
MEMORANDUM

Recipient: Cheryl Low – Matakanui Gold Limited

From: Julie Palich – Geocontam Risk Management

Date: 13 September 2026

Document Number: J-H-NZ0238-012-M-Rev0

Document Title: Response to RFI 11 – Fast Track Approvals Application FTA-2507-1089

Geocontam Risk Management Limited (GRM) has provided this memo in response to additional submissions provided with respect to information provided in Request for Information (RFI) 11 associated with the Fast-track Approvals Act 2024 (FTAA) application for the Bendigo-Ophir Gold Project (BOGP). Specifically, this letter addresses the following matters raised in the comments:

- Sludge Disposal – Hannan Family.
- Adequacy of Baseline Water Data – multiple respondents.
- Revised Compliance Limits and Monitoring Locations – EDS, Fish & Game, Torlesse Environmental on behalf of ORC.
- Ecotoxicity of Pit Lakes and Wetlands – EDS and Fish & Game.

SLUDGE DISPOSAL

Sludge characterisation and definition of the sludge disposal option inherently cannot be undertaken prior to operations because the sludge does not yet exist and its properties depend on the actual chemistry of mine-impacted water (MIW), treatment reagents, and Water Treatment Plant (WTP) operating conditions. While MIW quality has been predicted, representative sludge can only be generated and reliably characterised through treatment trials using actual MIW during WTP commissioning and operation.

The industry-standard approach is to characterise sludge generated under actual operating conditions, as it enables waste classification, leachability, management requirements, and disposal options to be determined using representative material rather than predictive assumptions. Based on industry experience, I am confident that sludge generated from the proposed WTP would have a viable management or disposal pathway.

During operations, if an active WTP is required, sludge will be managed within the TSF and will not require off-site disposal. Any need for alternative disposal or beneficial reuse options would only arise at mine closure. Identifying a specific disposal facility or acceptance pathway now would require speculative assumptions regarding future regulations, waste acceptance criteria, infrastructure availability, and waste management practices.

The more appropriate approach is to characterise and classify sludge once generated, and periodically review disposal, reuse, and resource recovery options throughout the life of the mine, which would be

documented within the Mine Closure Plan (updated reflect any new technical information and/or amendments to relevant standards, as per condition C137). This allows final management decisions to be based on the actual sludge characteristics, contemporary regulatory requirements, available infrastructure, and technological developments at the time closure decisions are required. Such an approach is consistent with adaptive closure planning and recognises the ongoing advancement of technologies for sludge reuse, resource recovery, and contaminant immobilisation.

ADEQUACY OF BASELINE WATER MONITORING NETWORK AND DATA

Baseline Surface Water Monitoring Network and Data

A robust program of baseline surface water quality monitoring data has been collected in association with the project since late 2022/early 2023 as summarised in Table 1. The presentation of the 2023/2024 baseline data water was provided in the Baseline Water Quality Report (B.06 MWM Impacted Water Overview Report - Appendix D) which formed part of the substantiative application.

Table 1: Summary of baseline surface water quality monitoring.

MONITORING LOCATIONS	MONITORING PERIOD/FREQUENCY	MONITORING SUITE
Shepherds Creek (SC01, SC03)	09/2022 – 02/2024 (quarterly) 03/2024 – present (fortnightly to monthly)	Field: pH, redox potential, electrical conductivity, temperature, turbidity, dissolved oxygen Physicochemical parameters: pH, electrical conductivity, total hardness, total dissolved solids, total suspended solids, turbidity
Bendigo Creek (RS01, RS02, RS03, RS04, RSB, RSA1)	04/2023 – 12/2023 (quarterly) 01/2024 – present (fortnightly to monthly)	Major anions: alkalinity – total, acidity, chloride, fluoride, bromide, sulfate Nutrients: nitrate, nitrite, ammoniacal nitrogen, total nitrogen, total phosphorus, total cyanide, dissolved silicon, silicon, phosphorus, total organic carbon, dissolved organic carbon, total Kjeldahl nitrogen, dissolved reactive phosphorus
Other tributaries (CC01, JC01)	03/2024 – present (monthly) 09/2024	Total and dissolved metals: silver, aluminium, arsenic, boron, barium, beryllium, bismuth, calcium, cadmium, cobalt, chromium, caesium, copper, iron, germanium, mercury, potassium, lanthanum, lithium, magnesium, manganese, molybdenum, sodium, nickel, lead, rubidium, antimony, selenium, tin, strontium, titanium, thallium, uranium, vanadium, yttrium, zinc

Recent Applicant RFI responses have primarily focussed on evaluation of the compliance monitoring sites and select analytes from the monitoring suite to address specific stakeholder queries. Where presented, statistics have been calculated from the entire temporal dataset. The complete baseline surface water quality monitoring dataset for the site is spatially and temporally robust and exceeds the minimum baseline water quality recommendations put forth in the ANZG (2018) by capturing short-term and long-term temporal variations and seasonal patterns.

Additional monitoring sites SW13 (Bendigo Creek) and SW14 (Lindis River) were added to the monitoring network in June 2026 in response to comments in the Joint Expert Water Conferencing (JWS, 8-10 June 2026) and RFI 11 and will continue to be monitored monthly as performance monitoring sites throughout the mine life as required by Condition 20 in D.02. The initial water quality information provided in the RFI-11 response was only intended to provide the available information from the new surface water monitoring sites on Lindis River and Bendigo Creek.

Baseline Groundwater Monitoring Network and Data

A second key outcome from the Joint Expert Water Conferencing (JWS, 8-10 June 2026) was an agreement that additional groundwater monitoring locations needed to be established. The recommended groundwater monitoring bores were installed in June/July 2026. The initial water quality information provided during the RFI-11 response was only intended to provide the available information from the the new groundwater monitoring bores.

Whilst it is acknowledged that this initial data set does not yet allow for seasonal appreciation of background conditions, monthly monitoring will continue to be undertaken at all new surface water and groundwater monitoring locations. This will result in approximately 6 months of genuine baseline data being collected before major onsite earthworks commence. The initial construction works/pre-production phase will include pre-stripping of shallow non-acid forming materials. From a mining hydrogeology perspective, this above water table, pre-stripping phase primarily carries risks of hydraulic disturbance associate with changes in recharge through disturbed land surfaces rather than a groundwater quality disturbance.

While the baseline monitoring period will overlap with pre-construction activities, the risk of materially influencing groundwater quality at the downgradient monitoring locations is considered low. Pre-stripping of materials and shallow earthworks are not expected to generate a significant source of acidity, dissolved metals, sulfate, or other mining-related contaminants. As such, there is no credible mechanism by which substantial changes in groundwater quality would be expected to occur at receptors located downgradient during the construction period. Any groundwater quality effects would be expected to be localised to the immediate vicinity of disturbance areas and would attenuate with distance through dilution, dispersion, and geochemical buffering within the groundwater system.

The overlap between baseline monitoring and construction activities is therefore considered unlikely to materially compromise the ability of the monitoring programme to characterise background groundwater quality conditions of the underlying groundwater system. The collected data are expected to remain representative of baseline conditions and suitable for future comparison with operational and closure monitoring results.

Water Quality Monitoring Standards

Both surface and groundwater quality monitoring has been undertaken in accordance with the National Environmental Monitoring Standards (NEMS, 2019):

- Water Quality Part 2: Sampling, Measuring, Processing and Archiving of Discrete River Water Quality Data.
- Water Quality Part 1 - Sampling, Measuring, Processing and Archiving of Discrete Groundwater Quality Data.

Quality assurance/quality control (QA/QC) requirements from the standards, include use of consistent sampling equipment and sampling methods, detailed field records, appropriate sample preservation, appropriate sample transport and holding times, collection of field QA/QC samples at the appropriate frequency, and analysis at an IANZ-accredited laboratory. Standard operating procedures defining the requirements for surface water and groundwater monitoring were included in the Baseline Water Quality Report (B.06A MWM Impacted Water Overview Report - Appendix D).

Due to the compressed timeframe between groundwater monitoring bore installation, development, and initial groundwater quality sampling in July/August 2026, it is acknowledged that the initial elevated total metal concentrations reported in groundwater (e.g. Fe, Al¹) may reflect residual drilling and well development effects potentially resulting in elevated turbidity and mobilisation of fine particulates that can artificially increase total metal concentrations. As such the initial results may not be representative of aquifer conditions. However, the data currently available provide a basis for assessing groundwater quality and it is acknowledged that the longer-term dataset currently being collected will build on this dataset and provide a comprehensive basis for confirming the representativeness of the initial data provided in my response to RFI 11-5 dated 17 August 2026.

COMPLIANCE LIMITS AND MONITORING LOCATIONS

Feedback from multiple stakeholders regarding revised compliance limits has been considered in the updated version of the Consent Conditions. The following sections aim to address the rationale behind the decision-making on some of the recurring themes from the additional responses provided by section 53 invited parties in their 7 September 2026 feedback.

New Surface Water Performance Monitoring Locations

New surface water monitoring stations SW13 (Bendigo Creek) and SW14 (Lindis River) have been added as performance monitoring locations. These sites are not suitable as compliance monitoring points because they are sufficiently downstream of the Project that the influence of third-party sources, including upstream catchment inputs and surrounding pastoral, horticultural and viticultural land uses, cannot be excluded. Notwithstanding, the results of the performance monitoring at these sites, taken at the same frequency and timing as the compliance monitoring, will be compared against the compliance limits established at SC01. Any deterioration in water quality at these locations will trigger an evaluation of site and receiving environment water quality to determine whether any observed changes can reasonably be attributed to Project activities. Compliance limits are specified in conditions 22 and 27 in D.04 and are to be included within the Annual Surface Water and Groundwater Monitoring and Compliance Report in accordance with Condition 34 in D.04. The latter includes a requirement to report the results of compliance and performance monitoring.

The framework for developing and implementing appropriate performance monitoring triggers and response actions for both surface water and groundwater will be specified in the Water Management Plan (WMP). This will include the methodology, criteria, and decision-making process used to establish trigger values, taking account of baseline conditions, natural variability, monitoring trends, and the spatial relationship between monitoring locations and potential Project contaminant sources. The WMP will also set out the investigation, assessment, and management responses that will be implemented should trigger values be exceeded. These measures will be designed to ensure that any deterioration in groundwater or surface water quality that may be attributable to Project activities is identified at the earliest practicable stage and investigated and addressed before adversely affecting receiving environments.

¹ The presentation of total Zn above the NZ DW MAV in the initial evaluation is acknowledged as erroneous and resulted from a unit conversion error. Correction of this unit error results in no reported exceedances of the NZ DW MAV in the initial monitoring results.

Nitrate Limit (1.1 m/L, ANZG 95% SPL)

This limit was extensively discussed in conferencing and has been updated since the drafting of my previous RFI 11-8 response (J-H-NZ0238-008-M-Rev0, dated August 2026). Although the proposed groundwater quality limits are higher than current baseline concentrations, they are not intended to permit degradation of the aquifer up to a specified concentration. Rather, they define the upper limit of acceptable change based on protection of the identified environmental value and therefore function as risk-based assessment thresholds rather than target concentrations. The environmental objective remains to avoid and minimise contaminant releases wherever practicable and to maintain the long-term functionality of the groundwater resource.

It is also important to recognise that the adopted freshwater nitrate guideline is intended to protect the identified receiving-environment values and is not the sole mechanism for managing eutrophication-related effects. Although the nitrate criterion is higher than concentrations typically associated with the onset of nutrient enrichment responses, the risk of eutrophication and excessive algal growth is addressed through a separate consent condition (Condition 39(f)) specifically requiring periphyton monitoring and management. This condition provides a direct assessment of the ecological response most relevant to nutrient enrichment and therefore, acts as a more appropriate and sensitive measure of eutrophication risk than groundwater nitrate concentrations alone.

This multi-element framework represents a responsible approach to environmental protection whereby water quality limits establish concentrations protective of the identified water resource values, while separate periphyton performance measures provide direct protection against nutrient enrichment effects in receiving surface waters. This approach ensures that adoption of the groundwater quality limits does not constitute a licence to pollute, instead providing an integrated management approach designed to protect both groundwater resources and downstream aquatic ecosystems.

Different Compliance Limits Between Catchments

The different limits proposed for select analytes in the Rise and Shine Creek/Bendigo Creek catchment and the Shepherd's Creek catchment reflect the different values associated with the groundwater resources and downstream aquatic ecosystems in the catchments. The principle adopted is for the compliance criteria is that the lowest criteria associated with the potential ecological or beneficial use value applicable to the resource/catchment has been proposed as the compliance limit. For clarity, Table 2 summarises the rationale for these differences. As Rise and Shine Creek is not interpreted to have the same connectivity to the Ardgour and Bendigo Aquifers, as is understood to be present for Shepherd's Creek, compliance monitoring limits have predominantly been retained to protect freshwater ecosystem values.

Table 2: Rationale of compliance limit differences between SC01 and RS03.

ANALYTES	RATIONALE FOR SW COMPLIANCE LIMIT DIFFERENCES
Antimony, sulfate	SC01 has adopted the lower NZ MAV drinking water standard for these analytes (instead of the ANZG 95% SPL) due to the interpreted direct connectivity of surface water from Shepherds Creek to the downstream groundwater system to protect the beneficial groundwater use value.
Boron	The ANZG (2024) Long-term irrigation water guideline (LTIG) has been adopted at SC01 due to the interpreted direct connectivity of surface water from Shepherds Creek to the downstream groundwater system to protect the beneficial groundwater use value. In this case the boron LTIG is the lowest criteria associated with the potential beneficial uses of groundwater in the Shepherd's Creek catchment.

ANALYTES	RATIONALE FOR SW COMPLIANCE LIMIT DIFFERENCES
Molybdenum	The draft ANZG (2023) Livestock drinking water guideline (LDWG) has been adopted at SC01 due to the interpreted direct connectivity of surface water from Shepherds Creek to the downstream groundwater system to protect the beneficial groundwater use value. In this case the molybdenum LDWG is the lowest criteria associated with the potential beneficial uses of groundwater in the Shepherd's Creek catchment.
Arsenic	The ANZG (2025) 80% SPL for arsenic has been adopted at RS03 as background concentrations confirm that the historical mining activities have resulted in elevated arsenic concentrations at this compliance monitoring point.

Application of Statistical Comparison to Guidelines

Based on invited parties' feedback, updates to the water quality assessment tables provided as part of RFI-11 responses are provided in Attachment A. In particular, comparison to the 95%ile data statistics (calculated on the full history of data at SC01 and RS03) have been incorporated for surface water, noting that for the purpose of comparison of the new data at SW13 and SW14 this approach is less conservative and results in the identification of fewer parameters that are statistically higher at SW13 and SW14 than previously interpreted (as the 95%ile will always be higher than the mean).

Note that derivation of 95%ile data for the pit lakes was also not undertaken, as in the previous evaluation the maximum, mean, and median either all exceeded or were all below the assessment criteria, therefore comparison to the 95%ile will result in the same conclusions previously presented.

At this point in time there is not sufficient data to undertake a statistical evaluation of groundwater quality results.

ECOTOXICITY OF PIT LAKES TO AVIFAUNA

The following is provided to address the response provided by Jayde Edward Malthus Couper on behalf of Otago Fish and Game Council (8 September 2026). The respondent's expertise as an avifauna specialist in the Otago Region is respectfully acknowledged. In contrast my area of expertise with respect to the aquatic risk assessment is associated with the principles that underpin the ANZG (2018) derivation of the default aquatic freshwater guideline values (DGVs) that have been adopted as a screening-level tool for risk assessment purposes. Understanding the principles of the DGV derivation is a key component to assessing risk to receptors and note that industry often erroneously interprets the exceedance of a DGV as an indicator that ecological harm will occur as opposed to using the exceedance as a trigger to evaluate the probability of the risk occurring.

Inherently the ANZG freshwater-DGVs, which are the industry standard guidelines used for Tier 1 ecological risk assessment, are derived to protect aquatic organisms (fish, invertebrates, algae, macrophytes, etc.) and are based on ecotoxicological exposure studies for those organisms over a chronic lifetime of exposure. They are not generally derived in consideration of avian drinking water, habitat usage, or dietary toxicity studies. Therefore, for the purpose of assessing risks to waterbirds, the ANZG aquatic ecosystem trigger values have only been used as an initial screening tool, acknowledging that they may not directly address bird exposure. The DGVs do not explicitly account for waterbird exposure durations or drinking-water ingestion rates.

In principle however, one would generally expect avian water quality criteria to be less stringent (i.e. derivation of avian-specific criteria would result in higher allowable concentrations) on the basis that exposure is intermittent rather than chronic under the water usage and exposure scenario described in the Otago Fish and Game Response (i.e. loafing, roofing, refuse and temporary stop-over habitat as

opposed to a significant feeding habitat). Under these circumstances, the dominant exposure pathway shifts from dietary exposure to direct water contact and incidental water ingestion.

With respect to arsenic and antimony, which are the key metals which are currently predicted to exceed the adopted DGVs at 80% species protection levels (SPL), I have the following responses regarding the conservative nature of the ANZG DGVs with respect to the migratory bird behaviours described above:

- For birds floating or resting on the lake surface contaminant uptake of arsenic and antimony is typically negligible because dermal absorption of arsenic and antimony is very limited and exposure duration is intermittent. Therefore, risk is generally much lower than would be inferred for resident aquatic organisms subjected to continuous exposure.
- Drinking represents the most relevant direct exposure pathway; however, ANZG values were designed around chronic aquatic organism exposure occurring essentially 24 hours per day over life-cycle timeframes. In contrast, a migratory bird visits intermittently, drinks relatively small volumes, and spends much of its life elsewhere. As a result, a modest exceedance of an aquatic ecosystem DGV does not necessarily imply an ecologically significant risk to transient birds.
- Preening, washing, moulting and socialising usually involve external contact with water, feather wetting, and occasional incidental ingestion. For arsenic and antimony, these pathways are generally considered minor compared with dietary or drinking-water exposure.
- Grit collection and ingestion is an exposure pathway not addressed by the ANZG criteria. ANZG DGV exceedances do not necessarily translate into elevated risk associated with these activities. In a steep-sided pit lake like the RAS pit, however, this pathway may also be naturally constrained because there will be limited shallow shoreline and therefore accessible sediment areas are restricted.

On balance, the available weight of evidence indicates that the predicted exceedances of ANZG DGVs are unlikely to result in ecologically significant adverse effects to avifauna using the pit lakes. Although some uncertainty remains and the possibility of adverse effects cannot be completely excluded, the exposure regime expected for waterbirds is substantially less intensive than the chronic exposure scenarios on which the DGVs are based. Accordingly, the predicted exceedances should be interpreted as indicating the presence of a potential risk requiring consideration, rather than evidence of a probable or unacceptable risk to avifauna.

GEOCONTAM RISK MANAGEMENT PTY LTD



Julie Palich, MSc MBA CEnvP
Director

Attachments: Attachment A – Updated Surface Water Quality Data Table

REFERENCES

Australian and New Zealand Governments and Australian state and territory governments (ANZG). 2018. Australian and New Zealand Guidelines for Fresh and Marine Water Quality. Canberra, ACT, Australia.

ANZG. 2023. Livestock Drinking Water Guidelines (Draft for Public Comment). Australian and New Zealand Guidelines for Fresh and Marine Water Quality. Australian and New Zealand Governments and Australian state and territory governments, Canberra.

ANZG. 2024. Water Quality for Irrigation and General Water Uses: Guidelines (Draft revised Chapter 4.2, Australian and New Zealand Guidelines for Fresh and Marine Water Quality). Australian and New Zealand Governments and Australian state and territory governments, Canberra, ACT

National Environmental Standards (NEMS). 2019. Water Quality Part 1 - Sampling, Measuring, Processing and Archiving of Discrete Groundwater Quality Data. Version 1.0.0, published 31 March 2019. National Environmental Monitoring Standards, New Zealand.

National Environmental Standards (NEMS). 2019. Water Quality Part 2: Sampling, Measuring, Processing and Archiving of Discrete River Water Quality Data. Version 1.0.0, published 31 March 2019. National Environmental Monitoring Standards, New Zealand.

New Zealand Government. 2022. *Water Services (Drinking Water Standards for New Zealand) Regulations 2022*. Secondary Legislation 2022/168. Wellington, New Zealand

United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA). 2026. Technical Overview of Ecological Risk Assessment: Risk Characterization. Office of Pesticide Programs, Washington, DC.

ATTACHMENT A – UPDATED SW QUALITY TABLE

Attachment A
BOGP Lindis River and Bendigo Creek
Table 1: Surface Water Quality Results

			Field Parameters							Water Quality Parameters					Hardness				Major Ions											
			Temperature	Dissolved Oxygen (%)	Dissolved Oxygen	Electrical Conductivity	pH	ORP (mV)	Turbidity	Total Dissolved Solids (Lab) (filtered)	Total Suspended Solids (Lab)	Dissolved Oxygen	Dissolved Organic Carbon	Turbidity	Calcium Hardness	Magnesium Hardness	Soluble Hardness	Total Hardness	Calcium	Calcium (filtered)	Magnesium	Magnesium (filtered)	Sodium	Sodium (filtered)	Potassium	Potassium (filtered)	Chloride (filtered)	Sulfate (filtered)		
Field ID	Date	ALS Sample Code	°C	%	mg/L	µS/cm	-	mV	NTU	mg/L	mg/L	mg/L	mg/L	NTU	mg CaCO3/L	mg CaCO3/L	mg CaCO3/L	mg CaCO3/L	mg/L	mg/L	mg/L	mg/L	mg/L	mg/L	mg/L	mg/L	mg/L	mg/L		
EQL			--	--	--	--	--	--	--	3	3	0.1	0.5	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.05	0.05	0.5	0.15		
LINDIS RIVER CATCHMENT																														
COMPLIANCE LIMITS - SC01			--	--	--	--	6.5 - 9.0	--	--	--	50	--	--	5	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	250		
95%ile - SC01 (24/04/2023 - 20/05/2026)			--	--	--	638	8.4	--	1.4	382	16	--	6.1	8.5	--	--	--	332	--	76.7	--	29.9	--	16.5	--	3.1	8.7	46.5		
SW14	25-Jun-26	NH2602707002	3.9	100.6	12.5	34.3	6.76	202.3	7.16	50	41	--	--	10.7	16.1	5.99	22.1	--	6.76	--	1.83	--	3.07	--	1.11	--	0.9	2.26		
SW14	24-Jul-26	NH2602985002	4.6	97.5	12.32	60.6	8.26	172.1	15.8	49	111	10.9	3.2	31.1	15.8	6.01	21.8	26.3	6.99	6.32	2.15	1.46	3.31	2.93	1.72	0.61	0.9	1.99		
BENDIGO CREEK CATCHMENT																														
COMPLIANCE LIMITS - RS03			--	--	--	--	6.5 - 9.0	--	--	--	50	--	--	5	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	500		
MEDIAN - RS01 (24/04/2023 - 20/05/2026)			--	--	--	108	7.7	--	1.4	47	--	17.5	3.4	1.4	--	--	--	46	--	13.8	--	2.6	--	18.4	--	0.8	2.2	2.9		
SW13	25-Jun-26	NH2602707002	5.9	98.4	11.75	56.7	6.85	123	34.05	45	<3	--	--	0.26	15.7	5.1	20.8	--	6.42	--	1.29	--	2.72	--	0.44	--	1.2	0.96		
SW13	24-Jul-26	NH2602985001	3.8	101	12.88	54.3	8.14	175.5	2.33	39	8	11.6	7.7	2.84	9.35	3.29	12.6	13.9	4.06	3.74	0.92	0.8	2.25	2.05	0.78	0.7	1	0.66		

(##) acute compliance limit not to be exceeded

Attachment A
BOGP Lindis River and Bendigo Creek
Table 1: Surface Water Quality Results

			Inorganics					Nutrients						Metals														
			pH (Lab)	Electrical Conductivity (Non Compensated)	Bicarbonate	Carbonate Alkalinity	Cyanide Total	Nitrogen (Total)	Kjeldahl Nitrogen Total	Nitrate (as N) (filtered)	Ammonia as N (filtered)	Total Phosphorus as P (Organic Phosphate as P)	Dissolved Reactive Phosphorus as P	Aluminium (filtered)	Antimony	Antimony (filtered)	Arsenic (filtered)	Boron (filtered)	Cadmium (filtered)	Chromium (III+VI) (filtered)	Cobalt (filtered)	Copper (filtered)	Iron	Iron (filtered)	Manganese (filtered)	Molybdenum (filtered)	Selenium	Zinc (filtered)
Field ID	Date	ALS Sample Code	-	µS/cm	g CaCO3/m3	g CaCO3/m3	mg/L	mg/L	mg/L	mg/L	mg/L	mg/L	ug/L	ug/L	ug/L	ug/L	ug/L	ug/L	ug/L	ug/L	ug/L	ug/L	ug/L	ug/L	ug/L	ug/L	ug/L	ug/L
EQL			0.01	10	1	1	0.002	0.1	0.1	0.002	0.005	0.005	0.002	3	0.1	0.0001	0.5	5	0.02	0.2	0.01	0.2	5	5	0.5	0.2	0.5	1
LINDIS RIVER CATCHMENT																												
COMPLIANCE LIMITS - SC01			6.5 - 9.0	--	--	--	0.007	--	--	1.1	0.4	--	--	0.055	0.02	--	0.013	0.94	0.0002	0.001	0.0014 (0.11)	0.0014	0.3	--	1.9	0.01	0.005	0.0008
95%ile - SC01 (24/04/2023 - 20/05/2026)			60.2	638	272	5.8	0.005	0.78	--	0.17	0.029	0.062	0.007	0.0096	0.0002	--	0.0047	--	0.00002	0.001	0.0005	0.0007	--	0.03	0.002	0.012	0.005	0.003
SW14	25-Jun-26	NH2602707002	7.17	56.5	24	<1	<0.002	0.3	--	0.098	<0.005	0.067	0.004	0.016	<0.0001	<0.0001	0.0005	<0.01	<0.00002	0.0002	0.00008	0.0005	1.01	0.029	0.0023	<0.0002	<0.001	<0.001
SW14	24-Jul-26	NH2602985002	6.59	53.1	25	<1	<0.002	0.3	0.16	0.11	<0.005	0.078	0.004	0.030	<0.0001	<0.0001	0.0006	<0.01	<0.00002	<0.0002	0.00008	0.0006	2.46	0.044	0.0019	<0.0002	<0.001	0.001
BENDIGO CREEK CATCHMENT																												
COMPLIANCE LIMITS - RS03			6.5 - 9.0	--	--	--	0.007	--	--	1.1	0.4	--	--	0.055	0.074 (0.25)	--	0.042	0.94	0.0002	0.001	0.0014 (0.11)	0.0014	0.3	--	1.9	0.034	0.005	0.008
MEDIAN - RS01 (24/04/2023 - 20/05/2026)			7.7	108	48	<1	0.0035	--	--	0.02	0.02	0.022	0.007	0.023	0.001	--	0.015	--	0.0002	0.001	0.0005	0.00073	--	0.1	0.043	0.0005	0.005	0.005
SW13	25-Jun-26	NH2602707002	7.14	50	25	<1	<0.002	<0.1	--	<0.002	<0.005	0.025	0.007	0.004	<0.0001	<0.0001	0.0045	<0.01	<0.00002	<0.0002	0.00003	<0.0002	0.032	0.013	0.0024	<0.0002	<0.001	<0.001
SW13	24-Jul-26	NH2602985001	6.48	32.5	13	<1	<0.002	0.4	--	<0.002	<0.005	0.032	0.007	0.042	0.0005	<0.0001	0.0036	<0.01	<0.00002	0.0002	0.00006	0.0006	0.467	0.068	0.0012	<0.0002	0.002	<0.001

(##) acute compliance limit not to be exceeded