

# Fingerboards Mineral Sands Project Environment Effects Statement

8 February 2021

The Proponent has prepared this document in response to IAC’s request for information dated 11 December 2020 (Tabled Document 16) and IAC Direction No. 28 (Tabled Document 22).

Column 2 in this document replicates the specific requests made by IAC, but does not set out the references to them. This document should be read together with Tabled Document 16, which sets out references that provide context to IAC’s specific information requests.

In this document, any reference to a ‘witness statement’ is a reference to a witness statement filed by the Proponent on 2 February 2021 unless specified otherwise.

## Table of Contents

1.	Particular issues.....	2
2.	Biodiversity.....	7
3.	Ground and surface water .....	9
4.	Air quality and greenhouse gases .....	10
5.	Noise and vibration.....	14
6.	Radiation .....	15
7.	Roads, traffic and transport.....	15
8.	Land use planning.....	18
9.	Landscape and visual .....	19
10.	Agriculture and horticulture .....	22
11.	Cultural heritage.....	23
12.	Socioeconomic .....	24
13.	Rehabilitation and closure.....	27
14.	The draft planning scheme amendment .....	29

No.	IAC request	Proponent's response
<b>Particular issues</b>		
1.	The Proponent should detail the format and wording of specific recommendations of technical experts in specialist areas that are accepted, or not, by the Proponent and how these have informed the Environment Management Framework (EMF) and will be reflected in relevant management plans.	Refer to Technical note TN 002.
2.	Following the circulation of expert evidence, the same exercise should be undertaken if there are new or additional expert recommendations made.	This work is underway.
3.	<p>The Proponent should provide an outline scheduling plan for major construction and operation activities onsite and offsite (product transport, water intake pipeline, powerline establishment) including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) the expected years lifecycle of the mining operations, including identification of the years of peak expected production and activity</li> <li>(b) how (a) might occur on a seasonal basis across the year</li> <li>(c) an anticipated daily schedule during construction and operation including those activities (and machinery proposed) which may occur on a 24 hour basis and the associated night time impacts on and off site (see also Section 10.5 of this report).</li> </ul>	Refer to Technical note TN 005.
4.	Outline how the EMF will work in concert with the Planning Scheme Amendment (PSA), Mining Licence and Work Plan to ensure the environmental management outcomes sought can be achieved and enforced.	Refer to Technical note TN 003.
5.	Provide specific examples of how this would work in practice including outlining the responsibilities of the Proponent, regulatory authorities and East Gippsland Shire Council as relevant for scenarios including:	Refer to Technical note TN 003.

No.	IAC request	Proponent's response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) Alleged exceedances of night-time construction noise at nearby residences</li> <li>(b) Alleged exceedances of evening and night-time truck movements at nearby residences</li> <li>(c) Alleged release of tailings or other pollutants into the Mitchell River</li> <li>(d) Alleged over-extraction of water and/or groundwater</li> <li>(e) Alleged exceedances of dust deposition criteria at nearby properties</li> <li>(f) Failure of rehabilitation post-closure.<sup>1</sup></li> </ul>	
6.	Explain how the bond process (if relevant) under the <i>Mineral Resources (Sustainable Development) Act 1990</i> will operate for the project and in what circumstances would it be accessed by the regulator.	Refer to Technical note TN 003.
7.	Construction concept plans of the rail siding which demonstrate the footprint, access roads and associated infrastructure.	<p>Concept designs have been provided to IAC. Refer to Tabled Documents No. 55-59.</p> <p>These designs have been developed based on ground survey taken in November 2020. The design has been developed using 12D to create a digital terrain model to which the V/Line standard rail cross sections have been applied. Allowances have been made for container storage and administration areas.</p>
8.	Concept design of key engineering structures such as Tailings Storage Facilities (TSF), diversion drains and dams.	Refer to Technical note TN 006.
9.	Provide information on whether TSF structural failure impacts on the environment have been adequately modelled or assessed.	A reliable model of TSF structural failure is underway and will be provided shortly, when it is finished
10.	Provide information on the justification for not lining the temporary TSF to prevent leachate entering the ground and surface water system.	Refer to Technical note TN 006.

<sup>1</sup> To be clear the IAC is not suggesting any of these or other scenarios are likely or will happen but is looking for guidance on who will be responsible for regulating and ensuring that standards and criteria during construction and operation are met.

No.	IAC request	Proponent's response
11.	Provide information on the operational requirements, dam and TSF safety obligations (including the allowance for the potential of cascading dam failures should upstream dams fail, impacting on downstream dams which also contain mine site sediments), and management of instream environmental and biodiversity impacts.	Refer to Technical note TN 006.
12.	Clarify dam and TSF capacity and the point at which mine contact water would spill from dams.	Refer to Technical note TN 006.
13.	Explain the 3% Average Exceedance Probability (AEP) Mitchell River spillway discharge design criteria and why this is different to the Pery River design criteria of 1% AEP which is a more widely adopted design criteria for mine water runoff.	See section 3.5 of the witness statement of James Weidmann.
14.	Clarify total water requirements for the Project including during construction, operation, rehabilitation (including progressive rehabilitation) and mine closure. This should include a detailed breakdown of quantities required and assumptions around losses due to seepage, evaporation, and environmental returns and what if any sensitivity analysis has been undertaken.	<p>The peak water requirement during operations, if no centrifuges are used, is modelled to be around 4.7 GL/year – see sections 4.4 and 4.6 in the witness statement of Jarrah Muller for a detailed breakdown of quantities required and modelling assumptions.</p> <p>If centrifuges are included in the Project, the peak water requirement for the Project is modelled to be around 2.8 GL/year. See section 3 of the supplementary witness statement of Jarrah Muller filed on 8 February 2021.</p> <p>Water requirements for construction and initial start-up, rehabilitation and decommissioning are much less than for operations and are discussed in the <i>Conceptual Surface Water Management Strategy and Water Balance</i> (EES, Appendix A006/A).</p>
15.	Clarify the impact access to 'winterfill' water from the Mitchell River will have on the local and downstream environment, other users, and the waterway.	See section 5.2.1 of the witness statement of John Sweeney.
16.	Provide information around modelling assumptions used to determine availability of surface and groundwater and how seasonal variation, drought and climate change projections have been accounted for.	Refer to the <i>Conceptual Surface Water Management Strategy and Water Balance</i> (EES, Appendix A06/A) – in particular, sections 8.6, 8.7 and 7.3; and section 8.5 of the <i>Groundwater and Surface Water Impact Assessment</i> (EES, Appendix A006/B)

No.	IAC request	Proponent's response
17.	Provide information on modelling of cumulative ecological impacts of water use for the proposed mine operation in addition to current and projected agriculture use.	<p>This modelling has not been undertaken. It is understood that Southern Rural Water releases water from the Mitchell River to agriculture and other users by direct pumping licences, conditional licences and by winter fill allocations to the market. EES Appendix 006/F at Figure 2-7 indicates that in 2014, total allocation of water from the Mitchell River for agriculture was about 19GL.</p> <p>As explained in more detail in response to RFI #20, Southern Rural Water is progressively releasing 4GL of winter fill to the market. While the Proponent proposes to seek part of that allocation, it does not seek additional water over and above what Southern Rural Water is already intending to allocate. There is therefore no cumulative impact of water extraction for Fingerboards beyond what Southern Rural Water has already decided to allocate to the market.</p>
18.	Clarify whether any back up water sources have been considered for the Project in the absence of the quantity of surface and groundwater required for operation.	<p>Availability of water has been considered in the design of the Project.</p> <p>Construction of the Project will be staged and operations will be scalable to allow the production rate to be scaled down if water requirements cannot be met.</p>
19.	Clarify the differences and merits between the Proponent's rainfall data collation to input water balance modelling for an annual mean estimation over 117-year period (1900-2017) in contrast to water industry data collation from 1975 to date.	The water balance modelling undertaken for the Project did not use annual mean rainfall data. Modelling used daily data obtained from SILO, which is a data set derived from BoM records suitable for long term modelling. See <i>Conceptual Surface Water Management Strategy and Water Balance</i> (EES Appendix A006/A) at section 3.2.1.
20.	Advise whether the allocation of 2GL of water in the Mitchell River to the Gunaikurnai Land and Waters Aboriginal Corporation (GLaWAC) will have any impact on water availability for the Project.	The Proponent originally proposed to source 3 GL/year of water from the Mitchell River under a winter-fill license from Southern Rural Water ( <b>SRW</b> ). However, now that 2 GL has been allocated to GLaWAC and SRW offered an additional 2 GL to the market late last year, it is understood that only 2 GL of winterfill water is potentially available. SRW has indicated that this water will be offered to the market later this year. Accordingly, the Proponent will look to supplement any winterfill allocation it obtains from SRW with additional water – most likely a groundwater allocation.
21.	Advise whether it has been able to secure access to the Unsurveyed Area since the EES was prepared and/or the status of any negotiations.	The Proponent has been unable to obtain access to this property.
22.	Advise the IAC how it should address this deficiency (if it still exists) during the EES process.	IAC can address this deficiency by recommending that detailed ecological surveys be undertaken as a condition of the mining licence or work plan. If access cannot be negotiated before a mining licence is granted, there are mechanisms under the MRSD Act for determining compensation payable to the landowner - once

No.	IAC request	Proponent's response
		<p>compensation is determined, the Proponent would be able to gain access to the land to undertake the required surveys.</p> <p>If the Proponent is unable to obtain access the land during the preparation of the cultural heritage management plan (<b>CHMP</b>), it will consult with GLaWAC and Aboriginal Victoria about the possibility of adopting post-approval management conditions in the CHMP, that apply to the unsurveyed area.</p>
23.	Clarify the number and type of sensitive receptors that are within: (a) 2kms; and (b) 5kms of the Project boundary, including the proposed haul road and proposed Fernbank rail siding footprint.	Refer to Technical note TN 004.
24.	<p>To the extent that additional sensitive receptors are identified that were not included in the EES, provide updated impact assessments on the following issues for each of these receptors:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) Air quality</li> <li>(b) Noise and vibration</li> <li>(c) Traffic and transport</li> <li>(d) Landscape and visual</li> <li>(e) Agricultural and horticultural (as relevant)</li> <li>(f) Socioeconomic</li> <li>(g) Human health risk.</li> </ul>	Refer to Technical note TN 004.
25.	The Proponent should advise how the Project will comply with the <i>Environment Protection Act 2017</i> as amended by the <i>Environment Protection (Amendment) Act 2018</i> and in particular the general environmental duty, the duties in respect of contaminated land and the duties in relation to waste management.	<p>Various management plans will be required to be prepared and approved for the Project under the Work Plan and Incorporated Document, as described in Technical note TN 003. These management plans will need to speak to the requirements of the <i>Environment Protection Act 2017 (new Act)</i>, which is expected to commence on 1 July 2021 (among other legislative requirements).</p> <p>The new Act introduces a number of duties, including the general environmental duty (<b>GED</b>). The GED imposes an obligation on anyone engaged in an activity to eliminate, or if that is not reasonably practicable, to reduce risks of harm to human health or the environment from pollution or waste so far as reasonably practicable. This aligns with the approach taken in the EES.</p> <p>The Proponent is considering amending the draft Work Plan and Incorporated Document to make specific reference to the new duties that will be imposed under the new EP Act, as recommended by the EPA.</p>

No.	IAC request	Proponent's response
26.	The Proponent should provide further information on the cumulative impact (including socioeconomic and health) of the bushfires for the Project and the assumptions made in studies in relation to distribution and abundance of impacted flora and fauna, and proposals for habitat offsets.	Refer to pages 46-47 of the witness statement of Aaron Organ.
<b>Biodiversity</b>		
27.	Provide information on the conditions under which the flora and fauna surveys were undertaken, and whether survey conditions provide a true representation of conditions such as drought and the impact from the 2014 Mt Ray bushfire.	See pages 46-47 of the witness statement of Aaron Organ.
28.	Clarify biodiversity-related mitigation measures and targets proposed to demonstrate how success will be measured.	See pages 42-43 of the witness statement of Aaron Organ.
29.	Clarify the scope of the ecology impact assessment and whether the study has considered impacts from water extraction on biodiversity values in the Mitchell River.	This is considered in section 7.4.1 of the <i>Detailed Ecological Investigations</i> report (EES Appendix A005).
30.	Provide information on how Groundwater Dependent Ecosystems (GDE's) were selected for field investigations and impact assessment.	<p>GDEs were selected based on the results of the desktop assessment where a small area of potential GDE was recorded (Astral Research and Consulting 2020).</p> <p>Based on the detailed groundwater modelling, desktop analysis completed by Austral Research and Consulting (2020) and the subsequent site observations along the banks of the Mitchell River and Moilun Creek, there is a very low likelihood that the project will impact any GDE. Any required GDE monitoring would primarily be located along the lower reach of Moilun Creek and sections of Mitchell River.</p>
31.	Provide information on the current calculation of remaining Gippsland Red Gum Grassy Woodland and Associated Native Grassland (noted as being 660-5,650ha in 2008) in Chapter 10, Table 10.20.	<p>This calculation is based on the reference of the area stated on Page 16 in the listing advice for the ecological community: <i>Commonwealth Listing Advice on Gippsland Red Gum (Eucalyptus tereticornis subsp. mediana) Grassy Woodland and Associated Native Grassland. Threatened Species Scientific Committee. Commonwealth, Canberra, ACT. (DEWHA 2009).</i></p> <p>It states: "Estimates for the present extent of the national ecological community range from about 660 ha to 5,650 ha (Table 4). The variation in estimates may be due to several factors, notably: the difficulty in determining the extent of the</p>

No.	IAC request	Proponent's response
		ecological community on private land tenure; differences in how the ecological community is defined for each estimate; or the degree to which degraded patches are included within the estimate.”
32.	The Proponent should respond and/or provide further information in relation to the deficiencies identified.	See page 39 of the witness statement of Aaron Organ.
33.	The Proponent should clarify whether the proponent has investigated and considered the implications of the reported Dissected New Holland Daisy on Carey's Lane roadside.	<p>Dissected New Holland Daisy is not listed as threatened under the Commonwealth EPBC Act or the Victorian FFG Act. However, it is considered 'poorly known' under DELWP's threatened flora advisory list and is therefore of State significance.</p> <p>Despite targeted surveys being undertaken across the study area over multiple days by qualified botanists during the species flowering period (i.e. Spring) this species was not recorded within the project area. The species is short lived and specimens may not have been detectable during the site surveys.</p> <p>Additional targeted surveys can be undertaken (a measure that can be included in the Biodiversity Sub-plan that will be prepared and implemented as part of the project) to confirm the species presence or otherwise along Carey's Lane Roadside. If the species is confirmed to be present, and specimens are proposed to be impacted by the project, there is opportunity to either salvage and relocate individual plants and/or collect seed (at an appropriate time of the year), so that the species can be propagated in the nursery / seed production areas that have been established for the proposed 200 hectare Grassy Woodland Restoration project.</p>
34.	The appendices associated with the Department of Environment, Land, Water and Planning (DELWP) Native Vegetation Removal Report have not been included in Appendix 6 of the Detailed Ecological Investigations report. The IAC requests clarification on when this information will be provided.	The complete report has been provided to the DELWP regional office.
35.	The Proponent should demonstrate how native vegetation removal has been avoided and minimised in gullies.	See pages 23-25 of the witness statement of Aaron Organ.
36.	The Proponent should provide information on the preferred rail siding option, and how the location chosen abutting the rail reserve avoids and minimises impact on native vegetation, including <i>Prasophyllum correctum</i> (Gaping Leek-orchid).	See the witness statement of Aaron Organ - in particular, sections 5.1.1 and 7.1 and Table 3 (pages 26-28).



No.	IAC request	Proponent's response
37.	The Proponent should clarify how the current proposed joining point of the proposed railway siding at the Cowells Lane intersection has been sited to avoid impact on native grasslands listed under the EPBC Act 1999 and FFG Act 1988.	See the witness statement of Aaron Organ - in particular, section 7.1 and Table 3 (pages 26-28).
38.	The Proponent should provide information on the justification for siting the current join point of the rail siding to the existing rail line, considering the direct impacts on the recorded population of <i>Diuris punctata</i> (Purple Diuris).	See the witness statement of Aaron Organ - in particular, section 7.1 and Table 3 (pages 26-28).
39.	The Proponent should provide information on the indirect impacts of the railway siding on the wetland area including potential changes in the hydrological regime.	See section 3.12 of the witness statement of James Weidmann.
40.	The Proponent should detail other options considered for a railway siding and joining points that avoid and minimise impact on ecological values e.g. locating the siding at the mine site, moving the current joining point further east or to other sites impacting on Lowland Forest areas rather than grassland communities.	<p>The Proponent did give consideration to developing a spur line that extended from the Gippsland line to the project area, but this was discounted due to the high capital cost involved, road safety issues with installing level crossings required along the line, and the extent of native vegetation removal.</p> <p>The Proponent also considered a rail siding option at Fernbank West and three options at Fernbank East. A description of these options is presented in EES Main Volume Section 4.11.2, and in particular Table 4.10. The preferred location of the Fernbank rail siding was concluded to have the least impact on native vegetation and the lowest overall impact of the three Fernbank East options considered.</p>
41.	The IAC seeks further information that demonstrates the offset requirements are available and able to be secured in perpetuity, should clearing be approved.	<p>See section 8.2 and Table 3 (page 25-26) of the witness statement of Aaron Organ.</p> <p>The Proponent is in the process of securing the required offsets and will provide more information about this during the course of the IAC hearing.</p>
<b>Ground and surface water</b>		
42.	The Proponent should provide information on the management regime to manage sediment loads in mapped ponds across the site.	See section 3.3.4 of the witness statement of Dr Michael Cheetham. See also the discussion of mapped ponds across the site in section 3.3.5 of Dr Cheetham's statement.
43.	The Proponent should provide information on flood modelling undertaken to demonstrate changes to flood level and impact on the	See section 3.12 of the witness statement of James Weidmann.

No.	IAC request	Proponent's response
	catchment, private property, and public infrastructure, until discharge of surface water to Lake Wellington.	
44.	The Proponent should clarify impacts on waterways downstream of the water management dams, before they join the Mitchell River, and plan (if any) to maintain environmental flows for these environments.	See section 3.5.1.1 of the witness statement of Tony McAlister and section 5.2.6 of the witness statement of John Sweeney.
45.	The Proponent should provide information on the impacts of contaminants (including nutrients) on water quality of the Mitchell and Perry Rivers which are connected to the Gippsland Lakes under 'abnormal' conditions.	See section 3.1 of the witness statement of Tony McAlister.
46.	The Proponent should provide information on the assessment of the mine water runoff including assessment of salinity, pH or radionuclides.	The assessment of salinity and pH is discussed in sections 3.4.3 and 3.4.6 of the witness statement of Tony McAlister.  The assessment of radionuclides is discussed in section 7.3 of the witness statement of Darren Billingsley.
47.	The Proponent should provide information on potential GDEs within the groundwater impact area to assess which GDE's are likely to be fed by perched aquifers or the regional water table aquifer.	See section 6.2 of the witness statement of John Sweeney and section 5.4.3(i) of the witness statement from Joel Georgiou.
48.	The Proponent should clarify the shallow aquifer impacts from dewatering of the mine pit and associated risks.	See section 6.6 of the witness statement of John Sweeney and section 5.4.3(ii) of the witness statement from Joel Georgiou.
49.	The Proponent should clarify the expected quantity and quality of tailing seepage entering the groundwater system.	See section 5.4.3(iii) of the witness statement from Joel Georgiou.
50.	The Proponent should clarify the groundwater monitoring plan (including GDE's) within the locality of the project.	See section 6.15 of the witness statement of John Sweeney and section 5.4.3(iv) of the witness statement from Joel Georgiou..
51.	The Proponent should provide information on the non-registered groundwater users (for example spring fed dams and non-registered bores) in the locality.	See section 5.4.3(v) of the witness statement from Joel Georgiou..
<b>Air quality and greenhouse gases</b>		
52.	Has any analysis of potential air quality impacts using methods wholly consistent with the <i>Victorian State Environment Protection Policy</i> –	Yes - the EES includes an air quality assessment that was conducted in accordance with the <i>Victorian State Environment Protection Policy – Protocol for</i>

No.	IAC request	Proponent's response
	<p><i>Protocol for Environmental Management (Mining and Extractive Industries) 2007</i> been undertaken and if so what has it demonstrated?</p>	<p><i>Environmental Management (Mining and Extractive Industries) 2007 (PEM)</i>. Refer to Stage Two Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Assessment (EES Appendix A009).</p> <p>The air quality assessment has been conducted to comply with the requirements of a Level 1 assessment as defined in the PEM. Accordingly, the assessment includes 12 months of ambient monitoring data and 12 months of meteorological data collected at the Project site.</p> <p>The assessment shows that the Project can be conducted and managed to achieve compliance with the PEM objectives for air quality at all sensitive receptors. To achieve this, a range of dust control and mitigation measures will be implemented as detailed in section 3.4 and 3.7 of Appendix A009.</p>
53.	<p>Has any analysis been completed for all sources of emissions during construction and operation and if so, what has it demonstrated?</p>	<p>Yes - analysis has been completed for all sources of emissions during construction and operation. Refer to section 3.4 of Appendix A009. Construction emissions were estimated to be less than 20% of the emissions during operations. Emissions for three operational years were also estimated. Appendix A009 shows that the Project can be conducted and managed to achieve compliance with the PEM objectives for air quality at all sensitive receptors.</p> <p>Subsequent analysis also shows that the Project can be conducted and managed to achieve compliance with the SEPP AAQ objectives for air quality at all sensitive receptors. See part 2.1 of the witness statement of Simon Welchman.</p>
54.	<p>Has any analysis been undertaken to assess potential emission control measures necessary to mitigate dust and other emissions to the maximum extent achievable consistent with the objective of the <i>Victorian State Environment Protection Policy – Protocol for Environmental Management (Mining and Extractive Industries) 2007</i>, and if so what has it demonstrated.</p>	<p>Yes – refer to section 3.4.2 of Appendix A009 which lists the documents reviewed to identify best practice and maximum extent achievable (<b>MEA</b>) control measures. More recent publications - for example, the US Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and National Institute for Occupation Safety and Health's <i>Dust Control Handbook for Industrial Minerals Mining and Processing</i> (2019) - provide dust controls that are generally consistent with them.</p> <p>Table 13 in Appendix A009 benchmarks proposed dust controls against best practice and MEA. The Project's proposed dust controls are either best practice or MEA. In all instances where a best practice dust control is applied, there is no MEA technique that is a suitable substitute.</p> <p>Appendix A009 indicates that under certain infrequent atmospheric and meteorological conditions, best practice and MEA dust controls may not be sufficient to avoid elevated dust levels. Under such conditions, Appendix A009</p>

No.	IAC request	Proponent's response
		demonstrates that mining activities can be adjusted or curtailed to avoid adverse impacts on receptors. The Proponent proposes continuous dust monitoring data and other real-time information to trigger additional mitigation to prevent elevated dust levels. See the statement of Simon Welchman –in particular, sections 2.1 and 4.3.
55.	Present a plan showing modelled maximum likely extent of dust dispersal presuming wetting down has not occurred, based on monthly wind maximums and corresponding evaporation rates, using nearby <u>Bureau of Meteorology (BOM)</u> weather station data.	<p>The requested plan cannot be developed for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The dispersion model cannot be simply adjusted to include monthly wind maximums in isolation of other necessary information. The model utilises 8,760 1-hour average meteorological variables (including wind speed, wind direction, temperature, sensible heat flux, Monin-Obukhov length amongst others), the majority of these parameters are not recorded at BoM weather stations.</li> <li>• Dust assessment criteria have either 24-hour, month or annual averaging periods. Monthly wind maximums are short-term measurements (e.g. 10-minute average or instantaneous). The minimum averaging period of the AERMOD dispersion model is 1 hour. As a consequence, the requested plan, even if it could be created, would result in dust predictions with a shorter averaging period than the dust assessment criteria, and would, therefore, not be comparable to the modelling results that are presented in the EES Appendix A009 – Stage Two Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Assessment.</li> <li>• EPA Victoria's regulatory dispersion model, AERMOD, like other similar models (e.g. AUSPLUME, CALPUFF) does not characterise the effect of evaporation on dust generation.</li> </ul>
56.	Present a plan showing the maximum likely extent of dust dispersal should wetting down fail or not prove as effective as forecast, based on monthly wind averages and assumed evaporation rates, using monitoring station data from <u>onsite</u> monitoring undertaken for the EES.	As above.
57.	Advise whether any analysis of potential dust deposition consistent with the <i>Victorian State Environment Protection Policy – Protocol for Environmental Management (Mining and Extractive Industries) 2007</i> has been undertaken and if so, what has it demonstrated.	<p>The PEM at Page 12 describes a dust deposition guideline in the context of monitoring operations to enable nuisance issues to be addressed. Notably, the dust deposition guideline is not included in Table 2, Page 8, of the PEM where assessment criteria are listed for use in air quality assessments.</p> <p>Appendix A009 assessed predicted maximum monthly dust deposition rates against the Queensland guideline of 120 mg/m<sup>2</sup>/day, which is equivalent to 3.6</p>

No.	IAC request	Proponent's response
		<p>g/m<sup>2</sup>/month and slightly stricter than the value that appears at Page 12 of the PEM of 4 g/m<sup>2</sup>/month (including background).</p> <p>To avoid any ambiguity, the predicted dust deposition rates due to the construction and operational phases of the Project as presented in Appendix A009, have been compared to the dust deposition guideline that is shown at Page 12 of the PEM. This comparison is shown in <b>Error! Reference source not found.</b> in Technical note TN 007.</p> <p>These deposition rates are presented as the total for the Project in isolation (increment / inc) and the total for the Project plus background (Inc + Bg).</p> <p>The dust deposition rates that are presented in <b>Error! Reference source not found.</b> do not account for the additional dust controls that will be implemented to achieve compliance with the SEPP AAQ objectives. These additional dust controls will result in dust deposition rates that are lower than those presented in <b>Table 1</b>.</p>
58.	Provide an assessment of the number of water tankers required and time taken to effectively wet down all disturbed areas in periods of high wind, high temperature and highest evaporation rates based on BOM data from nearby weather stations.	<p>The water balance model estimates a daily maximum dust suppression rate of 1.6 ML/day in summer months, and less in other seasons. Assuming dust suppression is primarily required during daylight hours (16 hrs/day in summer) this means approximately 0.1 ML/hr (100 kL/hr) dust suppression required.</p> <p>There are a number of variables involved in calculating the number of trucks required to apply 100 kL/hr such as time to fill the trucks, travel distances from fill point to application point, and traffic management. If 30 min operation plus 15 min refilling is assumed for a turn around time of 45 minutes, a single 45 kL truck could apply around 60 kL/hr and 2x trucks would be required simultaneously.</p> <p>Refer also to part 4.5 of the witness statement of Simon Welchman.</p>
59.	Advise the trigger wind strength and direction(s) that would trigger suspension of operations to mitigate dust impacts.	<p>The trigger levels recommended for the Project are not simply based on wind strength and direction but would also account for measured particulate concentrations and forecast weather conditions. This is discussed in the EES air quality assessment (Appendix A009, Section 3.7.2).</p> <p>Katestone has prepared a draft Air Quality Management Plan for the Fingerboards Project. At Section 8 of the draft plan, two alert levels are proposed that would be triggered based on data from the real-time dust monitoring network. Particulate levels of 100 µg/m<sup>3</sup> and 150 µg/m<sup>3</sup> (1-hour average) are proposed, which would</p>

No.	IAC request	Proponent's response
		<p>trigger two different alert levels. A 24-hour average particulate level of 50 µg/m<sup>3</sup> is also proposed.</p> <p>A trigger level based on forecast light winds was also proposed. EPA has advised that a trigger level should be set for wind speeds of 20 km/hour. The Proponent adopts this as a trigger to prompt additional dust mitigation. Refer to further discussion in part 4.3 of the witness statement of Simon Welchman.</p>
60.	Advise whether additional methods were considered to assist in dust suppression and if so, what where they and what were any predicted impacts if it involves application of surface treatments or other combining agents, other than overplanting with grass?	The estimate of water usage for dust suppression assumes the use of water alone as a suppression agent. The Proponent is considering available additives and will provide further information during the hearing.
61.	Advise the expected total annual dust deposition per hectare for areas that may experience dust deposition from project activities?	<p>The total predicted annual dust deposition rates (kg/hectare/year) at each sensitive receptor have been calculated and are presented in <b>Error! Reference source not found.</b> in Technical note TN 007. These deposition rates are presented as the total for the Project in isolation (increment / inc) and the total for the Project plus background (Inc + Bg).</p> <p>The dust deposition rates that are presented in <b>Error! Reference source not found.</b> do not account for the additional dust controls that will be implemented to achieve compliance with the SEPP AAQ objectives. These additional dust controls will result in dust deposition rates that are lower than those presented above.</p>
<b>Noise and vibration</b>		
62.	Provide a specific response to the issues around noise in the EPA submission Chapter 6.4 in addition to a general response to other submissions on noise.	<p>The Proponent generally accepts the recommendations made by the EPA in section 6.4 of its submission, subject to the opinions expressed by Christophe Delaire in his expert witness statement at paragraphs 5.36-5.49. The Proponent submits that a pragmatic approach to controlling construction noise is warranted given the particular circumstances of the Project.</p> <p>See the witness statement of Christophe Delaire for a discussion of noise issues raised in other submissions.</p>
63.	Outline the specific management controls that will be used to ensure exceedances do not occur.	See section 10.3 of the <i>Noise and Vibration Assessment</i> (EES Appendix A010) and the witness statement of Christophe Delaire at paragraphs 5.36-5.49.

No.	IAC request	Proponent's response
<b>Radiation</b>		
64.	Has any assessment of the potential for ingestion of potentially contaminated dust by livestock in general grazing and cropping areas impacted by potential dust deposition been undertaken?	This assessment has not yet been undertaken. It is proposed to be undertaken as part of the preparation of the Radiation Environment Plan, which will need to be approved by the Department of Health and Human Services before the Proponent can obtain Radiation Management Licence under the <i>Radiation Act (2005)</i> . This is discussed in section 6.5.3 of the witness statement of Darren Billingsley.
65.	What is the assessed risk to livestock and other grazing animals from dust ingestion?	Refer to the response to RFI #64 above.
<b>Roads, traffic and transport</b>		
66.	Advise the current status of any negotiations with transport authorities with respect to the feasibility of establishing the proposed Fernbank siding, and for transport of the heavy mineral concentrate by rail.	<p>During October and November 2020, the Proponent conducted a competitive tender to select a preferred logistics operator. The scope of this service includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Container handling (train and truck loading and unloading) at the rail siding</li> <li>• Rail haulage (above rail)</li> <li>• Management of access rights (below rail)</li> <li>• Rail Infrastructure Manager at the siding</li> <li>• Port operation / stevedoring from train loading / unloading to vessel loading.</li> </ul> <p>As part of this process, the Proponent and the tenderers are working with V/Line, Metro and the Department of Transport with regard to the mainline connection, rail timetables and rollingstock configurations. The rail solution will take advantage of the recently-completed the Avon River Bridge and continuing upgrade works to the Gippsland line due for completion in 2022.</p> <p>The rail siding at Fernbank will be classified as “a private siding” and will therefore be under the effective management and control of the Proponent’s nominated Rail Infrastructure Manager. This role will be performed by the preferred logistics operator, who must be accredited by the Office of the National Rail Safety Regulator to perform this function. The mainline connection and siding is being designed to</p>

No.	IAC request	Proponent's response			
		conform to V/Line's technical standards. Once the rail access application has been submitted to V/Line by the Rail Infrastructure Manager, discussions to progress and finalise the application will commence resulting in the connecting infrastructure configuration being finalised, and commercial agreements being executed.			
67.	Provide the estimated total cost for the proposed upgrades to roads and other transport infrastructure, and rehabilitation. This information should be presented in a table showing each of the proposed upgrades or changes proposed, cost to implement the change and estimated cost to reinstate infrastructure or roads where a temporary relocation is proposed.	Preliminary cost estimates of the external road upgrading for the project are detailed in the table below.			
		<b>Item</b>	<b>Road Description</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>Estimated Cost</b>
		1	Relocate FGR (Including Intersection onto BDR and access provisions for eastern end of old FGR)	0	\$ 3,280,000
		2	Relocate Bairnsdale Dargo Road Stage 1 - West Section, including realignment of the FGR south and north of proposed roundabout	0	\$ 2,360,000
		3	Construct 4-Way Roundabout on FGR and BDR	0	\$ 1,540,000
		4	Relocate Bairnsdale Dargo Road - Stage 1 North Section	1	\$ 1,100,000
		5	Relocate Bairnsdale Dargo Road - Stage 2 Mid Section	2	\$ 1,490,000
		6	Relocate Careys Road	3	\$ 970,000
		7	Relocate Bairnsdale Dargo Road - Stage 1 South Section	5	\$ 1,720,000
		8	Relocate Bairnsdale Dargo Road Stage 2 - East Section	5	\$ 3,450,000
		9	Reinstate Careys Road	10	\$ 1,170,000



No.	IAC request	Proponent's response			
		10	Reinstate Bairnsdale Dargo Road - East Section	8	\$ 3,130,000
			<b>Total Estimated Cost</b>		<b>\$ 20,210,000</b>
		<p>In addition to the cost of relocating and reinstating the roads, there are several existing telecommunication services to the Fernbank exchange that must be relocated at the same time that roads are relocated. The cost of the final services relocation depends on the final design agreed with the asset owners and whether the design incorporates interim diversions or permanent diversions. The cost of the communication service and network infrastructure diversions is estimated at <b>\$2,740,000</b> for copper and fibre optic services.</p>			
68.	Advise whether agreements are in place with affected landholders to enable proposed road realignments to occur.	The Proponent has agreements in place with some of the affected landholders but as yet, not all.			
69.	The expected volume, frequency and night time movements of concentrate via rail if rail emerges as the preferred option.	Refer to Technical note TN 005.			
70.	The expected holding period of Heavy Mineral Concentrate at rail sidings that may be used.	<p>In preparation for the arrival of each train, an equivalent number of containers filled with HMC will be located at the siding ready to be loaded on the train. With five trains arriving and departing per week, the maximum duration these containers will be located at the siding will be approximately two days with the majority of containers being removed within 24hrs of arriving at the rail siding.</p> <p>The logistics chain has been designed for the HMC to be stockpiled as loose bulk at the port awaiting export rather than at the rail siding. All HMC at the siding will be in sealed containers awaiting transport by the next train.</p>			
71.	The proposed security and access controls proposed for any rail sidings.	<p>The perimeter of the siding, including container storage, administration buildings and other infrastructure, would be enclosed within a fence. During operations, a gate across the site access and truck haul road will be opened and the product haul trucks will pass through a security boom to access the container storage area. Outside of operations, this gate would be locked.</p> <p>Personnel and visitor vehicles will park in the allocated area outside the fence adjacent to the administration building fitted with an access control gate. Personnel will swipe in and visitors will be buzzed into the admin building. Refer to the layout plan (Tabled Document No. 59) which identifies the fence and infrastructure.</p>			

No.	IAC request	Proponent's response
<b>Land use planning</b>		
72.	The Proponent should clarify the application of the Wellington Shire Planning Scheme to the Project Area and the Infrastructure Options Area.	The Wellington Shire Planning Scheme does not apply - all proposed works for the Project are located in the East Gippsland Shire. See section 3.4.2 of the Land Use and Planning Impact Assessment (Appendix A013 to the EES).
73.	The Proponent should clarify the application of the LSIO to the Project Area and the Infrastructure Options Area.	The LSIO does not apply to the Project Area or the Infrastructure Options Area.
74.	Clarify whether any amendment to the Land Use and Planning Impact Assessment report (A013) is required as a result of Clause 14.01-1R Protection of agricultural land – Gippsland.	Clause 14.01-1R is discussed in the witness statement of John Glossop (see paragraphs 35-40).
75.	Provide a response to the objectives and decision guidelines of land within the Project Area and the Infrastructure Options Area affected by Environmental Significance Overlay Schedule 1, 2 and 3 or Vegetation Protection Overlay Schedule 1.	<p>The Project Area and the Infrastructure Options Area are not affected by ESO2 or ESO3.</p> <p>Sections of the Project Area and the Infrastructure Options Area are affected by ESO1-51 and VPO1 – see Figures 8.36 and 8.33 (respectively) in the EES. The objectives and decision guidelines of ESO1-51 and VPO1 are discussed in the witness statement of Aaron Organ (see Table 3, pages 28-32).</p>
76.	Provide further comment on how the Project (including the PSA) aligns with the Local Planning Policy Framework and matters included in the Municipal Strategic Statement such as: (1) Future agricultural land use; (2) Goods and services to facilitate personnel – Economic development and business facilitation; and (3) Housing to facilitate personnel, in respect of the area surrounding the Project Area and Infrastructure Options Area that may need to be developed to facilitate and support the Project.	<p>Strategic support for the Project is discussed in the witness statement of John Glossop.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Refer to paragraphs 35-40 for discussion of agricultural land use policies and protection of agricultural land. It is noted there will be a temporary loss of agricultural production but post-mining rehabilitation will see the return of agricultural production.</li> <li>2. The Project and its personnel will require goods and services in areas such as equipment, maintenance contracts, IT support, food, accommodation, fertilisers and seed and the Proponent is committed to maximising opportunities for local businesses to supply these. Further detail of the goods and services required and the initiatives for maximising local economic benefits is provided in the Socioeconomic Impact Assessment (Appendix A018 to the EES). See also the Proponent's specific commitments in the mitigation register (Attachment H to the EES), including SE29, SE30, SE43, SE59 and SE63. These are consistent with the MSS at clauses 21.06-4 and 21.09-2, which seek to encourage the development of mineral resources in appropriate locations, presumably on the</li> </ol>

No.	IAC request	Proponent's response
		<p>basis of the economic benefits which are expected to flow to the local and regional economy.</p> <p>3. The private market will be used to house personnel and this is expected to mostly occur in nearby towns. There is no proposal to establish a workers village/camp.</p>
77.	Clarify whether Plan Melbourne (2017 – 2050) is relevant to the Project and if so, provide advice on whether the Project is consistent with it.	Plan Melbourne (2017-2050) includes general commentary on the role regional Victoria contributes to the Victorian economy (page 128). The Project is consistent with outcome 7, which is for Regional Victoria to be productive, sustainable and supports jobs.
78.	The Proponent should provide a map and further details (in table form) of the land or interests in land that are proposed to be compulsorily acquired for the Project (both inside the Project Area and in the Infrastructure Options Area), the proposed Acquiring Authority and legislation under which such land or interest in land will be acquired, and the likely area of land impacted in each case. <sup>2</sup>	The Proponent has no intention of compulsorily acquiring any interests in land. It has not sought to reserve land for compulsory acquisition through a Public Acquisition Overlay, nor does it have the statutory power to compulsorily acquire land.
<b>Landscape and visual</b>		
79.	Confirm whether these references are the most up to date and most relevant to the Project and provide any updates as required.	To be provided in a separate Technical Note.
80.	Explain any change to the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment required by AS4282 as published in 2019.	To be provided in a separate Technical Note.
81.	Provide a map that consolidates all sensitive receptors (Figure 8.25) and viewpoints used in the visual impact assessment (Figure 9.62).	To be provided in a separate Technical Note.
82.	Identify these 10 residences (for example by reference to Figure 8.25 and Table 9.63), their owners/occupiers and the submission number of any submission received from the owners/occupiers of these 10 residences. <sup>3</sup>	To be provided in a separate Technical Note.

<sup>2</sup> This information should be provided to the IAC only in the first instance.

<sup>3</sup> This information should be provided to the IAC only in the first instance.

No.	IAC request	Proponent's response
83.	Select the most impacted and/or representative properties to undertake photomontages to enable the visual impact and the proposed mitigation measures to be effectively assessed (including at least Residences 15, 19 and 22 in Figure 9.63).	To be provided in a separate Technical Note.
84.	The Proponent should provide photomontages of Viewpoints 11, VP17 (service corridor) and diverted tourist roads to demonstrate the assessed visual impact of the Project and the proposed mitigation measures.	To be provided in a separate Technical Note.
85.	Provide a visual and landscape assessment of the impacts of the Project, including the impact of loss of vegetation cover, as experienced when travelling along roadways used by tourist traffic driving to and from the Mitchell River National Park (for example the Bairnsdale-Dargo Road and the Fernbank-Glenaladale Road) rather than from specific vantage points on such roadways as is currently provided. Include appropriate photomontages demonstrating how the mitigation measures proposed will avoid adverse effects on the landscape and recreational values of the Mitchell River National Park.	To be provided in a separate Technical Note.
86.	Provide a topographic profile of these roadways used by tourist traffic driving to and from the Mitchell River National Park in relation to the mine and its highest and lowest visual points.	To be provided in a separate Technical Note.
87.	The Proponent should provide information (such as topographical references or the like) for each of the vantage points discussed in the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (Appendix A014) in a manner that the IAC can easily understand the rationale for selection of vantage points and the relative heights and vistas of each vantage point in relation to the Project Area.	To be provided in a separate Technical Note.
88.	Provide details of any residences that will have a direct view of lighting of the fixed plant at night.	To be provided in a separate Technical Note.
89.	Provide details of any residences that do not have surrounding, screening vegetation that will mitigate the lighting of the fixed and moving plant at night.	To be provided in a separate Technical Note.

No.	IAC request	Proponent's response
90.	Provide further details and lux measurements on what is meant by a "soft glow".	To be provided in a separate Technical Note.
91.	Provide further details on the degree or amount of increase in the night-time lighting impacts of the Project in cloudy conditions.	To be provided in a separate Technical Note.
92.	Provide details of how sensitive viewpoints will be impacted by the lighting on moving components of the mine and truck movements at night.	To be provided in a separate Technical Note.
93.	<p>Information on which activities:</p> <p>(a) will be undertaken during daylight hours as opposed to evening and night-time, their frequency, the type of lighting required and the impact of that lighting.</p> <p>(b) can only be undertaken at night-time (if any), their frequency, the type of lighting required and the impact of that lighting.</p>	Refer to Technical note TN 005.
94.	Information in relation to the situations in which activities could not practicably be undertaken other than at night-time, their frequency, the type of lighting required and the impact of that lighting.	There are no activities, such as concrete pours, that could not practicably occur other than at night-time. The consequence of being unable to mine at night is that the mine rate production, and hence the overall length of the mine life, will be much longer.
95.	Provide advice about direct consultation with affected landowners adjacent to the Project Area about visual impacts and mitigation options that has been or will be undertaken, including landscape screening.	To be provided in a separate Technical Note.
96.	Clarify the process through which requests for landscape screening from affected landowners will be managed, assessed and approved.	To be provided in a separate Technical Note.
97.	The Proponent should provide advice on the effectiveness of using vegetation screens to ameliorate visual impacts associated with the Project (VL01; VL06) including proposed vegetation types and how vegetation screens will be established and maintained.	To be provided in a separate Technical Note.
98.	The proponent should provide advice on the proximity of potential vegetation screening to residential or other structures, and whether the	To be provided in a separate Technical Note.

No.	IAC request	Proponent's response
	proposed vegetation would contribute to any change in potential bushfire risk or impact for any properties identified.	
<b>Agriculture and horticulture</b>		
99.	Advise whether an assessment of total production value, and added value has been undertaken based on direct inquiry and information from all landholders and growers within the river flats agricultural precinct, and for dryland agricultural activities within 5 km of the Project Area and if yes what does it show?	Refer to sections 1.2 and 1.3 of the Agriculture Impact Assessment Report (EES Appendix A015).
100.	Advise whether an assessment has been undertaken of the maximum extent of high-quality agricultural land in the Lindenow area, compared to the extent that is currently intensively cropped?	This assessment has not been undertaken.
101.	Advise whether an assessment of the potential for increased production from the intensive agricultural precinct been undertaken, presuming that additional water volume and supply certainty was possible.	See the witness statement of Dr Doris Blaesing at paragraph 59.
102.	Provide a plan identifying which agricultural properties within the Project Area or within 5 km of the Project Area boundary that were directly consulted, and those properties where no direct consultation occurred.	To be provided in a separate Technical Note.
103.	Advise whether an analysis of the probabilities for successful restoration of the land topsoil has been undertaken in the context of the prevailing soil types and conditions in the Project Area.	Yes - the initial assessment of rehabilitation options considered the particular factors at the Project Area that presented difficulties, as well as the factors that were favourable, for rehabilitation success. Based on this assessment, the probability of successful rehabilitation is considered high, provided care is taken to manage the dispersive overburden present. This is consistent with the findings of initial small-scale trials, which have successfully established pasture species on soil profiles re-formed using site materials. Larger scale trials will commence in early 2021 to further investigate and compare optimal mixing ratios and rates of amendments (eg. gypsum, fertilisers, organic material). See paragraph 15 of the witness statement of Dr Rob Loch.
104.	Advise whether there is empirical evidence on successful reestablishment of pasture landforms where soil profiles are to a	See the response to submission 716B on page 17 of the statement of Dr Rob Loch. See paragraphs 23 and 26 of the witness statement of Dr Rob Loch.

No.	IAC request	Proponent's response
	greater or lesser extent comingled in the process of stockpiling and redistribution.	
<b>Cultural heritage</b>		
105.	<p>The Proponent should provide details of the status of the CHMP, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) when the draft CHMP is expected to be completed and submitted for approval.</li> <li>(b) whether a draft CHMP will be available to the IAC and if so, when.</li> <li>(c) any further consultation undertaken with Aboriginal Victoria (as Registered Aboriginal Party), GLaWAC (either directly or through Aboriginal Victoria) (refer EES 9.12.1) and any other relevant stakeholders since the release of the EES.</li> <li>(d) the likely major issues to be negotiated prior to its finalisation.</li> <li>(e) whether the CHMP, when finalised, might or is likely to require any changes to the Project, including changes to the proposed location, design, construction, or operation of the Project.</li> </ul>	Refer to Technical note TN 008.
106.	Provide details of any further investigation and assessment of intangible Aboriginal cultural heritage since the EES and how any impacts on intangible heritage values will be addressed.	Refer to Technical note TN 008.
107.	Provide details of any contemporary oral histories or ethnographic research that has been undertaken in relation to the Project Area.	Refer to Technical note TN 008.
108.	Provide information on the impact on Aboriginal cultural values of the potential allocation of water from the Mitchell River to the Project.	Refer to Technical note TN 008.
109.	Provide information on the impact of the Project on the Aboriginal cultural values associated with the Mitchell River itself as well as the broader landscape.	Refer to Technical note TN 008.

No.	IAC request	Proponent's response
110.	Provide a response to the submissions made at pages 489-495 of Submission 813.	Refer to Technical note TN 008.
111.	The Proponent should provide further information on the salvage and storage measures that are being proposed to mitigate the impacts of removal/destruction of known and unknown indigenous cultural heritage sites and places and evidence of Aboriginal Victoria's and GLaWAC's views on these suggested mitigation measures.	Refer to Technical note TN 008.
112.	The Proponent should provide further details of the proportion of each place and its contents that is inside and outside the proposed mining boundary area including by providing a clear map.	Refer to Technical note TN 008.
113.	The Proponent should provide detail on the extent to which the rehabilitation plans have/will address Aboriginal heritage values and provide opportunities for traditional owner/GLaWAC input to ensure that cultural values are restored and/or improved to the extent possible.	Refer to Technical note TN 008.
<b>Socioeconomic</b>		
114.	Provide updated data sources and explain the extent to which any parts of the socioeconomic impact assessment need to be adjusted for any relevant changes to data on which the impact assessment is based.	<p>Coffey has advised the Proponent that in response to this request, it has reviewed the data sources it relied on to inform the socioeconomic assessment and report.</p> <p>Coffey has advised the Proponent that in response to this request, it has reviewed the data sources it relied on to inform the socioeconomic assessment and report.</p> <p>Coffey has acknowledged that some data sources, such as Department of Education and Training (2014; 2017), State of Victoria (2015) and Tourism Victoria 2015, could be updated to provide more recent information. The Propnent has requested Coffey to collate and document these updated data sources where available, and will provide this to the IAC when it is in hand.</p>
115.	Explain and provide justification where more recent data is not available.	As above.
116.	Explain the justification for the use of the consequence criteria which combine time and distance.	The scope and context of the socio-economic risk assessment was to consider the socio-economic impacts of the Fingerboards Project within a study area that comprised the East Gippsland, Wellington and La Trobe municipalities. It is understood this framed the "distance" component of the consequence criteria, so



No.	IAC request	Proponent's response
		<p>that a Project impact that affected the entire community within these three municipalities would have a greater socio-economic consequence than if the same impact affected a smaller community. That is not to say that the impact on the smaller community is not important and doesn't need to be addressed, but the large study area frames the way in which the distance element of the consequence criteria are defined in the risk assessment.</p> <p>The time criteria is, as EES Appendix 018 explains at Section 2.6, a matter of "professional judgment" applied by the Coffey experts.</p> <p>The Proponent commends the observations made by the authors of EES Appendix 018 on p.15 that the consequence criteria "are a guide and reflect multiple though not necessarily mutually exclusive factors used to identify consequence ratings."</p>
117.	<p>Explain how the consequence criteria apply where only one variable is triggered. For example, explain how the consequence criteria are applied where there is a long term and potentially irreversible impact that is localised to the Project Area.</p>	<p>The consequence criteria presented in the socioeconomic impact assessment are a guide, and are not intended to be exhaustive. In this light, a risk assessment of a long term and irreversible but high local impact could, for example, be characterised as having an "extreme" consequence on that local community, so as to warrant a design modification or control to reduce impacts on that community.</p>
118.	<p>Provide a cumulative impact assessment on the basis that the mining projects referred to at page 70 of Appendix A018 proceed with particular reference to cumulative impacts on workforce availability (noting the comments at page 72 on anticipated skills shortages in the mining sector), community infrastructure and services, and accommodation availability.</p>	<p>The Stockman Base Metals Project is the only mining project in the region. This project is located near Benambra, approximately 150 km north of the project area. It is a copper and zinc project, with ore transported by truck to market along the Great Alpine Road to the Princes Highway. The planning scheme amendment (C130 to the East Gippsland planning scheme) for infrastructure outside the mining licence area authorised and regulated a mine camp to accommodate the mine workforce, which was seen as necessary due to the remote location of the mine and the very small towns in its vicinity. The Proponent does not consider there to be any material or significant cumulative impacts with that project.</p> <p>Neither the Nowa Nowa Iron Project (near Nowa Nowa, approximately 50 km east of Bairnsdale), nor Oroya Mining's Orbest Copper-Gold Project (near Orbest, approximately 90 km east of Bairnsdale) are being actively pursued by the respective projects. The EES for the Nowa Nowa Iron Project is formally on hold at the proponent's request (see: <a href="https://www.planning.vic.gov.au/environment-assessment/browse-projects/projects/nowa-nowa-iron">https://www.planning.vic.gov.au/environment-assessment/browse-projects/projects/nowa-nowa-iron</a>). There is no active referral or assessment in the Victorian planning system for the Orbest Copper-Gold Project.</p>

No.	IAC request	Proponent's response
119.	Provide information on the status of each of the mining projects referred to at page 70 of Appendix A018.	The Stockman Base Metal Project was assessed in an EES, following which the mining licence and mine work plan were granted and Amendment C130 to the East Gippsland Planning Scheme was approved in respect of mine infrastructure and works located outside the mining licence area.
120.	The Proponent should provide the names of the owners/occupiers of these dwellings and the submission number of any relevant submissions made by these persons. <sup>4</sup>	To be provided to IAC separately.
121.	The Proponent should provide an update on whether any consultation has been undertaken with GLaWAC or a statement of cultural values has been received since the EES.	Refer to the response to RFI #106 above.
122.	The Proponent should clarify the process for addressing concerns identified by affected parties in the engagements to be undertaken under Mitigation Measures SE03, SE06, SE12, SE14, SE15, SE17, SE19, SE20, SE26, and SE57.	The Proponent will receive and address concerns raised by affected parties in accordance with its complaints management process set out in section 12.4.10.3 of the EES.
123.	The Proponent should clarify the expected quantum of the community fund to be established under Mitigation Measure SE04 and the process for managing allocation of the fund to address the range of social interaction issues identified in the Socioeconomic Impact Assessment Report (Appendix A018) and any that may be identified in other engagement processes to be undertaken by the Proponent under other Mitigation Measures.	<p>The quantum of the community fund has not yet been finalised. At this stage, the Proponent has budgeted \$40K/year for the period post approval but pre construction, and expects that this would be increased to around \$100K/year once construction and operations are underway.</p> <p>The Proponent is currently investigating the model it would like to use for allocation of funds. Its current thinking is that the fund would have 3 parts as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Part 1 - a stand-alone community sponsorship/donations program (approximately \$40k/year) in the pre-construction phase.</i></li> </ul> <p>The Proponent would decide on allocation of funds, likely by an internal committee. A structured and transparent application system would be made available on the Proponent's website.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Part 2 – a community partnership program (in the order of \$100k/year) that will be established once construction of the Project commences.</i></li> </ul> <p>The Proponent is looking to focus this program on 2-3-5 year projects/programs that can deliver a specific benefit to the local community, in</p>

<sup>4</sup> This information should be provided to the IAC only in the first instance.

No.	IAC request	Proponent's response
		<p>collaboration with Council and/or state government agencies and community groups. Reporting requirements would be established to maintain accountability by tracking progress and ensuring that goals are achieved within specified timeframes, and community benefits are quantified.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Part 3 – Incentives for staff (to help encourage community involvement and lessen their environmental footprint).</i></li> </ul> <p>No financial or operational parameters have been set yet for this initiative.</p>
124.	<p>The Proponent should clarify the process for addressing any concerns about the impact of the Project that are raised through the environmental review committee and the community reference group to be established under Mitigation Measures SE19 and SE20 respectively.</p>	<p>The Proponent's proposed complaints management process is set out in section 12.4.10.3 of the EES. This will be made available on the Project website and incorporated into the updated community engagement plan. Note that a draft plan is attached as Appendix D to the draft Work Plan (EES, Attachment B).</p> <p>The Community Reference Group (<b>CRG</b>) and Environmental Review Committee (<b>ERC</b>) are intended to provide an avenue for two-way communication between the Proponent, and our community and stakeholders.</p> <p>The draft Terms of Reference for the CRG are listed in section 7.1.5 of the community engagement plan (EES, Attachment B/D). They do not set out a formal process for addressing concerns raised, but the Proponent has no objection to including this. Draft terms of reference for the ERC have not yet been formulated.</p>
125.	<p>The Proponent should provide advice on whether they have considered this impact and any socioeconomic impacts or specific mitigation that might be required.</p>	<p>See the witness statement of Dr Doris Blaesing, particularly at paragraphs 78 and 79. See also section 6.4.1 of the socioeconomic impact assessment report (EES Appendix A018).</p>
<p><b>Rehabilitation and closure</b></p>		
126.	<p>The Proponent should provide information on whether the dams created as part of the project are proposed to remain as part of the final form of the rehabilitated site.</p>	<p>No, they will be deconstructed and rehabilitated.</p>
127.	<p>The Proponent should provide information on how the footprint of land remediation was determined, and whether drainage lines and ephemeral gullies, both within and downstream of the mine site were considered.</p>	<p>See section 7 of the Geotechnical Assessment (Appendix A003 to the EES).</p>

No.	IAC request	Proponent's response
128.	The Proponent should provide information on the mechanism to be used to ensure revegetated areas have long-term protection and native vegetation cover is established.	The Proponent is currently considering its options and will provide more information during the hearing.
129.	The Proponent should provide details of the proposed 'research and development program' (Appendix A020 – Section 7.5.2) to assess soil requirements, seed sourcing and maintenance for the Native Grass Woodland domain 'Zone E' which is proposed to be initiated once operations commence. Further details requested include funding arrangements, similar programs in operation and expected program duration.	Further information will be provided during the hearing.
130.	The Proponent should clarify the volumes of materials required for rehabilitation including topsoil, subsoil, manufactured subsoil.	Refer to Table 3 in the Rehabilitation Report (EES, Appendix A020).
131.	The Proponent should confirm the management practices that will be used to prevent soil erosion during rehabilitation and closure.	<p>The management practices will vary with the level and type of erosion risk:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hydroseeding (application of seed and tackifier to provide erosion resistance to the surface soil) if there is a risk of wind erosion and/or minor risk of erosion by water (sites with low gradient – e.g., &lt;5%).</li> <li>• Hydromulching (application of seed, tackifier, and some mulch to provide erosion resistance to the surface soil) for situations with moderate to high risk of erosion by water (differing types and rates of hydromulch can provide differing levels of erosion resistance as required) (sites of moderate to high gradient – e.g. 5 – 25% depending on slope lengths).</li> <li>• Compost blanket (application of a layer of compost, seed, amendments and fertiliser approximately 50 mm thick) for steep slopes (typically &gt;15% gradient) impacted by erosion by water.</li> <li>• Rock armouring (incorporation of rock into surface soil) for situations of erosion risk from significant overland runoff flows (long and/or steep slopes).</li> </ul> <p>See also the witness statement of Dr Rob Loch at page 24.</p>
132.	The Proponent should clarify when the Topsoil Management Plan mentioned in Section 7.4 of Appendix A020 Rehabilitation Report will	Further information will be provided during the hearing.

No.	IAC request	Proponent's response
	be developed, who will be responsible for review and monitoring of this plan, and how it fits into the EMF.	
133.	The Proponent should provide information on the geotechnical design assumptions used for the permanent landform.	Design assumptions for the permanent landform are described in section 7 of the Geotechnical Assessment (Appendix A003 to the EES).
134.	The Proponent should update the IAC on the progress of activities to address 'Table 6: Key knowledge gaps for rehabilitation' (Appendix A020).	The Proponent will provide an update through the course of the hearing.
135.	The Proponent should clarify how unquantified performance measures can be assessed and measured.	See section 6.15 of the witness statement of John Sweeney.
136.	The Proponent should provide information on how the closure monitoring frequency and scope was determined.	See section 3.1 of the witness statement of Dr Michael Cheetham. See also section 9.3 of the Groundwater and Surface Water Impact Assessment (EES Appendix A006).
137.	The Proponent should clarify whether the closure and rehabilitation plan includes reinstatement of the chain of ponds system, and what the likely condition of aquifers that support the chain of ponds will be.	See section 3.3.5 of the witness statement of Dr Michael Cheetham.
<b>The draft planning scheme amendment</b>		
138.	The Proponent should provide further explanation for why the SCO was selected as the preferred Victoria Planning Provision tool and why an approach using Environmental Performance Requirements was not preferred.	<p>An approach using Environmental Performance Requirements (EPRs) was considered but was not used given that EPRs have tended to be used only for government-sponsored projects, such as the Desalination Plant, Port Phillip Bay dredging, and major transport projects including Metro Rail, the West Gate Tunnel and North East Link.</p> <p>The SCO was suggested because a similar tool was used for the Stockman Base Metals Project (Am C130 to the EGPS). The use of the SCO was supported by DELWP and EGSC members on the TRG.</p>
139.	The Proponent should explain whether there can there be more specificity about the extent of the boundaries of SCO1, including site and title details, and maps of the final haul road and water pipeline to clearly identify its alignment.	<p>The degree of specificity set out in the SCO1 maps is determined by the planning scheme map base.</p> <p>Technical note TN 009 sets out the title details of the land proposed to be subject to SCO1.</p>

No.	IAC request	Proponent's response
140.	<p>The Proponent should clarify whether any amendments to the PSA provisions are proposed to address the above matters at this stage of the IAC proceeding, including in response to submissions.</p>	<p>The Proponent agrees to amend the PSA provisions to address the matters outlined in the IAC RFI References 15.2(i) and 15.3(i).</p> <p>The Proponent also agrees to make the additional changes recommended in the witness statement of John Glossop (Appendix D).</p> <p>The Proponent intends to incorporate these changes when it circulates its 'Track change' version of the PSA in accordance with IAC Direction 40.</p>
141.	<p>The Proponent should provide the following further information in relation to the Incorporated Document:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) explain the approval processes for the Incorporated Document after the EES IAC process and any mechanisms for review and further consultation.</li> <li>(b) explain how the Incorporated Document will operate, including how the required plans (Development, Traffic and Roads, Noise Management, Environmental Management, Construction Management, Native Vegetation Management, and Fire Management) are to be prepared, reviewed and approved, including whether and how public input to these plans will be facilitated.</li> <li>(c) explain how the Incorporated Document will provide a mechanism to implement relevant Mitigation Measures or other outcomes of the EES process, and how this will be coordinated with other approval documentation (e.g. Works Approval, Water Licences etc).</li> <li>(d) given that several Mitigation Measures are aspirational or are not measurable, how will the proposed framework of the PSA, SCO, Incorporated Document and various management plans achieve a framework that is readily enforceable by relevant regulators including local council.</li> <li>(e) explain how relevant work and findings from this EES process will be implemented in the Incorporated Document.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) The Incorporated Document will be approved by the Minister for Planning as a planning scheme amendment. Its form is like a planning permit requiring various plans to be prepared to the satisfaction of Council and other relevant agencies. This triggers a review right to VCAT if satisfaction is not achieved. Further 3rd party consultation is not envisaged because the plans are detailed technical plans.</li> <li>b) The various plans will be prepared by the Proponent and/or its consultants and submitted to the relevant agencies for approval. Post EES public input is not proposed.</li> <li>c) The various plans will include the relevant mitigation measures, and are expected to be consistent with other approval documentation.</li> <li>d) It is not clear which mitigation measures are considered aspirational or non-measurable. The various plans required under the Incorporated Document will need to be prepared to the satisfaction of Council and other relevant agencies and therefore there is opportunity to ensure that any mitigation measures that are included in the approved plans are specific and measurable.</li> <li>e) See c) above. The relevant work and findings from the EES process will be implemented through the various plans that must be prepared to the satisfaction of relevant approval agencies.</li> </ul>

No.	IAC request	Proponent's response
142.	The Proponent should clarify whether any amendment to the PSA provisions are proposed to address the above.	Refer to the response to RFI #140 above.
143.	The Proponent should clarify whether an additional planning scheme amendment (or other mechanism) is proposed to accommodate the land acquisitions referred to above.	Section 8.9.1.5 of the EES was included in error. No further planning scheme amendment to reserve land for compulsory acquisition through a Public Acquisition Overlay or other mechanism is proposed.