

Agenda

Santa Cruz County Advisory Panel Meeting #16

Wednesday, September 23, 2022, 12p-2p

Wild Horse Inn - 309 W McKeown Ave, Patagonia

Meeting Objectives

- Provide update on the project
- Start process of selecting permanent facilitator
- Discuss items of interest from last meeting

Agenda

1. Introductions, Roadmap & Charter Review
(Facilitator/All) 10 min
2. August Meeting Items: 80 min
 - a. Process and Criteria for New Facilitator
 - b. Questions and Update about Water
 - c. Social Impact Assessment
3. Hermosa Project Overview/Update *(South32)* 20 min
4. Wrap up and Looking Forward 10 min

Meeting Minutes

Santa Cruz County Advisory Panel Meeting #16
Wednesday, September 23, 2022, 12p-2p
Wild Horse Inn - 309 W McKeown Ave, Patagonia

Attendance

Meeting Facilitators:

- Dean Slocum, Ranay Guifarro – Acorn International

South 32 Hermosa Advisory Panel Members Present:

- Olivia Ainza-Kramer
- Liz Collier
- Gerry Isaac
- Ruth Ann LeFebvre
- Damian Rawoot
- Fritz Sawyer
- Linda Shore
- Guillermo (Mimo) Valencia
- Marcelino Varona
- Michael Young
- John Fanning

South32 Hermosa Advisory Panel Members Absent:

- Carolyn Shafer
- Chris Young

South32:

- Melanie Lawson, Tomas Goode, Pat Risner
- Judy Brown, Victor Cock, Joyce **Nessin**

12:00 1. Introductions, Roadmap & Charter Review

Dean and Ranay introduced themselves as transitional Panel facilitators, asked by South32 to help the Panel (1) find, select and on-board a new, permanent facilitator, and (2) continue to progress discussions and review on priority items during the search and on-boarding process.

Dean reviewed the agenda and Panel mission statement, saying that the mission statement appears to be well done and a good example of mission statements for multi-stakeholder panels based on Acorn International's experience and research.

Regarding the agenda, Panelists had a number of comments:

Marcelino - When is the Professor going to be here? I thought the plan was for him to be here.

Tomas - Ty cannot be here because he would be unable to answer the questions the panel has asked and therefore would not be worthwhile for him to attend.

Marcelino - What is worthwhile? I have attended 17 meetings and I feel put aside because the professor is not here, and the decision on this should have been because we (the panel) asked. What happened to the "Good Neighbor Agreement" Presentation, that the grad student gave us, we only saw the first part, and there was a second part.

Melanie - Our intent was not to make you feel pushed aside - we realized internally is we want Ty's role to be increased. His current role is technical advisor, there are some agreements we need to work through so he can fulfill an expanded role, and we can go into that next meeting. Ty agreed that he didn't want to talk about things until his role was agreed upon.

Dean - Would the panel like to continue talking about water or- the selection of a Facilitator., water, or the Social Impact Assessment

Marcelino - I would like to talk about the facilitator

12:10 2. Meeting Agenda Items

2a. Facilitator Transition

Dean presented and discussed a process to consider for selecting a permanent facilitator:

- *Confirm responsibility of facilitator*
- *Identify criteria for a permanent facilitator (see list of examples to start thinking)*
- *Propose candidates (using forms provided)*
- *Evaluate and prioritize candidates (multi-voting method to be determined by Panel)*
- *Recommend candidates to sponsor for approval*
- *Confirm selection, engage and on-board*

Dean - This is not the process we have to use, but in our experience, it is a good way to begin that process. If the panel agrees with this process, I think we can identify the first points two today. The next step is to propose candidates, and we have some forms that you can use for nominating candidates and for candidates to outline their qualifications. Then we can evaluate them and feed them back to you, where then you would prioritize the candidates and use a multi-voting mechanism (ideally at the next meeting.) Then we will recommend these facilitators to the sponsor (South 32) for their approval/acceptance/endorsement (which of these?).

Ruth Ann - Hire, They have to hire the facilitator and approve them because they have to pay for them

Dean - OK, then there would be confirmation and onboarding because you don't want to be in a situation where there is a gap from what you learn over these three months and the next facilitator, we want the new facilitator to come in and be ready, so we need to spend some time to onboard the new facilitator. That is the kind of process that we have seen work well, and it doesn't have to be the exact process you use, but rather than start from scratch, we thought we would through that out there for the panel to consider. Any thoughts on that?

Ruth Ann - I do. Before we were even formed, South 32 hired Angie, so you guys had some sort of evaluation process, some kind of responsibility you wanted her to do, so I wonder if some of those criteria you had for hiring Angie could be applied for what we are doing now. We didn't have any say in hiring Angie.

Melanie - We hired Angie before there was a Panel and a charter. We didn't have anything, so I pulled ideas from talking with Victor and other people in the company that had experience with similar panels in other communities so I had some examples. One criteria we could discuss today. We wanted someone to be local, but that comes with pros and cons, because they might have a conflict of interest that might arise. So there is criteria like that we could discuss, if that is still good criteria to keep or if you want someone from like Tucson because they might be a little more objective.

Dean - You bring a good point, Melanie. Do you all even what to do this, or do you want to tell South 32 we trust you and rely on you to do a good job and bring us a suitable facilitator? Usually we try to ensure there is a lot of collaboration, a lot of input.

Marcelino - Their selection of Angie as a facilitator in my opinion, how she handled herself, how facilitated these meetings was outstanding, and Melanie complemented Angie extremely well. I felt that when Angie left, she was yanked out and we didn't know why, as an example, on the last agenda there was an agenda item that said "my, goodbyes" and then suddenly that meeting was canceled, as soon as that agenda went out, a day or two later that meeting was canceled. So I don't know why she is not here and that kind of fluctuates the spectrum on trust and no trust.

Linda - Marcelino did you not get the letter from Angie on why she left? It was her decision to leave, not South 32's.

Marcelino - yes, I got the letter but I don't think in my conversations that you sentence is accurate. Sometimes you have to say things that you don't want to say to keep peace. I read the letter and I know the factual contents. Now I think the only one in the group that understands the function of this committee from South 32 is Melanie, she is the only one that brings prior experience, she doesn't come and go as she wants. She has been here - she is committed and has done an excellent job. The only downfall I have is the departure of Angie I don't agree with the statement that was made right now, as to the letter, and I don't feel comfortable. Now do I feel comfortable with you right now Melanie? I think you, right now, in my opinion you and Greg could take off with this, right with out going any place else. We have gone through 17 meetings I don't know why we are going on another hunt. Dean, I was very apprehensive of you, why are you brining someone from Houston, Texas? I can't understand why you are brining someone. But the way he started right now, he did very well. He was upfront, he never flinched, he said

no, I want to answer it, and discuss it. That's the type of person I want, someone upfront, someone who isn't trying to steer us anywhere, there are a lot of intellectual minds here and we are going to have the 5 or 6 meetings and when we talk about water, I don't see there being polite discussions here because we are going to protect this little town of Patagonia and its water supply, no matter what. No matter if somebody lost a case at the state agency or whatever its not going to be an easy task, but I think Dean is off to a good start, Melanie, I have a lot of trust in you and Greg to take this thing. I don't need to go through an elaborate search and all that, I just want someone like how you guys are handling yourselves. Don't lie to us, tell us the truth be upfront with us because we are going to demand the town of Patagonia has a safe and secure water supply, and if something goes wrong with the good neighbor agreement, or you guys stand up and say that they (wells) are going to be monitored, and we are going to do the monitoring to make sure nothing happens, and if there is flooding I want to know, are you going to shut down the water, or are you going to let it continue? These are some of the questions and I have a responsibility to answer. When I walk out of the meeting, those people out there are going to ask me why did you vote the way you did? And I have to stand up and justify my vote, my explanation.

Linda - Marcelino is your answer to Ruth Ann's Question, you don't care if South 32 picks the facilitator like they picked Angie?

Olivia - The way I see it is that we need to have local people, like Melanie she has been doing a wonderful job, I agree with Mr. Marcelino. By learning about Patagonia and the whole of Santa Cruz County. I think we also need someone local like Greg, that knows the ins and outs, and he knows how to represent Nogales - the whole of us. I think it is very important to keep local people.

Dean - Let me put this out to the whole group – The whole process that we laid you will take some time, and some work. Would you rather say: "South 32 you bring us some candidates and we will review them"?

Fritz - Yes, three candidates.

Damion - I agree with the discussion generally, I have worked with facilitators locally and would be happy to propose facilitators but beyond that I agree with the group, as far as identifying criteria for a permanent facilitator I think, like Marcelino and the group has said, we were pretty happy with how Angie did, so we want a continuation of that sort of role. Melanie, you do a great job of liaising with the company. There are some bread and butter things we need - good note taking, good documentation from my perspective. Angie understood (the facilitator role) as being a translator of the process between South 32 and this panel by going through the road map and translating that into actionable process for us as a panel.

Linda – We should have a professional facilitator.

Dean - We have slides and print outs of criteria of what makes a good facilitator – based on the International Society of Facilitators, Association of Consultants to Non-profits, and Acorn International experience. If you want, we hand out this list and you can circle what you want, and hand it back to us, or share with Melanie later.

Marcelino - There was the idea that 3 facilitators be presented to us and then we will decide the one we want.

Dean - So it sounds like Damion knows a few

Damion- Yes, they are around, if you consider Tucson local.

Melanie- Yes, so that is what I was going to suggest but I didn't want to influence the group, but if we could consider Tucson as local because we do need someone local but independent enough so they could be removed from conflict of interests

Marcelino - Local as in Southern Arizona

(Several panelists voiced agreement)

Dean reviewed slides (Attachment A) on criteria for facilitators. Any others?

Ruth Ann - One think that Angie did is look ahead in that she was meeting with the Flood and Flow committee, and who would have thought of that,

Linda - It was because of her interest in the County.

Liz - But that information became integral to a lot of the decisions we made.

Damion- We need somebody that is familiar with the broader operation environment that this panel is working with.

Dean - Does this feel okay, that the panel will tell Dean and Ranay and South 32, we will tell you things we want to see in a facilitator and you bring us 3 candidates and we as a committee will evaluate them?

Memo – I think there was a comment on being able to recommend someone.

Damion - Yes, I like the idea of having the opportunity to recommend someone.

Marcelino - Yes, they can apply and show the criteria so they can apply

Melanie- You can submit someone if you know the name, you can leave it with me or Dean.

Community College Ballot Initiative (not on agenda but Panel agreed it would be timely to address at this meeting)

Ruth Ann & Linda - What happened with the workforce, that was set aside with Robin?

Liz - yes, we have an initiative of the ballot in November and I wanted to inform the people on what it was.

Dean -That was in the email with agenda item choices - the ballot initiative

(General agreement that the Panel should take time now for discussion on the ballot issue regarding the Community College)

Marcelino - It is critical that the work from Robin continues to try to understand what South 32's qualifications for employment are so people from southern Arizona have priority for those jobs. I think 71% percent of the workforce is from southern Arizona and we want to make sure that that still continues as South 32 continues to grow. I don't see why Robin can't continue with all the work she has done. I don't want to have to back track on work that is already done.

Melanie - I think we have her workforce outcome 2.0 mapped, the next step is for us - South 32 - to define our qualifications and timeframe and jobs and then we can move that discussion forward. We can continue that discussion with the panel, and that 6-month road map with all the different topics on it and how it has shifted and advance it and update it.

Dean - I understand that you all want an update on what is going on with the ballot measure – Liz would you give us a quick update?

Liz - Prop 413 is about spending limits. Does everyone know what spending limits are? Arizona regulates what you can spend, so every single school, college, and university and a lot of towns and cities have expenditure limits, where you are just not allowed to spend over a certain amount. Our expenditure limit was set by a formula that was established in 1978. What they didn't know was, COVID, and they didn't know a lot of the other things going around. So what has happened over the years is our enrollment has gone up, which is great, then enrollment went down, and then our enrollment went down severely once COVID hit because we were not allowed to be in the building and we were not set up to give credit for online classes. Our enrollment dropped down to like 100 students which, when you plug into the formula that was established 30 some years ago it didn't work and we don't have enough money to move forward. So we are not asking for a tax increase. Our taxes are the second lowest in the state, we are very responsible with money. We have \$3.5million in the bank that I cannot touch. What we are asking the voters is to allow us to expend the money we need that we can collect from our tax revenues and take it out of savings. Some of the things we want to do are update our computers and start hiring full time teachers. One of our biggest problems that I also wanted to talk about is our enrollment is up over 230% It's the highest growth in the state which is promising and confirms there is demand for post-secondary education, but we don't have enough teachers so we are having to cancel classes. If anybody has master's degrees and is interested in teaching a course please contact the community college. We really need teachers.

Memo - If this referendum doesn't pass, what will happen to the college?

Liz - we would have real troubles, and we would have to ask for a tax increase, which is not what we want to do. We just want to maintain what we are doing and spend the money we collect.

John – Liz, if this is goes through how much are our taxes going to go up?

Liz- None

Gerry- We had this happen in our elections in Patagonia, and the write up was very confusing but it was written poorly so which way do we vote if we want it to pass?

Michael - So that Liz doesn't get in trouble, because there are a couple of board members here, I wrote a letter as an educator and community member in support of Prop 413. I am a product of the Community College in Nogales and I highly encourage everyone to vote yes on 413.

Liz - Michael has made it so the kids that graduate here in high school graduate with a year of college under their belts that they didn't have to pay a cent for.

Michael - This year's seniors will graduate with 30 credit hours for their associates degree. Seniors next year will potentially graduate with 36 credit hours, I keep pushing the dual credit hours for my juniors and seniors. As legislation is changing, we can potentially hit freshman

through 12th grade and that is my goal, lets kill two birds with one stone and help the families at no cost. Pima County Community college has been right there with me to help support our youth in Santa Cruz County in every facet they could and I want to see that partnership blossom even more by allowing that proposition to pass. It's not increasing our taxes - it is made to help them get access to the coffers and the money they already have had for 40 years.

Liz- There is a pamphlet that will be going out to every household in Santa Cruz County, but it won't go out until the 28th as required by law

Dean- is there information online?

Liz-Yes, are working on something online, including FAQ's on our website soon.

Introduced new participants from South32: Pat, Judy, Joyce

Marcelino- Could you give a brief overview on what happened at the beginning, so that Pat understands how we feel.

Dean provided a recap.

2b. Water

Dean - Lets go ahead and start on water, however I understand the committee doesn't want to talk much about water without Ty.

Tomas - As was mentioned before we are in the process of reviewing the questions and are trying to answer them. The ones that we can answer and provide the input on, we can back to you. We have been working with Ty, and to confirm that the reason that why he is not here is because we don't have the answers for you and he wouldn't have the opportunity to provide significant input and he didn't think it would be of significant value for him to be here.

Linda - And he has a real job

Tomas - Yes he does have a real job

Melanie - It's not summer anymore

Tomas - Yes he does teach and to make sure his time is spent effectively, that was the decision. In terms the questions asked we went back and looked at the information that was available to us, so that we could make it available to the panel. There were a number of public documents and permits such as the APP permit and we discovered the final is not published on the website, just the draft. We were able to provide the final on the Hermosa website. A number of questions are associated with water quality, what are the criteria that South 32 will be held accountable for in terms of discharge in to Harshaw Creek. Those questions are all answered in the APP permit as well as the ADQ permit we have to discharge in Harshaw Creek. Has everyone had an opportunity to look at the Hermosa website? *(All members raised their hands.)* If everyone has looked at it then that is the most important thing.

Melanie (*showed how to access the document page on the South 32 Hermosa website.*) We are trying to put everything on here, so it's all convenient, I can send a link out to this page as well, and some questions are answered in the 3-minute video.

Fritz - I am a bit confused on the signed permit for the Hermosa project, because on the very last page of that permit it says draft.

Tomas - On this particular version, it might have been an oversight in terms of downloading it from ADEQ, but ultimately there is a signed copy.

Fritz - So is it final, final, you're done with it?

Tomas - Yes, there is pending litigation with it. There are some questions we can't answer because there is pending litigation.

Ruth Ann - I thought that huge list of questions that we had related to the models? How you would answer them with the models that you use and then I somewhere got the idea that the models you were using to answer were the South 32 models not the model the flood and flow and whoever else developed. I understand that the AZPDES has answers on how much you can discharge, but I thought the whole idea of those questions were to test the models?

Tomas - I think I can answer your question. There are a number of questions with regard to hydrological information that could be answered by a hydrological model, how to approach the ground water models and whether they would be adequate to answer some of the questions the panel has. So I've mentioned this in a previous meeting, I believe that one of the challenges for us at South 32 is that these models will be used in regulatory processes, which means we are not ready to submit these models to a regulatory body so therefore we can't release these publicly. Therefore, Ty cannot review these, therefore I cannot provide answers to a lot of the questions. I recognize that there is work that has been done, and we have tried to provide answers using the information that is publicly available. The models are not publicly available, and therefore Ty cannot review the models.

Ruth Ann - But didn't we know that way back when? When we started the list of questions?

Melanie - Well what we are trying to say is what we can do with Ty at the next meeting is line out what we can do. We aren't saying we aren't ever going to release it, we are just saying we aren't going to release it right now. I think it's good to remember that we aren't operating so some of this information isn't ready, yet. But we can work with Ty and communicate a timeframe of when the information is available.

Linda - I was going to ask how much is this related to the fact that the feasibility study isn't done?

Melanie - The feasibility study is just an internal process. The regulatory process that Tomas is referring to is different.

Linda - So they are not all tied together?

Melanie - No

Linda - Has the regulatory process begun, or the process of submitting to regulators begun?

Tomas - No

Linda - And its not because of the feasibility study?

Tomas - There are a lot of things in the air. In regard to the feasibility study, and decisions moving forward on mine development. So until that has been finalized, there is no mine design to identify what potential impacts there will be. So it's all really preliminary - on the feasibility side there are a lot of decisions that haven't been made. From a personal side I would hate to come in here and provide you an answer today and a month from now say it's changed, and another month, its changed again. We want to make sure that those processes have been finalized, and that is the feasibility study. Just to map out a bit of the process, there is the feasibility study, then there is an internal review process within South 32. These are months long processes even with the feasibility study to determine that yes, this is what we want to do, or not and then revise something. The answers to what are you going to do and when are not even answered internally so we can't provide these answers.

Fritz - So I understand where you are coming from, that list of question, you are going to answer some, and others kick down the road? Can you just put down on a piece of paper where you are at with some of this stuff?

Tomas - That is exactly what we are in the process of doing right now, identifying what questions we can answer right now and how much we can answer, and how many of those questions we are going to kick down the road.

Fritz - I think that will relieve a lot of frustrations, because we were told May and here we are in September.

Dean - I think we can help expedite that a bit. It seems that part of these concerns are related to content and the other part is process – you want to know that you are being listened to and there is a process that allows you to know when you can see things.

Fritz - Some of the questions we had are very simple and not based off a mine plan, or what you have in the ground, those don't need to be answered right away.

Tomas - I can answer some questions conceptually, I can tell you there will be water level rise with associated with discharge but that also is where the difficulty is because then the question is how much, where and who is going to be impacted and how much are they going to be impacted. Those are the questions I can't answer right now.

Fritz - I think a summary page would be really great, even if you say I can't answer this question right now.

Tomas - The reason that we weren't able to present that today is because it is being internally reviewed. I apologize for the poor communication on the long timeline. The groundwater models can't be made public prior to those being submitted to the regulatory agencies, and I don't have a timeline for that.

Melanie - We can create a document with all your questions and provide you the location of where you can find the answers on the questions that can be answered and for the questions that can't be answered we can provide a little bit of explanation. We can work on having this at the October meeting.

Linda - So what you are saying is that the timeline is being revised not only because Angie left, but because everything is moving.

Dean - South 32 is going to get back to you with a one-pager, and the questions that are available to you at this point.

Ruth Ann - So you are going to use that huge sheet 11x17 and 3 pages of questions, and at the end of each question, there will be an answer if available.

Dean - We can create a more user-friendly dashboard so you can more easily find the questions and answers.

Ruth Ann - I have a reservation when you say you are going to consolidate, because you are using your judgment to eliminate some questions and answers.

Dean - Sorry, I wasn't clear - we will not be filtering out any questions, just creating a more user-friendly dashboard.

Tomas - I want to set expectations, I know that some questions are very important and relevant but I won't be able to answer them now, and there might be some frustration in the coming months, I recognize that and I will answer as many questions as I can.

Gerry - I would appreciate seeing a kind of summary that you are talking about that does synthesize this huge amount of paper and data we have in front of us. I feel we are acting like staff who deep dives into everything to try to figure out what is going on and I view my role as someone who sees some executive summary of things and has the ability to take a deeper dive if I want to. But right now I don't have the choice, I have to take the deep dive because that's all there is - massive amounts of data.

Dean - That could be something Ty could help the panel with, we have to balance giving you the information you need and without someone only telling you what they think is important.

Marcelino - Tomas, I am still a little bit confused when the professor was talking about the model that he was going to be using, then all of a sudden you guys came back and said you can't use that model because that is part of the litigation against South32. Could you explain that part, not now but in your narrative? I just want to make sure I understand your complexities from my simplification of thought as to all the months we spent talking about the model, and now we can use the model.

Tomas - If I can clarify, what was misunderstood? In your question, you stated the reasons why that model was not going to be used

Marcelino - The problem is that you dragged us all these months, and you could have told us and the professor that we can't use that model.

Melanie - It wasn't until the June or July meeting when that model was brought up on the list of potential models and so when it was brought up we had to say, "actually we can't use that model because there is ongoing litigation". Prior to that we were referencing South32 models that were being built.

Damion - I think in your write-up South32 should just say that it has this model that is proprietary and what can and cannot be shared with Ty. I think being clear on what models exist and will be used to get the answers, and which ones won't be, and why would be useful.

2c. SIA

Sabrina and Norma from SOOP Strategies presented on the Social Impact Assessment. See handout and report on project web site for summary or results and recommendations.

1:40 3. South 32 Mine Update

Pat - Before I start the update, I want to thank you for your patience as we transition with the facilitator. We are still very committed to this panel and appreciate your patience as we work through all this.

The feasibility study around Taylor is due to be finished in the middle of next year, around June and it is on track and the study work is progressing. This is when we will make the big decision on Taylor. The construction work on-site around the de-watering program is also progressing on schedule. The construction of the water treatment plant which is going to be commissioned around June next year is on track and progressing, including the initial well program. So, for the most part, nothing for Taylor has really changed from what we provided you a few months ago.

What has changed and where things are evolving and are becoming more uncertain in a positive way is around Clark and the manganese side. What is driving this is around February/March of this year we have seen a pretty significant increase in the federal administration focus on electric vehicles and batteries. This was also the same time when we started to engage with all the electric vehicle producers and battery manufacturers who are planning on building facilities in the US. The other thing that has happened is there has been some policy developments by the administration focused on 5 batteries minerals, and manganese was one of them, to promote the production of electric vehicles. So there is a strong push by the administration as well to look at national resources to produce those 5 minerals. The recent Inflation Reduction Act that was recently passed had a lot of incentives for electric vehicle and battery manufacturers that gave tax credits if they sourced their raw materials from a US supply.

With this all happening it made us think about an earlier time frame, so we have entered into negotiations with a lot more companies since around March. We have started to look at potentially accelerating the production of Clark, and we are putting plans to finish the first phase of the pre-feasibility study on Clark at the end of the calendar year. There is a lot of permitting and a number of other actions that have to happen because Taylor and Clark are one mining operation. We will know a lot more at the end of the calendar year- early in the new year and we will be able to share more then.

The last thing is there was a lot of discussion about things we can't do because of litigation and given the context of the conversation we just had it is important to discuss how this impacts timing as well. The water quality appeals board upheld the permit, but about 60 days later litigation was filed in the Arizona Superior Court challenging that decision. So we are now not in an administrative appeals process we are in state superior court, which is a process that is portably going to carry on for a while. Questions?

Fritz - If you are in litigation, that is going to hold everything back?

Pat - In terms of activity, we are already in construction the water treatment plant. We will continue with the construction - we have the ability to operate while the litigation is in play.

Linda - Where do you stand with ADOT?

Melanie - This fall we might have some information to share, we have not submitted the proposal, and can put that on the agenda to keep you informed.

1:55 Wrap-up

Dean thanked Panel members, briefly recapped the meeting and asked Panelists to provide meeting evaluation forms as well as facilitator criteria and candidates to Melanie, Dean or Ranay in next week or so to permit us to identify, evaluate and propose candidates at next meeting.

Follow up actions:

- *Panelists to provide input on facilitator criteria and candidates – Acorn International to evaluate and endeavor to present 3 candidates for consideration at next meeting.*
- *South32 to provide one-page summary of information sharing status regarding water issue*
- *South 32 with Acorn International support to create user-friendly but complete list of questions and answers, with a goal to provide this before the next meeting*
- *South32 to save SIA summary presentation and links to Community Perception Survey to the project website.*

For next meeting, in addition to the above, South32 will do it's best to have decisions in place so Ty can participate – and will update the Panel 6-month roadmap.

Some Panelists suggested setting aside 1 hour before the next meeting to discuss the water issue in more detail for those who would be able to attend.

Evaluation Forms/Feedback

How are you feeling so far? What could improve?

- Very good, glad we are continuing the advisory panel
- Will have a better answer next meeting
- Still lacking trust of South 32
- Ok- Curious to see where this goes- the new facilitator process
- Thanks for attempting to be transparent. I like Dean and Ranay and they seem to be ready for the transition, although we will miss Angie

What do we need to address next?

- Continue with finding another facilitator
- Water models, how is the group going to proceed with the new facilitator
- Dewatering- keep it going, summary, mine vehicle mud track out, and generation of AMD with the mine during operation and closure

- Deep dive on water issues
- Let's keep working on the key issues and not let the facilitator issues workout
- Keep up the Great work and thanks for allowing me to be part of this process.

How well have you felt heard so far? (0-5, with 0 not at all and 5 very well)

- 3 - 1 vote
- 4 - 3 votes
- 5 - 1 vote