

**Division 70: Office of the Environmental Protection Authority —**

**[Supplementary Information No A35.]**

*Question: Mr C.J. Tallentire requested details of the travel specifically to review uranium projects and where that funding was sourced.*

*Answer:* Members of the Environmental Protection Authority (EPA) and relevant officers in the Office of the EPA have undertaken the following site visits to uranium proposals currently under assessment:

- BHP Billiton's Yeelirrie Uranium Project on 7 October 2010;
- Toro Energy's Wiluna Uranium Project on 4 November 2010; and
- Mega Uranium's Lake Maitland Uranium Project on 19 May 2011.

All of these site visits used charter aircraft due to the number of people attending, including company representatives, consultants to the company and officers of other agencies in the case of the Lake Maitland visit.

The EPA and Office of the EPA have a policy of using commercial flights where available, and have funds in their budget for this, however this was not possible in each of these circumstances. The companies arranged for each of the charters.

**[Supplementary Information No A36.]**

*Question: Mr C.J. Tallentire requested information on the number of projects awaiting EPA action.*

*Answer:* The number of projects under assessment recorded on the Environmental Protection Authority (EPA) web-site as at 30 May 2011 is 95. Of these, 43 projects require EPA action.

**[Supplementary Information No A37.]**

*Question: Mr C.J. Tallentire requested information on the number of projects that were audited for the first outcome, the efficiency and effectiveness indicator, which is the percentage of approved projects with actual impacts not exceeding those predicted during the assessment, and the number of projects that were audited for the 100 per cent reading there.*

*Answer:* The determination of whether a project has had impacts exceeding those predicted during the assessment is based on information from Office of the Environmental Protection Authority (OEPA) audits, audits by other Government agencies, reports submitted by project proponents and information reported by the public.

A key measure for this key performance indicator is the number of times that action needs to be taken beyond routine compliance to achieve protection of the environment as specified under conditions in an Implementation Statement. Such action could relate to the issuing of a notice by the Minister for Environment to prevent, control or abate any pollution or environmental harm caused by non-compliance.

The anticipated 2010-2011 result of 100 per cent for effectiveness indicator 1 was determined by considering the criteria outlined above, including the outcome of 50 detailed audits undertaken by the OEPA in 2010-2011 and compliance reports submitted by proponents.

**[Supplementary Information No A38.]**

*Question: Mr F.M. Logan requested information on the detail of the \$700 000 allocated to the fertiliser action program.*

*Answer:* The provision of \$1.09 million in 2011-2012 for income from grants and subsidies is an estimate of likely income for that year. The Royalties for Regions: Pilbara Cities funding of \$390,000 is the only confirmed amount.

The balance of \$700,000 represents an estimate of other income that may arise based on historic trends.

The one-off Fertiliser Action Plan grant of \$610,000 from State NRM funds received by the Office of the Environmental Protection Authority in 2009-2010 on behalf of other agencies has been acquitted. \$350,000 of the funds were used by the Department of Agriculture for commencement of trials on low water soluble fertiliser. \$120,00 to the Department of Water, for work on soil amendments. The balance was expended by the Department of Environment and Conservation/Office of the Environmental Protection Authority, working with the fertiliser manufacturers and fertiliser experts to develop the basis for packaged fertiliser regulations.