

APPLICANT RESPONSES TO RELEVANT COMMENTS FROM OWNERS AND OCCUPIERS OF THE ADJACENT LAND FOR THE BENDIGO-OPHIR GOLD PROJECT

This document contains the key comments from the following parties:

- > Ross Hannan;
- > Sharon Brodie;
- > QWIL Investments (NZ) Pty Limited – Katherine Smith;
- > Professor Geoffrey Kearsley and Dr. Claire Fletcher-Flinn;
- > Megan Bryan;
- > Bruce Lambie;
- > Diane Jean Lucas;
- > Canyon Vineyard; and
- > Trevathan Family.

Comments from Ross Hannan

Comment Number	Comment	Applicant Technical Input	Where Addressed in the Application Documents	Response
1	The application does not meaningfully assess potential effects on the Lindis Ribbon Alluvial Aquifer (LRA) or Ardgour Aquifer (AA), despite their hydrological connection to Shepherds Creek.	Groundwater	<p>Substantive FTA Application:</p> <p>B.03 Kōmanawa Solutions, Groundwater Existing environment – Environmental Effects.</p> <p>K.01 Kōmanawa Solutions, Post Closure Impact on the Ardgour Aquifer, 10 March 2026.</p> <p>Response Evidence:</p> <p>Responses by Jens Rekker to invited comments by Ross Hanan, Paragraphs 54 -127.</p>	The Shepherds Creek alluvium, Ardgour Aquifer and Lindis Alluvial Ribbon Aquifer have been covered with reports B.03 and K.01 in Kōmanawa Solutions reporting and modelling by Matt Dumont and Jens Rekker. Jens Rekker has undertaken reviews, research, participated in groundwater modelling, and provided evidence in the Environment Court. Indeed, Jens Rekker named the Lindis Alluvial Ribbon Aquifer and Ardgour (Alluvial or Valley) Aquifer) in his report to the Environment Committee of Otago Regional Council in setting the draft allocation and water take controls in 2010. BOGP proposals have been hydrologically assessed in full knowledge of the current state of data and information for these three ground water bodies and associated creeks and Lindis River.
2	There is inadequate understanding of groundwater–surface water interactions between Shepherds Creek, the LRA, the AA, and the Lindis River, creating unacceptable uncertainty in impact predictions.	Groundwater	<p>Substantive FTA Application:</p> <p>B.02 Kōmanawa Solutions, Groundwater Existing environment – Environmental Effects.</p> <p>Response Evidence:</p> <p>Statement of evidence by Jens Rekker</p>	Kōmanawa Solutions responses that there is adequate information on the Shepherds Creek alluvium, Ardgour Aquifer and Lindis Alluvial Ribbon Aquifer and this has been outlined the referenced reports for the BOGP project. A number of organisations; ORC, Otago Fish & Game, Ryder Consulting and Lincoln Agritech have undertaken field-based and computer modelling studies of the Ardgour Aquifer, Lindis Alluvial Ribbon Aquifer and Lindis River since 2009.

Comment Number	Comment	Applicant Technical Input	Where Addressed in the Application Documents	Response
				The groundwater – surface water interactions were the particular focus of all of the above investigation and analysis, particularly for the lower Lindis Valley.
3	Groundwater plume modelling relies on generic, unvalidated; a proven, site-specific scientific model is required to assess contaminant transport and dilution.	Groundwater	<p>Substantive FTA Application:</p> <p>B.02 Kōmanawa Solutions, Groundwater Existing environment – Environmental Effects.</p> <p>K.01 Kōmanawa Solutions, Post Closure Impact on the Ardgour Aquifer, 10 March 2026.</p> <p>B.05 Kōmanawa Solutions, Groundwater Modelling Analysis for Mining Bendigo Ophir Gold Deposit.</p> <p>Response Evidence:</p> <p>Responses by Jens Rekker to invited comments by Ross Hanan, Paragraphs 54 -127.</p>	<p>Groundwater “plume” modelling relies on the simulation of continuous or pulses of contaminants released virtually into the model framework. Groundwater “plume” modelling was not undertaken in the Komanawa Solutions’ groundwatr mass transport model simulations of the Shepherds Creek alluvium, Ardgour Aquifer and Lindis Alluvial Ribbon Aquifer. Sensitivity analysis style modelling was employed to make estimates of the degree of mixing and dilution that may be afforded by</p> <p>In case the plume modelling referred to is that of schist-rock groundwater, indeed no groundwater seepage from mine waste management structures such as the TSF or ELFs was undertaken since it would be evident that conceptual model projection of the fate of mine waste fluids in groundwater would be to the base of the steeply incised gorges and gullies into which the mine wastes will be emplaced.</p> <p>The parallels made to be the Pope & Craw and Craw and Nelson scientific papers are noted. However, the KSL response draws attention to the distinct and pertinent differences in topography and hydrogeology of Macraes Mine and Bendigo.</p>
4	Because the LRA is hydrologically connected to the Lindis River, water quality compliance limits should use the strictest applicable, including surface water criteria.	Water Quality Groundwater	<p>Substantive FTA Application:</p> <p>B.02 Kōmanawa Solutions, Groundwater Existing environment – Environmental Effects.</p> <p>K.01 Kōmanawa Solutions, Post Closure Impact on the Ardgour Aquifer, 10 March 2026.</p> <p>Response Evidence:</p> <p>Evidence of Greg Ryder – paragraph 66</p> <p>Responses by Jens Rekker to invited comments by Ross Hanan, Paragraphs 54 -127.</p>	<p>The risk of effects on Lindis River water quality are very low, and it has been predicted that any contaminants that may reach that river have very low likelihood of exceeding ANZG DGVs for the 95 % level of species protection.</p> <p>KSL: It could be pointed out that the ORC adoption as part Plan Change 1C to include the LARA as a Schedule 2C water body was within the context of managing the Lindis catchment’s river water resources and alluvial ribbon groundwater resources conjunctively. However, the Schedule 2C declaration of the LARA was not for water quality reasons. The groundwater quality protection tool within the Regional Plan: Water is the Groundwater Protection Zone (A and B) and no such declaration of a Groundwater Protection Zone was made in the Plan 1C or Plan Change 5A processes.</p> <p>Characterisation and assessment of potential effects in terms of water quantity or water quality within the MGL application has acknowledged the dual groundwater – surface water nature of the LARA and the associated Lindis River. Accordingly, MGL and its technical advisors have a comprehensive understanding of the dual groundwater – surface water context and the water resource spectrum within which the LARA and river are managed.</p>

Comment Number	Comment	Applicant Technical Input	Where Addressed in the Application Documents	Response
5	Surface water monitoring is proposed only monthly and at limited locations, which is inadequate for detecting contamination events; additional monitoring sites along the Lindis River are required.	Water Quality Planning	Response Evidence: Paragraph 67 in Evidence of Greg Ryder	Monthly monitoring is a standard interval that fits with most water quality guidelines and protocols. Additional Lindis River and Bendigo Creek surface water monitoring conditions are proposed and included in D.04 - Schedule Two - General Conditions for ORC Consents (17 April 2026) (NEW 6).
6	The application does not include a dedicated groundwater monitoring plan for the LRA or AA, and no monitoring wells are located within either aquifer.	Surface and Groundwater	Substantive FTA Application: B.02 Kōmanawa Solutions, Groundwater Existing environment – Environmental Effects. K.01 Kōmanawa Solutions, Post Closure Impact on the Ardgour Aquifer, 10 March 2026 Response Evidence: Responses by Jens Rekker to invited comments by Ross Hanan, Paragraphs 54 -127.	KSL: Groundwater monitoring includes the MW-101 compliance monitoring site at the conjunction of the Shepherds Creek Alluvium and Ardgour Aquifer is an important contribution to surveilling for the movement of any unanticipated potential contaminated concentrations, and in order to establish the data for assessing long-term trends. It is proposed to extend performance monitoring to the Lindis River to a site adjacent to the ORC flow monitoring site off Ardgour Road. Monthly sampling and the full surface water and groundwater analyte list will be set for analysis. The recent proposals for monitoring surface water at the sites Lindis River at Ardgour Road, and Bendigo Creek at the BSL gauging site, plus groundwater characterisation at the SC-01 bedrock gap have been outlined above.
7	The Water Management Plan lacks a sludge disposal plan and proposes silt and sediment ponds designed only for a 1-in-10-year rainfall event, which is insufficient under current and future climate conditions.	Mine Waste Management Preliminary Site Investigation Geotechnical	Substantive FTA Application: B.06C Mine Waste Management Limited - Mine Impacted Water Overview Report – Appendix I to O - Appendix M. G.01 Water Management Plan - Section 9.6 Response Evidence: Evidence of Julie Palich. Evidence of Eric Torvelainen - Paragraph 33 and Paragraph 35	Sludge management will be offsite. If studies confirm other options are suitable these will be assessed early in the Operational phase as part of water treatability studies, which will generate sludge. Removal of sediment ponds is a regular maintenance activity for earthmoving operations. Sediment from the silt ponds will be excavated, transported, and placed either in Shepherds Tailings Storage Facility or Shepherds ELF. The sediment in silt ponds will be from the ELF surface and so return this to the ELFs or TSF is normal practice. There are only two sediment retention devices onsite that are required to function for more than two years. The Shepherds Silt Pond and Western ELF Silt Pond. EGL has checked the capacity of space allowed for the Shepherds Silt Pond and confirm that a 1 in 20-year design basis can be achieved within the existing silt pond footprint for the Project. A 1 in 20-year storm event means there is an approximately 5% chance each year that a storm event will not be fully contained and water will spill over the auxiliary spillway weir (which is designed for a 1 in 1000-year event) as a shallow sheet flow. In this situation detention times will be shorter than normal and higher sediment concentrations could be discharged. Such discharges would be for a very short period, and the additional sediment load would be small in comparison with the downstream receiving waters (water courses). In final closure all surfaces of areas reporting to the Shepherds Silt Pond will be rehabilitated and the silt pond will no longer be required.



Comment Number	Comment	Applicant Technical Input	Where Addressed in the Application Documents	Response
				The Western ELF is only operational for a short period during the mine life i.e. around 2 years or less. I consider that it is appropriate that the design basis for sediment retention is 1 in 10 years.
8	Flood modelling shows that a major rainfall event could cause contaminated runoff to enter the Lindis River, with major to catastrophic environmental effects, and no remediation plan is provided.	Geotechnical	Response Evidence: Evidence of Dr Trevor Matuschka - Paragraphs 21 and 56	<p>Flood modelling referenced in this comment relates to a hypothetical breach scenario conducted as part of a Potential Impact Classification (PIC) dam breach assessment. It does not reflect the likelihood of a breach occurring.</p> <p>The Water Management Plan states “During operations, the TSF will be a fully contained, no release facility with no dedicated spillway, with all supernatant (decant) water managed onsite and contained within the mine circuit water.” This refers to the management of water on the surface of the tailings which will not be released from the facility. Sufficient storage volume is allowed on the TSF to manage all operational situations plus a Probable Maximum Flood, plus 1 m freeboard for wave action.</p> <p>The TSF is assessed to be a High PIC dam and will be designed for a 1 in 10,000-year earthquake and Probable Maximum Precipitation 72-hour storm event. These criteria are similar to other international design guidelines for dams (ICOLD, ANCOLD, CDA) including the GISTM. Dams that are designed, constructed, operated, and governed to these standards have an acceptably low likelihood of failure (i.e., a breach would not be expected to occur).</p>
9	Although the application describes the TSF and engineered landforms as “fully contained,” the water management documentation includes extensive provisions for managing seepage, indicating containment is not absolute.	Geotechnical	Response Evidence: Evidence of Dr Trevor Matuschka - Paragraph 21 - 22	The term fully contained relates to surface water management, not seepage. The Water Management Plan states “During operations, the TSF will be a fully contained, no release facility with no dedicated spillway, with all supernatant (decant) water managed onsite and contained within the mine circuit water.” This refers to the management of water on the surface of the tailings which will not be released from the facility. Sufficient storage volume is allowed on the TSF to manage all operational situations plus a Probable Maximum Flood, plus 1 m freeboard for wave action.
10	The application does not include a comprehensive climate change assessment for water management, flood risk, infrastructure design, or long-term operational and closure impacts.	Geotechnical	Response Evidence: Evidence of Dr Trevor Matuschka - Paragraphs 22-30	<p>The primary control for surface water on the TSF is allowing for an inflow design flood. Final details for the dam are subject to detailed design and application for a Building Consent as required by the Building Act 2004. This also requires independent peer review. This is currently underway, and this includes the assessment of the inflow design flood.</p> <p>The detailed design will allow for climate change effects. The allowance for climate change effect in the detailed design inflow design flood will be based on the increases in high intensity rainfall estimates published by NIWA in their High Intensity Rainfall Database Version 4 for Climate Change Scenario Representative Concentration Pathway 8.5. For a 1 in 250-year event the modelling indicates for a 72-hour storm duration.</p>

Comment Number	Comment	Applicant Technical Input	Where Addressed in the Application Documents	Response
11	The seismic hazard assessment does not adequately evaluate TSF stability under earthquake conditions, leaving uncertainty over the risk of geotechnical failure and subsequent contamination.	Geotechnical	Response Evidence: Evidence of Dr Trevor Matuschka - Paragraphs 31 - 35	<p>Seismic hazards include ground shaking, displacement of the ground due to fault rupture, and landslides. The principal hazard for most dams is ground shaking unless there are active faults underlying the dam. There is no evidence of active faults at the site. Landslides are a potential hazard if they are large enough to displace the contents stored by a dam. The site would have experienced multiple large magnitude earthquakes over the millions of years that the site has existed in its current form. There is no evidence that this has resulted in landslides on the sides of the valley that could displace tailings from the TSF and so this hazard is considered very low risk.</p> <p>The tailings dam will be designed to meet the New Zealand Dam Safety Guidelines. These guidelines are based on international best practices. For earthquakes the TSF will be designed to withstand a 1 in 10,000-year earthquake. The seismic hazard study to determine the seismic hazard loading is based on the latest National Seismic Hazard Model released in 2022 and includes rupture of the Alpine Fault and large magnitude faults near to the site.</p> <p>The proposed design has the tailings contained behind a rockfill embankment that will also be buttressed by a large volume of rockfill placed in the Shepherds ELF. The proposed TSF will provide a very safe and robust tailings storage solution for both operation and post closure of the site. The detailed design will be independently peer reviewed as part of the Building Consent approval process for the tailings dam. I consider that the tailings dam will safely contain tailings when subjected to potential future extreme earthquakes.</p>
12	Plan Change 5A low-flow and allocation constraints in the Lindis catchment may limit the ability to undertake remediation or dilution following contamination, and this has not been assessed.	Surface and Groundwater	<p>Substantive FTA Application:</p> <p>B.02 Kōmanawa Solutions, Groundwater Existing environment – Environmental Effects.</p> <p>K.01 Kōmanawa Solutions, Post Closure Impact on the Ardgour Aquifer, 10 March 2026.</p> <p>Response Evidence:</p> <p>Responses by Jens Rekker to invited comments by Ross Hanan, Paragraphs 54 -127.</p>	<p>It is noted that the Lindis River catchment is already fully allocated with an exacting set of water take controls et in the RM17.301 series resource consents. These consents concern almost all current water take consents in the Lindis catchment.</p> <p>KSL understands the concern in relation to the Lindis catchment water management relates to the possible eventuality of, say, a release of contaminated surface water or groundwater into the lower Lindis Valley that would require a remediation such damming, diversion or groundwater pumping.</p> <p>KSL considers that such an eventuality has very low probability, however were MGL in the position of planning to undertake such remedial works, it would need to apply in the normal manner to the appropriate authorities. In such an application process I would anticipate that the interests and values of Lindis Catchment water users and stakeholders would have primacy in the normal balancing of current or future legislation and regulations.</p>
13	The application relies heavily on adaptive management and future mitigation measures that are not yet developed or tested, rather than presenting proven, upfront controls.	Mine Waste Management Planning	<p>Substantive FTA Application:</p> <p>Adaptive management is used throughout the documents provided by MWM and the Water and ELF management plans.</p>	<p>Adaptive management is an accepted and common effects management process. The appropriateness of adaptive management processes to manage uncertainty through evolving project knowledge is explained in the legal submission.</p> <p>Papers on adaptive management are provided in the evidence of Dr Paul Weber.</p>



Comment Number	Comment	Applicant Technical Input	Where Addressed in the Application Documents	Response
----------------	---------	---------------------------	--	----------

Response Evidence:

Evidence of Dr Paul Weber.

Comments from Sharon Brodie

Comment Number	Comment	Applicant Technical Input	Where Addressed in the Application Documents	Response
----------------	---------	---------------------------	--	----------

1	<p><u>Tailings storage and toxic contamination risks</u></p> <p>Strong concern about the tailings storage facility (TSF) including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> > The presence of cyanide, arsenic, ferric chloride, and heavy metals such as lead, mercury, and cadmium in tailings. > The TSF being unlined, despite allowing a stated level of seepage. <p>Ms Brodie also questions whether proposed clay and rock layers can reliably prevent leakage in schist, rocky, and silty soils, noting that water can move unpredictably through such geology.</p> <p>Ms Brodie also raises concerns about acid mine drainage, where sulfide minerals exposed to air and rain could generate sulfuric acid and leach heavy metals into soils and groundwater and argues that historical experience shows tailings dams do fail.</p>	<p>Geotechnical</p> <p>Geochemistry</p>	<p>Response Evidence:</p> <p>Evidence of Ryan Burgess.</p> <p>Evidence of Dr Trevor Matuschka - Paragraphs 10 and 41</p>	<p>At the BOGP, MWSFs will be placed within constrained valleys where groundwater flows from valley sides up into the valley bottom. Such hydrogeological settings act to concentrate seepage in the valley bottom creating favourable conditions seepage collection. The combination of the BOGP hydrogeological setting, proposed forward works, proposed seepage collection systems, performance monitoring, contingency measures available, the potential for high levels of seepage bypassing collection systems is low.</p> <p>There are several features that restrict seepage. They include containment by naturally high groundwater levels around the TSF except in the downstream direction, design features (low permeability zone on upstream face of the dam, cutoff to bedrock, grouting of rock defects, chimney drain behind low permeability zone, underdrains to collect seepage, seepage collection pipes to a seepage collection sump), operational features (discharge and management of tailings from dam so that pond water is not in direct contact with dam and abutments). Seepage will be collected and treated. Performance monitoring will be undertaken to monitor surface and ground water quality downstream of the TSF and ELF. If monitoring indicates a change in water quality, there are contingency measures that can be implemented. This includes grout curtains, seepage cutoff wall, seepage interception drains, or seepage recovery wells. The residual risk to the Ardgour and Lindis Aquifer is low because seepage is constrained in a narrow valley so that the implementation of seepage recovery measures is relatively straight forward.</p> <p>With respect to the TSF being unlined:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Liners can be constructed from low permeability compacted earthfill or be a geomembrane (often HDPE). Geomembrane liners are the most popular but there is uncertainty about their long-term durability and if they will provide containment in perpetuity. Liners are necessary where the impact of seepage can have adverse environmental impacts. Their greatest benefit is during operation when seepage is highest. Liners are not necessary where the seepage is contained by natural or design features and it is feasible to monitor and implement a seepage control system. As explained in paragraphs 10 and 37 to 40 the natural features of the site (containment by groundwater), design
---	---	---	---	---

Comment Number	Comment	Applicant Technical Input	Where Addressed in the Application Documents	Response
				features, and performance monitoring and ability to implement a seepage control system means that a liner has no significant benefit for this project.
2	<p><u>Seismic risk and dam safety</u></p> <p>Ms Brodie expresses scepticism about claims that the tailings dam can withstand a 1-in-10,000-year earthquake, particularly given:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> > The alpine environment; and > Expectations of significant seismic activity associated with the Alpine Fault. <p>Ms Brodie also questions what evidence supports the dam's safety under these conditions.</p>	Geotechnical Engineering	<p>Response Evidence:</p> <p>Evidence of Dr Trevor Matuschka - Paragraphs 31 - 35</p>	<p>Embankment dams like that proposed for the tailings dam have very good seismic performance and many have experienced ground motions like that proposed for the design of the dam. Seismic hazards include ground shaking, displacement of the ground due to fault rupture, and landslides. The principal hazard for most dams is ground shaking unless there are active faults underlying the dam. There is no evidence of active faults at the site. Landslides are a potential hazard if they are large enough to displace the contents stored by a dam. The site would have experienced multiple large magnitude earthquakes over the millions of years that the site has existed in its current form. There is no evidence that this has resulted in landslides on the sides of the valley that could displace tailings from the TSF and so this hazard is considered very low risk.</p> <p>The tailings dam will be designed to meet the New Zealand Dam Safety Guidelines. These guidelines are based on international best practices. For earthquakes the TSF will be designed to withstand a 1 in 10,000-year earthquake. The seismic hazard study to determine the seismic hazard loading is based on the latest National Seismic Hazard Model released in 2022 and includes rupture of the Alpine Fault and large magnitude faults near to the site.</p> <p>The proposed design has the tailings contained behind a rockfill embankment that will also be buttressed by a large volume of rockfill placed in the Shepherds ELF. The proposed TSF will provide a very safe and robust tailings storage solution for both operation and post closure of the site. The detailed design will be independently peer reviewed as part of the Building Consent approval process for the tailings dam. I consider that the tailings dam will safely contain tailings when subjected to potential future extreme earthquakes.</p>
3	<p><u>Wind erosion and toxic dust</u></p> <p>Ms Brodie notes that Bendigo experiences extreme winds (120–160 km/h) at certain times of year and is concerned that, because dry stacked tailings would not be capped with water, windblown toxic dust poses respiratory risks to workers and residents and would cause wider environmental contamination.</p>	Air Quality	<p>Substantive FTA Application:</p> <p>B.33 Pattle Delamore Partners - Assessment of Environmental Effects from the Discharge of Contaminants into Air (PDP 2025) - Section 8.0</p> <p>Response Evidence:</p> <p>Evidence of Jeff Bluett - Paragraph 16.</p>	<p>The AQA (Document 33) and subsequent review of the Lake Clearview data has included three years of wind data, including a number of high wind events. The data record provides an accurate picture of wind conditions experienced in the area and that these wind conditions have been captured in the dust impact assessment.</p>
4	<i>Comment row intentionally blank</i>			
5	<i>Comment row intentionally blank</i>			

Comment Number	Comment	Applicant Technical Input	Where Addressed in the Application Documents	Response
6	<p><u>Noise and blasting</u></p> <p>Ms Brodie disputes the applicant's characterisation of noise effects. More particularly, she considers night-time blasting would be clearly audible in an otherwise very quiet rural environment and argues noise impacts require more assessment.</p>	Acoustics	<p>Substantive FTA Application:</p> <p>B.29 - Marshall Day Acoustics - Assessment of Noise and Vibration Effects (Marshall Day 2025)</p> <p>A.10 - Section 3 – Project Description Project Description - Section 3.5.4</p>	Ms Brodie's dwelling is approximately 7.5 km from the BOGP Processing Plant Area, and BOGP operational noise will largely be inaudible at this location. For context, local noise sources, such as traffic noise from the adjacent State Highway 8, will be more prominent at this property. No surface blasting in open pits shall occur at night - before 10 am and no later than 9 pm
7	<p><u>Noise, blasting, and associated wildlife disturbance</u></p> <p>Considers blasting and noise would severely disrupt wildlife behaviour and habitat and associated effects on ecosystems requires more assessment.</p>	Acoustics	<p>Substantive FTA Application:</p> <p>A.10 - Section 3 – Project Description Project Description - Section 3.5.4</p>	No surface blasting in open pits shall occur before 10 am and no later than 9 pm
8	<p><u>Downstream and cumulative environmental effects</u></p> <p>Ms Brodie emphasises concern about downstream impacts, beyond the immediate project area, including cumulative effects on ecosystems and communities.</p>	MGL	N/A	MGL has reviewed related comments to these general concerns and acknowledges such concerns are genuinely held, however, the comments do not include any specific assessment or evidence on which to provide a considered response. Accordingly, MGL considers there is no technical or evidential basis for any further response over and above the information already provided to the Panel.
9	<p><u>Economic fairness</u></p> <p>Expresses concern that profits will largely flow offshore while locals bear lasting consequences and economic benefits are insufficient relative to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Long-term environmental damage; and > Permanent alteration of a landscape described as highly biodiverse. 	<p>Legal</p> <p>Economics</p>	<p>Response Evidence:</p> <p>Legal Submissions, 17 April 2026 at 'Overall Assessment of Economic Effects'</p> <p>Evidence of Benje Patterson</p>	As at 31 March 2026, 39.1% of SML shareholders were New Zealanders, and workers will not be FIFO so will live in the local area. It is estimated that GNP will be \$230m pa on average out of \$360m of direct GDP.
10	<p><u>Community relations and safety</u></p> <p>Raises concern about the conduct and attitude of the applicant, citing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Disparaging remarks by company representatives toward locals; and > Alleged intimidation, vandalism, and physical abuse of opponents. 	MGL	N/A	MGL has reviewed related comments to these general concerns and acknowledges such concerns are genuinely held, however, the comments do not include any specific assessment or evidence on which to provide a considered response. Accordingly, MGL considers there is no technical or evidential basis for any further response over and above the information already provided to the Panel.



Comments from QWIL Investments (NZ) Pty Limited – Katherine Smith

Comment Number	Comment	Applicant Technical Input	Where Addressed in the Application Documents	Response
1	<i>Comment row intentionally blank.</i>			
2	<p><u>Groundwater quality and food safety risks</u></p> <p>Concerned about contamination risks from:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Cyanide use and storage; > Tailings and waste rock facilities; > Long-term leachate migration. <p>Relief sought includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Comprehensive baseline groundwater testing on the commentor’s property before disturbance; > Ongoing monitoring for parameters relevant to viticulture (e.g. cyanide, heavy metals, salinity, sulphates, pH); and > Immediate mitigation and compensation if project related water quality impacts occur, without burden of proof on the landowner. 	MGL	<p>Substantive FTA Application:</p> <p>B.03 - Kōmanawa Solutions Limited - Groundwater Existing Environment and Effects Assessment (Kōmanawa 2025b)</p> <p>B.04 - Kōmanawa Solutions Limited - Surface Water and Catchment Existing Environment and Effects Assessment (Kōmanawa 2025c)</p> <p>B.06 - Mine Waste Management Limited - Mine Impacted Water Overview Report (MWM 2025)</p> <p>B.21 - Engineering Geology Limited - Shepherds Tailings Storage Facility Technical Report (EGL 2025b)</p> <p>B.23 - Engineering Geology Limited - Shepherds Tailings Storage</p> <p>Part D – Proposed Approvals and Conditions</p>	<p>These potential effects have been addressed in the extensive technical assessments that formed the Substantive Application to the Fast Track Process. Waste rock and tailings have the highest potential to cause the environmental effects if not properly managed. The risks have been assessed and addressed in a number of geotechnical, geochemistry, hydrology and hydrogeology reports. These assessments will direct the design and construction of the project to manage the risks. Ground and surface water monitoring will identify any changes to water quality or flow. Monitoring locations are selected to ensure early warning of change and confirm compliance with conditions. Conditions set limits to protect the environment. Monitoring and reporting data will be publicly available. Bonding ensures that funds are available for restoration, if required, at any stage of the mine life.</p> <p>Baseline monitoring has been undertaken since 2022. Performance and compliance monitoring requirements will be set in conditions and required for the duration of the consent.</p>
3	<p><u>Monitoring, transparency, and independent oversight</u></p> <p>Requests conditions requiring:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Monitoring bores between the mine and vineyards, not solely on mine land > Regular provision of monitoring data in an understandable format > An independent regulator with authority to require operational changes or suspension if thresholds are exceeded 	<p>Hydrogeology</p> <p>Planning</p>	<p>Response Evidence:</p> <p>Provided in the evidence of Ryan Burgess.</p>	<p>The proposed groundwater monitoring locations (performance and compliance) are strategically located along potential groundwater pathways between potential contamination sources (e.g., mine waste storage facilities, MWSFs) and receptors (e.g., groundwater users), consistent with standard industry practise.</p> <p>MGL has drafted firm and enforceable conditions across the full range of disciplines which were submitted with the substantive application. These draft conditions will be further refined with input from agencies and the panel through the assessment process.</p>
4	<p><u>Make-good provisions and financial assurance</u></p> <p>Concern that high value horticultural landowners could bear risk without adequate protection.</p> <p>Requests conditions that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Require a legally binding “make-good” framework for loss of groundwater quantity, quality, or reliability; 	Planning	N/A	<p>This comment does not provide specific alternative condition or amendments and as such, we have not considered this matter further due to the compressed timeframes and no changes to the conditions have been made at this time.</p>

Comment Number	Comment	Applicant Technical Input	Where Addressed in the Application Documents	Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Include provision for alternative water supply or infrastructure upgrades at the applicant's cost; and > Require robust financial assurance lasting through mine life and post closure, regardless of ownership changes 			
5	<p>Cumulative and long-term effects</p> <p>Highlights the intergenerational nature of viticulture, with land value closely tied to environmental integrity, and expresses concerns about:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Delayed groundwater impacts > Post closure contaminant migration > Reliance on perpetual management regimes that may fail or become unfunded <p>Argues that short term mining benefits should not transfer long term environmental and financial risk to neighbouring agricultural landowners.</p>	MGL	N/A	MGL has reviewed related comments to these general concerns and acknowledges such concerns are genuinely held, however, the comments do not include any specific assessment or evidence on which to provide a considered response. Accordingly, MGL considers there is no technical or evidential basis for any further response over and above the information already provided to the Panel.
6	Apply a precautionary approach to Bendigo Aquifer protection.	Legal	<p>Response Evidence:</p> <p>Legal Submissions, 17 April 2026 at 'Use of Models'</p>	The expert technical assessment and proposed adaptive management approach demonstrates that the risk is known, mitigated and appropriate.

Comments from Professor Geoffrey Kearsley and Dr Claire Fletcher-Flinn

Comment Number	Comment	Applicant Technical Input	Where Addressed in the Application Documents	Response
1	<p><u>Tailings dam risks</u></p> <p>The proposed large tailings dam above the valley is viewed as a permanent and serious liability.</p> <p>Even with design safeguards, a dam failure or longterm seepage is always possible, particularly as unexpected events can occur.</p> <p>The presence of active regional fault lines, including the Alpine Fault, raises concern about catastrophic failure during a future earthquake.</p>	Geotechnical	<p>Response Evidence:</p> <p>Evidence of Dr Trevor Matuschka - Paragraphs 9-11, 32 - 36</p>	Refer to responses to Sharon Brodie comment #2, Ross Hanan comments #9,11



Comment Number	Comment	Applicant Technical Input	Where Addressed in the Application Documents	Response
	A tailings dam would remain long after mine closure, leaving a burden for future generations.			
2	<p><u>Water quality and chemical contamination</u></p> <p>Concerns are expressed about long term contamination of aquifers, Shepherds Creek, and the Lindis and Clutha Rivers - Citing mining evidence from comparable operations (e.g. Macraes) where groundwater leakage has persisted.</p> <p>Particular concern is raised about:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Arsenic and other contaminants entering waterways via seepage, runoff, or flooding; and > The mine's location in a narrow valley prone to flooding during heavy rainfall. <p>Uncertainty is highlighted about the company's commitment to the International Cyanide Code.</p> <p>Climate change is expected to increase extreme rainfall, heightening contamination risk.</p>	<p>Water Quality</p> <p>Geochemistry</p> <p>Hydrogeology</p> <p>Geotechnical</p> <p>MGL</p>	<p>Response Evidence:</p> <p>Provided in the evidence of Ryan Burgess.</p>	<p>In my opinion, the combination of the BOGP hydrogeological setting, proposed forward works, proposed seepage collection systems, performance monitoring, contingency measures available, the potential for high levels of seepage bypassing collection systems is low. Climate change was represented in the Water and Load Balance Model.</p> <p>Cyanide detoxification and arsenic precipitation steps are implemented prior to process slurry deposition into the TSF. Cyanide levels of all slurry entering the TSF meet international standards for the protection of wildlife and the environment. All decant water from the TSF (including seepage and drains drains) is recycled back to the process plant. Cyanide use and storage is tightly controlled and monitored. Supply from ORICA for manufacturing and transportation of NaCN to site is certified under the ICMC. Site designs are compliant with the ICMC.</p> <p>In terms of climate change effects on extreme rainfall, Refer to response to Ross Hanan #10.</p> <p>Risk of significant changes to the water quality of the Lind River and Clutha River / Mata-Au are low.</p>
3	<p><u>Dust and arsenic exposure</u></p> <p>Mining activities would generate significant dust, especially from blasting, haul roads, and processing.</p> <p>High winds through Thomson Gorge could carry dust well beyond the site, affecting air quality.</p> <p>Of particular concern is arsenic laden dust, citing examples from Macraes where arsenic visibly settles on surrounding land.</p>	<p>Air Quality</p>	<p>Substantive FTA Application:</p> <p>B.33 - Pattle Delamore Partners - Assessment of Environmental Effects from the Discharge of Contaminants into Air (PDP 2025) - Sections 5.2, 5.4 and 5.6.</p> <p>B.33 - Pattle Delamore Partners - Assessment of Environmental Effects from the Discharge of Contaminants into Air (PDP 2025) - sections 2.1, 3.1 4.1.3, 5.3.1, 9.1, 10.3 and 12.2.</p> <p>B.33 - Pattle Delamore Partners - Assessment of Environmental Effects from the Discharge of Contaminants into Air (PDP 2025) - Section 8.</p> <p>Response Evidence:</p> <p>Evidence of Jeff Bluett - Paragraph 26</p> <p>Evidence of Jeff Bluett - Paragraphs 71 to 80.</p>	<p>Haul roads and processing are potentially significant sources of dust. These dust sources have been identified, mitigation proposed, monitoring planned and impacts assessed in the AQA (Document B33[1]). Due to the frequency and duration of blasting events it is not considered a significant source of dust. But it is covered in the AQA (Document B33[2]). However, control of the impact of dust from blasting will be captured by the resource consent conditions and in the AQMP.</p> <p>Amenity effects resulting from the discharge of dust from the southern zone would likely be less than minor.</p> <p>Actual effects from the site's emission of particles containing elevated levels of arsenic are assessed as less than minor and most likely negligible. To demonstrate compliance with this conclusion, MGL has committed to running an arsenic air quality monitoring programme that will establish background levels of this contaminant and ensure that the emissions from potential sources do not in reality generate any adverse effects on the receiving environment beyond the boundary of the site. The results from the arsenic monitoring programme will be reviewed by ORC and be made available to the public.</p>
4	<p><u>Noise, blasting, and vibration</u></p>	<p>Acoustics</p>	<p>Substantive FTA Application:</p> <p>B.29 - Marshall Day Acoustics - Assessment of Noise and Vibration Effects (Marshall Day 2025)</p>	<p>The Noise Report shows that noise and blasting levels will be similar to, or considerably less than, the noise effects that are anticipated by the District Plan permitted activity standards.</p>



Comment Number	Comment	Applicant Technical Input	Where Addressed in the Application Documents	Response
	These effects are expected to dramatically alter rural amenity and character, with activity early mornings, evenings, and potentially 24/7.			
5	<p><u>Workers' camp and social impacts</u></p> <p>Strong concern about a proposed nearby workers' camp. While citing studies, concerns are expressed about the mining camp causing social disruption, including increased alcohol and drug use and anti-social behaviour.</p> <p>In addition, a concern is expressed that a supposedly temporary camp could become permanent due to regional housing shortages.</p>	MGL	<p>Substantive FTA Application:</p> <p>F16 - Bendigo-Ophir Gold Project Pre-Application Engagement report pg. 25</p> <p>F.19 - Boffa-Miskell-Landscape, Natural Character and Visual Effects Assessment 2025 Part 1 – p.32 and pg.40</p>	The project model prioritises people who already live in Central Otago, along with local contractors. A short-term, 20-site caravan facility and 80-person construction camp on Ardour Flats are proposed only for contractors who cannot reasonably commute during intensive work periods. It would be managed under strict policies covering behaviour, security, and drug and alcohol standards to minimise any off-site impacts. We have advanced discussions in nearby communities to utilise existing underutilised accommodation options to support the construction workforce.
6	<p><u>Broader regional concerns</u></p> <p>Concerns also raise wider general issues including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Damage to the reputation of tourism and wine industries > Increased diesel and electricity demand, affecting supply and prices > Large groundwater extraction > Effects on flora, fauna, and biodiversity > Costs to local councils for infrastructure upgrades > Regional socio-economic pressures (housing shortage, labour market) > Uncertainty around mine closure, rehabilitation, and bonding 	MGL	N/A	MGL has reviewed related comments to these general concerns and acknowledges such concerns are genuinely held, however, the comments do not include any specific assessment or evidence on which to provide a considered response. Accordingly, MGL considers there is no technical or evidential basis for any further response over and above the information already provided to the Panel.
7	<p><u>Traffic disruption</u></p> <p>Concerned that road widening, tree removal will cause increased traffic, and long periods of disruption have already affected daily life.</p>	Transportation	<p>Substantive FTA Application:</p> <p>B.30 - Stantec - Integrated Transport Assessment (Stantec 2025)</p>	Traffic disruption during road improvements is of a temporary nature, with outcomes being an improved road network that will support CODC requirements as the existing gravel road is not fit for purpose for accessing BOGP.
8	<p><u>Power outages</u></p> <p>Concern expressed about multiple extended power outages already being experienced that have impacted their household and accommodation business.</p>	MGL	N/A	All planned outages associated with project-related works have been communicated in advance to affected parties. Where outages were expected to have a direct impact, residents were offered the use of generators to maintain continuity of power.
9	<p><u>Property value and income loss</u></p>	Legal	Response Evidence:	Property value and income loss is not a relevant consideration under the FTA.

Comment Number	Comment	Applicant Technical Input	Where Addressed in the Application Documents	Response
	<p>Concerns expressed about the Project:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Reducing property attractiveness and value; > Severely affected marketability of their property; and > Causing loss of income from their B&B and olive oil business. <p>Concerns also expressed there has been no engagement or compensation from the applicant.</p>	MGL	Legal Submissions, 17 April 2026 at 'Matters not relevant to Panel's Consideration'	
10	<p><u>Mental health and wellbeing</u></p> <p>Ongoing disruption, landscape change, uncertainty, and perceived disregard by the applicant have had a negative mental health impact.</p> <p>They state that mine infrastructure is already proceeding as if consent were guaranteed, exacerbating stress.</p>	MGL	N/A	MGL has reviewed related comments to these general concerns and acknowledges such concerns are genuinely held, however, the comments do not include any specific assessment or evidence on which to provide a considered response. Accordingly, MGL considers there is no technical or evidential basis for any further response over and above the information already provided to the Panel.

Comments from Megan Bryan

Comment Number	Comment	Applicant Technical Input	Where Addressed in the Application Documents	Response
1	<p><u>Environmental impacts</u></p> <p>Gold mining is seen as having significant detrimental effects on local ecosystems, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Habitat destruction and loss of biodiversity > Pollution of water bodies from toxic chemicals used in gold extraction > She is concerned that toxic by-products could contaminate water sources, posing risks to wildlife and to drinking water for nearby communities. > Believes the long-term environmental damage could be irreversible and outweigh any short-term economic benefits. 	MGL	<p>Substantive FTA Application:</p> <p>B.03 Kōmanawa Solutions Limited - Groundwater Existing Environment and Effects Assessment (Kōmanawa 2025b)</p> <p>B.04 Kōmanawa Solutions Limited - Surface Water and Catchment Existing Environment and Effects Assessment (Kōmanawa 2025c)</p> <p>B.06 Mine Waste Management Limited - Mine Impacted Water Overview Report (MWM 2025)</p> <p>B.21 Engineering Geology Limited - Shepherds Tailings Storage Facility Technical Report (EGL 2025b)</p>	<p>These potential effects have been addressed in the extensive technical assessments that formed the Substantive Application to the Fast Track Process. Waste rock and tailings have the highest potential to cause the environmental effects listed by Ms Bryan if not properly managed. The risks have been assessed and addressed in a number of geotechnical, geochemistry, hydrology and hydrogeology reports. These assessments will direct the design and construction of the project to manage the risks. Ground and surface water monitoring will identify any changes to water quality or flow. Monitoring locations are selected to ensure early warning of change and confirm compliance with conditions.</p> <p>Conditions set limits to protect the environment. Monitoring and reporting data will be publicly available.</p> <p>Bonding ensures that funds are available for restoration, if required, at any stage of the mine life.</p>



Comment Number	Comment	Applicant Technical Input	Where Addressed in the Application Documents	Response
			B.23 Engineering Geology Limited - Shepherds Tailings Storage Facility Technical Report (EGL 2025b) Part D Proposed Approvals and Conditions	
2	<p><u>Safety risks in a populated, earthquake prone region</u></p> <p>Central Otago's seismic history raises concerns about the safety of mining infrastructure.</p> <p>Earthquakes could result in accidents or toxic spills, endangering residents and the environment.</p> <p>Establishing a toxic mining operation close to populated areas is viewed as an unacceptable risk to human health and community safety.</p>	Geotechnical	N/A	Refer to response to Ross Hanan's comment #11
3	<p><u>Questioning the necessity of gold mining</u></p> <p>Argues that gold is no longer an essential resource in modern society.</p> <p>Suggests investment should instead be directed toward sustainable industries, such as renewable energy, sustainable agriculture, and eco-tourism.</p> <p>Believes these alternatives can provide economic benefits and employment without the environmental costs associated with mining.</p>	MGL	N/A	MGL has reviewed related comments to these general concerns and acknowledges such concerns are genuinely held, however, the comments do not include any specific assessment or evidence on which to provide a considered response. Accordingly, MGL considers there is no technical or evidential basis for any further response over and above the information already provided to the Panel.

Comments from Bruce Lambie

Comment Number	Comment	Applicant Technical Input	Where Addressed in the Application Documents	Response
1	<p><u>Destruction of an outstanding natural landscape</u></p> <p>The proposed mine site is described as a wild, unspoilt, and iconic Central Otago landscape.</p> <p>Mr Lambie believes mining would permanently transform this area into a large-scale industrial site, destroying its natural character.</p>	Landscape	<p>Substantive FTA Application:</p> <p>B.19 – Landscape, Natural Character and Visual Effects Assessment (Boffa Miskell 2025) (2 Parts)</p> <p>G.07A – Landscape and Ecological Rehabilitation Management Plan</p>	It is not accepted that the proposal would destroy the wider Dunstan Mountains ONL or its natural character overall, as the lodged landscape material assesses high adverse effects in parts of the Site but concludes that effects on the wider ONL are more contained, with the broader mountain framework, skyline and legibility remaining evident. It is accepted that the TSF and some other mine landforms would remain as permanent modified features, but the application describes those as rehabilitated and integrated landforms rather than an unmitigated industrial landscape “forever”.



Comment Number	Comment	Applicant Technical Input	Where Addressed in the Application Documents	Response
	Toxic tailings dams would remain in the landscape forever, fundamentally altering it.		D.03 – Schedule One - Central Otago District Council and Otago Regional Council Common Conditions. Response Evidence: Evidence of Rhys Girvan.	
2	<u>Risks from tailings and arsenic contamination</u> Strong concerns are expressed about the dispersal of arsenic laden dust, given the site’s high winds - notes that approximately 18 million cubic metres of toxic tailings would remain after mining.	Air Quality	Substantive FTA Application: B.33 - Pattle Delamore Partners - Assessment of Environmental Effects from the Discharge of Contaminants into Air (PDP 2025) - sections 2.1, 3.1 4.1.3, 5.3.1, 9.1, 10.3 and 12.2. Response Evidence: Evidence of Jeff Bluett - Paragraphs 71 to 80.	The actual effects from the site’s emission of particles containing elevated levels of arsenic are assessed as being less than minor and most likely negligible. To demonstrate compliance with this conclusion, MGL has committed to running an arsenic air quality monitoring programme that will establish background levels of this contaminant and ensure that the emissions from potential sources do not in reality generate any adverse effects on the receiving environment beyond the boundary of the site. The results from the arsenic monitoring programme will be reviewed by ORC and be made available to the public.
3	<u>Risk of tailings dam failure</u> Mr Lambie fears a tailings dam failure, particularly in the event of a major Alpine Fault earthquake, which he considers overdue.	Geotechnical	N/A	Refer to response to Ross Hanan’s comment #11
4	<u>Water quality impacts</u> > Raises concerns (including health risk concerns) about arsenic contamination of local water supplies from tailings dams and mine operations and other mine related discharges.	Water Quality Geochemistry Preliminary Site Investigation	Response Evidence: Evidence of Greg Ryder	The proposed water quality limits for surface and ground waters, and proposed monitoring programmes and their responses, will protect local water supplies. Groundwater compliance limits are based largely on NZ drinking water standards for potable water supply.
5	<u>Air pollution</u> > Concerned about air pollution from dust and wind-blown contaminants.	Air Quality	Substantive FTA Application: B.33 - Pattle Delamore Partners - Assessment of Environmental Effects from the Discharge of Contaminants into Air (PDP 2025) - sections 1.5.1, 2.1, 3.1 4.1, 5.0, 7.0, 8.2, 9.1, 10.0, 11.0 and 12.2 Response Evidence: Evidence of Jeff Bluett - Paragraphs 20 to 24.	The conclusions relevant to Mr Lambie’s concerns are: A) The assessment of potential amenity effects resulting from the discharge of dust found that for both the northern and southern zones any adverse effect would likely be less than minor; and, B) any adverse health impacts from the particulate matter (PM10, RCS and As) discharged from the proposed mine will be negligible and certainly less than minor. With regular monitoring and simple mitigation measures, dust discharged from dry beaches on the edge of TSF will be minimised and not cause any offensive or objectional effects to occur beyond the site boundary. This specific TSF risk will only occur during the active mining phase of the project when it can be addressed. The risk is eliminated after the TSF has been rehabilitated.



Comment Number	Comment	Applicant Technical Input	Where Addressed in the Application Documents	Response
6	<p><u>Loss of rural amenity</u></p> <p>The area is currently quiet, rural, and dark sky valued.</p> <p>Mining would introduce:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Heavy machinery > Blasting noise > High volumes of truck traffic > Industrial lighting affecting night skies <p>This would markedly degrade local amenity and rural lifestyle.</p>	<p>Landscape</p> <p>Transportation</p> <p>Acoustics</p>	<p>Substantive FTA Application:</p> <p>B.29 - Marshall Day Acoustics - Assessment of Noise and Vibration Effects (Marshall Day 2025)</p>	<p>It is accepted that the proposal would introduce machinery, blasting, truck movements and night lighting into a presently quiet rural environment, and that those changes can adversely affect local amenity. It is not accepted, however, that the wider rural landscape or lifestyle amenity would be degraded to the extent asserted, as the lodged material relies on siting within folded landform and proposed controls for noise, vibration, blasting and lighting to limit those effects beyond the immediate mine setting.</p> <p>Mr Lambie's property is approximately 7.5 km from the closest point where blasting is likely. BOGP has proposed consent conditions relating to blasting that will ensure effects are acceptable at the closest dwellings to the site and therefore blasting noise effects will be further reduced at Mr Lambie's property.</p>

Comments from Diane Jean Lucas

Comment Number	Comment	Applicant Technical Input	Where Addressed in the Application Documents	Response
1	<p><u>Conservation Covenant</u></p> <p>Rise and Shine Covenant for purposes of protection of landscape and botanical values.</p> <p>Under FTAA the Panel must take into account the purpose of the covenant and the conservation values it involves.</p> <p>Lack of landscape assessment for the Dept of Conservation that assesses the potential effect of the proposal on the Rise and Shine covenant area.</p>	<p>Landscape</p> <p>Legal</p>	<p>Response Evidence:</p> <p>Legal Submissions, 17 April 2026 at 'Partial Revocation of the Conservation Covenant'</p>	<p>It is accepted that the Panel must have regard to the purpose and conservation values of the Bendigo Conservation Covenant, including the landscape and botanical values associated with the Rise and Shine area. It is not accepted that those values were not assessed in landscape terms: the lodged material identifies the covenant in the statutory context and addresses the relevant physical, perceptual and associative effects.</p>
2	<p><u>Landscape Site Analysis</u></p> <p>Boffa Miskell 2024 report does not provide a landscape analysis of the project area:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Maps are at a scale that do not provide sufficient detail. > Land typing inadequate to inform mine design. 	<p>Landscape</p>	<p>Substantive FTA Application:</p> <p>K.02 – Boffa Miskell - Assessment of Dunstan Mountains Outstanding Natural Landscape dated May 2024;</p> <p>B.19 – Landscape, Natural Character and Visual Effects Assessment (Boffa Miskell 2025) (2 Parts)</p> <p>Response Evidence:</p>	<p>It is not accepted that the 2024 report failed to provide a landscape analysis of the project area. Rather, K.02 was prepared because the earlier LA4 study identified the Dunstan Mountains as outstanding through broad sensitivity scoring, but did not set out the specific landscape values in the way current best practice requires; the 2024 study was therefore undertaken to identify those values more specifically and to inform design, planning and management of the proposed mining activity in that context.</p>



Comment Number	Comment	Applicant Technical Input	Where Addressed in the Application Documents	Response
	> Assessment of ONL does not meet the stated intent of the report to “assist in the design, planning and management of a proposed mining project”.		Evidence of Rhys Girvan.	
3	<p><u>Effects Assessment</u></p> <p>The physical, associative and perceptual attributes, values and effects, the overall landscape effects of the proposed intrusive and very large-scale works would cumulatively result in high adverse landscape effects on the Dunstan Range ONL.</p>	Landscape	<p>Substantive FTA Application:</p> <p>B.19 – Landscape, Natural Character and Visual Effects Assessment (Boffa Miskell 2025) (2 Parts)</p> <p>Response Evidence:</p> <p>Evidence of Rhys Girvan.</p>	It is not accepted that the cumulative overall landscape effects on the wider Dunstan Range ONL are high. The lodged material recognises high adverse effects for some major components and cumulative localised effects within the Shepherds Creek and Rise and Shine Creek valleys but concludes that when assessed at the scale of the wider ONL the overall adverse effects remain moderate during operation and reduce to low-moderate at closure. The reasons for which the Dunstan Mountains were identified as an ONL in the Central Otago District Plan also remain, including its role as a memorable mountain backdrop, the extensive summit plateau, distinctive rock tors on the skyline, and the broader coherence and legibility of the range.
4	<p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>The scale and type of mitigation works proposed at the mine site are extremely questionable. No reliance should be placed on them as mitigating or remedying measures.</p>	Landscape	<p>Substantive FTA Application:</p> <p>B.19 – Landscape, Natural Character and Visual Effects Assessment (Boffa Miskell 2025) (2 Parts)</p> <p>G.07A – Landscape and Ecological Rehabilitation Management Plan</p> <p>D.03 – Schedule One - Central Otago District Council and Otago Regional Council Common Conditions.</p>	It is not accepted that no reliance should be placed on mitigation or rehabilitation measures as a whole. The lodged material does not assume immediate or complete recovery, but instead identifies residual high adverse effects that remain, while relying on project shaping, progressive rehabilitation, long-term management, monitoring and consent conditions to materially reduce effects elsewhere over time; the more legitimate issue is the robustness of implementation for particular measures, not whether all mitigation should be disregarded altogether.

Comments from Canyon Vineyard

Comment Number	Comment	Applicant Technical Input	Where Addressed in the Application Documents	Response
1	<p><u>Amenity Values</u></p> <p>Personal and recreational connections to the Bendigo Historic Reserve. Regular walker and mountain biker over the Kanuka and Aurora Creek trails. The presence of a large-scale industrial mine would fundamentally destroy the tranquility and natural character of these trails, which represent a core component of the "sense of place" that defines Bendigo.</p>	Landscape Recreation	<p>Substantive FTA Application:</p> <p>B.19 – Landscape, Natural Character and Visual Effects Assessment (Boffa Miskell 2025) (2 Parts)</p> <p>Response Evidence:</p> <p>Evidence of Rhys Girvan.</p>	It is accepted that the Bendigo Historic Reserve and walking and mountain biking trails in Bendigo Scenic Reserve contribute to Bendigo’s sense of place, visitor experience and tranquillity. It is not accepted that the proposal would fundamentally destroy the character of those trails, as the lodged assessment records that views from the Bendigo Scenic Reserve, including the Kanuka Loop, and from areas near the Bendigo Historic Reserve are generally limited by intervening topography and that visual effects on users of those reserves are no greater than very low adverse, reducing to neutral at closure.



Comment Number	Comment	Applicant Technical Input	Where Addressed in the Application Documents	Response
2	<p><u>Economic Incompatibility</u></p> <p>Reference to Prof Hingham view (appended) that the "clean, green" brand equity of Central Otago cannot survive the introduction of a large-scale open-pit mining.</p>	Economics	<p>Response Evidence:</p> <p>Evidence of Benje Patterson</p>	<p>Just 0.3% of visitor days in Inland Otago occur on land immediately adjoining the mine site.</p> <p>In Australia, the Hunter Valley is estimated to have a tourism sector worth over AUD\$641 million annually, which is centred on the Lower Hunter Valley, which was identified in paragraph 102 as being located within 50km of the Bulga open pit coal mine (with another four mines located close to that site).</p> <p>in New Zealand, there is no evidence that Rotorua's tourism sector has suffered lost income because of perceptions effects associated with visitors driving past the Waihi Mine just over one hour before they reach Rotorua.</p> <p>76% of visitor days in Inland Otago (3.8 million) occurred one hour's drive away from the Project site within the Destination Queenstown area centred on the Whakatipu Basin.</p> <p>Most visitors to Queenstown do not even pass through Central Otago on their journey, with Destination Queenstown Data in paragraph 107 showing that the majority of visitors arrive by plane. There is little likelihood that this minority of visitors to Queenstown who drive past the mine site will associate their Queenstown experience with having momentarily seen a mine from a distance, as they drive past at least one hour before they arrive in Queenstown. This point should also be considered in conjunction with evidence for the Applicant by Rhys Girvan of Boffa Miskell who assessed the visual effects of the mine as being low to moderate from state highways, with these effects reducing to neutral at closure.</p>
3	<p><u>Risk to Trade and Tourism Reputation</u></p> <p>The name Bendigo is currently synonymous with prestigious fine wine and export-grade merino wool. This identity enables competition with other fine wine regions like Burgundy and Oregon.</p> <p>There is both a perceived and real risk in allowing the BOGP to proceed. Once the Bendigo name is associated with modern heavy industrial gold mining, our "Unique Selling Point" of purity and landscape-driven prestige is liquidated.</p>	Economics	<p>Response Evidence:</p> <p>Evidence of Benje Patterson</p>	<p>Several parties commented that alongside direct effects, perceptions related to mining by the BOGP, could indirectly affect sales of wine from vineyards across the rest of the Central Otago wine region through branding effects. Such indirect effects are not anticipated if the BOGP is operating within the conditions of its approvals.</p> <p>The Central Otago wine region is geographically spread out, with Bannockburn 30km away from the mine site, and Gibbston 55km away. Evidence from the Hunter Valley in Australia suggests that premium wine regions can coexist with mining. Paragraph 97 highlighted several vineyards within 2-4km of the Bulga Coal open pit mine employing 940 people by Singleton. Furthermore, there are another 150 premium vineyards in the Lower Hunter Valley which operate within less than 50km of the Bulga Coal mine. Note that in addition to Bulga, there are also 4 other open pit coal mines in total in the Singleton area where the Bulga Coal mine is located, with other coal mines also located elsewhere in the Hunter Valley</p>
4	<p><u>Economic Loss</u></p>	Legal	<p>Response Evidence:</p> <p>Legal Submissions, 17 April 2026 at 'Matters not relevant to Panel's Consideration'</p>	<p>The desire for adjacent property owners to have their business purchased by MGL is not a relevant consideration for the Panel as the statutory framework does not require nor provide for property value protection or underwriting.</p>



Comment Number	Comment	Applicant Technical Input	Where Addressed in the Application Documents	Response
	Meaningful relief must include a guaranteed buyout calculated on the fair market value of the business in the total absence of the gold mine.			

Comments from Trevathan Family

Comment Number	Comment	Applicant Technical Input	Where Addressed in the Application Documents	Response
1	<p><u>TSF Failure</u></p> <p>Property sites within the Red Zone of flood and inundation maps under various tailings dam failure scenarios. Transfer of risk onto landowner is unreasonable.</p>	Geotechnical	Refer to response to Ross Hanan's comment #8.	Refer to response to Ross Hanan's comment #8.
2	<p><u>Arsenic</u></p> <p>Effects on groundwater from TSF leakage.</p>	Water Quality	<p>Response Evidence:</p> <p>Paragraph 69 in Evidence of Greg Ryder</p>	Groundwater compliance limits, including for arsenic, are based largely on NZ drinking water standards for potable water supply.
3	<p><u>Bond</u></p> <p>Clean up and loss faced by individual landowners; lack of underwrite of risks to third parties.</p>	Bond Introduction	<p>Substantive FTA Application:</p> <p>B.44 - Lane Associates Limited – Bond Introduction (Lane Associates 2025)</p>	The conditions of consent require a bond that addresses these matters. The bond quantum will be based on the scale and type of site disturbance during operations and beyond closure. Where insurances are required, the bond will provide for the annual premiums of the relevant policies. A risk cost component will also be included where needed to cover the occurrence costs associated with risk that are either uninsurable or that attract impractically expensive premiums. The bond will be held by the Regional and District Councils, which will have an exclusive right to call on it.
4	<p><u>Financial Benefits</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Unconvinced that stated financial benefits will be realised. > Lack of insurance or other compensation mitigation packages. 	<p>Economics</p> <p>Bond Introduction</p>	<p>Response Evidence:</p> <p>Evidence of Benje Patterson</p>	<p>OceanaGold returned almost \$200m of tax revenue to the government in 2025 from corporate taxes and royalties.</p> <p>Refer above.</p>