

ENVIRONMENT REVIEW COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

Item	Details
Meeting date & time	12 February 2025, 11:04am – 12:42pm
Meeting location	FGM Safety Training Room
Present	Jude Holt (Chair), Lance Faulkner (General Manager, FGM), Will Wettenhall (Environment and Community Manager, FGM), Trudi Jackson (Community Superintendent, FGM), Oliver Hickson (Senior Environment and Community Advisor, FGM), Natasha van Leeuwen (Environment and Community Advisor, FGM), Wendy Campbell (Community Officer, FGM), Leigh Byrne (Community Officer, FGM), Tessa Fitzpatrick (Environment Officer, FGM), Tess Smythe (Community Administrator, FGM), Ryan Straub (EPA), Jacob McDonald (EPA), Jeff White (DEECA), Ariunjargal Begzragchaa (DJAARA), Scott Sandercock (ERR), Ian Ralston (Community Representative), Jon Constable (Community Representative), Cr Shivali Chatley (Axedale Ward, COGB), Glen Payne (GMW), Frank Casimir (COGB)
Absent	N/A
Apologies	Rebecca Carlton (ERR), Anthony Petherbridge (COGB), Keith Obrein (Community Representative)
By invitation	Nil
Observers	Grant Clarke (ERR)

Item number	Agenda item
1	Welcome, attendance and apologies
1.1	Chairperson Jude Holt welcomed everyone to the meeting.
2	Acknowledgement of Country and introductions
2.1	<p>The Chairperson acknowledged the traditional custodians of the land on which the meeting was held – the Dja Dja Wurrung people, and paid respects to their Elders' past and present.</p> <p>Each attendee then introduced themselves and the capacities in which they were attending.</p> <p>Will Wettenhall informed the committee that the two ERC Community Representative vacancies had been filled following the expressions of interest process. Ian Ralston was reappointed, and Keith Oberin, a local landholder, has been appointed to the committee. Will thanked Frank Casimir for his contributions as a COGB representative and acknowledged his new counterpart, who will be welcomed at the May ERC meeting. Will also introduced Ariunjargal Begzragchaa, representing DJAARA as an environmental practitioner. Will recognised the significant milestone agreement formalised in 2024 between FGM and DJAARA. Additionally, he welcomed COGB Councillor Shivali Chatley to the ERC committee.</p>

3	Declaration of interests								
3.1	No conflicts of interest declared.								
4	Minutes, actions and matters arising since last committee meeting								
4.1	<p>Confirmation of minutes from meeting on 11 November 2024.</p> <p>The minutes of the meeting on 11 November 2024 were reviewed for accuracy.</p> <p>IT WAS RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting on 11 November 2024 be confirmed as a true and accurate record of proceedings:</p> <table> <tr> <td>MOVED:</td><td>Ian Ralston</td></tr> <tr> <td>SECONDED:</td><td>Scott Sandercock</td></tr> <tr> <td>AGAINST:</td><td>NA</td></tr> <tr> <td>OUTCOME:</td><td>Carried unanimously</td></tr> </table>	MOVED:	Ian Ralston	SECONDED:	Scott Sandercock	AGAINST:	NA	OUTCOME:	Carried unanimously
MOVED:	Ian Ralston								
SECONDED:	Scott Sandercock								
AGAINST:	NA								
OUTCOME:	Carried unanimously								
5	Information/project updates to ERC Members								
5.1	<p><u><i>FGM Sustained Operations Project EES Update</i></u></p> <p>Will Wettenhall provided an update on the Sustained Operations Project EES.</p> <p>Will informed the ERC that the independent panel enquiry took place from early November to mid-December, spanning a 7-week period. This forum allowed Fosterville to present the Sustained Operations Project and provided an opportunity for organisations and individuals who made submissions during the public exhibition phase to present to the panel and ask questions. This concluded the formal EES process. The four independent panel members will now prepare a report with recommendations for the Department of Transport and Planning, which will be used by the Minister of Planning to make a decision on the Sustained Operations Project EES. FGM expects the planning panel to finalise the report by 20 February, although a final decision date remains unknown at this stage.</p>								
5.2	<p><u><i>Good Neighbour Guide Update</i></u></p> <p>Trudi Jackson provided a progress update on the development of FGM's Good Neighbour Guide (GNG).</p> <p>Trudi announced that the dedicated community line is now operational. The number is available on FGM's website and will be included in engagement materials over the coming month.</p> <p>Trudi also highlighted the development work underway to improve FGM's online platform, which will be used to publish ground vibration monitoring results. Additionally, a mine-induced seismicity educational video is being created to explain key concepts and will be made available on the website.</p> <p>Trudi provided an update on the expansion of the surface ground vibration monitoring network. In December, twelve of the twenty-two new monitors were installed, with the remaining ten set to be installed by the end of February. These efforts are geared towards supporting the implementation of the GNG framework, which has been drafted. The next steps involve reconvening the working group to discuss the draft guide and what FGM aims to present to the community. The GNG will need internal approval before being shared with the broader community. The goal is to have the guide implemented by mid-2025.</p> <p>Scott Sandercock asked for clarification regarding the decommissioning of the surface ground vibration monitors. Trudi and Will Wettenhall explained it won't be the sites themselves but the old Ecotech monitors, which will be replaced by new IMS monitors before the old monitors are removed.</p>								

	<p>Scott inquired about the data used to determine the monitor locations. Trudi explained that a combination of factors informed the location selection, including identifying key population areas, integrating the EES ground vibration studies, and maintaining continuity with the existing monitors.</p> <p>Shivali Chatley emphasised the importance of communication and asked about the content of the mine-induced seismicity video. Trudi explained that the video will be easily digestible, providing clear information on mine seismicity. Will Wettenhall and Trudi noted that FGM already published fact sheets and extensive information on their website, and this video will serve as an additional visual aid to cater to different preferences.</p> <p>Jude Holt confirmed with Trudi that FGM has a dedicated section on their website for the community, detailing the various services available to landholders.</p> <p>Jon Constable asked if the video could include details regarding what vibration levels could potentially cause damage to houses. Trudi acknowledged that this is part of FGM's intent, to assist with addressing commonly asked questions.</p> <p>Scott suggested that it would be beneficial to include how FGM approaches mine-induced seismicity from a risk perspective.</p>
6	Update on actions arising from the previous minutes & site tour
6.1	No actions
7	Official business on the agenda
7.1	<p>Quarterly Environment and Community Report</p> <p><u>Environmental activities and incidents</u></p> <p><i>As per presentation – Oliver Hickson</i></p> <p><u>Groundwater monitoring</u></p> <p><i>As per presentation – Natasha van Leeuwen</i></p> <p>Scott Sandercock inquired whether there is an adjacent bore to BGL115 producing similar Arsenic results. Natasha explained that while there are bores near Robbins Hill pit, they are further away, and BGL115 is located within 50 meters from Robbins Hill Pit. Natasha noted that regional bores to FGM operations also show varying levels of Arsenic, as Arsenic is commonly found in groundwater in this region.</p> <p>Jon Constable asked how long it takes for a bore to stabilise. Natasha explained that BGL115 results are starting to stabilise, however, this bore is also potentially influenced by the Robbins Hill Pit water, which has higher concentrations of some analytes, so it may take longer before we establish a stable trend for Arsenic that is within the historical mean and standard deviation. Will Wettenhall added that establishing a mean for an analyte requires multiple data points. Will explained that since February 2024, the results for Arsenic have been fairly consistent, and we are starting to see the results stabilise. Will also said that some groundwater bores can take up to 5 years to stabilize. Will further explained that the timeframe depends on various factors, including the specific parameter, variability, and groundwater interactions, so there is no set timeframe.</p> <p>Scott asked if other parameters for BGL115 had stabilised since the bore was installed. Natasha confirmed that she has reviewed other parameters, such as chloride, which is found in higher concentrations within the mine water than in groundwater, and chloride had not stabilised. Scott asked if other metals had stabilised and Natasha stated she had not reviewed if all the other metals had stabilised.</p> <p>Jacob McDonald inquired whether FGM's hydrogeologist conducts reviews quarterly or only</p>

	<p>when anomalies are observed. Natasha clarified that reviews occur only when FGM engages the hydrogeologist. Oliver Hickson added that FGM routinely engages with the hydrogeologist to review the groundwater data, with the hydrogeologist routinely available to review data, as required. Will Wettenhall confirmed that FGM is planning to engage the hydrogeologist to complete a bi-annual review of all our groundwater monitoring data this year.</p> <p>Ariunjargal Begzagchaa questioned several figures from previous ERC reports regarding Arsenic concentrations that were above the ANZECC guidelines. Natasha van Leeuwen explained that Arsenic is naturally occurring in the groundwater within the mining licence area. FGM monitors two background bores located over 2 km from the mining operations that have Arsenic concentrations higher than some bores adjacent to our operations. Natasha explained that FGM reviews the historical trends of the bores to assess if the mining operations are having any impact on the groundwater.</p> <p>Ariunjargal also questioned the Arsenic trigger value adopted in the WSP groundwater report that was produced for the EES. Will Wettenhall informed Ari that the ERC is an opportunity to discuss FGM environmental performance and reporting, and the environmental results are compared against the guideline values in our current approved Work Plan rather than documentation that has been prepared for the Sustained Operations Project EES.</p> <p>Scott asked for clarification as to the amount of groundwater exceedances, as the report stated two high and one moderate exceedance. Natasha clarified that BGL95 had two exceedances while BGL115 had one exceedance during the quarter. Oliver Hickson also confirmed that both exceedances are reflected within the environmental monitoring summary table of the presentation.</p> <p><u>Air quality monitoring</u></p> <p><i>As per presentation- Tess Fitzpatrick</i></p>
7.2	<p><u>Community</u></p> <p><i>As per presentation – Leigh Byrne</i></p> <p>Scott Sandercock inquired about community complaints, asking if they change seasonally and whether FGM looks for trends. Trudi Jackson responded that FGM does look for trends and recently reviewed complaints from 2024 and 2025. Trudi noted that the majority of complaints are related to ground vibration. Over the past few years, there hasn't been a variation in the sources of these complaints, with the exception of the 3.4 Mw event, where a larger number of landholders submitted a complaint.</p> <p>Will Wettenhall added that FGM examines the volume of complaints, the number of complainants, their locations, and whether the number of complaints is trending upwards. Communications from new landholders in the area often prompt further discussions to identify any changes or differences.</p> <p>Ian Ralston highlighted a landholder with a high number of complaints, questioning their proximity to FGM's operations. Trudi Jackson responded that the landholder is located within a couple of kilometres of the mine site. Ground vibration monitoring results indicate that this landholder is not experiencing the highest levels of ground vibration. Trudi noted that the complaints are reflective of the landholder's sensitivity to ground vibration.</p>
7.3	<p><u>Quarterly Operations Report</u></p> <p>Lance Faulkner presented Q4 2024 operational results, including an update on the 25/11/2024 fall of ground event.</p> <p>Lance acknowledged that the overall performance was significantly impacted by the seismic and ground fall events.</p> <p>Lance explained that FGM experienced one significant potential incident, a fall of ground in the</p>

	<p>Ellesmere decline.</p> <p>Jonathan Constable asked about the composition of the ground support. Lance explained that the ground support comprised fibrecrrete (a layer of concrete) as surface support and ground reinforcement (rocks bolts). At the time of mining there were resin bolts installed in the area. Where resin bolts could not be installed, split sets were installed and grouted.</p> <p>Scott Sandercock asked about the deterioration of ground support in galvanized steel. Lance explained that in 2008, the ground support was originally installed to reflect the life-of-mine timeframe at the time of mining, approximately 10 years. The Ellesmere decline has now been in service for 17 years. The steel may not have been galvanized but the ground support had been damaged and deteriorated (likely corrosion) over time by the wet conditions in the area.</p>
8	Regulatory Updates
8.1	EPA – No update
8.2	COGB – No update. Frank Casimir personally thanked the ERC for his time on the committee.
8.3	ERR – Scott Sandercock said ERR is in ongoing dialogue to improve their understanding and staging of the recommencement of underground blasting at Fosterville. ERR was awaiting Fosterville's submission of the Stage 3b recommencement of blasting memo for review.
8.4	DEECA – No update
8.5	GMW – No update
8.6	Community representatives – No update
8.7	Djaara – No update. Ariunjargal Begzragchaa made a recommendation that FGM present an annual summary of environmental performance. Will Wettenhall referenced the existing ERC TOR's, which guide the content and format of the quarterly ERC reports and meetings. Will acknowledged that any suggested changes to the ERC would need to take into consideration the existing TOR's.
9	Other Business
9.1	<p><u>5/11/2024 Seismic Event Update</u></p> <p>Will Wettenhall provided an update on the 3.4 Mw seismic event that occurred on 05/11/2024. He acknowledged that FGM experienced a 3.4 Mw seismic event at 6:41 am, which occurred during the Phoenix 3910 Swan firing. Will gave an overview of the three active mining areas: Phoenix, Harrier, and Robbins Hill. The event took place 1290 metres below the surface. He explained that seismic events occur frequently, with many not registering as a ground vibration on the surface. This particular event was the result of a crush and slip event associated with multiple faults. Will also discussed the community engagement response following the event and outlined the process for recommencing blasting activities in the underground mine.</p> <p>Ian Ralston enquired about the time period represented in Will's seismic event update graph. Will explained that the graph shows a 3-hour period. He also informed the ERC that it is not uncommon to observe smaller-scale events following a larger seismic event.</p> <p>Ian Ralston asked if there was any damage to underground infrastructure. Will explained that while no damage to FGM infrastructure was reported on the surface, some areas of the underground mine experienced damage. Will mentioned that the Rock Mechanics team were undertaking inspections and preparing advice for Mining Operations to rehabilitate the ground support.</p> <p>Jon Constable asked whether the fall of ground event was related to the seismic event. Will Wettenhall clarified that the two events were unrelated and mentioned that Lance Faulkner had provided an update on the fall of ground event during the operational update.</p> <p>Scott Sandercock provided feedback to Will Wettenhall, noting that his explanation was very</p>

	informative for the committee.
9.2	<p><u><i>Sharkeys Pit Update</i></u></p> <p>Natasha van Leeuwen provided a brief update on the Sharkey's Pit project, stating that the backfilling works had been completed and the topsoil spreading and planting would be completed in mid-2025. Natasha presented a video that provided an overview of the Sharkeys Pit rehabilitation project for the committee to view.</p> <p>Scott Sandercock asked if FGM had positioned a real-time air quality monitor near the backfilling activities. Oliver Hickson responded that a dust deposition monitor was already located near the pit and deemed sufficient for the project. Oliver added that the contractor, Yellow Iron Fleet, had a dedicated water truck available for the duration of the project. Oliver mentioned that at the completion of the project, the exposed areas from the overburden dump were sprayed with a dust suppressant to mitigate dust. Scott then inquired if the water from FGM's pits was used for dust suppression. Natasha van Leeuwen informed him that mine water from O'Dwyer's North pit was used for the majority of the project, before switching to Epsom Class B recycled water for the final 3 m of the backfilling to ensure suitable conditions for vegetation growth.</p>
10	Next meeting
10.1	<p>Date/time: 14 May 2025, 11:00 am</p> <p>Location: FGM Safety Training Room, Fosterville, VIC, 3557</p>
11	Meeting closure
11.1	The meeting concluded at 12.42 pm

SCHEDULE 1

SUMMARY OF ACTIONS

Action ref.	Action description	Assigned to	Due date
202502-01	FGM to clarify Arsenic trigger value adopted in WSP EES report	FGM	May 2025