

## ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

Item	Details
<b>Meeting date &amp; time</b>	Wednesday, 10 November 2021, 11:02am–1:09pm
<b>Meeting location</b>	Board Room, Fosterville, VIC 3557 and online
<b>Present</b>	Clare Fountain (Chair), Will Wettenhall (Environment and Community Manager, Fosterville Gold Mine), Trudi Jackson (Senior Community Advisor, Fosterville Gold Mine), Lance Faulkner (General Manager, Fosterville Gold Mine), Jack Bowen (Senior Environment and Community Advisor, Fosterville Gold Mine), Oliver Hickson (Senior Environment and Community Advisor, Fosterville Gold Mine), Natasha van Leeuwen (Environment and Community Advisor, Fosterville Gold Mine), Felicia Binks (Director Environment and Government Relations, Australia, Kirkland Lake Gold), Tim Norden (Acting Regional Manager, Planning & Approvals, Department of Environment, Land, Water and Planning), Jacob McDonald (Environment Protection Officer, EPA), Ryan Straub (Environment Protection Officer, EPA), Bob Disken (Inspector of Mines, Earth Resources Regulation), Lynley Strachen (Goulburn Murray Water), Andrew Radojkovic (Regional Manager, Earth Resources Regulation), Cr Greg Penna (Eppalock Ward, City of Greater Bendigo), Tim Harrington (Community Representative), Ian Ralston (Community Representative)
<b>Absent</b>	N/A
<b>Apologies</b>	Barrie Winzar (Community Representative), Cr Andrea Metcalf (City of Greater Bendigo), Frank Casimir (City of Greater Bendigo)
<b>By invitation</b>	Will Rosewarne (minute taker)
<b>Observers</b>	N/A

Item number	Agenda item
<b>1</b>	<b>Welcome, attendance and apologies</b>
1.1	The Chairperson welcomed everyone to the meeting and introduced herself to those present.
<b>2</b>	<b>Acknowledgement of country and introductions</b>
2.1	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, present and emerging. Each attendee at the meeting then introduced themselves and the capacities in which they were attending.
<b>3</b>	<b>Declaration of interests</b>
3.1	Nil declared at this meeting.

<b>4</b>	<b>Minutes, actions and matters arising since last committee meeting</b>								
4.1	<p>Confirmation of minutes from meeting on 4 August 2021</p> <p>The minutes of the previous meeting on were reviewed for accuracy.</p> <p>The specific details of the previous minutes to the extent that they recorded the outcomes of a noise monitoring assessment conducted at the Axedale Quarry was queried – the noise assessment process was discussed in detail. Clarification was provided confirming that the Axedale Sand Quarry was the site assessed during the noise investigations.</p> <p>The role of the 2020 Social Impact Study detailed in the minutes was also clarified, and it was noted that the conduct of the above-mentioned study was not intended to form part of Fosterville Gold Mine's Environmental Effects Statement (“EES”).</p> <p><b>IT WAS RESOLVED</b> that the minutes of the previous meeting on 4 August 2021 be confirmed as a true and accurate record of proceedings:</p> <table> <tr> <td><b>MOVED:</b></td><td>Jacob McDonald</td></tr> <tr> <td><b>SECONDED:</b></td><td>Tim Norden</td></tr> <tr> <td><b>AGAINST:</b></td><td>N/A</td></tr> <tr> <td><b>OUTCOME:</b></td><td>Carried unanimously</td></tr> </table>	<b>MOVED:</b>	Jacob McDonald	<b>SECONDED:</b>	Tim Norden	<b>AGAINST:</b>	N/A	<b>OUTCOME:</b>	Carried unanimously
<b>MOVED:</b>	Jacob McDonald								
<b>SECONDED:</b>	Tim Norden								
<b>AGAINST:</b>	N/A								
<b>OUTCOME:</b>	Carried unanimously								
4.2	<p>No actions arising from ERC site tour preceding meeting.</p> <p>The ERC site tour attended FGM's new Security Gatehouse and Core Processing Facility.</p> <p>The site tour was attended by Will Wettenhall (Environment and Community Manager, Fosterville Gold Mine), Oliver Hickson (Senior Environment and Community Advisor), Andrew Mattiske (Health, Safety and Security Manager, Fosterville Gold Mine), Alex Thompson (Geology Manager, Fosterville Gold Mine), Michael Bowditch (Senior Geologist, Fosterville Gold Mine), Andrew Radojkovic (Regional Manager, Earth Resources Regulation), Lynley Strachen (Goulburn Murray Water), Tim Harrington (Community Representative), Ian Ralston (Community Representative), Cr Greg Penna (Eppalock Ward, City of Greater Bendigo).</p> <p>Mr. Mattiske presented a tour of the new Security Gatehouse where he demonstrated features and improvements of the new building. Mr. Mattiske answered questions about the sites capacity to conduct rapid antigen tests and fit for work tests.</p> <p>Mr. Thompson and Mr. Bowditch presented a tour of the new Core Processing Facility, highlighting improvements to the facilities ergonomics, capacity, and logging technology. Mr. Thompson and Mr. Bowditch answered general questions from the group about underground drill rigs, core transportation, local geology, mineralization, recovery rates, core logging and sample preparation. The tour included a visit to the sample cutting room where technical conversation followed Mr. Thompson's description of PhotonAssay technology. The tour concluded with the showcase of a high-grade drill core from the Swan Zone.</p>								
4.3	<p>Information/project updates to ERC Members</p> <p>(a) <i>FGM Sustained Operations Project EES Update</i></p> <p>Felicia Binks discussed the progress of the Project referral Project for an assessment pursuant to the <i>Environment Effects Act 1978</i> (Vic), noting that the mine was regularly checking in with the office of the Minister for Planning at a State Level and Minister for Environment at a Federal Level to determine the status of the EES and <i>Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999</i> (Cth) (“EPBC”) referral submissions.</p> <p>It was noted that the referral for an EPBC was likely to be deemed a controlled action, however FGM were still awaiting formal advice from the Department of Planning.</p>								

	<b>ACTION (202111-1):</b>	FGM to provide an update to all Committee members as to the decision of the Minister for Planning in respect of the requirement to obtain an EES.
	<b>ACTION (202111-2):</b>	Copy minutes of the 4 August 2021 meeting to be distributed to DEWLP and Earth Resources representatives.
	Committee representative (Tim Harrington) queried what the approval process may involve if an EES is not required? Felicia Binks noted that a less substantive version of the EES, called an Environmental Report may need to be prepared as part of the planning approvals process; explaining the differences between the reports in detail. The provision of this report to the community in the interests of transparency was stressed.	
4.3	Update on actions arising from the minutes	
	<p>The actions arising from the previous meeting were reviewed.</p> <p><b>Action 202108-1</b> – Waste management overview and the recent tender process (FGM)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Action to be carried over – update will be provided in 2022</li> </ul> <p><b>Action 202108-2</b> – Provide flowchart outlining the EES process (FGM)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Action will be addressed in future EES fact sheet after decision on EES referral is announced</li> </ul> <p><b>Action 202108-3</b> - Regulatory notification process for water management authorities (GMW and/or CMA's) following mine-induced seismic events (GMW/ERR)</p> <p>The impact of seismic events on the Goulburn Murray Water Authority's catchments were discussed broadly. The Committee discussed regulatory obligations and reporting requirements relating to mine induced seismic events. The quantification of seismic activity arising from underground mining events was also discussed broadly. Lynley Strachen clarified that any organisation with an operating licence for a potentially hazardous dam has a requirement to undertake surveillance of their dams on a routine basis. There is no regulatory requirement for FGM to notify GMW or the Catchment Management Authority (CMA) of mine-induced seismic events. Andrew Radojkovic confirmed that ERR are kept informed of the nature and magnitude of mine induced seismic events at FGM and can pass this information onto the water authorities if they would like this information.</p> <p><b>Action 202108-4</b> – Update participating landholders on results from the 2020 social survey undertaken by Umwelt (FGM)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Completed</li> </ul>	
	<b>ACTION (202111-3):</b>	GMW to follow up with ground water and streams to understand if they would like information regarding FGM mine induced seismicity.
4.4	Other business to be noted for discussion at end of presentations	
	<p>The Chairperson noted one question had been submitted in advance of the meeting, while Mr. Harrington added he had several questions for consideration by the Committee, which he was happy to be taken on notice if time did not permit them to be responded to in detail at this meeting.</p> <p>Details of the Managed Aquifer Recharge ("MAR") proposal were discussed further. Ms. Strachen clarified the requirement for the MAR project to reinject water quality of the same standard as the receiving aquifer.</p>	



<b>6</b>	<b>Official business on the agenda</b>
6.1	<p>Quarterly Environment and Community Report</p> <p>Will Wettenhall introduced the Quarterly Environment and Community Report and noted that there was an error in the version tabled to the Committee (rural living and farming zone limits were incorrectly noted in the context of noise assessments in Table 8.1). The YTD incident calculations in Table 3.1 of the report were noted as not adding up correctly.</p> <p>Mr. Wettenhall also introduced new E&amp;C team members that had joined FGM in the past month.</p> <p>The quarterly environment and community report was discussed as per the presentation.</p> <p>Community activities and complaints were discussed in detail. Noise complaints from two community members were noted, with attended noise monitoring offered to these individuals – one of which accepted notwithstanding the challenges COVID-19 limiting site access/property attendance. The ceasing of night shift drilling by two rigs was noted as a means towards addressing noise concerns. The offering of double glazing of windows to community members impacted by mining activities was queried, noting that it would be offered to affected persons on an as-needs basis alongside further outsourced noise monitoring support.</p> <p>The capacity of FGM's acoustic consultants to analyse and filter noise detected during monitoring activities was clarified.</p> <p>Environmental incidents for the quarter were discussed in detail. The undertaking of additional noise monitoring in the MIN5404 Southern Extension Area prior to FGM's EES was discussed broadly, given further water and dust monitoring was being conducted. Earth Resources Regulation and FGM agreed to discuss any environmental monitoring requirements additional to the current regulatory approved environmental monitoring program.</p> <p>Noise monitoring results were presented and discussed. The addition of an extra column in the noise reporting table providing the distance from the core business site was suggested, along with a query relating to additional noise monitoring during evening and night activities, where noise complaints had been recorded. Mr. Wettenhall spoke to both of these suggestions, clarifying that investigative noise monitoring was planned and undertaken, additional to the compliance noise monitoring schedule. These investigative monitoring sessions were planned and undertaken to assess noise in response to operational changes (i.e., exploration drill rig movements) and/or community feedback/complaints. Bob Disken commented on ERR's capacity to respond to community complaints.</p>
<b>10</b>	<b>Any other business</b>
10.1	<p>Questions received by the Committee on notice</p> <p>(a) <i>Provision of environmental impact data reports to the community</i></p> <p>The Chairperson noted that the community had requested copies of the last four quarterly environmental monitoring reports. Mr. Wettenhall noted FGM's preference was always to engage directly with community members so that their specific concerns/information requests could be understood. As FGM had previously advised it would not be providing the quarterly Environment and Community reports to community members. Mr. Harrington observed that this response was unlikely to be satisfactory to community members and requested that further rationale be provided for this determination. Extending the opportunity for this community member to consult with FGM directly was suggested. The provision of information on the website was also suggested as a possible means of proactively addressing community concerns.</p> <p>(b) <i>Waste rock dumps</i></p> <p>Mr. Harrington raised some concerns as to the extent/availability of waste rock material (oxide) being utilized as part of FGM's operational activities particularly where these sites have previously been rehabilitated. The concern was clarified as one regarding visual amenity. The Committee then extensively discussed what capacity these closed, rehabilitated sites had for regeneration/restoration inclusive of their</p>

	<p>capacity to be fertile enough for vegetation to grow, and/or what other suitable materials could be utilized for operational requirements (e.g., TSF embankment lifts, hardstands, etc.). Mr. Radojkovic commented that from a regulatory perspective if FGM specify in their rehabilitation plan that these waste rock dumps will be revegetated they will be held to account to that. A work plan has closure criteria that has to be achieved before the bond will be released back to the company.</p> <p>(c) <i>Rainwater tank testing</i></p> <p>The extensiveness of rainwater tank testing program was queried by Mr. Harrington. Mr. Wettenhall noted that FGM had approached landowners and/or responded to those concerned about contamination to offer testing and gather data, which was then shared with the landholder. It was suggested that the testing of water tanks be offered when blast monitors are being calibrated by FGM staff or external contractors. It was noted that the persons calibrating blast monitors would not normally be equipped to conduct water testing nor would it be appropriate for blast calibration consultants to conduct water sampling. FGM advised water tank sampling is made available to landholders who express interest, and this approach would remain in place for the foreseeable future.</p> <p>FGM confirmed that offers to sample the water tank of one landholder had been made on multiple occasions over an 18-month period, and that these offers had been continuously declined by the landholder to-date.</p> <p>(d) <i>Handling of complaints and comments</i></p> <p>Mr. Harrington queried the receipt and/or classification of complaints from community members, and the process through which the complaints were referred to the regulators. It was noted that some community members will communicate observations/feedback to FGM, which do not constitute complaints, and these are captured as general inquiries/feedback. Ms. Jackson added that FGM seek clarification from the individual, if/where there is any uncertainty on the classification of the correspondence, and this process has also been embedded in FGM's blasting feedback system. It was further noted that regulators are routinely copied into correspondence from some community members. Mr. Faulkner clarified FGM's preference that community members engage directly with FGM on complaints or concerns in the first instance, and that several community members readily communicate feedback to FGM but do not wish to file a formal complaint.</p> <p>(e) <i>Community Survey Report update</i></p> <p>Mr. Harrington enquired about the progress of the community survey being undertaken and requested some feedback from the survey once complete. Mr. Wettenhall advised that FGM expects to receive an initial report in the coming month and feedback will be provided at the next ERC meeting and to the broader community in the New Year.</p>		
	<table border="1"> <tr> <td data-bbox="300 1480 673 1624"> <p><b>ACTION</b> <b>(202111-4):</b></p> </td><td data-bbox="673 1480 1487 1624"> <p>FGM to provide a summary to the group of the Community Perceptions Survey report at the next meeting on 2 February 2022.</p> </td></tr> </table>	<p><b>ACTION</b> <b>(202111-4):</b></p>	<p>FGM to provide a summary to the group of the Community Perceptions Survey report at the next meeting on 2 February 2022.</p>
<p><b>ACTION</b> <b>(202111-4):</b></p>	<p>FGM to provide a summary to the group of the Community Perceptions Survey report at the next meeting on 2 February 2022.</p>		
	<p>(f) <i>Receipt of community questions from [REDACTED]</i></p> <p>Mr. Harrington tabled six questions of behalf of community member, [REDACTED], to be included in the meeting minutes. Mr. Harrington read Question 6 and Question 6A to the group as a matter of interest. Mr. Ralston rejected the statement in Question 6A that claimed information contained within the Axedale Antics is factually incorrect, as the information was provided by FGM. The Chairperson asked how FGM would like to respond to the questions. Mr. Wettenhall said FGM would take the questions on notice.</p> <p>Mr. Harrington requested for FGM to respond to the tabled questions within 14 days. Mr. Faulkner committed to providing a timely response to the individuals questions. The tabled questions would be provided in the minutes as an Annexure.</p>		

	<b>ACTION (202111-5):</b>	FGM to provide a response to the individual's questions.
10	Confirmation of actions arising	
10.2	The minute taker summarised the actions arising from this meeting.	
10.3	Conclusion of Chairperson tenure	
	The Chairperson indicated that while she would complete her current tenure, she did not intend to re-stand for appointment at its conclusion.	

<b>11</b>	<b>Next meeting</b>	
11.1	<b>Date/time:</b> Wednesday, 2 February 2022, 11:00am <b>Location:</b> Board Room, Fosterville, VIC 3557.	
<b>12</b>	<b>Meeting closure</b>	
	The meeting concluded at <b>1:09pm</b> .	

## SCHEDULE I

### SUMMARY OF ACTIONS

Action ref.	Action description	Assigned to	Due date
202108-01	Waste management overview and the recent tender process (FGM)	FGM	2022
202111-01	FGM to provide an update to all Committee members as to the decision of the Minister for Planning in respect of the requirement to obtain an EES.	FGM	2 February 2022
202111-02	Copy minutes of the 4 August 2021 meeting to be distributed to DEWLP and ER representatives.	FGM	24 November 2021
202111-03	GMW to follow up with ground water and streams to understand if they would like information regarding FGM mine induced seismicity.	GMW	2 February 2022
202111-04	FGM to provide a summary to the group of the Community Perceptions Survey report at the next meeting on 2 February 2022.	FGM	2 February 2022
202211-05	FGM to provide a response to the individual's questions.	FGM	No date assigned



## ANNEXURE I

### QUESTIONS RECEIVED BY THE ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW COMMITTEE ON NOTICE, 10 NOVEMBER 2021

Kirkland Lake Gold Fosterville Gold Mine

ENVIRONMENT REVIEW COMMITTEE MEETING

Wednesday 10<sup>th</sup> November 2021

QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY:

AN AFFECTED LANDHOLDER - [REDACTED]

I, [REDACTED] request to have the following questions tabled at the Kirkland Lake Gold Fosterville Gold Mine Environment Review Committee so that I can be assured that they are included in the minutes of the meeting and that the responses given are of a transparent nature.

- 1) As we know Kirkland Lake Gold have submitted the Fosterville Gold Mine Sustained Operations Project which includes Mining in the Southern Extension of MIN 5404 to the State Minister for Planning to determine if an Environment Effects Statement is required. To our knowledge this decision is yet to be decided by the State Planning Minister.
  - a) How can Victorian Government Regulators approve Kirkland Lake Gold to conduct *any* underground Exploration work using standard underground mining methods in the Southern Extension of MIN 5404 when a decision is still pending for an Environment Effects Statement?
  - b) Surely if Kirkland Lake Gold go ahead with using standard underground mining methods in the Southern Extension of MIN 5404 under the guise of exploration this provides further evidence to the Community that Kirkland Lake Gold Fosterville Gold Mine and Victorian Government Regulators fail to adhere to regulatory processes?
  - c) If Kirkland Lake Gold Fosterville Gold Mine begin to use standard underground mining methods in the Southern Extension of MIN 5404 under the guise of Exploration who do I as an affected Landholder of the standard underground mining methods Report this to in order to have it stopped until the appropriate processes are adhered to in relation the pending Environment Effects Statement decision?
- 2) In the Kirkland Lake Gold's Community Newsletter 2<sup>nd</sup> & 3<sup>rd</sup> edition 2021 there are no reports, measurements or results of Dust Monitoring or Water Quality Monitoring in surrounding Fosterville Gold Mine bores.
  - a) Why does Kirkland Lake Gold Fosterville Gold Mine choose NOT to inform the Community of these results especially given the serious nature of the chemicals being used and the possible adverse effects on surrounding affected Landholders?
  - b) As a surrounding affected Landholder I please request to be provided with a copy of Kirkland Lake Gold Fosterville Gold Mine's Dust and Water Quality Quarterly Monitoring Reports for 2020 and 2021 to date?
- 3) In the last two years at how many Kirkland Lake Gold Fosterville Gold Mine Environment Review Meetings does the Quarterly Report show there is an exceedance of Arsenic and Respirable Silica in the dust monitoring report?



- 4) In the last two years at how many Kirkland Lake Gold Fosterville Gold Mine Environment Review Meetings does the Quarterly Report show there is an exceedance of Arsenic in the bores surrounding Fosterville Gold Mine?
- 5) Our requests for the Quarterly Reports in relation to Kirkland Lake Gold Fosterville Gold Mine Mining Induced Seismic Earthquake Events have gone unanswered.
  - a) I please request to be provided with a copy of the Kirkland Lake Gold Fosterville Gold Mine Mining Induced Seismic Earthquake Events for this year 2021 to current date.
- 6) Fosterville Gold Mine Environment Review Committees and Meetings were established to supposedly provide information and comfort to the Community.
  - a) Other than a random often factually incorrect article in Axedale Antics, what other communication methods are the 3 Fosterville Gold Mine ERC Representatives utilising to distribute information that derives from these ERC Meetings to the Community they are representing?