

Hi there

I provide some further correspondence regarding the licence guidance out for public comment. I am grateful to a phone call from Michael Christenen on 28 October 2015 in response to the comments I have written in the email below. My understanding from the conversation with Michael is that the board of directors is only supposed to apply to smaller operators and not intended for multi-national operators. I think this needs to be made clearer.

I also verbally mentioned that the industry briefing was not well publicised (even though now I have signed up to alerts which I hadn't before) and that we would like to see the risk assessment framework prior to commenting on the proposed changes. Unfortunately the risk assessment framework is yet to be released and I think this underpins the proposed changes. Michael did acknowledge that there are several interlinked guidance materials currently available at the moment.

Overall I think the changes make sense and should streamline things. One big change is to remove annual reporting however the AACR guidance would be published on the DER website. Given the lack of resources of officers to assess the reports, reducing the reporting to an AACR will make things quicker and more targeted to key issues, should they arise.

I'm curious about the decision to include clearing permit requirements. Section 2.5, 2.6, 2.7 of the application form requires that the amount of hectares of clearing required to be specified, the method and an aerial photograph. Section 3.3 requires the period of clearing undertaken to align with clearing permit applications. Given that Works Approvals are governed by the Environmental Protection Regulations 1987 (EP Regulations) and the Environmental Protection Act 1984 this is a little confusing. The Environmental Protection (Clearing of Native Vegetation) Regulations 2004 also govern clearing requirements but do not impact the licensing process.

The proposed changes includes the requirement to complete a risk schedule as part of the application form in accordance with the hazard-pathway-receptor model of environmental risks. This model will form the basis of DER's proposed Environmental Risk Assessment Framework but we cannot comment further as this is yet to be released. Whilst this framework shall include matters such as modelling information, monitoring information and emissions management plans it is difficult to fully comment without the guidance.

The idea to combine concurrent applications for works approval and licence is a good idea. My experience is that officers have done this in the past, but it formalises the process now.

Whilst I understand the online submission has been removed, I support this process. Better notification so payment can be made by credit card (if not too large) to enable prompt advertising and therefore potentially reduce timeframes for overall approval (ie a stop the clock scenario) is encouraged.

I hope this feedback provides some insight and assists the reform process. I look forward the risk assessment framework being open for public comment to add to this discussion.

All the best,
Freea

Freea Itzstein-Davey
Senior Environmental Scientist



MBS ENVIRONMENTAL

4 Cook Street, West Perth WA 6005

t: +61 [REDACTED]

f: +61 [REDACTED]

e: [REDACTED]

w: www.mbsenvironmental.com.au

Disclaimer:

The information contained in this message is intended for those to whom it is addressed. It may contain confidential or privileged information and if you are not the intended recipient, you must not copy, distribute or take any action in reliance on it. If you received this message in error please destroy it and reply to the sender immediately or contact Martinick Bosch Sell Pty Ltd. on +61 8 9226 3166 immediately. All care has been taken to ensure that this message and any attachments are virus free; we do not accept responsibility for any virus infections caused by receipt of this message.