

Decision Report

Application for Works Approval

Part V Division 3 of the Environmental Protection Act 1986

Works Approval Number	W6364/2020/1
Applicant	Evolution Mining (Mungari) Pty Ltd
ACN	002 124 745
File Number	DER2020/000071
Premises	Mungari Gold Mine
Premises	Mungari Gold Mine Kundana Road
Premises	Mungari Gold Mine Kundana Road KALGOORLIE WA 6430
Premises	Mungari Gold Mine Kundana Road KALGOORLIE WA 6430 Mining Tenements M15/829 and M15/830
Premises	Mungari Gold Mine Kundana Road KALGOORLIE WA 6430 Mining Tenements M15/829 and M15/830
Premises Date of Report	Mungari Gold Mine Kundana Road KALGOORLIE WA 6430 Mining Tenements M15/829 and M15/830 10 September 2020
Premises Date of Report	Mungari Gold Mine Kundana Road KALGOORLIE WA 6430 Mining Tenements M15/829 and M15/830 10 September 2020

Lauren Fox A/MANAGER RESOURCE INDUSTRIES INDUSTRY REGULATION

An officer delegated by the CEO under section 20 of the EP Act

Table of Contents

1.	Decision summary1				
2.	Scope of assessment1				
	2.1	Regulatory framework1			
	2.2	Application summary and overview of Premises1			
	2.3	Department of Mines, Industry Regulation and Safety2			
3.	Risk a	assessment2			
	3.1	Source-pathways and receptors			
		3.1.1 Emissions and controls			
		3.1.2 Receptors			
	3.2	Risk ratings			
4.	Consu	ultation11			
5.	Concl	usion11			
Refe	rences	511			
Арро	endix 1	1: Summary of applicant's comments on risk assessment and draft			
conc	litions				
Appe	endix 2	2: Application validation summary14			

Table 1: Staged TSF construction	2
Table 2: Proposed applicant controls	3
Table 3: Sensitive environmental receptors and distance from prescribed activity	4
Table 4: Risk assessment of potential emissions and discharges from the Premises during construction and operation	9
Table 5: Consultation	.11
Figure 1: Premises location (regional context)	6
Figure 2: Premises general arrangement plan	7

1. Decision summary

This Decision Report documents the assessment of potential risks to the environment and public health from emissions and discharges during the construction and operation of the Premises. As a result of this assessment, Works Approval W6364/2020/1 has been granted.

2. Scope of assessment

2.1 Regulatory framework

In completing the assessment documented in this Decision Report, the department has considered and given due regard to its Regulatory Framework and relevant policy documents which are available at https://www.der.wa.gov.au.

2.2 Application summary and overview of Premises

On 7 February 2020, the applicant submitted an application for a works approval to the department under section 54 of the *Environmental Protection Act 1986* (EP Act).

The applicant operates the Mungari Gold Mine which mines ore from one open pit (White Foil) and an underground mine (Frogs Leg). The application is to undertake construction works relating to an additional Tailings Storage Facility (TSF) at the Premises. The Premises is approximately 20 km west of Kalgoorlie-Boulder (Figure 1).

The Premises relates to the category and assessed design capacity under Schedule 1 of the *Environmental Protection Regulations 1987* (EP Regulations) which are defined in Works Approval W6364/2020/1. The infrastructure and equipment relating to the premises category and any associated activities which the department has considered in line with *Guidance Statement: Risk Assessments* (DER 2017) are outlined in Works Approval W6364/2020/1.

The Premises includes an existing double-cell paddock-style TSF (TSF1 and 2). To ensure sufficient tailings storage capacity for the Premises life-of-mine (LOM), the construction of a new TSF (Cell 3 and Cell 4) is proposed.

The new TSF will reflect a conventional rectangular paddock-style facility, comprising two cells separated by a cell-dividing causeway. Each cell will consist of a decant causeway and a central decant tower, from which supernatant water will be pumped from the TSF to the processing plant via decant return system for re-use.

The new TSF will be constructed adjacent to the west of TSF1 and 2 and will cover a total footprint area of 197.1 ha (Figure 2). The anticipated tailings storage capacity of the new TSF is 25 Mt. Construction will be undertaken in ten stages over a ten year period. Each stage will comprise an embankment lift, providing an annual tailings storage capacity of approximately 2.5 Mt. A summary of staged works is provided in Table 1 below.

Stage 1 of construction will involve the development of a low permeability soil liner, multi-zoned perimeter embankment and a starter embankment. Stage 2 will comprise the development of a downstream lift, followed by a centreline lift in Stage 3. Upstream lifts will be constructed from Stages 4 to 10.

Tailings will be transported to the facility from the processing plant by pipeline and deposited via a water delivery pipe connected to a spigot offtake. Tailings deposition will result in the formation of supernatant ponds in the centre of each cell.

Tailings moisture content will be managed via the decant and return water system, which will pump water collected from the underdrainage collection system back to the processing plant via a decant return water pipeline.

Stage	Deposition Period	Tonnage (Mt)	Cumulative Tonnage (Mt)	Achieved Average Densities (t/m ³)	Crest Elevation	Crest Raise Height (m)
1	Year 1	~2.5	2.5	1.30	347.4	Max 4.4
2	Year 2	~2.5	5.0	1.34	349.1	1.70
3	Year 3	~2.5	7.5	1.36	350.7	1.60
4	Year 4	~2.5	10.0	1.38	352.4	1.65
5	Year 5	~2.5	12.5	1.39	354.1	1.70
6	Year 6	~2.5	15.0	1.39	355.8	1.70
7	Year 7	~2.5	17.5	1.39	357.6	1.80
8	Year 8	~2.5	20.0	1.39	359.4	1.80
9	Year 9	~2.5	22.5	1.39	261.3	1.90
10	Year 10	~2.5	25.0	1.39	363.2	1.90

Table 1: Staged TSF construction

2.3 Department of Mines, Industry Regulation and Safety

The applicant has submitted a Mining Proposal to the Department of Mines, Industry Regulation and Safety (DMIRS) under the *Mining Act 1978* for the construction and operation of the TSF. DMIRS is currently assessing the application and has indicated that it is likely to approve all stages of the TSF construction but will put a condition on the mining tenement that requires the applicant to submit a TSF design report prior to commencement of any upstream lifts (Stages 4 to 10) (refer to Table 5).

The applicant holds a clearing permit (ref 8797/1) to clear 210.3 ha of native vegetation for the construction of the TSF.

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 *Guidance Statement: Risk Assessments* (DER 2017).

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 construction and operation which have been considered in this Decision Report are detailed in Table 2 below. Table 2 also details the proposed control measures the applicant has proposed to assist in controlling these emissions, where necessary.

Emission	Sources	Potential pathways	Proposed controls			
Construction						
Dust	Earthworks, increased vehicle movements	Air/windborne pathway	Water cart retained onsite, wetting down of roads and stockpiles when required.			
Noise	Earthworks, increased vehicle movements	Air/windborne pathway	None specified. Environmental Protection (Noise) Regulations 1997 apply.			
Operation						
Contaminated	TSF Cell 3	Seepage through	Low permeability TSF base and embankments.			
water	and Cell 4	base and embankments of TSF to soil and groundwater	Upstream cut-off trenches.			
			Underdrainage basin collection system.			
			Three toe-drains along the upstream toe of the perimeter embankment.			
			Daily inspection of TSF, decant system, underdrainage, toe-drains, and seepage trench.			
			Monitoring of TSF embankments, groundwater bores, TSF basin, standpipe piezometers and vibrating-wire piezometers (VWPs).			
Tailings and contaminated water	TSF Cell 3 and Cell 4	Overtopping of TSF and direct discharge to land	Sufficient stormwater storage capacity to accommodate all design storm event including Probable Maximum Precipitation (PMP).			
Tailings and	Tailings	Pipeline burst or	Pipelines constructed in containment trench.			
contaminated water	and Decant Return	leak and direct discharge to land	Telemetered flow meters at process plant and at toe of TSF embankment.			
	Corridor (TDRT)		Daily inspections of pipeline integrity.			

Table 2: Proposed applicant controls

3.1.2 Receptors

In accordance with the *Guidance Statement: Risk Assessment* (DER 2017), the Delegated Officer has excluded employees, visitors and contractors of the applicants from its assessment. Protection of these parties often involves different exposure risks and prevention strategies and is provided for under other state legislation.

Table 3 below provides a summary of potential environmental receptors that may be impacted as a result of activities upon or emission and discharges from the prescribed premises *(Guidance Statement: Environmental Siting* (DER 2016)). The closest human receptors are residential premises located about 20km east of the prescribed activity. No reasonable source-pathway-receptor linkages exist for impacts to human receptors from the potential construction noise and dust impacts due to separation distance.

Environmental receptors	Distance from prescribed activity			
Inland water bodies	Un-named salt lake	0.5 km south		
(playa/salt lakes)	West Lake	0.7 km west		
	Cattle Swamp	2.1 km south		
	Kurrawan Lake	1.5 km south		
	Kopai Lake	2.2 km east		
	Greta Lake	3.1 km northeast		
	Kurrawang White Lake	5.8 km northeast		
Native vegetation, flora	Four vegetation zones identified within Premises:			
and fauna	Mixed Eucalyptus Woodlands over sclerophyll shrublands.			
	Eucalyptus Salubris woodlands.			
	Casuarina pauper over sclerophyll shrublands.			
	Eucalyptus oleosa thicket over sclerophyll shrublands.			
	No Threatened or Priority Flora, Threatened Ecological Communities (TECs) or Priority Ecological Communities (PECs) have been recorded in the Premises and none are located within 2 km of the premises.			
	conservation significant vertebrate fauna have remises and none are located within 2.3 km of the			

Table 3: Sensitive environmental receptors and distance from prescribed activity

Environmental receptors	Distance from prescribed activity
Groundwater	Temporary, intermittent perched aquifers can develop in shallow cover horizons immediately following major rainfall events.
	A regional watertable occurs and the depth to the water table ranges from less than 5 m in some playa-lake environments to more than 40 m in elevated areas. Groundwater flow is towards major palaeodrainages and modern playa lakes, where the water table is close to the surface. Groundwater discharge occurs mainly by evaporation from playa lakes, with a relatively small amount of discharge via flow through palaeochannels. There will also be discharge as baseflow to local drainages (from shallow aquifers) when the water table is elevated immediately following significant rainfall events.
	Groundwater is mainly saline to hypersaline. The salinity ranges from around 1,000 mg/L TDS in some shallow aquifers in cover or saprolite adjacent to basement outcrops and in intermittent perched aquifers following rainfall, to as much as 200,000 mg/L TDS in the palaeochannels, adjacent playa-lake sediments, and in adjacent fractured and weathered bedrock.
	The predicted worst-case groundwater mound around the TSF indicates a groundwater rise of 4 m extending around 200 m from the inside toe of the TSF. Based on measured water levels in the TSF footprint, the mounded water table at the margins of the TSF area will be 5 to 9 m below surface.
	The water table mound is predicted to rapidly decrease in magnitude with distance from the TSF and the predicted water table rise is less than 1 m at 400 m distance from the inside toe of the TSF. The nearest downstream salt lake is approximately 500 m away and groundwater is anticipated to remain more than 6 m below ground level (i.e. below the root zone of native vegetation).
	Seepage flows will initially be semi-radially away from the TSF under the influence of the water table mound and will eventually come under the influence of regional hydraulic gradients. Based on available topographic data, the predicted maximum water table mound rise, and the influence of the existing mound beneath TSF Cells 1 and 2, all seepage from TSF Cells 3 and 4 is predicted to flow to the south and eventually into the White Foil pit.



Figure 1: Premises location (regional context)

Works Approval: W6364/2020/1

IR-T13 Decision Report Template (short) v1.0 (May 2020)



Figure 2: Premises general arrangement plan

Works Approval: W6364/2020/1

IR-T13 Decision Report Template (short) v1.0 (May 2020)

3.2 Risk ratings

Risk ratings have been assessed in accordance with the *Guidance Statement: Risk Assessments* (DER 2017) for each identified emission source 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 applicant 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 applicant's proposed controls to be critical to maintaining an acceptable level of risk, these will be incorporated into the works approval as regulatory controls.

Additional regulatory controls may be imposed where the applicant's controls are not deemed sufficient. Where this is the case the need for additional controls will be documented and justified in Table 4.

Works Approval W6364/2020/1 that accompanies this Decision Report authorises construction and time-limited operations. The conditions in the issued Works Approval, as outlined in Table 4, have been determined in accordance with *Guidance Statement: Setting Conditions* (DER 2015).

An amendment to Licence L7750/2001/9 is required following the time-limited operational phase authorised under the works approval to authorise emissions associated with the ongoing operation of the Premises i.e. use of the new TSF. A risk assessment for the operational phase has been included in this Decision Report; however, licence conditions will not be finalised until the department assesses the licence amendment application.

Risk Event					Risk rating ¹	Applicant	Conditions ² of	
Source/Activities	Potential emission	Potential pathways and impact	Receptors	Applicant controls	C = consequence L = likelihood	controls sufficient?	works approval	Justification for additional regulatory controls
Operation includin	g time-limited-o	perations operations						
		Seepage through base and embankments of TSF causing impacts to groundwater quality	Groundwater					The applicant has proposed a low permeability compacted soil liner (10 ⁻⁷ to 10 ⁻⁹ m/s). The Delegated Officer considers a compacted soil liner is suitable given: the material will be won
Deposition and storage of tailings in TSF 3 and 4	Contaminated water	Seepage through base and embankments of TSF creating groundwater mounding and flow causing impacts to surface water quality and health of native vegetation	Surface water features (incl. salt lakes) Native vegetation	Refer to Section 3.1.1	C = Moderate L = Possible Medium risk	No	Condition 1 Condition 2 Condition 3 Conditions 4, 5, 6, and 7 Conditions 8, 9, 10, 11, and 12 Conditions 13, 14, and 15 Condition 17 Conditions 18 and 19 Conditions 20, 21, and 22	trom the site; the relatively low permeability of the sub-surface; the nature of the sensitive receptors that can be impacted by seepage; and the limited value of the groundwater. However, based on the results of geotechnical testing of the in-situ soil, the Delegated Officer has specified the permeability of the compacted soil liner must meet 5x10 ⁻⁸ m/s (95% UCL) with a maximum hydraulic conductivity of 2x10 ⁻⁷ m/s. This will ensure that higher permeability material that is present is removed and will provide more certainty on the permeability that will be achieved. A program of testing of the compacted soils has also been specified to ensure that the permeability is low. When considering the duration of the works approval; the proposed timeline for staged construction (Table 1); and the DMIRS requirement for the applicant to prepare and submit a TSF design report prior to commencement of any upstream lifts (Stage 4 on), the Delegated Officer has approved construction and operation of the TSF to Stage 3 only. Future TSF raises can be assessed under a licence amendment process.

Table 4: Risk assessment of potential emissions and discharges from the Premises during construction and operation

Risk Event				Risk rating ¹	Conditions ² of			
Source/Activities	Potential emission	Potential pathways and impact	Receptors	Applicant controls	C = consequence L = likelihood	controls sufficient?	works approval	Justification for additional regulatory controls
Deposition and storage of tailings in TSF 3 and 4	Tailings	Overtopping of TSF cells causing impacts to surface water quality, health of native vegetation and localised soil contamination	Soils Surface water features (incl. salt lakes) Native vegetation	Refer to section 3.1.1	C = Major L = Unlikely Medium risk	Yes	Condition 1 Conditions 4 and 5 Conditions 13, 14, and 15 Condition 16 Condition 17 Conditions 18 and 19 Conditions 20, 21, and 22	N/A
Tailings and Decant Return Pipeline Corridor (TDRT)	Tailings and contaminated water	Pipeline burst or leak causing impacts to surface water quality, health of native vegetation and localised soil contamination	Soils Surface water features (incl. salt lakes) Native vegetation	Refer to section 3.1.1	C = Moderate L = Possible Medium Risk	Yes	Condition 3 Conditions 6 and 7 Conditions 13, 14, and 15 Condition 16 Condition 17 Conditions 18 and 19 Conditions 20, 21, and 22	N/A

Note 1: Consequence ratings, likelihood ratings and risk descriptions are detailed in the Guidance Statement: Risk Assessments (DER 2017).

Note 2: Proposed applicant controls are depicted by standard text. Bold and underline text depicts additional regulatory controls imposed by department.

4. Consultation

Table 5 provides a summary of the consultation undertaken by the department.

Table 5: Consultation

Consultation method Comments received		Department response
Application advertised on the department's website (10/032020) and in the West Australian newspaper (09/03/2020).	None received	N/A
Department of Mines, Industry Regulation and Safety (DMIRS) advised of proposal (10/03/2020)	DMIRS replied confirming receipt of the mining proposal and advising that it will approve all stages of the TSF. However, it will place a condition on the mining tenement that requires the applicant to submit a TSF design report for DMIRS acceptance/ approval prior to commencement of any upstream lifts. This will require the applicant to provide DMIRS with details regarding the material parameters from the tailings material where it is used as the foundation or in the embankment construction.	The Delegated Officer has limited the granted works approval to Stage 3 of the TSF to be consistent with the assessment of the mining proposal and the proposed condition on the mining tenement requiring the applicant to submit a TSF design report prior to commencement of any upstream lifts (Stages 4 to 10).
Applicant was provided with draft documents on 13/08/2020	The applicant responded on 31 August 2020. Refer to Appendix 1.	Refer to Appendix 1.

5. Conclusion

Based on the assessment in this Decision Report, the Delegated Officer has determined that a works approval will be granted, subject to conditions commensurate with the determined controls and necessary for administration and reporting requirements.

References

- 1. Department of Environment Regulation (DER) 2016, *Guidance Statement: Environmental Siting*, Perth, Western Australia.
- 2. DER 2017, Guidance Statement: Risk Assessments, Perth, Western Australia.
- 3. DER 2015, Guidance Statement: Setting Conditions, Perth, Western Australia.

Appendix 1: Summary of applicant's comments on risk assessment and draft conditions

Condition	Summary of applicant's comment	Department's response
Condition 1 (Table 1; Item 1)	The applicant requested that the specified storage area of 95 ha be updated to 118 ha, which represents the maximum impoundment area at Stage 3. The 95 ha is the area at the final Stage 10 height. The applicant also queried the storage capacity of 7.5Mt.	The area of the TSF was updated to 118 ha to reflect the area at Stage 3 which is the maximum height authorised by the works approval. The storage capacity of 7.5Mt of tailings material aligns with the cumulative tailings storage capacity of 7.5 Mt by completion of Stage 3 which is the final stage authorised by the works approval.
Condition 3 (Table 3; Item 3) Condition 8 (Table 4; Column 1) Schedule 3, Condition 1 (Table 1; Column 1)	An updated Drawing 801-137-C3000-900 (Revision D) was provided to facilitate the re-naming of monitoring boreholes within the work area. The applicant requested that all references to "MB-07 to MB- 14" in the draft works approval should be changed to "MB-08 to MB- 15" to reflect the construction of MB-07 already installed to the west of Cell 4.	Revision C of Drawing 801-137-C3000-900 in Schedule 1 of the works approval was replaced with Revision D and borehole references in Table 4 and Schedule 3, Table 1 updated.
Condition 8 (Table 4; Well design and construction; Well construction log)	The applicant requested that references to international standard <i>ASTM D5092/D5092M-16</i> are replaced with the <i>Minimum Construction Requirements for Water Bores in Australia.</i>	References to international standard <i>ASTM D5092/D5092M-16</i> were replaced with the <i>Minimum Construction Requirements for Water Bores in Australia</i> as an appropriate national standard and definitions updated.
Condition 8 (Table 4; Logging of borehole)	The applicant requested that reference to Australian Standard AS1762 Geotechnical site investigations is replaced with the <i>Minimum Construction Requirements for Water Bores in Australia</i> , as the standard is more practically applied to geotechnical bores rather than water monitoring bores and logging would be made impractical due to the method of drilling.	Reference to international <i>AS1762</i> was replaced with the <i>Minimum Construction Requirements for Water Bores in Australia</i> and definitions updated.
Condition 13	The applicant requested confirmation that Cell 3 and Cell 4 of the TSF can be constructed separately and separate Critical Containment Infrastructure Reports submitted to the CEO as required by condition 13.	The delegated officer confirmed that staged construction is possible and that separate Critical Containment Infrastructure Reports can be submitted. Works approval conditions have been updated to make it clearer that there are two separate cells. Condition 5 which relates to the Critical Containment Infrastructure Report outlines that certification of each item of critical containment infrastructure or component thereof is permitted, hence separate reports for Cell 3 and Cell 4 infrastructure can be submitted.
Condition 22	The applicant enquired whether scanned electronic copies of daily shift logs would satisfy record keeping requirements (i.e. 'The works	The term 'books' is defined in the EP Act and definitions of the works approvals to include '(a) any register or other record of information:

Works Approval: W6364/2020/1

Condition	Summary of applicant's comment	Department's response
	approval holder must maintain accurate and auditable books'.	and (b) any accounts or accounting records, however compiled, recorded or stored, and also includes any document;' Therefore, a scanned copy of a daily shift log would satisfy the record keeping requirements of the works approval.

Appendix 2: Application validation summary

SECTION 1: APPLICATION SUMMARY (as updated from validation checklist)				
Application type				
Works approval	Relates to existing mining operation under Licence L7750/2001/9			
Date application received	7/02/2020			
Applicant and Premises details				
Applicant name/s (full legal name/s)	Evolution Mining (Mungari) Pty Ltd			
Premises name	Mungari Gold Mine			
Premises location	Mining Tenements M15/829 and M15/830			
Local Government Authority	Shire of Coolgardie			
Application documents				
HPCM file reference number:	DER2020/000071			
Key application documents (additional to application form):	Mungari Gold Operations TSF Cell 3 and 4: Application for Works Approval including: TSF3 and 4 Design Report and Tailing Storage Facility Cell 3 Geotechnical Investigation Report			
Scope of application/assessment				
Summary of proposed activities or changes to existing operations.	Construction of an additiona TSF3 and 4. Tailings storage capacity of	onal Tailings Storage Facility (TSF) being of 2.5 million tonnes per annum		
Category number/s (activities that cause the premises to become prescribed premises)				
Table 1: Prescribed premises categories				
Prescribed premises category and description	Proposed production or design capacity		Proposed changes to the production capacity	
Category 5: Processing and beneficiation of metallic or non-metallic ore	2,000,000 tonnes per annual period		No	
Legislative context and other approvals				
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?	Yes □ No ⊠	Referral decision No: Managed under Part V □ Assessed under Part IV □		
Does the applicant hold any existing Part IV Ministerial Statements relevant to the application?	Yes □ No ⊠	Ministerial statement No: EPA Report No:		
Has the proposal been referred and/or assessed under the EPBC Act?	Yes 🗆 No 🖂	Reference	e No:	

Has the applicant demonstrated occupancy (proof of occupier status)?	Yes 🛛 No 🗆	Certificate of title General lease Mining lease / tenement Expiry: Other evidence Expiry:	
Has the applicant obtained all relevant planning approvals?	Yes 🗆 No 🗆 N/A 🛛	Approval: Expiry date: If N/A explain why?	
Has the applicant applied for, or have an existing EP Act clearing permit in relation to this proposal?	Yes 🛛 No 🗆	CPS No: 8797/1	
Has the applicant applied for, or have an existing CAWS Act clearing licence in relation to this proposal?	Yes 🗆 No 🖂	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 🗆 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 □ No ⊠	Name: N/A	
Is the Premises situated in a Public Drinking Water Source Area (PDWSA)?	Yes □ No ⊠	Name: N/A Priority: N/A Are the proposed activities/ landuse compatible with the PDWSA (refer to <u>WQPN 25</u>)? Yes No N/A	
Is the Premises subject to any other Acts or subsidiary regulations (e.g. Dangerous Goods Safety Act 2004, Environmental Protection (Controlled Waste) Regulations 2004)	Yes 🛛 No 🗆	Mining Act 1978	
Is the Premises within an Environmental Protection Policy (EPP) Area?	Yes □ No ⊠		
Is the Premises subject to any EPP requirements?	Yes □ No ⊠		
Is the Premises a known or suspected contaminated site under the <i>Contaminated Sites Act 2003</i> ?	Yes □ No ⊠	Classification: N/A Date of classification: N/A	