



Environmental Protection Authority

Referral of a Proposal by the Proponent to the Environmental Protection Authority under Section 38(1) of the *Environmental Protection Act 1986*.

EPA REFERRAL
FORM
PROPONENT

PURPOSE OF THIS FORM

Section 38(1) of the *Environmental Protection Act 1986* (EP Act) provides that where a development proposal is likely to have a significant effect on the environment, a proponent may refer the proposal to the Environmental Protection Authority (EPA) for a decision on whether or not it requires assessment under the EP Act. This form sets out the information requirements for the referral of a proposal by a proponent.

Proponents are encouraged to familiarise themselves with the EPA's *General Guide on Referral of Proposals* [see Environmental Impact Assessment/Referral of Proposals and Schemes] before completing this form.

A referral under section 38(1) of the EP Act by a proponent to the EPA must be made on this form. A request to the EPA for a declaration under section 39B (derived proposal) must be made on this form. This form will be treated as a referral provided all information required by Part A has been included and all information requested by Part B has been provided to the extent that it is pertinent to the proposal being referred. Referral documents are to be submitted in two formats – hard copy and electronic copy. The electronic copy of the referral will be provided for public comment for a period of 7 days, prior to the EPA making its decision on whether or not to assess the proposal.

CHECKLIST

Before you submit this form, please check that you have:

	Yes	No
Completed all the questions in Part A (essential).	X	
Completed all applicable questions in Part B.	X	
Included Attachment 1 – location maps.	X	
Included Attachment 2 – additional document(s) the proponent wishes to provide (if applicable).	X	
Included Attachment 3 – confidential information (if applicable).		X
Enclosed an electronic copy of all referral information, including spatial data and contextual mapping but excluding confidential information.	X	

Following a review of the information presented in this form, please consider the following question (a response is optional).

Do you consider the proposal requires formal environmental impact assessment?	
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not sure
If yes, what level of assessment?	
<input type="checkbox"/> Assessment on Proponent Information	<input type="checkbox"/> Public Environmental Review

PROPONENT DECLARATION (to be completed by the proponent)

I,, (*full name*) declare that I am authorised on behalf of..... (being the person responsible for the proposal) to submit this form and further declare that the information contained in this form is true and not misleading.

Signature	Name (print)
Position	Company
Date	

PART A - PROPONENT AND PROPOSAL INFORMATION

(All fields of Part A must be completed for this document to be treated as a referral)

1 PROPONENT AND PROPOSAL INFORMATION

1.1 Proponent

Name	Main Roads Western Australia.
Joint Venture parties (if applicable)	Not Applicable.
Australian Company Number (if applicable)	
Postal Address (where the proponent is a corporation or an association of persons, whether incorporated or not, the postal address is that of the principal place of business or of the principal office in the State)	PO Box 5010 Bunbury WA 6231
Key proponent contact for the proposal: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• name• address• phone• email	John Szeliga Robertson Drive Bunbury WA 6231 (08) 9724 5632 John.szeliga@mainroads.wa.gov.au
Consultant for the proposal (if applicable): <ul style="list-style-type: none">• name• address• phone• email	Sean McSevich 10 Victoria Street Bunbury WA 6230 (08) 9271 0718 sean.mcsevich@ghd.com

1.2 Proposal

Title	Margaret River Perimeter Road
Description	<p>Main Roads Western Australia (Main Roads) proposes to construct a 7 km dual carriageway perimeter road, to the east of the Margaret River town site. The Project corridor navigates east around the Margaret River townsite, extending from Bussell Highway approximately 2 km north of Margaret River and linking back to the Bussell Highway approximately 1 km south of Rosa Brook Road. The Project includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Construction of a 7 km dual carriageway road;• Construction of two 85 m long bridges over the Margaret River;• a culvert crossing at Darch Brook;• A 1.6km extension of John

	<p>Archibald Drive;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Roundabouts at the northern and southern tie-ins to Bussell Highway; • Drainage structures; • Side road intersections with the Margaret River Airport access road, John Archibald Drive, Rosa Brook Road east and a proposed future light industrial area; • Fencing; and • Landscaping. <p>Road construction will be undertaken through both cut and fill operations, with the Project comprising;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Typically 90m wide road reserve; • Road comprising 2 x 3.5m sealed lanes with 1.5 sealed shoulders and 1.0 m unsealed shoulders; • A bridge across the Margaret River; and • A culvert crossing at Darch Brook. <p>The Margaret River Bridge consists of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A three span composite bridge approximately 85m in length with a central span across the river of approximately 45m; • Piers to be designed on the river banks; and • A bridge cross section comprising a total of 12m wide road surface with a 2m wide shared path on the eastern side. <p>Initially the road will be constructed as a single carriageway and single bridge, with an upgrade to dual</p>
--	--

	<p>carriageway and dual bridges should traffic volume warrant.</p> <p>The proposed Project will be undertaken in stages, with Stage 1 (southern link to Rosa Brook Road) proposed to commence in 2013/14.</p>																																												
Extent (area) of proposed ground disturbance.	42 ha, of which 8.5 ha is native vegetation, with 5.2 ha of this identified as good to very good condition																																												
Timeframe in which the activity or development is proposed to occur (including start and finish dates where applicable).	Construction is proposed to commence in the summer of 2013/14.																																												
Details of any staging of the proposal.	Construction is to be staged, commencing with Stage 1 (Southern link between Bussell Highway south of Margaret River townsite and Rosa Brook Road)																																												
Is the proposal a strategic proposal?	Not Applicable.																																												
<p>Is the proponent requesting a declaration that the proposal is a derived proposal?</p> <p>If so, provide the following information on the strategic assessment within which the referred proposal was identified:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • title of the strategic assessment; and • Ministerial Statement number. 	No																																												
Please indicate whether, and in what way, the proposal is related to other proposals in the region.	No																																												
Does the proponent own the land on which the proposal is to be established? If not, what other arrangements have been established to access the land?	<p>The land on which the Project is proposed to be constructed consists of varied ownership;</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Lot Number</th> <th>Land Type</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr><td>2153</td><td>Crown</td></tr> <tr><td>2150</td><td>Crown</td></tr> <tr><td>2143</td><td>Crown</td></tr> <tr><td>2143</td><td>Crown</td></tr> <tr><td>2149</td><td>Crown</td></tr> <tr><td>587</td><td>Crown</td></tr> <tr><td>2140</td><td>Crown</td></tr> <tr><td>13</td><td>Freehold</td></tr> <tr><td>16</td><td>Freehold</td></tr> <tr><td>1</td><td>Freehold</td></tr> <tr><td>9006</td><td>Freehold</td></tr> <tr><td>15</td><td>Freehold</td></tr> <tr><td>21</td><td>Freehold</td></tr> <tr><td>20</td><td>Freehold</td></tr> <tr><td>9006</td><td>Freehold</td></tr> <tr><td>852</td><td>Freehold</td></tr> <tr><td>352</td><td>Freehold</td></tr> <tr><td>351</td><td>Freehold</td></tr> <tr><td>300</td><td>Freehold</td></tr> <tr><td>300</td><td>Freehold</td></tr> <tr><td>856</td><td>Freehold</td></tr> </tbody> </table>	Lot Number	Land Type	2153	Crown	2150	Crown	2143	Crown	2143	Crown	2149	Crown	587	Crown	2140	Crown	13	Freehold	16	Freehold	1	Freehold	9006	Freehold	15	Freehold	21	Freehold	20	Freehold	9006	Freehold	852	Freehold	352	Freehold	351	Freehold	300	Freehold	300	Freehold	856	Freehold
Lot Number	Land Type																																												
2153	Crown																																												
2150	Crown																																												
2143	Crown																																												
2143	Crown																																												
2149	Crown																																												
587	Crown																																												
2140	Crown																																												
13	Freehold																																												
16	Freehold																																												
1	Freehold																																												
9006	Freehold																																												
15	Freehold																																												
21	Freehold																																												
20	Freehold																																												
9006	Freehold																																												
852	Freehold																																												
352	Freehold																																												
351	Freehold																																												
300	Freehold																																												
300	Freehold																																												
856	Freehold																																												

	855	Freehold
	853	Freehold
	859	Freehold
	854	Freehold
	0	Easement
	1	Building Strata
	0	Road
	0	Road Reserve
	<p>Main Roads will acquire land from State Forest, timber reserve and private property to create the road reserve.</p> <p>Consultation with property owners, Shire of Augusta-Margaret River (SAMR), Department of Environment and Conservation and Western Australian Planning Commission. Communication will continue as planning for the proposal progresses.</p>	
What is the current land use on the property, and the extent (area in hectares) of the property?	<p>The proposed development extends across the following land uses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agriculture and Rural; • State Forest (Crown Land); • Parks and Recreation; and • Road Reserve. <p>Lot numbers and land types are listed in Attachment 2.1.</p>	

1.3 Location

Name of the Shire in which the proposal is located.	Shire of Augusta-Margaret River
For urban areas: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • street address; • lot number; • suburb; and • nearest road intersection. 	Not Applicable
For remote localities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • nearest town; and • distance and direction from that town to the proposal site. 	The nearest town is Margaret River, located approximately 2 km to the west of the Project Area.
Electronic copy of spatial data - GIS or CAD, geo-referenced and conforming to the following parameters: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GIS: polygons representing all activities and named; • CAD: simple closed polygons representing all activities and named; • datum: GDA94; • projection: Geographic (latitude/longitude) or Map Grid of Australia (MGA); • format: Arcview shapefile, Arcinfo coverages, Microstation or AutoCAD. 	Yes

1.4 Confidential Information

Does the proponent wish to request the EPA to allow any part of the referral information to be treated as confidential?	No
If yes, is confidential information attached as a separate document in hard copy?	Not Applicable

1.5 Government Approvals

Is rezoning of any land required before the proposal can be implemented? If yes, please provide details.	No		
Is approval required from any Commonwealth or State Government agency or Local Authority for any part of the proposal? If yes, please complete the table below.	Yes		
Agency/Authority	Approval required	Application lodged Yes / No	Agency/Local Authority contact(s) for proposal
Department of Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and	Uncertain	A referral will be submitted concurrent with this referral	

Communities.			
Department of Indigenous Affairs	Section 18	Yes, been submitted	
Department of Water	Permit to interfere with Bed and Banks.	No	
Department of Environment and Conservation	Clearing Permit	Possible, if not assessed under Part IV	
Western Australian Planning Commission	Re-zoning	No	

PART B - ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND PROPOSED MANAGEMENT

2. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

Describe the impacts of the proposal on the following elements of the environment, by answering the questions contained in Sections 2.1-2.11:

- 2.1 flora and vegetation;
- 2.2 fauna;
- 2.3 rivers, creeks, wetlands and estuaries;
- 2.4 significant areas and/ or land features;
- 2.5 coastal zone areas;
- 2.6 marine areas and biota;
- 2.7 water supply and drainage catchments;
- 2.8 pollution;
- 2.9 greenhouse gas emissions;
- 2.10 contamination; and
- 2.11 social surroundings.

These features should be shown on the site plan, where appropriate.

For all information, please indicate:

- (a) the source of the information; and
- (b) the currency of the information.

2.1 Flora and Vegetation

2.1.1 Do you propose to clear any native flora and vegetation as a part of this proposal?

[A proposal to clear native vegetation may require a clearing permit under Part V of the EP Act (Environmental Protection (Clearing of Native Vegetation) Regulations 2004)]. Please contact the Department of Environment and Conservation (DEC) for more information.

- (please tick) Yes **If yes**, complete the rest of this section.
 No **If no**, go to the next section

2.1.2 How much vegetation are you proposing to clear (in hectares)?

The Project footprint is approximately 42 ha (including fencing areas). However, the majority of this footprint comprises previously disturbed areas (including agricultural land), with approximately 8.5 ha of remnant vegetation, of which 5.2 is rated as *good* to *very good* condition.

2.1.3 Have you submitted an application to clear native vegetation to the DEC (unless you are exempt from such a requirement)?

- Yes No **If yes**, on what date and to which office was the application submitted of the DEC?

Main Roads has been granted a Statewide Clearing Permit (CPS 818/6) which permits clearing for roadworks under certain conditions and prescribes specific management and offset requirements. CPS 818/6 requires an assessment against the 'Ten Clearing Principles', with this Project identified as at variance with Principle f) and may be at variance with Principles a), b), and h).

This Referral document is being submitted to the EPA for a determination under Section 38 of the *Environmental Protection Act 1986* (EP Act) on the requirement of formal assessment. Should the Project not be formally assessed, Main Roads will seek to conduct the clearing under CPS 818/6 or will seek a Purpose Clearing Permit under the Environmental Protection (Clearing of Native Vegetation) Regulations 2004.

2.1.4 Are you aware of any recent flora surveys carried out over the area to be disturbed by this proposal?

Yes

No

If yes, please attach a copy of any related survey reports and provide the date and name of persons / companies involved in the survey(s).

If no, please do not arrange to have any biological surveys conducted prior to consulting with the DEC.

The following flora assessments have been undertaken for the Margaret River Perimeter Road:

- GHD (2012a) Flora and Fauna Assessment (Attachment 2.2), undertaken in November 2011; and
- GHD (2012b) Priority Flora and Environmental Assessment (Attachment 2.2), undertaken in September 2012.

Flora assessments were also undertaken in 2000 by Ecologica and in 2005 by GHD. These surveys covered similar alignment to the proposed Margaret River Perimeter Road, with no Declared Rare Flora recorded.

2.1.5 Has a search of DEC records for known occurrences of rare or priority flora or threatened ecological communities been conducted for the site?

Yes

No

If you are proposing to clear native vegetation for any part of your proposal, a search of DEC records of known occurrences of rare or priority flora and threatened ecological communities will be required. Please contact DEC for more information.

Searches have been conducted with the results discussed in Attachment 2.2.

2.1.6 Are there any known occurrences of rare or priority flora or threatened ecological communities on the site?

Yes No **If yes**, please indicate which species or communities are involved and provide copies of any correspondence with DEC regarding these matters.

No rare species were identified within the Project Area during the spring 2011 survey.

One Priority Flora species was recorded by GHD (2012a) during the spring 2011 flora survey, with a targeted priority flora assessment undertaken for *Gastrolobium formosum* (Priority 3) in September 2012.

The targeted survey identified approximately 400 *G. formosum* plants within the project footprint, with an average cover of 70%. Additionally, more than 200 *G. formosum* individuals, with an average cover of 70%, were identified within 50 m on either side of the proposed corridor. All plants were identified within a narrow band along the northern banks of Margaret River (GHD, 2012b). See Attachment 2.2 for specific locations and details.

No Declared Rare species were identified during a survey undertaken by Ecologia in 2000, or a Survey undertaken by GHD in 2005. Two priority species were identified during the 2005 survey, although these are not within the current alignment or no longer listed.

2.1.7 If located within the Perth Metropolitan Region, is the proposed development within or adjacent to a listed Bush Forever Site? (You will need to contact the Bush Forever Office, at the Department for Planning and Infrastructure)

Yes No **If yes**, please indicate which Bush Forever Site is affected (site number and name of site where appropriate).

2.1.8 What is the condition of the vegetation at the site?

The condition of vegetation within the proposed footprint ranges from *Very Good* (3) to *Completely Degraded* (6), with the majority of area considered to be *Completely Degraded* (6) (GHD, 2012a).

Approximately 5 km of the Project Area traverses cleared agricultural land, predominately used for crops, sheep and cattle grazing and viticulture. The Project also traverses pine plantation, existing roads and private properties.

Approximately 8.5ha of the Project Area consists of native vegetation of predominantly Jarrah/Marri Forest and riparian vegetation. Remnant vegetation within the Project Area varies in condition, ranging from *Very Good* to *Degraded*, with 5.2 ha rated as *Very Good* to *Good*. The vegetation traversing the Bramley National Park is generally in *Very Good* condition, although it has been historically logged and had a fire within the last 10-15 years (GHD, 2012).

Further details are provided in the EIA (Attachment 2.2).

2.2 Fauna

2.2.1 Do you expect that any fauna or fauna habitat will be impacted by the proposal?

- (please tick) Yes **If yes**, complete the rest of this section.
 No **If no**, go to the next section.

2.2.2 Describe the nature and extent of the expected impact.

The vegetation in the alignment ranges from *Very Good* to *Completely Degraded*, with the majority of the area considered to be *Completely Degraded* (6) (GHD, 2012a). Vegetation identified as *Degraded* to *Completely Degraded* generally offers minimal habitat value to native fauna.

Approximately 8.5 ha of remnant vegetation requires clearing for the Project. The fragmented remnant vegetation traversed by the alignments contains evidence of degradation and disturbance with no significant linkages to larger vegetated areas (GHD, 2007). The remnant vegetation in the State Forest (in the north of the Project Area) is generally in *Very Good* condition and offers significant habitat value. However, this area is bordered by the Bramley National Park, so fauna habitat to will be cleared is likely to be locally well represented.

The total area of Black Cockatoo feeding habitat within the proposed corridor, and therefore likely to be cleared during construction, is approximately 4.54 ha, with approximately 0.86 ha identified as being habitat for the Western Ringtail Possum (GHD, 2012a). However, the Project is surrounded by 18000 ha of native vegetation within the surrounding 10 km, including the 3892 ha Bramley National Park and 610 ha State Forest.

2.2.3 Are you aware of any recent fauna surveys carried out over the area to be disturbed by this proposal?

- Yes No **If yes**, please attach a copy of any related survey reports and provide the date and name of persons / companies involved in the survey(s).
If no, please do not arrange to have any biological surveys conducted prior to consulting with the DEC.

A Fauna assessment was undertaken by GHD (2012a) for the Margaret River Perimeter Road (see Attachment 2.2).

2.2.4 Has a search of DEC records for known occurrences of Specially Protected (threatened) fauna been conducted for the site?

- Yes No (please tick)

A search of the EPBC Act *Protected Matters Search Tool* (2012) and DEC's *NatureMap* (2012) databases was undertaken. The results of these searches are detailed in Attachment 2.2. A DEC threatened fauna database search was undertaken as detailed in Attachment 2.2.

2.2.5 Are there any known occurrences of Specially Protected (threatened) fauna on the site?

- Yes No **If yes**, please indicate which species or communities are involved and provide copies of any correspondence with DEC regarding these matters.

Searches of the EPBC PMST (2012) and DEC's NatureMap (2012) database identified thirteen threatened species (7 species identified in Naturemap Seach), with a further six marine and/or migratory bird species, within 5 km of the Project Area. Six additional DEC listed Priority fauna species were recorded within 5 km of the Project Area. Conservation significant fauna identified in the desktop assessment are listed in Attachment 2.2.

Four of the 82 fauna species recorded during the 2011 site survey are conservation significant species specifically protected under the *Wildlife Conservation Act 1950* (WA) and EPBC Act, these being:

- Baudin's Black Cockatoo (*Calyptorhynchus baudinii*);
- Forest Red-tailed Black Cockatoo (*Calyptorhynchus banksia naso*);
- Western Ringtail Possum (*Pseudocheirus occidentalis*); and
- Southern Brush-tailed Phascogale (*Phascogale tapoatafa*).

2.3 Rivers, Creeks, Wetlands and Estuaries

2.3.1 Will the development occur within 200 metres of a river, creek, wetland or estuary?

- (please tick) Yes **If yes**, complete the rest of this section.
 No **If no**, go to the next section.

2.3.2 Will the development result in the clearing of vegetation within the 200 metre zone?

- Yes No **If yes**, please describe the extent of the expected impact.

A bridge crossing is proposed of the Margaret River, with a culvert proposed for the Darch Brook. Construction will require clearing of vegetation on the banks of the watercourses and a Permit to Interfere with Bed and Banks under the *Rights in Water and Irrigation Act 1914* will be required.

Clearing of vegetation during construction, may result in impacts including erosion, sedimentation and hydrocarbon contamination. These impacts are expected to be short term and will be managed through a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP).

2.3.3 Will the development result in the filling or excavation of a river, creek, wetland or estuary?

- Yes No **If yes**, please describe the extent of the expected impact.

Construction of the Bridge and Culvert crossing will require disturbance of the banks of the watercourses, with potential excavation and filling required. Potential impacts during construction include contamination, through increased sedimentation or hydrocarbon contamination, and alternation of hydrology.

The proposed crossings will be constructed to maintain surface water flows, and are not expected to result in significant long term impacts on the water courses.

Potential construction impacts will be managed through a CEMP.

2.3.4 Will the development result in the impoundment of a river, creek, wetland or estuary?

Yes No **If yes**, please describe the extent of the expected impact.

2.3.5 Will the development result in draining to a river, creek, wetland or estuary?

Yes No **If yes**, please describe the extent of the expected impact.

2.3.6 Are you aware if the proposal will impact on a river, creek, wetland or estuary (or its buffer) within one of the following categories? (please tick)

Conservation Category Wetland	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Unsure
Environmental Protection (South West Agricultural Zone Wetlands) Policy 1998	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Unsure
Perth's Bush Forever site	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Unsure
Environmental Protection (Swan & Canning Rivers) Policy 1998	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Unsure
The management area as defined in s4(1) of the <i>Swan River Trust Act 1988</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Unsure
Which is subject to an international agreement, because of the importance of the wetland for waterbirds and waterbird habitats (e.g. Ramsar, JAMBA, CAMBA)	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Unsure

2.4 Significant Areas and/ or Land Features

2.4.1 Is the proposed development located within or adjacent to an existing or proposed National Park or Nature Reserve?

Yes No **If yes**, please provide details.

North of the proposed Margaret River crossing, between chainages 0 and 2300, the Project traverses the Keenan State Forest No. 56; a timber reserve and the Bramley National Park

In the North, the Project is situated adjacent to the Bramley National Park (International Union for Conservation of Nature Category II) (Attachment 2.2). No current management plan exists for Bramley National Park.

Prior to being set aside, a section of the proposed Bramley National Park was excluded at the request of Main Roads and the Shire of AMR, for the road. However, due to alignment changes, the Project will require exclusion of 0.54 ha, from the National Park.

Main Roads will apply to have this area excised, to allow for road construction.

2.4.2 Are you aware of any Environmentally Sensitive Areas (as declared by the Minister under section 51B of the EP Act) that will be impacted by the proposed development?

Yes No **If yes**, please provide details.

2.4.3 Are you aware of any significant natural land features (e.g. caves, ranges etc) that will be impacted by the proposed development?

Yes No **If yes**, please provide details.

2.5 Coastal Zone Areas (Coastal Dunes and Beaches)

2.5.1 Will the development occur within 300metres of a coastal area?

(please tick) Yes **If yes**, complete the rest of this section.
 No **If no**, go to the next section.

2.5.2 What is the expected setback of the development from the high tide level and from the primary dune?

2.5.3 Will the development impact on coastal areas with significant landforms including beach ridge plain, cusped headland, coastal dunes or karst?

Yes No **If yes**, please describe the extent of the expected impact.

2.5.4 Is the development likely to impact on mangroves?

Yes No **If yes**, please describe the extent of the expected impact.

2.6 Marine Areas and Biota

2.6.1 Is the development likely to impact on an area of sensitive benthic communities, such as seagrasses, coral reefs or mangroves?

Yes No **If yes**, please describe the extent of the expected impact.

2.6.2 Is the development likely to impact on marine conservation reserves or areas recommended for reservation (as described in *A Representative Marine Reserve System for Western Australia*, CALM, 1994)?

Yes No **If yes**, please describe the extent of the expected impact.

2.6.3 Is the development likely to impact on marine areas used extensively for recreation or for commercial fishing activities?

Yes No **If yes**, please describe the extent of the expected impact, and provide any written advice from relevant agencies (e.g. Fisheries WA).

2.7 Water Supply and Drainage Catchments

2.7.1 Are you in a proclaimed or proposed groundwater or surface water protection area?

(You may need to contact the Department of Water (DoW) for more information on the requirements for your location, including the requirement for licences for water abstraction. Also, refer to the DoW website)

Yes No **If yes**, please describe what category of area.

The proposal is situated within the [Busselton-Capel and Blackwood RIWI Groundwater Areas](#).

The southern extent of the proposal extends into the [Cape to Cape South surface water area](#).

2.7.2 Are you in an existing or proposed Underground Water Supply and Pollution Control area?

(You may need to contact the DoW for more information on the requirements for your location, including the requirement for licences for water abstraction. Also, refer to the DoW website)

Yes No **If yes**, please describe what category of area.

2.7.3 Are you in a Public Drinking Water Supply Area (PDWSA)?

(You may need to contact the DoW for more information or refer to the DoW website. A proposal to clear vegetation within a PDWSA requires approval from DoW.)

Yes No **If yes**, please describe what category of area.

2.7.4 Is there sufficient water available for the proposal?

(Please consult with the DoW as to whether approvals are required to source water as you propose. Where necessary, please provide a letter of intent from the DoW)

Yes No (please tick)

The project is not expected to require ground or surface water during construction. However, should groundwater be required, a licence will be sought under the *Rights in Water Irrigation Act 1914*.

2.7.5 Will the proposal require drainage of the land?

Yes No **If yes**, how is the site to be drained and will the drainage be connected to an existing Local Authority or Water Corporation drainage system? Please provide details.

Construction of the bridge crossing of Margaret River may require dewatering, with piers to be constructed on the river banks. Disposal of this dewater will be undertaken through infiltration, and will be directed away from water bodies, including the river. Acid sulphate soils will be managed in accordance with a CEMP developed for the Project.

2.7.6 Is there a water requirement for the construction and/ or operation of this proposal?

(please tick) Yes **If yes**, complete the rest of this section.
 No **If no**, go to the next section.

2.7.7 What is the water requirement for the construction and operation of this proposal, in kilolitres per year?

The water requirement for construction is unknown at this time.

2.7.8 What is the proposed source of water for the proposal? (e.g. dam, bore, surface water etc.)

The proposed water source is unknown at this time.

2.8 Pollution

2.8.1 Is there likely to be any discharge of pollutants from this development, such as noise, vibration, gaseous emissions, dust, liquid effluent, solid waste or other pollutants?

(please tick) Yes **If yes**, complete the rest of this section.
 No **If no**, go to the next section.

2.8.2 Is the proposal a prescribed premise, under the Environmental Protection Regulations 1987?

(Refer to the EPA's *General Guide for Referral of Proposals to the EPA under section 38(1) of the EP Act 1986* for more information)

Yes No **If yes**, please describe what category of prescribed premise.

2.8.3 Will the proposal result in gaseous emissions to air?

Yes No **If yes**, please briefly describe.

Gaseous air emissions will result from construction and operation of the Project.

Emissions during construction will result from earthmoving and construction equipment, and from light vehicles, while emissions during operation will result from vehicular traffic.

Expected emissions during construction and operation are expected to comprise the main vehicle pollutants; including carbon monoxide (CO), particulate matter with an aerodynamic size of less than 10 (PM10) and less than 2.5 micron (PM2.5), oxides of nitrogen (NOx), polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs) and volatile organic compounds (VOCs), including benzene, toluene, xylenes, formaldehyde and acetaldehyde.

2.8.4 Have you done any modelling or analysis to demonstrate that air quality standards will be met, including consideration of cumulative impacts from other emission sources?

Yes No **If yes**, please briefly describe.

Based on the rural nature of the Project Area, the very low predicted traffic volumes (1500 vehicles per day), the unavailability of suitable background data and the small number of sensitive receptors within 200 m of the Perimeter road, Main Roads does not believe that air quality modelling is warranted.

2.8.5 Will the proposal result in liquid effluent discharge?

Yes No **If yes**, please briefly describe the nature, concentrations and receiving environment.

During operation of the Project, road run-off has the potential to contaminate surface water, including the Margaret River and Darch Brook. Additionally, sediment from disturbed areas may contaminate surface water bodies. These potential emissions will be managed during detailed design, to prevent direct run-off to watercourses.

Contaminated stormwater (ie sediment from disturbed areas and possibly hydrocarbon from spills) may result from construction activities, as well as dewatering during bridge construction. These emissions will be diverted away from existing water bodies for management, with actions detailed in the CEMP.

2.8.6 If there is likely to be discharges to a watercourse or marine environment, has any analysis been done to demonstrate that the State Water Quality Management Strategy or other appropriate standards will be able to be met?

Yes No **If yes, please describe.**

2.8.7 Will the proposal produce or result in solid wastes?

Yes No **If yes, please briefly describe the nature, concentrations and disposal location/ method.**

General construction waste and possible excess excavated soil may result from construction activities. All wastes generated will be re-used or disposed of at an appropriate waste disposal facility.

2.8.8 Will the proposal result in significant off-site noise emissions?

Yes No **If yes, please briefly describe.**

Noise emissions will result from construction activities and from operation of the Project.

Monitoring of existing noise levels on Bussell Highway noted an average 11 dB difference between day and night time noise levels. As the difference between the night time and daytime noise levels is greater than the 5 dB difference detailed in the WAPC policy, daytime levels have been determined to be the constraining factor in determining compliance with the WAPC policy.

Noise modelling was undertaken by Lloyd George Acoustics to determine expected traffic noise exposure from the new road and compliance with State Planning Policy 5.4 Road and Rail Transport Noise and Freight Considerations in Land Use Planning (WAPC, 2009). Modelling was based on the dual carriageway and assumed two urban development scenarios; low development of and full development of the Margaret River area (Attachment 2.2).

The results of this assessment indicated that for the Perimeter Road dual carriageway option, the future traffic noise is predicted to be under the WAPC State Planning Policy 5.4 limit criteria at all noise sensitive receivers assuming the "low development" scenario for Margaret River; and would exceed the limit criteria at seven noise sensitive receivers assuming the "full development" scenario for Margaret River.

Main Roads will implement management measures as required to ensure compliance with the WAPC policy. Noise Contour maps showing the expected noise levels resulting from both the single and dual carriageway options for the Project are provided in the EIA (Attachment 2.2).

Separate noise modelling was undertaken to assess the potential impact of the proposed John Archibald Drive, which forms a component of the project but will be a Shire road. 56 existing residences are located within 100 m of the proposed John Archibald Drive centreline, with this expected to increase as vacant lots in the vicinity are developed.

The John Archibald Drive Traffic Noise Assessment identified approximately five existing residences that are expected to experience noise levels between the WAPC target and limit levels at opening. The modelling predicted that these limits would not be exceeded for these existing residences.

Under the two development scenarios considered in the traffic noise assessment (low and full development of the Margaret River area), the number of existing residences expected to experience noise above the WAPC target level by 2031 increases to nine for the low development scenario and 11 for the full development scenario. Of the predicted target exceedances under the low development scenario, no existing residences are expected to experience noise levels above the limit. Under the full development scenario, seven of the 11 exceedances of the target also exceed the WAPC limit. The full noise assessment report for John Archibald Drive is provided in Attachment 2.2.

Management measures will form a key consideration during detailed design and be implemented along John Archibald Road to ensure compliance with the WAPC policy.

As outlined above, residents will be exposed to noise once the road opens. However, this noise will be managed to be consistent with the WAPC policy for existing residences, through the use of engineering measures (ie bunds, noise walls, road surface treatment) by Main Roads and the Shire of Augusta Margaret River.

Post construction, any development will be required to implement measures to ensure noise impacts from the road are consistent with WAPC State Planning Policy 5.4.

Residents will be exposed to short term noise during construction activities from vehicle and machinery movement. The construction phase of the Project will be temporary and is regulated under the Environmental Protection (Noise) Regulations 1997, which under Regulation 13, provide an exemption from compliance with the requirements of Regulation 7, for noise emitted from construction works on a construction site.

2.8.9 Will the development be subject to the Environmental Protection (Noise) Regulations 1997?

Yes

No

If yes, has any analysis been carried out to demonstrate that the proposal will comply with the Regulations?

Please attach the analysis.

Construction work will be subject to the requirements of the *Environmental Protection (Noise) Regulations 1997*.

The Construction works will be short term and the works will be carried out in accordance with control of environmental noise practices set out in Section 6 of *Australian Standard (AS) 2436-2010 Guide to Noise and Vibration Control on Construction, Demolition and Maintenance Sites*.

Operations will be undertaken to ensure compliance with these regulations, with relevant management actions detailed in the CEMP

2.8.10 Does the proposal have the potential to generate off-site, air quality impacts, dust, odour or another pollutant that may affect the amenity of residents and other

“sensitive premises” such as schools and hospitals (proposals in this category may include intensive agriculture, aquaculture, marinas, mines and quarries etc.)?

Yes

No

If yes, please describe and provide the distance to residences and other “sensitive premises”.

Two residences and three short stay accommodation chalets are located within 100 m of the Perimeter road centreline, with 56 residences located within 100m of John Archibald Drive. Local air quality may be temporarily affected by dust emissions during construction, however these potential impacts are not considered significant.

During construction of the Project, dust may be generated from clearing of vegetation, earthworks, spillage of soil material and vehicle movements along sealed and unsealed roads. Excessive dust emissions have the potential to impact on the health of the local community and surrounding vegetation.

2.8.11 If the proposal has a residential component or involves “sensitive premises”, is it located near a land use that may discharge a pollutant?

Yes

No

Not Applicable

If yes, please describe and provide the distance to the potential pollution source

2.9 Greenhouse Gas Emissions

2.9.1 Is this proposal likely to result in substantial greenhouse gas emissions (greater than 100 000 tonnes per annum of carbon dioxide equivalent emissions)?

Yes

No

If yes, please provide an estimate of the annual gross emissions in absolute and in carbon dioxide equivalent figures.

2.9.2 Further, if yes, please describe proposed measures to minimise emissions, and any sink enhancement actions proposed to offset emissions.

2.10 Contamination

2.10.1 Has the property on which the proposal is to be located been used in the past for activities which may have caused soil or groundwater contamination?

Yes

No

Unsure

If yes, please describe.

A search of the DEC’s Contaminated Sites database (2012) identified no registered contamination sites within the Project Area.

2.10.2 Has any assessment been done for soil or groundwater contamination on the site?

Yes

No

If yes, please describe.

2.10.3 Has the site been registered as a contaminated site under the *Contaminated Sites Act 2003*? (on finalisation of the CS Regulations and proclamation of the CS Act)

Yes

No

If yes, please describe.

2.11 Social Surroundings

2.11.1 Is the proposal on a property which contains or is near a site of Aboriginal ethnographic or archaeological significance that may be disturbed?

Yes

No

Unsure

If yes, please describe.

Brad Goode and Associates undertook an ethnographic (2007) and Aboriginal Heritage Surveys (2012) of the Project Area (see Attachment 2.2). Both assessments included archival research involving an examination of the Department of Indigenous Affairs (DIA) Sites Register, a review of any relevant site files and a review of any unpublished ethnographic reports that relate to the Margaret River Area (Brad Goode and Associates, 2007 and 2012). The 2012 review identified one Aboriginal Heritage site within the Project Area, Site ID 4495, Margaret River, which is considered a significant mythological site (DIA, 2012).

Site ID 4495 includes Darch Brook, which intersects the Project corridor at John Archibald Drive and Rosa Brook Road and the Margaret River, which will be affected by the construction of the bridge crossing (Figure 2) and as such requires ministerial consent under Section 18 of the *Aboriginal Heritage Act 1972* (AH Act). Any plans that may impact other tributaries of the Margaret River, within 30 m of their normal high water mark of the water courses, will require clearance under Section 18 of the *Aboriginal Heritage Act 1972*.

Consultation with local Nyungar informants stated that they would support Main Roads request for a Section 18 clearance to cross the Margaret River, and requested that the proposed bridge span entirely across the Margaret River and that Main Roads develop strategies to minimise disturbance to the embankments and not to adversely interfere with the natural flow of the waterway (Brad Goode and Associates, 2012).

An application has been submitted by Main Roads for consent to use the land on which the site occurs (Margaret River & Darch Brook) under Section 18 of the AH Act.

The buffer of other sites were identified within the Project Area, with the buffer of registered Aboriginal Heritage Site ID 4494, Rosa Brook Roads (Lore Ground), intersecting the south-east section of the Project Area (see Figure 2). Brad Goode and Associates (2007) confirmed the actual location of Site ID 4494, Rosa Brook Roads (Lore Ground), to be some 500 m east of the Project Area. Therefore, the actual site does not place any constraints upon the Project and is not anticipated to be impacted by the Project (Brad Goode and Associates, 2007).

Two ethnographic sites, Site ID 21037 Wcm/01 Red Gum Tree and Site ID 21038 Wcm/02 Water Course (Waugly Site) were also identified to intersect John Archibald Drive, located to the west (see Figure 2). Both these Aboriginal Heritage sites have been accessioned as 'Stored Data' on the DIA database and as such are no longer protected under the Aboriginal Heritage Act 1972 (Brad Goode and Associates, 2007).

2.11.2 Is the proposal on a property which contains or is near a site of high public interest (e.g. a major recreation area or natural scenic feature)?

Yes No **If yes**, please describe.

2.11.3 Will the proposal result in or require substantial transport of goods, which may affect the amenity of the local area?

Yes No **If yes**, please describe.

3. PROPOSED MANAGEMENT

3.1 Principles of Environmental Protection

3.1.1 Have you considered how your project gives attention to the following Principles, as set out in section 4A of the EP Act? (For information on the Principles of Environmental Protection, please see EPA Position Statement No. 7, available on the EPA website)

- | | | |
|--|---|-----------------------------|
| 1. The precautionary principle. | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| 2. The principle of intergenerational equity. | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| 3. The principle of the conservation of biological diversity and ecological integrity. | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| 4. Principles relating to improved valuation, pricing and incentive mechanisms. | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| 5. The principle of waste minimisation. | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No |

3.1.2 Is the proposal consistent with the EPA's Environmental Protection Bulletins/Position Statements and Environmental Assessment Guidelines/Guidance Statements (available on the EPA website)?

Yes No

3.2 Consultation

3.2.1 Has public consultation taken place (such as with other government agencies, community groups or neighbours), or is it intended that consultation shall take place?

Yes

No

If yes, please list those consulted and attach comments or summarise response on a separate sheet.

Various alignment options have been considered by the Shire of Augusta Margaret River (SAMR) since 1996, with this consideration incorporating extensive community consultation.

A proposed perimeter road alignment was included in the Margaret River Local Planning Strategy (LPS) and Margaret River Concept Plan, prepared by the Shire of Augusta Margaret River. The LPS included consultation with affected owners and Main Roads, and forms the proposed alignment.

The LPS documents were formally advertised for public comment and resulted in the final strategy being adopted by Council in June 2009, before being endorsed by the Western Australian Planning Commission (WAPC) in May 2011.

During the past three years, Main Roads has consulted with a range of environmental stakeholders, including;

Consultation with directly affected landowners

Main Roads in partnership with SAMR has been consulting with directly affected landowners over the past three years to discuss property impacts and to negotiate a preferred alignment across these properties. The consultations with landowners included a route definition assessment and planning to reduce environmental and social impacts and maximise opportunities to site the alignment in an acceptable location to all parties.

The consultation and communication program included periodic meetings with landowners to keep them informed on progress and development of the project.

Consultation with other stakeholders

Briefings, workshops and presentation to the shire council and government agencies began in June 2011 and are listed in **Table 1**.

Meetings have also been held with Indigenous stakeholders (Brad Goode and Associates 2007), relevant service authorities and environmental stakeholders to ensure they have been regularly updated with project progress. An Aboriginal Heritage application for a Section 18 (Margaret River & Darch Brook) is underway.

Table 1 Environmental Stakeholder Consultation

	Agency	Date	Attendees
1	Department of Environment and Conservation Bunbury office	Nov 11, 2011	Peter Hanley, Andrew Webb Kim Williams, Brad Comins, Jeremy Chick
		Feb 14, 2012	Peter Hanley, Kim Williams, Andrew Webb, Grant Lamb
		Oct 18, 2012	Peter Hanly, Brad Commins, Kim Williams, Grant Lamb and Chris Bishop
	Department of Environment and Conservation Margaret River office	May 4, 2012	Jeremy Chick
		Sept 11, 2012	Jeremy Chick

2	Office of the Environmental Protection Authority	Feb 15, 2012	Murray Hogarth, Han Jacobs
		October 22, 2012	Hans Jacob, John McPherson (DEC)
3	Shire of Augusta Margaret River	June 23, 2011	Full Council meeting
		Feb 1, 2012	Planning & Technical group
		March 29, 2012	Full Council meeting
		August 22, 2012	Full Council meeting
4	Fisheries WA	Feb 15, 2012	Nathan Harrison

Main Roads identified Riverslea Estate residents as key stakeholders, due to their proximity to the alignment. In response, addresses of residents within this area were sourced from the Shire's ratepayer database and letters were sent to residents on 19 August 2012 inviting them to technical briefings in Margaret River about the project. The estate was divided into four areas with separate briefings for each area to ensure all interested residents were able to raise any issues in a smaller group environment.

Each briefing was two hours (Monday 27 August and Tuesday 28 August: 4:30-6:30pm; 6:30-8:30pm). This allowed queries to focus on specific issues for each area, and to gain feedback on both alignments. The actions from these briefings included:

- Requests for briefings in Perth or Bunbury are being accommodated and continuing as requested.
- Absentee owners have been in contact via telephone and email.
- Landowners will be kept informed, through a fact sheet and relevant diagrams (via post or email).
- Queries will continue to be taken by phone and email.

Main Roads has also provided briefing sessions to residents located on the southern end of the project area. Residents from Darch Brook Road and Rosa Brook Road attended.

Community Reference Group

A Community Reference Group (CRG) has been established in order to deal with the issues that will be associated with this Project. Issues the CRG may provide advice on will include noise mitigation, landscaping, and environmental aspects. Main Roads anticipates that the CRG may continue through the project's construction phases.

The group will be independently facilitated and have representative input from the following:

- LGA technical officer/s
- LGA elected member (1)
- Chamber of Commerce (1)
- Leeuwin Conservation Group (1)

- ▶ General community members (4-5)
- ▶ Main Roads Senior Project Manager, Community Engagement Representative and other staff as required.

The CRG had its first meeting on October 18, 2012 and is expected to meet irregularly as the Project develops, with the next meeting expected to be in late January 2013.

Other Activities:

- ▶ Project information is available on the Main Roads website.
- ▶ A project contact (Community Engagement Consultant) is available to address community concerns and queries.
- ▶ Queries for briefings prior to the July 2012 newsletter distribution have been accommodated on request.
- ▶ A newsletter will be developed with the latest project information and announcement of the CRG membership in October 2012.

It is understood that Main Roads will continue to consult with these, and other relevant stakeholders through the development of the Project

Attachment 1

Figure 1 – Project Locality

Attachment 2

2.1 – Lot Numbers

Lot Number	Land Type
2153	Crown
2150	Crown
2143	Crown
2143	Crown
2149	Crown
587	Crown
2140	Crown
13	Freehold
16	Freehold
1	Freehold
9006	Freehold
15	Freehold
21	Freehold
20	Freehold
9006	Freehold
852	Freehold
352	Freehold
351	Freehold
300	Freehold
300	Freehold
856	Freehold
855	Freehold
853	Freehold
859	Freehold
854	Freehold
0	Easement
1	Building Strata
0	Road
0	Road Reserve

2.2 – Environmental Impact Assessment