

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** Ian Magee [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Thursday, 13 May 2021 9:36 PM  
**To:** Fingerboards Inquiry and Advisory Committee (DELWP)  
**Subject:** A Clarification of Thursday's Presentation by Katestone on Air Quality.

[REDACTED] [REDACTED]

EXTERNAL SENDER: Links and attachments may be unsafe.

Good Morning Amy,

I trust the AIC is standing up to the long days !

Might you please offer the following clarification from the BDEC on Thursday's hearing to the Chair. It is not a question that requires a response, just a technical clarification to assist the understanding of the parties.

Mr Chair,

Your comment on Thursday afternoon late that all offsite dust was considered as generated from ore was correct. Katestone in their documentation considered that offsite dust was generated as 4% from ore, or mining, and 96% from haul roads or handling of other material such as overburden.

They then took a conservative approach and calculated the offsite risk as though all dust was generated from ore. Ore hosts more toxic material than the general soil makeup, so they have established a margin of safety - no matter the final makeup of dust that might eventually be captured in monitors.

Regarding the HMC stockpiles, the zircon, monazite and other components of HMC all have, within reason, the same particle size range and density as silica, so HMC is as susceptible to wind erosion as say overburden - if the HMC is dry.

The radionuclides and rare earths are the elements which do have a high density, but they exist as only trace elements in monazite or elsewhere, so in raised windspeed they "go along for the free ride".

Our belief is that Katestone were never referred to the HMC stockpiles by the proponent so have never assessed these stockpiles as a source of dust. ( hosting radionuclides ).

Regards, Ian Magee for BDEC.

Sent from my iPad