

Review Group	Management Plan/PEPR Section	Rex Feedback ID (Internal)	Reviewer Feedback	Feedback Duplication /Similarity	Rex Response
		B020	Need performance indicators/measurement criteria against which the achievement of each of the outcomes in S6 C9 can be assessed. These to be developed in consultation with local community before blasting commences.		Adverse impacts which are qualitative rather than quantitative. Therefore reports will be handled through the grievance procedure, investigated and the outcomes reported in the ACR. This is in the PEPR Section 5 Blasting (CMc)
		B021	<i>Adjacent: - see S 2 c 6: Rex must notify property owners "adjacent to land."</i> o Are these only those whose land is contiguous with the mining lease or o Does it include eg RP and PP residents and nearby farmers whose land is not contiguous with the mine tenement boundary?		Yes its contiguous with the mining lease. (CMc)
		B022	<i>Adjoining: S2 c 10.4: Blasting protocol and blasting schedule to be developed in consultation with residents adjoining the land.</i> How does this differ from adjacent?	B021	Alternate language - it doesn't differ. (CMc)
		B023	According to Table 5, limits set for ground vibration and overpressure are based on human comfort levels at residential premises. Is this why Rex are allowed to exceed the limits for sections of the redirected Yorke Highway, on the basis that vehicles moving along the road are not residences? eg • Vibration - Fig 3 shows max vibration impact contour of 10mm/sec extends over highway for north east section of road. • Air overpressure impacts (Fig 4) - larger area of NE section of diversion falls within the 120 db(L) maximum limit.		There are no sensitive receptors in the location referred to. Vehicles and their occupants are not sensitive receptors. The modelling shows worst case scenario. Under the 6S C11 outcomes it is allowed 5% of the time for sensitive receptors. (CMc).
		B024	Why aren't all segments of the Highway required to be located outside of the maximum air overpressure and vibration impact zones?	B023	There are no sensitive receptors in the location referred to. Vehicles, their occupants and the highway are not sensitive receptors. The modelling shows worst case scenario. Under the 6S C11 outcomes it is allowed 5% of the time for sensitive receptors. Highway relocation designed for avoidance of flyrock. (CMc).
		B025	Validity of modelling? Based on only one month study period (p 6) and assuming 'favourable' met. conditions (p 7).		This is baseline study of overpressure of an adjacent location without blasting. It is valid. Modelling is based on standard industry formulas. (CMc).
		B026	Was modelling based on blasts located around perimeter of pit?	B025	Yes, modelling was based on blasts around perimeter as well as through the pit. (CMc).
		B027	At June meeting, Rex presenter noted: <i>if met. conditions are unfavourable, could delay blasting "for several hours if need to"</i> . What happens if conditions remain unfavourable for an entire day or several consecutive days? Will blasting be postponed for this extended period?	B012	Rex will not blast until it believes that it will not exceed its Mineral Lease conditions and outcomes regardless of the period. (CMc).
		B028	What is the earliest/latest Rex can blast on any given day? Can Rex blast during night hours?		There is no restriction on timing but Rex will try to standardise to one time period per day during daylight hours. (CMc)
		B029	P 9; Rex assurances that <i>"no damage or injury to personnel, livestock, property etc... from fly-rock</i> . What responsibility does Rex have (eg compensation) if damage does occur?	B011	Rex does have accountability of this occurs, and will have in place public liability insurance as required. However, the fly rock zones have been applied conservatively based on maximum blasting. (CMc).
		B030	<i>the blast exclusion zone will, on occasion, impinge on a small area of adjacent agricultural land and may restrict access for short periods.... Rex Minerals will work with landowner to develop an agreed Landowner Communication Protocol.</i> When will this Protocol be developed?	B019	Prior to commencing mining activities, Rex is required to have this protocol and agreement in place. A draft blasting protocol and blasting schedule will be developed and will be syndicated with the relevant landowner (CMc)
		B031	<i>All blasts will be internally reviewed by Rex?</i> Will there be any review by an independent agency?		External reviews of blasting procedures or outcomes may only be initiated if trigger alert BTL 2 is activated. (CMc). A review once blasting commences has been recommended by Independent expert and this is noted in Section 5 of PEPR.
		B032	MP states these will be detailed in SOP. Will this be made publicly available and when? Which agency approves the SOP?		The necessary strategies, procedures and protocols to comply with the conditions are now added to the BMP. The references to SOP has been removed from the BMP (CMc).
		B033	Community Recommendation: Additional methods of publicising weekly blasting schedules are required. Tourists visiting the area will not know to check the Rex website or look on the Hillside Mine notice board. At very least, need notices inserted on Pine Point, RP notice boards and weekly advertisements in the YPCT.		This is not a lease requirement and Rex doesn't believe it is necessary or warranted. During operations Rex will continue to engage with local community to determine whether its planned blasting communications are working effectively. If tourists wish to access the mine the blast times will be clearly displayed on the mine access rd. (CMc).
		B034	<i>Rex will notify property owners adjacent to... ML of all blasts at least 48 hrs in advance via SMS network</i> . Which property owners will be automatically included in this, and which need to request inclusion?	B030	Those adjacent to the mine will be included as per Lease conditions, and once notification system is set up others may request inclusion. (CMc).

Review Group	Management Plan/PEPR Section	Rex Feedback ID (Internal)	Reviewer Feedback	Feedback Duplication /Similarity	Rex Response
Community	Blast Management Plan	B035	Community Recommendation: Option to be included on SMS messaging system needs much broader publicity (similar to Call for Expression re Rainwater Tank Testing). At the very least, use HMCV, Progress Association etc. email networks.		Those adjacent to the mine will automatically be included as per Lease conditions. During operations Rex will continue to engage with local community on best effective communication. (CMc).
		B036	<i>Preliminary investigations will commence/response will be provided as soon as practical. Community Recommendation: Need performance indicators based on time to commence investigation/report findings to complainant/resolve the complaint to satisfaction of complainant (see Complaints register – s2 c45 – 49).</i>		Refer to Complaints Management Procedure and the Community Engagement Plan, which contain an outline of the complaints process and time to respond to complainants. As some blasting issues may take significant time to investigate the time could be quite varied. The reporting of time to close out complaints from different categories could be reported on but this is not required in the BMP. It could be reported from the complaints register database via the community engagement plan. (CMc).
		B037	o Blasting Protocol and Blasting Schedule (s2 c10.4) o Communication and Operating Protocol (s2, C 42). o Landowner Communication Protocol re fly rock incursion (MP page 9) Are these the same, or different? If different, When will each protocol be developed? Which parties will be consulted for each? (eg farmers within the land only, nearby residents etc.)		The blasting protocol and blasting schedule are now included in the appendix of the BMP. The Communication Protocol appears in the Community Engagement Plan which is separate to the BMP. The Landowner communication protocol is drafted and will be established with ML or adjacent landowners as required prior to or during operations. (CMc)
		B038	<i>Page 21, Appendix 2: Landholder Communication Protocol: “This protocol will be used with landowners from approximately year 5 onwards when open pit perimeter extends South and West.” Why is the protocol to only be used from year 5 onwards?</i>	B019	Blasting will not impact adjacent land in regard to potential flyrock until year 5. The BMP now includes the blasting protocol and blasting schedule in the appendix. (CMc)
		B039	<i>Saros report p 12: With Respect to Ground vibration and air overpressure it is recommended the compliance monitoring program should include a minimum of two locations and where possible, adjacent to the closest sensitive receptors. Rex has opted for this minimum number. Inadequate – see below.</i>		Rex has followed the recommendations of the expert consultant and has assessed that it is adequate. (CMc).
		B040	Automated real time monitoring for air over pressure and vibration. Nothing for fly rock. How does Rex intend to monitor fly rock to ensure no exceedance of exclusion zone, especially along St Vincent’s Highway and in SW area adjacent to the pit?	B029	Flyrock monitoring will include visual assessment either from blast guards, video cameras or drones and this is described in the BMP. (CMc).
		B041	Permanent monitors: only two: P2 makes sense, but why is the other – P1 – located a considerable distance from the pit and in a NW direction? Reason for P1 location cited as “residential location” yet there is only one house at P1, compared with multiple dwellings at RP and PP (the latter of which is much closer to the pit). Why is there a permanent monitor at this location?		P1 is located next to a residential location and is not shielded by the RSF or the TSF. This was the recommendation of the expert. (CMc).
		B042	No permanent monitoring at RP, PP or Receptor 25 – these only get a portable monitoring unit which, according to MP: - MAY be undertaken if there is a complaint (<i>note; Saros report P. 12: ... in the case where a registered complaint s received monitoring SHOULD be conducted at the complaint location for sufficient period of time to check compliance.</i>) - Will continue in use until sufficient data has been obtained..... - Table 6 states frequency will be “ad hoc”	B041	The use of the term Ad Hoc is defined as for a specific purpose, in this case to ensure that the blasting over pressure and vibration are well with in the lease conditions or to check levels if there are complaints. (CMc).
B043	One portable unit (B4) located NE of pit on coastal side of E WRD, but outside (to the north) of that section of the road which sits within the 10mm/s limit for vibrations and the 120 db(L) limit for air overpressure. Why isn’t it positioned inside of both of these limits? Why isn’t there a permanent monitoring station along the eastern section because this would provide the best indication of any exceedances of limits on road users? Why is the purpose of this one listed as “industrial monitor”. Not aware of any industry at this point!	B041	The portable B4 sensor will be located at a position well within the lease boundary but outside the 2mm/s vibration and 115dB(L) overpressure. It makes no sense to locate them closer to the pit, rather it makes it more sense to locate them closer to the edge of the lease where the conditions are measured. Road users are not sensitive receptors. Industrial compliance was be changed to residential compliance which has even more stringent criteria, however the receptor will not be there during mine operations as there is a plan to move them. (CMc)		

Review Group	Management Plan/PEPR Section	Rex Feedback ID (Internal)	Reviewer Feedback	Feedback Duplication /Similarity	Rex Response
		B044	Community Recommendations: Permanent monitors be located at Pine Point as a priority. Rogues Point (when blasting in northern section of pit). The portable monitor at B4 be replaced by a permanent monitor, and relocated southward to a position which puts it within that section of St Vincent's Highway which, according to the modelling, will experience in excess of the max limits set for air overpressure and vibration levels.	B041	The worst case modelling shows that northern part of Pine Point will receive 1mm/s vibration much less than the 5mm/s allowed for 95% of the blasts and Rogues Point even lower. The worst case modelling shows Pine Point is at least 1km from the 115dB(L) limit and Rogues Point is even further. So it makes no sense to increase the number of sensors or to relocate them. (CMc).
		B045	<i>Saros report P. 12: also recommended video records be captured for open pit blast activities... should be analysed as part of the post-blast analysis and is a useful tool when assessing rock movement and air overpressure controls. Will this be done? If not, why not?</i>		All blasts will be video recorded where it is safe to do so as a record on performance of the blast in normal QA/QC blasting. This is now stated in the BMP. (CMc).
		B046	<i>Re exceedances: Rex Minerals will conduct investigation to ascertain cause and prepare a detailed report which may be provided to relevant agencies (MP page 14). Why not mandatory? And why restrict circulation of results to agencies?</i>		Rex is permitted to exceed the vibration and overpressure levels of 5mm/s and 115dB(L) for 5% of the time. It clear in the BMP this is what this refers to in the Trigger and Response plan because we have not necessarily breached ML S6C11. As stated in BMP, compliance monitoring results will also be updated regularly to the HMCV. (CMc)
		B047	Community Recommendation: all reports re exceedances to be provided to community and HMCV as soon as they become available. ACR unacceptable.		Breaches of Conditions can be reported to the HMCV either monthly or quarterly depending on their meeting frequency. The BMP has been updated to reflect this (CMc)
		B048	Community Recommendation: As noted earlier, community- based performance indicators/ measurement criteria needed for each outcome category listed in s6 c9. Need performance indicators based on time to commence investigation/report findings to complainant/resolve the complaint to satisfaction of complainant. 6 or 12 monthly community satisfaction survey required (as per Air Quality and Noise).	B020	Details around this are listed in the PEPR Section 5, blasting. As outlined in the Complaints Management Procedure, all complaints actions, including resolution and timing, will be recorded in the complaints register. This information will also be provided in the Annual Compliance Report and the HMCV will be regularly updated with informatoin on reported matters. During operations Rex will continue to engage with local community to determine whether its complaints procedure and follow up are working effectively (CMc).