

## ORC Conditions – Submitter Comments / HML Responses

Condition	Feedback	HML Response / Edits
<b>Millers Flat Water Company</b>		
<b>RM23.819.01 – Land Use Consent to construct a bore for the purpose of digging a mine pit that intercepts groundwater</b>		
7. <i>In the event of a discharge of unauthorised contaminant(s) to water or to land in a manner that may enter water, including but not limited to fuel, hydraulic fluid, contaminated soil or leachate, the Consent Holder must:</i>	MFWC values immediate notification to fulfil Water Services Act obligations. Accepting CODC's 24-hour notification requirement, ORC remains primary for spill responses to water.	Accepted, both consent authorities are to be notified in the event of a spill and is reflected in both sets of conditions.
12. <i>The Consent Holder must submit an Annual Groundwater Report by the 30<sup>th</sup> of June each year which includes the following: ...</i>	MFWC requests a copy when submitted to the Consent Authority.	Accepted, condition reflects this.
<b>Graeme Young</b>		
<b>RM23.819.03 – Discharge Permit to discharge sediment-laden water to water in a bore, and to land in a manner that may enter water</b>		
6. <i>No contaminants other than silt, sediment and biodegradable flocculants shall be discharged.</i>	This documentation in Discharge Permit 6, confirms the use of Flocculants. Despite repeated assurances from the applicant that no chemicals will be used on site, this is the second chemical they now disclose. The first being the chemical already being used to suppress dust, (this was inadvertently admitted by their operations manager at a public Q&A meeting). It's also reasonable to suppose significant amounts of rubber will be deposited into the gravels on site from the tyres of the dump trucks making their thousands of movements. As the impacts of rubber in our environments are still being understood it's impossible to eliminate potential risks from this contamination and the synergies of it combined with other contaminants.	This condition was put forward by ORC and has not been amended by HML. It follows that ORC are comfortable that any adverse effects associated with biodegradable flocculants are acceptable and can be a useful mitigation tool.  Whilst HML has not proposed the use of flocculants, and does not intend to do so, they have remained in the condition suite as a contingency.
12. <i>For the term of this consent, quarterly (four times per year) water monitoring must be undertaken for total suspended solids and</i>	The applicant recommends deleting the requirement to test the river water above and below the	This condition has been kept in the proposed condition suite with

Condition	Feedback	HML Response / Edits
<p>turbidity at the following sites:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Final operational infiltration pond/area discharge;</li> <li>• True left bank of the Clutha River/Mata-Au at within 100 m upstream of the site; and</li> <li>• True left bank of the Clutha River/Mata-Au at within 500 m downstream of final infiltration pond/area discharge.</li> </ul>	<p>proposed mine site. We are very concerned by this as we know the applicant pushes boundaries and breaks rules. It is their hope that the huge volume of water flowing downstream will attenuate the contamination contained within the water from the mining operations, which ultimately will return to the Clutha River.</p> <p>To not regularly test this river water is negligent and supports my written submission to the CODC where we quote Dr Richard Antiss, an environmental geochemist, who warns of the risks and dangers of current monitoring protocols around mining sites.</p> <p>In consideration of the multiple contaminations including high nitrate levels on site, we would like to quote from the EC Otago Report under 10 Limitations.</p> <p><i>"There is no investigation that is thorough enough to preclude the presence of materials at the site that presently, or in the future, may be considered hazardous. As the regulatory criteria are subject to change, a status with respect to contamination that is presently considered to be acceptable may in the future become subject to different regulatory standards that cause the site to become unacceptable for existing or proposed land use activities."</i></p> <p>We believe it would be imperative to regularly test</p>	<p>requirements for reporting proposed in addition to the condition referenced here – refer to condition 13 of the revised set.</p> <p>In addition to this, regular groundwater quality monitoring and reporting is proposed as set out by proposed conditions 10-15.</p> <p>The monitoring will be undertaken by a staff member employed by HML who will be appropriately trained to undertake the required tasks and operations.</p>

Condition	Feedback	HML Response / Edits
	<p>the river water above and below the proposed mining site and that these tests be undertaken by a qualified person outside of the employ of the mining company. Due to the applicants somewhat adversarial relationships with local government, it is essential that site/river monitoring be strengthened rather than weakened as the applicant's recommendation requires.</p>	