

# McPhillamys Gold Project CCC Minutes

Title	McPhillamys Gold Project Community Consultative Committee (CCC) Meeting #8																																					
Meeting Date	1 June 2020 @ 6pm																																					
Venue	Regis Blayney Office (Adelaide St), GoToMeeting (by video)																																					
Chair	<b>David Johnson</b>	Independent Chairperson*																																				
Meeting Attendees	<table border="0"> <tr> <td><b>Evan Leitch</b></td> <td>Community Representative*</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Elizabeth Russ</b></td> <td>Community Representative#</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Bob Russ</b></td> <td>Community Representative Alternate#</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Tom Williams</b></td> <td>Community Representative#</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Miles Hedge</b></td> <td>Community Representative#</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Daniel Sutton</b></td> <td>BHPG Representative*</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Cyril Smith</b></td> <td>ORWSA Representative*</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2"><hr/></td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Rebecca Ryan</b></td> <td>Blayney Council*</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Heather Nicholls</b></td> <td>Cabonne Council*</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2"><hr/></td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Rod Smith</b></td> <td>Regis Resources*</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Tony McPaul</b></td> <td>Regis Resources#</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Andrew Wannan</b></td> <td>Regis Resources*</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Chris Roach</b></td> <td>Regis Resources Alternate*</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2"><hr/></td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Stacey McFawn</b></td> <td>Minutes#</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Louise Hobby</b></td> <td>GoToMeeting Organiser#</td> </tr> </table>		<b>Evan Leitch</b>	Community Representative*	<b>Elizabeth Russ</b>	Community Representative#	<b>Bob Russ</b>	Community Representative Alternate#	<b>Tom Williams</b>	Community Representative#	<b>Miles Hedge</b>	Community Representative#	<b>Daniel Sutton</b>	BHPG Representative*	<b>Cyril Smith</b>	ORWSA Representative*	<hr/>		<b>Rebecca Ryan</b>	Blayney Council*	<b>Heather Nicholls</b>	Cabonne Council*	<hr/>		<b>Rod Smith</b>	Regis Resources*	<b>Tony McPaul</b>	Regis Resources#	<b>Andrew Wannan</b>	Regis Resources*	<b>Chris Roach</b>	Regis Resources Alternate*	<hr/>		<b>Stacey McFawn</b>	Minutes#	<b>Louise Hobby</b>	GoToMeeting Organiser#
<b>Evan Leitch</b>	Community Representative*																																					
<b>Elizabeth Russ</b>	Community Representative#																																					
<b>Bob Russ</b>	Community Representative Alternate#																																					
<b>Tom Williams</b>	Community Representative#																																					
<b>Miles Hedge</b>	Community Representative#																																					
<b>Daniel Sutton</b>	BHPG Representative*																																					
<b>Cyril Smith</b>	ORWSA Representative*																																					
<hr/>																																						
<b>Rebecca Ryan</b>	Blayney Council*																																					
<b>Heather Nicholls</b>	Cabonne Council*																																					
<hr/>																																						
<b>Rod Smith</b>	Regis Resources*																																					
<b>Tony McPaul</b>	Regis Resources#																																					
<b>Andrew Wannan</b>	Regis Resources*																																					
<b>Chris Roach</b>	Regis Resources Alternate*																																					
<hr/>																																						
<b>Stacey McFawn</b>	Minutes#																																					
<b>Louise Hobby</b>	GoToMeeting Organiser#																																					
Apologies	Jim Newman Bob Bourke Peter Hildenbeutel	Community Representative Mayor, Bathurst Council Community Representative Alternate																																				
Next Meeting	3 <sup>rd</sup> August 2020 @ 6.00pm Blayney Community Centre 91 Adelaide Street, Blayney NSW																																					

\* Attended video meeting remotely via GoToMeeting

# Attended video meeting from Regis Blayney Office via GoToMeeting

## **MEETING WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS - David Johnson**

Meeting opened at 6:07pm via GoToMeeting (video conference call platform).

Apologies for the meeting tendered for Peter Hildenbeutel, Jim Newman and Bob Bourke.

Introduction by David Johnson:

- Peter Hildenbeutel by proxy (Tony McPaul) declared a Pecuniary interest for receiving compensation for bore monitoring on his property. It was noted by Tony McPaul that similar compensation for bore monitoring was also received by some other CCC members.
- Evan Leitch joined meeting at 6.20pm via GoToMeeting.

## **BUSINESS ARISING FROM MINUTES OF LAST MEETING – David Johnson**

- Cyril Smith questioned whether McPhillamys should be assessed as a 'preferred project' due to its State Significant Development (SSD) status and the existence of Discovery Ridge. This was based on his experience with the Orange water pipeline project. He also raised whether the power supply, and the water supply pipeline should be part of the McPhillamys Gold Project's EIS?
- Daniel Sutton questioned who decides how the project is assessed, the proponent or the regulator?
- Andrew Wannan indicated that the SSD assessment system has changed significantly since the Orange pipeline project and his understanding was that 'preferred projects' no longer existed as part of the current system. The current system now requests that the proponent provide 'amendments' if applicable. Further to that, he explained that the power supply is assessed under a different regime and that the water supply pipeline was part of the EIS.
- A lengthy discussion was then held with respect to what was and was not said at the previous CCC Meeting held on 24<sup>th</sup> February 2020. Evan Leitch's view was that the Minutes of the previous CCC Meeting were inaccurate and should be updated in accordance with his comments submitted in writing in the week before this CCC Meeting, and circulated to CCC members by the Chair.. Rod Smith stated that in his opinion, Evan's recollection of what was said was not accurate and the previous CCC minutes should not be changed. Evan apologised for not raising the matter during the review period subsequent to the CCC Meeting, as is the protocol, as he was unable to for personal reasons. Rod suggested that Evan's comments relating to the accuracy of the previous CCC minutes should be recorded, but also noted that no other committee member had raised any objection, nor commented on the accuracy of the previous CCC Minutes, and as such, the previous CCC Minutes should remain as they were, with Evan's disputation recorded in this meeting's CCC Minutes.
- David Johnson agreed that Evan's comments relating to his belief that the previous CCC Minutes were inaccurate should be included in this meeting's CCC Minutes.
- Based on the above, it is noted Evan Leitch does not agree with the Minutes of the CCC meeting held on the 24th February 2020 as being an accurate record with respect to his Question 1, and that in Evan's opinion, the answer has not been recorded accurately.

- The principal area of disagreement relates to the meaning of the term 'peer review'. Evan Leitch interprets it in a strict scientific sense (as would apply to scientific papers or publications), whereas Rod Smith and Regis used it to include a factual review or second opinion by an independent expert or consultant, separate to the author or prime consultant.
- Mr Leitch subsequently requested clarification as to Regis' answers to his questions 1a, 1c and 1d of the written questions he provided prior to the meeting of 24 February, and which he believes were not adequately recorded in the attachment to the minutes of that meeting. To clarify, and give further detail, the answers provided by Regis were as follows:
  - 1a Yes, Regis is in possession of peer reviews, as identified in the EIS. Only the groundwater peer review was included in the EIS as a specific requirement of the Dept of Industry-Water;
  - 1c The peer review of the noise management report as noted in the EIS was not provided to Regis as a formal report and as such will not be released separately, but Regis will further address noise impacts through the Submissions Report and in ongoing consultations with relevant agencies;
  - 1d Other peer reviews obtained by Regis and its consultants were not provided as formal reports and as such will not be released separately but information relevant to the various reports will be contained in the Submissions Report.

#### **CORRESPONDENCE**

- General email exchanges.
- No Correspondence.

#### **REGIS RESOURCES MCPHILLAMYS GOLD PROJECT UPDATE**

- PowerPoint presentation by Tony McPaul using the Shared Screen facility of GoToMeeting as follows (copy on McPhillamys website)
  - Community engagement has been continuing with the acknowledgement of the advertising provided by Regis for local businesses during COVID-19 pandemic.
  - Progressing with mitigation discussion within the Kings Plains community.
  - Community Information Sheet #11 is scheduled to be release in June.
  - Continued work with fortnightly updates in the Blayney Chronicle and also by email and mail.
  - Air and water monitoring is continuing at McPhillamys.
  - Current project activities include weed and feral animal control, ongoing environmental monitoring, regional exploration and discussions relating to visual screening and response to submissions.
  - Two test bores have been constructed for groundwater testing and suitability for short term construction requirements.
  - McPhillamys Response to Submissions (RTS) amendments outlined refinements to pit exits, waste rock emplacement schedule, water management facilities, processing area and site access.

- Regis currently preparing response to submissions. Aiming to be complete as soon as practicable with July 2020 target, however may be delayed until August 2020.
- Danielle Wallace will be joining the Regis team as the Environment Superintendent commencing the 8<sup>th</sup> June 2020.

#### QUESTIONS ARISING FROM PRESENTATION

- Miles Hedge- In terms of water are you talking about tonnes per hour, one cubic meter= one tonne.  
*Answer- yes, that is correct.*
- Elizabeth Russ- Questioned where the location of the test bores were?  
*Answer- Wills property and McIvor/Vaughan property (map showing location was presented).*
- Miles Hedge- Questioned if the IPC hearing will be held in Blayney?  
*Answer- That would depend on the Covid-19 restrictions. If people can attend in person, then it would almost certainly be held in Blayney. If Covid-19 restrictions exist, then the IPC can conduct hearings by video conference.*
- Elisabeth Russ- Questioned the timing of the IPC for McPhillamys. Could it be in December 2020?  
*Answer- Possibly late this year or early next year.*
- Miles Hedge- Questioned the depth of gold from the surface.  
*Answer- Final depth of the pit is approximately 450m, however, gold is recovered from the surface through to the final depth.* Evan Leitch and Tom Williams each provided a question relating to the proposed site access road amendment and its location?  
*Answer- Chris Roach indicated that currently planned intersection was from the Mid-Western Highway, just east of the present entrance to the Rutherford property and almost opposite to that to the property Cedar Hill.*
- Daniel Sutton- Question relating to the proposed fast tracking of projects (as announced by NSW Government) and the proposed time frame for the IPC to make a determination in 12 weeks.  
*Answer- The fast-tracking announcement relates to Covid-19 and is unlikely to be applied to greenfields projects such as McPhillamys. The IPC determination time frame of 12 weeks is not related to Covid-19, but rather has resulted from a review in 2019 by the NSW Productivity Commissioner.*
- Daniel Sutton- Questioned whether the proposed fast tracking of projects relates to DPIE?  
*Answer- It is understood that it does.*
- Daniel Sutton- Questioned whether the proposed site access road needed to be completed prior to commencing construction?  
*Answer- This is not finalised and discussions are ongoing with RMS and Blayney Council.*

## OTHER AGENDA ITEMS

No Other Agenda Items. **GENERAL BUSINESS**

- Steven O'Donoghue from Department of Planning, Industry and Environment (DPIE) sends his apologies for not attending this meeting. He is aiming to attend the next CCC Meeting and meet with community members.

## ADDITIONAL EXPLANATIONS RELATING TO QUESTIONS AND ANSWERED RECEIVED

- Tony McPaul thanked the CCC members for submitting questions which allowed answers to be provided prior to this meeting early.
- Daniel Sutton indicated he was satisfied with the answers provided by Regis in response to the questioned submitted.
- Evan Leitch indicated he was not satisfied with the answers provided by Regis and wished to discuss them further.
- Q1- Evan Leitch Indicated that he wanted a direct Yes or No answer as to whether Regis had considered the use of the Mitchell Highway for access to McPhillamys.  
*Answer- Tony McPaul had reiterated that Regis had considered a number of options, some of which included access from Mitchell Highway and also noted that the project does not extend all the way to the Mitchell Highway.*
- Q2- Evan Leitch asked whether Regis would provide information relating to the main access road to the CCC once confirmed?  
*Answer- yes, as everyone was shown the proposed access.*
- Q3- Evan Leitch asked whether the pumping Rates in tph were for, 24 hours per day and was the drawdown from these pumping rates included in the EIS?  
*Answer- Yes, pumping rates are for 24 hours per day and, no as the data did not exist then, but test pumping data, once available, would form part of the overall ongoing groundwater modelling.*
- Q4- Evan Leitch asked for further details in relation the 'extra works' and Discovery Ridge?  
*Answer- Explained within the questions and answers sheet, and it was reiterated that any development at Discovery Ridge would be subject to a separate approval.*
- Q4(b)- Evan Leitch asked whether the extra works would delay the start of the construction phase?  
*Answer- No.*
- Q4(b)- Evan Leitch asked whether the TSF has extra capacity?  
*Answer-Yes*
- Q4(b)- Evan Leitch asked whether Regis was building McPhillamys to treat more than McPhillamys?

*Answer- It was reiterated that Regis is building McPhillamys to treat McPhillamys. The DA is for McPhillamys and without McPhillamys being approved first, nothing else can be considered.*

- Q5- Evan Leitch- Will there be a delay from the DA to the start of construction?  
*Answer- Yes. At present, the best guess is around 3 months, but is dependent on ancillary approval, which the Government is in control of in terms of timing.*

**Other Business**

No other business.

---

## **ACTIONS**

	<b>Action Items</b>	<b>Who</b>	<b>Due By</b>
1	Book Blayney Community Centre for the 3rd August 2020 @6pm	Stacey McFawn	9 <sup>th</sup> June 2020
2	Draft minutes to be provided to the Chairperson.	Stacey McFawn	Within one week
3	Draft minutes distributed to members by email Including the alternate representatives	David Johnson	Within one week
4	Committee members provide comment on minutes to Chairperson	All committee members	1 <sup>st</sup> July 2020
5	Minutes finalised & posted on the McPhillamys Website	David Johnson Tony McPaul / Rod Smith	10 <sup>th</sup> July 2020
6	Questions and answers from the <u>June</u> CCC meeting to be added to the McPhillamys website.	Stacey McFawn	10 <sup>th</sup> July 2020

## **MEETING CLOSED**

Meeting closed at 7.55pm.

## **NEXT MEETING**

Monday 3<sup>rd</sup> August 2020 at 6pm at the Blayney Community Centre, 91 Adelaide Street, Blayney NSW.

## ATTACHMENT 1

### Questions from concerned community members submitted for answer at McPhillamys Gold Project Community Consultative Committee meeting 01/06/20 (Evan Leitch)

1. We note that Regis has extended their McPhillamys Gold Project area north to the Mitchell Highway. Has Regis given any consideration to using the Mitchell Highway – Vittoria to Milthorpe Road intersection as providing the major access to the main entrance to the mine site? It would seem to (i) have the advantages of already constructed turning lanes from both Bathurst and Orange directions, (ii) minimise the number of properties affected by traffic noise including that associated with acceleration and braking, (iii) minimise traffic through Blayney and Milthorpe, and (iv) avoid the very steep grades that cause difficulties for heavily laden trucks climbing Fitzgerald's Mount during icy road conditions.

The McPhillamys Gold Project area (as shown in the EIS) does not extend north to the Mitchell Highway, however Land owned by LFB does extend to the Mitchell Highway.

Regis considered a number of options for accessing the mine site before selecting the currently proposed site access.

2. (a) Will Regis indicate where they plan to place their main mine entrance road intersection with the Mid-Western Highway please?

(b) Will it involve changes to the disturbance footprint/mine site boundary as shown in the EIS?

- a) Regis will provide the CCC with a proposed alternate site access at the meeting on 1 June.
- b) The mine development project area remains the same as that stated in the EIS, The Response to Submissions may involve some minor changes to the disturbance footprint.

3. (a) With the decision to draw bore water from the project area prior to the Lithgow Pipeline coming into operation what is the expected average rate at which water is to be derived from this source up until the pipeline supplied water arrives?

(b) Has this drawdown been included in the EIS groundwater modelling for the construction phase of the project?

(a) The water demand in the first six to nine months of construction, that is, for the time required to construct the water supply pipeline is estimated as follows:

- 0-6 months approximately 40-50tph (11-14l/s)
- 7-9 months approximately 80-100tph (22-28l/s)

(b) Groundwater bore tests are currently underway.

4. In recent (2020) investor communications (RBC, BMO) Regis has indicated with respect to the Discovery Ridge Project that 'extra works required at McPhillamys to be included in DFS (?McPhillamys) to ensure seamless incorporation in future mine plan.'

(a) What are these 'extra works'?

(b) Are the 'extra works' to be undertaken at the McPhillamys site concurrent with the

construction phase of the McPhillamys Gold Project?

(d) Will these 'extra works' (i) delay the start of the construction phase at McPhillamys and extend the duration of the construction phase?

(c) Are these 'extra works' that are required at the McPhillamys mine site to be the subject of (i) a separate approval process, or (ii) to be described in the McPhillamys RTS, or (iii) added to the McPhillamys DA as a 'modification application'?

The 'extra works' comment referred to in the investor communication was in anticipation of market questions relating to the potential for McPhillamys to process remote deposits should they exist; be feasible; be approvable; and be commercially viable. The 'extra works' as such, would generally be included in any new mine development and primarily relate to the design of road networks so that they provide an ability to safely operate on-road haul trucks in and around the mine administration, processing plant and run of mine (ROM) areas.

As stated previously, the current EIS is for McPhillamys only and any other ore source would be the subject of a separate development application and Environmental Impact Statement (EIS).

5. What delay will there be between any granting of the DA for the McPhillamys Gold Project and the expected start of the construction phase of the development?

In NSW it is not unusual for a short delay, (potentially up to three months) to occur between the granting of the DA and receiving the other approvals required.

## ATTACHMENT 2

### Questions from concerned community members submitted for answer at McPhillamys Gold Project Community Consultative Committee meeting 01/06/20 (Daniel Sutton)

1. Jim Beyer admits that Regis' injury rate continues to be "well above industry average" and you are now looking at implementing further health and safety measures and culture in your practices. Can you expand on what these injuries were/which teams within the business these occur?

The 12-month moving average (MMA) lost time injury frequency rate (LTIFR) to the end of the quarter was 4.4, up from 3.5 at the end of the prior quarter. This year all of these LTIs have been relatively low risk soft tissue/muscular type injuries. However, the Company has not seen any sustainable improvements for some time in these metrics and has now initiated a review of its health and safety standards, processes and culture across Regis and its contractor partners. This initiative includes the recruitment of additional experienced health and safety specialists to help improve safety performance.

2. Can you please outline what specifically will be amended from the original EIS with your RTS, given we're only a month away from receiving it, you would know what you're amending by now.

We are still working through the Response to Submissions and; we will make all relevant information available as soon as we can. The RTS will be shared with our stakeholders and the community in full, when it is finalized.

3. How does Regis intend to fund the capital costs of the proposal? Jim Beyer stated that Regis should be able to "self-Fund" the Capex associated with the proposal. With around only \$160m in the bank, where will the shortfall of funds come from?

Regis has several options available to it for funding the McPhillamys Gold Project. The Board will ultimately decide the most appropriate method. Over the coming period, prior to commencement and during the project execution, the company will continue to generate cashflow from its existing operations. The ability for the company to self-fund from this cashflow will depend on many factors including (but not limited to) the prevailing gold price, maintaining dividend payments, hedging programme and other capital demands of the business. Ultimately the decision on which will be the best way to fund the expenditure will be considered by the Board and this corporate strategic decision will consider using existing cash, other funding sources such as debt or equity a combination of all of these options.

4. Does the IPC have an avenue to request an extension of time for their assessment beyond the 12 weeks instructed by the Minister of Planning? If so, how?

The second point in the Ministers referral to the Independent Planning Commissions (IPC) on the 19th February 2020 states.

"2. Complete the public hearing and make its determination of the development application within 12 weeks of receiving the Department's assessment report in respect of the project, unless the Planning Secretary agrees otherwise."