



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

**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).	✓	
Completed all applicable questions in Part B.	✓	
Included Attachment 1 – location maps.	✓	
Included Attachment 2 – additional document(s) the proponent wishes to provide (if applicable).	✓	
Included Attachment 3 – confidential information (if applicable).		✓
Enclosed an electronic copy of all referral information, including spatial data and contextual mapping but excluding confidential information.	✓	

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input 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, Drew Farrar, declare that I am authorised on behalf of Kugan Kuganathan (MRWA) (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) Drew Farrar
Manager, Ecology, Marine and Impact Assessment	Company GHD Pty Ltd
Date	06/06/2014

## 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)	N/A
Australian Company Number (if applicable)	ABN: 50 860 676 021
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)	Main Roads Western Australia Don Aitken Centre Waterloo Crescent East Perth Perth WA 6004
Key proponent contact for the proposal: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• name</li><li>• address</li><li>• phone</li><li>• email</li></ul>	Kugan Kuganathan Main Roads Western Australia Don Aitken Centre Waterloo Crescent East Perth WA 6004 (08) 9323 4121 kugan.kuganathan@mainroads.wa.gov.au
Consultant for the proposal (if applicable): <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• name</li><li>• address</li><li>• phone</li><li>• email</li></ul>	Timothy Moulds GHD Pty Ltd 239 Adelaide Tce, Perth, WA, 6004 08 62228973 Tim.moulds@ghd.com

#### 1.2 Proposal

Title	Mitchell Freeway Extension – Neerabup Rd East and West
Mitchell Freeway Extension Stage 1 – Neerabup Road East / West and associated works	<p>This referral is for the assessment of Neerabup Road East and Neerabup Road West only (within Stage 1 of the Mitchell Freeway Extension).</p> <p>Stage 1 (Neerabup Road East / West) Project includes the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Grade separated interchanges (including road bridges) at Neerabup Road</li><li>• Underpasses at Neerabup Road</li><li>• Neerabup Road upgrade from Connolly Drive to Wanneroo Road connection to freeway</li></ul> <p>Neerabup Road East and Neerabup Road West will require clearing of 12.07 ha of native vegetation, with 11.24 ha located within Bush Forever Site 383.</p> <p>The remaining areas of Stage 1 of the project have previously been assessed as part of the</p>

	<p>MRS amendment 992/33 in March 2000 and were approved under Ministerial Statement 629 in 2003.</p> <p>In addition to these works, there is a proposed relocation of an existing quarry access road off Hester Avenue, which will result in the clearing of 0.74 ha of native vegetation within Neerabup National Park and Bush Forever Site 383.</p>
<p>Extent (area) of proposed ground disturbance.</p>	<p>13.15 ha total, of which 12.07 ha of clearing is proposed for Stage 1 of the Mitchell Freeway Extension - Neerabup Road East / West. The relocation of an existing quarry access road will disturb 1.58 ha of land with a total clearing of 0.85 ha (0.74 ha native vegetation and 0.11 ha revegetation).</p> <p>The total combined land disturbance for Mitchell Freeway Extension Stage 1 - Neerabup Road East / West and Associated Works is 14.73 ha, with 12.92 ha of native vegetation clearing is proposed.</p>
<p>Timeframe in which the activity or development is proposed to occur (including start and finish dates where applicable).</p>	<p>The construction of Stage 1 of the Project is proposed to commence in late 2015 and will be completed by December 2017.</p>
<p>Details of any staging of the proposal.</p>	<p>The Mitchell Freeway Extension Community Working Group (CWG) was established by the State Minister for Transport to assist Government to better understand what the local community sees as priority in achieving road transport solutions to address the growth of the north metropolitan Perth area in the next 20 years, including the timeline for the extension of the Mitchell Freeway north.</p> <p>The Strategic Business Case prepared by the CWG in 2012 for Mitchell Freeway Extension was approved by the State Minister for Transport and the proposed works have been divided into three stages.</p> <p><b>Stage 1:</b> Freeway extension from Burns Beach Road to Hester Avenue and the connecting roads (Neerabup Road and Hester Avenue). Planned for 2015–2017.</p> <p>State Minister for Transport has committed funding for Mitchell Freeway Extension from Burns Beach Road to Hester Avenue (Stage 1) and to complete the project by December 2017. Stage 1 of the Project is not dependent on the design or construction of either Stage 2 or 3 of the Project.</p> <p>As part of the Stage 1 works the Wanneroo</p>

	<p>Road/Neerabup Road/Flynn Drive intersection will be constructed to its ultimate stage and it requires duplication of Wanneroo Road on either side of the intersection for a distance of approximately 400m. This will leave a small section of Wanneroo Road with single carriageway between Hall Road and the duplicated Wanneroo Road at Flynn Drive/ Neerabup Road intersection. Main Roads has included Wanneroo Road duplication between Hall Road and Neerabup Road/Flynn Drive intersection as a priced option in Stage 1 works if funding permits.</p> <p><b>Stage 2:</b> Freeway extension from Hester Avenue to Romeo Road and connecting road (Romeo Road). Planned for 2017–2021 (subject to funding).</p> <p><b>Stage 3:</b> Wanneroo Road duplication from Joondalup Drive to Hall Road and Connelly Drive dual carriageway. Planned for 2027–2029 (subject to funding)</p> <p>Stages 2 and 3 have not been referred because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The majority of Stages 2 and 3 occur within Ministerial Statement 629.</li> <li>• The State has not committed funding for Stages 2 and 3.</li> <li>• A well-developed concept plan for Stages 2 and 3 is not available.</li> </ul>
Is the proposal a strategic proposal?	No
<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"> <li>• title of the strategic assessment; and</li> <li>• Ministerial Statement number.</li> </ul>	No
Please indicate whether, and in what way, the proposal is related to other proposals in the region.	<p>As above, this proposal is part of Stage 1 of the extension of the Mitchell Freeway.</p> <p>The proposal includes the proposed relocation of an existing quarry access road (off Hester Avenue) directly adjacent to the project area.</p>
Does the proponent own the land on which the proposal is to be established? If not, what other arrangements have been	With regards to land requirement for the Neerabup Road, East of the Freeway; a small portion (1.3 ha) of the land required is an A Class Reserve 27575. A submission has been made to the

<p>established to access the land?</p>	<p>Department of Parks &amp; Wildlife seeking the Conservation Commissions agreement to the excision of this land from the reserve for its use and dedication as road. Access to this land will only occur once the land has been cleared and excised from the A Class reservation in compliance of S42(4)(b) of the Land Administration Act.</p> <p>A portion of the land is held by the Department of Lands as Unallocated Crown Land and will be dedicated as road during the course of the project. Permission to access the Crown land will be obtained from the Department of Lands if access is required prior to the land being dedicated road reserve.</p> <p>A portion of the land is held in freehold by the West Australian Planning Commission. A submission is with the Commission seeking surrender of the required land for its use and dedication as road reserve. Permission to access the land will be obtained from the Commission if access is required prior to the land being dedicated road reserve.</p> <p>With regards to the land requirement for the Neerabup Road, West of the Freeway; this land is already dedicated road reserve.</p> <p>The existing quarry access road and vegetation proposed to be cleared (1.58 ha) is located within A Class Reserve 27575. Main Roads has consulted with the Conservation Commission and DPaW about the access road within the National Park.</p>
<p>What is the current land use on the property, and the extent (area in hectares) of the property?</p>	<p>The total area for Neerabup Road East and West is 13.15 ha.</p> <p>The area for Neerabup Road West is currently a mixture of Degraded vegetation (0.86 ha) and tracks, and 1.06 ha of tuart woodland.</p> <p>Neerabup Road East traverses Neerabup National Park and is comprised of Banksia woodland (2.26 ha), Degraded vegetation/ roads/ tracks/ railways (0.22 ha) and Tuart woodland (8.76 ha).</p> <p>The land associated with the quarry access off Hester Avenue is 1.58 ha in size and includes approximately 0.73 ha of the existing access road and 0.85 ha of native vegetation (Banksia woodland and revegetation).</p>

### 1.3 Location

Name of the Shire in which the proposal is located.	City of Joondalup and City of Wanneroo
For urban areas: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• street address;</li> <li>• lot number;</li> <li>• suburb; and</li> <li>• nearest road intersection.</li> </ul>	<p>Stage 1 includes the freeway extension within the MRS boundary between Burns Beach Road and Hester Avenue; Neerabup Road between Connolly Drive and Wanneroo Road; Hester Avenue from Mitchell Freeway to Wanneroo Road; and Wanneroo Road between Flynn Drive and Hall Road.</p> <p>This referral relates to Neerabup Road East (from Mitchell Freeway to Wanneroo Road) and west (from Mitchell Freeway to Connolly Drive) only (within Stage 1 of the project) and the quarry access road.</p>
For remote localities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• nearest town; and</li> <li>• distance and direction from that town to the proposal site.</li> </ul>	N/A
Electronic copy of spatial data - GIS or CAD, geo-referenced and conforming to the following parameters: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• GIS: polygons representing all activities and named;</li> <li>• CAD: simple closed polygons representing all activities and named;</li> <li>• datum: GDA94;</li> <li>• projection: Geographic (latitude/longitude) or Map Grid of Australia (MGA);</li> <li>• format: Arcview shapefile, Arcinfo coverages, Microstation or AutoCAD.</li> </ul>	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?	N/A

### 1.5 Government Approvals

Is rezoning of any land required before the proposal can be implemented? If yes, please provide details.	Noting the information above regarding land ownership, all the land is reserved 'Other Regional Roads
---	---

		<p>Reservation' under the Metropolitan Region Scheme. The Eastern portion was reserved in the Clarkson- Butler MRS Amendment No. 992/33.</p> <p>The land is similarly reserved for road under the City of Wanneroo Town Planning Scheme No. 2.</p>	
<p>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.</p>		Yes	
Agency/Authority	Approval required	Application lodged Yes / No	Agency/Local Authority contact(s) for proposal
Department of the Environment	EPBC referral	Yes (no. 2013/7091)	Nikki Ward



## 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)?

12.92 ha (12.07 ha for Stage 1 of the Mitchell Freeway Extension and 0.85 ha for the relocation of the existing quarry access road.)

2.1.3 Have you submitted an application to clear native vegetation to the DER (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?

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.

A flora and fauna assessment was undertaken by GHD in 2013 (GHD 2014, Mitchell Freeway Extension Flora and Fauna Assessment Report. Unpublished report completed for Main Roads Western Australia). A preliminary reconnaissance flora and fauna survey was completed for the quarry access road off Hester Avenue (GHD 2014, Mitchell Freeway BGC Quarry Access Realignment Preliminary Environmental Impact Assessment Report. Unpublished report completed for Main Roads Western Australia. GHD 2014, BGC Quarry Access Realignment Preliminary Clearing Impact Assessment Report. Unpublished report completed for Main Roads Western Australia).

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.

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.

Individuals of two DPaW Priority-listed flora taxa will be cleared for the relocation of the quarry access road, including *Acacia benthamii* (Priority 2) and five individuals of *Jacksonia sericea* (Priority 4).

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).

One Bush Forever site occurs within the boundaries of the Project Area:

- Site 383: Neerabup National Park, Lake Nowergup Nature Reserve and adjacent bushland, Neerabup.

The project will clear 11.98 ha of Bush Forever Site 383 (11.24 ha for Stage 1 of the Mitchell Freeway Extension and 0.74 ha for the relocation of the existing quarry access road).

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

Neerabup Rd West is degraded to completely degraded. Neerabup Rd East is excellent to very good. The vegetation to be cleared to relocate the quarry road is very good to degraded condition.

## 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.

Three broad fauna habitat types were identified within the Neerabup Rd study area, including Banksia Woodland, Tuart Forest and Jarrah–Banksia Woodland.

The native vegetation within the Study Area consists predominantly of a combination of mixed Eucalypt woodlands and Banksia woodlands. These habitat types consist of a dominant overstorey of *Eucalyptus gomphocephala* (tuart), *E. marginata* (jarrah), *Banksia attenuata* and *B. menziesii* and were generally associated with grey sandy soils on plains or low undulating dune systems. The Eucalypt and Banksia woodlands ranged from very good to excellent condition and provide particularly high habitat value for fauna species due to the variety of microhabitats and various resource niches available (i.e. fallen logs, hollows, leaf litter, sandy soil).

The woodlands (all three habitat types) would be expected to support a high diversity of bird species. Across these woodlands there are areas of sandy soils that are particularly suitable for burrowing reptiles. The connectivity of canopy cover in the woodland varies and the mid-layer of the habitat is relatively sparse. The woodland has patches of thick leaf litter and ground cover.

This ground cover would provide foraging opportunities and refuge areas for ground-dwelling mammals such as the Echidna, Southern Brown Bandicoot/Quenda and Western Brush Wallaby and reptiles such as goannas and skinks. Micro-habitat features such as tree hollows and cavities provide habitat for a number of birds, reptiles and small mammal species. The presence of tuart, jarrah, banksia and other proteaceous species provides key foraging habitat for conservation significant black cockatoo species. Some of the larger Eucalypts also provide potential breeding and roosting habitat for black cockatoos.

Two broad fauna habitats associated with the quarry access study area were recorded, Banksia woodland and revegetation. The Banksia woodland is well represented in the immediate vicinity within Neerabup National Park and in the

broader City of Wanneroo region. The project area contains *Banksia spp.* *Hakea spp.* and other proteaceous species that provide suitable foraging habitat for the conservation significant Black Cockatoo species. There is 0.74 ha of Banksia woodland foraging habitat within the project area. There is however no potential breeding habitat or suitable roosting habitat for Black Cockatoos within the project area. Overall, clearing of vegetation within the project area is not expected to adversely impact upon available fauna species habitat locally or regionally.

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 number of fauna surveys have been undertaken as detailed below:

- Black Cockatoo Assessment (GHD 2013, Mitchell Freeway Extension Black Cockatoo Assessment. Unpublished report completed for Main Roads Western Australia).
- Flora and Fauna Assessment (GHD 2014, Mitchell Freeway Extension Flora and Fauna Assessment Report. Unpublished report completed for Main Roads Western Australia).
- Level 2 Fauna Survey (GHD 2014, Neerabup Road Extension Level 2 Fauna Survey. Unpublished report completed for Main Roads Western Australia).
- Neerabup Road Extension Fauna Movement Survey (GHD 2014, Neerabup Road Extension Fauna Movement Survey. Unpublished report completed for Main Roads Western Australia).
- Preliminary reconnaissance flora and fauna survey (GHD 2014, Mitchell Freeway BGC Quarry Access Realignment Preliminary Environmental Impact Assessment Report. Unpublished report completed for Main Roads Western Australia).
- GHD 2014, BGC Quarry Access Realignment Preliminary Clearing Impact Assessment Report. Unpublished report completed for Main Roads Western Australia).

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)

DER/DPaW records were analysed as part of the fauna surveys detailed above, and these search results were then utilised to determine which species are likely to occur within the Project area. A total of 10 conservation significant fauna have been identified as present or potentially occurring in the Neerabup Rd study area based on a combination of observations and habitat assessment.

A likelihood of occurrence assessment was undertaken for conservation significant fauna considered potentially occurring in the quarry access study

area. This assessment found that eight species are considered likely to occur, with five species in common with the Neerabup Rd study area.

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.

A total of five Threatened species were recorded from the study area or immediate surrounds during the field surveys (Flora and Fauna Assessment and Black Cockatoo Assessment) including:

- Carnaby's Black Cockatoo (*Calyptorhynchus latirostris*) - Schedule 1
- Baudin's Black Cockatoo (*Calyptorhynchus baudinii*) - Schedule 1
- Forest Red-tailed Black Cockatoo (*Calyptorhynchus banksii* subsp. *naso*) - Schedule 1
- Rainbow Bee Eater (*Merops ornatus*) –Schedule 3.
- Carpet Python (*Morelia spilota imbricata*) – Schedule 4.

Two Priority species were also identified:

- Southern Brown Bandicoot (*Isododon obesulus fusciventer*) – Priority 5.
- Western Brush Wallaby (*Macropus Irma*) – Priority 4.

Further, two Threatened and two Priority species are considered likely to occur:

- Peregrine Falcon (*Falco peregrinus*) - Schedule 4
- Fork-tailed Swift (*Apus pacificus*) - Schedule 3
- Jewelled Ctenotus (*Ctenotus gemmula*) (Swan Coastal Plain pop.) - Priority 3
- Black-striped Snake (*Neelaps calonotos*) - Priority 3

The Chuditch (*Dasyurus geoffroii*, Schedule 1) is also considered potentially occurring within the project area based on anecdotal evidence only.

No conservation significant fauna species were recorded during the reconnaissance survey of the quarry access road off Hester Avenue. A likelihood of occurrence assessment for conservation significant fauna identified eight species likely to occur within the study area, including:

- Carnaby's Black Cockatoo (*Calyptorhynchus latirostris*) - Schedule 1
- Baudin's Black Cockatoo (*Calyptorhynchus baudinii*) - Schedule 1
- Rainbow Bee-eater (*Merops ornatus*) - Schedule 3
- Western Brush Wallaby (*Macropus irma*) - Priority 4
- Carpet Python (*Morelia spilota subsp. imbricata*) - Schedule 4
- Black-striped Snake (*Neelaps calonotos*) - Priority 3
- a native bee (*Hylaeus globuliferus*) - Priority 3
- the Graceful Sun Moth (*Synemon gratiosa*) - Priority 4

An assessment of the impacts of the project on black cockatoos was undertaken. Approximately 12.61 ha of cockatoo habitat (11.87 ha for Stage 1 of the Mitchell Freeway Extension and 0.74 ha for the relocation of the existing quarry access road) will be cleared for this project.

## 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.

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.

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.

The project will traverse the Neerabup National Park (total area of 937 ha) and involve the clearing of 11.98 ha (11.24 ha for Stage 1 of the Mitchell Freeway Extension and 0.74 ha for the relocation of the existing quarry access road) in the Park.

The project is near Neerabup Nature Reserve; however this reserve will not be impacted.

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.

The project traverses one ESA associated with Bush Forever Site 383: Neerabup National Park, Lake Nowergup Nature Reserve and adjacent bushland, Neerabup.

The project will clear 11.98 ha of Bush Forever Site 383 (11.24 ha for Stage 1 of the Mitchell Freeway Extension and 0.74 ha for the relocation of the existing quarry access road).

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 project is located in the Perth Groundwater 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.

The Project is within the Perth Coastal Underground Water Pollution Control Area Public Drinking Water Source 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.

The Project is located in the Perth Coastal Underground Water Pollution Control Area Public Drinking Water Source 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)

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.

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?

Current estimations suggest that the project may require 120 kilolitres per year, however, further refinement will be determined upon detailed design.

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

Main Roads is currently looking into the availability of existing bores as a water source, however, this may need to be supplemented by other sources if required.

## 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.

Project construction will result in air emissions from construction machinery. Sandy soils are common in the project area, and have the potential for movement in strong breezes. Excessive dust emissions can impact on the health of the local community and surrounding vegetation and will require preventative management.

The project has been designed to remove pressure on nearby arterial roads including Mitchell Freeway and Wanneroo Road and reduce congestion.

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.

2.8.5 Will the proposal result in liquid effluent discharge?

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

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.

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

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

A noise modelling study was conducted for the larger Mitchell Freeway Project, and found that residences alongside Mitchell freeway parallel to the existing Neerabup Road have a high degree of noise resulting from the road, typically above the night time noise limit of 55 dBA, and in some locations above the day

time noise limit of 60 dBA. Further modelling indicated a similar noise level and impact to receptors post construction of the Mitchell Freeway Project, without any mitigation measures in place.

The installation of noise walls alongside the Principle Shared Path in the Neerabup project area will limit noise at these receptors to within approved limits.

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.

The construction associated with the project will comply with the Environmental Protection (Noise) Regulations 1997. Any works undertaken outside approved working hours will have local government approval.

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”.

The project has the potential to result in dust and noise impacts to sensitive receptors including residences on Neerabup Road East. The nearest residence is approximately 15 m from the construction works. Appropriate noise control measures will be enforced for this project.

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.

The DER Contaminated Sites Database (available online) identified no known contaminated sites present within or immediately adjacent to the project. No historic uses that may result in contamination were identified.

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

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

A Preliminary Site Investigation was conducted for the larger Mitchell Freeway Project which included the Neerabup road extension. No contaminated sites were identified; however a general fly tipping site was identified at the eastern end of the project area.

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.

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.

The majority of this project is located across Neerabup National Park.

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.

The project will result in increased vehicle movements during construction, including the transportation of materials to site. After construction the project will result in regular traffic movements through the area.

### 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.

The Mitchell Freeway extension has been the subject of a planning process undertaken by Main Roads for several years. The Mitchell Freeway Extension Community Working Group (CWG) was formed by the State Government in March 2012 with the aim of working with the community and assisted by Main Roads to develop the "right transport" solution for the community in the northern corridor. The CWG closely examined six options and associated costs and then prepared a Strategic Business Case, recommending Value Engineered Option F (staged construction) as the preferred transport solution.

Main Roads is establishing a Community Reference Group (CRG) to provide input to the preliminary design for the Mitchell Freeway Extension. It is intended the CRG will include key stakeholders from eight suburbs: Joondalup, Currambine, Kinross, Clarkson, Merriwa, Ridgewood, Butler and Alkimos. Also included will be some members of the CWG.

The CRG will be a non-decision making group that will assist Main Roads throughout the preliminary design process by providing input into a range of

issues such as environmental concerns, noise wall location and design, impacts on local traffic and the development of a Principal Shared Path (PSP).

Additional groups consulted for this project include:

- Quinns Rocks Environmental Group
- Cockatoo Alliance
- DPaW
- Friends of Yellagonga
- Lake Nowergup/Carrabooda Valley Community Group