Mineral Projects

DIANNE COPPER MINE RECOMMENCEMENT PROJECT

DETSI Information Request Response

EA holder: *Mineral Projects Pty Ltd and Tableland Resources Pty Ltd*
EA Holder Contact Details: *Mineral Projects Pty Ltd located at Level 15, 300 Queen Street, Brisbane, QLD, 4000*
Tenure: *ML 2810, ML 2811, ML 2831, ML 2832, ML 2833 and ML 2834*
Document ID: *DCM_EPML00881213_IR_Response*
Version: *1.0*
Date of Submission: *October 2025*

The Dianne Copper Mine is located in Cape York Peninsula, Queensland, approximately 160 kilometres northwest of Cairns and 100 km southwest of Cooktown. The Dianne Copper Mine comprises Mining Leases ML 2810, ML 2811, ML 2831, ML 2832, ML 2833 and ML 2834. The mine has been under care and maintenance since copper mining activities ceased in 1982. The proponent for the Dianne Copper Mine is Mineral Projects Pty Ltd and Tableland Resources Pty Ltd.

This Environmental Authority (EA) amendment application was submitted for the recommencement of mining at the Dianne Copper Mine on 24 February 2025. An Information Request (IR) was received from the Department of Environment, Tourism, Science and Innovation (DETSI) on 27 June 2025. This document provides Mineral Project's response to the IR, and is set out as follows:

- Appendix 1 – a detailed response to the IR matters
- Appendix 2 – supplementary project information
- Appendix 3 – high resolution copies of the figures in the Environmental Authority Amendment Application
- Appendix 4 – detailed technical advice on ecology and surface water matters
- Appendix 5 – a summary report for hydrogeology
- Appendix 6 – raw water quality data, split into separate surface water and groundwater spreadsheets
- Appendix 7 – Release Dam upgrade construction methodology
- Appendix 8 – an updated Water Management Plan
- Appendix 9 – an updated Waste Rock Management Plan
- Appendix 10 – an updated Final Landform and Cover Design Report
- Appendix 11 – Soils Report
- Appendix 12 – final CCA for all structures
- Appendix 13 – a summary report for mine water management and flood modelling
- Appendix 14 – Landowner Agreement Letter
- Appendix 15 – an updated Progressive Rehabilitation and Closure Plan (PRCP) and PRCP Schedule

Supplementary project information, as referenced throughout the IR matters, has been updated and detailed in Appendix 2.

Appendix 1 – Response to information request for matters relating to the Environmental Authority

Item	Reference	Matter	Information Request	Mineral Project Response
EA1.	Dianne Copper Mine (DCM) Recommencement Project Environmental Authority Amendment Application Environment Assessment Report (EAR)	The EAR includes maps that do not meet the requirements of the department's guideline – '*Spatial Information guideline'* (ESR/2018/4337 Version 6.00) (the Spatial Guideline). The following errors or matters must be addressed: i) Figure 2: Project Layout, (Section 2), scale is incorrect, unable to read detail due to size and image resolution provided in the report. ii) Figure 2a: Project Layout – Sewage Treatment Plant Location (Section 2), scale is incorrect, unable to read detail due to size and image resolution provided in the report. iii) Figure 2b: Project Layout – Sewage Treatment Plant Indicative Layout (Section 2), scale is incorrect, unable to read detail due to size and image resolution provided in the report. iv) Figure 2c: Project Layout – Mine Electrical Reticulation (Section 2), scale is incorrect, unable to read detail due to size and image resolution provided in the report. v) Figure 3: Indicative processing flowchart (Section 2), unable to read detail due to size and image resolution provided in the report. vi) Figure 4: Indicative Processing Infrastructure Layout (Section 2), scale	Provide maps in accordance with the department's Spatial Information guideline, and rectify the errors noted. Where required, provide the images as higher resolution files.	All figures are updated and attached at a high resolution in Appendix 3.

Item	Reference	Matter	Information Request	Mineral Project Response
		is incorrect, unable to read detail due to size and image resolution provided in the report. vii) Figure 6: Overburden Stockpile (Section 6.2), scale is incorrect, unable to read detail due to size and image resolution provided in the report. viii) Figure 7: Soil Sampling Locations, (Section 11.3) unable to read detail due to size and image resolution provided in the report. ix) Figure 8: Backfilled Pit (Section 11.4), unable to read detail due to size and image resolution provided in the report. x) Figure 12: Predicted Landfill Layout (Section 14.6), unable to read detail due to size and image resolution provided in the report. xi) Figure 12a: Predicted Landfill Layout – Plan and Cross Section (Section 14.6 unable to read detail due to size and image resolution provided in the report. xii) Figure 12b: Predicted Landfill Layout – Detailed Cross Section (Section 14.6), unable to read detail due to size and image resolution provided in the report. xiii) Appendix 11 – New Figure for Environmental Authority, scale is incorrect, unable to read detail due to size and image resolution provided in the report.		

Item	Reference	Matter	Information Request	Mineral Project Response
EA2.	Appendix 4 Dianne Copper Mine Terrestrial Ecology Report	The report does not provide information or assessment of controls to demonstrate the following: i) Mitigation measures for vegetation clearing and associated habitat loss. ii) Decisions made to protect against unnecessary clearing. iii) A schedule of clearing. iv) What is the definition of a "significant area" to avoid in the vegetation clearing, and species-specific method of identification of animal breeding places v) Section 7.2.1.2.5 lists a mitigation action as "… no excessive clearing occurs". However, there is no definition of what excessive clearing is. vi) Management plan for species-specific breeding places. vii) Definition of residual impacts and proposed offsets for these residual impacts on environmental values. viii) Self-assessment of significant residual impact and supporting spatial data which complied with the department's Spatial Guideline.	i) Describe mitigation measures for vegetation clearing and associated habitat loss in detail, with reference to 7.2.1.2 Mitigation and Management Measures. ii) Provide a plan for proposed clearing and a decision list of measures which will be undertaken to avoid any unnecessary clearing. iii) Provide a plan, map and schedule for sequential clearing including area size estimates. iv) Provide a list of defining attributes and definition of significant areas to avoid when clearing, and a species-specific method of identification of animal breeding places. v) In 7.2.1.2.5: Define "excessive clearing" in terms of the following description supplied: "Topsoil and subsoil will be stripped to a minimum of 200 mm depth for all new disturbance for the project. Over much of the project site, clay is present below the topsoil for an additional 500 mm dept(h). In these areas, additional stripping of clay material will be undertaken." vi) Provide a species-specific management plan for tampering with animal breeding places. vii) Provide indicative proposed offsets for compensation for residual impacts on environmental values, including a	i. The location of the project includes recommencing activities at the existing care and maintenance site, to address a number of legacy issues and bring the project to contemporary environmental standards, particularly rehabilitation, to provide a positive environmental impact. The project has been designed to reduce the disturbance footprint as much as practicable, including utilisation of existing disturbance areas including the existing pit, mined in the 1980's. In addition, the project disturbance footprint has been kept within the same catchment as the existing mine to reduce any potential impacts to site hydrology Mitigation measures for vegetation clearing are detailed in EA Amendment EAR (Nov, 2024) Section 9 and Appendix 4 Terrestrial Ecology Report Section 7.2.1.2 and will include: • Minimising disturbance footprint and utilise existing disturbance as much as practical – achieved through project design to reduce project footprint and use of existing disturbance areas • Progressive rehabilitation will occur as soon as practicable, per the PRCP • Fauna spotter catcher will be present for all vegetation clearing • Stockpiling of fallen logs and trees with hollows for use in rehabilitation

Item	Reference	Matter	Information Request	Mineral Project Response
			threshold definition for residual impacts. viii) Provide the significant residual impact self-assessment test details including spatial data showing the calculation of remnant vegetation intersecting a watercourse.	• The freshwater dams will be remediated as required and kept post-mining as agreed with landowners • Weed and pest control management measures will be in place for construction and operations ii. and iii. There is a total of 33.4 ha to be cleared for the project (50 ha total disturbance, with 16.6 ha already cleared under the existing EA). This is shown on drawing J022.130.10-SKE-007.01-Clearing_Area_Layout. The project has been designed to reduce the disturbance footprint as much as practicable, including utilisation of existing disturbance, therefore avoiding unnecessary clearing. The clearing program includes areas of mining activity only, with all surrounding and buffer areas to remain uncleared. Measures in place to avoid unnecessary clearing include: • Clearing area will be surveyed and delineated • Use of designated parking areas and access tracks • Avoidance documented project design • Utilisation of existing cleared areas • Clearing is limited to the minimum area required for key infrastructure and mining activities • A vegetation clearance procedure will be in place for construction

Item	Reference	Matter	Information Request	Mineral Project Response
				In addition, numerous management measures will be in place during clearing to reduce impacts on the environment, including presence of a fauna spotter catcher. Due to the small scale of the project, it is anticipated that the majority of the disturbance footprint will be cleared within 1 month at the start of construction, in the following order: • Mine water management areas and roads • Offices and workshop areas • Pit • Heap leach pads • ROM and processing areas • Initial waste rock stockpile. However, to mitigate impacts, the eastern and western waste rock stockpile areas won't be cleared until they are required, which will be determined with the detailed mine scheduling. iv. The proponent commits to obtaining an approved Species Management Program (SMP) for potential impacts (tampering with) animal breeding places under the Nature Conservation Act 1992 (NC Act) and Nature Conservation (Animals) Regulation 2020 (NC Regulation) prior to the commencement of any clearing activities on site, to be included as an Environmental Authority condition. Further detail is provided in Appendix 4.

Item	Reference	Matter	Information Request	Mineral Project Response
				v. Excessive clearing is defined as clearing that is clearing that is beyond that reasonable and necessary for the project. Excessive clearing will be avoided with the mitigation measures discussed in response ii and iii above. vi. An Impact Management Plan (IMP), including a Fauna Salvage and Relocation Plan, will be prepared to support the high-risk SMP for tampering with animal breeding places prior to any clearing being undertaken. The IMP will provide species-specific management for tampering with breeding places. Further detail is provided in Appendix 4. vii. Due to the small disturbance area, short term nature of the activities, and mitigation measures in place for the project, there is not anticipated to be any significant residual impacts on any Commonwealth or State listed species. As such, biodiversity offsets are not required. viii. The threshold for the clearing of remnant vegetation intersecting a VM Act watercourse, to be considered a significant residual impact (SRI), is 2 ha. Therefore, based on the calculations completed (i.e. the area of remnant vegetation directly affected by the proposed operation is 1.700535 ha), a SRI will

Item	Reference	Matter	Information Request	Mineral Project Response
				not occur from the proposed project activities. Further detail is provided in Appendix 4.
EA3.	Appendix 2 Dianne Copper Mine Water Management Plan Appendix 3 Dianne Copper Mine Groundwater and Surface Water Impact Assessment Report	Receiving environment water quality data has been provided in Appendix A: Water Quality Data, however there are identified gaps in the data and a lack of analysis and interpretation in relation to consideration of potential surface and groundwater interactions for the proposed mining disturbances. Background surface water quality data is required for the checking and derivation of water quality limits, suitability of monitoring locations to demonstrate an effective and appropriate monitoring network and compliance framework is established for the operations. <u>The following data has been provided:</u> <u>Gum Creek Tributary – Dissolved Metals and Metalloids:</u> Upstream / Reference site data has been provided for sites S7 and S13 up until April 2023, Downstream / Receiving sites S11 and S12 data have been provided up to April 2023. <u>Gum Creek Tributary – General Parameters:</u> Upstream / Reference site data has been provided for sites S7 and S13 up until April 2023, Downstream / Receiving sites S11 and S12 data have been provided up to April 2023. <u>Gum Creek Tributary – Nutrients:</u> Upstream / Reference site data has been provided for sites S7 and S13 up until April 2023,	i) Provide background/baseline receiving environment water quality monitoring data and upstream reference data for the Gum Creek Tributary for dissolved metals and metalloids, general parameters, and nutrients; and site water dissolved metals and metalloids for raw water dams and mine water dams, as well as release dam data for general parameters, all of which are more up to date, from at least 2024 and through 2025. ii) Provide projection of potential changes in the water quality downstream of the receiving environment with consideration of the potential surface water - groundwater interaction and the proposed expansion features, including pit, WRD, heap leach pads and processing plant. iii) Provide the raw data (with no outlier removal) utilised to derive the water quality objectives proposed in Table 7 of Appendix 3 (section 6.2.6).	i. C&R EA Amendment Groundwater and Surface Water Impact Assessment Report has data from January 2020 (surface water) and October 23 (groundwater) through May 2024 (report was finalised in November 2024). Annual REMP assessments have been undertaken since which would provide further insight into the water quality collected within the receiving environment. The expanded groundwater monitoring network detailed within the Hydrogeology RFI Response (Appendix 5) report aims to further clarify any knowledge gaps in relation to the surface water and groundwater interaction. However, both reports do highlight that there is minimal evidence to suggest that current mining conditions have impacted the groundwater system. ii Detailed mine water management for the project is provided in Appendix 8 – updated Water Management Plan. iii. Raw background/baseline surface water and groundwater quality data is provided in Appendix 6.

Item	Reference	Matter	Information Request	Mineral Project Response
		Downstream / Receiving sites S11 and S12 data have been provided up to April 2023. Site Water – Dissolved Metals and Metalloids: Raw Water Dams (Clean Water) site data has been provided for S1 (RWD 1) up until July 2022, S3 (RWD2) until July 2022, and Mine Water Dams (Mine Affected Water) S4 (Pit) until July 2022. Release dam – General Parameters: site data has been provided for S6 up to April 2023.		
EA4.	Appendix 2 Dianne Copper Mine Water Management Plan	Groundwater quality data has been provided in the section 3.5.2.1 Groundwater Quality however there are identified gaps in the data and a lack of analysis and interpretation in relation to groundwater flow direction/s for the proposed mining disturbances and the location and siting of monitoring bores and requirements for additional bores to provide a comprehensive and appropriate monitoring network. Background groundwater is required to check and derive appropriate site-specific water quality limits for monitoring of controls and to establish the compliance framework during the operations. The data which has been provided for GW01 (reference site), GW04 (reference site) and GW03 (impact site) is up to April 2023.	i) Provide a conceptual groundwater flow model supporting the choice of bore locations proposed. ii) Provide an updated application/Water Management Plan that includes updated data for Groundwater Monitoring Water Quality Results parameters using the most recently available data (e.g. from at least 2024 or later). iii) Provide a comprehensive assessment of the groundwater system that captures the potential pathways and impacts from all the proposed mine features. This requires: ○ inclusion of further monitoring bores upgradient and downgradient of each key structure (e.g. pit, WRD, heap leach pads, processing plant and settling/release dam), with justification of bore placements	Generally, the detailed groundwater assessment has confirmed the need for seven additional groundwater bores for the project. Three of these bores will be constructed prior to operations commencing, and the remaining four will be constructed as soon as practicable once construction has been completed (due to required location). i. Hydrogeology RFI Response (Appendix 5) Section 4 - Groundwater conceptual model discusses in detail the current groundwater conceptual flow model with the additional bores located to affirm our understanding. Given the site's context (Hydrogeology RFI Response Section 2 and 3), the development of a numerical groundwater model is not considered appropriate. The geology in the project area is highly complex, with structural and lithological features exerting a dominant control on groundwater flow pathways. These features cannot be reliably represented in a numerical model without significant uncertainty, which would undermine the defensibility of any predictions produced. In

Item	Reference	Matter	Information Request	Mineral Project Response
			(e.g. between the mine features and sensitive receptors) ○ baseline data of at least 18 months (if monitored 1-2 monthly) to allow for understanding the groundwater system and potential seasonality impacts. iv) Provide the raw data (with no outlier removal) utilised to derive the water quality objectives proposed in Table 7 of the report (p.40).	addition, the site itself has a very limited footprint (less than 50 ha), with no identified groundwater users in the vicinity and no formally recognised groundwater dependent ecosystems. In this setting, the benefits of a numerical model would be negligible relative to the level of effort, assumptions, and uncertainty involved. A more targeted, conceptual approach to understanding groundwater conditions provides a more proportionate and technically robust basis for assessing groundwater considerations at this site. ii and iii. Data up to May 2024 are include in C&R EA Amendment Groundwater and Surface Water Impact Assessment Report. Hydrogeology RFI Response (Appendix 5) Section 4 - Groundwater conceptual model discusses in detail the current groundwater conceptual flow model with the additional bores located to affirm our understanding. Water quality datasets are provided and contain further data since the interim limits were derived. Interim groundwater limits to be confirmed prior to extractive and processing activities. The Water Management Plan will be updated upon finalisation the interim limits, and will also include the final detail of the new groundwater bores. The recommended new EA condition is: *Interim groundwater quality limits will be finalised prior to the commencement of extractive and processing activities or April 2026 (whichever is earlier) and provided to the administering authority.*

Item	Reference	Matter	Information Request	Mineral Project Response
				iv. Raw surface water and groundwater quality data is provided in Appendix 6.
EA5.	Dianne Copper Mine Recommencement Project Environmental Authority Amendment Application Environment Assessment Report	Further to the above points, the application material states that the water quality objectives within the DCM EA will be updated to be site specific objectives once sufficient data has been collected, which is expected to occur in 2024. The data from the first and second sampling events from 2024 have been included, but data points are insufficient to establish site-specific surface water trigger values.	Provide all available water quality data for surface and groundwater, in support of, and as detailed above.	Raw surface water and groundwater quality data is provided in Appendix 6.
EA6.	Appendix 1 Dianne Copper Mine – Waste Rock Management Plan	The current monitoring program on site includes 10 surface water and 5 groundwater locations. This is proposed to be increased to include newly constructed features. There is no information on the location, intensity and the objectives to be achieved through the monitoring program. It is noted that Figure 8 proposes 11 surface water monitoring points and 2 groundwater bores, with no monitoring coverage for most of the mine features (e.g. no monitoring around pit area, Waste Rock Dump (WRD) or Run of Mine (RoM) area).	Provide a comprehensive assessment of the groundwater system that captures the potential pathways and impacts from all the proposed mine features. This requires: i) Inclusion of further monitoring bores upgradient and downgradient of each key structure (e.g. pit, WRD, heap leach pads, processing plant and settling/release dam), with justification of bore placements (e.g. between the mine features and sensitive receptors); and ii) Baseline data of at least 18 months (if monitored 1-2 monthly) to allow for understanding the groundwater system and potential seasonality impacts.	Hydrogeology RFI Response (Appendix 5) Section 3 - Groundwater conceptual model discusses in detail the current groundwater conceptual flow model with the additional bores located to affirm our understanding. i. Hydrogeology RFI Response (Appendix 5) Section 6. ii. Hydrogeology RFI Response (Appendix 5) Section 6. As of September 2025 - eight historical data points are available from the existing monitoring network (DCM_GW01, DCM_GW02, and DCM_GW03). These provide a foundation for establishing interim groundwater contaminant limits, which will be implemented ahead of extractive and processing activities. In parallel, monthly monitoring of the new bores (GW05–GW11) will be undertaken to

Item	Reference	Matter	Information Request	Mineral Project Response
				further strengthen the dataset prior to operations commencing.
EA7.	Appendix 3 Dianne Copper Mine Groundwater and Surface Water Impact Assessment Report	There are no groundwater dependent ecosystems identified through the standard mapping systems. However, the presence of regional riparian vegetation communities (with greater zones around Gum Creek) that rely on the ephemeral watercourses suggests that there may be indirect groundwater dependence. The deep-rooted Melaleuca and Eucalyptus would tap into shallow water tables and perched aquifers.	Provide an assessment of seasonal surface water persistence and potential baseflow contributions to the Regional Ecosystems within and surrounding the site.	The climate at Dianne Copper Mine is characterised by extended dry periods (May–October) with no stream flow, and wet seasons (November–April) with sustained rainfall and consistent flows. Waterways associated with the project site are either ephemeral or intermittent dependent on their connectivity to groundwater seeps. South Creek (also called Gum Creek tributary) flow data from the 2024–2025 wet season (and detailed in C&R (2025) shows short flows occurred throughout the wet season, with most events occurring between November and February. These short peaks reflect rainfall events within the upper catchment area. The data suggests that the system is ephemeral, with flows quickly falling back to zero following the cessation of the corresponding rainfall event. However, due to the natural shifting of the low-flow channel within the creek bed caused by high seasonal flows, baseflows may often be missed by the gauge, suggesting the system should be considered intermittent. During the updates of the water management system for the project, including remediation of the Settling Dam, both the flow gauges will be reviewed and if necessary, repositioned for the project. In parallel, the setting in the creek of the flow gauges will be investigated to see if they can

Item	Reference	Matter	Information Request	Mineral Project Response
				be lowered in the channel. It should be noted that it is only low flow events that the existing flow gauge location in the creek does not pick up, and during these low flow events, a release from the Settling Dam (Release Dam) is extremely unlikely. Prior to the availability of flow data (pre-2024), photographic and visual evidence was utilised and indicated that the system was intermittent, with baseflows persisting in the system for extended periods (up to 1 month) following rainfall runoff flow events. These extended baseflows are expected to be related to groundwater seeps in the upper catchment area. Additionally, due to the presence of bedrock throughout South Creek's reaches pooled water can persist throughout much of the year (i.e. up to ¾ of the year) at various locations. Full detail is provided in Appendix 5.
EA8.	Appendix 3 Dianne Copper Mine Groundwater and Surface Water Impact Assessment Report	Several sections of the report provide evidence that the seepage is likely accruing downstream of MAW dam (e.g. higher sulphate in monitoring sites S6, S9, S11 and S12 compared with the rest of the monitoring locations – section 6.2.2). The report highlights that the concentration of toxicants in the receiving environment of South Creek were significantly higher than the background levels. This also confirms the likelihood of downstream water quality being influenced by the potential seepage from the MAW within the settling dam. The information further confirms the likelihood of	Detail all and propose any additional management and mitigation measures to address the apparent seepage of mine-affect water from the MAW dam, and any other affected dams.	Detailed in Appendix 7 Release Dam Upgrade Construction Methodology.

Item	Reference	Matter	Information Request	Mineral Project Response
		surface water and groundwater interactions on site.		
EA9.	Appendix 3 Dianne Copper Mine Groundwater and Surface Water Impact Assessment Report	The reported groundwater monitoring network and data is a limiting factor in identifying and enabling an understanding of the groundwater behaviour and its interaction with the site. Based on the information provided, the network is unable to define the groundwater gradients or drawdown contours. There are no bores to the east of the pit or around the proposed WRD which limits the ability to capture a baseline for comparison of impacts in future. There are no bores between the main features such as heap leach pads and the pit or the processing plant, or the RoM, or the WRD – This does not allow for any delineation of potential source of contamination and/or localised impacts. This limiting factor also questions the proposed mitigation strategies (stated to be part of the site water management plan). There is limited vertical profiling and therefore limited capacity to capture information on potential pathways to the groundwater system and potential downstream users. For these reasons, the conclusion of limited impact on the surface water and groundwater environmental values identified in the project area (statement included in section 8 of the report) is not supported. There is no demonstration of the consideration of water quality objectives and the Australian and New Zealand Guidelines	Provide a comprehensive assessment of the groundwater system that captures the potential pathways and impacts from all the proposed mine features. This would require: i) Inclusion of further monitoring bores upgradient and downgradient of each key structure (e.g. pit, WRD, heap leach pads, processing plant and settling/release dam), with justification of bore placements (e.g. between the mine features and sensitive receptors). ii) Baseline data of at least 18 months (if monitored 1-2 monthly) to allow for understanding the groundwater system and potential seasonality impacts. iii) Appropriate groundwater operational monitoring locations, monitoring frequency, quality characteristics and limits that are fit for purpose and capable of identifying contamination from all disturbed areas. iv) An updated monitoring program that specifies frequency of water quality monitoring at sufficient intervals to be suitable to monitor for potential impacts and to detect potential changes indicating controls are not adequate or other intervention is required. v) Demonstrate how the water quality objectives and the ANZG 2018 guidelines have been considered.	Hydrogeology RFI Response (Appendix 5) Section 6 including the additional monitoring network and monitoring regime to ensure sufficient data is gathered prior to extractive activities.

Item	Reference	Matter	Information Request	Mineral Project Response
		for Fresh and Marine Water Quality (ANZG 2018).	vi) Groundwater modelling showing potential drawdown zone, and potential changes to groundwater level, including vertical profiling. vii) Information regarding groundwater impacts to potential downstream users	
EA10.	Appendix 3 Dianne Copper Mine Groundwater and Surface Water Impact Assessment Report	The application is unclear as to the contaminants of concern (CoC) that pose a risk to environmental values of the receiving groundwater environment. These should also be consistent with (or in addition to) the CoC for the surface water environment. The application is unclear as to the extent of Groundwater modelling and the demonstration of any potential drawdown zone, and/or potential changes to groundwater level.	Provide an identification of Contaminants of Concern (CoC) that pose a risk to environmental values of the receiving groundwater environment. The CoCs should be consistent with the parameters monitored for surface water (i.e. to determine any interaction between surface and groundwater), and a description of the following: i) source, pathway and fate of contaminants that have the potential to impact environmental values; ii) infiltration and seepage intervention and collection controls; iii) surface water diversions and long-term management requirements; iv) dewatering requirements; and v) on-going water management and reduction requirements (i.e. treatment).	All identified contaminants will be managed to reduce any risk of impacts to environmental values. Management measures in place for the project include: • Routine monitoring • Upgrade of the mine water management system • Progressive rinsing of spent ore • Processing area being fully contained in lined ponds/pads Key Contaminants of Concern have been identified as: • Copper • Arsenic • Sulphate • Aluminium • Manganese • Ferric Sulphate • Unbalanced pH The details for Contaminants of Concern and mitigation measures are contained with Section 5 of Appendix 2 Supplementary Information.

Item	Reference	Matter	Information Request	Mineral Project Response
				In addition, Hydrogeology RFI Response (Appendix 5) Section 5 describes potential pathways for contaminant migrant and Table 6 identifies the monitoring regime which will be in place to monitor for contaminant migration.
EA11.	Appendix 2 Dianne Copper Mine Water Management Plan	Figure 4.1 in the Water Management Plan shows a catchment boundary line for the contributing catchment upstream of the Settling Dam (to be renamed the Release Dam). However, the area (in km^2) of the catchment area was not provided. The emphasis in Section 5.3.2.2 is on the annual volumes of water released; not on the potential instantaneous rate of discharge from the Release Dam, which is what determines the required spillway capacity. The total catchment area upstream of the Release Dam would have had to be known, for insertion into the water balance modelling which is discussed in Section 5 of the Water Management Plan. Water management model parameters are discussed in Section 5; but without mention of actual catchment areas contributing. The Water Management Plan contains information on the total annual volumes of water discharging through and around Release Dam. However, it lacks information on the maximum flood discharge and instantaneous rate of discharge.	i) Provide the area (in km^2) for the contributing catchment area upstream of the Settling Dam (to be renamed the Release Dam). ii) Provide data on the potential instantaneous rate of discharge from the Release Dam, and how this was calculated to determine the required spillway capacity. iii) Under a 0.1% AEP, provide estimate of the maximum flood discharge which could occur in the Release Dam, including the instantaneous rate of discharge.	i. Catchment areas are detailed in Section 2 of the updated Water Management Plan (Appendix 8). ii. Instantaneous rates of discharge are provided in Section 3.3.1 of the updated Water Management Plan (Appendix 8). iii. Flood details, including 0.1% AEP and 1% AEP and rates of discharge, are detailed in Section 3 of the updated Water Management Plan (Appendix 8).
EA12.	Dianne Copper Mine Recommencement Project	The application does not contain information on temporary/permanent watercourse diversions, however they are	Provide information regarding the proposed watercourse diversions planned and	Based on the Water Act definitions of a watercourse and drainage feature and the onsite observations, the unnamed tributary

Item	Reference	Matter	Information Request	Mineral Project Response
	Environmental Authority Amendment Application Environment Assessment Report	expected to be required based on this information provided in the application. For example, the Heap Leach Pads are proposed to be in a valley where there would surface water control issues and heightened risk to receiving environment. Watercourse diversions should comply with the Department of Natural Resources, Mines and Energy Guideline: "*Works that interfere with water in a watercourse for a resource activity— watercourse diversions authorised under the* Water Act 2000*"*.	required for the project. Include information on: i) Provide information and drawings outlining the design of the water diversion(s), both permanent and / or temporary; ii) How any permanent watercourse diversion is to be designed and operated to ensure that it is stable, self-sustaining and does not impact on the adjoining upstream and downstream reaches of the existing watercourse; and describe how it will meet the requirements for functional design, design plan and operation and monitoring plan of permanent watercourse diversions. iii) Any temporary watercourse diversion, and how it meets similar outcomes as required for permanent watercourse diversions, however, a temporary watercourse diversion is not expected to be self-sustaining or incorporate natural features typical of local watercourses. iv) Any interactions between surface water diversions, the Heap Leach Pads, and the watercourse bed within which the Heap Leach Pads are proposed to be located. Describe management controls and measures to ensure mine affected water is kept separate from clean runoff.	(and associated tributaries) meets the criteria for classification as a drainage feature. Therefore, no diversions are required for the recommencement of operations at Dianne Copper Mine. A full assessment is provided in Appendix 4.

Item	Reference	Matter	Information Request	Mineral Project Response
			v) Any authorisations required / lodged under the *Water Act 2000*, relevant approval of the diversion, and long-term management requirements.	
EA13.	Appendix 14 Acid consuming properties of Dianne heap leach ore Appendix 13 Geochemistry Report for the Dianne Copper	Heap Leach column testing results. The information the department received with the application on 24 February included a report which gave results for two leach columns, and partial results for the remaining two. The application does not address or make clear how the requirements of Schedule 8 of the Environmental Protection Regulation 2019 (EP Reg) will be achieved. In particular, Schedule 8, Part 3, Division 1, Water, Performance Outcome 2(e) as below; *(e) acid producing rock will be managed to ensure that the production and release of acidic waste is prevented or minimised, including impacts during operation and after the environmental authority has been surrendered;*	i) The results on the remaining two leach columns. ii) Demonstration that the project has been designed and how it will be operated to meet the requirements of Schedule 8 of the EP Reg. Including, but not limited to, Schedule 8, Part 3, Division 1, Water, Performance Outcome 2(e) as below; *(e) acid producing rock will be managed to ensure that the production and release of acidic waste is prevented or minimised, including impacts during operation and after the environmental authority has been surrendered;*	i) This is provided as Annexure 2.2 of Appendix 9, Dianne Copper Mine Waste Rock Management Plan. ii) Mineral Resources has undertaken extensive test work on samples that represent all waste rock streams for the project (overburden, mined ore and the existing waste rock stockpile). This test work has demonstrated that approximately 5% of total mined tonnage is at risk of being PAF or PAF-LC material. Primary ore types (high pyritic sulphur) are not anticipated / observed within the current pit schedule and hence short-term releases of metals and metalloids are not expected. As part of the WRMP at Appendix 9, any discrete volumes of moderate to high pyritic S content material that could be PAF or PAF-LC, if present, will be identified ahead of mining. Small material tonnages will be easily segregated and covered to control infiltration prior to emplacement within a non-oxidising environment either within the back-filled pit as per the Final Landform and Cover Design Report (Appendix 10).
EA14.	Appendix 1 Dianne Copper Mine –	The planned activities are mining of the overburden and waste rock and heap	i) Provide a complete waste rock characterisation of the existing WRD	i)

Item	Reference	Matter	Information Request	Mineral Project Response
	Waste Rock Management Plan Appendix 7 Dianne Copper Mine – Final Landform & Cover Design	leaching of ore. The WRM plan states that any material mined from the pit that is below the ore cutoff grade of 0.25% copper will be classified as waste rock and will be used (for construction) or deposited of in an out of pit WRD or for backfilling the mined open pit/void. The EA includes conditions for an 'Action Plan' to manage existing WRD, part of which also requires a waste rock characterisation, condition D6 (C (iii)). There is an existing WRD with a capacity of 0.4Mt after reshaping. A WRD characterisation was conducted in 2020, as per section 5.2 of the plan. The block model based on the average sulphur content of the material shows less than 2% of material having higher than 0.5% sulphur content. It is unclear how the average sulphur content for areas with no auger samples was determined. There is a risk with averaging across areas with no samples, as it does not consider the spatial variability, and therefore may lead to missing the potential high sulphur zones entirely. The WRD plan states that prior to construction of the new WRD, the designs plan will be completed which would include geotechnical analysis and proposed placement of potentially acid forming (PAF) material. A detailed characterisation of the existing waste and/or the potential waste to be stockpiled (e.g. spent ore from the pit) is not provided. The metrics of the existing WRD are unclear, and what will be excavated out	and the material from the pit to be deposited in the new WRD. ii) Provide information on the static sulphur testing on selection of samples across depth and location within the existing WRD. iii) Provide an updated assessment of this characterisation and comparison of worst-case scenario with the lower risk scenarios for taking conservative approaches. iv) Provide information on the characterisation and the geotechnical stability of the spent ore.	*a – Material from existing WRD* A detailed and comprehensive auger sampling program was completed in 2020 on the existing WRS. The stockpile is comprised of predominantly (~95%) low Cu grade material consistent with the oxidised halo of 'Green Hills' mineralisation surrounding the current historical pit excavation mixed with minor (~5%) waste oxide supergene material associated with the high-grade Main Ore lens (Dianne Mining Corporation Pty Ltd, 2022). Further detail is provided in Appendix 9 and Annexure 1. *b – Ore from Mining* Test work on representative heap leach residue samples suggests such that most post-leached ores will be geochemically benign in terms of acid forming characteristics. As the leach pads will be flushed to remove residual acidity and neutralised prior to emplacement in dedicated waste facilities, the heap leach residue is not anticipated to be a source of adverse drainage water quality. Staged (4) water extraction testwork on the composite leach residue samples (using an unbuffered water source similar to what will be used in leaching operations) showed a decrease of metals and metalloids with sequential leaching and typically approached negligible to low concentrations by stage four. Staged (4) peroxide extraction testwork on the same composite leach residue samples also

Item	Reference	Matter	Information Request	Mineral Project Response
		of the old pit. Furthermore, it is unclear whether waste rock characterisation that was completed in 2020 on the existing WRD has also considered testing the material from the open pit to be labelled as WRD. It is proposed that the spent ore (post heap leaching process) will also be deposited in the new WRD and/or used as backfill in the mined pit. Information on the characterisation of this material is not provided.		demonstrated the residual waste is unlikely to release significant metals or metaloids under strongly oxidised conditions. Primary ore types (high pyritic sulphur) are not observed or anticipated within the current pit schedule and hence short-term releases of metals and metalloids are not expected. Further detail is provided in Appendix 9 and Annexure 2. *c – Waste from Mining* For the waste material that reports directly to construction activities on the new WRS, Seventeen (17) representative composite waste samples have been analysed for acid neutralising capacity (ANC); single addition and sequential Net Acid Generation (NAG) tests; single and 4-stage batch water extractions and peroxide extractions; pH/EC and acidity/alkalinity titration; and Acid-Buffering Characteristic Curve (ABCC) testing at EGI's laboratory in Castle Hill, NSW. Total sulphur, Chromium Reducible Sulphur (CRS), total carbon, organic carbon, multi element of solids analyses were carried out by NATA accredited Australian Laboratory Services (ALS), Brisbane, QLD. Multi-element analyses on liquors from water and peroxide extractions were carried out by ALS, Smithfield, NSW. The broader waste characterisation testwork on oxide Greenhills composite samples demonstrated no significant readily available acidity or salinity up to elevated levels of 1% Total S).

Item	Reference	Matter	Information Request	Mineral Project Response
				Sulphur speciation test work (comprising Total sulphur and sulphur forms) undertaken by Environmental Consultants EGI on waste supports the geological logging observations that the majority of S present in the oxide zone throughout the deposit is not present as pyritic sulphur. The results of the completed test work suggest that most waste rock represented by the samples tested will be geochemically benign (i.e., NAF) and not likely adversely influence watershed water quality within and around the mine. They are also likely to be suitable for outer rehabilitation layers of mine waste landforms at closure. Further detail is provided in Appendix 9 and Annexure 2. ii) This data is provide at Annexure 1 of Appendix 9. Static sulphur testing on the existing waste rock stockpile, results estimate that less than 1.5% of the material contained in this waste rock stockpile contained higher than 0.2% sulphur (within global average of <0.05% Total S). Under AMD classification, all samples with S values of less than or equal to 0.05% S are classified as NAF due to negligible risk of acid formation. iii) In a worst-case scenario, where they may be small tonnages of PAF or PAF-LC in existing WRS, as the test work also demonstrates economic concentrations of copper in the current waste stockpile, a lower risk scenario is presented in the current development plan as it proposes to move and treat the current waste stockpile through the leach pads thereby mitigating AMD risk by

Item	Reference	Matter	Information Request	Mineral Project Response
				treating any minor currently unrecognised PAF material. As the observed material types within the existing WRS are consistent with the composite samples provided/analysed as broader deposit Waste Geochemical Assessment, it is proposed that the level of AMD risk of the existing WRS has been appropriately assessed by additional test work undertaken to understand the PAF attributes of the residual leached material (REFER EA13). iv) For characterisation of spent ore, refer to i) *b – Ore from Mining* within this response above. For geotechnical stability of the spent ore, the WRS final landform has a factor of safety of 1.6 (Blackrock Mining Services Report September 2025) with the spent ore mixed in with the mined waste.
EA15.	Appendix 7 Dianne Copper Mine – Final Landform & Cover Design	The final landform report includes information on the geotechnical stability of the WRD. However, the report indicates that the assessment is based on literature information and no foundation or WRD material investigation. The report notes that the geochemical characterisation of the WRD is out of scope of the report. The placement and compaction method for the PAF material is suggested to be incapsulated in the interior of the landform. However, there is no information on the estimated volume/percentage of the PAF	i) Provide clarification on how conservative parameters were adopted for the WRD stability assessment. Clarify whether suitability and availability of material prior to construction is assessed. ii) Provide a geochemical stability analysis that assesses the impact from the proposed new WRD that includes: • the waste rock characterisation of all material to be placed in the WRD (acid producing potential, pH and EC, leachable material, etc)	i) Under the proposed Final Landform Design (Appendix 10), the material balance at closure of the WRD will be approximately 1.1 Mt of waste. A geotechnical stability assessment has demonstrated that the lowest factor of safety for a batter face is 1.6 (Blackrock Mining Services, 2025) which is conservative c.f. a minimum FoS of 1.3. A Slaked Durability test for a representative sample of waste rock resulted in 98.1% material retained on the first cycle and 96.5% retained on the second cycle.

Item	Reference	Matter	Information Request	Mineral Project Response
		and non acid forming (NAF) material and the subsurface conditions (foundation or settlement risk). No geotechnical testing or sampling was carried out for the assessment, only recommendations for testing in future is provided. The stability assessment was undertaken based on the assumption that non-hazardous material will be dumped within the WRD. It is not clear how conservative parameters were adopted for the stability assessment.	• kinetic testing and geochemical modelling (what will leach out and how fast, especially under rainfall infiltration).	ii) Geochemical stability analysis has been undertaken on Seventeen (17) representative composite waste samples (analysed for acid neutralising capacity (ANC); single addition and sequential Net Acid Generation (NAG) tests; single and 4-stage batch water extractions and peroxide extractions; pH/EC and acidity/alkalinity titration; and Acid-Buffering Characteristic Curve (ABCC) testing at EGI's laboratory in Castle Hill, NSW. Total sulphur, Chromium Reducible Sulphur (CRS), total carbon, organic carbon, multi element of solids analyses were carried out by NATA accredited Australian Laboratory Services (ALS), Brisbane, QLD. Multi-element analyses on liquors from water and peroxide extractions were carried out by ALS, Smithfield, NSW. The results of the test work suggest that all materials forming the final WRD will be geochemically benign in terms of acid forming characteristics (i.e., all composite samples were classified as NAF), and short-term water contact with such materials is not likely to result in particularly adverse drainage water quality. Water extraction testing across all weathering zones (oxide, transitional and fresh) indicate only slightly elevated concentrations of certain elements (aluminum, copper, chromium, fluoride, iron, lead, zinc, arsenic cobalt, cadmium) after contact with initial mixing / infiltration with an unbuffered water source. The slightly elevated screening criteria were fresh-water ecosystem protection values, consistent with the 95% level of protection

Item	Reference	Matter	Information Request	Mineral Project Response
				values (ANZG 2018) or a suitably conservative estimate alternate freshwater ecosystem / beneficial water use protection value. During the LOM, the test work indicates that the majority of waste material is deemed suitable for outer rehabilitation layers of mine waste temporary landforms and at closure. Confirmation of any minor high pyritic S content materials that may be subsequently identified will, as part of an AMD management plan during construction and prior to commencement of operations, can adequately be contained within significant volumes of NAF waste material (Section 8.2). Full detail is provided in Appendices 9 and 10.
EA16.	Appendix 1 Dianne Copper Mine – Waste Rock Management Plan	i) The general description of soil in the area is provided in section 3.5 is brief and difficult to link to the various sections of the project on site. ii) The soil information concludes that majority of the soils sampled are not overly susceptible to erosion based on the physical and chemical properties observed. However, detailed observations were not provided. This raises concerns, for example if the soil type has high bulk density can limit infiltration but increases the runoff and erosion.	i) Provide soil types information across the site as a colour-coded figure and in accordance with the Australian Soil Classification (ASC) system. ii) Provide descriptive information that relates to erosion risk factors to verify the conclusions. This must include information on soil texture and structure, bulk density, soil infiltration rate, and stability.	A detailed Soils Report is provided in Appendix 11. The Soils Report includes: • A figure showing soil types across the project disturbance footprint (Figure 2) • Additional samples and results from the ROM area (Sections 2.2 and 3.2) • Description of erosivity indicators in relation to Emerson aggregate tests and exchangeable sodium percent and sodium adsorption ratios (Section 3.1.3).

Item	Reference	Matter	Information Request	Mineral Project Response
				Additional detail on the erosion risk factors is provided in Appendix 10 – Final Landform and Cover Design Report Section 4.2.
EA17.	Appendix 1 Dianne Copper Mine – Waste Rock Management Plan	i) The application is not clear on the soil description relating to EC tests of soil samples from the RoM area. However, the application does not provide the relevant information. Furthermore, no leach testing results have been provided in relation to this material. ii) The management plan notes the EC levels are extreme. Given the highly acidic nature of the soil in this area and high level of EC there is a high likelihood of metal leaching.	i) Provide information on the EC level and toxicants such as metals/metalloids from the soil samples in the ROM area. ii) Provide results of further leach testing analysis on ROM material to help understand how the metals mobilise over time.	A detailed Soils Report is provided in Appendix 11. The Soils Report includes: • Additional samples and results from the ROM area (Section 2.2) • Description of EC and toxicants from the ROM samples (Section 3.2) • These additional results indicate that the extreme EC level in the 2024 sample was an outlier due to being an existing disturbed location. ii) Mineral Resources has undertaken extensive test work on samples that represent all waste rock streams for the project (overburden, mined ore and the existing waste rock stockpile). This test work has demonstrated that approximately 5% of total mined tonnage is at risk of being PAF or PAF-LC material. Primary ore types (high pyritic sulphur) are not anticipated / observed within the current pit schedule and hence short-term releases of metals and metalloids are not expected. As part of the WRMP at Appendix 9, any discrete volumes of moderate to high pyritic S content material that could be PAF or PAF-

Item	Reference	Matter	Information Request	Mineral Project Response
				LC, if present, will be identified ahead of mining. Small material tonnages will be easily segregated and covered to control infiltration prior to emplacement within a non-oxidising environment either within the back-filled pit as per the WRMP (Appendix 9).
EA18.	Appendix 3 Dianne Copper Mine Groundwater and Surface Water Impact Assessment Report	The proposal provides limited information to describe the hydrogeology of the Dianne Copper Mine Project Site including hydraulic conductivity or the current or potential future connection to surrounding groundwater and surface waters. It is indicated that the total depth of the proposed pit will be 124m, however no information on its potential cross section/s with the underlaying geological structure is provided. Section 3.2 provides description of the geology around the area. It is evident that the pit likely will intersect the groundwater system. The information is indicative of structural complexity and highlights the presence of faults and intrusive bodies. The secondary fault that trends west-northwest may create zone of structural weakness and act as preferential groundwater flow paths, which potentially could result in water ingress into the pit but also it can create localised sulphide mineralisation which can increase acid mine drainage (AMD) risk. However, the elevated bedrock plateau location of the site, with intense fracturing and faulting in the area can limit the groundwater inflows to the pit (e.g. likely water will flow vertically to deeper aquifers, high risk of seepage). In	Provide a hydrogeological conceptual model to understand and describe potential risks from the project to the groundwater system. This model needs to provide the relevant information requirements (including contemporary information) as follows: i) determination of the groundwater occurrence including the existence of, and depth to, aquifers and aquitards ii) location of groundwater recharge and discharge locations locally and regionally iii) groundwater quality within each of the aquifers and from surface expressions (i.e. seeps and springs) iv) current and potential future uses of groundwater including existing groundwater extraction bores v) groundwater flow direction and velocity, including field tests to determine hydraulic conductivity	Hydrogeology RFI Response (Appendix 5) addresses several of these points while also outlining how these will be addressed. i) - known for current bores, additional bores will confirm. ii) - recharge locally identified and displayed within conceptual model. iii) - no identifiable 'aquifers' due to the preferential pathways - detailed within conceptual model. iv) - No identified users within 30 km radius (Section 5.5) v) - Hydraulic tests completed in August 2025 and results were incorporated into the conceptual model with the additional bores. vi) Potentiometric mapping will provide greater certainty with the additional bore network, although cautiously applied due to the geological complexity creating discontinuities - will need to be combined with structural mapping. vii) Refer to EA10 response. The conceptual model guides the positioning of additional

Item	Reference	Matter	Information Request	Mineral Project Response
		addition, the potential joints and fractures developed through multiple deformation events creates high potential for surface water and groundwater interaction (e.g. surface runoffs can infiltrate quickly through fractures and increase recharge rate).	vi) the development of potentiometric mapping and hydro stratigraphic cross sections vii) groundwater modelling to determine contaminant transport and potential changes to groundwater level from dewatering or waste storage.	bores to enable the detection of any contaminant transport and changes to groundwater levels.
EA19.	Appendix 3 Dianne Copper Mine Groundwater and Surface Water Impact Assessment Report	Without an understanding of the hydrological intersections with the site features, particularly the pit expansion, it is impossible to estimate whether there is a potential drawdown or change in inflow and outflows of the groundwater system. This limits the identification of potential zone of influence from the pit. The information on outflows will also assist with assessment of risk from WRD and heap leach pads. The application is unclear as to the derivation of the groundwater inflow. It is noted that Section 7.2.3. estimates this value at 32ML/year. However, it is unclear how this value has been estimated.	Provide a water balance model for the site with an estimation of potential inflows and outflows to and from groundwater with consideration of all new expansion features, including the pit, WRD, heap leach pads and processing plant. The estimations must also include post closure scenario.	An updated Water Management Plan, including an updated water balance model for the site including all project water management features and groundwater inflows for both operations and post closure, is provided in Appendix 8.
EA20.	Appendix 12 Dianne Recommencement Project Preliminary Consequence Category Assessment	Detailed and certified Consequence Category Assessments (CCAs) for all structures, dams and levees in accordance with the *Manual for assessing consequence categories and hydraulic performance of structures* (the Manual) is required. The preliminary CCA provided within Appendix 12 is preliminary and limited in relation to its	i) Provide certified CCA for all relevant structures, dams and levees undertaken in accordance with the Manual. ii) Provide a Register of Regulated Structures in the format provided for under the Manual.	i) A final CCA for all relevant structures has been completed and provided in Attachment 12. ii) A Register of Regulated Structures is not required under the Manual.

Item	Reference	Matter	Information Request	Mineral Project Response
		assessment risks associated with each structure.		
EA21.	Appendix 3 Dianne Copper Mine Groundwater and Surface Water Impact Assessment Report	Water quality – The negative impact to the water quality of the receiving environment downstream of the current settling dam on site is evident. For example, the GW-SW report presents significantly higher concentrations of EC and metals such as copper in AQ03 compared with AQ06 (section 6.2.3). AQ03 is located downstream of Gum Creek and within the surface water monitoring network of the site and AQ06 is an upstream location in upper catchment of Gum Creek. The report also highlights the significantly high levels of copper and zinc in downstream monitoring location in South Creek. It is suggested that the exceedances are associated with the potential seepage from the settling dam and also overtopping during the heavy rainfall event in 2024 (section 6.2.3). The assessment of this impact is not considered.	Provide information on: i) the settling dam sediment characteristics, information on the volume and depth of sediments. ii) How the project will manage and mitigate impacts to the receiving waters, including stream sediments, from the settling dam. iii) The controls to be implemented to minimise the risk of overtopping and seepage from the structure. iv) How any ongoing or additional impacts from the settling dam to the receiving water and/or stream sediments will be monitored. v) Confirm the triggers for any corrective action or remediation.	Full detail on the upgrades to the Settling Dam are provided in Appendix 7. i) the sediments contain elevated levels of metals and have been estimated at 700m3 approximately 1.5m deep in the deepest part. ii) Once the first heap leach pad has been prepared, the sediments referred to in i) above will be relocated to the leach pad as 'over-cushion'. This will place them in a safe, contained environment with similar geochemical contaminants of concern. Large sediment loads are not expected to reach the Release Dam during operations as they will captured and managed in upstream sediment dams. As demonstrated by the geochemical characterisation, only 5% of mined materials are at risk of being PAF, and these are at the end of the mining schedule. As implemented via the WRMP, where possible, PAF will be placed directly into the encapsulation zone. If PAF needs to be temporarily stored, it will be stored where runoff first enters the landfill storage basin and that runoff can be ameliorated there (if necessary) before being released into the sediment system. Water will not be released from the release dam unless it meets the Water Quality

Item	Reference	Matter	Information Request	Mineral Project Response
				Objectives. In circumstances that a release event is imminent and water is outside of the WQO, it will be pumped and stored in the pit. iii) The settlement dam (to be renamed the Release Dam) will be upgraded as described in Appendix 7. This will include a geosynthetic clay liner to prevent seepage and an increase to the wall to increase storage. The dam water levels will be managed in accordance with the water management plan. iv) During release events, water will be sampled and tested at RP01 as shown on drawing J022.200.00-SKE-009.00D-Groundwater Borehole Locations. v) Corrective action and/or remediation will be trigged in the event of a release outside of Water Quality Objectives.
EA22.	Appendix 12 Dianne Recommencement Project Preliminary Consequence Category Assessment	Table 6-1 (section 6.2) The Consequence Category Assessment document states that *"The Release Dam (previously the Settling Dam) will be rebuilt…Contaminated sediment will be stored in a discrete compartment within the new waste rock dump."*	i) Describe the method of storing contaminated sediment within the new waste rock dump ii) Describe the settling dam (to be renamed the Release Dam) sediment characteristics iii) Provide information on the volume and depth of sediments in the settling dam iv) Provide a decommissioning plan and timeframe for the settling dam, including information on the transfer or remediation of contaminants (if left in situ) v) Provide information on post decommissioning flow and predicted	i) The method of storing current sediment in the Release Dam has been modified and the sediment will now be placed over the liner in the leach pads. This will place all contaminants of concern in the same controlled location where they can be managed. ii) This is described in part i) of EA21. iii) This is described in part i) of EA21. iv) This information is provided in Appendix 7. v) This information is provided in Appendix 7.

Item	Reference	Matter	Information Request	Mineral Project Response
			changes in water quality downstream of settling dam.	
EA23.	Appendix 12 Dianne Recommencement Project Preliminary Consequence Category Assessment	The application is unclear regarding the details of the release dam rebuild incorporating a geosynthetic clay layer (GCL) liner and spillway. The following sheets were listed on the plan list, Appendix B, design drawings, but not included: Sheet 11, J022.200.40 – DWG – 001 Release Dam – Plan and Longsection , Rev. C Sheet 12, J022.200.40 – DWG – 002 Release dam – Detail Cross Sections, Rev. A	i) Provide additional details regarding the construction of the release dam rebuild, GCL liner, and spillway, including when it will be built ii) Provide plans: Sheet 11, J022.200.40 – DWG – 001 Release Dam – Plan and Longsection , Rev. C Sheet 12, J022.200.40 – DWG – 002 Release dam – Detail Cross Sections, Rev. A	i) Upgrades to the Settling Dam (Release Dam) are generally as follows to remediate the existing dam and protect water values: • Geosynthetic Clay Liner will be placed down the upstream face of the existing embankment and buried at least 750mm into firm founding material below the toe of the existing embankment. • Selectively sourced fine cohesive fill will be placed to 500mm thickness against the GCL and to 500mm depth 10m out from the toe of the existing embankment. • Saturated sections of the downstream toe fill will be selectively removed and replaced with coarse general fill (also sourced from the same location as the general fill). • A downstream buttress will be constructed with coarse general fill from the pit mining activities. • Sediment will be removed The dam rebuild is targeted for early works within the project construction schedule, pending site weather and water balance conditions. Some of the rebuild works can be undertaken prior to the EA Amendment under the existing EA approval, and Mineral Projects is currently assessing the schedule for that

Item	Reference	Matter	Information Request	Mineral Project Response
				work and discussing with the DETSI Compliance Team. See Appendix 7 Release Dam Upgrade Construction Methodology for more details. ii) These plans are provided in Appendix 1.
EA24.	Appendix 12 Dianne Recommencement Project Preliminary Consequence Category Assessment	The Spillway Capacity for the Release Dam, and the design of the Release Dam Spillway has not been discussed. The Environmental Assessment Report, February 2025, does not include any assessment of the required spillway capacity for the Release Dam.	Provide assessment of the required spillway capacity for the Release Dam during various flood scenarios including the 0.1% AEP. Provide 0.1% AEP modelling for catchment above the Release Dam and Spillway and design storage allowance for the release dam and spillway, as per 1st November guideline.	Flood details, including 0.1% AEP and 1% AEP and rates of discharge, are detailed in Section 3.3 (spillway) and Section 4 (DSA and freeboard) of Appendix 8 and 13.
EA25.	Appendix 12 Dianne Recommencement Project Preliminary Consequence Category Assessment	The Release Dam and Spillway. Due to the contaminated mine affected water upstream, the size of the catchment upstream, the failure to provide sediment protection and potential for the release dam to fill with transported sediment, the Release Dam and Spillway appear to be high risk category, a significant hazard dam.	Provide re-evaluation of the consequence category assessment for the release dam and spillway in terms of 0.1% AEP and considering the modelled catchment in terms of this scenario above the release dam.	Flood details, including 0.1% AEP and 1% AEP and rates of discharge, are detailed in Section 3 of Appendix 8 and 13. As noted in EA21 ii) sediment dams throughout the catchment will prevent mobilisation of sediment to the Release Dam. Further, contaminated water will be contained within the lined process water dam and overflow dams. The consequence category assessment has been updated and re-evaluated for the Release Dam and spillway for a 0.1% AEP event and remains a Low category. A full Consequence Category Assessment is provided at Appendix 10.

Item	Reference	Matter	Information Request	Mineral Project Response
EA26.	Dianne Recommencement Project, Preliminary Consequence Category Assessment,	A comprehensive risk assessment associated with seepage, release of contaminants, overtopping, drainage failure, liner failure, residual cyanide contamination, long-term monitoring and management measures to be in place to minimise environmental impacts has not been provided. It is unclear whether reliance on the functionality of the liner is an appropriate measure to conclude that there will be no contamination to the underlying material and groundwater. It is unclear whether the selected location is suitable for the proposed activity, The presented assessment in the current application generally does not appear to align with best practice environmental management therefore, justification on how the HLP is designed to operate in accordance with leading practice environmental management is required and how the requirements of Schedule 8 of the EP Reg have been met.	i) Given other lower risk (closed system) processing / extraction methods are readily available, provide justification why such measures have been discounted in the context of the risk of environmental harm. ii) Clarify the timeframe over which spent residue will be processed through the HLP and provide justification for the appropriateness of this timeframe considering the risks of unrehabilitated HLP in the environment e.g. presenting an ongoing contaminant source, and an expectation that disturbed land should be progressively rehabilitated. iii) Provide a detailed risk assessment of potential environmental harm associated with the chosen location and operation of the HLP on the environmental values, mitigation measures and management practices proposed to be implemented to minimise adverse environmental harm. Ensure risks such as overflow during heavy rainfall accounts for extreme weather events and climate change impacts, direct or indirect release of contaminants to groundwater from the operation of the activity are included. iv) Provide details of long-term monitoring (monitoring of liners, pads and leachate	i) An assessment of processing/extraction methods was completed, with the proposed Heap Leach, Solvent Extraction and Electrowinning process being the most environmentally responsible of extracting copper from the resource. There is no risk of residual cyanide contamination and the long-term monitoring measures are less than many other processes will require. At closure, the site will consist of rehabilitated level ground, one waste rock stockpile containing benign rock and the pit will be fill and rehabilitated with (potentially) some PAF waste encapsulated within the pit. Further information is provided in Sections 2, 4 and 5 of the Supplementary Report (Appendix 2). ii) The spent residue is expected to stay on the HLP for four weeks after terminal copper recovery is achieved. To clarify the question, there will be no processing once the ore is identified as spent residue. It will be rinsed, tested and removed from the HLP, which is expected to take four weeks. Mineral Projects' justification of this timeframe is based on testwork that has been completed to confirm that rinsing of the spent residual is expect to take two weeks. With regard to rehabilitation, Mineral Projects notes that the HLP is a live processing area and through the mine life once a stockpile of spent residual ore has been removed from the

Item	Reference	Matter	Information Request	Mineral Project Response
			collection systems) and measures in place to monitor residual contaminants in leach and that will prevent or minimise adverse effects to groundwater or any associated surface ecological systems. v) Provide conceptual designs of heap leach facilities including adequate measures to capture seepage (such as seepage interception and drainage) and how it will be isolated and contained in recognising the proposed location within a drainage channel. vi) Provide details of heap leach material. vii) Provide justification on how the HLP is designed to operate in a manner that aligns with best practice environmental management and prevents adverse effects on adjacent areas. viii) Provide the referenced model or additional information on how the capacity of heap leach or storm water ponds were determined.	HLP, a new stockpile will be placed until ore has been leached. As the last stockpiles of ore are progressively removed, progressive rehabilitation of the HLP area will occur. iii) See Section 6.3 of the Supplementary Report (Appendix 2). iv) See Section 6 of the Hydrogeology Report (Appendix 5). v) See drawings: • J022.230.00-DWG-001-B-HEAP LEACH & PROCESS AREA - LAYOUT PLAN & LONG SECTION • J022.230.00-DWG-002-A-HEAP LEACH PADS - TYPICAL SECTIONS & DETAILS • J022.200.00-DWG-003-B-STORMWATER MANAGEMENT LAYOUT PLAN • J022.200.00-DWG-007-A-STORMWATER MANAGEMENT - PROCESS DAMS UNDER DRAINAGE ARRANGEMENT vi) See Section 4.2 of the Supplementary Report (Appendix 2). vii) See Section 6 of the Supplementary Report (Appendix 2).

Item	Reference	Matter	Information Request	Mineral Project Response
				viii) An updated water balance model is provided in the updated Water Management Plan (Section 5.3) in Appendix 8, and includes detail of all water management structures for the project.

EA27.	Schedule 8, EP Reg	The application does not make clear how it meets the matters prescribed under Schedule 8 of the EP Reg.	Provide a full assessment against all matters provided for in Schedule 8 of the EP Reg including details how the performance outcomes have been achieved for all aspects of the amendment.
			
			This must include information necessary to inform the assessment of how the application meets the environmental objectives and performance outcomes of Part 3, Schedule 8. This will need to include all of the following areas at a minimum:
			• Operational assessment—
			  ○ Air;
			  ○ Water;
			  ○ Groundwater;
			  ○ Noise; and
			  ○ Waste;
			• Land use assessment—
			  ○ Site suitability;
			  ○ Location on site; and
			  ○ Critical design requirements.
				An assessment of all matters as prescribed under Schedule 8 Part 3 of the EP Regulations has been completed, with each relevant section describing the management measures in place for the project to protect environmental values.
				• Air – EA EAR Section 14.2 describes the sensitive receptors for the project, and details that there is not anticipated to be any air quality impacts from the project nor adverse impacts to environmental values. Greenhouse gas emissions are also detailed in this section.
				• Surface Water – EA EAR Section 8 describes environmental surface water values of the project site, and details management measures in place to protect these values, including:
				  ○ Water releases are detailed in Section 8.2 and 8.4.
				  ○ Site water management including storm water is detailed in Section 8.3. An

Item	Reference	Matter	Information Request	Mineral Project Response
				updated Water Management Plan has also been provided in Appendix 8. ○ Potential for acid mine drainage is detailed in Section 6.3, with additional detail provided in new Appendix 9 – updated Waste Rock Management Plan; Appendix 10 – updated Final Landform and Cover Design Report. ○ Contaminant storage is detailed in Sections 6.2 and 14.6.1. Section 7 describes wetland values and that there are none within the project site. • Groundwater – EA EAR Section 7 describes the groundwater environmental values of the project site, and management measures in place to protect groundwater environmental values. In addition, Appendix 5 to this document provides further detail on the groundwater model and management measures in place to protect groundwater quality for the project. • Noise – EA EAR Section 14.1 describes the sensitive receptors for

Item	Reference	Matter	Information Request	Mineral Project Response
				the project, and details that there is not anticipated to be any noise auditable from the project nor adverse impacts to environmental values of noise. • Waste – EA EAR Section 14.6 describes non-mining waste for the project, including use of the waste hierarchy and disposal requirements. Waste streams, quantities, and management strategies are all detailed in this section. • Land use assessment – EA EAR Section 2.2 provides detail on the critical design requirements, and site suitability/location.
EA28.	Human Rights Act 2019	Relevant decision makers are required to consider human rights in any decision or action or action taken.	Provide any additional or specific information regarding human rights implications associated with the amendment to ensure the decision maker is fully informed. This may or may not be a relevant matter that you choose to respond to.	The project is strongly supported by the landowner and Traditional Owners of the area, as detailed in Appendix 14 - Traditional Owner Environmental and Cultural Report, and a letter of support is provided as Appendix 14 to this document. The project aligns with the Queensland Government Critical Minerals Strategy, and has received a $1.3M grant from the Queensland Government Critical Minerals and Battery Technology Fund to support further exploration and expedite the recommencement of the mine. The Queensland Critical Minerals and Battery Technology Fund has been established by the

Item	Reference	Matter	Information Request	Mineral Project Response
				Queensland Government to support Australian business to compete globally by enhancing the extraction and processing of critical minerals in Queensland, accelerating the development of battery technologies and production of precursor or advanced materials in Queensland and supporting Queensland jobs and economic growth. These critical minerals projects support the renewable energies transition. In addition, the Project will assist in the rehabilitation of the sites legacy impacts and bring site environmental management to contemporary standards, providing a net benefit for the environment within the mining leases.

Appendix 4 – Information request for matters relating to the Progressive Rehabilitation and Closure Plan and Schedule

Item	Reference	Matter	Information Request	Mineral Project Response
PRCP1.	Dianne Copper Mine, Progressive Rehabilitation and Closure Plan	The justification for this soil stripping is required, in light of the fact that this material has not been included in "*Table 3 Preliminary Soil Material Balance"* (section 2.1.9 *"Other Disturbance Areas will have minor disturbance, so for a conservative material balance it is assumed no topsoil stripping"*) and that there is sufficient material according to this ("*The preliminary material balance shows that there is sufficient topsoil/subsoil for use in rehabilitation"*) without the need for the inclusion of stripping these areas. It is unclear what the proposed process of rehabilitation to return the stripped areas to a PMLU of cattle grazing, given the following information: i) there is no provision for topsoil replacement for the 27.8 ha of minor disturbance for stock feed and vegetation to grow in, ii) no method has been provided to reestablish the identified environmental values for this area, iii) the required topsoil replacement source for rehabilitation has not been identified (PRCP document Page 41 states "*It is not anticipated that import of topsoil will be required due to initial positive rehabilitation outcomes, risk of importing pests, weeds and disease, economic constraints, distance from substantial topsoil resources.*"), and	i) Provide proposed rehabilitation methodology of the new disturbance areas for a PMLU of cattle grazing, including a schedule as to methods to replicate the identified environmental values. ii) Provide the source, quantity and haul distance from site of the topsoil for rehabilitation of the new disturbance areas. iii) Provide methodology for avoidance of MSES 1.042 ha of remnant vegetation intersecting a watercourse. iv) Provide a list of all the areas which are planned to have topsoil stripped, the size of the areas, and the depth of stripping (≥200mm) for each area, v) Provide a list of all the areas for which an additional stripping of clay material, below the topsoil for an additional 500mm depth is planned, including the size of each area. vi) Provide details of erosion mitigation measures proposed for the topsoil / clay stripping, particularly in terms of erosion and sediment control.	All areas of new disturbance for the project will be stripped of topsoil (to an average of 200 mm), stockpiled and used in rehabilitation. The Other Disturbance Areas have not been included in the soil material balance as much of these areas will not be disturbed for the project (e.g. much of this area is buffer zones). However, any disturbance within these areas will undergo the same management as other disturbance areas – i.e. topsoil stripped to 200 mm, to then be stockpiled and used in rehabilitation. i. Detailed rehabilitation methodology for PMLU grazing is provided in PRCP 2.4.1 and PRCP Table 6, and includes: • Decommissioning of infrastructure • Rehabilitation of mine water management structures (other than those being retained for use in cattle grazing) • Remediation of contaminated land • Landform development, reshaping, and revegetation to a vegetation type similar to that of pre-disturbance and surrounding areas. Additional

Item	Reference	Matter	Information Request	Mineral Project Response
		iv) The Mattes of state environmental significance (MSES) tool identified within the study area consists of regulated vegetation intersecting a watercourse. It is estimated that up to 1.042 ha of remnant vegetation intersecting a watercourse may be affected by the proposed development. No detail as to how these areas are to be avoided has been provided. The application is unclear is whether topsoil stripping in 'Other Disturbance' areas is planned and proposed in accordance with best practice and if it would incur more disturbance that necessary. It is also unclear if this stripping method is proposed to supplement the overall site's available topsoil reserves. It is noted that section 2.1 of the PRCP identifies these areas are to include 'minor' disturbance in the form of access tracks, powerlines and pipelines. However, section 2.1.9 of PRCP also states that topsoil and subsoil will be stripped to a minimum of 200mm for *"...all new disturbance for the project."*		detail on topsoil has been included per item PRCP13. • Establishment of vegetation suitable for low density cattle grazing Additional detail on PLMU grazing and PMLU native ecosystem has been included in Section 2.3.1 of the PRCP as follows: *As PMLU grazing is for remote, low density cattle numbers, per the existing landowner operations, PMLU grazing and PMLU native ecosystem both have the same rehabilitation methodology once areas are reshaped, as outlined in Table 6 and the PRCP Schedule. The notable difference in rehabilitation methodology is the post-mining inclusion of cattle or to exclude cattle, respectively. The rehabilitation methodology for both PMLU's have outcomes of the same vegetation types and environmental values post-mining.* ii. The preliminary soil material balance is provided in PRCP Table 3, which provides source and quantity of topsoil to be stripped for the project for use in rehabilitation. Haul distances have been included in Section 2.1.10 of the PRCP. *The haul distance across the entire project disturbance area is less than 1,000 m, and between topsoil*

Item	Reference	Matter	Information Request	Mineral Project Response
				stripping areas and topsoil stockpiles it is an average of 230 m, ranging from 200 m between the overburden stockpile and the adjacent topsoil stockpile, 185 m from the pit to the adjacent topsoil stockpile, and 300 m from the processing area to the nearest topsoil stockpile. Conversely, the haul distance between topsoil stockpiles and rehabilitation areas is an average of 230 m. iii. The existing disturbance area has already been developed within the VM Act mapped drainage line, prior to the VM Act being established, including the Raw Water Dam, Settling Dam, and waste rock stockpile. Therefore, the drainage line has not had any aquatic ecology values since the Dianne Copper Mine operations were originally developed in the late 1970's. Hence, the project redeveloping these areas would not create any additional or new impacts to these habitats. This has been assessed in detail in the Aquatic Ecology Report, Appendix 5 of the original Environmental Authority Amendment Application Environmental Assessment Report. iv. A soil material balance is provided in PRCP Table 3, and has been updated to reflect amendments in this IR.

Item	Reference	Matter	Information Request	Mineral Project Response
				v. Generally, the soils within the project site have light to medium clay B horizons (Section 3.1.1, Appendix 11). During topsoil stripping, if it is identified that clay material is present below the 200 mm of topsoil stripped, then these areas will be stripped to 500 mm. It is anticipated that these areas will total 12.8 ha, and focus on the gully areas of the Overburden Stockpile and Raw Water Dam. As a conservative measure, the soil material balance includes topsoil (200 mm) only. Section 2.1.10 has been updated accordingly. *Generally, the soils within the project site have light to medium clay B horizons. In these areas, and where necessary (e.g. to get sufficient capping material for the overburden stockpile rehabilitation), additional stripping of clay material will be undertaken to 500 mm depth. It is anticipated that these areas will total 12.8 ha (approximately 38,000 m^3), and focus on the gully areas of the Overburden Stockpile and Raw Water Dam. As a conservative measure, these areas of additional clay subsoils have not been included in the preliminary soil material balance (Table 3).* vi. Erosion and sediment control measures will be in place prior to the commencement of topsoil stripping.

Item	Reference	Matter	Information Request	Mineral Project Response
				Section 2.1.10 of the PRCP has been updated to include this detail. *The soils within the project site are not overly susceptible to erosion based on physical and chemical properties observed. However, the following erosion and sediment controls will be in place for topsoil stripping:* • *Erosion and sediment controls, per the Water Management Plan, such as silt fences, clean water diversion drains, etc. will be installed prior to the commencement of disturbance.* • *Clearing and topsoil stripping will be limited during and immediately after rainfall.* • *Once stockpiled, erosion and sediment controls will be installed around topsoil stockpiles.* • *Any topsoil stockpiles to be in place for greater than 12 months will be seeded as soon as practicable, with a seed mix in line with that used for rehabilitation.*
PRCP2.	Dianne Copper Mine, Progressive Rehabilitation and Closure Plan	Several figures are unclear in the PRCP: i) Figure 2: Project Layout (section 2.1), scale is incorrect, unable to read	Provide replacement Figures to rectify the identified issues.	All figures have been included in the updated PRCP and a high resolution version provided in Appendix 3.

Item	Reference	Matter	Information Request	Mineral Project Response
		detail due to size and image resolution provided in the report. ii) Figure 4: Reference Map (section 2.1.2.2), scale is incorrect, unable to read detail due to size and image resolution provided in the report. iii) Figure 7: Regional Ecosystems (C&R, 2024) (section 2.1.12), scale is incorrect, unable to read detail due to size and image resolution provided in the report. iv) Figure 9: Final Site Design (section 2.3.1.3) too small to see detail, unable to read detail due to size and image resolution provided in the report. v) Figure 10: Final Landform 3D Design (section 2.4.5unable to read detail due to size and image resolution provided in the report.		
PRCP3.	Dianne Copper Mine Recommencement Project Environmental Authority Amendment Application Environment Assessment Report Dianne Copper Mine, Progressive Rehabilitation and Closure Plan	There are Figures referred to in the EAR documents which do not appear in the PRCP document, these are listed below. i) Figures and Sections which were responded to regarding the Not Properly Made Notice which appear in EAR but require inclusion in PRCP ii) Figure 2a: Project Layout – Sewage Treatment Plant Location iii) Figure 2b: Project Layout – Sewage Treatment Plant Indicative Layout iv) Figure 2c: Project Layout – Mine Electrical Reticulation	Provide inclusion of these figures, subject to any improved versions referred to above, into the PRCP document.	All figures and additional requested information now included in updated PRCP.

Item	Reference	Matter	Information Request	Mineral Project Response
		v) Updated bounding coordinates (EAR Page 10), indicative project infrastructure to replace the current Environmental Authority Schedule A – Table 1 (Project Infrastructure Layout), based on discussions with the DETSI compliance team vi) Figure 12: Predicted Landfill Layout vii) Figure 12a: Predicted Landfill Layout – Plan and Cross Section viii) Figure 12b: Predicted Landfill Layout – Detailed Cross Section ix) Section 14.2 EAR Page 58 Air quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions x) Section 14.1 EAR Page 58 Noise and Vibration xi) Section 11 EAR Page 49 Land, Soils and Rehabilitation xii) Section 7 EAR Page 38 Groundwater xiii) Section 8 EAR Page 41 Surface Water and Mine Water Management xiv) No detailed description of sewage treatment plant, or power infrastructure in PRCP xv) Section 11.3 EAR Page 49 Soils and land capability		
PRCP4.	Appendix 2 Dianne Copper Mine Water Management Plan	The PRCP guideline section 3.1 requires the EA holder to provide baseline information with respect to site hydrology and fluvial networks	i) Provide flood depth and velocity for a variety of flood flow events including 0.1% AEP, for the final landform and justify how this will form a stable condition.	i and ii. Flood details, including 0.1% AEP and 1% AEP and rates of discharge, and condition of the watercourses during both operation

Item	Reference	Matter	Information Request	Mineral Project Response
		Section 3.6.1 of the PRCP Guideline requires information regarding the effect of flood flow through the site for the post mining land use. The Rehabilitation Planning Part does not provide information on the long-term sustainability of the final landform. Flood modelling is required to determine the influence of flood depth and velocity on the final landform.	ii) Provide information on the future conditions of watercourses, including the geotechnical assessment against flood modelling velocities, the post mining flood model, and justify how this will form a stable condition.	and post closure are detailed in Section 3 of Appendix 8.
PRCP5.	Appendix 2 Dianne Copper Mine Water Management Plan Appendix 3 Dianne Copper Mine Groundwater and Surface Water Impact Assessment Report	Appendix 2 identifies the relevant waterways and their environmental values. Receiving environment water quality data has been provided in Appendix A: Water Quality Data. The PRCP guideline section 3.1 requires the EA holder to provide baseline information with respect to site hydrology and fluvial networks. Background surface water quality data is required to derive or otherwise allocate water quality limits, suitability of monitoring locations to demonstrate the stability and non-polluting state of the final rehabilitated landform. <u>Gum Creek Tributary – Dissolved Metals and Metalloids:</u> Upstream / Reference site data has been provided for sites S7 and S13 up until April 2023, Downstream / Receiving sites S11 and S12 data have been provided up to April 2023. <u>Gum Creek Tributary – General Parameters:</u> Upstream / Reference site data has been provided for sites S7 and S13 up until April	i) Provide background/baseline receiving environment water quality monitoring data and upstream reference data for the Gum Creek Tributary for dissolved metals and metalloids, general parameters, and nutrients; and site water dissolved metals and metalloids for raw water dams and mine water dams, as well as release dam data for general parameters, all of which are more up to date, from at least 2024. ii) Provide projection of potential changes in the water quality downstream of the receiving environment with consideration of the potential surface water - groundwater interaction and the proposed expansion features, including pit, WRD, heap leach pads and processing plant. iii) Provide the raw data (with no outlier removal) utilised to derive the water	i and iii. Raw surface water and groundwater quality data is provided in Appendix 6. ii. Per Appendix 4, reports indicate South Creek (also referred to as Gum Creek tributary) currently displays impacts from releases of mine-affected water (MAW) discharges. Under the proposed expansion, water management techniques across the project site, as outlined in the Water Management Plan, will include: • Increase pH of acidic mine affected water to meet WQO to facilitate precipitation of dissolved metals. • Clean water diversion drains; • Mine water cut off drains to capture potentially contaminated water;

Item	Reference	Matter	Information Request	Mineral Project Response
		2023, Downstream / Receiving sites S11 and S12 data have been provided up to April 2023. Gum Creek Tributary – Nutrients: Upstream / Reference site data has been provided for sites S7 and S13 up until April 2023, Downstream / Receiving sites S11 and S12 data have been provided up to April 2023. Site Water – Dissolved Metals and Metalloids: Raw Water Dams (Clean Water) site data has been provided for S1 (RWD 1) up until July 2022, S3 (RWD2) until July 2022, and Mine Water Dams (Mine Affected Water) S4 (Pit) until July 2022. Release dam – General Parameters: site data has been provided for S6 up to April 2023.	quality objectives proposed in Table 7 of Appendix 3 (section 6.2.6)	• Flow through sediment basin to capture course sediment in runoff; • Additional clean water dams; • Dilution using clean runoff from the clean water dams; • Movement of water between storages at the onset of significant rainfall events to minimise volume of spills; and • Mechanical evaporators when required Additionally, with respect to the existing issues associated with seepage from the Settling Dam, the project will: • Remove all existing contaminated sediment; • Install a Geosynthetic Clay Liner (GCL) on the upstream face of the existing embankment/dam wall and buried at least 750 mm into firm founding material below the toe; • Place fine cohesive fill at 500 mm thickness against the GCL and out 10m from the

Item	Reference	Matter	Information Request	Mineral Project Response
				toe of the existing embankment; • Remove saturated sections of fill from the downstream side of the embankment toe and replaced with coarse general/clean fill; and • Construct a buttress with coarse general fill on the downstream side of the embankment (to improve stability). These measures are expected to reduced contaminant loads and improve downstream water quality. Ongoing monitoring will be required to confirm improvements and detect any changes related to pit, overburden stockpile, heap leach pads and processing plant.
PRCP6.	Appendix 3 Dianne Copper Mine Groundwater and Surface Water Impact Assessment Report	The application does not contain sufficient information on watercourse diversions, however they are expected to be required based on the information provided in the application. Watercourse diversions should comply with the Department of Natural Resources, Mines and Energy Guideline: "*Works that interfere with water in a watercourse for a resource activity— watercourse diversions authorised under the* Water Act 2000*"*.	i) Provide information and drawings outlining the design of the water diversion(s), both permanent and / or temporary, in terms of post-mine operations. ii) Provide a description and drawings outlining the method and final design of the diversion(s) post rehabilitation. iii) Provide information showing how The Functional Diversion Design	Per EA12

Item	Reference	Matter	Information Request	Mineral Project Response
		There may be other considerations for any permanent watercourse diversions or alterations to site drainage in the final landform.	Report aligns with the PMLU identified in the PRCP schedule and demonstrate that the diversion alignment and final landform design will achieve a stable condition. iv) Provide details of any licenses required under the *Water Act 2000* for closure.	
PRCP7.	DCM_PRCP2024 Appendix 1 – PRCP Schedule_V2	Proposed Rehabilitation Milestone 5 (RM5) is focused on the rehabilitation of existing and proposed mine water management structures. The Milestone Criteria are written in broad terms, and detail is lacking in the description of transfer of water, i.e. 'Free-standing water transferred out of structures to an appropriate place'.	i) Refine RM5 to adhere to the SMART principles. This may include rewriting criteria to more clearly achieve the desired outcome. Where terms which are open to interpretation are used, it may be desirable to provide a definition (e.g. what constitutes free-standing water, etc.). ii) Provide structured detail and an inventory as to the locations of the water to be transferred, the method of transfer, rate and schedule of the transfer, and the receiving destination of the water in each instance.	i. The PRCP Schedule and PRCP Table 6 have been updated so RM5 adheres to SMART principles and sufficient detail. In particular, item 1 has been updated to be: *All remaining water transferred out of structures to an appropriate place.* ii. Provided in Appendix 2 Supplementary Report.
PRCP8.	Appendix 3 Dianne Copper Mine Groundwater and Surface Water Impact Assessment Report	The application indicates that the decommissioning and remediation of the settling dam will be planned, but it does not provide any information on the logistics of the potential plan and the management strategies in the meantime to minimise the identified impact, or strategies to minimise the impacts during the decommissioning process.	i) Update the PRCP and Schedule and provide information regarding to include information on the rehabilitation activities to decommission the settling dam and information on post decommissioning flow and predicted changes in water quality downstream of settling dam. ii) Update the PRCP and Schedule to contemplate the above for any other	As outlined in PRCP Section 2.4.7, the Settling Dam will undergo significant remediation and upgrade to form the Release Dam for the project, with these works to be completed as soon as possible. Works will include: • Widening of the dam wall to remediate seepage • Raising of the dam wall and installation of a clay-infused

Item	Reference	Matter	Information Request	Mineral Project Response
			water management structures or dams.	geosynthetic (GCL) to increase storage capacity • Raising of the dam wall to increase storage capacity • Removal of sediments from within the dam impoundment area to contained structures upstream to improve water quality • Construction of a buttress on the downstream embankment to improve structural integrity of the wall. Further detail is provided in Appendix 7 Release Dam Upgrade Construction Methodology. As such, all discussion on rehabilitation post-mining for this structure is referred to as the Release Dam. The PRCP and PRCP schedule detail this rehabilitation in RM5. During rehabilitation, once water inflow at the Release Dam achieves quality similar to the surrounding environment, the embankment will be removed and the resultant earth placed within what was the dam impoundment area to mimic natural creek bank conditions. Standard earthworks erosion and sediment controls will be implemented until the Release Dam footprint is rehabilitated. The GCL and blockwork will be

Item	Reference	Matter	Information Request	Mineral Project Response
				removed and disposed of in an appropriately licensed facility. Upon the completion of rehabilitation of water management structures, these areas will have natural water flow and water quality similar to the surrounding environment. Additional detail has been provided in PRCP Section 2.4.7.
PRCP9.	Appendix 2 Dianne Copper Mine Water Management Plan Appendix 3 Dianne Copper Mine Groundwater and Surface Water Impact Assessment Report	The proposed PRCP provides limited information to describe the hydrogeology of the Dianne Copper Mine Project Site including hydraulic conductivity or the current or potential future connection to surrounding groundwater and surface waters. It is indicated that the total depth of the proposed pit will reach 124m, however, no information on its potential cross section/s with the underlaying geological structure is provided. Section 3.2 provides description of the geology around the area. It is evident that the pit likely will intersect the groundwater system. The information is indicative of structural complexity and highlights the presence of faults and intrusive bodies. The secondary fault that trends west-northwest may create zone of structural weakness and act as preferential groundwater flow paths, which potentially could result in water ingress into the pit but also it can create localised sulphide mineralisation which can increase AMD risk. However, the elevated bedrock plateau location of the site, with intense fracturing and faulting in the area can limit the	Provide an updated PRCP that includes the relevant information requirements (including contemporary information) of section 3.6.1 of the PRCP Guideline as follows: i) determining the groundwater occurrence including the existence of, and depth to, aquifers and aquitards ii) locating groundwater recharge and discharge locations locally and regionally iii) groundwater quality within each of the aquifers and from surface expressions (i.e. seeps and springs) iv) current and potential future uses of groundwater including existing groundwater extraction bores v) groundwater flow direction and velocity, including field tests to	Per EA18.

Item	Reference	Matter	Information Request	Mineral Project Response
		groundwater inflows to the pit (e.g. likely water will flow vertically to deeper aquifers, high risk of seepage). In addition, the potential joints and fractures developed through multiple deformation events creates high potential for surface water and groundwater interaction (e.g. surface runoffs can infiltrate quickly through fractures and increase recharge rate).	determine hydraulic conductivity vi) the development of potentiometric mapping and hydro stratigraphic cross sections vii) groundwater modelling to determine contaminant transport and potential changes to groundwater level from dewatering or waste storage. Provide an updated PRCP that captures all relevant information within the PRCP and if required, provide all referenced documentation that is considered critical to the proposed PRCP.	
PRCP10	Appendix 3 Dianne Copper Mine Groundwater and Surface Water Impact Assessment Report	Groundwater quality data has been provided in the section 3.5.2.1 Groundwater Quality however there are identified gaps in the data and a lack of analysis and interpretation in relation to groundwater flow direction/s for the proposed mining disturbances and the location and siting of monitoring bores and requirements for additional bores to provide a comprehensive and appropriate monitoring network for closure. Background groundwater is required to check and derive appropriate site-specific water quality limits for monitoring of controls and to establish the compliance framework during closure. The data which has been provided for GW01 (reference site), GW04 (reference site) and GW03 (impact site) is up to April 2023.	i) Provide an updated PRCP that includes updated data for Groundwater Monitoring Water Quality Results parameters using the most recently available data (e.g. from at least 2024 or later). ii) Provide a comprehensive assessment of the groundwater system that captures the potential pathways and impacts from all the proposed mine features at closure. This requires: ○ inclusion of further monitoring bores upgradient and downgradient of each key structure (e.g. pit, WRD, heap leach pads, processing plant and	Per EA4 and EA6. Water quality datasets are provided and contain further data since the interim limits were derived. Interim groundwater limits to be confirmed prior to extractive and processing activities. The recommended new EA condition is: *Interim groundwater quality limits will be finalised prior to the commencement of extractive and processing activities or April 2026 (whichever is earlier) and provided to the administering authority.* iii. Raw surface water and groundwater quality data is provided in Appendix 6.

Item	Reference	Matter	Information Request	Mineral Project Response
			settling/release dam), with justification of bore placements (e.g. between the mine features and sensitive receptors) ○ baseline data of at least 18 months (if monitored 1-2 monthly) to allow for understanding the groundwater system and potential seasonality impacts. iii) Provide the raw data (with no outlier removal) utilised to derive the water quality objectives proposed in Table 7 of the report (p.40).	
PRCP11	Appendix 3 Dianne Copper Mine Groundwater and Surface Water Impact Assessment Report	The reported groundwater monitoring network and data is a limiting factor in identifying and enabling an understanding of the groundwater behaviour and its interaction with the site. Based on the information provided, the network is unable to define the groundwater gradients or drawdown contours. There are no bores to the east of the pit or around the proposed WRD which limits the ability to capture a baseline for comparison of impacts in future. There are no bores between the main features such as heap leach pads and the pit or the processing plant, or the RoM, or the WRD – This does not allow for any delineation of potential source of contamination and/or localised impacts. This limiting factor also questions the proposed mitigation and closure strategies (stated to be part of the site water management plan).	Provide a comprehensive assessment of the groundwater system that captures the potential pathways and impacts from all the proposed mine features in the closure setting. This would require: i) Inclusion of further monitoring bores upgradient and downgradient of each key structure (e.g. pit, WRD, heap leach pads, processing plant and settling/release dam), with justification of bore placements (e.g. between the mine features and sensitive receptors). ii) Baseline data of at least 18 months (if monitored 1-2 monthly) to allow for understanding the groundwater	Per EA4 and EA6.

Item	Reference	Matter	Information Request	Mineral Project Response
		There is limited vertical profiling and therefore limited capacity to capture information on potential pathways to the groundwater system and potential downstream users. There is no demonstration of the consideration of water quality objectives and the Australian and New Zealand Guidelines for Fresh and Marine Water Quality (ANZG 2018).	system and potential seasonality impacts. iii) Appropriate groundwater rehabilitation and closure monitoring locations, monitoring frequency, quality characteristics and limits that are fit for purpose and capable of identifying contamination from all disturbed areas. iv) An updated monitoring program that specifies frequency of water quality monitoring at sufficient intervals to be suitable to demonstrate that the land will achieve a stable conditions (i.e. non-polluting). v) Demonstrate how the water quality objectives and the ANZG 2018 guidelines have been considered. vi) Groundwater modelling showing potential drawdown zone, and potential changes to groundwater level, including vertical profiling. vii) Information regarding groundwater impacts to potential downstream users	
PRCP12.	Appendix 1 Dianne Copper Mine Waste Rock Management Plan	Out of Pit Waste Dump. The proposed final landforms for the waste rock dumps (WRD) have not been provided, and limited information has been provided to demonstrate that they can be expected to	Provide a revised rehabilitation planning part that includes an updated PRCP that addresses the requirements of section 3.6.1 of the *Statutory guideline*	All matters are provided in the revised Final Landform and Closure Design Report (Appendix 10).

Item	Reference	Matter	Information Request	Mineral Project Response
		remain erosionally stable in the long term (refer to Section 3.6.1 of the *Statutory guideline Progressive rehabilitation and closure plan*). Furthermore, insufficient information has been provided to demonstrate the proposed final WRD landforms will achieve a stable condition. Erosion assessment modelling for the out of pit waste dump, presented in a way that adequately quantifies risk or demonstrates stability has not been provided. The department expects any erosion modelling undertaken for the WRD landforms to be presented in a way that appropriately identifies the critical risks of erosional failure on slopes.	*Progressive rehabilitation and closure plan* including: i) 3D design plans of the final landform ii) method of determining landform design iii) modelling predicting the long-term stability of the final landform design iv) method of construction v) Quality Assurance / Quality Control (QA/QC) requirements vi) trial methodology to verify the predicted success of the final landform design vii) limitations and assumptions of the landform design. viii) clear and detailed description of the proposed WRD final landforms (including slope geometries). ix) Operational lift heights, batter angles, and berms to allow for safe construction of the waste dump and removal of additional stockpiled waste material; x) Geotechnical analysis to support the operational waste dump design; xi) Additional detail on placement of any identified PAF material.	

Item	Reference	Matter	Information Request	Mineral Project Response
			xii) erosion assessment based on measured material properties demonstrating that the proposed landforms can be expected to remain erosionally stable, with consideration given to the specific risks of each landform (e.g., containing potentially acid forming (PAF) material, topographic features that may concentrate flows, ability of growth media to support adequate plant growth, etc.). xiii) demonstrate how the proposed landforms are compatible with the proposed PMLUs. xiv) Provide SMART milestone criteria which demonstrate stability of the final landform Furthermore, provide details as per the section 3.6.1 of the PRCP Guideline addressing the key considerations of the landform design to achieve long-term stability.	
PRCP13.	Appendix 7 Dianne Copper Mine Final Landform & Cover Design	Erosion assessment is required to be undertaken prior to commencement of expansion. However, no information is provided to predict the potential risks associated with the erodibility of the material and its interactions under various weather conditions. While it is noted that two soil sample tests have been conducted which indicated a low erosion risk (with Emerson ranking of 7), the conclusions remain to be based on insufficient data.	i) Provide erosion modelling to predict the potential risks associated with the erodibility of the waste rock material and its interactions under various weather conditions. The erosion modelling must also consider the long-term stability of the final landform. ii) Provide an updated PRCP schedule that includes milestone	i and iii. See Sections 2.8, 3.3 and 3.4 of the Final Landform and Closure Design Report (Appendix 10). ii. The PRCP Schedule and PRCP Table 6 have been updated to meet SMART principles in relation to soil testing and erosion. *RM7 - Topsoil will have the following suitability criteria:*

Item	Reference	Matter	Information Request	Mineral Project Response
		Erosion and/or stability issues may cause failure of rehabilitation areas (i.e. not a stable landform). Section 2.5.3 states that further erosion assessment should be undertaken which should include an evaluation of the interactions between soil erodibility, rainfall erosivity, landform height, gradient and vegetation cover to ensure long-term stability of the final landform. A final landform design is a key component of rehabilitation and closure planning. The final landform design must be based on the proposed PMLUs and NUMAs and demonstrate that the land will be safe and structurally stable. The final landform design must include: i) 3D design plans of the final landform ii) method of determining landform design iii) modelling predicting the long-term stability of the final landform design iv) method of construction v) Quality Assurance / Quality Control (QA/QC) requirements vi) trial methodology to verify the predicted success of the final landform design vii) limitations and assumptions of the landform design. Key considerations of the landform design report must also include:	criteria that meet the SMART principles for erosion (maximum erosion rate) and soil testing criteria (e.g. Rootzone EC, Soil pH, Exchangeable Sodium Percentage, etc.) sufficient to ensure that the final landform is stable. iii) Provide additional erosion modelling including evaluation of the interactions between soil erodibility, rainfall erosivity, landform height, gradient and vegetation cover to ensure long-term stability of the final landform, and to guide final landform design.	• *pH range 5.5 to 9* • *Salinity <1,000 us/cm EC* • *Organic matter >1.5%* • *Copper <270 mg/kg* *RM8 - No erosion classed as 'Moderate' or 'Severe' is present (per Erosion Classification Framework in PRCP Table 6), and erosion rates do not exceed erosion rates observed in the reference sites.*

Item	Reference	Matter	Information Request	Mineral Project Response
		i) structure location, footprint and height (including proposed lift heights) – these factors may be influenced by location of environmental values, local topography, location of sensitive receptors or visual impact ii) whether the structure requires a lining to prevent water or air ingress and minimise the potential for seepage release and/or a seepage collection system iii) whether the landform is 'water-retaining' or 'water-shedding', considering rainfall patterns, and intensity, and the composition and texture of the waste iv) the identification of materials available for landform rehabilitation including their ability to achieve the required landform design outcomes v) erosion assessments to determine landform heights, gradients, profiles, and material placement vi) slope profile design considering the interactions between soil erodibility, rainfall erosivity, landform height, gradient and vegetation cover to identify acceptable erosion rates over a long-term average vii) settling and subsidence over time, which may impact the availability of areas for rehabilitation viii) hydrological and hydrogeological assessments		

Item	Reference	Matter	Information Request	Mineral Project Response
		ix) a waste placement strategy developed to mitigate environmental and rehabilitation risks during the construction and decommissioning phase x) • specific landform requirements committed to in stakeholder consultation, mine planning or other sources, which could include rock incorporation, designed flow paths, aesthetic considerations, non-linear batter slopes and targeted placement of materials xi) • monitoring to determine performance of control measures (i.e. liners or seepage collection systems). The landform design objective must be targeted at achieving long-term stability. To demonstrate this, the applicant must provide an analysis of future stability based on the factors described above (e.g. landform evolution modelling). Rehabilitation trials should be carried out during the rehabilitation planning stage to confirm the landform design predictions prior to the construction of the final site design.		
PRCP14	DCM_PRCP2024 Appendix 1 – PRCP Schedule_V2	The application is unclear as to how minimum soil quality requirements in terms of stable condition can be achieved; RM7 does not have the provision for an AQP to assess the suitability of soil proposed for use as growth media. To achieve a stable outcome, the topsoil needs to be of suitable quality to achieve the target vegetation community.	Provide details as to the assessment of an AQP regarding the suitability of soil proposed for use as growth media.	An AQP will assess the suitability of topsoil and outline any required ameliorants prior to use in rehabilitation. Appendix 15 – updated PRCP and PRCP Schedule has been updated to include this commitment.

Item	Reference	Matter	Information Request	Mineral Project Response
PRCP15.	BioCondition Assessment Manual V2, February 2025, Queensland Herbarium	The application does not appear to propose criteria that follow the BioCondition Assessment Manual (V2, February 2025, Queensland Herbarium) (Assessment Manual).	Provide an updated PRCP Schedule to include criteria for a BioCondition assessment in line with the Assessment Manual.	A BioCondition Assessment will be completed for project rehabilitation in RM8. Appendix 15 – updated PRCP and PRCP Schedule has been updated to include this commitment.
PRCP16.	PRCP 20230331 Final Schedule EPML00881213 Dianne Copper Mine; Dianne Copper Mine Recommencement Project Environmental Authority Amendment Application Environment Assessment Report	It is noted that Rehabilitation Milestones in the PRCP Schedule and EAR refer to analogue/reference sites, however, the justification of analogue/reference sites is not provided.	i) Provide an updated Rehabilitation Planning Part that identifies analogue/references sites are justified and discussed with relation to the proposed RM's. ii) Provide an updated Rehabilitation Planning Part that includes a description of the analogue/reference site attributes.	Section 2.9.2 of the PRCP has been updated to provide a detailed rehabilitation monitoring program in line with the PRCP Guideline.
PRCP17.	PRCP 20230331 Final Schedule EPML00881213 Dianne Copper Mine; Dianne Copper Mine Recommencement Project Environmental Authority Amendment Application Environment Assessment Report	The PRCP schedule proposes to allow 1 year for each of the milestones. The risk assessment does not identify the potential for significant events to impact on the ability to achieve the milestone criteria by the scheduled date.	Provide an updated PRCP Schedule that considers the time required to achieve each rehabilitation milestone. Provide timeframes that consider impacts from events identified in the risk assessment.	An additional 12 months has been included in RM 1 – 7 to include contingency for significant events (e.g. fire) impacting on the ability to achieve milestone criteria per the risk assessment. Appendix 15 – updated PRCP and PRCP Schedule has been updated accordingly.
PRCP18.	Queensland Mine Rehabilitation Commissioner Research and Guidance	Pursuant to section 176A(2)(b)(vi) and Chapter 8A of (including but not limited to 444A – 444O) of the EP Act, the Office of the Queensland Mine Rehabilitation Commissioner (QMRC) has published advice, reports, and guidance. The administering authority is required to consider the QMRC's	Provide an updated PRCP Schedule that considers published advice, reports and guidance from the QMRC as it relates to the Project.	The publications and advice from the Office of the Queensland Mine Rehabilitation Commissioner have been reviewed and considered throughout the PRCP and PRCP schedule. All new publications were reviewed as part of the IR response.

Item	Reference	Matter	Information Request	Mineral Project Response
		published advice in making its decision. Accordingly, the advice, reports and guidance should be considered where appropriate for the Project. All advice, reports and guidance can be located on the following Queensland Government website: https://www.qmrc.qld.gov.au/publications/research		The new publications (released since November 2024) have been reviewed and relevant documents in this IR response have been updated accordingly.
PRCP19.	Queensland Mine Rehabilitation Commissioner Research and Guidance	The Rehabilitation Monitoring Program does not include an appropriate range of characteristics to demonstrate native vegetation has achieved a stable condition. It is unclear how the proposed monitoring program is specific, measurable, demonstrates the PMLU has been achieved and is sustainable (resilient to disturbance).	Provide an updated rehabilitation planning part that includes a monitoring program that considers the recommendations of the Office of the Queensland Mine Rehabilitation Commissioner.	Section 2.9.2 of the PRCP has been updated to provide a detailed rehabilitation monitoring program that aligns with SMART principals and the PRCP Guideline.
PRCP20.	PRCP 20230331 Final Schedule EPML00881213 Dianne Copper Mine; Dianne Copper Mine Recommencement Project Environmental Authority Amendment Application Environment Assessment Report	The proposed PRCP provides limited detail on the status of existing rehabilitation, or the rehabilitation techniques implemented. Details of when rehabilitation activities commenced and were completed and evidence that the land has been rehabilitated to a stable condition have not been provided. In the absence of progressive certification, a detailed assessment of each area considered to have undergone rehabilitation must include monitoring data that supports the assertion that a stable condition has been achieved. In addition, the assessment of the final landform design, land stability and residual contamination, to rehabilitation areas is required. The information provided in the proposed PRCPning part does not satisfy the requirements of section 3.1 of the PRCP	Provide an updated PRCP that includes the relevant information requirements of section 126C(1)(j) of the EP Act and section 3.1 of the PRCP Guideline as follows: i) a description of the rehabilitation works previously carried out; ii) when the rehabilitation works commenced and were completed; iii) whether the rehabilitation has been applied for or approved as progressively certified under the EP Act. Provide an updated PRCP that includes evidence that the areas of existing	Per Section 2.1.14 of the PRCP, rehabilitation on site since Mineral Projects took ownership of the Environmental Authority has focused on legacy issues including improvement of the mine water management system and associated water quality, and historical access roads. No areas have been applied to be certified. Additional detail has been included in Section 2.1.14 of the PRCP: *Additionally, all exploration areas completed have been rehabilitated in accordance with Environmental Authority Condition A16 and Eligibility*

Item	Reference	Matter	Information Request	Mineral Project Response
		Guideline. PRCPs must also include details about any existing rehabilitation already completed at the time of submission of the proposed PRCP. Spatial Information outlining the location of all existing rehabilitation has also not been submitted as part of the proposed PRCP.	rehabilitation are safe, stable and non-polluting, including: i) monitoring data demonstrating performance of control measures; ii) erosion assessments and landform evolution modelling; iii) geotechnical stability assessment; iv) information on infiltration and seepage intervention and collection controls; v) surface water diversions and long-term management requirements; vi) source, pathway and fate of any contaminants that have the potential to impact environmental values; vii) erosion assessments; viii) contaminated land assessments. Provide updated Spatial Information that includes the relevant information requirements of 3.1 of the PRCP Guideline outlining the location of all existing rehabilitation as part of the proposed PRCP.	*criteria and standard conditions for exploration and mineral development projects" (ESR/2016/1985).* *Since this time, all non-mining waste (e.g. scrap metal and general rubbish) has been cleaned up and removed from site to appropriately licenced facilities. Areas of rehabilitation include:* • *An area downstream of the Settling Dam has been recontoured and seeded.* • *An old access road to the east of the pit has been reshaped, ripped and seeded (8 kg/ha)* • *Erosion and sediment controls have been installed throughout the site.* *The existing rehabilitation sites and reference sites will be disturbed as part of the project, and a new rehabilitation monitoring system will be put in place.*
PRCP21.	DCM_PRCP2024 Appendix 1 – PRCP Schedule_V2	The proposed RM8 is the previous RM6 but otherwise remains functionally similar except for the absence of the criteria that there is no evidence of seepage from Settling Dam from	Provide detail on mitigation measures and methods, including lining the dam, proposed to prevent seepage from Settling Dam from external	As outlined in PRCP Section 2.4.7, the Settling Dam will undergo significant remediation and upgrade to form the Release Dam for the project,

Item	Reference	Matter	Information Request	Mineral Project Response
		external embankments and toe, and no seepage evident into diversion drains. Seepage does not appear to be addressed directly in the proposed PRCP Schedule.	embankments and toe, and seepage into diversion drains.	with these works to be completed as soon as possible. Works will include: • Widening of the dam wall to remediate seepage • Raising of the dam wall and installation of a clay-infused geosynthetic (GCL) to increase storage capacity • Raising of the dam wall to increase storage capacity • Removal of sediments from within the dam impoundment area to contained structures upstream to improve water quality • Construction of a buttress on the downstream embankment to improve structural integrity of the wall Further detail is provided in Appendix 7 Release Dam Upgrade Construction Methodology.
PRCP22.	Dianne Copper Mine Progressive Rehabilitation and Closure Plan	Retained infrastructure handover (Raw Water Dam 1 and roads), raw water dam 1 has the ability to spill during the wet season. Raw Water Dam to remain post mining per existing written agreement with landowner as important assets to grazing activities, with additional positive environmental outcomes. The schedule must demonstrate that all retained infrastructure items have achieved a stable condition, including a non-polluting state with respect to the receiving	Demonstrate that all retained infrastructure, specifically Raw Water Dam 1 is non-polluting to the receiving environment. Provide justification and data to support the retention of dams in final landform such that any spills do not release contaminants to the receiving waters.	Raw Water Dam 1 currently sits outside of the mine disturbance footprint, is upstream from any potential risks for spills, and spills naturally. There is no chance of impacts to the dam from the project. Any spills from the dam bypass the project disturbance footprint directly to a tributary of Gum Creek, as shown in the original EA Amendment Application Appendix 2 – Water Management Plan and Appendix 3 -

Item	Reference	Matter	Information Request	Mineral Project Response
		environment. Stock water limits and parameters concerning Raw Water Dam 1 do not clearly achieve a non-polluting state in respect of the receiving environment.		Groundwater and Surface Water Impact Assessment Report. Raw Water Dam 1 sits outside of the project disturbance footprint and will not be negatively impacted by the project disturbance area. The catchment does not include any project disturbance footprint. In addition, any water pumped into the dam (as a contingency only in high rainfall scenarios) will only include clean water. Raw Water Dam 1 is to remain post mining per existing written agreement with landowner (Attachment 3) as an important asset to grazing activities (and has been for the past 40 years), as it is currently being used. The PRCP has been updated to include this detail.
PRCP23.	Dianne Copper Mine Recommencement Project Environmental Authority Amendment Application Environment Assessment Report Dianne Copper Mine Progressive Rehabilitation and Closure Plan February 2025	A landholder agreement has not been provided for the infrastructure proposed to be retained.	Provide a landholder agreement for any infrastructure proposed to retained post closure.	Landholder letter (Attachment 3) confirming Raw Water Dam 1 and access roads to be retained post-mining.

Item	Reference	Matter	Information Request	Mineral Project Response
PRCP24.	Schedule 8A, EP Reg	The application does not make clear how it meets the matters prescribed under Schedule 8A of the EP Reg.	Provide a full assessment against all matters provided for in Schedule 8A of the EP Reg including details how the performance outcomes have been achieved for all aspects of the amendment. This must include information necessary to inform the assessment of how the application meets the PRCP objectives and PRCP performance outcomes of Part 3, Schedule 8A. This will need to include (not exhaustive): i) Final site design assessment— ii) PMLU assessment— ○ Rehabilitation milestones; and ○ Progressive rehabilitation;	An assessment of all matters as prescribed under Schedule 8A Part 3 of the EP Regulations has been completed, with each relevant section describing the PRCP rehabilitation performance objectives and outcomes. Additional clarity has been included in the PRCP: • Final site design assessment – Sections 2.3.1 and 2.3.2 *PMLU Grazing provides compliance with Schedule 8A of the EP Regulations performance outcomes for post-mining land uses having regard to the use of the land in the surrounding region, and being consistent with the land use pre-mining.* *There are no non-use management areas proposed for closure on any mining lease. As such, Schedule 8A of the EP Regulation Table 1 item 2 and 3; and Table 3 are complied with.* • Post-mining land use assessment – rehabilitation milestones – Section 2.4.1 *Rehabilitation milestones are also compliant with Schedule 8A of the EP Regulations Table 2, as follows:*

Item	Reference	Matter	Information Request	Mineral Project Response
				○ *Milestone criteria is appropriate for achieving the PMLUs of the site* ○ *Milestone criteria is appropriate for achieving each rehabilitation milestone* ○ *Each milestone criteria facilitates subsequent milestone criteria* ○ *The last milestone criteria demonstrates a sustainable, long-term PMLU* • Post-mining land use assessment – progressive rehabilitation – Section 2.4.1 *Progressive mine rehabilitation will commence as soon as practicable as land becomes available, and at a maximum will commence 12 months after land becomes available and in line with the risk assessment completed for the project, as per Section 126D(4) of the EP Act and Schedule 8A Table 2 of the EP Regulation. The first rehabilitation milestones in the PRCP will start as soon as practicable (and a*

Item	Reference	Matter	Information Request	Mineral Project Response
				maximum of 12 months) after than land becomes available. Progressive rehabilitation performance outcomes have been included in community consultation (Section 2.2) and formed part of the risk assessment (Section 2.8). Due to the nature of the mining activities and small disturbance footprint for the project, there are limited areas that become available for rehabilitation prior to the end of mine life. • Non-use management area assessment – Section 2.3.2 *There are no non-use management areas proposed for closure on any mining lease. As such, Schedule 8A of the EP Regulation Table 1 item 2 and 3; and Table 3 are complied with.*