald Mineral Sands Project (the Balranald Project). The Balranald Project includes construction, mining, primary processing and rehabilitation of two linear mineral sand deposits, known as the West Balranald and Nepean deposits located approximately 12 kilometres (km) and 66 km north-west of the town of Balranald (Balranald town), respectively. The location of the project area is shown in Figure 1.1.

Ore extracted from the Balranald Project would be processed on-site to produce heavy mineral concentrate (HMC) and ilmenite, which will be transported by road to Victoria. Processing of HMC would be undertaken at Iluka's existing mineral separation plant (MSP) at Hamilton (the Hamilton MSP). From the Hamilton MSP, HMC products will continue to be transported by rail to Portland or other ports within Victoria. Ilmenite would be transported by road to a proposed rail loading facility in Manangatang, Victoria. From here, it would be loaded into wagons or containers to be railed to port facilities in Victoria.

By-products from the Hamilton MSP would be managed within Iluka's existing Victorian operations or returned by road to the Balranald Project for management within the mine void. Disturbance associated with mining will be progressively rehabilitated.


The Balranald Project also includes groundwater management infrastructure, a workforce accommodation facility, the extraction of gravel from local sources, an electricity transmission line and a fresh water supply pipeline from the Murrumbidgee River.

1.2 Need for the Balranald Project

HMC produced at Iluka's Murray Basin operations is processed at the Hamilton MSP in Victoria. The MSP has a capacity of approximately 0.5 million tonnes (Mt) per annum. Operation of the MSP currently relies largely on HMC feed from Iluka's Woornack, Rownack and Pirro (WRP) mine which is located 20 km south-east of Ouyen. Mining at the WRP mine ceased in March 2015.

Unless a new source of HMC feedstock for the Hamilton MSP is provided following exhaustion of HMC feedstock from the WRP mine, the MSP is likely to either be fed from an alternative interstate mine (eg HMC from Eucla Basin in South Australia), placed into care and maintenance or closed.

The Balranald Project has been identified as the subsequent main source of HMC for the Hamilton MSP (due to its proximity and value) following completion of HMC feedstock from the WRP mine.



1.3 Approvals required

The Balranald Project is deemed to be a controlled action under the Commonwealth *Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999* (EPBC Act) and requires approval from the Commonwealth Minister for the Environment. This environmental impact statement (EIS), also referred to as the Commonwealth EIS, has been prepared to support an application for the Balranald Project under Part 8 of the EPBC Act in accordance with the *Guidelines for the content of a draft environmental impact statement* (the EIS Guidelines), dated 22 November 2012, prepared for the Balranald Project by the delegate of the Minister for the Environment (Appendix A).

The EIS Guidelines contain four parts, including a preamble, general advice on the guidelines, key assessment requirements and specific content. The specific content part has 12 separate sections covering matters such as requirements for the provision of general information, description of the action and the conclusion. Each of these parts and sections are referenced in this EIS where relevant.

While the Balranald Project requires approval under the EPBC Act, it also requires a number of approvals in NSW and Victoria, including, but not limited to:

- development consent from the NSW Minister for Planning, or delegate, under the State significant development (SSD) provisions under Part 4 of the NSW *Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979* (EP&A Act);
- either approval from Essential Energy and/or Transgrid under Part 5 of the EP&A Act or approval under the SSD provisions under Part 4 of the EP&A Act for a transmission line;
- development consent under Part 4 of the EP&A Act for an accommodation facility in Balranald town (as may be required); and
- a planning permit under the Victorian *Planning and Environment Act 1987* (P&E Act) from Swan Hill Rural City Council (SHRCC) for the construction and operation of a proposed rail loading facility in Manangatang.

Development consent for the Balranald Project was granted by a delegate for the NSW Minister for Planning under the SSD provisions of Part 4 of the EP&A Act on 5 April 2016. Approvals for the transmission line, accommodation facility in Balranald town and the rail loading facility in Manangatang have yet to be obtained.

Initially the proposed action included all project elements in Victoria, including development of the rail loading facility at Manangatang, traffic movements generated by the Balranald Project in Victoria and transport of ilmenite by rail to ports in Victoria.

Iluka subsequently lodged an application with the Commonwealth Department of the Environment (DoE) to remove the above components from the action such that they are not considered further as part of the action. The proposed variation also sought conformation that the proposed accommodation facility in Balranald town did not form part of the action. The delegate of the Minister for the Environment accepted the proposed variation as requested.

As such, for the purposes of the EPBC Act, the action excludes traffic movements generated by the Balranald Project in Victoria, development of a rail loading facility at Manangatang (Victoria), transport of ilmenite by rail to ports in Victoria and the accommodation facility in Balranald town. As such, it only includes those project elements described in Chapter 3 which are wholly contained in NSW.

This EIS has been prepared to address the EIS Guidelines issued on 22 November 2012 for the action as modified. It has also been prepared to address:

- comments on a preliminary draft EIS made by DoE following submission of the preliminary draft EIS on 12 June 2015.
- comments on the draft EIS (dated 29 January 2016) following public exhibition of the draft EIS between 12 February and 10 March 2016; and
- comments on the draft biodiversity assessment and draft BOP provided to community groups on 24 June 2016.

Details on key approvals required for the Balranald Project are discussed in Chapter 5. Details on the EIS consultation process are provided in Chapter 6.

1.4 EIS format

This EIS has been prepared to address the format and style requirements in the EIS Guidelines, which state:

2. FORMAT AND STYLE

The EIS should comprise three elements, namely:

- the executive summary;
- the main text of the document; and
- appendices containing detailed technical information and other information that can be made publicly available.

The guidelines have been set out in a manner that may be adopted as the format for the EIS. This format need not be followed where the required information can be more effectively presented in an alternative way. However, each of the elements must be addressed to meet the requirements of the EPBC Act and Regulations.

The EIS should be written so that any conclusions reached can be independently assessed. To this end all sources must be appropriately referenced using the Harvard standard. The reference list should include the address of any Internet "web" pages used as data sources.

The main text of the EIS should include a list of abbreviations, a glossary of terms and appendices containing:

- a copy of these guidelines;
- a list of persons and agencies consulted during the EIS;
- contact details for the Proponent; and
- the names of the persons involved in preparing the EIS and work done by each of these persons.

Maps, diagrams and other illustrative material should be included in the EIS. Maps should be at an appropriate scale and contain a title, legend, scale bar and orientation marker. The EIS should be produced on A4 size paper capable of being photocopied, with maps and diagrams on A4 or A3 size and in colour where possible.

This EIS comprises six volumes.

Volume 1, the main EIS, is structured as follows:

Executive summary - a condensed version of the EIS which provides details on the main issues or matters.

Part A - Introduction, the proponent, the project, regulatory framework and consultation - an overview of the Balranald Project, proponent, need for the project and the environmental, social and legislative context in which it would be developed, and consultation undertaken during preparation of the EIS.

Part B – Environmental impact assessment - for each relevant technical study, the assessment objectives, methods and existing environment are described. The management measures that would be implemented are presented followed by the predicted impacts following the implementation of these measures. Finally, environmental monitoring is described to measure impact predictions and allow management/monitoring to be refined.

Part C - Commitments and justification - a statement of commitments that consolidates the key environmental management measures. The Balranald Project is justified on social, economic and environmental grounds, taking into account its consistency with objectives of the EPBC Act.

All sources are referenced using the Harvard referencing standard, and all acronyms and references used in the preparation of this EIS are at the end of this volume. This EIS relies and uses a number of maps and diagrams which have been drawn at appropriate scales, contain titles, legends, scale bars and north (orientation markers).

Volumes 2 to 6 contain all supporting technical studies as shown in Table 1.1.

Table 1.1 **Technical study location in EIS**

Volume	Appendix	Study
2	C	Biodiversity assessment
3	D	Aboriginal cultural heritage assessment
4	E	Non-Aboriginal cultural heritage assessment
	F	Rehabilitation and closure strategy
	G	Water assessment
	H	Groundwater dependant ecosystems assessment report
5	I	Balranald mineral sands project groundwater assessment
	J	Surface water management report
	K	Geochemistry assessment
6	L	Radiation risk assessment
	M	Social assessment
	N	Economic assessment

The technical chapters contained in this EIS provide summaries of the technical studies contained in Appendices C to N. The information in the technical studies is therefore more detailed and takes precedence over the information in the chapters. In particular, government agencies reviewing this EIS should rely on the information in the technical studies.

1.5 Key assessment requirements

The EIS Guidelines state that the key assessment requirements for the EIS are as follows:

KEY ASSESSMENT REQUIREMENTS

- (1) Impacts on threatened species and ecological communities listed under Sections 18 and 18A of the *Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999*;
- (2) Impacts on migratory species listed under Section 20 and 20A of the *Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999*;
- (3) Impacts on the world heritage values of a declared World Heritage property listed under Sections 12 and 15A of the *Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999*;
- (4) Impacts on the national heritage values of a National Heritage place listed under section 15B and 15C of the *Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999*;
- (5) Any relevant Commonwealth and State Government technical and policy guidelines;
- (6) Matters outlined in Schedule 4 of the *Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Regulation 2000*, included in the requirements below; and
- (7) The requirements outlined below:

The requirements below refer to the requirements contained within the specific content part of the EIS Guidelines.

Impacts on threatened species, ecological communities and migratory species listed under sections 18, 18A, 20 and 20A of the EPBC Act are addressed in Chapter 9 and the biodiversity assessment contained in Appendix C. Chapter 9 provides a summary of the biodiversity assessment contained in Appendix C.

Impacts on the heritage values on world and national heritage properties and places listed under sections 12, 15A, 15B and 15C of the EPBC Act are addressed in Chapters 10 and 11 and the Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal cultural (or historic) heritage assessments contained in Appendices D and E. Chapters 10 and 11 provide a summary of the Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal cultural (or historic) heritage assessments contained in Appendices D and E.

Relevant Commonwealth and State Government technical and policy guidelines are discussed in Chapter 5.

In relation to EIS Guidelines requirements (6) and (7) above, Schedule 4 of the Commonwealth *Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Regulation 2000* (EPBC Regulation), and the requirements specify particular requirements in relation to:

- general information;
- description of the action;
- feasible alternatives;
- description of the environment;
- relevant impacts;

- proposed avoidance, mitigation and offset measures;
- other approvals and conditions;
- consultation;
- environmental record of person(s) proposing to take the action;
- economic and social matters;
- information sources provided in the EIS; and
- conclusion.

These requirements are addressed in various sections of this EIS.

1.6 EIS study team

This EIS has been prepared by EMM Consulting Pty Limited (EMM) and a team of technical specialists. The study team is provided in Appendix B.

A pre-feasibility study (PFS) and phase one of a definitive feasibility study (DFS) for the Balranald Project have been completed by Iluka, with input from environmental and engineering specialists. Information from these studies and the specialists involved has been used in the preparation of this EIS.

2 General information

2.1 Introduction

This chapter provides general information on the Balranald Project, including a background to the project. General information has been provided in accordance with the requirements specified in the EIS Guidelines which state:

1. GENERAL INFORMATION

This should provide the background and context of the action including:

- (a) the title of the action;
- (b) the full name and postal address of the designated Proponent;
- (c) a clear outline of the objectives of the action;
- (d) the locations in which the components of the action will take place;
- (e) the background to the development of the action;
- (f) how the action relates to any other actions (of which the Proponent should reasonably be aware) that have been, or are being, taken or that have been approved in the region affected by the action;
- (g) the current status of the action; and
- (h) the consequences of not proceeding with the action.

The EIS Guidelines also state that the EIS is to contain a:

9. ENVIRONMENTAL RECORD OF PERSON(S) PROPOSING TO TAKE THE ACTION

Description of the environmental record of the person taking the action. The information provided must include details of any proceedings under a Commonwealth, State or Territory law for the protection of the environment or the conservation and sustainable use of natural resources against:

- (a) the person proposing to take the action; and
- (b) for an action for which a person has applied for a permit, the person making the application.

If the person proposing to take the action is a corporation, details of the corporation's environmental policy and planning framework must also be included.

Each of these requirements is addressed below.

2.2 Title of action

The title of the action is the Balranald Mineral Sands Project, or Balranald Project for short. A detailed description of the action is provided in Chapter 3.

2.3 The proponent

2.3.1 General

The designed proponent of the Balranald Project is Iluka. Iluka's corporate office is located in Perth, Western Australia. Its address is:

Level 23, 140 St Georges Terrace
Perth WA 6000
GPO Box U1988
Perth WA 6845

Iluka is an Australian-listed ASX 100 company and a major participant in the global mineral sands industry. It is involved in the exploration, project development, operation (mining and processing) and marketing of mineral sands products.

Iluka's mining and processing operations in Australia produce zircon for ceramics and refractories, and titanium minerals for paint pigments and other protective coatings.

Over recent years, the company has transformed its asset base from its historical reliance on its Western Australian mining operations to new, high quality operations in the Murray Basin (Victoria and NSW) and Eucla Basin (South Australia). Iluka's mining operations in the Murray Basin include the Douglas and Kulwin mines which have ceased production, and the WRP mine which only recently ceased mining in March 2015.

Further details on Iluka can be found at www.iluka.com.

2.3.2 Environmental record of proponent

i Environmental policy and planning framework

Iluka has operations and activities in a number of different locations, with each site presenting unique environmental challenges and opportunities. Every Iluka operation and activity requires an individual environmental management approach. Iluka's mining and processing activities undertaken on a regional reserve in South Australia require different environmental management in comparison to its operations on farming and grazing properties in Victoria and Virginia in the US. Iluka's Western Australian operations face the challenge of proximity to populated areas.

Iluka's approach to environmental management is underpinned by the company's environment health and safety (EHS) policy and environment, health and safety management system (EHSMS) which guides the company in demonstrating leading practice in these areas through all business activities; from exploration, planning, research and project development, through to operation, closure and rehabilitation.

Iluka's EHS Policy is as follows:

Within Iluka we are committed to operating in a sustainable manner.

We believe that targeting high levels of performance and pursuing leading practice in the areas of environment, health and safety reflects our values of Commitment, Integrity and Responsibility.

We will:

- assess and manage environment, workforce and community risks associated with our operations;
- comply with all legislative requirements which we recognise as the minimum standard to achieve;
- ensure our environment, health and safety standards reflect relevant leading practice;
- set clear, achievable and measurable performance targets;
- seek to continuously improve performance to meet or exceed our standards;
- provide appropriate training to employees and contractors to help them meet our standards;
- engage our communities and ensure their views are part of our decision-making process;
- maintain an EH&S management system covering all areas of the business;
- develop effective plans for the cessation of operations and rehabilitation of disturbed areas;
- use resources efficiently, in particular energy, water and land;
- maintain a product stewardship approach towards the safe use of our products; and
- strive to lead by example.

The EHSMS consists of 15 standards, five major risk procedures and eight environmental procedures all of which support the EHS Policy. In addition, Iluka has systems and procedures for managing the environmental impacts of its operations, including:

- acid sulphate soils;
- dieback;
- dust;
- fauna;
- fire;
- mine site rehabilitation;
- noise;
- radiation;
- tailings management;

- vegetation and flora;
- waste;
- water resources (surface and groundwater); and
- weeds.

The EHSMS is managed by Iluka's Sustainability group who oversee the business-wide implementation of the company's EHS policy, standards and group procedures. Site-based personnel are directly accountable for the development of site-specific procedures and risk assessments that comply with the standards of the management system.

Environment, health and safety management system audits are conducted to measure the company's compliance and effectiveness in managing sustainability performance, and to drive continual improvement in this area. All group standards and group procedures are measurable and auditable.

Iluka provides annual updates on its environmental management activities via its Annual Report.

ii Environmental record

Iluka uses an event management system to record environmental incidents, which are then classified according to the severity of the potential impact to the environment from Level 1 environmental incidents to Level 5 environmental incidents. Level 1 incidents have no or minimal impact, and Level 5 incidents have the greatest potential cumulative impact over time. Table 2.1 shows the number of recorded environmental incidents from 2007 to 2014. Incidents for 2015 had not been collated at the time of preparation of this EIS. Incidents in 2007 to 2009 are averaged over that period.

Table 2.1 Iluka's environmental incidents (Australia and US)

Environmental incident level	2014	2013	2102	2011	2010	2007-2009 (averaged)
1	1,002	769	796	481	486	763
2	154	145	187	180	62	37
3	30	45	43	82	0	1
4	4	12	16	3	0	0
5	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	1,190	971	1,042	746	548	801

Source: Iluka Annual Report 2014 and 2011.

In 2014, the number of incidents classified Level 3 and above was 34, a decrease from 57 from 2013. Investigations determined poor risk assessment, equipment design factors and inadequate procedures as the main contributing factors for Level 3 and above incidents. The overall number of incidents being reported has increased steadily, which is a positive indication of a culture that is more prepared to report a range of incidents, even if minor in their own right. This is largely attributable to the recent approach by US operations, in Virginia, to report all incidents in the system. Previously the system was only used for the reporting of level 3 incidents and above.

Mitigation measures were implemented for all Level 3 and 4 incidents.

Iluka also records jurisdictional responses to all environmental incidents, which are also classified according to the level of jurisdictional response from receipt of a provisional improvement notice to the receipt of a prohibition notice or order.

Table 2.2 provides details of jurisdictional notices received in 2012, 2013 and 2014 for Iluka's operations in Australia and the US.

Table 2.2 Iluka's jurisdictional notices (Australia and US)

Jurisdiction	Provisional improvement notice			Improvement notice/citation/ notice of violation			Prohibition notice/order		
	2012	2013	2014	2012	2013	2014	2012	2013	2014
Australia	0	0	0	14	9	7	0	1	0
US	0	0	0	84	71	7	5	2	0

Source: Iluka (2015).

The US and Australian regulatory environments differ in that the latter operates within the paradigm of self-governance, and the former in a framework developed around compliance. The large difference in number of citations issued to the US operations should be considered in this context.

The Australian operations prohibition notice was issued in July, relating to a damaged floor section in Wharf Shed 7 at the Geraldton Port. The damaged sections, situated over redundant conveyor tunnels, were promptly removed and a new floor installed in accordance with relevant Australian Standards.

The US operations prohibition orders in 2013 were in relation to:

- the provision of hazard training prior to commencing work; and
- an escalation of three of the 71 citations, relating to site discharges along the Brink Corridor and an incident at Concord when a tails pond wall failure resulting in sediment and tails discharge into an adjacent wetland.

There were no prohibition notices issued in the US in 2014. The improved performance in 2014 can be attributed to improved hazard identification (a 419% increase from 2013), increased pro-active engagement on environmental issues where increased regulator site presence was requested in an effort to increase transparency and to foster a solid working relationship, and a reduced number of safety-related visits from the regulators (three in 2014 compared to 10 in 2013).

2.4 Objectives of the action

The key objectives of the Balranald Project are to:

- extend the life of Iluka's operations in the Murray Basin;
- maintain continuity of HMC supply to Iluka's MSP in Hamilton, Victoria;
- continue mining related employment in the Murray Basin;

- enable Iluka to maintain its position as a major producer of zircon and the largest producer of titanium dioxide in the global market;
- continue to provide quality products that meet customer expectations;
- operate the project in a manner that achieves positive economic and social outcomes and has an acceptable impact on the community and environment;
- develop and operate the project in compliance with all statutory requirements; and
- continue to maintain open and honest relationships with stakeholders.

2.5 Location of action

The Balranald Project is located within the Murray Basin in south-western NSW, near Balranald town, within the Balranald Local Government Area (LGA). The Murray Basin forms part of the larger Murray-Darling Basin in Queensland, NSW, Victoria, South Australia and the Australian Capital Territory. The West Balranald and Nepean deposits are contained within Exploration Licence (EL) 7450 issued to Iluka by the NSW Minister for Industry, Resources and Energy under the *NSW Mining Act 1992* (Mining Act). The regional context of the Balranald Project is presented in Figure 1.1.

The land on which the West Balranald and Nepean mines are proposed to be developed, referred to as the project area (Figure 2.1), is approximately 9,964 hectares (ha). Within the project area are the West Balranald and Nepean mines, access roads, groundwater injection borefields, gravel extraction areas, an accommodation facility, a water supply pipeline and other ancillary infrastructure. Within the project area, the land directly disturbed for the Balranald Project is referred to as the disturbance area. For some project elements in the project area, a larger area has been surveyed and assessed than would actually be disturbed. This enables some flexibility to account for changes that may occur during detailed design and operation. The project area and disturbance area for each project element are in Table 2.1.

Table 2.3 Project area and disturbance area

Project element	Project area (ha)	Disturbance area (ha)
West Balranald mine	3,059	3,059
Nepean mine	805	805
West Balranald access road	128	52 ¹
Nepean access road	173	156 ²
Injection borefields	5,721	1,214 ³
Gravel extraction	42	42
Water supply pipeline	29	11 ⁴
Accommodation facility	7	7
Total	9,964	5,346

Notes: 1. 60 m wide corridor within project area.
 2. 40-50 m wide corridor within project area.
 3. 100 m wide corridors within project area.
 4. 15 m wide corridor within project area.

Land uses in the project area are primarily agricultural. These include grazing and broad acre cropping. Agricultural land is interspersed with areas of native vegetation, primarily chenopod and mallee scrub, as well as conservations areas in the region (refer Chapter 7).

2.6 Background to action

2.6.1 Overview of mineral sands


Mineral sands is a collective term applied to a group of heavy minerals with a high specific gravity. The mineral sands industry consists of two principal product streams; zircon and titanium dioxide minerals, in the form of rutile, ilmenite and leucoxene.

Deposits of mineral sands are formed along ancient coastlines where heavier minerals have been concentrated by wave and wind action. Mineral sand ore bodies are categorised based on the mode of deposition: alluvial (deposited by water/wave action) or aeolian (deposited by wind). The Balranald Project comprises two alluvial deposits, which are further categorised as ‘marine beach placer’ deposits, or strandlines, which are relatively narrow, linear strandlines of ore.

Most mineral sand deposits are found in unconsolidated fossil shorelines between several hundred metres to hundreds of kilometres inland from the present coastline. Repeated storm erosion and reworking over centuries or millennia may progressively enrich a mineral sands deposit (Iluka2012).

Over geologically longer periods, subsidence of coastal sediments, changing sea levels caused by ice ages, or isostatic adjustment of continental margins may cause the shorelines to migrate inland (marine transgression), reworking earlier accumulations into larger deposits, or to migrate seaward (marine regression) leaving reworked deposits preserved inland.

Most mineral sands deposits currently mined by Iluka were formed during the Holocene and Pleistocene periods (over the past 1.8 million years) but may date back into the Mid Miocene period (12 million years ago) (Iluka 2012). The West Balranald and Nepean deposits are located some 450 km from the south-eastern Australian coastline, and are approximately 5 million years old.



Location of the project area

Balranald Mineral Sands Project
Environmental Impact Statement

Figure 2.1

2.6.2 Iluka's mining operations in the Murray Basin

Iluka's operations in the Murray Basin (Figure 2.2) produce approximately 0.32 Mt of HMC per annum. The operations have involved mining a series of southern and northern deposits within the Murray Basin since 2004.

Initial mining in the Murray Basin occurred at the southern deposits located near Douglas and a satellite deposit called Echo located about 50 km south-west of Horsham. The Douglas mine commenced operations in mid-2005 and concluded in early 2012. In 2010 the site commenced processing of ore from Echo mine (now complete). The Douglas site currently receives the non-saleable by-products from the Hamilton MSP operations that are placed in a mined out void created during mining operations. At the time of publication of this EIS, Iluka were seeking separate approval from the Victorian Minister for Planning for the continued disposal of Hamilton MSP by-products at Douglas.

The second stage of operations in the Murray Basin involved mining a series of northern ore bodies known as the Kulwin and WRP group of deposits. The initial northern deposit, Kulwin, was located 28 km east of Ouyen and 30 km west of Manangatang. Kulwin operations were completed in early 2012. Operations commenced in May 2012 at the WRP group of deposits, located 20 km south-east of Ouyen, with mining ceasing during March 2015 and transportation of HMC stockpile anticipated to be completed by 2016.


2.6.3 Resource exploration

Exploration drilling has been undertaken at the West Balranald and Nepean deposits since 1998, when the West Balranald deposit was first discovered. Initial air core drilling was undertaken along the West Balranald deposit in 1998 and 1999, with further intermittent drilling programmes completed in 2001 and 2003, and an Inferred Resource (quantity and grade/quality estimated on the basis of limited geological evidence and sampling) for West Balranald was reported in 2003. Further drilling was conducted in 2006 and 2007 which defined the extent of the deposit.

A major drilling program over a 17 km length of the deposit was completed in 2009 with an Indicated Resource reported later that year. In 2011 a drilling program was completed to extend the Indicated Resource a further 2.8 km at the north end of the deposit, and from late 2011 to early 2012 infill drilling was conducted to achieve a drill grid of 20 m by 200 m over a 5.6 km strike length near the centre of the deposit.

The Nepean deposit was initially intersected by exploration drilling in 2002. An initial Inferred Resource was reported in 2007. A further two additional drilling programs and a resultant Inferred Resource estimate update was completed in 2008 and 2010. An Indicated Resource was reported for the Nepean deposit in 2011, and updated in 2012 following further drilling.

Iluka was granted EL 7450 on 18 February 2010 covering both deposits. Prior to this, exploration was undertaken in both deposits under a number of ELs, some of which were consolidated to form EL 7450.



Iluka's Murray Basin operations

Balranald Mineral Sands Project
Environmental Impact Statement

Figure 2.2

2.6.4 Balranald Project mineral characteristics

The West Balranald and Nepean deposits have an approximate north-west/south-east alignment and are approximately 20 km and 8 km long respectively. The West Balranald deposit consists of a single high grade linear strand of ore 50 to 80 m below the surface with a variable width along its strike length, from 160 m in the south and north to a maximum of 300 m in the centre. Average thickness also varies along strike from approximately 3 m at the southern and northern extremities to 6 m through the central area of the strand. The Nepean deposit consists of a single high grade linear strand 40 to 60 m below the surface with a variable width along its strike length from 130 m in the south to 160 m in the north with an average thickness of between 4 to 5 m.

The combined Measured, Indicated and Inferred Resource of the West Balranald deposit (excluding Nepean) contains 12.0 Mt of heavy mineral with an average assemblage of 10.8% zircon, 11.9% rutile and 64.1% ilmenite. The Measured Resource makes up 3.8 t of the total Measured, Indicated and Inferred Resource. The combined Indicated and Inferred Resource reported for the Nepean deposit contains 2.4 Mt of heavy mineral with an average assemblage of 14.4% zircon, 14.5% rutile and 59.7% ilmenite.

2.6.5 Iluka's mineral processing in the Murray Basin

Until March 2015, mineral processing was undertaken at the WRP mine to produce HMC and ilmenite. HMC is transported from the WRP mine by road to Iluka's rail loading facility at Hopetoun, and by rail to the Hamilton MSP. Further downstream mineral processing of HMC is undertaken at the Hamilton MSP. The MSP uses gravimetric, electrostatic and electromagnetic separation to produce final products including zircon, rutile, leucosene and ilmenite. From the Hamilton MSP, product is transported by road to the Port of Portland for export to customers or to Iluka operations in Western Australia for further processing.

2.7 Relationship to other actions

The Balranald Project is not related to any other actions under the EPBC Act within the local area. As discussed in Chapter 5, the action excludes a proposed transmission line required to provide power to the Balranald Project. This transmission line will be subject to a separate referral under the EPBC Act. Should the Minister for the Environment determine that the transmission line is a controlled action under the EPBC Act, the Balranald Project will be directly related to that action.

With the exception of the transmission line, the status of which (under the EPBC Act) is yet to be determined, the Balranald Project will not rely on any actions for its construction and operation.

2.8 Status of action

As previously stated, while the Balranald Project requires approval under the EPBC Act, it also requires a number of approvals in NSW and Victoria, including, but not limited to:

- development consent from the NSW Minister for Planning, or delegate, under the SSD provisions of Part 4 of the EP&A Act;
- either approval from Essential Energy and/or Transgrid under Part 5 of the EP&A Act or approval under the SSD provisions under Part 4 of the EP&A Act for the transmission line;
- development consent under Part 4 of the EP&A Act for an accommodation facility in Balranald town (as may be required); and

- a planning permit under the P&E Act from SHRCC for the construction and operation of a proposed rail loading facility in Manangatang.

Development consent under the SSD provisions of Part 4 of the EP&A Act was granted by a delegate of the NSW Minister for Planning on 5 April. A copy of this development consent (SSD-5285) can be found at http://majorprojects.planning.nsw.gov.au/index.pl?action=view_job&job_id=5285.

The applications for the transmission line, accommodation facility in Balranald town and the rail loading facility in Manangatang have yet to be prepared and lodged with the relevant approval authorities. It is anticipated that these will be prepared and lodged in 2016.

The Balranald Project has yet to be determined by the Commonwealth Minister for the Environment. This EIS has been prepared to provide sufficient information to allow the Minister to make an informed decision on whether or not to approve, under Part 9 of the EPBC Act, the taking of the action for the purposes of each controlling provision.

2.9 Consequences of not proceeding with action

Should the Balranald Project not proceed, the social and economic benefits of the project would not be realised. Conversely, the environmental impacts of the project, albeit minor, would also not be realised.

The social and economic benefits of the Balranald Project are discussed in chapters 15 and 16. The economic assessment found that the Balranald Project would require an average workforce of 209 people for the construction of the West Balranald mine, requiring an annual expenditure of approximately \$75 M. Economic activity analysis, using input-output analysis, found that the stimulus effects of this expenditure and employment on the region are in the order of:

- \$136 M in annual direct and indirect regional output or business turnover;
- \$51 M in annual direct and indirect regional value added;
- \$24 M in annual direct and indirect household income; and
- 420 direct and indirect jobs.

Stimulus effects would be much greater during the operational phase when the expenditure and employment created would be more substantial. The representative increased annual stimulus provided to the region and NSW is estimated as follows:

- \$965 M and \$720 M in annual direct and indirect output or business turnover regionally and for NSW respectively;
- \$300 M and \$196 M in annual direct and indirect value added regionally and for NSW respectively;
- \$82 M and \$58 M in annual direct and indirect household income regionally and for NSW respectively; and
- 1,289 and 771 extra direct and indirect jobs created regionally and for NSW respectively.

These stimulus effects would be significant for the region in which the Balranald Project is located. They would likely:

- diversify and strengthen the economic base of the region;
- increase the size of a number of industry sectors within the region, particularly mining, but also mining related services such as mechanical repairs, utilities, wholesale and retail trade, accommodation and entertainment;
- benefit existing businesses within the region through increased expenditure generated through employment and services catering to the project; and
- help offset population decline through the creation of direct and indirect jobs.

Should the Balranald Project not proceed, these benefits would not be realised.

Conversely, should the Balranald Project not proceed, the environmental impacts identified in this EIS would not occur. These impacts are discussed in chapters 9 to 14 and include, but are not limited to:

- the progressive clearing 5,160.4 ha of native vegetation;
- impacts on one threatened fauna species listed under the EPBC Act (Malleefowl) and six threatened fauna species listed under the NSW *Threatened Species Conservation Act 1995* (TSC Act) (Grey-crowned Babbler, Malleefowl, Little Pied Bat, Jewelled Gecko, Mallee Worm-lizard and Western Blue-tongued Lizard);
- the impact of land with high and moderate Aboriginal archaeological value, including land associated with an ephemeral stream (Box Creek) and relic lakes and depressions which may reveal important details about how and when Aboriginal people lived the local area;
- the disturbance of 256 Aboriginal sites (containing predominantly artefact scatters); and
- hydrogeological impacts associated with the abstraction and subsequent reinjection of predominantly saline groundwater.

A range of management and mitigation measures are proposed to minimise the above impacts. In particular, a biodiversity offset strategy which has been developed in response to biodiversity impacts would improve overall biodiversity values in the region within the long term.

The economic assessment included an a benefit cost analysis (BCA) to weigh up the benefits and costs of the Balranald Project. The BCA found that the benefits of the Balranald Project significantly outweigh its costs. The BCA indicated that the Balranald Project would have net production benefits of \$148 M. Assuming 55% foreign ownership, \$132 M of these net production benefits would accrue to Australia. Provided the residual environmental, social and cultural impacts of the Balranald Project that accrue to Australia are considered to be valued at less than \$132 M, the Project can be considered to provide an improvement in economic efficiency and hence is justified on economic grounds.

Instead of leaving impacts of the Balranald Project unquantified, an attempt was made to quantify them. The majority were quantified and incorporated into production costs. Only the costs relating to greenhouse gas emissions were not incorporated into production costs, and these were estimated to be less than \$1 M. These costs were considerably less than the estimated net production benefits of the Balranald Project.

Overall, the Balranald Project is estimated to have net social benefits to Australia of between \$132 M and \$148 M and hence is desirable and justified from an economic efficiency perspective.

As stated in Chapter 1 of this EIS, the Balranald Project has been identified as the subsequent main source of HMC for the Hamilton MSP (due to its proximity and value) following completion of HMC feedstock from the WRP mine. Should the Balranald Project not proceed, feedstock for the MSP would need to be fed from an alternative interstate mine (eg HMC from Eucla Basin in South Australia), placed into care and maintenance or closed. The impacts of either closure or the placement of the Hamilton MSP into care and maintenance have not considered in this EIS. However, the consequences of either of these actions would be significant for the region in which the Hamilton MSP operates. It would likely lead to a loss of employment and expenditure within the region.

3 The project

3.1 Introduction

The EIS Guidelines require a description of the proposed action. They state:

2. DESCRIPTION OF THE ACTION

A description of the action, including:

- a) all the components of the action, including construction, operation, decommissioning and rehabilitation components;
- b) the precise location of the preferred option for any works to be undertaken, structures to be built and elements of the action that may have relevant impacts; and
- c) how the works are to be undertaken and design parameters for those aspects of the structures or elements of the action that may have relevant impacts.

This chapter provides a detailed description of the Balranald Project in accordance with these requirements.

3.2 Project overview

The key components of the Balranald Project include:

- construction, mining and rehabilitation of the West Balranald and Nepean deposits, referred to as the West Balranald and Nepean mines, including progressive rehabilitation;
- processing of extracted ore to produce HMC and ilmenite;
- road transport of HMC and ilmenite to Victoria;
- backfilling of the mine voids with overburden and tailings, including transport of by-products from the processing of HMC in Victoria for backfilling in the mine voids;
- an accommodation facility for the construction and operational workforce;
- gravel extraction from local sources for construction requirements; and
- a water supply pipeline from the Murrumbidgee River to provide fresh water during construction and operation.

These components are described in more detail in this chapter.

3.3 Schedule

The Balranald Project is projected to have a life of approximately 15 years, including construction, mining, backfilling of overburden material, rehabilitation and decommissioning. An indicative schedule for the Balranald Project is presented in Figure 3.1. The project area and key project elements are shown in Figure 3.2 to 3.5.

Commencement of construction of the Balranald Project would depend on a range of factors including market demand and approval timeframes. Construction would commence at the West Balranald mine and is expected to take about 2.5 years. Operations would commence at the West Balranald mine in Year 1 of the operational phase, which would overlap with approximately the last six months of the construction phase. The operational phase would include mining and associated ore extraction, processing and transport activities and would be approximately nine years in duration. This would include completion of backfilling overburden into the pits at both the West Balranald and Nepean mines. Construction of infrastructure at the Nepean mine would commence from approximately Year 5 of the operational phase, with mining of ore starting in Year 6, and being complete by approximately Year 8.


Decommissioning and ongoing rehabilitation is expected to take a further two to five years following Year 9 of the operational phase.


3.4 Construction phase

The initial construction phase of the Balranald Project is expected to take approximately 2.5 years from commencement, and is proposed to occur 24 hours per day, seven days per week. The construction phase would commence at the West Balranald mine, and would involve all non-mining related activities including:


- site establishment, including vegetation clearing, topsoil/subsoil stockpiling, establishment of construction compound and bulk earthworks;
- gravel extraction from borrow pits;
- construction of the West Balranald and Nepean access roads and internal roads;
- construction of the accommodation facility;
- construction of buildings, workshops, security fencing, and other ancillary facilities;
- installation of groundwater management (extraction and injection) infrastructure at the West Balranald mine and injection borefields;
- establishment and commissioning of the processing plant; and
- construction of the water supply pipeline.

Construction of infrastructure at the Nepean mine would commence from approximately Year 5 of operation.






West Balranald access road, water supply pipeline and gravel extraction areas




West Balranald mine and gravel extraction areas

Balranald Mineral Sands Project
Environmental Impact Statement

Figure 3.3





3.4.1 Site establishment

Site establishment at the West Balranald mine would involve the clearing of vegetation and topsoil/subsoil for the West Balranald access road, initial boxcut, internal roads, and hardstand areas for infrastructure. Conventional earth moving equipment would be used including dozers, tractor scoops, scrapers and trucks to clear vegetation and stockpile material. Activities would also include site bulk earthworks, construction of drainage infrastructure, water storage dams, as well as the installation of above ground and below ground services, reticulation of power and water services and concrete foundations.

Site establishment for the Nepean mine would involve similar activities to those described above, but would not occur until approximately Year 5 of the operational phase.

3.4.2 Gravel extraction

During construction, gravel would be required to construct the West Balranald access road, Nepean access road, hardstand areas for infrastructure and internal roads. During operation, gravel would be required for access and haul road maintenance and construction of in-pit benches and ramps that would be progressively installed to reflect mine planning.

The total gravel demand for the life of the Balranald Project is estimated in the order of 3.06 million cubic metres (Mm³) of gravel. The breakdown is summarised in Table 3.1.

Table 3.1 Gravel demand

Project element	Gravel required (Mm ³)
West Balranald and Nepean access roads	0.33
Hardstand areas for infrastructure	0.08
Internal haul roads	0.57
In-pit benches and ramps	2.01
Internal roads	0.07
Total	3.06

Source: Tonkin 2014.

Gravel would be sourced both from within the project area and from third party suppliers. Local sources of gravel included in the project area (see Figure 3.2 and 3.3) would primarily provide gravel during the construction phase. The estimated volume of gravel that would be extracted from the project area is 0.16 Mm³. It is possible that additional gravel would be extracted from the disturbance area if identified opportunistically during construction or operation.

The shortfall of gravel (approximately 2.90 Mm³) would be obtained from third party external gravel sources in the region.

Gravel extraction within the project area would involve a series of borrow pits (see Figure 3.2 and 3.3). The process would include:

- removal and screening of topsoil and subsoil which would be stockpiled separately for reinstatement during rehabilitation;
- extraction of gravel to a depth of up to 2 to 3 m;

- stockpiling the gravel adjacent to the borrow pit;
- processing in a crushing/screening plant (if required); and
- transporting gravel by truck to the required location(s).

Borrow pits would be progressively excavated using an excavator and dozer. If crushing or screening is required, it would occur at the borrow pit. Gravel would be loaded into trucks and transported to locations within the project area.

Approximately 500 to 1,500 tonnes (t) of gravel would be extracted per day, depending on the required rate of extraction.

It is anticipated that the majority of the borrow pits would be constructed and excavated at the commencement of the Balranald Project. Borrow pits would likely be operational for up to 12 months before being progressively rehabilitated. In some cases the borrow pits may remain open for greater than one year to provide gravel for maintenance works.

Once gravel extraction is complete at each borrow pit, rehabilitation activities would typically include:

- removal of all infrastructure from site;
- deep ripping of compacted areas;
- placement of any material that was not suitable for construction purposes back into the excavation;
- battering of pit walls to an appropriate angle to ensure they are safe, stable and suitable for the surrounding land use;
- spreading of previously stockpiled topsoil over the final landform and disturbed areas; and
- revegetation, seeding and/or planting (depending on the final land use).

Details of the rehabilitation activities are provided in the rehabilitation and closure strategy which is contained in Appendix F.

3.4.3 Construction of access roads

There are two primary access roads that would be constructed as part of the Balranald Project; the West Balranald access road and Nepean access road. These are shown in Figure 3.2 and Figure 3.4.

i West Balranald access road

The West Balranald access road would be a new two way access road, approximately 18 km in length, constructed from the Balranald-Ivanhoe Road to the processing area at the West Balranald mine (Figure 3.2). This would be the primary access road to the project area, including the accommodation facility. Its design would include shaped shoulders to allow stormwater runoff to drain from the road surface, culverts in low lying areas and reflective road side markers.

This road would be unsealed with the exception of its intersection with the Balranald-Ivanhoe Road which would be designed and constructed in accordance with guidelines on intersection layouts set out in *Austrroads Guide to Road Design Part 4*. This intersection would include provision of a short auxiliary lane left turn treatment from Balranald-Ivanhoe Road into the access road. The conceptual intersection layout is presented in Figure 3.6.

The West Balranald access road would take approximately 4 to 6 months to construct, including:

- clearing of vegetation and topsoil, which would be stockpiled within the road corridor, retained and utilised for rehabilitation purposes;
- bulk earth works (cut and fill);
- establishment of drainage systems (culverts and swales); and
- construction of the road base and surface, including the placement and compaction of road base materials.

Traffic control and management would be implemented during construction of the intersection with Balranald-Ivanhoe Road.

During construction of the West Balranald access road, the Burke and Wills Road (public road) and private access tracks through the project area would be used temporarily until access within the project area is established.


ii Nepean access road

The Nepean access road would be constructed between the West Balranald and Nepean mines. It would be approximately 39 km long comprising new private access roads and sections of two existing public roads (Burke and Wills Road and Arumpo Road) as shown on Figure 3.4.

The Nepean access road would include:

- approximately 22 km of existing public roads via Burke and Wills Road and Arumpo Road;
- a new 12 km section of road constructed from the West Balranald mine to the Burke and Wills Road; and
- a new 5 km section of road constructed from Arumpo Road to the Nepean mine.

The Nepean access road would provide access between the West Balranald mine and Nepean mine during the life of the Balranald Project. The Nepean access road, from the West Balranald mine to Arumpo Road, is also likely to be used during the initial construction phase to provide access to the injection borefield. Iluka will regrade this unsealed road to address any induced damage.



Balranald Ivanhoe Road and West Balranald access road intersection design

During the operational phase, the Nepean access road would be the primary route between the West Balranald and Nepean mines, and would be used to transport extracted ore from the Nepean mine to the West Balranald mine from approximately Year 6 to Year 8.

Burke and Wills Road and Arumpo Road are generally unsealed except for short sections. The Nepean access road would also be unsealed. The sections of Burke and Wills and Arumpo roads which would form part of the Nepean access road and would be upgraded in sections to accommodate design traffic.

iii Internal roads

Internal roads within the project area would be constructed to minimise interaction between mining equipment and haul trucks, and general light vehicle traffic on-site. A car park would be established at the processing area at the West Balranald mine.

Internal roads would be constructed using suitable overburden and gravel sourced from within the project area, and external sources.

3.4.4 Accommodation facility

Construction activities would involve vegetation clearance, hardstand construction, installation of underground services, installation of buildings, construction of walkways, car parks and landscaping. A sewage treatment plant (STP) would also be installed.

Modular buildings and portable structures would be transported to the project area, placed in position by cranes (or similar) and assembled on site.

Topsoil cleared during construction would be used for rehabilitation.

3.4.5 Buildings, workshops and other ancillary facilities

Construction of buildings, workshops and other ancillary facilities, primarily located at the processing area, would involve vegetation clearing, removal and stockpiling of topsoil and subsoil and civil works. The majority of buildings would be portable demountable structures that would be transported to the project area and assembled on-site.

3.4.6 Installation of dewatering and injection infrastructure

i Dewatering

Dewatering of aquifers overlying and surrounding the ore body would be required ahead of mining operations at the West Balranald and Nepean mines. This would involve dewatering of underlying aquifers via a series of dewatering bores installed adjacent to, and in advance of, mining operations at the West Balranald mine.

Based on modelling and in-field trials to date, in the order of 350 dewatering bores spaced 100 m apart are expected to be installed for dewatering of the West Balranald and Nepean mines over the course of mining, however this would be optimised based on continued groundwater modelling and project design. Bores are proposed to be located in two parallel lines either side of the mine void. The dewatering system would be installed progressively over the course of operation, typically several kilometres in advance of the mine void as the mine progresses.

Iluka have successfully dewatered and mined the Kulwin and WRP deposits in Victoria using dewatering bores (albeit with the deposits at shallower depths).

Dewatering bores would be screened in the Loxton-Parilla Sands to avoid any risk of contamination. Optimal bore spacing would be refined during detailed design. The bores would be installed using drilling rigs. During installation, a drill rig, water truck, support crane, compressors, light vehicles and excavator would be on-site. Depending on the conditions, each bore would take up to five days to install and would involve:

- confirmation of bore locations –bore locations would be surveyed as part of the site establishment activities;
- vegetation removal –once the locations of each site have been confirmed, appropriate access and a clear works area around each bore location would be established. For the dewatering bores located along the mine void, it is likely that vegetation clearance would occur as part of the larger site preparation works;
- management of drilling fluids – either by:
 - above ground sumps using appropriately sized tanks; or
 - excavation of lined mud pits that would be up to 2.5 m deep by 10 m long and 10 m wide;
- construction of turkeys nests – a series of lined water storage dams will be constructed to provide a disposal locations for water and drill pads associated with bore construction;
- drilling of bores –bores would typically comprise a pre-collar and production casing; and
- bore development –involving the pumping of water into the screens via a jetting tool, and removing drilling mud, mobilised sediment and contained water from the bore.

The dewatering system (including bores and pumps) would be constructed and commissioned along the length of the pit as the mine progresses. Bores would feed water to a transfer main on either side of the mine.

ii Injection

Groundwater abstracted prior to mining would be injected back into the Loxton-Parilla Sands Formation. Two methods of groundwater injection (constructed and developed similar to dewatering bores) will be undertaken:

- on-path injection – involves the injection of groundwater into bores located along the West Balranald mine pit ahead of (and behind) mining operations; and
- off-path injection – involves the injection of groundwater into bores located some 5 to 30 km away from mining operations in the injection borefields (Figure 3.4).

On-path injection bores will connect to a water transfer main on either side of the mine pit. These injection bores will be fed directly from this transfer main.

Off-path injection bores would be connected to a network of pipeline infrastructure that will extend from the water transfer main at the mine to each of the injection borefields. Each injection borefield would typically comprise:

- a row of injection wells within 50 m wide borefield corridors, with individual wells spaced at a minimum of 100 m intervals. The two 50 m wide corridors would be approximately 350 to 400 m apart (Figure 3.4);
- a network of pipelines laid overland within pipe traces (ie graded windrow on either side);
- service roads for vehicle access during construction and operation; and
- a series of water storage dams to store water during well development.

All bores would be designed and installed to ensure that only the target formation (Loxton-Parilla Sands) is utilised. Bore casing would be fully cement sealed to prevent upward migration of injection water.

The dewatering and injection system would require bore casing, pumps, generators, material for the pipe network, electrical equipment and valves for each site. On top of each of bore would be head works connected to generators and/or a reticulated power supply.

Further detail on the operation of the dewatering and injection infrastructure is provided in Section 3.5.3.

Two groundwater retention dams would also be constructed at the West Balranald mine to allow the precipitation of solids and exposure of groundwater to ultra-violet light to reduce iron bacteria that could potentially foul the injection bore screens. These dams would be 175 ML and approximately 10 ha each in size. One dam would be constructed ahead of mining at West Balranald (in the area to be disturbed by mining). A second dam would be constructed north of the mine void at the West Balranald mine (see Figure 3.3).

3.4.7 Establishment and commissioning of processing plant

The processing plant for the Balranald Project would primarily be relocated from Iluka's WRP mine. The processing plant would be dismantled and transported by truck in various components, and reassembled at the processing area at the West Balranald mine for the duration of the Balranald Project (refer Figure 3.3).

Vegetation and clearing within the processing area would be undertaken prior to the processing plant arriving on-site. The operation of processing plant is described in detail in Section 3.6 of this chapter.

3.4.8 Water supply pipeline

A water supply pipeline would be constructed from the Murrumbidgee River to the accommodation facility and West Balranald processing area (see Figure 3.2). The fresh water pipeline would typically consist of the following components:

- a pumping station with suction pipeline and pump station;
- a 200 to 250 mm pipeline placed in a trench from the river to the Balranald Ivanhoe Road or lay overland within a pipe trace adjacent the mine access road;
- pipeline fittings including air valves at all high points and isolation valves approximately every 5 km;

- pipeline drainage points (ie scour valves at low points); and
- underground road crossings.

The water supply pipeline construction for trenching or pipe trace would be constructed using a trenching or direct plough method.

The water supply pipeline for the processing area would connect to the non-saline water storage dam within the processing area. For construction purposes the pipeline would require a corridor of approximately 7 to 15 m. A small laydown area within the project area would be required for the construction equipment which would include:

- grader for topsoil stripping and vegetation removal (as required);
- trucks for materials transport (pipe, bedding/backfill material);
- excavator or similar of pipe trenching;
- skid steer or front end loader for sand bedding and back filling;
- backhoe loader or excavator or similar for pipe slinging and trench reinstatement;
- polyethylene butt welding equipment (for HDPE if used);
- trench roller or excavator compaction roller for backfill compaction;
- water cart for dust suppression; and
- light vehicles for personnel access.

3.4.9 Construction equipment

The initial start-up of the Balranald project would require the least amount of plant and equipment. As operations commence more equipment would be necessary to meet the required production rates.

The construction phase would require dozers, tractor scoops, excavators, trucks, cranes and graders.

3.5 Operational phase

Mining operations for the Balranald Project would involve a sequenced dry-mining method. Dewatering of groundwater from aquifers overlying and surrounding the ore body would be required ahead of mining operations. The mine layout, processing area, groundwater management, mining method, staging and sequence and equipment required for mining operations are described in this section. Mining operations would occur 24 hours a day, seven days a week.

3.5.1 Mine layout

The West Balranald and Nepean mines would include:

- open cut mining areas (ie pit/mine void) that would be developed using dry mining methods to remove overburden and extract the ore;
- timber, soil and overburden stockpiles;
- ore stockpiles and mining unit plant (MUP) locations;
- processing area (at the West Balranald mine), including a processing plant, tailings storage facility (TSF), maintenance areas and workshops, product stockpiles, truck load-out area, administration offices and amenities;
- groundwater management infrastructure, including dewatering, injection and monitoring bores and associated pumps and pipelines;
- surface water management infrastructure;
- service infrastructure (eg power);
- haul roads for heavy machinery and service roads for light vehicles; and
- other ancillary equipment and infrastructure.

Conceptual site layout plans for the project are shown in Figure 3.2 to 3.5.

3.5.2 Processing area

The processing area would be located at the West Balranald mine (see Figure 3.3) and would include:

- administration buildings;
- the processing plant, product stockpiles and TSF;
- maintenance areas and workshops;
- car parking; and
- other ancillary infrastructure.

A conceptual layout for the processing area is shown in Figure 3.11. Internal access roads would connect the processing area to the area of active mining and would include haul roads for heavy mine vehicles and service roads for light vehicles.

i Administration buildings

Administration buildings would be located at the processing area. Buildings would include:

- administration and contractor offices;
- site security hut at plant gate;

- laboratories;
- crib rooms; and
- toilets and amenities.

Administration facilities and workshop requirements at the Nepean mine would be similar to West Balranald mine but at a smaller scale.

ii Processing plant, product stockpiles and tailings storage facility

The location of the processing plant, including the pre-concentrator plant (PCP), wet concentrator plant (WCP), wet high-intensity magnetic separator (WHIMS) plant, ilmenite separation plant (ISP), product stockpiles and the TSF is shown in Figure 3.11. Further detail on the processing plant is provided in Section 3.6, and the TSF in Section 3.7.

iii Maintenance areas and workshops

A store warehouse and integrated workshop with washdown bays located within the processing area. This would be a steel framed industrial shed with concrete floors. The store warehouse would provide storage of consumables and spare parts. The workshop would be used for routine maintenance of mine plant and equipment. Vehicle access to both the workshop and warehouse would be provided for forklifts, franna cranes and light vehicles. A hardstand apron would be established to facilitate deliveries from semi-trailers or rigid trucks.

A yard would be provided adjacent to the workshop for a laydown area of large items. The lay down area and workshop shelter would provide storage for materials required for maintenance and fabrication tasks.

iv Other ancillary infrastructure

The West Balranald and Nepean mines would have a combination of stock and security fencing. An employee and visitor car park would be located in the processing area at the West Balranald mine.

A fuel storage and refuelling area would be constructed in the processing area. The facility would provide fuel for the earthmoving fleet, heavy haulage vehicles, light vehicles and mobile equipment.

An on-site gas supply is required to provide fuel for the ISP. The gas supply would be either LPG or LNG and would be delivered to site by tanker, with a dedicated tanker unloading facility and stored in above ground gas tanks.

Separation distances between the fuel and gas storages and other infrastructure (such as buildings) would be provided in accordance with relevant standards and guidelines.

3.5.3 Groundwater management

Dewatering of groundwater from aquifers overlying and surrounding the ore body would be required ahead of mining operations. This would involve dewatering via a series of bores installed adjacent to, and in advance of, mining. Extracted water would be injected back into the same formation. The dewatering and injection infrastructure is described in the following sections.

i Dewatering system

It is estimated that dewatering would commence around six months in advance of mining operations. Each dewatering bore would have a nominal flow rate of approximately 25 L/s and be connected to a skid-mounted head works arrangement. In the order of 350 dewatering bores spaced about 100 m apart would be required along the West Balranald mine over the life of the mine. The bores are proposed to be located in two parallel lines either side of the mine void. The dewatering system would be installed progressively over the course of operation, typically several kilometres in advance of the mine void as the mine progresses.


The dewatering bores would be powered by a combination of a 22 kilovolt (kV) power and diesel generators. Power would be provided with the use of skid mounted pump control panels (or similar) with multiple dewatering bores likely to be connected to each panel.

ii Injection system

Groundwater would be injected back into the Loxton-Parilla Sands Formation. Two methods of groundwater injection will be undertaken:

- on-path injection – involves the injection of groundwater into bores located along the West Balranald mine pit ahead and behind mining operations. The injection bores will be connected to a water transfer main on either side of the mine pit; and
- off-path injection – involves the injection of groundwater into bores located some 5 to 30 km away from mining operations in the injection borefields. The injection bores would be connected to a network of pipeline infrastructure that will extend from the water transfer main at the mine to each of the injection borefields (Figure 3.4).


The two constructed groundwater retention dams at the West Balranald mine would allow for the precipitation of solids and exposure of groundwater to ultra-violet light to reduce iron bacteria that would potentially foul the injection bore screens.



Conceptual mine stage plan for West Balranald mine - Year 1

Balranald Mineral Sands Project
Environmental Impact Statement


Figure 3.7



Conceptual mine stage plan for West Balranald mine - Year 4

Balranald Mineral Sands Project
Environmental Impact Statement


Figure 3.8



Conceptual mine stage plan for West Balranald mine - Year 8

Balranald Mineral Sands Project
Environmental Impact Statement


Figure 3.9



Conceptual mine stage plan for Nepean mine - Year 8

Balranald Mineral Sands Project
Environmental Impact Statement

Figure 3.10



Processing area conceptual layout

Balranald Mineral Sands Project
Environmental Impact Statement

Figure 3.11

3.5.4 Mining method, staging and sequence

Mining of the West Balranald and Nepean mines would be by dry-mining methods using trucks and shovels and associated equipment fleets. A conceptual long section and plan view of mining progression are shown in Figure 3.12 and 3.13. A range of alternative mining methods were considered during Iluka's pre-feasibility study for the Balranald Project; these are discussed in Chapter 4.

The typical process for mining of West Balranald and Nepean mines would include:

- vegetation removal, soil stripping and stockpiling;
- overburden removal and management, which would include overburden stockpiles outside of the mine pit and direct backfilling of the mining void;
- ore recovery, including stockpiling and initial processing of run of mine (ROM) ore at the MUP;
- management of tailings and mining by-products, which would include progressive backfill of the mining void with fines and sand tailings from the processing plant, TSF and Hamilton MSP; and
- rehabilitation of mined areas.

Mining would commence with the establishment of an initial boxcut at the southern end of the West Balranald mine to enable ramps to be installed in the pit floor. Stripping of topsoil followed by removal of dry overburden would begin in Year 1. Soil stripping and overburden removal occurring several hundred metres ahead of the initial boxcut.

Once the initial boxcut at the West Balranald mine is established, mining would commence northwards. Initially, all overburden would be stockpiled adjacent to the boxcut. As mining advances, overburden, including saline overburden (SOB) and non-saline overburden (NSOB), would both be stockpiled separately adjacent to the pit and backfilled directly in the mine void. Mining would advance north at a rate of approximately 8 to 10 m per day. The active mining area at any given time would typically be in the order of 2 to 2.5 km long, 300 m wide and up to 80 m deep, as illustrated in Figures 3.12 and 3.13.

The conceptual mine layout plans for Years 1, 4 and 8 of the mine life, provided in Figures 3.7 to 3.10 show the progression of the active area of mining, commencing at the south of West Balranald mine in Year 1 and progressing north. Mining operations at Nepean mine commence at approximately Year 6 and would progress from south to north. As the mine advances, the mine void would be backfilled with the overburden and subsoil and topsoil reinstated (see Figure 3.13). A similar process would be undertaken at the Nepean mine, over a shorter mine path and at shallower depths.

Once mining commences at the Nepean mine, ROM ore from the Nepean mine would be transported by truck to the processing area at the West Balranald mine.

i Vegetation removal, topsoil stripping and stockpiling

In order to remove the volume of overburden to facilitate mine advancement, vegetation would be cleared in advance of mining. Timber, vegetation, topsoil and subsoil would be stripped separately using conventional earth moving machinery including tractor scoops, dozers, excavators and scrapers. It would then be stockpiled separately along the length of the disturbed area. Timber, vegetation, topsoil and subsoil removal rates would be dictated by the requirement to remove soils and overburden in advance of the mine face. Timber would be stockpiled, topsoil would be stockpiled to a height of about 2 m and subsoil would be stockpiled to a height of about 10 m. In the order of 5.2 Mbcm on-path, and 10.6 Mbcm total (including off-path), topsoil and subsoil would be removed.

ii Overburden removal and management

Overburden extracted during mining would be either stockpiled adjacent to the pit or backfilled directly in the mine void. This would depend on the stage of mining operations and material type. At commencement of mining operations with the initial boxcut in Year 1, all extracted material would be stockpiled outside of the mine pit. As mining progresses, where possible, overburden would be placed directly into the void behind the advancing pit which would reduce disturbance outside of the pit along the length of the mine.

Overburden has been characterised as NSOB, SOB and material that is potentially acid forming (PAF) on exposure to atmospheric conditions. NSOB is overburden material that is generally above the water table and therefore has relatively low salinity and is not PAF. SOB is overburden situated below the water table is therefore saline, but is not PAF. These materials are considered to have low reactivity from an acid generation perspective. Overburden which is PAF is located directly above the ore and is more reactive and has the potential to generate acid on exposure to atmospheric conditions.


Table 3.2 shows the indicative tonnages of overburden and ore to be excavated. Tonnages include the material moved as part of mining but exclude rehandled overburden from stockpiles back into the pit.

Table 3.2 Indicative material volumes over the life of the Balranald Project

Mine	Volume of material (Mm ³) ¹				
	SOB	NSOB	PAF	Ore	Tailings/mining by-products
West Balranald	133.6	53.6	32.2	10.2	8.4
Nepean	n/a	35.2	n/a	2.7	2.3

Notes: 1. Excludes rehandled material volumes.

Overburden stockpiles would have a height of up to 15 m and would be formed using earthmoving equipment. Runoff from overburden stockpiles would be captured and transferred to collection drains and dams (NSOB) and the MUP dams (SOB).




Note: Not to Scale

Conceptual mining progression - long section

Balranald Mineral Sands Project
Environmental Impact Statement

Figure 3.12



Conceptual mining progression - plan view

Balranald Mineral Sands Project
Environmental Impact Statement

Figure 3.13

PAF material within the overburden would be extracted using earthmoving machinery and would be returned, via in-pit access ramps, as backfill and covered as soon as practicable. Some PAF material would need to be stockpiled during the establishment of the initial boxcut. Runoff from overburden stockpiles containing PAF materials would be captured and transferred to the MUP dam. Further details on the management of PAF material is discussed in Section 3.6.3.

Most overburden would ultimately be returned to the mine void, although five NSOB stockpiles in the southern half of the West Balranald mine (refer Figure 3.9) would remain in-situ and would be shaped and contoured as part of the final landform. Topsoil and subsoil would be reinstated above the overburden, and the area would be rehabilitated.

iii Ore recovery, stockpiling and processing at the mining unit plant

Extracted ore would initially be stockpiled on ROM pads adjacent to the MUP. At any time, the quantity of ore stockpiled at the MUP is estimated at up to around 1.2 Mt. This is equivalent to approximately four months supply of ore feed at any time, based on an ore processing rate of 475 tonnes per hour (tph) and a rougher head feed of 440 tph.

The MUP is the first stage in processing of extracted ore, which screens the ore to remove oversize material (greater than 2.5 mm in diameter). The ore is then slurried with water from the MUP dam and pumped via pipeline to the processing plant. Oversize material greater than 2.5 mm is returned directly into the mine pit. Ore from stockpiles would be processed in the MUP at a nominal rate of approximately 500 tph dry.

The MUP would consist of an apron feeder with a vibrating dry grizzly, scrubber and trommel unit and would be track-mounted to enable relocation as mining progresses. The MUP is expected to be relocated approximately four times over the life of the mine. Approximate locations of the MUP over the life of the West Balranald mine are shown in Figure 3.3.

3.5.5 Mining equipment

Typical equipment that would be used during mining includes:

- shovels;
- excavators;
- haul trucks;
- dozers (tracked and wheel dozers);
- graders;
- tractor scoops;
- water trucks;
- loaders;
- scrapers;
- conveyors;

- lighting plants; and
- service and maintenance vehicles.

Iluka is continuing to investigate optimised earth moving techniques for overburden, including in-pit conveyor and a dozer push or bucket wheel excavator. If adopted, these optimised methods would reduce the numbers of earthmoving equipment required to mine the Balranald Project (ie shovels, excavators and haul trucks).

Final mining equipment (including type, number and size), would be determined during detailed design.

3.6 Processing plant

Mineral processing would be undertaken at the processing plant, shown in Figure 3.11. The processing plant would concentrate the ore to generate two primary product streams; HMC and ilmenite. Annual average production rates of HMC and ilmenite are 0.5 Mtpa and 0.6 Mtpa respectively. The processing plant would have a processing rate of 475 tonnes per hour (tph) and a rougher head feed of 440 tph. Once processed, HMC and ilmenite would be stockpiled at the processing area prior to off-site transport (see Figure 3.11).

The processing plant has a number of components including the PCP, WCP, WHIMS plant and ISP. Water requirements for the processing plant would be fed from the process water dam, except for the ISP, which requires fresh water. The site water management system including process water and water storage infrastructure is described in Section 3.7.2.

The processing plant is described below and a process flow diagram is shown in Figure 3.14.

3.6.1 Pre-concentrator plant

The PCP utilises desliming cyclones for fines removal and gravity spirals to concentrate the heavy mineral within the ore. Wet gravity processing methods would separate light minerals (such as quartz) from heavy minerals (such as rutile and zircon), and remove mining by-products such as slimes and sand.

The PCP comprises thickeners, a spirals building, flocculant units, a cyclone stacker, pump stations and a mining by-product handling plant. The PCP requires water, which would be supplied by the process water dam.

The PCP would receive slurried ore via pipeline from the MUP, and would process ore at a nominal rate of 440 tph. The slurried ore is initially pumped to the PCP vibrating screen which would remove material 2.5 mm or larger. The PCP then separates the fines (-53 micrometres (μm)) fraction from the coarser sand fraction, and concentrates the heavy mineral in the sand to a grade suitable to feed into the WCP.

The fines fraction (-53 μm) is separated from the coarser sand fraction by desliming cyclones. The fines report to the cyclone overflow and are gravity fed to a thickener unit, where flocculant is added to create a thickened fines by-product stream (thickener underflow (or slimes)). The coarse sand fraction reports to the cyclone underflow and is pumped to the PCP gravity spirals which separate the heavy mineral fraction from the lighter sand material.

The PCP circuit produces a concentrated heavy mineral stream and a sand by-product stream. The concentrated heavy mineral either goes directly to the WCP as a slurry, or to the decoupling stacker. The sand by-product stream is diverted to a sand tails stacker and stockpiled. Once the sand by-product stockpile has reached capacity it is trucked to the mine void for disposal.

3.6.2 Wet concentrator plant

The WCP further upgrades the heavy mineral content of the concentrate stream (from the PCP) to between 95% and 98% heavy mineral. Wet gravity processing methods further separate light and heavy minerals.

The WCP produces an upgrade HMC product at a rate of 150 tph. The WCP comprises a decoupling plant with a PCP heavy mineral stockpile, a constant density tank and structure, a spirals building consisting of five or six spiral stages, screens and associated stockpiles and pipelines, pump stations and water storage dams. The WCP is typically divided into a primary and secondary concentrating circuit where the primary circuit contains gravity spirals which upgrades the PCP concentrate. The secondary WCP consists of the WHIMS circuit and the up-current classifier circuit. The upgraded ore is fed through the WHIMS plant.

3.6.3 Wet high intensity magnetic separation plant

The WHIMS plant is a series of high strength magnets which separate magnetic material (magnetic or primary ilmenite) from non-magnetic material (HMC). The WHIMS plant is a wet process that splits the product into two streams (HMC product stream and magnetic ilmenite stream) with different destinations and beneficiation process routes.

The WHIMS plant includes five primary and two secondary processing units with the primary unit feed rate approximately 150 tph. Each of the five units would process approximately 30 tph.

The secondary WHIMS units would receive approximately 34 tph dry solids. These units would further recover entrained ilmenite from the non-magnetic WHIMS stream. The secondary WHIMS magnetic stream is combined with the primary magnetic stream and fed to the ISP.

The non-magnetic stream is HMC, which is stockpiled in the processing area (Figure 3.11).

3.6.4 Ilmenite separation plant

The ISP separates the WHIMS magnetic stream into two ilmenite products; sulphate and chloride ilmenite. The ISP would have a feed rate of approximately 90 tph (dry) and include a stockpile reclaim system to feed the ISP, a wash plant to remove dissolved salts from the mineral surfaces and a dry separation plant comprising rare earth drum roll magnetic separators to magnetically fractionate the mineral.

The ISP non-magnetic stream would be directed to the non-magnetic tank bin, while the magnetic streams of sulphate ilmenite and chloride ilmenite reports to the sulphate and chloride bins respectively (Figure 3.11).

3.6.5 Product stockpiles

HMC and ilmenite product stockpiles would be located at the processing area, as shown in Figure 3.11.

3.7 Tailings and mining by-products management

Tailings and mining by-products would be generated by the MUP and processing plant. Tailings generated at the MUP would include oversize material, which would be temporarily stockpiled at the MUP before being returned to the pit. Tailings generated at the processing plant would include sand and slimes. A portion of sand tailings would be stockpiled before being returned to the pit, while the remainder would be disposed using a process known as modified co-disposal. Modified co-disposal would involve slurring sand tails with slimes from the processing plant, and placement in the TSF.

Non-saleable by-products associated with the processing of Balranald Project HMC from the Hamilton MSP would be managed as part of Iluka's existing Victorian operations or returned to the West Balranald mine void (refer Figure 3.14). At the time of publication of this EIS, Iluka were seeking separate approval from the Victorian Minister for Planning for the continuing disposal of Hamilton MSP by-products at Douglas.

3.7.1 Tailings storage facility

Management of tailings and mining by-products would be by modified co-disposal. Modified co-disposal would involve slurring sand tails from the WCP with slimes (thickener underflow) from the PCP, and placement in the TSF. The sand and thickener underflow mixture is referred to as ModCod.

The TSF would be located within the processing area (Figure 3.11). The TSF would be approximately 30 ha in area with a tailings volume in the order of 1 Mm³, lined and divided into a number of individual cells. The ModCod would be pumped into a single cell of the TSF. Once a cell is at capacity, the ModCod would be directed to the next empty cell while the first cell dries and consolidates. Once the ModCod has dried sufficiently, the cell would be excavated and the dried material transported by truck back to the mine pit for backfilling into the mine void. Cells that have been excavated would then become available to refill. The cycle from slurry to consolidation to recovery is estimated to take 12 months per cell.

Water would be recovered from the TSF via decant or an in cell pontoon pump and either gravity fed or pumped to the settling dam.

Sand tailings not required for the ModCod would be pumped to a sand stacking pad located adjacent to the ROM stockpile at the MUP. Once the sand tails are dried they would be backfilled into the mine void.


3.7.2 Processing mining by-products from Hamilton mineral separation plant

The Hamilton MSP would generate by-products during processing of HMC from the Balranald Project. This would include the following streams:


- sand and slimes tailings;
- sand tails containing monazite; and
- float plant tails.

Hamilton MSP by-products generated would be required to be managed as part of Iluka's existing Victorian operations or returned to be placed in the West Balranald pit as part of backfilling activities.

PROJECT AREA - NSW



VICTORIA



KEY

- Backfilled in mine void
- Loading facility
- Product streams
- Mining by-products
- Mineral separation plant by-products

BY-PRODUCTS TRANSPORTED TO PROJECT AREA FOR BACKFILL IN MINE VOID

BY-PRODUCTS DISPOSED IN DOUGLAS VOID

Douglas void

Mineral processing flow diagram

Balranald Mineral Sands Project
Environmental Impact Statement

Figure 3.14

3.7.3 Management of potentially acid forming material

The Balranald Project would produce multiple sources of PAF material:

- organic overburden and ore from the West Balranald mine;
- tailings underflow from the PCP thickener;
- sand tails;
- ModCod;
- ilmenite and HMC product streams; and
- mining by-products from the Hamilton MSP.

i Organic overburden

Organic overburden would be generated over the life of mining at the West Balranald mine. Initially, organic overburden created by the initial boxcut would be managed by:

- routine geological/geochemical assessment of overburden extracted to enable segregation of organic overburden and selective handling/reuse according to potential acid generation risk;
- stockpiling PAF overburden on a low permeability pad with a limestone liner (eg ultra-fine grained limestone) with surface water drainage control (upstream cut-off drains), within the designated stockpile area at the MUP, with runoff or seepage directed to the MUP dam;
- blending or applying thin layers of a sufficient quantity of limestone into the temporary organic overburden stockpile from the initial boxcut;
- develop operating protocols to maintain/create sufficient storage and conduct regular monitoring of water level and chemistry in the MUP dam; and
- monitoring of the integrity of the surface water and drainage management around the PAF pad, and any limestone blending equipment.

Once the initial boxcut is complete, there would be no above-ground organic overburden stockpiled during the operational phase, due to the ongoing placement of newly disturbed organic overburden directly within the pit (at the base of the backfill face and covering with overburden as soon as possible). Limestone may be blended with, or applied to the organic overburden (as required) as it is progressively backfilled. Operating protocols would be developed prior to operation.

ii Ore

Ore would be removed from the pit and stored on a ROM stockpile pad adjacent to the MUP. The ROM stockpile pad would be constructed on a low permeability pad with a limestone liner (eg ultra-fine grained limestone) with surface water drainage control (upstream cut off drains), within the stockpile area at the MUP, with runoff/seepage directed to the MUP dam.

iii Tailings underflow

Tailings underflow from the PCP thickener would be mixed with sand tails from the WCP to form ModCod and sent to the TSF.

iv Sand tails

Sand tails from the WCP process that are not mixed with tailings underflow would be stored on a sand stacking pad. The sand stacking pad would be constructed with a low permeability base and runoff capture system. Runoff would be directed to the MUP dam. Once the sand tails are dry they would be trucked back to the mine void and covered with overburden as part of backfilling operations.

v ModCod

The TSF would be designed with a low permeability lining. Each cell of the multi-cell TSF would be sequentially filled. Once each cell is full, the next cell would commence use. When the material in each cell is dry the cell would be excavated with the dry material trucked back to the pit void and covered with overburden as part of the backfilling process. The decant water reclaimed from TSF would be recirculated through the processing plant.

vi Product streams

Ilmenite and HMC product streams would be stockpiled separately on ore pads with low permeability and runoff capture. Runoff from the stockpiles would be directed to the settling dam. The magnetic rejects from the ISP would be blended with sand tails from the WCP and placed back into the pit void and covered with overburden as part of backfilling operations.

vii Mineral separation plant by-products

Any mining by-products associated with the processing of Balranald HMC at the Hamilton MSP, if transported back to the West Balranald mine, would be stockpiled on a pad with low permeability and runoff capture. The runoff would be directed to the settling dam. The by-product material from the MSP would be blended with sand tails and placed back into the pit void and covered with overburden as part of backfilling operations.

3.8 Site water management

The water management system for the Balranald Project includes both the management of surface water on-site, and management of extracted groundwater. The surface water management system would be designed to manage surface water flows on-site according to catchment area and associated water quality, and is described in the following sections.

The groundwater management system forms part of the overall site water balance and is an input into the surface water management system. The groundwater management system has been described in Section 3.4.6.

The location of surface water management infrastructure in the project area is shown in Figure 3.3 and 3.5.

3.8.1 Water sources

During construction, water would be abstracted from the Olney Formation (ie lower salinity/brackish water) in the project area. The rate of abstracted water would be up to 150 ML/yr.

During operation, water sources would include:

- surface runoff – generated by direct rainfall within the surface water catchment areas in the project area. This would be separated into mine affected water (elevated salinity, low pH, elevated concentrations of heavy metals and elevated concentrations of oil and grease) and sediment laden water;
- groundwater:
 - inflow to the pit – although the dewatering system is designed to completely dewater the pit ahead of mining, it is expected that there would be a small volume of groundwater inflow into the pit during the life of the mine;
 - groundwater extracted from the Loxton-Parilla Sands – to dewater the pit prior to mining as described in Section 3.4.6; and
- fresh water – supplied from the Murrumbidgee River by the water supply pipeline (Figure 3.2) (extraction of water from the Murrumbidgee River may commence during the construction phase if construction of the pipeline is completed).

Site water management is necessary during all phases of project operations. Water has been divided into five streams. The proposed strategy for the management of water is based on the separation of water from different sources based on anticipated water quality, as follows:

- groundwater dewatered from the Loxton-Parilla Sands. Some groundwater would be used to satisfy mine water demands, however the majority would be treated with ultra-violet (UV) light and injected back into the Loxton-Parilla Sands.
- Mine affected water, comprising runoff and groundwater inflow to the pit collecting in the active mining area at the West Balranald mine, runoff from SOB and PAF stockpiles and runoff from the MUP area and processing area (including ROM pads, and tailings and mining by-product stockpiles). Management would include:
 - seepage, groundwater and surface runoff inflows to the active mining area would be collected in on-site storages and used preferentially to satisfy mine water demands; and
 - runoff from the MUP area and processing area, and the SOB and PAF stockpiles would also be collected in on-site storages and used to satisfy mine water demands.
- Sediment laden water, comprises runoff from the active mining area at the West Balranald mine and the Nepean mine, and runoff from NSOB, topsoil and subsoil stockpiles. Surface runoff from NSOB stockpiles and the active mining area at the Nepean mine would be captured and treated in sediment dams and used for dust suppression.
- Surface water runoff from undisturbed areas would be diverted, wherever possible, around areas disturbed by mining and released from the site, minimising the capture of clean surface runoff.

- Fresh water for use in the ISP, dust suppression on NSOB stockpiles, soil stockpiles and rehabilitated areas, and to supply filtered water demands would be pumped from the Murrumbidgee River via the water supply pipeline. Potable water would be trucked to the project area and stored.

Sewage at the project area would be managed in two ways:

- for areas with high density of personnel (ie processing area and accommodation facility), a package waste treatment system (ie STP) would be used, which would require occasional pumping out of sludge. Wastes would be collected from site by licensed contractor and disposed of at a licensed facility; and
- for ablutions located in areas with low or infrequent use, untreated waste would be collected in septic tanks which would be emptied by tanker as required.

3.8.2 Water storage infrastructure

Water used in processing operations would be managed by various dams and structures. Water storage infrastructure that would be constructed as part of the water management system are shown in Table 3.3. All dams would be lined to prevent leakage.

Table 3.3 Water storage infrastructure

Dam	Description
Settling dam	The settling dam would collect runoff water from the processing area. It allows for settling of solids before transfer to the process water dam and recycling within the processing area.
Process water dam	The process water dam would be the primary water supply for the processing plant. It would receive water from the settling dam and groundwater from the dewatering system. The process water pumps are supplied from this dam. Receives overflows from settling dam via gravity.
MUP dam	The MUP dam would received watering flows from West Balranald mine and transfers of excess water from process water dam. It would supply water to the MUP. The MUP dam would also collect runoff from the ROM pad, stockpile pads containing PAF materials, sand tails stacking pad, which are potentially acid forming. The pH of the MUP dam would be continuously monitored and lime tipping would be done on occasion to maintain a pH > 4.5.
Processing area runoff dam	Captures runoff from the processing area. Water is transferred to the settling dam.
TSF	Receives modified co-disposal (ModCod) slurry consisting of sand and thickener underflow mixture (or slimes). It would contain all direct rainfall and resulting runoff that occurs within the TSF area. Water is decanted from the TSF and returned to the settling dam for reuse in the processing plant.
Groundwater retention dams	Two groundwater retention dams would store groundwater extracted from the Loxton-Parilla Sands by the dewatering bores. Groundwater would be exposed to UV light prior to being reinjected.
Non-saline water dam	Constructed to hold imported fresh water from the water supply pipeline.
Runoff collection drains and dams	Constructed to capture runoff from the NSOB, topsoil and subsoil stockpiles. Would function as sediment basins.

3.8.3 Water demand

Demands for water would be primarily generated by the processing plant (including MUP, PCP, WCP and ISP), dust suppression and potable requirements for amenities. The ISP requires potable water which would be sourced from the water supply pipeline from the Murrumbidgee River.

3.9 Waste management

The mine would generate various non-hazardous recyclable and non-recyclable wastes, as well as waste hydrocarbons. Bins would be positioned where food is consumed so the mine is kept free of litter. All non-hazardous waste (including putrescibles and inert) would be securely stored. All waste would be removed from site and disposed of by licensed contractors. Recyclable materials would be sent to a licensed recycler. Sewerage waste would be generated by on-site amenities. Sewage wastes would be collected from site by licensed contractor and disposed of at a licensed facility.

Operation and maintenance of plant and equipment would generate waste hydrocarbons such as greases, oils and hydraulic fluids. These waste hydrocarbons would be placed in suitable containers and placed in a bunded area to await disposal at either an EPA-approved hydrocarbon waste site or a recycling depot.

3.10 Roads and transport

3.10.1 Mine access and internal roads

The primary access road for the Balranald Project would be a private access road from the Balranald-Ivanhoe Road to the West Balranald mine. Access to the Nepean mine would be via the Nepean access road, constructed from the West Balranald mine to the Nepean mine that would include portions of the Burke and Wills and Arumpo roads (ie public roads). The access roads are shown in Figure 3.2 and 3.4.

Internal roads would be constructed along the length of the mine disturbance area generally parallel to the mine void.

3.10.2 Product transport

HMC and ilmenite would be transported by B-double trucks from West Balranald mine.

Trucks transporting HMC (in bulk) would travel along the Balranald-Ivanhoe Road, McCabe Street, the Sturt Highway south of Balranald, Balranald-Tooleybuc Road, through Tooleybuc and then west into Victoria to Iluka's existing rail facility at Hopetoun in Victoria. Transport of ilmenite would be by either B-double (in bulk) or containerised on flat-bed trucks. Ilmenite would be transported along the same product haulage route as HMC within NSW to a proposed rail loading facility in Manangatang, Victoria. The transport route for HMC and ilmenite in NSW is shown in Figure 3.15.

Transport of HMC would generate approximately 35 trucks per day to transport product to Hopetoun, Victoria, and 40 trucks per day for the transport of ilmenite to Manangatang, Victoria.

3.10.3 Back-loaded processing by-product transport

Non-saleable by-products associated with the processing of HMC at the Hamilton MSP would continue to be managed as part of Iluka's Murray Basin operations in Victoria, which includes placement of by-products from the Hamilton MSP in the mine void of Iluka's Douglas mine. However, where this is not possible, the non-saleable by-products would be transported back to the project area by road for placement in the mine void.

3.11 Accommodation facility

The accommodation facility would provide accommodation for all workers who choose not to commute to the project area on a daily basis, or who cannot commute within Iluka's enforced maximum daily commute time of 60 minutes one way. It would provide up to approximately 550 single rooms/quarters to accommodate peak construction and operational workforces of approximately 225 and 550 people, respectively. The facility itself would be operated by a staff of about 10 to 20, including administration, cleaning, food preparation, maintenance and security staff.

It is expected that the majority (95%) of the construction and operational workforce would stay at the accommodation facility. That is, it has been assumed that only 5% of the construction and operational workforce would commute on a daily basis while on-shift.

It is expected that approximately 70% of both the construction and operational workforce would be on site at any point in time with 30% on periods of rostered or other leave periods expected that the peak construction and operational workforce on-site at anyone point in time would be approximately 158 and 385 people, respectively. During the overlap of the construction and operational phases, it is expected that the combined construction and operational workforce on-site at any one point in time would be about 315 people. Based on the assumption that 95% of this workforce would use the accommodation facility, it is expected that the facility would cater for approximately:

- 150 construction employees during the construction phase;
- 366 operational employees during the operational phase; and
- 299 construction and operational employees during the overlap of the construction and operation phases.

The facility would principally accommodate employees and long stay contractors. Visitors and short stay contractors may also be accommodated.

The facility would be located adjacent to the West Balranald mine near the intersection of the primary access road with the Balranald-Ivanhoe Road (see Figure 3.16). Vehicle access would be provided off the West Balranald access road.

The facility would include:

- modular and relocatable single rooms/quarters;
- office building;
- wet mess area (including stores, kitchen and dining area);
- laundry facilities;
- toilet and shower facilities;
- car and bus parking area; and

recreation areas. A design using modular and relocatable single rooms/quarters would enable the accommodation facility to be 'scaled up' and then 'scaled down' in order to accommodate the requisite number of commuting workers. A conceptual layout is shown in Figure 3.17.

The recreation areas would contain facilities such as BBQs, gym/recreational room, hard ball sport area and swimming pool.


The accommodation facility site is cleared and currently used for grazing. It is well screened from the Balranald-Ivanhoe Road by a thick stand of vegetation along the road corridor which would be maintained as part of the design of the facility.

The accommodation facility would be supplied with potable water either via the proposed water pipeline from the Murrumbidgee River or a potable system supplied by truck. Power and telecommunications would be via existing services immediately to the east within the Balranald-Ivanhoe Road corridor.

A package waste treatment system (ie STP) would be used to service the accommodation facility for the life of the project. The system would be designed, installed and operated in accordance with the requirements of relevant government agencies and Balranald Shire Council (BSC). Waste from the system would be pumped out and disposed at Balranald townships wastewater treatment plant.

Iluka is also investigating lodging a separate development application (DA) under Part 4 of the EP&A Act with BSC to locate the accommodation facility within Balranald town, at a location on the Balranald-Ivanhoe Road and adjacent to Mungo and River streets. It is recognised that an accommodation facility within Balranald may provide increased benefits for Iluka's workforce (through access to recreational and other services), as well as promoting a higher level of integration with and utilisation of services (ie retail, hospitality, health sectors) provided in Balranald town.

Iluka will progressively develop concepts for a Balranald accommodation facility, including consulting with key stakeholders in a constructive manner, and seek approval under a separate DA to be assessed by BSC. In the event that approval is received for both options, Iluka would only construct an accommodation facility at one of the approved locations.



Transport route for HMC and ilmenite

Balranald Mineral Sands Project
Environmental Impact Statement

Figure 3.15

3.12 Electricity and communications infrastructure

The Balranald Project would have a power demand in the order of 15 million volt amps (MVA), mostly for the WCP, PCP, WHIMS, ISP, MUP and groundwater injection system. Electricity would be supplied to the mine by connection to the existing electricity supply network. The construction and operation of a transmission line from this network to the project area would form part of a separate referral under the EPBC Act and approval process under the EP&A Act.

A standard suite of communication systems would be installed in the project area, including two telecommunications towers. The towers include a 70 m self-supporting lattice tower located 500 m from the processing area at West Balranald mine, and a 50 m lattice mast supported by guy wires located at Nepean mine. The 70 m tower would be erected during the initial construction phase and the 50 m mast would be erected before the commencement of mining at Nepean mine. Both would be decommissioned following completion of mining.

A telecommunication system would be installed to the site offices located in the mine infrastructure area at the West Balranald mine.

3.13 Workforce

During the construction phase, the Balranald Project would employ a peak construction workforce of approximately 225 people. During the operational phase, a peak workforce of approximately 550 people is anticipated. There would be a short period when there would be an overlap of these workforces as construction is finalised and mining operations commence. During this overlap, it is expected there would be a combined construction and operational workforce of about 450 people.

It is expected that approximately 70% of both the construction and operational workforce would be on-site at any point in time with 30% on scheduled leave periods. Accordingly, the peak construction and operational workforce on-site at anyone point in time is expected to be about 158 people and 385 people respectively. During the overlap of the construction and operational phases, it is expected that there would be approximately 315 people on-site at any one point in time.


The possible roster for construction workers would be 14:7 (14 days on then 7 days off) or 21:7. The possible roster for operational workers would be 8:6 or 4:3.

3.14 Rehabilitation and decommissioning

The rehabilitation of the Balranald Project would include the progressive re-establishment of native Chenopod Shrub lands, mallee and areas designated for agricultural production.

Rehabilitation of the final landform would be undertaken on a domain basis, which represent land management or rehabilitation areas and post mine landforms areas. Rehabilitation would be undertaken using different techniques suited to the type of disturbance incurred and the proposed post-mine land use.

Closure and decommissioning would involve removing site services, buildings and infrastructure, roadways, car parks and hardstand areas.



Accommodation facility location

Balranald Mineral Sands Project
Environmental Impact Statement

Figure 3.16

West Balranald access road



KEY

- Recreation areas
- Laundry facilities
- Self-contained accommodation
- Existing vegetation
- Bushfire setback

Accommodation facility conceptual layout

Balranald Mineral Sands Project
Environmental Impact Statement

Figure 3.17

4 Consideration of alternatives

4.1 Introduction

The EIS Guidelines states that the EIS is to provide a:

... description of any feasible alternatives to the action, to the extent reasonably practicable, including:

- (a) if relevant, the alternative of taking no action;
- (b) a comparative description of the impacts of each alternative on the NES matters protected by controlling provisions of Part 3 of the EPBC Act for the action; and
- (c) sufficient detail to make clear why any alternative is preferred to another.

Short, medium and long-term advantages and disadvantages of the options should be discussed.

This chapter has been prepared to address these requirements.

4.2 Alternatives considered

This chapter describes the alternatives that were considered as part of the development of the Balranald Project described in Chapter 3. The justification for the preferred option is discussed briefly.

The alternative of taking no action was not considered. The consequences of not undertaking the action have been considered in Chapter 2.

The key elements of the project where alternatives were considered included:

- mining methods and handling of overburden;
- mining sequence;
- mine footprint;
- processing area location;
- power supply;
- gravel supply;
- materials handling and processing;
- product transport;
- accommodation facility; and
- water management and supply.

All alternatives initially considered a range of options. These options were assessed against different criteria to determine the preferred option. The criteria included considerations such as, but not limited to, cost (ie capital and operating), schedule, operability and potential environmental impact, including potential impacts on habitat for threatened fauna. Most assessments of each option for each alternative were qualitative and therefore a quantitative comparative description of impacts on matters of national environmental significance (MNES) cannot be undertaken. Notwithstanding this, as demonstrated in Chapter 9, the consideration of alternatives has led to a reduction in overall clearing (compared with the initial project area) of Malleefowl habitat by approximately 3,000 ha and potential Corben's Long-eared Bat habitat by approximately 2,000 ha.

Each of the alternatives is discussed in the following sections.

4.3 Mining methods and handling of overburden

A number of different mining methods were considered for the Balranald Project to provide an economically efficient option for extraction of the mineral sands resource. Initially a qualitative assessment was undertaken on all known mining methods, both conventional and unconventional, to assess which mining alternatives had potential application to mineral sand deposits with similar characteristics to the West Balranald and Nepean deposits.

Qualitative consideration was given to all known conventional open cut and underground mining methods, including highwall, board and pillar, longwall, shortwall, and block caving mining methods, however most were discounted early in the process due to being unsuitable for a range of economic, safety and geotechnical characteristics.

In addition to the proposed method of mining using conventional truck and shovel equipment as described in Chapter 3, three other mining methods were shortlisted for more detailed investigation and are described in further detail below:

- dragline;
- dredging; and
- integrated mining systems, including a range of technologies for overburden materials handling.

4.3.1 Dragline

Due to the geometry of the West Balranald pit, the dragline application was considered unconventional and would involve regular relocations of the dragline between two or more active mining areas. An assessment concluded that while dragline operations had some potential to result in an operating cost saving, this potential benefit was negated by an additional capital requirement to relocate mining equipment.

Risks were also identified including:

- productivity risks associated with the interaction between dragline operations and other site activities (dewatering, mining, tails disposal, management of PAF); and
- geotechnical risks where the poor cohesion of overburden materials at the West Balranald mine and the associated flat batter angles limit the material within reach of the dragline.

The above risks were considered to further impact the viability of dragline mining. It was concluded that the use of draglines was not a viable mining solution for the Balranald Project.

4.3.2 Dredging

Given the mineral sand deposit at the West Balranald mine is beneath the water table and the overburden largely consists of unconsolidated sands, the application of dredge mining was investigated.

An evaluation concluded that dredge mining was not a viable solution due to:

- high capital and rehabilitation costs associated with dredge mining and slimes handling;
- risks when compared to conventional mining, such as:
 - slimes management and associated infrastructure;
 - geotechnical issues impacting total material volumes and water impoundment structures within the pit;
 - heavy mineral recovery issues associated with dredge mining process and slimes build up within ponds; and
 - operability of multiple dredges within a narrow pit.

Based on this, dredging and all other forms of wet mining (such as sluicing) were eliminated as viable mining options.

4.3.3 Integrated mining system

A range of integrated mining methods that could replace the truck and shovel method were evaluated, including:

- bucket wheel excavators;
- dozer trap/conveyor systems;
- cross-pit stacking systems;
- loader and hopper mining options;
- continuous miner based mining systems; and
- associated conveyor systems.

It was concluded that integrated mining methods were not viable due to:

- high capital expenditure costs;
- operational inflexibility – once the equipment has been designed and constructed, there is limited opportunity to vary the operation to meet market demands and/or operational variability, which is not suited to the characteristics to the Balranald Project;

- technologies having not been applied to mining resources with similar pit characteristics to the Balranald Project; and
- production-critical nature of equipment, with equipment typically arranged on-site in a series where disruption to any part of the production equipment could disrupt production schedules.

Notwithstanding the above, further consideration is still being given to the use of cross-pit stacking systems in combination with the truck and shovel mining method. Such technology could replace a portion of the truck and shovel equipment fleet for handling overburden materials.

4.4 Mining sequence

Various mining sequences were investigated. The optimum mining direction for West Balranald and Nepean was identified as being from south to north due to a range of factors including deposit geometry, grade and assemblage distribution and ability to meet required production rates using this mining sequence.

4.5 Mine footprint

Iluka has undertaken a process throughout the preparation of this EIS to avoid and minimise environmental impacts, including impacts on habitat for threatened fauna, as far as practicable. Generally, this process has involved:

- undertake baseline surveys to identify constraints within the project area and surrounds;
- overlay of preliminary project footprint information on aerial photography together with mapping of environmental constraints, particularly for biodiversity and Aboriginal cultural heritage;
- refine location of project infrastructure to avoid known constraints where possible;
- avoidance of direct impacts to identified constraints during detailed design, for example through relocating infrastructure (such as roads, stockpiles, ancillary infrastructure) where reasonable and feasible; and
- where significant features could not be avoided, identification of mitigation measures to minimise impacts, or compensation (eg offsets) if impacts were not able to be sufficiently mitigated or avoided.

The Balranald Project mine footprint has been reduced and refined based on mine plan optimisation during pre-feasibility and detailed feasibility studies. The area directly disturbed by mining is primarily defined by the location of the mineral sands resource. There were limited opportunities to reduce the footprint of the actual mine pit that would not affect the economic viability and safe extraction of the resource, which is highly influenced by geotechnical considerations. Therefore, there was limited scope to avoid impacts that would occur in the direct path of the mine.

However, significant re-design of the mine plan was completed which resulted in a reduced mining extent in the southern part of the West Balranald mine and maximised the direct placement of overburden materials within mine void, thereby reducing the volume of material requiring stockpiling at the surface on the eastern side of the mine. This resulted in significantly less surface disturbance for the placement of stockpiles outside the pit and disturbance of land associated with the starter pit (or box cut) at the West Balranald mine. Key drivers for the re-design of the mine plan were economics and management of potentially acid forming materials; however, the locations in which stockpile areas were reduced and the extent of mining in the south were guided by the presence of environmental constraints (eg ecology and cultural heritage) at the surface.

The southern part of the West Balranald mine contains habitat for the Malleefowl and therefore reducing impacts in this area, reduces impacts on this species.

The locations of the stockpiles were primarily areas identified as having potential Aboriginal cultural heritage significance. However, this also resulted in a reduction in impacts to native vegetation associated with an overall reduction in the disturbance area as a result.

The reduction of surface disturbance for the placement of stockpiles outside the pit and the reduction of mining in the southern part of the West Balranald mine reduced the amount of vegetation and habitat loss originally proposed by approximately 15%.

Cumulatively, changes in the mine footprint have led to a reduction in overall clearing (compared with the initial project area) of Malleefowl habitat by approximately 3,000 ha and potential Corben's Long-eared Bat habitat by approximately 2,000 ha.

Furthermore, the reduction of mining in the southern part of the West Balranald mine has assisted in ensuring an ongoing connection between patches of remnant vegetation in this area which is of particular importance to the Malleefowl.

4.6 Processing area location

The location of the processing area and associated infrastructure was investigated using a range of strategic drivers that included alignment with the West Balranald and Nepean access roads, proximity to homesteads/dwellings on surrounding properties, extent of vegetation clearing required, topography, electricity infrastructure alignments, mine operations, environmental, cultural heritage, land tenure and view shed analysis (ie visibility).

The optimum location was determined to be within 3 km of the centre of the West Balranald deposit. Further analysis was undertaken to determine if the processing area should be located on the east or west side of the pit. The outcome was that the processing area was to be located on the west side of the West Balranald mine in its proposed location (refer Figure 3.11).

Consideration was given to the size of the process area to ensure that surface disturbance was minimised as much as practicable. The processing area presented in this EIS is approximately 80% of the area initially proposed.

Consideration was given to the relocation of the mineral processing plant from the WRP mine (comprising PCP, WCP and WHIMS) to the Balranald Project, versus the plant remaining at the WRP mine. Relocating the plant to the Balranald Project would enable heavy minerals to be processed at the project area, with HMC transported by road from Balranald to the existing rail facility at Hopetoun (Victoria), and railed to the Hamilton MSP. For the plant to remain at the WRP mine, ore would need to be transported by road to the WRP mine for processing, and then transported again by road to the Hopetoun rail loading facility.

A financial, risk and sensitivity analysis was completed for each option, with the conclusion that the mineral processing plant should be located in the project area.

The processing plant identified for reuse at the Balranald Project is the PCP coupled with the WCP located at the WRP mine. As the pieces of plant are separate, modular buildings, it is possible to locate the PCP closer to the ROM pad and relocate it periodically. The optimisation model considered relocating the PCP periodically compared to pumping lower volumes of material to the WCP.

A single PCP co-located with the WCP at the processing area for the life of the Balranald Project was identified as the optimum scenario.

4.7 Power supply

Multiple power supply options were considered to provide power to the Balranald Project over the mine life. Options assessed included an islanded power station running on diesel or gas, a hybrid wind/diesel option and a network supply option. All options were examined with respect to capital and operating costs, carbon emissions and time to implement. Sensitivities around mine life and mine load were also considered in the analysis.

Based on the outcome of the options analysis it was recommended that a connection to the existing electricity network be adopted as the power supply option for the Balranald Project. This option provides the lowest cost over the mine life and represented the best value.

The power supply for the Balranald Project will be subject to a separate referral under the EPBC Act and a separate approval process under Part 4 or Part 5 of the EP&A Act.

4.8 Gravel supply

Two options were considered to supply gravel for the Balranald Project principally for the provision of road base material for internal roads and in pit ramps, comprising local resource extraction and importation of gravel from external suppliers.

Site investigations were completed within the area proximate to the West Balranald and Nepean mines to identify resources of gravel and if local supply was feasible. Sampling and testing of the areas confirmed that suitable material yet limited volumes is available for the construction of roads. Due to the shortfall of suitable local viable material, additional gravel from external sources would need to be purchased to meet the demand for the life of the Balranald Project.

Notwithstanding the above, the Balranald Project includes the extraction of gravel from 12 small borrow pits, principally for the construction phase. One of the key considerations in the locations of these pits was avoiding and minimising vegetation clearance and habitat loss. As shown in Figures 3.2 and 3.3, gravel pits were located to avoid clearance of Malleefowl habitat, particularly in the areas to the south and east of the West Balranald mine.

4.9 Materials handling and processing

A range of options were evaluated for handling of ore and tailings. These included:

- ROM pads; and
- mining by-products disposal method.

4.9.1 Run of mine pads

Multiple ROM pads and MUP locations and configurations were considered as a means of reducing trucking costs. The MUP is typically located alongside a ROM stockpile. There are environmental and cost benefits to minimising trucking distances by relocating the ROM pad and MUP periodically as the mining operation advances. The environmental impacts (eg ground disturbance) and cost associated with the construction of multiple ROM pads was compared against the cost of trucking and pumping over various distances. Scenarios operating between one and eight ROM locations were assessed, with total of four locations over the life of the mine being assessed as optimal.

4.9.2 Mining by-products disposal

The Balranald Project would produce tailings over the mine life as a result of on-site mineral processing activities. Early project development work considered the construction TSF (ModCoD) versus solar drying dams for the management of tailings.

ModCoD requires a smaller area for the TSF while all other parameters remained similar. An outcome of this was that the solar drying option was approximately 20% greater net present cost (NPC) than the ModCoD scenario across the varying ROM and PCP scenarios, due largely to the increased construction and rehabilitation costs associated with a larger facility. ModCoD was determined to be the best option for mining by-product disposal.

4.10 Product transport

4.10.1 Transport of ore from the Nepean mine

A number of alternative scenarios were considered for the transport of ore mined at the Nepean mine, including quad trucks, B-doubles, heavy off-road haul trucks and long distance pumping. Variations of these options also included considering both pre-concentration at Nepean and concurrent mining of Nepean at a lower rate. Economic modelling, coupled with a qualitative risk assessment identified the use of B-doubles as the preferred method of transporting ore from the Nepean mine to the MUP at the West Balranald mine. An access road between the Nepean and West Balranald mines (using portions of the Burke and Wills and Arumpo roads) is proposed to be constructed as part of the Balranald Project.

By the time mining is due to commence at the Nepean mine (approximately Year 6), the MUP would be located on a ROM pad at the northern end of the West Balranald mine, and it would remain in this location for the duration of mining at Nepean. Ore would be mined and loaded into trucks at Nepean and transported to the MUP at the northern end of the West Balranald mine.

One of the key considerations in the location of the Nepean access road was avoiding and minimising vegetation clearance and habitat loss. This included the use of portions of the Burke and Wills and Arumpo roads and making use of existing cleared fence lines where possible.

4.10.2 Transport of heavy mineral concentrate

A number of different transport options were analysed for the transport of HMC from the Balranald project area. A comparative traffic impact analysis considered:

- road classifications;
- network capacity if development proceeded;
- number of dwellings and other sensitive areas;
- road and intersections upgrade requirements; and
- journey time.

As a result of the analysis, transport by road by B-double trucks to Iluka's Hopetoun rail loading facility in Victoria and thereafter by rail to Hamilton MSP was selected as the preferred transport option for HMC.

4.10.3 Transport of ilmenite

Iluka investigated different options for the transport of ilmenite from the Balranald project area to the nearest port facility in Victoria. A comparative assessment considered:

- port options, including Portland, Geelong and Melbourne;
- rail sidings and network capacity in NSW and Victoria; and
- directly trucking, or the combined use of road and rail to port facilities.

The preferred option was for material to be loaded into B-Double trucks (bulk or containerised) at West Balranald mine and trucked to a proposed rail facility at Manangatang, Victoria. From here, it would be loaded into wagons or containers to be railed to port facilities in Victoria.

4.11 Accommodation facility

As part of the Balranald Project, Iluka has considered two primary options for accommodating the workforce, including a purpose built accommodation facility located close to the mine site or located in or adjacent to Balranald town.

Factors considered included:

- area of land available;
- proximity to other dwellings and land uses;
- proximity to the project area and required travel distances;
- environmental considerations (such as ecology, cultural heritage, noise, air quality);
- site access and traffic impacts;
- proximity to electricity and water services; and
- proximity to services and facilities.

Approval is sought as part of the Balranald Project for an accommodation facility to be located in the project area, south east of the West Balranald mine, to cater for the construction and operational workforce required for the life of the project.

As Figure 4.16 demonstrates, the accommodation facility has been sited to avoid vegetation clearance and habitat loss.

Iluka is also investigating lodging a separate DA under Part 4 of the EP&A Act with BSC to locate the accommodation facility within Balranald town, at a location on the Balranald-Ivanhoe Road and adjacent to Mungo and River streets. It is recognised that an accommodation facility within Balranald may provide increased benefits for Iluka's workforce (through access to recreational and other services), as well as promoting a higher level of integration with and utilisation of services (ie retail, hospitality, health sectors) provided in Balranald town.

Iluka will progressively develop concepts for a Balranald accommodation facility, including consulting with key stakeholders in a constructive manner, and seek approval under a separate DA to be assessed by BSC.

In the event that approval is received for both options, Iluka would only construct an accommodation facility at one of the approved locations.

4.12 Water management and supply

4.12.1 Groundwater management

Iluka investigated a number of options for the injection of extracted groundwater to allow dry mining of the Balranald deposit. Numerical modelling of the injection process influenced the design of the injection borefields to ensure the system could be operated within acceptable parameters. The design of the injection borefields included extensive consideration of hydrogeological properties, bore spacing and other infrastructure configurations through detailed modelling, as well as consideration of environmental parameters such as groundwater quality, groundwater dependent ecosystems and other water users.

The proposed location of injection borefields in the project area were identified as a result of the extensive modelling process.

4.12.2 Fresh water supply

Iluka investigated different fresh water supply options for the Balranald Project. Options considered included:

- treatment of saline groundwater by desalination;
- direct connection to surface water supply (extraction from a river); and
- third party supply (Balranald township municipal supply or bottled water).

Direct connection to a surface water supply was considered the most feasible and best option. Five different pipeline locations and four different pumping station options were considered for connection to the Murrumbidgee River. The pipeline and pumping station outlined in Section 3.3.8 was selected as the preferred option based on factors including reducing total pipeline distance, land access, availability of disturbed area for pump station infrastructure and minimising potential environmental impacts.

5 Approval framework

5.1 Introduction

The EIS Guidelines state that the EIS is to contain information of approvals that apply to the Balranald Project. They state:

7. OTHER APPROVALS AND CONDITIONS

The EIS must include information on any other requirements for approval or conditions that apply, or that the proponent reasonably believes are likely to apply, to the proposed action. This must include:

- (a) details of any local or State Government planning scheme, or plan or policy under any local or State Government planning system that deals with the proposed action, including:
 - what environmental assessment of the proposed action has been, or is being, carried out under the scheme, plan or policy; and
 - how the scheme provides for the prevention, minimisation and management of any relevant impacts;
- (b) a description of any approval that has been obtained from a State, Territory or Commonwealth agency or authority (other than an approval under the Act), including any conditions that apply to the action;
- (c) a statement identifying any additional approval that is required; and
- (d) a description of the monitoring, enforcement and review procedures that apply, or are proposed to apply, to the action.

Accordingly, this chapter provides details on:

- approvals obtained for the Balranald Project;
- an overview of the key approvals required under the EPBC Act and NSW and Victorian legislation for all elements of the Balranald Project; and
- details on relevant Commonwealth and NSW legislation and policies relevant to the action, including details on approvals required, if any, under the legislation and policies.

As demonstrated in Section 5.3.2, while the Balranald Project contains elements in Victoria, these elements do not form part of the action. All elements of the Balranald Project that form part of the action are contained in NSW.

All monitoring, enforcement and review procedures that will apply to the Balranald Project will be contained within approvals, if granted, under Commonwealth and NSW legislation, and subsequently within management plans prepared by Iluka based on the outcomes of all technical studies and the approvals. These management plans would be consolidated under an environmental management strategy (EMS) developed by Iluka for the project. Further details on the EMS can be found in Section 17.2.

5.2 Approvals obtained

A number of approvals have been granted for exploration, and mine planning and design activities, and one approval has been granted for the construction, operation, rehabilitation and closure of the Balranald Project. Details on approvals obtained for the project are contained in Table 5.1.

Table 5.1 Approvals obtained

Approval reference	Approval authority	Date granted	Activity approved
BN11-1993	NSW Trade and Investment, Mineral Resources	27 May 2011	Hydrogeological Test Work Program (Stage 1) – West Balranald and Nepean deposits
BN11-2709	NSW Trade and Investment, Mineral Resources	4 July 2011	Sonic Drilling Program 2011 – West Balranald and Nepean deposits
OUT12/9736	NSW Trade and Investment, Resources and Energy	15 May 2012	2012 Air Core Exploration Drilling Program and Soil Survey Activities – West Balranald, Nepean and Regional Exploration Area
OUT12/9736	NSW Trade and Investment, Resources and Energy	15 May 2012	Stage 2 Hydrogeological Test Work Program – West Balranald and Nepean deposits
DA06/2013-14	Balranald Shire Council	27 September 2013	Stage 3 Hydrogeological Program – Balranald Mineral Sands Project
OUT13/26287	NSW Trade and Investment, Resources and Energy	11 September 2013	Stage 3 Hydrogeological Program – Balranald Mineral Sands Project
OUT13/28341	NSW Trade and Investment, Resources and Energy	18 October 2013	Borehole Mining Trial – West Balranald Deposit
OUT14/23837 MCV14/887	NSW Trade and Investment, Resources and Energy	19 August 2014	Sonic (Geotechnical PQ3P Drilling Program – West Balranald Deposit
DA34/2015	Balranald Shire Council	16 April 2015	Stage 4 Hydrogeological Program – Balranald Mineral Sands Project
OUT15/4939 MCV15/1	NSW Trade and Investment, Resources and Energy	12 March 2015	Stage 4 Hydrogeological Drilling Program
OUT 15/27702	NSW Trade and Investment, Resources and Energy	8 October 2015	Extension of timeframe to undertake Borehole Mining Trial – West Balranald Deposit subject to OUT13/28341
SSD-5285	Minister for Planning	5 April 2016	The construction, operation, rehabilitation and closure of the Balranald Project

5.3 Approvals required

While the Balranald Project requires approval under Part 9 of the EPBC Act, it also requires a number of approvals in NSW and Victoria. One element of the Balranald Project, the transmission line to supply power to the project, will also be subject to a separate referral process under the EPBC Act.

Notwithstanding the above, as discussed in Section 5.2.1 below, the action subject of this EIS excludes all project elements in Victoria and some elements in NSW, including the transmission line.

Details on approvals required for the Balranald Project and how they relate to the action are discussed below.

5.3.1 Commonwealth approval

The EPBC Act provides a legal framework to protect and manage nationally and internationally important flora, fauna, ecological communities and heritage places which are defined as MNES.

MNES, as defined under the EPBC Act, include:

- world heritage properties;
- national heritage places;
- wetlands of international significance;
- listed threatened species and ecological communities;
- migratory species;
- Commonwealth marine areas;
- the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park;
- nuclear actions (including uranium mining); and
- a water resource in relation to coal seam gas development and large coal mining development.

Under the EPBC Act, actions (or developments) that may have a significant impact on a MNES are deemed to be 'controlled actions' and can only proceed with the approval of the Commonwealth Minister for the Environment. An action that potentially has an impact on a MNES is required to be referred to the Minister for the Environment for determination as to whether or not the action is a controlled action.

The Balranald Project was referred to the Commonwealth Minister for the Environment through the DoE on 20 August 2012 for consideration as a controlled action (reference EPBC 2012/6509) under the EPBC Act, based on potential impacts to listed threatened species.

The referral excluded the transmission line which will be subject to a separate referral. This referral is expected to be prepared and lodged in 2016.

On 25 October 2012, the Minister for the Environment Balranald Project confirmed that the Balranald Project was a controlled action as it may potentially impact the following MNES:

- world heritage properties;
- places listed on the National Heritage Register;
- listed threatened species and ecological communities; and
- listed migratory species.

These MNES are deemed to be the controlling provisions for the Balranald Project.

Following the provision of EPBC Act referral documentation, the delegate of the Minister for the Environment determined on 25 October 2012 that the action be assessed by an EIS. Subsequently on 22 November 2012, DoE issued the EIS Guidelines.

On 25 September 2014 Iluka lodged an application with DoE to vary the proposed action in accordance with sections 156A(1) and 156A(3) of EPBC Act. The proposed variation to the action sought to remove the following components from the proposed action such that they are not considered further as part of the proposed action:

- traffic movements generated by the Balranald Project in Victoria; and
- development of a rail loading facility at Manangatang (Victoria), and transport of ilmenite by rail to ports in Victoria.

The proposed variation also sought conformation that the proposed accommodation facility in Balranald town did not form part of the action.

The proposed variation was supported by documentation demonstrating that the above components would not have any significant impacts on the controlling provisions.

On 5 December 2014, the delegate of the Minister for the Environment accepted the proposed variation as requested. As such, for the purposes of the EPBC Act, the action excludes traffic movements generated by the Balranald Project in Victoria, development of a rail loading facility at Manangatang (Victoria), transport of ilmenite by rail to ports in Victoria and the accommodation facility in Balranald town. As such, it only includes those project elements described in Chapter 3 which are wholly contained in NSW.

This EIS has been prepared to address the EIS Guidelines issued on 22 November 2012 for the action as modified. It has also been prepared to address:

- comments on a preliminary draft EIS made by DoE following submission of the preliminary draft EIS on 12 June 2015.
- comments on the draft EIS (dated 29 January 2016) following public exhibition of the draft EIS between 12 February and 10 March 2016; and
- comments on the biodiversity assessment and BOP provided to community groups on 24 June 2016.

Further details on comments on the draft EIS, biodiversity assessment and BOP are provided in Section 6.8.

5.3.2 Key NSW approvals

i Overview

In NSW, three key planning approvals are required:

- development consent from the NSW Minister for Planning or his delegate under the SSD provisions under Part 4, Division 4.1 of the EP&A Act for:
 - construction, operation and rehabilitation of the West Balranald and Nepean mines;
 - processing of extracted ore to produce HMC and ilmenite;
 - transport of HMC and ilmenite by road to Victoria either for further mineral processing or directly to market;
- either approval from Essential Energy and/or Transgrid under Part 5 of the EP&A Act or approval under the SSD provisions under Part 4 of the EP&A Act for the transmission line; and
- development consent under Part 4 of the EP&A Act for an accommodation facility in Balranald town (as may be required).

Further details on these approvals are provided below.

ii SSD application

An EIS (the NSW EIS) is also required to be prepared to accompany the SSD application under Part 4 of the EP&A Act.

As part of the SSD application process, the NSW EIS was prepared by EMM with input from various technical specialists. It was prepared to address specific requirements provided in the Secretary's environmental assessment requirements (SEARs) for the SSD application, issued on 2 December 2014. It was prepared to inform government authorities and other stakeholders about the Balranald Project, and the measures that will be included to mitigate, manage and/or monitor potential impacts and the resultant social, economic and environmental impacts, both positive and negative.

A draft NSW EIS was lodged with DP&E on 14 April 2015 for an adequacy review by DP&E. Following review, on 23 April 2015, it was deemed adequate for finalisation and exhibition.

The NSW EIS was placed on public exhibition for a period of 34 days from 3 June to 6 July 2015 at the following locations:

- DP&E information centre - 23-33 Bridge Street, Sydney;
- Nature Conservation Council - Level 2, 5 Wilson Street, Newtown; and
- BSC administration centre - 70 Market Street, Balranald.

It was also made available on DP&E's website and copies were sent to government agencies nominated by DP&E. Iluka also made copies available to councillors of BSC and landholders within and surrounding the project area.

Exhibition details were advertised within local and regional newspaper, the Guardian and Riverine Grazier, and on DP&E's website.

In response, Iluka received 12 submissions, including nine submissions from government (including eight submissions from NSW government agencies and one submission from BSC) and three submissions from community members.

The majority of submissions from NSW government agencies provided support to the Balranald Project and provided recommended conditions of consent. Only one agency submission, from the Office of Environment and Heritage (OEH) requested additional information be provided in relation to Aboriginal cultural heritage and biodiversity matters.

Of the three submissions from community members, one submission provided support to the Balranald Project, one questioned how air quality and water monitoring will be undertaken, and only one raised concerns regarding the project.

A response to submissions (RTS) document was prepared by EMM and lodged with DP&E on 20 November 2011 which responded to all matters raised in the submissions. The RTS document was subsequently circulated by DP&E to all NSW government agencies who provided comments on the EIS.

Following consideration of NSW EIS, submissions received on the EIS, and the RTS, development consent (SSD-5285) was granted by a delegate for the Minister for Planning on 5 April 2016.

iii Transmission line

The approval path for the transmission line under the EP&A Act depends on who owns and operates the line, and this has yet to be determined. Should either Essential Energy or Transgrid own and operate the transmission line, an approval under Part 5 of the EP&A Act will be required. However, should Iluka own and operate the transmission line, approval under the SSD provisions under Part 4 of the EP&A Act will be required.

A review of environmental factors (REF) is required to be prepared to accompany an application under Part 5 of the EP&A Act for the transmission line. An EIS is required to accompany an application for a SSD under Part 4 of the EP&A Act.

It is expected that the application and the REF or EIS will be prepared and submitted to the relevant approval body in 2016. As previously stated, the transmission line is not subject to the action being assessed in this EIS.

iv Accommodation facility

As discussed in Chapter 3, the Balranald Project includes an accommodation facility at the mine site to cater for the construction and operational workforce required for the life of the project. Iluka is also investigating lodging a separate DA under Part 4 of the EP&A Act with BSC to locate the accommodation facility within Balranald town. In the event that approval is received for both options, Iluka would only construct an accommodation facility at one of the approved locations.

As previously stated, the town accommodation facility is not subject to the action being assessed in this EIS.

The application for the town accommodation facility has yet to be prepared. It is anticipated it will be lodged in 2016.

5.3.3 Key Victorian approvals

In Victoria, one key approval is required, including a planning permit under the P&E Act from HRCC for the construction and operation of a proposed rail loading facility in Manangatang, approximately 110 km south-west of Balranald town.

A statement of environmental effects (SEE) is required to be prepared to accompany the permit application. It is expected that the application and SEE will be prepared and lodged with SHRCC in 2016.

As previously stated, the Manangatang rail loading facility is not subject to the action being assessed in this EIS.

5.4 Commonwealth legislation

5.4.1 Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999

Details on approval requirements under the EPBC Act have been discussed above in Section 5.2.1.

5.4.2 Native Title Act 1993

The Commonwealth *Native Title Act 1993* (NT Act) allows a native title determination application (native title claim) to be made in respect of land or waters where native title has not been validly extinguished (eg extinguished by the grant of freehold land).

A register of native title claims is maintained by the National Native Title Tribunal. Applications for compensation for extinguishment or impairment of native title rights can also be made. All native title claims are subjected to a registration test and claims will only be registered if claimants satisfy a number of conditions.

Proposed activities or development that may affect native title are called 'future acts'. Claimants whose native title claims have been registered have the right to negotiate about some future acts, including mining and the granting of a mining lease, over the land the subject of their native title claim. Where a native title claim is not registered a development can proceed through the mediation and determination processes, though claimants will not be able to participate in future act negotiations.

A future act includes the granting of a mining lease over Crown land or reserves. While there are Crown reserves proximate to the project area, the proposed mining lease area will not cover these reserves and the Native Title Act therefore does not apply to the Balranald Project.

5.4.3 Water Act 2007

The Commonwealth *Water Act 2007* commenced on 3 March 2008 and implemented key reforms for water management in Australia, including:

- establishing the Murray-Darling Basin Authority (MDBA) with the functions and powers needed to ensure that water resources in the Murray-Darling Basin (MDB) are managed in an integrated and sustainable way;
- requiring the MDBA to prepare a strategic plan (the Basin Plan) for the integrated and sustainable management of water resources in the MDB; and
- establishing a Commonwealth Environmental Water Holder to manage the Commonwealth's environmental water to protect and restore the environmental assets of the Basin and outside the Basin where the Commonwealth owns water.

i Murray-Darling Basin Authority

The MDBA oversees water planning considering the MDB as a whole, rather than state by state. Key functions of the MDBA under the *Water Act 2007* include:

- preparing a Basin Plan for adoption by the Minister, including setting sustainable limits on water that can be taken from surface and groundwater systems across the Basin (known as sustainable diversion limits or SDLs);
- advising the Minister on the accreditation of state water resource plans;
- developing a water rights information service which facilitates water trading across the MDB;
- measuring and monitoring water resources in the MDB;
- gathering information and undertaking research; and
- engaging the community in the management of the MDB's resources.

ii The Basin Plan

The *Water Act 2007* requires the MDBA to prepare the Basin Plan and establishes mandatory content for the plan, including:

- limits on the amount of water (both surface and ground water) that can be taken from MDB water resources on a sustainable basis;
- identification of risks to MDB water resources, such as climate change, and strategies to manage those risks;
- requirements that a state water resource plan will need to comply with if it is to be accredited under the Act;
- an environmental watering plan to optimise environmental outcomes for the MDB by specifying environmental objectives, watering priorities and targets for Basin water resources;

- a water quality and salinity management plan which may include targets; and
- rules about trading of water rights in relation to Basin water resources.

A draft Basin Plan was released on 28 May 2012 following consultation with various stakeholders. Following amendments, the Basin Plan was adopted by the Federal Water Minister on 22 November 2012.

The Basin Plan provides a coordinated approach to water use across the Basin's four states and the Australian Capital Territory (ACT). It limits water use at environmentally sustainable levels by determining long-term average SDLs for both surface water and groundwater resources. SDLs are the maximum long-term annual average quantities of water that can be taken on a sustainable basis from MDB water resources as a whole, and from each SDL resource unit, from 2019.

The MDBA has determined 10,873 gigalitres (GL) per year to be the volume of surface water that reflects an environmentally sustainable level of take as a long term average with different limits for every river valley in the MDB. This would provide an additional 2,750 GL per year of water returned to the MDB's rivers. For groundwater, this volume is 3,324 GL per year.

The MDBA estimates that, as of 30 June 2012, 1,547 GL per year had been recovered for the environment. As of December 2013, 1,894 GL of the 2,750 GL SDL reduction target set out in the Basin Plan had been secured.

The MDB has been divided into 29 surface water SDL resource units and 66 groundwater SDL resource units. Surface water SDL resource units SS15 Murrumbidgee and SS18 Lower Darling, and groundwater SDL resource units GS50 Western Porous Rock and GS28 Lower Murrumbidgee Alluvium cover the project area.

The location of the surface water and groundwater SDL resource units can be seen in Figures 5.1 and 5.2.

Schedule 2 of the Basin Plan sets the SDLs for each surface water SDL resource unit as a formula: it is the baseline diversion limit (BDL) minus the local reduction amount and, where applicable, the shared reduction amount. The schedule includes notes of the MDBA's estimates, in GL per year, of the quantity of water represented by BDLs, SDLs, the amount of environmental water already recovered and the remaining gap. For SS15 Murrumbidgee the following SDL has been prescribed:

The limit is the BDL minus 320 GL per year (local reduction amount) minus the SDL resource unit shared reduction amount.

Note 1: The Authority estimates the BDL to be 2501 GL per year and therefore this limit is estimated to be 2181 GL per year minus the SDL resource unit shared reduction amount.

Note 2: As of 30 June 2012, the reduction achieved is estimated to be 173 GL per year and thus the gap remaining is estimated to be 147 GL per year in relation to the local reduction amount for this SDL resource unit.

For SS15 Lower Darling, the following SDL has been prescribed:

The limit is the BDL minus 8 GL per year (local reduction amount) minus the SDL resource unit shared reduction amount.

Note 1: The Authority estimates the BDL to be 60.5 GL per year and therefore this limit is estimated to be 52.5 GL per year minus the SDL resource unit shared reduction amount.

Note 2: As of 30 June 2012, the reduction achieved is estimated to be 2.8 GL per year and thus the gap remaining is estimated to be 5.2 GL per year in relation to the local reduction amount for this SDL resource unit.

These estimates are summarised in Table 5.2.


Table 5.2 Estimate surface water SDLs

Surface-water SDL resource unit	Estimated BDL (GL/y)	Local reduction amount GL/y)	Shared reduction amount (GL/y)	Estimated long-term average SDL (GL/y)	Local reduction achieved from BDL	Local gap remaining
	A	B	C	D = A – B – C	As of 30 Sept 2011 (GL/y)	
Murrumbidgee (SS15)	2,501	320	X9	2,181 – X9	137	183
Lower Darling (SS18)	60.5	8	X11	52.5 – X11	0.4	7.6

Schedule 4 of the Basin Plan sets the SDLs for each groundwater SDL resource unit. For GS50 Western Porous Rock, the prescribed SDL is 116.6 GL per year. For GS28 Lower Murrumbidgee Alluvium the prescribed SDL is 26.9 GL per year for the shallow Shepparton Formation and 273.6 GL per year for the deep Calivil Formation and Renmark Group.

The long-term average SDLs set out in schedules 2 and 4 of the Basin Plan take effect on 1 July 2019, by which point they will be incorporated in state water resource plans which are required to be accredited under the *Water Act 2007*. Accredited water resource plans will be an important means for the states and the ACT to align their water management with elements of the Basin Plan.


As of April 2015, NSW had not produced any state water resource plans to address the SDLs required for surface water SDL resource units SS15 Murrumbidgee and SS18 Lower Darling, and groundwater SDL resource unit GS50 Western Porous Rock which cover the project area.



Boundary of surface water SDL resource units

Balranald Mineral Sands Project
Environmental Impact Statement

Figure 5.1



Boundary of groundwater SDL resource units

Balranald Mineral Sands Project
Environmental Impact Statement

Figure 5.2

5.5 NSW legislation

5.5.1 Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979

i Planning approval requirements

The EP&A Act and the NSW *Environmental Planning and Assessment Regulation 2000* (EP&A Regulation) form the statutory framework for planning approval and environmental assessment in NSW. Implementation of the EP&A Act is the responsibility of the Minister for Planning, statutory authorities and local councils. It contains three parts that impose requirements for planning approvals:

- Part 4 which provides for control of 'development' that requires development consent from the relevant consent authority. A division of Part 4 (Division 4.1) provides for control of SSD where the Minister for Planning (or delegate) is the consent authority;
- Part 5 which provides for control of 'activities' that do not require approval or development consent under or Part 4; and
- Part 5A which provides for control of State significant infrastructure that do not require approval or development consent under Part 4.

The requirement for development consent is set out in environmental planning instruments (EPIs); state environmental planning policies (SEPPs), regional environmental plans (REPs) or local environmental plans (LEPs).

ii State significant development approval process

Section 89C(2) of the EP&A Act states that:

... State environmental planning policy may declare any development, or any class or description of development, to be State significant development.

Schedule 1 of the State and Regional Development SEPP identifies what constitutes SSD, with one form being development for the purpose of mineral sands mining. As the Balranald Project is of a kind described within Schedule 1 of the State and Regional Development SEPP (ie mineral sands mining), it meets the requirements for SSD (see below for further information).

Under section 89D of the EP&A Act, the NSW Minister for Planning is the consent authority for SSD. However, pursuant to section 23 of the Act, the Minister may delegate the consent authority function to the Planning Assessment Commission (PAC), the Director-General or to any other public authority.

A DA for SSD must be accompanied by an EIS, prepared in accordance with the EP&A Regulation. Before preparing an EIS, an applicant must request SEARs (which are essentially terms of reference and were previously known as Director-General's requirements) which specify what must be addressed in an EIS. The SEARs for the Balranald Project were first issued on 25 May 2012 and then revised on 2 December 2014.

A draft NSW EIS was lodged with DP&E on 14 April 2015 for an adequacy review. Following review, on 23 April 2015 it was deemed adequate for finalisation and exhibition. The NSW EIS was placed on public exhibition for a period of 34 days from 3 June to 6 July 2015.

In response to the exhibition of the NSW EIS, Iluka received 12 submissions. A RTS document was prepared by EMM and lodged with DP&E on 20 November 2011.

Following consideration of NSW EIS, submissions received on the EIS, and the RTS, development consent (SSD-5285) was granted by a delegate for the Minister for Planning on 5 April 2016.

iii Environmental planning instruments

The following environmental planning instruments are relevant to the Balranald Project:

- State and Regional Development SEPP;
- *State Environmental Planning Policy (Mining, Petroleum Production and Extractive Industries) 2007* (the Mining SEPP);
- *State Environmental Planning Policy No. 33 – Hazardous and Offensive Development* (SEPP 33);
- *State Environmental Planning Policy No. 44 – Koala Habitat Protection* (SEPP 44);
- *State Environmental Planning Policy No 55 – Remediation of Land* (SEPP 55); and
- *Balranald Local Environmental Plan 2010* (Balranald LEP).

The relevant provisions of the above instruments to the Balranald Project are discussed in the following sections.

a. State Environmental Planning Policy (State and Regional Development) 2005

The State and Regional Development SEPP, among other matters, defines certain development that is SSD. Clause 8 of the SEPP states:

- (1) Development is declared to be State significant development for the purposes of the Act if:
 - (a) the development on the land concerned is, by the operation of an environmental planning instrument, not permissible without development consent under Part 4 of the Act; and
 - (b) the development is specified in Schedule 1 or 2.

Schedule 1 of the State and Regional Development SEPP defines a range of general SSDs, including mining. Clause 5 of Schedule 1 states:

- (1) Development for the purpose of mining that:
 - (a) is coal or mineral sands mining; or
 - (b) is in an environmentally sensitive area of State significance; or
 - (c) has a capital investment value of more than \$30 million.

The Balranald Project is a development for the purposes of mineral sands mining and will have a capital investment value exceeding \$30 M. It will not, however, be developed in an environmentally sensitive area of State significance.

The Balranald Project is not permissible without development consent (ie is permissible with development consent) under the Mining SEPP and the Balranald LEP.

The Balranald Project meets both the requirements of clause 8 of the State and Regional Development SEPP as it is not permissible without development consent and is development specified in Schedule 1. Therefore, the Balranald Project is SSD for the purposes of the EP&A Act.

b. [State Environmental Planning Policy \(Mining, Petroleum Production and Extractive Industries\) 2007](#)

The Mining SEPP provides for the proper management and development of mineral, petroleum and extractive material resources for the social and economic welfare of NSW. The Mining SEPP establishes appropriate planning controls to encourage ecologically sustainable development.

Aims

Clause 2 of the Mining SEPP sets out its aims. It states:

The aims of this Policy are, in recognition of the importance to New South Wales of mining, petroleum production and extractive industries:

- (a) to provide for the proper management and development of mineral, petroleum and extractive material resources for the purpose of promoting the social and economic welfare of the State; and
- (b) to facilitate the orderly and economic use and development of land containing mineral, petroleum and extractive material resources; and
- (b1) to promote the development of significant mineral resources; and
- (c) to establish appropriate planning controls to encourage ecologically sustainable development through the environmental assessment, and sustainable management, of development of mineral, petroleum and extractive material resources; and
- (d) to establish a gateway assessment process for certain mining and petroleum (oil and gas) development:
 - (i) to recognise the importance of agricultural resources; and
 - (ii) to ensure protection of strategic agricultural land and water resources; and
 - (iii) to ensure a balanced use of land by potentially competing industries; and
 - (iv) to provide for the sustainable growth of mining, petroleum and agricultural industries.

For the reasons set out in the chapter, the Balranald Project is considered to be consistent with these aims.

Permissibility

Clause 7 of the Mining SEPP defines what mining development can be undertaken with development consent. It states:

- (1) Mining

Development for any of the following purposes may be carried out only with development consent:

...

(b) mining carried out:
 - (i) on land where development for the purposes of agriculture or industry may be carried out (with or without development consent); or
 - ...

Under the Balranald LEP, the project area is zoned RU1 Primary Production within which agriculture is permissible with consent. Accordingly, the Balranald Project is permissible with development consent under the Mining SEPP.

Matters for consideration

Part 3 of the Mining SEPP outlines matters for consideration in DAs. The clauses relevant to the Balranald Project are detailed below.

Non-discretionary development standards

Clause 12AB of the Mining SEPP sets out a number of non-discretionary development standards for the purposes of section 79C(2) and (3) of the EP&A Act in relation to the carrying out of development for the purposes of mining. These standards relate to cumulative noise level, cumulative air quality level and aquifer interference and were considered by DP&E when undertaking its assessment of the NSW EIS.

Compatibility of the mine with other land uses

Clause 12 of the Mining SEPP requires the consent authority to consider the compatibility of the development with other land uses, and states:

Before determining an application for consent for development for the purposes of mining, petroleum production or extractive industry, the consent authority must:

- (a) consider:
 - (i) the existing uses and approved uses of land in the vicinity of the development; and
 - (ii) whether or not the development is likely to have a significant impact on the uses that, in the opinion of the consent authority having regard to land use trends, are likely to be the preferred uses of land in the vicinity of the development; and
 - (iii) any ways in which the development may be incompatible with any of those existing, approved or likely preferred uses; and

- (b) evaluate and compare the respective public benefits of the development and the land uses referred to in paragraph (a) (i) and (ii); and
- (c) evaluate any measures proposed by the applicant to avoid or minimise any incompatibility, as referred to in paragraph (a)(iii).

Potential impacts on existing land uses were addressed in the NSW EIS. This demonstrated that the Balranald Project will not have a significant impact on existing and approved land uses in the vicinity of the project area.

Consideration of voluntary land acquisition and mitigation policy

Clause 12A of the Mining SEPP requires consent authorities to consider any applicable provisions of the voluntary land acquisition and mitigation policy before determining an application for consent for SSD for the purposes of mining, petroleum production or extractive industry. It states:

- (2) Before determining an application for consent for State significant development for the purposes of mining, petroleum production or extractive industry, the consent authority must consider any applicable provisions of the voluntary land acquisition and mitigation policy and, in particular:
 - (a) any applicable provisions of the policy for the mitigation or avoidance of noise or particulate matter impacts outside the land on which the development is to be carried out; and
 - (b) any applicable provisions of the policy relating to the developer making an offer to acquire land affected by those impacts.
- (3) To avoid doubt, the obligations of a consent authority under this clause extend to any application to modify a development consent for State significant development for the purposes of mining, petroleum production or extractive industry.

The reference to the voluntary land acquisition and mitigation policy is the *Voluntary Land Acquisition and Mitigation Policy* which was published by the NSW Minister for Planning in the Government Gazette on 19 December 2014. The *Voluntary Land Acquisition and Mitigation Policy* describes how consent authority's are to deal with predicted noise and dust impacts from State significant mining, petroleum production and extractive industry proposals when determining DAs for those proposals.

The provisions of the *Voluntary Land Acquisition and Mitigation Policy* were considered in the noise and air quality assessments which were prepared as part of the NSW EIS.

Compatibility of proposal with mining

Clause 13 of the Mining SEPP relates to matters a consent authority must take into consideration when determining applications for development that is:

- in the vicinity of an existing mine, petroleum production facility or extractive industry;
- identified on a map as being the location of State or regionally significant resources of minerals, petroleum or extractive materials; or
- identified by an environmental planning instrument as being the location of significant resources of minerals, petroleum or extractive materials.

Clause 13(2) states:

Before determining an application to which this clause applies, the consent authority must:

- (a) consider:
 - (i) the existing uses and approved uses of land in the vicinity of the development; and
 - (ii) whether or not the development is likely to have a significant impact on current or future extraction or recovery of minerals, petroleum or extractive materials (including by limiting access to, or impeding assessment of, those resources); and
 - (iii) any ways in which the development may be incompatible with any of those existing or approved uses or that current or future extraction or recovery; and
- (b) evaluate and compare the respective public benefits of the development and the uses, extraction and recovery referred to in paragraph (a) (i) and (ii); and
- (c) evaluate any measures proposed by the applicant to avoid or minimise any incompatibility, as referred to in paragraph (a) (iii).

Therefore, this clause requires the consent authority to consider the proposal's potential impact on other mining, petroleum production and extractive industries within the local area.

The Balranald Project is located proximate to an existing small gypsum mine. It is also located approximately 20 km from Cristal's Atlas-Campaspe Minerals Sands Project being the northern extent of the Nepean mine, which has yet to commence construction. The Balranald Project would not directly, or indirectly, impact on these mines.

There are also a number of other lineal mineral sand deposits located proximate to the West Balranald and Nepean deposits. Some of these deposits are covered by existing exploration licences (ELs) issued under the *NSW Mining Act 1992* (Mining Act), held by Iluka and others. The Balranald Project has been designed to ensure that it does not impact on the ability to extract or recover those deposits in the future (including by limiting access to, or impeding assessment of, those resources).

Natural resource and environmental management

Clause 14 of the Mining SEPP requires the consent authority to consider natural resources management, and states:

- (1) Before granting consent for development for the purposes of mining, petroleum production or extractive industry, the consent authority must consider whether or not the consent should be issued subject to conditions aimed at ensuring that the development is undertaken in an environmentally responsible manner, including conditions to ensure the following:
 - (a) that impacts on significant water resources, including surface and groundwater resources, are avoided, or are minimised to the greatest extent practicable,
 - (b) that impacts on threatened species and biodiversity, are avoided, or are minimised to the greatest extent practicable,
 - (c) that greenhouse gas emissions are minimised to the greatest extent practicable.

- (2) Without limiting subclause (1), in determining a development application for development for the purposes of mining, petroleum production or extractive industry, the consent authority must consider an assessment of the greenhouse gas emissions (including downstream emissions) of the development, and must do so having regard to any applicable State or national policies, programs or guidelines concerning greenhouse gas emissions.

An assessment of the Balranald Project's potential impacts on biodiversity and water resources are addressed in Chapters 9 and 12 respectively. An assessment of the Balranald Project's greenhouse gas emissions was prepared as part of the NSW EIS. It demonstrates that greenhouse gas emissions are minor.

Resource recovery

Clause 15 of the Mining SEPP requires the consent authority to consider the efficiency of resource recovery, and states:

- (1) Before granting consent for development for the purposes of mining, petroleum production or extractive industry, the consent authority must consider the efficiency or otherwise of the development in terms of resource recovery.
- (2) Before granting consent for the development, the consent authority must consider whether or not the consent should be issued subject to conditions aimed at optimising the efficiency of resource recovery and the reuse or recycling of material.
- (3) The consent authority may refuse to grant consent to development if it is not satisfied that the development will be carried out in such a way as to optimise the efficiency of recovery of minerals, petroleum or extractive materials and to minimise the creation of waste in association with the extraction, recovery or processing of minerals, petroleum or extractive materials.

The Balranald Project has been designed to maximise the efficiency of resource recovery. A range of alternatives have been considered for the Balranald Project. Evaluation of the alternatives has, among other things, considered resource recovery efficiency including mining method, material handling strategies, tailings and mining by-product management and product transport options. A description of the alternatives considered is provided in Chapter 4.

Transport

Clause 16 of the Mining SEPP requires the consent authority to consider the implications of transport of materials in connection of the development on public roads, and states:

- (1) Before granting consent for development for the purposes of mining or extractive industry that involves the transport of materials, the consent authority must consider whether or not the consent should be issued subject to conditions that do any one or more of the following:
 - (a) require that some or all of the transport of materials in connection with the development is not to be by public road;
 - (b) limit or preclude truck movements, in connection with the development, that occur on roads in residential areas or on roads near to schools; and
 - (c) require the preparation and implementation, in relation to the development, of a code of conduct relating to the transport of materials on public roads.

The Balranald Project would transport materials (including HMC, ilmenite and may transport Hamilton MSP by-products) on public roads in NSW. A traffic assessment was prepared as part of the NSW EIS. It demonstrates that the Balranald Project would not have a significant impact on the road network.

Rehabilitation

Clause 17 of the Mining SEPP requires the consent authority to consider rehabilitation. It states:

- (1) Before granting consent for development for the purposes of mining, petroleum production or extractive industry, the consent authority must consider whether or not the consent should be issued subject to conditions aimed at ensuring the rehabilitation of land that will be affected by the development.
- (2) In particular, the consent authority must consider whether conditions of the consent should:
 - (a) require the preparation of a plan that identifies the proposed end use and landform of the land once rehabilitated; or
 - (b) require waste generated by the development or the rehabilitation to be dealt with appropriately; or
 - (c) require any soil contaminated as a result of the development to be remediated in accordance with relevant guidelines (including guidelines under section 145C of the Act and the *Contaminated Land Management Act 1997*); or
 - (d) require steps to be taken to ensure that the state of the land, while being rehabilitated and at the completion of the rehabilitation, does not jeopardize public safety.

The above aspects are considered in Chapter 17 and in detail in the rehabilitation and closure strategy which is contained in Appendix F.

c. State Environmental Planning Policy No. 33 – Hazardous and Offensive Development

SEPP 33 requires the consent authority to consider hazard potential of proposed activities including the location of the development, the way in which it is to be carried out, and the storage of dangerous goods. Mining of mineral sands is not identified as a potentially hazardous or offensive industry. However, the Balranald Project may be determined to be a potentially hazardous development if the storage of dangerous goods exceeds the requirements of *Hazardous and Offensive Development Application Guidelines: Applying SEPP 33* (DP&I 2011) (Applying SEPP 33).

An assessment of hazard potential of the Balranald Project against Applying SEPP 33 was undertaken as part of the NSW EIS. It found that the storage of dangerous goods would comply with threshold quantities and distances to site boundaries specified in DP&E's guideline Applying SEPP 33. Subject to these setbacks being maintained and provided that dangerous goods such as diesel, petrol oils and LPG/LNG are stored in accordance with relevant standards, the Balranald Project will not be a hazardous or offensive development.

d. [State Environmental Planning Policy No. 44 – Koala Habitat Protection](#)

SEPP 44 encourages the conservation and management of koala habitats, to ensure permanent free-living koala populations will be maintained over their present range. SEPP 44 requires the consent authority to consider if the land in the development application is ‘potential koala habitat’ or ‘core koala habitat’.

An assessment of potential and core koala habitat has been undertaken for the Balranald Project (refer to Chapter 9) and has determined the project area does not contain any potential or core koala habitat.

e. [State Environmental Planning Policy No 55 – Remediation of Land](#)

SEPP 55 was enacted to provide a state-wide approach to the remediation of contaminated land for the purpose of minimising the risk to human health and the environment. No contaminated lands have been identified within the project area that would be disturbed by mining or for mining associated purposes. Should contaminated sites be encountered during construction and operation of the Balranald Project, these sites would be assessed and treated as required.

f. [Balranald Local Environmental Plan 2010](#)

As stated above, under the Balranald LEP, the project area is zoned RU1 Primary Production. Within this zone, open cut mining is permissible with development consent. Open cut mining is defined as “mining carried out on, and by excavating, the earth’s surface, but does not include underground mining.”

iv [Planning agreements](#)

One of the matters of consideration under section 79C of the EP&A Act is the relevant provisions of any planning agreements. Section 93F of the EP&A Act relates to planning agreements, which:

... is a voluntary agreement or other arrangement under this Division between a planning authority (or 2 or more planning authorities) and a person (the developer):

- (a) who has sought a change to an environmental planning instrument; or
- (b) who has made, or proposes to make, a development application; or
- (c) who has entered into an agreement with, or is otherwise associated with, a person to whom paragraph (a) or (b) applies, under which the developer is required to dedicate land free of cost, pay a monetary contribution, or provide any other material public benefit, or any combination of them, to be used for or applied towards a public purpose.

Section 93F enables the applicant (or proponent) of a development to enter into a voluntary planning agreement (VPA) or another arrangement with planning authorities in lieu of a section 94 contribution. Iluka propose to progress discussions with BSC on potential Iluka involvement in or support towards relevant community programs that provide material public benefits. It is noted that Condition 18 of the development consent issued under the EP&A Act for the Balranald Project requires Iluka to enter into a VPA with BSC prior to commencement of construction of the West Balranald mine.

v Likely impacts of the development

This EIS and the NSW EIS comprehensively describes the likely impacts of Balranald Project, including environmental impacts on both the natural and built environments, and social and economic impacts in the local area, region and State. It also describes commitments proposed by Iluka to mitigate and manage these impacts. These descriptions are based on technical studies prepared by specialists using the most recent and accurate scientific data relevant to the Balranald Project in consideration of current policies and legislation. In addition, the technical studies adopted conservative assumptions to enable the upper limit of likely impacts to be assessed.

In granting development consent for the Balranald Project, the NSW Minister for Planning and DP&E concluded that the project will not have significant adverse impacts. In its assessment report (April 2016), DP&E concluded that:

... the impacts of the project can be adequately minimised, managed, or at least compensated for, to an acceptable standard ...

vi Suitability of the site for the development

It is considered that the site of the Balranald Project (the project area) is suitable for a mineral sands mine. Principally, the Balranald Project would facilitate the recovery of mineral sand reserves within the footprint of an EL granted under the Mining Act. It would also be undertaken on privately-owned land where open cut mining is permissible. It is considered to be broadly compatible with surrounding land uses, particularly considering the proposed rehabilitation and closure strategy which would result in no long term net loss of agriculture land. A range of commitments have been made by Iluka to mitigate potential impacts of the Balranald Project on surrounding land uses. Subject to the application of the commitments, the Balranald Project is unlikely to have a significant impact on these land uses.

In granting development consent for the Balranald Project, the NSW Minister for Planning and DP&E concluded that the site is suitable for the Balranald Project. In its assessment report (April 2016), DP&E concluded that:

... the site is suitable for the project, as it contains State significant mineral resources within a region recognised as having the primary economically recoverable mineral sands resources in NSW, is relatively sparsely populated, and is a permissible development on the land. The project site and surrounds predominantly comprises cleared grazing land, with the majority of native vegetation of limited conservation value due to historic grazing. The operation of the project would not compromise the long-term use of the land for agricultural purposes ...

vii Submissions

Like this EIS, the NSW EIS was placed on public exhibition for a period of 34 days from 3 June to 6 July 2015 by DP&E and submissions sought from BSC, government agencies and the community.

In response, Iluka received 12 submissions, including nine submissions from government (including eight submissions from NSW government agencies and one submission from BSC) and three submissions from community members. The majority of submissions from NSW government agencies provided support to the project and provided recommended conditions of consent. Only one agency submission, from OEH requested additional information be provided in relation to Aboriginal cultural heritage and biodiversity matters. Of the three submissions from community members, one submission provided support to the Balranald Project, one questioned how air quality and water monitoring will be undertaken, and only one raised concerns regarding the project.

A RTS document was prepared by EMM and lodged with DP&E on 20 November 2011.

viii Public interest

In granting development consent for the Balranald Project, the NSW Minister for Planning and DP&E concluded that the project is in the public interest. In its assessment report (April 2016), DP&E concluded that:

... the project is considered to be in the public interest, particularly as it would:

- o be consistent with the NSW Government's vision for economic growth in regional areas through the development of the mineral sands industry in western NSW;
- o assist in ensuring continued supply of valuable minerals for a range of industrial and commercial purposes;
- o generate significant economic benefits for the region and State of NSW; and
- o facilitate employment for up to 225 personnel during construction and 550 personnel during operations.

5.6 Other NSW legislation

5.6.1 Mining Act 1992

The Mining Act makes provision for granting mining authorities, leases and licences for the exploration and mining of minerals and coal. The Mining Act places controls on methods of exploration and mining, the disposal of mining waste, land rehabilitation, and environmental management activities.

The Balranald Project requires the granting of a mining lease under the Mining Act. An application for the mining lease was lodged by Iluka on 9 November 2015. On 3 May 2016, DPI-Mineral Resources wrote to Iluka stating that the Department proposed to grant a mining lease subject to Iluka accepting the conditions of the lease and payment of lease fees, security bond and administrative fees.

5.6.2 Protection of the Environment Operations Act 1997

The NSW *Protection of the Environment Operations 1997* (POEO Act) is the principal NSW environmental protection legislation which is administered by the EPA. Schedule 1 of the POEO Act lists the 'scheduled activities' which are to be regulated by an environment protection licence (EPL) which includes criteria and monitoring requirements for environmental pollution. Schedule 1 includes:

- mineral processing;
- mining for minerals;
- waste disposal (application to land); and
- waste storage.

Each of these activities are described below.

Clause 26 of Schedule 1 of the POEO Act relates to 'mineral processing', including mineral waste generation. It states that activities which process more than 150 tonnes per day (tpd) of ores (using methods including chemical, electrical, magnetic, gravity or physical-chemical) and/or involves having on site at any time more than 5 t of prescribed waste, not including excluded material, are scheduled activities. Prescribed waste is defined as hazardous waste, restricted solid waste or liquid waste, or any combination of them. Excluded material is defined as contaminated soil, grease trap waste, waste stored prior to its lawful discharge to a sewer or waters, septic tank waste, stormwater or recoverable oil or oil and water mixture.

The Balranald Project would process more than 150 tpd of mineral sand. It is also likely to have more than 5 t of prescribed waste on site at any time. As stated in the radiation risk assessment in Appendix L, test work indicates that the mining by-products have been characterised as either restricted solid waste or hazardous waste. Therefore, the Balranald Project is scheduled activity under the POEO Act, for the purposes of a mineral processing activity.

Clause 29 of Schedule 1 of the POEO Act relates to 'mining for minerals', meaning the mining, processing or handling of minerals, that is to disturb a total surface area of more than 4 ha of land. The Balranald Project involves the mining, processing and handling of minerals and would disturb a total surface area exceeding 4 ha. The Balranald Project is, therefore, a scheduled activity for the purposes of mining for minerals.

Clause 39 of Schedule 1 of the POEO Act relates to 'waste disposal (application to land)'. It applies to the application to land of waste received from off site, including (but not limited to) application by ploughing, injecting or mixing into the land. The Balranald Project would dispose of mining by-products generated on and off-site. As stated above, the radiation risk assessment (Appendix L) states that these mining by-products have been characterised as either restricted solid waste or hazardous waste. Therefore, the Balranald Project is a scheduled activity under the POEO Act, for the purposes of waste disposal (application to land).

Clause 42 of Schedule 1 of the POEO Act relates to 'waste storage'. It states that activities which store more than 5 t of hazardous waste, restricted solid waste, liquid waste or special waste (other than waste tyres) on the premises at any time are scheduled activities. The Balranald Project would likely store more than 5 t of mining by-products which have been characterised as either restricted solid waste or hazardous waste at any one point in time, and is therefore defined as a scheduled activity under the POEO Act for the purposes of waste storage.

Accordingly, the Balranald Project is deemed to be a scheduled activity under the POEO Act for the purposes of mineral processing, mining for minerals, waste disposal (application to land) and waste storage and would require an EPL.

5.6.3 Water Act 1912 and Water Management Act 2000

The NSW *Water Act 1912* (Water Act) has historically been the main legislation for the management of NSW water resources. However the Water Act is progressively being repealed and replaced by the NSW *Water Management Act 2000* (WM Act) on a water source by water source basis as water sharing plans (WSPs) commence. The water sources in the vicinity of the Balranald Project have WSPs that have commenced and therefore most aspects of water management come under the WM Act.

However, some aspects of the Water Act are still operational across all of NSW, such as licenses for monitoring bores, and licensing of groundwater injection activities. Licensing of monitoring bores continues under the Water Act until a regulation surrounding aquifer interference activities provides a mechanism for an approval for these activities. Licensing of injection into groundwater systems is also still currently still managed under the Water Act.

As stated, the WM Act applies to those areas where a WSP has commenced. WSPs are statutory plans under the WM Act that apply to individual water source areas and which contain the rules for sharing and managing the water resources of NSW. The WM Act outlines the requirements for the taking and trading of water through water access licences (WALs), water supply works and water use approvals.

Groundwater and surface water within the project area is governed under the WM Act within the relevant WSPs which are discussed below.

WSPs aim to ensure sustainable and integrated management of NSW water by providing clear arrangements for activities that affect water quality and quantity. The plans sets management rules for WALs, water allocation accounts, dealings in licences and water allocations, water supply works approvals, and the extraction of water.

There are provisions in the surface water WSPs to provide water to support the ecological processes and environmental needs of the rivers, and direct how the surface water available for extraction is to be shared. The provisions in the groundwater WSPs provide water to support the ecological processes and environmental needs of high priority groundwater dependent ecosystems (GDEs) and rivers, and direct how the water available for extraction is to be shared.

There are a number of surface and groundwater WSPs that relate to water sources in and surrounding the project area, including:

Groundwater

- *Water Sharing Plan for the NSW Murray-Darling Basin Porous Rock Groundwater Sources 2011;*
- *Water Sharing Plan for the Lower Lachlan Groundwater Source 2003; and*
- *Water Sharing Plan for the Lower Murrumbidgee Groundwater Sources 2003.*

Surface water

- *Water Sharing Plan for the Murrumbidgee Regulated River Water Source 2003;*
- *Water Sharing Plan for the Lachlan Regulated River Water Source 2003;*
- *Water Sharing Plan for the New South Wales Murray and Lower Darling Regulated Rivers Water Sources 2003;*
- *Water Sharing Plan for the Lachlan Unregulated and Alluvial Water Sources 2012; and*
- *Water Sharing Plan for the Murrumbidgee Unregulated and Alluvial Water Sources 2012.*

Combined

- *Water Sharing Plan for the Lower Murray-Darling Unregulated and Alluvial Water Sources 2011.*

Of these, the Balranald Project would be required to be licensed to take (or extract) water in relation to two WSPs, namely:

- *Water Sharing Plan for the NSW Murray-Darling Basin Porous Rock Groundwater Sources 2011* (herein referenced as the MDB Porous Rock WSP); and
- *Water Sharing Plan for the Murrumbidgee Regulated River Water Source 2003* (herein referenced as the Murrumbidgee River WSP).

Under section 89J of the EP&A Act, water use and management approvals (under sections 89, 90 and 91 of the Water Act) are not required for SSD. However, SSD is not exempt from the obligation to secure an aquifer interference approval under section 91(3) of the WM Act and WALs under section 56 of the WM Act. However, it should be noted that section 91(3) of the WM Act has not yet commenced and aquifer interference approvals do not actually exist. The Balranald Project would need to comply with the *NSW Aquifer Interference Policy (AIP)* which requires licences for all water taken and intercepted from each relevant water source. This would be required for the Balranald Project under the relevant WSPs. Further details on the AIP are provided in Section 5.5.4.

An access licence may also be granted where the right to apply for the licence has been acquired in accordance with a controlled allocation order made under section 65 of the WM Act. Section 65 provides that:

The Minister may, by order published in the Gazette, declare that the right to apply for an access licence for a specified water management area or water source is to be acquired by auction, tender or other means specified in the order.

The Balranald Project would require:

- WALs under section 56 of the WM Act for the extraction of water (groundwater and surface water) from the relevant WSPs; and
- compliance with the AIP.

Further discussion on the water impacts of the Balranald Project is provided in Chapter 12.

i [*Water Sharing Plan for the NSW Murray-Darling Basin Porous Rock Groundwater Sources 2011*](#)

The MBD Porous Rock WSP commenced on 16 January 2012 and is due for extension or replacement in July 2022.

In general, the MBD Porous Rock WSP area includes all porous rock groundwater sources within the MDB and that are not included in other WSPs, such as porous rock groundwater sources in the *Water Sharing Plan for the Great Artesian Basin Groundwater Sources 2008*. The plan also includes minor miscellaneous, unmapped alluvial sediments that overly outcropping porous rock groundwater sources as well as fractured rocks that occur within groundwater sources that are predominantly porous rock.

The groundwater sources within the MBD Porous Rock WSP cover an area of:

- approximately 8,642,000 ha, which includes only the outcropped portions (ie that portion of the groundwater source with a surface expression); and
- approximately 3,436,000 ha, which includes only the buried portions (ie that portion of the groundwater source that is buried under another groundwater source and, therefore, has no surface expression).

There are four groundwater sources within the MBD Porous Rock WSP:

- the Gunnedah-Oxley Basin MDB Groundwater Source (a portion on the north eastern side of the MDB between Narrabri, Gunnedah and Dubbo eastward to the MDB border);
- the Oaklands Basin Groundwater Source (a portion in the south-central area of NSW that is completely buried by the Murray Basin alluvial sediments near Jerilderie);
- the Sydney Basin MDB Groundwater Source (a small portion of the Sydney Basin that occurs west of the dividing range on the eastern side of the MDB extending southward along the basin border to nearly Bathurst); and
- the Western Murray Porous Rock Groundwater Source (a portion in the far west of NSW from south of Broken Hill southward to the state border and to the west of the Lower Lachlan, Lower Murrumbidgee, and Lower Murray Groundwater Sources westward to the NSW border).

The project area lies within Western Murray Porous Rock Groundwater Source.

Section 4(6) of this WSP states that:

- (6) Subject to subclause (8), the Western Murray Porous Rock Groundwater Source includes all water contained in:
- (a) all rocks of Tertiary and Quaternary age within the outcropped and buried areas; and
 - (b) all alluvial sediments within the outcropped areas,
- within the boundary of the Western Murray Porous Rock Groundwater Source as shown on the Plan Map.

The Western Murray Porous Rock Groundwater Source covers an outcrop area of 7,302,000 ha. It extends from the boundary with the Adelaide and Kanmantoo Fold Belts in the north to the Murray River in the south. To the east the water source is bound by the boundary between the Kanmantoo and Lachlan Fold Belts. The water source incorporates the alluvial Renmark Group and Calivil Formation in the east which grade into the Murray Group Limestone and Loxton-Parilla Sands to the southwest.

Section 8 of the Basin Groundwater WSP states that:

The vision for this Plan is to provide for healthy and enhanced groundwater sources and water dependent ecosystems and for equitable water sharing among users in these groundwater sources.

The objectives of this Basin Groundwater WSP are to:

- (a) protect, preserve, maintain and enhance the high priority groundwater dependent ecosystems and important river flow dependent ecosystems of these groundwater sources;
- (b) protect, preserve, maintain and enhance the Aboriginal, cultural and heritage values of these groundwater sources;
- (c) protect basic landholder rights;
- (d) manage these groundwater sources to ensure equitable sharing between users;
- (e) provide opportunities for enhanced market based trading of access licences and water allocations within environmental and system constraints;
- (f) provide water allocation account management rules which allow sufficient flexibility in water use;
- (g) contribute to the maintenance of water quality;
- (h) provide recognition of the connectivity between surface water and groundwater;
- (i) adaptively manage these groundwater sources; and
- (j) contribute to the environmental and other public benefit outcomes identified under the Water Access Entitlements and Planning Framework in the Intergovernmental Agreement on a National Water Initiative (2004) (hereafter the NWI).

There are approximately 40,746 unit shares of entitlement (under licence) in the area covered by the MDB Porous Rock WSP. The majority of these licences are for industrial and mining purposes. Of these shares, 21,782 unit shares are licenced for the Western Murray Porous Rock Groundwater Source. In addition, a number of salt interception schemes operate in the Western Murray Porous Rock Groundwater Source; these are expected to be issued entitlements in the order of 14,582 unit shares. Basic landholder rights within the Western Murray Porous Rock Groundwater Source are estimated at 26,747 ML/year, and represent a significant volume of the total rights within this water source. There is also a significant amount of unassigned water within the source estimated to be 467,377ML/yr (refer Table 6.3).

The MDB Porous Rock WSP sets the annual groundwater recharge volumes for each identified groundwater source and the volumes of water available for sharing (the long-term average annual extraction limit). Provisions are made for environmental water allocations, basic landholder rights, domestic and stock rights and native title rights. The statistics for the Western Murray Porous Rock Groundwater Source availability are presented in Table 5.3.

Table 5.3 Requirements for water sharing (Western Murray Porous Rock Groundwater Source)

Use	Share component
Recharge	1,060,971 ML/yr (not high environmental value) 42,994 ML/yr (high environmental value)
Environmental water	530,485 (50% of recharge for not high environmental value) 42,994 ML/yr (100% of recharge for high environmental value) Plus all groundwater in storage
Long-term average annual extraction limit (LTAAEL)	530,486 ML/yr
Town water supply	0 ML/year
Basic rights (domestic and stock)	26,747 ML/yr
Native title	0 ML/yr
Aquifer access licences	21,780 unit shares ³
Salinity and water table management	14,582 ML/yr
Total water requirements ¹	63,109 ML/yr
Unallocated water ²	467,377 ML/yr

1. This number is not listed in the MDB Porous Rock WSP, but is calculated by summing all requirements for water under Part 5 of the plan for the Western Murray Porous Rock Groundwater Source and assuming 1 unit share is equal to 1 ML.
2. This number is not listed in the MDB Porous Rock WSP, but is calculated as the difference between the long-term average annual extraction limit minus the total water requirements.
3. A unit share is defined in section 29(2)(b) of the MDB Porous Rock WSP as being a maximum of 1 ML per unit share, or a lower amount if the volume of water extraction from the water source is deemed to be in excess of the LTAAEL over a three year rolling period by 5% or more.

As Table 5.3 shows, there is a significant amount of unallocated water within the Western Murray Porous Rock Groundwater Source of the MDB Porous Rock WSP.

The WSP does not however distinguish between aquifers containing highly saline water (ie requiring dewatering and injection into the same aquifer as part of the Balranald Project) and those aquifers containing water that has beneficial use.

The Balranald Project would abstract groundwater over a 10 year period, with a peak abstraction period spanning six years. Over this six year peak, Iluka would seek to abstract a 'gross' volume of groundwater in the order of between 20,000 and 30,000 ML/year, of which, approximately 90%, would be injected back into the same aquifer. These gross abstraction volumes (notwithstanding injection) are well within the sustainable limits of the Western Murray Porous Rock Groundwater Source and constitute only 6% of the current level of unallocated water within this source.

In accordance with the WM Act, a WAL may be granted where the right to apply for the licence has been acquired in accordance with an order made under section 65 of the Act.

Iluka currently have two WALs (WAL 31101 and 31102) that are, and have been, used to assign groundwater allocations for relevant trade periods with water supply works approval extraction locations nominated. As part of the Balranald Project, Iluka will continue to use one or both of these WALs to assign future groundwater allocations, while additional WALs may be applied for in accordance with the WM Act.

During 2013/14, Iluka negotiated third party water trades under the WM Act in the order of 1,100 ML (2013/14) and 900 ML (2014/15) to support field program activities. The groundwater allocation was secured from the Western Murray Porous Rock Groundwater Source and assigned to nominated water supply works approvals to facilitate Iluka's hydrogeological programs and a mining trial.

Iluka would obtain further allocations to support the Balranald Project from the Western Murray Porous Rock Groundwater Source through third party water trades and/or through controlled allocation orders under section 65 of the WM Act. These allocations would be obtained with consideration to return flow regulations which the NSW government initially proposed to introduce in 2015. As part of a controlled allocation order made on 9 September 2014, the NSW government stated that:

Return flow rules are likely to be made for aquifer access licences in the second half of 2014. Once these rules are put in place, licence holders will receive a credit to their water allocation account for water returned to the same groundwater source from which it was taken, providing specific conditions are met. Licence holders will only need to hold enough licence shares to account for the net amount of water extracted, ie the amount of water initially extracted minus the amount of water returned. Water usage fees will only be applied to the net amount of water extracted.

The return flow regulations have yet to be introduced or enacted. Iluka would seek credits for all injected water under the return flow regulation once it is enacted. As stated above, this regulation was set to commence in late 2014, but is yet to commence. Under this regulation Iluka would only required to hold the licence volume for the difference between the 'net' and 'gross' take of groundwater.

Iluka will continue to engage with the NSW Government regarding when the return flow rules are enacted and on the timing of a future controlled allocation order to secure a WAL for the Balranald Project.

ii [Water Sharing Plan for the Murrumbidgee Regulated River Water Source 2003](#)

The Murrumbidgee River WSP lies within the Murrumbidgee Water Management Area and the Murray Water Management Area. The water source is defined as the water between the banks of all rivers, from the upper limit of Burrinjuck Dam water storage (being the Taemas Bridge crossing) and Blowering Dam water storage (being the dam wall and spillway for Jounama Pondage), downstream to the junction of the Murrumbidgee and Murray rivers. This includes the Murrumbidgee River at Balranald where fresh water is proposed to be extracted to supply the project.

The Murrumbidgee River WSP commenced on 1 July 2004 and applied for a period of 10 years to 30 June 2014. In May 2014, the Minister for Natural Resources, Lands and Water approved an extension to the plan until its date of replacement (by 1 July 2015 or sooner). At the time of finalising this EIS, the Murrumbidgee River WSP had not been replaced.

Section 9 of the Murrumbidgee River WSP states that:

The vision for this Plan is to provide for equitable sharing of limited water resources to sustain a healthy and productive river and the welfare and well being of Murrumbidgee regional communities.

The objectives of this Murrumbidgee River WSP are to:

- (a) protect and restore in-river and riparian habitats and ecological processes;
- (b) provide for appropriate watering regimes for wetlands;
- (c) sustain and enhance population numbers and diversity of indigenous species;

- (d) protect basic landholder rights, as specified in the Water Management Act 2000, including native title rights;
- (e) maximise early season general security allocations;
- (f) protect town water supply;
- (g) protect end-of-system flows;
- (h) provide for commercial consumptive use;
- (i) provide for identified recreational water needs;
- (j) protect identified indigenous and traditional uses of water; and
- (k) within the ability of this Plan promote the recovery of known threatened species.

The provisions in the WSP provide water to support the ecological processes and environmental needs of the Murrumbidgee River and direct how the water available for extraction is to be shared. The plan also sets rules that effect the management of water access licences, water allocation accounts, the trading of or dealings in licences and water allocations, the extraction of water, the operation of dams and the management of water flows.

At the commencement of the Murrumbidgee River WSP, the following unit shares were available from the Murrumbidgee River:

- general security - 2,043,432 unit shares;
- high security - 298,021 unit shares;
- domestic and stock - 35,572 ML/year;
- local water utility - 23,403 ML/year;
- Murrumbidgee irrigation (conveyance) - 243,000 unit shares;
- Coleambally irrigation (conveyance) - 130,000 unit shares; and
- supplementary water - 220,000 unit shares.

The share components of licences such as local water utility and domestic and stock are expressed as a number of megalitres per year. The share components of high security and general security, conveyance and supplementary water access licences are expressed as a number of unit shares.

The unit share equivalent in megalitres would vary year to year depending on water availability in the river system. An Available Water Determination (AWD), as a percentage, would be made and this would determine what each unit share is equal to in megalitres. The mechanism for this is outlined in Part 8 Division 2 of the Murrumbidgee River WSP.

An AWD for regulated river (high security) access licences would generally be between 0.95 ML/unit share and 1 ML/unit share. There are some exceptions to this for extreme drought conditions. An AWD for regulated river (general security) access licences would not be made until the AWD for high security licences is greater than 0.95 ML/unit share.

The reliability of supply history for both general security and high security surface water licences in the Murrumbidgee River WSP is presented in Table 6.4. It tabulates average availability over the last five years, over the last 10 years (since commencement of the Murrumbidgee River WSP) and since 1983/84 when records of availability commenced.

Table 5.4 Average availability of high and general security water from the Murrumbidgee River WSP

Average availability	General security	High security
Average last 5 years	78%	98%
Average last 10 years (since commencement of the Murrumbidgee River WSP)	53%	96%
Average since 1983/84 (period of record)	86%	98%

An embargo on applications for new commercial (or industrial) water access licences has been in place for the since 1985. Under the WM Act, the only applications that can be made are for those categories or sub-categories specified in either the NSW *Water Management (General) Regulation 2011* or in the Murrumbidgee River WSP. This includes replacement access licences as a result of access licence dealings (or water dealings) which include:

- sale or transfer of the ownership of an access licence (called a transfer);
- change in the location where a water access licence can be used;
- sale of the share component of an access licence (called assigning share component);
- subdivision of an access licence or consolidation of access licences;
- sale of allocation water (called an assignment of water allocation);
- change in the category of an access licence (called a conversion); and/or
- rental of a water access licence (called a term transfer).

Iluka would obtain a 450 ML of high security water from the Murrumbidgee River WSP through access licence dealings to secure a fresh water supply for the Balranald Project.

5.6.4 National Parks and Wildlife Act 1974

The NSW *National Parks and Wildlife Act 1974* (NPW Act) provides for nature conservation in NSW including the conservation of places, objects and features of significance to Aboriginal people and protection of native flora and fauna. A person must not harm or desecrate an Aboriginal object or place without an Aboriginal heritage impact under section 90 of the NPW Act. However, a section 90 permit is not required for SSD approvals by virtue of section 89J of the EP&A Act.

Potential impacts to Aboriginal heritage objects resulting from the Balranald Project are detailed in Chapter 13.

5.6.5 Threatened Species Conservation Act 1995

The TSC Act aims to conserve biological diversity in NSW through the protection of threatened flora and fauna species and endangered ecological communities (EECs).

The potential impacts of the Balranald Project on threatened species and EECs listed under the TSC Act are discussed in Chapter 9.

5.6.6 Native Vegetation Act 2003

The NSW *Native Vegetation Act 2003* (NV Act) provides for the promotion, improvement and protection of native vegetation in NSW. Approval to clear native vegetation in NSW is required under the NV Act. Under section 89J of the EP&A Act, SSD is exempt from an authorisation to clear native vegetation under section 12 of the NV Act.

Potential impacts to native vegetation resulting from the Balranald Project are detailed in Chapter 9.

5.6.7 Roads Act 1993

The NSW *Roads Act 1993* (Roads Act) regulates activities that may impact on public roads in NSW. Section 138 of the Roads Act states that

A person must not:

- (a) erect a structure or carry out a work in, on or over a public road; or
- (b) dig up or disturb the surface of a public road; or
- (c) remove or interfere with a structure, work or tree on a public road; or
- (d) pump water into a public road from any land adjoining the road; or
- (e) connect a road (whether public or private) to a classified road;

other than with the consent of the appropriate roads authority.

As discussed in Chapter 3, some road improvements works are required as part of the Balranald Project. Any road works would require approvals under section 138 of the Roads Act from BSC and NSW Roads and Maritime Services (RMS).

5.6.8 Crown Lands Act 1989

The NSW *Crown Land Act 1989* (CL Act) sets out how Crown land is to be managed. In particular, specific use of Crown land generally needs to be authorised by a lease, licence or permit. The approval of the NSW Crown Land Division would be required under the CL Act for any works or mining in Crown land.

No Crown land will be affected by the Balranald Project, and is therefore not relevant to the project.

5.6.9 Western Lands Act 1901

The NSW *Western Lands Act 1901* (WL Act) establishes an appropriate system for land administration and effective integration with natural resource management of land in the Western Division of NSW. The project area is within the Western Division and most land is held under Western Land Leases (WLL) granted under the WL Act.

WLLs in the project area have been granted mostly for grazing purposes as well as for grazing and cultivation. The WLLs can include conditions which are tailored to the individual property. Many of the WLLs applicable to the project area include a condition that allows mining to be carried out on land within a WLL, subject to securing the required approvals under environmental, planning and mining legislation.

There are three WLLs within the project area which include conditions relating to management of areas known as southern mallee conservation areas (SMCAs). These areas are subject to special conditions which require the areas to be managed by current lease holders in such a way that conserve vegetation in certain areas of the lease holding.

The BOP for the Balranald Project has considered impacts to the SMCAs and additional offsets have been provided to compensate for these impacts.

5.6.10 Heritage Act 1977

The NSW *Heritage Act 1977* (Heritage Act) aims to protect and conserve the natural and cultural history of NSW, including scheduled heritage items, sites and relics. Approvals under Part 4 or an excavation permit under section 139 of the Heritage Act are not required for SSD by virtue of section 89J of the EP&A Act.

The potential heritage impacts of the Balranald Project are discussed in Chapter 11.

5.6.11 Rural Fires Act 1997

The NSW *Rural Fires Act 1997* (RF Act) aims to among other things, to prevent, mitigate and suppress bush and other fires in LGAs (or parts of areas) and other parts of NSW constituted as rural fire districts, including Balranald.

On 1 August 2002, the EP&A Act and the RF Act were both amended to enhance bush fire protection through the development assessment process. The EP&A Act establishes a system for requiring bush fire protection measures on bush fire prone land at the DA stage. Generally DAs on bush fire prone land must be accompanied by a bush fire assessment report demonstrating compliance with the aim and objectives of *Planning for Bush fire Protection 2006* (PBFP guidelines) and the specific objectives and performance criteria for the land use proposed.

A bushfire assessment of the Balranald Project was undertaken in accordance with the PBFP guidelines as part of the NSW EIS. This assessment indicates that parts of the project area contain bushfire prone land, including the processing area where habitable buildings would be constructed. Buildings in the processing area would be designed and constructed to protect human life and reduce the impact from a bushfire.

Management measures would be used to prevent a fire or explosion in the project area igniting a bushfire, reduce the severity of an existing bushfire through the provision of appropriately sized asset protection zones and outline ways of fighting fires with mine resources.

Therefore, the risks associated with the Balranald Project being damaged by, igniting or contributing to the severity of a bushfire are expected to be appropriately managed.

5.6.12 Dams Safety Act 1978

The NSW *Dams Safety Act 1978* (DS Act) established the Dams Safety Committee to approve and maintain records of 'prescribed dams' in NSW. Prescribed dams are defined in Schedule 1 of the DS Act. Consultation with the Dams Safety Committee would be undertaken by Iluka to determine if any dams proposed under the Balranald Project, such as the TSF and groundwater retention dams, would be deemed to be prescribed dams and require inclusion within Schedule 1 of the DS Act.

5.6.13 Radiation Control Act 1990

The NSW *Radiation Control Act 1990* (RC Act) includes provisions regulating the use, sale, giving away, disposal, storage, possession, transport, installation, maintenance or repair, remediation or clean-up of regulated material in NSW.

Regulated material include radioactive substances, ionising radiation apparatus, non-ionising radiation apparatus and sealed source devices. A radioactive substance is defined as:

... any natural or artificial substance whether in solid or liquid form or in the form of a gas or vapour (including any article or compound whether it has or has not been subjected to any artificial treatment or process) which emits ionising radiation spontaneously with a specific activity greater than the prescribed amount and which consists of or contains more than the prescribed activity of any radioactive element whether natural or artificial.

The prescribed activity of radioactive substances are contained in Schedule 1 of the NSW *Radiation Control Regulation 2013* (RC Regulation).

Under Section 6 of the RC Act, a person responsible for regulated material must hold a radiation management licence in respect of the regulated material and must comply with any conditions to which the licence is subject.

Section 6(1) of the RC Act states that:

For the purposes of this Act each of the following persons is a person responsible for regulated material:

- (a) the owner of the regulated material;
- (b) any person who is storing, selling or giving away the regulated material;
- (c) any person who has possession of the regulated material, other than:
 - (i) a person who is the holder of a radiation user licence in respect of the regulated material and who has possession of the regulated material only for the purposes of using the regulated material; or
 - (ii) a person who has possession of the regulated material only for the purposes of transporting the regulated material.

Section 7 of the RC Act states that a person who uses regulated material must hold a radiation user licence and must comply with any conditions to which the licence is subject.

Notwithstanding the above, under Part 2 of the RC Regulation, persons are exempt from radiation management and radiation user licences for managing and using radioactive ores that are at any place to which the NSW Mine Health and Safety Act 2004. This legislation has been repealed and replaced with the NSW *Work Health and Safety (Mines) Act 2013* (WH&S Mines Act). No exemptions are provided in the RC Act, RC Regulation or WH&S Mines Act for holding radiation management and radiation user licences.

A radiation risk assessment prepared by Iluka (refer to Chapter 14 and Appendix L) indicates that no mining materials, including the overburden, ore, HMC, mineral concentrates and mining by-products are classified as regulated material. As such, Iluka are not required to obtain licences under sections 6 and 7 of the RC Act for the handling and use of regulated material.

5.6.14 Work Health and Safety Act 2011 and Work Health and Safety (Mines) Act 2013

The aim of the NSW *Work Health and Safety Act 2011* (WH&S Act) is to ensure a consistent approach to ensuring health and safety of workers in NSW. One of the key aims of the WH&S Mines Act is to assist in securing the objects of the WH&S Act at mines, including the object of securing and promoting the health and safety of persons at work at mines or related places.

The Balranald Project would implement the necessary policies and training required under the WH&S Act and WH&S Mines Act, including obtaining licenses for storage and handling of dangerous goods.

5.6.15 Pipelines Act 1967

The NSW *Pipelines Act 1967* aims to:

- implement a timely and efficient approvals system to facilitate the construction of cross-country transmission pipelines in New South Wales;
- ensure the effect of a pipeline project commenced under the Act on the environment, landowners and native titleholders is properly considered and managed; and
- ensure pipeline licensees protect the environment, pipeline employees and the public from dangers arising from both pipeline construction and the transmission of potentially hazardous substances.

Not all pipelines are required to be licenced under the *Pipelines Act 1967*. Predominantly, licenced pipelines convey oil, gas and petroleum.

Pipelines constructed as part of the Balranald Project, particularly the water supply pipeline do not need to be licenced under the *Pipelines Act 1967*.

5.7 Strategic policies

5.7.1 Draft Murray Regional Strategy

The *Draft Murray Regional Strategy* (the Strategy) was prepared in 2009 by the then Department of Planning (now DP&E) and identified key priorities for the Murray Region. The region is composed of ten LGA's including Balranald and, therefore, applies to the project area. The Strategy recognises the challenges of the region and aims to:

- protect and manage the sensitive riverine environment of the Region's major waterway, such as the Murray River;
- cater for the Region's housing demand over the next 25 years;
- prepare for and manage the significantly ageing population;
- reinforce the role of Albury as the region's major regional centre;
- ensure an adequate supply of employment land;
- protect the rural landscape and natural environment;
- consideration of additional development sites outside of agreed local strategies;
- ensure that the land use planning systems can respond to changing circumstances for settlement and agricultural activity arising from water trading; and
- recognise, value and protect the cultural and archaeological heritage values of the Region for both Aboriginal and European cultures.

Mining is recognised by the Strategy as one of the key drivers of rural and regional economies in the Murray Region. In particular, the Strategy notes that mining of mineral sands in the Balranald LGA is a potentially significant contributor to the subregional economy. The Murray Region has valuable resources with mineral sands being recognised as the most valuable of these commodities.

The Strategy identifies a key action as being the protection of land uses for primary production, including mining, and to facilitate related industries with appropriate zones and planning provisions.

The Balranald Project is consistent with the aims and objectives of the Strategy, as it would allow the region to realise the economic potential and benefits of the mineral sand resources that would be mined as part of the Balranald Project.

5.7.2 NSW 2021

The *NSW 2021: A Plan to Make NSW Number One* (NSW Government 2011) aims to guide policy and budget decisions over the ten year period to 2021. The plan is based around the following strategies:

- rebuild the economy;
- return quality services;
- renovate infrastructure; and
- strengthen the local environment and communities.

Work has been undertaken to localise NSW 2021 through consultation with local communities to identify local priorities for action at the regional level. A regional action plan for the Murray-Lower Darling, in which Balranald LGA and town is located, was prepared in December 2012 (the Murray-Lower Darling Regional Action Plan).

The Regional Action Plan was underpinned by community consultation which included holding regional forums to hear directly from communities. These forums were aimed at identifying regional issues and priorities how the State Government could assist in delivering those priorities. The key priorities identified by communities within the Murray-Lower Darling Regional Action Plan include:

Prosperous and economically diverse – The Murray-Lower Darling will use its competitive advantages in location, workforce availability, climate, education and training opportunities, agribusiness and infrastructure to grow and diversify the economy. The region will be recognised as a place for new and innovative business concepts, products and services and for nurturing new high-value export-orientated industries in agriculture, manufacturing, mining, transport, arts and culture.

Providing quality education and training opportunities – The Murray-Lower Darling region will continue to be home to quality education and research institutions. Industry and educational institutions will partner to promote lifelong learning and provide people with more education, training and employment options.

Recognised for its strong communities – The Murray-Lower Darling will be recognised for its resilient communities and effective regional leadership to adapt to the challenges of water management, climate change and the ever changing nature of agriculture production in inland NSW.

Well-connected – The Murray-Lower Darling will be well-connected with increased access to transport services within our region and to other regions and major airports. Roads will be upgraded to continue to support the critical transport and logistics industry. Improvements and increased access to new technologies will link the Murray-Lower Darling region to high quality reliable mobile and internet services.

Specifically in relation to growth and diversification of the economy, the Murray-Lower Darling Regional Action Plan states:

The Murray-Lower Darling region has a strong economy based on agriculture, forestry, the services sector, tourism and the training sector. There are further opportunities to grow the economy and increase regional business investment through the expansion of manufacturing, food processing, logistics industries and the new mineral sand mining industry in the west of the region.

Expansion of these industries will increase local employment opportunities, including for young people. Delivery of education and training services to support these industries will be required to ensure local people have the skills required to take advantage of new employment opportunities.

Accordingly, part of the Murray-Lower Darling Regional Action Plan is to grow the regional economy through the development of mineral sands mines within the Murray Basin. These NSW government expects these mines, such as the Balranald Project, to increase employment opportunities.

5.7.3 Strategic Regional Land Use Policy

The NSW government has recently prepared the *Strategic Regional Land Use Policy* which aims to protect strategic agricultural land and valuable water resources in areas of regional NSW where mining and coal seam gas resources are prevalent.

Seven regions in NSW have been identified as applying under this Policy with each region having a Strategic Regional Land Use Plan (SRLUP). These regions include Upper Hunter, New England North West, Central West, Southern Highlands, Western, Murrumbidgee, and Alpine. As of November 2012, two SRLUP's (Upper Hunter and New England North West) had been completed with the remainder to be completed or commenced in 2013.

The *Strategic Regional Land Use Policy* also includes provisions to review and update existing regional strategies for a number of regions including the Strategy discussed above.

Although the project area is not located on mapped strategic agricultural land, under the *Strategic Regional Land Use Policy* all SSD and coal seam gas projects that may impact agricultural resources, whether or not they are located on land mapped as strategic agricultural land under a SRLUP, require an agricultural impact statement (AIS) to accompany a DA. An AIS for the Balranald Project was prepared to accompany the NSW EIS.

The *Strategic Regional Land Use Policy* also references the AIP which is discussed in the following section.

5.7.4 NSW Aquifer Interference Policy

The AIP was released by the NSW government in September 2012 to address water licensing and the potential impacts of aquifer interference activities within NSW. The AIP defines the regime for protecting and managing the impacts of aquifer interference activities on NSW's water resources and assist proponents to prepare necessary information for activities that have will have an interference on aquifers.

The AIP aims to:

- clarify water licence and impact assessment requirements for aquifer interference activities;
- ensure equitable water sharing among different types of water users;
- ensure that water taken by aquifer interference activities is properly licensed and accounted for in the water budget and water sharing arrangements; and
- enhance existing regulation, resulting in a comprehensive framework to protect the rights of all water users and the environment.

The AIP states that the activity must address minimal impact consideration for impacts on water table, water pressure and water quality. It requires that planning for measures in the event that the actual impacts are greater than predicted, including making sure there is sufficient monitoring in place.

The AIP focuses on high risk activities such as mining, coal seam gas, sand and gravel extraction, construction dewatering, aquifer injection activities, and other activities that have the potential to contaminate groundwater or decrease aquifer storage and yields. Impacts on connected alluvial aquifers and surface water systems, as well as impacts to other water dependent assets, such as water supply bores and groundwater dependent ecosystems are also considered.

All water taken from a water source by an aquifer interference activity, regardless of its quality, is required to be accounted for within the long term average extraction limit specified for that water source. The AIP states that separate approval is required (under section 91(3) of the WM Act) for aquifer interference activities to ensure that the amount of water taken from each water source does not exceed the extraction limit set in the WSP. However, as stated in Section 5.4.3, section 91(3) of the WM Act has not yet commenced and aquifer interference approvals do not actually exist. Where an aquifer interference activity results in the movement of adjacent, overlying or underlying water into the groundwater source separate aquifer licenses are required for each of these sources for the predicted volume of impact.

The AIP requires that two years of baseline groundwater data be collected and incorporated into the impact assessment prior to lodging a DA. For the Balranald Project, groundwater will be taken incidentally via dewatering to allow effective and safe operation of dry mining activities. All water taken by aquifer interference activities, regardless of its quality, needs to be accounted for within the extraction limits for the respective water source, in this case the Western Murray Porous Rock Groundwater Source within the MBD Porous Rock WSP and other connected water source if required.

The Balranald Project has been assessed in accordance with the AIP with further detail provided in Chapter 12.

Aquifer interference activities located within strategic agricultural land are subject to a gateway process prior to submission of a DA in accordance with the *Strategic Regional Land Use Policy*. The gateway process includes consideration of impacts to agriculture as well as aquifers. The Balranald Project is not located within strategic agricultural land and therefore is not subject to the gateway process.

5.7.5 National Water Initiative

The NSW government is a partner to an intergovernmental agreement, the National Water Initiative (NWI), which was signed by the Council of Australian Governments (CoAG) in June 2004. The NWI recognises the continuing imperative to increase the productivity and efficiency of Australia's water use, the need to service rural and urban communities, and to ensure the health of river and groundwater systems by establishing clear pathways to return all systems to environmentally sustainable levels of extraction.

The NWI has a number of relevant requirements for water planning, including:

- settling the trade-offs between the competing uses must be based on the best available;
- science and socio-economic analysis, as well as consultation with the community;

- ensuring that environmental and other public-benefit outcomes are provided for through planned and adaptive environmental water on a statutory basis and achieved, including actions to sustain high-conservation value rivers, reaches, and groundwater areas;
- providing for water trading to enhance water markets;
- recognising and addressing surface and groundwater connectivity;
- managing local impacts in groundwater areas as well as protecting GDEs;
- providing for indigenous consultation and aboriginal cultural and commercial entitlements;
- assessing and addressing interception; and
- monitoring and reporting on implementation.

The NWI sets outcomes, guidelines and timelines for water plans and planning processes. The National Water Commission (NWC) is an independent statutory body responsible for providing advice to CoAG on the implementation of the NWI and national water issues and undertakes a biennial assessment of each state's progress on implementing the NWI.

NSW's primary vehicles for implementation of the NWI are through the preparation and implementation of the various WSPs and AIP.

5.8 Summary of licences approvals and permits

Table 5.5 contains a summary of the licences, approvals and permits that are likely to be required for the Balranald Project as described in Chapter 3.

Table 5.5 Summary of required licenses approvals and permits

Legislation	Authorisation	Consent or approval authority
EPBC Act	Approval to undertake controlled action	Minister for the Environment or delegate
EP&A Act	Development consent	Minister for Planning or delegate Granted 5 April 2016
	Construction certificate required prior to construction of certain structures in the processing area	BSC or Private Certifier
	Occupation certificate required prior to use of certain buildings in the infrastructure and facilities areas	BSC
Mining Act	Mining lease for project area	DRE Proposal to grant a lease provided 3 May 2016
	MOP or REMP for mining operations	DRE
POEO Act	EPL for mining operations	EPA
Roads Act	Section 138 permit for road and intersection improvements including construction of intersections with Balranald-Ivanhoe Road, Burke and Wills Road and Arumpo Road	BSC

Table 5.5 **Summary of required licenses approvals and permits**

Legislation	Authorisation	Consent or approval authority
<i>Crown Lands Act 1989</i>	Approval for the use of Crown Land	Crown Lands
Water Act	Licencing of monitoring bores Licencing of injection into groundwater	DPI-Water
WM Act	Water access licence to access water from MDB Porous Rock WSP and Murrumbidgee River WSP	DPI-Water
<i>Dams Safety Act 1978</i>	Listing of water storage dams	Dams Safety Committee
<i>Work Health and Safety Act 2011</i>	Licensing of dangerous goods (eg diesel and ANFO magazine storage)	NSW WorkCover Authority

6 Consultation

6.1 Overview

The EIS Guidelines require details of consultation undertaken in relation to the action. They state:

8. CONSULTATION

Details of any consultation undertaken in relation to the action, including:

- a) any consultation that has already taken place;
- b) proposed consultation about relevant impacts of the action;
- c) if there has been consultation about the proposed action, any documented response to, or result of, the consultation; and
- d) identification of affected parties, including a statement mentioning any communities that may be affected and describing their views; and
- e) methodology and results of consultation with the relevant Indigenous people with rights or interests (as discussed above in sections 4 and 5).

This chapter has been prepared to address the above requirements. It provides an overview of stakeholder consultation and engagement activities undertaken for the Balranald Project and a summary of the consultation results that have been incorporated into the project design, environmental assessments and mitigation measures in this EIS and the NSW EIS.

Further details on consultation with the Balranald community are provided in Chapter 15 and the social assessment in Appendix M. Further details on consultation with Indigenous people are provided in Chapter 10 and the Aboriginal cultural heritage assessment in Appendix D.

6.2 Iluka and stakeholder consultation

The development of strong relationships with stakeholders is an important aspect of Iluka's business. Throughout the development of a project, Iluka strives to build and maintain these relationships by demonstrating the values of commitment, integrity and responsibility.

Iluka's approach to stakeholder consultation is established in the company's Stakeholder Relations Policy (Iluka 2013). This document demonstrates the manner in which Iluka will engage, consult and support the stakeholders and communities relevant to its activities.

Of the commitments established in the Stakeholder Relations Policy, the following were the most critical in developing a stakeholder consultation strategy for the Balranald Project:

- engage in open and meaningful communication with our stakeholders; and
- acknowledge, respect and incorporate stakeholder rights, values, beliefs and culture in our decision-making processes.

6.3 Consultation objectives

The aim of Iluka's stakeholder consultation activities for the Balranald Project has been to facilitate structured stakeholder input to inform relevant environmental assessments and demonstrate open, transparent engagement through EIS development and publication.

To achieve this aim, Iluka has established a number of objectives, being to:

- consult early to establish points of contact, develop Iluka's profile within government agencies and ensure all government requirements are identified;
- identify other relevant stakeholders who have a known or potential future interest in the Balranald Project;
- establish relationships with the community;
- provide stakeholders with accurate and regular information on the Balranald Project;
- identify and understand the aspects of the Balranald Project which are of most interest to stakeholders; and
- continually seek feedback on relevant areas of Balranald Project and the strategies proposed to minimise impacts, and identify opportunities to accommodate feedback into the project design.

Stakeholder engagement and consultation has been led by Iluka with support from EMM and technical specialists, as required.

6.4 Stakeholder consultation activities

6.4.1 Consultation strategy

To assist in the development of consultation activities, Iluka has developed two strategies in support of:

- community consultation, including for EIS requirements and community relations exercises; and
- government consultation and relations.

The consultation strategy is inclusive of Balranald project field activities required to support environmental assessments that have been conducted from late 2011 to 2015. These strategies were developed following a detailed stakeholder and issues identification process, risk assessment and management planning.

6.4.2 Stakeholder consultation planning overview

Stakeholder consultation requires detailed planning, execution and documenting of engagement and other relevant events, incorporating a process of continual improvement and refinement to reflect changes within the stakeholder groups, issues or local, regional and national sensitivities.

The basis of planning for Iluka's preliminary (before preparation of this EIS) and formal consultation activities incorporated the following key tasks:

- stakeholder identification and assessment;
- early stakeholder consultation and scoping;
- issues identification and analysis;
- tool/event identification and evaluation;
- development of consultation plans/strategies; and
- implementation, monitoring, documenting and review of consultation activities.

i Stakeholder identification and assessment

The objective of the stakeholder identification process was to identify, as far as reasonably practicable, those stakeholders deemed to hold a direct or indirect interest in the development of the Balranald Project. In identifying stakeholders and developing a stakeholder register, Iluka considered the range of government stakeholders, relevant local communities including their varied occupations, interests, community infrastructure or services that could be potentially impacted by the development of the Balranald Project, as well as any regional interests such as media outlets or special interest groups. Iluka's stakeholder register was regularly updated as changes in community were identified or project configuration and design evolved.

Three stakeholder categories were identified, community, government and Indigenous, each with a number of sub-groups as follows:

- community - property owners, local businesses, schools and training centres, the local community, special interest groups, service providers and the media;
- government - BSC, neighbouring local councils and State and Commonwealth government agencies, local members and Ministers; and
- Indigenous - registered Aboriginal parties (refer to Chapter 10), the local indigenous community and those organisations servicing their interests or representation.

Once stakeholders were identified, an assessment of each stakeholder, their relationships and areas of interest or concern were established and assessed, as they pertain to the Balranald Project and its perceived/potential impacts or benefits, to allow Iluka to define stakeholder engagement strategies tailored to individual or group needs and at the most relevant time given the project schedule.

ii Early stakeholder consultation

Iluka places a high level of importance on early engagement both with the local community and government stakeholders. Before late 2010, Iluka undertook initial consultation with government stakeholders, engaged with the local community, Aboriginal stakeholders, organisations and local businesses. This high level of engagement sought to introduce Iluka and the proposed Balranald Project to new stakeholders and has continued through the environmental impact assessment process, up to finalisation of this EIS and the NSW EIS.

This early engagement provided Iluka with the opportunity to commence building relationships with the key stakeholder groups that would form the basis for detailed consultation planning and ongoing activities through the development of this EIS and the NSW EIS.

iii Issues identification and assessment

To identify issues that may be raised by one or more stakeholders, Iluka implemented an issues identification and analysis process to establish a register of potential matters of concern or interest. Using records of early engagement activities, interviewing Iluka project personnel and online/media research, a list of potential matters was consolidated and categorised into the following groups:

- political;
- regulatory approvals;
- land access;
- land use and logistics;
- land management;
- water (surface and groundwater);
- emissions, nuisance and sustainability;
- social impact;
- economic development, business and employment; and
- Iluka's social licence to operate.

iv Tool/event identification

A range of stakeholder engagement tools and methods were considered and used, including:

- face-to-face meetings;
- workshops;
- newsletters and targeted updates (ie resident's update);
- fact sheets and other guidance material;
- drop-in sessions;
- Iluka participation in community events;
- information available on the Iluka website;
- media articles and advertising; and
- meetings with BSC and government agencies.

v Development of consultation plans and strategies

Following the completion of the stakeholder and issues identification and assessment process, project action plans and consultation strategies were developed to guide stakeholder engagement.

vi Consultation activities and events

As outlined above, to achieve Iluka's own stakeholder relations objectives and demonstrate appropriate consultation with community, government and Indigenous groups, a range of formal and informal stakeholder engagement methods (ie tools, events) have been employed in accordance with project action plans and consultation strategies.

Following a review of all consultation activities, it is evident that consultation processes have evolved with time, both in the content delivered and the responses provided by stakeholders. Consultation completed as part of Balranald Project Scoping Report (EMM 2012) and PFS activities (up to mid-2013) was characterised by high-level project briefings and limited or no stakeholder responses (ie effectively an awareness and educative process). As a result, records have been collated and summarised to reflect the briefing content and those limited issues raised.

Upon commencement of the DFS (mid-2013 onwards), Iluka began providing detailed concept and impact information to stakeholders who were subsequently able to raise specific issues for Iluka to consider and address as part of the environmental assessment process. Those consultation activities completed since 2013 have been targeted towards specific issues or outcomes and promoted significantly more discussion and response from stakeholders than PFS-stage consultation.

Tables 6.1, 6.2 and 6.3 list the consultation activities undertaken in support of the Balranald Project and details the purpose, key issues and are detailed by stakeholder category. Where a consultation activity has resulted in a change to project design, level of impact or to a mitigation strategy, such a change has been demarcated.

vii Government consultation

Local councils, State and Commonwealth government agencies were principally consulted to identify key issues for this EIS and the NSW EIS, to seek guidance on assessment approaches and to investigate government policies that apply to the Balranald Project. The primary consultation tool was to hold targeted meetings with agency representatives, either face-to-face or by phone. Table 6.1 provides an overview of those meetings and briefing sessions held with government agencies to date and the key issues discussed.

Iluka will continue to engage with councils and relevant government agencies on a regular basis throughout the project development processes associated with the Balranald Project.

It should be noted that the State government agencies listed in Table 6.1 contain a number of separate divisions, offices or agencies that were consulted during preparation of this EIS and the NSW EIS. Details on these separate divisions, offices or agencies are provided below:

- DITIRIS (also known as NSW Trade and Investment) has a number of operational divisions, including NSW Department of Primary Industries (DPI) and Resources and Energy (DRE):
 - DRE was engaged a number of times during the preparation of this EIS and the NSW EIS.

- DPI itself has a number of divisions, including Land and Natural Resources and Water (DPI-Water). Of these divisions, Land and Natural Resources and DPI-Water were regularly engaged during the preparation of this EIS and the NSW EIS.
- The Land and Natural Resources division of DPI contains a number business units and agencies, including Crown Lands. Crown Lands administers all crown land in NSW, including all land within the Western Division of NSW (including the Balranald LGA) held under Western Lands Leases, granted under the NSW *Western Lands Act 1901*. Crown Lands was engaged during the preparation of this EIS and the NSW EIS.
- DP&E includes a number of affiliated agencies, including OEH. In addition, NSW National Parks and Wildlife Service (NPWS) forms part of OEH. DP&E, OEH and NPWS were regularly engaged during the preparation of this EIS and the NSW EIS.
- Transport for NSW also contains a number of agencies, including Roads and Maritime Services (RMS) which was regularly engaged during the preparation of this EIS and the NSW EIS.

In addition to the meetings listed above, a planning focus meeting (PFM) was held in Balranald with a number of government agencies and BSC on 10 May 2012. Attendees included representatives from DP&E, DRE, DPI-Water, Crown Lands, EPA, OEH, NPWS and BSC. The DoE was unable to attend the PFM.

The PFM included a presentation on:

- the background and need for the Balranald Project;
- project description, as it was known at the time;
- statutory and approval requirements;
- planned stakeholder engagement; and
- an initial assessment of potential environmental issues and how these issues would be addressed in this EIS and the NSW EIS.

The presentation was followed by a tour of the project area.

Table 6.1 **Government consultation activities and outcomes**

Agency	Date	Purpose and key issues	Relevant to project design?	Applied changes
Local government				
BSC (Senior staff or Council, as identified)	15 February 2011	Meeting to provide an initial project briefing to Council.	No	-
	27 June 2011	Meeting to provide a project update.	No	-
	20 September 2011	Meeting to provide a project update.	No	-
	10 November 2011	Project briefing including discussion of power supply options, road options from West Balranald mine to Sturt Highway, road/rail options to Victoria, construction/civil works, accommodation facility options, airport capability and potable water supply options for project.	No	-
	21 February 2012	Meeting to provide a project update.	No	-
	17 July 2012	Meeting to provide a project update.	No	-
	3 October 2013	Transport briefing including discussion on options study and preferred product haulage route.	Yes	Informed preferred product haulage route
	18 February 2014	Presentation to Council to provide a project update, including discussion on accommodation facility and community involvement/support program process.	No	-
	2 April 2014	Transport briefing including discussion on traffic and transport assessments on preferred product haulage route. Road Safety Audit, preliminary pavement condition assessment on preferred product haulage route and proposed over dimensional transport route.	Yes	Informed scope and assumptions applied to supporting technical studies
	24 June 2014	Presentation to Council to provide a project update.	No	-
	10 September 2014	Presentation to Council workshop on Iluka's design and consultation activities for the proposed Town accommodation facility. Background and rationale for site selection; overview of residential consultation completed/proposed and accommodation facility concept layout options.	Yes	Informed town accommodation facility site selection process
	9 October 2014	Transport briefing including discussion on pavement condition assessment on preferred product haulage route and rehabilitation treatment options. Pavement condition assessment, predicted design traffic and rehabilitation treatment (road safety / maintenance).	Yes	Informed development of traffic mitigation measures
	26 November 2014	Transport briefing including discussion on road safety/maintenance. Road safety/maintenance objectives and framework.	Yes	Informed parameters for developing any future framework (if required)
	10 March 2015	Presentation to Council to provide a project update.	No	-

Table 6.1 **Government consultation activities and outcomes**

Agency	Date	Purpose and key issues	Relevant to project design?	Applied changes
	7 December 2015	Meeting with DP&E and BSC to discuss matters raised in BSC's submission on the project.	No	-
Wakool Shire Council (Senior staff or Council, as identified)	18 July 2012	Presentation to Council to provide a briefing on the project. Iluka business, Balranald Project and schedule overview.	No	-
	12 November 2014	Meeting to provide project update. Balranald Project update, traffic and transport assessments and consultation.	No	-
	19 March 2015	Meeting to provide project update. Balranald Project update, traffic and transport assessments and consultation.	No	-
	20 September 2011	Presentation to Council to provide a briefing on the project. Iluka business, Balranald Project, transport options study, community engagement and schedule overview.	No	-
SHRCC (Senior staff or Council, as identified)	15 November 2011	Briefing on transport and logistics options for HMC to Hamilton.	No	-
	21 February 2012	Meeting to provide a project update.	No	-
	18 July 2012	Meeting to provide a project update. Balranald Project, transport options study and project schedule.	No	-
	11 September 2014	Meeting to provide project update. Balranald Project overview, traffic and transport assessments, social / economic benefits overview & project schedule.	No	-
	13 November 2014	Meeting to provide project update. Balranald Project update, traffic and transport assessments and consultation.	No	-
	19 March 2015	Meeting to provide project update. Balranald Project update, traffic and transport assessments and consultation.	No	-
	11 November 2011	Meeting to provide a briefing on the project. Iluka business, Balranald Project, transport options study, community engagement & schedule overview.	No	-
Mildura Rural City Council (Senior staff only)				

Table 6.1 **Government consultation activities and outcomes**

Agency	Date	Purpose and key issues	Relevant to project design?	Applied changes
State government agencies				
DPI –Mineral Resources	10 March 2011	Initial presentation of conceptual development plan of the project.	No	-
	13 April 2011	Briefing session to provide update on the project.	No	-
	27 July 2011	Briefing session to provide update on the project.	No	-
	7 November 2011	Briefing session to provide update on the project and discuss proposed exploration activities in 2012.	No	-
	9 December 2011	Meeting to discuss mining lease application process.	No	-
	7 March 2012	Meeting where final conceptual project development plan was presented.	No	-
	27 September 2012	Meeting to provide update on the project and confirm certain aspects of the mining lease application process.	No	-
	27 March 2013	Meeting to provide update on project, status of studies and discuss proposed borehole mining trial (separate to Balranald Project).	No	-
	19 November 2013	Workshop to provide update on the project and discuss preliminary results of groundwater and geochemistry modelling and assessments.	No	-
	11 September 2014	Meeting to provide an update on the project, including outcomes of rehabilitation strategy.	No	-
DPI-Water	21 October 2015	Meeting to provide an update on the project, the UGM trial and the preparation of the mining lease application and a mining operations plan (MOP).	No	-
	14 April 2011	Meeting to provide a briefing on the project and seek advice on water related approvals and licences.	No	-
	8 November 2011	Meeting to provide a briefing on hydrogeological test work and progress on groundwater flow model development.	No	-
	5 July 2012	Project briefing.	No	-
	23 July 2012	Update on hydro-geological investigations and groundwater flow modelling results to date.	No	-
	20 June 2013	Meeting to provide update on project and discuss controlled allocation order.	No	-
	19 November 2013	Workshop to provide update on the project and discuss preliminary results of groundwater and geochemistry modelling and assessments.	Yes	Revised hydrogeological modelling and injection bore field design
	18 November 2014	Briefing session to provide update on the project and discuss results of groundwater and geochemistry modelling and assessments and proposed mitigation and management measures.	Yes	Finalised materials handling strategies and hydrogeological modelling approach

Table 6.1 **Government consultation activities and outcomes**

Agency	Date	Purpose and key issues	Relevant to project design?	Applied changes
Crown Lands	20 November 2015	Meeting to provide an update on the project and 2016 site activities.	No	-
	4 April 2011	Project briefing.	No	-
	7 June 2012	Meeting to provide briefing on project and obtain advice on assessment procedures and policies on Western Lands.	No	-
DP&E	14 December 2010	Meeting to provide initial project briefing.	No	-
	10 March 2011	Meeting where initial conceptual development plan of the project was presented.	No	-
	4 November 2011	Meeting to provide update on project design and baseline investigations.	No	-
	7 March 2012	Meeting where final conceptual project development plan was presented.	No	-
	20 June 2013	Meeting to provide update on project and seek advice on assessment timeframes.	No	-
	12 September 2013	Meeting to provide update on the project.	No	-
	18 June 2014	Meeting to provide update project, progress of technical studies, consultation with other agencies and timeframe for finalisation of EIS.	No	-
	1 July 2015	Meeting to provide update on the project.	No	-
	7 August 2015	Meeting with DP&E and OEH to discuss OEH's submission on the EIS.	No	-
	7 December 2015	Meeting with DP&E and BSC to discuss matters raised in BSC's submission on the EIS.	No	-
	23 March 2016	Meeting with DP&E to discuss draft conditions of development consent.	No	-
OEH and NPWS	15 April 2011	Project briefing and discussed key environmental approvals processes and OEH involvement.	No	-
	5 June 2012	Project briefing discussion regarding biodiversity offset requirements.	No	-
	5 June 2014	Meeting to present results of ecology and Aboriginal heritage investigations and discuss approach to offsets.	No	-
	2 September 2014	Project briefing and update. Update on the results of the Aboriginal heritage assessment and results of investigations on proposed biodiversity offset options.	No	-
	6 February 2015	Project briefing and update. Discussion on results of further field surveys and status of the biodiversity offset strategy.	Yes	Informed biodiversity offset strategy and mitigation measures
	7 August 2015	Meeting with DP&E and OEH to discuss OEH's submission on the EIS.	No	-
	16 September 2015	Meeting to discuss draft sub-surface investigation program.	No	-
	23 October 2015	Meeting to discuss proposed offsets and offset credit calculations.	No	-
	30 October 2015	Meeting to discuss trigger action response plans for Aboriginal cultural heritage.	No	-

Table 6.1 **Government consultation activities and outcomes**

Agency	Date	Purpose and key issues	Relevant to project design?	Applied changes
EPA	17 July 2012	Project briefing. Baseline radiation survey requirements.	No	-
	19 November 2013	Project briefing and update. Preliminary results of groundwater and geochemistry modelling and assessments.	No	-
	13 January 2014	Project briefing and update. Regulations and requirements for assessment of the transport of waste.	No	-
	12 August 2014	Project briefing and update. Air quality modelling approach and baseline monitoring results, and provide update on groundwater and geochemistry assessments.	Yes	Informed environmental assessment and development of mitigation measures for air quality and geochemistry
	18 November 2014	Project briefing and update. Results of groundwater and geochemistry modelling and assessments and proposed mitigation and management measures.	Yes	Informed finalisation of materials handling strategies and hydrogeological modelling approach
	20 November 2015	Project update and briefing on 2016 site activities.	No	-
RMS	27 May 2011	Project briefing. Road and transport options being considered for project.	No	-
	10 November 2011	Project briefing. Power supply options, road options from project area to Sturt Highway, road/rail options to Hamilton, construction/civil works, accommodation village options, aerodrome capability, potable water supply options for project area (joint meeting with BSC).	No	-
	3 October 2013	Transport briefing including discussion on options study and preferred product haulage route. Preferred product haulage route selection and rationale.	Yes	Informed preferred product haulage route
	2 April 2014	Transport briefing including discussion on traffic and transport assessments on preferred product haulage route. Road Safety Audit, preliminary pavement condition assessment on preferred product haulage route and proposed over dimensional transport route.	Yes	Informed scope and assumptions applied to supporting technical studies
	9 October 2014	Transport briefing including discussion on pavement condition assessment on preferred product haulage route and rehabilitation treatment options. Pavement condition assessment, predicted design traffic and rehabilitation treatment (road safety/maintenance).	Yes	Informed development of traffic mitigation measures
	25 November 2014	Transport briefing including discussion on road safety / maintenance. Road safety/maintenance objectives and framework.	Yes	Informed parameters for developing any future framework (if required)

Table 6.1 **Government consultation activities and outcomes**

Agency	Date	Purpose and key issues	Relevant to project design?	Applied changes
Crown Lands	7 June 2012	Define Western Land Lease conditions, transfer processes and gravel extraction/royalty requirements.	No	-
Commonwealth government				
DoE	6 July 2012	Meeting to discuss aspects of EPBC Act referral – in particular, nuclear action, endangered species, Ramsar wetlands, bilateral process.	No	-
	9 October 2012	Meeting to discuss splitting the transmission line works and Balranald Project into two separate referrals.	No	-
	18 December 2012	Meeting to discuss commonwealth EIS guidelines and requirements for technical studies.	No	-
	1 July 2013	Meeting to discuss status of project, planned work program for 2013/2014, advice on secondary approvals, air and noise assessments, outcomes of preliminary BioBanking assessment and offsetting strategy and upcoming government consultation.	No	-
	18 September 2013	Meeting to provide update on project and discuss process for varying the controlled action.	No	-
	17 June 2014	Meeting to provide update on project, including ecological studies, transmission line referral and request to submit application to amend action.	Yes	Informed environmental impact assessment and mitigation measures for ecology
	6 February 2015	Meeting to provide update on project and brief new DoE personnel.	No	-
	19 August 2015	Site inspection with DoE personnel.	No	-
	22 October 2015	Meeting to discuss DoE's comments on the draft EIS and Iluka's response to the comments.	No	-
	11 November 2015	Meeting with DoE to discuss approval process.	No	-
	7 January 2016	Meeting to brief DoE on revised draft EIS.	No	Minor changes and updates to Assessments of Significance for selected MNES.
	11 April 2016	Meeting to discuss issues raised in submissions and assessment of offsets. Discussions were also held on the underlying assumptions made in relation to calculating offset values of the offset site, including assumptions made by DoE and Niche.	No	Updates to biodiversity assessment and BOP.

Table 6.1 **Government consultation activities and outcomes**

Agency	Date	Purpose and key issues	Relevant to project design?	Applied changes
Government forums and boards				-
Lower Murray Darling Catchment Management Authority Board	7 December 2011	Project briefing to the board.	No	-
Central Murray Transport Forum	15 May 2012	Provided briefing to representativeness of forum including representatives from BSC, Swan Hill, Mildura, Buloke, Gannawarra, Wakool councils, RMS, VicRoads, and DTPLI.	No	-
	3 December 2014	Provided briefing to representativeness of forum including representatives from BSC, Swan Hill, Mildura, Buloke, Gannawarra, Wakool councils, RMS, VicRoads, and DTPLI.	No	-

6.5 Indigenous stakeholder consultation

Aboriginal stakeholders were engaged in accordance with OEH's *Aboriginal cultural heritage consultation requirements for proponents (DECCW, 2010)* and *Draft Guidelines for Aboriginal cultural heritage impact assessment and community consultation (DEC, 2005c)* as part of the cultural heritage assessment for the Balranald Project. Consultation included the "Ask First" principles (Australian Heritage Commission 2002) which are included in OEH's requirements and guidelines.

The Aboriginal cultural heritage consultation requirements provide detailed guidance on the implementation of a four stage consultation process. The four stages are:

- Stage 1 – notification of the Balranald Project and registration of interest;
- Stage 2 – presentation of information about the Balranald Project;
- Stage 3 – gathering information about the cultural significance; and
- Stage 4 – review draft cultural heritage assessment report.

Engagement with Indigenous stakeholders is detailed in Chapter 10 and Appendix D, including key issues raised and proposed mitigation measures.

6.6 Community and service provider consultation

Consultation within the local communities in which Iluka proposes to operate is crucial in identifying potential issues and benefits with the relevant stakeholder groups. Given the often varied demographic base of community stakeholders, it is important for Iluka to implement a number of strategies to provide the greatest reach possible to all sectors of the community. As such, Iluka has sought to implement strategies to reach the following key groups:

- landholders with a direct relationship to the Balranald Project;
- other regional landholders (eg within the Homebush district);
- community and other service providers within Balranald;
- Balranald community members; and
- residents adjacent to the land being considered for the accommodation facility in Balranald town.

The following sections detail the processes and outcomes of a range of consultation activities undertaken to achieve Iluka's community consultation objectives.

6.6.1 Landholder consultation

Landholders directly affected by the Balranald Project (ie landholders directly within the project area) have been consulted on an ongoing basis regarding Iluka's activities (including the operation of a number of field trials and regional environmental, cultural and geology investigations and studies) and development of the Balranald Project. The majority of this consultation has been conducted via individual meetings to provide a private setting to discuss details specific to their property.

Consultation with landholders who are indirectly affected by the Balranald Project (such as landholders adjacent to the West Balranald and Nepean mines, access roads, transmission line, water supply pipeline and accommodation facility) has also been by face-to-face meetings to discuss specific matters.

Table 6.2 provides an overview of the key issues raised by landholders during the consultation process which generally relate to the project design or potential impacts of the project.

Complementing the direct consultation of landholders, in 2014 Iluka commenced a program of providing quarterly briefings to the Homebush Landcare Group (HLG), a member-based organisation that holds an interest in land management activities of the area. Many of the landholders engaged directly by Iluka also attend the HLG briefing sessions. This forum provided Iluka with the means to garner a broader response to its proposed activities, especially from those who do not incur part of the project footprint or who live within closer proximity to the Balranald township.

It should also be noted that those community consultation activities, as described in Section 6.5, were also available or provided to landholders as members of the Balranald community.

In addition to face-to-face meetings in Table 6.2, interviews were completed with 11 landholders directly affected by the Balranald Project as part of the social assessment (refer to Chapter 15 and Appendix M), while 16 landholders were directly consulted in the development of the groundwater use study (refer to Chapter 12 and Appendix I).

Table 6.2 Landholder consultation activities and outcomes

Stakeholder	Date	Consultation details	Key issues discussed	Relevant to project design?	Applied changes
Individual landholder meetings	Various (2011 to 2016)	Individual (one-on-one) meetings with landholders, including those with direct and indirect interface with the Balranald Project	Mine disturbance footprint – query on establishing the extent of the mine in relation to properties required for development.	No	-
			Mine disturbance footprint – query on general land management (i.e. dust suppression activities) and accessibility issues (i.e. exclusions) with West Balranald mine development.	No	-
			Mine disturbance footprint – issue raised that landholder prefers the area to be left to farming practices, rather than mining.	No	-
			Mining program – query on Nepean mine development program.	No	-
			Mining program – query on scheduled commencement and stage progress.	No	-
			Haul road – query on preferred route and discussion on proximity to grazing and cropping.	No	-
			Injection borefield – issue raised twice on the suitability of proposed groundwater injection borefields given lower topographic elevation of some areas, with concern over potential surface expression and overall sustainability/land management/impact considerations.	Yes	Review of injection borefield locations
			Water supply – issue raised many times over Iluka’s potential use of fresh/brackish groundwater as a large source of water for project development and operations.	Yes	Non-saline water supply option consideration
			Water supply – issue raised many times that the Murrumbidgee should be considered the preferred and simplest source of water for Iluka.	Yes	Non-saline water supply option consideration
			Water supply – recommendations provided for potential pipeline routes and river pumping locations.	Yes	Non-saline water supply option consideration
			Electricity transmission line – issue raised that proposed transmission line route options have a disproportionate productivity impact on small river-fronting properties.	Yes	Transmission line route – contingent options
			Electricity transmission line – issue raised that proposed transmission line causes efficiency declines in seeding, crop management and harvesting by adding extra barriers (in the form of poles).	Yes	Transmission line route – contingent options and infrastructure design

Table 6.2 Landholder consultation activities and outcomes

Stakeholder	Date	Consultation details	Key issues discussed	Relevant to project design?	Applied changes
Homebush Landcare Group	12 July 2013	Meeting to provide briefing on the Balranald project and hydrogeological field program planned for late-2013/14	Iluka provided an update on the Balranald Project and hydrogeological field program planned to inform groundwater modelling & project design.	No	-
	25 March 2014	Meeting to provide a briefing on the project, with key focus on 2014 field trial activities and short-term water sourcing	Water supply – consensus of group demonstrating concern over Iluka’s potential use of fresh/brackish groundwater as a large source of water for project development and operations.	Yes	Non-saline water supply option consideration
	12 September 2014	Meeting to provide a briefing on the project, with key focus on hydrogeology study results and long-term water supply needs	Iluka provided feedback on its water supply assessment process – highlighting a change in preference to river water for project supply requirements with some potential for minor, discreet brackish groundwater extraction.	Yes	Non-saline water supply option consideration
	27 November 2014	Site visit (long-term pump test site) and to provide a briefing on the project	Iluka demonstrated the infrastructure requirements and operational processes for groundwater dewatering and injection systems that would be proposed to be deployed as part of the Balranald Project. A general project update was provided, with specific focus on Iluka’s proposal for an injection borefield north of the West Balranald mine.	No	-

6.6.2 Community service providers

Iluka consulted with community and service providers within Balranald to identify and assess the availability of the providers to meet foreseeable demand or other impacts as a result of the Balranald Project and the introduction of a new workforce to the area.

As part of the social assessment, a total of 65 interviews were also undertaken with community and service providers in and around the town of Balranald by Environmental Affairs Pty Limited on behalf of Iluka. While most interviews were held in-person, some were also undertaken by telephone. The interviews were completed across the following periods:

- 24 to 26 July 2012;
- 12 and 13 September 2012;
- 30 October and 1 November 2012; and
- 21 to 23 January 2013.

Results of this interview program are included in the social assessment in Chapter 15 and Appendix M.

6.6.3 Balranald (and surrounds) community consultation

Iluka has sought to inform the Balranald community through a number of strategies as outlined below.

i Community information sessions

Community information sessions provided an opportunity for a community to engage directly with representatives of Iluka. Iluka has held annual community information sessions, in conjunction with the Balranald 5 Rivers Outback Festival, an annual community festival held at the township of Balranald since 2010. Sessions have been held in Balranald town on:

- 31 October 2012;
- 11 and 12 October 2013; and
- 10 and 11 October 2014.

The provision of information has increased each year, reflecting the rate of project and approvals development and the community's understanding of the Balranald Project. The format of the most-recent (2014) event aimed to provide information on the Balranald Project to a broad range of the community, including the regional community which is attracted to the festival.

The information sessions were advertised in the local newspaper and on radio with attendees able to read the project display boards and talk to representatives from Iluka about the Balranald Project. Information provided included:

- details on Iluka and its operations in the Murray Basin;
- mineral sands and how they are used;

- the Balranald Project and the approvals required for the project to commence; and
- methods for obtaining more information about the Balranald Project.

Copies of the information displays provided at the community information sessions on 10 and 11 October 2014 are provided in Appendix B of the social assessment in Appendix M and remain available to the community through Iluka.

Iluka has undertaken a significant amount of community consultation post lodgement and exhibition of the NSW EIS, including community information sessions on:

- 9 June at Balranald Discovery Centre - 4.00 – 7.00pm;
- 10 June at Balranald Discovery Centre - 9.00am – 12.00pm;
- 10 June at Tooleybuc Bridge Keeper's Cottage - 4.00 – 7.00pm;
- 11 June at Tooleybuc Bridge Keeper's Cottage - 9.00am – 12.00pm;
- 22 June at Balranald Discovery Centre - 4.00 – 7.00pm;
- 23 June at Balranald Discovery Centre - 9.00am – 12.00pm; and
- 24 June 2015 at Swan Hill Region Information Centre - 9.00 am – 12.00 pm.

ii Community newsletters and fact sheets

As part of Iluka's community engagement and project consultation activities, newsletters have been periodically distributed within the Balranald locality. The most recent newsletters were distributed in November 2013 and October 2014, with further newsletters proposed generally on a quarterly basis starting with this EIS and NSW EIS public display period. Newsletters are posted to all households within the Balranald local region via Australia Post and are made available at community information sessions and in Iluka's Balranald operations office.

These newsletters provide information relating to Iluka's field activities, community consultation and general project updates. The newsletters also advertise opportunities for community members to engage with Iluka representatives and discuss the Balranald Project.

Copies of the community newsletters are provided in Appendix C of the social assessment in Appendix M.

Balranald Project fact sheets have been developed to ensure information provided at the October 2014 community information sessions are available to those that were unable to attend. Replicating the display board information, these fact sheets are available at Iluka's Balranald operations office.

Fact sheets were also provided during the community information sessions held after the lodgement and exhibition of the NSW EIS.

iii Town accommodation facility consultation activities

As outlined in Section 3.11, Iluka has identified that establishing an accommodation facility within Balranald town may provide increased benefits for its workforce (through access to recreational and other services), as well as promoting a higher level of integration with and utilisation of services (ie retail, hospitality, health sectors) provided by the Balranald community.

On this basis, Iluka implemented a consultation strategy targeted at those residents adjacent to the site being investigated for the accommodation facility in Balranald town. Residents of Mungo Street (eight properties in total), occupiers of one property on River Street and one on Balranald-Ivanhoe Road were identified as being immediately proximate to the proposed development.

Iluka conducted three door-knock campaigns, each with individual objectives, being:

- January 2014 – introduce the possibility of an accommodation facility being located on the adjacent site and solicit feedback on potential design concepts;
- April/May 2014 – present four site layout options for review and discussion, demonstrating inclusion of those design concepts suggested by residents in January 2014; and
- March 2015 – provide an update on ongoing design and engineering works for the Balranald town accommodation facility, ensure an understanding of Iluka’s dual accommodation facility proposals (ie mine site and town) and forecast further engagement on final design considerations in 2015.

Iluka will continue to seek approval for the development of the accommodation facility in Balranald town concurrent to the approval being sought as part of the EIS for the accommodation facility to be located within the project area.

iv Other engagement activities

Iluka has incorporated a number of other activities into its overall consultation strategy. The following briefly summarises those activities:

- Emergency response providers site visit – as part of the 2014 field activities, Iluka hosted representatives of all Balranald emergency response providers to increase their awareness of the Balranald Project and discuss potential capability requirements in the event of full project development. Representatives of NSW Police, NSW Fire and Rescue, Rural Fire Service, Volunteer Rescue Association, Ambulance NSW and BSC attended.
- Landholder and local government mine tour – Iluka invited project area landholders and BSC representatives to attend a tour of Iluka’s WRP mine in Victoria. The tour was held on 11 March 2015 and was attended by numerous landholders and two representatives of BSC, in addition to representatives of the HLG and Balranald Inc. The key objective of this activity was to provide attendees a greater understanding of the operations and management of a mineral sands mine and discuss aspects of the Balranald (scale, operational capacity, groundwater dewatering and injection system) within the context of an existing, visible operation.
- Community relations officer – Iluka has provided a dedicated community relations resource to provide a one-stop interface with the Balranald community and other stakeholders. The community relations advisor is generally in the community on a fortnightly basis and responds to enquires for project information, requests for meetings and discussions with landholders, local businesses and the community.
- Local business engagement – Iluka has welcomed interest from local businesses and service providers about opportunities to support Iluka’s development and maintains a register of all enquiries. Periodic, informal discussions with local business representation agency Balranald Inc also occur.

- Iluka website – Iluka maintains general project information on its website (www.iluka.com), as well as advice on how to make contact with the company to discuss the Balranald Project further.
- Media engagement - Iluka provides local media outlets with copies of any material it distributes within the community, such as periodic newsletters.

For results and outcomes of all community consultation activities completed to date, refer to Table 6.3.

Table 6.3 **Community consultation activities and outcomes**

Stakeholder	Date	Consultation details	Key issues discussed	Relevant to project design?	Applied changes
Mungo Street, River Street, Balranald-Ivanhoe Road residents	January 2014	Door-knocking campaign to introduce town accommodation facility proposal and seek design ideas	Hesitation in the location of a Town accommodation facility adjacent their property.	No	-
			Concern on behavioural aspects of facility residents, particularly alcohol consumption and noise.	No	-
			Preference to locate car parking and common areas further away from existing residential areas to minimise potential noise.	Yes	Balranald town accommodation facility design parameters
			Locate accommodation closer to residents, in preference to car parking and common areas.	Yes	Balranald town accommodation facility design parameters
			Fencing and landscaping are important for aesthetic and security purposes.	Yes	Balranald town accommodation facility design parameters
			Access and egress should be located away from residences.	Yes	Balranald town accommodation facility design parameters
			Incorporation of a buffer zone (setback, landscaping) into the facility design is desirable.	Yes	Balranald town accommodation facility design parameters
	April/May 2014	Door knocking campaign to present site layout options and seek feedback	Questioning of the site selection process.	No	-
			Reinforced initial comments on-site layout (car parking and recreational areas further away from existing residences, accommodation units closer).	Yes	Balranald town accommodation facility design parameters
	March 2015	Door knocking campaign to update residents on progress	General consensus on a site layout option preference for temporary accommodation closer to residential areas to provide longer-term buffer zones and to minimise Iluka accommodation units fronting towards existing houses.	Yes	Balranald town accommodation facility design parameters
			Acknowledge Iluka's ongoing concept development and site planning activities for town accommodation facility and establish upcoming consultation activities ensure understanding of dual accommodation facility proposals (ie mine site and town) and forecast further engagement on final design considerations in 2015.	No	-
	October 2015	Door knocking and interviews	Update on design of the accommodation facility and Iluka's activities onsite.	Yes	Balranald town accommodation facility design parameters

Table 6.3 **Community consultation activities and outcomes**

Stakeholder	Date	Consultation details	Key issues discussed	Relevant to project design?	Applied changes
Attendees at the 2014 community information sessions	10 October 2014	Community information stall at the Balranald community centre on Market Street, Balranald	A stall was held at the Balranald community centre. Information provided included details on Iluka and its operations in the Murray Basin, mineral sands and how they are used, the Balranald Project and the approvals required for the project to commence, and methods for obtaining more information about the project. The stall was advertised in local media and was open for people to drop in throughout the day. Iluka personnel were available to answer questions about the Balranald Project.	No	-
	11 October 2014	Community information stall at the Balranald 5 Rivers Outback Festival	A stall was held at the Balranald 5 Rivers Outback Festival. Information provided included details on Iluka and its operations in the Murray Basin, mineral sands and how they are used, the Balranald Project and the approvals required for the project to commence, and methods for obtaining more information about the project. The stall was advertised in local media and was open for people to drop in throughout the day. Iluka personnel were available to answer questions about the Balranald Project.	No	-
Attendees at the 2015 community information sessions	9 to 24 June 2015	Various locations	A stall was set up at various locations. Information was provided on the results of the NSW EIS and methods for obtaining more information on the Balranald Project. The stall was advertised in local media. Iluka personnel were available to answer questions about the Balranald Project.	No	-
Emergency response providers site visit attendees	11 September 2014	Introduce all providers to field trials and future project development; discuss capabilities	Some capabilities are limited within Balranald, particularly on Hazmat response or rescue squad equipment capabilities and capacities.	No	-

Table 6.3 **Community consultation activities and outcomes**

Stakeholder	Date	Consultation details	Key issues discussed	Relevant to project design?	Applied changes
Balranald business owners		Discussion on general procurement processes	Outlined procurement processes and timeframes for potential development.	No	-
Balranald business owners Lessee		Discussion on the development of the town accommodation facility option	Discussed potential temporary use of one business premises for overflow car parking; business operator indicated a workable position.	Yes	Balranald town accommodation facility design parameters

6.7 Project design considerations

In completing its detailed consultation activities, Iluka has engaged with a broad range of the Balranald community, landholders, service providers, businesses, indigenous groups and representatives of local, State and Commonwealth government agencies and offices. Iluka has endeavoured to provide information on the development and relevant potential impacts of the Balranald Project to these stakeholders.

Subsequently, at multiple stages throughout the consultation process, Iluka has engaged with relevant stakeholders on various aspects of the Balranald Project and has provided ongoing opportunities to the broader community to provide general feedback on the development of the Balranald Project.

As outlined in Sections 6.6 to 6.8, Iluka has recorded information on key issues discussed with stakeholders (particularly through the DFS consultation phase) and has identified issues that subsequently informed project design principles, concepts, scope or outcomes. Key stakeholder issues raised that are relevant to project design are listed below:

- **Project accommodation facility options** – feedback regarding the location of the accommodation facility was sought from a number of local stakeholders and BSC. As a result, and taking into consideration the feedback received, Iluka undertook a detailed analysis of a number of options for locating the accommodation facility in or adjacent to Balranald town and of sites closer to the project area. There was a strong desire from many within the community and BSC to locate the accommodation facility within Balranald town to maximise integration and potential service utilisation. However, those residents adjacent to the preferred Balranald town accommodation facility site demonstrated some specific concerns relating to the proposed development.

Although not relevant to this EIS, Iluka has undertaken detailed consultation with residents adjacent to the preferred Balranald town accommodation facility site to establish preliminary site design objectives. Such advice has included:

- optimised layout preferences for on-site positioning of car parking, communal/recreational areas and accommodation zones;
- the provision of buffer zones, fencing and landscaping;
- designated access/egress locations; and
- accommodation unit alignment.

As outlined in Section 3.11, Iluka is progressing with two accommodation facility applications – one adjacent to the West Balranald mine (included in this EIS) and the Balranald town option (to be included in a separate DA to BSC). This process will allow Iluka to develop the optimum accommodation facility site following consideration of each option.

- **Fresh water supply during construction and operation of the Balranald Project** – consultation with stakeholders identified a preference against the use and treatment (ie desalinisation) of groundwater abstracted from the Olney Formation (Lower Renmark Group) as the principal fresh water supply for the Balranald Project. This is due to the level of existing beneficial use (as a stock and domestic supply) and its status as a water supply of ‘last-resort’ during droughts. Even if potential Iluka use was not deleterious to the aquifer, it was seen by some stakeholders as a resource that should only be utilised for agricultural productivity. Iluka considered various factors (including stakeholder concerns) and determined that a secure, tenable, economic and low risk/impact water supply for mine development could be obtained (subject to licensing) from the Murrumbidgee River. However, groundwater is still proposed to be abstracted from the Olney Formation at reduced volumes (150 ML/yr) during the construction phase.

Additionally, prior to commencing the proposed scoping of pipeline routes for fresh water supply from the Murrumbidgee River, Iluka sought input from adjacent landholders on land access, existing pipeline routes and infrastructure.

- **Injection borefield** – landholders identified a topographic low in an early concept for the injection borefield. Concern for how groundwater reinjection may impact through surface expression in naturally low-lying areas was raised. Through Iluka’s groundwater assessments, it was determined that an injection borefield in this area was not suitable, reflecting the concerns of the landholders.
- **Transmission line** – although not within the scope of this EIS, feedback was received from a landholder in regards to the potential productivity and logistics challenges that may be imposed when a power line is placed through small, high intensity irrigation plots. Additionally, some landholders identified potentially productivity losses as a result of power line infrastructure placement. In this regard, Iluka will continue to consider the potential impacts of the transmission line alignment as it defines a preferred route and construction methods.
- **Transport routes and methods for product haulage** – consultation was completed with both NSW and Victorian transport regulators, as well as BSC, to inform the preferred transport route from the project area to destinations in Victoria and proposed mitigation measures to accommodate design traffic. This influenced the transport assessment and a range of other technical studies prepared in support of the Balranald Project.
- **Hydrogeological modelling approach** - consultation with DPI-Water regarding the approach to the hydrogeological modelling for the project and use of the model in predicting the hydrogeological impact associated with the project. The consultation confirmed the approach and suitability of model for impact assessment purposes.
- **Assessment of acid generation associated with materials handling** – extensive consultation was undertaken with key NSW government agencies including EPA and DPI-Water regarding the assessment approach and sampling and test work to characterise acid-generating overburden materials. This verified the approach taken by Iluka and provided suitable outcomes for management of overburden characterised as potentially acid forming.

6.8 Exhibition of draft environmental impact statement

A draft of this EIS was placed on public exhibition from 12 February to 10 March 2016 at the following locations:

- BSC administration centre - 70 Market Street, Balranald;
- OEH's offices - Corner of Sturt Highway and Melaleuca Street, Buronga; and
- DoE's offices - 51 Allara Street, Civic.

The draft EIS was also made available on Iluka's website.

Exhibition details were advertised within the Guardian, Riverine Grazier and Sydney Morning Herald.

The advertisements stated that members of the public were invited to view and provide comments to Iluka on the draft EIS or the action.

In response, Iluka received four submissions, including three submissions from people representing Malleefowl recovery groups and one submission from a member of the public. Details on the matters raised in these submissions, and a response to the matters raised are provided in Table 6.4 below.

In addition, post exhibition of the draft EIS, Iluka provided copies of the revised biodiversity assessment and BOP to the representatives from Malleefowl organisations people who made submissions on the draft EIS for review and comment. These were provided on 24 June 2016 and comments sought by 8 July 2016. In response, one submission was received. Details on the matters raised in this submission, and a response, are provided in Table 6.5.

Table 6.4 Matters raised in relation to draft EIS

Item	Matter	Response
John Olsen on behalf of the Victorian Malleefowl Recovery Group (VMRG)		
Unacceptable impacts to a local population	The habitat in the mine site at Balranald may be amongst the best Malleefowl habitat anywhere in NSW and therefore it is extremely important that it should not be cleared for mining.	<p>The importance of the habitat has been acknowledged within the biodiversity assessment (Appendix C) for the project and Commonwealth assessment of significance for MF (Appendix 8: Fauna – Vulnerable species, pg 343 of the biodiversity assessment). Field survey of the project area, adjacent areas and proposed offset areas indicated the presence of very similar habitat throughout the area referred to as the West Balranald Subpopulation area and that Malleefowl densities are likely to be similar throughout comparable habitats.</p> <p>Avoidance and mitigation measures have been incorporated into the Balranald Project to the fullest extent possible and will continue to be employed during the project as part of a BMP (BMP – see Section 9.6.2 of this EIS).</p>
Unacceptable impacts to a local population	Destruction of the local population of Malleefowl, as well as six other threatened species, is unacceptable as the proposed offsets are inadequate compensation for the displacement of birds and the loss of habitat.	The methods used to determine offsets for the project are consistent with both NSW and Commonwealth offset requirements as described in detail within the biodiversity assessment and the BOP for the project.
Unacceptable impacts to a local population	The activity observed is just the tip of a very large iceberg and that many more birds are active in the relevant area. Based on the extensive monitoring of the VMRG, breeding numbers fluctuate in poor seasons and the past two years have been relatively poor seasons for breeding success. In good seasons, because of the quality of habitat, there could be as many as 10 to 12 breeding pairs in the mine footprint.	<p>As described in the biodiversity assessment and the Assessment of Significance for Malleefowl within the biodiversity assessment, the area to be impacted by the West Balranald Mine forms part of an extensive area of Malleefowl habitat referred to as the West Balranald Malleefowl subpopulation (WBMS). It is acknowledged that Malleefowl breeding success fluctuates annually and therefore quantification of habitat and habitat quality was the main emphasis for the impact assessment and quantification of offset areas. The impact was assessed by assuming the clearing of 1,306 ha of known and potential WBMS habitat of which 1,169 ha is considered core habitat. This would constitute removal of approximately 13% of the core area of habitat for the WBMS east of Box Creek but less than 2% of the WBMS overall core habitat (combined areas east and west of Box Creek).</p> <p>Surveys adjacent to the mine area and in nearby proposed offset areas indicated that extensive comparable habitat is present and that such habitat is occupied by Malleefowl at similar densities to habitat over the project area when habitat quality is taken into account (as accounted for and mapped within the biodiversity assessment (Figure 12b and the BOP).</p> <p>Further information on Malleefowl abundance within the project area, adjacent areas and proposed offset area will be gathered prior to clearing of Malleefowl habitat.</p>

Table 6.4 **Matters raised in relation to draft EIS**

Item	Matter	Response
Adequacy of surveys	Extensive searches are required and acknowledgment of seasonal variation be considered. Many recently used mounds have been found in the biodiversity searches which indicate a much higher population than what is being considered in a single snap shot. The Balranald area may be a “hot spot” for Malleefowl in South Western NSW and ought to be protected from clearing.	Comprehensive targeted surveys were undertaken for Malleefowl (see section 3.4 of biodiversity assessment). The survey effort followed EPBC Act guidelines: DEWHA (2010) <i>Survey guidelines for Australia’s threatened birds</i> <i>Guidelines for detecting birds listed as threatened under the Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999</i> . Additionally, consultation with the Department was undertaken to discuss the survey effort given the large size of the project area.
Biodiversity management	Biodiversity Management Plan - we would expect that the plan would take habitat and climatic conditions into account and be made a strong pre-condition before any approval is given.	Commitment to a BMP for the project has been made within the biodiversity assessment and is discussed in Section 9.6.2 of this EIS. Clearing of vegetation will not occur until the BMP has been prepared and approved. Habitat mapping has identified and prioritised Malleefowl habitat throughout the project area and this habitat mapping will be updated as further surveys, searches and monitoring of Malleefowl mounds occurs prior to clearing of the site.
Adequacy of offsets	The Draft EIS is silent on the adequacy of the proposed offset land to support Malleefowl. While acknowledging that the suggested acquisition of a 6,400 ha property does not meet the offset requirements of the New South Wales government the document claims that details cannot be given as they are commercial-in-confidence. This is unacceptable as there is no way of assessing the quality of this land to support Malleefowl.	<p>The results of Malleefowl surveys within the offset site are presented within the BOP (section 4.2), which demonstrated comparable Malleefowl habitat and densities of mounds within the offset area compared with the project area. It was also established that this habitat (at least 7,100 ha) would be managed in-perpetuity for the express purpose of improving habitat for MF based on known threats to the species.</p> <p>The offset commitment outlined within the biodiversity assessment and the BOP is for a minimum of 7,100 ha of Malleefowl habitat (as evidenced by suitable vegetation types and the occurrence of recent mounds within these areas) and for 10,430 ha of habitat for CLEB to be included within a managed offset . Therefore the acquisition of a 6,400 hectare property is not the commitment made, but that at least 7,100 ha of known MF habitat will be secured and managed specifically for MF in-perpetuity. As management of habitat for CLEB will be largely consistent with management of habitat for MF, and as these areas of habitat overlap within the offset area the offset will deliver significantly greater offset for MF than is strictly required. Further, offset requirements under NSW State approvals will add significantly to the aforementioned offset commitments which address the DoE offset policy.</p> <p>There is no explicit requirement for offsetting for Malleefowl under the NSW Framework for Biodiversity Assessment.</p> <p>The overall offset requirements to satisfy the NSW development consent conditions and committed to within the biodiversity assessment for the project are for in-perpetuity management of an estimated 28,338 ha of vegetation, including 16,132 ha of vegetation considered as Malleefowl habitat (ecosystem credit species). Payment into an offsetting trust fund, which is currently under development by NSW OEH may also be used to cover some of the NSW offset, as stipulated in the development consent conditions for the project.</p>

Table 6.4 **Matters raised in relation to draft EIS**

Item	Matter	Response
Adequacy of offsets	Apart from the suggested land being of inadequate size, if the property already supports an existing populations of Malleefowl there will be a net loss of area for Malleefowl habitat. It is not possible to translocate Malleefowl and establish them in a new area so destruction of habitat in one area condemns the resident birds to extinction.	<p>The principles of avoid, mitigate and offset have been applied in relation to the project. It is acknowledged that Malleefowl habitat will be lost by the project - 13% of the core area of habitat for the WBMS east of Box Creek and approximately 2% of the WBMS overall core habitat (combined areas east and west of Box Creek).</p> <p>Translocation of Malleefowl for the Balranald Project is not being proposed due to its limited success; rather clearing controls will allow Malleefowl present within the project area to move into adjacent uncleared areas and clearing will not occur during the breeding season. Despite undertaking the mitigation measures documented in the biodiversity assessment, survivorship of displaced individuals has not been presumed within the impact assessment.</p> <p>The net loss of Malleefowl habitat will be offset by habitat improvements and threat reduction within the offset site and areas adjacent to the project area such that mortality of resident birds will be reduced as far as possible and so that the carrying capacity of presently occupied areas should be increased.</p>
Adequacy of offsets	NSW Threatened species responses to Management actions used in clearing assessments indicate that an offset of at least 7:1 is required for Malleefowl. If fox control is also carried out this may fall to approximately 5:1. Ref: http://www.bionet.nsw.gov.au/ . Under no circumstances is an offset of less than 4:1 considered adequate. If long term effect fox control cannot be guaranteed then an offset of at least 7:1 will be necessary.	<p>It is unclear where the referred to offset ratios have come from. In NSW the project has been assessed under the NSW Framework for Biodiversity Assessment (FBA). Under the FBA, there is no explicit requirement for offsets for Malleefowl as the species is an Ecosystem Credit species rather than a Species Credit Species. Instead offsets are required for the vegetation communities for which Malleefowl are associated. The overall offset ratio for each cleared Plant Community Type (PCT) impacted by the project is determined by the quality and context of the area to be cleared and the suite of Ecosystem Credit species associated with the vegetation zone and their ability to respond to management (Tg value). The expected improvement in vegetation condition within the offset areas, after management, also determines the overall offset ratio.</p> <p>There is a specific offset requirement for Malleefowl under the Commonwealth offset policy as the species is a listed threatened species. The Commonwealth offset policy and guide has been applied in calculating the required offset area and this process has been described in the BOP with the offset requirements and commitments presented in Table 12 of the BOP.</p> <p>The overall offset requirements to satisfy the NSW development consent conditions and committed to within the biodiversity assessment for the project are for in-perpetuity management of an estimated 28,338 ha of vegetation, including 16,132 ha of vegetation considered as Malleefowl habitat (ecosystem credit species). Payment into an offsetting trust fund, which is currently under development by NSW OEH may also be used to address a proportion of the NSW offset, as stipulated in the development consent conditions for the project.</p>

Table 6.4 **Matters raised in relation to draft EIS**

Item	Matter	Response
Habitat fragmentation	The degree to which an offset area is connected to other areas of known Malleefowl habitat is critical in encouraging populations to recolonise areas where they previously occurred. If appropriate corridors are available, Malleefowl are able to move into suitable areas and recolonise them when conditions allow. The recolonisation can only occur if birds are able to move in the landscape but in the absence of information about the proposed offset land no estimate of connectedness can be made.	<p>A reduction in the southern extent of clearing for the West Balranald Mine area by approximately 1.9 km has resulted in the inclusion of a 600 m wide corridor of Mallee vegetation at the southern end of the West Balranald mine, which is an area of very high potential habitat for Malleefowl (see Figures 12a and 12b of the biodiversity assessment). This will serve to allow continued connectivity between east and west parts of known Malleefowl habitat east of Box Creek.</p> <p>The Closure and Rehabilitation Strategy recognises the importance of establishing mallee dominated vegetation links across the final landform of the rehabilitated project area in order to provide suitable cover habitat for fauna species to disperse through the rehabilitated landscape. This will reintroduce further connectivity between east and west sides of the mine.</p> <p>Connectivity is addressed in the EPBC Act Assessment of Significance (Appendix 8 of biodiversity assessment) and within Section 4.2.3 of the BOP. Malleefowl habitat within the subject offset site has connectivity with Malleefowl habitat to be impacted from the Balranald Project, with habitat between the two areas being predominantly native vegetation. Overall there is expected to be some migration of Malleefowl individuals (albeit infrequent) between the Balranald Project and offset site. Establishment of large secure offset area adjacent to the impact area is was not possible due to the presence of exploration tenements held by other companies.</p>
Habitat fragmentation	The EIS acknowledges that the plan will lead to greater fragmentation of habitat which is a significant factor in the decline of the Malleefowl population. Unless the offset is identified prior to any approval no judgement can be made about the available wildlife corridors.	<p>A reduction in the southern extent of clearing for the West Balranald Mine area by approximately 1.9 km (based on a refined mine design) has resulted in the inclusion of a 600 m wide corridor of Mallee vegetation at the southern end of the mine, which is very high potential habitat for Malleefowl (see Figures 12a and 12b of the biodiversity assessment). This will serve to allow continued connectivity between east and west parts of known Malleefowl habitat east of Box Creek.</p> <p>The Closure and Rehabilitation Strategy recognises the importance of establishing mallee dominated vegetation links across the final landform of the rehabilitated project area in order to provide suitable cover habitat for fauna species to disperse through the rehabilitated landscape. This will reintroduce further connectivity between east and west sides of the mine.</p>
Biodiversity management	The management of mining operations to accommodate Malleefowl in the Balranald site is well discussed in the suggested Biodiversity Management Plan. However this plan is yet to be drafted and agreed and although suggested points are encouraging their acceptance as operational protocols should be a pre-condition of approval.	<p>Iluka has committed to formulation of a BMP (see Section 9.6.2 of this EIS) to mitigate impacts to Malleefowl arising from the project. Clearing from the project under the NSW development consent is contingent on the establishment of appropriate measures as outlined in the biodiversity assessment. THE BMP for the Balranald Project is required to be prepared in consultation with NSW OEH.</p> <p>The development consent can be accessed online at: https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com/public/298a6636c798d0fbdc671aae4d1614f2/Balranald%20Mines%20Sands%20Development%20Consent.pdf</p>

Table 6.4 **Matters raised in relation to draft EIS**

Item	Matter	Response
Management offsets	of The ownership of land, the ongoing management of habitat and the monitoring of Malleefowl breeding in the offset area is of concern. The VMRG expects that the area designated as offset would be managed for the conservation of Malleefowl and other threatened species in the manner of a national park. This would mean minimum disturbance and adequate feral animal and weed controls. Malleefowl data should be included on the national database. The costs of maintaining the offset area should be met by Iluka.	<p>The mechanism used to enable in-perpetuity management of the offset site will be a BioBanking agreement. The agreement compels the landholder to carry out the management actions committed to within the BioBanking agreement which will include the actions documented within section 5.1 of the BOP.</p> <p>Unlike funding for National Parks, funding for a biobank site is guaranteed in-perpetuity through payment into the BioBanking Trust Fund, from which the landholder will receive annual payments to carry out costed management actions as detailed and scheduled within the BioBanking agreement, which must be approved by NSW OEH (including appropriate costing of management actions). Iluka will be responsible for purchase of the credits generated from the BioBanking site which will then be transferred into the BioBanking Trust fund.</p> <p>Section 6.5.2 of the biodiversity assessment commits to contribution to the conservation of Malleefowl by sharing data obtained with relevant stakeholders and liaison with relevant stakeholder groups.</p> <p>Amongst other conditions, prior to any clearing, the NSW development consent includes the requirement for:</p> <p>“a specific Malleefowl management and monitoring plan, consistent with the ‘National Manual for the Malleefowl Monitoring System’ and the ‘National Recovery Plan for Malleefowl’;</p> <p>(e) include a seasonally-based program to monitor and report on the effectiveness of these measures.</p> <p>The development consent can be accessed online at:</p> <p>https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com/public/298a6636c798d0fbdc671aae4d1614f2/Balranald%20Minal%20Sands%20Development%20Consent.pdf</p>
Rehabilitation	The rehabilitation of mined areas after the extraction process should aim to provide Mallee habitat that is suitable for recolonisation by Malleefowl and other species. Studies show that it takes at least 25 years for Mallee habitat to regenerate to the point where it provides suitable conditions to support Malleefowl after fire and even longer through revegetation. A condition of mining approval should require Iluka to rehabilitate the mine site to “like for like” over a long period to ensure Malleefowl will be able to return to the mine site in future years in numbers at least as numerous as this point in time .	<p>Details on rehabilitation are provided in Chapter 17 and Appendix F, including the provision of a rehabilitation strategy. The rehabilitation strategy includes the provision of large corridors of Mallee woodland (Dune Mallee and Sandplain Mallee) at both the West Balranald and Nepean mines to provide linkages with remnant Mallee surrounding the mines.</p> <p>It should be noted that development consent has been granted under the EP&A Act for the Balranald Project. In relation to rehabilitation, DP&E's assessment report states that "Both OEH and DRE are supportive of Iluka's proposed rehabilitation measures." Notwithstanding this, a condition of the development consent requires that Iluka prepares a rehabilitation management plan for the Balranald Project to the satisfaction of the Secretary of the DPI prior to carrying out any development on the site. It states that the plan is required to be prepared in consultation with DP&E, OEH, DPI and BSC.</p>

Table 6.4 **Matters raised in relation to draft EIS**

Item	Matter	Response
Rehabilitation	A rehabilitation plan should be a prerequisite to the granting of mining approval.	<p>A rehabilitation strategy for the Balranald Project has been prepared and is contained in Chapter 17 and Appendix F.</p> <p>As stated above, a condition of the development consent requires that Iluka prepares a rehabilitation management plan for the Balranald Project to the satisfaction of the Secretary of the DPI prior to carrying out any development on the site. It states that the plan is required to be prepared in consultation with DP&E, OEH, DPI and BSC.</p> <p>A standard condition of a mining lease is the requirement to prepare a mining operations plan (MOP). These documents are required to demonstrate how mining activities will be undertaken to achieve the agreed rehabilitation outcome.</p>
Peter Stokie		
Unacceptable impacts to a local population	The project will cause a long-term decrease in the overall population size due to habitat removal.	The importance of the habitat has been acknowledged within the EPBC Act Assessment of Significance in the biodiversity assessment (Appendix 8). The principles of avoid, mitigate and offset have been applied in relation to the project. It is understood that Malleefowl habitat will be lost by the project - 13% of the core area of habitat for the WBMS east of Box Creek but less than 2% of the WBMS overall core habitat (combined areas east and west of Box Creek). Extensive areas of mallee woodland habitat is present within the region and offset areas will be established to mitigate against losses of habitat from the Balranald Project, which should assist in securing Malleefowl populations regionally. It seems unlikely therefore that the removal and modification of habitat from the action would lead to significant declines of the species overall, however some declines are likely to occur at a local level.
Unacceptable impacts to a local population	The area of occupancy for the malleefowl will be reduced by the area of clearing to be undertaken, and will be further reduced by the effects of fragmentation resulting from the clearing. Fragmentation will lead to further long-term decreases in the population.	Addressed and impacts acknowledged within the EPBC Act Assessment of Significance in the biodiversity assessment (Appendix 8).
Unacceptable impacts to a local population	Impacts to known breeding habitat may impact habitat critical to the survival of the population in this location (but not at a regional or national level). Local threat to critical survival needs to be considered as avoidable.	The importance of the habitat has been acknowledged within the EPBC Act Assessment of Significance in the biodiversity assessment (Appendix 8).
Unacceptable impacts to a local population	The action will disturb the breeding cycle of an important population. Habitat will be lost permanently unless long-term revegetation post-mining occurs.	The importance of the habitat has been acknowledged within the EPBC Act Assessment of Significance in the biodiversity assessment (Appendix 8).

Table 6.4 **Matters raised in relation to draft EIS**

Item	Matter	Response
Unacceptable impacts to a local population	The action will fragment an important population into two or more populations	The potential east-west fragmentation has been acknowledged in the EPBC Act Assessment of Significance in the biodiversity assessment. However a 600 metre corridor of vegetation is being retained at the southern end of the West Balranald mine area which will assist with connectivity and lessen the impacts of reduced patch size for the local Malleefowl population. The Closure and Rehabilitation Strategy recognises the importance of establishing mallee dominated vegetation links across the final landform of the rehabilitated project area in order to provide suitable cover habitat for fauna species to disperse through the rehabilitated landscape. This will reintroduce further connectivity between east and west sides of the mine.
Unacceptable impacts to a local population	If no measures were taken to address habitat corridors to link patches separated by clearing it is possible to mitigate against population fragmentation and hence a loss of gene-flow.	<p>A reduction in the southern extent of clearing for the West Balranald Mine area by approximately 1.9 km has resulted in the potential to include a 600 m wide corridor area within the Mallee vegetation at the southern end of the mine, which is very high potential habitat for Malleefowl (Figure 12a of biodiversity assessment). This will serve to allow continued connectivity between east and west parts of known Malleefowl habitat which will be fragmented by the mine. The Closure and Rehabilitation Strategy recognises the importance of establishing mallee dominated vegetation links across the final landform of the rehabilitated project area in order to provide suitable cover habitat for fauna species to disperse through the rehabilitated landscape. This will reintroduce further connectivity between east and west sides of the mine.</p> <p>The action is unlikely to cause loss of long-term gene flow between any two populations.</p>
Management	It is essential that the management of remaining habitat be proactive in habitat improvement by revegetation and the reduction of threats from goat grazing and fox predation to ensure that inadvertent population gene-flow does not happen.	<p>The BMP, discussed in Section 9.6.2 of this EIS, will be prepared in consultation with OEH to manage threatened species, pests and weeds, fire and site hygiene. Details are provided in section 6.5 of biodiversity assessment and within the NSW development consent conditions for the project.</p> <p>The development consent can be accessed online at: https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com/public/298a6636c798d0fbdc671aae4d1614f2/Balranald%20Mines%20Development%20Consent.pdf</p>
Unacceptable impacts to a local population	The action will modify, destroy, remove or isolate or decrease quality habitat to the extent that the species is likely to decline locally.	It is acknowledged that Malleefowl habitat will be lost by the project - 13% of the core area of habitat for the WBMS east of Box Creek and approximately 2% of the WBMS overall core habitat (combined areas east and west of Box Creek). The predicted impacts are acknowledged within the EPBC Act Assessment of Significance in the biodiversity assessment (Appendix 8).

Table 6.4 **Matters raised in relation to draft EIS**

Item	Matter	Response
Management offsets	of Mitigation, offset and detail management plans be investigated and assessed for effectiveness and specified as conditions for the mine to be approved.	<p>Iluka has committed to formulation of a BMP (see Section 9.6.2 of this EIS) to mitigate impacts to Malleefowl arising from the project. Clearing from the project under the NSW development consent (see page 14) is contingent on the establishment of appropriate measures as outlined in the biodiversity assessment, and in consultation with NSW OEH.</p> <p>The development consent can be accessed online at: https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com/public/298a6636c798d0fbd671aae4d1614f2/Balranald%20Minal%20Sands%20Development%20Consent.pdf</p>
Management offsets	of If the mitigation, offset and management plans are decided to be too challenging or difficult to implement then the Commonwealth will not give approval for the mine to proceed.	Mitigation measures and management of the offset site will be assessed by NSW OEH and the Commonwealth DOE and subject to conditions of consent that are issued.
Tim Burnard, on behalf of the National Malleefowl Recovery Group Incorporated (NMFRG)		
Adequacy surveys	of It is essential that more detailed searches be conducted before any consideration and decisions on mining approval is determined by the Commonwealth to ensure that a decision is made with complete knowledge of the total population that will be impacted upon by the mines.	<p>Comprehensive targeted surveys were undertaken for Malleefowl (see section 3.4 of biodiversity assessment). The survey effort followed EPBC Act guidelines: DEWHA (2010) <i>Survey guidelines for Australia's threatened birds Guidelines for detecting birds listed as threatened under the Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999</i>. Additionally, consultation with the Department was undertaken to discuss the survey effort given the large size of the project area.</p> <p>Further information on Malleefowl abundance will be gathered prior to clearing of Malleefowl habitat, including efforts to identify all active, recently active and old mounds within the project area, adjacent areas and the offset area. Survey will use LiDAR technology or other appropriate methods. This information will be communicated to relevant stakeholders and inform the ongoing management of the project area and the offset site.</p>
Adequacy surveys	of recommend a full search be undertaken (by LiDAR for example) of the proposed project area and surrounding areas before any approvals are given so that we have a full understanding of the implications of the proposed native vegetation clearance.	As above.
Adequacy of offsets	also expect that any offset properties be fully searched for the presence of Malleefowl as well as active and long unused mounds to establish how suitable such properties would be to enable the number of Malleefowl to increase and offset the loss of a significant population in the mine footprint.	Further information on Malleefowl abundance within the project area, adjacent areas will be gathered prior to clearing of Malleefowl habitat. This will include LiDAR survey or other appropriate methods to identify active, recent and old mounds.

Table 6.4 **Matters raised in relation to draft EIS**

Item	Matter	Response
Adequacy of offsets	Need to be assured that offsets will be suitable as quality habitat for Malleefowl, or would become quality habitat by vegetation improvements as a result of improvements specified through the approval process determined by the Commonwealth.	<p>The results of MF surveys within the offset site are presented within the BOP (section 4.2), which demonstrated comparable Malleefowl habitat and densities of mounds within the offset area compared with the project area. It was also established that this habitat (at least 7,100 ha) would be managed in-perpetuity for the express purpose of improving habitat for MF based on known threats to the species.</p> <p>The exact location and extent of the offset area has been presented to DoE for consideration.</p> <p>The offset commitment outlined within the biodiversity assessment and the BOP is for a minimum of 7,100 ha of Malleefowl habitat (as evidenced by suitable vegetation types and the occurrence of recent mounds within these areas) and for 10,430 ha of habitat for CLEB to be included within a managed offset. As management of habitat for CLEB will be largely consistent with management of habitat for MF, and as these areas of habitat overlap within the offset area the offset will deliver significantly greater offset for MF than is strictly required.</p> <p>Further, offset requirements under NSW State approvals will add significantly to the aforementioned offset commitments which address the DoE offset policy.</p>
Adequacy of offsets	Particularly concerned that 1179 ha within the 3034 ha are already listed as Southern Mallee Conservation Areas (SMCA). Our understanding is that this area has already been set aside as an offset for crop production. It is completely unacceptable that land that is already acting as an offset can be traded again. This land, having already been used for offsetting Malleefowl habitat loss, should be considered as National Park or other conservation reserve land should rightly be.	<p>The impacts on the SMCA have been considered and assessed in the biodiversity assessment and the BOP.</p> <p>The SMCAs were provided as a form of conservation reserve to compensate for the clearing of Mallee vegetation for agricultural land use. Typically, the SMCAs were established to conserve like for-like vegetation at offset ratios of 1:1 to 1:2. The title conditions for the SMCAs typically require fencing and destocking, restrictions on clearing or timber removal, and best practice management in accordance with applicable regional guidelines.</p> <p>Approximately 1,179 ha of a total of 22,574 ha (or approximately 5%) of the three SMCAs would be disturbed by the project. To account for the proposed disturbance to the SMCAs, and in acknowledgement of their existing conservation status, Iluka and OEH have negotiated an additional offsetting (or replacement) requirement for the SMCAs over and above the offsetting requirements for the clearing using the BioBanking calculator for NSW and the Commonwealth's offset policy. The additional offset liability amounts to some 2,041 ha of Mallee and Chenopod vegetation communities (see Table 34 of the biodiversity assessment for the overall NSW offset requirement).</p>

Table 6.4 **Matters raised in relation to draft EIS**

Item	Matter	Response
Adequacy of offsets	Impossible for us to comment on the worthiness of the proposed offset property as a part offset. We recommend that no approvals be granted until the details of all offsets can be scrutinised by interested stakeholders. We would expect that vegetation at the offsets be as comparable as possible, or in better condition, than the vegetation to be cleared at the mine. Further we would expect the offsets would comfortably support additional numbers of a breeding population of Malleefowl.	The results of Malleefowl surveys within the offset site are presented within the BOP (section 4.2), which demonstrated comparable Malleefowl habitat and densities of mounds within the offset area compared with the project area. It was also established that this habitat (at least 7,100 ha) would be managed in-perpetuity for the express purpose of improving habitat for MF based on known threats to the species.
Adequacy of offsets	The suggested offset property has an existing Malleefowl population and a mound density that is similar or higher to that at West Balranald mine area. Clearly, this offset property does not add anything to the net habitat available to Malleefowl. While an in perpetuity conservation agreement may enhance the security of this proposed offset, there is no evidence presented that the proposed offset is actually under any real threat of clearing. Thus, this proposal will result in a substantial net loss of habitat suitable for Malleefowl and provide no clear benefits to their conservation.	As highlighted in Section 6.26 of the BOP, a conservation agreement for the offset site has recently expired thus placing Malleefowl habitat within the property at greater risk of clearing and degradation due to the expiration of restrictions on stocking and other management requirements. Pending changes to legislation in NSW may also facilitate increased risk of future land clearing. A 20% risk of clearing has been applied by DoE in their use of the offsets calculator demonstrating a conservative approach to this estimate given the 20 year time frame used for the assessment.
Unacceptable impacts to a local population	Limiting of clearance within 200m of mounds between Sept-Feb will only assist with nesting and hatching success for a part of just one breeding season. However, Malleefowl have a breeding life of roughly twenty years, and as it is proposed to clear their habitat, the chicks resulting from the final breeding season and their parents will have to disperse to neighbouring habitats that are already occupied by Malleefowl where they would need to displace other Malleefowl to survive. Limiting clearing to the March-August period will do little to mitigate the conservation transgression of clearing the species' habitat, although we agree that it is advisable to prevent wanton destruction of active mounds and provide some chance of survival for emerging chicks.	The potential impacts of clearing have been considered and acknowledged within the biodiversity assessment. The clearing limitations are one of a series of mitigation measures committed to, which will assist in lessening impacts from the Balranald Project but which will not prevent impacts from clearing of Malleefowl habitat. Offsets and management of Malleefowl habitat are incorporated into the Balranald Project in order to achieve an overall improve or maintain outcome in the medium to long-term, consistent with OEH and DoE policy on these matters.

Table 6.4 **Matters raised in relation to draft EIS**

Item	Matter	Response
Monitoring	An obligation to monitor both the neighbourhood of the mines and the offsets is expected. This should commence well before the mining activities start. Monitoring data be uploaded to the National Malleefowl Monitoring Database on an annual basis with costs covered for adding the site to the database and ongoing maintenance. Monitoring and management data be available to the Australia wide Malleefowl Adaptive Management Project, including regularly uploading information on Malleefowl, camera traps, predator and herbivore control, and other management actions to the National Malleefowl Monitoring Database.	Monitoring commitments have been made within the biodiversity assessment for the project and are also required in accordance with the NSW development consent conditions, which state that the BMP must: “include a specific Malleefowl management and monitoring plan, consistent with the ‘National Manual for the Malleefowl Monitoring System’ and the ‘National Recovery Plan for Malleefowl’; include a seasonally-based program to monitor and report on the effectiveness of these measures.” Monitoring of Malleefowl is expected to commence on receiving approval from the DoE.
Adequacy of offsets	Consideration of what offsets could possibly balance the damage being proposed to Malleefowl conservation is required. Proponents should adopt a lead role and endeavour to improve the conservation outlook for Malleefowl in the region, and perhaps other species as well. Not specifically outlining potential offset sites and their habitat quality is unhelpful in this regard, and should rightly be viewed with deep suspicion.	The values of the offset site and relevant information pertaining to it are described in Chapter 9 and the BOP in Appendix C. Presently, specific details of the location of the subject offset site have not been given publically due to privacy limitations, however its characteristics in regard to biodiversity values (particularly in relation to Malleefowl and Corben’s Long-eared Bat) along with its capacity to meet EPBC offset requirements are presented in Appendix C.
Rehabilitation	We are also concerned about some of the proposed rehabilitation works. The proposed West Balranald Mine will be mined by conventional methods with overburden stockpiles and a void to remain after mining, providing permanent and unsightly scars on the landscape. On the other hand, Nepean will be back-filled, with eventual contours similar to surrounding land. The EIS states that the intention is to ‘cap’ the overburden with 700mm of topsoil/subsoil. This is commendable as Spinifex-Mallee will need a minimum of 50cm of topsoil above a carbonate subsoil.	As stated above, details on rehabilitation are provided in Chapter 17 and Appendix F, including the provision of a rehabilitation and closure strategy. This includes details on the rehabilitation of the post mining landform. The vast majority of overburden at both the West Balranald and Nepean mines will be used to establish a post mining landform that is similar to the existing landform. of the project area. Notwithstanding this, the final land form envisages the provision of a final mine void and the rehabilitation of some overburden stockpiles. However, these areas are relatively small particularly compared to the size of the project area. Out of the total disturbance area of 5,346 ha, including 3,864 ha for the mining areas, the final void has been restricted to 40 ha and the stockpiles restricted to 151 ha. The final void will be shaped more like a depression and the stockpiles shaped prior to rehabilitation. The final void and the stockpiles will not be unsightly scars on the landscape.

Table 6.4 **Matters raised in relation to draft EIS**

Item	Matter	Response
Soil management	Adherence to the best topsoil stripping practices will be critical to successful revegetation. Topsoil and subsoil removal, stockpiling and later rehabilitation placement has been flagged in the Draft EIS to be undertaken by conventional scrapers. However, in Mallee the loss of topsoil by conventional scrapers will approach 40-50% when conditions are dry (90% of the time). The outcome is even worse for clay loams and sandy clay loams, the dominant soil textures of shrubland and Belah areas, as they tend to pulverize to bulldust which is very susceptible to erosion by wind and rain.	<p>Iluka has considerable experience in the successful stripping, stockpiling and management of topsoil. Like all aspects of the mining sequence, it is critical to their business. This is undertaken by a range of machinery including tractor scoops, dozers, excavators and scrapers.</p> <p>As stated above, a condition of the development consent requires that Iluka prepares a rehabilitation management plan for the Balranald Project to the satisfaction of the Secretary of the DPI prior to carrying out any development on the site. It states that the plan is required to be prepared in consultation with DP&E, OEH, DPI and BSC. In addition, a standard condition of a mining lease is the requirement to prepare a MOP. These documents are required to demonstrate how mining activities will be undertaken to achieve the agreed rehabilitation outcome, including how topsoil will be removed and managed.</p> <p>In preparing the rehabilitation management plan and MOP, Iluka will give consideration to the results of the soils resources assessment of the West Balranald and Nepean mining areas and the use of the diverse range of machinery available for removal and management of the topsoil.</p>
Soil management	We are concerned that the likely losses associated with conventional scrapers for shallow topsoil areas (i.e. ~30cm of topsoil depth or less above the subsoil carbonate layer) which comprise the vast majority of the proposed mining area, will mean that there will be little topsoil budget to put back. The leftover topsoil will be pulverized and average less than 20cm which is not a sufficient medium in to which to rehabilitate.	See above.
Soil management	Modern Laser-scoop buckets towed behind 4WD tractors would prove a better alternative to conventional scrapers as they can be pre-programmed to scalp at precise locations within 2cm. In section 5.2.2 of the draft, it is stated that "carry graders" might be trialed which we believe refers to laser-scoop buckets. We agree with the use of laser-scoop buckets but suggest that the success achieved by other companies with this technology makes a trial unnecessary. While laser-scoop buckets would be a substantial improvement over conventional scrapers, a loss of 10-20% of topsoil under dry stripping conditions is nonetheless likely.	<p>See above.</p> <p>Also, it should be noted that there was no Section 5.2.2 in the main volume (Volume 1) of the draft EIS. It is believed that the reference to Section 5.2.2 relates to the section on research and continual improvement in the rehabilitation and closure strategy which was Appendix F in Volume 4 of the draft EIS. This stated that "A diverse range of machinery is relied on to complete the mining and rehabilitation processes. Iluka will continue to trial new machinery, or new methods of operating existing machinery to improve rehabilitation outcomes. An example of such innovation is the use of tractor driven carry-graders for top soil replacement."</p> <p>This section related to the replacement of topsoil during rehabilitation as opposed to the removal of soil during the stripping process.</p>

Table 6.4 **Matters raised in relation to draft EIS**

Item	Matter	Response
Rehabilitation	Table 3.1 (Rehab Report) suggests the land will be returned to grazing on Chenopod Shrublands. Although revegetation with mallee is mentioned as a series of tables for 'Spinifex-Mallee' and 'Chenopod Sandplain Mallee' ecosystems, we are concerned that these areas may be revegetated with chenopod shrublands which is easier to achieve – replacing mallee with chenopod shrublands has in fact occurred at some other sand mining operations. Under no circumstances should the proposed West Balranald and Nepean mines be allowed to revegetate spinifex-mallee and chenopod sandplain mallee with anything other than the proportions that these communities comprised within the original vegetation. These communities comprise 10% and 38% of the 5,346 ha area of potential disturbance, and accordingly, half of the rehabilitation landscape should be mallee.	<p>Details on rehabilitation are provided in Chapter 17 and Appendix F, including the provision of a rehabilitation and closure strategy. The rehabilitation and closure strategy includes the provision of large corridors of Mallee woodland (Dune Mallee and Sandplain Mallee) at both the West Balranald and Nepean mines to provide linkages with remnant Mallee surrounding the mines.</p> <p>It should be noted that development consent has been granted under the EP&A Act for the Balranald Project. In relation to rehabilitation, DP&E's assessment report states that "Both OEH and DRE are supportive of Iluka's proposed rehabilitation measures." Notwithstanding this, a condition of the development consent requires that Iluka prepares a rehabilitation management plan for the Balranald Project to the satisfaction of the Secretary of the DPI prior to carrying out any development on the site. It states that the plan is required to be prepared in consultation with DP&E, OEH, DPI and BSC.</p>
Rehabilitation	We acknowledge that rehabilitating mallee habitats is difficult. In fact, we are not aware of any successful, large scale revegetation project involving spinifex-mallee in southeast Australia. These habitats are critically important for a number of threatened species, including Malleefowl. We suggest that further research into ways of rehabilitating mallee is desperately needed and should be supported by this proposed project to provide some compensation for the permanent loss of habitat.	<p>A rehabilitation strategy for the Balranald Project has been prepared and is contained in Chapter 17 and Appendix F.</p> <p>As stated above, a condition of the development consent requires that Iluka prepares a rehabilitation management plan for the Balranald Project to the satisfaction of the Secretary of the DPI prior to carrying out any development on the site. It states that the plan is required to be prepared in consultation with DP&E, OEH, DPI and BSC.</p> <p>A standard condition of a mining lease is the requirement to prepare a mining operations plan (MOP). These documents are required to demonstrate how mining activities will be undertaken to achieve the agreed rehabilitation outcome.</p>
Greg Ogle		
Unacceptable impacts to a local population	Survival is very unlikely following malleefowl capture and release. Carrying capacity of existing habitat is already occurring.	Malleefowl capture and release has not been proposed to mitigate impacts from the projects nor relied upon in conducting assessments of significance.
Unacceptable impacts to a local population	Concerns regarding the capture of birds (how would they be identified and captured)	Malleefowl capture and release has not been proposed to mitigate impacts from the projects.
Unacceptable impacts to a local population	Birds may return to the site looking for their cleared homeground, and be killed by predators.	Impacts to Malleefowl from vegetation clearing have been addressed in the biodiversity assessment (Appendix C).
Unacceptable impacts to a local population	Concerns regarding the effect of large area of core habitat being lost to many species.	Impacts from clearing have been addressed within the biodiversity assessment (Appendix C).

Table 6.4 **Matters raised in relation to draft EIS**

Item	Matter	Response
Adequacy of offsets	Some offsets areas are already existing offsets from other land clearing.	To account for the proposed disturbance to the SMCAs, and in acknowledgement of their existing conservation status, Iluka and OEH have negotiated an additional offsetting (or replacement) requirement for the SMCAs over and above the offsetting requirements for the clearing using the BioBanking calculator for NSW and the Commonwealth's offset policy. The additional offset liability amounts to some 2,041 ha of Mallee and Chenopod vegetation communities.
Rehabilitation	Many of the existing offsets in the area, are not monitored, and are heavily grazed by goats, and other animals. Goats are valuable to graziers (value \$30 – \$60) therefore will not be targeted as vermin.	<p>The currently proposed offset mechanism (BioBanking) includes the requirement for annual reporting and compliance monitoring. The owner of a BioBank site must pass a fit and proper person test. Penalties for not completing actions include the ability of OEH to enter land and perform management actions and recover associated costs. OEH can also apply for a court order to transfer the land to a more responsible land manager if necessary.</p> <p>Landholders are expected to include provision for financial losses (due to having a significantly lower goat harvest due to fencing and penning) into the price for establishing the offset, therefore lessening the impetus for encouraging goat abundance for greater harvesting income.</p>
Rehabilitation	Will the cleared 5000 Ha be regenerated, or eventually be used by farmers for growing cereal crops.	A rehabilitation strategy for the Balranald Project has been prepared and is contained in Chapter 17 and Appendix F. The rehabilitation strategy includes the provision of large corridors of Mallee woodland (Dune Mallee and Sandplain Mallee) at both the West Balranald and Nepean. Only areas where the pre-mining land use was cropping will be returned to cropping post mining.
Rehabilitation	Concerns regarding the timeframe for regeneration to occur, and its success.	As stated above, a rehabilitation strategy for the Balranald Project has been prepared and is contained in Chapter 17 and Appendix F. Completion criteria for rehabilitation, including timeframes, will be developed as part of the MOP for the Balranald Project in accordance DRE's requirements.
Rehabilitation	What will happen to the cleared habitat, will it be burned? Will the large trees be stockpiled and returned as dead habitat trees to the site?	Management of cleared vegetation is discussed in Section 4.5.1 of the rehabilitation and closure strategy (Appendix F). Revegetation will include the spreading of brush and timber across rehabilitated areas.
Rehabilitation	How will the site manage rabbits and weeds?	Management of pests and weeds will be addressed in the BMP, as described in Section 9.6.2 of the EIS. Pest and weed management activities will include management protocols for feral animals such as foxes, goats, pigs and cats, and management protocols for the identification of noxious or important environmental weeds within areas to be cleared (in order to avoid transporting the weeds to the rehabilitation area).
Rehabilitation	Part of any offset should include total removal of vermin such as foxes and cats for a surrounding area of 200 square km.	The subject offset site would be managed in accordance with a management plan that would address the control of pests such as vermin and foxes that pose a risk of predation for key species, as described in the BOP.
Rehabilitation	If the site is cleared and regenerated, it should be fenced in vermin proof structure such as done at Scotia Sanctuary. Otherwise there is going to be a massive net loss to biodiversity. Extinction of the Mallee Fowl and other species in the area will be likely.	The principles of avoid, mitigate and offset have been applied in relation to the project. It is acknowledged that Malleefowl habitat will be lost by the project - 13% of the core area of habitat for the WBMS east of Box Creek and approximately 2% of the WBMS overall core habitat (combined areas east and west of Box Creek).

Table 6.4 **Matters raised in relation to draft EIS**

Item	Matter	Response
Rehabilitation	If Mallee Fowl are relocated, it needs to be in a huge enclosure, and the birds will need to be artificially fed on an appropriate ration. This is the only way survival can be guaranteed, until suitable habitat is regenerated, the birds or their offspring can eventually be released into the regenerated area, once it is vermin proof fenced.	<p>Translocation of Malleefowl for the Balranald Project is not being proposed due to its limited success; rather clearing controls will allow Malleefowl present within the project area to move into adjacent uncleared areas and clearing will not occur during the breeding season. Despite undertaking the mitigation measures documented in the biodiversity assessment, survivorship of displaced individuals has not been presumed within the impact assessment.</p> <p>The net loss of Malleefowl habitat will be offset by habitat improvements and threat reduction within the offset site and areas adjacent to the project area such that mortality of resident birds will be reduced as far as possible and so that the carrying capacity of presently occupied areas should be increased.</p>

Table 6.5 Matters raised in relation to biodiversity assessment and BOP

Item	Matter	Response
Tim Burnard, on behalf of the National Malleefowl Recovery Group Incorporated (NMFRG)		
	Concerns raised in the original submission remain unchanged.	
Adequacy of offsets	The offset package has identified another high value Malleefowl area within 50km of the subject site and essentially proposes to compensate for certain permanent loss of the proposed mine subject site by permanent protection of the offset site from possible future clearing. This nonetheless involves a substantial net loss of habitat for Malleefowl, and proposes to trade a certain loss for uncertain gains. This deal is not in the interests of Malleefowl conservation, a species that is Endangered in NSW and Vulnerable nationally primarily due to habitat loss (National Recovery Plan for Malleefowl, 2007).	Offsets and management of Malleefowl habitat are incorporated into the BOP in order to achieve an improve or maintain outcome from the proposal in the medium to long-term, consistent with OEH and DoE policy on these matters. Clearing from the project will be reduced wherever consistent with avoidance measures implemented to date.
Adequacy of offsets	We do not accept that improved management at the offset site adequately compensates for the permanent loss of suitable habitat for the species at the subject site. Indeed, the habitat improvement at the offset site is largely conjecture and in any case funding for management is unlikely to be in perpetuity and probably only 20 years (as referred in section 6.2.4).	Offsets and management of Malleefowl habitat are incorporated into the BOP in order to achieve an improve or maintain outcome from the proposal in the medium to long-term, consistent with OEH and DoE policy on these matters. Measures to improve habitat within the offset site are aimed at addressing listed Key Threatening Processes for Malleefowl and other impacted species. Funding to carry out these actions will be provided in-perpetuity as this is the requirement of the BioBanking scheme and is the purpose of establishment of the BioBanking Trust Fund from which annual payments are made. As explained in section 6.2.4 of the BOP, the sole reason for use of the 20 year figure for time over which loss is averted to calculate offset requirements, was due to the inability to enter a longer period into the DoE offsets assessment guide.
Adequacy of offsets	In particular, recent analyses of the effects of fox baiting on Malleefowl populations show no long term benefit to Malleefowl breeding numbers at any level of baiting (Benshemesh et al. 2007, Walsh et al. 2012; updated analyses involving over 1000 site years is currently underway). While there are no detailed studies on the effects of goats, we suggest that current measures at the proposed offset site (annual harvest) might be adequate and that further effort may not result in benefit to Malleefowl. In this regard we note that there are uncertainties in what comprises best management for Malleefowl, as shown in the lack of response by Malleefowl to fox baiting.	Measures to improve habitat within the offset site are aimed at addressing listed Key Threatening Processes for Malleefowl and other impacted species.

Table 6.5 **Matters raised in relation to biodiversity assessment and BOP**

Item	Matter	Response
Adequacy of offsets	The national Malleefowl Recovery Team has embarked on a sophisticated and extensive adaptive management program that aims to test the effectiveness of management actions at benefitting Malleefowl populations. Unlike conventional research, this is an ongoing program that aims to simultaneously implement and test management at a national scale. Support of this program is more likely to benefit Malleefowl in the long term than the application of management that is merely supposed to be beneficial based on theoretical assumptions or small scale studies.	<p>As an active contributor of funds to Malleefowl management groups and programs, Iluka is aware of the Adaptive Management Program. The research project has been funded in partnership with Iluka, Parks Victoria and the Victorian Malleefowl Recovery Group.</p> <p>Iluka is happy to further contribute to the program through the provision of monitoring data to assist the wider program in analysing and reporting to assist understanding local population trends etc.</p> <p>Relevant lessons learned from the Adaptive Management Program will also be applied to ongoing Malleefowl management on the project area and subject offset site consistent with approved management plans and conditions of approval.</p>
Adequacy of offsets	We are appalled that the subject site includes areas that have already been used as offsets for previous clearing. While this may be legally permissible under the terms of the previous offset, it is nonetheless morally and ethically unconscionable.	<p>To account for the proposed disturbance to the SMCAs, and in acknowledgement of their existing conservation status, Iluka and OEH have negotiated an additional offsetting (or replacement) requirement for the SMCAs over and above the offsetting requirements for the clearing using the BioBanking calculator for NSW and the Commonwealth's offset policy. The additional offset liability amounts to some 2,041 ha of Mallee and Chenopod vegetation communities.</p> <p>BioBanking ratios are typically much higher than ratios used for the establishment of SMCA areas and the BioBanking scheme provides annual income in-perpetuity for carrying out of targeted land management which is a major deficiency of SMCA agreements. Moreover, the suite of management actions required at the offset site will be significantly greater than requirements under existing SMCA agreements.</p>

6.9 Ongoing stakeholder engagement

Stakeholder engagement undertaken by Iluka on the Balranald Project has been comprehensive and reflects the requirements of the EIS Guidelines. Iluka will continue to work closely with councils, particularly BSC, State and Commonwealth agencies, directly and indirectly affected landholders, service providers, and the Balranald community to help inform the Balranald Project's final design and management and ensure the project meets the reasonable expectations of stakeholders.

Iluka will seek to undertake further consultation activities to complement the approvals process.

