



Application for Licence Amendment

Part V Division 3 of the *Environmental Protection Act 1986*

Licence Number	L8041/1990/5
Licence Holder	IGO Forrestania Ltd
ACN	091 049 357
File Number	DER2015/000458
Premises	Forrestania Nickel Operations Forrestania-Southern Cross Road FORRESTANIA WA 6359 Legal description – Mining tenements M74/57, M74/58, M74/90, M74/91, M77/335, M77/399, M77545, M77/568, M77/574, M77/582, M77/583, M77/584, M77/586, M77/587, M77/588, M77/589, M77/912, L70/111, L74/44, L77/104, L77/141, G70/226 and G70/231 As defined by the Premises maps attached to the Revised Licence
Date of Report	14 September 2023
Decision	Revised licence granted

A/MANAGER – RESOURCE INDUSTRIES
REGULATORY SERVICES
an officer delegated under section 20 of the *Environmental Protection Act 1986* (WA)

Table of Contents

1. Decision summary	1
2. Scope of assessment	1
2.1 Regulatory framework	1
2.2 Application summary	1
2.3 Part IV of the EP Act	3
3. Risk assessment	3
3.1 Source-pathways and receptors	4
3.1.1 Emissions and controls	4
3.1.2 Receptors	4
3.2 Risk ratings	7
3.3 Detailed risk assessment for the discharge of dilute decant water to evaporation ponds	10
4. Consultation	10
5. Conclusion	11
5.1 Summary of amendments	11
References	12
Appendix 1: Application validation summary	13
Table 1: Licence Holder controls	4
Table 2: Sensitive human and environmental receptors and distance from prescribed activity	5
Table 3. Risk assessment of potential emissions and discharges from the Premises during operation	8
Table 4: Consultation	10
Table 5: Summary of licence amendments	11

1. Decision summary

Licence L8041/1990/5 is held by IGO Forrestania Limited (Licence Holder) (previously Western Areas Limited) for the Forrestania Nickel Operations (the Premises), located on mining tenements M74/57, M74/58, M74/90, M74/91, M77/335, M77/399, M77545, M77/568, M77/574, M77/582, M77/583, M77/584, M77/586, M77/587, M77/588, M77/589, M77/912, L70/111, L74/44, L77/104, L77/141 and general purpose leases G70/226 and G70/231.

This amendment report documents the assessment of potential risks to the environment and public health from proposed changes to the emissions and discharges during the construction and operation of the Premises. As a result of this assessment, revised licence L8041/1990/5 has been granted.

2. Scope of assessment

2.1 Regulatory framework

In completing the assessment documented in this amendment report, the department has considered and given due regard to its regulatory framework and relevant policy documents which are available at <https://dwer.wa.gov.au/regulatory-documents>.

2.2 Application summary

On 7 July 2023, the Licence Holder submitted an application to the department to amend Licence L8041/1990/5 under section 59 and 59B of the *Environmental Protection Act 1986* (EP Act).

The licence holder is requesting to send the tailings storage facility (TSF) decant water (a category 5 discharge) to a HDPE-lined raw water pond containing mine dewatering (currently a category 6 waste stream). The raw water pond, listed on the licence as the Cosmic Boy staging pond, is prioritised to send water to the mineral processing plant but excess water from this pond is discharged to the Mossco Farm evaporation ponds at the premises. When the evaporation ponds have reached capacity, overflow is sent to a mine void that has been approved to receive mine dewatering (category 6) discharge, called Digger's Rock pit.

The request from the licence holder was driven by a need to resolve a safety issue regarding excess decant water on the southern cell of the TSF that is threatening the stability of the embankments. The Department of Mines, Industry Regulation and Safety (DMIRS) issued the premises with an Improvement Notice on 10 March 2023, requiring them to reduce the volume of water on the southern cell of the TSF to safe levels within 6 weeks.

Key infrastructure of the Cosmic Boy area can be seen in Figure 1 (below). The round northern cell of the TSF has been closed for tailings deposition and the tailings from this cell is being reclaimed for use in the paste plant. Tailings is currently being deposited into the southern cell. The processing plant can be seen to the northwest of the TSF, with the Cosmic Boy staging pond in the northwest corner of the plant.



Figure 1: Cosmic Boy site layout

The application states that the licence holder intends to remove around 90,000 tonnes of decant water over a 6-month period. To achieve this, a very short spur line will need to be established between the decant return pipeline and a raw water return pipeline within the processing plant area (Figure 2). All other infrastructure that is required is already in place and operational.



Figure 2: Proposed pipeline configuration

The current licence requires the licence holder to ensure that tailings and all process water (including decant water) is contained in a closed circuit, with material either being deposited in the TSF or being returned for use in the processing plant. This is standard industry practice and is intended to contain any potentially harmful constituents released through the processing of the ore, as well as any chemicals that may be added during processing. Tailings at this site is hypersaline, has a low pH and has been characterized as potentially acid forming. Monitoring results were limited, but indicate the presence of elevated levels of aluminium, iron, nickel and arsenic. Reagents used in the processing plant include cyanide, potassium amyl xanthate (PAX), polyfroth, copper sulphate, and flocculent. The levels of total and weak acid dissociable (WAD) cyanide in the decant water or tailings streams are unknown as they are not currently measured.

Mine dewatering at the premises, however, does not have the requirement to be contained and may be discharged to the environment through evaporation ponds, to selected mine voids or via reinjection back into the groundwater at designated locations. Monitoring results for the mine dewater indicate variable results across the premises, with salinities ranging between 25,000mg/L and 50,000mg/L total dissolved solids (TDS) and pH generally in the 5 to 7 range.

The licence holder's request would continue to see decant water prioritised for use in the processing plant. However, overflows, which would be blended (and therefore diluted) with mine dewater would be permitted to be sent to the Mossco Farm evaporation ponds or the Digger's Rock pit, if required.

Monitoring data indicates that the groundwater quality around the Mossco Farm evaporation ponds already has elevated salinity and metals (aluminium and iron) and low pH. Groundwater mounding around the facility has historically been an issue, so a seepage recovery network has been established to return seepage to the evaporation ponds. There are no known users of the groundwater in the area. The surface water in the evaporation ponds is typically over 280,000mg/L TDS, which is generally considered unpalatable to most fauna.

Groundwater quality monitoring around the Digger's Rock pit indicates that the groundwater at this location also has elevated salinity and a low pH.

The licence holder has stated that there will be no change to the throughput of any category as a result of this change. This amendment is limited only to modifications to categories 5 and 6 activities on the licence. No changes to category 7, 12, 54 and 89 have been requested by the licence holder.

The licence holder has also requested that the occupier name be updated from Western Areas Limited to IGO Forresteria Limited as part of this amendment. The ACN and registered business address remain unchanged.

2.3 Part IV of the EP Act

A small portion of the prescribed premises is regulated under Part IV of the EP Act (Ministerial Statement 808). It relates to the Spotted Quoll mining area, which is located about 12kms to the northeast of the processing plant. Due to the distance, the Spotted Quoll mining area will not be impacted by the amendments that have been proposed.

3. Risk assessment

The department assesses the risks of emissions from prescribed premises and identifies the potential source, pathway and impact to receptors in accordance with the *Guideline: Risk assessments* (DWER 2020).

To establish a risk event there must be an emission, a receptor which may be exposed to that emission through an identified actual or likely pathway, and a potential adverse effect to the receptor from exposure to that emission.

3.1 Source-pathways and receptors

3.1.1 Emissions and controls

The key emissions and associated actual or likely pathway during premises operation which have been considered in this amendment report are detailed in Table 1 below.

Table 1 also details the control measures the Licence Holder has proposed to assist in controlling these emissions, where necessary, and any relevant control measures that are on the existing licence.

Table 1: Licence Holder controls

Emission	Sources	Potential pathways	Proposed controls
TSF decant return water containing elevated metals and processing reagents	TSF decant return water transferred to Cosmic Boy staging pond, Mossco Farm evaporation ponds or Digger's Rock pit	Direct discharge from pipeline spill/rupture	Pipelines are currently in operation and show no defects Leak detection on pipelines Daily inspections Bunding and scour sumps installed
		Overtopping of Cosmic Boy staging pond	Requirement for a 300mm freeboard Daily inspections Contingency to pump water to Mossco Farm evaporation ponds
		Seepage through base of the evaporation ponds affecting groundwater or adjacent farmland	Seepage recovery network around the evaporation ponds Groundwater monitoring Groundwater mounding limit of 4mbgl Evaporation pond water quality monitoring
		Overtopping of the evaporation ponds affecting adjacent farmland	Existing requirement for a 300mm freeboard Daily inspections when operating Contingency to pump water to Digger's Rock pit
		Fauna exposure at the evaporation ponds	Hypersaline water (>280,000mg/L) generally unpalatable to fauna Daily inspections when operating
		Seepage through Diggers Rock Pit walls impacting groundwater or mounding impacting vegetation	Groundwater monitoring Groundwater mounding limit of 8mbgl

3.1.2 Receptors

In accordance with the *Guideline: Risk assessments* (DWER 2020), the Delegated Officer has excluded employees, visitors and contractors of the Licence Holder's from its assessment. Protection of these parties often involves different exposure risks and prevention strategies, and is provided for under other state legislation.

Table 2 below provides a summary of potential human and environmental receptors that may be impacted as a result of activities upon or emission and discharges from the prescribed premises (*Guideline: Environmental siting* (DWER 2020)).

Table 2: Sensitive human and environmental receptors and distance from prescribed activity

Human receptors	Distance from prescribed activity
Agricultural properties	Surround the evaporation ponds. Wheat, canola and barley crops are immediately adjacent to the ponds.
Environmental receptors	Distance from prescribed activity
Native vegetation	<p>Native vegetation is present around the prescribed activity within the premises. Vegetation communities include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mallee shrubland comprising <i>Eucalyptus eremophila</i>, <i>E. redunca</i> and spp; and <p>Open woodland comprising <i>E. calophylla</i>, <i>E. wandoo</i> and <i>E. camaldulensis</i>.</p> <p>Jackson Nature reserve (an A-class reserve) lies to the south of the premises, about 2.5kms south of the perimeter of the evaporation ponds.</p>
Threatened and/or priority flora	<p>A number of threatened and priority flora have been recorded within the premises, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Lepidosperma ferriculmen</i> (Priority 1); <i>Pityrodia scabra</i> subsp. <i>dendrotricha</i> (Priority 3); <i>Stenanthemum liberum</i> (Priority 1); <i>Grevillea insignis</i> subsp. <i>elliottii</i> (Priority 3); <i>Calamphoreus inflatus</i> (formerly known as <i>Eremophila inflata</i>) (Priority 4); <i>Boronia revoluta</i> (Threatened); <i>Stylidium sejunctum</i> (Priority 3); <i>Banksia viscida</i> (Priority 3); and <i>Microcorys</i> sp Forresteria (Priority 4). <p>The PEC area includes vegetation surrounding the prescribed activity. No threatened taxa were identified, though five priority flora were: <i>Acacia singula</i> (Priority 3), <i>L. ferriculmen</i>, <i>M. sp. Forresteria</i>, <i>S. liberum</i> and <i>S. sejunctum</i>.</p>
Priority ecological communities (PEC)	<p>A Priority 3 PEC (Iron cap Hills vegetation assemblages) occurs across the northern area of the premises. The evaporation ponds lie outside the PEC area.</p> <p>No clearing was proposed as part of this amendment.</p>

Fauna	<p>Species of conservation significance that have been identified in the area include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Carnaby's Black Cockatoo - Malleefowl - Western Rosella - Shy Groundwren - Rufous Fieldwren - White-browed babbler - Peregrine Falcon - Western Brush Wallaby - Chuditch
Groundwater	<p>The processing plant is located within the Kondinin-Ravensthorpe Groundwater Area. Regional groundwater occurs in weathered and fractured bedrock aquifers.</p> <p>The evaporation ponds lie in the Shire of Lake Grace are about 2kms outside the prescribed Kondinin-Ravensthorpe Groundwater Area</p> <p>Groundwater quality across the premises is mildly acidic (pH 5 – 7), and ranges from saline to hypersaline. Pockets of pH 3 – 4 groundwater occur around the TSF, Mossco Farm evaporation ponds and Digger's Rock discharge point. There are no known nearby groundwater users.</p> <p>Localised groundwater mounding is evident at the Cosmic Boy tailings storage facility, and at the Mossco Farm evaporation ponds.</p>

3.2 Risk ratings

Risk ratings have been assessed in accordance with the *Guideline: Risk Assessments* (DWER 2020) for those emission sources which are proposed to change and takes into account potential source-pathway and receptor linkages as identified in Section 3.1. Where linkages are incomplete they have not been considered further in the risk assessment.

Where the Licence Holder has proposed mitigation measures/controls (as detailed in Section 3.1), these have been considered when determining the final risk rating. Where the Delegated Officer considers the Licence Holder's proposed controls to be critical to maintaining an acceptable level of risk, these will be incorporated into the licence as regulatory controls.

Additional regulatory controls may be imposed where the Licence Holder's controls are not deemed sufficient. Where this is the case the need for additional controls will be documented and justified in Table 3.

The Revised Licence L8041/1990/5 that accompanies this amendment report authorises changes to emissions categories 5 and 6 associated with the operation of the Premises.

The conditions in the Revised Licence have been determined in accordance with *Guidance Statement: Setting Conditions* (DER 2015).

Table 3. Risk assessment of potential emissions and discharges from the Premises during operation

Risk Event					Risk rating ¹ C = consequence L = likelihood	Licence Holder's controls sufficient?	Conditions ² of licence	Justification for additional regulatory controls
Source/Activities	Potential emission	Potential pathways and impact	Receptors	Licence Holder's controls				
Operation and Commissioning								
Transfer and storage of decant water to Cosmic Boy staging pond	Decant water	Direct discharge via pipeline failure, impacting on surrounding soils	Soil	Refer to Section 3.1	C = Slight L = Unlikely Low Risk	Y	Condition 1 and 4	Existing conditions requiring leak detection and bunding, with inspection requirements are sufficient to manage risks
	Decant water (dilute)	Overtopping of staging pond within disturbed processing plant area	Soil	Refer to Section 3.1	C = Slight L = Unlikely Low Risk	Y	Condition 3 and 4	Existing conditions requiring freeboard and inspection requirements are sufficient to manage risks
Discharge of decant water to Mossco Farm evaporation ponds	Decant water (dilute)	Direct discharge via pipeline failure of pipeline going to evaporation ponds	Soils and priority vegetation (PEC community)	Refer to Section 3.1	C = Major L = Unlikely Medium Risk	Y	Condition 1 and 4	Existing conditions requiring leak detection and bunding, with inspection requirements are sufficient to manage risks
	Decant water (dilute)	Overtopping of evaporation ponds	Soil and surrounding agricultural land	Refer to Section 3.1	C = Moderate L = Unlikely Medium Risk	Y	Condition 3 and 4	Existing conditions requiring freeboard and inspection requirements are sufficient to manage risks
	Decant water (dilute)	Seepage through the base of the evaporation ponds causing groundwater mounding	Vegetation or surrounding agricultural land	Refer to Section 3.1	C = Minor L = Possible Medium Risk	N	Condition 19, 22 and 23 Condition 18	Additional monitoring requirements added, refer to section 3.3
	Decant water (dilute)	Seepage through the base of the evaporation	Groundwater	Refer to Section 3.1	C = Minor	N	Condition 19	Additional monitoring requirements added, refer

Licence: L8041/1990/5

Risk Event					Risk rating ¹	Licence Holder's controls sufficient?	Conditions ² of licence	Justification for additional regulatory controls
Source/Activities	Potential emission	Potential pathways and impact	Receptors	Licence Holder's controls	C = consequence L = likelihood			
		ponds causing deterioration of groundwater quality			L = Likely Medium Risk			to section 3.3
	Decant water (dilute)	Fauna exposure at the evaporation ponds	Fauna	Refer to Section 3.1	C = Moderate L = Possible Medium Risk	N	Condition 18	Additional monitoring requirements added, refer to section 3.3
Discharge of decant water to Digger's Rock pit	Decant water (dilute)	Direct discharge via pipeline failure	Soils and priority vegetation (PEC community)	Refer to Section 3.1	C = Major L = Unlikely Medium Risk	Y	Condition 1 and 4	Existing conditions requiring leak detection and bunding, with inspection requirements are sufficient to manage risks
	Decant water (dilute)	Overtopping of pit	Soils and priority vegetation (PEC community)	Refer to Section 3.1	C = Major L = Unlikely Medium Risk	Y	Condition 19	Existing conditions requiring SWL of bores surrounding pit not to exceed 8mbgl, and quarterly monitoring is sufficient to reduce risks
	Decant water (dilute)	Seepage through the walls of the pit	Soils and priority vegetation (PEC community)	Refer to Section 3.1	C = Major L = Unlikely Medium Risk	Y	Condition 19	Existing conditions requiring SWL of bores surrounding pit not to exceed 8mbgl, and quarterly monitoring is sufficient to reduce risks
			Groundwater quality deterioration	Refer to Section 3.1	C = Minor L = Possible Medium Risk	Y	Condition 19	

Note 1: Consequence ratings, likelihood ratings and risk descriptions are detailed in the *Guideline: Risk assessments* (DWER 2020).

Note 2: Proposed Licence Holder's controls are depicted by standard text. **Bold and underline text** depicts additional regulatory controls imposed by department.

3.3 Detailed risk assessment for the discharge of dilute decant water to evaporation ponds

The licence holder has a pressing need to remove TSF decant water from the process water circuit, which is not currently permitted by the licence. The licence holder is requesting approval to send this water, diluted via a staging pond, to the Mossco Farm evaporation ponds as required. If further capacity is needed, overflows will then be sent to the Digger's Rock pit. Operationally, this will be expedient as the infrastructure required is largely in place and operational, and meets the current licence requirements.

It is recognized, however, that due to the lower quality of the decant water (containing elevated nickel and arsenic, and reagents including cyanide) this may cause a deterioration in the water quality both in the evaporation ponds and in the surrounding groundwater at this location. The decant water at the site is not routinely sampled, so there is some uncertainty around the expected levels of contaminants that will report to these locations.

Of particular concern are the changes to the water quality at the evaporation ponds, which may be readily accessed by fauna. It is acknowledged that the decant water will be diluted and that the evaporation ponds are hypersaline, which reduces the risk that fauna will utilize this water source due to it being unpalatable. These factors dramatically reduce the risk of discharging decant water to this location. On the other hand, the presence of cyanide and elevated metals in the discharge may increase any negative impacts to fauna. Cyanide levels, particularly, are recognized as having the potential to negatively impact fauna. On balance, the Delegated Officer finds the risks to fauna low enough to be acceptable, but due to the inherent uncertainty, will require increased monitoring of water quality parameters including cyanide levels. This may be reconsidered in the future, if the licence holder can demonstrate with increased certainty that the risks of impacting fauna are low.

The groundwater surrounding the evaporation ponds displays a low pH and elevated salinity, and there are no known groundwater users in the vicinity. Even though the likelihood of the groundwater quality being negatively impacted is likely, the lack of other groundwater users in the region reduces the potential consequences of this deterioration to minor. It is also worth noting that a groundwater seepage recovery network is in place around the evaporation ponds, so although there is a history of groundwater mounding in this area, it is likely to be manageable though the current infrastructure.

This strategy of discharging decant water to existing discharge locations is likely to increase the environmental impacts at the premises, however, the Delegated Officer finds that these impacts can be adequately managed with increased process monitoring and groundwater monitoring. For this reason, groundwater quality monitoring around the evaporation ponds has been increased from annually to quarterly and total and WAD cyanide parameters have been added to the existing groundwater monitoring regime across site and in the evaporation ponds.

Additional decant water characterization parameters have also been added to better quantify potential impacts both at the TSF and at the new decant water discharge locations.

4. Consultation

Table 4 provides a summary of the consultation undertaken by the department.

Table 4: Consultation

Consultation method	Comments received	Department response
Licence Holder was provided with draft amendment on 13/09/23	No comments, please issue.	N/A

5. Conclusion

Based on the assessment in this amendment report, the Delegated Officer has determined that a revised licence will be granted, subject to conditions commensurate with the determined controls and necessary for administration and reporting requirements.

5.1 Summary of amendments

Table 5 provides a summary of the proposed amendments and will act as record of implemented changes. All proposed changes have been incorporated into the Revised Licence as part of the amendment process.

Table 5: Summary of licence amendments

Condition no.	Proposed amendments
-	Updated licence holder to "IGO Forrestania Ltd"
3	Added Cosmic Boy staging pond as an approved discharge point for decant return water. Clarified that Mossco Farm evaporation ponds can accept water from the Cosmic Boy staging pond.
4	Clarified the definition of the pipelines that require inspections to ensure that decant return pipelines are included.
11	Clarified that overflow from the Mossco Farm evaporation ponds can be discharged to the Diggers Rock pit
18	Added quarterly water quality monitoring parameters for decant water. Added a requirement to record the volume of decant water going to the Cosmic Boy staging pond and the volume of water discharged to the evaporation ponds. Added the requirement to measure total and WAD cyanide in the Mossco Farm evaporation ponds and increased monitoring at this location to quarterly.
19	Added the requirement to measure total and WAD cyanide for groundwater monitoring locations around the premises. Reformatted water quality monitoring requirements table, clarifying that bores around the evaporation ponds are monitored quarterly, while all others are monitored annually. Added requirement for major ions and metalloids to be measured quarterly at the evaporation ponds (previously only pH and EC were required quarterly)

References

1. Department of Environment Regulation (DER) 2015, *Guidance Statement: Setting Conditions*, Perth, Western Australia.
2. Department of Water and Environmental Regulation (DWER) 2020, *Guideline: Environmental Siting*, Perth, Western Australia.
3. DWER 2020, *Guideline: Risk Assessments*, Perth, Western Australia.

Appendix 1: Application validation summary

SECTION 1: APPLICATION SUMMARY (as updated from validation checklist)				
Application type				
Amendment to licence	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Current licence number:	L8041/1990/5	
		Relevant works approval number:		N/A
Date application received		11 July 2023		
Applicant and Premises details				
Applicant name/s (full legal name/s)		IGO Forresteria Ltd		
Premises name		Forresteria Nickel Operation		
Premises location		Mining tenements: G70/226, G70/231, L70/111, L74/12, L74/25, L74/44, L77/104, L77/182, L77/141, M74/57, M74/58, M74/90, M74/91, M77/335, M77/399, M77/568 and M77/574		
Local Government Authority		Shire of Kondinin and Shire of Lake Grace		
Application documents				
HPCM file reference number:		DER2015/000458-1~7		
Key application documents (additional to application form):		Attachment 1C – Letter of Authorisation Attachment 2C – FNO Operational Areas Attachment 2B – CBMill Aerial Spur Line Attachment 2B – FNO Emissions Map Attachment 8A – Tenure details Attachment 8B – DMIRS Improvement Notice Attachment 8C – Water Quality data Attachment *D – Summary Water Quality Data		
Scope of application/assessment				

<p>Summary of proposed activities or changes to existing operations.</p>	<p>Licence amendment:</p> <p>A recent DMIRS visit to the site, identified a potential safety issue due to volume of water in the current operating tailings storage facility (TSF). The volume of water is outside design parameters and may pose a risk to wall stability and safety to workers. As such, FNO need to reduce the water.</p> <p>FNO proposes to remove the excess water to an existing raw water pond – the Cosmic Boy staging pond. The raw water pond overflow is sent to evaporation ponds at Mossco Farm (MF), and if further capacity is needed, to Diggers Rock Pit (DR).</p> <p>The pipeline from the raw water pond at the concentrator to MF and DR is already established, however a pipeline connection will be required from the decant return water into the raw water pond. No further modifications required from the raw water pond to the evaporation ponds.</p> <p>The proposed volume of TSF decant is 90,000 tonnes, potentially less depending on the TSF operation over the period. The proposed duration is 6 months.</p> <p>Since the application was submitted, a further email was sent to the Department on 17 July 2023, notifying a change to occupier name to IGO Forresteria limited. There is no change to ACN/ABN or registered business address (ie not a transfer). Therefore, the change to occupier name will be included in this amendment.</p>
--------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Category number/s (activities that cause the premises to become prescribed premises)

Table 1: Prescribed premises categories

Prescribed premises category and description	Assessed production or design capacity	Proposed changes to the production or design capacity (amendments only)
Category 5: processing or beneficiaion of metallic or non-metallic ore	680,000 tonne per annum	No change
Category 6: Mine dewatering	6,400,000 tonnes per annum	No change
Category 7: Vat or in-situ leaching of metal	20,000 tonnes per annum	No change
Category 12: Screening, etc. of material	150,000 tpa	No change
Category 54: Sewage facility	110 m ³ /day	No change
Category 89: Putrescible landfill site	1,500 tpa	No change

Legislative context and other approvals

<p>Has the applicant referred, or do they intend to refer, their proposal to the EPA under Part IV of the EP Act as a significant proposal?</p>	<p>Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>Referral decision No: Managed under Part V <input type="checkbox"/> Assessed under Part IV <input type="checkbox"/></p>
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Does the applicant hold any existing Part IV Ministerial Statements relevant to the application?	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>	Ministerial statement No: 808 EPA Report No: 1795
Has the proposal been referred and/or assessed under the EPBC Act?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Reference No:
Has the applicant demonstrated occupancy (proof of occupier status)?	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>	Certificate of title <input type="checkbox"/> General lease <input type="checkbox"/> Expiry: Mining lease / tenement <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Expiry: Other evidence <input type="checkbox"/> Expiry:
Has the applicant obtained all relevant planning approvals?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Approval: Expiry date: If N/A explain why? Mining tenure
Has the applicant applied for, or have an existing EP Act clearing permit in relation to this proposal?	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>	CPS No: CPS 2424-3 No clearing is proposed.
Has the applicant applied for, or have an existing CAWS Act clearing licence in relation to this proposal?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Application reference No: N/A Licence/permit No: N/A
Has the applicant applied for, or have an existing RIWI Act licence or permit in relation to this proposal?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Application reference No: Licence/permit No: Licence / permit not required.
Does the proposal involve a discharge of waste into a designated area (as defined in section 57 of the EP Act)?	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>	Name: Kondinin-Ravensthorpe Groundwater Area Type: Proclaimed Groundwater Area Has Regulatory Services (Water) been consulted? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> Regional office:
Is the Premises situated in a Public Drinking Water Source Area (PDWSA)?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Name: N/A Priority: P1 / P2 / P3 / N/A Are the proposed activities/ landuse compatible with the PDWSA (refer to WQPN 25)? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/>
Is the Premises subject to any other Acts or subsidiary regulations (e.g. <i>Dangerous Goods Safety Act 2004</i> , <i>Environmental Protection (Controlled Waste) Regulations</i>)	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>	<i>Dangerous Goods Safety Act 2004</i> <i>Mining Act 1978</i> <i>Environmental Protection (Unauthorised discharges)</i>

<i>2004, State Agreement Act xxxx)</i>		<i>Regulations 2004</i>
Is the Premises within an Environmental Protection Policy (EPP) Area?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Is the Premises subject to any EPP requirements?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Is the Premises a known or suspected contaminated site under the <i>Contaminated Sites Act 2003</i> ?	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>	Classification: possibly contaminated (PC-IR) Date of classification: 25 August 2008