Section 20 Stakeholder Involvement and Consultation

20.1 Aims of Community Consultations

Terra Gold's parent company GBS Gold has adopted a comprehensive community relations and community consultation approach to ensure all stakeholders are well-informed and have a chance to clarify issues, ask questions on any GBS projects in the region and provide GBS with feed back.

The objectives of the community consultation during the preparation of this EIS are to ensure the interests of individuals, groups and agencies potentially affected by the Maud Creek project are considered and addressed during the environmental impact process.

This is achieved by providing a comprehensive outline of the project to all groups and individuals potentially affected by the project, or who perceived they could be affected. The emphasis of briefings was to encourage discussion, obtain feedback, listen to and understand concerns and respond to issues raised.

As discussed below, this led to significant modifications to the original proposal.

20.2 Consultation Before Preparation of EIS

Community consultation for Maud Creek began after the Notice of Intent for Maud Creek was lodged in November 2006, with a briefing for key stakeholders held in Katherine in December 2006. During this initial phase, informal discussions were held with several parties to identify any concerns. These parties included:

- Katherine Town Council;
- Pine Creek Town Council;
- Katherine Chamber of Commerce;
- Aboriginal Areas Protection Authority;
- Department of Planning and Infrastructure; and
- Department of Primary Industry, Fisheries and Mines.

20.3 Consultations Undertaken During the EIS Preparation

During preparation of the EIS, consultation was undertaken with a wide range of stakeholders, including government agencies, non-government agencies and local businesses. The aims of the consultation program were to:

- identify and consult with any additional stakeholders;
- disseminate information and identify stakeholder issues;
- obtain feedback from stakeholders; and
- respond to stakeholder issues.

Section 20 Stakeholder Involvement and Consultation

Most meetings were attended by personnel from communications consultant Michels Warren Munday, environmental consultant URS and GBS. The meetings generally comprised a formal PowerPoint presentation followed by a discussion session. Detailed minutes were kept and feedback was provided on any issues that could not be answered immediately. A database of all stakeholders was maintained.

Consultation included a site visit (arranged through the Jawoyn Association) with members of the Jawoyn Association board, elders and residents of Jodetluk (Gorge) Community. At this meeting, members of the Jawoyn board, elders, and Jodetluk community members were shown the site of the proposed mine, the existing pit, and the location of proposed infrastructure.

The project area was identified on satellite maps in relation to a dreaming site in Nitmiluk National Park near the project area. The Jawoyn people identified their traditional hunting areas and agreed that the proposed mine would have no impact on them. GBS Gold had a display at this years Katherine Show, and also opened a shopfront at a prominent location in Katherine to enable people to easily gain information about the project.

20.3.1 Identification of stakeholders

An Issues and Stakeholder Analysis Workshop was held in January 2007, attended by senior staff from GBS and URS and facilitated by the project's communications consultant, Jane Munday. This workshop drew on information from public responses to a draft EIS prepared by Kilkenny Gold (Dames and Moore 1998) and PER by Anglo Gold in 2000.

Several additional stakeholders were identified during discussions.

For the purposes of this EIS, stakeholders are defined as:

- People affected directly by, or concerned about, the environmental, social and economic assessment and management of the project;
- Government agencies that would be regulating the proposed operations;
- Community groups and non-government organisations; and
- People with a direct commercial interest in the project.

The local and Northern Territory Government agencies consulted during the preparation of the EIS include the following:

- Minister for Mines, Chris Natt MLA;
- Minister for the Environment, Delia Lawrie MLA;
- Member for Daly, Robert Knight MLA;
- Member for Katherine, Fay Miller, MLA;
- Katherine Town Council;
- Mayor of Katherine, Anne Shepherd;
- Katherine Town Councillors;
- Department of Primary Industry, Fisheries and Mines;
- Department of Natural Resources, Environment and the Arts – Parks and Wildlife;

- Department of Natural Resources, Environment and the Arts – Natural Resources Division;
- NT Environment Protection Agency;
- Department of Business, Economic and Regional Development – Regional Development;
- Power and Water Corporation;
- Department of Employment, Education and Training;
- Northern Territory Police, Fire and Emergency Services;
- Pine Creek Community Government Council;
- Aboriginal Areas Protection Authority;
- Department of Planning and Infrastructure – Roads Division;
- RAAF; and
- Katherine Hospital.

Indigenous stakeholders consulted included the following:

- Jawoyn Association staff;
- Jawoyn Association Board;
- Jodetluk community members; and
- Northern Land Council.

A presentation to the Nitmiluk Board was cancelled due to the board having a full agenda at the designated meeting although discussions were held with the Manager of Parks in the Katherine region, the Senior Nitmiluk Park Ranger and a Senior Nitmiluk Traditional Owner.

Other stakeholders, industry bodies and non-government organisations consulted during the preparation of the EIS included the following:

- Adjacent properties owners;
- Amateur Fishermen's Association of the Northern Territory;
- Katherine Chamber of Commerce and Industry;
- Katherine Economic Development Committee;
- Katherine Extended Coordination Committee;
- Northern Territory Environment Centre;
- Katherine Regional Tourist Association; and
- Landcare (by phone).

Section 20 Stakeholder Involvement and Consultation

20.4 Feedback on stakeholder issues

The stakeholder consultation took account of issues raised in response to the previous EIS submitted in 1998 by Kilkenny Gold, although the project has been considerably modified by Terra Gold (GBS). The key concerns in 1998 were:

- contamination of Katherine's water supply;
- transparency of water monitoring;
- potential for chemical contamination;
- acid mine drainage; and
- waste rock stockpile and tailings storage.

The issues identified during the current consultation programme are listed in Table 20.1. The main issues raised during the current EIS preparation process were:

- the potential impact on the quality of Katherine's drinking water, through contamination of ground and surface water in the catchment;
- the potential for contaminated run-off from the site;
- the nature of processing on site, including the chemicals to be used;
- water turbidity during construction, the filtering capacity of the Power and Water Corporation's equipment, and the impact this could have on Katherine's water supply;
- waste rock storage and potential for acid mine drainage;
- the potential for seepage from tailings;
- the potential impact on Aboriginal sites of significance or hunting grounds;
- whether rehabilitation of the waste rock dump and tailings dam would be sufficient and what bonds would be paid by GBS;
- the social impacts on availability of housing and tradespeople;
- likely impacts of noise and dust from blasting and trucks;
- solute load issues;
- what jobs and training would be available to local people, including Indigenous employment and training programs;
- the importance of baseline data so future impacts can be measured; and
- the impact on Katherine Hospital/ Emergency service resources.

Section 20 Stakeholder Involvement and Consultation

20.5 Response to issues

The comprehensive stakeholder consultation undertaken during preparation of the EIS provided GBS with a sound understanding of government and community issues and affected elements of the design and management of the project. The key outcomes were:

1. The project was considerably modified as a result of the consultation process. Initially, it was proposed to conduct preliminary processing on site, to reduce the number of trucks carting ore through Katherine. However, during community consultation, it was apparent that the community's main concerns related to water quality, with a low tolerance for risk in relation to potential contamination of surface and ground water in the Maud Creek or Katherine River catchments.

   Under the revised proposal, all ore will be transported directly from Maud Creek to Union Reefs near Pine Creek for processing. The significant reduction in environmental impacts was viewed favourably in subsequent stakeholder consultation.

   All stakeholders were advised by letter of the changes and offered new briefings. It is important to note that the revised proposal negated many of the issues raised in community consultation, such as:

   - waste rock storage and associated acid mine drainage;
   - management of tailings;
   - solute load issues in Maud Creek, which is a tributary of the Katherine River; and
   - potential for contamination of surface and ground water by chemicals used in initial processing.

2. GBS has also recognised advice given in community consultation meetings about the importance of an Indigenous employment strategy that goes beyond just making positions available to Indigenous people. GBS is now working with the Northern Land Council and Jawoyn Association to implement a comprehensive Indigenous Employment Strategy that covers prevocational training, selection, and mentoring.

A summary of the issues raised and the response developed in relation to these issues is provided in Table 20-1. The table also indicates where in the EIS the reader can find additional information on the issues. GBS responded to the issues raised by stakeholders as communicated through the distribution of the EIS and follow-up briefings with key stakeholder groups.

It is noted that some issues, mitigation options and figures quoted in the Table 20-1 have been updated since the community consultations took place, so as to incorporate GBS responses to the issues that were raised.

Section 20 Stakeholder Involvement and Consultation

Table 20-1 Summary of issues raised by stakeholders

Topic	Issues raised	Proponent's response	Reference in EIS
General			
Lifespan	What is the lifespan of operations at Maud Creek and is this dependent on gold prices?	The projected lifespan of the Maud Creek project is 10 years. The current gold price is a motivating factor in GBS developments, however GBS is setting up as a low-cost producer, and so will be able to operate profitably even with a significant drop in the current price of gold.	Section 2
Grade of ore	How good is the grade of ore at Maud Creek?	The grade at Maud Creek is good - at approximately 6 grams of gold per tonne of ore.	Section 2
Refractory ore	What is refractory ore and why is it harder to process?	Gold ore is typically defined as refractory when the gold recovery is less than 80 % through conventional gold leach processes such as standard cyanidation and carbon adsorption processes (CIL). These refractory ores require pre-treatment in order for cyanidation to be effective in recovery of the gold. A refractory ore generally contains sulfide minerals, organic carbon, or both. Sulphide minerals often trap or occlude gold particles, making it difficult for the leach solution to dissolve the gold for recovery in the carbon absorption circuit. Refractory ores require pre-treatment in order for the gold to be recovered. This typically entails producing a high grade, low tonnage concentrate in a flotation plant. .	Section 2

Section 20 Stakeholder Involvement and Consultation

Topic	Issues raised	Proponent's response	Reference in EIS
Exploration	Does reopening Maud Creek make further exploration attractive on the tenement and is the mine likely to be expanded beyond its life of 10 years. The previous EIS was for 6 years and the quality of ore was much lower?	GBS is spending presently about $6 to $8 million a year on exploration. Further exploration on the tenement will depend on the price of gold at the time. GBS does not know at this stage whether the life of the mine will be extended; this will depend on the gold price, the extent and grade of the ore arising from the exploration and processing costs.	Section 2
Cost	What is the project costing GBS?	$50 million to get Maud Creek started, with up to $800,000 on the EIS. The revised project reduces Nett Present Value (NPF) of the project by around 20%, but appears to be more acceptable to the community and government and GBS is prepared to reduce profitability.	Section 1
Gold	Where does the gold go?	It all goes to the Perth Mint	Section 1
Power	Where will GBS source its power?	From the existing electricity grid. Power and Water believes it can supply current GBS needs.	Section 2
Footprint	Will the underground mine stay within the lease or will some parts extend outside the Maud Creek Station boundary	It will remain within the mining lease area.	Section 2
Rehabilitation and mine closure			
Rehabilitation	What structures will be left behind, what is the long-term stability of infrastructure and potential for contamination of surface and ground water?	GBS has a long-term commitment to the region and has been rehabilitating several other old mines. Rehabilitation is covered in the mine closure plan. Most of the infrastructure will be removed, leaving only the open cut, pit and original waste rock dump. DPIFM	Section 3

Topic	Issues raised	Proponent's response	Reference in EIS
		will monitor that the mine has been left stable long-term.	
Pit	What will happen to the void at the end of mining?	It will be left as is and filled with water	Section 3
Environmental bonds	What environmental bonds will be required by the Government?	A security classification is made as part of the Mining Management Plan. GBS expects to pay a substantial bond up front, together with reporting commitments on environmental issues.	Section 3
Ground water			
Ground water quality	Concerns at the potential contamination of either the Maud Creek or Tindal aquifers.	No contamination of any aquifers is anticipated.	Section 5
Impacts from dewatering	What will be the rate and impact of dewatering on the water table?	The rate of dewatering will be 20 to 30 litres a second. In comparison, a centre pivot irrigation system delivers about 60 litres a second. Fracture zones appear to be localised to the ore body, limiting any broader impacts on the aquifer. The revised plan covers a longer period (10 years) than original EIS, which means less water needs to be pumped out each year. Other options are being considered, such as grouting of the incline to prevent water ingress.	Section 5
Water monitoring	What water monitoring has taken place since the original 1998 EIS was prepared and what plans are there for ongoing monitoring?	GBS has commenced with a monthly surface and ground water monitoring programme in April 2007 to gather baseline data. There will be on-going environmental monitoring to an approved Environment Management Plan, including on site water quality tests. The Department of Mines will take regular samples independent of the mine. This will be covered in the Mining Management Plan.	Section 5, Section 6

Section 20 Stakeholder Involvement and Consultation

Topic	Issues raised	Proponent's response	Reference in EIS
Flooding	How well understood is flood behaviour in the area, is all infrastructure above 1998 flood levels, and how will the proponent prevent flooding of the pit?	Flood modelling has been undertaken, the mine is designed to withstand a 1:500 ARI event and a bund wall will protect the pit against flooding.	Section 6
Flood levels	Is the site above the 1998 flood level and how were flood levels established?	There is no definitive data on the 1998 flood levels although anecdotal discussion suggests the mine is above 1998 flood levels. With the updated proposal, the mine is being designed for 1:500 ARI.	Section 6
Surface water			
Sedimentation of surface water	Concerns about potential contamination of Katherine River from contaminated run-off or sedimentation during construction. The Power and Water Corporation has limited capacity to filter out sediments and turbidity could also affect chlorination and the proportion of ground water used for the town's drinking water.	Construction will take place in the Dry, when creeks are not flowing. There may a slight increase in localised turbidity of Gold Creek during construction and the creek diversion. This could flow into Katherine River during the 'first flush' of the Wet season but will be short-lived and would occur at a time of high sedimentation from all sources when Power and Water does not draw potable water from the river. Long-term, the banks of Gold Creek will be stabilised and rehabilitated.	Section 1, Section 2
Climate change	The EIS should take account of climate change.	GBS has updated its predictions to take account of rising rainfall data. GBS has modified its plans by reducing the mine footprint and shifting processing to URGM. These changes will reduce the risk of catastrophic failure linked to climate change induced extreme climatic events.	Section 2, Section 12
Downstream impacts	What impacts will there be downstream of the Katherine River, e.g. the Daly River?	No impact on the Katherine River is anticipated, therefore there should be no downstream impacts on the Daly River.	Section 6

Section 20 Stakeholder Involvement and Consultation

Topic	Issues raised	Proponent's response	Reference in EIS
Water discharge	Will water discharge licences be needed for the site?	All excess water will be irrigated onto Maud Creek Station. It is not anticipated that a discharge licence will be needed.	Section 6
Use of chemicals	What chemicals will be used in processing and what is the potential for run-off into water systems?	No cyanide will be used at Maud Creek. With the amended proposal, there is no processing on site; therefore no processing chemicals will be used and therefore risk is low.	Section 2, Section 16
Arsenic	If soils are arsenopyritic, will the mine increase arsenic in the waterways?	The mine is designed to have no run-off; therefore no additional arsenic will enter the waterways (arsenic is naturally occurring).	Section 6
Gold Creek diversion			
Creek diversion	What is the likely impact on biodiversity of diverting Gold Creek?	Based on 1:500 year flood modelling, mine design has been altered to include a perimeter bund which will exclude flooding in extreme rainfall events from the mine are. The diversion of Gold Creek to mitigate flood risk is no longer required or a part of the mine plan.	Section 6
Irrigation			
Use of pit water	What will be done with water from the mine pit and could it cause contamination?	Water from the pit will be irrigated through a pivot system onto improved pasture at Maud Creek Station. The irrigation water from the mine is considered "agricultural" quality by ANZECC guidelines. All water will be irrigated on Maud Creek Station according to standard agricultural practices for irrigated pastures in the Katherine region and there will be no direct discharge to the creek system.	Section 6
Acid mine drainage			

Section 20 Stakeholder Involvement and Consultation

Topic	Issues raised	Proponent's response	Reference in EIS
Acid rock drainage	What is the risk of acid mine drainage, people are concerned after seeing the impacts of Mt Todd?	Overall, rock at Maud Creek is acid consuming not acid forming. Under the revised proposal, ore bearing rock will be taken to Union Reefs and no waste rock will be brought to the surface.	Section 16, Section 4
Flora and fauna			
Weeds	Will the mine increase weed impacts? There are already problems in the park with Gamba Grass and Devil's Claw.	A Weed Management Plan has been developed and will be implemented in the Mining Management Plan. Actions are likely to include weed control (spraying) along mine access roads and in the irrigation area, particularly for declared weeds and gamba grass.	Section 7
Clearing	How much clearing will take place and what impact will this have?	Total cleared land requirement is 77 hectares for the irrigation area, mine water dam and new haul road. All this land is partially cleared pastoral land and does not contain any significant vegetation communities or fauna habitats. New clearing is expected to be 18 hectares	Section 2
Biodiversity	Are there any threatened species on the Maud Creek site?	Recent field studies indicate that no threatened species of flora and fauna will be impacted by the mine project.	Section 7, Section 8
Baseline data	Importance of having good baseline data	Baseline ecological studies were carried out at the Maud Creek mine site in 1998 and 2007. These have incorporated dry season and wet season conditions. Baseline monitoring includes surface water quality, ground water quality, archaeological values, flora, fauna and aquatic ecosystems.	Section 7, Section 8, Section10, Section 11

Section 20 Stakeholder Involvement and Consultation

Topic	Issues raised	Proponent's response	Reference in EIS
Nitmiluk National Park			
Nitmiluk Park	What impacts will there be on Nitmiluk Park, including the "Snake Dreaming" site in the Mt Shepherd area across Maud Creek? This area has strong cultural significance for the Jawoyn people.	No environmental impacts are expected. Staff and contractors will be confined to the station area. Restrictions on access to the area can be written into the Mining Management Plan and the site will be fenced.	Section 9, Section 11
Cultural and historical environment			
Impact on hunting areas	Will there be any impact on Gold and Maud Creeks, including Jawoyn hunting areas?	No mining activities will occur near the Jawoyn hunting areas along Maud Creek.	Section 2, Section 11
Culture and heritage	What sites of significance exist on Maud Creek and what impact is likely.	Surveys have identified archaeological sites inside the mining lease. Three sites are close to or within the mining footprint and ministerial permission will be sought before disturbing them. Other sites close to mining activities will be protected via fencing and signage. No Aboriginal sacred sites or places on the Register of National Estate will be impacted by the project.	Section 11
Access	Will Jawoyn and Parks and Wildlife have access to the land (most survey work is likely to be aerial)?	The mine site will be fenced off but supervised access can be arranged by obtaining permission from the land owner.	Section 2
Air quality, noise and greenhouse gases			
Noise	What level of noise will result from the mining activities and will it impact on	There will be some blasting, but it will be underground and probably won't be heard off the mining lease (there were no complaints of	Section 2, Section 12

Topic	Issues raised	Proponent's response	Reference in EIS
	amenity?	noise with the previous mine). The closest neighbours are Jodetluk Camp and bed and breakfast accommodation on Gorge Road. There could be some increased noise from trucks.	
Blasting	What about impacts from blasting?	The noise from blasting is short-term and should not be heard by tourists. Vibrations should not be felt more than 1 to 2 kilometres away.	Section 2, Section 12
Dust	What dust will be produced during construction and operations and what impact will it have?	Dust off haul road may be produced but will be actively controlled through dust suppression systems during construction and operations. Ore transport will take place in covered trucks and overall no impact is expected from dust.	Section 12
Socioeconomic issues			
Jobs	Will GBS have an Indigenous employment and training program and what work will be available for locals?	GBS will try to draw its workforce from the local area. It is committed to real jobs and is in the process of preparing anIndigenous employment policy and procedures. A MOU is expected to be signed between GBS, the NLC and Jawoyn Association in the near future.	Section 14
Local industry participation	What is Gas's commitment to local industry participation?	As much as possible, all contracts and services will be sourced from Katherine or the Territory, depending on availability and quality. Local sub-contractors are being used for earthworks and transport.	Section 14
Workers camp	Will there be a camp on site for workers?	GBS hope to outsource the accommodation requirements however may construct a permanent camp should it be required	Section 2
Medical Services	What impact will there be on medical services, such as Katherine Hospital in the	GBS will have a trained occupational first aiders, ambulance and first aid facilities on site. No chemicals or hazardous materials will be	Section 16, Section 17,

Topic	Issues raised	Proponent's response	Reference in EIS
	event of an incident. Mass casualties could overwhelm the hospital's resources?	used on site, so any injuries are likely to be cuts and sprains. Katherine Hospital has a mass casualty plan and is on Tindal's designated deployment plan for planes flying to Darwin and Asia. The hospital believes it can respond to the sorts of injuries that could potentially occur at the mine. The GBS Emergency Response Team will visit the hospital as part of its routine training.	Section 18, Section 19
Crews	How many people would be working on the mine at any one time?	Once the mine is operational, there would be around 40 people working on the lease, with a total workforce of about 60.	Section 2, Section 14
Housing	Will GBS have an impact on local housing availability?	There could be some impact from additional staff, but GBS is trying to source workers from existing population.	Section 14
Skills shortage	What is the likely impact on availability of skilled tradespeople in Katherine, given the existing shortage and competition from other mining projects, such as Territory Iron?	GBS is offering several apprenticeships in the Katherine/Pine Creek areas (electrical, boilermaker, diesel). The attraction of working from Katherine and Pine Creek is that people can go home at night, rather than working on a fly in-fly-out basis. The ability to provide services to the mine may boost the capabilities of local contractors.	Section 14
Traffic and transport			
Truck movements	What is the number of truck movements each day?	Quadruple road trains will do about 15 return journeys each day, so a total of about 30 movements a day (under the initial proposal truck movements were one per day each way). Trucks will be restricted to a maximum of 40 km/hr through Katherine and will operate only during daylight hours.	Section 15

Section 20 Stakeholder Involvement and Consultation

Topic	Issues raised	Proponent's response	Reference in EIS
Road safety	Reflectors should be placed along the full length of vehicles as people may not see the last trailer of laden trucks when they are turning.	Trucks have good safety markings and will be on the highway only during daylight hours.	Section 15
Railway crossings	What is the level of crossings planned?	There are flashing lights at Ping Que Road (the only crossing along the route).	Section 15
Route	What alternative routes were considered for trucks?	A number of routes were considered, including the use of rail, however the Stuart Highway through Katherine is the safest and most practical route.	Section 15
Traffic Management	The EIS needs to include a traffic management plan, detailing total traffic movements (construction and operational).	The EIS includes a traffic management plan, detailing hours of operation, tonnage and proposed strategy for movement through Katherine, speed controls, markings and upgrades of intersections.	Section 15
Intersections	The Ross Road intersection will need to be widened and marked to warn of turning vehicles.	Haul trucks will not be using this route in the long term.	Section 15
Access roads	What access roads will be used to reach Maud Creek and has an alternative been considered?	Current access is via Ross Road and Fox Road to Maud Creek station, but GBS is considering a shorter road across its property to reach the Stuart Highway north of Ross Road. This would avoid the need to cross Gold Creek.	Section 15
Rail	Has rail been considered as an option for transporting the ore?	Yes, however it would mean double-handling and currently there is no off-loading facility at Pine Creek. Rail transport has been determined to be uneconomic for this reason.	Section 15

Section 20 Stakeholder Involvement and Consultation

Topic	Issues raised	Proponent's response	Reference in EIS
Waste and hazardous materials management			
Cyanide	Will there be increased transport of cyanide to Union Reefs for processing and has GBS investigated alternatives?	Yes, deliveries are likely to double as a result of the Maud Creek project. There are no practical alternatives to cyanide.	Section 16
Risk assessment			
Safeguards	What emergency safeguards will be in place?	Procedures needed to deal with a catastrophic event will be included in the Mining Management Plan, however GBS will continue with its proactive approach to safety and the prevention of incidents and accidents.	Section 17, Section 18, Section 19

Section 20 Stakeholder Involvement and Consultation

20.6 Consultation During the EIS Review Period

Under Northern Territory legislation, the EIS is subject to a public review period of at least 28 days. During this time, the proposal is available for further scrutiny by all stakeholders. The draft EIS will be available for viewing at:

- Government Centre, First Street Katherine;
- Katherine Public Library, Main Street, Katherine;
- Electoral office of the Hon. Fay Miller, Member for Katherine;
- Jawoyn Association, First Street, Pandanus Plaza;
- Environment Protection Agency, 2nd Floor, Darwin Plaza, Smith Street Mall;
- Department of Primary Industry, Fisheries and Mines Library, Level 3, Centrepoint Building, Smith Street Mall, Darwin;
- NT Library, Parliament House, Darwin;
- GBS Office in Katherine, Shop 2 / 22 Katherine Terrace; and
- Union Reefs Gold Mine, Ping Que Road, Pine Creek.

Terra Gold (GBS) will continue the community consultation process while the EIS is on public display. Recognising that the EIS is a complex document, fact sheets summarising the EIS document will be made available, as well as maps and displays at the GBS Katherine office. In addition:

- A public notice will be placed in the Northern Territory News and Katherine Times advising of locations where the EIS can be viewed and its availability;
- GBS will provide information to stakeholders when requested, including direct responses to stakeholders who have asked questions during the EIS consultation period; and
- Interested members of the public will be invited to view the full EIS on the NRETA website or to view hard copies at the relevant local libraries or council officers.

20.7 Consultations Following the Proposal Implementation

GBS has a strong ongoing commitment to good community relations and consultation. A communications strategy has been prepared to cover on-going communication that will include a mechanism for bringing any stakeholder grievances to the attention of GBS. On-going communication includes:

- Fact sheets and displays;
- Project information on the GBS website; and
- Access to GBS staff to discuss any issues of concern.

Section 20 Stakeholder Involvement and Consultation

20.8 Commitments

Terra Gold commits to maintaining stakeholder consultation by continuing to consult throughout the public review period and throughout the construction, operation and rehabilitation phase of the mining operations.

Terra Gold commits to developing a consultation strategy to ensure that current project information is delivered in a timely manner and in a way that is appropriate for all stakeholders.