

EES SPECIALIST STUDIES Q&A WEBINAR

Wednesday 14 October 2020 – 7 pm to 8.45 pm

The information provided below is a written record of the questions asked and answers provided during the EES Specialist Studies Q&A Webinar held on Wednesday 14 October 2020. The questions and answers have been grouped in the subject matter topics as they were presented during the webinar. The list of questions includes:

- those that were submitted prior to the webinar
- those that were asked during the webinar and were answered during the webinar
- those that were asked during the webinar but not answered due to time constraints

This session was video recorded and can be found on our Fingerboards Project website and viewed via YouTube. Approximately 45 members of the general public attended this webinar.

The written questions and answers are not intended to be a transcript of the webinar.

Biodiversity and vegetation removal	
Question	Relating to light pollution – as your planned operation will be 24/7, there will be light pollution? How will you mitigate against this impact on ecosystems?
Answer	<p>There are several potential impacts to native fauna associated with environmental light pollution, namely fauna attraction to artificial lighting (eg insectivorous bats), avoidance due to the area being illuminated (e.g. arboreal and ground dwelling species) and potential disorientation (eg nocturnal flying species such as waterbirds and bats). Potential impacts associated with environmental light pollution are likely to be more pronounced in areas where lighting is adjacent to large wetlands or waterbodies, for which there is no or marginal habitat for waterbodies, including migratory shorebirds that are principally associated with the wetlands in the Gippsland Lakes Ramsar site. The management of likely and potential impacts to fauna from lighting include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensuring lighting is located away from areas supporting native vegetation and fauna habitat • Direct lighting away from sites containing ecological values • The installation of shields to minimise light spill into ecologically sensitive areas • Remove temporary lighting as soon as it is no longer required.
Question	Are there any opportunities for the project to improve ecological values during and after the mining operations, and if so, where and when?
Answer	<p>The EES goes through the risk assessment process to establish what the values are. The impact assessment then determines the residual impacts. It's mainly driven around what the impacts are and the significance of impacts. Notwithstanding that there will be extensive areas of vegetation and habitat proposed to be removed (that's clear in all the reports), but there is a real opportunity to ensure that the restoration project proposed will be a positive thing. Given where it's located in pine plantations or cleared paddocks – there are definitely opportunities to protect existing native vegetation. As part of the offset process there are a number of properties that will be identified, which will be managed in perpetuity. So there will be an overall improvement in the vegetation quality and the threatened processes on that land (or different properties) and they will essentially be managed. There's a real opportunity to enhance the values, and ultimately over time there's a requirement that the restoration process restores as much as possible. It takes time - things don't happen overnight, particularly where you have large trees that take many years to develop. There are opportunities to enhance ecological values, particularly as part of that offset process and also the restoration.</p>
Question	Having read the EES and biodiversity technical report, we are aware of the offset requirements for the project. Are you able to provide an update on the biodiversity offset

	process, particularly how and when the project will meet the offset requirements for the proposed removal of native vegetation under the Commonwealth EPBC Act and the State Native Vegetation Guidelines?
Answer	Several landowners that have large (ie >20 hectares) native vegetation on their property(ies) have been contacted, and detailed site assessments have subsequently been undertaken at multiple properties over the past 3-6 months to determine site eligibility to be secured as an offset, and to determine the type and total number of credits that can be generated on each site. This process will continue prior to and after any permitted approval of the project and there are opportunities for landowners to be involved. No vegetation removal will occur until the required biodiversity offsets are secured and after evidence of this has been provided to the relevant agency as part of the conditions of approval for the project.
Question	I am concerned about the native flora and fauna along the railway track and that the rail siding might destroy it.
Answer	That has received a lot of consideration and detailed surveys. The rail siding area is not proposed to be located in a road reserve. There will be access tracks punching in to that road reserve but the location along Cowells Lane is a narrow area which will be disturbed, and the actual siding itself will be located in cleared paddocks where there is very little ecological value. There is a requirement to consider indirect impacts during operation in those areas along the railway reserve. The vegetation along the Gippsland rail reserve is quite important and quite significant – it contains the grassy woodland community that the EPBC Act-listed community and also there are records along there for threatened species so it is something that we have looked at. We have spoken with DELWP and gone out on site to undertake a comprehensive survey to a point where we will be going back in coming months to do further surveys given the seasonality and temporal nature of flowering of certain species to feed into the management of the project.
Question	How are you going to replace hollow bearing trees which are 120-400 years old into this landscape?
Answer	The reality is that trees will be removed that do have hollows and a range of different size hollows. You can use nest boxes in some regard but that's not necessarily going to replace what's there now and what's going to be removed. It comes down to the significance of that loss and what species would use those hollows currently or in the future. That's been assessed quite extensively. The other consideration is the spatial context in which those trees are located. Mentioned before as one of the slides, a lot of the large remnant old trees are located, not only in patches of vegetation on roadsides, but also across paddocks. There are fewer species that would use those hollows in those areas as opposed to an area where there is a large consolidated patch of vegetation say out to the west or north of this site where you have significant forested habitat where you get a greater diversity of species using those hollows. Nest boxes can only provide some level of habitat and it's not necessarily going to replace those trees that are providing hollows and homes at the moment. It takes many years to form hollows in 100 to 200 years to form those, but it comes down to what species are using those and the significance of those species as part of the impact assessment.
Question	Kalbar is going to protect wildlife and return them when the works are finished. Where is the wildlife going to be transferred to while the mine is working? Is someone going to be taking care of them at an animal sanctuary?
Answer	Salvage and relocation of fauna will occur during the site clearance activities. Where possible, fauna will be removed by qualified zoologists and relocated to adjoining habitats (well outside of the disturbance areas). It is not proposed that animals captured will be brought into captivity and cared for and released back into the area post the removal/disturbance of habitat.
Question	Will removing water from the water table affect existing flora negatively?
Answer	A detailed Groundwater Dependent Ecosystem (GDE) investigation has been undertaken and no significant impacts to terrestrial or wetland habitats are predicted to occur as a

	result of removing water from the underground water table. The methods and results of the GDE impact assessment is outlined in the detailed report appended to the Ecological Investigations report (technical document).
Question	How will Kalbar know the same fauna that are removed are the same fauna that are captured and brought back?
Answer	Once habitat is reinstated fauna species (mammals, birds, reptiles and frogs etc) will naturally colonise areas over time. There will be no assisted translocation back into rehabilitated areas.
Question	There's lots of talk about the plants and virtually no talk about the affected wildlife. It seems that Kalbar cares about plants but not very much about the wildlife.
Answer	<p>Comprehensive investigations of flora and fauna (wildlife) has been undertaken across the study area, and although there will be impacts to a diversity fauna species (principally locally common species), based on the detailed risk analysis and impact assessment undertaken as part of the EES, there is a very low likelihood that any significant fauna species would be significantly impacted (both direct and indirectly) by the project (i.e. no impacts on a regional, State or National level).</p> <p>Predicted impacts will be localised and over time there will be a requirement (as outlined in any conditions of approval) for Kalbar to rehabilitate disturbed areas and to ensure that habitats are reinstated so that fauna species can recolonise and use habitats across the area during and after the life of the mine.</p>
Grassy woodland restoration	
Question	<p>Please provide the following details for the proposed Plains Grassy Woodland restoration:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • plant species selection and numbers • age of plants • a plan of the layout of the area showing where various species would be located • methods of soil preparation • plant protection from herbivores • fencing and guard types
Answer	The species chosen for the grassy woodland and grassland restorations come from a range of sources including relevant regional EVCs indicative species lists, herbarium records (Royal Botanic Gardens Melbourne, Atlas of Living Australia) and written records (eg Plains Wandering Lunt et al). In most areas ground layer species will be directly seeded, while trees may be planted. Species lists and seeding layouts will be developed in advance of sowings/restoration and will be dependent on seed supplies, sowing locations and prevailing climatic conditions. Soils will be prepared to minimise weed loads and produce cultivated and friable seed or planting beds. Protection from herbivores will include temporary and permanent exclusion and guarding mechanisms.
Question	What is the largest restoration of this nature you have done elsewhere?
Answer	I have undertaken many grassy restorations over the past twenty years. These have been conducted primarily in Victoria and NSW (although I have indirectly assisted with more recent work undertaken in SA). Most of these restorations are between 1 and 5 hectares in scale. Several have been between 10 and 20 hectares, while many early attempts were smaller scale research studies. All together, these various restorations would be in the vicinity of 200-500 hectares. While this does not seem like a large amount, it is by far the largest number and scale undertaken to-date. It is my hope that when successful, the Kalbar grassy woodland restoration project provides a prime example of its type that leads to a much larger uptake of these approaches across Victoria and beyond in future years by mining companies, environmental groups and government agencies. In this way we may go some way to halting the loss of these precious native communities.
Question	Will you establish native grassy woodland anywhere else in the rehabilitation other than the planned 200 hectares?

Answer	Yes. The restoration program aims to restore species-rich ground layer vegetation along re-aligned road verges. Native grasses, shrubs and trees will also be used extensively in non-plateau grazing areas to create habitat and soil stability. If seed production output produces enough seed supplies to do so, there is potential to increase the scope and area of grassy woodland restoration to parts of the mine areas currently occupied by pine plantation forestry.
Question	Can you use native grassy woodland as an offset?
Answer	<p>Although the Grassy Eucalypt Woodland Restoration Project is not proposed to contribute to the biodiversity offsets required under the State’s Native Vegetation Guidelines (ie Species Habitat Units) (DELWP 2017), there is an opportunity for the restoration project to contribute to the Commonwealth Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999 (EPBC Act) offset that is required (ie approximately 8-10 hectares) for the permitted removal of 1.74 hectares of the EPBC Act-listed Gippsland Red Gum (<i>Eucalyptus tereticornis</i> subsp. <i>mediana</i>) Grassy Woodland and Associated Native Grassland.</p> <p>Details of the Grassy Eucalypt Woodland Restoration Project feed into the EPBC Act Offset Management Plan that will be prepared for the project, and that will need to be approved by the Commonwealth Department of Agriculture, Water and Environment (DAWE) and the Department of Environment, Land, Water and Planning (DELWP).</p>
Question	What are the anticipated and/or potential barriers to achieving this restoration to the level described tonight please?
Answer	<p>The most fundamental barrier is seed. If the aim is to restore complex species-rich grassy communities you need seed in quantity – for example, up to 50 kilograms per hectare. The seed also needs to be of good quality so plants will germinate and establish. When diversity is required to reconstruct a community which is rare in its own right, it’s very difficult to get that seed from the wild. Buying seed is effectively impossible for large species numbers (and in bulk quantities), and even for the species that are available for purchase native seed is very expensive. So, that is why in many ways seed is the major constraint. We are trying to address this issue through the use of seed production. I (and others) have found in earlier small-scale works that seed production is a fundamental approach that allows us to get past this seed availability barrier. In other parts of the world (such as Europe and America) large-scale seed production has been particularly important in restoring native ground layer communities.</p> <p>Other big constraints are a lack of restoration markets or drivers – what is going to provide the impetus and funding to do this work? In our case, it’s the project itself. The project provides the reason for us to go into developing seed production capacity. In this type of work there is a need to develop sufficient budgets - often this doesn’t happen. Timelines also must be realistic – often in government funded restorations funding periods are very short and CMAs, councils, or others doing restorations have to complete works in 1-3 years (if you’re lucky) – which is in most cases unrealistic. It’s very hard to do something very complex (such as what we are proposing) in 1-3 years when there needs to be proper planning, sourcing and growing of seed, development of infrastructure and expertise. In fact, it’s essentially impossible. With a project like the Fingerboards where we have up to 20 years to plan and build up supplies it begins to be feasible. Also, the restoration itself will be progressive over that time, so we’re not having to do everything in one hit. We can learn as we go, improve our experience and knowledge as we go. All these factors are big constraints to achieving successful restoration outcomes which (paradoxically) our project allow us to address.</p> <p>At the ground level factors like weeds and some soils can also present significant barriers to most restoration projects. We have learned a lot from past projects in this respect. If you are able to manage or restrict weed loads, and you can manage excessive nutrients (which favour exotics not natives), then the native species can establish much more successfully. In</p>

	<p>this project where the soil is essentially removed, and then replaced, we can actually replace the soil in whatever structure and composition that we want. We can also modify the soil with amendments (such as organic matter), we can treat weeds and nutrients (through burial or dilution), so the native species get a more ideal setting for growth. These things together are also major constraints to restoring complex ground layer communities.</p> <p>The last constraint is in ‘the doing’ of a project like this. There needs to be proper expertise, equipment, budgets and proper time periods to undertake this work. Because I think we will be able to develop all these things, this is a program where there is huge scope (and desire on Kalbar’s part) to really engage with the community to develop expertise and knowledge that is specific this region. We believe we can build up expertise and build up the teams, and over that longer period all those constraints and barriers that normally scuttle attempts to undertake restoration of the scale and type we are proposing can and will be overcome. This will be unique in Australia, and we in this region have a genuine opportunity to show how such a restoration can be achieved.</p>
Question	You are using irrigation to grow native plants for seed. Will this be necessary when using native plants for site restoration?
Answer	<p>No – with some caveats. Yes, we use irrigation, and manage plants in seed production (to reduce those negative factors that may limit seed production in the wild). However, in the restoration, because we are doing these things at large scale (eg we are talking 80 hectares a year), we are direct-seeding and using seed from the region, which has developed/evolved the genetic traits to cope with local conditions (ie rainfall, or lack of). Also, because we sow a lot of seed, and we know not everything survives, we put enough into the ground so we are confident that enough seedlings germinate and grow. The other really important thing about using seed, as opposed to planting, is that if conditions aren’t right for germination, the seed is queued not to germinate until those conditions actually do arrive.</p> <p>So – we don’t need to irrigate, which is something we have learned from earlier restorations. The images presented tonight of restored grasslands that are 10-15 years old now, were all direct-seeded. None of them were irrigated. That success would not be possible if we had tried to install all that vegetation by planting all those species. This is because (and many people in the sector have experienced this) that when planting as tube stock one of the things that most limits success is if it doesn’t rain for the next 6-12 months - and all those plants just die.</p> <p>One exception to all this is that we will be wanting to establish low tree densities in the grassy woodland. This means smaller numbers per hectare. These can be grown and planted after the ground layer area is seeded, and these trees can easily be irrigated if required. At that scale it is feasible - but on the broad direct sown areas, grasses and wildflowers will be looking after themselves.</p>
Question	What is a Forb?
Answer	Generally speaking, when people talk about plant communities, they talk about trees, shrubs, grasses, and the plants left over - wildflowers, lilies, things that creep along the ground, we generally describe them as forbs. They’re typically things that produce flowers – it’s sort of a technical term that has general usage in the sector.
Surface water management	
Question	What is the volume and dimensions of the process water dam?
Answer	<p>The anticipated storage capacity of the process water dam is around 35 ML.</p> <p>The final dimensions of the dam will be developed during the detailed design period, but this dam volume could be achieved by a dam with dimensions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 100 metres x 200 metres and 2 metres deep; or • 100 metres x 100 metres and 5 metres deep

	The dam will have sufficient storage to hold 17 hours water supply for the mine processing plant, plus an allowance to store the 1 in 100-year rainfall.
Question	What is the volume and dimensions of the contingency water dam?
Answer	In the site layout presented in the EES, the contingency dam is allocated the same footprint as the process water dam. However, the size of the contingency water dam has not been finalised. The final dimensions will be optimised during detailed design based on the volumes of groundwater required and for the balance between how much water can be stored in the process water dam and the contingency dam together.
Question	How did you use the data from your weather station to design your water management dams?
Answer	<p>The water management dams were sized by estimating the volume of runoff that would occur in a 1 in 100-year rainfall event.</p> <p>The Kalbar weather station has only a short data record available through the period that Kalbar has been active at the Fingerboards site, and so was not used to estimate what a 1 in 100-year rainfall event could look like, and was not used directly in dam design.</p> <p>The Australian Bureau of Meteorology maintains rainfall gauges at Bairnsdale and Glenaladale with long record periods. The Bureau has analysed the entire rainfall data set collected across Australia since records began and developed sets of design rainfall predictions which apply to each point in Australia. This data is publicly available and using the Bureau data is engineering best practice. The Bureau predictions of storm intensity, duration and frequency were downloaded for the Fingerboards site, and the 72-hour 1 in 100-year data was used when estimating the required size of each water management dam.</p>
Question	Can the modelling demonstrate that climate related changes have been accounted for over forward years (increased extreme weather events, less rain, more wind). Can you explain how this has been done?
Answer	<p>A climate change assessment was included in the modelling completed by EMM. There were two reports which we reviewed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DELWP, 2016, Guidelines for Assessing the Impact of Climate Change on Water Supplies in Victoria, State of Victoria Department of Environment, Land, Water and Planning • CSIRO, 2015, Southern Slopes Cluster Report, Climate Change in Australia Projections for Australia's Natural Resource Management Regions, CSIRO and Bureau of Meteorology Australia <p>These reports describe:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Temperature – Average temperatures are predicted to increase in all seasons, with hotter and more frequent hot days and fewer frost days. • Rainfall – A decline in annual rainfall is predicted, with more time spent in drought. The greatest rainfall reduction is expected to occur in winter and spring. Heavy rainfall events are expected to increase in intensity. • Evaporation – Potential evapotranspiration is projected to increase in all seasons, with the largest relative increase in winter and spring. • Runoff – Changes to rainfall and evapotranspiration will lead to decreased soil moisture and runoff. <p>The following alterations were made applied to the water balance model at year 15 of the mine operations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the daily rainfall total for storm events with an AEP of 50% to 1% (24-168 hour storm) was increased by 5% per degree of warming (6.5%) as recommended in the DELWP (2016) guideline; • evaporation rates were increased by 4.7%;

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • annual rainfall totals were reduced by 2.3%; and • Mitchell River streamflow was decreased by 11%.
Question	Where will Kalbar get water from when the Mitchell River does not meet the criteria for removal of water?
Answer	When the Mitchell River does not meet the flow threshold for the winterfill extraction the plan is to supplement the water supply with groundwater. The groundwater system is currently fully allocated so access to groundwater would occur only through the purchase of existing licenses. This means that the total volume of groundwater extracted from the aquifer would remain the same as current levels. Those purchases will be arranged after project approval.
Question	Have you considered the impact of your dams located at the top of gullies on downstream farm gully dams?
Answer	<p>The surface water (runoff) management objective is to minimise the impact on existing natural flows to downstream receptors and prevent the uncontrolled release of sediment-laden runoff from the mine site. Water running off undisturbed ground will be diverted around disturbance areas as part of the surface water management strategy.</p> <p>An adaptive management strategy will be implemented, based on water quality and quantity monitoring results, to determine whether offset water that would typically be returned to the Mitchell River may be directed to ephemeral drainage gullies (and therefore farm dams) in a controlled manner.</p>
Question	What data and modelling was used to predict rainfall and runoff in the Mitchell River catchment?
Answer	<p>Runoff from the regional Mitchell River catchment was modelled by WaterTech, not by EMM, so my understanding of this modelling is based on reading technical reports.</p> <p>WaterTech obtained the stream flow records from the Glenaladale and Bairnsdale flow gauges, and rainfall records for the catchment upstream. All of this data is publicly available via the Bureau of Meteorology website.</p> <p>WaterTech then created a model of the river using software called eWater Source, which was developed in Australia through collaboration between state and federal government and consultants for the purpose of having a consistent piece of software to model water resources through the country. When Julia Gillard was PM she announced that the eWater Source software was to be the national water modelling platform, and the various state based models should be transitioned to the eWater Source platform.</p> <p>WaterTech calibrated the rainfall runoff relationships from the catchment so that the model adequately predicted flows past the gauge locations.</p>
General	
Question	Whilst many risks noted in the EES state 'unlikely' this does not equate to 'impossible'. I'm interested to know the type of response (not mitigation) program from Kalbar if the 'unlikely' does happen. A specific example is if surface water and/or surface water run-off (and dust) has a major impact to the horticulture growers in the area which negatively impacts the strong clean, green, trusted provenance image. How will Kalbar respond to this and what actions will they take (noting again not prior mitigation actions to reduce risk, but response should the risk actually occur).
Answer	Risk is a combination of likelihood and consequence. Management is designed to reduce either or both of those in order to reduce the risk. Risk is never completely removed and a risk event can occur. This question is alluding to what is Kalbar going to do if there is a contamination event.

	<p>As part of the EES and ongoing operations, Kalbar is undertaking extensive baseline monitoring. We are monitoring water quality, air quality and dust deposition, eg around the site. We are also monitoring soils, so we will have a fairly extensive database which describes the pre-mining conditions. During mining we will continue to monitor so we can determine what changes are occurring, whether to water quality, air quality etc. In the event that there is a contamination event of the horticultural industry the first thing that needs to be established is where has that contamination event occurred or where has it come from – to determine whether it’s a direct result of something that Kalbar has done or is that something that is a result of more general event. In the Glenaladale area you do get days of extensive dust storms and therefore dust landing on vegetables, so having that baseline data gives the ability to determine whether Kalbar is responsible or not. If Kalbar is responsible for contamination, we will be doing continuous air and noise modelling so any excursion that we have, regardless of a contamination event, we will have to investigate and determine why it may have occurred. If there is a contamination event and it’s determined that Kalbar is responsible, then we will have to deal with the landowner whose land is contaminated for whatever reason and ensure that there is adequate compensation. We will ensure that we are monitoring changes so we can ascertain whether we are responsible and if we are, then we will obviously make good.</p>
Question	<p>Given the amount of sediment and nutrients that currently flow down the Mitchell River, what is the overall impact of the project on Mitchell River and Gippsland Lakes sediment and nutrient loads?</p>
Answer	<p>The long-term data analysis in the Perry and Mitchell Rivers indicates that there will be a net decrease in nutrients in the receiving waters under the three mining scenarios assessed (year 5, 8 ,15). Consequently, it is predicted that there will be no nutrient related impact to the Gippsland Lakes due to mining activities.</p> <p>The water quality analysis in the Perry River predicted that TSS would increase for short periods, however average annual sediment loads were shown to decrease for all mining scenarios. In the Mitchell River downstream of the project site, average annual sediment loads were predicted to slightly increase for the year 5 and year 15 mining scenarios by 9 t/y and 22 t/y, respectively. This could result in negligible additional sediment loads to the Gippsland Lakes, which is 50 kilometres downstream of the project site.</p> <p>Of the additional sediment loads, it is likely that the sediment will be a mixture of grain sizes, and thus a portion of the predicted sediment load will settle prior to reaching the Gippsland Lakes. Consequently, the inference that all additional loads will reach the Gippsland Lakes is very conservative.</p> <p>A previous study estimated average annual sediment loads from the Mitchell River catchment to be 35,017 t/y, with sediment loads ranging from 1,266 t/y to 109,217 t/y (Webster and Grace 2001). This highlights the large variability in sediment delivery to the Gippsland Lakes. Additionally, when considering surrounding tributaries, CSIRO (2007) estimated a total suspended load of 198,000 t/y enters the Gippsland Lakes. The additional sediment loads related to mining, which are 9 t/y (year 5) and 22 t/y (year 15) would result in a potential 0.03% and 0.06% increase to the average Mitchell River sediment load, and when comparing them to the total sediment load that enters the Gippsland lakes, they represent a potential 0.005% and 0.01% increase. When considering the variability and scale of existing sediment loads, the potential marginal increase due to mining is not expected to have any impact.</p> <p>Additionally, Webster and Grace (2001) indicate that the sedimentation rate for the Gippsland Lakes is 0.6 mm/y. The addition of 22 t/y over Lake King, which has an approximate area of 60 square kilometres, would result in an additional sedimentation rate</p>

	<p>of 2.5 x 10-10 mm/year, assuming all the predicted sediment is universally distributed and is transported to the Lakes with no settling.</p> <p>Any potential sediment related impacts to the Gippsland Lakes are insignificant and negligible in comparison to existing sediment transport processes that take place.</p>
Question	<p>Why did you only look at air quality within a 5-kilometre radius of the mine? Have you looked in to how far mining dust including radioactive and respirable silica particles can travel?</p>
Answer	<p>The air quality study focussed on using dispersion modelling to predict dust levels at the most affected sensitive receptors. In the case of a mine where dust emissions are from activities that occur on the ground, the most affected receptors will be those that are closest to the mining activity. It's possible that dust from the mine will travel outside the area considered in the study. However, generally speaking, air quality outside the 5 kilometre radius will be less influenced by the mine than inside the 5 kilometre radius because as the dust travels through the air away from the mine its concentration will tend to reduce. The study predicted that dust concentrations and deposition rates drop to below the relevant air quality criteria within the area considered in the study, and so further afield they will also be below the criteria.</p>
Question	<p>So the long awaited answer to contamination on horticulture produce is compensation. This means money. Or something else. What sort of compensation? If money, how much money? How would Kalbar decide how much money to compensate a farmer?</p>
Answer	<p>Kalbar does not have a formal compensation policy. We currently have a Stakeholder Relations Policy, which can be found on our website.</p> <p>Firstly, it is important to note that the owner and occupier of private land outside the mine licence area is entitled under Victorian minerals legislation to claim compensation from Kalbar for certain types of damage, such as damage to the surface of land and improvements and a decrease in the market value of land. Such claims must be made within 3 years of when the loss or damage occurs or within 3 years of the expiry of the mine licence, whichever occurs earlier. A compensation claim can be resolved by agreement or by VCAT or the Supreme Court.</p> <p>It is obviously in the interests of Kalbar and its neighbours to avoid any situation that could give rise to a compensation claim. Like any good neighbour, Kalbar will address any concerns and complaints from the community. This includes any claims from neighbouring farmers regarding contamination (or other impacts on their business). Claims will be investigated via Kalbar's Complaints Procedure and if Kalbar is found to have been the cause of any business impact, the severity of the impact will be determined and appropriate compensation (monetary or otherwise) will be agreed with the landowner.</p>