

ENVIRONMENT REVIEW COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

Item	Details
Meeting date & time	14 May 2025, 11:11am – 1:10pm
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) online, Steve Pugh (Senior Environment Advisor, FGM), Natasha van Leeuwen (Water Management Specialist, FGM), Wendy Campbell (Community Officer, FGM), Leigh Byrne (Community Officer, FGM), Tessa Fitzpatrick (Environment Officer, FGM), Tess Smythe (Community Administrator, FGM), Ryan Straub (EPA) online, Glen Payne (GMW), Ariunjargal Begzragchaa (DJAARA), Scott Sandercock (ERR), Ian Ralston (Community Representative), Jon Constable (Community Representative), Keith Oberin (Community Representative), Cr Shivali Chatley (Axedale Ward, COGB), Mayor Andrea Metcalf (Mayor and Epsom Ward, COGB), Varinder Sapehiyia (Coordinator Environmental Health and Immunisation, COGB).
Absent	N/A
Apologies	Oliver Prest (Senior Environment and Community Officer, FGM), Jacob McDonald (EPA), Rebecca Carlton (ERR), Jeff White (DEECA).
By invitation	Lewis Brown (DJAARA), Felicia Binks (Director Environment and Sustainability, Agnico Eagle Australia)
Observers	Nil

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	Lewis Brown 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. Lewis also provided a brief lesson in the traditional language of the Djaara people to the ERC. Each attendee then introduced themselves and the capacities in which they were attending.
3	Declaration of interests
3.1	No conflicts of interest declared.
4	Minutes, actions and matters arising since last committee meeting
4.1	Ariunjargal Begzragchaa noted that her suggestions made at the February ERC meeting was

	not included in the meeting minutes. Will acknowledged this and committed to amending the minutes to include Ariunjargal's recommendation that FGM present an annual summary of environmental performance.								
	<table> <tr> <td>Action 202505-01</td><td>FGM to amend the Q1 2025 ERC meeting minutes and reissue to the committee.</td></tr> </table>	Action 202505-01	FGM to amend the Q1 2025 ERC meeting minutes and reissue to the committee.						
Action 202505-01	FGM to amend the Q1 2025 ERC meeting minutes and reissue to the committee.								
	Scott Sandercock inquired about the last review of the ERC Terms of Reference (TOR). In response, Trudi Jackson noted that the TOR was last reviewed in May 2022. Will added that this presents a timely opportunity to revisit and update the TOR ahead of the next ERC meeting in August.								
	<table> <tr> <td>Action 202505-02</td><td>Committee to review the ERC TOR</td></tr> </table>	Action 202505-02	Committee to review the ERC TOR						
Action 202505-02	Committee to review the ERC TOR								
	Confirmation of minutes from meeting on 12 February 2025.								
	The minutes of the meeting on 12 February 2025 were reviewed for accuracy.								
	IT WAS RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting on 12 February 2025 be confirmed as a true and accurate record of proceedings:								
	<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 and TSF5 and Additional Southern Ventilation Shaft Work Plan Variation</i></u></p> <p>Will Wettenhall provided an update on the Sustained Operations Project EES. Will informed the ERC that the formal Environment Effects Statement (EES) process had concluded and was awaiting the Minister of Planning's decision. While no timeframe has been provided, FGM remains hopeful of a decision in May.</p> <p>Will also delivered a presentation on the first Work Plan Variation (WPV) being prepared in anticipation of a positive EES outcome. He clarified that while the EES grants planning approval, a WPV is required to obtain approval under the <i>Mineral Resources (Sustainable Development) Act</i>, which is administered by Earth Resources Regulator (ERR).</p> <p>Will said should the EES decision be favourable, the first WPV submitted will include the development of Tailings Storage Facility 5 (TSF5) and a new Southern Ventilation Shaft. Pending EES approval, this WPV is expected to be submitted between mid to late June, with a minimum three-month review period for the referral agencies. Will noted that the proposed locations for TSF5 and the Southern Ventilation Shaft were selected based on the EES assessment process and are situated close to existing infrastructure of a similar nature.</p> <p>Will Wettenhall continued his update by discussing TSF5 and the Southern Ventilation Shaft. He explained that TSF5 will be an above-ground surface flotation and neutralisation TSF, similar in height to the adjacent TSF1 and TSF4. Will emphasised that this infrastructure is essential for FGM's continued operations. He also outlined the construction and closure processes, highlighting the rigorous oversight involved, including reviews by the Independent Review Board, FGM's Engineer of Record, and operational staff.</p> <p>In relation to the Southern Ventilation Shaft, Will noted that it will serve as an additional return air rise. This is necessary to address the increasing resistance in the ventilation network as mining progresses to deeper levels.</p> <p>Scott Sandercock added to the discussion, confirming that ERR will be actively involved in the review and evaluation of the WPV. He also touched on the closure planning and the associated</p>								

5.2	<p>review processes. Scott asked if TSF centreline construction had previously been used at FGM, with Felicia confirming a centreline lift was used in the construction of on TSF4.</p> <p>Mayor Metcalf concluded the discussion by thanking Will for his clear explanation and acknowledged that the information provided would help provide some reassurance in the community.</p> <p><u>Good Neighbour Guide Update</u></p> <p>Trudi Jackson provided a progress update on the development of FGM's Good Neighbour Guide (GNG).</p> <p>Trudi informed the ERC that the FGM Community Line has now been active for three months, and it continues to serve as a valuable point of contact for local engagement. A mine-induced seismicity (MIS) video is currently in development and is expected to be released in June. FGM has also acquired a new Community Van to support outreach and visibility of our community engagement activities across the region.</p> <p>In addition, the fourth GNG Workshop was held in April, with the draft GNG shared with the working group for review and feedback.</p> <p>Cr Chatley raised a question regarding the purpose of the Community Van. In response, Trudi explained that the van is designed to support and strengthen community engagement activities. It will be fully equipped with relevant resources and information, enabling the team to mobilise quickly and maintain a visible presence in the community, particularly during events or in response to emerging situations (e.g., MIS event). Additionally, the van will play a key role in facilitating and supporting the delivery of community events.</p> <p>Trudi provided an update on the expansion of the ground vibration monitoring network. Trudi reported that the final four monitors were installed at the end of April 2025, completing the expansion. The network has grown significantly—from 6 to 25 monitors—with 7 units installed on FGM owned property and 18 on private properties. To ensure consistency and accuracy, both the existing and new systems will operate in parallel for a two-month period.</p> <p>Trudi also noted that two portable monitors have been acquired to support vibration monitoring at landholder properties, which is a service offered by FGM to community members.</p> <p>Trudi provided an update on ongoing efforts to improve public access to ground vibration data. She noted that enhancements are currently being made to the FGM website to ensure that community members can easily access and understand monitoring data.</p> <p>Feedback from the GNG Working Group has been reviewed and consolidated, resulting in a number of minor amendments to the draft GNG. The revised version has now been circulated for internal approval. Following internal endorsement, the next phase will involve broader community engagement. This will include drop-in sessions where community members can view the guide, ask questions, and provide feedback. The team is aiming to officially launch the GNG by the end of Q2 2025.</p> <p>Ian Ralston inquired about the level of uptake with the new Community Line. Trudi responded that FGM has received a number of calls during business hours, with fewer calls received outside of those times. However, she emphasised that the line remains available for anyone wishing to raise concerns.</p> <p>Ian also asked whether the Community Van would be equipped with remote internet access. Trudi confirmed that this is indeed the intention, to support flexible and responsive community engagement in the field.</p> <p>Scott Sandercock asked whether the data from the newly installed ground vibration monitors would be reflected in the next quarterly report. Trudi clarified that the upcoming Q2 report will not include data from the new monitors, as the expanded IMS ground vibration monitoring network had not yet been commissioned.</p>
-----	---

	<p>She explained that this transition period is essential to validate the new system and ensure a smooth integration/transition. The Q3 report will incorporate data from the expanded ground vibration monitoring network. Trudi also noted that supporting systems and processes are being developed to ensure the long-term success and reliability of the new monitoring network.</p> <p>Scott Sandercock asked whether the installation of the new ground vibration monitoring system was carried out by a third party. Trudi confirmed that IMS was engaged for the installation of all the ground vibration monitors. The team travelled from Tasmania to complete the setup and is also responsible for managing the data acquisition and technical support.</p> <p>Scott Sandercock shared his thoughts on the IMS explainer video, emphasising the importance of making it as clear and easy to understand as possible. Trudi assured the group that the video is being developed to clearly convey the key messages in a simple and accessible format.</p> <p>Cr Chatley asked whether she could share information about FGM's upcoming drop-in sessions on her social media platforms. Trudi and Will Wettenhall confirmed that once the dates are finalised, they will be shared with the entire ERC to support broader community promotion.</p> <p>Action 202505 - 03 FGM to communicate the GNG information sessions to the ERC via email.</p>
5.3	<p><u>ESG Principles and TSM</u></p> <p>Felicia Binks provided an overview of the Environmental, Social and Governance industry principles, and the Towards Sustainable Mining (TSM) audit process currently being conducted at FGM, including an explanation of the scoring system used to assess performance.</p> <p>She also noted that an external audit is scheduled for September 2025. As part of the September audit, interviews will be conducted with FGM's Community of Interest — individuals or groups who have an interest in, or may be affected by, FGM's operations. Felicia advised that in September, FGM will be reaching out to request participation from community members in support of this external audit process.</p> <p>Scott Sandercock questioned whether any mines in Victoria (Australia) are meeting a triple-A score. Felicia confirmed FGM has some triple-A scores, and other mining companies also have triple-A scores. Felicia also highlighted that the Mineral Council Australia has also adopted TSM protocols.</p>
6	Update on actions arising from the previous minutes & site tour
6.1	<p>Action 202502-01 FGM to clarify Arsenic trigger value adopted in WSP EES report – Complete</p> <p>Will confirmed that the correct Arsenic trigger value is for Arsenic III, which is 0.024 mg/L, which is also written into FGM's Groundwater Management Plan and FGM's approved Work Plan Variation. Will also confirmed that the Arsenic trigger value included in the EES WSP report was for Arsenic V. Will highlighted that the groundwater quality criteria that FGM reports against for regulatory compliance is Arsenic III (0.024 mg/L).</p>
7	Official business on the agenda
7.1	<p><u>Quarterly Environment and Community Report</u></p> <p><u>Environmental activities and incidents</u></p> <p><i>As per presentation – Steve Pugh</i></p> <p>Ariunjargal Begzragchaa raised a question regarding in-pit monitoring exclusions. Will Wettenhall suggested that this question be addressed during the presentation of groundwater results.</p> <p>Ariunjargal also requested that the full appendix reports be provided to all ERC members, noting that Appendices F and G for the Q1 Environment and Community report were only sent to her the day prior to the meeting. In response, Will Wettenhall clarified that it has been a long-standing practice whereby only attachments relevant to members' regulatory roles or expressed interests are distributed. However, he confirmed that FGM is more than happy to provide Appendices F and G to any members who wish to receive them.</p>

<u>Action 202505 - 04</u>	FGM to send all Q1 Environment and Community quarterly report Appendices to Ariunjargal Begzagchaa
<p><u>Groundwater monitoring</u></p> <p><i>As per presentation – Tessa Fitzpatrick</i></p> <p>Tessa acknowledged an oversight in the distribution of Appendix C displaying the groundwater exceedance maps. It was identified that the version distributed did not include the green groundwater exceedance markers. Tessa confirmed that this will be rectified following the meeting, and the amended map will be redistributed to all ERC members.</p>	
<u>Action 202505-05</u>	FGM to send amended Appendix C to relevant ERC members.
<p>Tessa invited Natasha van Leeuwen to respond to Ariunjargal Begzagchaa's question regarding in-pit residue monitoring bore PB01, which has sulphate levels above the Stage 3 Trigger Level. Natasha explained that following the January 2024 flood event, which resulted in the loss of pumping and electrical infrastructure and reduced groundwater extraction surrounding Hunt's Pit, there was a rise in sulphate levels in groundwater monitoring bore PB01. Despite the reinstatement of infrastructure in 2024, sulphate levels remained above the Stage 3 Trigger Level. In response, FGM installed additional extraction infrastructure surrounding Hunt's Pit/TSF2 in-pit facility, which has led to a declining trend in sulphate levels from April 2025 onward.</p> <p>Will Wettenhall asked Natasha to elaborate on the in-pit storage facilities and the associated Trigger Action Response Plan (TARP). Natasha explained that the TARP was developed to manage potential seepage from the in-pit TSF's, supported by a network of monitoring bores and extraction bores with varying trigger levels to ensure effective management and response.</p> <p>Ariunjargal Begzagchaa noted that the number of in-pit monitoring excursions appeared quite high. In response, Will Wettenhall clarified that the focus of the monitoring is not solely about the number of excursions, but rather to ensure that levels/concentrations of specific parameters are being measured to observe the trends of a particular parameter overtime. Will explained that where increasing trends are observed, which was initially seen in PB01 following the infrastructure loss, the appropriate controls are implemented and the monitoring frequency is increased to ensure that a decreasing trend is observed. Encouragingly, current monitoring shows that levels are trending downward in PB01, which is a positive outcome.</p> <p>Jonathan Constable asked how many trigger levels are in place for the in-pit TSF groundwater monitoring program. Natasha responded that there are three stages of trigger levels, each with specific actions that must be undertaken when triggered. One of these actions includes conducting weekly monitoring to ensure appropriate response and oversight.</p> <p>Varinder Sapehiya clarified that his understanding was that the sulphate exceedances at this site were primarily due to the infrastructure loss and asked whether these exceedances would typically occur, or if the recent instances were primarily due to the flooding event. Natasha explained that FGM monitors groundwater through a network of bores, some of which are located closer to the in-pit tailings facilities, and contain higher concentrations of sulphates which are present in the tailings and process water placed on these facilities. The bores that are further away from the in-pit TSFs show sulphate concentrations below the Trigger Levels and at lower concentrations, and FGM is confident that there is no broader environmental impact.</p> <p>Will Wettenhall added that following the loss of infrastructure during the flood event, some bores did show an increase in sulphate levels, which has since been addressed through the mitigation measures adopted.</p> <p>Scott Sandercock suggested that FGM develop a case study on this particular groundwater monitoring bore (PB01) to present at the next ERC meeting. He noted that this could help improve members' understanding of groundwater systems and monitoring practices.</p>	

	Will Wettenhall welcomed the suggestion and expressed support for building baseline knowledge across the group around the in-pit storage facilities and associated monitoring and management practices.	
	Action 202505-06	FGM to provide an overview of the in-pit storage facilities and monitoring and management of groundwater around these facilities.
	<p><u>Surface water monitoring</u></p> <p><i>As per presentation – Tessa Fitzpatrick</i></p> <p>Tessa invited Will Wettenhall to present a proposal to ERC members regarding the monitoring of operational dams. Prior to Will's presentation, Ariunjargal raised that in the ERC quarterly report there was no reference to the specific TDS concentration for FWO12, which was identified as an exceedance of the ANZECC guideline value. Will acknowledged this omission and thanked Ariunjargal for identifying it.</p> <p>Will proposed an adjustment to the reporting of surface water quality results for operational dams. He explained that the dams are functioning as intended by capturing runoff and sediment from operational areas (e.g., roads and waste rock dumps), and such fluctuations in water quality are expected under normal conditions. Will referred to the examples in previous quarterly reports, where exceedances of surface water quality criteria had occurred due to natural seasonal variations (e.g., where surface water dams naturally contract during dryer summer months, which can lead to a temporary increase in certain parameters/metal concentrations). Will proposed that monitoring and reporting on these operational dams should only occur in the event of a spill or overflow.</p> <p>Scott Sandercock expressed some reservations about the proposal to exclude operational dams from routine monitoring. He requested further details on the rationale behind the suggestion, noting the proximity of these dams to the mine site and nearby waterways, which could pose a heightened environmental risk.</p> <p>Ian Ralston added that the current dry conditions and lack of rainfall are contributing to increased evaporation, which in turn may lead to higher concentrations of minerals in the dams, potentially resulting in more exceedances in the near future, under the current reporting framework.</p> <p>In response, Will Wettenhall acknowledged these concerns and confirmed that the data collected over the past 4–5 years supports this trend, with seasonal contraction and evaporation contributing to elevated mineral levels during drier periods. Will relayed this back to the purpose of the ERC, and wanting to ensure discussions were risk-based and focused appropriately to ensure an effective use of everyone's time.</p> <p>Varinder Sapehiyia suggested that external environmental research be considered to support further investigation and help establish a formal protocol for managing operational dam monitoring.</p> <p>Will Wettenhall thanked Varinder for the suggestion and acknowledged the value of the feedback. He agreed that additional work is needed on this topic and committed to providing further context and an explanatory memo.</p> <p>Keith Oberin recommended taking a common-sense approach to the proposal. He noted that he has received a substantial amount of information regarding FGM's operations and environmental monitoring. Keith expressed his support for Will's proposal, pending the completion of further investigations and the provision of additional context.</p>	
	Action 202505-07	FGM to prepare an explanatory memo, providing additional information/context on the proposed reporting of surface water monitoring results from operational dams.

	<p><u>Air quality monitoring</u></p> <p><i>As per presentation- Tessa Fitzpatrick</i></p> <p>Scott Sandercock asked whether protocols are in place to manage forecasted extreme weather events. Tessa confirmed that in such conditions, water cart usage is increased, and in line with the Air Quality Trigger Action Response Plan (TARP), operational activities are either reduced or ceased entirely in extreme weather conditions. Tessa emphasised that FGM often implement changes to reduce air quality impacts pre-emptively when weather forecasts suggest inclement weather is approaching.</p> <p>Scott also inquired whether FGM has an on-site weather station. Tessa confirmed that a weather station is in place, and the data it collects is used to inform the quarterly environmental reports.</p> <p>Scott encouraged FGM to continue providing comprehensive updates at ERC meetings to ensure members have a full understanding of the nature and context of site-related issues. Will Wettenhall agreed, stating that this is indeed the approach taken, particularly when discussing exceedances linked to FGM's operations. Will reiterated Tessa's statement that due to the background site HVA3 exceeding, the increased values have not been attributed to FGM's mining operations. Will suggested that further explanation of on-site operational activities is not required for such exceedances, which have been demonstrated as non-mine related.</p> <p>Ian Ralston commended FGM for taking proactive steps to minimise environmental impacts on surrounding areas.</p>
7.2	<p><u>Community</u></p> <p><i>As per presentation – Leigh Byrne</i></p>
7.3	<p><u>Exploration</u></p> <p><i>As per presentation – Leigh Byrne</i></p>
7.4	<p><u>Quarterly Operations Report</u></p> <p>Lance Faulkner presented Q1 2025 operational results.</p>
8	Regulatory Updates
8.1	EPA – No update.
8.2	COGB – No update.
8.3	ERR – No update.
8.4	DEECA – No update.
8.5	GMW – No update.
8.6	Community representatives – No update.
8.7	DJAARA – No update.
9	Other Business
9.1	<p>Ian Ralston requested an update on the Sharkey's Pit backfill project. Will Wettenhall confirmed that the pit backfilling was completed last year, and the remaining rehabilitation will be carried out using FGM's internal resources, with no involvement from Goldfields Vegetation. He added that topsoil placement and seeding are planned to occur mid-year as part of the ongoing rehabilitation works, subject to suitable conditions (e.g., rain).</p> <p>Ian also commended FGM on the solar-powered lighting installed at the core shed, noting its environmentally conscious design and downward diffusion to minimise light pollution.</p> <p>Trudi Jackson acknowledged that Jon Constable's term on the ERC will conclude in August and expressed her appreciation for his contributions to the committee.</p>

	<p>Trudi also raised the scenario that should FGM receive multiple ERC community representative applications during the EOI period that met the selection criteria for the ERC, FGM would like to propose increasing the number of community representatives from three to five. FGM raised this because the ERC TOR's currently refers to a maximum of three community representatives on the ERC.</p> <p>There was general agreement from ERC members that this approach was appropriate, should this situation arise. Jude Holt remarked that this is well-timed, aligning with the upcoming review of the Terms of Reference.</p> <p>Will Wettenhall congratulated Natasha van Leeuwen on her new position as a Water Management Specialist within the Processing Team and thanked her for her contribution to the ERC.</p>
10	Next meeting
10.1	<p>Date/time: 13 August 2025, 11:00am</p> <p>Location: FGM Safety Training Room, Fosterville, VIC, 3557</p>
11	Meeting closure
11.1	The meeting concluded at 1:09pm

SCHEDULE 1

SUMMARY OF ACTIONS

Action ref.	Action description	Assigned to	Due date
202505-01	FGM to amend the Q1 ERC meeting minutes and reissue to the committee.	FGM	ASAP
202505-02	Committee to review the ERC Terms of Reference.	ALL	August 2025
202505-03	FGM to communicate the GNG information sessions to the ERC via email.	FGM	August 2025
202505-04	FGM to send all Q1 Environment and Community quarterly report Appendices to Ariunjargal Begzragchaa.	FGM	ASAP
202505-05	FGM to send amended Appendix C to relevant ERC members.	FGM	ASAP
202505-06	FGM to provide an overview of the in-pit storage facilities and monitoring and management of groundwater around these facilities.	FGM	August 2025
202505-07	FGM to prepare an explanatory memo, providing additional information/context on the proposed reporting of surface water monitoring results from operational dams.	FGM	August 2025