| Environmer                      | nt & Commu                             | nity Broad Brush Risk Asse   | essment:   |  |  |                              |                    |                        |
|---------------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|------------------------------|--------------------|------------------------|
| Key Element                     | Process Area                           | Risk Description   | Caused By  | Consequence  | Current Controls (are in place)  | Expected Risk<br>Consequence | Risk<br>Likelihood | Current Risk<br>Rating |
| Noise                           | Production                             | Mine generated noise that exceeds criteria or results in a complaint | General ill will towards mining from the community  Mobile equipment - non-attenuated  Cumulative Impact (other mines, infrastructure, extractive industries)  Drilling  Climatic Conditions can amplify effects  Changed Community expectations  Elevated waste dumps  Equipment modification | Non-compliance Community complaint Compulsory acquisition Delay/constrained/no approvals Business interruption Impact on social licence to operate | Real time monitors CROs Noise and Dust Procedure Limited equipment noise attenuated Modification of operations Buffer lands Noise Management Plan Attended noise monitoring for compliance Community consultation Complaints management procedure Data sharing agreement x3 mines Change Management  | 2                            | В                  | М                      |
| Noise                           | Constrained<br>Infrastructure          | Mine generated noise that exceeds criteria or results in a complaint | Mobile equipment (on stockpiles) Equipment modification Washery Coal stockpiles (ROM product) Train load out Rail loop MIA Climatic Conditions can amplify effects Changed Community expectations  | Non-compliance Community complaint Compulsory acquisition Delay/constrained/no approvals Business interruption Impact on social licence to operate | Real time monitors CROs Noise and Dust Procedure Limited equipment noise attenuated Modification of operations Buffer lands Noise Management Plan Attended noise monitoring for compliance Community consultation Community Complaints Procedure Complaints management procedure Data sharing agreement x3 mines Change Management   | 2                            | С                  | M                      |
| Noise                           | Exploration                            | Mine generated noise that exceeds criteria or results in a complaint | Exploration Drills Drill pad and access road preparation Climatic Conditions can amplify effects Changed Community expectations  | Community complaint Business interruption Impact on social licence to operate  | Peabody own all land within exploration areas Drill only during daylight hours Community consultation Community Complaints Procedure Complaints management procedure   | 2                            | D                  | L                      |
| Dust/Air Quality (particulates) | Production, constrained infrastructure | Mine generated dust that exceeds criteria or results in a complaint  | Mine activities that generate dust Traffic on unsealed roads Exposed areas Stockpiles out of pit dumps Land clearing activities Changed Community expectations Addition of lime to CHPP Blasting Spon Com Climatic conditions (seasonal variations)  | Non-compliance Community complaint (visible dust, health, aesthetics) Delay/constrained/no approvals Business interruption Cumulative impacts      | Real time monitors CROs Noise and Dust Procedure Dust suppression systems (drill rigs, ROM bin) Water carts Air quality monitoring program Progressive rehabilitation Modification of operations Buffer lands Air and GHG Management Plan Community consultation Community Complaints Procedure Complaints management procedure Data sharing agreement x3 mines Air quality modelling Workforce training and inductions Speed limits | 2                            | В                  | M                      |

| Spontaneous<br>Combustion     | Production,<br>constrained<br>infrastructure | Spontaneous combustion of carbonaceous material                 | Incorrect classification of material (Spon com not previously identified as an issue) LTA focus on inert material at start of project due to incorrect classification LTA placement of material Coal stockpile and out of pit dumps Stockpile duration Stockpile management   | Community complaints Loss of social licence to operate Health risks on community Risk of securing future approvals Increased costs of operating through methodology Increased mine closure costs Reputational loss Legal action from the community Failed rehab  | Mine planning Spon Com Management Plan Monitoring age of coal stockpiles Air Quality Monitoring Program   | 4 | В | Н |
|-------------------------------|--|---|---|--|---|---|---|---|
| Blasting                      | Production                                   | Blasting at the mine exceeds criteria or results in a complaint | Vibration / Overpressure as a result of blasting Fumes as a result of blasting  | Community complaints Non-compliance Poor community perception Damage to property (mine owned) Damage to property (non-mine owned) Real and/or Perceived health impacts Increased regulator attention Increased media attention Impact on Aboriginal sites Impact on public and utility infrastructure (rail, nowerlines) | Continual update of blast design site laws Blast monitoring network Vibration/overpressure model Buffer lands Blast Management Plan Blast notifications Information on website and road side signs Additional monitoring near complainants Community Complaints Procedure | 2 | С | М |
| Blasting                      | Production                                   | Increasing frequent closure of public utility                   | Proximity of road to Pit Several pits advancing to the North Wind direction Cumulative road closure with other operations   | Community complaints Possible exposure to gases  | Blast notifications Information/advertising in paper, on website and on road side signs Road and rail possession process Community Complaints Procedure   | 2 | С | M |
| Flora and Fauna               | Production,<br>Exploration                   | Breach of legislation or site procedure                         | Clearing of land without approval Surface disturbance outside areas that are approved Changes in legislation (EEC) LTA planning of the works Lack of awareness Not following Management Plan requirements   | Non-compliance Prosecution Community dis-satisfaction Future approvals jeopardised   | Ground Disturbance Permit (GDP) Mining lease conditions and environmental approvals Rehabilitation Management Plan  | 2 | A | M |
| Erosion & Sediment<br>Control | Production,<br>Exploration                   | Pollution of surface or ground water                            | Significant rainfall event or uncontrolled discharge Pollution LTA design of Erosion/sedimentation controls Construction activities LTA monitoring LTA design of final landforms - size of sediment retention basins etc. Unknown material characterisation Aggressive topsoil stripping Failed or LTA rehabilitation Climatic events (wind, drought, flooding) | Community dis-satisfaction Non-compliance & fines Licence Breach Business interruption Impact on receiving environment and community   | ESC Plan Surface Water Management Plan GDP Process OCE Inspections  | 3 | С | M |

| Matan                           | Dan di indii a in          | Dellution of ourfees weter  | Dinalina failura  | Community dia actiofaction  | Ingrestions  | 2 | Г |   |
|---------------------------------|----------------------------|---|---|---|--|---|---|---|
| Water                           | Production                 | Pollution of surface water  | Pipeline failure Dam failure Tailings spill (dam and/or pipelines) Uncontrolled discharge Offsite discharge of water from the water cart Hydrocarbon/ chemical leaks/spills AMD   | Community dis-satisfaction Non-compliance & fines Licence Breach Business interruption Impact on receiving environment and community  | Inspections Surface Water Management Plan EPL POEO Act Annual inspection for tailings dams undertaken by certified engineer Pump Crew have Dam Safety Committee training Site water management design RO Plant   | 3 | В | Н |
| Water                           | Production                 | Pollution of ground water   | Tailings leaching Hydrocarbon/chemical spills/leaks AMD Potential recharge from pit water 1 in 100 Year Flood Event   | Community dis-satisfaction (quality or quantity impacts) Non-compliance & fines EPL Licence Breach Business interruption Impact on receiving environment and community  | Inspections Groundwater Management Plan (includes groundwater monitoring network) POEO Act   | 3 | D | M |
| Water                           | Production                 | Final void water quality  | LTA understanding of final void water quality   | Significant change to current approved void configuration or water management system Inability to execute mine closure  | Final Void Management Plan<br>Surface Water Management Plan  | 3 | С | М |
| Traffic                         | Community                  | Increased community concerns about mine related traffic (including damage to road)  | Speeding vehicles Mine use of public roads Equipment to and from the mine (float) Increased cumulative traffic Increased traffic incidences Increased rubbish/littering   | Breach of road rules Damage to public roads Sediment on public roads Community complaints Traffic accident Loss of social licence to operate Reputational damage  | Ulan Road Strategy Communication to workforce through site inductions Car-pooling program Project Communication Strategy Restriction on heavy vehicle movement in school bus hours Coordination of shift change hours with other mines. Community Complaints Procedure Revised traffic assessment Wilpinjong Employee Handbook | 2 | В | M |
| Aboriginal Cultural<br>Heritage | Production,<br>Exploration | Damage/destruction/storage of Aboriginal heritage known/unknown sites (prosecution) | LTA planning for known sites Non-compliance with GDP Disturbance by unauthorised mine related and exploration activities Blasting impacts Dust impacts Inadequate Archaeological consultant LTA resources   | Damage or loss to items of Aboriginal cultural heritage Delay in mining activities/construction where clearance is required Objections from Aboriginal community Prosecution / Fines Lack of trust from the Community More onerous conditions in Management Plans Reputational damage Loss of social licence to operate Non-compliance with ACHMP and National parks and Wildlife Act | ACHMP GDP Process Induction training program Native Title Liaison Officer Cultural Heritage Surveys over the disturbance areas Aboriginal site database Air Quality Monitoring Blast Monitoring Routine monitoring Cultural Heritage Liaison Sub-Committee Implementation of the Native Title Agreement                        | 2 | С | M |
| Aboriginal Cultural<br>Heritage | Community                  | Inadequate engagement of Aboriginal Stakeholders (including the Native Title Party) | LTA communication from the mine (quality and quantity) LTA communication within the community and to the mine Not meeting Native Title Agreement commitments Legacy of historical relationships Internal relationships within the Aboriginal Community (poorly defined succession | Lack of trust   | Native Title Agreement ACHMP Native Title Liaison Officer Engagement of a competent archaeologist  | 2 | С | М |

| Historic (European)  | Production,     | Damage/destruction of European heritage know   | LTA planning for known sites                   | Damage or loss of European heritage.  | European Heritage Survey across current mining     | 2 | С | M |
|----------------------|-----------------|--|--|---------------------------------------|--|---|---|---|
| Heritage             | Exploration     |  | Non-compliance with GDP                        | Loss of community trust               | lease  |   |   |   |
|                      | '               | ,  | Incomplete heritage survey across mine         | Reputational damage                   | Location of sites recorded on electronic database  |   |   |   |
|                      |                 |  | (historical oil shale mine shafts)             | Loss of social licence to operate     |  |   |   |   |
|                      |                 |  | Disturbance by unauthorised mine related and   | · ·                                   |  |   |   |   |
|                      |                 |  | exploration activities                         |                                       |  |   |   |   |
|                      |                 |  | Blasting impacts                               |                                       |  |   |   |   |
|                      |                 |  | I TA resources                                 |                                       |  |   |   |   |
| Stakeholders         | Community       | Increased community concerns                   | Increased focus on the industry                | Community complaints                  | Project consultation strategy (includes current    | 3 | В | Н |
| (Community)          |                 | Changes in community expectations              | Other non Peabody approvals and activities     | Increased regulator attention         | operations)  |   |   |   |
|                      |                 |  | Poor Performance (i.e. Spon Com, noise)        | Objections to approvals               | ccc  |   |   |   |
|                      |                 |  | Historical land acquisition/consultation       | No/constrained approvals              | Donations program                                  |   |   |   |
|                      |                 |  | programs                                       | Loss of trust with community          | Lloyd Coleman (Land and Property Officer)          |   |   |   |
|                      |                 |  | Lack of understanding in the community         | Requests for unrealistic acquisitions | Minerals Council publicity campaign - 'this is our |   |   |   |
|                      |                 |  | Unrealistic expectations from the              | Management distractions (time)        | story'   |   |   |   |
|                      |                 |  | public/community.                              | Increased monitoring costs            | Company newsletters                                |   |   |   |
|                      |                 |  | Planning process                               |                                       | Peabody public relations department                |   |   |   |
|                      |                 |  | Wilpinjong Extension Project plans             |                                       | Wollar 'Have a Chat' day - monthly                 |   |   |   |
|                      |                 |  | Social Media/ media attention                  |                                       |  |   |   |   |
| Stakeholders         | Community       | Delays in future approvals                     | Increased community expectations               | Delay in approval                     | Project consultation strategy (includes current    | 3 | С | M |
| (Government)         |                 | Increase scrutiny by regulators                | Change in legislation                          | No/constrained approval               | operations)  |   |   |   |
| (Coronnium,          |                 | 7 7 9  | Perception of poor performance                 | Non-compliance                        | Annual Review                                      |   |   |   |
|                      |                 |  | Actual poor performance                        | Increased regulator attention         | Environmental Monitoring Programs                  |   |   |   |
|                      |                 |  | rotati poor porrotmanos                        | Prosecution                           | External reporting                                 |   |   |   |
|                      |                 |  |  | Increased non-routine workload        | Peabody public relations department                |   |   |   |
|                      |                 |  |  | Changes in policy and legislation     | Peabody State and Federal Government Public        |   |   |   |
|                      |                 |  |  | Increased cost of monitoring          | Relations Manager                                  |   |   |   |
| Stakeholders (other  | Community       | Negative perception towards Mining as a result | Cumulative Impacts (perceived or real)         | Delay in approval                     | Data sharing arrangements                          | 2 | С | M |
| non Peabody mining   |                 | of cumulative impacts                          | LTA performance by non Peabody mining          | No/constrained approval               | Quarterly meetings between the three mines         |   |   |   |
| projects)            |                 |  | companies                                      | Increased regulator attention         | Ulan Road Strategy                                 |   |   |   |
|                      |                 |  | Different approach in community                | Increased community concern           |  |   |   |   |
|                      |                 |  | engagement/interactions                        | Loss of trust                         |  |   |   |   |
|                      |                 |  | Influence of other primary industries/mines    | Increased cost of monitoring          |  |   |   |   |
|                      |                 |  | (i.e. Coal seam gas, other mines in the region |                                       |  |   |   |   |
| 0(                   |                 | N. C.      | etc.)  |                                       | D. I. I. D. I. D. I. D. I. I.                      | 2 |   |   |
| Stakeholders (NGO's) | Community       | Negative impact on licence to operate and      | Increased participation of NGOs in mining      | Delays in future approvals            | Peabody Public Relations Department                | 2 | D | L |
|                      |                 |  | space  | No/constrained approval               | Minerals Council Advocacy Groups                   |   |   |   |
|                      |                 |  | Social Media/ media attention                  | Increased regulator attention         |  |   |   |   |
|                      |                 |  |  | Increased community concern           |  |   |   |   |
|                      |                 |  |  | Loss of trust                         |  |   |   |   |
|                      |                 |  |  | Increased cost of monitoring          |  |   |   |   |
|                      |                 |  |  | Increased cost of operation           |  |   |   |   |
|                      |                 |  |  | Legal action                          |  |   |   |   |
| Waste Management     | Production,     | Inappropriate waste disposal resulting in a    | LTA training and awareness                     | Breach of the EPL requirements        | Licenced waste management contractor               | 2 | С | M |
|                      | constrained     |  | People bringing waste in from off site         | Prosecution / Fines                   | Inductions/training                                |   |   |   |
|                      | infrastructure, | Increased cost associated with waste           | not using appropriately licenced waste         | Loss of social licence to operate     | Tyre burial procedure                              |   |   |   |
|                      | exploration     |  | contractors                                    | Increased cost of waste management    |  |   |   |   |
|                      | 1 '             |  | LTA receptacles                                | l                                     |  |   |   |   |
|                      |                 |  | LTA hydrocarbon management facilities          |                                       |  |   |   |   |
|                      |                 |  | Illegal dumping of waste                       |                                       |  |   |   |   |
|                      |                 | 1  | I TA resources (human and capital)             |                                       |  |   | I |   |

| Mineral Waste<br>Management             | Production                     | Inappropriate disposal of reactive mineral waste resulting in a liability for Peabody  | LTA management of tailings LTA management of reactive material (ARD, saline etc.) LTA dump design   | Rehabilitation closure impacts Increased scrutiny from regulators Increased costs Inability to relinquish liability Directive pollution through receiving environment Spon Com Impacts to machinery Insufficient cover material Need to change LOM dump Insufficient tailings dam storage space if belt press filter does not operate correctly. | Tailings management strategy Dumping strategy  | 4 | В | Н |
|---|--------------------------------|--|---|--|--|---|---|---|
| Hazardous Materials and Dangerous Goods | infrastructure,<br>exploration | , and the second | LTA storage and treatment facilities (oil water separator systems etc.) Spills and Leaks LTA construction of bunded facilities Presence of hazardous materials in current infrastructure (asbestos, radiation sources etc.)                             | Health and Safety Environmental contamination  | New hydrocarbon management facilities are being constructed to Australian Standards New service trucks have been designed to Australian Standards Spill kits within CHPP, drill rigs, refill trucks ChemAlert Chemical Approval Procedure  | 2 | В | М |
| Land & Property<br>Management           | Buffer lands                   | Loss of reputation with neighbours and community Degradation of the land   | LTA property management (includes properties that are rented) Natural Hazard (fire, flood) Lack of resources to management Limited weed and pest management Presence of feral animals Historical management practices LTA resources (human and capital) | Security/public safety Poor bushfire control Loss of assets on the properties owned/managed by Peabody   | Agistment strategy Long-term leases established with a major Agribusiness company Significant pasture and infrastructure improvements undertaken on acquired lands Extensive weed control programs undertaken Routine feral animal control program undertaken in partnership with local mines and local land services.   | 2 | D | L |
| Land & Property<br>Management           | Community                      | Loss of rural community  | Peabody land purchasing program Consolidation of land holdings  | Loss of community identity/connection  | Renovated houses on Peabody Pastoral lands and re-leased to mining families Supported the continued operation of the Wollar General Store Supported the Community Hall through donations program Contribution to maintenance of public areas within the Wollar village and removing other domestic waste. Purchased own fire fighting truck Mine employees trained as RFS volunteers | 3 | В | Н |
| Land & Property<br>Management           | Buffer lands                   | Failure to achieve ECA and regeneration commitments  | LTA Rehabilitation Management Plan<br>Poorly defined roles and responsibilities<br>LTA resources (human and capital)  | Non-compliance with project approval conditions and voluntary conservation agreement Reputational damage No/delayed approvals  | Binding VCA  | 3 | В | Н |
| Green House Gases                       | Community                      | addressing the climate change issue Non-compliance with the abatement  | Media (link Climate change with mining) Further changes in the legislation relating to CO2 Community perception   | Delay/constrained/no approval Business interruption Non compliance with EIS predictions/commitments Loss of Social Licence to operate  | Quantified GHG emissions from coal reserves  | 3 | D | М |
| Monitoring & Reporting                  | Community                      | LTA monitoring and reporting   | LTA review of the monitoring results and monitoring locations LTA resourcing Increased internal and external monitoring and reporting requirements Limited baseline monitoring (noise, water, etc.)   | Non compliance with the reporting requirements Non-compliance with regulatory requirements Difficulty in demonstrating compliance when comparing to baseline. Poorly calibrated modelling due to limited actual  | 60m met station<br>Environmental monitoring programs   | 2 | С | M |

| Rehabilitation and | Community       | Poor Community and regulator perception          | Not achieving targets                             | Decreased land value                                   | CCC  | 2   | D | 1    |
|--------------------|-----------------|--|---|--|--|-----|---|------|
| Mine Closure       | Community       | towards rehabilitation and final landuse         | LTA rehabilitation strategy integrated into the   | Poor community perception                              | Government Regulators (e.g. DRE)                                 |     |   | _    |
| IVIII IG OIOSUIG   |                 | towards remadification and initial failuase      | mine plan   | Decreased ecological diversity                         | Commitments in EIS/MOP   |     |   |      |
|                    |                 |  | LTA landform design                               | Failed lease relinquishment                            |  |     |   |      |
|                    |                 |  | Mine plan change                                  | Ongoing liabilities                                    | Conceptual mine closure plan                                     |     |   |      |
|                    |                 |  | , · ·   | 1 5 5  |  |     |   |      |
|                    |                 |  | failure to engage with stakeholders               | Reduced land capacity                                  |  |     |   |      |
|                    |                 |  | LTA resources                                     | Unstable landform                                      |  |     |   |      |
|                    |                 |  |   | Poor drainage  |  |     |   |      |
| Rehabilitation and | Production      | Inability to relinquish mining lease             | Not achieving targets                             | Loss of social licence to operate Decreased land value | Commitments in EIS/MOP   | 1   | С | Н    |
| Mine Closure       | Toduction       | inability to relinquish mining lease             | LTA rehabilitation strategy integrated into the   | Decreased ecological diversity                         | Conceptual mine closure plan                                     | 7   |   | "    |
| Willie Closule     |                 |  | mine plan   | Failed lease relinquishment                            | Rehabilitation provision process (ARO)                           |     |   |      |
|                    |                 |  | LTA landform design                               | ·  | Annual Review of Rehabilitation cost estimates                   |     |   |      |
|                    |                 |  | · ·   | Ongoing liabilities                                    |  |     |   |      |
|                    |                 |  | Mine plan change                                  | Reduced land capacity                                  | Progressive Rehab  |     |   |      |
|                    |                 |  | Insufficient accrual for mine closure             | Unstable landform                                      | Mine Plan (5-year budget)  |     |   |      |
|                    |                 |  | LTA progressive rehab                             | Poor drainage  |  |     |   |      |
|                    |                 |  | LTA resources allocated to closure (human         | Increased cost of closure                              |  |     |   |      |
|                    |                 |  | and capital)                                      |  |  |     |   |      |
|                    |                 |  | Lack of closure plan                              |  |  |     |   |      |
|                    |                 |  | LTA material characterisation                     |  |  |     |   |      |
|                    |                 |  | LTA monitoring program to demonstrate             |  |  |     |   |      |
|                    |                 |  | criteria have been met                            |  |  |     |   |      |
| Tanaail            | Draduction      | LTA rehabilitation                               | Eailure of robah                                  | Rehabilitation failure                                 | Descline accomments  | 3   |   |      |
| Topsoil            | Production      | L I A renabilitation                             | Ineffective topsoil management                    |  | Baseline assessments   | 3   | С | M    |
|                    |                 |  | LTA quantity or quality of topsoil                | Increased cost due to maintenance works being          |  |     |   |      |
|                    |                 |  | LTA material classification and management        | required.  |  |     |   |      |
|                    |                 |  | Poor stockpile management (temporary              | Soil erosion   |  |     |   |      |
|                    |                 |  | vegetation cover, soil amelioration)              | Reputational damage                                    |  |     |   |      |
|                    |                 |  | Weeds   | Failure to meet completion criteria                    |  |     |   |      |
|                    |                 |  | Stockpile duration                                | Failure to relinquish mining lease                     |  |     |   |      |
| Annaniala and      | Draduation      | Failure to obtain/registain appropriate project  | I TA control and stripping depth                  | Cignificant costs                                      | Dedicated resource on site                                       | 4   |   | - 11 |
| Approvals and      | Production,     | Failure to obtain/maintain appropriate project   | Failure to lodge renewals in a timely manner      | Significant costs                                      |  | 4   | С | Н    |
| Permitting         | constrained     | approvals (State and Federal) and mining         | LTA resourcing                                    | Delays to mining operations                            | Dedicated mine plan support off-site                             |     |   |      |
|                    | infrastructure, | leases   | Poor project definition/ changes                  | Impact on mining continuity                            | Project approvals schedule                                       |     |   |      |
|                    | exploration     |  | Changing government legislation/ expectations     |  | Approvals strategy   |     |   |      |
|                    |                 |  | Not addressing DGRs adequately                    | Mine becomes marginal                                  |  |     |   |      |
|                    |                 |  | Poor environmental performance                    |  |  |     |   |      |
|                    |                 |  | Capital delays by Peabody                         |  |  |     |   |      |
|                    |                 |  |   |  |  |     |   |      |
| Approvals and      | Production,     | Inability to secure appropriate supplementary    | Failure to consult and/or reach agreement with    | Significant costs                                      | Dedicated resource on site                                       | 4   | E | 1    |
| Permitting         | constrained     | approvals (incl. lease renewals, water licenses, | appropriate regulatory departments or             | Delays to mining operations                            | Dedicated resource on site  Dedicated mine plan support off-site |     | - | _    |
| i crimung          | infrastructure, | s100, MOP, EPL etc.)                             | stakeholders                                      | Impact on mining continuity                            | Project approvals schedule                                       |     |   |      |
|                    | 1               | 3 100, MOF, LF L 610.)                           |   | Impact on mining continuity                            | Approvals strategy   |     |   |      |
|                    | exploration     |  | Not planning for Tier 2 approvals  LTA resourcing |  | Approvais strategy   |     |   |      |
| Approvals and      | Production,     | Failure to comply                                | No supported compliance management                | Delayed process in determining a corporate             | EMS  | 4   | В | Н    |
| Permitting         | constrained     | 1 22.0 10 00                                     | system  | compliance management system                           | Spreadsheets   |     | _ |      |
|                    | infrastructure, |  | LTA resourcing                                    | Non-compliances with operating approval                | Compliance database that is no longer maintained                 |     |   |      |
|                    | exploration     |  | L 17 (1030 di oling                               | conditions   | Compilation database that is no longer maintained                |     |   |      |
|                    | ολρισιαιίση     |  |   | Government resistance to approve future                |  |     |   |      |
|                    |                 |  |   | 1  |  |     |   |      |
| <u> </u>           |                 |  | ļ.  | approvals  |  | I . |   |      |

| Visual Impact | Production,     | Poor community and regulator perception | Increased disturbance by mining           | Increased complaints             | Property acquisition                           | 2 | D | L |
|---------------|-----------------|---|---|----------------------------------|--|---|---|---|
|               | constrained     |   | Industrialisation of the landscape        | Increased scrutiny by regulators | Community complaints procedure                 |   |   |   |
|               | infrastructure, |   | Inability to complete rehab due to future | Increased costs                  | Screening along main road                      |   |   |   |
|               | exploration     |   | mining options                            |                                  | Property management activities on buffer lands |   |   |   |
|               |                 |   | Poor rehabilitation of ground disturbance |                                  | Stakeholder engagement                         |   |   |   |
|               |                 |   | Rehabilitation Legacy                     |                                  |  |   |   |   |
|               |                 |   | Variation from approved visual impact     |                                  |  |   |   |   |
|               |                 |   | assessment                                |                                  |  |   |   |   |
|               |                 |   | Lighting (fixed and mobile)               |                                  |  |   |   |   |
|               |                 |   | Climatic affects and poor design (i.e     |                                  |  |   |   |   |
|               |                 |   | reduction in water volumes in final voids |                                  |  |   |   |   |
|               |                 |   | exposing highwalls)                       |                                  |  |   |   |   |