Cowal Gold Operation (CGO)  
Complaints Register – 1 July to 31 July 2016

Schedule 2 of the Development Consent (DA 14/98) includes Condition 9.4(a)(v), which requires that a complaints register, updated on a monthly basis, be made publicly available on the Cowal Gold Project’s website.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DETAILS</th>
<th>Resident of Lake Cowal, (Complainant A)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COMPLAINT / CONCERN</td>
<td>Resident of Lake Cowal – called the CGM Community Complaints and Enquiry Number reporting shaking of his house at the approximate time of the blast in the Pit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DATE and TIME</td>
<td>13/07/16 – 12:34pm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| OUTCOME | Wednesday 13/07/16  
1. Senior Environment Advisor contacted Complainant A and told him he would speak to the Mining Department and analyse the data to see if anything abnormal or non-compliant had occurred.  
2. Senior Environment Advisor contacted Saros Consultants to conduct an investigation into the blasting impacts on BM08.1. Data would not be available until 6pm 13/07/2016  
Thursday 14/07/2016  
3. Senior Environment Advisor met with Complainant A at their home to discuss the complaint (13/07/2016) regarding our blasting activities and they described what had happen. Complainant A described how his son was outside and heard a loud crack and felt the ground shake, while Complainant A felt the walls shake.  
4. Senior Environment advisor discussed the results of the Saros investigation which indicated that:  
   • The Nearfield / Mine Bund monitor (BM10) did record higher levels of overpressure at 128.4 dB(L) but there was no significant vibration associated with the blast.  
   • No vibration was recorded at BM8.1 monitor and overpressure levels at the time of blasting were only 101.0 dB(L).  
   • No significant levels were picked up at the Southern Bird Breeding (BM05) monitor which is between the pit and Cowal North (BM08.1), or at the Northern Bird Breeding (BM04.1) monitor.  
5. Senior Environment Advisor was present at the Complainants home when a blast event occurred at CGO which was faintly heard but there was no vibration or overpressure impacts felt at the house.  
6. Complainant A asked if there would be any compensation if things got bad regarding the blasting activities. The Senior Environment Advisor suggested ongoing monitoring of the data and explore if there is any correlation between past complaints and weather conditions, as the monitoring data does not indicate a significant impact  
7. Complainant A was generally happy with this response and the Senior Environment Advisor offered to come back to Cowal North if similar blasting and weather conditions present themselves. |
| DATE OF RESPONSE | 13/07/16 |