

# FOSTERVILLE GOLD MINE - ENVIRONMENT REVIEW COMMITTEE

4 August 2021

## MEETING MINUTES

<b>Meeting Opened at:</b> 11:00am	<b>Minutes by:</b> Natasha van Leeuwen
<b>Attendance:</b> Clare Fountain (CF) - Chairperson Trudi Jackson (TJ) – FGM Will Wettenhall (WW) – FGM Rachel Spencer (RS) – FGM Natasha van Leeuwen (NvL) – FGM Lance Faulkner (LF) – FGM Sue Mills (SM) - FGM Rob McLean (RM) – FGM Matt Farrington (MF) – FGM Felicia Binks (FB) – FGM Tim Harrington (TH) – Community Representative Barrie Winzar (BW) – Community Representative Ian Ralston (IR) – Community Representative Tim Nordon (TN) – DELWP Jacob McDonald (JM) – EPA Ryan Straub (RSt) – EPA Bob Disken (BD) – ERR Judy Scott (JS) – ERR Natalie Lane (NL) – GMW Frank Casimir (FC) – CoGB Andrea Metcalf (AM) – CoGB Councillor	<b>Apologies</b> Ashley Elliott  <b>Observers</b>

### Site Tour

- Waste Rock Storages - McCormick's Waste Rock Dump Extension, Falcon Tip Head and Harrier Tip Head
- Attended by WW, NvL, JS, BW, TH, IR, JS

### Meeting Commenced 11am

- Acknowledgement of country (Dja Dja Wurrung)
- Welcome to committee & introductions
- Community representative (TH) asked if the recordings from the ERC meetings were available to the community (non-ERC members)? Chairperson (CF) acknowledged this has been discussed at previous meetings, and the meetings are recorded to assist the preparation and accuracy of the meeting minutes and are not available for distribution to community members.
- New declarations of Conflict of Interest – Nil. Community Representative (TH) reinstated his previous declarations (farming business - land leased through Fosterville Gold Mine).

### Minutes of the Previous Meeting

- Chairperson (CF) noted that (AE – Goldfields Revegetation) was an apology at the last meeting but was not listed as an apology.
- Community Representative (TH) noted that on Page 5 of the minutes it states FGM may not be the sole business attributable to the reverse beeper noise. TH does not believe there are other businesses that contribute to this noise. FGM (WW) advised that during noise monitoring sessions reverse beepers from

the Axedale quarry have been observed. The discussion at the previous meeting was regarding the transition to broadband 'squawker' style reverse beepers at FGM.

- CoGB Councillor (AM) noted on Page 6 the text states 'mower shavings' and then 'mover shavings'. FGM to update the minutes to reflect this change.

**Moved:** Andrea Metcalf

**Seconded:** Ian Ralston

All in favour of the meeting minutes – Yes, minutes passed

## Site Tour – Key Questions and General Discussion

- Waste Rock Dump Rehabilitation
  - Questions raised regarding FGM's approach to waste rock dump rehabilitation, including the type and availability of capping/cover material, cover thickness and rehabilitation timeframes.
  - FGM confirmed all waste rock dumps would be progressively rehabilitated as landform construction is progressed. The site Rehabilitation Plan nominates an oxide cap, which will provide the growth medium for revegetation – this is consistent with the rehabilitation method adopted for McCormicks Waste Rock Dump.
  - Community Representative (TH) made recommendation that revegetation of exposed (eastern facing) wall of waste rock dumps is prioritised to minimise impacts to community (i.e., visual amenity).
  - Questions and comments regarding rehabilitation standards and the acceptable outcomes. FGM and ERR spoke to relinquishment criteria that are required as part of an approved Rehabilitation Plan, and that Companies cannot relinquish land until regulators are satisfied that the criteria have been achieved. These criteria address aspects such as landform stability, erosion, vegetation coverage, water runoff, etc.
  - Questions and discussion about the availability and quality of rehabilitation materials (i.e., topsoil) and what methods could be used to improve the quality of these materials to improve rehabilitation success. FGM spoke to the TSF2 biosolids trial as an example of an initiative to improve soil health and rehabilitation success.
- Waste Rock Dump Planning and Operation
  - Questions and commentary around the timeframes and capacity that the existing and proposed waste rock dump storages will provide.
  - FGM responded:
    - MWRD extension: Storage capacity 2.8 million tonnes, Timeframe 3-4 years storage
    - Falcon WRD: Storage capacity 1.3 million tonnes, Timeframe 1-2 years storage
    - Harrier Pit WRD: Timeframe 5+ years storage.
  - General discussion and commentary regarding the backfilling of Falcon Pit and historical decisions regarding Huntly-Fosterville Road realignment and stability.
  - Question regarding the water being discharged into Falcon Pit? FGM advised this water is for use back underground as part of the mining operations.
  - Question regarding the location of proposed Waste Rock Dumps and the proximity to receptors. FGM pointed to receptors east (along Axedale-Goornong Road) and west (along Murphy's Road).
  - Question regarding the nature of the waste rock material mined and was there any variation between the Harrier and Phoenix zones. FGM explained the waste rock monitoring program and methods which are used to assess the geochemical properties of waste rock. Monitoring to-date confirms that all material is Non-Acid Forming, which significantly reduces any risk of acid-mine drainage.

## Action Items from Previous Meeting

No.	Action	Who
202105-1	Questions raised during ERC site tour to be added as an agenda item (completed)	FGM
202105-2	Relative height of the Falcon Waste Rock Dump (discussed in presentation)	FGM
202105-3	Confirm cover requirement for waste rock dumps/material (hard rock)	FGM

202105-4	Review and update environmental monitoring maps (completed)	FGM
202105-5	Last review date of the Australian Standard (AS 2187.2:2006) (ERR completed in meeting)	ERR
202105-6	FGM waste management overview and the recent tender process (action moved to next meeting)	FGM

#### **Action 5 – Last review date of the Australia Standard (AS 2187.2:2006)**

- ERR (BD) provided information relating to the history of the guidelines:
  - In 1990 the Australian and New Zealand Environment Council (ANZEC) produced guidelines for minimisation of noise in relation to ground vibration and blasting.
  - In 2006 the Australian Standard (AS 2187.2:2006) for surface vibration limits was developed.
  - The 1990 ANZEC guidance has not changed, and the 2006 AS2187.2:2006 is the latest review for surface vibration.
- Community Representative (TH) questioned the application and relevance of the standard relative to current mining practices?
- ERR (BD) advised that these questions regarding the development and application of the 1990 ANZEC guidance and AS 2187.2:2006 should be directed to the Council of Standards Australia – who are the administrators of these standards. ERR as a regulator has a role to use the standards set by Standards Australia – their role is to regulate the performance of mining and extractives operations against those standards.
- ERR (BD) offered to send TH copies of the descriptions about the standards.

#### **Information/project updates to ERC members**

As per presentations

#### **EES Projects Update – Fosterville Gold Mine Sustained Operations Project (FB)**

Questions/Comments

- ERR (BD) questioned the scope of the 1996 EES against the new EES with regards to the inclusion of surface vs. underground mining. FGM (FB) clarified that the new EES will assess potential impacts with respect to underground mining within the mining licence extension areas to the north and the south. The 1996 EES does refer to surface and underground mining, and the only new project/operational activity that FGM are proposing that wasn't covered in the 1996 EES is the Managed Aquifer Recharge (MAR) project.
- CoGB (FC) asked if the EES was going to be referred to council? FGM (FB) confirmed that the CoGB will be involved in the process after the EES referral decision. FGM is referring the project to the Minister of Planning (MoP) who will make the decision on whether or not an EES is required.
- Community Representative (TH) asked if FGM can send a flowchart of what has been presented today. FGM (FB) responded that separate communications will be developed and distributed after the EES referral decision, that will outline the EES process, what are the next steps, how does it progress, and when the community can be involved. **Action: 20210801.**
- DELWP (TN) clarified that CoGB won't be part of the EES referral process, however if the MoP decision confirms that an EES is required - then CoGB would be a member of the Technical Reference Group (TRG) for the project.

#### **Managed Aquifer Recharge (SM)**

Questions/Comments

- Community Representative (IR) asked about the number and location of groundwater bores required for the MAR project? FGM (SM) responded that there will be a total of 3 groundwater injection bores which will be located along the Fosterville Fault, approx. 50 m apart to the north. Water will be injected into the fractured bedrock aquifer.
- Community Representative (BW) asked about the radius and distance from where the water is injected, and whether it extends to the landholders using the saline water in the aquifer? FGM (SM) advised that FGM have completed hydraulic modelling for this project that extends past the township of Goornong. This model included consideration of the Lower Shepparton Sands, which is a more permeable and fresher aquifer, and FGM are not proposing to inject treated water into this aquifer. The MAR project

proposes to inject treated water into the bedrock aquifer, which is over 100m below ground level, and control measures to manage mounding (which is the radius/height of the injected water) includes pressure monitors to gauge and manage the rate of injection.

- ERR (BD) acknowledged that the progression of a Managed Aquifer Recharge system means FGM won't have to operate the reverse osmosis treatment plant or manage brine, which has beneficial outcomes. ERR (BD) asked what measures are in place to ensure the protection of the Campaspe River? FGM (SM) responded that the hydraulic modelling and groundwater monitoring to-date indicates that hydraulic movements east-west along the fault system is limited and the aquifer heading east towards the Campaspe River is impermeable, meaning the injected water from the MAR project will not reach the Campaspe River under any circumstances. The implementation of the MAR project will be staged and progressively expanded to monitor and assess the response of the receiving aquifer, before expanding injection to additional wells.
- DEWLP (TN) asked about the legislative approvals pathway for this proposal? EPA (JM) responded that there is a legislative approval that FGM will require and that there have been previous discussions relating to this trial with the EPA Assessments Team in Melbourne.
- DEWLP (TN) asked has there been consideration of impacts on groundwater dependent ecosystems and Stygofauna? FGM (WW) confirmed that stygofauna and groundwater assessments will be completed as part of this MAR project. Preliminary studies have already been undertaken, including stygofauna studies, which have been reported in previous ERC meetings. There will also be an MAR project that forms part of EES, which will address long term approval of the MAR project. What FGM are currently proposing is the permitting or licencing for an extended trial of at least 2 years. This long-term trial aims to validate MAR modelling and process, and then the long term approval to operate an MAR program will form part of the new EES.
- Community Representative (TH) commented on groundwater users in the vicinity of FGM's operations and how the proposed MAR project and Robbins Hill underground development might impact groundwater users. Community Representative (TH) questioned what is the science that provides the confidence that this is the correct method? FGM (SM) advised that FGM's hydrogeological model, which is developed using the significant dataset from years of groundwater monitoring, gives FGM the confidence that the MAR project is the correct approach. Continuous monitoring is critical to assess MAR performance and validate the model, and groundwater monitoring will increase once the MAR trial starts.
- Community Representative (TH) commented about the relevance of FGM's groundwater dataset and the reliance on this to inform decisions.
- ERR (BD) commented that Costerfield mine operates an MAR project similar to what FGM is proposing, and Costerfield's trial was approved by an EPA licence. FGM (SM) clarified that the major difference between the Costerfield and Fosterville proposal, is that FGM will be treating the mine water before injecting it, which Costerfield do not do, which demonstrate the additional control measures FGM are adopting.

### **Waste Paste Project (RM)**

#### Questions/Comments

- Community Representative (TH) queried if the current public roads are suitable for the planned truck movements associated with this project. FGM (LF) advised that road upgrade works would be undertaken, if needed.
- FGM (WW) commented that this project approval would be completed through a Work Plan Notification process that would include consultation with Council regarding roads, and consultation with EPA regarding the transportation of a waste product. If Council identify there is a risk with the roads then that would need to be addressed as part of the project.
- Community Representative (TH) asked what the suitable capping material would be for the roads? CoGB (FC) responded that he would need to speak to the CoGB engineers once further information on the project was received.

### **Mine Seismicity (MF)**

#### Questions/Comments

- Community Representative (TH) asked a question about the Earthquake Magnitude Scale. FGM (WW) responded that there is a difference between PPV (the measurement FGM uses to monitor surface ground vibration from blasting) and Local Magnitude (the unit of measurement FGM uses to describe the size of mine-induced seismic events).
- Community Representative (TH) asked who the regulator is for seismicity and what are FGMs obligations to report seismic events or measurements? ERR (JS) responded that ERR regulates ground vibration that can be from blasting or ground seismicity. FGM reports all ground vibration results to ERR, which includes blasting and seismicity.
- Community Representative (IR) asked if paste fill minimises the stress distribution on the rocks around it. FGM (MF) suggested it does provide confinement against the force of the surrounding stopes (open voids) and the rock is then less likely to redistribute stress.
- Community Representative (TH) asked if the increased frequency of the seismic events is related to blasting around original paste fill areas? FGM (MF) explained that FGM are currently mining from the centre of the orebody out. Previously when FGM did not use paste fill, crown pillars were left intact which increased stress and seismicity. The current method to extract all the rock reduces the stresses and is the most favourable approach.
- ERR Representative (BD) commented that ERR have received feedback from surrounding residents that they are impacted by the mine-induced seismic events. ERR (BD) continued to state that there is a correlation between the number of enquiries and complaints and this increasing activity, especially the event that occurred at 10:43pm on 04/07/2021 This is an emerging issue which is very relevant, and it is appreciated that FGM has presented on it today.
- FGM (LF) commented that FGM do want to reduce the impact of seismicity on the community; however, currently we do not have absolute answers.
- Community Representative (TH) commented that the seismic event on 04/07/2021 changed a lot of people's attitude to towards FGM. Previously some people would not take much notice of the mine, but now believe the mine is deliberately causing these events, and if these events are not minimised the community will continue to complain.

### **Low Frequency Noise Investigations**

#### **Questions/Comments**

- EPA Representative (JM) commented on the audibility threshold presented, which is representative for the majority of the population, however there are some people that may be able to hear noise below the audibility threshold.
- Community Representative (TH) asked how long or how many times in-house measurements taken as part of the LFN investigations? FGM (LF) stated that there were two consultants that attended the household. One consultant completed both indoor and outdoor attended noise monitoring and the second consultant installed a fixed continuous noise monitor outdoors and completed outdoor attended monitoring. The monitoring was completed when weather conditions were most conducive for any mine noise being generated to travel to the south.
- ERR Representative (JS) referred to a site tour undertaken by ERR prior to the ERC where discussions were had around any additional engineering improvements to the ventilation fans. FGM (LF) advised that noise attenuation was already engineered into the design, however FGM will follow up with the supplier to understand what else is possible.
- Community Representative (TH) asked if there had been any retrospective changes to the design, and enquired if FGM had completed any maintenance on the Vent Fans since their installation? FGM (LF) confirmed that immediately after construction and commissioning noise monitoring was undertaken and that all noise monitoring since this time has yielded similar results. FGM (WW) commented that AECOM were involved in verification of the post commissioning noise monitoring of the vent fans, and TLT Turbo (the supplier) engaged Marshall Day as their acoustic consultant, and the fan operation at the time was comparable. Community Representative (TH) commented that it is not the design of the vent fans that he is questioning but has something changed when the fans are running that FGM has not noticed.
- EPA Representative (JM) asked if fan speeds are being monitored and if they had changed? FGM (LF) confirmed FGM monitor vent fan data, including speed, voltage etc. FGM (RS) confirmed that fan speed

variances had formed part of the noise investigations and the data showed the fan speeds have not changed since they were installed.

- ERR Representative (BD) made comment on the noise monitoring sites and asked if there was consideration to putting another noise monitoring site to the south of FNB9. FGM (WW) responded that the sites on the map are FGM's fixed compliance monitoring sites, however additional investigative noise sites are monitored at various locations depending on operational activities, including at private and FGM-owned properties.

### **Environment and Community Report**

Decision was made by the ERC that the Environment and Community Report will be as per the report provided.

### **Quarterly Operations Report**

Decision was made by the ERC that the Quarterly Operations Report will be as per the report provided.

## **OTHER BUSINESS**

### **Community Concerns**

#### **Ian Ralston Questions**

- Community Representative (IR) asked what type of air quality monitors are used in FGM's dust monitoring program? FGM (WW) responded that FGM have a number of different air quality monitors, which include depositional dust gauges, directional dust gauges, high volume samplers and continuous air quality monitors.
- Community Representative (IR) explained that he had been approached by a nearby landholder raising concerns around the levels of Aluminium, Antimony, Arsenic, Iron, Lead and Manganese in dust from their roof. FGM (WW) clarified that FGM do analyse the dust content from the Depositional Dust Gauges from monitoring stations around site.
- Community Representative (IR) submitted to the committee copies of the laboratory analysis reports from the landholder.
- Community Representative (BW) asked if the reports Ian Ralston was submitting were related to the rainwater tanks. FGM (WW) responded that this complaint is related to the rainwater tank monitoring program that FGM is completing, along with FGM's air quality monitoring program.

#### **Tim Harrington Questions**

- Community Representative (TH) commented that the outgoing communications to landholders are now signed by the FGM Community Team and suggested that the individual members of the FGM Community Team providing response identify themselves.
- Community Representative (TH) made comment in relation to the Coffee and Conversation sessions and attendance levels by the community and suggested that FGM invite the local Council or the local police to encourage attendance at future events.
- Community Representative (TH) commented on the purchase of the Bendigo Wine Estate and questions relating to future plans for the property FGM (LF) advised the purchase of the estate has not settled yet, when it was FGM would look to lease out the Bendigo Wine Estate vineyard.
- Community Representative (TH) mentioned community speculation that FGM had acquired the Bendigo Wine Estate as a path for HV powerlines from the FGM Terminal station to the solar and renewables project on the opposite side of the river. FGM (LF) responded that this is not correct.
- Community Representative (TH) mentioned the articles published in the Axedale Antics relating to noise. A discussion regarding feedback on article content and the appropriate approach for sharing ERC information occurred.
- Community Representative (TH) asked how do we assess the wider implications of the seismic event? What damage occurred at the work front? Who is the lead regulator? As the Campaspe River is adjacent to FGM, what type of reporting has to occur with the managers of the river? ERR (JS) responded that ERR regulates ground vibration, impacts to community and public safety and Worksafe is involved in workplace safety. ERR (JS) was unable to answer who regulates the Campaspe River, and with the

results FGM have reported from the seismic events, including the 2.0MI event, it is unlikely there would be any kind of structural damage with this event.

- Community Representative (TH) responded that he understands that GMW and the Northern Catchment Management Authority are the managers and controllers of the water, however, when an event like this occurs, is there a requirement for FGM to communicate information with the management authorities of the river? **Action: 202108-2**
- Community Representative (TH) raised the social impact study completed by Umwelt in November 2020, and asked what the key outcomes and findings were, and would these be shared? FGM explained that the social impact study was undertaken in preparation for further assessments during the EES, and there was different and varied feedback provided from the stakeholders. FGM confirmed that a summary of the study would be shared with survey participants. **Action: 20210803**
- Community Representative (TH) commented that the FGM business is growing rapidly, with many new projects underway, and asked how the regional regulators were managing this growth? Commentary regarding regulatory engagement, early and appropriate project planning, and the criticality to project success was discussed

#### Other community questions

- Community Representative (TH) tabled questions from [REDACTED] and requested FGM include these within the meeting minutes.
- Chairperson (CF) suggested that for future meetings any questions on behalf of community be distributed to the committee prior to the meeting, so they can be addressed in FGM's report, if/where appropriate.
- Community Representative (TH) asked for the questions to be shared with the Eppalock Ward Councillors, COGB, ERR and EPA, and requested FGM provide a response within 14 days. FGM (LF) responded that without knowing the content of the questions, FGM will be expeditious in our response and try to respond within that timeframe.
- There was a lengthy discussion regarding the number of concerns within the community and the feedback and pressure that ERC Representatives are observing. Comments were made about the adequacy of FGM's community engagement programs and representation and participation at FGM's ERC meetings.
- FGM (LF) commented that the Company takes the communication with community members seriously and we do try to respond in a timely manner, albeit some community members may not think this. FGM are absolutely dependent on the communication with the ERC members and would encourage conversations with all community members.

#### General Comments

- FGM (LF) mentioned that this meeting has gone overtime, however he thanked the committee for the participation
- Community Representative (BW) mentioned that, subject to COVID restrictions, the Annual Fosterville Family and Friends Day will be held on the Saturday after the Grand Final.
- Discussion and comments were made about the length of the ERC and potential amendments/allowances to the meeting agenda – if future meetings intended to present the volume of content covered today.

**Meeting Closed: 14:07**

#### Next Meeting:

Wednesday 10<sup>th</sup> November

FGM- ENVIRONMENT REVIEW COMMITTEE

Wednesday 4<sup>th</sup> August 2021

**QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY:**

**AN AFFECTED LANDHOLDER-** [REDACTED]

1. How is it possible that a 1996 Perseverance Exploration Pty Ltd ACN: 010 604 878 Environment Effects Statement can be utilised to undertake mining by Kirkland Lake Gold who only acquired Fosterville Gold Mine in 2016?
2. What Department gave Kirkland Lake Gold the approval to conduct mining operations under a 1996 Perseverance Exploration Pty Ltd ACN: 010 604 878 Environment Effects Statement?
3. Has Earth Resources (DJPR), DELWP, EPA and COGB all granted approvals and planning permits on a 1996 Perseverance Exploration Pty Ltd Environment Effects Statement which is now 25 year old?
4. Will Earth Resources (DJPR), DELWP, EPA, COGB and the Resource Minister be using the 1996 Perseverance Exploration Pty Ltd Environment Effects Statement to approve Kirkland Lake Gold to mine in the southern extension which goes within 1.5km from the local primary school?
5. Has Earth Resources (DJPR), DELWP, EPA and COGB granted approximately 42 Work Plan Variations to Kirkland Lake Gold on 1996 Perseverance Exploration Pty Ltd Environment Effects Statement?
6. As an affected land holder (who only found out April this year that I had a mining licence on my property) can I please obtain a copy of the Community Engagement Plan that was used to gain approval to obtain a mining licence over my land?
7. Why was the Kirkland Lake Gold Workplan variation withdrawn for the Southern Extension and when?
8. As an affected land holder can I please obtain a copy of the withdrawn Work Plan Variation that Kirkland Lake Gold submitted to seek approval to mine on my land?
9. If Kirkland Lake Gold do not release the documents I have requested why? Given they proudly publicise the fact they are transparent and engage their local community?
10. Because Kirkland Lake Gold have been allowed to expand Mining Licence MIN 5404 (over 10 times the legislation limit of 260 hectares), utilising a 25 year old Environment Effects Statement from another company, with 42 Work Plan Variations does this mean I have never been afforded the opportunity to submit an Objection in the last 25 years to any Mining operations at the Fosterville Gold Mine especially under Kirkland Lake Gold?
11. On July 4<sup>th</sup> 2021 Axedale landholders were impacted by a Mine Induced Seismic 'Earthquake' of 2.0ML on the Richter Scale. And since the start of 2021 til 26<sup>th</sup> July 2021 28 'events' have occurred. What impact and size 'earthquake' has to occur before Kirkland Lake Gold have their southern extension mining licence cancelled?



---

**Questions from the Axedale Community to be Raised at the August 4<sup>th</sup>, 2021**

**Quarterly Fosterville Goldmine Meeting.**

Submitted to: Tim Harrington

---

1. Will blasting affect structural integrity of dams?
2. Is there any evidence, or have there been any reports by residents anywhere near the mine that mining or blasting has damaged any structures including houses?
3. Why do you need to operate 24/7?
4. Why is the mine always so loud on Sunday nights?
5. What is this constant shaking in my house caused by?
6. What is this rotten-egg smell?
7. What is causing the new deep thudding that has been occurring since approximately the 15<sup>th</sup> of July, and now happens constantly day and night keeping residents awake at night? The mine is now so noisy that they keep residents awake EVERY night rather than just randomly. How are residents expected to live in a 'rural living zone' if they are unable to sleep?
8. Exhaust fans/ ventilation shafts...
  - a. Where will they be placed?
  - b. What will they be emitting?
9. Why does the noise from the mine vary so much on a daily basis? Especially at night.
10. Is Kirkland Lake Gold taking any water out of the Campaspe River if so what is the maximum limit of the water right?

11. Residents have recently noticed that the mine is noisier at night than during the day.

For example, on Sunday 1<sup>st</sup> August the mine was barely audible during the day. At 6.15pm or thereabouts there was a noticeable change in the machinery being operated and the heavy low-frequency thudding started that causes pressure in bedrooms. Residents have noticed these changes specifically at nightshift. Is the mine operating this new equipment more at night? Why does the sound and equipment used change between day and nightshift?

12. Residents have made daily reports to the mine, ERR and EPA about a new extremely disruptive low-frequency noise coming from under the ground where the mine is operating since about the 15<sup>th</sup> July. We have been told that this is under investigation and that it is unknown what could be causing this new constant thudding/droning/ thumping sound that has prevented residents sleeping since it began. A recent 'quarterly results' article published by Kirkland Lake Gold (28<sup>th</sup> July) states that "In the Lower Phoenix System, a new drill drive (Drill Drive 3912) was completed in June 2021 with five underground drills being deployed by the end of the month to test the down-plunge extension of the Swan Zone." Do you not find that the timing of these new drills being deployed and the timing of the noise less than 2 weeks after this date is not suspicious? Have you investigated this new extremely disruptive noise at all yet? What are your findings? What do you intend to do about this new extremely disruptive noise that has caused some residents to become extremely unwell.

13. Could you please provide us with a copy of the Community Engagement Plan submitted to Earth Resources when you seek approval to extend your mining licences.

14. Can we please see copies of the workplan variations or EES where you deal with the potential for noise disruptions at the SOUTHERN end of the mine.
15. Did you ever consult with Axedale residents and have they ever been given the right to object to the EES that you are operating under?
16. Can you please advise us on the noise cancelling devices you recommend for your employees to protect their ears from low-frequencies so that we may buy the correct devices to protect our own hearing?
17. How is it that mining and dangerous pollution is allowed in a specifically designated 'Rural Living Zone'? How can council designate this zone for families to live, while the state government permits licences for mining to negatively impact their health and wellbeing?
18. Is, or has your mining or any mining under the current EES at Fosterville Goldmine affected residential bores in any way AT ALL? Have you, or any other company operating under the current EES ever had complaints from residents that their bore, dam/rainwater or trees have been contaminated by your or the previous company's mining operations while this EES has been in place?
19. Who is responsible for ensuring air and water quality is not at dangerous levels for people living in our rural living zone?
20. Who regulates dust suppression from mining? What are the standards for acceptable dust levels for mining near residential properties?
21. Where does the water come from for your mining? Does it come from underground streams? How can we find out if mining will dry up our bores? Many residents rely on bores for their main source of firefighting during summer. If their bores dry up, they have no way to protect themselves or their homes.

22. When will mining operations commence south of Sugarloaf Road or has this already commenced? What are the plans for this part of the mining operation?
23. What are the details of the work plans submitted to Earth Resources? Can the community under your mining license be given copies of these work plans prior to their submission and post approval?
24. A newer phenomenon being experienced by residence are the “mine induced seismic events”. The impact being experienced is waking people up and some residents have found this to be frightening. Can you explain more about this and what residents may experience? E.g., What are the maximum levels residents will experience; Richter scale, frequency, damage to properties, likelihood, (etc.)? What efforts are the mine making to minimise and prevent this impact?
25. Many residents have until quite recently been unaware that the mine now has a mining license over their property. It is very likely that all residents are to yet be informed. How is the mine and others going to better communicate with the individual residents going forward? Letters were supposed to have been sent to individual land-owners – can copies of these letters be supplied as no landowner that has been asked so far can even recall a letter to them on this matter.
26. When will the mine, ERR or EPA be in possession of the necessary noise monitoring equipment to start monitoring the low-frequency noise that is causing negative health and wellbeing effects (that you have received formal complaints about for almost 12 months) on residents.
27. If a resident is unable to sleep properly due to the noise and vibrations emitted from the mine, what will the mine do to ensure that this is resolved? i.e., will the mine stop machinery to allow residents to sleep? Why is it that residents must have their

lives further disrupted by leaving their homes while these issues are investigated, rather than the mine being made to shut down operations while the issue is investigated. Why punish the victim further? The mine has offered double-glazing. This is not possible due to the age of most homes in the area so another solution must be found. What will the council do? Some bedrooms are now uninhabitable (being on the north side of houses) and residents have moved into their loungerooms to get a night's sleep.

28. Residents are getting increasingly concerned about health impacts being experienced due to the current mining operations. What is being done to investigate and prevent these health problems becoming worse? Who is responsible to ensure that residents' health is being properly considered? Some children have said that the noise is hurting their ears, waking them up, or they fear the blasting or seismic activity. Does any health impact review take children into account?
29. Residents have been complaining to the mine about noise and disturbances for over a year or more, but these do not seem to be appearing on the mine's reporting. How do we ensure that complaints are being properly recorded and reported? How do we ensure that unresolved complaints are continued to be reported? How do we ensure that the impact to residents is being properly reported? Who reviews the reporting? Who responds to the reporting?
30. Residents are concerned about renovating their homes or constructing new buildings due to the current and potential impacts of the mining in the area (impacts including but not limited to noise, vibration, etc.). What assurance can the mine give that the local landowners will be able to properly enjoy and make proper use of their properties within a 'Rural Living Zone' (for which they paid a premium on land to live

within) without adverse impacts of the mine? Can the mine guarantee that the value of homes in the area will not be negatively impacted by their operation?

Landowners need assurances for years to come to ensure their investments already made and planned in their properties are properly realised; can the mine's assurances be given for years to come, or how far ahead can landowners be able to count of the mine's assurances? If assurances cannot be provided, what options or compensations can be provided to landowners?

31. Who is responsible for ensuring that there are no adverse impacts on wildlife? How is this done? Blasting and seismic activity have been seen to be impacting residents' pets, so it is very likely that this is also impacting wildlife. Are wildlife surveys taken in the area and if so, what do they show?

32. How do we get feedback/responses from the ERC? Who does this go to?

33. As more residents become aware that the mine has recently extended their mining licence to within 1.5km of the Axedale township, how soon do you anticipate that residents within the township will start experiencing negative health and wellbeing impacts of mining? The current negative health and wellbeing effects have been felt at approximately 3km from where you are mining in the Rural Living Zone. The Axedale township is only another further 1.5 km away. Does the mine, or EPA or ERR intend to warn residents of the potential negative impacts to theirs and their children's health (especially with regard to the permanent damage low-frequency noise can cause to developing brains and hearing) now that you are aware of this potential harm as communicated to you by residents in the rural living zone? How do you intend to communicate this information to the Axedale community?