Extract from Hansard

[COUNCIL - Tuesday, 17 September 2002] p1042b-1042b Hon Jim Scott; Mr Tom Stephens

JANGARDUP MINERAL SANDS MINE, AUDIT REPORT

8. Hon Jim Scott to the Minister for Housing and Works representing the Minister for the Environment and Heritage

In relation to the DEP Audit Report 6/02 of June 25 2002 for the Jangardup mineral sands mine -

- (1) Is the Minister aware that most references to acid-sulphate soils in the area have been removed from the original Audit Report?
- (2) Is the Minister aware that reference to groundwater levels being manipulated by dewatering bores has been removed?
- (3) Will the Minister table the vegetation 'block translocations' the Audit Report mentions have been carried out?

Hon TOM STEPHENS replied:

- (1) Yes. References to acid sulphate soils were removed. The Department of Environmental Protection Audit Report 6/02 released on 25 June 2002 states:
 - The Jangardup site exhibits pH levels and sulphate concentrations similar to sites that have reactive acid-sulphate soils, that being low pH and increased sulphate levels. The Draft DEWCP and EPA Guidance on Acid-Sulphate Soils (April 2002) define acid sulphate soils as soils or sediments containing highly acidic soil horizons or layers resulting from the aeration of soils or sediments that are rich in iron sulphides, commonly iron pyrite. The presence of iron pyrites in the Jangardup area is limited, and therefore, the strict definition as noted by the Guidance does not apply in this situation.'
 - The references have been corrected to state low pH and increased sulphate concentrations.
- (2) The reference to groundwater manipulation by dewatering bores was incorrect, and therefore it was corrected. Groundwater levels are manipulated by dewatering from within the dredge pond.
- (3) Block translocations have occurred in Mining Locations 70/363, 70/997 and 70/362 at the Jangardup mine and I now table the results. The process involves removing sections of vegetation and topsoil intact from areas to be cleared for mining, and translocation of these sections away from the mining area. The size of each block is approximately 1.5 x 2.5 x 0.3m. Results to date suggest that the block translocations have been successful. This method is used in conjunction with seeding for rehabilitation purposes. [See paper No 214.]