

**ENVIRONMENT PROTECTION ACT 1970
SECTION 22(1)
NOTICE TO SUPPLY FURTHER INFORMATION**

TO: TIM RUDGE

**OF: YUMBAH AQUACULTURE PTY LTD
LEVEL 4, 166 ALBERT RD
SOUTH MELBOURNE
VICTORIA 3205**

WHEREAS an application by you for a works approval in respect of premises situated at LOTS 1 AND 8, 315 DUTTON WAY AND LOTS 2 PRINCES HIGHWAY, BOLWARRA, Victoria was received by the Environment Protection Authority ("the Authority") on 29 OCTOBER 2018

AND WHEREAS we consider the information specified herein is necessary and relevant to the consideration of the application

NOW TAKE NOTICE that pursuant to section 22(1)(a) of the Environment Protection Act ("the Act") you are **HEREBY REQUIRED** to supply to the Authority by 2.00pm on the 29 day of January 2019 the information specified in Attachment A of this notice.

DATED: 22 January 2019



**RICHARD HOOK
DELEGATE OF THE
ENVIRONMENT PROTECTION AUTHORITY**

ATTACHMENT A

Yumbah Aquaculture Ltd should:

- (1) respond to the joint submission received from the Victorian Abalone Industry Committee and the Western Abalone Divers Association
- (2) provide further information on the biosecurity risks associated with the proposed development, including a draft of the emergency response plan to be approved by a DEDJTR Veterinarian officer (referred to in section 5.4 of the draft Biosecurity Plan), ensure consistency across documents (Risk Assessment and Draft Biosecurity Plan), and detail how reduction in biosecurity risks are best practice
- (3) demonstrate what and how biosecurity treatment options have been considered across the proposed farm and in particular the water intake and outlet systems, and how biosecurity management will be continuously improved in the staged development of the Nyamat farm
- (4) detail previous biosecurity incidents which have occurred to any abalone farms now owned and operated by Yumbah Aquaculture Ltd, and the best practice measures that have been implemented since to prevent such incidents reoccurring, and which would be employed at reduce biosecurity risk at the Nyamat Farm
- (5) provide justification for maximising the development's footprint and consider providing setbacks to enable greater separation of the proposed development from sensitive receptors
- (6) clarify how it will manage potential environmental risks in the event of a significant event requiring a temporary or permanent shutdown of operations (e.g. due to disease, fire, offshore pollution, lack of cash flow or liquidity)
- (7) clarify how it proposes to decommission the farm, and the end state it proposes to return the site to in the future
- (8) develop plain English, transparent, fact sheets about the proposal, answering new questions and clarifying information already provided, as detailed in the Environment Protection Act 1970 Section 20B Conference Report for this Application prepared by Kismet Forward dated January 2019. Efforts should be made to ensure the documents are not written from a public relations perspective but are developed with the purpose of building community understanding. In particular, the following should be explained:
 - a. the rationale for proposing the development at this location given the concerns that community members have expressed;
 - b. potential nighttime lighting impacts;

- c. how noise, vibration, odour, dust (including silica) and effluent discharge will be managed to ensure compliance with regulated limits (including management of waste and sediment);
 - d. job and training opportunities and projections, including any initiatives to favour local skills;
 - e. how site hydrology/drainage will be managed, particularly with regard to the shallow water table, frequent site flooding, the presence of the natural spring, protection of groundwater quality etc;
 - f. the nature and timing of works to the rock seawall, and how residences will be protected from inundation or storm surges during construction;
 - g. how impacts of the intake/outlet pipes will be managed during construction and operation, including impacts on recreation (e.g. swimming, fishing), marine ecology (e.g. temperature, nutrients, suction) and coastal dynamics (movement of sand, how the pipes will be kept covered),
 - h. side elevation/modelling to show what the completed facility will look like.
- (9) justify extrapolation of data in modelling of potential impacts given there is no comparable facility.
- (10) provide consideration of the potential for the proposal to affect (and be affected by) Port of Portland sand bypassing operations and any future construction of groynes along the foreshore at Dutton Way.