

Item no. 5599 Same as: 5600, 5601, 5602, 5603, 5604, 5605

No. to identify the observations received from the public

No. 112999/25.08.2006 Same as: No. 113000/25.08.2006, No. 112929/25.08.2006, No. 112988/25.08.2006, No. 112954/25.08.2006, No. 112953/25.08.2006, No. 112877/25.08.2006

Proposal

The questioner formulated remarks and proposals as follows:

- The total costs for the mine closure are unrealistic;
- The financial guarantees have not been established;
- There is no liner proposed for the tailings pond;
- The EIA report does not stipulate financial guarantees destined to secure the waste rock deposit.
- There is not a Safety Report submitted for the public consultation;
- The EIA report does not assess the "Zero Alternative";
- The Project poses a threat for the protected flora and fauna;
- Roşia Montană Gold Corporation does not comply with the provisions of art. 11 of The Mining Law no. 85/2003.
- The EIA report does not comprise an assessment of the impact of "the cyanide rain" phenomenon generated by the evaporation of the cyanide from the tailings pond and also it does not describe the cross-border impact in case of a spillage affecting important natural areas, such as KOROS MAROS National Park located in Hungary, along the Mureş Valley.

SEE CONTENT OF THE TYPE 3 CONTESTATION

The mine closure costs are not unrealistic. RMGC's closure estimates, which were developed by a team of independent experts with international experience and will be reviewed by third party experts, are based on the assumption that the project can be completed according to the plan, without interruptions, bankruptcy or the like They are engineering calculations and estimates based on the current commitments of the closure plan and are summarized in the EIA's Mine Closure and Rehabilitation Management Plan (Plan J in the EIA). Annex 1 of Plan J will be updated using a more detailed approach looking at every individual year and calculating the amount of surety, which must be set aside year by year to rehabilitate the mine before RMGC is released from all its legal obligations. Most importantly, the current estimates assume the application of international best practice, best available technology (BAT) and compliance with all Romanian and European Union laws and regulations.

Solution

Closure and rehabilitation at Roşia Montană involves the following measures:

- Covering and vegetating the waste dumps as far as they are not backfilled into the open pits;
- Backfilling the open pits, except Cetate pit, which will be flooded to form a lake;
- Covering and vegetating the tailings pond and its dam areas;
- Dismantling of disused production facilities and revegetation of the cleaned-up areas;
- Water treatment by semi-passive systems (with conventional treatment systems as backup) until all effluents have reached the discharge standards and need no further treatment;
- Maintenance of the vegetation, erosion control, and monitoring of the entire site until it has been demonstrated by RMGC that all remediation targets have been sustainably reached.

While the aspects of closure and rehabilitation are many, we are confident in our cost estimates because the largest expense – that incurred by the earthmoving operation required to reshape the landscape – can be estimated with confidence. Using the project design, we can measure the size of the areas that must be reshaped and resurfaced. Similarly, there is a body of scientific studies and experiments that enable scientists to determine the depth of soil cover for successful revegetation. By multiplying the size of the areas by the necessary depth of the topsoil by the unit rate (also derived from studying similar earthmoving operations at similar sites), we can estimate the potential costs of this major facet of the rehabilitation operation. The earthmoving operation, which will total approximately US \$65 million, makes up 87% of closure and rehabilitation costs.

Also, the necessity of additional technological measures to stabilize and reshape the tailings surface will be discussed in the update of the Economical Financial Guarantee (EFG) estimate, which leads to an increase the provisions for tailings rehabilitation, especially if the TMF is closed prematurely and no optimized tailings disposal regime is applied. The exact figures depend on the details of the TMF closure strategy which can be finally determined only during production

We believe that – far from being unrealistic – our cost estimates are evidence of our high level of commitment to closure and rehabilitation. Just as a comparison, the world’s largest gold producer has set aside US \$683 million (as of December 31, 2006) for the rehabilitation of 27 operations, which equates to US \$25 million on average per mine. The RMGC closure cost estimates, recently revised upward from the US \$73 million reported in the EIA based on additional information, currently total US \$76 million.

*

Information regarding our Environmental Financial Guarantee (“EFG”) is fully discussed in the section of the Environmental Impact Assessment titled “Environmental and Social Management and System Plans” (Annex 1 of the subchapter titled “Mine Rehabilitation and Closure Management Plan”). The EFG is updated annually and will always reflect the costs associated with reclamation. These funds will be held in protected accounts at the Romanian state disposal.

In Romania, the creation of an EFG is required to ensure adequate funds are available from the mine operator for environmental cleanup. The EFG is governed by the Mining Law (no. 85/2003) and the National Agency for Mineral Resources instructions and Mining Law Enforcement Norms (no. 1208/2003).

Two directives issued by the European Union also impact the EFG: the Mine Waste Directive (“MWD”) and the Environmental Liability Directive (“ELD”).

The Mine Waste Directive aims to ensure that coverage is available for 1) all the obligations connected to the permit granted for the disposal of waste material resulting from mining activities and 2) all of the costs related to the rehabilitation of the land affected by a waste facility. The Environmental Liability Directive regulates the remedies, and measures to be taken by the environmental authorities, in the event of environmental damage created by mining operations, with the goal of ensuring adequate financial resources are available from the operators for environmental cleanup efforts. While these directives have yet to be transposed by the Romanian Government, the deadlines for implementing their enforcement mechanisms are 30 April 2007 (ELD) and 1 May 2008 (MWD) – thus before operations are scheduled to begin at Roşia Montană.

RMGC has already begun the process of complying with these directives, and once their implementation instruments are enacted by the Romanian Government, we will be in full compliance.

Each EFG will follow detailed guidelines generated by the World Bank and the International Council on Mining and Metals.

The current projected closure cost for Roşia Montană is US \$76 million, which is based on the mine operating for its full 16-year lifespan. The annual updates will be completed by independent experts, carried out in consultation with the NAMR, as the Governmental authority competent in mining activities field. These updates will ensure that in the unlikely event of early closure of the project, at any point in time, each EFG will always reflect the costs associated with reclamation. (These annual updates will result in an estimate that exceeds our current US \$76 million costs of closure, because some reclamation activity is incorporated into the routine operations of the mine.)

A number of different financial instruments are available to ensure that RMGC is capable of covering all of the expected closure costs. These instruments, which will be held in protected accounts at the Romanian state disposal, include:

- Cash deposit;
- Trust funds;
- Letter of credit;
- Surety bonds;

- Insurance policy.

Under the terms of this guarantee, the Romanian government will have no financial liability in connection with the rehabilitation of the Roşia Montană project.

*

An engineered liner is included in the design of the Tailings Management Facility (TMF) basin to be protective of groundwater. Specifically, the Roşia Montană Tailings Management Facility (TMF or “the facility”) has been designed to be compliant with the EU Groundwater Directive (80/68/EEC), transposed as Romanian GD 351/2005. The TMF is also designed for compliance with the EU Mine Waste Directive (2006/21/EC) as required by the Terms of Reference established by the MEWM in May, 2005. The following paragraphs provide a discussion of how the facility is compliant with the directives.

The TMF is composed of a series of individual components including:

- the tailings impoundment;
- the tailings dam;
- the secondary seepage collection pond;
- the secondary containment dam; and
- the groundwater monitoring wells/extraction wells located downstream of the Secondary Containment dam.

All of these components are integral parts of the facility and necessary for the facility to perform as designed.

The directives indicated above require that the TMF design be protective of groundwater. For the Roşia Montană project (RMP), this requirement is addressed by consideration of the favorable geology (low permeability shales underlying the TMF impoundment, the TMF dam, and the Secondary Containment dam) and the proposed installation of a low-permeability (1×10^{-6} cm/sec) recompacted soil liner beneath the TMF basin. Please see Chapter 2 of EIA Plan F, “The Tailings Facility Management Plan” for more information.

The proposed low permeability soil liner will be fully compliant with Best Available Techniques (BAT) as defined by EU Directive 96/61 (IPPC) and EU Mine Waste Directive. Additional design features that are included in the design to be protective of groundwater include:

- A low permeability (1×10^{-6} cm/sec) cut off wall within the foundation of the starter dam to control seepage;
- A low permeability (1×10^{-6} cm/sec) core in the starter dam to control seepage;
- A seepage collection dam and pond below the toe of the tailings dam to collect and contain any seepage that does extend beyond the dam centerline,
- A series of monitoring wells, below the toe of the secondary containment dam; to monitor seepage and ensure compliance, before the waste facility limit.

In addition to the design components noted above specific operational requirements will be implemented to be protective of human health and the environment. In the extremely unlikely case that impacted water is detected in the monitoring wells below the secondary containment dam, they will be converted to pumping wells and will be used to extract the impacted water and pump it into the reclaim pond where it will be incorporated into the RMP processing plant water supply system, until the compliance is reestablish.

*

Information regarding our Environmental Financial Guarantee (“EFG”) is fully discussed in the section of the Environmental Impact Assessment titled “Environmental and Social Management and System Plans” (Annex 1 of the subchapter titled “Mine Rehabilitation and Closure Management Plan”). The EFG is updated annually and will always reflect the costs associated with reclamation. These funds will be held in protected accounts at the Romanian state disposal.

In Romania, the creation of an EFG is required to ensure adequate funds are available from the mine operator for environmental cleanup. The EFG is governed by the Mining Law (no. 85/2003) and the National Agency for Mineral Resources instructions and Mining Law Enforcement Norms (no. 1208/2003).

Two directives issued by the European Union also impact the EFG: the Mine Waste Directive (“MWD”) and the Environmental Liability Directive (“ELD”).

The Mine Waste Directive aims to ensure that coverage is available for 1) all the obligations connected to the permit granted for the disposal of waste material resulting from mining activities and 2) all of the costs related to the rehabilitation of the land affected by a waste facility. The Environmental Liability Directive regulates the remedies, and measures to be taken by the environmental authorities, in the event of environmental damage created by mining operations, with the goal of ensuring adequate financial resources are available from the operators for environmental cleanup efforts. While these directives have yet to be transposed by the Romanian Government, the deadlines for implementing their enforcement mechanisms are 30 April 2007 (ELD) and 1 May 2008 (MWD) – thus before operations are scheduled to begin at Roşia Montană.

RMGC has already begun the process of complying with these directives, and once their implementation instruments are enacted by the Romanian Government, we will be in full compliance.

Each EFG will follow detailed guidelines generated by the World Bank and the International Council on Mining and Metals.

The current projected closure cost for Roşia Montană is US \$76 million, which is based on the mine operating for its full 16-year lifespan. The annual updates will be completed by independent experts, carried out in consultation with the NAMR, as the Governmental authority competent in mining activities field. These updates will ensure that in the unlikely event of early closure of the project, at any point in time, each EFG will always reflect the costs associated with reclamation. (These annual updates will result in an estimate that exceeds our current US \$76 million costs of closure, because some reclamation activity is incorporated into the routine operations of the mine.)

A number of different financial instruments are available to ensure that RMGC is capable of covering all of the expected closure costs. These instruments, which will be held in protected accounts at the Romanian state disposal, include:

- Cash deposit;
- Trust funds;
- Letter of credit;
- Surety bonds;
- Insurance policy.

Under the terms of this guarantee, the Romanian government will have no financial liability in connection with the rehabilitation of the Roşia Montană project.

*

The Security Report has been made available for public access by being posted at the following Internet address http://www.mmediu.ro/dep_mediu/rosia_montana_securitate.htm as well as through the printed version which could have been found at several information locations established for public hearings.

*

The EIA Report considered all alternative developments, including the option of not proceeding with any project – an option that would generate no investment, allowing the existing pollution problems and socio-economic decline to continue. (Chapter 5 – Assessment of Alternatives)

The report also considered alternative developments – including agriculture, grazing, meat processing, tourism, forestry and forest products, cottage industries, and flora/fauna gathering for pharmaceutical purposes – and concluded that these activities could not provide the economic, cultural and

environmental benefits brought by the Roşia Montană Project.

Chapter 5 also examines alternative locations for key facilities as well as alternative technologies for mining, processing and waste management, in line with best practice and as compared against published EU best available techniques (BAT) documentation.

*

The impact on the protected flora and fauna will be obvious only at local level, and it will not lead to the disappearance of any species. The mining project was conceived from the onset so as to comply with the conditions and standards stipulated by the Romanian and European legislation in the field of environmental protection.

The company believes that the environmental impact generated by proposed project remains significant the more so as it will cover the pre-existing ones. But the required investments for the ecological restoration/rehabilitation of the Roşia Montană area meant to solve complex environmental issues existing at present can be developed only after the implementation of economic projects able to generate and ensure that direct and responsible measures are taken, as part of the principles that represent the basis for the sustainable development concepts. The presence of a strong economic system is the key for the implementation of clean economic processes and technologies, in full respect of the environment, which are able to remove the previous effects generated by anthropic activities.

The documentation drafted to support this mining project represents an objective justification for its implementation given that the company assumed the environmental responsibility, which is extremely complex in the Roşia Montană area.

Some of species existing at Roşia Montană that are under a certain protection status represent an insignificant percentage from populations estimated at national level. The characterization of species from their habitat point of view exists in the species tables presented in the Biodiversity Chapter of the EIA Report and its annexes, although this is not a requirement imposed by the Habitats Directive. Given the large amount of information contained, these tables are available in the electronic format of the EIA. 6000 DVD/CDs comprising the EIA Report have been made available to the public both in English and in Romanian. Moreover, the EIA is also available on RMGC's website as well as on the websites of the Ministry of Environment and Waters Management and of the Local and Regional Environment Protection Agencies of Alba County, Cluj County and Sibiu County, etc.

From practical point of view, the low value of conservation of the impact area is also indirectly emphasized by the fact that there is no proposal to designate the area a SPA (aviafaunistic special protected area) and by the denial as unfounded of the proposal to designate the area as a pSCI area (sites of community importance).

Taking all these into account, we believe that the proposed Project is compliant with the provisions of EU Directive no. 92/43 Habitats[1], and EU Directive no. 79/409 Birds[2] respectively, especially because within Biodiversity Management Plan, Plan H, several active and responsible measures are provided to restore/rehabilitate several natural habitats, pursuant to the provisions of the same documents [3].

References:

[1] art.3, 2nd paragraph, Each Member State shall contribute to the creation of Natura 2000 (network) in proportion to the representation within its territory of the natural habitat types and the habitats of species referred to in paragraph 1. To that effect each Member State shall designate, in accordance with Article 4, sites as special areas of conservation taking account of the objectives set out in paragraph 1.

art.4, 1st paragraph. On the basis of the criteria set out in Annex III (Stage 1) and relevant scientific information, each Member State shall propose a list of sites indicating which natural habitat types in Annex I and which species in Annex II that are native to its territory the sites host. For animal species ranging over wide areas these sites shall correspond to the places within the natural range of such species which present the physical or biological factors essential to their life and reproduction. For aquatic species which range over wide areas, such sites will be proposed only where there is a clearly identifiable area

representing the physical and biological factors essential to their life and reproduction. Where appropriate, Member States shall propose adaptation of the list in the light of the results of the surveillance referred to in Article 11. [...]

2nd paragraph.[...] Member States whose sites hosting one or more priority natural habitat types and priority species represent more than 5 % of their national territory may, in agreement with the Commission, request that the criteria listed in Annex III (Stage 2) be applied more flexibly in selecting all the sites of Community importance in their territory. [...]

Art. 6. 4th paragraph. If, in spite of a negative assessment of the implications for the site and in the absence of alternative solutions, a plan or project must nevertheless be carried out for imperative reasons of overriding public interest, including those of a social or economic nature, the Member State shall take all compensatory measures necessary to ensure that the overall coherence of Natura 2000 is protected. It shall inform the Commission of the compensatory measures adopted.

Art. 16. Provided that there is no satisfactory alternative and the derogation is not detrimental to the maintenance of the populations of the species concerned at a favorable conservation status in their natural range, Member States may derogate from the provisions of Articles 12, 13, 14 and 15 (a) and (b):[...]

- in the interests of public health and public safety, or for other imperative reasons of overriding public interest, including those of a social or economic nature and beneficial consequences of primary importance for the environment;

[2] Art.4, 1st paragraph. The species mentioned in annex 1 shall be the subject of special conservation measures concerning their habitat in order to ensure their survival and reproduction in their area of distribution. [...]

Trends and variations in population levels shall be taken into account as a background for evaluations. Member states shall classify in particular the most suitable territories in number and size as special protection areas for the conservation of these species, taking into account their protection requirements in the geographical sea and land area where this directive applies.

[3] Directive 92/43 Habitats, art. 2, 2nd paragraph; Directive 79/409 Birds, art. 3, 2nd paragraph, letter c.

*

The statement RMGC does not fulfill the provisions of art. 11 of the Mining Law no.85/2003, published in the Romanian Official Gazette, Section I, no. 197/27.03.2003 is incorrect. The Mining Law no. 85/2003 has a general applicability and makes no reference to the Roşia Montană Project or to other mining projects, as it has been mistakenly suggested. According to art. 11 of the Mining Law, *“the performance of mining activities on the lands where historical monuments are located, [...] archaeological sites of special interest [...], as well as the creation of an easement right for mining activities on such lands is strictly forbidden. The exemptions from the provisions of art. 1 are established by Government decision, with the approval of the relevant authorities in the field and by establishing indemnification and other compensatory measures”*.

Based on the Concession License for mining exploitation no. 47/1999, RMGC obtained the right to perform mining activities in the Roşia Montană perimeter, which includes areas upon which a protection regime has been instituted. In case the interdiction established by art. 11 would have been absolute, the Mining Law would have provided the legal interdiction of creating mining perimeters in the locations where there have been created protection regimes.

Such an interdiction does not exist; moreover, the Government Ordinance no. 43/2000 on the protection of the archaeological patrimony and declaring of some archaeological sites as national interest areas, republished in the Official Gazette, Section I, no. 951/24.11.2006 („GO no. 43/2000”), as well as Law n o. 422/2001 on the protection of the historical monuments, republished in the Official Gazette, Section I, no. 938/20.11.2006 („Law no. 422/2001”), provide specific procedures for the returning of such lands to current human activities, by declassifying the historical monument and by granting the archaeological clearance. Such procedures represent the rule applicable in all situations in which there is contemplated

the performing of works requiring a construction authorization on lands subject to a protection regime.

The Mining Law no. 85/2003 does not forbid the use of such procedures, only allows that, in exceptional cases, the Government may be empowered, based on the Mining Law, to establish by decision the cases in which the performance of the mining activities would be possible without following the legal procedures generally applicable, as provided by GO no. 42/2000 and Law no. 422/2001. Such a Government decision is not necessary in case of the Roşia Montană Project, as RMGC observes the provisions and procedures established by GO no. 43/2001 and Law no. 422/2001, for the archaeological clearance of the lands to be affected by the mining activities, as these are to be returned to the current human activities, as per the law.

Also, for the cultural patrimony values existing in the Roşia Montană perimeter and classified as per the law, the Project provides the creation of a protected area, within which no mining activity shall be performed, as well as the preservation *in situ* of the historical monuments located outside this area, as detailed in the Cultural Heritage Management Plan - Plan M from the EIA Report.

*

It is stated precisely that a “cyanide rain” phenomenon will not exist. Neither was encountered in other places or situations. Moreover, the specialty literature doesn’t mention the so-called “cyanide rains” phenomenon, but only “acidic rains” phenomenon which can’t be generated by the cyanic compounds breaking down in the atmosphere.

The reasons for making the statement that ‘cyanide rains’ phenomenon won’t occur are the followings:

- The sodium cyanide handling, from the unloading from the supplying trucks up to the processing tailings discharge onto the tailings management facility, will be carried out only in liquid form, represented by alkaline solutions of high pH value (higher than 10.5 – 11.0) having different sodium cyanide concentrations. The alkalinity of these solutions has the purpose to maintain the cyanide under the form of cyan ions (CN⁻) and to avoid the hydrocyanic acid formation (HCN), phenomenon that occurs only within environments of low pH;
- The cyanide volatilization from a certain solution cannot occur under the form of free cyanides, but only under the form of HCN;
- The handling and storage of the sodium cyanide solutions will take place only by means of some closed systems; the only areas/plants where the HCN can occur and volatilize into air, at low emission percentage, are the leaching tanks and slurry thickener, as well the tailings management facility for the processing tailings;
- The HCN emissions from the surface of the above mentioned tanks and from the tailings management facility surface can occur as a result of the pH decrease within the superficial layers of the solutions (that helps the HCN to form) and of the desorption (volatilization in air) of this compound;
- The cyanide concentrations within the handled solutions will decrease from 300 mg/L within the leaching tanks up to 7 mg/L (total cyanide) at the discharge point into the tailings management facility. The drastic reduction of the cyanide concentrations for discharging into the Tailings Management Facility (TMF) will be done by the detoxification system;
- The knowledge of the cyanide chemistry and on the grounds of the past experience, we estimated the following possible HCN emissions into air: 6 t/year from the leaching tanks, 13 t/year from the slurry thickener and 30 t/year (22.4 t, respectively 17 mg/h/m² during the hot season and 7.6 t, respectively 11.6 mg/h/m² during the cold season) from the tailings management facility surface, which totals 134.2 kg/day of HCN emission;
- Once released into air, the hydrocyanic acid is subject to certain chemical reactions at low pressure, resulting ammonia;
- The mathematical modeling of the HCN concentrations within the ambient air (if the HCN released in the air is not subject to chemical reactions) emphasized the highest concentrations being at the ground level, within the industrial site namely within the area of the tailings management facility and within a certain area near the processing plant. The maximum concentration is of 382 µg/m³/h;
- The highest HCN concentrations within the ambient air will be 2.6 times lower than the standard value stipulated by the national legislation for occupational safety;
- The HCN concentrations within the ambient air in the populated areas close by the industrial site will be of 4 to 80 µg/m³, more than 250 – 12.5 times lower than standard value stipulated by the

national legislation for occupational safety – the national legislation and European Union (EU) legislation on the Air Quality don't stipulate standard values for the population's health protection;

- Once released in air, the evolution of the HCN implies an insignificant component resulted from the reactions while liquid (water vapors and rain drops). The reactions are due to HCN being weak water-soluble at partially low pressures (feature of the gases released in open air), and the rain not effectively reducing the concentrations in the air (Mudder, et al., 2001; Cicerone and Zellner, 1983);
- The probability that the HCN concentration value contained by rainfalls within and outside the footprint of the Project be significantly higher than the background values (0.2 ppb) is extremely low.

Details referring to the use of cyanide in the technological processes, to the cyanides balance as well as to the cyanide emission and the impact of the cyanides on the air quality are contained in the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Report, Chapter 2, Subchapter 4.1 and Subchapter 4.2 (Section 4.2.3).

*

We appreciate that there is concern about transboundary impacts and have worked extensively with independent experts and scientists to fully assess all possibilities. These assessments, including a just-completed study of catastrophic failure scenarios by The University of Reading, have concluded that the Roşia Montană Project has no transboundary impact. A full copy of the University of Reading study can be found in the reference documents included as an annex to this report.

The Environmental Impact Assessment Report (EIA) (Chapter 10 Transboundary Impacts) assesses the proposed project with regard to potential for significant river basin and transboundary impacts downstream which could, for example, affect the Mureş and Tisa river basins in Hungary. The Chapter concludes that under normal operating conditions, there would be no significant impact for downstream river basins/transboundary conditions.

The issue of a possible accidental large-scale release of tailings to the river system was recognized to be an important issue during the public meetings when stakeholders conveyed their concern in this regard. As a result, further work has been undertaken to provide additional detail to that provided in the EIA Report on impacts on water quality downstream of the project and into Hungary. This work includes modelling of water quality under a range of possible operational and accident scenarios and for various flow conditions.

The model used is the INCA model developed over the past 10 years to simulate both terrestrial and aquatic systems within the EUROLIMPACS EU research program (www.eurolimpacs.ucl.ac.uk). The model has been used to assess the impacts from future mining, and collection and treatment operations for pollution from past mining at Roşia Montană.

The modelling created for Roşia Montană simulates eight metals (cadmium, lead, zinc, mercury, arsenic, copper, chromium, manganese) as well as Cyanide, Nitrate, Ammonia and dissolved oxygen. The model has been applied to the upper catchments at Roşia Montană as well as the complete Abrud-Arieş-Mureş river system down to the Hungarian Border and on into the Tisa River. The model takes into account the dilution, mixing and physico-chemical processes affecting metals, ammonia and cyanide in the river system and gives estimates of concentrations at key locations along the river, including at the Hungarian Boarder and in the Tisa after the Mureş joins it.

Because of dilution and dispersion in the river system, and of the initial European Union Best Available Techniques (EU BAT) - compliant technology adopted for the project (for example, the use of a cyanide destruct process for tailings effluent that reduces cyanide concentration in effluent stored in the Tailings Management Facility -TMF- to below 6 mg/l), even a large scale unprogrammed release of tailings materials (for example, following failure of the dam) into the river system would not result in transboundary pollution. The model has shown that under worse case dam failure scenario all legal limits for cyanide and heavy metals concentrations would be met in the river water before it crosses into Hungary.

The INCA model has also been used to evaluate the beneficial impacts of the existing mine water

collection and treatment and it has shown that substantial improvements in water quality are achieved along the river system under normal operational conditions.

For more information, an information sheet presenting the INCA modelling work is presented under the title of the Mures River Modelling Program and the full modelling report is presented as Annex 5.1.

Item no.	5606 Same as: 5607, 5608, 5609, 5610	
No. to identify the observations received from the public	No. 109583/18.08.2006	Same as: No. 112960/25.08.2006, No. 112959/25.08.2006, No. 112943/25.08.2006, No. 112945/25.08.2006
Proposal	<p>The questioner opposes the proposed gold and silver mining project at Roşia Montană and formulate comments and observations as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -In EIA there are not presented all the possible risks derived from this project; -The overall costs for mine closure are not realistic. -There isn't until now an approved Zonal Urbanism Plan for the Protected Areas; -The phase of public consultation and quality evaluation of the impact assessment study report begun without a valid urbanism certificate; -Information about the foundation which RMGC will establish and subsidize is not given. This foundation follows to assume the obligations which the mining operation can not assume; -The present urbanism plans of the Roşia Montană commune do not correspond with the mining project proposal described in EIA; -There is no liner proposed for the tailings pond; -The proposed waste deposits will be not constructed according to the legislation in force; -The financial guarantees have not been established; -There is not a Safety Report submitted for the public consultation and evaluation by the competent authorities; -The EIA report does not assess the "Zero Alternative"; -The Project poses a threat for protected flora and fauna; -The EIA report does not refer to the impact on the listed heritage buildings of noise and vibrations caused by the mining operations; -The public/ONGs which to consult the contracts and agreements between Company and Romanian State; -The Urbanism Plan has been modified without public consultation; -From archeological point of view, the area proposed to be occupied by project was not legally investigated; -It disputes the spiritual and architectural monuments, including the responsible involvement of the Institutions of the State in the protection program; <p>SEE THE CONTENT OF THE TYPE 1 CONTESTATION</p>	
Solution	<p>It is the nature of risk that it can be mitigated and diminished; it cannot be made to disappear. In order to put this into context, the common action of walking on the street or developing everyday activities have an accident potential. This accident potential is twice higher than within the framework of industrial activities that use hazardous substances.</p> <p>A major chapter of the EIA report was dedicated to the identification of risks for the project. In addition, this chapter provides a discussion of the mitigation measures for each risk and how they were incorporated into the project designs. It is recognized that risk identification is difficult due to the number and diversity of events that can be envisioned. The EIA report cannot assume to cover all of the potential risks associated with the project. However, it has attempted to identify and address the most relevant risks. The extent of risk assessment and the intensity of the prevention and mitigation measures should be proportional to the risk involved and therefore only the risks that have been considered important have been assessed in detail. Each is described below.</p> <p>In the larger sense, the entire EIA report is focused on the assessment of impacts and their associated mitigation. Specifically, Chapter 4 of the EIA presents that impact assessment of the project. The following discussion presents a summary of the impact discussed in the EIA.</p> <p>As far as natural and technological risks assessments are concerned, Chapter 7, "Risk Cases", from the Report on Environmental Impact Assessment, emphasizes the fact that safety and prevention measures, the implementation of the environmental management and risk systems are mitigating the consequences to acceptable levels as compared to the most restrictive norms, standards, the best practices or national and international recommendations in the field. The risk level has been established as moderate and so,</p>	

socially acceptable. The extension of the risk assessment and the intensity of the prevention and mitigation measures of the consequences should be proportionate to the risk involved. Selection of a specific mitigation technique is depends on the analyzed accident scenario.

More detailed assessments are conducted for accident scenarios that, based on the qualitative assessment are found to be potentially major, of probability more than 10^{-6} (reduced recovery periods of 1/1,000,000) meaning that they could have major consequences therefore, elevated associated risk, a higher risk level than 9 to 12 (on a scale of 1-25). To put this in context, simply living in southern Florida rates a 25 on the risk scale.

A global assessment of the risks associated with the Roşia Montană Project is obtained by the quick environmental and health risk assessment methodology initially developed by the Italian Ministry of the Environment and the World Health Organization. Natural hazard and risk identification and analysis presents key data and information in assessing potential technological accidents. Thus:

- In designing the Tailings Management Facility, the design parameters were chosen to fully cover the characteristic seismic risk of the area. These seismic design parameters adopted for the TMF and other facilities on the proposed site result in a safety factor much greater than the minimum accepted under the Romanian and European design standards for such facilities;

- in the sector physically impacted by the Project, the risk of floods will remain very low due to the small catchments (controlled by the Roşia and Corna Streams) the area affected by the operation, and the creation of containment, diversion and drainage hydro-technical structures for storm waters on the site, and in the Abrud catchment in general;

- risks caused by meteorological events have been reviewed and used in assessing the hazards of the affected technological processes.

From the analysis of morphometrical parameters and their correlation with other sets of information on the natural slopes on and near the site shows that the (qualitatively estimated) landslide occurrence risk is low to moderate and its consequences will not cause major impacts on the structural components of the Project.

There is no significant risk associated with resource depletion. Mining activities are planned judiciously, so as to extract only the profitable gold and silver resources and only the necessary construction rock for the Project. The management of the mining concession site will minimize reserve "sterilization" (limitation of future access to the reserves).

In assessing technological hazards and risks, the quantity of hazardous substances on the site was calculated as a total and by category, as provided by the *Notification Procedure* approved by Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry, Water and Environment (MAFWE) Order 1084/2003. Based on an evaluation of hazardous substances in stock on the Project site in relation to the relevant quantities provided by the Government Decision 95/2003 which transposes the Seveso Directive, the Project ranges between the upper and the lower limits, and therefore S.C. Roşia Montană Gold Corporation S.A. is required to prepare a Report on Environmental Impact Assessment Study to be sent to the local environmental authority and the local civilian protection authority a *Safety Report* on its operations to prevent major accident risks.

In assessing the consequences of major accidents involving dangerous substances, physical-mathematical models accepted internationally and especially at EU level, and the current version of the SLAB (Canada) software have been used, the latter for the atmospheric dispersion of denser than air gases, that may handle a multitude of situations and scenarios. Similarly, the EFFECTSGis 5.5 (Netherlands) software, developed for the analysis of the effects of industrial accidents and of consequences. Several scenarios were considered in response to the internal legislative requirements, especially related to the implementation of the Internal Emergency Plans (GD 647/2005). The conclusions of the risk assessment for major accidents were:

- The total destruction of plant facilities may only be caused by terrorist attack with classic or nuclear weapons. Simultaneous damage to the HCl tank (including containment) and to the NaCN solution tank, the tanks containing enriched solution, to one or more leaching tanks, having as a result HCN dispersion into the air. At the same time, under certain situations and weather conditions unfavorable for dispersion, people within 40 m of the emission source, surprised by the toxic cloud for more than 1 minute without respiratory protection equipment, will most certainly die. It may also be considered that, on a radius of about 310 m, persons exposed for more than 10 minutes may suffer

serious intoxications that may also lead to death. Toxic effects may occur in persons up to about 2 km downwind of the process plant;

- Operating errors and/or failures in the measurement and control devices, resulting in a lower pH in the leaching tank, thickener and/or DETOX slurry and accidental emissions of hydrocyanic acid. The area affected by concentrations of 290 ppm over a 10 min exposure time is within a circle of 36 m radius and the 50 ppm IDLH threshold for 30 min exposure will be reached over an area of 157.5 m radius. The center of these circles is the middle of the CIL tanks platform;

- Accidental HCN emission from the decanter. The accident may be caused by a drop of pH in the CIL tanks combined with an overdose of flocculent solution and faulty pH monitoring systems. The area affected by concentrations of 300 ppm over a 10 min exposure time is within a circle of 65 m radius and the 50 ppm IDLH threshold for 30 min exposure will be reached over an area of 104 m radius. The center of these circles is mid-distance between the two DETOX facilities;

- Accidental HCN emission from the DETOX facility. The accident may be caused by a drop of pH in the reactors generated by an overdose of metabisulfite solution and/or copper sulphate combined with faulty pH monitoring systems. The area affected by high 1900 ppm concentrations for a 1 min exposure time is located within a 10 m radius circle. The area affected by concentrations of 300 ppm over a 10 min exposure time is within a circle of 27 m radius and the 50 ppm IDLH threshold for 30 min exposure will be reached over an area of 33 m radius. The center of these circles is mid-distance between the two DETOX facilities;

- Explosion of the LPG storage tank. The LPG storage tank has a 50 ton capacity and is located outdoors, near the heating plant. The simulation was conducted for the worst case scenario, considering an explosion of the full tank. Threshold I with heat 12.5 kW/m² is within a 10.5 m radius circle and Threshold II, of heat radiation 5 kW/m² is within a circle of 15 m radius;

- Damage and/or fire at the fuel tanks. Simulations were conducted for the worst case scenarios, considering ignition and combustion of all the diesel (fire in the tank, or in the containment vat, when full of diesel);

- Corna Dam break and breach development. Two credible accident scenarios were considered in simulating tailings flow out of the Tailings Management Facility, and six credible scenarios for the flow of decant water and tailings pore water, with significant effects on the terrestrial and aquatic ecosystems, in different weather conditions;

- Tailings flow may occur along Corna Valley, on a 800 m (starter dam break) or over 1600 m reach should the Corna dam break in its final stage;

- In regard to water quality impacts, cyanide concentrations in the water in the shape of a pollution plume may reach Arad, near the Romanian-Hungarian border on the Mureş River, in concentrations ranging between 0.03 and 0.5 mg/L. Due to inherent mathematical limitations in the models, these values and the accident effects are considered overestimated. Therefore, the results describe the "worst case scenario" based on extreme dam break assumptions for the Corna Dam.

A new and much more precise and realistic simulation has been subsequently established based on the INCA Mine model, that considers the dispersion, volatilization and breakdown of cyanides during the downstream movement of the pollutant flow (Whiteland et al., 2006).

The model used is the INCA model developed over the past 10 years to simulate both terrestrial and aquatic systems within the EUROLIMPACS EU research program (www.eurolimpacs.ucl.ac.uk). The model has been used to assess the impacts from future mining, and collection and treatment operations for pollution from past mining at Roşia Montană.

The modeling created for Roşia Montană simulates eight metals (cadmium, lead, zinc, mercury, arsenic, copper, chromium, manganese) as well as Cyanide, Nitrate, Ammonia and dissolved oxygen. The model has been applied to the upper catchments at Roşia Montană as well as the complete Abrud-Arieş-Mureş river system down to the Hungarian Border and on into the Tisa River. The model takes into account the dilution, mixing and physical-chemical processes affecting metals, ammonia and cyanide in the river system and gives estimates of concentrations at key locations along the river, including at the Hungarian Boarder and in the Tisa after the Mureş joins it.

Because of dilution and dispersion in the river system, and of the initial EU BAT-compliant technology adopted for the project (for example, the use of a cyanide destruct process for tailings effluent that reduces cyanide concentration in effluent stored in the TMF to below 6 mg/l), even a large scale unprogrammed release of tailings materials (for example, following failure of the dam) into the river

system would not result in transboundary pollution. The model has shown that under worse case dam failure scenario all legal limits for cyanide and heavy metals concentrations would be met in the river water before it crosses into Hungary.

The INCA model has also been used to evaluate the beneficial impacts of the existing mine water collection and treatment and it has shown that substantial improvements in water quality are achieved along the river system under normal operational conditions.

For more information, an information sheet presenting the INCA modeling work is presented under the title of the Mureş River Modeling Program and the full modeling report is presented in Annex 5.1:

- Development of HCN on the tailings pond surface. Simulated emissions of HCN from the Tailings Management Facility pond surface and of their dispersion into the ambient air show that the level of $400\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ hourly average and $179\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ 8hr average will not be exceeded. These HCN concentrations are only slightly over the odor threshold (0.17ppm) and much below potentially dangerous concentrations;

- Cetate Dam break and breach development. Flood modeling was in case of a break in Cetate dam was based on the design parameters obtained from the hydrometeorological study "Assessment of rainfall intensity, frequency and runoff for the Roşia Montană Project - Radu Drobot". The breach characteristics were predicted using the BREACH model, and the maximum height of the flood wave in various flow sections was modeled using the FLDWAV software. The assumptions included a total 800000 m^3 discharge for one hour, when the peak of the flood hydrograph is about 4.9 m above base flow immediately below the dam and in the narrow Abrud valley 5.9-7,5 km downstream of the dam, while in the last section considered (10,5 km) water depth is about 2.3 m above base flow and the maximum flow rate 877 m^3/s . Further, the broader Aries valley allows the flood wave to propagate on a significantly wider bed, which results in a highly attenuated hydrograph. These results describe the "worst case scenario" based on extreme dam break assumptions:

- Accidents during cyanide transportation. Due to the large quantities of cyanide transported (about 30t /day) the risks associated to this activity were assessed in detail using the ZHA- Zurich Hazard Analysis method. As a consequence, the optimum transport route was selected from the manufacturer to the Process Plant, e.g.;

- Cyanide transport (in solid state) will exclusively involve special SLS (Solid to Liquid System) containers, 16 tons each. The ISO compliant container will be protected by a framework with legs, which allows separation from the transport trailer for temporary storage. The wall is 5.17 mm thick, which, together with the protective framework, provides additional protection to the load in case of accident. This system is considered BAT and is currently one of the safest cyanide transportation options.

It is being mentioned the fact that the study develops the occurrence possibility of these scenarios (pages 166-171, Conclusions).

As regards the cyanides management, there is a baseline study named "Roşia Montană Golden Project, Cyanides Management Plan" prepared in compliance with the "International Management Code for the Manufacture, Transport and Use of Cyanide in the Production of Gold (International Cyanide management Institute) May 2002". S.C. Roşia Montană Gold Corporation is signatory to this code.

Bibliographical references for Chapter 7 "Risk Cases" are listed at page 173-176.

*

The overall costs for mine closure are realistic. RMGC's closure estimates, which were developed by a team of independent experts with international experience and will be reviewed by third party experts, are based on the assumption that the project can be completed according to the plan, without interruptions, bankruptcy or the like. They are engineering calculations and estimates based on the current commitments of the closure plan and are summarized in the EIA's Mine Closure and Rehabilitation Management Plan (Plan J in the EIA). Annex 1 of Plan J will be updated using a more detailed approach looking at every individual year and calculating the amount of surety, which must be set aside year by year to rehabilitate the mine before RMGC is released from all its legal obligations. Most importantly, the current estimates assume the application of international best practice, best available technology (BAT) and compliance with all Romanian and European Union laws and regulations.

Closure and rehabilitation at Roşia Montană involves the following measures:

- Covering and vegetating the waste dumps as far as they are not backfilled into the open pits;
- Backfilling the open pits, except Cetate pit, which will be flooded to form a lake;
- Covering and vegetating the tailings pond and its dam areas;
- Dismantling of disused production facilities and re-vegetation of the cleaned-up areas;
- Water treatment by semi-passive systems (with conventional treatment systems as backup) until all effluents have reached the discharge standards and need no further treatment;
- Maintenance of the vegetation, erosion control, and monitoring of the entire site until it has been demonstrated by RMGC that all remediation targets have been sustainably reached.

While the aspects of closure and rehabilitation are many, we are confident in our cost estimates because the largest expense—that incurred by the earthmoving operation required to reshape the landscape—can be estimated with confidence. Using the project design, we can measure the size of the areas that must be reshaped and resurfaced. Similarly, there is a body of scientific studies and experiments that enable scientists to determine the depth of soil cover for successful re-vegetation. By multiplying the size of the areas by the necessary depth of the topsoil by the unit rate (also derived from studying similar earthmoving operations at similar sites), we can estimate the potential costs of this major facet of the rehabilitation operation. The earthmoving operation, which will total approximately US \$65 million, makes up 87% of closure and rehabilitation costs.

Also, the necessity of additional technological measures to stabilize and reshape the tailings surface will be discussed in the update of the Economical Financial Guarantee (EFG) estimate, which leads to an increase in the provisions for tailings rehabilitation, especially if the TMF is closed prematurely and no optimized tailings disposal regime is applied. The exact figures depend on the details of the TMF closure strategy which can be finally determined only during production.

We believe that—far from not being realistic—our cost estimates are evidence of our high level of commitment to closure and rehabilitation. Just as a comparison, the world's largest gold producer has set aside US \$683 million (as of December 31, 2006) for the rehabilitation of 27 operations, which equates to US \$25 million on average per mine. The RMGC closure cost estimates, recently revised upward from the US \$73 million reported in the EIA based on additional information, currently total US \$76 million.

*

According to Law 5/2000, regarding the approval of the Territory Arrangement Plan – 3rd Section – protected areas (“Law 5/2000”) (article 5, paragraphs 2-3), local public authorities, with the support of the competent central public authorities, had the obligation to establish the boundaries of the protection areas for the cultural heritage elements stipulated in Annex III to the above-mentioned law. This measure should have been taken within 12 months from the effective date of Law 5/2000, based on specialized studies. For this purpose, the local public authorities had to prepare the town planning documentation and its related regulations, developed and approved according to the law. This documentation must comprise the necessary protection and conservation measures for the national cultural heritage elements located in this area.

Concurrently, Law 350/2001 on the territory arrangement and urbanism stipulates the right of legal or natural persons interested in arranging the territory, to initiate the development of urbanism plans.

In accordance with these legal provisions, in 2001, RMGC initiated the preparation of these specific town-planning documentations - the General Urbanism Plan and the Zonal Urbanism Plan. These plans have been developed by Romanian certified companies and followed the legal approval procedure. The permit for the establishment of the Roşia Montană Historical Centre Protected Area was issued by the Ministry of Culture and Religious Affairs in 2002 (permits no. 61/14.02.2002 and no. 178/20.06.2002) as part of the procedure for the approval of the town planning documentation. Based on these permits, the Ministry of Culture and Religious Affairs requested the company to develop a Zonal Urbanism Plan for the Historical Centre of Roşia Montană. Out of the 41 historical buildings in Roşia Montană, thirty-five (35) are located inside the protected area of the Roşia Montană Historical Centre.

As for the heritage elements located in the future industrial development area (6 historical buildings), these are discussed in the Industrial Zonal Urbanism Plan prepared by SC Proiect Alba SA. The regulations

included in this document will contain measures for the protection of these monuments.

In conclusion, the town planning studies and the specialized studies conducted for the purpose of establishing the boundaries of the protection areas within the future mining operations perimeter are currently pending approval, in accordance with the legal provisions, by the competent institutions and committees. Please note that none of the historical houses located in the perimeter of the proposed project will be affected; on the contrary, all the 41 historic buildings will be included in a complex restoration and rehabilitation program (see the Management Plan). This program is mandatory, regardless of the implementation of the mining project, if we want to prevent these buildings from collapsing because of their advanced degradation.

*

Your assertion regarding the failure to obtain an applicable urbanism certificate at the start up of the public debates and of the evaluation of the quality of the report to the environmental impact assessment, is not correct.

Thus, by the time when the public debate stage started up there was an applicable urbanism certificate and namely the urbanism certificate no. 78/26.04.2006 issued by Alba County Council. This certificate was obtained prior to the evaluation stage of the quality of the report to the environmental impact assessment which started up once the EIA was submitted to the Ministry of Environment and Water Management on the 15th May 2006.

For better understanding the applicable legal provisions and the facts developed within the mining project of Roşia Montană zone we would like to make several comments:

- The procedure for issuing the environmental permit for Roşia Montană project started up on the 14th December 2004 by submitting the technical memorandum and the urbanism certificate no.68/26.August 2004 (certificate applicable by that time). S.C. Roşia Montană Gold Corporation S.A. (RMGC) applied for and obtained a new urbanism certificate no.78/26.04.2006 issued by Alba County Council for the entire Roşia Montană Project applicable on the date of the EIA Report submission (15th May 2006) and prior to the public debate start up (June 2006);
- The Section 1 of the urbanism certificate no.78 of 26th 04.2006 entitled Work construction, position 10 – “Processing plant and associated constructions “ – including the tailing management facility which existence is compulsory for the processing plant running. The Tailing management facility is also specified on the layout plans which are integral part of the urbanism certificate and they were sealed by Alba County Council so that they cannot be modified;
- The Urbanism Certificate is an informative document and its goal is only to inform the applicant about the legal, economic and technical regime of the existing lands and buildings and to establish the urbanism requirements and the approvals necessary to obtain the construction permit (including the environmental permit) as per art.6 of Law 50/1991 referring to the completion of construction works, republished and art 27 paragraph 2 of the Norms for the application of Law 50/1991 – Official Journal 825 bis/13.09.2005).

As it is an informative document, it does not limit the number of certificates an applicant may obtain for the same land plot (art. 30 of Law no. 350/2001 regarding the territorial planning and urbanism).

*

Introduced as part of the Environmental Impact Assessment Report Study (EIA), the Roşia Montană Foundation is shifting in focus. The Community Sustainable Development Plan activities initially conceived as coming under the Foundation umbrella (business oriented activities: business incubator, business advisory center, micro-finance facility, as well as social oriented activities: education and training center) have been advanced independently, via partnerships and with community participation in decision-making – a preferable way to advance social and economic development programs.

Going forward, the Foundation will take shape around preservation, patrimony and cultural heritage issues, with its final form determined in consultation with the community.

In terms of the philosophy that guides the company's Sustainable Development efforts, the Roşia

Montană Gold Corporation (RMGC) sees itself not as principal provider, but as a partner. Community involvement is considered the starting point; over time, as the community builds the capacity to maintain programs in its own right, the company will turn over control of currently-established programs to the community and its institutions.

For more information, please see Roșia Montană Sustainable Development and the Roșia Montană Project – annex 4.

*

We underline the fact that your statement is false. The General Urbanism Plan for the Roșia Montană commune, endorsed in 2002 allows the development of Roșia Montană project, as it has been presented during the public consultations.

Concurrently, pursuant to the provisions of art. 41, paragraph 2, from the Mining Law no.85/2003, the authorities from the local administration have the liability to adjust and/or update the territory arrangement plans and the general urbanism plans, in order to allow the development of all operations necessary for the development of mining activities.

RMGC has also initiated the preparation of two zonal urbanism plans: Zonal Urbanism Plan Modification – Roșia Montană Industrial Area and Zonal Urbanism Plan – Roșia Montană Historical Area. The first urbanism plan is required by the urbanism certificate no.78/26.04.2006, which updates the Zonal Urbanism Plan for the Industrial Area approved in 2002. As far as the historical area is concerned, its Zonal Urbanism Plan is required by the General Urbanism Plan approved also in 2002. Both urbanism plans are pending approval and have been subject to public consultations.

*

An engineered liner is included in the design of the Tailings Management Facility (TMF) basin to be protective of groundwater. Specifically, the Roșia Montană Tailings Management Facility (TMF or “the facility”) has been designed to be compliant with the EU Groundwater Directive (80/68/EEC), transposed as Romanian GD 351/2005. The TMF is also designed for compliance with the EU Mine Waste Directive (2006/21/EC) as required by the Terms of Reference established by the MEWM in May, 2005. The following paragraphs provide a discussion of how the facility is compliant with the directives.

The TMF is composed of a series of individual components including:

- the tailings impoundment;
- the tailings dam;
- the secondary seepage collection pond;
- the secondary containment dam; and
- the groundwater monitoring wells/extraction wells located downstream of the Secondary Containment dam.

All of these components are integral parts of the facility and necessary for the facility to perform as designed.

The directives indicated above require that the TMF design be protective of groundwater. For the Roșia Montană project (RMP), this requirement is addressed by consideration of the favorable geology (low permeability shales underlying the TMF impoundment, the TMF dam, and the Secondary Containment dam) and the proposed installation of a low-permeability (1×10^{-6} cm/sec) recompacted soil liner beneath the TMF basin. Please see Chapter 2 of EIA Plan F, “The Tailings Facility Management Plan” for more information.

The proposed low permeability soil liner will be fully compliant with Best Available Techniques (BAT) as defined by EU Directive 96/61 (IPPC) and EU Mine Waste Directive. Additional design features that are included in the design to be protective of groundwater include:

- A low permeability (1×10^{-6} cm/sec) cut off wall within the foundation of the starter dam to control seepage;
- A low permeability (1×10^{-6} cm/sec) core in the starter dam to control seepage;

- A seepage collection dam and pond below the toe of the tailings dam to collect and contain any seepage that does extend beyond the dam centerline,
- A series of monitoring wells, below the toe of the secondary containment dam; to monitor seepage and ensure compliance, before the waste facility limit.

In addition to the design components noted above specific operational requirements will be implemented to be protective of human health and the environment. In the extremely unlikely case that impacted water is detected in the monitoring wells below the secondary containment dam, they will be converted to pumping wells and will be used to extract the impacted water and pump it into the reclaim pond where it will be incorporated into the RMP processing plant water supply system, until the compliance is reestablish.

*

An engineered liner is included in the design of the Tailings Management Facility (TMF) basin to be protective of groundwater. Specifically, the Roşia Montană Tailings Management Facility (TMF or “the facility”) has been designed to be compliant with the EU Groundwater Directive (80/68/EEC), transposed as Romanian GD 351/2005. The TMF is also designed for compliance with the EU Mine Waste Directive (2006/21/EC) as required by the Terms of Reference established by the MEWM in May, 2005. The following paragraphs provide a discussion of how the facility is compliant with the directives.

The TMF is composed of a series of individual components including:

- the tailings impoundment;
- the tailings dam;
- the secondary seepage collection pond;
- the secondary containment dam; and
- the groundwater monitoring wells/extraction wells located downstream of the Secondary Containment dam.

All of these components are integral parts of the facility and necessary for the facility to perform as designed.

The directives indicated above require that the TMF design be protective of groundwater. For the Roşia Montană project (RMP), this requirement is addressed by consideration of the favorable geology (low permeability shales underlying the TMF impoundment, the TMF dam, and the Secondary Containment dam) and the proposed installation of a low-permeability (1×10^{-6} cm/sec) recompacted soil liner beneath the TMF basin. Please see Chapter 2 of EIA Plan F, “The Tailings Facility Management Plan” for more information.

The proposed low permeability soil liner will be fully compliant with Best Available Techniques (BAT) as defined by EU Directive 96/61 (IPPC) and EU Mine Waste Directive. Additional design features that are included in the design to be protective of groundwater include:

- A low permeability (1×10^{-6} cm/sec) cut off wall within the foundation of the starter dam to control seepage;
- A low permeability (1×10^{-6} cm/sec) core in the starter dam to control seepage;
- A seepage collection dam and pond below the toe of the tailings dam to collect and contain any seepage that does extend beyond the dam centerline;
- A series of monitoring wells, below the toe of the secondary containment dam; to monitor seepage and ensure compliance, before the waste facility limit.

In addition to the design components noted above specific operational requirements will be implemented to be protective of human health and the environment. In the extremely unlikely case that impacted water is detected in the monitoring wells below the secondary containment dam, they will be converted to pumping wells and will be used to extract the impacted water and pump it into the reclaim pond where it will be incorporated into the RMP processing plant water supply system, until the compliance is reestablish.

With respect to your comments made as regards a presumptive infringement of the provisions of

Government Decision No.351/2005 (“GD 351/2005”), there are several aspects to be taken into consideration. Thus:

1. Firstly, please note that, according to the provisions of art. 6 of GD 351/2005, any activity that might determine the discharge of dangerous substances into the environment is subject to the prior approval of the water management authorities and shall comply with the provisions of the water permit issued in accordance with the relevant legislation.

The GD 351/2005 provides that the water permit shall be issued only after all technical-construction measures are implemented as prevent the indirect discharge of dangerous substances into the underground waters. The maximum discharge limits are expressly provided under GD 351/2005 and compliance with such is a condition for granting and maintaining the water permit.

In accordance with the provisions of GD 351/2005, the actual discharge limits should be authorized by the relevant authority, such process being understood by the lawmaker in consideration of the complexity and variety of industrial activities, as well as the latest technological achievements.

Therefore, please note that the EIA stage is not intended to be finalized into an overall comprehensive permit, but it represents only a part of a more complex permitting process. Please note that, according with art. 3 of GD 918/2002, the data’s level of detail provided in the EIA is the one available in the feasibility stage of the project, obviously making impossible for both the titleholder and authority to exhaust all required technical data and permits granted.

The adequate protection of the ground water shall be ensured by the terms and conditions of the water permit. The issuance of the water permit shall be performed following an individual assessment of the project, considering its particular aspects and the relevant legal requirements applicable for mining activities. Until the water permit is obtained, any allegation regarding the infringement of GD 351/2005 is obviously premature mainly because the water permit shall regulate, in accordance with the relevant legal provisions, the conditions to be observed by the developer as regards the protection of the ground water;

2. Secondly, kindly note that the complexity and specificity of mining projects generated the need of a particular legal framework. Therefore, for such projects, the reading of the legal provisions of a certain enactment should be corroborated with the relevant provisions of the other regulations applicable.

In this respect, please not that the understanding of GD 351/2005 must be corroborated with the provisions of the entire relevant legislation enforceable as regards Roşia Montană Project, with a particular accent to Directive 2006/21/EC on the management of waste from the extractive industries (“Directive 21”).

The very scope of Directive 21 is to provide a specific legal framework for the extractive wastes and waste facilities related to mining projects, considering the complexity of such projects and the particular aspects of mining activities that can not always be subject to the common regulations on waste management and landfill.

From this perspective, Directive 21 provides that, an operator of a waste facility, as such is defined thereunder (please note that the TMF proposed by RMGC is considered a “waste facility” under Directive 21), must inter alia, ensure that:

- a) *“the waste facility is [.....]designed so as to meet the necessary conditions for, in the short and long-term perspectives, preventing pollution of the soil, air, groundwater or surface water, taking into account especially Directives 76/464/EEC (1), 80/68/EEC (2) and 2000/60/EC, and ensuring efficient collection of contaminated water and leachate as and when required under the permit, and reducing erosion caused by water or wind as far as it is technically possible and economically viable;”*
- b) *“the waste facility is suitably constructed, managed and maintained to ensure its physical stability and to prevent pollution or contamination of soil, air, surface water or groundwater in the short and long-term perspectives as well as to minimize as far as possible damage to landscape.”*

In addition, it should be mentioned that RMGC was required by MWEM under the Terms of Reference, to perform the EIA considering the provisions of Directive 21 and the BAT Management of Mining Waste. The Directive 21 was intended by the EU DG of Environment to be the legislative regime applicable to

sound management of mining waste throughout Europe and therefore compliance with its provisions is mandatory.

*

Information regarding our Environmental Financial Guarantee (“EFG”) is fully discussed in the section of the Environmental Impact Assessment titled “Environmental and Social Management and System Plans” (Annex 1 of the subchapter titled “Mine Rehabilitation and Closure Management Plan”). The EFG is updated annually and will always reflect the costs associated with reclamation. These funds will be held in protected accounts at the Romanian state disposal.

In Romania, the creation of an EFG is required to ensure adequate funds are available from the mine operator for environmental cleanup. The EFG is governed by the Mining Law (no. 85/2003) and the National Agency for Mineral Resources instructions and Mining Law Enforcement Norms (no. 1208/2003).

Two directives issued by the European Union also impact the EFG: the Mine Waste Directive (“MWD”) and the Environmental Liability Directive (“ELD”).

The Mine Waste Directive aims to ensure that coverage is available for 1) all the obligations connected to the permit granted for the disposal of waste material resulting from mining activities and 2) all of the costs related to the rehabilitation of the land affected by a waste facility. The Environmental Liability Directive regulates the remedies, and measures to be taken by the environmental authorities, in the event of environmental damage created by mining operations, with the goal of ensuring adequate financial resources are available from the operators for environmental cleanup efforts. While these directives have yet to be transposed by the Romanian Government, the deadlines for implementing their enforcement mechanisms are 30 April 2007 (ELD) and 1 May 2008 (MWD) – thus before operations are scheduled to begin at Roșia Montană.

RMGC has already begun the process of complying with these directives, and once their implementation instruments are enacted by the Romanian Government, we will be in full compliance.

Each EFG will follow detailed guidelines generated by the World Bank and the International Council on Mining and Metals.

The current projected closure cost for Roșia Montană is US \$76 million, which is based on the mine operating for its full 16-year lifespan. The annual updates will be completed by independent experts, carried out in consultation with the NAMR, as the Governmental authority competent in mining activities field. These updates will ensure that in the unlikely event of early closure of the project, at any point in time, each EFG will always reflect the costs associated with reclamation. (These annual updates will result in an estimate that exceeds our current US \$76 million costs of closure, because some reclamation activity is incorporated into the routine operations of the mine.)

A number of different financial instruments are available to ensure that RMGC is capable of covering all of the expected closure costs. These instruments, which will be held in protected accounts at the Romanian state disposal, include:

- Cash deposit;
- Trust funds;
- Letter of credit;
- Surety bonds;
- Insurance policy.

Under the terms of this guarantee, the Romanian government will have no financial liability in connection with the rehabilitation of the Roșia Montană project.

*

The Security Report has been made available for public access by being posted at the following Internet address http://www.mmediu.ro/dep_mediu/rosia_montana_securitate.htm as well as through the printed

version which could have been found at several information locations established for public hearings.

*

The EIA Report considered all alternative developments, including the option of not proceeding with any project – an option that would generate no investment, allowing the existing pollution problems and socio-economic decline to continue. (Chapter 5 – Assessment of Alternatives)

The report also considered alternative developments – including agriculture, grazing, meat processing, tourism, forestry and forest products, cottage industries, and flora/fauna gathering for pharmaceutical purposes – and concluded that these activities could not provide the economic, cultural and environmental benefits brought by the Roșia Montană Project.

Chapter 5 also examines alternative locations for key facilities as well as alternative technologies for mining, processing and waste management, in line with best practice and as compared against published EU best available techniques (BAT) documentation.

*

The impact on protected flora and fauna will exist only locally, but this impact will not lead to the loss of any specie. The Project has been designed even from the beginning to fully comply with the requirements and norms imposed by Romanian and European environmental legislation.

The company believes the fact that the project impact on environment remains significant, especially because covers previous impacts. But, the investments required to ecologically restore/rehabilitate Roșia Montană area in order to address current complex environmental issues, are only achievable following the implementation of some economic projects that will generate and warrant implementation of some direct and responsible actions as a component of base principles of sustainable development concepts. Clean processes and technologies may be developed only in the presence of a solid economic environment fully compliant with the environment that will also resolve previous impacts of anthropic activities.

The base documents of the Project are in fact an unbiased reason of its implementation, considering the highly complex environmental commitment within Roșia Montană area.

Some of the Roșia Montană species that are under a certain protection status stand for an insignificant percentage of the scale of populations estimated at national level. The characterization of species from their habitat point of view exists in the species tables presented in the Biodiversity Chapter of the EIA Report and its annexes, although this is not a requirement imposed by the Habitats Directive. Due to their large volume of information, the annexes of chapter 4.6 Biodiversity can be found in the electronic version of the EIA disclosed by the company both in Romanian and English through approx. 6,000 DVD/CD copies, being accessible on the company website, and on the websites of Ministry of Environment and Water Management, local and regional environmental protection agencies of Alba, Sibiu, Cluj, etc.

From practical point of view, the low value of conservation of the impact area is also indirectly emphasized by the fact that there is no proposal to designate the area a SPA (aviafaunistic special protected area) and by the denial as unfounded of the proposal to designate the area as a pSCI area (sites of community importance).

Taking all these into account, we believe that the proposed Project is compliant with the provisions of EU Directive no. 92/43 Habitats[1], and EU Directive no. 79/409 Birds[2] respectively, especially because within Biodiversity Management Plan, Plan H, several active and responsible measures are provided to reconstruct/rehabilitate several natural habitats, pursuant to the provisions of the same documents [3].

References:

[1] art.3, 2nd paragraph, Each Member State shall contribute to the creation of Natura 2000 (network) in proportion to the representation within its territory of the natural habitat types and the habitats of species referred to in paragraph 1. To that effect each Member State shall designate, in accordance with Article 4, sites as special areas of conservation taking account of the objectives set out in paragraph 1.

art.4, 1st paragraph. On the basis of the criteria set out in Annex III (Stage 1) and relevant scientific information, each Member State shall propose a list of sites indicating which natural habitat types in Annex I and which species in Annex II that are native to its territory the sites host. For animal species ranging over wide areas these sites shall correspond to the places within the natural range of such species which present the physical or biological factors essential to their life and reproduction. For aquatic species which range over wide areas, such sites will be proposed only where there is a clearly identifiable area representing the physical and biological factors essential to their life and reproduction. Where appropriate, Member States shall propose adaptation of the list in the light of the results of the surveillance referred to in Article 11. [...]

2nd paragraph.[...] Member States whose sites hosting one or more priority natural habitat types and priority species represent more than 5 % of their national territory may, in agreement with the Commission, request that the criteria listed in Annex III (Stage 2) be applied more flexibly in selecting all the sites of Community importance in their territory.[...]

Art. 6, 4th paragraph. If, in spite of a negative assessment of the implications for the site and in the absence of alternative solutions, a plan or project must nevertheless be carried out for imperative reasons of overriding public interest, including those of a social or economic nature, the Member State shall take all compensatory measures necessary to ensure that the overall coherence of Natura 2000 is protected. It shall inform the Commission of the compensatory measures adopted.

Art. 16. Provided that there is no satisfactory alternative and the derogation is not detrimental to the maintenance of the populations of the species concerned at a favourable conservation status in their natural range, Member States may derogate from the provisions of Articles 12, 13, 14 and 15 (a) and (b):[...]

- in the interests of public health and public safety, or for other imperative reasons of overriding public interest, including those of a social or economic nature and beneficial consequences of primary importance for the environment;

[2] Art.4, 1st paragraph. The species mentioned in annex 1 shall be the subject of special conservation measures concerning their habitat in order to ensure their survival and reproduction in their area of distribution. [...]

Trends and variations in population levels shall be taken into account as a background for evaluations. Member states shall classify in particular the most suitable territories in number and size as special protection areas for the conservation of these species, taking into account their protection requirements in the geographical sea and land area where this directive applies.

[3] Directive 92/43 Habitats, art. 2, 2nd paragraph; Directive 79/409 Birds, art. 3, 2nd paragraph, letter c.

*

This statement is ungrounded, because the environmental impact assessment (EIA) process has included preliminary cumulative estimates for stationary motorized equipment and linear (vehicular) sources were prepared in order to provide an initial understanding of the potential cumulative noise and vibration impacts from background and Roşia Montană Project sources, and to guide future monitoring and measurement activities as well as the selection of appropriate Best Management Practices/Best Available Techniques for further mitigation of the potential noise and vibration impacts from Project activities. These preliminary estimates apply to major construction activities, as well as the operation and decommissioning/closure of the mine and process plant. They are documented as data tables and isopleth maps for major noise-generating activities in selected, representative Project years; see **Tables 4.3.8** through **4.3.16** and **Exhibits 4.3.1** through **4.3.9**. All these details related to the applied assessment methodology, the input data of the dispersion model, the modeling results and the measures established for the prevention/mitigation/elimination of the potential impact for all project stages (construction, operation, closure) are included in Chapter 4, Section 4.3 Noise and Vibrations of the EIA Report.

Project Years 0, 9, 10, 12, 14, and 19 were selected for modeling because they are considered to be representative of the most significant levels of noise-generating activity. They are also the same years used

for air impact modeling purposes in Section 4.2, as air and noise impacts share many of the same sources or are otherwise closely correlated. In order to more accurately reflect potential receptor impacts, all of these exhibits integrate the background traffic estimates discussed in Section 4.3.6.1.

The Project site plan and process plant area and facility drawings were used to establish the position of the noise sources and other relevant physical characteristics of the site. Receptor locations were established using background reports and project engineering and environmental documentation provided by RMGC. With this information, the source locations and receptor locations were translated into input (x, y, and z) co-ordinates for the noise-modeling program.

Tables 4.3.8 through 4.3.16 and **Exhibits 4.3.1 through 4.3.9** present the average maximum noise values likely to be experienced by the receptor community over all Project phases after incorporation of a variety of initial mitigation measures designed specifically to reduce the impacts associated with mobile and stationary machinery sources. The influence of non-mining related background (primarily traffic) noise is also included.

To evaluate the sound levels associated with haul trucks and other mobile sources crossing the site carrying excavated ore, waste rock, and soil, a noise analysis program based on the (U.S.) Federal Highway Administration's (FHWA) standard RD-77-108 [1] model was used to calculate reference noise emissions values for heavy trucks along the project roadways. The FHWA model predicts hourly L_{eq} values for free-flowing traffic conditions and is generally considered to be accurate within 1.5 decibels (dB).

The model is based on the standardized noise emission factors for different types and weights of vehicles (e.g., automobiles, medium trucks, and heavy trucks), with consideration given to vehicle volume, speed, roadway configuration, distance to the receiver, and the acoustical characteristics of the site. The emission levels of all three vehicle types increase as a function of the logarithm of their speed.

To evaluate the sound sources from the proposed mine processing facility and the semi-stationary material handling equipment (at the ore extraction, waste rock and soil stockpiling areas), a proprietary computerized noise prediction program was used by AAC to simulate and model the future equipment noise emissions throughout the area. The modeling program uses industry-accepted propagation algorithms based on the following American National Standards Institute (ANSI) and International Organization for Standardization (ISO) standards:

- *ANSI S1.26-1995 (R2004), Method for the Calculation of the Absorption of Sound by the Atmosphere;*
- *ISO 9613-1:1993, Acoustics -- Attenuation of sound during propagation outdoors-- Part 1: Calculation of the absorption of sound by the atmosphere;*
- *ISO 9613-2:1996, Acoustics -- Attenuation of sound during propagation outdoors -- Part 2: General method of calculation;*
- *ISO 3891:1978, Acoustics -- Procedure for describing aircraft noise heard on the ground.*

The calculations account for classical sound wave divergence (i.e., spherical spreading loss with adjustments for source directivity from point sources) plus attenuation factors due to air absorption, minimal ground effects, and barriers/shielding.

This model has been validated by AAC over a number of years via noise measurements at several operating industrial sites that had been previously modeled during the engineering design phases. The comparison of modeled predictions versus actual measurements has consistently shown close agreement; typically in the range of 1 to 3 dB (A).

References:

[1] FHWA Highway Traffic Noise Prediction Model; see Federal Highway Administration Report Number FHWA-RD-77-108, USA, Washington, D.C., 1978.

A detailed presentation of blasting technology can be found in the annex 7.1 - Proposed blasting technology for the operational phase of Roşia Montană Project.

*

The partnership between Gabriel Resources and Regia Autonomă a Cuprului Deva (currently, CNCAF Minvest SA) has been established based on Law no. 15/1990 on the reorganization of the state owned companies as autonomous directions and trade companies, published in the Official Gazette, Section I, no. 98/08.08.1990, as subsequently amended and supplemented. Art. 35 of this law provides the possibility of the regies autonomous to enter into partnerships with legal third parties, Romanian or foreign, for the purpose of setting up new trading companies.

Roșia Montană Gold Corporation SA was set up in 1997, according to the legal provisions in force as at that time, the setting up being made by observing all the conditions imposed by Company Law no. 31/1990 and Trade Register Law no. 26/1990, in regard of the setting up of the joint stock companies with mixed capital.

We underline that the Articles of Associations of Roșia Montană Gold Corporation SA, representing the result of the parties agreement in regard of the terms and conditions under which the partnership between the Romanian state and investor takes place represents a public document, being included in the category of documents which, as per Law no. 26/1990 on the Trade Register, are published in the Romanian Official Gazette and for which the Trade Register is obliged to issue, on the expense of the persons submitting a request, certified copies.

As for the agreement concerning the setting up of the mixed company together with Gabriel Resources Ltd., this has been expressed by the Ministry of Industry and Trade, the conditions imposed by the setting up of the mixed company being the following: (i) ensuring of the jobs at the level existing upon the conclusion of the agreement concerning the setting up of the mixed company; (ii) the expenses incurred by the fulfillment of the exploration stage should be fully supported by Gabriel; (iii) the obtaining of the approval from the ANRM by the Copper Autonomous Direction Deva and (iv) the observance of all legal provisions in force concerning the setting up of the mixed companies with foreign partners. These conditions have been fully complied withy as at the setting up of the company and during the development of its activity.

We also specify that the establishing of the shareholders' quotas to the benefits and losses of Roșia Montană Gold Corporation SA has been made by considering their contribution quota to the company's share capital. The current percentage of 80% for Gabriel Resources Ltd. and of 19.31% for CNCAF Minvest SA resulted from the initial contribution and the subsequent contributions of the shareholders to the company's share capital, in consideration also of Gabriel Resources Ltd. advancing all expenses and costs related to the development-exploitation and permitting of the Roșia Montană Mining Project.

The provisions of the Articles of Associations of Roșia Montană Gold Corporation SA on the necessary majority and quorum conditions for the decision-making process within the General Shareholders Meeting and the quotas to the benefits and losses of the company are taken from Law no. 31/1990, and no derogation exists in regard of this aspect.

*

This claim is not true; the Urbanism Plan has been prepared with public consultation.

Roșia Montană Gold Corporation SA (RMGC) has requested and obtained from Alba County Council the Urbanism Certificate no. 78 of 26.04.2006, for the entire Roșia Montană mining project, including the tailings management facility. The Urbanism Certificate also stipulated the preparation of a Zonal Urbanism Plan, to reflect all changes made to the Roșia Montană Project, following the public consultations and debates organized in relation to this project, and the consultations with the permitting authorities. This plan, entitled "Modification of the Zonal Urbanism Plan, Roșia Montană Industrial Area", was prepared and subjected to public debate in June 2006 in accordance with the provisions of Order no.176/N/2000 issued by the Ministry of Public Works and Territory Development for the approval of the technical regulations "Guidelines regarding the methodology applied for the preparation and framework content of the Zonal Urbanism Plan" and, at present, it is pending approval.

Concerning the Roșia Montană General Urbanism Plan approved in 2002, such plan was prepared in parallel with the Zonal Urbanism Plan of 2002, all the provisions of the General Urbanism Plan being also included in the Zonal Urbanism Plan. Also, the approval procedure related to the two urbanism plans was

carried out in parallel.

*

Preventive archaeological researches within the Roşia Montană mining project area have been undertaken based on specific techniques, specifically trial trenches in all accessible areas that are suitable for human habitation, taking into account the bibliographical information and the observations recorded during the archaeological survey campaigns, the geophysical studies and the analyses of the photogrammetric flights. In addition, surface investigations were undertaken, where appropriate.

The archaeological researches at Roşia Montană covered a large surface and focused on the areas known to have archaeological potential. THEREFORE, ALL AREAS THAT HAVE BEEN ARCHAEOLOGICALLY DISCHARGED HAD BEEN PREVIOUSLY INVESTIGATED. All research programs, beginning with the 2004 campaign, have been undertaken in full compliance with the current legal requirements, i.e. Ministerial Order no. 2392 of 6 September 2004 on the establishment of the Archaeological Standards and Procedures by the Ministry of Culture and Religious Affairs.

The proposed gold mining project at Roşia Montană has raised a series of issues related to the rescue of the historical-archaeological heritage within the area, as well as issues related to its scientific development and also the enhancement of heritage within a museum. Given the complex difficulties encountered in this respect, the Ministry of Culture and Religious Affairs decided to initiate the “Alburnus Maior” National Research Program.

The company’s role was to provide the necessary financial resources for the assessment, research and enhancement of the archaeological remains, in full compliance with the Romanian current legislation. The development of the research and of the archaeological discharge works has been conducted through specific means and methodologies that have been adjusted to the realities of every site researched, in our case, Roşia Montană. They consisted in:

- Archives studies;
- Archaeological surveys; trial trenches;
- aerial reconnaissance/survey and aerial photo interpretation ; high resolution satellite images;
- mining archaeology studies; underground topography and 3D modeling;
- geophysical surveys;
- extensive archaeological investigations in the areas with an identified archaeological potential- this implied carrying out archaeological excavations;
- Interdisciplinary studies- sedimentology, archaeo-zoology, comparative palynology, archaeo-metallurgy, geology, mineralogy;
- Radiocarbon dating and dendrochronology;
- This research and its results were included in an integrated database;
- traditional and digital archaeological topography and development of the GIS project; generate a photo archive- both traditional and digital;
- restoration of artifacts;
- an inventory and a digital catalogue of the artifacts;
- studies conducted by specialists in order to enhance the research results - publication of monographs/scientific books and journals, exhibitions, websites, etc.

All the preventive archaeological researches undertaken at Roşia Montană since 2000 have been carried out as part of a complex research program; permits for preventive archaeological excavations being issued in compliance with the current legislation. These archaeological investigations have been undertaken by representatives of 21 specialized institutions from Romania and 3 others from abroad, under the scientific coordination of the Romanian National Museum of History. All archaeological researches have been conducted in full compliance with the existing legislation. The investigations undertaken during each archaeological research campaign have been approved by the Ministry of Culture and Religious Affairs based on the Annual Archaeological Research Plan approved by the National Commission of Archaeology.

Under the current legislation (Ministerial Order no. 2392 of 6 September 2004 on the establishment of the Archaeological Standards and Procedures by the Ministry of Culture and Religious Affairs) the archaeologists who have conducted the research may ask that an archaeological discharge certificate be

granted. Based on a complex research program, the archaeologists prepare comprehensive documentation with regard to the researched area. Upon consideration of the submitted documentation, the National Commission of Archaeology makes a decision as to whether to recommend or not the granting of the archaeological discharge certificate. In the case of the research conducted in the period 2001-2006, the archaeological discharge certificate was issued directly by the Ministry of Culture and Religious Affairs or by its local agencies.

Preventive archaeological researches at Roşia Montană have allowed the research of five Roman cremation necropolis (Tău Corna, Hop-Găuri, Țarina, Jig - Piciorag and Pârâul Porcului – Tăul Secuilor), two funerary areas (Carpeni, Nanului Valley), sacred areas (Hăbad, Nanului Valley), habitation areas (Hăbad, Carpeni, Tăul Țapului, Hop), the most significant being the Roman structures on the Carpeni Hill and the circular funerary monument at Tău Găuri. In addition, for the first time in Romania, surface investigations have been paralleled by underground investigations of Cetate, Cârnic, Jig and Orlea massifs, with important discoveries in the Piatra Corbului, area, Cătălina-Monuleşti gallery and the Păru Carpeni mining sector.

The research consisted of aerial photo interpretation, archaeological magnetometric studies, electrical resistivity, palynology, sedimentology, geology studies, radiocarbon and dendrochronology dating. For a better management of the research units and of the archaeological findings, data bases were used, including text and photographs-among which 4 satellite images (an archive satellite image type SPOT Panchromatic (10m) from 1997; 2 satellite images LANDSAT 7 MS (30 m), dating from 2000 and 2003; a satellite image with priority programming SPOT 5 SuperMode color (2,5 m resolution-19 July 2004); all data have been included in a comprehensive GIS program, a first in the Romanian archaeological research.

In the case of archaeological monuments that are located close to industrial facilities, plans have been redesigned to ensure that the archaeological remains in question will not be affected. Where appropriate, the archaeological monument was preserved in situ and restored, i.e. the circular funerary monument at Hop-Găuri (see The “Alburnus Maior” monograph series, volume II, Bucharest, 2004). Another example in this respect is the Carpeni Hill, designated an “archaeological “ reserve, and the Piatra Corbului area. In 2004, after being thoroughly investigated, these areas have been included on the List of Historic Monuments. Add to this the areas where ancient mining remains will be preserved, such as the Cătălina Monuleşti gallery and the mining sector Păru Carpeni, as well as the protected area Roşia Montană Historic Center, including a number of heritage assets (35 historic monument houses).

We emphasise in this respect that the identified and researched structures have been published in preliminary form in the Archaeological Research Chronicle of Romania, after every archaeological research campaign, as well as in volume 1 of the Alburnus Maior monographic series. We mention here the areas where Roman habitation structures have been identified and researched, as well as the references to be consulted for further information: Hop-Găuri, Carpeni, Tăul Țapului (CCA 2001 (2002), p. 254-257, no. 182; 261-262, nr. 185; 264-265, no. 188; 265-266, no. 189. Alburnus Maior I, 2003, p. 45-80; 81-122; 123-148; CCA 2001 (2002), 257-261; CCA 2003 (2004) ,280-283; Alburnus Maior I, 2003, p. 387-431, 433-446, 447-467).

For further details related to the applicable legal framework, the responsibilities of the Project titleholder, or for a detailed description of the preventive archaeological researches undertaken to date and of the Cultural Heritage Management Plans, please see Annex called “Information on the Cultural heritage of Roşia and Related Management Aspects”. In addition, the annex includes supplementary information with regard to the result of the researches undertaken as part of the “Alburnus Maior” National Research Program between 2001 and 2006.

In conclusion, the area mentioned by the questioner has been researched in accordance with the Romanian legal requirements, as well as with European standards and practices in the field.

Note that the type of research undertaken at Roşia Montană, known as preventive/rescue archaeological research, as well as other related heritage studies, are done everywhere in the world in close connection with the economic development of certain areas. Both the costs for the research and for the enhancement and maintenance of the preserved areas are provided by investors, in a public-private partnership set up in order to protect the cultural heritage, as per the provisions of the European Convention on the Protection of the Archaeological Heritage (Malta-1992) [1].

References:

[1]The text of the Convention is available at the following address:

<http://conventions.coe.int/Treaty/Commun/QueVoulezVous.asp?NT=143&CM=8&DF=7/6/2006&CL=ENG>

*

In 2000, in the context of the proposal of a new mining project in the Roşia Montană area, the Ministry of Culture and Religious Affairs approved a series of studies to be conducted in order to research the archaeological and architectural heritage of the area. At the end of that year, the Design Centre for National Cultural Heritage (now the National Institute for Historical Monuments) presented the preliminary results of these researches in front of the National Commission for Historical Monuments and of the National Commission of Archaeology. Based on these results, in 2001, the Ministry of Culture and Religious Affairs initiated the “Alburnus Maior” National Research Program (the Order no. 2504 / 07.03.2001 of the Minister of Culture and Religious Affairs) in compliance with the Law 378/2001 (as subsequently amended by Law 462/2003 and by Law 258/2006 and Law 259/2006). Thus, since 2000, the Ministry of Culture and Religious Affairs has fulfilled its duties – directly or through its subordinated institutions - with regard to the management of the issues related to Roşia Montană’s heritage.

The preventive archaeological researches have been conducted by the representatives of 21 national institutions and 3 others from abroad, with a broad expertise in the field. They have been carried out based on the annual approval of the National Commission of Archaeology of the Ministry of Culture and Religious Affairs. In accordance with current legislation, this research program is carried out with financial support provided by RMGC, i.e. the company that plans to expand and continue to mine the gold-silver deposit in Roşia Montană. Thus, large-scale preventive investigations have been conducted or are underway in the RMP impact area. A proposal will be made based on the results of these investigations, either for the archaeological discharge of some researched areas or the preservation in situ of certain representative structures and monuments, in compliance with current legislation. For areas proposed for conservation or for archaeological discharge measures the decision was made based on the surveys conducted by specialists and on the analysis of the results by the National Commission of Archaeology. In the period 2000-2005, the mining project underwent a series of modifications designed to promote the conservation of the local heritage. Examples of this include extending the duration of the field investigations (e.g. in Tarina, Pârâul Porcului, Orlea) and changing the location of some elements of mining infrastructure in order to allow the conservation of the archaeological remains found in the Carpeni, in the Tău Găuri and Piatra Corbului areas.

The architectural and town-planning surveys have been conducted, in accordance with current legislation, by companies certified by the Ministry of Culture and Religious Affairs, while the town-planning documentation drafted by these companies, and the restoration and conservation works undertaken so far, have been approved by the National Commission for Historical Monuments. Thus, the town-planning documentation has been approved and implemented in accordance with current legislation, and the company has agreed to these decisions and modified the mine development plans accordingly:

Extensive ethnographic research was conducted in the Roşia Montană-Abrud-Corna area in the period 2001-2004 coordinated by a team of specialists for the Romanian Village Museum „Dimitrie Gusti” (a National Museum directly under the coordination of the Ministry of Culture and Religious Affairs). Moreover, a broad series of oral history interviews was conducted in the period 2001-2002 by the Romanian Society of Radio broadcasting through the „Gheorghe Brătianu” Oral History Centre, Bucharest (SRR - CIO).

In compliance with the requirements of the Ministry of Environment and Waters Management and the Ministry of Culture and Religious Affairs, specific management plans have been drawn up for the management and conservation of the heritage remains from the Roşia Montană area, in the context of the implementation of the mining project. These plans have been included in the documentation prepared for the report on the Environmental Impact Assessment Study. (see EIA Report, volume 32-33, Plan M-Cultural Heritage Management Plan, part I –Management Plan for the Archaeological Heritage from Roşia Montană Zone; part II-Management Plan for the Historical Monuments and Protected Zone from Roşia Montană; part III- Cultural Heritage Management Plan).

These management plans comprise detailed presentations of the obligations and responsibilities for the

protection and conservation of the heritage remains from the Roşia Montană area, which the company has assumed as part of the mining project, in accordance with the decision of the central government. These heritage remains include: archaeological remains above and under the ground, historic buildings, protected areas, intangible heritage assets, cultural landscape items, etc. In this context, it should be noted that besides the works for the protection and preservation of the archaeological heritage, works are also being carried out for the rehabilitation and conservation of the protected area Historical Centre Roşia Montană (comprising 35 historic buildings, and projects for the restoration of 11 of these buildings are currently being drafted) and at Tăul Mare, Tăul Brazi and Tăul Anghel, plus remains of the surface mining works from the Văidoaia area, and the creation of a modern museum dedicated to the history of mining in the Apuseni Mountains area. This museum will be established including exhibitions of geology, archaeology, industrial and ethnographic heritage as well as an underground section organized around the Cătălina Monuleşti gallery.

Moreover, representatives of the Directorate/Department for Culture, Religious Affairs and National Cultural Heritage of Alba County have paid a number of visits to Roşia Montană in order to collect information and to check the situation. The same administrative body was the intermediary for the acquisitions of historic buildings made by RMGC. The Ministry of Culture and Religious Affairs expressed its pre-emption right regarding the acquisition of these buildings.

It should be mentioned, however, that apart from the obligations undertaken by RMGC as regards the protection and conservation of the archaeological remains and historical monuments, there are also a series of obligations which rest with the local public authorities from Roşia Montană and from Alba County, and with the central public authorities, specifically the Romanian Government. These aspects are detailed in the Cultural Heritage Management Plans included in the EIA Report (see EIA Report, volume 32, Management Plan for the Archaeological Heritage from Roşia Montană Zone, pages 22-24, 49, 55-56, 71-72 and the EIA Report, volume 33- Management Plan for the Historical Monuments and Protected Zone from Roşia Montană pages 28-29, 47-50, 51-53, 65-66, page 103 – Annex 1).

Item no.	30/D; 5609/B
No. to identify the observations received from the public	No. 114456/ 08.09.2006
Proposal	The questioner opposes the promotion of the Roşia Montană Project.
Solution	<p>Regarding your allegation, we mention that art. 44 (3) of the Minister of Waters and Environment Protection Order no. 860/2002 on the environmental impact assessment and the issuance of environmental agreements Procedures ("Order no. 860/2002") provides that <i>"based on the results of the public debate, the relevant authority for the environmental protection evaluates the grounded proposals/comments of the public and requests the titleholder the supplementation of the report on the environmental impact assessment study with an appendix comprising solutions for the solving of the indicated issues"</i>.</p> <p>Consequently, considering the fact that your proposal is just an allegation which does not indicate possible problems, nor provide additional information, we mention that the decision on the issuance or refusal of the environmental approval cannot be made only by considering a simple proposal, but according to certain objective criteria provided by the wording of art. 45 of the Order no. 860/2002 and <u>only after examining</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) the report on the environmental impact assessment study; (ii) the conclusions of the parties involved in the assessment; (iii) the possibilities to implement the project; (iv) the titleholder answers to the grounded proposals/comments of the public.

Item no.	31/D; 5610/B
No. to identify the observations received from the public	No. 4716/ SB 12.09.2006
Proposal	<p>- The contestation presents the technical lacunae from the Assessment Report as well as the risks and prejudices which this project may generate within the Roşia Montană community in the following domains:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Agriculture - tourism - economic development of the area
Solution	<p>Contrary to the questioner's claim, Information on existing and potential industries, such as agriculture and tourism, is provided in the Environmental Impact Assessment Study Report (EIA) and supporting documents. This information was presented primarily so that an assessment could be completed on the potential effects of the proposed project on these industries. Roşia Montană Gold Corporation (RMGC) is not in a position to comment authoritatively on alternative development options. However, the company is committed to promoting long term development opportunities as part of the sustainable development plan. Under the auspices of the United Nations Development Plan (UNDP), a number of working groups will be established one of which will be assigned the task of exploring development opportunities. These working groups will be made up of Government, community representatives and RMGC. The working groups will welcome suggestions and contributions from all interested parties.</p> <p>Chapter 5 of the EIA identifies and assesses project alternatives, including tourism. Importantly, the EIA concludes that the project does not preclude the development of other industries such as tourism. On the contrary, the mining project would remove some of the existing significant impediments to establishment of other industries, such as pollution, poor access and other problems that have arisen through lack of inward investment. As described in Volume 14, 4.8 Social and Economical Environment, and in Volume 31, Community Sustainable Development Management Plans, there are currently some tourism activities in Roşia Montană. However the tourism industry is not at present a significant economic driver.</p> <p>As for potential to develop commercial agriculture, the role of agriculture in the economy in Roşia Montană is effectively minimized by the altitude, steep slopes, and poor (and polluted) soils. Currently, approximately 7% of the land in Roşia Montană is arable. The agricultural activities that do occur are primarily related to subsistence and supplement income from wage employment. Agricultural activities may continue in Roşia Montană, even if the mine proceeds, in the areas where the General Urbanism Plan (PUG) allows it. During the mine's life, if people wish to develop agriculture as an economically sustainable practice, RMGC in cooperation with Community stakeholders will provide assistance. In the Community Sustainable Development Plan land-based livelihoods including organic farming were presented as possibilities for development. It requires Community parties to actively desire to undertake these activities. Agricultural activities may also continue post mine closure depending on whether there is a desire by people to practice it.</p> <p>As the Roşia Montană Project (RMP) affects only 4 of Roşia Montană's 16 sub-comuna, Roşia Montană could continue to develop its tourism potential. There are initiatives to do so, such as "Tourism development model and its contribution to sustainable development in Zlatna, Bucium, Roşia Montană and Baia de Arieş as alternative to mono-industrial mining activities" prepared by the National Institute for Research and Development in Tourism (INCDT) published in April 2006, just as the EIA report was being submitted to the Ministry of Environment and Water Management (MEWM).</p> <p>RMGC has also commissioned a study which sets out how the potential tourism markets and how these might best be approached in an integrated project:</p> <p>"From experience, tourism will be possible and profitable only when there is something to offer to tourists in terms of clean environment, proper infrastructure (good roads, accommodation, restaurants,</p>

running water, proper sewage system, waste disposal facilities, etc.), attractions (museums, other things to see such as historical monuments, etc). A mining project such as the one proposed by RMGC will provide, through taxes, and the development of service industries, the necessary funds to improve the infrastructure. Through the RMP and its heritage management plans, US\$25 million will be invested by the company in the protection of cultural heritage in such a way to support tourism. A training program will provide the necessary skills to develop tourist activities and the Roşia Montană Micro Credit will support people in starting pensions, restaurants, etc., all needed for attracting tourists. At the end of the project, there will be a new village, plus the restored old centre of Roşia Montană with a museum, hotels, restaurants and modernized infrastructure, plus restored mining galleries (e.g. Cătălina Monuleşti) and preserved monuments such as the one from Tău Găuri - all of which would serve as tourist attractions. Further to this, it is understood that the government will be acting locally to encourage economic growth. (see Roşia Montană Initial Tourism Proposals Gifford Report 13658.R01).

The RMP will be a catalyst for local and regional economic development. Beneficial impacts will be maximised by involving local and regional governments and other relevant parties from the community in development initiatives as part of a participatory approach of the Community Sustainable Development Management Plans. Negative impacts will be mitigated through measures as described in the EIA. RMGC is committed to working proactively to create an enabling business environment promoting local sustainable development to be developed during the life of the project and designed to operate independently following mine closure.

For more information, please see Roşia Montană Sustainable Development and the Roşia Montană Project – annex 4.

*

Item no.	32/D; 5611/B
No. to identify the observations received from the public	No. 115103/ 13.10.2006
Proposal	<p>The questioner opposes the proposed gold and silver mining project at Roşia Montană and formulate comments and observations as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -In EIA there are not presented all the possible risks derived from this project; -The overall costs for mine closure are not realistic. -There isn't until now an approved Zonal Urbanism Plan for the Protected Areas; -The phase of public consultation and quality evaluation of the impact assessment study report begun without a valid urbanism certificate; -Information about the foundation which RMGC will establish and subsidize is not given. This foundation follows to assume the obligations which the mining operation can not assume; -The present urbanism plans of the Roşia Montană commune do not correspond with the mining project proposal described in EIA; -There is no liner proposed for the tailings pond; -The proposed waste deposits will be not constructed according to the legislation in force; -The financial guarantees have not been established; -There is not a Safety Report submitted for the public consultation and evaluation by the competent authorities; -The EIA report does not assess the "Zero Alternative"; -The Project poses a threat for protected flora and fauna; -The EIA report does not refer to the impact on the listed heritage buildings of noise and vibrations caused by the mining operations; -The public/ONGs which to consult the contracts and agreements between Company and Romanian State; -The Urbanism Plan has been modified without public consultation; -From archeological point of view, the area proposed to be occupied by project was not legally investigated; -It disputes the spiritual and architectural monuments, including the responsible involvement of the Institutions of the State in the protection program;
Solution	<p>It is the nature of risk that it can be mitigated and diminished; it cannot be made to disappear. In order to put this into context, the common action of walking on the street or developing everyday activities have an accident potential. This accident potential is twice higher than within the framework of industrial activities that use hazardous substances.</p> <p>In the larger sense, the entire EIA report is focused on the assessment of impacts and their associated mitigation. Specifically, Chapter 4 of the EIA presents that impact assessment of the project. The following discussion presents a summary of the impact discussed in the EIA.</p> <p>As far as natural and technological risks assessments are concerned, Chapter 7, "Risk Cases", from the Report on Environmental Impact Assessment, emphasizes the fact that safety and prevention measures, the implementation of the environmental management and risk systems are mitigating the consequences to acceptable levels as compared to the most restrictive norms, standards, the best practices or national and international recommendations in the field. The risk level has been established as moderate and so, socially acceptable. The extension of the risk assessment and the intensity of the prevention and mitigation measures of the consequences should be proportionate to the risk involved. Selection of a specific mitigation technique is depends on the analyzed accident scenario.</p> <p>More detailed assessments are conducted for accident scenarios that, based on the qualitative assessment are found to be potentially major, of probability more than 10^{-6} (reduced recovery periods of 1/1,000,000) meaning that they could have major consequences therefore, elevated associated risk, a higher risk level than 9 to 12 (on a scale of 1-25). To put this in context, simply living in southern Florida rates a 1 - 25 on the risk scale.</p>

A global assessment of the risks associated with the Roşia Montană Project is obtained by the quick environmental and health risk assessment methodology initially developed by the Italian Ministry of the Environment and the World Health Organization. Natural hazard and risk identification and analysis presents key data and information in assessing potential technological accidents. Thus:

- in designing the Tailings Management Facility, the design parameters were chosen to fully cover the characteristic seismic risk of the area. These seismic design parameters adopted for the TMF and other facilities on the proposed site result in a safety factor much greater than the minimum accepted under the Romanian and European design standards for such facilities;

- in the sector physically impacted by the Project, the risk of floods will remain very low due to the small catchments (controlled by the Roşia and Corna Streams) the area affected by the operation, and the creation of containment, diversion and drainage hydro-technical structures for storm waters on the site, and in the Abrud catchment in general;

- risks caused by meteorological events have been reviewed and used in assessing the hazards of the affected technological processes.

From the analysis of morphometrical parameters and their correlation with other sets of information on the natural slopes on and near the site shows that the (qualitatively estimated) landslide occurrence risk is low to moderate and its consequences will not cause major impacts on the structural components of the Project.

There is no significant risk associated with resource depletion. Mining activities are planned judiciously, so as to extract only the profitable gold and silver resources and only the necessary construction rock for the Project. The management of the mining concession site will minimize reserve "sterilization" (limitation of future access to the reserves).

In assessing technological hazards and risks, the quantity of hazardous substances on the site was calculated as a total and by category, as provided by the *Notification Procedure* approved by Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry, Water and Environment (MAFWE) Order 1084/2003. Based on an evaluation of hazardous substances in stock on the Project site in relation to the relevant quantities provided by the Government Decision 95/2003 which transposes the Seveso Directive, the Project ranges between the upper and the lower limits, and therefore S.C. Roşia Montană Gold Corporation S.A. is required to prepare a Report on Environmental Impact Assessment Study to be sent to the local environmental authority and the local civilian protection authority a *Safety Report* on its operations to prevent major accident risks.

In assessing the consequences of major accidents involving dangerous substances, physical-mathematical models accepted internationally and especially at EU level, and the current version of the SLAB (Canada) software have been used, the latter for the atmospheric dispersion of denser than air gases, that may handle a multitude of situations and scenarios. Similarly, the EFFECTSGis 5.5 (Netherlands) software, developed for the analysis of the effects of industrial accidents and of consequences. Several scenarios were considered in response to the internal legislative requirements, especially related to the implementation of the Internal Emergency Plans (GD 647/2005). The conclusions of the risk assessment for major accidents were:

- The total destruction of plant facilities may only be caused by terrorist attack with classic or nuclear weapons. Simultaneous damage to the HCl tank (including containment) and to the NaCN solution tank, the tanks containing enriched solution, to one or more leaching tanks, having as a result HCN dispersion into the air. At the same time, under certain situations and weather conditions unfavorable for dispersion, people within 40 m of the emission source, surprised by the toxic cloud for more than 1 minute without respiratory protection equipment, will most certainly die. It may also be considered that, on a radius of about 310 m, persons exposed for more than 10 minutes may suffer serious intoxications that may also lead to death. Toxic effects may occur in persons up to about 2 km downwind of the process plant;

- Operating errors and/or failures in the measurement and control devices, resulting in a lower pH in the leaching tank, thickener and/or DETOX slurry and accidental emissions of hydrocyanic acid. The area affected by concentrations of 290 ppm over a 10 min exposure time is within a circle of 36 m radius and the 50 ppm IDLH threshold for 30 min exposure will be reached over an area of 157.5 m radius. The center of these circles is the middle of the CIL tanks platform;

- Accidental HCN emission from the decanter. The accident may be caused by a drop of pH in the CIL tanks combined with an overdose of flocculent solution and faulty pH monitoring systems. The area

affected by concentrations of 300 ppm over a 10 min exposure time is within a circle of 65 m radius and the 50 ppm IDLH threshold for 30 min exposure will be reached over an area of 104 m radius. The center of these circles is mid-distance between the two DETOX facilities;

- Accidental HCN emission from the DETOX facility. The accident may be caused by a drop of pH in the reactors generated by an overdose of metabisulfite solution and/or copper sulphate combined with faulty pH monitoring systems. The area affected by high 1900 ppm concentrations for a 1 min exposure time is located within a 10 m radius circle. The area affected by concentrations of 300 ppm over a 10 min exposure time is within a circle of 27 m radius and the 50 ppm IDLH threshold for 30 min exposure will be reached over an area of 33 m radius. The center of these circles is mid-distance between the two DETOX facilities;

- Explosion of the LPG storage tank. The LPG storage tank has a 50 ton capacity and is located outdoors, near the heating plant. The simulation was conducted for the worst case scenario, considering an explosion of the full tank. Threshold I with heat 12.5 kW/m² is within a 10.5 m radius circle and Threshold II, of heat radiation 5 kW/m² is within a circle of 15 m radius;

- Damage and/or fire at the fuel tanks. Simulations were conducted for the worst case scenarios, considering ignition and combustion of all the diesel (fire in the tank, or in the containment vat, when full of diesel);

- Corna Dam break and breach development. Two credible accident scenarios were considered in simulating tailings flow out of the Tailings Management Facility, and six credible scenarios for the flow of decant water and tailings pore water, with significant effects on the terrestrial and aquatic ecosystems, in different weather conditions;

- Tailings flow may occur along Corna Valley, on a 800 m (starter dam break) or over 1,600 m reach should the Corna dam break in its final stage;

- In regard to water quality impacts, cyanide concentrations in the water in the shape of a pollution plume may reach Arad, near the Romanian-Hungarian border on the Mures River, in concentrations ranging between 0.03 and 0.5 mg/L. Due to inherent mathematical limitations in the models, these values and the accident effects are considered overestimated. Therefore, the results describe the “worst case scenario” based on extreme dam break assumptions for the Corna Dam.

A new and much more precise and realistic simulation has been subsequently established based on the INCA Mine model, that considers the dispersion, volatilization and breakdown of cyanides during the downstream movement of the pollutant flow (Whiteland et al., 2006).

The model used is the INCA model developed over the past 10 years to simulate both terrestrial and aquatic systems within the EUROLIMPACS EU research program (www.eurolimpacs.ucl.ac.uk). The model has been used to assess the impacts from future mining, and collection and treatment operations for pollution from past mining at Roşia Montană.

The modeling created for Roşia Montană simulates eight metals (cadmium, lead, zinc, mercury, arsenic, copper, chromium, manganese) as well as Cyanide, Nitrate, Ammonia and dissolved oxygen. The model has been applied to the upper catchments at Roşia Montană as well as the complete Abruđ-Arieş-Mureş river system down to the Hungarian Border and on into the Tisa River. The model takes into account the dilution, mixing and physical-chemical processes affecting metals, ammonia and cyanide in the river system and gives estimates of concentrations at key locations along the river, including at the Hungarian Boarder and in the Tisa after the Mureş joins it.

Because of dilution and dispersion in the river system, and of the initial EU BAT-compliant technology adopted for the project (for example, the use of a cyanide destruct process for tailings effluent that reduces cyanide concentration in effluent stored in the TMF to below 6 mg/l), even a large scale unprogrammed release of tailings materials (for example, following failure of the dam) into the river system would not result in transboundary pollution. The model has shown that under worse case dam failure scenario all legal limits for cyanide and heavy metals concentrations would be met in the river water before it crosses into Hungary.

The INCA model has also been used to evaluate the beneficial impacts of the existing mine water collection and treatment and it has shown that substantial improvements in water quality are achieved along the river system under normal operational conditions.

For more information, an information sheet presenting the INCA modeling work is presented under the

title of the Mureş River Modeling Program and the full modeling report is presented in Annex 5.1:

- Development of HCN on the tailings pond surface. Simulated emissions of HCN from the Tailings Management Facility pond surface and of their dispersion into the ambient air show that the level of $400\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ hourly average and $179\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ 8hr average will not be exceeded. These HCN concentrations are only slightly over the odor threshold (0.177ppm) and much below potentially dangerous concentrations;

- Cetate Dam break and breach development. Flood modeling was in case of a break in Cetate dam was based on the design parameters obtained from the hydrometeorological study "Assessment of rainfall intensity, frequency and runoff for the Roşia Montană Project - Radu Drobot". The breach characteristics were predicted using the BREACH model, and the maximum height of the flood wave in various flow sections was modeled using the FLDWAV software. The assumptions included a total $800,000\text{ m}^3$ discharge for one hour, when the peak of the flood hydrograph is about 4.9 m above base flow immediately below the dam and in the narrow Abrud valley 5.9-7.5 km downstream of the dam, while in the last section considered (10.5 km) water depth is about 2.3 m above base flow and the maximum flow rate $877\text{ m}^3/\text{s}$. Further, the broader Aries valley allows the flood wave to propagate on a significantly wider bed, which results in a highly attenuated hydrograph. These results describe the "worst case scenario" based on extreme dam break assumptions;

- Accidents during cyanide transportation. Due to the large quantities of cyanide transported (about 30t /day) the risks associated to this activity were assessed in detail using the ZHA- Zurich Hazard Analysis method. As a consequence, the optimum transport route was selected from the manufacturer to the Process Plant, e.g

Cyanide transport (in solid state) will exclusively involve special SLS (Solid to Liquid System) containers, 16 tons each. The ISO compliant container will be protected by a framework with legs, which allows separation from the transport trailer for temporary storage. The wall is 5.17 mm thick, which, together with the protective framework, provides additional protection to the load in case of accident. This system is considered BAT and is currently one of the safest cyanide transportation options.

It is being mentioned the fact that the study develops the occurrence possibility of these scenarios (pages 166-171, Conclusions).

As regards the cyanides management, there is a baseline study named "Roşia Montană Golden Project, Cyanides Management Plan" prepared in compliance with the "International Management Code for the Manufacture, Transport and Use of Cyanide in the Production of Gold (International Cyanide management Institute) May 2002". S.C. Roşia Montană Gold Corporation is signatory to this code.

Bibliographical references for Chapter 7 "Risk Cases" are listed at page173-176.

*

RMGC's closure estimates, which were developed by a team of independent experts with international experience and will be reviewed by third party experts, are based on the assumption that the project can be completed according to the plan, without interruptions, bankruptcy or the like They are engineering calculations and estimates based on the current commitments of the closure plan and are summarized in the EIA's Mine Closure and Rehabilitation Management Plan (Plan J in the EIA). Annex 1 of Plan J will be updated using a more detailed approach looking at every individual year and calculating the amount of surety, which must be set aside year by year to rehabilitate the mine before RMGC is released from all its legal obligations. Most importantly, the current estimates assume the application of international best practice, best available technology (BAT) and compliance with all Romanian and European Union laws and regulations.

Closure and rehabilitation at Roşia Montană involves the following measures:

- Covering and vegetating the waste dumps as far as they are not backfilled into the open pits;
- Backfilling the open pits, except Cetate pit, which will be flooded to form a lake;
- Covering and vegetating the tailings pond and its dam areas;
- Dismantling of disused production facilities and revegetation of the cleaned-up areas;
- Water treatment by semi-passive systems (with conventional treatment systems as backup) until all effluents have reached the discharge standards and need no further treatment;
- Maintenance of the vegetation, erosion control, and monitoring of the entire site until it has

been demonstrated by RMGC that all remediation targets have been sustainably reached.

While the aspects of closure and rehabilitation are many, we are confident in our cost estimates because the largest expense—that incurred by the earthmoving operation required to reshape the landscape—can be estimated with confidence. Using the project design, we can measure the size of the areas that must be reshaped and resurfaced. Similarly, there is a body of scientific studies and experiments that enable scientists to determine the depth of soil cover for successful revegetation. By multiplying the size of the areas by the necessary depth of the topsoil by the unit rate (also derived from studying similar earthmoving operations at similar sites), we can estimate the potential costs of this major facet of the rehabilitation operation. The earthmoving operation, which will total approximately US \$65 million, makes up 87% of closure and rehabilitation costs.

Also, the necessity of additional technological measures to stabilize and reshape the tailings surface will be discussed in the update of the Economical Financial Guarantee (EFG) estimate, which leads to an increase the provisions for tailings rehabilitation, especially if the TMF is closed prematurely and no optimized tailings disposal regime is applied. The exact figures depend on the details of the TMF closure strategy which can be finally determined only during production.

We believe that—far from being not realistic—our cost estimates are evidence of our high level of commitment to closure and rehabilitation. Just as a comparison, the world's largest gold producer has set aside US \$683 million (as of December 31, 2006) for the rehabilitation of 27 operations, which equates to US \$25 million on average per mine. The RMGC closure cost estimates, recently revised upward from the US \$73 million reported in the EIA based on additional information, currently total US \$76 million.

*

According to Law 5/2000, regarding the approval of the Territory Arrangement Plan – 3rd Section – protected areas (“Law 5/2000”) (article 5, paragraphs 2-3), local public authorities, with the support of the competent central public authorities, had the obligation to establish the boundaries of the protection areas for the cultural heritage elements stipulated in Annex III to the above-mentioned law. This measure should have been taken within 12 months from the effective date of Law 5/2000, based on specialized studies. For this purpose, the local public authorities had to prepare the town planning documentation and its related regulations, developed and approved according to the law. This documentation must comprise the necessary protection and conservation measures for the national cultural heritage elements located in this area.

Concurrently, Law 350/2001 on the territory arrangement and urbanism stipulates the right of legal or natural persons interested in arranging the territory, to initiate the development of urbanism plans.

In accordance with these legal provisions, in 2001, RMGC initiated the preparation of these specific town-planning documentations - the General Urbanism Plan and the Zonal Urbanism Plan. These plans have been developed by Romanian certified companies and followed the legal approval procedure. The permit for the establishment of the Roşia Montană Historical Centre Protected Area was issued by the Ministry of Culture and Religious Affairs in 2002 (permits no. 61/14.02.2002 and no. 178/20.06.2002) as part of the procedure for the approval of the town planning documentation. Based on these permits, the Ministry of Culture and Religious Affairs requested the company to develop a Zonal Urbanism Plan for the Historical Centre of Roşia Montană. Out of the 41 historical buildings in Roşia Montană, thirty-five (35) are located inside the protected area of the Roşia Montană Historical Centre.

As for the heritage elements located in the future industrial development area (6 historical buildings), these are discussed in the Industrial Zonal Urbanism Plan prepared by SC Proiect Alba SA. The regulations included in this document will contain measures for the protection of these monuments.

In conclusion, the town planning studies and the specialized studies conducted for the purpose of establishing the boundaries of the protection areas within the future mining operations perimeter are currently pending approval, in accordance with the legal provisions, by the competent institutions and committees. Please note that none of the historical houses located in the perimeter of the proposed project will be affected; on the contrary, all the 41 historic buildings will be included in a complex restoration and rehabilitation program (see the Management Plan). This program is mandatory, regardless

of the implementation of the mining project, if we want to prevent these buildings from collapsing because of their advanced degradation.

*

Your assertion regarding the failure to obtain an applicable urbanism certificate at the start up of the public debates and of the evaluation of the quality of the report to the environmental impact assessment, is not correct.

Thus, by the time when the public debate stage started up there was an applicable urbanism certificate and namely the urbanism certificate no. 78/26.04.2006 issued by Alba County Council. This certificate was obtained prior to the evaluation stage of the quality of the report to the environmental impact assessment which started up once the EIA was submitted to the Ministry of Environment and Water Management on the 15th May 2006.

For better understanding the applicable legal provisions and the facts developed within the mining project of Roşia Montană zone we would like to make several comments:

- The procedure for issuing the environmental permit for Roşia Montană project started up on the 14th December 2004 by submitting the technical memorandum and the urbanism certificate no.68/26.August 2004 (certificate applicable by that time). S.C. Roşia Montană Gold Corporation S.A. (RMGC) applied for and obtained a new urbanism certificate no.78/26.04.2006 issued by Alba County Council for the entire Roşia Montană Project applicable on the date of the EIA Report submission (15th May 2006) and prior to the public debate start up (June 2006);
- The Section 1 of the urbanism certificate no.78 of 26th 04.2006 entitled Work construction, position 10 – “Processing plant and associated constructions “ – including the tailing management facility which existence is compulsory for the processing plant running. The Tailing management facility is also specified on the layout plans which are integral part of the urbanism certificate and they were sealed by Alba County Council so that they cannot be modified;
- The Urbanism Certificate is an informative document and its goal is only to inform the applicant about the legal, economic and technical regime of the existing lands and buildings and to establish the urbanism requirements and the approvals necessary to obtain the construction permit (including the environmental permit) as per art.6 of Law 50/1991 referring to the completion of construction works, republished and art 27 paragraph 2 of the Norms for the application of Law 50/1991 – Official Journal 825 bis/13.09.2005).

As it is an informative document, it does not limit the number of certificates an applicant may obtain for the same land plot (art. 30 of Law no. 350/2001 regarding the territorial planning and urbanism).

*

Introduced as part of the Environmental Impact Assessment Report Study (EIA), the Roşia Montană Foundation is shifting in focus. The Community Sustainable Development Plan activities initially conceived as coming under the Foundation umbrella (business oriented activities: business incubator, business advisory center, micro-finance facility, as well as social oriented activities: education and training center) have been advanced independently, via partnerships and with community participation in decision-making – a preferable way to advance social and economic development programs.

Going forward, the Foundation will take shape around preservation, patrimony and cultural heritage issues, with its final form determined in consultation with the community.

In terms of the philosophy that guides the company’s Sustainable Development efforts, the Roşia Montană Gold Corporation (RMGC) sees itself not as principal provider, but as a partner. Community involvement is considered the starting point; over time, as the community builds the capacity to maintain programs in its own right, the company will turn over control of currently-established programs to the community and its institutions.

For more information, please see Roşia Montană Sustainable Development and the Roşia Montană Project – annex 4.

*

We underline the fact that your statement is false. The General Urbanism Plan for the Roşia Montană commune, endorsed in 2002 allows the development of Roşia Montană project, as it has been presented during the public consultations.

Concurrently, pursuant to the provisions of art. 41, paragraph 2, from the Mining Law no.85/2003, the authorities from the local administration have the liability to adjust and/or update the territory arrangement plans and the general urbanism plans, in order to allow the development of all operations necessary for the development of mining activities.

RMGC has also initiated the preparation of two zonal urbanism plans: Zonal Urbanism Plan Modification – Roşia Montană Industrial Area and Zonal Urbanism Plan – Roşia Montană Historical Area. The first urbanism plan is required by the urbanism certificate no.78/26.04.2006, which updates the Zonal Urbanism Plan for the Industrial Area approved in 2002. As far as the historical area is concerned, its Zonal Urbanism Plan is required by the General Urbanism Plan approved also in 2002. Both urbanism plans are pending approval and have been subject to public consultations.

*

An engineered liner is included in the design of the Tailings Management Facility (TMF) basin. Specifically, the Roşia Montană Tailings Management Facility (TMF or “the facility”) has been designed to be compliant with the EU Groundwater Directive (80/68/EEC), transposed as Romanian GD 351/2005. The TMF is also designed for compliance with the EU Mine Waste Directive (2006/21/EC) as required by the Terms of Reference established by the MEWM in May, 2005. The following paragraphs provide a discussion of how the facility is compliant with the directives.

The TMF is composed of a series of individual components including:

- the tailings impoundment;
- the tailings dam;
- the secondary seepage collection pond;
- the secondary containment dam; and
- the groundwater monitoring wells/extraction wells located downstream of the Secondary Containment dam.

All of these components are integral parts of the facility and necessary for the facility to perform as designed.

The directives indicated above require that the TMF design be protective of groundwater. For the Roşia Montană project (RMP), this requirement is addressed by consideration of the favorable geology (low permeability shales underlying the TMF impoundment, the TMF dam and the Secondary Containment dam) and the proposed installation of a low-permeability (1×10^{-6} cm/sec) recompacted soil liner beneath the TMF basin. Please see Chapter 2 of EIA Plan F, “The Tailings Facility Management Plan” for more information.

The proposed low permeability soil liner will be fully compliant with Best Available Techniques (BAT) as defined by EU Directive 96/61 (IPPC) and EU Mine Waste Directive. Additional design features that are included in the design to be protective of groundwater include:

- A low permeability (1×10^{-6} cm/sec) cut off wall within the foundation of the starter dam to control seepage;
- A low permeability (1×10^{-6} cm/sec) core in the starter dam to control seepage;
- A seepage collection dam and pond below the toe of the tailings dam to collect and contain any seepage that does extend beyond the dam centerline;
- A series of monitoring wells, below the toe of the secondary containment dam, to monitor seepage and ensure compliance, before the waste facility limit.

In addition to the design components noted above specific operational requirements will be implemented to be protective of human health and the environment. In the extremely unlikely case that impacted water is detected in the monitoring wells below the secondary containment dam, they will be converted to

pumping wells and will be used to extract the impacted water and pump it into the reclaim pond where it will be incorporated into the RMP processing plant water supply system, until the compliance is reestablish.

*

An engineered liner is included in the design of the Tailings Management Facility (TMF) basin to be protective of groundwater. Specifically, the Roșia Montană Tailings Management Facility (TMF or “the facility”) has been designed to be compliant with the EU Groundwater Directive (80/68/EEC), transposed as Romanian GD 351/2005. The TMF is also designed for compliance with the EU Mine Waste Directive (2006/21/EC) as required by the Terms of Reference established by the MEWM in May, 2005. The following paragraphs provide a discussion of how the facility is compliant with the directives.

The TMF is composed of a series of individual components including:

- the tailings impoundment;
- the tailings dam;
- the secondary seepage collection pond;
- the secondary containment dam; and
- the groundwater monitoring wells/extraction wells located downstream of the Secondary Containment dam.

All of these components are integral parts of the facility and necessary for the facility to perform as designed.

The directives indicated above require that the TMF design be protective of groundwater. For the Roșia Montană project (RMP), this requirement is addressed by consideration of the favorable geology (low permeability shales underlying the TMF impoundment, the TMF dam, and the Secondary Containment dam) and the proposed installation of a low-permeability (1×10^{-6} cm/sec) recompacted soil liner beneath the TMF basin. Please see Chapter 2 of EIA Plan F, “The Tailings Facility Management Plan” for more information.

The proposed low permeability soil liner will be fully compliant with Best Available Techniques (BAT) as defined by EU Directive 96/61 (IPPC) and EU Mine Waste Directive. Additional design features that are included in the design to be protective of groundwater include:

- A low permeability (1×10^{-6} cm/sec) cut off wall within the foundation of the starter dam to control seepage;
- A low permeability (1×10^{-6} cm/sec) core in the starter dam to control seepage;
- A seepage collection dam and pond below the toe of the tailings dam to collect and contain any seepage that does extend beyond the dam centerline;
- A series of monitoring wells, below the toe of the secondary containment dam; to monitor seepage and ensure compliance, before the waste facility limit.

In addition to the design components noted above specific operational requirements will be implemented to be protective of human health and the environment. In the extremely unlikely case that impacted water is detected in the monitoring wells below the secondary containment dam, they will be converted to pumping wells and will be used to extract the impacted water and pump it into the reclaim pond where it will be incorporated into the RMP processing plant water supply system, until the compliance is reestablish.

With respect to your comments made as regards a presumptive infringement of the provisions of Government Decision No.351/2005 (“GD 351/2005”), there are several aspects to be taken into consideration. Thus:

1. Firstly, please note that, according to the provisions of art. 6 of GD 351/2005, any activity that might determine the discharge of dangerous substances into the environment is subject to the prior approval of the water management authorities and shall comply with the provisions of the water permit issued in accordance with the relevant legislation.
The GD 351/2005 provides that the water permit shall be issued only after all technical-construction measures are implemented as prevent the indirect discharge of dangerous substances into the underground waters. The maximum discharge limits are expressly provided

under GD 351/2005 and compliance with such is a condition for granting and maintaining the water permit.

In accordance with the provisions of GD 351/2005, the actual discharge limits should be authorized by the relevant authority, such process being understood by the lawmaker in consideration of the complexity and variety of industrial activities, as well as the latest technological achievements.

Therefore, please note that the EIA stage is not intended to be finalized into an overall comprehensive permit, but it represents only a part of a more complex permitting process. Please note that, according with art. 3 of GD 918/2002, the data's level of detail provided in the EIA is the one available in the feasibility stage of the project, obviously making impossible for both the titleholder and authority to exhaust all required technical data and permits granted.

The adequate protection of the ground water shall be ensured by the terms and conditions of the water permit. The issuance of the water permit shall be performed following an individual assessment of the project, considering its particular aspects and the relevant legal requirements applicable for mining activities. Until the water permit is obtained, any allegation regarding the infringement of GD 351/2005 is obviously premature mainly because the water permit shall regulate, in accordance with the relevant legal provisions, the conditions to be observed by the developer as regards the protection of the ground water;

2. Secondly, kindly note that the complexity and specificity of mining projects generated the need of a particular legal framework. Therefore, for such projects, the reading of the legal provisions of a certain enactment should be corroborated with the relevant provisions of the other regulations applicable.

In this respect, please note that the understanding of GD 351/2005 must be corroborated with the provisions of the entire relevant legislation enforceable as regards Roşia Montană Project, with a particular accent to Directive 2006/21/EC on the management of waste from the extractive industries ("Directive 21").

The very scope of Directive 21 is to provide a specific legal framework for the extractive wastes and waste facilities related to mining projects, considering the complexity of such projects and the particular aspects of mining activities that can not always be subject to the common regulations on waste management and landfill.

From this perspective, Directive 21 provides that, an operator of a waste facility, as such is defined thereunder (please note that the TMF proposed by RMGC is considered a "waste facility" under Directive 21), must inter alia, ensure that:

- a) *"the waste facility is [...] designed so as to meet the necessary conditions for, in the short and long-term perspectives, preventing pollution of the soil, air, groundwater or surface water, taking into account especially Directives 76/464/EEC (1), 80/68/EEC (2) and 2000/60/EC, and ensuring efficient collection of contaminated water and leachate as and when required under the permit, and reducing erosion caused by water or wind as far as it is technically possible and economically viable;"*
- b) *"the waste facility is suitably constructed, managed and maintained to ensure its physical stability and to prevent pollution or contamination of soil, air, surface water or groundwater in the short and long-term perspectives as well as to minimize as far as possible damage to landscape."*

In addition, it should be mentioned that RMGC was required by MWEM under the Terms of Reference, to perform the EIA considering the provisions of Directive 21 and the BAT Management of Mining Waste. The Directive 21 was intended by the EU DG of Environment to be the legislative regime applicable to sound management of mining waste throughout Europe and therefore compliance with its provisions is mandatory.

*

Information regarding our Environmental Financial Guarantee ("EFG") is fully discussed in the section of the Environmental Impact Assessment titled "Environmental and Social Management and System Plans" (Annex 1 of the subchapter titled "Mine Rehabilitation and Closure Management Plan"). The EFG is updated annually and will always reflect the costs associated with reclamation. These funds will be held in

protected accounts at the Romanian state disposal.

Roşia Montană Gold Corporation (“RMGC”) has invested significant time, energy, and resources assessing the viability of a mining project in the valley of Roşia Montană. This assessment has led RMGC to conclude that Roşia Montană presents an attractive long-term development opportunity – an opinion confirmed by a variety of lending institutions, who have completed detailed reviews of the project’s design and profitability. We have every confidence that we will see the project through to the end of its projected 16-year lifespan, regardless of any fluctuations in the market price of gold.

In Romania, the creation of an EFG is required to ensure adequate funds are available from the mine operator for environmental cleanup. The EFG is governed by the Mining Law (no. 85/2003) and the National Agency for Mineral Resources instructions and Mining Law Enforcement Norms (no. 1208/2003).

Two directives issued by the European Union also impact the EFG: the Mine Waste Directive (“MWD”) and the Environmental Liability Directive (“ELD”).

The Mine Waste Directive aims to ensure that coverage is available for 1) all the obligations connected to the permit granted for the disposal of waste material resulting from mining activities and 2) all of the costs related to the rehabilitation of the land affected by a waste facility. The Environmental Liability Directive regulates the remedies, and measures to be taken by the environmental authorities, in the event of environmental damage created by mining operations, with the goal of ensuring adequate financial resources are available from the operators for environmental cleanup efforts. While these directives have yet to be transposed by the Romanian Government, the deadlines for implementing their enforcement mechanisms are 30 April 2007 (ELD) and 1 May 2008 (MWD) – thus before operations are scheduled to begin at Roşia Montană.

RMGC has already begun the process of complying with these directives, and once their implementation instruments are enacted by the Romanian Government, we will be in full compliance.

Each EFG will follow detailed guidelines generated by the World Bank and the International Council on Mining and Metals.

The current projected closure cost for Roşia Montană is US \$76 million, which is based on the mine operating for its full 16-year lifespan. The annual updates will be completed by independent experts, carried out in consultation with the NAMR, as the Governmental authority competent in mining activities field. These updates will ensure that in the unlikely event of early closure of the project, at any point in time, each EFG will always reflect the costs associated with reclamation. (These annual updates will result in an estimate that exceeds our current US \$76 million costs of closure, because some reclamation activity is incorporated into the routine operations of the mine.)

A number of different financial instruments are available to ensure that RMGC is capable of covering all of the expected closure costs. These instruments, which will be held in protected accounts at the Romanian state disposal, include:

- Cash deposit;
- Trust funds;
- Letter of credit;
- Surety bonds;
- Insurance policy.

Under the terms of this guarantee, the Romanian government will have no financial liability in connection with the rehabilitation of the Roşia Montană project.

*

The Security Report has been made available for public access by being posted at the following Internet address http://www.mmediu.ro/dep_mediu/rosia_montana_securitate.htm as well as through the printed version which could have been found at several information locations established for public hearings.

*

The Report on the Environmental impact assessment study (EIA) considered all alternative developments, including the option of not proceeding with any project – an option that would generate no investment, allowing the existing pollution problems and socio-economic decline to continue (Chapter 5 – *Assessment of Alternatives*).

The report also considered alternative developments – including agriculture, grazing, meat processing, tourism, forestry and forest products, cottage industries, and flora/fauna gathering for pharmaceutical purposes – and concluded that these activities could not provide the economic, cultural and environmental benefits brought by the Roşia Montană Project (RMP).

Chapter 5 also examines alternative locations for key facilities as well as alternative technologies for mining, processing and waste management, in line with best practice and as compared against published EU best available techniques (BAT) documentation.

*

The impact on protected flora and fauna will exist only locally, but this impact will not lead to the loss of any specie. The Project has been designed even from the beginning to fully comply with the requirements and norms imposed by Romanian and European environmental legislation.

The company believes the fact that the project impact on environment remains significant, especially because covers previous impacts. But, the investments required to ecologically restore/rehabilitate Roşia Montană area in order to address current complex environmental issues, are only achievable following the implementation of some economic projects that will generate and warrant implementation of some direct and responsible actions as a component of base principles of sustainable development concepts. Clean processes and technologies may be developed only in the presence of a solid economic environment fully compliant with the environment that will also resolve previous impacts of anthropic activities.

The base documents of the Project are in fact an unbiased reason of its implementation, considering the highly complex environmental commitment within Roşia Montană area.

Some of the Roşia Montană species that are under a certain protection status stand for an insignificant percentage of the scale of populations estimated at national level. The characterization of species from their habitat point of view exists in the species tables presented in the Biodiversity Chapter of the EIA Report and its annexes, although this is not a requirement imposed by the Habitats Directive. Due to their large volume of information, the annexes of chapter 4.6 Biodiversity can be found in the electronic version of the EIA disclosed by the company both in Romanian and English through approx. 6,000 DVD/CD copies, being accessible on the company website, and on the websites of Ministry of Environment and Water Management, local and regional environmental protection agencies of Alba, Sibiu, Cluj, etc.

From practical point of view, the low value of conservation of the impact area is also indirectly emphasized by the fact that there is no proposal to designate the area a SPA (aviafaunistic special protected area) and by the denial as unfounded of the proposal to designate the area as a pSCI area (sites of community importance).

Taking all these into account, we believe that the proposed Project is compliant with the provisions of EU Directive no. 92/43 Habitats[1], and EU Directive no. 79/409 Birds[2] respectively, especially because within Biodiversity Management Plan, Plan H, several active and responsible measures are provided to reconstruct/rehabilitate several natural habitats, pursuant to the provisions of the same documents [3].

References:

[1] art.3, 2nd paragraph, Each Member State shall contribute to the creation of Natura 2000 (network) in proportion to the representation within its territory of the natural habitat types and the habitats of species referred to in paragraph 1. To that effect each Member State shall designate, in accordance with Article 4, sites as special areas of conservation taking account of the objectives set out in paragraph 1.

art.4, 1st paragraph. On the basis of the criteria set out in Annex III (Stage 1) and relevant scientific information, each Member State shall propose a list of sites indicating which natural habitat types in

Annex I and which species in Annex II that are native to its territory the sites host. For animal species ranging over wide areas these sites shall correspond to the places within the natural range of such species which present the physical or biological factors essential to their life and reproduction. For aquatic species which range over wide areas, such sites will be proposed only where there is a clearly identifiable area representing the physical and biological factors essential to their life and reproduction. Where appropriate, Member States shall propose adaptation of the list in the light of the results of the surveillance referred to in Article 11. [...]

2nd paragraph.[...] Member States whose sites hosting one or more priority natural habitat types and priority species represent more than 5 % of their national territory may, in agreement with the Commission, request that the criteria listed in Annex III (Stage 2) be applied more flexibly in selecting all the sites of Community importance in their territory.[...]

Art. 6, 4th paragraph. If, in spite of a negative assessment of the implications for the site and in the absence of alternative solutions, a plan or project must nevertheless be carried out for imperative reasons of overriding public interest, including those of a social or economic nature, the Member State shall take all compensatory measures necessary to ensure that the overall coherence of Natura 2000 is protected. It shall inform the Commission of the compensatory measures adopted.

Art. 16. Provided that there is no satisfactory alternative and the derogation is not detrimental to the maintenance of the populations of the species concerned at a favourable conservation status in their natural range, Member States may derogate from the provisions of Articles 12, 13, 14 and 15 (a) and (b):[...]

- in the interests of public health and public safety, or for other imperative reasons of overriding public interest, including those of a social or economic nature and beneficial consequences of primary importance for the environment;

[2] Art.4, 1st paragraph. The species mentioned in annex 1 shall be the subject of special conservation measures concerning their habitat in order to ensure their survival and reproduction in their area of distribution. [...]

Trends and variations in population levels shall be taken into account as a background for evaluations. Member states shall classify in particular the most suitable territories in number and size as special protection areas for the conservation of these species, taking into account their protection requirements in the geographical sea and land area where this directive applies.

[3] Directive 92/43 Habitats, art. 2, 2nd paragraph; Directive 79/409 Birds, art. 3, 2nd paragraph, letter c.

*

This statement is ungrounded, because the environmental impact assessment (EIA) process has included preliminary cumulative estimates for stationary motorized equipment and linear (vehicular) sources were prepared in order to provide an initial understanding of the potential cumulative noise and vibration impacts from background and Roşia Montană Project sources, and to guide future monitoring and measurement activities as well as the selection of appropriate Best Management Practices/Best Available Techniques for further mitigation of the potential noise and vibration impacts from Project activities. These preliminary estimates apply to major construction activities, as well as the operation and decommissioning/closure of the mine and process plant. They are documented as data tables and isopleth maps for major noise-generating activities in selected, representative Project years; see **Tables 4.3.8** through **4.3.16** and **Exhibits 4.3.1** through **4.3.9**. All these details related to the applied assessment methodology, the input data of the dispersion model, the modeling results and the measures established for the prevention/mitigation/elimination of the potential impact for all project stages (construction, operation, closure) are included in Chapter 4, Section 4.3 Noise and Vibrations of the EIA Report.

Project Years 0, 9, 10, 12, 14, and 19 were selected for modeling because they are considered to be representative of the most significant levels of noise-generating activity. They are also the same years used for air impact modeling purposes in Section 4.2, as air and noise impacts share many of the same sources or are otherwise closely correlated. In order to more accurately reflect potential receptor impacts, all of

these exhibits integrate the background traffic estimates discussed in Section 4.3.6.1.

The Project site plan and process plant area and facility drawings were used to establish the position of the noise sources and other relevant physical characteristics of the site. Receptor locations were established using background reports and project engineering and environmental documentation provided by RMGC. With this information, the source locations and receptor locations were translated into input (x, y, and z) co-ordinates for the noise-modeling program.

Tables 4.3.8 through 4.3.16 and **Exhibits 4.3.1 through 4.3.9** present the average maximum noise values likely to be experienced by the receptor community over all Project phases after incorporation of a variety of initial mitigation measures designed specifically to reduce the impacts associated with mobile and stationary machinery sources. The influence of non-mining related background (primarily traffic) noise is also included.

To evaluate the sound levels associated with haul trucks and other mobile sources crossing the site carrying excavated ore, waste rock, and soil, a noise analysis program based on the (U.S.) Federal Highway Administration's (FHWA) standard RD-77-108 [1] model was used to calculate reference noise emissions values for heavy trucks along the project roadways. The FHWA model predicts hourly L_{eq} values for free-flowing traffic conditions and is generally considered to be accurate within 1.5 decibels (dB).

The model is based on the standardized noise emission factors for different types and weights of vehicles (e.g., automobiles, medium trucks, and heavy trucks), with consideration given to vehicle volume, speed, roadway configuration, distance to the receiver, and the acoustical characteristics of the site. The emission levels of all three vehicle types increase as a function of the logarithm of their speed.

To evaluate the sound sources from the proposed mine processing facility and the semi-stationary material handling equipment (at the ore extraction, waste rock and soil stockpiling areas), a proprietary computerized noise prediction program was used by AAC to simulate and model the future equipment noise emissions throughout the area. The modeling program uses industry-accepted propagation algorithms based on the following American National Standards Institute (ANSI) and International Organization for Standardization (ISO) standards:

- *ANSI S1.26-1995 (R2004), Method for the Calculation of the Absorption of Sound by the Atmosphere;*
- *ISO 9613-1:1993, Acoustics -- Attenuation of sound during propagation outdoors-- Part 1: Calculation of the absorption of sound by the atmosphere;*
- *ISO 9613-2:1996, Acoustics -- Attenuation of sound during propagation outdoors -- Part 2: General method of calculation;*
- *ISO 3891:1978, Acoustics -- Procedure for describing aircraft noise heard on the ground.*

The calculations account for classical sound wave divergence (i.e., spherical spreading loss with adjustments for source directivity from point sources) plus attenuation factors due to air absorption, minimal ground effects, and barriers/shielding.

This model has been validated by AAC over a number of years via noise measurements at several operating industrial sites that had been previously modeled during the engineering design phases. The comparison of modeled predictions versus actual measurements has consistently shown close agreement; typically in the range of 1 to 3 dB (A).

References:

[1] FHWA Highway Traffic Noise Prediction Model; see Federal Highway Administration Report Number FHWA-RD-77-108, USA, Washington, D.C., 1978.

A detailed presentation of blasting technology can be found in the annex 7.1 - Proposed blasting technology for the operational phase of Roşia Montană Project.

*

The partnership between Gabriel Resources and Regia Autonomă a Cuprului Deva (currently, CNCAF Minvest SA) has been established based on Law no. 15/1990 on the reorganization of the state owned companies as autonomous directions and trade companies, published in the Official Gazette, Section I, no.

98/08.08.1990, as subsequently amended and supplemented. Art. 35 of this law provides the possibility of the regies autonomous to enter into partnerships with legal third parties, Romanian or foreign, for the purpose of setting up new trading companies.

Roşia Montană Gold Corporation SA was set up in 1997, according to the legal provisions in force as at that time, the setting up being made by observing all the conditions imposed by Company Law no. 31/1990 and Trade Register Law no. 26/1990, in regard of the setting up of the joint stock companies with mixed capital.

We underline that the Articles of Associations of Roşia Montană Gold Corporation SA, representing the result of the parties agreement in regard of the terms and conditions under which the partnership between the Romanian state and investor takes place represents a public document, being included in the category of documents which, as per Law no. 26/1990 on the Trade Register, are published in the Romanian Official Gazette and for which the Trade Register is obliged to issue, on the expense of the persons submitting a request, certified copies.

As for the agreement concerning the setting up of the mixed company together with Gabriel Resources Ltd., this has been expressed by the Ministry of Industry and Trade, the conditions imposed by the setting up of the mixed company being the following: (i) ensuring of the jobs at the level existing upon the conclusion of the agreement concerning the setting up of the mixed company; (ii) the expenses incurred by the fulfillment of the exploration stage should be fully supported by Gabriel; (iii) the obtaining of the approval from the ANRM by the Copper Autonomous Direction Deva and (iv) the observance of all legal provisions in force concerning the setting up of the mixed companies with foreign partners. These conditions have been fully complied with as at the setting up of the company and during the development of its activity.

We also specify that the establishing of the shareholders' quotas to the benefits and losses of Roşia Montană Gold Corporation SA has been made by considering their contribution quota to the company's share capital. The current percentage of 80% for Gabriel Resources Ltd. and of 19.31% for CNCAF Minvest SA resulted from the initial contribution and the subsequent contributions of the shareholders to the company's share capital, in consideration also of Gabriel Resources Ltd. advancing all expenses and costs related to the development-exploitation and permitting of the Roşia Montană Mining Project.

The provisions of the Articles of Associations of Roşia Montană Gold Corporation SA on the necessary majority and quorum conditions for the decision-making process within the General Shareholders Meeting and the quotas to the benefits and losses of the company are taken from Law no. 31/1990, and no derogation exists in regard of this aspect.

*

This claim is not true; the Urbanism Plan has been prepared with public consultation.

Roşia Montană Gold Corporation SA (RMGC) has requested and obtained from Alba County Council the Urbanism Certificate no. 78 of 26.04.2006, for the entire Roşia Montană mining project, including the tailings management facility. The Urbanism Certificate also stipulated the preparation of a Zonal Urbanism Plan, to reflect all changes made to the Roşia Montană Project, following the public consultations and debates organized in relation to this project, and the consultations with the permitting authorities. This plan, entitled "Modification of the Zonal Urbanism Plan, Roşia Montană Industrial Area", was prepared and subjected to public debate in June 2006 in accordance with the provisions of Order no.176/N/2000 issued by the Ministry of Public Works and Territory Development for the approval of the technical regulations "Guidelines regarding the methodology applied for the preparation and framework content of the Zonal Urbanism Plan" and, at present, it is pending approval.

Concerning the Roşia Montană General Urbanism Plan approved in 2002, such plan was prepared in parallel with the Zonal Urbanism Plan of 2002, all the provisions of the General Urbanism Plan being also included in the Zonal Urbanism Plan. Also, the approval procedure related to the two urbanism plans was carried out in parallel.

*

Preventive archaeological researches within the Roşia Montană mining project area have been undertaken based on specific techniques, specifically trial trenches in all accessible areas that are suitable for human habitation, taking into account the bibliographical information and the observations recorded during the archaeological survey campaigns, the geophysical studies and the analyses of the photogrammetric flights. In addition, surface investigations were undertaken, where appropriate.

The archaeological researches at Roşia Montană covered a large surface and focused on the areas known to have archaeological potential. THEREFORE, ALL AREAS THAT HAVE BEEN ARCHAEOLOGICALLY DISCHARGED HAD BEEN PREVIOUSLY INVESTIGATED. All research programs, beginning with the 2004 campaign, have been undertaken in full compliance with the current legal requirements, i.e. Ministerial Order no. 2392 of 6 September 2004 on the establishment of the Archaeological Standards and Procedures by the Ministry of Culture and Religious Affairs.

The proposed gold mining project at Roşia Montană has raised a series of issues related to the rescue of the historical-archaeological heritage within the area, as well as issues related to its scientific development and also the enhancement of heritage within a museum. Given the complex difficulties encountered in this respect, the Ministry of Culture and Religious Affairs decided to initiate the "Alburnus Maior" National Research Program.

The company's role was to provide the necessary financial resources for the assessment, research and enhancement of the archaeological remains, in full compliance with the Romanian current legislation. The development of the research and of the archaeological discharge works has been conducted through specific means and methodologies that have been adjusted to the realities of every site researched, in our case, Roşia Montană. They consisted in:

- Archives studies;
- Archaeological surveys; trial trenches;
- aerial reconnaissance/survey and aerial photo interpretation ; high resolution satellite images;
- mining archaeology studies; underground topography and 3D modeling;
- geophysical surveys;
- extensive archaeological investigations in the areas with an identified archaeological potential- this implied carrying out archaeological excavations;
- Interdisciplinary studies- sedimentology, archaeo-zoology, comparative palynology, archaeo-metallurgy, geology, mineralogy;
- Radiocarbon dating and dendrochronology;
- This research and its results were included in an integrated database;
- traditional and digital archaeological topography and development of the GIS project; generate a photo archive- both traditional and digital;
- restoration of artifacts;
- an inventory and a digital catalogue of the artifacts;
- studies conducted by specialists in order to enhance the research results - publication of monographs/scientific books and journals, exhibitions, websites, etc.

All the preventive archaeological researches undertaken at Roşia Montană since 2000 have been carried out as part of a complex research program; permits for preventive archaeological excavations being issued in compliance with the current legislation. These archaeological investigations have been undertaken by representatives of 21 specialized institutions from Romania and 3 others from abroad, under the scientific coordination of the Romanian National Museum of History. All archaeological researches have been conducted in full compliance with the existing legislation. The investigations undertaken during each archaeological research campaign have been approved by the Ministry of Culture and Religious Affairs based on the Annual Archaeological Research Plan approved by the National Commission of Archaeology.

Under the current legislation (Ministerial Order no. 2392 of 6 September 2004 on the establishment of the Archaeological Standards and Procedures by the Ministry of Culture and Religious Affairs) the archaeologists who have conducted the research may ask that an archaeological discharge certificate be granted. Based on a complex research program, the archaeologists prepare comprehensive documentation with regard to the researched area. Upon consideration of the submitted documentation, the National Commission of Archaeology makes a decision as to whether to recommend or not the granting of the

archaeological discharge certificate. In the case of the research conducted in the period 2001-2006, the archaeological discharge certificate was issued directly by the Ministry of Culture and Religious Affairs or by its local agencies.

Preventive archaeological researches at Roşia Montană have allowed the research of five Roman cremation necropolis (Tău Corna, Hop-Găuri, Țarina, Jig - Picioară and Pârâul Porcului – Tăul Secuilor), two funerary areas (Carpeni, Nanului Valley), sacred areas (Hăbad, Nanului Valley), habitation areas (Hăbad, Carpeni, Tăul Țapului, Hop), the most significant being the Roman structures on the Carpeni Hill and the circular funerary monument at Tău Găuri. In addition, for the first time in Romania, surface investigations have been paralleled by underground investigations of Cetate, Cărnăc, Jig and Orlea massifs, with important discoveries in the Piatra Corbului, area, Cătălina-Monulești gallery and the Păru Carpeni mining sector.

The research consisted of aerial photo interpretation, archaeological magnetometric studies, electrical resistivity, palynology, sedimentology, geology studies, radiocarbon and dendrochronology dating. For a better management of the research units and of the archaeological findings, data bases were used, including text and photographs-among which 4 satellite images (an archive satellite image type SPOT Panchromatic (10m) from 1997; 2 satellite images LANDSAT 7 MS (30 m), dating from 2000 and 2003; a satellite image with priority programming SPOT 5 SuperMode color (2,5 m resolution-19 July 2004); all data have been included in a comprehensive GIS program, a first in the Romanian archaeological research.

In the case of archaeological monuments that are located close to industrial facilities, plans have been redesigned to ensure that the archaeological remains in question will not be affected. Where appropriate, the archaeological monument was preserved in situ and restored, i.e. the circular funerary monument at Hop-Găuri (see The "Alburnus Maior" monograph series, volume II, Bucharest, 2004). Another example in this respect is the Carpeni Hill, designated an "archaeological " reserve, and the Piatra Corbului area. In 2004, after being thoroughly investigated, these areas have been included on the List of Historic Monuments. Add to this the areas where ancient mining remains will be preserved, such as the Cătălina Monulești gallery and the mining sector Păru Carpeni, as well as the protected area Roşia Montană Historic Center, including a number of heritage assets (35 historic monument houses).

We emphasise in this respect that the identified and researched structures have been published in preliminary form in the Archaeological Research Chronicle of Romania, after every archaeological research campaign, as well as in volume 1 of the Alburnus Maior monographic series. We mention here the areas where Roman habitation structures have been identified and researched, as well as the references to be consulted for further information: Hop-Găuri, Carpeni, Tăul Țapului (CCA 2001 (2002), p. 254-257, no. 182; 261-262, nr. 185; 264-265, no. 188; 265-266, no. 189. Alburnus Maior I, 2003, p. 45-80; 81-122; 123-148; CCA 2001 (2002), 257-261; CCA 2003 (2004) ,280-283; Alburnus Maior I, 2003, p. 387-431, 433-446, 447-467).

For further details related to the applicable legal framework, the responsibilities of the Project titleholder, or for a detailed description of the preventive archaeological researches undertaken to date and of the Cultural Heritage Management Plans, please see Annex called "Information on the Cultural heritage of Roşia and Related Management Aspects". In addition, the annex includes supplementary information with regard to the result of the researches undertaken as part of the "Alburnus Maior" National Research Program between 2001 and 2006.

In conclusion, the area mentioned by the questioner has been researched in accordance with the Romanian legal requirements, as well as with European standards and practices in the field.

Note that the type of research undertaken at Roşia Montană, known as preventive/rescue archaeological research, as well as other related heritage studies, are done everywhere in the world in close connection with the economic development of certain areas. Both the costs for the research and for the enhancement and maintenance of the preserved areas are provided by investors, in a public-private partnership set up in order to protect the cultural heritage, as per the provisions of the European Convention on the Protection of the Archaeological Heritage (Malta-1992) [1].

References:

[1]The text of the Convention is available at the following address:

<http://conventions.coe.int/Treaty/Commun/QueVoulezVous.asp?NT=143&CM=8&DF=7/6/2006&CL=ENG>

*

In 2000, in the context of the proposal of a new mining project in the Roşia Montană area, the Ministry of Culture and Religious Affairs approved a series of studies to be conducted in order to research the archaeological and architectural heritage of the area. At the end of that year, the Design Centre for National Cultural Heritage (now the National Institute for Historical Monuments) presented the preliminary results of these researches in front of the National Commission for Historical Monuments and of the National Commission of Archaeology. Based on these results, in 2001, the Ministry of Culture and Religious Affairs initiated the “Alburnus Maior” National Research Program (the Order no. 2504 / 07.03.2001 of the Minister of Culture and Religious Affairs) in compliance with the Law 378/2001 (as subsequently amended by Law 462/2003 and by Law 258/2006 and Law 259/2006). Thus, since 2000, the Ministry of Culture and Religious Affairs has fulfilled its duties – directly or through its subordinated institutions - with regard to the management of the issues related to Roşia Montană’s heritage.

The preventive archaeological researches have been conducted by the representatives of 21 national institutions and 3 others from abroad, with a broad expertise in the field. They have been carried out based on the annual approval of the National Commission of Archaeology of the Ministry of Culture and Religious Affairs. In accordance with current legislation, this research program is carried out with financial support provided by RMGC, i.e. the company that plans to expand and continue to mine the gold-silver deposit in Roşia Montană. Thus, large-scale preventive investigations have been conducted or are underway in the RMP impact area. A proposal will be made based on the results of these investigations, either for the archaeological discharge of some researched areas or the preservation in situ of certain representative structures and monuments, in compliance with current legislation. For areas proposed for conservation or for archaeological discharge measures the decision was made based on the surveys conducted by specialists and on the analysis of the results by the National Commission of Archaeology. In the period 2000-2005, the mining project underwent a series of modifications designed to promote the conservation of the local heritage. Examples of this include extending the duration of the field investigations (e.g. in Tarina, Pârâul Porcului, Orlea) and changing the location of some elements of mining infrastructure in order to allow the conservation of the archaeological remains found in the Carpeni, in the Tău Găuri and Pietra Corbului areas.

The architectural and town-planning surveys have been conducted, in accordance with current legislation, by companies certified by the Ministry of Culture and Religious Affairs, while the town-planning documentation drafted by these companies, and the restoration and conservation works undertaken so far, have been approved by the National Commission for Historical Monuments. Thus, the town-planning documentation has been approved and implemented in accordance with current legislation, and the company has agreed to these decisions and modified the mine development plans accordingly:

Extensive ethnographic research was conducted in the Roşia Montană-Abrud-Corna area in the period 2001-2004 coordinated by a team of specialists for the Romanian Village Museum „Dimitrie Gusti” (a National Museum directly under the coordination of the Ministry of Culture and Religious Affairs). Moreover, a broad series of oral history interviews was conducted in the period 2001-2002 by the Romanian Society of Radio broadcasting through the „Gheorghe Brătianu” Oral History Centre, Bucharest (SRR - CIO).

In compliance with the requirements of the Ministry of Environment and Waters Management and the Ministry of Culture and Religious Affairs, specific management plans have been drawn up for the management and conservation of the heritage remains from the Roşia Montană area, in the context of the implementation of the mining project. These plans have been included in the documentation prepared for the report on the Environmental Impact Assessment Study. (see EIA Report, volume 32-33, Plan M-Cultural Heritage Management Plan, part I –Management Plan for the Archaeological Heritage from Roşia Montană Zone; part II-Management Plan for the Historical Monuments and Protected Zone from Roşia Montană; part III- Cultural Heritage Management Plan).

These management plans comprise detailed presentations of the obligations and responsibilities for the protection and conservation of the heritage remains from the Roşia Montană area, which the company has assumed as part of the mining project, in accordance with the decision of the central government. These heritage remains include: archaeological remains above and under the ground, historic buildings, protected areas, intangible heritage assets, cultural landscape items, etc. In this context, it should be noted

that besides the works for the protection and preservation of the archaeological heritage, works are also being carried out for the rehabilitation and conservation of the protected area Historical Centre Roşia Montană (comprising 35 historic buildings, and projects for the restoration of 11 of these buildings are currently being drafted) and at Tăul Mare, Tăul Brazi and Tăul Anghel, plus remains of the surface mining works from the Văidoaia area, and the creation of a modern museum dedicated to the history of mining in the Apuseni Mountains area. This museum will be established including exhibitions of geology, archaeology, industrial and ethnographic heritage as well as an underground section organized around the Cătălina Monuleşti gallery.

Moreover, representatives of the Directorate/Department for Culture, Religious Affairs and National Cultural Heritage of Alba County have paid a number of visits to Roşia Montană in order to collect information and to check the situation. The same administrative body was the intermediary for the acquisitions of historic buildings made by RMGC. The Ministry of Culture and Religious Affairs expressed its pre-emption right regarding the acquisition of these buildings.

It should be mentioned, however, that apart from the obligations undertaken by RMGC as regards the protection and conservation of the archaeological remains and historical monuments, there are also a series of obligations which rest with the local public authorities from Roşia Montană and from Alba County, and with the central public authorities, specifically the Romanian Government. These aspects are detailed in the Cultural Heritage Management Plans included in the EIA Report (see EIA Report, volume 32, Management Plan for the Archaeological Heritage from Roşia Montană Zone, pages 22-24, 49, 55-56, 71-72 and the EIA Report, volume 33- Management Plan for the Historical Monuments and Protected Zone from Roşia Montană pages 28-29, 47-50, 51-53, 65-66, page 103 – Annex 1).

Item no.

33

No. to identify the observations received from the public

No.
110003/
28.08.2006

Proposal

- The questioner does not agree to the Roşia Montană project implementation enumerating few destructive transboundary effects on environment, among which:
- Terrestrial and aquatic ecosystem contamination with cyanides;
 - Local population migration due to the environment degradation;
 - Degradation of the historical monuments from Roşia Montană area.

Solution

We appreciate that there is concern about transboundary impacts and have worked extensively with independent experts and scientists to fully assess all possibilities. These assessments, including a just-completed study of catastrophic failure scenarios by The University of Reading, have concluded that RMGC has no transboundary impact. A full copy of the University of Reading study can be found in the reference documents included as an annex to this report. This report provides an analysis of the water quality of the upper catchments of Roşia Montană and an analysis of the impacts of future mining and collection and treatment operations. A new model INCA-Mine has been developed and the model has been applied to the four upper catchments at Roşia Montană, as well as the complete river system. The model has been used to assess the impacts of the collecting and treating the existing pollution sources as part of the project and shows that significant improvements in water quality in the downstream rivers will be achieved. A key question is the impact of cyanide pollution in the event of an accidental discharge from the tailings dam. This effect has been simulated and it is shown that because of dilution, dispersion and degradation that cyanide concentrations will be below the standards required at the border and in the River Tisza.

The EIA Report (Chapter 10 Transboundary Impacts) assesses the proposed project with regard to potential for significant river basin and transboundary impacts downstream which could, for example, affect the Mures and Tisa river basins in Hungary. The Chapter concludes that under normal operating conditions, there would be no significant impact for downstream river basins/transboundary conditions.

The issue of a possible accidental large-scale release of tailings to the river system was recognized to be an important issue during the public meetings when stakeholders conveyed their concern in this regard. As a result, further work has been undertaken to provide additional detail to that provided in the EIA Report on impacts on water quality downstream of the project and into Hungary. This work includes modelling of water quality under a range of possible operational and accident scenarios and for various flow conditions.

The model used is the INCA model developed over the past 10 years to simulate both terrestrial and aquatic systems within the EUROLIMPACS EU research program (www.eurolimpacs.ud.ac.uk). The model has been used to assess the impacts from future mining, and collection and treatment operations for pollution from past mining at Roşia Montană.

The modelling created for Roşia Montană simulates eight metals (cadmium, lead, zinc, mercury, arsenic, copper, chromium, manganese) as well as Cyanide, Nitrate, Ammonia and dissolved oxygen. The model has been applied to the upper catchments at Roşia Montană as well as the complete Abrud-Arieş-Mureş river system down to the Hungarian Border and on into the Tisa River. The model takes into account the dilution, mixing and physico-chemical processes affecting metals, ammonia and cyanide in the river system and gives estimates of concentrations at key locations along the river, including at the Hungarian Boarder and in the Tisa after the Mures joins it.

Because of dilution and dispersion in the river system, and of the initial EU BAT-compliant technology adopted for the project (for example, the use of a cyanide destruct process for tailings effluent that reduces cyanide concentration in effluent stored in the TMF to below 6 mg/l), even a large scale unprogrammed release of tailings materials (for example, following failure of the dam) into the river system would not result in transboundary pollution. The model has shown that under worst case dam failure scenario all legal limits for cyanide and heavy metals concentrations would be met in the river water before it crosses into Hungary.

The INCA model has also been used to evaluate the beneficial impacts of the existing mine water collection and treatment and it has shown that substantial improvements in water quality are achieved along the river system under normal operational conditions.

For more information, an information sheet presenting the INCA modelling work is presented as Annex 5.1 under the title of the Mureş River Modelling Program together with the full modelling report is presented

Cyanide is used in hundreds of gold mines and in many other industries around the world. At Roşia Montana, the TMF will be constructed to the highest international standards. It will be an environmentally safe construction for permanent deposition of detoxified tailings resulting from ore processing. Sophisticated equipment will be used for geotechnical and water level monitoring. Because detoxification will take place before the tailings are deposited to the TMF, they will contain very low concentrations of cyanide (5-7ppm) which is below the regulatory limit of 10ppm recently adopted in the EU Mine Waste Directive for discharge to storage ponds.

The cyanide used in operations will be carefully handled according to EU guidelines and safely contained. Cyanide rapidly breaks down to harmless substances under normal atmospheric conditions, i.e. it is short-lived in the environment. The cyanide used in the project will be subject to a cyanide destruct process and residual cyanide deposited with the process tailings in the Tailings Management Facility will degrade rapidly. This system of use and disposal of cyanide in gold mining is classed as Best Available Techniques by the EU.

For further information, please see Chapter 3.0 of Plan F, "The Tailings Facility Management Plan" of the EIA and Chapter 6 of Plan F, for description of the comprehensive monitoring program that will be established to confirm that the design and operational parameters are being met.

*

Population has been declining in Roşia Montană for several decades, not unlike other areas in Romania, in large part due to economic decline. Those who remain must live with impacts of historic pollution from poor mining practices. The Roşia Montană Project (RMP) will address economic, social and environmental issues with positive impacts for Roşia Montană and surrounding communities.

For more information, please see Roşia Montană Sustainable Development and the Roşia Montană Project – annex 4.

*

Please note the fact that none of the buildings classified as historical monuments, within the Roşia Montană Project area will be affected; all 41 historical buildings will be included in an extensive rehabilitation and restoration program (see the Environmental Impact Assessment Study, vol. 33, Plan M, Management Plan for the Historical Monuments and the Protected Zone of the Roşia Montană area, pages 76-94). The undertaking of such program is mandatory, irrespective of the project's implementation, or else the houses will completely deteriorate, given their current dilapidated state.

RMGC currently owns 14 buildings classified as historical monuments. These buildings have been acquired in accordance with the provisions of Law 422/2001 on the protection of historical monuments, as last amended. They were in different conditions when acquired, this aspect being reflected in the sale-purchase agreements and documented by photographic records taken at their acquisition and up to the present day. It should be noted that between 2000 and 2002 the Design Centre for the National Cultural Heritage (CPPCN), currently known as The National Institute for Historical Monuments and, later on, S.C. OPUS S.R.L., an architecture company, undertook a comprehensive inventory of all archaeological heritage assets within the Roşia Montană commune. The process involved updating the analytical record cards of each building classified as historical monument, as well as making observations on their state of preservation.

Law 422/2001, article 38 stipulates the obligations of owners of buildings classified as historical monuments, both natural and legal persons. Further information on the owners' duties, to which RMGC is fully committed, are included in the annex to this document. It is the owner's immediate duty to

maintain the historical building in good condition. Therefore, in 2003, as soon as the acquisition process began, the company created a team made up of 10 people with construction-related qualifications. This team is in charge of the permanent maintenance of these houses. The people employed have been trained on the job, so as to become acquainted with the legislation in the field and with the interventions allowed in the case of historical monuments. So far the team has taken all the necessary legal measures to ensure the preservation of the historical monuments owned by RMGC within the Roşia Montană commune or at least to maintain them in their original state, when bought by the company. As a first measure, the historic buildings acquired by RMGC have been subjected to remedial works such as: roof repair works (meant to prevent deterioration caused by rain infiltration), installation of downpipes and gutters to prevent rainwater from infiltrating into the building's foundation or walls, usual repair works, repair works to the surrounding fences and "moors" (ancient walls traditional in Roşia Montană) and disposal of domestic waste piled up over the years. This team performs an ongoing and sustained activity. The specific activities conducted to date include:

- the erection of a supportive scaffolding outside the historic building no. 372 so as to prevent it from tilting (Approval no. 142/2004);
- historic building no.392, initially used as a habitation area, has been turned into an office space (Approval no. 453/2004)
- the building authorization for the house no. 325 was obtained (Approval no. 25/27.10.2006), in accordance with law 422/2001. Although the building has not been classified as a historical monument, it is situated in the centre of the Roşia Montană protected area (permit). This building will be restored in accordance with the legal provisions of the Romanian Ministry of Culture and Religious Affairs and will host an Information and Exhibitions Centre.

Mention should be made that the company has nearly completed the engineering documentation necessary for the restoration of 11 historic buildings within the Roşia Montană area, prepared in accordance with the regulations issued by the Ministry of Culture and Religious Affairs, to be submitted for approval by the Local Commission for Historical Monuments.

As for the Protected Zone from Roşia Montană, it will cover over 130 ha and will include 35 historical monuments and other local architectural assets (restored and enhanced). A modern mining museum is proposed to be established at Roşia Montană. The museum will include geology, archaeology, ethnography exhibitions (including an open-air section), industrial heritage exhibitions, as well as a significant underground part organized around the Cătălina Monuleşti gallery. In this part of Roşia Montană, the company plans to promote the development of traditional tourism activities (e.g. guest houses; small pubs). East and south-east of the historical centre there are a number of historic lakes: Tăul Mare, Tăul Brazi and Tăul Anghel. This area is suitable for modern, recreational tourism. However, any proposal submitted by the company in this respect should be endorsed by the local community and approved by the authorities.

The company does not want to turn this area into a museum; the overall plan is that this part of the community continues to be lived in by local people or, in the case of the buildings purchased by RMGC, by the company's employees involved in the future mining operations. Job opportunities and tourism-related small businesses are to be developed in the area.

The company wants to protect and promote all these heritage assets. Therefore, special measures will be taken both inside the protected area Historical Centre of Roşia Montană (restoration-consolidation-conservation) and in the industrial area (special blasting techniques, buffer zones between the 2 areas, permanent monitoring of vibrations and the blasting adjusted to the waves' propagation speed, etc.). As publicly stated in the EIA Report, once the Roşia Montană Mining Project is approved, all historical monument buildings in Roşia Montană, owned by RMGC, will be included in a comprehensive restoration and conservation program. Should any historic buildings remain under the ownership of various institutions or individuals, upon their consent, RMGC will finance the restoration of the buildings, in full compliance with the specific relevant regulations issued by the Ministry of Culture and Religious Affairs. In the coming years, if the Roşia Montană project is implemented, the company plans to allocate USD 3,385,000 for conservation, restoration and maintenance works to be undertaken in the Protected Zone Historical Centre of Roşia Montană as well as for the historical buildings located outside this area.

To date, RMGC has complied with all its legal obligations as owner of historical monument buildings. By taking into account the data and conclusions set out in the Management Plan for the historical monuments and protected zones within Roşia Montană, included in the EIA Report, RMGC plans to

continue this responsible approach and to ensure the financial resources necessary for the conservation and restoration of the historic buildings and of the Rosia Montană Historic Centre. All interventions on these buildings will be carried out in compliance with the current legal provisions, based on the conclusions set out in the technical review of the historic buildings within Roşia Montană, undertaken by the Bucharest Technical University of Civil Engineering - the National Centre for Earthquake Engineering and Vibrations, between 2005 and 2006.

For further information on the studies and modeling conducted by the Bucharest Technical University of Civil Engineering and IPROMIN with regard to the special measures necessary for the mitigation of the impacts caused by blasting on the historic buildings, please consult the corresponding annex.

Item no.

34

No. to identify the observations received from the public

No.
114516/
13.09.2006

Proposal

The questioner opposes the proposed project at Roşia Montană and makes the following observations and comments :

- This is no a durable development project, but a project of durable environment destruction;
- The project implementation would affect gravely the biodiversity;
- The foreseen barrage does not present guarantees in extreme situations;
- The way in which the provisions of GD 351 and 352 regarding the interdiction to discharge dangerous substances into the aquatic environment are observed is not specified;
- The project affects the archeological area unique in world and of a great historical and cultural value;
- The EIA report does not assess the "Zero Alternative";
- There is no a description of the measures recommended by BAT for the occurrence prevention of the acid waters.

A starting premise to this context is that RMGC is committed to ensuring that the Roşia Montană Project (RMP) will be a catalyst for local and regional economic development. It is recognised that, as with any major industrial development, impacts will be positive and negative. RMGC commits to work alone and in partnership to ensure that beneficial impacts will be maximised. RMGC will priorities a participatory approach wherever possible and will seek guidance from local and regional authorities and from the community when deciding on issues that may impact the area's development. Negative impacts will be mitigated through measures as described in the EIA report.

RMGC recognizes that in order to ensure it meets its sustainable development commitments it must support, as a minimum, five key interrelated areas that make up the three traditional pillars of sustainable development - social, environmental and economic. These areas are presented below as five capitals of sustainable development.

RMGC has developed its Sustainable Development Policy [1] in support of this and this is presented further on in this annex. Supporting elements are also presented, as are a set of Authority, Community, and Company initiatives within the Roşia Montană Sustainable Development Partnerships and Programs.

Solution

1. Five Capitals of Sustainable Development

Financial Capital

Economic Development Impact, fiscal management, taxes

- Average of 1200 jobs during construction over 2 years, the majority of which sourced locally
- 634 jobs during operations (direct employment including contracted employment for cleaning, security, transportation, and other), for 16 years, most of which sourced locally
- Some 6000 indirect jobs for 20 years, locally & regionally [2]
- US\$ 1billion in profit share, profit tax, royalties and other taxes and fees to Romanian local, regional & national government
- US\$ 1.5 billion procuring goods & services. US\$ 400 million during construction (2 years) and US\$ 1.1 billion during production, from Romania (16 years)

To further promote and develop the economic opportunities presented by the RMP, RMGC is also cooperating with local stakeholders regarding setting up their own businesses:

- The set up of a micro-credit finance facility in the area to allow access to affordable financing
- The set up of a business centre and incubator units, offering mentoring, training (entrepreneurial, business plans, fiscal & administrative management, etc), legal, financial & administrative advice to promote local & regional business development both to service the RMP but also to encourage entrepreneurship in preparation of the post-mining sustainable development needs,

Physical Capital

Infrastructure – including buildings, energy, transport, water and waste management facilities

- Increases in revenue to government agencies, of the order of US\$ 1 billion over 20 years (construction + production + closure) will result in additional money the government may allocate to improving community infrastructure
- RMGC will also develop the resettlement sites of Piatra Albă and Dealul Furcilor in Alba Iulia. Piatra Albă will contain a new civic centre, commercial and residential areas. These will be transferred to the local authorities once complete. The RRAP contains full details of these initiatives

Human Capital

Health and education

- A private dispensary & health clinic in Piatra Albă (see RRAP), accessible to wider community through health insurance
- Upgrading of a wing of Abrud hospital, accessible to the wider community through the national Romanian health system
- Improvement of mobile emergency medical system in the area
- The building of a new school, residential & civic centre in Piatra Albă. This is fully described in the RRAP
- Health awareness campaigns (in partnership with local authorities & NGOs) covering: reproductive health, diet, and lifestyle amongst others
- Partnerships with education providers & NGOs concerning access to & improvement of education facilities in the area, e.g.: the NGO and local authorities lead CERT Educational Partnership (www.certapusen.ro).

Social Capital

Skills training, community relationships and social networks and the institutional capacity to support them, preservation of cultural patrimony

- Efforts to develop and promote Roşia Montană's cultural heritage for both locals and tourism – RMGC is a partner in the Roşia Montană Cultural Heritage Partnership (info@rmchp.ro)
- Providing adult education opportunities and skills enhancement including training programs, funds and scholarships, to increase employment chances both direct with RMGC and indirect – RMGC is a partner in the Roşia Montană Professional and Vocational Program (info@rmpvtp.ro)
- Programs assisting vulnerable people & groups, and to consolidate social networks particularly in Roşia Montană – RMGC is a partner in the Roşia Montană Good Neighbour Program lead by local NGO ProRoşia (info@rmgnp.ro)
- RMGC supports a NGO-lead partnership working with the youth in the area to improve and increase the capacity of the community (www.certapusen.ro).

Natural Capital

Landscape, biodiversity, water quality, ecosystems

- Measures contained in the RMP management plans and SOPs will result in mitigation of environmental impacts and conditions as identified in the EIA.
- The improved environmental condition will enhance the quality of life in Roşia Montană.
- Training & assistance in integrating environmental considerations into business plans.
- Awareness-building regarding positive environmental performance of business activities.
- Environmental standards associated with loans through the micro-credit finance facility including monitoring of environmental performance.
- Business Code of Conduct requiring suppliers to RMP to comply with RMGC's environmental performance standards.

RMGC's view of the social and economic benefits of the RMP is described in the Community Sustainable Development Plan and EIA Chapter 4.8 – the Social and Economic Environment.

In order to achieve its commitments, RMGC acknowledges that it needs to collaborate with the Community, Authorities and civil society on issues that impact the area's development. This approach allows the Community to own, direct and control all relevant development issues in a multi-stakeholder and integrated manner.

In the spirit of that commitment, to date, RMGC has conducted extensive consultations, including 1262 individual meetings and interviews, and the distribution of questionnaires for which over 500 responses have been received, 18 focal group meetings, and 65 public debates, in addition to holding discussions with government authorities, non-governmental organisations and potentially affected stakeholders. Feedback has been used in the preparation of the Management Plans of the RMP's Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) as well as the drafting of the Annex to the EIA.

Support of the area's sustainable development will be conducted within the framework of Partnership as promoted by organisations such as the United Nations Development Program (UNDP). For example, future socio-economic impacts mitigation and enhancement measures will be conducted under the guidance of the Roşia Montană Socio-Economic Research Centre (info@rmserc.ro), which in turn is partnered with the local authorities. This will allow a transparent evaluation of the effectiveness of sustainable development support and will provide a forum to implement necessary improvements.

Other sustainable development support partnerships are presented under the section entitled Roşia Montană Sustainable Development Programs and Partnerships further in this annex (www.rmsdpps.ro).

Beyond immediate direct and indirect benefits, the presence of the RMP as a major investment improves the area's economic climate, that will in turn encourage the development of non-mining activities. It is expected that the improved investment and economic climate will lead to business opportunities that can develop concurrent with the RMP, even as they extend well beyond economic activities related directly to mining operations. This diversification of economic development is a critical benefit of the investments generated to realise the RMP.

References:

[1] This is an updated version of the policy already presented in the EIA management plans – it has been improved following feedback during public consultation.

[2] Economists have argued that the multiplier effect for the RMP is in the order of 1 Direct job to 30 Indirect Full Time Job Equivalents over twenty years – the methodology used may be available via a direct request to RMGC. However, the more conservative 1 : 10 Direct : Indirect figure is used here to maintain consistency with internationally accepted multiplier effects for large mining projects in impoverished regions, such as mentioned in UNCTAD (2006) Commodity policies for development: a new framework for the fight against poverty. TD/B/COM.1/75, Geneva, Switzerland. From experience, this is also the number most often quoted in Canada.

*

The impact on the protected flora and fauna will be obvious only at local level, and it will not lead to the disappearance of any species. The mining project was conceived from the onset so as to comply with the conditions and standards stipulated by the Romanian and European legislation in the field of environmental protection.

The company believes that the environmental impact generated by proposed project remains significant the more so as it will add to the pre-existing ones. But the required investments for the ecological restoration/rehabilitation of the Roşia Montană area meant to solve complex environmental issues existing at present can be developed only after the implementation of economic projects able to generate and ensure that direct and responsible measures are taken, as part of the principles that represent the basis for the sustainable development concepts. The presence of a strong economic system is the key for the implementation of clean economic processes and technologies, in full respect of the environment, which are able to remove the previous effects generated by human activities.

The documentation drafted to support this mining project represents an objective justification for its implementation given that the company has assumed the environmental responsibility, which is extremely complex in the Roşia Montană area.

Some of species existing at Roşia Montană that are under a certain protection status represent an insignificant percentage from populations estimated at national level. The characterization of species from their habitat point of view exists in the species tables presented in the Biodiversity Chapter of the EIA

Report and its annexes, although this is not a requirement imposed by the Habitats Directive. Given the large amount of information contained, these tables are available in the electronic format of the EIA. 6000 DVD/CDs comprising the EIA Report have been made available to the public both in English and in Romanian. Moreover, the EIA is also available on RMGC's website as well as on the websites of the Ministry of Environment and Waters Management and of the Local and Regional Environment Protection Agencies of Alba County, Cluj County and Sibiu County, etc.

From practical point of view, the low value of conservation of the impact area is also indirectly emphasized by the fact that there is no proposal to designate the area a SPA (aviafaunistic special protected area) and by the denial as unfounded of the proposal to designate the area as a pSCI area (sites of community importance).

Taking all these into account, we believe that the proposed Project is compliant with the provisions of EU Directive no. 92/43 Habitats[1], and EU Directive no. 79/409 Birds[2] respectively, especially because within Biodiversity Management Plan, Plan H, several active and responsible measures are provided to restore/rehabilitate several natural habitats, pursuant to the provisions of the same documents [3].

References:

[1] art.3, 2nd paragraph, Each Member State shall contribute to the creation of Natura 2000 (network) in proportion to the representation within its territory of the natural habitat types and the habitats of species referred to in paragraph 1. To that effect each Member State shall designate, in accordance with Article 4, sites as special areas of conservation taking account of the objectives set out in paragraph 1.

art.4, 1st paragraph. On the basis of the criteria set out in Annex III (Stage 1) and relevant scientific information, each Member State shall propose a list of sites indicating which natural habitat types in Annex I and which species in Annex II that are native to its territory the sites host. For animal species ranging over wide areas these sites shall correspond to the places within the natural range of such species which present the physical or biological factors essential to their life and reproduction. For aquatic species which range over wide areas, such sites will be proposed only where there is a clearly identifiable area representing the physical and biological factors essential to their life and reproduction. Where appropriate, Member States shall propose adaptation of the list in the light of the results of the surveillance referred to in Article 11. [...]

2nd paragraph.[...] Member States whose sites hosting one or more priority natural habitat types and priority species represent more than 5 % of their national territory may, in agreement with the Commission, request that the criteria listed in Annex III (Stage 2) be applied more flexibly in selecting all the sites of Community importance in their territory.[...]

Art. 6, 4th paragraph. If, in spite of a negative assessment of the implications for the site and in the absence of alternative solutions, a plan or project must nevertheless be carried out for imperative reasons of overriding public interest, including those of a social or economic nature, the Member State shall take all compensatory measures necessary to ensure that the overall coherence of Natura 2000 is protected. It shall inform the Commission of the compensatory measures adopted.

Art. 16. Provided that there is no satisfactory alternative and the derogation is not detrimental to the maintenance of the populations of the species concerned at a favorable conservation status in their natural range, Member States may derogate from the provisions of Articles 12, 13, 14 and 15 (a) and (b):[...]

- in the interests of public health and public safety, or for other imperative reasons of overriding public interest, including those of a social or economic nature and beneficial consequences of primary importance for the environment;

[2] Art.4, 1st paragraph. The species mentioned in annex 1 shall be the subject of special conservation measures concerning their habitat in order to ensure their survival and reproduction in their area of distribution. [...]

Trends and variations in population levels shall be taken into account as a background for evaluations. Member states shall classify in particular the most suitable territories in number and size as special

protection areas for the conservation of these species, taking into account their protection requirements in the geographical sea and land area where this directive applies.

[3] Directive 92/43 Habitats, art. 2, 2nd paragraph; Directive 79/409 Birds, art. 3, 2nd paragraph, letter c.

*

The proposed dam at the Tailings Management Facility (TMF) and the secondary dam at the catchment basin are rigorously designed to exceed Romanian and international guidelines, to allow for significant rainfall events and prevent dam failure due to overtopping and any associated cyanide discharge, surface or groundwater pollution.

Specifically, the facility has been designed for two Probable Maximum Precipitation (PMP) events and the associated Probable Maximum Flood (PMF). The design criterion for TMF includes storage for two PMF flood events, more rain than has ever been recorded in this area. The construction schedule for embankment and basin staging will be completed to ensure that PMP storage requirements are available throughout the project life. In addition, an emergency spillway for the dam will be constructed in the unlikely event that another event occurs after the second PMP event. A spillway is only built for safety reasons to ensure proper water discharge in an unlikely event and, thus, avoid overtopping which could cause a dam breach. The TMF design therefore very significantly exceeds required standards for safety. This has been done to ensure that the risks involved in using Corna valley for tailings storage are well below what is considered safe in every day life.

Additional study was done regarding earthquakes, and, as indicated in the EIA the TMF is engineered to withstand the Maximum Credible Earthquake which could be projected to occur during the life of the Roşia Montană Project.

*

With respect to your comments made as regards a presumptive infringement of the provisions of Government Decision No.351/2005 ("GD 351/2005"), there are several aspects to be taken into consideration. Thus:

1. Firstly, please note that, according to the provisions of art. 6 of GD 351/2005, any activity that might determine the discharge of dangerous substances into the environment is subject to the prior approval of the water management authorities and shall comply with the provisions of the water permit issued in accordance with the relevant legislation.

The GD 351/2005 provides that the water permit shall be issued only after all technical-construction measures are implemented as prevent the indirect discharge of dangerous substances into the underground waters. The maximum discharge limits are expressly provided under GD 351/2005 and compliance with such is a condition for granting and maintaining the water permit.

In accordance with the provisions of GD 351/2005, the actual discharge limits should be authorized by the relevant authority, such process being understood by the lawmaker in consideration of the complexity and variety of industrial activities, as well as the latest technological achievements.

Therefore, please note that the EIA stage is not intended to be finalized into an overall comprehensive permit, but it represents only a part of a more complex permitting process. Please note that, according with art. 3 of GD 918/2002, the data's level of detail provided in the EIA is the one available in the feasibility stage of the project, obviously making impossible for both the titleholder and authority to exhaust all required technical data and permits granted.

The adequate protection of the ground water shall be ensured by the terms and conditions of the water permit. The issuance of the water permit shall be performed following an individual assessment of the project, considering its particular aspects and the relevant legal requirements applicable for mining activities. Until the water permit is obtained, any allegation regarding the infringement of GD 351/2005 is obviously premature mainly because the water permit shall regulate, in accordance with the relevant legal provisions, the conditions to be observed by the developer as regards the protection of the ground water.

2. Secondly, kindly note that the complexity and specificity of mining projects generated the need of a particular legal framework. Therefore, for such projects, the reading of the legal provisions of a certain enactment should be corroborated with the relevant provisions of the other regulations applicable.

In this respect, please note that the understanding of GD 351/2005 must be corroborated with the provisions of the entire relevant legislation enforceable as regards Roşia Montană Project, with a particular accent to Directive 2006/21/EC on the management of waste from the extractive industries (“Directive 21”).

The very scope of Directive 21 is to provide a specific legal framework for the extractive wastes and waste facilities related to mining projects, considering the complexity of such projects and the particular aspects of mining activities that can not always be subject to the common regulations on waste management and landfill.

From this perspective, Directive 21 provides that, an operator of a waste facility, as such is defined thereunder (please note that the TMF proposed by RMGC is considered a “waste facility” under Directive 21), must inter alia, ensure that:

- a) *“the waste facility is [...]designed so as to meet the necessary conditions for, in the short and long-term perspectives, preventing pollution of the soil, air, groundwater or surface water, taking into account especially Directives 76/464/EEC (1), 80/68/EEC (2) and 2000/60/EC, and ensuring efficient collection of contaminated water and leachate as and when required under the permit, and reducing erosion caused by water or wind as far as it is technically possible and economically viable;”*
- b) *“the waste facility is suitably constructed, managed and maintained to ensure its physical stability and to prevent pollution or contamination of soil, air, surface water or groundwater in the short and long-term perspectives as well as to minimize as far as possible damage to landscape;”*

In addition, it should be mentioned that RMGC was required by MWEM under the Terms of Reference, to perform the EIA considering the provisions of Directive 21 and the BAT Management of Mining Waste. The Directive 21 was intended by the EU DG of Environment to be the legislative regime applicable to sound management of mining waste throughout Europe and therefore compliance with its provisions is mandatory.

An engineered liner is included in the design of the Tailings Management Facility (TMF) basin to be protective of groundwater. Specifically, the Roşia Montană Tailings Management Facility (TMF or “the facility”) has been designed to be compliant with the EU Groundwater Directive (80/68/EEC), transposed as Romanian GD 351/2005. The TMF is also designed for compliance with the EU Mine Waste Directive (2006/21/EC) as required by the Terms of Reference established by the MEWM in May, 2005. The following paragraphs provide a discussion of how the facility is compliant with the directives.

The TMF is composed of a series of individual components including:

- the tailings impoundment;
- the tailings dam;
- the secondary seepage collection pond;
- the secondary containment dam;
- the groundwater monitoring wells/extraction wells located downstream of the Secondary Containment dam.

All of these components are integral parts of the facility and necessary for the facility to perform as designed.

The directives indicated above require that the TMF design be protective of groundwater. For the Roşia Montană project (RMP), this requirement is addressed by consideration of the favorable geology (low permeability shales underlying the TMF impoundment, the TMF dam, and the Secondary Containment dam) and the proposed installation of a low-permeability (1×10^{-6} cm/sec) recompacted soil liner beneath the TMF basin. Please see Chapter 2 of EIA Plan F, “The Tailings Facility Management Plan” for more information.

The proposed low permeability soil liner will be fully compliant with Best Available Techniques (BAT) as defined by EU Directive 96/61 (IPPC) and EU Mine Waste Directive. Additional design features that are

included in the design to be protective of groundwater include:

- A low permeability (1×10^{-6} cm/sec) cut off wall within the foundation of the starter dam to control seepage;
- A low permeability (1×10^{-6} cm/sec) core in the starter dam to control seepage;
- A seepage collection dam and pond below the toe of the tailings dam to collect and contain any seepage that does extend beyond the dam centerline;
- A series of monitoring wells, below the toe of the secondary containment dam, to monitor seepage and ensure compliance, before the waste facility limit.

In addition to the design components noted above specific operational requirements will be implemented to be protective of human health and the environment. In the extremely unlikely case that impacted water is detected in the monitoring wells below the secondary containment dam, they will be converted to pumping wells and will be used to extract the impacted water and pump it into the reclaim pond where it will be incorporated into the RMP processing plant water supply system, until the compliance is reestablish.

*

Note that the implementation of the mining project does not involve the destruction or abandonment of archaeological heritage assets in the area of Roşia Montană commune and full consideration has been given to their existence there. Based on the specialist reports and publications, the Roman galleries at Roşia Montană are considered important, but not unique. Thus, a catalog of ancient mining works in Transylvania and Banat – developed as part of the Environmental Impact Assessment Study for Roşia Montană – states that it is difficult to justify a claim that the Roşia Montană site is unique, at least in the context of Roman mining operations throughout the Empire, and particularly in Dacia Province. There are at least 20 other sites of relatively similar characteristics – some of which, including Ruda Brad, Bucium – the Vulcoi Corabia and the Haneş – Amlaşul Mare areas, have already provided real data on archaeological remains comparable to the ancient *Alburnus Maior* and discount claims for the uniqueness of the site.

Prior to 1999, the Roman galleries at Roşia Montană were not researched by mining archeology specialists, although their existence had been known for over 150 years. In practice, before 2000, this type of archaeological remains was unknown from scientific research, the references connected to these being in most of the times empirical. Neither the surface archaeological were better known the real sense of the word, but information originated from chance finds occasioned by agricultural and construction works.

Mining archeology research conducted – since 1999 – by a multi-disciplinary specialist team from the University of Toulouse Le Mirail (France), and coordinated by Dr. Beatrice Cauuet aimed to develop – as a first in Romania – a detailed study of this type of archaeological remains, i.e. old mining galleries of Roman and later periods. Extensive research and heritage studies conducted during 200-2006 helped create a comprehensive image of these the national cultural heritage assets, and to adopt specific measures in regard to their protection.

The study of these structures therefore meant better knowledge and documented decision making in regard to their conservation and enhancement. Based on the results of research conducted to date (and finalized for Cetate, Cârnic, Jig and ongoing in Orlea), it was decided to preserve and enhance the following areas of old mining works:

- the Cătălina Monuleşti Gallery – located in the Historic Center of Roşia Montană, where the most important cache of wax tablets and an ancient mine drainage system had been found in the past;
- mining sector Păru Carpeni – located in the south-eastern part of Orlea, where a successive chamber drainage system equipped with Roman wooden installations (wheels, channels, etc.) was discovered;
- the Piatra Corbului area – located in the south-western part of Cârnic, and preserving traces of fire and water mining operations of ancient and medieval age;
- the Văidoaia area – north-west of Roşia Montană village, preserving areas of ancient open cast mining.

Preventive archaeological research conducted in 2001-2006 helped define and research 13 archaeological sites, for some of which – once exhaustive research work was finalized – the decision was to apply the archaeological duty of care removal procedures, while for others it was decided to apply on site

conservation – the funerary precinct at Tăul Găuri, the Roman relics on Dealu Carpeni; Orlea area will be researched in detail during the 2007-2012 period.

As for the historic mining galleries of the Roman period discovered in the mining sectors of Cătălina Monulești and Păru Carpeni, comprehensive rehabilitation, reinforcement and development works have been planned, in order help preserve them in situ and develop them for tourism. This decision was based on the value of the archaeological remains preserved in the galleries, i.e. the wooden Roman installations built for the drainage of mine water during the Roman Age (the so-called Roman wheels). At the same time, the gallery at Cătălina Monulești is renowned for being the one where – in mid 19th century – the most significant cache of waxed tablets was discovered (according to the sources in the historical archives they were 11 of the 32 artifacts of this kind known to date).

Most of the ancient mining works in Cărnic mountain, as well as other mining sectors, are only accessible in difficult conditions, to specialists, and are partly inaccessible to the public at large. Moreover, safety regulations governing similar activities in the museums of the European Union, and which will become law for Romania as well, are not compatible with the conversion of the Roman galleries, inherently exposed to high risk factors, to a space available to tourists. Note that there will be comparable Roman gallery sections that will be preserved on site. As an impact mitigation measure, apart from the full research and publication of research results, the specialists considered it appropriate to develop a 3D graphic model of these structures, and 1:1 replicas within the proposed mining museum at Roșia Montană.

As an alternative, the elaboration of a specialty study was taken into account in order to evaluate the costs needed for the integral preservation and introduction into the tourism circuit of the galleries situated in Cărnic massif. Thus, the necessary investments in order to arrange and maintain the public tourism in this massif rise at an amount unjustified from economic point of view (see the informative brochure entitled *Costs Estimate for the Development of Ancient Mining Networks from Cărnic* elaborated by British companies Gifford, Geo-Design and ForkersLtd).

For the Orlea area (the only one where ancient mining relics have been classified to date, i.e. under HML 2004 Roman mining operations at Alburnus Maior, Orlea area cod LMI AB-I-m-A-00065.02), research has only been of a preliminary nature so far. Detailed research of this area is planned for 2007-2012, and when this research is finalized the necessary measures under the law will have to be taken, either to conserve some sections on site, or to apply the archaeological duty of care removal procedure for others. Detailed information on random archaeological discoveries and preliminary archaeological research (both above and underground) in the area of Orlea Hill was published in the Environmental Impact Assessment Study for the Roșia Montană Project, vol. 6 – Cultural Heritage Baseline Study, Annex I p. 219-222. Also note that the study further states: “As Project development in Orlea area has been scheduled for a later date, as of 2007, surface archaeological investigations will focus on this area. Thus, the building activities involved in Project implementation can not be initiated before archaeological investigations carried out under the Romanian legal provisions and international recommendations and practice have been finalized. (Cultural Heritage Baseline Study, vol. 6, p. 46).

Within the Orlea Massif from Roșia Montană, a Mining Museum was established in 1980. In this mining perimeter a series of well preserved galleries were arranged and separated by concrete walls towards the mining works which assured the access. The Orlea galleries have a characteristic trapezoidal profile, similarly with the mining works from Cărnic and other mining sector from Roșia Montană. Also, these ancient works suffered in time successive “reshaping”, respectively the taking again having in regard the mining of new ore reserves. These mining works destroyed parts from these ancient remains. Moreover, their preservation state falls into disrepair due to the recent mining works which used drilling – blasting technology, a fact leading to the rock destabilization and destroying of the underground mining remains. The removal of the rockfill from the ancient mining works during the mining archaeological investigations represents another factor contributing to the degradation of the ancient mining works. The degradation of the preservation condition of the mining remains of all ages is accelerated also by the closure of the mining operation managed by Minvest (June 01 2006), which assured, at a minimum level, the global drainage of the system of galleries of the Roșia Montană mine. The closure of a mining activity, according to the national norms in force, implies an extremely wide range of preservation measures, but at Roșia Montană the extractive activity purely and simply was stopped, the mine being abandoned. After few months from abandon, the main gallery of the mine water drainage, namely the Sf. Cruce from Orlea

gallery is in a critic condition. In fact, the mine water silted the drainage ways longer than several kilometers. In the case when this mining heritage will be only “frozen” without to take maintenance measures, having in regard their preservation for the next generations, the result will be disastrous. All still existing remains will disappear due to the underground falling and flood. An edifying example consists – unfortunately – from the “Roman steps” from Brad (Roman remains also listed by Law 5/2000) where these became inaccessible when the maintenance works ceased.

Considering the importance of the cultural heritage at Roşia Montană and current legislation, the heritage research budget allocated for 2001-2006 by S.C. Roşia Montană Gold Corporation S.A. amounted to more than 10 million US\$. Moreover, based on the research results, the specialist opinions and competent authority decisions, the budget estimated by the Company for the research, conservation and restoration of the cultural heritage at Roşia Montană in future years, provided the Project is implemented, will be US\$ 25 million, as disclosed in the Environmental Impact Assessment of May 2006 (see EIA Report vol. 32, Archaeological Heritage Management Plan for Roşia Montană area, p. 84-85). Therefore, the intention is to continue work in Orlea area, and especially to create a **modern Mining Museum with geological, archaeological, industrial and ethnographic heritage** displays, and the development of tourist access to the **Cătălina-Monuleşti** gallery and to the monument at **Tău Găuri**, as well as to **preserve and restore the 41 historic monument buildings and the protected area of Roşia Montană Historic Center**.

In order to get some information on the historic of the researches and of the main discoveries related to historic galleries at Roşia Montană, as well as to get to know the conclusions of the experts regarding this issue, and also the assessments for a tourist route dedicated to historic mining structures from the Carnic Massif or the opinions formulated in 2004 by Edward O’Hara – General Rapporteur on Cultural Heritage within the Parliamentary Assembly of Europe Council; we ask you to read the annexes entitled “Information on the Cultural Heritage of Roşia Montană and Related Management Aspects” and “Costs Estimate for the Development of Ancient Mining Networks from Cărnăc”, as well as the annexed version in Romanian language of the O’Hara report. Detail information regarding the complex issue of the study on ancient mining activities from Roşia Montană, of the results of these researches and their development perspectives, they are all available in the Environmental Impact Assessment Study for the Roşia Montană Project, volume 6 – Baseline conditions page 32, 35-58, 83-109.

In conclusion, we note that there is no question of destroying the archaeological remains at Roşia Montană, or of merely replacing them with replicas. Research of this type – known as preventive/rescue archaeological research – is done everywhere in the world in relation to economic development of areas, and the costs thereof, as well as the costs of enhancing and maintaining the preserved areas, have to be provided by the investors, which leads to the establishment of a public private partnership in the protection of cultural assets, as provided by the European Convention of Malta (1992) on the protection of the archaeological heritage [1].

It is worth stressing that, apart from the obligations RMGC has committed to in protecting and preserving archaeological remains and historic monuments, there are a number of obligations that relate to both the local government authorities in Roşia Montană and Alba County and to the central government authorities, i.e. the Romanian State. The Cultural Heritage Management Plans included in the EIA Study Report provide clarification of such aspects (see EIA Report, vol. 32, Management Plan for the Archaeological Heritage at Roşia Montană p. 22-24, 49, 55-56, 71-72 and EIA Report, vol. 33, Management Plan for the Historic Monuments and Protected Areas at Roşia Montană p. 28-29, 47-50, 51-53, 65-66, p. 103 – Annex 1).

All these publicly assumed commitments of the Company are described in detail in the EIA Report, vol. 33, Cultural Heritage Management Plan.

References:

[1] The text of this Convention is available on website:

<http://conventions.coe.int/Treaty/Commun/QueVoulezVous.asp?NT=143&CM=8&DF=7/6/2006&CL=ENG>

*

The Report on the Environmental impact assessment study (EIA) considered all alternative developments, including the option of not proceeding with any project – an option that would generate no investment,

allowing the existing pollution problems and socio-economic decline to continue (Chapter 5 – *Assessment of Alternatives*).

The report also considered alternative developments – including agriculture, grazing, meat processing, tourism, forestry and forest products, cottage industries, and flora/fauna gathering for pharmaceutical purposes – and concluded that these activities could not provide the economic, cultural and environmental benefits brought by the Roşia Montană Project (RMP).

Chapter 5 also examines alternative locations for key facilities as well as alternative technologies for mining, processing and waste management, in line with best practice and as compared against published EU best available techniques (BAT) documentation.

*

Based on the evaluation of the mining project, the extraction pits contain approximately 256.9 million tonnes of waste rock, and the tailings – ore ratio is of 1.2:1. The rock in the crushed rock pits and the waste rock obtained from the extraction preparation activities will be used, as required, in the construction of the tailings management facility dam in Valea Corna and other embankments. If the waste rock will not be necessary for construction activities, it will be transported to the Cetate and/or Cărnic TMFs, and by transfer mining, to the depleted pits (mainly Cărnic, Orlea and Jig). BAT [1] stipulates the use of transfer mining if there's an excavation where the waste rock can be economically stockpiled.

In order to minimize the formation of ARD, S.C Roşia Montana Gold Corporation S.A will implement a waste segregation and waste encapsulation strategy which is described in the following:

- Waste rock dumps will be piled up using a combination of end-dumping and stackdumping. End-dumping will be used for the dumps basements and for the outer rim of the dump, where the NAG material will be used, while stack-dumping, which leads to higher compaction, will be used for the inner parts of the dump, where the PAG material will be deposited. The compaction associated with stack-dumping minimizes exposure to oxygen and water around the body of compacted PAG material. Stackdumping allows the use a relatively thin cover system without strict requirements to be applied on the waste dumps.
- End-dumped PAG material will be deposited in a small section along the outer rim of the waste dumps and covered with a less permeable cover system than the (larger) NAG portion where the water balance and oxygen ingress is less of a concern. Wherever technologically feasible, PAG material which is end-dumped according to the mine plan will be covered and encapsulated with NAG material which is rehandled after the end of the operations phase, in order to minimize the amount of sub-soil and top-soil needed for a more elaborate cover.
- The material which will be backfilled to the open pits will be sorted in a way which PAG material will predominantly be placed at the bottom of the backfill or be covered by at least 10 m of NAG material, so that oxygen contact with the PAG material is minimized.

More details on the waste segregation strategy are contained in the *Mine Rehabilitation and Closure Plan* of the EIA.

References:

[1] Best Available Techniques for Management of Tailings and Waste-Rock in Mining Activities. EUROPEAN COMMISSION, DIRECTORATE-GENERAL JRC JOINT RESEARCH CENTRE, Institute for Prospective Technological Studies, Technologies for Sustainable Development, European IPPC Bureau, Final Report, July 2004 (<http://eippcb.jrc.es/pages/FActivities.htm>).

Item no.

35

No. to identify the observations received from the public

No.
116015/
08.12.2006

Proposal

The questioner does not agree to the Roşia Montană Project and formulates the following remarks and comments:

- the opinion of the scientists against the project must be taken into consideration;
- if the project will be implemented and the cyanide will be utilized, the ecological disaster which will occur in Apuseni Mountains must be taken into account;
- as a result of the mountain stripping, noxious radiations might occur;
- the richness of the Romanian people should not be exploited, for a song, by foreigners because the next generations would remain without nothing;
- The Government members should go to the area and take measures of infrastructure rehabilitation and tourism promotion;
- Strong assurances against the seepages from the tailings management facility and the cyanide vapors which may cross the boundary can not be given;
- Why is the decision of the Alba Iulia law court, which renders void the archeological discharge certificate, not observed?

Solution

The views of scientists have been fully considered throughout the public consultation process. We value the suggestions we have received during the public consultation process, including from members of the Romanian Academy and other scientists.

The most recent position of the Romanian Academy regarding the Roşia Montană project (RMP) was made public on February 27, 2006, almost three months before the submission of the Environmental Impact Assessment Study Report (EIA) to the Ministry of Environment and Water Management (MMGA), while statements from other scientists date back well before 2006.

RMGC made changes to the project design based on issues raised by stakeholders, including scientists, notably a reduction in the size of several proposed pits as well as enhancing sustainable development activities, and a stronger commitment to preservation of cultural patrimony including a reduced impact on local churches, before submission of the EIA. Thus the position of the scientists does not reflect the changes to the project design or an analysis of the EIA that was actually submitted to MMGA.

Further, it is important to remember that the EIA was prepared by over 100 consultants, (certified) experts and Romanian and foreign specialists, including members of the Romanian Academy.

*

The affirmation lacks of substance. The proposed technology for mining and process is successfully applied by over 400 mines worldwide, and the detoxification process in over 90 similar projects worldwide and it was patented 30 years ago; in Europe, this procedure works successfully in more than 5 mines (please see BREF document [1] for examples).

The Project is designed in accordance to the new European Directive (2006/21/EC) for the management of mining waste. This imposes, that for new mining projects, the cyanide concentration in tailings be less than 10 parts per million (ppm), at the point of discharge.

The cyanide is extremely toxic, and therefore its manufacturing, transport, handling and neutralization must be handled with care. However, the cyanide has a great advantage for the environment because it breaks down quickly (biodegradation under UV light) becoming inert under normal weather conditions, and the compounds resulting from the degradation, hydrolysis, adsorption processes taking place in the TMF are very stable (basically, these compounds become inert within the environment in the TMF once the process tailings are stored); there is no possibility of bio-accumulation, for example of mercury or

heavy metals. This Project will implement the Best Available Techniques (BAT) for gold recovery and waste management (we refer here to waste resulting from mining and processing) and will comply with the European Directive for cyanide content mining waste.

The cyanide used for the ore processing will be handled / stored in compliance with the EU standards and the provisions of the International Code for the Management of the Cyanide (ICMC-www.cyanidecode.org); it will be safely kept on the processing plant site in order to prevent any accidental spillage. The cyanide and its compounds will be subject to INCO detoxification procedure (DETOX) – this procedure is considered the Best Available Technique (BAT) as per BREF document; the process tailings will be discharged into the TMF in accordance with EU Directive 2006/21/CE on the management of mining waste.

RMGC complies with the International Code for the Management of Cyanide, which requires the use of the best management practice for cyanide. RMGC will purchase the cyanide from a producer which will also comply with this Code.

The Section 4.3 „*Alternatives for leaching agents*” of Chapter 5 (*Alternatives*) of the EIA includes an assessment of the alternatives with regards to the use of cyanide in consideration to the environmental protection and cost-efficiency, and implementation in the processing. The conclusion was that the use of the cyanide represents the best available technique (BAT) in accordance to the definition accepted by the European Union.

References:

[1] Best Available Techniques for Management of Tailings and Waste-Rock in Mining Activities. EUROPEAN COMMISSION, DIRECTORATE-GENERAL JRC JOINT RESEARCH CENTRE, Institute for Prospective Technological Studies, Technologies for Sustainable Development, European IPPC Bureau, Final Report, July 2004 (<http://eippcb.jrc.es/pages/FActivities.htm>)

*

No. There are no radioactive ore deposits within area. According to the measurements carried out by The National Research – Development Institute for Environmental Protection – ICIM Bucharest, the environment radioactivity is situated within the natural background limits, in the context in which the Roşia Montană gold and silver mining in open pit began in the Cetate open pit in 1970 (until now the height of Cetate peak has decreased with about 300 m, as compared to its initial altitude due to the ore mining) and has also been extended to the Cărnic open pit. The ore mining and processing activities in Cetate and Cărnic open pits were performed by CNCAF MINVEST SA Deva – a Roşiamin subsidiary, continually, during the period 1970 – 2006.

*

As related to your comment, please consider the following aspects:

According to art. 44 (1) of the Order of the Minister of Waters and Environmental Protection no. 860/2002 regarding the environment impact assessment and the issuance of environmental agreement procedures *”during the public debate meeting the project titleholder [...], provides grounded answers to the justified proposals of the public, which were received under a written form, previously to the respective hearing”;*

At the same time, art. 44 (3) of Order no. 860/2002 provides that *” based on the results of the public debate, the relevant authority for the environmental protection evaluates the grounded proposals/comments of the public and requests to the titleholder the supplementation of the report on the environmental impact assessment study with an appendix comprising solutions for the solving of the indicated issues”.*

Please note that the Environmental Impact Assessment Study Report (EIA) indicates that the existing baseline conditions are characterized by widespread water pollution and the presence of large areas of derelict mined land and waste heaps. This presents a serious impediment to development other than that proposes under the Project. Remediation of the area would be very expensive and certainly beyond the means of the local community. However, Chapter 5 of the EIA Report (*Assessment of the Alternatives*) examines alternative options for the Roşia Montană Project (“RMP”) including the “no-project” option.

The EIA considered alternative developments that include agriculture, grazing, meat processing, tourism, forestry and forest products, cottage industries, and flora/fauna gathering for pharmaceutical purposes. It concluded that none of these industries could provide the economic stimulus to assure sustainable prosperity for local communities as is forecast for the RMP. However, it also noted that the Project would not halt development of alternative industries in parallel and would indeed remove some of the current obstacles for sustainable development, such as pollution and land dereliction. The Project would therefore support the community's initiatives to develop industries other than mining and this is central to the *Community Sustainable Development Management Plan* attached to the EIA report (Plan L). Additional supplementary information/study materials completed since the submittal of the EIA, reflecting comments received during the public consultation process, further expands on our community sustainable development efforts, has been included as reference documents to the Annex 4 – Roșia Montană Sustainable Development Programs and Partnerships.

As for the claim that Romania is somehow losing its richness “for a song”, please note that, as at the end of 2006, RMGC had invested over US\$ 200 million, and the company expects to invest nearly US\$1 billion before production begins, all part of US\$ 2.5 billion infused into Romanian Economy. The direct financial benefit to the Romanian State, at the local, county, and national level is projected to be US\$ 1.0 billion. This includes the government's share of profits, profit taxes, royalties and other taxes such as payroll taxes. An additional US\$ 1.5 billion of Romanian goods and some services will be acquired by the project, including US\$ 400 million during construction (2 years) and US\$ 1.1 billion during production, from Romania (16 years).

*

With respect to your comment, please note that according to art. 44 (1) of the Order of the Minister of Waters and Environmental Protection no. 860/2002 regarding the environment impact assessment and the issuance of environmental agreement procedures (“Order no. 860/2002”) *“during the public debate meeting the project titleholder [...], provides grounded answers to the justified proposals of the public, which were received under a written form, previously to the respective hearing”*;

At the same time, art. 44 (3) of Order no. 860/2002 provides that *“based on the results of the public debate, the relevant authority for the environmental protection evaluates the grounded proposals/comments of the public and requests to the titleholder the supplementation of the report on the environmental impact assessment study with an appendix comprising solutions for the solving of the indicated issues”*.

Considering the legal wordings quoted above, as your allegation (i) does not identify nor indicate issues related to the project initiated by Roșia Montană Gold Corporation (RMGC) and undergoing the environment impact assessment procedure (EIA), (ii) refers to decisional capacities under the competence of certain public authorities, issues to which RMGC is not in the position to answer, we mention that the project titleholder cannot provide an answer in this respect.

However, the questioner's concern – doing something positive for the Rosia Montana region, be it tourism or other development – is understandable and commendable.

We would like to underline that the Roșia Montană Project (RMP) will infuse so much economic activity into the region and Romania as a whole.

As an illustration of the economic concept of Foreign Direct Investment – in which non-national companies undertake economic risk with benefits to the host company - this project will provide many benefits to Romania. RMGC has been working on this project since 1998 and has invested over \$200 million to date. By the time production begins, the company will have invested almost \$1 billion. Mining is a high risk industry; it is an industry rule of thumb that for every 1000 projects considered, 100 merit drilling, and only one is opened as an actual productive mine. In fact, no country in the developed world is currently involved directly in assuming the risk of mining operations; instead, private capital assumes the risk and will bring best available techniques (BAT) to Romania. Approval of this project will show the world that Romania welcomes this type of productive foreign investment. The profits from the mine and the jobs provided by the mine are tangible benefits to Romania – on the order of USD \$2.5 billion over the life of the mine infused into the Romanian economy.

*

The designs for the Tailings Management Facility (TMF) have considered seepage from the dam and the tailings basin. The designs are compliant with the EU Groundwater Directive (80/68/EEC), transposed as Romanian GD 351/2005. The TMF is also designed for compliance with the EU Mine Waste Directive (2006/21/EC) as required by the Terms of Reference established by the MEWM in May, 2005. The following paragraphs provide a discussion of how the facility is compliant with the directives.

The TMF is composed of a series of individual components including:

- the tailings impoundment;
- the tailings dam;
- the secondary seepage collection pond;
- the secondary containment dam; and
- the groundwater monitoring wells/extraction wells located downstream of the Secondary Containment dam.

All of these components are integral parts of the facility and necessary for the facility to perform as designed.

The directives indicated above require that the TMF design be protective of groundwater. For the Roșia Montană Project (RMP), this requirement is addressed by consideration of the favorable geology (low permeability shales underlying the TMF impoundment, the TMF dam, and the Secondary Containment dam) and the proposed installation of a low-permeability (1×10^{-6} cm/sec) recompacted soil liner beneath the TMF basin. Please see Chapter 2 of EIA Plan F, "The Tailings Facility Management Plan" for more information.

The proposed low permeability soil liner will be fully compliant with Best Available Techniques (BAT) as defined by EU Directive 96/61 (IPPC) and EU Mine Waste Directive. Additional design features that are included in the design to be protective of groundwater include:

- A low permeability (1×10^{-6} cm/sec) cut off wall within the foundation of the starter dam to control seepage;
- A low permeability (1×10^{-6} cm/sec) core in the starter dam to control seepage;
- A seepage collection dam and pond below the toe of the tailings dam to collect and contain any seepage that does extend beyond the dam centerline;
- A series of monitoring wells, below the toe of the secondary containment dam; to monitor seepage and ensure compliance, before the waste facility limit.

In addition to the design components noted above specific operational requirements will be implemented to be protective of human health and the environment. In the extremely unlikely case that impacted water is detected in the monitoring wells below the secondary containment dam, they will be converted to pumping wells and will be used to extract the impacted water and pump it into the reclaim pond where it will be incorporated into the RMP processing plant water supply system, until the compliance is reestablish.

With respect to cyanide, it is used in hundreds of gold mines and in many other industries around the world. At Roșia Montană, the Tailings Management Facility (TMF) will be constructed to the highest international standards. It will be an environmentally safe construction for permanent deposition of detoxified tailings resulting from ore processing. Because detoxification will take place before the tailings are deposited to the TMF, they will contain very low concentrations of cyanide (5-7ppm) which is below the regulatory limit of 10ppm recently adopted in the EU Mine Waste Directive for discharge to seepage ponds.

The cyanide used in operations will be carefully handled according to EU guidelines and safely contained. Tailings deposited in the TMF will be treated to contain cyanide levels below the new EU directive of 10 parts per million (ppm), and well below international standards of 50 ppm. Cyanide rapidly breaks down to harmless substances under normal atmospheric conditions, i.e. it is short-lived in the environment. The cyanide used in the project will be subject to a cyanide destruct process and residual cyanide deposited with the process tailings in the Tailings Management Facility will degrade rapidly. This system of use and disposal of cyanide in gold mining is classed as Best Available Techniques

by the EU.

We appreciate that there is concern about transboundary impacts and have worked extensively with independent experts and scientists to fully assess all possibilities. These assessments, including a just-completed study of catastrophic failure scenarios by The University of Reading, have concluded that the Roşia Montană Project has no transboundary impact. A full copy of the University of Reading study can be found in the reference documents included as an annex to this report. This report provides an analysis of the water quality of the upper catchments of Roşia Montană and an analysis of the impacts of future mining and collection and treatment operations. A new model INCA-Mine has been developed and the model has been applied to the four upper catchments at Roşia Montană, as well as the complete river system. The model has been used to assess the impacts of the collecting and treating the existing pollution sources as part of the project and shows that significant improvements in water quality in the downstream rivers will be achieved. A key question is the impact of cyanide pollution in the event of an accidental discharge from the tailings dam. This effect has been simulated and it is shown that because of dilution, dispersion and degradation that cyanide concentrations will be below the standards required at the border and in the River Tisza.

As part of the EIA development a series of air quality models were developed to assess air quality during the construction, operations, and closure phases of the project. These studies indicated that concentrations were generally low and fell below the limit values in the populated areas. The initial air dispersion modelling only considered the TMF decant pond, but considered both the summer and winter periods. The breakdown of metal-cyanide complexes to HCN is slow enough in the TMF, that volatilisation from the tailings beach is not considered. The maximum 1-hour averages in air at ground level are less than 400 µg/m³ compared to a commonly applied limit of 5,000 µg/m³. This limit is taken from the American Conference of Governmental Industrial Hygienists (ACGIH). This limit is often considered too conservative as a ceiling limit. The Board of Directors of the International Cyanide Management Institute has announced their intent to evaluate cyanide air limits for the Cyanide Code Implementation Guidance document of the International Cyanide Code (http://www.cyanidecode.org/whatnew/Revision_Standard.pdf). The modification being evaluated would establish an 11,000 µg/m³-ceiling limit (equivalent to 10 ppm) and maintain the 5,000 µg/m³ (4.7 ppm) limit as an exposure limit for a continuous 8-hour period.

Maximum HCN concentrations volatilised from the Roşia Montană TMF are indicated to be more than an order of magnitude below these limits directly above the source area, and more than two orders of magnitude lower outside of the site boundaries.

Another consideration is the “rainout” of HCN from the air, in which the rain would contain elevated cyanide. HCN uptake in precipitation is a very minor component of HCN fate in the atmosphere (Mudder, et al., 2001). Atmospheric concentrations of HCN are not very soluble in water, and rainout does not effectively reduce atmospheric HCN concentrations (Cicerone and Zellner, 1983). By inference and because of the low predicted atmospheric HCN concentration, concentrations of cyanide in rainfall are unlikely to be measurable above background in and around the Roşia Montană Project area.

For details regarding issues on the cyanide use in technological process, on cyanide balance, and on emissions and cyanide effects on the air quality: EIM Report, Chapter 2, Chapter 4.1 and Chapter 4.2.

*

We assume that the question refers to the decision of the Court of Appeals of Alba Iulia on the annulment of the archaeological discharge certificate for Cărnic massif. This was not a final decision. The case was referred to the High Court of Cassation and Justice of Romania, which sent it to the Court of Appeals of Braşov for review. Consequently, the case is currently on the roll of the Court of Appeals of Braşov.

We would like to complete this juridical information stating that ample preventive archaeological investigations and connected specialty studies were carried out so far in the Cărnic massif, and the its integrity is not threatened.

Most of the ancient mining works in Cărnic mountain, as well as other mining sectors, are only accessible

in difficult conditions, to specialists, and are partly inaccessible to the public at large. Moreover, safety regulations governing similar activities in the museums of the European Union, and which will become law for Romania as well, are not compatible with the conversion of the Roman galleries, inherently exposed to high risk factors, to a space available to tourists. Note that there will be comparable Roman gallery sections that will be preserved on site. As an impact mitigation measure, apart from the full research and publication of research results, the specialists considered it appropriate to develop a 3D graphic model of these structures, and 1:1 replicas within the proposed mining museum at Roşia Montană.

As an alternative, the elaboration of a specialty study was taken into account in order to evaluate the costs needed for the integral preservation and introduction into the tourism circuit of the galleries situated in Cărnic massif. Thus, the necessary investments in order to arrange and maintain the public tourism in this massif rise at an amount unjustified from economic point of view (see the informative brochure entitled *Costs Estimate for the Development of Ancient Mining Networks from Cărnic* elaborated by British companies Gifford, Geo-Design and ForkersLtd).

Item no.

36

No. to identify the observations received from the public

No.
116056/
11.12.2006

Proposal

The questioner does not agree to the implementation of the Roşia Montană project formulating the following remarks and comments:

- Within EIA, there are no presented all the possible risks caused by this project;
- The overall costs for mine closure are not realistic;
- There isn't until now an approved Zonal Urbanism Plan for the Protected Areas;
- The phase of public consultation and quality evaluation of the impact assessment study report begun without a valid urbanism certificate;
- Information about the foundation which RMGC will establish and subsidize is not given. This foundation follows to assume the obligations which the mining operation can not assume;
- The present urbanism plans of the Roşia Montană commune do not correspond with the mining project proposal described in EIA;
- There is no liner proposed for the tailings pond;
- The proposed waste deposits will be not constructed according to the legislation in force;
- No financial guarantees have been stipulated;
- There is not a Safety Report submitted for the public consultation and evaluation by the competent authorities;
- The EIA report does not assess the "zero alternative";
- The Project poses a threat for protected flora and fauna;
- The EIA report does not refer to the impact on the listed heritage buildings of noise and vibrations caused by the mining operations;
- The public/ONGs wish to consult the contracts and agreements between Company and Romanian State;
- The Urbanism Plan has been modified without public consultation;
- From archeological point of view, the area proposed to be occupied by project was not legally investigated;
- It disputes the spiritual and architectural monuments, including the responsible involvement of the Institutions of the State in the protection program.

Solution

It is the nature of risk that it can be mitigated and diminished; it cannot be made to disappear. In order to put this into context, the common action of walking on the street or developing everyday activities have an accident potential. This accident potential is twice higher than within the framework of industrial activities that use hazardous substances.

In the larger sense, the entire EIA report is focused on the assessment of impacts and their associated mitigation. Specifically, Chapter 4 of the EIA presents that impact assessment of the project. The following discussion presents a summary of the impact discussed in the EIA.

As far as natural and technological risks assessments are concerned, Chapter 7, "Risk Cases", from the Report on Environmental Impact Assessment, emphasizes the fact that safety and prevention measures, the implementation of the environmental management and risk systems are mitigating the consequences to acceptable levels as compared to the most restrictive norms, standards, the best practices or national and international recommendations in the field. The risk level has been established as moderate and so, socially acceptable. The extension of the risk assessment and the intensity of the prevention and mitigation measures of the consequences should be proportionate to the risk involved. Selection of a specific mitigation technique is depends on the analyzed accident scenario.

More detailed assessments are conducted for accident scenarios that, based on the qualitative assessment are found to be potentially major, of probability more than 10^{-6} (reduced recovery periods of 1/1,000,000) meaning that they could have major consequences therefore, elevated associated risk, a higher risk level than 9 to 12 (on a scale of 1-25). To put this in context, simply living in southern Florida rates a 1 - 25 on

the risk scale.

A global assessment of the risks associated with the Roşia Montană Project is obtained by the quick environmental and health risk assessment methodology initially developed by the Italian Ministry of the Environment and the World Health Organization. Natural hazard and risk identification and analysis presents key data and information in assessing potential technological accidents. Thus:

- in designing the Tailings Management Facility, the design parameters were chosen to fully cover the characteristic seismic risk of the area. These seismic design parameters adopted for the TMF and other facilities on the proposed site result in a safety factor much greater than the minimum accepted under the Romanian and European design standards for such facilities;

- in the sector physically impacted by the Project, the risk of floods will remain very low due to the small catchments (controlled by the Roşia and Corna Streams) the area affected by the operation, and the creation of containment, diversion and drainage hydro-technical structures for storm waters on the site, and in the Abrud catchment in general;

- risks caused by meteorological events have been reviewed and used in assessing the hazards of the affected technological processes.

From the analysis of morphometrical parameters and their correlation with other sets of information on the natural slopes on and near the site shows that the (qualitatively estimated) landslide occurrence risk is low to moderate and its consequences will not cause major impacts on the structural components of the Project.

There is no significant risk associated with resource depletion. Mining activities are planned judiciously, so as to extract only the profitable gold and silver resources and only the necessary construction rock for the Project. The management of the mining concession site will minimize reserve "sterilization" (limitation of future access to the reserves).

In assessing technological hazards and risks, the quantity of hazardous substances on the site was calculated as a total and by category, as provided by the *Notification Procedure* approved by Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry, Water and Environment (MAFWE) Order 1084/2003. Based on an evaluation of hazardous substances in stock on the Project site in relation to the relevant quantities provided by the Government Decision 95/2003 which transposes the Seveso Directive, the Project ranges between the upper and the lower limits, and therefore S.C. Roşia Montană Gold Corporation S.A. is required to prepare a Report on Environmental Impact Assessment Study to be sent to the local environmental authority and the local civilian protection authority a *Safety Report* on its operations to prevent major accident risks.

In assessing the consequences of major accidents involving dangerous substances, physical-mathematical models accepted internationally and especially at EU level, and the current version of the SLAB (Canada) software have been used, the latter for the atmospheric dispersion of denser than air gases, that may handle a multitude of situations and scenarios. Similarly, the EFFECTSGis 5.5 (Netherlands) software, developed for the analysis of the effects of industrial accidents and of consequences. Several scenarios were considered in response to the internal legislative requirements, especially related to the implementation of the Internal Emergency Plans (GD 647/2005). The conclusions of the risk assessment for major accidents were:

- The total destruction of plant facilities may only be caused by terrorist attack with classic or nuclear weapons. Simultaneous damage to the HCl tank (including containment) and to the NaCN solution tank, the tanks containing enriched solution, to one or more leaching tanks, having as a result HCN dispersion into the air. At the same time, under certain situations and weather conditions unfavorable for dispersion, people within 40 m of the emission source, surprised by the toxic cloud for more than 1 minute without respiratory protection equipment, will most certainly die. It may also be considered that, on a radius of about 310 m, persons exposed for more than 10 minutes may suffer serious intoxications that may also lead to death. Toxic effects may occur in persons up to about 2 km downwind of the process plant;

- Operating errors and/or failures in the measurement and control devices, resulting in a lower pH in the leaching tank, thickener and/or DETOX slurry and accidental emissions of hydrocyanic acid. The area affected by concentrations of 290 ppm over a 10 min exposure time is within a circle of 36 m radius and the 50 ppm IDLH threshold for 30 min exposure will be reached over an area of 157.5 m radius. The center of these circles is the middle of the CIL tanks platform;

- Accidental HCN emission from the decanter. The accident may be caused by a drop of pH in the

CIL tanks combined with an overdose of flocculent solution and faulty pH monitoring systems. The area affected by concentrations of 300 ppm over a 10 min exposure time is within a circle of 65 m radius and the 50 ppm IDLH threshold for 30 min exposure will be reached over an area of 104 m radius. The center of these circles is mid-distance between the two DETOX facilities;

- Accidental HCN emission from the DETOX facility. The accident may be caused by a drop of pH in the reactors generated by an overdose of metabisulfite solution and/or copper sulphate combined with faulty pH monitoring systems. The area affected by high 1900 ppm concentrations for a 1 min exposure time is located within a 10 m radius circle. The area affected by concentrations of 300 ppm over a 10 min exposure time is within a circle of 27 m radius and the 50 ppm IDLH threshold for 30 min exposure will be reached over an area of 33 m radius. The center of these circles is mid-distance between the two DETOX facilities;

- Explosion of the LPG storage tank. The LPG storage tank has a 50 ton capacity and is located outdoors, near the heating plant. The simulation was conducted for the worst case scenario, considering an explosion of the full tank. Threshold I with heat 12.5 kW/m² is within a 10.5 m radius circle and Threshold II, of heat radiation 5 kW/m² is within a circle of 15 m radius;

- Damage and/or fire at the fuel tanks. Simulations were conducted for the worst case scenarios, considering ignition and combustion of all the diesel (fire in the tank, or in the containment vat, when full of diesel);

- Corna Dam break and breach development. Two credible accident scenarios were considered in simulating tailings flow out of the Tailings Management Facility, and six credible scenarios for the flow of decant water and tailings pore water, with significant effects on the terrestrial and aquatic ecosystems, in different weather conditions;

- Tailings flow may occur along Corna Valley, on a 800 m (starter dam break) or over 1,600 m reach should the Corna dam break in its final stage;

- In regard to water quality impacts, cyanide concentrations in the water in the shape of a pollution plume may reach Arad, near the Romanian-Hungarian border on the Mures River, in concentrations ranging between 0.03 and 0.5 mg/L. Due to inherent mathematical limitations in the models, these values and the accident effects are considered overestimated. Therefore, the results describe the “worst case scenario” based on extreme dam break assumptions for the Corna Dam.

A new and much more precise and realistic simulation has been subsequently established based on the INCA Mine model, that considers the dispersion, volatilization and breakdown of cyanides during the downstream movement of the pollutant flow (Whiteland et al., 2006).

The model used is the INCA model developed over the past 10 years to simulate both terrestrial and aquatic systems within the EUROLIMPACS EU research program (www.eurolimpacs.ucl.ac.uk). The model has been used to assess the impacts from future mining, and collection and treatment operations for pollution from past mining at Roşia Montană.

The modeling created for Roşia Montană simulates eight metals (cadmium, lead, zinc, mercury, arsenic, copper, chromium, manganese) as well as Cyanide, Nitrate, Ammonia and dissolved oxygen. The model has been applied to the upper catchments at Roşia Montană as well as the complete Abrud-Arieş-Mureş river system down to the Hungarian Border and on into the Tisa River. The model takes into account the dilution, mixing and physical-chemical processes affecting metals, ammonia and cyanide in the river system and gives estimates of concentrations at key locations along the river, including at the Hungarian Boarder and in the Tisa after the Mureş joins it.

Because of dilution and dispersion in the river system, and of the initial EU BAT-compliant technology adopted for the project (for example, the use of a cyanide destruct process for tailings effluent that reduces cyanide concentration in effluent stored in the TMF to below 6 mg/l), even a large scale unprogrammed release of tailings materials (for example, following failure of the dam) into the river system would not result in transboundary pollution. The model has shown that under worse case dam failure scenario all legal limits for cyanide and heavy metals concentrations would be met in the river water before it crosses into Hungary.

The INCA model has also been used to evaluate the beneficial impacts of the existing mine water collection and treatment and it has shown that substantial improvements in water quality are achieved along the river system under normal operational conditions.

For more information, an information sheet presenting the INCA modeling work is presented under the title of the Mureş River Modeling Program and the full modeling report is presented in Annex 5.1:

- Development of HCN on the tailings pond surface. Simulated emissions of HCN from the Tailings Management Facility pond surface and of their dispersion into the ambient air show that the level of $400\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ hourly average and $179\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ 8hr average will not be exceeded. These HCN concentrations are only slightly over the odor threshold (0.17ppm) and much below potentially dangerous concentrations;

- Cetate Dam break and breach development. Flood modeling was in case of a break in Cetate dam was based on the design parameters obtained from the hydrometeorological study "Assessment of rainfall intensity, frequency and runoff for the Roşia Montană Project - Radu Drobot". The breach characteristics were predicted using the BREACH model, and the maximum height of the flood wave in various flow sections was modeled using the FLDWAV software. The assumptions included a total $800,000\text{ m}^3$ discharge for one hour, when the peak of the flood hydrograph is about 4.9 m above base flow immediately below the dam and in the narrow Abrud valley 5.9-7.5 km downstream of the dam, while in the last section considered (10.5 km) water depth is about 2.3 m above base flow and the maximum flow rate $877\text{ m}^3/\text{s}$. Further, the broader Aries valley allows the flood wave to propagate on a significantly wider bed, which results in a highly attenuated hydrograph. These results describe the "worst case scenario" based on extreme dam break assumptions;

- Accidents during cyanide transportation. Due to the large quantities of cyanide transported (about 30t /day) the risks associated to this activity were assessed in detail using the ZHA- Zurich Hazard Analysis method. As a consequence, the optimum transport route was selected from the manufacturer to the Process Plant, e.g

Cyanide transport (in solid state) will exclusively involve special SLS (Solid to Liquid System) containers, 16 tons each. The ISO compliant container will be protected by a framework with legs, which allows separation from the transport trailer for temporary storage. The wall is 5.17 mm thick, which, together with the protective framework, provides additional protection to the load in case of accident. This system is considered BAT and is currently one of the safest cyanide transportation options.

It is being mentioned the fact that the study develops the occurrence possibility of these scenarios (pages 166-171, Conclusions).

As regards the cyanides management, there is a baseline study named "Roşia Montană Golden Project, Cyanides Management Plan" prepared in compliance with the "International Management Code for the Manufacture, Transport and Use of Cyanide in the Production of Gold (International Cyanide management Institute) May 2002". S.C. Roşia Montană Gold Corporation is signatory to this code.

Bibliographical references for Chapter 7 "Risk Cases" are listed at page173-176.

*

RMGC's closure estimates, which were developed by a team of independent experts with international experience and will be reviewed by third party experts, are based on the assumption that the project can be completed according to the plan, without interruptions, bankruptcy or the like They are engineering calculations and estimates based on the current commitments of the closure plan and are summarized in the EIA's Mine Closure and Rehabilitation Management Plan (Plan J in the EIA). Annex 1 of Plan J will be updated using a more detailed approach looking at every individual year and calculating the amount of surety, which must be set aside year by year to rehabilitate the mine before RMGC is released from all its legal obligations. Most importantly, the current estimates assume the application of international best practice, best available technology (BAT) and compliance with all Romanian and European Union laws and regulations.

Closure and rehabilitation at Roşia Montană involves the following measures:

- Covering and vegetating the waste dumps as far as they are not backfilled into the open pits;
- Backfilling the open pits, except Cetate pit, which will be flooded to form a lake;
- Covering and vegetating the tailings pond and its dam areas;
- Dismantling of disused production facilities and revegetation of the cleaned-up areas;
- Water treatment by semi-passive systems (with conventional treatment systems as backup) until all effluents have reached the discharge standards and need no further treatment;

- Maintenance of the vegetation, erosion control, and monitoring of the entire site until it has been demonstrated by RMGC that all remediation targets have been sustainably reached.

While the aspects of closure and rehabilitation are many, we are confident in our cost estimates because the largest expense—that incurred by the earthmoving operation required to reshape the landscape—can be estimated with confidence. Using the project design, we can measure the size of the areas that must be reshaped and resurfaced. Similarly, there is a body of scientific studies and experiments that enable scientists to determine the depth of soil cover for successful revegetation. By multiplying the size of the areas by the necessary depth of the topsoil by the unit rate (also derived from studying similar earthmoving operations at similar sites), we can estimate the potential costs of this major facet of the rehabilitation operation. The earthmoving operation, which will total approximately US \$65 million, makes up 87% of closure and rehabilitation costs.

Also, the necessity of additional technological measures to stabilize and reshape the tailings surface will be discussed in the update of the Economical Financial Guarantee (EFG) estimate, which leads to an increase the provisions for tailings rehabilitation, especially if the TMF is closed prematurely and no optimized tailings disposal regime is applied. The exact figures depend on the details of the TMF closure strategy which can be finally determined only during production.

We believe that—far from being not realistic—our cost estimates are evidence of our high level of commitment to closure and rehabilitation. Just as a comparison, the world’s largest gold producer has set aside US \$683 million (as of December 31, 2006) for the rehabilitation of 27 operations, which equates to US \$25 million on average per mine. The RMGC closure cost estimates, recently revised upward from the US \$73 million reported in the EIA based on additional information, currently total US \$76 million.

*

According to Law 5/2000, regarding the approval of the Territory Arrangement Plan – 3rd Section – protected areas (“Law 5/2000”) (article 5, paragraphs 2-3), local public authorities, with the support of the competent central public authorities, had the obligation to establish the boundaries of the protection areas for the cultural heritage elements stipulated in Annex III to the above-mentioned law. This measure should have been taken within 12 months from the effective date of Law 5/2000, based on specialized studies. For this purpose, the local public authorities had to prepare the town planning documentation and its related regulations, developed and approved according to the law. This documentation must comprise the necessary protection and conservation measures for the national cultural heritage elements located in this area.

Concurrently, Law 350/2001 on the territory arrangement and urbanism stipulates the right of legal or natural persons interested in arranging the territory, to initiate the development of urbanism plans.

In accordance with these legal provisions, in 2001, RMGC initiated the preparation of these specific town-planning documentations - the General Urbanism Plan and the Zonal Urbanism Plan. These plans have been developed by Romanian certified companies and followed the legal approval procedure. The permit for the establishment of the Roşia Montană Historical Centre Protected Area was issued by the Ministry of Culture and Religious Affairs in 2002 (permits no. 61/14.02.2002 and no. 178/20.06.2002) as part of the procedure for the approval of the town planning documentation. Based on these permits, the Ministry of Culture and Religious Affairs requested the company to develop a Zonal Urbanism Plan for the Historical Centre of Roşia Montană. Out of the 41 historical buildings in Roşia Montană, thirty-five (35) are located inside the protected area of the Roşia Montană Historical Centre.

As for the heritage elements located in the future industrial development area (6 historical buildings), these are discussed in the Industrial Zonal Urbanism Plan prepared by SC Proiect Alba SA. The regulations included in this document will contain measures for the protection of these monuments.

In conclusion, the town planning studies and the specialized studies conducted for the purpose of establishing the boundaries of the protection areas within the future mining operations perimeter are currently pending approval, in accordance with the legal provisions, by the competent institutions and committees. Please note that none of the historical houses located in the perimeter of the proposed project will be affected; on the contrary, all the 41 historic buildings will be included in a complex

restoration and rehabilitation program (see the Management Plan). This program is mandatory, regardless of the implementation of the mining project, if we want to prevent these buildings from collapsing because of their advanced degradation.

*

Your assertion regarding the failure to obtain an applicable urbanism certificate at the start up of the public debates and of the evaluation of the quality of the report to the environmental impact assessment, is not correct.

Thus, by the time when the public debate stage started up there was an applicable urbanism certificate and namely the urbanism certificate no. 78/26.04.2006 issued by Alba County Council. This certificate was obtained prior to the evaluation stage of the quality of the report to the environmental impact assessment which started up once the EIA was submitted to the Ministry of Environment and Water Management on the 15th May 2006.

For better understanding the applicable legal provisions and the facts developed within the mining project of Roşia Montană zone we would like to make several comments:

- The procedure for issuing the environmental permit for Roşia Montană project started up on the 14th December 2004 by submitting the technical memorandum and the urbanism certificate no.68/26.August 2004 (certificate applicable by that time). S.C. Roşia Montană Gold Corporation S.A. (RMGC) applied for and obtained a new urbanism certificate no.78/26.04.2006 issued by Alba County Council for the entire Roşia Montană Project applicable on the date of the EIA Report submission (15th May 2006) and prior to the public debate start up (June 2006);
- The Section 1 of the urbanism certificate no.78 of 26th 04.2006 entitled Work construction, position 10 – “Processing plant and associated constructions “ – including the tailing management facility which existence is compulsory for the processing plant running. The Tailing management facility is also specified on the layout plans which are integral part of the urbanism certificate and they were sealed by Alba County Council so that they cannot be modified;
- The Urbanism Certificate is an informative document and its goal is only to inform the applicant about the legal, economic and technical regime of the existing lands and buildings and to establish the urbanism requirements and the approvals necessary to obtain the construction permit (including the environmental permit) as per art.6 of Law 50/1991 referring to the completion of construction works, republished and art 27 paragraph 2 of the Norms for the application of Law 50/1991 – Official Journal 825 bis/13.09.2005).

As it is an informative document, it does not limit the number of certificates an applicant may obtain for the same land plot (art. 30 of Law no. 350/2001 regarding the territorial planning and urbanism).

*

Introduced as part of the Environmental Impact Assessment Report Study (EIA), the Roşia Montană Foundation is shifting in focus. The Community Sustainable Development Plan activities initially conceived as coming under the Foundation umbrella (business oriented activities: business incubator, business advisory center, micro-finance facility, as well as social oriented activities: education and training center) have been advanced independently, via partnerships and with community participation in decision-making – a preferable way to advance social and economic development programs.

Going forward, the Foundation will take shape around preservation, patrimony and cultural heritage issues, with its final form determined in consultation with the community.

In terms of the philosophy that guides the company’s Sustainable Development efforts, the Roşia Montană Gold Corporation (RMGC) sees itself not as principal provider, but as a partner. Community involvement is considered the starting point; over time, as the community builds the capacity to maintain programs in its own right, the company will turn over control of currently-established programs to the community and its institutions.

For more information, please see Roşia Montană Sustainable Development and the Roşia Montană Project – annex 4.

*

We underline the fact that your statement is false. The General Urbanism Plan for the Roşia Montană commune, endorsed in 2002 allows the development of Roşia Montană project, as it has been presented during the public consultations.

Concurrently, pursuant to the provisions of art. 41, paragraph 2, from the Mining Law no.85/2003, the authorities from the local administration have the liability to adjust and/or update the territory arrangement plans and the general urbanism plans, in order to allow the development of all operations necessary for the development of mining activities.

RMGC has also initiated the preparation of two zonal urbanism plans: Zonal Urbanism Plan Modification – Roşia Montană Industrial Area and Zonal Urbanism Plan – Roşia Montană Historical Area. The first urbanism plan is required by the urbanism certificate no.78/26.04.2006, which updates the Zonal Urbanism Plan for the Industrial Area approved in 2002. As far as the historical area is concerned, its Zonal Urbanism Plan is required by the General Urbanism Plan approved also in 2002. Both urbanism plans are pending approval and have been subject to public consultations.

*

An engineered liner is included in the design of the Tailings Management Facility (TMF) basin. Specifically, the Roşia Montană Tailings Management Facility (TMF or “the facility”) has been designed to be compliant with the EU Groundwater Directive (80/68/EEC), transposed as Romanian GD 351/2005. The TMF is also designed for compliance with the EU Mine Waste Directive (2006/21/EC) as required by the Terms of Reference established by the MEWM in May, 2005. The following paragraphs provide a discussion of how the facility is compliant with the directives.

The TMF is composed of a series of individual components including:

- the tailings impoundment;
- the tailings dam;
- the secondary seepage collection pond;
- the secondary containment dam; and
- the groundwater monitoring wells/extraction wells located downstream of the Secondary Containment dam.

All of these components are integral parts of the facility and necessary for the facility to perform as designed.

The directives indicated above require that the TMF design be protective of groundwater. For the Roşia Montană project (RMP), this requirement is addressed by consideration of the favorable geology (low permeability shales underlying the TMF impoundment, the TMF dam and the Secondary Containment dam) and the proposed installation of a low-permeability (1×10^{-6} cm/sec) recompacted soil liner beneath the TMF basin. Please see Chapter 2 of EIA Plan F, “The Tailings Facility Management Plan” for more information.

The proposed low permeability soil liner will be fully compliant with Best Available Techniques (BAT) as defined by EU Directive 96/61 (IPPC) and EU Mine Waste Directive. Additional design features that are included in the design to be protective of groundwater include:

- A low permeability (1×10^{-6} cm/sec) cut off wall within the foundation of the starter dam to control seepage;
- A low permeability (1×10^{-6} cm/sec) core in the starter dam to control seepage;
- A seepage collection dam and pond below the toe of the tailings dam to collect and contain any seepage that does extend beyond the dam centerline;
- A series of monitoring wells, below the toe of the secondary containment dam, to monitor seepage and ensure compliance, before the waste facility limit.

In addition to the design components noted above specific operational requirements will be implemented to be protective of human health and the environment. In the extremely unlikely case that impacted water is detected in the monitoring wells below the secondary containment dam, they will be converted to

pumping wells and will be used to extract the impacted water and pump it into the reclaim pond where it will be incorporated into the RMP processing plant water supply system, until the compliance is reestablish.

*

An engineered liner is included in the design of the Tailings Management Facility (TMF) basin to be protective of groundwater. Specifically, the Roșia Montană Tailings Management Facility (TMF or “the facility”) has been designed to be compliant with the EU Groundwater Directive (80/68/EEC), transposed as Romanian GD 351/2005. The TMF is also designed for compliance with the EU Mine Waste Directive (2006/21/EC) as required by the Terms of Reference established by the MEWM in May, 2005. The following paragraphs provide a discussion of how the facility is compliant with the directives.

The TMF is composed of a series of individual components including:

- the tailings impoundment;
- the tailings dam;
- the secondary seepage collection pond;
- the secondary containment dam; and
- the groundwater monitoring wells/extraction wells located downstream of the Secondary Containment dam.

All of these components are integral parts of the facility and necessary for the facility to perform as designed.

The directives indicated above require that the TMF design be protective of groundwater. For the Roșia Montană project (RMP), this requirement is addressed by consideration of the favorable geology (low permeability shales underlying the TMF impoundment, the TMF dam, and the Secondary Containment dam) and the proposed installation of a low-permeability (1×10^{-6} cm/sec) recompacted soil liner beneath the TMF basin. Please see Chapter 2 of EIA Plan F, “The Tailings Facility Management Plan” for more information.

The proposed low permeability soil liner will be fully compliant with Best Available Techniques (BAT) as defined by EU Directive 96/61 (IPPC) and EU Mine Waste Directive. Additional design features that are included in the design to be protective of groundwater include:

- A low permeability (1×10^{-6} cm/sec) cut off wall within the foundation of the starter dam to control seepage;
- A low permeability (1×10^{-6} cm/sec) core in the starter dam to control seepage;
- A seepage collection dam and pond below the toe of the tailings dam to collect and contain any seepage that does extend beyond the dam centerline;
- A series of monitoring wells, below the toe of the secondary containment dam; to monitor seepage and ensure compliance, before the waste facility limit.

In addition to the design components noted above specific operational requirements will be implemented to be protective of human health and the environment. In the extremely unlikely case that impacted water is detected in the monitoring wells below the secondary containment dam, they will be converted to pumping wells and will be used to extract the impacted water and pump it into the reclaim pond where it will be incorporated into the RMP processing plant water supply system, until the compliance is reestablish.

With respect to your comments made as regards a presumptive infringement of the provisions of Government Decision No.351/2005 (“GD 351/2005”), there are several aspects to be taken into consideration. Thus:

1. Firstly, please note that, according to the provisions of art. 6 of GD 351/2005, any activity that might determine the discharge of dangerous substances into the environment is subject to the prior approval of the water management authorities and shall comply with the provisions of the water permit issued in accordance with the relevant legislation. The GD 351/2005 provides that the water permit shall be issued only after all technical-construction measures are implemented as prevent the indirect discharge of dangerous

substances into the underground waters. The maximum discharge limits are expressly provided under GD 351/2005 and compliance with such is a condition for granting and maintaining the water permit.

In accordance with the provisions of GD 351/2005, the actual discharge limits should be authorized by the relevant authority, such process being understood by the lawmaker in consideration of the complexity and variety of industrial activities, as well as the latest technological achievements.

Therefore, please note that the EIA stage is not intended to be finalized into an overall comprehensive permit, but it represents only a part of a more complex permitting process. Please note that, according with art. 3 of GD 918/2002, the data's level of detail provided in the EIA is the one available in the feasibility stage of the project, obviously making impossible for both the titleholder and authority to exhaust all required technical data and permits granted.

The adequate protection of the ground water shall be ensured by the terms and conditions of the water permit. The issuance of the water permit shall be performed following an individual assessment of the project, considering its particular aspects and the relevant legal requirements applicable for mining activities. Until the water permit is obtained, any allegation regarding the infringement of GD 351/2005 is obviously premature mainly because the water permit shall regulate, in accordance with the relevant legal provisions, the conditions to be observed by the developer as regards the protection of the ground water;

2. Secondly, kindly note that the complexity and specificity of mining projects generated the need of a particular legal framework. Therefore, for such projects, the reading of the legal provisions of a certain enactment should be corroborated with the relevant provisions of the other regulations applicable.

In this respect, please note that the understanding of GD 351/2005 must be corroborated with the provisions of the entire relevant legislation enforceable as regards Roşia Montană Project, with a particular accent to Directive 2006/21/EC on the management of waste from the extractive industries ("Directive 21").

The very scope of Directive 21 is to provide a specific legal framework for the extractive wastes and waste facilities related to mining projects, considering the complexity of such projects and the particular aspects of mining activities that can not always be subject to the common regulations on waste management and landfill.

From this perspective, Directive 21 provides that, an operator of a waste facility, as such is defined thereunder (please note that the TMF proposed by RMGC is considered a "waste facility" under Directive 21), must inter alia, ensure that:

- a) *"the waste facility is [...]designed so as to meet the necessary conditions for, in the short and long-term perspectives, preventing pollution of the soil, air, groundwater or surface water, taking into account especially Directives 76/464/EEC (1), 80/68/EEC (2) and 2000/60/EC, and ensuring efficient collection of contaminated water and leachate as and when required under the permit, and reducing erosion caused by water or wind as far as it is technically possible and economically viable;"*
- b) *"the waste facility is suitably constructed, managed and maintained to ensure its physical stability and to prevent pollution or contamination of soil, air, surface water or groundwater in the short and long-term perspectives as well as to minimize as far as possible damage to landscape."*

In addition, it should be mentioned that RMGC was required by MWEM under the Terms of Reference, to perform the EIA considering the provisions of Directive 21 and the BAT Management of Mining Waste. The Directive 21 was intended by the EU DG of Environment to be the legislative regime applicable to sound management of mining waste throughout Europe and therefore compliance with its provisions is mandatory.

*

Information regarding our Environmental Financial Guarantee ("EFG") is fully discussed in the section of the Environmental Impact Assessment titled "Environmental and Social Management and System Plans" (Annex 1 of the subchapter titled "Mine Rehabilitation and Closure Management Plan"). The EFG is

updated annually and will always reflect the costs associated with reclamation. These funds will be held in protected accounts at the Romanian state disposal.

Roșia Montană Gold Corporation (“RMGC”) has invested significant time, energy, and resources assessing the viability of a mining project in the valley of Roșia Montană. This assessment has led RMGC to conclude that Roșia Montană presents an attractive long-term development opportunity – an opinion confirmed by a variety of lending institutions, who have completed detailed reviews of the project’s design and profitability. We have every confidence that we will see the project through to the end of its projected 16-year lifespan, regardless of any fluctuations in the market price of gold.

In Romania, the creation of an EFG is required to ensure adequate funds are available from the mine operator for environmental cleanup. The EFG is governed by the Mining Law (no. 85/2003) and the National Agency for Mineral Resources instructions and Mining Law Enforcement Norms (no. 1208/2003).

Two directives issued by the European Union also impact the EFG: the Mine Waste Directive (“MWD”) and the Environmental Liability Directive (“ELD”).

The Mine Waste Directive aims to ensure that coverage is available for 1) all the obligations connected to the permit granted for the disposal of waste material resulting from mining activities and 2) all of the costs related to the rehabilitation of the land affected by a waste facility. The Environmental Liability Directive regulates the remedies, and measures to be taken by the environmental authorities, in the event of environmental damage created by mining operations, with the goal of ensuring adequate financial resources are available from the operators for environmental cleanup efforts. While these directives have yet to be transposed by the Romanian Government, the deadlines for implementing their enforcement mechanisms are 30 April 2007 (ELD) and 1 May 2008 (MWD) – thus before operations are scheduled to begin at Roșia Montană.

RMGC has already begun the process of complying with these directives, and once their implementation instruments are enacted by the Romanian Government, we will be in full compliance.

Each EFG will follow detailed guidelines generated by the World Bank and the International Council on Mining and Metals.

The current projected closure cost for Roșia Montană is US \$76 million, which is based on the mine operating for its full 16-year lifespan. The annual updates will be completed by independent experts, carried out in consultation with the NAMR, as the Governmental authority competent in mining activities field. These updates will ensure that in the unlikely event of early closure of the project, at any point in time, each EFG will always reflect the costs associated with reclamation. (These annual updates will result in an estimate that exceeds our current US \$76 million costs of closure, because some reclamation activity is incorporated into the routine operations of the mine.)

A number of different financial instruments are available to ensure that RMGC is capable of covering all of the expected closure costs. These instruments, which will be held in protected accounts at the Romanian state disposal, include:

- Cash deposit;
- Trust funds;
- Letter of credit;
- Surety bonds;
- Insurance policy.

Under the terms of this guarantee, the Romanian government will have no financial liability in connection with the rehabilitation of the Roșia Montană project.

*

The Security Report has been made available for public access by being posted at the following Internet address http://www.mmediu.ro/dep_mediu/rosia_montana_securitate.htm as well as through the printed version which could have been found at several information locations established for public hearings.

*

The Report on the Environmental impact assessment study (EIA) considered all alternative developments, including the option of not proceeding with any project – an option that would generate no investment, allowing the existing pollution problems and socio-economic decline to continue (Chapter 5 – *Assessment of Alternatives*).

The report also considered alternative developments – including agriculture, grazing, meat processing, tourism, forestry and forest products, cottage industries, and flora/fauna gathering for pharmaceutical purposes – and concluded that these activities could not provide the economic, cultural and environmental benefits brought by the Roşia Montană Project (RMP).

Chapter 5 also examines alternative locations for key facilities as well as alternative technologies for mining, processing and waste management, in line with best practice and as compared against published EU best available techniques (BAT) documentation.

*

The impact on protected flora and fauna will exist only locally, but this impact will not lead to the loss of any specie. The Project has been designed even from the beginning to fully comply with the requirements and norms imposed by Romanian and European environmental legislation.

The company believes the fact that the project impact on environment remains significant, especially because covers previous impacts. But, the investments required to ecologically restore/rehabilitate Roşia Montană area in order to address current complex environmental issues, are only achievable following the implementation of some economic projects that will generate and warrant implementation of some direct and responsible actions as a component of base principles of sustainable development concepts. Clean processes and technologies may be developed only in the presence of a solid economic environment fully compliant with the environment that will also resolve previous impacts of anthropic activities.

The base documents of the Project are in fact an unbiased reason of its implementation, considering the highly complex environmental commitment within Roşia Montană area.

Some of the Roşia Montană species that are under a certain protection status stand for an insignificant percentage of the scale of populations estimated at national level. The characterization of species from their habitat point of view exists in the species tables presented in the Biodiversity Chapter of the EIA Report and its annexes, although this is not a requirement imposed by the Habitats Directive. Due to their large volume of information, the annexes of chapter 4.6 Biodiversity can be found in the electronic version of the EIA disclosed by the company both in Romanian and English through approx. 6,000 DVD/CD copies, being accessible on the company website, and on the websites of Ministry of Environment and Water Management, local and regional environmental protection agencies of Alba, Sibiu, Cluj, etc.

From practical point of view, the low value of conservation of the impact area is also indirectly emphasized by the fact that there is no proposal to designate the area a SPA (aviafaunistic special protected area) and by the denial as unfounded of the proposal to designate the area as a pSCI area (sites of community importance).

Taking all these into account, we believe that the proposed Project is compliant with the provisions of EU Directive no. 92/43 Habitats[1], and EU Directive no. 79/409 Birds[2] respectively, especially because within Biodiversity Management Plan, Plan H, several active and responsible measures are provided to reconstruct/rehabilitate several natural habitats, pursuant to the provisions of the same documents [3].

References:

[1] art.3, 2nd paragraph, Each Member State shall contribute to the creation of Natura 2000 (network) in proportion to the representation within its territory of the natural habitat types and the habitats of species referred to in paragraph 1. To that effect each Member State shall designate, in accordance with Article 4, sites as special areas of conservation taking account of the objectives set out in paragraph 1.

art.4, 1st paragraph. On the basis of the criteria set out in Annex III (Stage 1) and relevant scientific information, each Member State shall propose a list of sites indicating which natural habitat types in

Annex I and which species in Annex II that are native to its territory the sites host. For animal species ranging over wide areas these sites shall correspond to the places within the natural range of such species which present the physical or biological factors essential to their life and reproduction. For aquatic species which range over wide areas, such sites will be proposed only where there is a clearly identifiable area representing the physical and biological factors essential to their life and reproduction. Where appropriate, Member States shall propose adaptation of the list in the light of the results of the surveillance referred to in Article 11. [...]

2nd paragraph.[...] Member States whose sites hosting one or more priority natural habitat types and priority species represent more than 5 % of their national territory may, in agreement with the Commission, request that the criteria listed in Annex III (Stage 2) be applied more flexibly in selecting all the sites of Community importance in their territory.[...]

Art. 6, 4th paragraph. If, in spite of a negative assessment of the implications for the site and in the absence of alternative solutions, a plan or project must nevertheless be carried out for imperative reasons of overriding public interest, including those of a social or economic nature, the Member State shall take all compensatory measures necessary to ensure that the overall coherence of Natura 2000 is protected. It shall inform the Commission of the compensatory measures adopted.

Art. 16. Provided that there is no satisfactory alternative and the derogation is not detrimental to the maintenance of the populations of the species concerned at a favourable conservation status in their natural range, Member States may derogate from the provisions of Articles 12, 13, 14 and 15 (a) and (b):[...]

- in the interests of public health and public safety, or for other imperative reasons of overriding public interest, including those of a social or economic nature and beneficial consequences of primary importance for the environment;

[2] Art.4, 1st paragraph. The species mentioned in annex 1 shall be the subject of special conservation measures concerning their habitat in order to ensure their survival and reproduction in their area of distribution. [...]

Trends and variations in population levels shall be taken into account as a background for evaluations. Member states shall classify in particular the most suitable territories in number and size as special protection areas for the conservation of these species, taking into account their protection requirements in the geographical sea and land area where this directive applies.

[3] Directive 92/43 Habitats, art. 2, 2nd paragraph; Directive 79/409 Birds, art. 3, 2nd paragraph, letter c.

*

This statement is ungrounded, because the environmental impact assessment (EIA) process has included preliminary cumulative estimates for stationary motorized equipment and linear (vehicular) sources were prepared in order to provide an initial understanding of the potential cumulative noise and vibration impacts from background and Roşia Montană Project sources, and to guide future monitoring and measurement activities as well as the selection of appropriate Best Management Practices/Best Available Techniques for further mitigation of the potential noise and vibration impacts from Project activities. These preliminary estimates apply to major construction activities, as well as the operation and decommissioning/closure of the mine and process plant. They are documented as data tables and isopleth maps for major noise-generating activities in selected, representative Project years; see **Tables 4.3.8** through **4.3.16** and **Exhibits 4.3.1** through **4.3.9**. All these details related to the applied assessment methodology, the input data of the dispersion model, the modeling results and the measures established for the prevention/mitigation/elimination of the potential impact for all project stages (construction, operation, closure) are included in Chapter 4, Section 4.3 Noise and Vibrations of the EIA Report.

Project Years 0, 9, 10, 12, 14, and 19 were selected for modeling because they are considered to be representative of the most significant levels of noise-generating activity. They are also the same years used for air impact modeling purposes in Section 4.2, as air and noise impacts share many of the same sources or are otherwise closely correlated. In order to more accurately reflect potential receptor impacts, all of

these exhibits integrate the background traffic estimates discussed in Section 4.3.6.1.

The Project site plan and process plant area and facility drawings were used to establish the position of the noise sources and other relevant physical characteristics of the site. Receptor locations were established using background reports and project engineering and environmental documentation provided by RMGC. With this information, the source locations and receptor locations were translated into input (x, y, and z) co-ordinates for the noise-modeling program.

Tables 4.3.8 through 4.3.16 and **Exhibits 4.3.1 through 4.3.9** present the average maximum noise values likely to be experienced by the receptor community over all Project phases after incorporation of a variety of initial mitigation measures designed specifically to reduce the impacts associated with mobile and stationary machinery sources. The influence of non-mining related background (primarily traffic) noise is also included.

To evaluate the sound levels associated with haul trucks and other mobile sources crossing the site carrying excavated ore, waste rock, and soil, a noise analysis program based on the (U.S.) Federal Highway Administration's (FHWA) standard RD-77-108 [1] model was used to calculate reference noise emissions values for heavy trucks along the project roadways. The FHWA model predicts hourly L_{eq} values for free-flowing traffic conditions and is generally considered to be accurate within 1.5 decibels (dB).

The model is based on the standardized noise emission factors for different types and weights of vehicles (e.g., automobiles, medium trucks, and heavy trucks), with consideration given to vehicle volume, speed, roadway configuration, distance to the receiver, and the acoustical characteristics of the site. The emission levels of all three vehicle types increase as a function of the logarithm of their speed.

To evaluate the sound sources from the proposed mine processing facility and the semi-stationary material handling equipment (at the ore extraction, waste rock and soil stockpiling areas), a proprietary computerized noise prediction program was used by AAC to simulate and model the future equipment noise emissions throughout the area. The modeling program uses industry-accepted propagation algorithms based on the following American National Standards Institute (ANSI) and International Organization for Standardization (ISO) standards:

- ANSI S1.26-1995 (R2004), *Method for the Calculation of the Absorption of Sound by the Atmosphere*;
- ISO 9613-1:1993, *Acoustics -- Attenuation of sound during propagation outdoors-- Part 1: Calculation of the absorption of sound by the atmosphere*;
- ISO 9613-2:1996, *Acoustics -- Attenuation of sound during propagation outdoors -- Part 2: General method of calculation*;
- ISO 3891:1978, *Acoustics -- Procedure for describing aircraft noise heard on the ground*.

The calculations account for classical sound wave divergence (i.e., spherical spreading loss with adjustments for source directivity from point sources) plus attenuation factors due to air absorption, minimal ground effects, and barriers/shielding.

This model has been validated by AAC over a number of years via noise measurements at several operating industrial sites that had been previously modeled during the engineering design phases. The comparison of modeled predictions versus actual measurements has consistently shown close agreement; typically in the range of 1 to 3 dB (A).

References:

[1] FHWA Highway Traffic Noise Prediction Model; see Federal Highway Administration Report Number FHWA-RD-77-108, USA, Washington, D.C., 1978.

A detailed presentation of blasting technology can be found in the annex 7.1 - Proposed blasting technology for the operational phase of Roşia Montană Project.

*

The partnership between Gabriel Resources and Regia Autonomă a Cuprului Deva (currently, CNCAF Minvest SA) has been established based on Law no. 15/1990 on the reorganization of the state owned companies as autonomous directions and trade companies, published in the Official Gazette, Section I, no.

98/08.08.1990, as subsequently amended and supplemented. Art. 35 of this law provides the possibility of the regies autonomous to enter into partnerships with legal third parties, Romanian or foreign, for the purpose of setting up new trading companies.

Roşia Montană Gold Corporation SA was set up in 1997, according to the legal provisions in force as at that time, the setting up being made by observing all the conditions imposed by Company Law no. 31/1990 and Trade Register Law no. 26/1990, in regard of the setting up of the joint stock companies with mixed capital.

We underline that the Articles of Associations of Roşia Montană Gold Corporation SA, representing the result of the parties agreement in regard of the terms and conditions under which the partnership between the Romanian state and investor takes place represents a public document, being included in the category of documents which, as per Law no. 26/1990 on the Trade Register, are published in the Romanian Official Gazette and for which the Trade Register is obliged to issue, on the expense of the persons submitting a request, certified copies.

As for the agreement concerning the setting up of the mixed company together with Gabriel Resources Ltd., this has been expressed by the Ministry of Industry and Trade, the conditions imposed by the setting up of the mixed company being the following: (i) ensuring of the jobs at the level existing upon the conclusion of the agreement concerning the setting up of the mixed company; (ii) the expenses incurred by the fulfillment of the exploration stage should be fully supported by Gabriel; (iii) the obtaining of the approval from the ANRM by the Copper Autonomous Direction Deva and (iv) the observance of all legal provisions in force concerning the setting up of the mixed companies with foreign partners. These conditions have been fully complied with as at the setting up of the company and during the development of its activity.

We also specify that the establishing of the shareholders' quotas to the benefits and losses of Roşia Montană Gold Corporation SA has been made by considering their contribution quota to the company's share capital. The current percentage of 80% for Gabriel Resources Ltd. and of 19.31% for CNCAF Minvest SA resulted from the initial contribution and the subsequent contributions of the shareholders to the company's share capital, in consideration also of Gabriel Resources Ltd. advancing all expenses and costs related to the development-exploitation and permitting of the Roşia Montană Mining Project.

The provisions of the Articles of Associations of Roşia Montană Gold Corporation SA on the necessary majority and quorum conditions for the decision-making process within the General Shareholders Meeting and the quotas to the benefits and losses of the company are taken from Law no. 31/1990, and no derogation exists in regard of this aspect.

*

This claim is not true; the Urbanism Plan has been prepared with public consultation.

Roşia Montană Gold Corporation SA (RMGC) has requested and obtained from Alba County Council the Urbanism Certificate no. 78 of 26.04.2006, for the entire Roşia Montană mining project, including the tailings management facility. The Urbanism Certificate also stipulated the preparation of a Zonal Urbanism Plan, to reflect all changes made to the Roşia Montană Project, following the public consultations and debates organized in relation to this project, and the consultations with the permitting authorities. This plan, entitled "Modification of the Zonal Urbanism Plan, Roşia Montană Industrial Area", was prepared and subjected to public debate in June 2006 in accordance with the provisions of Order no.176/N/2000 issued by the Ministry of Public Works and Territory Development for the approval of the technical regulations "Guidelines regarding the methodology applied for the preparation and framework content of the Zonal Urbanism Plan" and, at present, it is pending approval.

Concerning the Roşia Montană General Urbanism Plan approved in 2002, such plan was prepared in parallel with the Zonal Urbanism Plan of 2002, all the provisions of the General Urbanism Plan being also included in the Zonal Urbanism Plan. Also, the approval procedure related to the two urbanism plans was carried out in parallel.

*

Preventive archaeological researches within the Roşia Montană mining project area have been undertaken based on specific techniques, specifically trial trenches in all accessible areas that are suitable for human habitation, taking into account the bibliographical information and the observations recorded during the archaeological survey campaigns, the geophysical studies and the analyses of the photogrammetric flights. In addition, surface investigations were undertaken, where appropriate.

The archaeological researches at Roşia Montană covered a large surface and focused on the areas known to have archaeological potential. THEREFORE, ALL AREAS THAT HAVE BEEN ARCHAEOLOGICALLY DISCHARGED HAD BEEN PREVIOUSLY INVESTIGATED. All research programs, beginning with the 2004 campaign, have been undertaken in full compliance with the current legal requirements, i.e. Ministerial Order no. 2392 of 6 September 2004 on the establishment of the Archaeological Standards and Procedures by the Ministry of Culture and Religious Affairs.

The proposed gold mining project at Roşia Montană has raised a series of issues related to the rescue of the historical-archaeological heritage within the area, as well as issues related to its scientific development and also the enhancement of heritage within a museum. Given the complex difficulties encountered in this respect, the Ministry of Culture and Religious Affairs decided to initiate the "Alburnus Maior" National Research Program.

The company's role was to provide the necessary financial resources for the assessment, research and enhancement of the archaeological remains, in full compliance with the Romanian current legislation. The development of the research and of the archaeological discharge works has been conducted through specific means and methodologies that have been adjusted to the realities of every site researched, in our case, Roşia Montană. They consisted in:

- Archives studies;
- Archaeological surveys; trial trenches;
- aerial reconnaissance/survey and aerial photo interpretation ; high resolution satellite images;
- mining archaeology studies; underground topography and 3D modeling;
- geophysical surveys;
- extensive archaeological investigations in the areas with an identified archaeological potential- this implied carrying out archaeological excavations;
- Interdisciplinary studies- sedimentology, archaeo-zoology, comparative palynology, archaeo-metallurgy, geology, mineralogy;
- Radiocarbon dating and dendrochronology;
- This research and its results were included in an integrated database;
- traditional and digital archaeological topography and development of the GIS project; generate a photo archive- both traditional and digital;
- restoration of artifacts;
- an inventory and a digital catalogue of the artifacts;
- studies conducted by specialists in order to enhance the research results - publication of monographs/scientific books and journals, exhibitions, websites, etc.

All the preventive archaeological researches undertaken at Roşia Montană since 2000 have been carried out as part of a complex research program; permits for preventive archaeological excavations being issued in compliance with the current legislation. These archaeological investigations have been undertaken by representatives of 21 specialized institutions from Romania and 3 others from abroad, under the scientific coordination of the Romanian National Museum of History. All archaeological researches have been conducted in full compliance with the existing legislation. The investigations undertaken during each archaeological research campaign have been approved by the Ministry of Culture and Religious Affairs based on the Annual Archaeological Research Plan approved by the National Commission of Archaeology.

Under the current legislation (Ministerial Order no. 2392 of 6 September 2004 on the establishment of the Archaeological Standards and Procedures by the Ministry of Culture and Religious Affairs) the archaeologists who have conducted the research may ask that an archaeological discharge certificate be granted. Based on a complex research program, the archaeologists prepare comprehensive documentation with regard to the researched area. Upon consideration of the submitted documentation, the National Commission of Archaeology makes a decision as to whether to recommend or not the granting of the archaeological discharge certificate. In the case of the research conducted in the period 2001-2006, the

archaeological discharge certificate was issued directly by the Ministry of Culture and Religious Affairs or by its local agencies.

Preventive archaeological researches at Roşia Montană have allowed the research of five Roman cremation necropolis (Tău Corna, Hop-Găuri, Țarina, Jig - Piciorag and Pârâul Porcului – Tăul Secuilor), two funerary areas (Carpeni, Nanului Valley), sacred areas (Hăbad, Nanului Valley), habitation areas (Hăbad, Carpeni, Tăul Țapului, Hop), the most significant being the Roman structures on the Carpeni Hill and the circular funerary monument at Tău Găuri. In addition, for the first time in Romania, surface investigations have been paralleled by underground investigations of Cetate, Cărnice, Jig and Orlea massifs, with important discoveries in the Piatra Corbului, area, Cătălina-Monulești gallery and the Păru Carpeni mining sector.

The research consisted of aerial photo interpretation, archaeological magnetometric studies, electrical resistivity, palynology, sedimentology, geology studies, radiocarbon and dendrochronology dating. For a better management of the research units and of the archaeological findings, data bases were used, including text and photographs-among which 4 satellite images (an archive satellite image type SPOT Panchromatic (10m) from 1997; 2 satellite images LANDSAT 7 MS (30 m), dating from 2000 and 2003; a satellite image with priority programming SPOT 5 SuperMode color (2,5 m resolution-19 July 2004); all data have been included in a comprehensive GIS program, a first in the Romanian archaeological research.

In the case of archaeological monuments that are located close to industrial facilities, plans have been redesigned to ensure that the archaeological remains in question will not be affected. Where appropriate, the archaeological monument was preserved in situ and restored, i.e. the circular funerary monument at Hop-Găuri (see The "Alburnus Maior" monograph series, volume II, Bucharest, 2004). Another example in this respect is the Carpeni Hill, designated an "archaeological " reserve, and the Piatra Corbului area. In 2004, after being thoroughly investigated, these areas have been included on the List of Historic Monuments. Add to this the areas where ancient mining remains will be preserved, such as the Cătălina Monulești gallery and the mining sector Păru Carpeni, as well as the protected area Roşia Montană Historic Center, including a number of heritage assets (35 historic monument houses).

We emphasise in this respect that the identified and researched structures have been published in preliminary form in the Archaeological Research Chronicle of Romania, after every archaeological research campaign, as well as in volume 1 of the Alburnus Maior monographic series. We mention here the areas where Roman habitation structures have been identified and researched, as well as the references to be consulted for further information: Hop-Găuri, Carpeni, Tăul Țapului (CCA 2001 (2002), p. 254-257, no. 182; 261-262, nr. 185; 264-265, no. 188; 265-266, no. 189. Alburnus Maior I, 2003, p. 45-80; 81-122; 123-148; CCA 2001 (2002), 257-261; CCA 2003 (2004) ,280-283; Alburnus Maior I, 2003, p. 387-431, 433-446, 447-467).

For further details related to the applicable legal framework, the responsibilities of the Project titleholder, or for a detailed description of the preventive archaeological researches undertaken to date and of the Cultural Heritage Management Plans, please see Annex called "Information on the Cultural heritage of Roşia and Related Management Aspects". In addition, the annex includes supplementary information with regard to the result of the researches undertaken as part of the "Alburnus Maior" National Research Program between 2001 and 2006.

In conclusion, the area mentioned by the questioner has been researched in accordance with the Romanian legal requirements, as well as with European standards and practices in the field.

Note that the type of research undertaken at Roşia Montană, known as preventive/rescue archaeological research, as well as other related heritage studies, are done everywhere in the world in close connection with the economic development of certain areas. Both the costs for the research and for the enhancement and maintenance of the preserved areas are provided by investors, in a public-private partnership set up in order to protect the cultural heritage, as per the provisions of the European Convention on the Protection of the Archaeological Heritage (Malta-1992) [1].

References:

[1]The text of the Convention is available at the following address:

<http://conventions.coe.int/Treaty/Commun/QueVoulezVous.asp?NT=143&CM=8&DF=7/6/2006&CL=ENG>

*

In 2000, in the context of the proposal of a new mining project in the Roşia Montană area, the Ministry of Culture and Religious Affairs approved a series of studies to be conducted in order to research the archaeological and architectural heritage of the area. At the end of that year, the Design Centre for National Cultural Heritage (now the National Institute for Historical Monuments) presented the preliminary results of these researches in front of the National Commission for Historical Monuments and of the National Commission of Archaeology. Based on these results, in 2001, the Ministry of Culture and Religious Affairs initiated the “Alburnus Maior” National Research Program (the Order no. 2504 / 07.03.2001 of the Minister of Culture and Religious Affairs) in compliance with the Law 378/2001 (as subsequently amended by Law 462/2003 and by Law 258/2006 and Law 259/2006). Thus, since 2000, the Ministry of Culture and Religious Affairs has fulfilled its duties – directly or through its subordinated institutions - with regard to the management of the issues related to Roşia Montană’s heritage.

The preventive archaeological researches have been conducted by the representatives of 21 national institutions and 3 others from abroad, with a broad expertise in the field. They have been carried out based on the annual approval of the National Commission of Archaeology of the Ministry of Culture and Religious Affairs. In accordance with current legislation, this research program is carried out with financial support provided by RMGC, i.e. the company that plans to expand and continue to mine the gold-silver deposit in Roşia Montană. Thus, large-scale preventive investigations have been conducted or are underway in the RMP impact area. A proposal will be made based on the results of these investigations, either for the archaeological discharge of some researched areas or the preservation in situ of certain representative structures and monuments, in compliance with current legislation. For areas proposed for conservation or for archaeological discharge measures the decision was made based on the surveys conducted by specialists and on the analysis of the results by the National Commission of Archaeology. In the period 2000-2005, the mining project underwent a series of modifications designed to promote the conservation of the local heritage. Examples of this include extending the duration of the field investigations (e.g. in Tarina, Pârâul Porcului, Orlea) and changing the location of some elements of mining infrastructure in order to allow the conservation of the archaeological remains found in the Carpeni, in the Tău Găuri and Pietra Corbului areas.

The architectural and town-planning surveys have been conducted, in accordance with current legislation, by companies certified by the Ministry of Culture and Religious Affairs, while the town-planning documentation drafted by these companies, and the restoration and conservation works undertaken so far, have been approved by the National Commission for Historical Monuments. Thus, the town-planning documentation has been approved and implemented in accordance with current legislation, and the company has agreed to these decisions and modified the mine development plans accordingly:

Extensive ethnographic research was conducted in the Roşia Montană-Abrud-Corna area in the period 2001-2004 coordinated by a team of specialists for the Romanian Village Museum „Dimitrie Gusti” (a National Museum directly under the coordination of the Ministry of Culture and Religious Affairs). Moreover, a broad series of oral history interviews was conducted in the period 2001-2002 by the Romanian Society of Radio broadcasting through the „Gheorghe Brătianu” Oral History Centre, Bucharest (SRR - CIO).

In compliance with the requirements of the Ministry of Environment and Waters Management and the Ministry of Culture and Religious Affairs, specific management plans have been drawn up for the management and conservation of the heritage remains from the Roşia Montană area, in the context of the implementation of the mining project. These plans have been included in the documentation prepared for the report on the Environmental Impact Assessment Study. (see EIA Report, volume 32-33, Plan M-Cultural Heritage Management Plan, part I –Management Plan for the Archaeological Heritage from Roşia Montană Zone; part II-Management Plan for the Historical Monuments and Protected Zone from Roşia Montană; part III- Cultural Heritage Management Plan).

These management plans comprise detailed presentations of the obligations and responsibilities for the protection and conservation of the heritage remains from the Roşia Montană area, which the company has assumed as part of the mining project, in accordance with the decision of the central government. These heritage remains include: archaeological remains above and under the ground, historic buildings, protected areas, intangible heritage assets, cultural landscape items, etc. In this context, it should be noted

that besides the works for the protection and preservation of the archaeological heritage, works are also being carried out for the rehabilitation and conservation of the protected area Historical Centre Roşia Montană (comprising 35 historic buildings, and projects for the restoration of 11 of these buildings are currently being drafted) and at Tăul Mare, Tăul Brazi and Tăul Anghel, plus remains of the surface mining works from the Văidoaia area, and the creation of a modern museum dedicated to the history of mining in the Apuseni Mountains area. This museum will be established including exhibitions of geology, archaeology, industrial and ethnographic heritage as well as an underground section organized around the Cătălina Monuleşti gallery.

Moreover, representatives of the Directorate/Department for Culture, Religious Affairs and National Cultural Heritage of Alba County have paid a number of visits to Roşia Montană in order to collect information and to check the situation. The same administrative body was the intermediary for the acquisitions of historic buildings made by RMGC. The Ministry of Culture and Religious Affairs expressed its pre-emption right regarding the acquisition of these buildings.

It should be mentioned, however, that apart from the obligations undertaken by RMGC as regards the protection and conservation of the archaeological remains and historical monuments, there are also a series of obligations which rest with the local public authorities from Roşia Montană and from Alba County, and with the central public authorities, specifically the Romanian Government. These aspects are detailed in the Cultural Heritage Management Plans included in the EIA Report (see EIA Report, volume 32, Management Plan for the Archaeological Heritage from Roşia Montană Zone, pages 22-24, 49, 55-56, 71-72 and the EIA Report, volume 33- Management Plan for the Historical Monuments and Protected Zone from Roşia Montană pages 28-29, 47-50, 51-53, 65-66, page 103 – Annex 1).

Item no.

37

No. to identify
the
observations
received from
the public

No.
115950/
04.12.2006

Proposal

The questioner requests the deputies elected by people to stop the Roşia Montană project commenting that the gold is of the Romanians and not of the foreigners who want to take it away.

Solution

As regarding your request, we mention that art. 44 (3) of the Minister of Waters and Environment Protection Order no. 860/2002 on the environment impact assessment and the issuance of environmental agreements Procedures ("Order no. 860/2002") provides that "*based on the results of the public debate, the relevant authority for the environmental protection evaluates the grounded proposals/comments of the public and requests the titleholder the supplementation of the report on the environmental impact assessment study with an appendix comprising solutions for the solving of the indicated issues*".

Consequently, considering the fact that your proposal is just an allegation which does not indicate possible problems, nor provide additional information, we mention that the decision on the issuance or refusal of the environment approval cannot be made only by considering a simple proposal, but according to certain objective criteria provided by the wording of art. 45 of the Order no. 860/2002 and only after examining,

- (i) the report on the environmental impact assessment study;
- (ii) the conclusions of stakeholders involved the assessment;
- (iii) the possibilities to implement the project;
- (iv) the titleholder answers to the grounded proposals/comments of the public.

Item no.

38

No. to identify the observations received from the public

No.
115692/
20.11.2006

Proposal

The questioner manifests its disagreement with the Roşia Montană mining project and requests the Romanian authorities to give publicly assurances to the citizens that Roşia Montană will not be destroyed and will not become a desert place. The contestation contains annexed a copy of an article from press which presents Mr. Aurel Sântimbreanu's opinion.

Solution

Roşia Montană will certainly not be destroyed and will not become a "desert place." Here are at least three reasons that come to support this statement:

1. The laws of Romania, an European Union member state (EU), have been aligned with the European legislation. As RMP is designed to meet Romanian law as well as EU directives – and, where they differ, the stricter of the two – this project will be governed by standards far stronger than any previous mining project built in Romania;
2. The Environmental Impact Assessment study report (EIA) for the Roşia Montană project (RMP) presents the way in which Roşia Montană will become a better and a more valuable community from an economical, social and cultural point of view, with benefits for Romania as a whole;
3. According to the legal provisions, the titleholder of the exploitation license is obliged to create a financial guarantee for the environmental recovery. To this end, please consider that the financial guarantee for the environmental recovery is regulated by (i) the Mining Law no. 85/2003 ("Law no. 85/2003"), (ii) the Norms of enforcement of Law no. 85/2003 and by (iii) Order no. 58/2004 for the approval of the Technical Instructions on the enforcement and monitoring of the measures established by the conformation program, the environmental recovery plan and the technical project, as well as the regulation of the manner to operate with the financial guarantee for the recovery of the environment affected by mining activities ("Order no. 58/2004"). The financial guarantee for the environmental recovery is annual and final.

Annual financial guarantee for environmental recovery

According to art. 131 of the Norms of enforcement of Law no. 85/2003, "*the financial guarantee for the environmental recovery, in case of the exploitation license, is created annually, in the first month of the period it refers to, and it is established within the license, so that it cover environmental recovery works specified in the environmental recovery plan and in the technical project*".

According to art. 133 (1) of the Norms of enforcement of Law no. 85/2003, the financial guarantee for the environmental recovery cannot be under the value of the environmental recovery works related to the respective year, so that the guarantee cover the rehabilitation works, in case the license's titleholder ceases the mining activity and does not fulfill the rehabilitation activities.

Final financial guarantee for environmental recovery

According to the provisions of art. 15 of Order no. 58/2004, the final financial guarantee for the environmental recovery is created annually and computed as a quota of the value of the environmental recovery works, according to the monitoring program for the post-closing environmental factors, which is included in the clearing technical program.

As for the insurance, please note that the provisions of art. 81 (2) of the former environmental law no. 137/1995, according to which "in case of activities with major risk, the insurance for damages is mandatory", have been abrogated by GEO no. 195/2005, and that no legal provision applicable requires the creation of an insurance.

The Directive no. 2004/35/CE on the liability for the environmental pollution and prevention and remedying of the damages to the environment, published in the Official Journal of the European Community no. L143/56 ("Directive no. 35/2004"), establishes the general regulating framework in the field of the liability for the pollution of the environment.

According to the provisions of art. 1 of the Directive no. 35/2004 *“the purpose of this directive is to establish a general framework in the field of liability for the environment, based on the principle the polluter pays, of preventing and remedying the damages caused to the environment”*.

The Directive no. 35/2004 establishes at principle level, in the content of the provisions of art. 14 (1), the fact that *“The Member States shall take all necessary measures for the development of the markets and financial instruments of guaranteeing, through the means of the economic and financial operators, inclusively financial mechanisms in case of insolvency, for the purpose of insuring the operators with the financial guarantees necessary for the obligations undertaken by the directive”*.

Moreover, according to the provisions of art. 19 (1) of the Directive no. 35/2004, the Member States will implement in the internal legislation the provisions of the Directive until 30.04.2007. We underline that, up to now, the Directive no. 35/2004 was not adopted by our legislation. Considering the above mentioned, please note that the project RMGC proposes does not breach the Directive no. 35/2004, as there are no internal regulations with a normative character which should establish the material and procedural aspects concerning the creation of such a guarantee/insurance.

Nevertheless, to the extent there will be specific legal provisions in regard of the creation of guarantees, RMGC shall take all necessary measures to fulfill the legal obligations incumbent on it.

Item no.	39 Same as: 40, 41
No. to identify the observations received from the public	No. 115500/06.11.2006 Same as: No. 169326/06.11.2006, No. 169325/06.11.2006
Proposal	<p>The questioner opposes to the project implementation on behalf of the citizens from historical Bucovina formulating the following comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Gold Corporation company will cause through the project implementation repercussions as follows: a tailings management facility of about 600 ha full with cyanide; demolition of 41 houses historical monuments; destruction of 9 churches and 10 cemeteries; disappearing of the Roman galleries - unique in Europe; affecting of 4 mountains which will become 4 craters; budget expenses of EURO 2 billion for environment rehabilitation.
Solution	<p>This question provides an opportunity to clear up a number of misconceptions.</p> <p>From the beginning please note that, the only authority able to analyze the Environmental Impact Assessment Study Report (EIA) is the environment authority. In this respect, we mention the provisions of art. 45 of Order no.860/2002 on the procedure for environmental impact assessment and the issue of environment approval ("Order no.860/2002") <i>"subsequent to the examination of the report on the environmental impact study, of conclusions of the parties involved in the assessment, of the possibilities to apply the project and of the <u>motivated evaluation of public proposals, the relevant environment protection public authority makes the decisions on the issue of the environment approval/integrated environment approval or the motivated refusal of the project on the respective location</u>"</i>.</p> <p>Cyanide used in operations will be carefully handled according to EU guidelines and safely contained. Cyanide rapidly breaks down to harmless substances under normal atmospheric conditions – it is short-lived to the environment. The cyanide used in the project will be subject to a cyanide destruct process, and residual cyanide deposited with the process tailings in the Tailings Management Facility (TMF) will degrade rapidly to levels well below maximum regulatory levels. This system of use and disposal of cyanide in gold mining is classed as Best Available Techniques (BAT) by the EU. A simplified description of the ore processing system and the use and management of cyanide is provided in the Non-Technical Summary.</p> <p>As the owner of buildings classified as historical monuments, Roşia Montană Gold Corporation (RMGC) is committed to maintain and use them strictly in accordance with the provisions of the law. To fulfill this commitment, RMGC has recruited and trained a local team led by a civil engineer, to implement repair and restoration of these monuments. This team has taken all the necessary measures to preserve the historical monuments at least in the state they were when acquired by the company. All the buildings classified as historical monuments acquired by RMGC have gone through an initial rehabilitation. Pending approval of the Rosia Montana project (RMP), all houses classified as historical monuments, owned by RMGC will be included in a comprehensive restoration and preservation program. Any other houses classified as historical monuments – in the historical area or the industrial area – will be restored in compliance with special regulations issued by the Romanian Ministry of Culture and Religious Affairs. Responding to comments by the Holy Synod and spiritual leaders of other faiths dating back to 2003, the RMP was redesigned to reduce impact on the community's churches. As a result, 6 of Rosia Montana's 10 churches and prayer houses, will remain where they are. Two churches and two prayer houses will move in accordance with the wishes of their congregations, at RMGC's expense; the churches following the human communities, providing them religious service and support.</p> <p>Six of the 12 cemeteries in Roşia Montană stand to be affected by the project, and approximately 410 graves will require relocation. A large area of 13 hectares has been allocated at the Piatra Albă site for cemeteries, to replace cemeteries in Roşia Montană impacted by the new mine and to fulfill the future requirements for the community. Cemeteries in the Corna Valley/ Gura Cornii area that are impacted by the new mine are planned for relocation. If desired by the family, a priest will conduct a service for both the reopening of the grave and the subsequent burial – all costs relating to the relocation of graves and</p>

associated ceremonies will be funded by RMGC. The grave of the local hero Simeon Balint will not be directly impacted by the Project. The access to this grave will be maintained during the life of the Project, although the access might be regularly restricted for safety reasons.

Regarding the Roman Galleries, a team of archeologists was contracted to research all of the underground galleries, and make recommendations as to which should be preserved. The team's recommendations were passed on to the National Commission of Archeology of the Romanian Ministry of Culture and Religious Affairs, which has final say over which galleries must be preserved.

Item no.	42 Same as: 43, 44
No. to identify the observations received from the public	No. 169324/06.11.2006 Same as: No. 169323/06.11.2006, No. 169322/06.11.2006
Proposal	<p>The questioner does not agree to the implementation of the Roşia Montană project formulating the following remarks and comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Within EIA, there are no presented all the possible risks caused by this project; - The overall costs for mine closure are not realistic; - There isn't until now an approved Zonal Urbanism Plan for the Protected Areas; - The phase of public consultation and quality evaluation of the impact assessment study report begun without a valid urbanism certificate; - Information about the foundation which RMGC will establish and subsidize is not given. This foundation follows to assume the obligations which the mining operation can not assume; - The present urbanism plans of the Roşia Montană commune do not correspond with the mining project proposal described in EIA; - There is no liner proposed for the tailings pond; - The proposed waste deposits will be not constructed according to the legislation in force; - No financial guarantees have been stipulated; - There is not a Safety Report submitted for the public consultation and evaluation by the competent authorities; - The EIA report does not assess the "zero alternative"; - The Project poses a threat for protected flora and fauna; - The EIA report does not refer to the impact on the listed heritage buildings of noise and vibrations caused by the mining operations; - The public/ONGs wish to consult the contracts and agreements between Company and Romanian State; - The Urbanism Plan has been modified without public consultation; - From archeological point of view, the area proposed to be occupied by project was not legally investigated; - It disputes the spiritual and architectural monuments, including the responsible involvement of the Institutions of the State in the protection program.
Solution	<p>It is the nature of risk that it can be mitigated and diminished; it cannot be made to disappear. In order to put this into context, the common action of walking on the street or developing everyday activities have an accident potential. This accident potential is twice higher than within the framework of industrial activities that use hazardous substances.</p> <p>In the larger sense, the entire EIA report is focused on the assessment of impacts and their associated mitigation. Specifically, Chapter 4 of the EIA presents that impact assessment of the project. The following discussion presents a summary of the impact discussed in the EIA.</p> <p>As far as natural and technological risks assessments are concerned, Chapter 7, "Risk Cases", from the Report on Environmental Impact Assessment, emphasizes the fact that safety and prevention measures, the implementation of the environmental management and risk systems are mitigating the consequences to acceptable levels as compared to the most restrictive norms, standards, the best practices or national and international recommendations in the field. The risk level has been established as moderate and so, socially acceptable. The extension of the risk assessment and the intensity of the prevention and mitigation measures of the consequences should be proportionate to the risk involved. Selection of a specific mitigation technique is depends on the analyzed accident scenario.</p> <p>More detailed assessments are conducted for accident scenarios that, based on the qualitative assessment are found to be potentially major, of probability more than 10^{-6} (reduced recovery periods of 1/1,000,000) meaning that they could have major consequences therefore, elevated associated risk, a higher risk level than 9 to 12 (on a scale of 1-25). To put this in context, simply living in southern Florida rates a 1 - 25 on</p>

the risk scale.

A global assessment of the risks associated with the Roşia Montană Project is obtained by the quick environmental and health risk assessment methodology initially developed by the Italian Ministry of the Environment and the World Health Organization. Natural hazard and risk identification and analysis presents key data and information in assessing potential technological accidents. Thus:

- in designing the Tailings Management Facility, the design parameters were chosen to fully cover the characteristic seismic risk of the area. These seismic design parameters adopted for the TMF and other facilities on the proposed site result in a safety factor much greater than the minimum accepted under the Romanian and European design standards for such facilities;

- in the sector physically impacted by the Project, the risk of floods will remain very low due to the small catchments (controlled by the Roşia and Corna Streams) the area affected by the operation, and the creation of containment, diversion and drainage hydro-technical structures for storm waters on the site, and in the Abrud catchment in general;

- risks caused by meteorological events have been reviewed and used in assessing the hazards of the affected technological processes.

From the analysis of morphometrical parameters and their correlation with other sets of information on the natural slopes on and near the site shows that the (qualitatively estimated) landslide occurrence risk is low to moderate and its consequences will not cause major impacts on the structural components of the Project.

There is no significant risk associated with resource depletion. Mining activities are planned judiciously, so as to extract only the profitable gold and silver resources and only the necessary construction rock for the Project. The management of the mining concession site will minimize reserve "sterilization" (limitation of future access to the reserves).

In assessing technological hazards and risks, the quantity of hazardous substances on the site was calculated as a total and by category, as provided by the *Notification Procedure* approved by Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry, Water and Environment (MAFWE) Order 1084/2003. Based on an evaluation of hazardous substances in stock on the Project site in relation to the relevant quantities provided by the Government Decision 95/2003 which transposes the Seveso Directive, the Project ranges between the upper and the lower limits, and therefore S.C. Roşia Montană Gold Corporation S.A. is required to prepare a Report on Environmental Impact Assessment Study to be sent to the local environmental authority and the local civilian protection authority a *Safety Report* on its operations to prevent major accident risks.

In assessing the consequences of major accidents involving dangerous substances, physical-mathematical models accepted internationally and especially at EU level, and the current version of the SLAB (Canada) software have been used, the latter for the atmospheric dispersion of denser than air gases, that may handle a multitude of situations and scenarios. Similarly, the EFFECTSGis 5.5 (Netherlands) software, developed for the analysis of the effects of industrial accidents and of consequences. Several scenarios were considered in response to the internal legislative requirements, especially related to the implementation of the Internal Emergency Plans (GD 647/2005). The conclusions of the risk assessment for major accidents were:

- The total destruction of plant facilities may only be caused by terrorist attack with classic or nuclear weapons. Simultaneous damage to the HCl tank (including containment) and to the NaCN solution tank, the tanks containing enriched solution, to one or more leaching tanks, having as a result HCN dispersion into the air. At the same time, under certain situations and weather conditions unfavorable for dispersion, people within 40 m of the emission source, surprised by the toxic cloud for more than 1 minute without respiratory protection equipment, will most certainly die. It may also be considered that, on a radius of about 310 m, persons exposed for more than 10 minutes may suffer serious intoxications that may also lead to death. Toxic effects may occur in persons up to about 2 km downwind of the process plant;

- Operating errors and/or failures in the measurement and control devices, resulting in a lower pH in the leaching tank, thickener and/or DETOX slurry and accidental emissions of hydrocyanic acid. The area affected by concentrations of 290 ppm over a 10 min exposure time is within a circle of 36 m radius and the 50 ppm IDLH threshold for 30 min exposure will be reached over an area of 157.5 m radius. The center of these circles is the middle of the CIL tanks platform;

- Accidental HCN emission from the decanter. The accident may be caused by a drop of pH in the

CIL tanks combined with an overdose of flocculent solution and faulty pH monitoring systems. The area affected by concentrations of 300 ppm over a 10 min exposure time is within a circle of 65 m radius and the 50 ppm IDLH threshold for 30 min exposure will be reached over an area of 104 m radius. The center of these circles is mid-distance between the two DETOX facilities;

- Accidental HCN emission from the DETOX facility. The accident may be caused by a drop of pH in the reactors generated by an overdose of metabisulfite solution and/or copper sulphate combined with faulty pH monitoring systems. The area affected by high 1900 ppm concentrations for a 1 min exposure time is located within a 10 m radius circle. The area affected by concentrations of 300 ppm over a 10 min exposure time is within a circle of 27 m radius and the 50 ppm IDLH threshold for 30 min exposure will be reached over an area of 33 m radius. The center of these circles is mid-distance between the two DETOX facilities;

- Explosion of the LPG storage tank. The LPG storage tank has a 50 ton capacity and is located outdoors, near the heating plant. The simulation was conducted for the worst case scenario, considering an explosion of the full tank. Threshold I with heat 12.5 kW/m² is within a 10.5 m radius circle and Threshold II, of heat radiation 5 kW/m² is within a circle of 15 m radius;

- Damage and/or fire at the fuel tanks. Simulations were conducted for the worst case scenarios, considering ignition and combustion of all the diesel (fire in the tank, or in the containment vat, when full of diesel);

- Corna Dam break and breach development. Two credible accident scenarios were considered in simulating tailings flow out of the Tailings Management Facility, and six credible scenarios for the flow of decant water and tailings pore water, with significant effects on the terrestrial and aquatic ecosystems, in different weather conditions;

- Tailings flow may occur along Corna Valley, on a 800 m (starter dam break) or over 1,600 m reach should the Corna dam break in its final stage;

- In regard to water quality impacts, cyanide concentrations in the water in the shape of a pollution plume may reach Arad, near the Romanian-Hungarian border on the Mures River, in concentrations ranging between 0.03 and 0.5 mg/L. Due to inherent mathematical limitations in the models, these values and the accident effects are considered overestimated. Therefore, the results describe the “worst case scenario” based on extreme dam break assumptions for the Corna Dam.

A new and much more precise and realistic simulation has been subsequently established based on the INCA Mine model, that considers the dispersion, volatilization and breakdown of cyanides during the downstream movement of the pollutant flow (Whiteland et al., 2006).

The model used is the INCA model developed over the past 10 years to simulate both terrestrial and aquatic systems within the EUROLIMPACS EU research program (www.eurolimpacs.ucl.ac.uk). The model has been used to assess the impacts from future mining, and collection and treatment operations for pollution from past mining at Roşia Montană.

The modeling created for Roşia Montană simulates eight metals (cadmium, lead, zinc, mercury, arsenic, copper, chromium, manganese) as well as Cyanide, Nitrate, Ammonia and dissolved oxygen. The model has been applied to the upper catchments at Roşia Montană as well as the complete Abrud-Arieş-Mureş river system down to the Hungarian Border and on into the Tisa River. The model takes into account the dilution, mixing and physical-chemical processes affecting metals, ammonia and cyanide in the river system and gives estimates of concentrations at key locations along the river, including at the Hungarian Boarder and in the Tisa after the Mureş joins it.

Because of dilution and dispersion in the river system, and of the initial EU BAT-compliant technology adopted for the project (for example, the use of a cyanide destruct process for tailings effluent that reduces cyanide concentration in effluent stored in the TMF to below 6 mg/l), even a large scale unprogrammed release of tailings materials (for example, following failure of the dam) into the river system would not result in transboundary pollution. The model has shown that under worse case dam failure scenario all legal limits for cyanide and heavy metals concentrations would be met in the river water before it crosses into Hungary.

The INCA model has also been used to evaluate the beneficial impacts of the existing mine water collection and treatment and it has shown that substantial improvements in water quality are achieved along the river system under normal operational conditions.

For more information, an information sheet presenting the INCA modeling work is presented under the title of the Mureş River Modeling Program and the full modeling report is presented in Annex 5.1:

- Development of HCN on the tailings pond surface. Simulated emissions of HCN from the Tailings Management Facility pond surface and of their dispersion into the ambient air show that the level of $400\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ hourly average and $179\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ 8hr average will not be exceeded. These HCN concentrations are only slightly over the odor threshold (0.17ppm) and much below potentially dangerous concentrations;

- Cetate Dam break and breach development. Flood modeling was in case of a break in Cetate dam was based on the design parameters obtained from the hydrometeorological study "Assessment of rainfall intensity, frequency and runoff for the Roşia Montană Project - Radu Drobot". The breach characteristics were predicted using the BREACH model, and the maximum height of the flood wave in various flow sections was modeled using the FLDWAV software. The assumptions included a total $800,000\text{ m}^3$ discharge for one hour, when the peak of the flood hydrograph is about 4.9 m above base flow immediately below the dam and in the narrow Abrud valley 5.9-7.5 km downstream of the dam, while in the last section considered (10.5 km) water depth is about 2.3 m above base flow and the maximum flow rate $877\text{ m}^3/\text{s}$. Further, the broader Aries valley allows the flood wave to propagate on a significantly wider bed, which results in a highly attenuated hydrograph. These results describe the "worst case scenario" based on extreme dam break assumptions;

- Accidents during cyanide transportation. Due to the large quantities of cyanide transported (about 30t /day) the risks associated to this activity were assessed in detail using the ZHA- Zurich Hazard Analysis method. As a consequence, the optimum transport route was selected from the manufacturer to the Process Plant, e.g

Cyanide transport (in solid state) will exclusively involve special SLS (Solid to Liquid System) containers, 16 tons each. The ISO compliant container will be protected by a framework with legs, which allows separation from the transport trailer for temporary storage. The wall is 5.17 mm thick, which, together with the protective framework, provides additional protection to the load in case of accident. This system is considered BAT and is currently one of the safest cyanide transportation options.

It is being mentioned the fact that the study develops the occurrence possibility of these scenarios (pages 166-171, Conclusions).

As regards the cyanides management, there is a baseline study named "Roşia Montană Golden Project, Cyanides Management Plan" prepared in compliance with the "International Management Code for the Manufacture, Transport and Use of Cyanide in the Production of Gold (International Cyanide management Institute) May 2002". S.C. Roşia Montană Gold Corporation is signatory to this code.

Bibliographical references for Chapter 7 "Risk Cases" are listed at page173-176.

*

RMGC's closure estimates, which were developed by a team of independent experts with international experience and will be reviewed by third party experts, are based on the assumption that the project can be completed according to the plan, without interruptions, bankruptcy or the like They are engineering calculations and estimates based on the current commitments of the closure plan and are summarized in the EIA's Mine Closure and Rehabilitation Management Plan (Plan J in the EIA). Annex 1 of Plan J will be updated using a more detailed approach looking at every individual year and calculating the amount of surety, which must be set aside year by year to rehabilitate the mine before RMGC is released from all its legal obligations. Most importantly, the current estimates assume the application of international best practice, best available technology (BAT) and compliance with all Romanian and European Union laws and regulations.

Closure and rehabilitation at Roşia Montană involves the following measures:

- Covering and vegetating the waste dumps as far as they are not backfilled into the open pits;
- Backfilling the open pits, except Cetate pit, which will be flooded to form a lake;
- Covering and vegetating the tailings pond and its dam areas;
- Dismantling of disused production facilities and revegetation of the cleaned-up areas;
- Water treatment by semi-passive systems (with conventional treatment systems as backup) until all effluents have reached the discharge standards and need no further treatment;

- Maintenance of the vegetation, erosion control, and monitoring of the entire site until it has been demonstrated by RMGC that all remediation targets have been sustainably reached.

While the aspects of closure and rehabilitation are many, we are confident in our cost estimates because the largest expense—that incurred by the earthmoving operation required to reshape the landscape—can be estimated with confidence. Using the project design, we can measure the size of the areas that must be reshaped and resurfaced. Similarly, there is a body of scientific studies and experiments that enable scientists to determine the depth of soil cover for successful revegetation. By multiplying the size of the areas by the necessary depth of the topsoil by the unit rate (also derived from studying similar earthmoving operations at similar sites), we can estimate the potential costs of this major facet of the rehabilitation operation. The earthmoving operation, which will total approximately US \$65 million, makes up 87% of closure and rehabilitation costs.

Also, the necessity of additional technological measures to stabilize and reshape the tailings surface will be discussed in the update of the Economical Financial Guarantee (EFG) estimate, which leads to an increase the provisions for tailings rehabilitation, especially if the TMF is closed prematurely and no optimized tailings disposal regime is applied. The exact figures depend on the details of the TMF closure strategy which can be finally determined only during production.

We believe that—far from being not realistic—our cost estimates are evidence of our high level of commitment to closure and rehabilitation. Just as a comparison, the world’s largest gold producer has set aside US \$683 million (as of December 31, 2006) for the rehabilitation of 27 operations, which equates to US \$25 million on average per mine. The RMGC closure cost estimates, recently revised upward from the US \$73 million reported in the EIA based on additional information, currently total US \$76 million.

*

According to Law 5/2000, regarding the approval of the Territory Arrangement Plan – 3rd Section – protected areas (“Law 5/2000”) (article 5, paragraphs 2-3), local public authorities, with the support of the competent central public authorities, had the obligation to establish the boundaries of the protection areas for the cultural heritage elements stipulated in Annex III to the above-mentioned law. This measure should have been taken within 12 months from the effective date of Law 5/2000, based on specialized studies. For this purpose, the local public authorities had to prepare the town planning documentation and its related regulations, developed and approved according to the law. This documentation must comprise the necessary protection and conservation measures for the national cultural heritage elements located in this area.

Concurrently, Law 350/2001 on the territory arrangement and urbanism stipulates the right of legal or natural persons interested in arranging the territory, to initiate the development of urbanism plans.

In accordance with these legal provisions, in 2001, RMGC initiated the preparation of these specific town-planning documentations - the General Urbanism Plan and the Zonal Urbanism Plan. These plans have been developed by Romanian certified companies and followed the legal approval procedure. The permit for the establishment of the Roşia Montană Historical Centre Protected Area was issued by the Ministry of Culture and Religious Affairs in 2002 (permits no. 61/14.02.2002 and no. 178/20.06.2002) as part of the procedure for the approval of the town planning documentation. Based on these permits, the Ministry of Culture and Religious Affairs requested the company to develop a Zonal Urbanism Plan for the Historical Centre of Roşia Montană. Out of the 41 historical buildings in Roşia Montană, thirty-five (35) are located inside the protected area of the Roşia Montană Historical Centre.

As for the heritage elements located in the future industrial development area (6 historical buildings), these are discussed in the Industrial Zonal Urbanism Plan prepared by SC Proiect Alba SA. The regulations included in this document will contain measures for the protection of these monuments.

In conclusion, the town planning studies and the specialized studies conducted for the purpose of establishing the boundaries of the protection areas within the future mining operations perimeter are currently pending approval, in accordance with the legal provisions, by the competent institutions and committees. Please note that none of the historical houses located in the perimeter of the proposed project will be affected; on the contrary, all the 41 historic buildings will be included in a complex

restoration and rehabilitation program (see the Management Plan). This program is mandatory, regardless of the implementation of the mining project, if we want to prevent these buildings from collapsing because of their advanced degradation.

*

Your assertion regarding the failure to obtain an applicable urbanism certificate at the start up of the public debates and of the evaluation of the quality of the report to the environmental impact assessment, is not correct.

Thus, by the time when the public debate stage started up there was an applicable urbanism certificate and namely the urbanism certificate no. 78/26.04.2006 issued by Alba County Council. This certificate was obtained prior to the evaluation stage of the quality of the report to the environmental impact assessment which started up once the EIA was submitted to the Ministry of Environment and Water Management on the 15th May 2006.

For better understanding the applicable legal provisions and the facts developed within the mining project of Roşia Montană zone we would like to make several comments:

- The procedure for issuing the environmental permit for Roşia Montană project started up on the 14th December 2004 by submitting the technical memorandum and the urbanism certificate no.68/26.August 2004 (certificate applicable by that time). S.C. Roşia Montană Gold Corporation S.A. (RMGC) applied for and obtained a new urbanism certificate no.78/26.04.2006 issued by Alba County Council for the entire Roşia Montană Project applicable on the date of the EIA Report submission (15th May 2006) and prior to the public debate start up (June 2006);
- The Section 1 of the urbanism certificate no.78 of 26th 04.2006 entitled Work construction, position 10 – “Processing plant and associated constructions “ – including the tailing management facility which existence is compulsory for the processing plant running. The Tailing management facility is also specified on the layout plans which are integral part of the urbanism certificate and they were sealed by Alba County Council so that they cannot be modified;
- The Urbanism Certificate is an informative document and its goal is only to inform the applicant about the legal, economic and technical regime of the existing lands and buildings and to establish the urbanism requirements and the approvals necessary to obtain the construction permit (including the environmental permit) as per art.6 of Law 50/1991 referring to the completion of construction works, republished and art 27 paragraph 2 of the Norms for the application of Law 50/1991 – Official Journal 825 bis/13.09.2005).

As it is an informative document, it does not limit the number of certificates an applicant may obtain for the same land plot (art. 30 of Law no. 350/2001 regarding the territorial planning and urbanism).

*

Introduced as part of the Environmental Impact Assessment Report Study (EIA), the Roşia Montană Foundation is shifting in focus. The Community Sustainable Development Plan activities initially conceived as coming under the Foundation umbrella (business oriented activities: business incubator, business advisory center, micro-finance facility, as well as social oriented activities: education and training center) have been advanced independently, via partnerships and with community participation in decision-making – a preferable way to advance social and economic development programs.

Going forward, the Foundation will take shape around preservation, patrimony and cultural heritage issues, with its final form determined in consultation with the community.

In terms of the philosophy that guides the company’s Sustainable Development efforts, the Roşia Montană Gold Corporation (RMGC) sees itself not as principal provider, but as a partner. Community involvement is considered the starting point; over time, as the community builds the capacity to maintain programs in its own right, the company will turn over control of currently-established programs to the community and its institutions.

For more information, please see Roşia Montană Sustainable Development and the Roşia Montană Project – annex 4.

*

We underline the fact that your statement is false. The General Urbanism Plan for the Roşia Montană commune, endorsed in 2002 allows the development of Roşia Montană project, as it has been presented during the public consultations.

Concurrently, pursuant to the provisions of art. 41, paragraph 2, from the Mining Law no.85/2003, the authorities from the local administration have the liability to adjust and/or update the territory arrangement plans and the general urbanism plans, in order to allow the development of all operations necessary for the development of mining activities.

RMGC has also initiated the preparation of two zonal urbanism plans: Zonal Urbanism Plan Modification – Roşia Montană Industrial Area and Zonal Urbanism Plan – Roşia Montană Historical Area. The first urbanism plan is required by the urbanism certificate no.78/26.04.2006, which updates the Zonal Urbanism Plan for the Industrial Area approved in 2002. As far as the historical area is concerned, its Zonal Urbanism Plan is required by the General Urbanism Plan approved also in 2002. Both urbanism plans are pending approval and have been subject to public consultations.

*

An engineered liner is included in the design of the Tailings Management Facility (TMF) basin. Specifically, the Roşia Montană Tailings Management Facility (TMF or “the facility”) has been designed to be compliant with the EU Groundwater Directive (80/68/EEC), transposed as Romanian GD 351/2005. The TMF is also designed for compliance with the EU Mine Waste Directive (2006/21/EC) as required by the Terms of Reference established by the MEWM in May, 2005. The following paragraphs provide a discussion of how the facility is compliant with the directives.

The TMF is composed of a series of individual components including:

- the tailings impoundment;
- the tailings dam;
- the secondary seepage collection pond;
- the secondary containment dam; and
- the groundwater monitoring wells/extraction wells located downstream of the Secondary Containment dam.

All of these components are integral parts of the facility and necessary for the facility to perform as designed.

The directives indicated above require that the TMF design be protective of groundwater. For the Roşia Montană project (RMP), this requirement is addressed by consideration of the favorable geology (low permeability shales underlying the TMF impoundment, the TMF dam and the Secondary Containment dam) and the proposed installation of a low-permeability (1×10^{-6} cm/sec) recompacted soil liner beneath the TMF basin. Please see Chapter 2 of EIA Plan F, “The Tailings Facility Management Plan” for more information.

The proposed low permeability soil liner will be fully compliant with Best Available Techniques (BAT) as defined by EU Directive 96/61 (IPPC) and EU Mine Waste Directive. Additional design features that are included in the design to be protective of groundwater include:

- A low permeability (1×10^{-6} cm/sec) cut off wall within the foundation of the starter dam to control seepage;
- A low permeability (1×10^{-6} cm/sec) core in the starter dam to control seepage;
- A seepage collection dam and pond below the toe of the tailings dam to collect and contain any seepage that does extend beyond the dam centerline;
- A series of monitoring wells, below the toe of the secondary containment dam, to monitor seepage and ensure compliance, before the waste facility limit.

In addition to the design components noted above specific operational requirements will be implemented to be protective of human health and the environment. In the extremely unlikely case that impacted water is detected in the monitoring wells below the secondary containment dam, they will be converted to

pumping wells and will be used to extract the impacted water and pump it into the reclaim pond where it will be incorporated into the RMP processing plant water supply system, until the compliance is reestablish.

*

An engineered liner is included in the design of the Tailings Management Facility (TMF) basin to be protective of groundwater. Specifically, the Roșia Montană Tailings Management Facility (TMF or “the facility”) has been designed to be compliant with the EU Groundwater Directive (80/68/EEC), transposed as Romanian GD 351/2005. The TMF is also designed for compliance with the EU Mine Waste Directive (2006/21/EC) as required by the Terms of Reference established by the MEWM in May, 2005. The following paragraphs provide a discussion of how the facility is compliant with the directives.

The TMF is composed of a series of individual components including:

- the tailings impoundment;
- the tailings dam;
- the secondary seepage collection pond;
- the secondary containment dam; and
- the groundwater monitoring wells/extraction wells located downstream of the Secondary Containment dam.

All of these components are integral parts of the facility and necessary for the facility to perform as designed.

The directives indicated above require that the TMF design be protective of groundwater. For the Roșia Montană project (RMP), this requirement is addressed by consideration of the favorable geology (low permeability shales underlying the TMF impoundment, the TMF dam, and the Secondary Containment dam) and the proposed installation of a low-permeability (1×10^{-6} cm/sec) recompacted soil liner beneath the TMF basin. Please see Chapter 2 of EIA Plan F, “The Tailings Facility Management Plan” for more information.

The proposed low permeability soil liner will be fully compliant with Best Available Techniques (BAT) as defined by EU Directive 96/61 (IPPC) and EU Mine Waste Directive. Additional design features that are included in the design to be protective of groundwater include:

- A low permeability (1×10^{-6} cm/sec) cut off wall within the foundation of the starter dam to control seepage;
- A low permeability (1×10^{-6} cm/sec) core in the starter dam to control seepage;
- A seepage collection dam and pond below the toe of the tailings dam to collect and contain any seepage that does extend beyond the dam centerline;
- A series of monitoring wells, below the toe of the secondary containment dam; to monitor seepage and ensure compliance, before the waste facility limit.

In addition to the design components noted above specific operational requirements will be implemented to be protective of human health and the environment. In the extremely unlikely case that impacted water is detected in the monitoring wells below the secondary containment dam, they will be converted to pumping wells and will be used to extract the impacted water and pump it into the reclaim pond where it will be incorporated into the RMP processing plant water supply system, until the compliance is reestablish.

With respect to your comments made as regards a presumptive infringement of the provisions of Government Decision No.351/2005 (“GD 351/2005”), there are several aspects to be taken into consideration. Thus:

1. Firstly, please note that, according to the provisions of art. 6 of GD 351/2005, any activity that might determine the discharge of dangerous substances into the environment is subject to the prior approval of the water management authorities and shall comply with the provisions of the water permit issued in accordance with the relevant legislation. The GD 351/2005 provides that the water permit shall be issued only after all technical-construction measures are implemented as prevent the indirect discharge of dangerous

substances into the underground waters. The maximum discharge limits are expressly provided under GD 351/2005 and compliance with such is a condition for granting and maintaining the water permit.

In accordance with the provisions of GD 351/2005, the actual discharge limits should be authorized by the relevant authority, such process being understood by the lawmaker in consideration of the complexity and variety of industrial activities, as well as the latest technological achievements.

Therefore, please note that the EIA stage is not intended to be finalized into an overall comprehensive permit, but it represents only a part of a more complex permitting process. Please note that, according with art. 3 of GD 918/2002, the data's level of detail provided in the EIA is the one available in the feasibility stage of the project, obviously making impossible for both the titleholder and authority to exhaust all required technical data and permits granted.

The adequate protection of the ground water shall be ensured by the terms and conditions of the water permit. The issuance of the water permit shall be performed following an individual assessment of the project, considering its particular aspects and the relevant legal requirements applicable for mining activities. Until the water permit is obtained, any allegation regarding the infringement of GD 351/2005 is obviously premature mainly because the water permit shall regulate, in accordance with the relevant legal provisions, the conditions to be observed by the developer as regards the protection of the ground water;

2. Secondly, kindly note that the complexity and specificity of mining projects generated the need of a particular legal framework. Therefore, for such projects, the reading of the legal provisions of a certain enactment should be corroborated with the relevant provisions of the other regulations applicable.

In this respect, please note that the understanding of GD 351/2005 must be corroborated with the provisions of the entire relevant legislation enforceable as regards Roşia Montană Project, with a particular accent to Directive 2006/21/EC on the management of waste from the extractive industries ("Directive 21").

The very scope of Directive 21 is to provide a specific legal framework for the extractive wastes and waste facilities related to mining projects, considering the complexity of such projects and the particular aspects of mining activities that can not always be subject to the common regulations on waste management and landfill.

From this perspective, Directive 21 provides that, an operator of a waste facility, as such is defined thereunder (please note that the TMF proposed by RMGC is considered a "waste facility" under Directive 21), must inter alia, ensure that:

- a) *"the waste facility is [...]designed so as to meet the necessary conditions for, in the short and long-term perspectives, preventing pollution of the soil, air, groundwater or surface water, taking into account especially Directives 76/464/EEC (1), 80/68/EEC (2) and 2000/60/EC, and ensuring efficient collection of contaminated water and leachate as and when required under the permit, and reducing erosion caused by water or wind as far as it is technically possible and economically viable;"*
- b) *"the waste facility is suitably constructed, managed and maintained to ensure its physical stability and to prevent pollution or contamination of soil, air, surface water or groundwater in the short and long-term perspectives as well as to minimize as far as possible damage to landscape."*

In addition, it should be mentioned that RMGC was required by MWEM under the Terms of Reference, to perform the EIA considering the provisions of Directive 21 and the BAT Management of Mining Waste. The Directive 21 was intended by the EU DG of Environment to be the legislative regime applicable to sound management of mining waste throughout Europe and therefore compliance with its provisions is mandatory.

*

Information regarding our Environmental Financial Guarantee ("EFG") is fully discussed in the section of the Environmental Impact Assessment titled "Environmental and Social Management and System Plans" (Annex 1 of the subchapter titled "Mine Rehabilitation and Closure Management Plan"). The EFG is

updated annually and will always reflect the costs associated with reclamation. These funds will be held in protected accounts at the Romanian state disposal.

Roșia Montană Gold Corporation (“RMGC”) has invested significant time, energy, and resources assessing the viability of a mining project in the valley of Roșia Montană. This assessment has led RMGC to conclude that Roșia Montană presents an attractive long-term development opportunity – an opinion confirmed by a variety of lending institutions, who have completed detailed reviews of the project’s design and profitability. We have every confidence that we will see the project through to the end of its projected 16-year lifespan, regardless of any fluctuations in the market price of gold.

In Romania, the creation of an EFG is required to ensure adequate funds are available from the mine operator for environmental cleanup. The EFG is governed by the Mining Law (no. 85/2003) and the National Agency for Mineral Resources instructions and Mining Law Enforcement Norms (no. 1208/2003).

Two directives issued by the European Union also impact the EFG: the Mine Waste Directive (“MWD”) and the Environmental Liability Directive (“ELD”).

The Mine Waste Directive aims to ensure that coverage is available for 1) all the obligations connected to the permit granted for the disposal of waste material resulting from mining activities and 2) all of the costs related to the rehabilitation of the land affected by a waste facility. The Environmental Liability Directive regulates the remedies, and measures to be taken by the environmental authorities, in the event of environmental damage created by mining operations, with the goal of ensuring adequate financial resources are available from the operators for environmental cleanup efforts. While these directives have yet to be transposed by the Romanian Government, the deadlines for implementing their enforcement mechanisms are 30 April 2007 (ELD) and 1 May 2008 (MWD) – thus before operations are scheduled to begin at Roșia Montană.

RMGC has already begun the process of complying with these directives, and once their implementation instruments are enacted by the Romanian Government, we will be in full compliance.

Each EFG will follow detailed guidelines generated by the World Bank and the International Council on Mining and Metals.

The current projected closure cost for Roșia Montană is US \$76 million, which is based on the mine operating for its full 16-year lifespan. The annual updates will be completed by independent experts, carried out in consultation with the NAMR, as the Governmental authority competent in mining activities field. These updates will ensure that in the unlikely event of early closure of the project, at any point in time, each EFG will always reflect the costs associated with reclamation. (These annual updates will result in an estimate that exceeds our current US \$76 million costs of closure, because some reclamation activity is incorporated into the routine operations of the mine.)

A number of different financial instruments are available to ensure that RMGC is capable of covering all of the expected closure costs. These instruments, which will be held in protected accounts at the Romanian state disposal, include:

- Cash deposit;
- Trust funds;
- Letter of credit;
- Surety bonds;
- Insurance policy.

Under the terms of this guarantee, the Romanian government will have no financial liability in connection with the rehabilitation of the Roșia Montană project.

*

The Security Report has been made available for public access by being posted at the following Internet address http://www.mmediu.ro/dep_mediu/rosia_montana_securitate.htm as well as through the printed version which could have been found at several information locations established for public hearings.

*

The Report on the Environmental impact assessment study (EIA) considered all alternative developments, including the option of not proceeding with any project – an option that would generate no investment, allowing the existing pollution problems and socio-economic decline to continue (Chapter 5 – *Assessment of Alternatives*).

The report also considered alternative developments – including agriculture, grazing, meat processing, tourism, forestry and forest products, cottage industries, and flora/fauna gathering for pharmaceutical purposes – and concluded that these activities could not provide the economic, cultural and environmental benefits brought by the Roşia Montană Project (RMP).

Chapter 5 also examines alternative locations for key facilities as well as alternative technologies for mining, processing and waste management, in line with best practice and as compared against published EU best available techniques (BAT) documentation.

*

The impact on protected flora and fauna will exist only locally, but this impact will not lead to the loss of any specie. The Project has been designed even from the beginning to fully comply with the requirements and norms imposed by Romanian and European environmental legislation.

The company believes the fact that the project impact on environment remains significant, especially because covers previous impacts. But, the investments required to ecologically restore/rehabilitate Roşia Montană area in order to address current complex environmental issues, are only achievable following the implementation of some economic projects that will generate and warrant implementation of some direct and responsible actions as a component of base principles of sustainable development concepts. Clean processes and technologies may be developed only in the presence of a solid economic environment fully compliant with the environment that will also resolve previous impacts of anthropic activities.

The base documents of the Project are in fact an unbiased reason of its implementation, considering the highly complex environmental commitment within Roşia Montană area.

Some of the Roşia Montană species that are under a certain protection status stand for an insignificant percentage of the scale of populations estimated at national level. The characterization of species from their habitat point of view exists in the species tables presented in the Biodiversity Chapter of the EIA Report and its annexes, although this is not a requirement imposed by the Habitats Directive. Due to their large volume of information, the annexes of chapter 4.6 Biodiversity can be found in the electronic version of the EIA disclosed by the company both in Romanian and English through approx. 6,000 DVD/CD copies, being accessible on the company website, and on the websites of Ministry of Environment and Water Management, local and regional environmental protection agencies of Alba, Sibiu, Cluj, etc.

From practical point of view, the low value of conservation of the impact area is also indirectly emphasized by the fact that there is no proposal to designate the area a SPA (aviafaunistic special protected area) and by the denial as unfounded of the proposal to designate the area as a pSCI area (sites of community importance).

Taking all these into account, we believe that the proposed Project is compliant with the provisions of EU Directive no. 92/43 Habitats[1], and EU Directive no. 79/409 Birds[2] respectively, especially because within Biodiversity Management Plan, Plan H, several active and responsible measures are provided to reconstruct/rehabilitate several natural habitats, pursuant to the provisions of the same documents [3].

References:

[1] art.3, 2nd paragraph, Each Member State shall contribute to the creation of Natura 2000 (network) in proportion to the representation within its territory of the natural habitat types and the habitats of species referred to in paragraph 1. To that effect each Member State shall designate, in accordance with Article 4, sites as special areas of conservation taking account of the objectives set out in paragraph 1.

art.4, 1st paragraph. On the basis of the criteria set out in Annex III (Stage 1) and relevant scientific information, each Member State shall propose a list of sites indicating which natural habitat types in

Annex I and which species in Annex II that are native to its territory the sites host. For animal species ranging over wide areas these sites shall correspond to the places within the natural range of such species which present the physical or biological factors essential to their life and reproduction. For aquatic species which range over wide areas, such sites will be proposed only where there is a clearly identifiable area representing the physical and biological factors essential to their life and reproduction. Where appropriate, Member States shall propose adaptation of the list in the light of the results of the surveillance referred to in Article 11. [...]

2nd paragraph.[...] Member States whose sites hosting one or more priority natural habitat types and priority species represent more than 5 % of their national territory may, in agreement with the Commission, request that the criteria listed in Annex III (Stage 2) be applied more flexibly in selecting all the sites of Community importance in their territory.[...]

Art. 6, 4th paragraph. If, in spite of a negative assessment of the implications for the site and in the absence of alternative solutions, a plan or project must nevertheless be carried out for imperative reasons of overriding public interest, including those of a social or economic nature, the Member State shall take all compensatory measures necessary to ensure that the overall coherence of Natura 2000 is protected. It shall inform the Commission of the compensatory measures adopted.

Art. 16. Provided that there is no satisfactory alternative and the derogation is not detrimental to the maintenance of the populations of the species concerned at a favourable conservation status in their natural range, Member States may derogate from the provisions of Articles 12, 13, 14 and 15 (a) and (b):[...]

- in the interests of public health and public safety, or for other imperative reasons of overriding public interest, including those of a social or economic nature and beneficial consequences of primary importance for the environment;

[2] Art.4, 1st paragraph. The species mentioned in annex 1 shall be the subject of special conservation measures concerning their habitat in order to ensure their survival and reproduction in their area of distribution. [...]

Trends and variations in population levels shall be taken into account as a background for evaluations. Member states shall classify in particular the most suitable territories in number and size as special protection areas for the conservation of these species, taking into account their protection requirements in the geographical sea and land area where this directive applies.

[3] Directive 92/43 Habitats, art. 2, 2nd paragraph; Directive 79/409 Birds, art. 3, 2nd paragraph, letter c.

*

This statement is ungrounded, because the environmental impact assessment (EIA) process has included preliminary cumulative estimates for stationary motorized equipment and linear (vehicular) sources were prepared in order to provide an initial understanding of the potential cumulative noise and vibration impacts from background and Roşia Montană Project sources, and to guide future monitoring and measurement activities as well as the selection of appropriate Best Management Practices/Best Available Techniques for further mitigation of the potential noise and vibration impacts from Project activities. These preliminary estimates apply to major construction activities, as well as the operation and decommissioning/closure of the mine and process plant. They are documented as data tables and isopleth maps for major noise-generating activities in selected, representative Project years; see **Tables 4.3.8** through **4.3.16** and **Exhibits 4.3.1** through **4.3.9**. All these details related to the applied assessment methodology, the input data of the dispersion model, the modeling results and the measures established for the prevention/mitigation/elimination of the potential impact for all project stages (construction, operation, closure) are included in Chapter 4, Section 4.3 Noise and Vibrations of the EIA Report.

Project Years 0, 9, 10, 12, 14, and 19 were selected for modeling because they are considered to be representative of the most significant levels of noise-generating activity. They are also the same years used for air impact modeling purposes in Section 4.2, as air and noise impacts share many of the same sources or are otherwise closely correlated. In order to more accurately reflect potential receptor impacts, all of

these exhibits integrate the background traffic estimates discussed in Section 4.3.6.1.

The Project site plan and process plant area and facility drawings were used to establish the position of the noise sources and other relevant physical characteristics of the site. Receptor locations were established using background reports and project engineering and environmental documentation provided by RMGC. With this information, the source locations and receptor locations were translated into input (x, y, and z) co-ordinates for the noise-modeling program.

Tables 4.3.8 through 4.3.16 and **Exhibits 4.3.1 through 4.3.9** present the average maximum noise values likely to be experienced by the receptor community over all Project phases after incorporation of a variety of initial mitigation measures designed specifically to reduce the impacts associated with mobile and stationary machinery sources. The influence of non-mining related background (primarily traffic) noise is also included.

To evaluate the sound levels associated with haul trucks and other mobile sources crossing the site carrying excavated ore, waste rock, and soil, a noise analysis program based on the (U.S.) Federal Highway Administration's (FHWA) standard RD-77-108 [1] model was used to calculate reference noise emissions values for heavy trucks along the project roadways. The FHWA model predicts hourly L_{eq} values for free-flowing traffic conditions and is generally considered to be accurate within 1.5 decibels (dB).

The model is based on the standardized noise emission factors for different types and weights of vehicles (e.g., automobiles, medium trucks, and heavy trucks), with consideration given to vehicle volume, speed, roadway configuration, distance to the receiver, and the acoustical characteristics of the site. The emission levels of all three vehicle types increase as a function of the logarithm of their speed.

To evaluate the sound sources from the proposed mine processing facility and the semi-stationary material handling equipment (at the ore extraction, waste rock and soil stockpiling areas), a proprietary computerized noise prediction program was used by AAC to simulate and model the future equipment noise emissions throughout the area. The modeling program uses industry-accepted propagation algorithms based on the following American National Standards Institute (ANSI) and International Organization for Standardization (ISO) standards:

- *ANSI S1.26-1995 (R2004), Method for the Calculation of the Absorption of Sound by the Atmosphere;*
- *ISO 9613-1:1993, Acoustics -- Attenuation of sound during propagation outdoors-- Part 1: Calculation of the absorption of sound by the atmosphere;*
- *ISO 9613-2:1996, Acoustics -- Attenuation of sound during propagation outdoors -- Part 2: General method of calculation;*
- *ISO 3891:1978, Acoustics -- Procedure for describing aircraft noise heard on the ground.*

The calculations account for classical sound wave divergence (i.e., spherical spreading loss with adjustments for source directivity from point sources) plus attenuation factors due to air absorption, minimal ground effects, and barriers/shielding.

This model has been validated by AAC over a number of years via noise measurements at several operating industrial sites that had been previously modeled during the engineering design phases. The comparison of modeled predictions versus actual measurements has consistently shown close agreement; typically in the range of 1 to 3 dB (A).

References:

[1] FHWA Highway Traffic Noise Prediction Model; see Federal Highway Administration Report Number FHWA-RD-77-108, USA, Washington, D.C., 1978.

A detailed presentation of blasting technology can be found in the annex 7.1 - Proposed blasting technology for the operational phase of Roşia Montană Project.

*

The partnership between Gabriel Resources and Regia Autonomă a Cuprului Deva (currently, CNCAF Minvest SA) has been established based on Law no. 15/1990 on the reorganization of the state owned companies as autonomous directions and trade companies, published in the Official Gazette, Section I, no.

98/08.08.1990, as subsequently amended and supplemented. Art. 35 of this law provides the possibility of the regies autonomous to enter into partnerships with legal third parties, Romanian or foreign, for the purpose of setting up new trading companies.

Roşia Montană Gold Corporation SA was set up in 1997, according to the legal provisions in force as at that time, the setting up being made by observing all the conditions imposed by Company Law no. 31/1990 and Trade Register Law no. 26/1990, in regard of the setting up of the joint stock companies with mixed capital.

We underline that the Articles of Associations of Roşia Montană Gold Corporation SA, representing the result of the parties agreement in regard of the terms and conditions under which the partnership between the Romanian state and investor takes place represents a public document, being included in the category of documents which, as per Law no. 26/1990 on the Trade Register, are published in the Romanian Official Gazette and for which the Trade Register is obliged to issue, on the expense of the persons submitting a request, certified copies.

As for the agreement concerning the setting up of the mixed company together with Gabriel Resources Ltd., this has been expressed by the Ministry of Industry and Trade, the conditions imposed by the setting up of the mixed company being the following: (i) ensuring of the jobs at the level existing upon the conclusion of the agreement concerning the setting up of the mixed company; (ii) the expenses incurred by the fulfillment of the exploration stage should be fully supported by Gabriel; (iii) the obtaining of the approval from the ANRM by the Copper Autonomous Direction Deva and (iv) the observance of all legal provisions in force concerning the setting up of the mixed companies with foreign partners. These conditions have been fully complied with as at the setting up of the company and during the development of its activity.

We also specify that the establishing of the shareholders' quotas to the benefits and losses of Roşia Montană Gold Corporation SA has been made by considering their contribution quota to the company's share capital. The current percentage of 80% for Gabriel Resources Ltd. and of 19.31% for CNCAF Minvest SA resulted from the initial contribution and the subsequent contributions of the shareholders to the company's share capital, in consideration also of Gabriel Resources Ltd. advancing all expenses and costs related to the development-exploitation and permitting of the Roşia Montană Mining Project.

The provisions of the Articles of Associations of Roşia Montană Gold Corporation SA on the necessary majority and quorum conditions for the decision-making process within the General Shareholders Meeting and the quotas to the benefits and losses of the company are taken from Law no. 31/1990, and no derogation exists in regard of this aspect.

*

This claim is not true; the Urbanism Plan has been prepared with public consultation.

Roşia Montană Gold Corporation SA (RMGC) has requested and obtained from Alba County Council the Urbanism Certificate no. 78 of 26.04.2006, for the entire Roşia Montană mining project, including the tailings management facility. The Urbanism Certificate also stipulated the preparation of a Zonal Urbanism Plan, to reflect all changes made to the Roşia Montană Project, following the public consultations and debates organized in relation to this project, and the consultations with the permitting authorities. This plan, entitled "Modification of the Zonal Urbanism Plan, Roşia Montană Industrial Area", was prepared and subjected to public debate in June 2006 in accordance with the provisions of Order no.176/N/2000 issued by the Ministry of Public Works and Territory Development for the approval of the technical regulations "Guidelines regarding the methodology applied for the preparation and framework content of the Zonal Urbanism Plan" and, at present, it is pending approval.

Concerning the Roşia Montană General Urbanism Plan approved in 2002, such plan was prepared in parallel with the Zonal Urbanism Plan of 2002, all the provisions of the General Urbanism Plan being also included in the Zonal Urbanism Plan. Also, the approval procedure related to the two urbanism plans was carried out in parallel.

*

Preventive archaeological researches within the Roşia Montană mining project area have been undertaken based on specific techniques, specifically trial trenches in all accessible areas that are suitable for human habitation, taking into account the bibliographical information and the observations recorded during the archaeological survey campaigns, the geophysical studies and the analyses of the photogrammetric flights. In addition, surface investigations were undertaken, where appropriate.

The archaeological researches at Roşia Montană covered a large surface and focused on the areas known to have archaeological potential. THEREFORE, ALL AREAS THAT HAVE BEEN ARCHAEOLOGICALLY DISCHARGED HAD BEEN PREVIOUSLY INVESTIGATED. All research programs, beginning with the 2004 campaign, have been undertaken in full compliance with the current legal requirements, i.e. Ministerial Order no. 2392 of 6 September 2004 on the establishment of the Archaeological Standards and Procedures by the Ministry of Culture and Religious Affairs.

The proposed gold mining project at Roşia Montană has raised a series of issues related to the rescue of the historical-archaeological heritage within the area, as well as issues related to its scientific development and also the enhancement of heritage within a museum. Given the complex difficulties encountered in this respect, the Ministry of Culture and Religious Affairs decided to initiate the "Alburnus Maior" National Research Program.

The company's role was to provide the necessary financial resources for the assessment, research and enhancement of the archaeological remains, in full compliance with the Romanian current legislation. The development of the research and of the archaeological discharge works has been conducted through specific means and methodologies that have been adjusted to the realities of every site researched, in our case, Roşia Montană. They consisted in:

- Archives studies;
- Archaeological surveys; trial trenches;
- aerial reconnaissance/survey and aerial photo interpretation ; high resolution satellite images;
- mining archaeology studies; underground topography and 3D modeling;
- geophysical surveys;
- extensive archaeological investigations in the areas with an identified archaeological potential- this implied carrying out archaeological excavations;
- Interdisciplinary studies- sedimentology, archaeo-zoology, comparative palynology, archaeo-metallurgy, geology, mineralogy;
- Radiocarbon dating and dendrochronology;
- This research and its results were included in an integrated database;
- traditional and digital archaeological topography and development of the GIS project; generate a photo archive- both traditional and digital;
- restoration of artifacts;
- an inventory and a digital catalogue of the artifacts;
- studies conducted by specialists in order to enhance the research results - publication of monographs/scientific books and journals, exhibitions, websites, etc.

All the preventive archaeological researches undertaken at Roşia Montană since 2000 have been carried out as part of a complex research program; permits for preventive archaeological excavations being issued in compliance with the current legislation. These archaeological investigations have been undertaken by representatives of 21 specialized institutions from Romania and 3 others from abroad, under the scientific coordination of the Romanian National Museum of History. All archaeological researches have been conducted in full compliance with the existing legislation. The investigations undertaken during each archaeological research campaign have been approved by the Ministry of Culture and Religious Affairs based on the Annual Archaeological Research Plan approved by the National Commission of Archaeology.

Under the current legislation (Ministerial Order no. 2392 of 6 September 2004 on the establishment of the Archaeological Standards and Procedures by the Ministry of Culture and Religious Affairs) the archaeologists who have conducted the research may ask that an archaeological discharge certificate be granted. Based on a complex research program, the archaeologists prepare comprehensive documentation with regard to the researched area. Upon consideration of the submitted documentation, the National Commission of Archaeology makes a decision as to whether to recommend or not the granting of the archaeological discharge certificate. In the case of the research conducted in the period 2001-2006, the

archaeological discharge certificate was issued directly by the Ministry of Culture and Religious Affairs or by its local agencies.

Preventive archaeological researches at Roşia Montană have allowed the research of five Roman cremation necropolis (Tău Corna, Hop-Găuri, Țarina, Jig - Piciorag and Pârâul Porcului – Tăul Secuilor), two funerary areas (Carpeni, Nanului Valley), sacred areas (Hăbad, Nanului Valley), habitation areas (Hăbad, Carpeni, Tăul Țapului, Hop), the most significant being the Roman structures on the Carpeni Hill and the circular funerary monument at Tău Găuri. In addition, for the first time in Romania, surface investigations have been paralleled by underground investigations of Cetate, Cărnic, Jig and Orlea massifs, with important discoveries in the Piatra Corbului, area, Cătălina-Monulești gallery and the Păru Carpeni mining sector.

The research consisted of aerial photo interpretation, archaeological magnetometric studies, electrical resistivity, palynology, sedimentology, geology studies, radiocarbon and dendrochronology dating. For a better management of the research units and of the archaeological findings, data bases were used, including text and photographs-among which 4 satellite images (an archive satellite image type SPOT Panchromatic (10m) from 1997; 2 satellite images LANDSAT 7 MS (30 m), dating from 2000 and 2003; a satellite image with priority programming SPOT 5 SuperMode color (2,5 m resolution-19 July 2004); all data have been included in a comprehensive GIS program, a first in the Romanian archaeological research.

In the case of archaeological monuments that are located close to industrial facilities, plans have been redesigned to ensure that the archaeological remains in question will not be affected. Where appropriate, the archaeological monument was preserved in situ and restored, i.e. the circular funerary monument at Hop-Găuri (see The "Alburnus Maior" monograph series, volume II, Bucharest, 2004). Another example in this respect is the Carpeni Hill, designated an "archaeological " reserve, and the Piatra Corbului area. In 2004, after being thoroughly investigated, these areas have been included on the List of Historic Monuments. Add to this the areas where ancient mining remains will be preserved, such as the Cătălina Monulești gallery and the mining sector Păru Carpeni, as well as the protected area Roşia Montană Historic Center, including a number of heritage assets (35 historic monument houses).

We emphasise in this respect that the identified and researched structures have been published in preliminary form in the Archaeological Research Chronicle of Romania, after every archaeological research campaign, as well as in volume 1 of the Alburnus Maior monographic series. We mention here the areas where Roman habitation structures have been identified and researched, as well as the references to be consulted for further information: Hop-Găuri, Carpeni, Tăul Țapului (CCA 2001 (2002), p. 254-257, no. 182; 261-262, nr. 185; 264-265, no. 188; 265-266, no. 189. Alburnus Maior I, 2003, p. 45-80; 81-122; 123-148; CCA 2001 (2002), 257-261; CCA 2003 (2004) ,280-283; Alburnus Maior I, 2003, p. 387-431, 433-446, 447-467).

For further details related to the applicable legal framework, the responsibilities of the Project titleholder, or for a detailed description of the preventive archaeological researches undertaken to date and of the Cultural Heritage Management Plans, please see Annex called "Information on the Cultural heritage of Roşia and Related Management Aspects". In addition, the annex includes supplementary information with regard to the result of the researches undertaken as part of the "Alburnus Maior" National Research Program between 2001 and 2006.

In conclusion, the area mentioned by the questioner has been researched in accordance with the Romanian legal requirements, as well as with European standards and practices in the field.

Note that the type of research undertaken at Roşia Montană, known as preventive/rescue archaeological research, as well as other related heritage studies, are done everywhere in the world in close connection with the economic development of certain areas. Both the costs for the research and for the enhancement and maintenance of the preserved areas are provided by investors, in a public-private partnership set up in order to protect the cultural heritage, as per the provisions of the European Convention on the Protection of the Archaeological Heritage (Malta-1992) [1].

References:

[1]The text of the Convention is available at the following address:

<http://conventions.coe.int/Treaty/Commun/QueVoulezVous.asp?NT=143&CM=8&DF=7/6/2006&CL=ENG>

*

In 2000, in the context of the proposal of a new mining project in the Roşia Montană area, the Ministry of Culture and Religious Affairs approved a series of studies to be conducted in order to research the archaeological and architectural heritage of the area. At the end of that year, the Design Centre for National Cultural Heritage (now the National Institute for Historical Monuments) presented the preliminary results of these researches in front of the National Commission for Historical Monuments and of the National Commission of Archaeology. Based on these results, in 2001, the Ministry of Culture and Religious Affairs initiated the “Alburnus Maior” National Research Program (the Order no. 2504 / 07.03.2001 of the Minister of Culture and Religious Affairs) in compliance with the Law 378/2001 (as subsequently amended by Law 462/2003 and by Law 258/2006 and Law 259/2006). Thus, since 2000, the Ministry of Culture and Religious Affairs has fulfilled its duties – directly or through its subordinated institutions - with regard to the management of the issues related to Roşia Montană’s heritage.

The preventive archaeological researches have been conducted by the representatives of 21 national institutions and 3 others from abroad, with a broad expertise in the field. They have been carried out based on the annual approval of the National Commission of Archaeology of the Ministry of Culture and Religious Affairs. In accordance with current legislation, this research program is carried out with financial support provided by RMGC, i.e. the company that plans to expand and continue to mine the gold-silver deposit in Roşia Montană. Thus, large-scale preventive investigations have been conducted or are underway in the RMP impact area. A proposal will be made based on the results of these investigations, either for the archaeological discharge of some researched areas or the preservation in situ of certain representative structures and monuments, in compliance with current legislation. For areas proposed for conservation or for archaeological discharge measures the decision was made based on the surveys conducted by specialists and on the analysis of the results by the National Commission of Archaeology. In the period 2000-2005, the mining project underwent a series of modifications designed to promote the conservation of the local heritage. Examples of this include extending the duration of the field investigations (e.g. in Tarina, Pârâul Porcului, Orlea) and changing the location of some elements of mining infrastructure in order to allow the conservation of the archaeological remains found in the Carpeni, in the Tău Găuri and Pietra Corbului areas.

The architectural and town-planning surveys have been conducted, in accordance with current legislation, by companies certified by the Ministry of Culture and Religious Affairs, while the town-planning documentation drafted by these companies, and the restoration and conservation works undertaken so far, have been approved by the National Commission for Historical Monuments. Thus, the town-planning documentation has been approved and implemented in accordance with current legislation, and the company has agreed to these decisions and modified the mine development plans accordingly:

Extensive ethnographic research was conducted in the Roşia Montană-Abrud-Corna area in the period 2001-2004 coordinated by a team of specialists for the Romanian Village Museum „Dimitrie Gusti” (a National Museum directly under the coordination of the Ministry of Culture and Religious Affairs). Moreover, a broad series of oral history interviews was conducted in the period 2001-2002 by the Romanian Society of Radio broadcasting through the „Gheorghe Brătianu” Oral History Centre, Bucharest (SRR - CIO).

In compliance with the requirements of the Ministry of Environment and Waters Management and the Ministry of Culture and Religious Affairs, specific management plans have been drawn up for the management and conservation of the heritage remains from the Roşia Montană area, in the context of the implementation of the mining project. These plans have been included in the documentation prepared for the report on the Environmental Impact Assessment Study. (see EIA Report, volume 32-33, Plan M-Cultural Heritage Management Plan, part I –Management Plan for the Archaeological Heritage from Roşia Montană Zone; part II-Management Plan for the Historical Monuments and Protected Zone from Roşia Montană; part III- Cultural Heritage Management Plan).

These management plans comprise detailed presentations of the obligations and responsibilities for the protection and conservation of the heritage remains from the Roşia Montană area, which the company has assumed as part of the mining project, in accordance with the decision of the central government. These heritage remains include: archaeological remains above and under the ground, historic buildings, protected areas, intangible heritage assets, cultural landscape items, etc. In this context, it should be noted

that besides the works for the protection and preservation of the archaeological heritage, works are also being carried out for the rehabilitation and conservation of the protected area Historical Centre Roşia Montană (comprising 35 historic buildings, and projects for the restoration of 11 of these buildings are currently being drafted) and at Tăul Mare, Tăul Brazi and Tăul Anghel, plus remains of the surface mining works from the Văidoaia area, and the creation of a modern museum dedicated to the history of mining in the Apuseni Mountains area. This museum will be established including exhibitions of geology, archaeology, industrial and ethnographic heritage as well as an underground section organized around the Cătălina Monuleşti gallery.

Moreover, representatives of the Directorate/Department for Culture, Religious Affairs and National Cultural Heritage of Alba County have paid a number of visits to Roşia Montană in order to collect information and to check the situation. The same administrative body was the intermediary for the acquisitions of historic buildings made by RMGC. The Ministry of Culture and Religious Affairs expressed its pre-emption right regarding the acquisition of these buildings.

It should be mentioned, however, that apart from the obligations undertaken by RMGC as regards the protection and conservation of the archaeological remains and historical monuments, there are also a series of obligations which rest with the local public authorities from Roşia Montană and from Alba County, and with the central public authorities, specifically the Romanian Government. These aspects are detailed in the Cultural Heritage Management Plans included in the EIA Report (see EIA Report, volume 32, Management Plan for the Archaeological Heritage from Roşia Montană Zone, pages 22-24, 49, 55-56, 71-72 and the EIA Report, volume 33- Management Plan for the Historical Monuments and Protected Zone from Roşia Montană pages 28-29, 47-50, 51-53, 65-66, page 103 – Annex 1).

Item no.

45

No. to identify the observations received from the public

No.
169321/
06.11.2006

Proposal

The questioner does not agree to the implementation of the Roşia Montană project formulating the following remarks and comments:

- Within EIA, there are no presented all the possible risks caused by this project;
- The overall costs for mine closure are not realistic;
- There isn't until now an approved Zonal Urbanism Plan for the Protected Areas;
- The phase of public consultation and quality evaluation of the impact assessment study report begun without a valid urbanism certificate;
- Information about the foundation which RMGC will establish and subsidize is not given. This foundation follows to assume the obligations which the mining operation can not assume;
- The present urbanism plans of the Roşia Montană commune do not correspond with the mining project proposal described in EIA;
- There is no liner proposed for the tailings pond;
- The proposed waste deposits will be not constructed according to the legislation in force;
- No financial guarantees have been stipulated;
- There is not a Safety Report submitted for the public consultation and evaluation by the competent authorities;
- The EIA report does not assess the "zero alternative";
- The Project poses a threat for protected flora and fauna;
- The EIA report does not refer to the impact on the listed heritage buildings of noise and vibrations caused by the mining operations;
- The public/ONGs wish to consult the contracts and agreements between Company and Romanian State;
- The Urbanism Plan has been modified without public consultation;
- From archeological point of view, the area proposed to be occupied by project was not legally investigated;
- It disputes the spiritual and architectural monuments, including the responsible involvement of the Institutions of the State in the protection program.

Solution

It is the nature of risk that it can be mitigated and diminished; it cannot be made to disappear. In order to put this into context, the common action of walking on the street or developing everyday activities have an accident potential. This accident potential is twice higher than within the framework of industrial activities that use hazardous substances.

In the larger sense, the entire EIA report is focused on the assessment of impacts and their associated mitigation. Specifically, Chapter 4 of the EIA presents that impact assessment of the project. The following discussion presents a summary of the impact discussed in the EIA.

As far as natural and technological risks assessments are concerned, Chapter 7, "Risk Cases", from the Report on Environmental Impact Assessment, emphasizes the fact that safety and prevention measures, the implementation of the environmental management and risk systems are mitigating the consequences to acceptable levels as compared to the most restrictive norms, standards, the best practices or national and international recommendations in the field. The risk level has been established as moderate and so, socially acceptable. The extension of the risk assessment and the intensity of the prevention and mitigation measures of the consequences should be proportionate to the risk involved. Selection of a specific mitigation technique is depends on the analyzed accident scenario.

More detailed assessments are conducted for accident scenarios that, based on the qualitative assessment are found to be potentially major, of probability more than 10^{-6} (reduced recovery periods of 1/1,000,000) meaning that they could have major consequences therefore, elevated associated risk, a higher risk level than 9 to 12 (on a scale of 1-25). To put this in context, simply living in southern Florida rates a 1 - 25 on

the risk scale.

A global assessment of the risks associated with the Roşia Montană Project is obtained by the quick environmental and health risk assessment methodology initially developed by the Italian Ministry of the Environment and the World Health Organization. Natural hazard and risk identification and analysis presents key data and information in assessing potential technological accidents. Thus:

- in designing the Tailings Management Facility, the design parameters were chosen to fully cover the characteristic seismic risk of the area. These seismic design parameters adopted for the TMF and other facilities on the proposed site result in a safety factor much greater than the minimum accepted under the Romanian and European design standards for such facilities;

- in the sector physically impacted by the Project, the risk of floods will remain very low due to the small catchments (controlled by the Roşia and Corna Streams) the area affected by the operation, and the creation of containment, diversion and drainage hydro-technical structures for storm waters on the site, and in the Abrud catchment in general;

- risks caused by meteorological events have been reviewed and used in assessing the hazards of the affected technological processes.

From the analysis of morphometrical parameters and their correlation with other sets of information on the natural slopes on and near the site shows that the (qualitatively estimated) landslide occurrence risk is low to moderate and its consequences will not cause major impacts on the structural components of the Project.

There is no significant risk associated with resource depletion. Mining activities are planned judiciously, so as to extract only the profitable gold and silver resources and only the necessary construction rock for the Project. The management of the mining concession site will minimize reserve "sterilization" (limitation of future access to the reserves).

In assessing technological hazards and risks, the quantity of hazardous substances on the site was calculated as a total and by category, as provided by the *Notification Procedure* approved by Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry, Water and Environment (MAFWE) Order 1084/2003. Based on an evaluation of hazardous substances in stock on the Project site in relation to the relevant quantities provided by the Government Decision 95/2003 which transposes the Seveso Directive, the Project ranges between the upper and the lower limits, and therefore S.C. Roşia Montană Gold Corporation S.A. is required to prepare a Report on Environmental Impact Assessment Study to be sent to the local environmental authority and the local civilian protection authority a *Safety Report* on its operations to prevent major accident risks.

In assessing the consequences of major accidents involving dangerous substances, physical-mathematical models accepted internationally and especially at EU level, and the current version of the SLAB (Canada) software have been used, the latter for the atmospheric dispersion of denser than air gases, that may handle a multitude of situations and scenarios. Similarly, the EFFECTSGis 5.5 (Netherlands) software, developed for the analysis of the effects of industrial accidents and of consequences. Several scenarios were considered in response to the internal legislative requirements, especially related to the implementation of the Internal Emergency Plans (GD 647/2005). The conclusions of the risk assessment for major accidents were:

- The total destruction of plant facilities may only be caused by terrorist attack with classic or nuclear weapons. Simultaneous damage to the HCl tank (including containment) and to the NaCN solution tank, the tanks containing enriched solution, to one or more leaching tanks, having as a result HCN dispersion into the air. At the same time, under certain situations and weather conditions unfavorable for dispersion, people within 40 m of the emission source, surprised by the toxic cloud for more than 1 minute without respiratory protection equipment, will most certainly die. It may also be considered that, on a radius of about 310 m, persons exposed for more than 10 minutes may suffer serious intoxications that may also lead to death. Toxic effects may occur in persons up to about 2 km downwind of the process plant;

- Operating errors and/or failures in the measurement and control devices, resulting in a lower pH in the leaching tank, thickener and/or DETOX slurry and accidental emissions of hydrocyanic acid. The area affected by concentrations of 290 ppm over a 10 min exposure time is within a circle of 36 m radius and the 50 ppm IDLH threshold for 30 min exposure will be reached over an area of 157.5 m radius. The center of these circles is the middle of the CIL tanks platform;

- Accidental HCN emission from the decanter. The accident may be caused by a drop of pH in the

CIL tanks combined with an overdose of flocculent solution and faulty pH monitoring systems. The area affected by concentrations of 300 ppm over a 10 min exposure time is within a circle of 65 m radius and the 50 ppm IDLH threshold for 30 min exposure will be reached over an area of 104 m radius. The center of these circles is mid-distance between the two DETOX facilities;

- Accidental HCN emission from the DETOX facility. The accident may be caused by a drop of pH in the reactors generated by an overdose of metabisulfite solution and/or copper sulphate combined with faulty pH monitoring systems. The area affected by high 1900 ppm concentrations for a 1 min exposure time is located within a 10 m radius circle. The area affected by concentrations of 300 ppm over a 10 min exposure time is within a circle of 27 m radius and the 50 ppm IDLH threshold for 30 min exposure will be reached over an area of 33 m radius. The center of these circles is mid-distance between the two DETOX facilities;

- Explosion of the LPG storage tank. The LPG storage tank has a 50 ton capacity and is located outdoors, near the heating plant. The simulation was conducted for the worst case scenario, considering an explosion of the full tank. Threshold I with heat 12.5 kW/m² is within a 10.5 m radius circle and Threshold II, of heat radiation 5 kW/m² is within a circle of 15 m radius;

- Damage and/or fire at the fuel tanks. Simulations were conducted for the worst case scenarios, considering ignition and combustion of all the diesel (fire in the tank, or in the containment vat, when full of diesel);

- Corna Dam break and breach development. Two credible accident scenarios were considered in simulating tailings flow out of the Tailings Management Facility, and six credible scenarios for the flow of decant water and tailings pore water, with significant effects on the terrestrial and aquatic ecosystems, in different weather conditions;

- Tailings flow may occur along Corna Valley, on a 800 m (starter dam break) or over 1,600 m reach should the Corna dam break in its final stage;

- In regard to water quality impacts, cyanide concentrations in the water in the shape of a pollution plume may reach Arad, near the Romanian-Hungarian border on the Mures River, in concentrations ranging between 0.03 and 0.5 mg/L. Due to inherent mathematical limitations in the models, these values and the accident effects are considered overestimated. Therefore, the results describe the “worst case scenario” based on extreme dam break assumptions for the Corna Dam.

A new and much more precise and realistic simulation has been subsequently established based on the INCA Mine model, that considers the dispersion, volatilization and breakdown of cyanides during the downstream movement of the pollutant flow (Whiteland et al., 2006).

The model used is the INCA model developed over the past 10 years to simulate both terrestrial and aquatic systems within the EUROLIMPACS EU research program (www.eurolimpacs.ucl.ac.uk). The model has been used to assess the impacts from future mining, and collection and treatment operations for pollution from past mining at Roşia Montană.

The modeling created for Roşia Montană simulates eight metals (cadmium, lead, zinc, mercury, arsenic, copper, chromium, manganese) as well as Cyanide, Nitrate, Ammonia and dissolved oxygen. The model has been applied to the upper catchments at Roşia Montană as well as the complete Abrud-Arieş-Mureş river system down to the Hungarian Border and on into the Tisa River. The model takes into account the dilution, mixing and physical-chemical processes affecting metals, ammonia and cyanide in the river system and gives estimates of concentrations at key locations along the river, including at the Hungarian Boarder and in the Tisa after the Mureş joins it.

Because of dilution and dispersion in the river system, and of the initial EU BAT-compliant technology adopted for the project (for example, the use of a cyanide destruct process for tailings effluent that reduces cyanide concentration in effluent stored in the TMF to below 6 mg/l), even a large scale unprogrammed release of tailings materials (for example, following failure of the dam) into the river system would not result in transboundary pollution. The model has shown that under worse case dam failure scenario all legal limits for cyanide and heavy metals concentrations would be met in the river water before it crosses into Hungary.

The INCA model has also been used to evaluate the beneficial impacts of the existing mine water collection and treatment and it has shown that substantial improvements in water quality are achieved along the river system under normal operational conditions.

For more information, an information sheet presenting the INCA modeling work is presented under the title of the Mureş River Modeling Program and the full modeling report is presented in Annex 5.1:

- Development of HCN on the tailings pond surface. Simulated emissions of HCN from the Tailings Management Facility pond surface and of their dispersion into the ambient air show that the level of $400\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ hourly average and $179\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ 8hr average will not be exceeded. These HCN concentrations are only slightly over the odor threshold (0.17ppm) and much below potentially dangerous concentrations;

- Cetate Dam break and breach development. Flood modeling was in case of a break in Cetate dam was based on the design parameters obtained from the hydrometeorological study "Assessment of rainfall intensity, frequency and runoff for the Roşia Montană Project - Radu Drobot". The breach characteristics were predicted using the BREACH model, and the maximum height of the flood wave in various flow sections was modeled using the FLDWAV software. The assumptions included a total $800,000\text{ m}^3$ discharge for one hour, when the peak of the flood hydrograph is about 4.9 m above base flow immediately below the dam and in the narrow Abrud valley 5.9-7.5 km downstream of the dam, while in the last section considered (10.5 km) water depth is about 2.3 m above base flow and the maximum flow rate $877\text{ m}^3/\text{s}$. Further, the broader Aries valley allows the flood wave to propagate on a significantly wider bed, which results in a highly attenuated hydrograph. These results describe the "worst case scenario" based on extreme dam break assumptions;

- Accidents during cyanide transportation. Due to the large quantities of cyanide transported (about 30t /day) the risks associated to this activity were assessed in detail using the ZHA- Zurich Hazard Analysis method. As a consequence, the optimum transport route was selected from the manufacturer to the Process Plant, e.g

Cyanide transport (in solid state) will exclusively involve special SLS (Solid to Liquid System) containers, 16 tons each. The ISO compliant container will be protected by a framework with legs, which allows separation from the transport trailer for temporary storage. The wall is 5.17 mm thick, which, together with the protective framework, provides additional protection to the load in case of accident. This system is considered BAT and is currently one of the safest cyanide transportation options.

It is being mentioned the fact that the study develops the occurrence possibility of these scenarios (pages 166-171, Conclusions).

As regards the cyanides management, there is a baseline study named "Roşia Montană Golden Project, Cyanides Management Plan" prepared in compliance with the "International Management Code for the Manufacture, Transport and Use of Cyanide in the Production of Gold (International Cyanide management Institute) May 2002". S.C. Roşia Montană Gold Corporation is signatory to this code.

Bibliographical references for Chapter 7 "Risk Cases" are listed at page173-176.

*

RMGC's closure estimates, which were developed by a team of independent experts with international experience and will be reviewed by third party experts, are based on the assumption that the project can be completed according to the plan, without interruptions, bankruptcy or the like They are engineering calculations and estimates based on the current commitments of the closure plan and are summarized in the EIA's Mine Closure and Rehabilitation Management Plan (Plan J in the EIA). Annex 1 of Plan J will be updated using a more detailed approach looking at every individual year and calculating the amount of surety, which must be set aside year by year to rehabilitate the mine before RMGC is released from all its legal obligations. Most importantly, the current estimates assume the application of international best practice, best available technology (BAT) and compliance with all Romanian and European Union laws and regulations.

Closure and rehabilitation at Roşia Montană involves the following measures:

- Covering and vegetating the waste dumps as far as they are not backfilled into the open pits;
- Backfilling the open pits, except Cetate pit, which will be flooded to form a lake;
- Covering and vegetating the tailings pond and its dam areas;
- Dismantling of disused production facilities and revegetation of the cleaned-up areas;
- Water treatment by semi-passive systems (with conventional treatment systems as backup) until all effluents have reached the discharge standards and need no further treatment;

- Maintenance of the vegetation, erosion control, and monitoring of the entire site until it has been demonstrated by RMGC that all remediation targets have been sustainably reached.

While the aspects of closure and rehabilitation are many, we are confident in our cost estimates because the largest expense—that incurred by the earthmoving operation required to reshape the landscape—can be estimated with confidence. Using the project design, we can measure the size of the areas that must be reshaped and resurfaced. Similarly, there is a body of scientific studies and experiments that enable scientists to determine the depth of soil cover for successful revegetation. By multiplying the size of the areas by the necessary depth of the topsoil by the unit rate (also derived from studying similar earthmoving operations at similar sites), we can estimate the potential costs of this major facet of the rehabilitation operation. The earthmoving operation, which will total approximately US \$65 million, makes up 87% of closure and rehabilitation costs.

Also, the necessity of additional technological measures to stabilize and reshape the tailings surface will be discussed in the update of the Economical Financial Guarantee (EFG) estimate, which leads to an increase the provisions for tailings rehabilitation, especially if the TMF is closed prematurely and no optimized tailings disposal regime is applied. The exact figures depend on the details of the TMF closure strategy which can be finally determined only during production.

We believe that—far from being not realistic—our cost estimates are evidence of our high level of commitment to closure and rehabilitation. Just as a comparison, the world’s largest gold producer has set aside US \$683 million (as of December 31, 2006) for the rehabilitation of 27 operations, which equates to US \$25 million on average per mine. The RMGC closure cost estimates, recently revised upward from the US \$73 million reported in the EIA based on additional information, currently total US \$76 million.

*

According to Law 5/2000, regarding the approval of the Territory Arrangement Plan – 3rd Section – protected areas (“Law 5/2000”) (article 5, paragraphs 2-3), local public authorities, with the support of the competent central public authorities, had the obligation to establish the boundaries of the protection areas for the cultural heritage elements stipulated in Annex III to the above-mentioned law. This measure should have been taken within 12 months from the effective date of Law 5/2000, based on specialized studies. For this purpose, the local public authorities had to prepare the town planning documentation and its related regulations, developed and approved according to the law. This documentation must comprise the necessary protection and conservation measures for the national cultural heritage elements located in this area.

Concurrently, Law 350/2001 on the territory arrangement and urbanism stipulates the right of legal or natural persons interested in arranging the territory, to initiate the development of urbanism plans.

In accordance with these legal provisions, in 2001, RMGC initiated the preparation of these specific town-planning documentations - the General Urbanism Plan and the Zonal Urbanism Plan. These plans have been developed by Romanian certified companies and followed the legal approval procedure. The permit for the establishment of the Roşia Montană Historical Centre Protected Area was issued by the Ministry of Culture and Religious Affairs in 2002 (permits no. 61/14.02.2002 and no. 178/20.06.2002) as part of the procedure for the approval of the town planning documentation. Based on these permits, the Ministry of Culture and Religious Affairs requested the company to develop a Zonal Urbanism Plan for the Historical Centre of Roşia Montană. Out of the 41 historical buildings in Roşia Montană, thirty-five (35) are located inside the protected area of the Roşia Montană Historical Centre.

As for the heritage elements located in the future industrial development area (6 historical buildings), these are discussed in the Industrial Zonal Urbanism Plan prepared by SC Proiect Alba SA. The regulations included in this document will contain measures for the protection of these monuments.

In conclusion, the town planning studies and the specialized studies conducted for the purpose of establishing the boundaries of the protection areas within the future mining operations perimeter are currently pending approval, in accordance with the legal provisions, by the competent institutions and committees. Please note that none of the historical houses located in the perimeter of the proposed project will be affected; on the contrary, all the 41 historic buildings will be included in a complex

restoration and rehabilitation program (see the Management Plan). This program is mandatory, regardless of the implementation of the mining project, if we want to prevent these buildings from collapsing because of their advanced degradation.

*

Your assertion regarding the failure to obtain an applicable urbanism certificate at the start up of the public debates and of the evaluation of the quality of the report to the environmental impact assessment, is not correct.

Thus, by the time when the public debate stage started up there was an applicable urbanism certificate and namely the urbanism certificate no. 78/26.04.2006 issued by Alba County Council. This certificate was obtained prior to the evaluation stage of the quality of the report to the environmental impact assessment which started up once the EIA was submitted to the Ministry of Environment and Water Management on the 15th May 2006.

For better understanding the applicable legal provisions and the facts developed within the mining project of Roşia Montană zone we would like to make several comments:

- The procedure for issuing the environmental permit for Roşia Montană project started up on the 14th December 2004 by submitting the technical memorandum and the urbanism certificate no.68/26.August 2004 (certificate applicable by that time). S.C. Roşia Montană Gold Corporation S.A. (RMGC) applied for and obtained a new urbanism certificate no.78/26.04.2006 issued by Alba County Council for the entire Roşia Montană Project applicable on the date of the EIA Report submission (15th May 2006) and prior to the public debate start up (June 2006);
- The Section 1 of the urbanism certificate no.78 of 26th 04.2006 entitled Work construction, position 10 – “Processing plant and associated constructions “ – including the tailing management facility which existence is compulsory for the processing plant running. The Tailing management facility is also specified on the layout plans which are integral part of the urbanism certificate and they were sealed by Alba County Council so that they cannot be modified;
- The Urbanism Certificate is an informative document and its goal is only to inform the applicant about the legal, economic and technical regime of the existing lands and buildings and to establish the urbanism requirements and the approvals necessary to obtain the construction permit (including the environmental permit) as per art.6 of Law 50/1991 referring to the completion of construction works, republished and art 27 paragraph 2 of the Norms for the application of Law 50/1991 – Official Journal 825 bis/13.09.2005).

As it is an informative document, it does not limit the number of certificates an applicant may obtain for the same land plot (art. 30 of Law no. 350/2001 regarding the territorial planning and urbanism).

*

Introduced as part of the Environmental Impact Assessment Report Study (EIA), the Roşia Montană Foundation is shifting in focus. The Community Sustainable Development Plan activities initially conceived as coming under the Foundation umbrella (business oriented activities: business incubator, business advisory center, micro-finance facility, as well as social oriented activities: education and training center) have been advanced independently, via partnerships and with community participation in decision-making – a preferable way to advance social and economic development programs.

Going forward, the Foundation will take shape around preservation, patrimony and cultural heritage issues, with its final form determined in consultation with the community.

In terms of the philosophy that guides the company’s Sustainable Development efforts, the Roşia Montană Gold Corporation (RMGC) sees itself not as principal provider, but as a partner. Community involvement is considered the starting point; over time, as the community builds the capacity to maintain programs in its own right, the company will turn over control of currently-established programs to the community and its institutions.

For more information, please see Roşia Montană Sustainable Development and the Roşia Montană Project – annex 4.

*

We underline the fact that your statement is false. The General Urbanism Plan for the Roşia Montană commune, endorsed in 2002 allows the development of Roşia Montană project, as it has been presented during the public consultations.

Concurrently, pursuant to the provisions of art. 41, paragraph 2, from the Mining Law no.85/2003, the authorities from the local administration have the liability to adjust and/or update the territory arrangement plans and the general urbanism plans, in order to allow the development of all operations necessary for the development of mining activities.

RMGC has also initiated the preparation of two zonal urbanism plans: Zonal Urbanism Plan Modification – Roşia Montană Industrial Area and Zonal Urbanism Plan – Roşia Montană Historical Area. The first urbanism plan is required by the urbanism certificate no.78/26.04.2006, which updates the Zonal Urbanism Plan for the Industrial Area approved in 2002. As far as the historical area is concerned, its Zonal Urbanism Plan is required by the General Urbanism Plan approved also in 2002. Both urbanism plans are pending approval and have been subject to public consultations.

*

An engineered liner is included in the design of the Tailings Management Facility (TMF) basin. Specifically, the Roşia Montană Tailings Management Facility (TMF or “the facility”) has been designed to be compliant with the EU Groundwater Directive (80/68/EEC), transposed as Romanian GD 351/2005. The TMF is also designed for compliance with the EU Mine Waste Directive (2006/21/EC) as required by the Terms of Reference established by the MEWM in May, 2005. The following paragraphs provide a discussion of how the facility is compliant with the directives.

The TMF is composed of a series of individual components including:

- the tailings impoundment;
- the tailings dam;
- the secondary seepage collection pond;
- the secondary containment dam; and
- the groundwater monitoring wells/extraction wells located downstream of the Secondary Containment dam.

All of these components are integral parts of the facility and necessary for the facility to perform as designed.

The directives indicated above require that the TMF design be protective of groundwater. For the Roşia Montană project (RMP), this requirement is addressed by consideration of the favorable geology (low permeability shales underlying the TMF impoundment, the TMF dam and the Secondary Containment dam) and the proposed installation of a low-permeability (1×10^{-6} cm/sec) recompacted soil liner beneath the TMF basin. Please see Chapter 2 of EIA Plan F, “The Tailings Facility Management Plan” for more information.

The proposed low permeability soil liner will be fully compliant with Best Available Techniques (BAT) as defined by EU Directive 96/61 (IPPC) and EU Mine Waste Directive. Additional design features that are included in the design to be protective of groundwater include:

- A low permeability (1×10^{-6} cm/sec) cut off wall within the foundation of the starter dam to control seepage;
- A low permeability (1×10^{-6} cm/sec) core in the starter dam to control seepage;
- A seepage collection dam and pond below the toe of the tailings dam to collect and contain any seepage that does extend beyond the dam centerline;
- A series of monitoring wells, below the toe of the secondary containment dam, to monitor seepage and ensure compliance, before the waste facility limit.

In addition to the design components noted above specific operational requirements will be implemented to be protective of human health and the environment. In the extremely unlikely case that impacted water is detected in the monitoring wells below the secondary containment dam, they will be converted to

pumping wells and will be used to extract the impacted water and pump it into the reclaim pond where it will be incorporated into the RMP processing plant water supply system, until the compliance is reestablish.

*

An engineered liner is included in the design of the Tailings Management Facility (TMF) basin to be protective of groundwater. Specifically, the Roșia Montană Tailings Management Facility (TMF or “the facility”) has been designed to be compliant with the EU Groundwater Directive (80/68/EEC), transposed as Romanian GD 351/2005. The TMF is also designed for compliance with the EU Mine Waste Directive (2006/21/EC) as required by the Terms of Reference established by the MEWM in May, 2005. The following paragraphs provide a discussion of how the facility is compliant with the directives.

The TMF is composed of a series of individual components including:

- the tailings impoundment;
- the tailings dam;
- the secondary seepage collection pond;
- the secondary containment dam; and
- the groundwater monitoring wells/extraction wells located downstream of the Secondary Containment dam.

All of these components are integral parts of the facility and necessary for the facility to perform as designed.

The directives indicated above require that the TMF design be protective of groundwater. For the Roșia Montană project (RMP), this requirement is addressed by consideration of the favorable geology (low permeability shales underlying the TMF impoundment, the TMF dam, and the Secondary Containment dam) and the proposed installation of a low-permeability (1×10^{-6} cm/sec) recompacted soil liner beneath the TMF basin. Please see Chapter 2 of EIA Plan F, “The Tailings Facility Management Plan” for more information.

The proposed low permeability soil liner will be fully compliant with Best Available Techniques (BAT) as defined by EU Directive 96/61 (IPPC) and EU Mine Waste Directive. Additional design features that are included in the design to be protective of groundwater include:

- A low permeability (1×10^{-6} cm/sec) cut off wall within the foundation of the starter dam to control seepage;
- A low permeability (1×10^{-6} cm/sec) core in the starter dam to control seepage;
- A seepage collection dam and pond below the toe of the tailings dam to collect and contain any seepage that does extend beyond the dam centerline;
- A series of monitoring wells, below the toe of the secondary containment dam; to monitor seepage and ensure compliance, before the waste facility limit.

In addition to the design components noted above specific operational requirements will be implemented to be protective of human health and the environment. In the extremely unlikely case that impacted water is detected in the monitoring wells below the secondary containment dam, they will be converted to pumping wells and will be used to extract the impacted water and pump it into the reclaim pond where it will be incorporated into the RMP processing plant water supply system, until the compliance is reestablish.

With respect to your comments made as regards a presumptive infringement of the provisions of Government Decision No.351/2005 (“GD 351/2005”), there are several aspects to be taken into consideration. Thus:

1. Firstly, please note that, according to the provisions of art. 6 of GD 351/2005, any activity that might determine the discharge of dangerous substances into the environment is subject to the prior approval of the water management authorities and shall comply with the provisions of the water permit issued in accordance with the relevant legislation. The GD 351/2005 provides that the water permit shall be issued only after all technical-construction measures are implemented as prevent the indirect discharge of dangerous

substances into the underground waters. The maximum discharge limits are expressly provided under GD 351/2005 and compliance with such is a condition for granting and maintaining the water permit.

In accordance with the provisions of GD 351/2005, the actual discharge limits should be authorized by the relevant authority, such process being understood by the lawmaker in consideration of the complexity and variety of industrial activities, as well as the latest technological achievements.

Therefore, please note that the EIA stage is not intended to be finalized into an overall comprehensive permit, but it represents only a part of a more complex permitting process. Please note that, according with art. 3 of GD 918/2002, the data's level of detail provided in the EIA is the one available in the feasibility stage of the project, obviously making impossible for both the titleholder and authority to exhaust all required technical data and permits granted.

The adequate protection of the ground water shall be ensured by the terms and conditions of the water permit. The issuance of the water permit shall be performed following an individual assessment of the project, considering its particular aspects and the relevant legal requirements applicable for mining activities. Until the water permit is obtained, any allegation regarding the infringement of GD 351/2005 is obviously premature mainly because the water permit shall regulate, in accordance with the relevant legal provisions, the conditions to be observed by the developer as regards the protection of the ground water;

2. Secondly, kindly note that the complexity and specificity of mining projects generated the need of a particular legal framework. Therefore, for such projects, the reading of the legal provisions of a certain enactment should be corroborated with the relevant provisions of the other regulations applicable.

In this respect, please note that the understanding of GD 351/2005 must be corroborated with the provisions of the entire relevant legislation enforceable as regards Roşia Montană Project, with a particular accent to Directive 2006/21/EC on the management of waste from the extractive industries ("Directive 21").

The very scope of Directive 21 is to provide a specific legal framework for the extractive wastes and waste facilities related to mining projects, considering the complexity of such projects and the particular aspects of mining activities that can not always be subject to the common regulations on waste management and landfill.

From this perspective, Directive 21 provides that, an operator of a waste facility, as such is defined thereunder (please note that the TMF proposed by RMGC is considered a "waste facility" under Directive 21), must inter alia, ensure that:

- a) *"the waste facility is [...]designed so as to meet the necessary conditions for, in the short and long-term perspectives, preventing pollution of the soil, air, groundwater or surface water, taking into account especially Directives 76/464/EEC (1), 80/68/EEC (2) and 2000/60/EC, and ensuring efficient collection of contaminated water and leachate as and when required under the permit, and reducing erosion caused by water or wind as far as it is technically possible and economically viable;"*
- b) *"the waste facility is suitably constructed, managed and maintained to ensure its physical stability and to prevent pollution or contamination of soil, air, surface water or groundwater in the short and long-term perspectives as well as to minimize as far as possible damage to landscape."*

In addition, it should be mentioned that RMGC was required by MWEM under the Terms of Reference, to perform the EIA considering the provisions of Directive 21 and the BAT Management of Mining Waste. The Directive 21 was intended by the EU DG of Environment to be the legislative regime applicable to sound management of mining waste throughout Europe and therefore compliance with its provisions is mandatory.

*

Information regarding our Environmental Financial Guarantee ("EFG") is fully discussed in the section of the Environmental Impact Assessment titled "Environmental and Social Management and System Plans" (Annex 1 of the subchapter titled "Mine Rehabilitation and Closure Management Plan"). The EFG is

updated annually and will always reflect the costs associated with reclamation. These funds will be held in protected accounts at the Romanian state disposal.

Roșia Montană Gold Corporation (“RMGC”) has invested significant time, energy, and resources assessing the viability of a mining project in the valley of Roșia Montană. This assessment has led RMGC to conclude that Roșia Montană presents an attractive long-term development opportunity – an opinion confirmed by a variety of lending institutions, who have completed detailed reviews of the project’s design and profitability. We have every confidence that we will see the project through to the end of its projected 16-year lifespan, regardless of any fluctuations in the market price of gold.

In Romania, the creation of an EFG is required to ensure adequate funds are available from the mine operator for environmental cleanup. The EFG is governed by the Mining Law (no. 85/2003) and the National Agency for Mineral Resources instructions and Mining Law Enforcement Norms (no. 1208/2003).

Two directives issued by the European Union also impact the EFG: the Mine Waste Directive (“MWD”) and the Environmental Liability Directive (“ELD”).

The Mine Waste Directive aims to ensure that coverage is available for 1) all the obligations connected to the permit granted for the disposal of waste material resulting from mining activities and 2) all of the costs related to the rehabilitation of the land affected by a waste facility. The Environmental Liability Directive regulates the remedies, and measures to be taken by the environmental authorities, in the event of environmental damage created by mining operations, with the goal of ensuring adequate financial resources are available from the operators for environmental cleanup efforts. While these directives have yet to be transposed by the Romanian Government, the deadlines for implementing their enforcement mechanisms are 30 April 2007 (ELD) and 1 May 2008 (MWD) – thus before operations are scheduled to begin at Roșia Montană.

RMGC has already begun the process of complying with these directives, and once their implementation instruments are enacted by the Romanian Government, we will be in full compliance.

Each EFG will follow detailed guidelines generated by the World Bank and the International Council on Mining and Metals.

The current projected closure cost for Roșia Montană is US \$76 million, which is based on the mine operating for its full 16-year lifespan. The annual updates will be completed by independent experts, carried out in consultation with the NAMR, as the Governmental authority competent in mining activities field. These updates will ensure that in the unlikely event of early closure of the project, at any point in time, each EFG will always reflect the costs associated with reclamation. (These annual updates will result in an estimate that exceeds our current US \$76 million costs of closure, because some reclamation activity is incorporated into the routine operations of the mine.)

A number of different financial instruments are available to ensure that RMGC is capable of covering all of the expected closure costs. These instruments, which will be held in protected accounts at the Romanian state disposal, include:

- Cash deposit;
- Trust funds;
- Letter of credit;
- Surety bonds;
- Insurance policy.

Under the terms of this guarantee, the Romanian government will have no financial liability in connection with the rehabilitation of the Roșia Montană project.

*

The Security Report has been made available for public access by being posted at the following Internet address http://www.mmediu.ro/dep_mediu/rosia_montana_securitate.htm as well as through the printed version which could have been found at several information locations established for public hearings.

*

The Report on the Environmental impact assessment study (EIA) considered all alternative developments, including the option of not proceeding with any project – an option that would generate no investment, allowing the existing pollution problems and socio-economic decline to continue (Chapter 5 – *Assessment of Alternatives*).

The report also considered alternative developments – including agriculture, grazing, meat processing, tourism, forestry and forest products, cottage industries, and flora/fauna gathering for pharmaceutical purposes – and concluded that these activities could not provide the economic, cultural and environmental benefits brought by the Roşia Montană Project (RMP).

Chapter 5 also examines alternative locations for key facilities as well as alternative technologies for mining, processing and waste management, in line with best practice and as compared against published EU best available techniques (BAT) documentation.

*

The impact on protected flora and fauna will exist only locally, but this impact will not lead to the loss of any specie. The Project has been designed even from the beginning to fully comply with the requirements and norms imposed by Romanian and European environmental legislation.

The company believes the fact that the project impact on environment remains significant, especially because covers previous impacts. But, the investments required to ecologically restore/rehabilitate Roşia Montană area in order to address current complex environmental issues, are only achievable following the implementation of some economic projects that will generate and warrant implementation of some direct and responsible actions as a component of base principles of sustainable development concepts. Clean processes and technologies may be developed only in the presence of a solid economic environment fully compliant with the environment that will also resolve previous impacts of anthropic activities.

The base documents of the Project are in fact an unbiased reason of its implementation, considering the highly complex environmental commitment within Roşia Montană area.

Some of the Roşia Montană species that are under a certain protection status stand for an insignificant percentage of the scale of populations estimated at national level. The characterization of species from their habitat point of view exists in the species tables presented in the Biodiversity Chapter of the EIA Report and its annexes, although this is not a requirement imposed by the Habitats Directive. Due to their large volume of information, the annexes of chapter 4.6 Biodiversity can be found in the electronic version of the EIA disclosed by the company both in Romanian and English through approx. 6,000 DVD/CD copies, being accessible on the company website, and on the websites of Ministry of Environment and Water Management, local and regional environmental protection agencies of Alba, Sibiu, Cluj, etc.

From practical point of view, the low value of conservation of the impact area is also indirectly emphasized by the fact that there is no proposal to designate the area a SPA (aviafaunistic special protected area) and by the denial as unfounded of the proposal to designate the area as a pSCI area (sites of community importance).

Taking all these into account, we believe that the proposed Project is compliant with the provisions of EU Directive no. 92/43 Habitats[1], and EU Directive no. 79/409 Birds[2] respectively, especially because within Biodiversity Management Plan, Plan H, several active and responsible measures are provided to reconstruct/rehabilitate several natural habitats, pursuant to the provisions of the same documents [3].

References:

[1] art.3, 2nd paragraph, Each Member State shall contribute to the creation of Natura 2000 (network) in proportion to the representation within its territory of the natural habitat types and the habitats of species referred to in paragraph 1. To that effect each Member State shall designate, in accordance with Article 4, sites as special areas of conservation taking account of the objectives set out in paragraph 1.

art.4, 1st paragraph. On the basis of the criteria set out in Annex III (Stage 1) and relevant scientific information, each Member State shall propose a list of sites indicating which natural habitat types in

Annex I and which species in Annex II that are native to its territory the sites host. For animal species ranging over wide areas these sites shall correspond to the places within the natural range of such species which present the physical or biological factors essential to their life and reproduction. For aquatic species which range over wide areas, such sites will be proposed only where there is a clearly identifiable area representing the physical and biological factors essential to their life and reproduction. Where appropriate, Member States shall propose adaptation of the list in the light of the results of the surveillance referred to in Article 11. [...]

2nd paragraph.[...] Member States whose sites hosting one or more priority natural habitat types and priority species represent more than 5 % of their national territory may, in agreement with the Commission, request that the criteria listed in Annex III (Stage 2) be applied more flexibly in selecting all the sites of Community importance in their territory.[...]

Art. 6, 4th paragraph. If, in spite of a negative assessment of the implications for the site and in the absence of alternative solutions, a plan or project must nevertheless be carried out for imperative reasons of overriding public interest, including those of a social or economic nature, the Member State shall take all compensatory measures necessary to ensure that the overall coherence of Natura 2000 is protected. It shall inform the Commission of the compensatory measures adopted.

Art. 16. Provided that there is no satisfactory alternative and the derogation is not detrimental to the maintenance of the populations of the species concerned at a favourable conservation status in their natural range, Member States may derogate from the provisions of Articles 12, 13, 14 and 15 (a) and (b):[...]

- in the interests of public health and public safety, or for other imperative reasons of overriding public interest, including those of a social or economic nature and beneficial consequences of primary importance for the environment;

[2] Art.4, 1st paragraph. The species mentioned in annex 1 shall be the subject of special conservation measures concerning their habitat in order to ensure their survival and reproduction in their area of distribution. [...]

Trends and variations in population levels shall be taken into account as a background for evaluations. Member states shall classify in particular the most suitable territories in number and size as special protection areas for the conservation of these species, taking into account their protection requirements in the geographical sea and land area where this directive applies.

[3] Directive 92/43 Habitats, art. 2, 2nd paragraph; Directive 79/409 Birds, art. 3, 2nd paragraph, letter c.

*

This statement is ungrounded, because the environmental impact assessment (EIA) process has included preliminary cumulative estimates for stationary motorized equipment and linear (vehicular) sources were prepared in order to provide an initial understanding of the potential cumulative noise and vibration impacts from background and Roşia Montană Project sources, and to guide future monitoring and measurement activities as well as the selection of appropriate Best Management Practices/Best Available Techniques for further mitigation of the potential noise and vibration impacts from Project activities. These preliminary estimates apply to major construction activities, as well as the operation and decommissioning/closure of the mine and process plant. They are documented as data tables and isopleth maps for major noise-generating activities in selected, representative Project years; see **Tables 4.3.8** through **4.3.16** and **Exhibits 4.3.1** through **4.3.9**. All these details related to the applied assessment methodology, the input data of the dispersion model, the modeling results and the measures established for the prevention/mitigation/elimination of the potential impact for all project stages (construction, operation, closure) are included in Chapter 4, Section 4.3 Noise and Vibrations of the EIA Report.

Project Years 0, 9, 10, 12, 14, and 19 were selected for modeling because they are considered to be representative of the most significant levels of noise-generating activity. They are also the same years used for air impact modeling purposes in Section 4.2, as air and noise impacts share many of the same sources or are otherwise closely correlated. In order to more accurately reflect potential receptor impacts, all of

these exhibits integrate the background traffic estimates discussed in Section 4.3.6.1.

The Project site plan and process plant area and facility drawings were used to establish the position of the noise sources and other relevant physical characteristics of the site. Receptor locations were established using background reports and project engineering and environmental documentation provided by RMGC. With this information, the source locations and receptor locations were translated into input (x, y, and z) co-ordinates for the noise-modeling program.

Tables 4.3.8 through 4.3.16 and **Exhibits 4.3.1 through 4.3.9** present the average maximum noise values likely to be experienced by the receptor community over all Project phases after incorporation of a variety of initial mitigation measures designed specifically to reduce the impacts associated with mobile and stationary machinery sources. The influence of non-mining related background (primarily traffic) noise is also included.

To evaluate the sound levels associated with haul trucks and other mobile sources crossing the site carrying excavated ore, waste rock, and soil, a noise analysis program based on the (U.S.) Federal Highway Administration's (FHWA) standard RD-77-108 [1] model was used to calculate reference noise emissions values for heavy trucks along the project roadways. The FHWA model predicts hourly L_{eq} values for free-flowing traffic conditions and is generally considered to be accurate within 1.5 decibels (dB).

The model is based on the standardized noise emission factors for different types and weights of vehicles (e.g., automobiles, medium trucks, and heavy trucks), with consideration given to vehicle volume, speed, roadway configuration, distance to the receiver, and the acoustical characteristics of the site. The emission levels of all three vehicle types increase as a function of the logarithm of their speed.

To evaluate the sound sources from the proposed mine processing facility and the semi-stationary material handling equipment (at the ore extraction, waste rock and soil stockpiling areas), a proprietary computerized noise prediction program was used by AAC to simulate and model the future equipment noise emissions throughout the area. The modeling program uses industry-accepted propagation algorithms based on the following American National Standards Institute (ANSI) and International Organization for Standardization (ISO) standards:

- ANSI S1.26-1995 (R2004), *Method for the Calculation of the Absorption of Sound by the Atmosphere*;
- ISO 9613-1:1993, *Acoustics -- Attenuation of sound during propagation outdoors-- Part 1: Calculation of the absorption of sound by the atmosphere*;
- ISO 9613-2:1996, *Acoustics -- Attenuation of sound during propagation outdoors -- Part 2: General method of calculation*;
- ISO 3891:1978, *Acoustics -- Procedure for describing aircraft noise heard on the ground*.

The calculations account for classical sound wave divergence (i.e., spherical spreading loss with adjustments for source directivity from point sources) plus attenuation factors due to air absorption, minimal ground effects, and barriers/shielding.

This model has been validated by AAC over a number of years via noise measurements at several operating industrial sites that had been previously modeled during the engineering design phases. The comparison of modeled predictions versus actual measurements has consistently shown close agreement; typically in the range of 1 to 3 dB (A).

References:

[1] FHWA Highway Traffic Noise Prediction Model; see Federal Highway Administration Report Number FHWA-RD-77-108, USA, Washington, D.C., 1978.

A detailed presentation of blasting technology can be found in the annex 7.1 - Proposed blasting technology for the operational phase of Roşia Montană Project.

*

The partnership between Gabriel Resources and Regia Autonomă a Cuprului Deva (currently, CNCAF Minvest SA) has been established based on Law no. 15/1990 on the reorganization of the state owned companies as autonomous directions and trade companies, published in the Official Gazette, Section I, no.

98/08.08.1990, as subsequently amended and supplemented. Art. 35 of this law provides the possibility of the regies autonomous to enter into partnerships with legal third parties, Romanian or foreign, for the purpose of setting up new trading companies.

Roşia Montană Gold Corporation SA was set up in 1997, according to the legal provisions in force as at that time, the setting up being made by observing all the conditions imposed by Company Law no. 31/1990 and Trade Register Law no. 26/1990, in regard of the setting up of the joint stock companies with mixed capital.

We underline that the Articles of Associations of Roşia Montană Gold Corporation SA, representing the result of the parties agreement in regard of the terms and conditions under which the partnership between the Romanian state and investor takes place represents a public document, being included in the category of documents which, as per Law no. 26/1990 on the Trade Register, are published in the Romanian Official Gazette and for which the Trade Register is obliged to issue, on the expense of the persons submitting a request, certified copies.

As for the agreement concerning the setting up of the mixed company together with Gabriel Resources Ltd., this has been expressed by the Ministry of Industry and Trade, the conditions imposed by the setting up of the mixed company being the following: (i) ensuring of the jobs at the level existing upon the conclusion of the agreement concerning the setting up of the mixed company; (ii) the expenses incurred by the fulfillment of the exploration stage should be fully supported by Gabriel; (iii) the obtaining of the approval from the ANRM by the Copper Autonomous Direction Deva and (iv) the observance of all legal provisions in force concerning the setting up of the mixed companies with foreign partners. These conditions have been fully complied with as at the setting up of the company and during the development of its activity.

We also specify that the establishing of the shareholders' quotas to the benefits and losses of Roşia Montană Gold Corporation SA has been made by considering their contribution quota to the company's share capital. The current percentage of 80% for Gabriel Resources Ltd. and of 19.31% for CNCAF Minvest SA resulted from the initial contribution and the subsequent contributions of the shareholders to the company's share capital, in consideration also of Gabriel Resources Ltd. advancing all expenses and costs related to the development-exploitation and permitting of the Roşia Montană Mining Project.

The provisions of the Articles of Associations of Roşia Montană Gold Corporation SA on the necessary majority and quorum conditions for the decision-making process within the General Shareholders Meeting and the quotas to the benefits and losses of the company are taken from Law no. 31/1990, and no derogation exists in regard of this aspect.

*

This claim is not true; the Urbanism Plan has been prepared with public consultation.

Roşia Montană Gold Corporation SA (RMGC) has requested and obtained from Alba County Council the Urbanism Certificate no. 78 of 26.04.2006, for the entire Roşia Montană mining project, including the tailings management facility. The Urbanism Certificate also stipulated the preparation of a Zonal Urbanism Plan, to reflect all changes made to the Roşia Montană Project, following the public consultations and debates organized in relation to this project, and the consultations with the permitting authorities. This plan, entitled "Modification of the Zonal Urbanism Plan, Roşia Montană Industrial Area", was prepared and subjected to public debate in June 2006 in accordance with the provisions of Order no.176/N/2000 issued by the Ministry of Public Works and Territory Development for the approval of the technical regulations "Guidelines regarding the methodology applied for the preparation and framework content of the Zonal Urbanism Plan" and, at present, it is pending approval.

Concerning the Roşia Montană General Urbanism Plan approved in 2002, such plan was prepared in parallel with the Zonal Urbanism Plan of 2002, all the provisions of the General Urbanism Plan being also included in the Zonal Urbanism Plan. Also, the approval procedure related to the two urbanism plans was carried out in parallel.

*

Preventive archaeological researches within the Roşia Montană mining project area have been undertaken based on specific techniques, specifically trial trenches in all accessible areas that are suitable for human habitation, taking into account the bibliographical information and the observations recorded during the archaeological survey campaigns, the geophysical studies and the analyses of the photogrammetric flights. In addition, surface investigations were undertaken, where appropriate.

The archaeological researches at Roşia Montană covered a large surface and focused on the areas known to have archaeological potential. THEREFORE, ALL AREAS THAT HAVE BEEN ARCHAEOLOGICALLY DISCHARGED HAD BEEN PREVIOUSLY INVESTIGATED. All research programs, beginning with the 2004 campaign, have been undertaken in full compliance with the current legal requirements, i.e. Ministerial Order no. 2392 of 6 September 2004 on the establishment of the Archaeological Standards and Procedures by the Ministry of Culture and Religious Affairs.

The proposed gold mining project at Roşia Montană has raised a series of issues related to the rescue of the historical-archaeological heritage within the area, as well as issues related to its scientific development and also the enhancement of heritage within a museum. Given the complex difficulties encountered in this respect, the Ministry of Culture and Religious Affairs decided to initiate the "Alburnus Maior" National Research Program.

The company's role was to provide the necessary financial resources for the assessment, research and enhancement of the archaeological remains, in full compliance with the Romanian current legislation. The development of the research and of the archaeological discharge works has been conducted through specific means and methodologies that have been adjusted to the realities of every site researched, in our case, Roşia Montană. They consisted in:

- Archives studies;
- Archaeological surveys; trial trenches;
- aerial reconnaissance/survey and aerial photo interpretation ; high resolution satellite images;
- mining archaeology studies; underground topography and 3D modeling;
- geophysical surveys;
- extensive archaeological investigations in the areas with an identified archaeological potential- this implied carrying out archaeological excavations;
- Interdisciplinary studies- sedimentology, archaeo-zoology, comparative palynology, archaeo-metallurgy, geology, mineralogy;
- Radiocarbon dating and dendrochronology;
- This research and its results were included in an integrated database;
- traditional and digital archaeological topography and development of the GIS project; generate a photo archive- both traditional and digital;
- restoration of artifacts;
- an inventory and a digital catalogue of the artifacts;
- studies conducted by specialists in order to enhance the research results - publication of monographs/scientific books and journals, exhibitions, websites, etc.

All the preventive archaeological researches undertaken at Roşia Montană since 2000 have been carried out as part of a complex research program; permits for preventive archaeological excavations being issued in compliance with the current legislation. These archaeological investigations have been undertaken by representatives of 21 specialized institutions from Romania and 3 others from abroad, under the scientific coordination of the Romanian National Museum of History. All archaeological researches have been conducted in full compliance with the existing legislation. The investigations undertaken during each archaeological research campaign have been approved by the Ministry of Culture and Religious Affairs based on the Annual Archaeological Research Plan approved by the National Commission of Archaeology.

Under the current legislation (Ministerial Order no. 2392 of 6 September 2004 on the establishment of the Archaeological Standards and Procedures by the Ministry of Culture and Religious Affairs) the archaeologists who have conducted the research may ask that an archaeological discharge certificate be granted. Based on a complex research program, the archaeologists prepare comprehensive documentation with regard to the researched area. Upon consideration of the submitted documentation, the National Commission of Archaeology makes a decision as to whether to recommend or not the granting of the archaeological discharge certificate. In the case of the research conducted in the period 2001-2006, the

archaeological discharge certificate was issued directly by the Ministry of Culture and Religious Affairs or by its local agencies.

Preventive archaeological researches at Roşia Montană have allowed the research of five Roman cremation necropolis (Tău Corna, Hop-Găuri, Țarina, Jig - Piciorag and Pârâul Porcului – Tăul Secuilor), two funerary areas (Carpeni, Nanului Valley), sacred areas (Hăbad, Nanului Valley), habitation areas (Hăbad, Carpeni, Tăul Țapului, Hop), the most significant being the Roman structures on the Carpeni Hill and the circular funerary monument at Tău Găuri. In addition, for the first time in Romania, surface investigations have been paralleled by underground investigations of Cetate, Cărnic, Jig and Orlea massifs, with important discoveries in the Piatra Corbului, area, Cătălina-Monulești gallery and the Păru Carpeni mining sector.

The research consisted of aerial photo interpretation, archaeological magnetometric studies, electrical resistivity, palynology, sedimentology, geology studies, radiocarbon and dendrochronology dating. For a better management of the research units and of the archaeological findings, data bases were used, including text and photographs-among which 4 satellite images (an archive satellite image type SPOT Panchromatic (10m) from 1997; 2 satellite images LANDSAT 7 MS (30 m), dating from 2000 and 2003; a satellite image with priority programming SPOT 5 SuperMode color (2,5 m resolution-19 July 2004); all data have been included in a comprehensive GIS program, a first in the Romanian archaeological research.

In the case of archaeological monuments that are located close to industrial facilities, plans have been redesigned to ensure that the archaeological remains in question will not be affected. Where appropriate, the archaeological monument was preserved in situ and restored, i.e. the circular funerary monument at Hop-Găuri (see The "Alburnus Maior" monograph series, volume II, Bucharest, 2004). Another example in this respect is the Carpeni Hill, designated an "archaeological " reserve, and the Piatra Corbului area. In 2004, after being thoroughly investigated, these areas have been included on the List of Historic Monuments. Add to this the areas where ancient mining remains will be preserved, such as the Cătălina Monulești gallery and the mining sector Păru Carpeni, as well as the protected area Roşia Montană Historic Center, including a number of heritage assets (35 historic monument houses).

We emphasise in this respect that the identified and researched structures have been published in preliminary form in the Archaeological Research Chronicle of Romania, after every archaeological research campaign, as well as in volume 1 of the Alburnus Maior monographic series. We mention here the areas where Roman habitation structures have been identified and researched, as well as the references to be consulted for further information: Hop-Găuri, Carpeni, Tăul Țapului (CCA 2001 (2002), p. 254-257, no. 182; 261-262, nr. 185; 264-265, no. 188; 265-266, no. 189. Alburnus Maior I, 2003, p. 45-80; 81-122; 123-148; CCA 2001 (2002), 257-261; CCA 2003 (2004) ,280-283; Alburnus Maior I, 2003, p. 387-431, 433-446, 447-467).

For further details related to the applicable legal framework, the responsibilities of the Project titleholder, or for a detailed description of the preventive archaeological researches undertaken to date and of the Cultural Heritage Management Plans, please see Annex called "Information on the Cultural heritage of Roşia and Related Management Aspects". In addition, the annex includes supplementary information with regard to the result of the researches undertaken as part of the "Alburnus Maior" National Research Program between 2001 and 2006.

In conclusion, the area mentioned by the questioner has been researched in accordance with the Romanian legal requirements, as well as with European standards and practices in the field.

Note that the type of research undertaken at Roşia Montană, known as preventive/rescue archaeological research, as well as other related heritage studies, are done everywhere in the world in close connection with the economic development of certain areas. Both the costs for the research and for the enhancement and maintenance of the preserved areas are provided by investors, in a public-private partnership set up in order to protect the cultural heritage, as per the provisions of the European Convention on the Protection of the Archaeological Heritage (Malta-1992) [1].

References:

[1]The text of the Convention is available at the following address:

<http://conventions.coe.int/Treaty/Commun/QueVoulezVous.asp?NT=143&CM=8&DF=7/6/2006&CL=ENG>

*

In 2000, in the context of the proposal of a new mining project in the Roşia Montană area, the Ministry of Culture and Religious Affairs approved a series of studies to be conducted in order to research the archaeological and architectural heritage of the area. At the end of that year, the Design Centre for National Cultural Heritage (now the National Institute for Historical Monuments) presented the preliminary results of these researches in front of the National Commission for Historical Monuments and of the National Commission of Archaeology. Based on these results, in 2001, the Ministry of Culture and Religious Affairs initiated the “Alburnus Maior” National Research Program (the Order no. 2504 / 07.03.2001 of the Minister of Culture and Religious Affairs) in compliance with the Law 378/2001 (as subsequently amended by Law 462/2003 and by Law 258/2006 and Law 259/2006). Thus, since 2000, the Ministry of Culture and Religious Affairs has fulfilled its duties – directly or through its subordinated institutions - with regard to the management of the issues related to Roşia Montană’s heritage.

The preventive archaeological researches have been conducted by the representatives of 21 national institutions and 3 others from abroad, with a broad expertise in the field. They have been carried out based on the annual approval of the National Commission of Archaeology of the Ministry of Culture and Religious Affairs. In accordance with current legislation, this research program is carried out with financial support provided by RMGC, i.e. the company that plans to expand and continue to mine the gold-silver deposit in Roşia Montană. Thus, large-scale preventive investigations have been conducted or are underway in the RMP impact area. A proposal will be made based on the results of these investigations, either for the archaeological discharge of some researched areas or the preservation in situ of certain representative structures and monuments, in compliance with current legislation. For areas proposed for conservation or for archaeological discharge measures the decision was made based on the surveys conducted by specialists and on the analysis of the results by the National Commission of Archaeology. In the period 2000-2005, the mining project underwent a series of modifications designed to promote the conservation of the local heritage. Examples of this include extending the duration of the field investigations (e.g. in Tarina, Pârâul Porcului, Orlea) and changing the location of some elements of mining infrastructure in order to allow the conservation of the archaeological remains found in the Carpeni, in the Tău Găuri and Pietra Corbului areas.

The architectural and town-planning surveys have been conducted, in accordance with current legislation, by companies certified by the Ministry of Culture and Religious Affairs, while the town-planning documentation drafted by these companies, and the restoration and conservation works undertaken so far, have been approved by the National Commission for Historical Monuments. Thus, the town-planning documentation has been approved and implemented in accordance with current legislation, and the company has agreed to these decisions and modified the mine development plans accordingly:

Extensive ethnographic research was conducted in the Roşia Montană-Abrud-Corna area in the period 2001-2004 coordinated by a team of specialists for the Romanian Village Museum „Dimitrie Gusti” (a National Museum directly under the coordination of the Ministry of Culture and Religious Affairs). Moreover, a broad series of oral history interviews was conducted in the period 2001-2002 by the Romanian Society of Radio broadcasting through the „Gheorghe Brătianu” Oral History Centre, Bucharest (SRR - CIO).

In compliance with the requirements of the Ministry of Environment and Waters Management and the Ministry of Culture and Religious Affairs, specific management plans have been drawn up for the management and conservation of the heritage remains from the Roşia Montană area, in the context of the implementation of the mining project. These plans have been included in the documentation prepared for the report on the Environmental Impact Assessment Study. (see EIA Report, volume 32-33, Plan M-Cultural Heritage Management Plan, part I –Management Plan for the Archaeological Heritage from Roşia Montană Zone; part II-Management Plan for the Historical Monuments and Protected Zone from Roşia Montană; part III- Cultural Heritage Management Plan).

These management plans comprise detailed presentations of the obligations and responsibilities for the protection and conservation of the heritage remains from the Roşia Montană area, which the company has assumed as part of the mining project, in accordance with the decision of the central government. These heritage remains include: archaeological remains above and under the ground, historic buildings, protected areas, intangible heritage assets, cultural landscape items, etc. In this context, it should be noted

that besides the works for the protection and preservation of the archaeological heritage, works are also being carried out for the rehabilitation and conservation of the protected area Historical Centre Roşia Montană (comprising 35 historic buildings, and projects for the restoration of 11 of these buildings are currently being drafted) and at Tăul Mare, Tăul Brazi and Tăul Anghel, plus remains of the surface mining works from the Văidoaia area, and the creation of a modern museum dedicated to the history of mining in the Apuseni Mountains area. This museum will be established including exhibitions of geology, archaeology, industrial and ethnographic heritage as well as an underground section organized around the Cătălina Monuleşti gallery.

Moreover, representatives of the Directorate/Department for Culture, Religious Affairs and National Cultural Heritage of Alba County have paid a number of visits to Roşia Montană in order to collect information and to check the situation. The same administrative body was the intermediary for the acquisitions of historic buildings made by RMGC. The Ministry of Culture and Religious Affairs expressed its pre-emption right regarding the acquisition of these buildings.

It should be mentioned, however, that apart from the obligations undertaken by RMGC as regards the protection and conservation of the archaeological remains and historical monuments, there are also a series of obligations which rest with the local public authorities from Roşia Montană and from Alba County, and with the central public authorities, specifically the Romanian Government. These aspects are detailed in the Cultural Heritage Management Plans included in the EIA Report (see EIA Report, volume 32, Management Plan for the Archaeological Heritage from Roşia Montană Zone, pages 22-24, 49, 55-56, 71-72 and the EIA Report, volume 33- Management Plan for the Historical Monuments and Protected Zone from Roşia Montană pages 28-29, 47-50, 51-53, 65-66, page 103 – Annex 1).

Item no.

46

No. to identify
the
observations
received from
the public

No.
115318/
26.10.2006

Proposal

The questioner opposes the promotion of the Roşia Montană Project.

Solution

Regarding your allegation, we mention that art. 44 (3) of the Minister of Waters and Environment Protection Order no. 860/2002 on the environmental impact assessment and the issuance of environmental agreements Procedures ("Order no. 860/2002") provides that "*based on the results of the public debate, the relevant authority for the environmental protection evaluates the grounded proposals/comments of the public and requests the titleholder the supplementation of the report on the environmental impact assessment study with an appendix comprising solutions for the solving of the indicated issues*".

Consequently, considering the fact that your proposal is just an allegation which does not indicate possible problems, nor provide additional information, we mention that the decision on the issuance or refusal of the environmental approval cannot be made only by considering a simple proposal, but according to certain objective criteria provided by the wording of art. 45 of the Order no. 860/2002 and only after examining

- (i) the report on the environmental impact assessment study;
- (ii) the conclusions of the parties involved in the assessment;
- (iii) the possibilities to implement the project;
- (iv) the titleholder answers to the grounded proposals/comments of the public.

Item no.

47

No. to identify
the
observations
received from
the public

No.
169200/
25.10.2006

Proposal

The questioner opposes the promotion of the Roşia Montană Project.

Solution

Regarding your allegation, we mention that art. 44 (3) of the Minister of Waters and Environment Protection Order no. 860/2002 on the environmental impact assessment and the issuance of environmental agreements Procedures ("Order no. 860/2002") provides that "*based on the results of the public debate, the relevant authority for the environmental protection evaluates the grounded proposals/comments of the public and requests the titleholder the supplementation of the report on the environmental impact assessment study with an appendix comprising solutions for the solving of the indicated issues*".

Consequently, considering the fact that your proposal is just an allegation which does not indicate possible problems, nor provide additional information, we mention that the decision on the issuance or refusal of the environmental approval cannot be made only by considering a simple proposal, but according to certain objective criteria provided by the wording of art. 45 of the Order no. 860/2002 and only after examining

- (i) the report on the environmental impact assessment study;
- (ii) the conclusions of the parties involved in the assessment;
- (iii) the possibilities to implement the project;
- (iv) the titleholder answers to the grounded proposals/comments of the public.

Item no.

48

No. to identify the observations received from the public

No.
115234/
20.10.2006

Proposal

The questioner does not agree to the Roşia Montană mining project implementation and formulates the following remarks and comments:

- The gold and silver grade is less than that one inscribed in bibliography and archives;
- The content of other metals from ore (Cu, Pb, Zn, Bi, Se, Te, Ge, In) was neglected;
- The applying of the cyanidation process is interdicted by the Romanian legislation.

RMGC has conducted the most extensive and detailed research program ever performed on a Romanian mine project and we stand behind our findings. This was all independently supervised.

The exploration activities conducted by RMGC between 1997 and 2006 show that there are 215 million tonnes of ore with an average content of 1.46 g/t gold and 6.9 g/t silver. This amounts to a total content of 314.11 t Au and 1480.36 t Ag. Roşia Montană's resource deposit calculations are based upon a very elaborate research program, which included the collection of 191,320 samples collected from underground networks surface outcrops and drill holes.

Each sampled metre has been tested for gold and silver. The database, containing over 400,000 tests, has been audited by independent experts – from Romania and abroad. One of the Romanian companies involved, Ipromin SA, conducted three feasibility studies for the Roşia Montană project. These feasibility studies include the resource and deposit calculations. Both Ipromin SA and the foreign auditors confirmed RMGC SA's results.

The resources and reserves which have been independently estimated and confirmed conform to Romanian Mining Law (85/2003), EU codes (Mineral Reporting Code, 2002) and International Law (NI 43-101). These results have all been independently verified and audited as is required under all the relevant laws.

Solution

It is known that in previous years richer areas of the deposit were generally mined (veins) and it is likely that data mentioned in the bibliography and the archives refer to those areas which unfortunately have been exploited in the meantime. What now exists at Roşia Montană is generally a disseminated mineralization which means a high quantity of ore with low grades however.

*

RMGC has conducted the most extensive and detailed research program ever performed on a Romanian mine project and we stand behind our findings. This program has been independently supervised and monitored.

At Roşia Montană, gold and silver are the only metal deposits present in sufficient concentrations to permit exploitation and capitalization. The ore content in other metals was not neglected. They were analyzed but the results obtained do not show important enough concentrations to be extracted in profitable conditions. This is based on analytical test work at certified laboratories that tested the concentration level for 47 elements and on petrographic studies. Concerning the elements mentioned by the questioner, the concentrations were as follows: Cu 59 ppm, Pb 42 ppm, Zn 135 ppm, Bi 0.225 ppm, Se 1.35 ppm, Te 0.44 ppm, Ge 0.21 ppm and In 0.05 ppm and represents very low levels for these elements. The concentration of most of the elements is below the natural average content of the earth, and falls within normal ranges as follows for; U (1.43 ppm compared to 3.7 ppm), Th (6.07 ppm compared to 18 ppm), Sr (95.4 ppm compared to 125ppm), and Mo (1.27 ppm compared to 1.5ppm), etc.

All these results were obtained through comprehensive research programs conducted between 1997 and 2006. Samples were collected from the existing underground galleries, open pit benches, surface outcrop,

and numerous surface and underground drill holes. The research program produced highly reliable and extremely detailed information about the Roşia Montană deposits.

*

The statement is incorrect, as no provision of the Romanian legislation in force forbids the use of cyanides. The Order no. 197/2003 for the approval of the Methodological Norms for the execution of the specialized cadastral works in the mining field even provides for this process at the chapter preparations stipulated in Annex 11 A “*exploring and/or exploitation means in case of concession*”, with a view to the filling of the form regarding the mining activities that are to be performed.

The Terms of Reference issued by the Ministry of Environment and Water Management for the performance of the environmental impact assessment, according to the provisions of Order of the Minister of Waters and Environmental Protection no. 860/2002 on the environment impact assessment and the issuance of environmental permit, recommended that “*the management plan for the cyanide and the acid waters provided by the Terms of Reference must be in compliance with the provisions of the new CE Directive on the management of the wastes from the extractive industry*”.

Please note that the preamble of the Directive no. 21/2006/EC on the management of the wastes resulting from the mining industry provides the need to mitigate the concentration of cyanide in the decantation ponds, due to its toxic and harmful effects, to the lowest degree possible, by using the best techniques. According to art. 13 paragraph 6 of the above mentioned Directive, the maximum limits of the cyanide concentration allowed in the decantation ponds are established as well as their periodical reduction until 2018, but its use is not forbidden. Also, please note that the deadline for this enactment to be adopted in the legislation of the member states, therefore in the Romanian legislation as well, is the year 2008.

Item no.

49

No. to identify the observations received from the public

No.
114373/
169078/
10.10.2006

Proposal

The questioner does not agree to the implementation of the Roşia Montană project formulating the following remarks and comments:

- Within EIA, there are no presented all the possible risks caused by this project;
- The overall costs for mine closure are not realistic;
- There isn't until now an approved Zonal Urbanism Plan for the Protected Areas;
- The phase of public consultation and quality evaluation of the impact assessment study report begun without a valid urbanism certificate;
- Information about the foundation which RMGC will establish and subsidize is not given. This foundation follows to assume the obligations which the mining operation can not assume;
- The present urbanism plans of the Roşia Montană commune do not correspond with the mining project proposal described in EIA;
- There is no liner proposed for the tailings pond;
- The proposed waste deposits will be not constructed according to the legislation in force;
- No financial guarantees have been stipulated;
- There is not a Safety Report submitted for the public consultation and evaluation by the competent authorities;
- The EIA report does not assess the "zero alternative";
- The Project poses a threat for protected flora and fauna;
- The EIA report does not refer to the impact on the listed heritage buildings of noise and vibrations caused by the mining operations;
- The public/ONGs wish to consult the contracts and agreements between Company and Romanian State;
- The Urbanism Plan has been modified without public consultation;
- From archeological point of view, the area proposed to be occupied by project was not legally investigated;
- It disputes the spiritual and architectural monuments, including the responsible involvement of the Institutions of the State in the protection program.

Solution

It is the nature of risk that it can be mitigated and diminished; it cannot be made to disappear. In order to put this into context, the common action of walking on the street or developing everyday activities have an accident potential. This accident potential is twice higher than within the framework of industrial activities that use hazardous substances.

In the larger sense, the entire EIA report is focused on the assessment of impacts and their associated mitigation. Specifically, Chapter 4 of the EIA presents that impact assessment of the project. The following discussion presents a summary of the impact discussed in the EIA.

As far as natural and technological risks assessments are concerned, Chapter 7, "Risk Cases", from the Report on Environmental Impact Assessment, emphasizes the fact that safety and prevention measures, the implementation of the environmental management and risk systems are mitigating the consequences to acceptable levels as compared to the most restrictive norms, standards, the best practices or national and international recommendations in the field. The risk level has been established as moderate and so, socially acceptable. The extension of the risk assessment and the intensity of the prevention and mitigation measures of the consequences should be proportionate to the risk involved. Selection of a specific mitigation technique is depends on the analyzed accident scenario.

More detailed assessments are conducted for accident scenarios that, based on the qualitative assessment are found to be potentially major, of probability more than 10^{-6} (reduced recovery periods of 1/1,000,000) meaning that they could have major consequences therefore, elevated associated risk, a higher risk level than 9 to 12 (on a scale of 1-25). To put this in context, simply living in southern Florida rates a 1 - 25 on

the risk scale.

A global assessment of the risks associated with the Roşia Montană Project is obtained by the quick environmental and health risk assessment methodology initially developed by the Italian Ministry of the Environment and the World Health Organization. Natural hazard and risk identification and analysis presents key data and information in assessing potential technological accidents. Thus:

- in designing the Tailings Management Facility, the design parameters were chosen to fully cover the characteristic seismic risk of the area. These seismic design parameters adopted for the TMF and other facilities on the proposed site result in a safety factor much greater than the minimum accepted under the Romanian and European design standards for such facilities;

- in the sector physically impacted by the Project, the risk of floods will remain very low due to the small catchments (controlled by the Roşia and Corna Streams) the area affected by the operation, and the creation of containment, diversion and drainage hydro-technical structures for storm waters on the site, and in the Abrud catchment in general;

- risks caused by meteorological events have been reviewed and used in assessing the hazards of the affected technological processes.

From the analysis of morphometrical parameters and their correlation with other sets of information on the natural slopes on and near the site shows that the (qualitatively estimated) landslide occurrence risk is low to moderate and its consequences will not cause major impacts on the structural components of the Project.

There is no significant risk associated with resource depletion. Mining activities are planned judiciously, so as to extract only the profitable gold and silver resources and only the necessary construction rock for the Project. The management of the mining concession site will minimize reserve "sterilization" (limitation of future access to the reserves).

In assessing technological hazards and risks, the quantity of hazardous substances on the site was calculated as a total and by category, as provided by the *Notification Procedure* approved by Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry, Water and Environment (MAFWE) Order 1084/2003. Based on an evaluation of hazardous substances in stock on the Project site in relation to the relevant quantities provided by the Government Decision 95/2003 which transposes the Seveso Directive, the Project ranges between the upper and the lower limits, and therefore S.C. Roşia Montană Gold Corporation S.A. is required to prepare a Report on Environmental Impact Assessment Study to be sent to the local environmental authority and the local civilian protection authority a *Safety Report* on its operations to prevent major accident risks.

In assessing the consequences of major accidents involving dangerous substances, physical-mathematical models accepted internationally and especially at EU level, and the current version of the SLAB (Canada) software have been used, the latter for the atmospheric dispersion of denser than air gases, that may handle a multitude of situations and scenarios. Similarly, the EFFECTSGis 5.5 (Netherlands) software, developed for the analysis of the effects of industrial accidents and of consequences. Several scenarios were considered in response to the internal legislative requirements, especially related to the implementation of the Internal Emergency Plans (GD 647/2005). The conclusions of the risk assessment for major accidents were:

- The total destruction of plant facilities may only be caused by terrorist attack with classic or nuclear weapons. Simultaneous damage to the HCl tank (including containment) and to the NaCN solution tank, the tanks containing enriched solution, to one or more leaching tanks, having as a result HCN dispersion into the air. At the same time, under certain situations and weather conditions unfavorable for dispersion, people within 40 m of the emission source, surprised by the toxic cloud for more than 1 minute without respiratory protection equipment, will most certainly die. It may also be considered that, on a radius of about 310 m, persons exposed for more than 10 minutes may suffer serious intoxications that may also lead to death. Toxic effects may occur in persons up to about 2 km downwind of the process plant;

- Operating errors and/or failures in the measurement and control devices, resulting in a lower pH in the leaching tank, thickener and/or DETOX slurry and accidental emissions of hydrocyanic acid. The area affected by concentrations of 290 ppm over a 10 min exposure time is within a circle of 36 m radius and the 50 ppm IDLH threshold for 30 min exposure will be reached over an area of 157.5 m radius. The center of these circles is the middle of the CIL tanks platform;

- Accidental HCN emission from the decanter. The accident may be caused by a drop of pH in the

CIL tanks combined with an overdose of flocculent solution and faulty pH monitoring systems. The area affected by concentrations of 300 ppm over a 10 min exposure time is within a circle of 65 m radius and the 50 ppm IDLH threshold for 30 min exposure will be reached over an area of 104 m radius. The center of these circles is mid-distance between the two DETOX facilities;

- Accidental HCN emission from the DETOX facility. The accident may be caused by a drop of pH in the reactors generated by an overdose of metabisulfite solution and/or copper sulphate combined with faulty pH monitoring systems. The area affected by high 1900 ppm concentrations for a 1 min exposure time is located within a 10 m radius circle. The area affected by concentrations of 300 ppm over a 10 min exposure time is within a circle of 27 m radius and the 50 ppm IDLH threshold for 30 min exposure will be reached over an area of 33 m radius. The center of these circles is mid-distance between the two DETOX facilities;

- Explosion of the LPG storage tank. The LPG storage tank has a 50 ton capacity and is located outdoors, near the heating plant. The simulation was conducted for the worst case scenario, considering an explosion of the full tank. Threshold I with heat 12.5 kW/m² is within a 10.5 m radius circle and Threshold II, of heat radiation 5 kW/m² is within a circle of 15 m radius;

- Damage and/or fire at the fuel tanks. Simulations were conducted for the worst case scenarios, considering ignition and combustion of all the diesel (fire in the tank, or in the containment vat, when full of diesel);

- Corna Dam break and breach development. Two credible accident scenarios were considered in simulating tailings flow out of the Tailings Management Facility, and six credible scenarios for the flow of decant water and tailings pore water, with significant effects on the terrestrial and aquatic ecosystems, in different weather conditions;

- Tailings flow may occur along Corna Valley, on a 800 m (starter dam break) or over 1,600 m reach should the Corna dam break in its final stage;

- In regard to water quality impacts, cyanide concentrations in the water in the shape of a pollution plume may reach Arad, near the Romanian-Hungarian border on the Mures River, in concentrations ranging between 0.03 and 0.5 mg/L. Due to inherent mathematical limitations in the models, these values and the accident effects are considered overestimated. Therefore, the results describe the “worst case scenario” based on extreme dam break assumptions for the Corna Dam.

A new and much more precise and realistic simulation has been subsequently established based on the INCA Mine model, that considers the dispersion, volatilization and breakdown of cyanides during the downstream movement of the pollutant flow (Whiteland et al., 2006).

The model used is the INCA model developed over the past 10 years to simulate both terrestrial and aquatic systems within the EUROLIMPACS EU research program (www.eurolimpacs.ucl.ac.uk). The model has been used to assess the impacts from future mining, and collection and treatment operations for pollution from past mining at Roşia Montană.

The modeling created for Roşia Montană simulates eight metals (cadmium, lead, zinc, mercury, arsenic, copper, chromium, manganese) as well as Cyanide, Nitrate, Ammonia and dissolved oxygen. The model has been applied to the upper catchments at Roşia Montană as well as the complete Abrud-Arieş-Mureş river system down to the Hungarian Border and on into the Tisa River. The model takes into account the dilution, mixing and physical-chemical processes affecting metals, ammonia and cyanide in the river system and gives estimates of concentrations at key locations along the river, including at the Hungarian Boarder and in the Tisa after the Mureş joins it.

Because of dilution and dispersion in the river system, and of the initial EU BAT-compliant technology adopted for the project (for example, the use of a cyanide destruct process for tailings effluent that reduces cyanide concentration in effluent stored in the TMF to below 6 mg/l), even a large scale unprogrammed release of tailings materials (for example, following failure of the dam) into the river system would not result in transboundary pollution. The model has shown that under worse case dam failure scenario all legal limits for cyanide and heavy metals concentrations would be met in the river water before it crosses into Hungary.

The INCA model has also been used to evaluate the beneficial impacts of the existing mine water collection and treatment and it has shown that substantial improvements in water quality are achieved along the river system under normal operational conditions.

For more information, an information sheet presenting the INCA modeling work is presented under the title of the Mureş River Modeling Program and the full modeling report is presented in Annex 5.1:

- Development of HCN on the tailings pond surface. Simulated emissions of HCN from the Tailings Management Facility pond surface and of their dispersion into the ambient air show that the level of $400\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ hourly average and $179\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ 8hr average will not be exceeded. These HCN concentrations are only slightly over the odor threshold (0.17ppm) and much below potentially dangerous concentrations;

- Cetate Dam break and breach development. Flood modeling was in case of a break in Cetate dam was based on the design parameters obtained from the hydrometeorological study "Assessment of rainfall intensity, frequency and runoff for the Roşia Montană Project - Radu Drobot". The breach characteristics were predicted using the BREACH model, and the maximum height of the flood wave in various flow sections was modeled using the FLDWAV software. The assumptions included a total $800,000\text{ m}^3$ discharge for one hour, when the peak of the flood hydrograph is about 4.9 m above base flow immediately below the dam and in the narrow Abrud valley 5.9-7.5 km downstream of the dam, while in the last section considered (10.5 km) water depth is about 2.3 m above base flow and the maximum flow rate $877\text{ m}^3/\text{s}$. Further, the broader Aries valley allows the flood wave to propagate on a significantly wider bed, which results in a highly attenuated hydrograph. These results describe the "worst case scenario" based on extreme dam break assumptions;

- Accidents during cyanide transportation. Due to the large quantities of cyanide transported (about 30t /day) the risks associated to this activity were assessed in detail using the ZHA- Zurich Hazard Analysis method. As a consequence, the optimum transport route was selected from the manufacturer to the Process Plant, e.g

Cyanide transport (in solid state) will exclusively involve special SLS (Solid to Liquid System) containers, 16 tons each. The ISO compliant container will be protected by a framework with legs, which allows separation from the transport trailer for temporary storage. The wall is 5.17 mm thick, which, together with the protective framework, provides additional protection to the load in case of accident. This system is considered BAT and is currently one of the safest cyanide transportation options.

It is being mentioned the fact that the study develops the occurrence possibility of these scenarios (pages 166-171, Conclusions).

As regards the cyanides management, there is a baseline study named "Roşia Montană Golden Project, Cyanides Management Plan" prepared in compliance with the "International Management Code for the Manufacture, Transport and Use of Cyanide in the Production of Gold (International Cyanide management Institute) May 2002". S.C. Roşia Montană Gold Corporation is signatory to this code.

Bibliographical references for Chapter 7 "Risk Cases" are listed at page173-176.

*

RMGC's closure estimates, which were developed by a team of independent experts with international experience and will be reviewed by third party experts, are based on the assumption that the project can be completed according to the plan, without interruptions, bankruptcy or the like They are engineering calculations and estimates based on the current commitments of the closure plan and are summarized in the EIA's Mine Closure and Rehabilitation Management Plan (Plan J in the EIA). Annex 1 of Plan J will be updated using a more detailed approach looking at every individual year and calculating the amount of surety, which must be set aside year by year to rehabilitate the mine before RMGC is released from all its legal obligations. Most importantly, the current estimates assume the application of international best practice, best available technology (BAT) and compliance with all Romanian and European Union laws and regulations.

Closure and rehabilitation at Roşia Montană involves the following measures:

- Covering and vegetating the waste dumps as far as they are not backfilled into the open pits;
- Backfilling the open pits, except Cetate pit, which will be flooded to form a lake;
- Covering and vegetating the tailings pond and its dam areas;
- Dismantling of disused production facilities and revegetation of the cleaned-up areas;
- Water treatment by semi-passive systems (with conventional treatment systems as backup) until all effluents have reached the discharge standards and need no further treatment;

- Maintenance of the vegetation, erosion control, and monitoring of the entire site until it has been demonstrated by RMGC that all remediation targets have been sustainably reached.

While the aspects of closure and rehabilitation are many, we are confident in our cost estimates because the largest expense—that incurred by the earthmoving operation required to reshape the landscape—can be estimated with confidence. Using the project design, we can measure the size of the areas that must be reshaped and resurfaced. Similarly, there is a body of scientific studies and experiments that enable scientists to determine the depth of soil cover for successful revegetation. By multiplying the size of the areas by the necessary depth of the topsoil by the unit rate (also derived from studying similar earthmoving operations at similar sites), we can estimate the potential costs of this major facet of the rehabilitation operation. The earthmoving operation, which will total approximately US \$65 million, makes up 87% of closure and rehabilitation costs.

Also, the necessity of additional technological measures to stabilize and reshape the tailings surface will be discussed in the update of the Economical Financial Guarantee (EFG) estimate, which leads to an increase the provisions for tailings rehabilitation, especially if the TMF is closed prematurely and no optimized tailings disposal regime is applied. The exact figures depend on the details of the TMF closure strategy which can be finally determined only during production.

We believe that—far from being not realistic—our cost estimates are evidence of our high level of commitment to closure and rehabilitation. Just as a comparison, the world’s largest gold producer has set aside US \$683 million (as of December 31, 2006) for the rehabilitation of 27 operations, which equates to US \$25 million on average per mine. The RMGC closure cost estimates, recently revised upward from the US \$73 million reported in the EIA based on additional information, currently total US \$76 million.

*

According to Law 5/2000, regarding the approval of the Territory Arrangement Plan – 3rd Section – protected areas (“Law 5/2000”) (article 5, paragraphs 2-3), local public authorities, with the support of the competent central public authorities, had the obligation to establish the boundaries of the protection areas for the cultural heritage elements stipulated in Annex III to the above-mentioned law. This measure should have been taken within 12 months from the effective date of Law 5/2000, based on specialized studies. For this purpose, the local public authorities had to prepare the town planning documentation and its related regulations, developed and approved according to the law. This documentation must comprise the necessary protection and conservation measures for the national cultural heritage elements located in this area.

Concurrently, Law 350/2001 on the territory arrangement and urbanism stipulates the right of legal or natural persons interested in arranging the territory, to initiate the development of urbanism plans.

In accordance with these legal provisions, in 2001, RMGC initiated the preparation of these specific town-planning documentations - the General Urbanism Plan and the Zonal Urbanism Plan. These plans have been developed by Romanian certified companies and followed the legal approval procedure. The permit for the establishment of the Roşia Montană Historical Centre Protected Area was issued by the Ministry of Culture and Religious Affairs in 2002 (permits no. 61/14.02.2002 and no. 178/20.06.2002) as part of the procedure for the approval of the town planning documentation. Based on these permits, the Ministry of Culture and Religious Affairs requested the company to develop a Zonal Urbanism Plan for the Historical Centre of Roşia Montană. Out of the 41 historical buildings in Roşia Montană, thirty-five (35) are located inside the protected area of the Roşia Montană Historical Centre.

As for the heritage elements located in the future industrial development area (6 historical buildings), these are discussed in the Industrial Zonal Urbanism Plan prepared by SC Proiect Alba SA. The regulations included in this document will contain measures for the protection of these monuments.

In conclusion, the town planning studies and the specialized studies conducted for the purpose of establishing the boundaries of the protection areas within the future mining operations perimeter are currently pending approval, in accordance with the legal provisions, by the competent institutions and committees. Please note that none of the historical houses located in the perimeter of the proposed project will be affected; on the contrary, all the 41 historic buildings will be included in a complex restoration and rehabilitation program (see the Management Plan). This program is mandatory, regardless

of the implementation of the mining project, if we want to prevent these buildings from collapsing because of their advanced degradation.

*

Your assertion regarding the failure to obtain an applicable urbanism certificate at the start up of the public debates and of the evaluation of the quality of the report to the environmental impact assessment, is not correct.

Thus, by the time when the public debate stage started up there was an applicable urbanism certificate and namely the urbanism certificate no. 78/26.04.2006 issued by Alba County Council. This certificate was obtained prior to the evaluation stage of the quality of the report to the environmental impact assessment which started up once the EIA was submitted to the Ministry of Environment and Water Management on the 15th May 2006.

For better understanding the applicable legal provisions and the facts developed within the mining project of Roşia Montană zone we would like to make several comments:

- The procedure for issuing the environmental permit for Roşia Montană project started up on the 14th December 2004 by submitting the technical memorandum and the urbanism certificate no.68/26.August 2004 (certificate applicable by that time). S.C. Roşia Montană Gold Corporation S.A. (RMGC) applied for and obtained a new urbanism certificate no.78/26.04.2006 issued by Alba County Council for the entire Roşia Montană Project applicable on the date of the EIA Report submission (15th May 2006) and prior to the public debate start up (June 2006);
- The Section 1 of the urbanism certificate no.78 of 26th 04.2006 entitled Work construction, position 10 – “Processing plant and associated constructions “ – including the tailing management facility which existence is compulsory for the processing plant running. The Tailing management facility is also specified on the layout plans which are integral part of the urbanism certificate and they were sealed by Alba County Council so that they cannot be modified;
- The Urbanism Certificate is an informative document and its goal is only to inform the applicant about the legal, economic and technical regime of the existing lands and buildings and to establish the urbanism requirements and the approvals necessary to obtain the construction permit (including the environmental permit) as per art.6 of Law 50/1991 referring to the completion of construction works, republished and art 27 paragraph 2 of the Norms for the application of Law 50/1991 – Official Journal 825 bis/13.09.2005).

As it is an informative document, it does not limit the number of certificates an applicant may obtain for the same land plot (art. 30 of Law no. 350/2001 regarding the territorial planning and urbanism).

*

Introduced as part of the Environmental Impact Assessment Report Study (EIA), the Roşia Montană Foundation is shifting in focus. The Community Sustainable Development Plan activities initially conceived as coming under the Foundation umbrella (business oriented activities: business incubator, business advisory center, micro-finance facility, as well as social oriented activities: education and training center) have been advanced independently, via partnerships and with community participation in decision-making – a preferable way to advance social and economic development programs.

Going forward, the Foundation will take shape around preservation, patrimony and cultural heritage issues, with its final form determined in consultation with the community.

In terms of the philosophy that guides the company’s Sustainable Development efforts, the Roşia Montană Gold Corporation (RMGC) sees itself not as principal provider, but as a partner. Community involvement is considered the starting point; over time, as the community builds the capacity to maintain programs in its own right, the company will turn over control of currently-established programs to the community and its institutions.

For more information, please see Roşia Montană Sustainable Development and the Roşia Montană Project – annex 4.

*

We underline the fact that your statement is false. The General Urbanism Plan for the Roşia Montană commune, endorsed in 2002 allows the development of Roşia Montană project, as it has been presented during the public consultations.

Concurrently, pursuant to the provisions of art. 41, paragraph 2, from the Mining Law no.85/2003, the authorities from the local administration have the liability to adjust and/or update the territory arrangement plans and the general urbanism plans, in order to allow the development of all operations necessary for the development of mining activities.

RMGC has also initiated the preparation of two zonal urbanism plans: Zonal Urbanism Plan Modification – Roşia Montană Industrial Area and Zonal Urbanism Plan – Roşia Montană Historical Area. The first urbanism plan is required by the urbanism certificate no.78/26.04.2006, which updates the Zonal Urbanism Plan for the Industrial Area approved in 2002. As far as the historical area is concerned, its Zonal Urbanism Plan is required by the General Urbanism Plan approved also in 2002. Both urbanism plans are pending approval and have been subject to public consultations.

*

An engineered liner is included in the design of the Tailings Management Facility (TMF) basin. Specifically, the Roşia Montană Tailings Management Facility (TMF or “the facility”) has been designed to be compliant with the EU Groundwater Directive (80/68/EEC), transposed as Romanian GD 351/2005. The TMF is also designed for compliance with the EU Mine Waste Directive (2006/21/EC) as required by the Terms of Reference established by the MEWM in May, 2005. The following paragraphs provide a discussion of how the facility is compliant with the directives.

The TMF is composed of a series of individual components including:

- the tailings impoundment;
- the tailings dam;
- the secondary seepage collection pond;
- the secondary containment dam; and
- the groundwater monitoring wells/extraction wells located downstream of the Secondary Containment dam.

All of these components are integral parts of the facility and necessary for the facility to perform as designed.

The directives indicated above require that the TMF design be protective of groundwater. For the Roşia Montană project (RMP), this requirement is addressed by consideration of the favorable geology (low permeability shales underlying the TMF impoundment, the TMF dam and the Secondary Containment dam) and the proposed installation of a low-permeability (1×10^{-6} cm/sec) recompacted soil liner beneath the TMF basin. Please see Chapter 2 of EIA Plan F, “The Tailings Facility Management Plan” for more information.

The proposed low permeability soil liner will be fully compliant with Best Available Techniques (BAT) as defined by EU Directive 96/61 (IPPC) and EU Mine Waste Directive. Additional design features that are included in the design to be protective of groundwater include:

- A low permeability (1×10^{-6} cm/sec) cut off wall within the foundation of the starter dam to control seepage;
- A low permeability (1×10^{-6} cm/sec) core in the starter dam to control seepage;
- A seepage collection dam and pond below the toe of the tailings dam to collect and contain any seepage that does extend beyond the dam centerline;
- A series of monitoring wells, below the toe of the secondary containment dam, to monitor seepage and ensure compliance, before the waste facility limit.

In addition to the design components noted above specific operational requirements will be implemented to be protective of human health and the environment. In the extremely unlikely case that impacted water is detected in the monitoring wells below the secondary containment dam, they will be converted to

pumping wells and will be used to extract the impacted water and pump it into the reclaim pond where it will be incorporated into the RMP processing plant water supply system, until the compliance is reestablish.

*

An engineered liner is included in the design of the Tailings Management Facility (TMF) basin to be protective of groundwater. Specifically, the Roșia Montană Tailings Management Facility (TMF or “the facility”) has been designed to be compliant with the EU Groundwater Directive (80/68/EEC), transposed as Romanian GD 351/2005. The TMF is also designed for compliance with the EU Mine Waste Directive (2006/21/EC) as required by the Terms of Reference established by the MEWM in May, 2005. The following paragraphs provide a discussion of how the facility is compliant with the directives.

The TMF is composed of a series of individual components including:

- the tailings impoundment;
- the tailings dam;
- the secondary seepage collection pond;
- the secondary containment dam; and
- the groundwater monitoring wells/extraction wells located downstream of the Secondary Containment dam.

All of these components are integral parts of the facility and necessary for the facility to perform as designed.

The directives indicated above require that the TMF design be protective of groundwater. For the Roșia Montană project (RMP), this requirement is addressed by consideration of the favorable geology (low permeability shales underlying the TMF impoundment, the TMF dam, and the Secondary Containment dam) and the proposed installation of a low-permeability (1×10^{-6} cm/sec) recompacted soil liner beneath the TMF basin. Please see Chapter 2 of EIA Plan F, “The Tailings Facility Management Plan” for more information.

The proposed low permeability soil liner will be fully compliant with Best Available Techniques (BAT) as defined by EU Directive 96/61 (IPPC) and EU Mine Waste Directive. Additional design features that are included in the design to be protective of groundwater include:

- A low permeability (1×10^{-6} cm/sec) cut off wall within the foundation of the starter dam to control seepage;
- A low permeability (1×10^{-6} cm/sec) core in the starter dam to control seepage;
- A seepage collection dam and pond below the toe of the tailings dam to collect and contain any seepage that does extend beyond the dam centerline;
- A series of monitoring wells, below the toe of the secondary containment dam; to monitor seepage and ensure compliance, before the waste facility limit.

In addition to the design components noted above specific operational requirements will be implemented to be protective of human health and the environment. In the extremely unlikely case that impacted water is detected in the monitoring wells below the secondary containment dam, they will be converted to pumping wells and will be used to extract the impacted water and pump it into the reclaim pond where it will be incorporated into the RMP processing plant water supply system, until the compliance is reestablish.

With respect to your comments made as regards a presumptive infringement of the provisions of Government Decision No.351/2005 (“GD 351/2005”), there are several aspects to be taken into consideration. Thus:

1. Firstly, please note that, according to the provisions of art. 6 of GD 351/2005, any activity that might determine the discharge of dangerous substances into the environment is subject to the prior approval of the water management authorities and shall comply with the provisions of the water permit issued in accordance with the relevant legislation. The GD 351/2005 provides that the water permit shall be issued only after all technical-construction measures are implemented as prevent the indirect discharge of dangerous

substances into the underground waters. The maximum discharge limits are expressly provided under GD 351/2005 and compliance with such is a condition for granting and maintaining the water permit.

In accordance with the provisions of GD 351/2005, the actual discharge limits should be authorized by the relevant authority, such process being understood by the lawmaker in consideration of the complexity and variety of industrial activities, as well as the latest technological achievements.

Therefore, please note that the EIA stage is not intended to be finalized into an overall comprehensive permit, but it represents only a part of a more complex permitting process. Please note that, according with art. 3 of GD 918/2002, the data's level of detail provided in the EIA is the one available in the feasibility stage of the project, obviously making impossible for both the titleholder and authority to exhaust all required technical data and permits granted.

The adequate protection of the ground water shall be ensured by the terms and conditions of the water permit. The issuance of the water permit shall be performed following an individual assessment of the project, considering its particular aspects and the relevant legal requirements applicable for mining activities. Until the water permit is obtained, any allegation regarding the infringement of GD 351/2005 is obviously premature mainly because the water permit shall regulate, in accordance with the relevant legal provisions, the conditions to be observed by the developer as regards the protection of the ground water;

2. Secondly, kindly note that the complexity and specificity of mining projects generated the need of a particular legal framework. Therefore, for such projects, the reading of the legal provisions of a certain enactment should be corroborated with the relevant provisions of the other regulations applicable.

In this respect, please note that the understanding of GD 351/2005 must be corroborated with the provisions of the entire relevant legislation enforceable as regards Roşia Montană Project, with a particular accent to Directive 2006/21/EC on the management of waste from the extractive industries ("Directive 21").

The very scope of Directive 21 is to provide a specific legal framework for the extractive wastes and waste facilities related to mining projects, considering the complexity of such projects and the particular aspects of mining activities that can not always be subject to the common regulations on waste management and landfill.

From this perspective, Directive 21 provides that, an operator of a waste facility, as such is defined thereunder (please note that the TMF proposed by RMGC is considered a "waste facility" under Directive 21), must inter alia, ensure that:

- a) *"the waste facility is [...]designed so as to meet the necessary conditions for, in the short and long-term perspectives, preventing pollution of the soil, air, groundwater or surface water, taking into account especially Directives 76/464/EEC (1), 80/68/EEC (2) and 2000/60/EC, and ensuring efficient collection of contaminated water and leachate as and when required under the permit, and reducing erosion caused by water or wind as far as it is technically possible and economically viable;"*
- b) *"the waste facility is suitably constructed, managed and maintained to ensure its physical stability and to prevent pollution or contamination of soil, air, surface water or groundwater in the short and long-term perspectives as well as to minimize as far as possible damage to landscape."*

In addition, it should be mentioned that RMGC was required by MWEM under the Terms of Reference, to perform the EIA considering the provisions of Directive 21 and the BAT Management of Mining Waste. The Directive 21 was intended by the EU DG of Environment to be the legislative regime applicable to sound management of mining waste throughout Europe and therefore compliance with its provisions is mandatory.

*

Information regarding our Environmental Financial Guarantee ("EFG") is fully discussed in the section of the Environmental Impact Assessment titled "Environmental and Social Management and System Plans" (Annex 1 of the subchapter titled "Mine Rehabilitation and Closure Management Plan"). The EFG is updated annually and will always reflect the costs associated with reclamation. These funds will be held in

protected accounts at the Romanian state disposal.

Roşia Montană Gold Corporation ("RMGC") has invested significant time, energy, and resources assessing the viability of a mining project in the valley of Roşia Montană. This assessment has led RMGC to conclude that Roşia Montană presents an attractive long-term development opportunity – an opinion confirmed by a variety of lending institutions, who have completed detailed reviews of the project's design and profitability. We have every confidence that we will see the project through to the end of its projected 16-year lifespan, regardless of any fluctuations in the market price of gold.

In Romania, the creation of an EFG is required to ensure adequate funds are available from the mine operator for environmental cleanup. The EFG is governed by the Mining Law (no. 85/2003) and the National Agency for Mineral Resources instructions and Mining Law Enforcement Norms (no. 1208/2003).

Two directives issued by the European Union also impact the EFG: the Mine Waste Directive ("MWD") and the Environmental Liability Directive ("ELD").

The Mine Waste Directive aims to ensure that coverage is available for 1) all the obligations connected to the permit granted for the disposal of waste material resulting from mining activities and 2) all of the costs related to the rehabilitation of the land affected by a waste facility. The Environmental Liability Directive regulates the remedies, and measures to be taken by the environmental authorities, in the event of environmental damage created by mining operations, with the goal of ensuring adequate financial resources are available from the operators for environmental cleanup efforts. While these directives have yet to be transposed by the Romanian Government, the deadlines for implementing their enforcement mechanisms are 30 April 2007 (ELD) and 1 May 2008 (MWD) – thus before operations are scheduled to begin at Roşia Montană.

RMGC has already begun the process of complying with these directives, and once their implementation instruments are enacted by the Romanian Government, we will be in full compliance.

Each EFG will follow detailed guidelines generated by the World Bank and the International Council on Mining and Metals.

The current projected closure cost for Roşia Montană is US \$76 million, which is based on the mine operating for its full 16-year lifespan. The annual updates will be completed by independent experts, carried out in consultation with the NAMR, as the Governmental authority competent in mining activities field. These updates will ensure that in the unlikely event of early closure of the project, at any point in time, each EFG will always reflect the costs associated with reclamation. (These annual updates will result in an estimate that exceeds our current US \$76 million costs of closure, because some reclamation activity is incorporated into the routine operations of the mine.)

A number of different financial instruments are available to ensure that RMGC is capable of covering all of the expected closure costs. These instruments, which will be held in protected accounts at the Romanian state disposal, include:

- Cash deposit;
- Trust funds;
- Letter of credit;
- Surety bonds;
- Insurance policy.

Under the terms of this guarantee, the Romanian government will have no financial liability in connection with the rehabilitation of the Roşia Montană project.

*

The Security Report has been made available for public access by being posted at the following Internet address http://www.mmediu.ro/dep_mediu/rosia_montana_securitate.htm as well as through the printed version which could have been found at several information locations established for public hearings.

*

The Report on the Environmental impact assessment study (EIA) considered all alternative developments, including the option of not proceeding with any project – an option that would generate no investment, allowing the existing pollution problems and socio-economic decline to continue (Chapter 5 – *Assessment of Alternatives*).

The report also considered alternative developments – including agriculture, grazing, meat processing, tourism, forestry and forest products, cottage industries, and flora/fauna gathering for pharmaceutical purposes – and concluded that these activities could not provide the economic, cultural and environmental benefits brought by the Roşia Montană Project (RMP).

Chapter 5 also examines alternative locations for key facilities as well as alternative technologies for mining, processing and waste management, in line with best practice and as compared against published EU best available techniques (BAT) documentation.

*

The impact on protected flora and fauna will exist only locally, but this impact will not lead to the loss of any specie. The Project has been designed even from the beginning to fully comply with the requirements and norms imposed by Romanian and European environmental legislation.

The company believes the fact that the project impact on environment remains significant, especially because covers previous impacts. But, the investments required to ecologically restore/rehabilitate Roşia Montană area in order to address current complex environmental issues, are only achievable following the implementation of some economic projects that will generate and warrant implementation of some direct and responsible actions as a component of base principles of sustainable development concepts. Clean processes and technologies may be developed only in the presence of a solid economic environment fully compliant with the environment that will also resolve previous impacts of anthropic activities.

The base documents of the Project are in fact an unbiased reason of its implementation, considering the highly complex environmental commitment within Roşia Montană area.

Some of the Roşia Montană species that are under a certain protection status stand for an insignificant percentage of the scale of populations estimated at national level. The characterization of species from their habitat point of view exists in the species tables presented in the Biodiversity Chapter of the EIA Report and its annexes, although this is not a requirement imposed by the Habitats Directive. Due to their large volume of information, the annexes of chapter 4.6 Biodiversity can be found in the electronic version of the EIA disclosed by the company both in Romanian and English through approx. 6,000 DVD/CD copies, being accessible on the company website, and on the websites of Ministry of Environment and Water Management, local and regional environmental protection agencies of Alba, Sibiu, Cluj, etc.

From practical point of view, the low value of conservation of the impact area is also indirectly emphasized by the fact that there is no proposal to designate the area a SPA (aviafaunistic special protected area) and by the denial as unfounded of the proposal to designate the area as a pSCI area (sites of community importance).

Taking all these into account, we believe that the proposed Project is compliant with the provisions of EU Directive no. 92/43 Habitats[1], and EU Directive no. 79/409 Birds[2] respectively, especially because within Biodiversity Management Plan, Plan H, several active and responsible measures are provided to reconstruct/rehabilitate several natural habitats, pursuant to the provisions of the same documents [3].

References:

[1] art.3, 2nd paragraph, Each Member State shall contribute to the creation of Natura 2000 (network) in proportion to the representation within its territory of the natural habitat types and the habitats of species referred to in paragraph 1. To that effect each Member State shall designate, in accordance with Article 4, sites as special areas of conservation taking account of the objectives set out in paragraph 1.

art.4, 1st paragraph. On the basis of the criteria set out in Annex III (Stage 1) and relevant scientific information, each Member State shall propose a list of sites indicating which natural habitat types in

Annex I and which species in Annex II that are native to its territory the sites host. For animal species ranging over wide areas these sites shall correspond to the places within the natural range of such species which present the physical or biological factors essential to their life and reproduction. For aquatic species which range over wide areas, such sites will be proposed only where there is a clearly identifiable area representing the physical and biological factors essential to their life and reproduction. Where appropriate, Member States shall propose adaptation of the list in the light of the results of the surveillance referred to in Article 11. [...]

2nd paragraph.[...] Member States whose sites hosting one or more priority natural habitat types and priority species represent more than 5 % of their national territory may, in agreement with the Commission, request that the criteria listed in Annex III (Stage 2) be applied more flexibly in selecting all the sites of Community importance in their territory.[...]

Art. 6, 4th paragraph. If, in spite of a negative assessment of the implications for the site and in the absence of alternative solutions, a plan or project must nevertheless be carried out for imperative reasons of overriding public interest, including those of a social or economic nature, the Member State shall take all compensatory measures necessary to ensure that the overall coherence of Natura 2000 is protected. It shall inform the Commission of the compensatory measures adopted.

Art. 16. Provided that there is no satisfactory alternative and the derogation is not detrimental to the maintenance of the populations of the species concerned at a favourable conservation status in their natural range, Member States may derogate from the provisions of Articles 12, 13, 14 and 15 (a) and (b):[...]

- in the interests of public health and public safety, or for other imperative reasons of overriding public interest, including those of a social or economic nature and beneficial consequences of primary importance for the environment;

[2] Art.4, 1st paragraph. The species mentioned in annex 1 shall be the subject of special conservation measures concerning their habitat in order to ensure their survival and reproduction in their area of distribution. [...]

Trends and variations in population levels shall be taken into account as a background for evaluations. Member states shall classify in particular the most suitable territories in number and size as special protection areas for the conservation of these species, taking into account their protection requirements in the geographical sea and land area where this directive applies.

[3] Directive 92/43 Habitats, art. 2, 2nd paragraph; Directive 79/409 Birds, art. 3, 2nd paragraph, letter c.

*

This statement is ungrounded, because the environmental impact assessment (EIA) process has included preliminary cumulative estimates for stationary motorized equipment and linear (vehicular) sources were prepared in order to provide an initial understanding of the potential cumulative noise and vibration impacts from background and Roşia Montană Project sources, and to guide future monitoring and measurement activities as well as the selection of appropriate Best Management Practices/Best Available Techniques for further mitigation of the potential noise and vibration impacts from Project activities. These preliminary estimates apply to major construction activities, as well as the operation and decommissioning/closure of the mine and process plant. They are documented as data tables and isopleth maps for major noise-generating activities in selected, representative Project years; see **Tables 4.3.8** through **4.3.16** and **Exhibits 4.3.1** through **4.3.9**. All these details related to the applied assessment methodology, the input data of the dispersion model, the modeling results and the measures established for the prevention/mitigation/elimination of the potential impact for all project stages (construction, operation, closure) are included in Chapter 4, Section 4.3 Noise and Vibrations of the EIA Report.

Project Years 0, 9, 10, 12, 14, and 19 were selected for modeling because they are considered to be representative of the most significant levels of noise-generating activity. They are also the same years used for air impact modeling purposes in Section 4.2, as air and noise impacts share many of the same sources or are otherwise closely correlated. In order to more accurately reflect potential receptor impacts, all of

these exhibits integrate the background traffic estimates discussed in Section 4.3.6.1.

The Project site plan and process plant area and facility drawings were used to establish the position of the noise sources and other relevant physical characteristics of the site. Receptor locations were established using background reports and project engineering and environmental documentation provided by RMGC. With this information, the source locations and receptor locations were translated into input (x, y, and z) co-ordinates for the noise-modeling program.

Tables 4.3.8 through 4.3.16 and **Exhibits 4.3.1 through 4.3.9** present the average maximum noise values likely to be experienced by the receptor community over all Project phases after incorporation of a variety of initial mitigation measures designed specifically to reduce the impacts associated with mobile and stationary machinery sources. The influence of non-mining related background (primarily traffic) noise is also included.

To evaluate the sound levels associated with haul trucks and other mobile sources crossing the site carrying excavated ore, waste rock, and soil, a noise analysis program based on the (U.S.) Federal Highway Administration's (FHWA) standard RD-77-108 [1] model was used to calculate reference noise emissions values for heavy trucks along the project roadways. The FHWA model predicts hourly L_{eq} values for free-flowing traffic conditions and is generally considered to be accurate within 1.5 decibels (dB).

The model is based on the standardized noise emission factors for different types and weights of vehicles (e.g., automobiles, medium trucks, and heavy trucks), with consideration given to vehicle volume, speed, roadway configuration, distance to the receiver, and the acoustical characteristics of the site. The emission levels of all three vehicle types increase as a function of the logarithm of their speed.

To evaluate the sound sources from the proposed mine processing facility and the semi-stationary material handling equipment (at the ore extraction, waste rock and soil stockpiling areas), a proprietary computerized noise prediction program was used by AAC to simulate and model the future equipment noise emissions throughout the area. The modeling program uses industry-accepted propagation algorithms based on the following American National Standards Institute (ANSI) and International Organization for Standardization (ISO) standards:

- ANSI S1.26-1995 (R2004), *Method for the Calculation of the Absorption of Sound by the Atmosphere*;
- ISO 9613-1:1993, *Acoustics -- Attenuation of sound during propagation outdoors-- Part 1: Calculation of the absorption of sound by the atmosphere*;
- ISO 9613-2:1996, *Acoustics -- Attenuation of sound during propagation outdoors -- Part 2: General method of calculation*;
- ISO 3891:1978, *Acoustics -- Procedure for describing aircraft noise heard on the ground*.

The calculations account for classical sound wave divergence (i.e., spherical spreading loss with adjustments for source directivity from point sources) plus attenuation factors due to air absorption, minimal ground effects, and barriers/shielding.

This model has been validated by AAC over a number of years via noise measurements at several operating industrial sites that had been previously modeled during the engineering design phases. The comparison of modeled predictions versus actual measurements has consistently shown close agreement; typically in the range of 1 to 3 dB (A).

References:

[1] FHWA Highway Traffic Noise Prediction Model; see Federal Highway Administration Report Number FHWA-RD-77-108, USA, Washington, D.C., 1978.

A detailed presentation of blasting technology can be found in the annex 7.1 - Proposed blasting technology for the operational phase of Roşia Montană Project.

*

The partnership between Gabriel Resources and Regia Autonomă a Cuprului Deva (currently, CNCAF Minvest SA) has been established based on Law no. 15/1990 on the reorganization of the state owned companies as autonomous directions and trade companies, published in the Official Gazette, Section I, no.

98/08.08.1990, as subsequently amended and supplemented. Art. 35 of this law provides the possibility of the regies autonomous to enter into partnerships with legal third parties, Romanian or foreign, for the purpose of setting up new trading companies.

Roşia Montană Gold Corporation SA was set up in 1997, according to the legal provisions in force as at that time, the setting up being made by observing all the conditions imposed by Company Law no. 31/1990 and Trade Register Law no. 26/1990, in regard of the setting up of the joint stock companies with mixed capital.

We underline that the Articles of Associations of Roşia Montană Gold Corporation SA, representing the result of the parties agreement in regard of the terms and conditions under which the partnership between the Romanian state and investor takes place represents a public document, being included in the category of documents which, as per Law no. 26/1990 on the Trade Register, are published in the Romanian Official Gazette and for which the Trade Register is obliged to issue, on the expense of the persons submitting a request, certified copies.

As for the agreement concerning the setting up of the mixed company together with Gabriel Resources Ltd., this has been expressed by the Ministry of Industry and Trade, the conditions imposed by the setting up of the mixed company being the following: (i) ensuring of the jobs at the level existing upon the conclusion of the agreement concerning the setting up of the mixed company; (ii) the expenses incurred by the fulfillment of the exploration stage should be fully supported by Gabriel; (iii) the obtaining of the approval from the ANRM by the Copper Autonomous Direction Deva and (iv) the observance of all legal provisions in force concerning the setting up of the mixed companies with foreign partners. These conditions have been fully complied with as at the setting up of the company and during the development of its activity.

We also specify that the establishing of the shareholders' quotas to the benefits and losses of Roşia Montană Gold Corporation SA has been made by considering their contribution quota to the company's share capital. The current percentage of 80% for Gabriel Resources Ltd. and of 19.31% for CNCAF Minvest SA resulted from the initial contribution and the subsequent contributions of the shareholders to the company's share capital, in consideration also of Gabriel Resources Ltd. advancing all expenses and costs related to the development-exploitation and permitting of the Roşia Montană Mining Project.

The provisions of the Articles of Associations of Roşia Montană Gold Corporation SA on the necessary majority and quorum conditions for the decision-making process within the General Shareholders Meeting and the quotas to the benefits and losses of the company are taken from Law no. 31/1990, and no derogation exists in regard of this aspect.

*

This claim is not true; the Urbanism Plan has been prepared with public consultation.

Roşia Montană Gold Corporation SA (RMGC) has requested and obtained from Alba County Council the Urbanism Certificate no. 78 of 26.04.2006, for the entire Roşia Montană mining project, including the tailings management facility. The Urbanism Certificate also stipulated the preparation of a Zonal Urbanism Plan, to reflect all changes made to the Roşia Montană Project, following the public consultations and debates organized in relation to this project, and the consultations with the permitting authorities. This plan, entitled "Modification of the Zonal Urbanism Plan, Roşia Montană Industrial Area", was prepared and subjected to public debate in June 2006 in accordance with the provisions of Order no.176/N/2000 issued by the Ministry of Public Works and Territory Development for the approval of the technical regulations "Guidelines regarding the methodology applied for the preparation and framework content of the Zonal Urbanism Plan" and, at present, it is pending approval.

Concerning the Roşia Montană General Urbanism Plan approved in 2002, such plan was prepared in parallel with the Zonal Urbanism Plan of 2002, all the provisions of the General Urbanism Plan being also included in the Zonal Urbanism Plan. Also, the approval procedure related to the two urbanism plans was carried out in parallel.

*

Preventive archaeological researches within the Roşia Montană mining project area have been undertaken based on specific techniques, specifically trial trenches in all accessible areas that are suitable for human habitation, taking into account the bibliographical information and the observations recorded during the archaeological survey campaigns, the geophysical studies and the analyses of the photogrammetric flights. In addition, surface investigations were undertaken, where appropriate.

The archaeological researches at Roşia Montană covered a large surface and focused on the areas known to have archaeological potential. THEREFORE, ALL AREAS THAT HAVE BEEN ARCHAEOLOGICALLY DISCHARGED HAD BEEN PREVIOUSLY INVESTIGATED. All research programs, beginning with the 2004 campaign, have been undertaken in full compliance with the current legal requirements, i.e. Ministerial Order no. 2392 of 6 September 2004 on the establishment of the Archaeological Standards and Procedures by the Ministry of Culture and Religious Affairs.

The proposed gold mining project at Roşia Montană has raised a series of issues related to the rescue of the historical-archaeological heritage within the area, as well as issues related to its scientific development and also the enhancement of heritage within a museum. Given the complex difficulties encountered in this respect, the Ministry of Culture and Religious Affairs decided to initiate the "Alburnus Maior" National Research Program.

The company's role was to provide the necessary financial resources for the assessment, research and enhancement of the archaeological remains, in full compliance with the Romanian current legislation. The development of the research and of the archaeological discharge works has been conducted through specific means and methodologies that have been adjusted to the realities of every site researched, in our case, Roşia Montană. They consisted in:

- Archives studies;
- Archaeological surveys; trial trenches;
- aerial reconnaissance/survey and aerial photo interpretation ; high resolution satellite images;
- mining archaeology studies; underground topography and 3D modeling;
- geophysical surveys;
- extensive archaeological investigations in the areas with an identified archaeological potential- this implied carrying out archaeological excavations;
- Interdisciplinary studies- sedimentology, archaeo-zoology, comparative palynology, archaeo-metallurgy, geology, mineralogy;
- Radiocarbon dating and dendrochronology;
- This research and its results were included in an integrated database;
- traditional and digital archaeological topography and development of the GIS project; generate a photo archive- both traditional and digital;
- restoration of artifacts;
- an inventory and a digital catalogue of the artifacts;
- studies conducted by specialists in order to enhance the research results - publication of monographs/scientific books and journals, exhibitions, websites, etc.

All the preventive archaeological researches undertaken at Roşia Montană since 2000 have been carried out as part of a complex research program; permits for preventive archaeological excavations being issued in compliance with the current legislation. These archaeological investigations have been undertaken by representatives of 21 specialized institutions from Romania and 3 others from abroad, under the scientific coordination of the Romanian National Museum of History. All archaeological researches have been conducted in full compliance with the existing legislation. The investigations undertaken during each archaeological research campaign have been approved by the Ministry of Culture and Religious Affairs based on the Annual Archaeological Research Plan approved by the National Commission of Archaeology.

Under the current legislation (Ministerial Order no. 2392 of 6 September 2004 on the establishment of the Archaeological Standards and Procedures by the Ministry of Culture and Religious Affairs) the archaeologists who have conducted the research may ask that an archaeological discharge certificate be granted. Based on a complex research program, the archaeologists prepare comprehensive documentation with regard to the researched area. Upon consideration of the submitted documentation, the National Commission of Archaeology makes a decision as to whether to recommend or not the granting of the archaeological discharge certificate. In the case of the research conducted in the period 2001-2006, the

archaeological discharge certificate was issued directly by the Ministry of Culture and Religious Affairs or by its local agencies.

Preventive archaeological researches at Roşia Montană have allowed the research of five Roman cremation necropolis (Tău Corna, Hop-Găuri, Țarina, Jig - Piciorag and Pârâul Porcului – Tăul Secuilor), two funerary areas (Carpeni, Nanului Valley), sacred areas (Hăbad, Nanului Valley), habitation areas (Hăbad, Carpeni, Tăul Țapului, Hop), the most significant being the Roman structures on the Carpeni Hill and the circular funerary monument at Tău Găuri. In addition, for the first time in Romania, surface investigations have been paralleled by underground investigations of Cetate, Cărnice, Jig and Orlea massifs, with important discoveries in the Piatra Corbului, area, Cătălina-Monulești gallery and the Păru Carpeni mining sector.

The research consisted of aerial photo interpretation, archaeological magnetometric studies, electrical resistivity, palynology, sedimentology, geology studies, radiocarbon and dendrochronology dating. For a better management of the research units and of the archaeological findings, data bases were used, including text and photographs-among which 4 satellite images (an archive satellite image type SPOT Panchromatic (10m) from 1997; 2 satellite images LANDSAT 7 MS (30 m), dating from 2000 and 2003; a satellite image with priority programming SPOT 5 SuperMode color (2,5 m resolution-19 July 2004); all data have been included in a comprehensive GIS program, a first in the Romanian archaeological research.

In the case of archaeological monuments that are located close to industrial facilities, plans have been redesigned to ensure that the archaeological remains in question will not be affected. Where appropriate, the archaeological monument was preserved in situ and restored, i.e. the circular funerary monument at Hop-Găuri (see The "Alburnus Maior" monograph series, volume II, Bucharest, 2004). Another example in this respect is the Carpeni Hill, designated an "archaeological " reserve, and the Piatra Corbului area. In 2004, after being thoroughly investigated, these areas have been included on the List of Historic Monuments. Add to this the areas where ancient mining remains will be preserved, such as the Cătălina Monulești gallery and the mining sector Păru Carpeni, as well as the protected area Roşia Montană Historic Center, including a number of heritage assets (35 historic monument houses).

We emphasise in this respect that the identified and researched structures have been published in preliminary form in the Archaeological Research Chronicle of Romania, after every archaeological research campaign, as well as in volume 1 of the Alburnus Maior monographic series. We mention here the areas where Roman habitation structures have been identified and researched, as well as the references to be consulted for further information: Hop-Găuri, Carpeni, Tăul Țapului (CCA 2001 (2002), p. 254-257, no. 182; 261-262, nr. 185; 264-265, no. 188; 265-266, no. 189. Alburnus Maior I, 2003, p. 45-80; 81-122; 123-148; CCA 2001 (2002), 257-261; CCA 2003 (2004) ,280-283; Alburnus Maior I, 2003, p. 387-431, 433-446, 447-467).

For further details related to the applicable legal framework, the responsibilities of the Project titleholder, or for a detailed description of the preventive archaeological researches undertaken to date and of the Cultural Heritage Management Plans, please see Annex called "Information on the Cultural heritage of Roşia and Related Management Aspects". In addition, the annex includes supplementary information with regard to the result of the researches undertaken as part of the "Alburnus Maior" National Research Program between 2001 and 2006.

In conclusion, the area mentioned by the questioner has been researched in accordance with the Romanian legal requirements, as well as with European standards and practices in the field.

Note that the type of research undertaken at Roşia Montană, known as preventive/rescue archaeological research, as well as other related heritage studies, are done everywhere in the world in close connection with the economic development of certain areas. Both the costs for the research and for the enhancement and maintenance of the preserved areas are provided by investors, in a public-private partnership set up in order to protect the cultural heritage, as per the provisions of the European Convention on the Protection of the Archaeological Heritage (Malta-1992) [1].

References:

[1]The text of the Convention is available at the following address:

<http://conventions.coe.int/Treaty/Commun/QueVoulezVous.asp?NT=143&CM=8&DF=7/6/2006&CL=ENG>

*

In 2000, in the context of the proposal of a new mining project in the Roşia Montană area, the Ministry of Culture and Religious Affairs approved a series of studies to be conducted in order to research the archaeological and architectural heritage of the area. At the end of that year, the Design Centre for National Cultural Heritage (now the National Institute for Historical Monuments) presented the preliminary results of these researches in front of the National Commission for Historical Monuments and of the National Commission of Archaeology. Based on these results, in 2001, the Ministry of Culture and Religious Affairs initiated the “Alburnus Maior” National Research Program (the Order no. 2504 / 07.03.2001 of the Minister of Culture and Religious Affairs) in compliance with the Law 378/2001 (as subsequently amended by Law 462/2003 and by Law 258/2006 and Law 259/2006). Thus, since 2000, the Ministry of Culture and Religious Affairs has fulfilled its duties – directly or through its subordinated institutions - with regard to the management of the issues related to Roşia Montană’s heritage.

The preventive archaeological researches have been conducted by the representatives of 21 national institutions and 3 others from abroad, with a broad expertise in the field. They have been carried out based on the annual approval of the National Commission of Archaeology of the Ministry of Culture and Religious Affairs. In accordance with current legislation, this research program is carried out with financial support provided by RMGC, i.e. the company that plans to expand and continue to mine the gold-silver deposit in Roşia Montană. Thus, large-scale preventive investigations have been conducted or are underway in the RMP impact area. A proposal will be made based on the results of these investigations, either for the archaeological discharge of some researched areas or the preservation in situ of certain representative structures and monuments, in compliance with current legislation. For areas proposed for conservation or for archaeological discharge measures the decision was made based on the surveys conducted by specialists and on the analysis of the results by the National Commission of Archaeology. In the period 2000-2005, the mining project underwent a series of modifications designed to promote the conservation of the local heritage. Examples of this include extending the duration of the field investigations (e.g. in Tarina, Pârâul Porcului, Orlea) and changing the location of some elements of mining infrastructure in order to allow the conservation of the archaeological remains found in the Carpeni, in the Tău Găuri and Pietra Corbului areas.

The architectural and town-planning surveys have been conducted, in accordance with current legislation, by companies certified by the Ministry of Culture and Religious Affairs, while the town-planning documentation drafted by these companies, and the restoration and conservation works undertaken so far, have been approved by the National Commission for Historical Monuments. Thus, the town-planning documentation has been approved and implemented in accordance with current legislation, and the company has agreed to these decisions and modified the mine development plans accordingly:

Extensive ethnographic research was conducted in the Roşia Montană-Abrud-Corna area in the period 2001-2004 coordinated by a team of specialists for the Romanian Village Museum „Dimitrie Gusti” (a National Museum directly under the coordination of the Ministry of Culture and Religious Affairs). Moreover, a broad series of oral history interviews was conducted in the period 2001-2002 by the Romanian Society of Radio broadcasting through the „Gheorghe Brătianu” Oral History Centre, Bucharest (SRR - CIO).

In compliance with the requirements of the Ministry of Environment and Waters Management and the Ministry of Culture and Religious Affairs, specific management plans have been drawn up for the management and conservation of the heritage remains from the Roşia Montană area, in the context of the implementation of the mining project. These plans have been included in the documentation prepared for the report on the Environmental Impact Assessment Study. (see EIA Report, volume 32-33, Plan M-Cultural Heritage Management Plan, part I –Management Plan for the Archaeological Heritage from Roşia Montană Zone; part II-Management Plan for the Historical Monuments and Protected Zone from Roşia Montană; part III- Cultural Heritage Management Plan).

These management plans comprise detailed presentations of the obligations and responsibilities for the protection and conservation of the heritage remains from the Roşia Montană area, which the company has assumed as part of the mining project, in accordance with the decision of the central government. These heritage remains include: archaeological remains above and under the ground, historic buildings, protected areas, intangible heritage assets, cultural landscape items, etc. In this context, it should be noted

that besides the works for the protection and preservation of the archaeological heritage, works are also being carried out for the rehabilitation and conservation of the protected area Historical Centre Roşia Montană (comprising 35 historic buildings, and projects for the restoration of 11 of these buildings are currently being drafted) and at Tăul Mare, Tăul Brazi and Tăul Anghel, plus remains of the surface mining works from the Văidoaia area, and the creation of a modern museum dedicated to the history of mining in the Apuseni Mountains area. This museum will be established including exhibitions of geology, archaeology, industrial and ethnographic heritage as well as an underground section organized around the Cătălina Monuleşti gallery.

Moreover, representatives of the Directorate/Department for Culture, Religious Affairs and National Cultural Heritage of Alba County have paid a number of visits to Roşia Montană in order to collect information and to check the situation. The same administrative body was the intermediary for the acquisitions of historic buildings made by RMGC. The Ministry of Culture and Religious Affairs expressed its pre-emption right regarding the acquisition of these buildings.

It should be mentioned, however, that apart from the obligations undertaken by RMGC as regards the protection and conservation of the archaeological remains and historical monuments, there are also a series of obligations which rest with the local public authorities from Roşia Montană and from Alba County, and with the central public authorities, specifically the Romanian Government. These aspects are detailed in the Cultural Heritage Management Plans included in the EIA Report (see EIA Report, volume 32, Management Plan for the Archaeological Heritage from Roşia Montană Zone, pages 22-24, 49, 55-56, 71-72 and the EIA Report, volume 33- Management Plan for the Historical Monuments and Protected Zone from Roşia Montană pages 28-29, 47-50, 51-53, 65-66, page 103 – Annex 1).

Item no.

50

No. to identify the observations received from the public

No.
114888/
05.10.2006

Proposal

The questioner does not agree to the Roşia Montană project implementation formulating the following remarks and comments:

- The implementation of this project implies the total destruction of the underground mining works from Roşia Montană;
- Demolition and relocation of half a living and dead population from Roşia Montană;
- There is no liner proposed for the tailings pond;
- The EIA report does not analyze all alternatives to the project.

The RM project does not imply the complete destruction of the underground mining works from Roşia Montană.

Indeed, the four pits planned overlap with most of the over 140 km long network of existing mine galleries and underground mining works. All the accessible galleries have been investigated and inventoried in order to identify ancient mining works as well as for their archaeological discharge. Approximately 7 km of cumulated galleries have been identified where traces of ancient mining activities have been found. But parts of these galleries have been deteriorated by medieval, modern and contemporary activities. The way some of these ancient and medieval mining works are going to be conserved is presented in the Cultural Heritage Management Plan (e.g. the Cătălina Monuleşti gallery, the Păru Carpeni gallery and the Piatra Corbului area).

Apart from these historical galleries, other galleries, both modern and older, will remain outside the planned pits. From the environmental protection point of view, the removal of most of the network of underground mining works in Roşia Montană will have a positive effect, as these works are the main generators of acid rock drainage.

If this project fails to be implemented as per the mine closure procedures, the galleries network in Roşia Montană would be closed down definitively. In this case, most of these galleries will collapse in time due to water accumulations on the inside.

Solution

*

It is not unusual that large projects need elements of resettlement and relocation. Think only of harbors, airports, highways, hydro-power generation units, mines.

The World Bank has developed what is considered the standard of this process which is followed closely by the custodians of these large investments. The focus is on the impacts mitigation measures designed and applied during the implementation of the projects, for and with the communities.

The mitigation plans and measures secure a smooth transition to the new location of the community impacted by the project and could easily cover a long period of time after the resettlement is done. Thorough monitoring and evaluation processes carried on indicate the corrective or improvement actions of the initial mitigation plans.

In spite of some opposition outside the area, in Roşia Montană the project is largely accepted and requested by the community and is seen at regional level as the only viable solution for the difficulties in the area, able to generate a wide range of individual and collective benefits.

Contrary to what the opponents of the mining project claim, no one wants to destroy homes or graveyards of Roşia Montană.

The property purchase program established by the company has been designed according to World Bank guidelines, and is based on a “willing seller, willing buyer” model.

To put the number of graves in context, the vast majority of Roșia Montană’s 1,905 graves will not be affected by the mining project (410 graves to move), as the company has to the maximum extent possible designed the mining operations to leave established graveyards in place.

All reburials will be done at the request of the families, and the expense of RMGC. The process will follow to the letter Romanian law on reburials [1], with the company’s commitment to act with respect and reverence. Abandoned graves will be relocated, also with full respect and reverence, to Piatra Albă’s new cemetery, for which 13 hectares have been set aside.

What the RMP project offers to future generations is a chance to continue a way of life in a village where that future – with 70% unemployment today, rising above 90% if RMGC’s proposed mine is not allowed to proceed – would be very much in doubt. In the event of Roșia Montană’s demise, the graves and churches there would likely be left behind, as in other abandoned mining villages in the Romanian countryside. Development of the RMP will keep the village alive – in fact and in spirit – and bring economic opportunity to the region.

References:

[1] the relocation of graves and cemeteries is governed by the following regulatory acts:

- (i) Law no. 489/2006 on the freedom of religion and the general regime of religious affairs, published in the Romanian Official Gazette, Section I, no. 11/08.01.2007;
- (ii) Law no. 98/1994 establishing and sanctioning breaches of the hygiene and public health rules, published in the Romanian Official Gazette, Section I, no. 317/16.11.1994, as subsequently amended and supplemented (“Law no. 98/1994”);
- (iii) The hygiene norms and recommendations concerning the population’s life environment, published in the Romanian Official Gazette, Section I, no. 140/03.07.1997, as subsequently amended and supplemented (“Order 536/1997”);
- (iv) GD no. 955/2004 on the approval of the framework Rules for the organization and operation of the public services for the administration of the public and private domain of local interest, published in the Romanian Official Gazette, Section I, no. 660/22.07.2004;
- (v) Order no. 261/1982 on the approval of the standard Rules for the administration of graveyards and the crematories of the localities, published in the Official Gazette no. 67/11.03.1983;
- (vi) Rules for the organization and operation of the parish and monastery graveyards within the eparchies of the Romanian Orthodox Church, approved by Decision of the Religious Affairs Department no. 16.285/31.12.1981.

*

An engineered liner is included in the design of the Tailings Management Facility (TMF) basin. Specifically, the Roșia Montană Tailings Management Facility (TMF or “the facility”) has been designed to be compliant with the EU Groundwater Directive (80/68/EEC), transposed as Romanian GD 351/2005. The TMF is also designed for compliance with the EU Mine Waste Directive (2006/21/EC) as required by the Terms of Reference established by the MEWM in May, 2005. The following paragraphs provide a discussion of how the facility is compliant with the directives.

The TMF is composed of a series of individual components including:

- the tailings impoundment;
- the tailings dam;
- the secondary seepage collection pond;
- the secondary containment dam; and
- the groundwater monitoring wells/extraction wells located downstream of the Secondary Containment dam.

All of these components are integral parts of the facility and necessary for the facility to perform as designed.

The directives indicated above require that the TMF design be protective of groundwater. For the Roșia

Montană project (RMP), this requirement is addressed by consideration of the favorable geology (low permeability shales underlying the TMF impoundment, the TMF dam and the Secondary Containment dam) and the proposed installation of a low-permeability (1×10^{-6} cm/sec) recompacted soil liner beneath the TMF basin. Please see Chapter 2 of EIA Plan F, “The Tailings Facility Management Plan” for more information.

The proposed low permeability soil liner will be fully compliant with Best Available Techniques (BAT) as defined by EU Directive 96/61 (IPPC) and EU Mine Waste Directive. Additional design features that are included in the design to be protective of groundwater include:

- A low permeability (1×10^{-6} cm/sec) cut off wall within the foundation of the starter dam to control seepage;
- A low permeability (1×10^{-6} cm/sec) core in the starter dam to control seepage;
- A seepage collection dam and pond below the toe of the tailings dam to collect and contain any seepage that does extend beyond the dam centerline;
- A series of monitoring wells, below the toe of the secondary containment dam, to monitor seepage and ensure compliance, before the waste facility limit.

In addition to the design components noted above specific operational requirements will be implemented to be protective of human health and the environment. In the extremely unlikely case that impacted water is detected in the monitoring wells below the secondary containment dam, they will be converted to pumping wells and will be used to extract the impacted water and pump it into the reclaim pond where it will be incorporated into the RMP processing plant water supply system, until the compliance is reestablish.

*

Chapter 5 of the Report on the environment impact assessment study (EIA) (*Assessment of Alternatives*) presents an assessment of all the alternatives that are appropriate to consider for the EIA and in line with the EIA Terms of Reference as issued by MEWM. This includes the “no-project” alternative.

The Chapter also examines alternative locations for key facilities as well as alternative technologies for mining, processing and waste management, in line with best practice and as compared against published EU best available techniques (BAT) documentation.

The EIA considered alternative developments – including agriculture, grazing, meat processing, tourism, forestry and forest products, cottage industries, and flora/fauna gathering for pharmaceutical purposes – and concluded that these activities could not provide the economic, cultural and environmental benefits brought by the Roşia Montană Project (RMP).

The examination of alternatives also evaluated the best mining technology, duration and staging of the project, mining and processing technologies, environmental management practices, site options for waste management facilities, transportation routes, and measures to prevent and minimize environmental impact.

Item no. 50BIS

No. to identify
the
observations
received from
the public

No.
114725/
31.08.2006

Proposal

The questioners oppose categorically to the project implementation

Solution

As regarding your request, we mention that art. 44 (3) of the Minister of Waters and Environment Protection Order no. 860/2002 on the environment impact assessment and the issuance of environmental agreements Procedures ("Order no. 860/2002") provides that *"based on the results of the public debate, the relevant authority for the environmental protection evaluates the grounded proposals/comments of the public and requests the titleholder the supplementation of the report on the environmental impact assessment study with an appendix comprising solutions for the solving of the indicated issues"*.

Consequently, considering the fact that your proposal is just an allegation which does not indicate possible problems, nor provide additional information, we mention that the decision on the issuance or refusal of the environment approval cannot be made only by considering a simple proposal, but according to certain objective criteria provided by the wording of art. 45 of the Order no. 860/2002 and only after examining:

- (i) the report on the environmental impact assessment study;
- (ii) the conclusions of the parties involved in the assessment;
- (iii) the possibilities to implement the project;
- (iv) the titleholder answers to the grounded proposals/comments of the public.

Item no.

51

No. to identify the observations received from the public

No.
114903/
05.10.2006

Proposal

The questioner does not agree to the implementation of the Roşia Montană project formulating the following remarks and comments:

- Within EIA, there are no presented all the possible risks caused by this project;
- The overall costs for mine closure are not realistic;
- There isn't until now an approved Zonal Urbanism Plan for the Protected Areas;
- The phase of public consultation and quality evaluation of the impact assessment study report begun without a valid urbanism certificate;
- Information about the foundation which RMGC will establish and subsidize is not given. This foundation follows to assume the obligations which the mining operation can not assume;
- The present urbanism plans of the Roşia Montană commune do not correspond with the mining project proposal described in EIA;
- There is no liner proposed for the tailings pond;
- The proposed waste deposits will be not constructed according to the legislation in force;
- No financial guarantees have been stipulated;
- There is not a Safety Report submitted for the public consultation and evaluation by the competent authorities;
- The EIA report does not assess the "zero alternative";
- The Project poses a threat for protected flora and fauna;
- The EIA report does not refer to the impact on the listed heritage buildings of noise and vibrations caused by the mining operations;
- The public/ONGs wish to consult the contracts and agreements between Company and Romanian State;
- The Urbanism Plan has been modified without public consultation;
- From archeological point of view, the area proposed to be occupied by project was not legally investigated;
- It disputes the spiritual and architectural monuments, including the responsible involvement of the Institutions of the State in the protection program.

Solution

It is the nature of risk that it can be mitigated and diminished; it cannot be made to disappear. In order to put this into context, the common action of walking on the street or developing everyday activities have an accident potential. This accident potential is twice higher than within the framework of industrial activities that use hazardous substances.

In the larger sense, the entire EIA report is focused on the assessment of impacts and their associated mitigation. Specifically, Chapter 4 of the EIA presents that impact assessment of the project. The following discussion presents a summary of the impact discussed in the EIA.

As far as natural and technological risks assessments are concerned, Chapter 7, "Risk Cases", from the Report on Environmental Impact Assessment, emphasizes the fact that safety and prevention measures, the implementation of the environmental management and risk systems are mitigating the consequences to acceptable levels as compared to the most restrictive norms, standards, the best practices or national and international recommendations in the field. The risk level has been established as moderate and so, socially acceptable. The extension of the risk assessment and the intensity of the prevention and mitigation measures of the consequences should be proportionate to the risk involved. Selection of a specific mitigation technique is depends on the analyzed accident scenario.

More detailed assessments are conducted for accident scenarios that, based on the qualitative assessment are found to be potentially major, of probability more than 10^{-6} (reduced recovery periods of 1/1,000,000) meaning that they could have major consequences therefore, elevated associated risk, a higher risk level than 9 to 12 (on a scale of 1-25). To put this in context, simply living in southern Florida rates a 1 - 25 on

the risk scale.

A global assessment of the risks associated with the Roşia Montană Project is obtained by the quick environmental and health risk assessment methodology initially developed by the Italian Ministry of the Environment and the World Health Organization. Natural hazard and risk identification and analysis presents key data and information in assessing potential technological accidents. Thus:

- in designing the Tailings Management Facility, the design parameters were chosen to fully cover the characteristic seismic risk of the area. These seismic design parameters adopted for the TMF and other facilities on the proposed site result in a safety factor much greater than the minimum accepted under the Romanian and European design standards for such facilities;

- in the sector physically impacted by the Project, the risk of floods will remain very low due to the small catchments (controlled by the Roşia and Corna Streams) the area affected by the operation, and the creation of containment, diversion and drainage hydro-technical structures for storm waters on the site, and in the Abrud catchment in general;

- risks caused by meteorological events have been reviewed and used in assessing the hazards of the affected technological processes.

From the analysis of morphometrical parameters and their correlation with other sets of information on the natural slopes on and near the site shows that the (qualitatively estimated) landslide occurrence risk is low to moderate and its consequences will not cause major impacts on the structural components of the Project.

There is no significant risk associated with resource depletion. Mining activities are planned judiciously, so as to extract only the profitable gold and silver resources and only the necessary construction rock for the Project. The management of the mining concession site will minimize reserve "sterilization" (limitation of future access to the reserves).

In assessing technological hazards and risks, the quantity of hazardous substances on the site was calculated as a total and by category, as provided by the *Notification Procedure* approved by Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry, Water and Environment (MAFWE) Order 1084/2003. Based on an evaluation of hazardous substances in stock on the Project site in relation to the relevant quantities provided by the Government Decision 95/2003 which transposes the Seveso Directive, the Project ranges between the upper and the lower limits, and therefore S.C. Roşia Montană Gold Corporation S.A. is required to prepare a Report on Environmental Impact Assessment Study to be sent to the local environmental authority and the local civilian protection authority a *Safety Report* on its operations to prevent major accident risks.

In assessing the consequences of major accidents involving dangerous substances, physical-mathematical models accepted internationally and especially at EU level, and the current version of the SLAB (Canada) software have been used, the latter for the atmospheric dispersion of denser than air gases, that may handle a multitude of situations and scenarios. Similarly, the EFFECTSGis 5.5 (Netherlands) software, developed for the analysis of the effects of industrial accidents and of consequences. Several scenarios were considered in response to the internal legislative requirements, especially related to the implementation of the Internal Emergency Plans (GD 647/2005). The conclusions of the risk assessment for major accidents were:

- The total destruction of plant facilities may only be caused by terrorist attack with classic or nuclear weapons. Simultaneous damage to the HCl tank (including containment) and to the NaCN solution tank, the tanks containing enriched solution, to one or more leaching tanks, having as a result HCN dispersion into the air. At the same time, under certain situations and weather conditions unfavorable for dispersion, people within 40 m of the emission source, surprised by the toxic cloud for more than 1 minute without respiratory protection equipment, will most certainly die. It may also be considered that, on a radius of about 310 m, persons exposed for more than 10 minutes may suffer serious intoxications that may also lead to death. Toxic effects may occur in persons up to about 2 km downwind of the process plant;

- Operating errors and/or failures in the measurement and control devices, resulting in a lower pH in the leaching tank, thickener and/or DETOX slurry and accidental emissions of hydrocyanic acid. The area affected by concentrations of 290 ppm over a 10 min exposure time is within a circle of 36 m radius and the 50 ppm IDLH threshold for 30 min exposure will be reached over an area of 157.5 m radius. The center of these circles is the middle of the CIL tanks platform;

- Accidental HCN emission from the decanter. The accident may be caused by a drop of pH in the

CIL tanks combined with an overdose of flocculent solution and faulty pH monitoring systems. The area affected by concentrations of 300 ppm over a 10 min exposure time is within a circle of 65 m radius and the 50 ppm IDLH threshold for 30 min exposure will be reached over an area of 104 m radius. The center of these circles is mid-distance between the two DETOX facilities;

- Accidental HCN emission from the DETOX facility. The accident may be caused by a drop of pH in the reactors generated by an overdose of metabisulfite solution and/or copper sulphate combined with faulty pH monitoring systems. The area affected by high 1900 ppm concentrations for a 1 min exposure time is located within a 10 m radius circle. The area affected by concentrations of 300 ppm over a 10 min exposure time is within a circle of 27 m radius and the 50 ppm IDLH threshold for 30 min exposure will be reached over an area of 33 m radius. The center of these circles is mid-distance between the two DETOX facilities;

- Explosion of the LPG storage tank. The LPG storage tank has a 50 ton capacity and is located outdoors, near the heating plant. The simulation was conducted for the worst case scenario, considering an explosion of the full tank. Threshold I with heat 12.5 kW/m² is within a 10.5 m radius circle and Threshold II, of heat radiation 5 kW/m² is within a circle of 15 m radius;

- Damage and/or fire at the fuel tanks. Simulations were conducted for the worst case scenarios, considering ignition and combustion of all the diesel (fire in the tank, or in the containment vat, when full of diesel);

- Corna Dam break and breach development. Two credible accident scenarios were considered in simulating tailings flow out of the Tailings Management Facility, and six credible scenarios for the flow of decant water and tailings pore water, with significant effects on the terrestrial and aquatic ecosystems, in different weather conditions;

- Tailings flow may occur along Corna Valley, on a 800 m (starter dam break) or over 1,600 m reach should the Corna dam break in its final stage;

- In regard to water quality impacts, cyanide concentrations in the water in the shape of a pollution plume may reach Arad, near the Romanian-Hungarian border on the Mures River, in concentrations ranging between 0.03 and 0.5 mg/L. Due to inherent mathematical limitations in the models, these values and the accident effects are considered overestimated. Therefore, the results describe the “worst case scenario” based on extreme dam break assumptions for the Corna Dam.

A new and much more precise and realistic simulation has been subsequently established based on the INCA Mine model, that considers the dispersion, volatilization and breakdown of cyanides during the downstream movement of the pollutant flow (Whiteland et al., 2006).

The model used is the INCA model developed over the past 10 years to simulate both terrestrial and aquatic systems within the EUROLIMPACS EU research program (www.eurolimpacs.ucl.ac.uk). The model has been used to assess the impacts from future mining, and collection and treatment operations for pollution from past mining at Roşia Montană.

The modeling created for Roşia Montană simulates eight metals (cadmium, lead, zinc, mercury, arsenic, copper, chromium, manganese) as well as Cyanide, Nitrate, Ammonia and dissolved oxygen. The model has been applied to the upper catchments at Roşia Montană as well as the complete Abrud-Arieş-Mureş river system down to the Hungarian Border and on into the Tisa River. The model takes into account the dilution, mixing and physical-chemical processes affecting metals, ammonia and cyanide in the river system and gives estimates of concentrations at key locations along the river, including at the Hungarian Boarder and in the Tisa after the Mureş joins it.

Because of dilution and dispersion in the river system, and of the initial EU BAT-compliant technology adopted for the project (for example, the use of a cyanide destruct process for tailings effluent that reduces cyanide concentration in effluent stored in the TMF to below 6 mg/l), even a large scale unprogrammed release of tailings materials (for example, following failure of the dam) into the river system would not result in transboundary pollution. The model has shown that under worse case dam failure scenario all legal limits for cyanide and heavy metals concentrations would be met in the river water before it crosses into Hungary.

The INCA model has also been used to evaluate the beneficial impacts of the existing mine water collection and treatment and it has shown that substantial improvements in water quality are achieved along the river system under normal operational conditions.

For more information, an information sheet presenting the INCA modeling work is presented under the title of the Mureş River Modeling Program and the full modeling report is presented in Annex 5.1:

- Development of HCN on the tailings pond surface. Simulated emissions of HCN from the Tailings Management Facility pond surface and of their dispersion into the ambient air show that the level of $400\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ hourly average and $179\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ 8hr average will not be exceeded. These HCN concentrations are only slightly over the odor threshold (0.17ppm) and much below potentially dangerous concentrations;

- Cetate Dam break and breach development. Flood modeling was in case of a break in Cetate dam was based on the design parameters obtained from the hydrometeorological study "Assessment of rainfall intensity, frequency and runoff for the Roşia Montană Project - Radu Drobot". The breach characteristics were predicted using the BREACH model, and the maximum height of the flood wave in various flow sections was modeled using the FLDWAV software. The assumptions included a total $800,000\text{ m}^3$ discharge for one hour, when the peak of the flood hydrograph is about 4.9 m above base flow immediately below the dam and in the narrow Abrud valley 5.9-7.5 km downstream of the dam, while in the last section considered (10.5 km) water depth is about 2.3 m above base flow and the maximum flow rate $877\text{ m}^3/\text{s}$. Further, the broader Aries valley allows the flood wave to propagate on a significantly wider bed, which results in a highly attenuated hydrograph. These results describe the "worst case scenario" based on extreme dam break assumptions;

- Accidents during cyanide transportation. Due to the large quantities of cyanide transported (about 30t /day) the risks associated to this activity were assessed in detail using the ZHA- Zurich Hazard Analysis method. As a consequence, the optimum transport route was selected from the manufacturer to the Process Plant, e.g

Cyanide transport (in solid state) will exclusively involve special SLS (Solid to Liquid System) containers, 16 tons each. The ISO compliant container will be protected by a framework with legs, which allows separation from the transport trailer for temporary storage. The wall is 5.17 mm thick, which, together with the protective framework, provides additional protection to the load in case of accident. This system is considered BAT and is currently one of the safest cyanide transportation options.

It is being mentioned the fact that the study develops the occurrence possibility of these scenarios (pages 166-171, Conclusions).

As regards the cyanides management, there is a baseline study named "Roşia Montană Golden Project, Cyanides Management Plan" prepared in compliance with the "International Management Code for the Manufacture, Transport and Use of Cyanide in the Production of Gold (International Cyanide management Institute) May 2002". S.C. Roşia Montană Gold Corporation is signatory to this code.

Bibliographical references for Chapter 7 "Risk Cases" are listed at page173-176.

*

RMGC's closure estimates, which were developed by a team of independent experts with international experience and will be reviewed by third party experts, are based on the assumption that the project can be completed according to the plan, without interruptions, bankruptcy or the like They are engineering calculations and estimates based on the current commitments of the closure plan and are summarized in the EIA's Mine Closure and Rehabilitation Management Plan (Plan J in the EIA). Annex 1 of Plan J will be updated using a more detailed approach looking at every individual year and calculating the amount of surety, which must be set aside year by year to rehabilitate the mine before RMGC is released from all its legal obligations. Most importantly, the current estimates assume the application of international best practice, best available technology (BAT) and compliance with all Romanian and European Union laws and regulations.

Closure and rehabilitation at Roşia Montană involves the following measures:

- Covering and vegetating the waste dumps as far as they are not backfilled into the open pits;
- Backfilling the open pits, except Cetate pit, which will be flooded to form a lake;
- Covering and vegetating the tailings pond and its dam areas;
- Dismantling of disused production facilities and revegetation of the cleaned-up areas;
- Water treatment by semi-passive systems (with conventional treatment systems as backup) until all effluents have reached the discharge standards and need no further treatment;

- Maintenance of the vegetation, erosion control, and monitoring of the entire site until it has been demonstrated by RMGC that all remediation targets have been sustainably reached.

While the aspects of closure and rehabilitation are many, we are confident in our cost estimates because the largest expense—that incurred by the earthmoving operation required to reshape the landscape—can be estimated with confidence. Using the project design, we can measure the size of the areas that must be reshaped and resurfaced. Similarly, there is a body of scientific studies and experiments that enable scientists to determine the depth of soil cover for successful revegetation. By multiplying the size of the areas by the necessary depth of the topsoil by the unit rate (also derived from studying similar earthmoving operations at similar sites), we can estimate the potential costs of this major facet of the rehabilitation operation. The earthmoving operation, which will total approximately US \$65 million, makes up 87% of closure and rehabilitation costs.

Also, the necessity of additional technological measures to stabilize and reshape the tailings surface will be discussed in the update of the Economical Financial Guarantee (EFG) estimate, which leads to an increase the provisions for tailings rehabilitation, especially if the TMF is closed prematurely and no optimized tailings disposal regime is applied. The exact figures depend on the details of the TMF closure strategy which can be finally determined only during production.

We believe that—far from being not realistic—our cost estimates are evidence of our high level of commitment to closure and rehabilitation. Just as a comparison, the world’s largest gold producer has set aside US \$683 million (as of December 31, 2006) for the rehabilitation of 27 operations, which equates to US \$25 million on average per mine. The RMGC closure cost estimates, recently revised upward from the US \$73 million reported in the EIA based on additional information, currently total US \$76 million.

*

According to Law 5/2000, regarding the approval of the Territory Arrangement Plan – 3rd Section – protected areas (“Law 5/2000”) (article 5, paragraphs 2-3), local public authorities, with the support of the competent central public authorities, had the obligation to establish the boundaries of the protection areas for the cultural heritage elements stipulated in Annex III to the above-mentioned law. This measure should have been taken within 12 months from the effective date of Law 5/2000, based on specialized studies. For this purpose, the local public authorities had to prepare the town planning documentation and its related regulations, developed and approved according to the law. This documentation must comprise the necessary protection and conservation measures for the national cultural heritage elements located in this area.

Concurrently, Law 350/2001 on the territory arrangement and urbanism stipulates the right of legal or natural persons interested in arranging the territory, to initiate the development of urbanism plans.

In accordance with these legal provisions, in 2001, RMGC initiated the preparation of these specific town-planning documentations - the General Urbanism Plan and the Zonal Urbanism Plan. These plans have been developed by Romanian certified companies and followed the legal approval procedure. The permit for the establishment of the Roşia Montană Historical Centre Protected Area was issued by the Ministry of Culture and Religious Affairs in 2002 (permits no. 61/14.02.2002 and no. 178/20.06.2002) as part of the procedure for the approval of the town planning documentation. Based on these permits, the Ministry of Culture and Religious Affairs requested the company to develop a Zonal Urbanism Plan for the Historical Centre of Roşia Montană. Out of the 41 historical buildings in Roşia Montană, thirty-five (35) are located inside the protected area of the Roşia Montană Historical Centre.

As for the heritage elements located in the future industrial development area (6 historical buildings), these are discussed in the Industrial Zonal Urbanism Plan prepared by SC Proiect Alba SA. The regulations included in this document will contain measures for the protection of these monuments.

In conclusion, the town planning studies and the specialized studies conducted for the purpose of establishing the boundaries of the protection areas within the future mining operations perimeter are currently pending approval, in accordance with the legal provisions, by the competent institutions and committees. Please note that none of the historical houses located in the perimeter of the proposed project will be affected; on the contrary, all the 41 historic buildings will be included in a complex restoration and rehabilitation program (see the Management Plan). This program is mandatory, regardless

of the implementation of the mining project, if we want to prevent these buildings from collapsing because of their advanced degradation.

*

Your assertion regarding the failure to obtain an applicable urbanism certificate at the start up of the public debates and of the evaluation of the quality of the report to the environmental impact assessment, is not correct.

Thus, by the time when the public debate stage started up there was an applicable urbanism certificate and namely the urbanism certificate no. 78/26.04.2006 issued by Alba County Council. This certificate was obtained prior to the evaluation stage of the quality of the report to the environmental impact assessment which started up once the EIA was submitted to the Ministry of Environment and Water Management on the 15th May 2006.

For better understanding the applicable legal provisions and the facts developed within the mining project of Roşia Montană zone we would like to make several comments:

- The procedure for issuing the environmental permit for Roşia Montană project started up on the 14th December 2004 by submitting the technical memorandum and the urbanism certificate no.68/26.August 2004 (certificate applicable by that time). S.C. Roşia Montană Gold Corporation S.A. (RMGC) applied for and obtained a new urbanism certificate no.78/26.04.2006 issued by Alba County Council for the entire Roşia Montană Project applicable on the date of the EIA Report submission (15th May 2006) and prior to the public debate start up (June 2006);
- The Section 1 of the urbanism certificate no.78 of 26th 04.2006 entitled Work construction, position 10 – “Processing plant and associated constructions “ – including the tailing management facility which existence is compulsory for the processing plant running. The Tailing management facility is also specified on the layout plans which are integral part of the urbanism certificate and they were sealed by Alba County Council so that they cannot be modified;
- The Urbanism Certificate is an informative document and its goal is only to inform the applicant about the legal, economic and technical regime of the existing lands and buildings and to establish the urbanism requirements and the approvals necessary to obtain the construction permit (including the environmental permit) as per art.6 of Law 50/1991 referring to the completion of construction works, republished and art 27 paragraph 2 of the Norms for the application of Law 50/1991 – Official Journal 825 bis/13.09.2005).

As it is an informative document, it does not limit the number of certificates an applicant may obtain for the same land plot (art. 30 of Law no. 350/2001 regarding the territorial planning and urbanism).

*

Introduced as part of the Environmental Impact Assessment Report Study (EIA), the Roşia Montană Foundation is shifting in focus. The Community Sustainable Development Plan activities initially conceived as coming under the Foundation umbrella (business oriented activities: business incubator, business advisory center, micro-finance facility, as well as social oriented activities: education and training center) have been advanced independently, via partnerships and with community participation in decision-making – a preferable way to advance social and economic development programs.

Going forward, the Foundation will take shape around preservation, patrimony and cultural heritage issues, with its final form determined in consultation with the community.

In terms of the philosophy that guides the company’s Sustainable Development efforts, the Roşia Montană Gold Corporation (RMGC) sees itself not as principal provider, but as a partner. Community involvement is considered the starting point; over time, as the community builds the capacity to maintain programs in its own right, the company will turn over control of currently-established programs to the community and its institutions.

For more information, please see Roşia Montană Sustainable Development and the Roşia Montană Project – annex 4.

*

We underline the fact that your statement is false. The General Urbanism Plan for the Roşia Montană commune, endorsed in 2002 allows the development of Roşia Montană project, as it has been presented during the public consultations.

Concurrently, pursuant to the provisions of art. 41, paragraph 2, from the Mining Law no.85/2003, the authorities from the local administration have the liability to adjust and/or update the territory arrangement plans and the general urbanism plans, in order to allow the development of all operations necessary for the development of mining activities.

RMGC has also initiated the preparation of two zonal urbanism plans: Zonal Urbanism Plan Modification – Roşia Montană Industrial Area and Zonal Urbanism Plan – Roşia Montană Historical Area. The first urbanism plan is required by the urbanism certificate no.78/26.04.2006, which updates the Zonal Urbanism Plan for the Industrial Area approved in 2002. As far as the historical area is concerned, its Zonal Urbanism Plan is required by the General Urbanism Plan approved also in 2002. Both urbanism plans are pending approval and have been subject to public consultations.

*

An engineered liner is included in the design of the Tailings Management Facility (TMF) basin. Specifically, the Roşia Montană Tailings Management Facility (TMF or “the facility”) has been designed to be compliant with the EU Groundwater Directive (80/68/EEC), transposed as Romanian GD 351/2005. The TMF is also designed for compliance with the EU Mine Waste Directive (2006/21/EC) as required by the Terms of Reference established by the MEWM in May, 2005. The following paragraphs provide a discussion of how the facility is compliant with the directives.

The TMF is composed of a series of individual components including:

- the tailings impoundment;
- the tailings dam;
- the secondary seepage collection pond;
- the secondary containment dam; and
- the groundwater monitoring wells/extraction wells located downstream of the Secondary Containment dam.

All of these components are integral parts of the facility and necessary for the facility to perform as designed.

The directives indicated above require that the TMF design be protective of groundwater. For the Roşia Montană project (RMP), this requirement is addressed by consideration of the favorable geology (low permeability shales underlying the TMF impoundment, the TMF dam and the Secondary Containment dam) and the proposed installation of a low-permeability (1×10^{-6} cm/sec) recompacted soil liner beneath the TMF basin. Please see Chapter 2 of EIA Plan F, “The Tailings Facility Management Plan” for more information.

The proposed low permeability soil liner will be fully compliant with Best Available Techniques (BAT) as defined by EU Directive 96/61 (IPPC) and EU Mine Waste Directive. Additional design features that are included in the design to be protective of groundwater include:

- A low permeability (1×10^{-6} cm/sec) cut off wall within the foundation of the starter dam to control seepage;
- A low permeability (1×10^{-6} cm/sec) core in the starter dam to control seepage;
- A seepage collection dam and pond below the toe of the tailings dam to collect and contain any seepage that does extend beyond the dam centerline;
- A series of monitoring wells, below the toe of the secondary containment dam, to monitor seepage and ensure compliance, before the waste facility limit.

In addition to the design components noted above specific operational requirements will be implemented to be protective of human health and the environment. In the extremely unlikely case that impacted water is detected in the monitoring wells below the secondary containment dam, they will be converted to

pumping wells and will be used to extract the impacted water and pump it into the reclaim pond where it will be incorporated into the RMP processing plant water supply system, until the compliance is reestablish.

*

An engineered liner is included in the design of the Tailings Management Facility (TMF) basin to be protective of groundwater. Specifically, the Roșia Montană Tailings Management Facility (TMF or “the facility”) has been designed to be compliant with the EU Groundwater Directive (80/68/EEC), transposed as Romanian GD 351/2005. The TMF is also designed for compliance with the EU Mine Waste Directive (2006/21/EC) as required by the Terms of Reference established by the MEWM in May, 2005. The following paragraphs provide a discussion of how the facility is compliant with the directives.

The TMF is composed of a series of individual components including:

- the tailings impoundment;
- the tailings dam;
- the secondary seepage collection pond;
- the secondary containment dam; and
- the groundwater monitoring wells/extraction wells located downstream of the Secondary Containment dam.

All of these components are integral parts of the facility and necessary for the facility to perform as designed.

The directives indicated above require that the TMF design be protective of groundwater. For the Roșia Montană project (RMP), this requirement is addressed by consideration of the favorable geology (low permeability shales underlying the TMF impoundment, the TMF dam, and the Secondary Containment dam) and the proposed installation of a low-permeability (1×10^{-6} cm/sec) recompacted soil liner beneath the TMF basin. Please see Chapter 2 of EIA Plan F, “The Tailings Facility Management Plan” for more information.

The proposed low permeability soil liner will be fully compliant with Best Available Techniques (BAT) as defined by EU Directive 96/61 (IPPC) and EU Mine Waste Directive. Additional design features that are included in the design to be protective of groundwater include:

- A low permeability (1×10^{-6} cm/sec) cut off wall within the foundation of the starter dam to control seepage;
- A low permeability (1×10^{-6} cm/sec) core in the starter dam to control seepage;
- A seepage collection dam and pond below the toe of the tailings dam to collect and contain any seepage that does extend beyond the dam centerline;
- A series of monitoring wells, below the toe of the secondary containment dam; to monitor seepage and ensure compliance, before the waste facility limit.

In addition to the design components noted above specific operational requirements will be implemented to be protective of human health and the environment. In the extremely unlikely case that impacted water is detected in the monitoring wells below the secondary containment dam, they will be converted to pumping wells and will be used to extract the impacted water and pump it into the reclaim pond where it will be incorporated into the RMP processing plant water supply system, until the compliance is reestablish.

With respect to your comments made as regards a presumptive infringement of the provisions of Government Decision No.351/2005 (“GD 351/2005”), there are several aspects to be taken into consideration. Thus:

1. Firstly, please note that, according to the provisions of art. 6 of GD 351/2005, any activity that might determine the discharge of dangerous substances into the environment is subject to the prior approval of the water management authorities and shall comply with the provisions of the water permit issued in accordance with the relevant legislation. The GD 351/2005 provides that the water permit shall be issued only after all technical-construction measures are implemented as prevent the indirect discharge of dangerous

substances into the underground waters. The maximum discharge limits are expressly provided under GD 351/2005 and compliance with such is a condition for granting and maintaining the water permit.

In accordance with the provisions of GD 351/2005, the actual discharge limits should be authorized by the relevant authority, such process being understood by the lawmaker in consideration of the complexity and variety of industrial activities, as well as the latest technological achievements.

Therefore, please note that the EIA stage is not intended to be finalized into an overall comprehensive permit, but it represents only a part of a more complex permitting process. Please note that, according with art. 3 of GD 918/2002, the data's level of detail provided in the EIA is the one available in the feasibility stage of the project, obviously making impossible for both the titleholder and authority to exhaust all required technical data and permits granted.

The adequate protection of the ground water shall be ensured by the terms and conditions of the water permit. The issuance of the water permit shall be performed following an individual assessment of the project, considering its particular aspects and the relevant legal requirements applicable for mining activities. Until the water permit is obtained, any allegation regarding the infringement of GD 351/2005 is obviously premature mainly because the water permit shall regulate, in accordance with the relevant legal provisions, the conditions to be observed by the developer as regards the protection of the ground water;

2. Secondly, kindly note that the complexity and specificity of mining projects generated the need of a particular legal framework. Therefore, for such projects, the reading of the legal provisions of a certain enactment should be corroborated with the relevant provisions of the other regulations applicable.

In this respect, please note that the understanding of GD 351/2005 must be corroborated with the provisions of the entire relevant legislation enforceable as regards Roşia Montană Project, with a particular accent to Directive 2006/21/EC on the management of waste from the extractive industries ("Directive 21").

The very scope of Directive 21 is to provide a specific legal framework for the extractive wastes and waste facilities related to mining projects, considering the complexity of such projects and the particular aspects of mining activities that can not always be subject to the common regulations on waste management and landfill.

From this perspective, Directive 21 provides that, an operator of a waste facility, as such is defined thereunder (please note that the TMF proposed by RMGC is considered a "waste facility" under Directive 21), must inter alia, ensure that:

- a) *"the waste facility is [...]designed so as to meet the necessary conditions for, in the short and long-term perspectives, preventing pollution of the soil, air, groundwater or surface water, taking into account especially Directives 76/464/EEC (1), 80/68/EEC (2) and 2000/60/EC, and ensuring efficient collection of contaminated water and leachate as and when required under the permit, and reducing erosion caused by water or wind as far as it is technically possible and economically viable;"*
- b) *"the waste facility is suitably constructed, managed and maintained to ensure its physical stability and to prevent pollution or contamination of soil, air, surface water or groundwater in the short and long-term perspectives as well as to minimize as far as possible damage to landscape."*

In addition, it should be mentioned that RMGC was required by MWEM under the Terms of Reference, to perform the EIA considering the provisions of Directive 21 and the BAT Management of Mining Waste. The Directive 21 was intended by the EU DG of Environment to be the legislative regime applicable to sound management of mining waste throughout Europe and therefore compliance with its provisions is mandatory.

*

Information regarding our Environmental Financial Guarantee ("EFG") is fully discussed in the section of the Environmental Impact Assessment titled "Environmental and Social Management and System Plans" (Annex 1 of the subchapter titled "Mine Rehabilitation and Closure Management Plan"). The EFG is updated annually and will always reflect the costs associated with reclamation. These funds will be held in

protected accounts at the Romanian state disposal.

Roşia Montană Gold Corporation ("RMGC") has invested significant time, energy, and resources assessing the viability of a mining project in the valley of Roşia Montană. This assessment has led RMGC to conclude that Roşia Montană presents an attractive long-term development opportunity – an opinion confirmed by a variety of lending institutions, who have completed detailed reviews of the project's design and profitability. We have every confidence that we will see the project through to the end of its projected 16-year lifespan, regardless of any fluctuations in the market price of gold.

In Romania, the creation of an EFG is required to ensure adequate funds are available from the mine operator for environmental cleanup. The EFG is governed by the Mining Law (no. 85/2003) and the National Agency for Mineral Resources instructions and Mining Law Enforcement Norms (no. 1208/2003).

Two directives issued by the European Union also impact the EFG: the Mine Waste Directive ("MWD") and the Environmental Liability Directive ("ELD").

The Mine Waste Directive aims to ensure that coverage is available for 1) all the obligations connected to the permit granted for the disposal of waste material resulting from mining activities and 2) all of the costs related to the rehabilitation of the land affected by a waste facility. The Environmental Liability Directive regulates the remedies, and measures to be taken by the environmental authorities, in the event of environmental damage created by mining operations, with the goal of ensuring adequate financial resources are available from the operators for environmental cleanup efforts. While these directives have yet to be transposed by the Romanian Government, the deadlines for implementing their enforcement mechanisms are 30 April 2007 (ELD) and 1 May 2008 (MWD) – thus before operations are scheduled to begin at Roşia Montană.

RMGC has already begun the process of complying with these directives, and once their implementation instruments are enacted by the Romanian Government, we will be in full compliance.

Each EFG will follow detailed guidelines generated by the World Bank and the International Council on Mining and Metals.

The current projected closure cost for Roşia Montană is US \$76 million, which is based on the mine operating for its full 16-year lifespan. The annual updates will be completed by independent experts, carried out in consultation with the NAMR, as the Governmental authority competent in mining activities field. These updates will ensure that in the unlikely event of early closure of the project, at any point in time, each EFG will always reflect the costs associated with reclamation. (These annual updates will result in an estimate that exceeds our current US \$76 million costs of closure, because some reclamation activity is incorporated into the routine operations of the mine.)

A number of different financial instruments are available to ensure that RMGC is capable of covering all of the expected closure costs. These instruments, which will be held in protected accounts at the Romanian state disposal, include:

- Cash deposit;
- Trust funds;
- Letter of credit;
- Surety bonds;
- Insurance policy.

Under the terms of this guarantee, the Romanian government will have no financial liability in connection with the rehabilitation of the Roşia Montană project.

*

The Security Report has been made available for public access by being posted at the following Internet address http://www.mmediu.ro/dep_mediu/rosia_montana_securitate.htm as well as through the printed version which could have been found at several information locations established for public hearings.

*

The Report on the Environmental impact assessment study (EIA) considered all alternative developments, including the option of not proceeding with any project – an option that would generate no investment, allowing the existing pollution problems and socio-economic decline to continue (Chapter 5 – *Assessment of Alternatives*).

The report also considered alternative developments – including agriculture, grazing, meat processing, tourism, forestry and forest products, cottage industries, and flora/fauna gathering for pharmaceutical purposes – and concluded that these activities could not provide the economic, cultural and environmental benefits brought by the Roşia Montană Project (RMP).

Chapter 5 also examines alternative locations for key facilities as well as alternative technologies for mining, processing and waste management, in line with best practice and as compared against published EU best available techniques (BAT) documentation.

*

The impact on protected flora and fauna will exist only locally, but this impact will not lead to the loss of any specie. The Project has been designed even from the beginning to fully comply with the requirements and norms imposed by Romanian and European environmental legislation.

The company believes the fact that the project impact on environment remains significant, especially because covers previous impacts. But, the investments required to ecologically restore/rehabilitate Roşia Montană area in order to address current complex environmental issues, are only achievable following the implementation of some economic projects that will generate and warrant implementation of some direct and responsible actions as a component of base principles of sustainable development concepts. Clean processes and technologies may be developed only in the presence of a solid economic environment fully compliant with the environment that will also resolve previous impacts of anthropic activities.

The base documents of the Project are in fact an unbiased reason of its implementation, considering the highly complex environmental commitment within Roşia Montană area.

Some of the Roşia Montană species that are under a certain protection status stand for an insignificant percentage of the scale of populations estimated at national level. The characterization of species from their habitat point of view exists in the species tables presented in the Biodiversity Chapter of the EIA Report and its annexes, although this is not a requirement imposed by the Habitats Directive. Due to their large volume of information, the annexes of chapter 4.6 Biodiversity can be found in the electronic version of the EIA disclosed by the company both in Romanian and English through approx. 6,000 DVD/CD copies, being accessible on the company website, and on the websites of Ministry of Environment and Water Management, local and regional environmental protection agencies of Alba, Sibiu, Cluj, etc.

From practical point of view, the low value of conservation of the impact area is also indirectly emphasized by the fact that there is no proposal to designate the area a SPA (aviafaunistic special protected area) and by the denial as unfounded of the proposal to designate the area as a pSCI area (sites of community importance).

Taking all these into account, we believe that the proposed Project is compliant with the provisions of EU Directive no. 92/43 Habitats[1], and EU Directive no. 79/409 Birds[2] respectively, especially because within Biodiversity Management Plan, Plan H, several active and responsible measures are provided to reconstruct/rehabilitate several natural habitats, pursuant to the provisions of the same documents [3].

References:

[1] art.3, 2nd paragraph, Each Member State shall contribute to the creation of Natura 2000 (network) in proportion to the representation within its territory of the natural habitat types and the habitats of species referred to in paragraph 1. To that effect each Member State shall designate, in accordance with Article 4, sites as special areas of conservation taking account of the objectives set out in paragraph 1.

art.4, 1st paragraph. On the basis of the criteria set out in Annex III (Stage 1) and relevant scientific information, each Member State shall propose a list of sites indicating which natural habitat types in

Annex I and which species in Annex II that are native to its territory the sites host. For animal species ranging over wide areas these sites shall correspond to the places within the natural range of such species which present the physical or biological factors essential to their life and reproduction. For aquatic species which range over wide areas, such sites will be proposed only where there is a clearly identifiable area representing the physical and biological factors essential to their life and reproduction. Where appropriate, Member States shall propose adaptation of the list in the light of the results of the surveillance referred to in Article 11. [...]

2nd paragraph.[...] Member States whose sites hosting one or more priority natural habitat types and priority species represent more than 5 % of their national territory may, in agreement with the Commission, request that the criteria listed in Annex III (Stage 2) be applied more flexibly in selecting all the sites of Community importance in their territory.[...]

Art. 6, 4th paragraph. If, in spite of a negative assessment of the implications for the site and in the absence of alternative solutions, a plan or project must nevertheless be carried out for imperative reasons of overriding public interest, including those of a social or economic nature, the Member State shall take all compensatory measures necessary to ensure that the overall coherence of Natura 2000 is protected. It shall inform the Commission of the compensatory measures adopted.

Art. 16. Provided that there is no satisfactory alternative and the derogation is not detrimental to the maintenance of the populations of the species concerned at a favourable conservation status in their natural range, Member States may derogate from the provisions of Articles 12, 13, 14 and 15 (a) and (b):[...]

- in the interests of public health and public safety, or for other imperative reasons of overriding public interest, including those of a social or economic nature and beneficial consequences of primary importance for the environment;

[2] Art.4, 1st paragraph. The species mentioned in annex 1 shall be the subject of special conservation measures concerning their habitat in order to ensure their survival and reproduction in their area of distribution. [...]

Trends and variations in population levels shall be taken into account as a background for evaluations. Member states shall classify in particular the most suitable territories in number and size as special protection areas for the conservation of these species, taking into account their protection requirements in the geographical sea and land area where this directive applies.

[3] Directive 92/43 Habitats, art. 2, 2nd paragraph; Directive 79/409 Birds, art. 3, 2nd paragraph, letter c.

*

This statement is ungrounded, because the environmental impact assessment (EIA) process has included preliminary cumulative estimates for stationary motorized equipment and linear (vehicular) sources were prepared in order to provide an initial understanding of the potential cumulative noise and vibration impacts from background and Roşia Montană Project sources, and to guide future monitoring and measurement activities as well as the selection of appropriate Best Management Practices/Best Available Techniques for further mitigation of the potential noise and vibration impacts from Project activities. These preliminary estimates apply to major construction activities, as well as the operation and decommissioning/closure of the mine and process plant. They are documented as data tables and isopleth maps for major noise-generating activities in selected, representative Project years; see **Tables 4.3.8** through **4.3.16** and **Exhibits 4.3.1** through **4.3.9**. All these details related to the applied assessment methodology, the input data of the dispersion model, the modeling results and the measures established for the prevention/mitigation/elimination of the potential impact for all project stages (construction, operation, closure) are included in Chapter 4, Section 4.3 Noise and Vibrations of the EIA Report.

Project Years 0, 9, 10, 12, 14, and 19 were selected for modeling because they are considered to be representative of the most significant levels of noise-generating activity. They are also the same years used for air impact modeling purposes in Section 4.2, as air and noise impacts share many of the same sources or are otherwise closely correlated. In order to more accurately reflect potential receptor impacts, all of

these exhibits integrate the background traffic estimates discussed in Section 4.3.6.1.

The Project site plan and process plant area and facility drawings were used to establish the position of the noise sources and other relevant physical characteristics of the site. Receptor locations were established using background reports and project engineering and environmental documentation provided by RMGC. With this information, the source locations and receptor locations were translated into input (x, y, and z) co-ordinates for the noise-modeling program.

Tables 4.3.8 through 4.3.16 and **Exhibits 4.3.1 through 4.3.9** present the average maximum noise values likely to be experienced by the receptor community over all Project phases after incorporation of a variety of initial mitigation measures designed specifically to reduce the impacts associated with mobile and stationary machinery sources. The influence of non-mining related background (primarily traffic) noise is also included.

To evaluate the sound levels associated with haul trucks and other mobile sources crossing the site carrying excavated ore, waste rock, and soil, a noise analysis program based on the (U.S.) Federal Highway Administration's (FHWA) standard RD-77-108 [1] model was used to calculate reference noise emissions values for heavy trucks along the project roadways. The FHWA model predicts hourly L_{eq} values for free-flowing traffic conditions and is generally considered to be accurate within 1.5 decibels (dB).

The model is based on the standardized noise emission factors for different types and weights of vehicles (e.g., automobiles, medium trucks, and heavy trucks), with consideration given to vehicle volume, speed, roadway configuration, distance to the receiver, and the acoustical characteristics of the site. The emission levels of all three vehicle types increase as a function of the logarithm of their speed.

To evaluate the sound sources from the proposed mine processing facility and the semi-stationary material handling equipment (at the ore extraction, waste rock and soil stockpiling areas), a proprietary computerized noise prediction program was used by AAC to simulate and model the future equipment noise emissions throughout the area. The modeling program uses industry-accepted propagation algorithms based on the following American National Standards Institute (ANSI) and International Organization for Standardization (ISO) standards:

- ANSI S1.26-1995 (R2004), *Method for the Calculation of the Absorption of Sound by the Atmosphere*;
- ISO 9613-1:1993, *Acoustics -- Attenuation of sound during propagation outdoors-- Part 1: Calculation of the absorption of sound by the atmosphere*;
- ISO 9613-2:1996, *Acoustics -- Attenuation of sound during propagation outdoors -- Part 2: General method of calculation*;
- ISO 3891:1978, *Acoustics -- Procedure for describing aircraft noise heard on the ground*.

The calculations account for classical sound wave divergence (i.e., spherical spreading loss with adjustments for source directivity from point sources) plus attenuation factors due to air absorption, minimal ground effects, and barriers/shielding.

This model has been validated by AAC over a number of years via noise measurements at several operating industrial sites that had been previously modeled during the engineering design phases. The comparison of modeled predictions versus actual measurements has consistently shown close agreement; typically in the range of 1 to 3 dB (A).

References:

[1] FHWA Highway Traffic Noise Prediction Model; see Federal Highway Administration Report Number FHWA-RD-77-108, USA, Washington, D.C., 1978.

A detailed presentation of blasting technology can be found in the annex 7.1 - Proposed blasting technology for the operational phase of Roşia Montană Project.

*

The partnership between Gabriel Resources and Regia Autonomă a Cuprului Deva (currently, CNCAF Minvest SA) has been established based on Law no. 15/1990 on the reorganization of the state owned companies as autonomous directions and trade companies, published in the Official Gazette, Section I, no.

98/08.08.1990, as subsequently amended and supplemented. Art. 35 of this law provides the possibility of the regies autonomous to enter into partnerships with legal third parties, Romanian or foreign, for the purpose of setting up new trading companies.

Roşia Montană Gold Corporation SA was set up in 1997, according to the legal provisions in force as at that time, the setting up being made by observing all the conditions imposed by Company Law no. 31/1990 and Trade Register Law no. 26/1990, in regard of the setting up of the joint stock companies with mixed capital.

We underline that the Articles of Associations of Roşia Montană Gold Corporation SA, representing the result of the parties agreement in regard of the terms and conditions under which the partnership between the Romanian state and investor takes place represents a public document, being included in the category of documents which, as per Law no. 26/1990 on the Trade Register, are published in the Romanian Official Gazette and for which the Trade Register is obliged to issue, on the expense of the persons submitting a request, certified copies.

As for the agreement concerning the setting up of the mixed company together with Gabriel Resources Ltd., this has been expressed by the Ministry of Industry and Trade, the conditions imposed by the setting up of the mixed company being the following: (i) ensuring of the jobs at the level existing upon the conclusion of the agreement concerning the setting up of the mixed company; (ii) the expenses incurred by the fulfillment of the exploration stage should be fully supported by Gabriel; (iii) the obtaining of the approval from the ANRM by the Copper Autonomous Direction Deva and (iv) the observance of all legal provisions in force concerning the setting up of the mixed companies with foreign partners. These conditions have been fully complied with as at the setting up of the company and during the development of its activity.

We also specify that the establishing of the shareholders' quotas to the benefits and losses of Roşia Montană Gold Corporation SA has been made by considering their contribution quota to the company's share capital. The current percentage of 80% for Gabriel Resources Ltd. and of 19.31% for CNCAF Minvest SA resulted from the initial contribution and the subsequent contributions of the shareholders to the company's share capital, in consideration also of Gabriel Resources Ltd. advancing all expenses and costs related to the development-exploitation and permitting of the Roşia Montană Mining Project.

The provisions of the Articles of Associations of Roşia Montană Gold Corporation SA on the necessary majority and quorum conditions for the decision-making process within the General Shareholders Meeting and the quotas to the benefits and losses of the company are taken from Law no. 31/1990, and no derogation exists in regard of this aspect.

*

This claim is not true; the Urbanism Plan has been prepared with public consultation.

Roşia Montană Gold Corporation SA (RMGC) has requested and obtained from Alba County Council the Urbanism Certificate no. 78 of 26.04.2006, for the entire Roşia Montană mining project, including the tailings management facility. The Urbanism Certificate also stipulated the preparation of a Zonal Urbanism Plan, to reflect all changes made to the Roşia Montană Project, following the public consultations and debates organized in relation to this project, and the consultations with the permitting authorities. This plan, entitled "Modification of the Zonal Urbanism Plan, Roşia Montană Industrial Area", was prepared and subjected to public debate in June 2006 in accordance with the provisions of Order no.176/N/2000 issued by the Ministry of Public Works and Territory Development for the approval of the technical regulations "Guidelines regarding the methodology applied for the preparation and framework content of the Zonal Urbanism Plan" and, at present, it is pending approval.

Concerning the Roşia Montană General Urbanism Plan approved in 2002, such plan was prepared in parallel with the Zonal Urbanism Plan of 2002, all the provisions of the General Urbanism Plan being also included in the Zonal Urbanism Plan. Also, the approval procedure related to the two urbanism plans was carried out in parallel.

*

Preventive archaeological researches within the Roşia Montană mining project area have been undertaken based on specific techniques, specifically trial trenches in all accessible areas that are suitable for human habitation, taking into account the bibliographical information and the observations recorded during the archaeological survey campaigns, the geophysical studies and the analyses of the photogrammetric flights. In addition, surface investigations were undertaken, where appropriate.

The archaeological researches at Roşia Montană covered a large surface and focused on the areas known to have archaeological potential. THEREFORE, ALL AREAS THAT HAVE BEEN ARCHAEOLOGICALLY DISCHARGED HAD BEEN PREVIOUSLY INVESTIGATED. All research programs, beginning with the 2004 campaign, have been undertaken in full compliance with the current legal requirements, i.e. Ministerial Order no. 2392 of 6 September 2004 on the establishment of the Archaeological Standards and Procedures by the Ministry of Culture and Religious Affairs.

The proposed gold mining project at Roşia Montană has raised a series of issues related to the rescue of the historical-archaeological heritage within the area, as well as issues related to its scientific development and also the enhancement of heritage within a museum. Given the complex difficulties encountered in this respect, the Ministry of Culture and Religious Affairs decided to initiate the "Alburnus Maior" National Research Program.

The company's role was to provide the necessary financial resources for the assessment, research and enhancement of the archaeological remains, in full compliance with the Romanian current legislation. The development of the research and of the archaeological discharge works has been conducted through specific means and methodologies that have been adjusted to the realities of every site researched, in our case, Roşia Montană. They consisted in:

- Archives studies;
- Archaeological surveys; trial trenches;
- aerial reconnaissance/survey and aerial photo interpretation ; high resolution satellite images;
- mining archaeology studies; underground topography and 3D modeling;
- geophysical surveys;
- extensive archaeological investigations in the areas with an identified archaeological potential- this implied carrying out archaeological excavations;
- Interdisciplinary studies- sedimentology, archaeo-zoology, comparative palynology, archaeo-metallurgy, geology, mineralogy;
- Radiocarbon dating and dendrochronology;
- This research and its results were included in an integrated database;
- traditional and digital archaeological topography and development of the GIS project; generate a photo archive- both traditional and digital;
- restoration of artifacts;
- an inventory and a digital catalogue of the artifacts;
- studies conducted by specialists in order to enhance the research results - publication of monographs/scientific books and journals, exhibitions, websites, etc.

All the preventive archaeological researches undertaken at Roşia Montană since 2000 have been carried out as part of a complex research program; permits for preventive archaeological excavations being issued in compliance with the current legislation. These archaeological investigations have been undertaken by representatives of 21 specialized institutions from Romania and 3 others from abroad, under the scientific coordination of the Romanian National Museum of History. All archaeological researches have been conducted in full compliance with the existing legislation. The investigations undertaken during each archaeological research campaign have been approved by the Ministry of Culture and Religious Affairs based on the Annual Archaeological Research Plan approved by the National Commission of Archaeology.

Under the current legislation (Ministerial Order no. 2392 of 6 September 2004 on the establishment of the Archaeological Standards and Procedures by the Ministry of Culture and Religious Affairs) the archaeologists who have conducted the research may ask that an archaeological discharge certificate be granted. Based on a complex research program, the archaeologists prepare comprehensive documentation with regard to the researched area. Upon consideration of the submitted documentation, the National Commission of Archaeology makes a decision as to whether to recommend or not the granting of the archaeological discharge certificate. In the case of the research conducted in the period 2001-2006, the

archaeological discharge certificate was issued directly by the Ministry of Culture and Religious Affairs or by its local agencies.

Preventive archaeological researches at Roşia Montană have allowed the research of five Roman cremation necropolis (Tău Corna, Hop-Găuri, Țarina, Jig - Piciorag and Pârâul Porcului – Tăul Secuilor), two funerary areas (Carpeni, Nanului Valley), sacred areas (Hăbad, Nanului Valley), habitation areas (Hăbad, Carpeni, Tăul Țapului, Hop), the most significant being the Roman structures on the Carpeni Hill and the circular funerary monument at Tău Găuri. In addition, for the first time in Romania, surface investigations have been paralleled by underground investigations of Cetate, Cărnice, Jig and Orlea massifs, with important discoveries in the Piatra Corbului, area, Cătălina-Monulești gallery and the Păru Carpeni mining sector.

The research consisted of aerial photo interpretation, archaeological magnetometric studies, electrical resistivity, palynology, sedimentology, geology studies, radiocarbon and dendrochronology dating. For a better management of the research units and of the archaeological findings, data bases were used, including text and photographs-among which 4 satellite images (an archive satellite image type SPOT Panchromatic (10m) from 1997; 2 satellite images LANDSAT 7 MS (30 m), dating from 2000 and 2003; a satellite image with priority programming SPOT 5 SuperMode color (2,5 m resolution-19 July 2004); all data have been included in a comprehensive GIS program, a first in the Romanian archaeological research.

In the case of archaeological monuments that are located close to industrial facilities, plans have been redesigned to ensure that the archaeological remains in question will not be affected. Where appropriate, the archaeological monument was preserved in situ and restored, i.e. the circular funerary monument at Hop-Găuri (see The "Alburnus Maior" monograph series, volume II, Bucharest, 2004). Another example in this respect is the Carpeni Hill, designated an "archaeological " reserve, and the Piatra Corbului area. In 2004, after being thoroughly investigated, these areas have been included on the List of Historic Monuments. Add to this the areas where ancient mining remains will be preserved, such as the Cătălina Monulești gallery and the mining sector Păru Carpeni, as well as the protected area Roşia Montană Historic Center, including a number of heritage assets (35 historic monument houses).

We emphasise in this respect that the identified and researched structures have been published in preliminary form in the Archaeological Research Chronicle of Romania, after every archaeological research campaign, as well as in volume 1 of the Alburnus Maior monographic series. We mention here the areas where Roman habitation structures have been identified and researched, as well as the references to be consulted for further information: Hop-Găuri, Carpeni, Tăul Țapului (CCA 2001 (2002), p. 254-257, no. 182; 261-262, nr. 185; 264-265, no. 188; 265-266, no. 189. Alburnus Maior I, 2003, p. 45-80; 81-122; 123-148; CCA 2001 (2002), 257-261; CCA 2003 (2004) ,280-283; Alburnus Maior I, 2003, p. 387-431, 433-446, 447-467).

For further details related to the applicable legal framework, the responsibilities of the Project titleholder, or for a detailed description of the preventive archaeological researches undertaken to date and of the Cultural Heritage Management Plans, please see Annex called "Information on the Cultural heritage of Roşia and Related Management Aspects". In addition, the annex includes supplementary information with regard to the result of the researches undertaken as part of the "Alburnus Maior" National Research Program between 2001 and 2006.

In conclusion, the area mentioned by the questioner has been researched in accordance with the Romanian legal requirements, as well as with European standards and practices in the field.

Note that the type of research undertaken at Roşia Montană, known as preventive/rescue archaeological research, as well as other related heritage studies, are done everywhere in the world in close connection with the economic development of certain areas. Both the costs for the research and for the enhancement and maintenance of the preserved areas are provided by investors, in a public-private partnership set up in order to protect the cultural heritage, as per the provisions of the European Convention on the Protection of the Archaeological Heritage (Malta-1992) [1].

References:

[1]The text of the Convention is available at the following address:

<http://conventions.coe.int/Treaty/Commun/QueVoulezVous.asp?NT=143&CM=8&DF=7/6/2006&CL=ENG>

*

In 2000, in the context of the proposal of a new mining project in the Roşia Montană area, the Ministry of Culture and Religious Affairs approved a series of studies to be conducted in order to research the archaeological and architectural heritage of the area. At the end of that year, the Design Centre for National Cultural Heritage (now the National Institute for Historical Monuments) presented the preliminary results of these researches in front of the National Commission for Historical Monuments and of the National Commission of Archaeology. Based on these results, in 2001, the Ministry of Culture and Religious Affairs initiated the “Alburnus Maior” National Research Program (the Order no. 2504 / 07.03.2001 of the Minister of Culture and Religious Affairs) in compliance with the Law 378/2001 (as subsequently amended by Law 462/2003 and by Law 258/2006 and Law 259/2006). Thus, since 2000, the Ministry of Culture and Religious Affairs has fulfilled its duties – directly or through its subordinated institutions - with regard to the management of the issues related to Roşia Montană’s heritage.

The preventive archaeological researches have been conducted by the representatives of 21 national institutions and 3 others from abroad, with a broad expertise in the field. They have been carried out based on the annual approval of the National Commission of Archaeology of the Ministry of Culture and Religious Affairs. In accordance with current legislation, this research program is carried out with financial support provided by RMGC, i.e. the company that plans to expand and continue to mine the gold-silver deposit in Roşia Montană. Thus, large-scale preventive investigations have been conducted or are underway in the RMP impact area. A proposal will be made based on the results of these investigations, either for the archaeological discharge of some researched areas or the preservation in situ of certain representative structures and monuments, in compliance with current legislation. For areas proposed for conservation or for archaeological discharge measures the decision was made based on the surveys conducted by specialists and on the analysis of the results by the National Commission of Archaeology. In the period 2000-2005, the mining project underwent a series of modifications designed to promote the conservation of the local heritage. Examples of this include extending the duration of the field investigations (e.g. in Tarina, Pârâul Porcului, Orlea) and changing the location of some elements of mining infrastructure in order to allow the conservation of the archaeological remains found in the Carpeni, in the Tău Găuri and Pietra Corbului areas.

The architectural and town-planning surveys have been conducted, in accordance with current legislation, by companies certified by the Ministry of Culture and Religious Affairs, while the town-planning documentation drafted by these companies, and the restoration and conservation works undertaken so far, have been approved by the National Commission for Historical Monuments. Thus, the town-planning documentation has been approved and implemented in accordance with current legislation, and the company has agreed to these decisions and modified the mine development plans accordingly:

Extensive ethnographic research was conducted in the Roşia Montană-Abrud-Corna area in the period 2001-2004 coordinated by a team of specialists for the Romanian Village Museum „Dimitrie Gusti” (a National Museum directly under the coordination of the Ministry of Culture and Religious Affairs). Moreover, a broad series of oral history interviews was conducted in the period 2001-2002 by the Romanian Society of Radio broadcasting through the „Gheorghe Brătianu” Oral History Centre, Bucharest (SRR - CIO).

In compliance with the requirements of the Ministry of Environment and Waters Management and the Ministry of Culture and Religious Affairs, specific management plans have been drawn up for the management and conservation of the heritage remains from the Roşia Montană area, in the context of the implementation of the mining project. These plans have been included in the documentation prepared for the report on the Environmental Impact Assessment Study. (see EIA Report, volume 32-33, Plan M-Cultural Heritage Management Plan, part I –Management Plan for the Archaeological Heritage from Roşia Montană Zone; part II-Management Plan for the Historical Monuments and Protected Zone from Roşia Montană; part III- Cultural Heritage Management Plan).

These management plans comprise detailed presentations of the obligations and responsibilities for the protection and conservation of the heritage remains from the Roşia Montană area, which the company has assumed as part of the mining project, in accordance with the decision of the central government. These heritage remains include: archaeological remains above and under the ground, historic buildings, protected areas, intangible heritage assets, cultural landscape items, etc. In this context, it should be noted

that besides the works for the protection and preservation of the archaeological heritage, works are also being carried out for the rehabilitation and conservation of the protected area Historical Centre Roşia Montană (comprising 35 historic buildings, and projects for the restoration of 11 of these buildings are currently being drafted) and at Tăul Mare, Tăul Brazi and Tăul Anghel, plus remains of the surface mining works from the Văidoaia area, and the creation of a modern museum dedicated to the history of mining in the Apuseni Mountains area. This museum will be established including exhibitions of geology, archaeology, industrial and ethnographic heritage as well as an underground section organized around the Cătălina Monuleşti gallery.

Moreover, representatives of the Directorate/Department for Culture, Religious Affairs and National Cultural Heritage of Alba County have paid a number of visits to Roşia Montană in order to collect information and to check the situation. The same administrative body was the intermediary for the acquisitions of historic buildings made by RMGC. The Ministry of Culture and Religious Affairs expressed its pre-emption right regarding the acquisition of these buildings.

It should be mentioned, however, that apart from the obligations undertaken by RMGC as regards the protection and conservation of the archaeological remains and historical monuments, there are also a series of obligations which rest with the local public authorities from Roşia Montană and from Alba County, and with the central public authorities, specifically the Romanian Government. These aspects are detailed in the Cultural Heritage Management Plans included in the EIA Report (see EIA Report, volume 32, Management Plan for the Archaeological Heritage from Roşia Montană Zone, pages 22-24, 49, 55-56, 71-72 and the EIA Report, volume 33- Management Plan for the Historical Monuments and Protected Zone from Roşia Montană pages 28-29, 47-50, 51-53, 65-66, page 103 – Annex 1).

Item no.

52

No. to identify
the
observations
received from
the public

No.
114897/
05.10.2006

Proposal

The questioner opposes the promotion of the Roşia Montană Project.

Solution

Regarding your allegation, we mention that art. 44 (3) of the Minister of Waters and Environment Protection Order no. 860/2002 on the environmental impact assessment and the issuance of environmental agreements Procedures ("Order no. 860/2002") provides that "*based on the results of the public debate, the relevant authority for the environmental protection evaluates the grounded proposals/comments of the public and requests the titleholder the supplementation of the report on the environmental impact assessment study with an appendix comprising solutions for the solving of the indicated issues*".

Consequently, considering the fact that your proposal is just an allegation which does not indicate possible problems, nor provide additional information, we mention that the decision on the issuance or refusal of the environmental approval cannot be made only by considering a simple proposal, but according to certain objective criteria provided by the wording of art. 45 of the Order no. 860/2002 and only after examining

- (i) the report on the environmental impact assessment study;
- (ii) the conclusions of the parties involved in the assessment;
- (iii) the possibilities to implement the project;
- (iv) the titleholder answers to the grounded proposals/comments of the public.

Item no.

53

No. to identify
the
observations
received from
the public

No.
114733/
25.09.2006

Proposal

The questioner opposes the promotion of the Roşia Montană Project.

Solution

Regarding your allegation, we mention that art. 44 (3) of the Minister of Waters and Environment Protection Order no. 860/2002 on the environmental impact assessment and the issuance of environmental agreements Procedures ("Order no. 860/2002") provides that *"based on the results of the public debate, the relevant authority for the environmental protection evaluates the grounded proposals/comments of the public and requests the titleholder the supplementation of the report on the environmental impact assessment study with an appendix comprising solutions for the solving of the indicated issues"*.

Consequently, considering the fact that your proposal is just an allegation which does not indicate possible problems, nor provide additional information, we mention that the decision on the issuance or refusal of the environmental approval cannot be made only by considering a simple proposal, but according to certain objective criteria provided by the wording of art. 45 of the Order no. 860/2002 and only after examining

- (i) the report on the environmental impact assessment study;
- (ii) the conclusions of the parties involved in the assessment;
- (iii) the possibilities to implement the project;
- (iv) the titleholder answers to the grounded proposals/comments of the public.

Item no.

54

No. to identify the observations received from the public

No.
114731/
25.09.2006

Proposal

The questioner does not agree to the Roşia Montană project implementation formulating the following remarks and comments:

- Flora and fauna were partially destroyed and the inhabitants are affected by the diseases caused by cyanide and silicosis;
- The mining into the four open pits will allow the water and wind to spread sodium cyanide;
- The archeological area of great historical and cultural value will be destroyed.

This comment appears to refer to the population's current health status and not to the population health status in relation with the future development of mining activities.

The health component of the EIA comprises an exhaustive presentation of the population's health status in more than 40 localities [1], using all medical records collected from all general practitioners and from the two local hospitals [2], as well as demographic data for the same area. All these data show that Roşia Montană population is characterized by the lowest life expectancy in the investigated area, and also as compared to data collected at regional and national level [3]. In addition, Roşia Montană shows a higher frequency of severe chronic diseases (respiratory, cardiovascular) as compared to some other localities in the area [4]. However, predictions made for specific periods of time during the life time of the project, with regard to the distribution of diseases researched have shown no significant increase in their frequency [5].

In conclusion, the Roşia Montană population is in poorer health when compared to other population groups in the area, according to present data, before the development of the proposed mining activities. In addition, the development of mining activities will not cause a significant increase of the frequency of the investigated diseases, for the concentrations of hazardous substances predicted to occur in the environment in the study area [6].

References:

Solution

- [1] Table 5-1, Subchapter 5-1, Chapter 5, *Morbidity Study*, page 52-53, vol. 5, *Health Baseline Report*
- [2] Subchapter 5.1.2, Table 5-3, Chapter 5, *Morbidity Study*, page 54, vol. 5, *Health Baseline Report*
- [3] Table 3-2, Figure 3-2, Chapter 3, *Demographic Data*, page 14-15, vol. 5, *Health Baseline Report*
- [4] Annex, page 137, vol. 5, *Health Baseline Report*
- [5] Chapter 6, *Risk Assessment*, pages 60-129, vol. 5, *Health Baseline Report*
- [6] Chapter 6.6, *Results and Discussions*, pages 124-129, vol. 5, *Health Baseline Report*

*

The pit mining has nothing in common with the use of cyanide. The cyanide is used in the technological process only which happens in closed circuit within the ore processing plant site.

The Project is designed in accordance to the new European Directive (2006/21/EC) for the management of mining waste. This imposes that for new mining projects, the cyanide concentration in tailings be smaller than 10 parts per million (ppm), at the point of discharge. For Roşia Montană Project, this is obtained by recycling a large quantity of cyanide and by reusing it due to the treatment of the residual cyanide taking place within a process which was tested and proven as being efficient for cyanide destruction.

The cyanide used for the ore processing will be handled / stored in compliance with the EU standards and the provisions of the International Code for the Management of the Cyanide (ICMC-www.cyanidecode.org); it will be safely kept on the processing plant site in order to prevent any accidental spillage. The cyanide and its compounds will be subject to INCO detoxification procedure (DETOX) – this

procedure is considered the Best Available Technique (BAT) as per BREF document; the process tailings will be discharged into the TMF in accordance with EU Directive 2006/21/CE on the management of mining waste.

The assessment of the HCN emissions is based on a Model summarized in Volume 12, Chapter 4.2 Air. AERMOD, Version 99351. -EPA, 2004. User's Guide for the AMS/EPA Regulatory Model – AERMOD. EPA-454/B-03-001, was used for modeling the dispersion of HCN. Please also see: http://www.epa.gov/scram001/dispersion_prefrec.htm#aermod. The concentrations estimate were much below the awareness limits stipulated by the standards for the air quality.

The Cyanide management Plan and the Air quality management Plan present clear solutions to prevent / reduce / remove the potential impact of the HCN emissions; starting from the results of the HCN dispersion model, we present here some of them:

- the sodium cyanide will be handled in liquid form only, as from the unloading from the supply trucks, up to the time it is discharged onto the TMF, within the tailings; the sodium cyanide is represented by alkaline solutions of high pH (over 10.5-11) of various sodium cyanide concentrations. The scope of the alkalinity of these solutions is to maintain the cyanide as cyan ions form (CN⁻) and to stop forming the hydrogen cyanide (HCN), phenomenon which occurs in environment of low pH only;
- the volatilization of the cyanide off a solution can't happen as free cyanide, but HCN only;
- the handling and storage of the cyanide solutions will only take place through closed systems; the only facilities / areas where HCN could form and volatilize, with small emission ratios, are the leaching tank and the tailings thickener, as well as the tailings dam;
- the HCN emissions from the surface of the above mentioned tanks and from the surface of the tailings dam could occur due to the decrease of the pH within the superficial layers of the solutions (which encourages the occurrence of HCN) and due to the desorption (volatilization in the air) of this compound;
- the concentration of the cyanides within the handled solutions will decrease from 300 mg/L in the leaching tanks up to 7 mg/L (total cyanides) at the point of discharge into the tailings dam. The significant decrease of the cyanide concentration at the point of discharge into the tailings dam is supported by the detox system;
- the knowledge on the cyanide chemistry, as well as the experience from similar activities, have lead us to the following possible HCN emissions in the air: 6 t/year from the leaching tanks, 13 t/year from the tailings thickeners and 30 t/year (22.4 t, and 17 mg/h/m², during hot season and 7.6 t, and 11.6 mg/h/m², during the cold season) from the surface of the tailings dam, meaning a daily average total HCN emission of 134.2 kg;
- once emitted, the hydrogen cyanide is subject to certain chemical reactions in low atmosphere, leading to ammonia;
- the mathematical modeling of the HCN concentrations in the ambient air (if the HCN is not subject to chemical reactions in the atmosphere) showed the highest concentrations at the level of the soil, within the industrial site, namely within the area of the TMF and near the processing plant – the maximum concentration being of 382 µg/m³per hour;
- the highest concentrations of HCN in the ambient air will be of 2.6 times smaller than the value imposed for the safety of the workers, as stipulated by the national legislation;
- the concentrations of HCN in the ambient air in the inhabited areas near the industrial site will be of 4 – 80 µg/m³, over 250 – 12.5 smaller than the safety value as stipulated by the national legislation (the national legislation and the EU legislation for the air quality don't stipulate any limit values for the protection of population's health);
- the advance of the HCN in the atmosphere involves an insignificant compound of reactions in liquid phase (the water vapors in the atmosphere and the rain drops) because, at partial low pressure, specific to gases in free air, the HCN is very weak soluble in water, and the rain will not effectively reduce the concentrations from the air (MUDDER, et al., 2001, CICERONE and ZELLNER, 1983);
- the chance for the value of the HCN concentrations in precipitations within or outside the area of the Project be significantly higher than the basic values (of 0.2 ppb) is extremely low.

For further details regarding the Use of cyanide in technological processes, the Balance of the cyanides, as well as the Emissions and the impact of the cyanide against the quality of the air, please see the EIA

Report, Chapter 2, Chapter 4.1 and Chapter 4.2 (Section 4.2.3).

The references for this Project include:

- CICERONE, R.J., and ZELLNER, R., 1983. *The atmospheric chemistry of hydrogen cyanide (HCN)*. *Journal of geophysics research*, Volume 88, issue no. C15, page. 10,689 to 10,696;
- MUDDER, T.I., BOTZ, M.M., and SMITH A., 2001. *Chemistry and Treatment of Cyanidation Wastes*, The Second edition. *Mining Journal Books, Ltd.*, London, 373 p.

*

Note that the implementation of the mining project does not involve the destruction or abandonment of archeological heritage assets in the area of Roșia Montană commune and full consideration has been given to their existence there. Based on the specialist reports and publications, the Roman galleries at Roșia Montană are considered important, but not unique. Thus, a catalog of ancient mining works in Transylvania and Banat – developed as part of the Environmental Impact Assessment Study for Roșia Montană – states that it is difficult to justify a claim that the Roșia Montană site is unique, at least in the context of Roman mining operations throughout the Empire, and particularly in Dacia Province. There are at least 20 other sites of relatively similar characteristics – some of which, including Ruda Brad, Bucium – the Vulcoi Corabia and the Haneș – Amlășul Mare areas, have already provided real data on archeological remains comparable to the ancient *Alburnus Maior* and discount claims for the uniqueness of the site.

Prior to 1999, the Roman galleries at Roșia Montană were not researched by mining archeology specialists, although their existence had been known for over 150 years. In practice, before 2000, this type of archeological remains was unknown from scientific research, the references connected to these being in most of the times empirical. Neither the surface archaeological were better known the real sense of the word, but information originated from chance finds occasioned by agricultural and construction works.

Mining archeology research conducted – since 1999 – by a multi-disciplinary specialist team from the University of Toulouse Le Mirail (France), and coordinated by Dr. Beatrice Cauuet aimed to develop – as a first in Romania – a detailed study of this type of archeological remains, i.e. old mining galleries of Roman and later periods. Extensive research and heritage studies conducted during 200-2006 helped create a comprehensive image of these the national cultural heritage assets, and to adopt specific measures in regard to their protection.

The study of these structures therefore meant better knowledge and documented decision making in regard to their conservation and enhancement. Based on the results of research conducted to date (and finalized for Cetate, Cârnic, Jig and ongoing in Orlea), it was decided to preserve and enhance the following areas of old mining works:

- the Cătălina Monulești Gallery – located in the Historic Center of Roșia Montană, where the most important cache of wax tablets and an ancient mine drainage system had been found in the past;
- mining sector Păru Carpeni – located in the south-eastern part of Orlea, where a successive chamber drainage system equipped with Roman wooden installations (wheels, channels, etc.) was discovered;
- the Piatra Corbului area – located in the south-western part of Cârnic, and preserving traces of fire and water mining operations of ancient and medieval age;
- the Văidoaia area – north-west of Roșia Montană village, preserving areas of ancient open cast mining.

Preventive archeological research conducted in 2001-2006 helped define and research 13 archeological sites, for some of which – once exhaustive research work was finalized – the decision was to apply the archeological duty of care removal procedures, while for others it was decided to apply on site conservation – the funerary precinct at Tăul Găuri, the Roman relics on Dealu Carpeni; Orlea area will be researched in detail during the 2007-2012 period.

As for the historic mining galleries of the Roman period discovered in the mining sectors of Cătălina Monulești and Păru Carpeni, comprehensive rehabilitation, reinforcement and development works have been planned, in order help preserve them in situ and develop them for tourism. This decision was based on the value of the archeological remains preserved in the galleries, i.e. the wooden Roman installations built for the drainage of mine water during the Roman Age (the so-called Roman wheels). At the same

time, the gallery at Cătălina Monulești is renowned for being the one where – in mid 19th century – the most significant cache of waxed tablets was discovered (according to the sources in the historical archives they were 11 of the 32 artifacts of this kind known to date).

Most of the ancient mining works in Carnic mountain, as well as other mining sectors, are only accessible in difficult conditions, to specialists, and are partly inaccessible to the public at large. Moreover, safety regulations governing similar activities in the museums of the European Union, and which will become law for Romania as well, are not compatible with the conversion of the Roman galleries, inherently exposed to high risk factors, to a space available to tourists. Note that there will be comparable Roman gallery sections that will be preserved on site. As an impact mitigation measure, apart from the full research and publication of research results, the specialists considered it appropriate to develop a 3D graphic model of these structures, and 1:1 replicas within the proposed mining museum at Roșia Montană.

As an alternative, the elaboration of a specialty study was taken into account in order to evaluate the costs needed for the integral preservation and introduction into the tourism circuit of the galleries situated in Cărnic massif. Thus, the necessary investments in order to arrange and maintain the public tourism in this massif rise at an amount unjustified from economic point of view (see the informative brochure entitled *Costs Estimate for the Development of Ancient Mining Networks from Cărnic* elaborated by British companies Gifford , Geo-Design and ForkersLtd).

For the Orlea area (the only one where ancient mining relics have been classified to date, i.e. under HML 2004 Roman mining operations at Alburnus Maior, Orlea area cod LMI AB-I-m-A-00065.02), research has only been of a preliminary nature so far. Detailed research of this area is planned for 2007-2012, and when this research is finalized the necessary measures under the law will have to be taken, either to conserve some sections on site, or to apply the archeological duty of care removal procedure for others. Detailed information on random archeological discoveries and preliminary archeological research (both above and underground) in the area of Orlea Hill was published in the Environmental Impact Assessment Study for the Roșia Montană Project, vol. 6 – Cultural Heritage Baseline Study, Annex I p. 219-222. Also note that the study further states: “As Project development in Orlea area has been scheduled for a later date, as of 2007, surface archeological investigations will focus on this area. Thus, the building activities involved in Project implementation can not be initiated before archeological investigations carried out under the Romanian legal provisions and international recommendations and practice have been finalized. (Cultural Heritage Baseline Study, vol. 6, p. 46).

Within the Orlea Massif from Roșia Montană, a Mining Museum was established in 1980. In this mining perimeter a series of well preserved galleries were arranged and separated by concrete walls towards the mining works which assured the access. The Orlea galleries have a characteristic trapezoidal profile, similarly with the mining works from Cărnic and other mining sector from Roșia Montană. Also, these ancient works suffered in time successive “reshaping”, respectively the taking again having in regard the mining of new ore reserves. These mining works destroyed parts from these ancient remains. Moreover, their preservation state falls into disrepair due to the recent mining works which used drilling – blasting technology, a fact leading to the rock destabilization and destroying of the underground mining remains. The removal of the rockfill from the ancient mining works during the mining archaeological investigations represents another factor contributing to the degradation of the ancient mining works. The degradation of the preservation condition of the mining remains of all ages is accelerated also by the closure of the mining operation managed by Minvest (June 01 2006), which assured, at a minimum level, the global drainage of the system of galleries of the Roșia Montană mine. The closure of a mining activity, according to the national norms in force, implies an extremely wide range of preservation measures, but at Roșia Montană the extractive activity purely and simply was stopped, the mine being abandoned. After few months from abandon, the main gallery of the mine water drainage, namely the Sf. Cruce from Orlea gallery is in a critic condition. In fact, the mine water silted the drainage ways longer than several kilometers. In the case when this mining heritage will be only “frozen” without to take maintenance measures, having in regard their preservation for the next generations, the result will be disastrous. All still existing remains will disappear due to the underground falling and flood. An edifying example consists – unfortunately – from the “Roman steps” from Brad (Roman remains also listed by Law 5/2000) where these became inaccessible when the maintenance works ceased.

Considering the importance of the cultural heritage at Roșia Montană and current legislation, the heritage

research budget allocated for 2001-2006 by S.C. Roşia Montană Gold Corporation S.A. amounted to more than 10 million US\$. Moreover, based on the research results, the specialist opinions and competent authority decisions, the budget estimated by the Company for the research, conservation and restoration of the cultural heritage at Roşia Montană in future years, provided the Project is implemented, will be US\$ 25 million, as disclosed in the Environmental Impact Assessment of May 2006 (see EIA Report vol. 32, Archeological Heritage Management Plan for Roşia Montană area, p. 84-85). Therefore, the intention is to continue work in Orlea area, and especially to create a **modern Mining Museum** with **geological, archeological, industrial and ethnographic heritage** displays, and the development of tourist access to the **Cătălina-Monuleşti** gallery and to the monument at **Tău Găuri**, as well as to **preserve and restore the 41 historic monument buildings and the protected area of Roşia Montană Historic Center**.

In order to get some information on the historic of the researches and of the main discoveries related to historic galleries at Roşia Montană, as well as to get to know the conclusions of the experts regarding this issue, and also the assessments for a tourist route dedicated to historic mining structures from the Carnic Massif or the opinions formulated in 2004 by Edward O'Hara – General Rapporteur on Cultural Heritage within the Parliamentary Assembly of Council of Europe; we ask you to read the annexes entitled "Information on the Cultural Heritage of Roşia Montană and Related Management Aspects" and "Costs Estimate for the Development of Ancient Mining Networks from Cărnic", as well as the annexed version in Romanian language of the O'Hara report. Detail information regarding the complex issue of the study on ancient mining activities from Roşia Montană, of the results of these researches and their development perspectives, they are all available in the Environmental Impact Assessment Study for the Roşia Montană Project, volume 6 – Baseline conditions page 32, 35-58, 85-109.

In conclusion, we note that there is no question of destroying the archeological remains at Roşia Montană, or of merely replacing them with replicas. Research of this type – known as preventative/rescue archeological research – is done everywhere in the world in relation to economic development of areas, and the costs thereof, as well as the costs of enhancing and maintaining the preserved areas, have to be provided by the investors, which leads to the establishment of a public private partnership in the protection of cultural assets, as provided by the European Convention of Malta (1992) on the protection of the archeological heritage [1].

It is worth stressing that, apart from the obligations RMGC has committed to in protecting and preserving archeological remains and historic monuments, there are a number of obligations that relate to both the local government authorities in Roşia Montană and Alba County and to the central government authorities, i.e. the Romanian State. The Cultural Heritage Management Plans included in the EIA Study Report provide clarification of such aspects (see EIA Report, vol. 32, Management Plan for the Archeological Heritage at Roşia Montană p. 22-24, 49, 55-56, 71-72 and EIA Report, vol. 33, Management Plan for the Historic Monuments and Protected Areas at Roşia Montană p. 28-29, 47-50, 51-53, 65-66, p. 103 – Annex 1).

All these publicly assumed commitments of the Company are described in detail in the EIA Report, vol. 33, Cultural Heritage Management Plan.

References:

[1] The text of this Convention is available on website:<http://conventions.coe.int/Treaty/Commun/QueVoulezVous.asp?NT=143&CM=8&DF=7/6/2006&CL=ENG>

Item no.

55

No. to identify
the
observations
received from
the public

No.
114654/
21.09.2006

Proposal

The questioner opposes the promotion of the Roşia Montană Project.

Solution

Regarding your allegation, we mention that art. 44 (3) of the Minister of Waters and Environment Protection Order no. 860/2002 on the environmental impact assessment and the issuance of environmental agreements Procedures ("Order no. 860/2002") provides that "*based on the results of the public debate, the relevant authority for the environmental protection evaluates the grounded proposals/comments of the public and requests the titleholder the supplementation of the report on the environmental impact assessment study with an appendix comprising solutions for the solving of the indicated issues*".

Consequently, considering the fact that your proposal is just an allegation which does not indicate possible problems, nor provide additional information, we mention that the decision on the issuance or refusal of the environmental approval cannot be made only by considering a simple proposal, but according to certain objective criteria provided by the wording of art. 45 of the Order no. 860/2002 and only after examining

- (i) the report on the environmental impact assessment study;
- (ii) the conclusions of the parties involved in the assessment;
- (iii) the possibilities to implement the project;
- (iv) the titleholder answers to the grounded proposals/comments of the public.

Item no.

56

No. to identify the observations received from the public

No.
114674/
02.10.2006

Proposal

The questioner does not agree to the Roşia Montană project implementation formulating the following remarks and comments:

- The information regarding the cyanide detoxification is incorrect;
- The barrage height of the tailings management facility does not give any guaranty of stability in time;
- The quantity from air of the cyanide and sulphuric acid vapors is by far higher than the value presented within report;
- The EIA report does not analyze all alternatives to the project
- The environment rehabilitation is summarily treated;
- No financial guarantees have been stipulated;

The affirmation lacks of substance. The detoxification process is successfully applied in over 90 similar projects worldwide and it was patented 30 years ago; in Europe, this procedure works successfully in more than 5 mines (please see BREF⁹ document for examples).

The Project is designed in accordance to the new European Directive (2006/21/EC) for the management of mining waste. This imposes that for new mining projects, the cyanide concentration in tailings to be less than 10 parts per million (ppm), at the point of discharge.

For Roşia Montană Project, this is obtained by reusing the biggest possible amount of cyanide and, to treat the residual cyanide, by using a process which was tested and proven as being efficient for tailings detoxification. The cyanide concentration below 10ppm is not toxic for people or animals, such as birds, cows or sheep.

It is difficult to make more comments on the subject while no clear data on the information the Questioner claims are erroneous.

*

Solution

The Tailings Management Facility has been designed to meet all Romanian and international standards for dam safety at each phase of construction. This includes the initial starter dam as well as each subsequent raise to the ultimate dam height.

The design crest elevation for the starter dam, each dam raise and the ultimate dam have been established to provide containment for the required tailings storage volume, the operating reclaim pond volume, two probable maximum flood volumes and freeboard. In addition, specific stability analyses have been conducted for each configuration to confirm adequate factors of safety under both static and dynamic loading conditions.

Prior to operation, the dam must be certified for operations by the National Commission for Dams Safety (CONSIB). RMGC has utilized the world's foremost experts in these areas to ensure the safety of the project's workers and the surrounding communities.

*

It is mentioned that from technological processes or from the surface of the tailings management facility there will be no emissions of "cyanide vapors", but only eventual emissions of hydrocyanic acid into air.

On the whole, the aspects related to this subject are as follows:

- The sodium cyanide handling, from the unloading from the supplying trucks up to the processing

tailings discharge onto the tailings management facility, will be carried out only in liquid form, represented by alkaline solutions of high pH value (higher than 10.5 – 11.0) having different sodium cyanide concentrations. The alkalinity of these solutions has the purpose to maintain the cyanide under the form of cyan ions (CN⁻) and to avoid the hydrocyanic acid formation (HCN), phenomenon that occurs only within environments of low pH;

- The cyanide volatilization from a certain solution cannot occur under the form of free cyanides, but only under the form of HCN;
- The handling and storage of the sodium cyanide solutions will take place only by means of some closed systems; the only areas/plants where the HCN can occur and volatilize into air, at low emission percentage, are the leaching tanks and slurry thickener, as well the tailings management facility for the processing tailings;
- The HCN emissions from the surface of the above mentioned tanks and from the tailings management facility surface can occur as a result of the pH decrease within the superficial layers of the solutions (that helps the HCN to form) and of the desorption (volatilization in air) of this compound;
- The cyanide concentrations within the handled solutions will decrease from 300 mg/L within the leaching tanks up to 7 mg/L (total cyanide) at the discharge point into the tailings management facility. The drastic reduction of the cyanide concentrations for discharging into the Tailings Management Facility (TMF) will be done by the detoxification system;
- The knowledge of the cyanide chemistry and on the grounds of the past experience, we estimated the following possible HCN emissions into air: 6 t/year from the leaching tanks, 13 t/year from the slurry thickener and 30 t/year (22.4 t, respectively 17 mg/h/m² during the hot season and 7.6 t, respectively 11.6 mg/h/m² during the cold season) from the tailings management facility surface, which totals 134.2 kg/day of HCN emission;
- Once released into air, the hydrocyanic acid is subject to certain chemical reactions at low pressure, resulting ammonia;
- The mathematical modeling of the HCN concentrations within the ambient air (if the HCN released in the air is not subject to chemical reactions) emphasized the highest concentrations being at the ground level, within the industrial site namely within the area of the tailings management facility and within a certain area near the processing plant. The maximum concentration is of 382 µg/m³/h;
- The highest HCN concentrations within the ambient air will be 2.6 times lower than the standard value stipulated by the national legislation for occupational safety;
- The HCN concentrations within the ambient air in the populated areas close by the industrial site will be of 4 to 80 µg/m³, more than 250 – 12.5 times lower than standard value stipulated by the national legislation for occupational safety – the national legislation and European Union (EU) legislation on the Air Quality don't stipulate standard values for the population's health protection;
- Once released in air, the evolution of the HCN implies an insignificant component resulted from the reactions while liquid (water vapors and rain drops). The reactions are due to HCN being weak water-soluble at partially low pressures (feature of the gases released in open air), and the rain not effectively reducing the concentrations in the air (Mudder, et al., 2001; Cicerone and Zellner, 1983);
- The probability that the HCN concentration value contained by rainfalls within and outside the footprint of the Project be significantly higher than the background values (0.2 ppb) is extremely low.

Details referring to the use of cyanide in the technological processes, to the cyanides balance as well as to the cyanide emission and the impact of the cyanides on the air quality are contained in the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Report, Chapter 2, Subchapter 4.1 and Subchapter 4.2 (Section 4.2.3).

*

Chapter 5 of the Report on the environment impact assessment study (EIA) (*Assessment of Alternatives*) presents an assessment of all the alternatives that are appropriate to consider for the EIA and in line with the EIA Terms of Reference as issued by MEWM. This includes the “no-project” alternative.

The Chapter also examines alternative locations for key facilities as well as alternative technologies for mining, processing and waste management, in line with best practice and as compared against published

EU best available techniques (BAT) documentation.

The EIA considered alternative developments – including agriculture, grazing, meat processing, tourism, forestry and forest products, cottage industries, and flora/fauna gathering for pharmaceutical purposes – and concluded that these activities could not provide the economic, cultural and environmental benefits brought by the Roșia Montană Project (RMP).

The examination of alternatives also evaluated the best mining technology, duration and staging of the project, mining and processing technologies, environmental management practices, site options for waste management facilities, transportation routes, and measures to prevent and minimize environmental impact.

*

RMGC is committed to responsible mine closure and rehabilitation in Roșia Montană and we have a plan to achieve it. Our Mine Closure and Rehabilitation Management Plan (Plan J in the EIA) sets out a series of measures to ensure that the mine leaves as small an imprint as possible on Roșia Montană's landscape. These measures are as follows:

- Covering and vegetating the waste dumps as far as they are not backfilled into the open pits;
- Backfilling the open pits, except Cetate pit, which will be flooded to form a lake;
- Covering and vegetating the tailings pond and its dam areas;
- Dismantling of disused production facilities and revegetation of the cleaned-up areas;
- Water treatment by semi-passive systems (with conventional treatment systems as backup) until all effluents have reached the discharge standards and need no further treatment;
- Maintenance of the vegetation, erosion control, and monitoring of the entire site until it has been demonstrated by RMGC that all remediation targets have been sustainably reached.

The mine's rehabilitation will meet or exceed the standards set by the EU Mine Waste Directive, which dictates that RMGC must "restore the land to a satisfactory state, with particular regard to soil quality, wild life, natural habitats, freshwater systems, landscape, and appropriate beneficial uses".

After completion of closure and rehabilitation, the 584 hectares (of the total 1646 hectares included in the PUZ) that compose the areas between the mine pits and processing facilities as well as the buffer zone will show no visual signs of the mining project. The infrastructure projects (i.e. roads, sewage treatment facilities, etc.) will be left for community use. In the case of the remaining 1062 hectares (see Chapter 4, Section 4.7 Landscape, table 3.1, from the EIA report), though they will be altered, they will also be remediate (reshaped, treated with an engineered soil-covering system, and revegetated) to blend with the surrounding landscape to the greatest extent possible.

*

Information regarding our Environmental Financial Guarantee ("EFG") is fully discussed in the section of the Environmental Impact Assessment titled "Environmental and Social Management and System Plans" (Annex 1 of the subchapter titled "Mine Rehabilitation and Closure Management Plan"). The EFG is updated annually and will always reflect the costs associated with reclamation. These funds will be held in protected accounts at the Romanian state disposal.

Roșia Montană Gold Corporation ("RMGC") has invested significant time, energy, and resources assessing the viability of a mining project in the valley of Roșia Montană. This assessment has led RMGC to conclude that Roșia Montană presents an attractive long-term development opportunity – an opinion confirmed by a variety of lending institutions, who have completed detailed reviews of the project's design and profitability. We have every confidence that we will see the project through to the end of its projected 16-year lifespan, regardless of any fluctuations in the market price of gold.

In Romania, the creation of an EFG is required to ensure adequate funds are available from the mine operator for environmental cleanup. The EFG is governed by the Mining Law (no. 85/2003) and the National Agency for Mineral Resources instructions and Mining Law Enforcement Norms (no. 1208/2003).

Two directives issued by the European Union also impact the EFG: the Mine Waste Directive (“MWD”) and the Environmental Liability Directive (“ELD”).

The Mine Waste Directive aims to ensure that coverage is available for 1) all the obligations connected to the permit granted for the disposal of waste material resulting from mining activities and 2) all of the costs related to the rehabilitation of the land affected by a waste facility. The Environmental Liability Directive regulates the remedies, and measures to be taken by the environmental authorities, in the event of environmental damage created by mining operations, with the goal of ensuring adequate financial resources are available from the operators for environmental cleanup efforts. While these directives have yet to be transposed by the Romanian Government, the deadlines for implementing their enforcement mechanisms are 30 April 2007 (ELD) and 1 May 2008 (MWD) – thus before operations are scheduled to begin at Roşia Montană.

RMGC has already begun the process of complying with these directives, and once their implementation instruments are enacted by the Romanian Government, we will be in full compliance.

Each EFG will follow detailed guidelines generated by the World Bank and the International Council on Mining and Metals.

The current projected closure cost for Roşia Montană is US \$76 million, which is based on the mine operating for its full 16-year lifespan. The annual updates will be completed by independent experts, carried out in consultation with the NAMR, as the Governmental authority competent in mining activities field. These updates will ensure that in the unlikely event of early closure of the project, at any point in time, each EFG will always reflect the costs associated with reclamation. (These annual updates will result in an estimate that exceeds our current US \$76 million costs of closure, because some reclamation activity is incorporated into the routine operations of the mine.)

A number of different financial instruments are available to ensure that RMGC is capable of covering all of the expected closure costs. These instruments, which will be held in protected accounts at the Romanian state disposal, include:

- Cash deposit;
- Trust funds;
- Letter of credit;
- Surety bonds;
- Insurance policy.

Under the terms of this guarantee, the Romanian government will have no financial liability in connection with the rehabilitation of the Roşia Montană project.

Item no.

57

No. to identify
the
observations
received from
the public

No.
114670/
02.10.2006

Proposal

The questioner does not agree to the Roşia Montană mining project implementation and formulates the following remarks and comments:
- The material presented within the three report chapters was elaborated in order to mislead;

Solution

The Environmental Impact Assessment study report (EIA) that Roşia Montană Gold Corporation (RMGC) submitted responded fully and professionally to the Terms of Reference (TOR) proposed by the Ministry of the Environment and Water Management (MMGA) and complied with the relevant legal provisions and international practices. More than 100 independent consultants, (certified) experts and specialists renowned at the national, European, and even international levels, prepared the report. We are confident that the EIA provides sufficiently detailed information and reasoning for its conclusions to permit the MMGA to make its decision on the Roşia Montană Project (RMP). Subsequent to submission of the EIA, it has been reviewed by two different sets of experts. Technical experts, representing several international private sector banks and export credit agencies have concluded that the EIA complies with the Equator Principles designed to promote responsible lending by financial institutions to projects which raise environmental and social concerns, and an ad hoc committee of European experts (International Group of Independent Experts - IGIE) has publicly stated that the EIA was well-developed, taking into consideration their recommendations and suggestions.

A copy of the IGIE report and RMGC's response is included as a reference document to the present annex of the EIA.

Item no.

58

No. to identify
the
observations
received from
the public

No.
114659/
21.09.2006

Proposal

The questioner opposes the promotion of the Roşia Montană Project.

Solution

Regarding your allegation, we mention that art. 44 (3) of the Minister of Waters and Environment Protection Order no. 860/2002 on the environmental impact assessment and the issuance of environmental agreements Procedures ("Order no. 860/2002") provides that "*based on the results of the public debate, the relevant authority for the environmental protection evaluates the grounded proposals/comments of the public and requests the titleholder the supplementation of the report on the environmental impact assessment study with an appendix comprising solutions for the solving of the indicated issues*".

Consequently, considering the fact that your proposal is just an allegation which does not indicate possible problems, nor provide additional information, we mention that the decision on the issuance or refusal of the environmental approval cannot be made only by considering a simple proposal, but according to certain objective criteria provided by the wording of art. 45 of the Order no. 860/2002 and only after examining

- (i) the report on the environmental impact assessment study;
- (ii) the conclusions of the parties involved in the assessment;
- (iii) the possibilities to implement the project;
- (iv) the titleholder answers to the grounded proposals/comments of the public.

Item no.	59
No. to identify the observations received from the public	No. 114672/ 21.09.2006
Proposal	<p>The questioner does not agree to the Roşia Montană project implementation formulating the following remarks and comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The nonobservance of the provisions from the Constitution in force which warrant the property right in Romania and the abusive annulment through law of the rights of the ex-owners of mines from Roşia Montană; - The leasing and abusively placement at the foreign investors' disposal of the richest area from the Golden Quadrilateral of the Apuseni Mountains; - The intention publicly manifested to valorize the gold and silver ore reserves from Roşia Montană area without to take into account: nature preservation and environment protection, pollution and environment degradation prevention (air, water, soil).
Solution	<p>Regarding your allegation, we mention that, during the development of the Roşia Montană Project, SC Rosia Montana Gold Corporation SA (RMGC) will take all the necessary measures for the observation of all the mandatory legal provisions applicable to this project.</p> <p>At the same time, as regarding your request, please consider the following aspects:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) according to the relevant legal provisions, the public may submit grounded proposals regarding the environmental impact assessment; (ii) art. 44 (1) of the Minister of Waters and Environment Protection Order no. 860/2002 on the environment impact assessment and the issuance of environmental agreement Procedures ("Order no. 860/2002") provides that <i>"during the public debate meeting the project titleholder [...], provides grounded answers to the justified proposals of the public, which were received under a written form, previously to the respective hearing"</i>; (iii) according to art. 44 (3) of the Order no. 860/2002 <i>"based on the results of the public debate, the relevant authority for the environmental protection <u>evaluates the grounded proposals/comments of the public and requests the titleholder the supplementation of the report on the environmental impact assessment study with an appendix comprising solutions for solving the indicated issues.</u>"</i> <p>As your allegation (i) does not identify nor indicate issues related to the project initiated by RMGC and undergoing the environment impact assessment procedure, (ii) refers to decisional capacities under the competence of certain public authorities, issues to which RMGC is not in the position to answer, we mention that the project titleholder cannot and does not have the capacity to provide an answer or make any comments in this respect.</p> <p>Nevertheless, taking into account the fact that RMGC expressed and is still expressing its availability to discuss any relevant issues regarding the proposed project, considering that your comment refers to the issue of the participation shares, we make the following comments.</p> <p>According to art. 54 of the Rule for the enactment of art. 264 of the Mining Law from March 28, 1929 "the participation share gives the titleholder the right to participate to the indivisible assets of the association, it is an effect (title) with undefined value, in an intangible form and preserves this form even when all the participation shares of the association are owned by a single individual."</p> <p>At the same time, the wording of art. 50 of the Mining Law from March 28, 1929 provides that the mining association based on participation shares had only the right of exploration and exploitation over the lands and not a property right, these lands being in their possession based on concession agreements.</p> <p>As regards the nature of the right granted by the participation share – a right of exploitation and not a</p>

property right - the provisions regarding the amending rules of Law 10/2001 on the legal status of the estates abusively requisitioned during the interval March 6, 1954 – December 22, 1989 („Law 10/2001”), republished and amended, are not applicable. According to art. 3 of Law 10/2001, the natural persons have the right to compensation in case they owned **as property the estate abusively requisitioned** or in case **the property right** belonged to some legal persons to which the entitled natural persons had the capacity of shareholders.

Accordingly, for each of the situations provided by Law 10/2001, an essential condition for the determination of the right to compensation is to ground a property right, either by the very natural person, or by the legal person to which he participated as shareholder, over the asset requisitioned by the state, a condition which is not fulfilled by the participation share owners.

*

The concession of mining activities in Roşia Montană perimeter was made in full observance of the Romanian applicable laws, therefore it may not be qualified as abusive. It should be noted that according to the public data available on the National Agency for Mineral Resources official website www.namr.ro there are numerous companies, other than Roşia Montană Gold Corporation (RMGC), which is a Romanian company, holding exploration and exploitation licenses and permits in the Golden Quadrilateral of the Apuseni Mountains. In fact, Romania will receive many economic benefits from the development of Roşia Montană Project (RMP).

No country in the developed world is currently involved directly in assuming the risk of mining operations; instead, private capital assumes the risk and applies best available techniques (BAT). RMGC has been working on this project since 1998 and has invested over US\$ 200 million to date. By the time production begins, the company will have invested almost US\$ 1 billion. Mining is a high risk industry; it is an industry rule of thumb that for every 1000 projects considered, 100 merit drilling, and only one is opened as an actual productive mine. Approval of this project will show the world that Romania welcomes this type of productive foreign investment.

The Romanian State through the Ministry of Industry and Commerce (“MEC”) has a 19.3% ownership interest in the project. This interest is a fully carried interest with no obligation to fund its share of the capital investment. The direct financial benefit to the Romanian State, at the local, county, and national level is projected to be US\$ 1,032 million. This includes the government’s share of profits, profit taxes, royalties and other taxes such as payroll taxes. An additional US\$ 1.5 billion of Romanian goods and services will be acquired over the life of the project.

Out of total expenditures related to the project of US\$ 3,703 million, Romania will receive 68% of the economic activity generated by the project.

The project initiated by RMGC complies with (i) the Terms of Reference proposed by the Ministry of the Environment and Water Management (ii) the relevant legal provisions, including the provisions of Order of Ministry of Waters and Environmental Protection no. 863/2002 on approval of the methodological guidelines applicable to the stages of the environmental assessment procedure (“Order no. 863/2002”), (iii) the best international relevant practices, as well as with (iv) EU standards, provides new jobs for Romanians, especially in the Roşia Montană region, and will serve as a catalyst for reviving the important mining sector, which is strategically important for the Romanian economy and an important part of rural development.

*

We strongly disagree with the view that the Roşia Montană Project (RMP) will lead to environmental destruction in the Roşia Montană area and the surrounding region. The environmental protection laws that are in effect all over the world, including in Romania, do not allow the destruction of the environment under any circumstances. The Roşia Montană Project will be conducted in full compliance with Romanian and European environmental and other laws and in accordance with international best practices. The RMP will bring best available techniques (BAT) to Romania, many of which are designed to minimize the impact of mining operations on the environment. Technical experts, representing several international private sector banks and export credit agencies have concluded that the Environmental

Impact Assessment Study Report (EIA) complies with the Equator Principles designed to promote responsible lending by financial institutions to projects which raise environmental and social concerns, and an ad hoc committee of European experts (International Group of Independent Experts - IGIE) has publicly stated that the EIA was well-developed, taking into consideration their recommendations and suggestions. A copy of the IGIE report and RMGC's response is included as a reference document to the present annex of the EIA.

Romanian law requires an environmental impact assessment study specifically to ensure that a project such as Roşia Montană will be assessed from an environmental perspective before being approved.

As detailed in the EIA study, RMGC will also undertake a significant plan of environmental rehabilitation at the site not only to mitigate the environmental effects of the current Project but to clean up the effects of past poor mining practices as well. There will be less pollution at the site after the mine closure process is complete than there is now.

Item no.

60

No. to identify
the
observations
received from
the public

Nr.
114557/
14.09.2006

Proposal

The questioner does not agree to the Roşia Montană project and addresses the following questions:
- Why was such public consultation regarding the mining and processing of this ore deposit not organized before granting the lease?
- I ask to be said nominally who precisely from authorities and when signed this concession and in what conditions?
- Why was a public debate not programmed also in Baia Mare, where the river Tisa was polluted by a similar case of cyanide utilization for gold extraction, with enormous damages for Romanian State which is still in dispute with Hungary which asks substantial compensations for polluting?

Solution

As regarding your claims, we mention that the public consultation method within the environment impact assessment procedure is provided by Order of the Minister of Waters and Environmental Protection no. 860/2002 on the environmental impact assessment and the issuance of environmental agreement procedures ("Order no. 860/2002").

Article 39 (1) of the Order no. 860/2002 provides that *"after performing the environment impact assessment and drafting the report on the environment impact assessment study, the relevant environmental protection authority and the project titleholder inform the public, [...], within at least 30 working days prior to the date of public debate meeting, on the following aspects: (i) the location and the date of the public debate, (ii) the location and the date when the report on the environment impact assessment study is available for consultation and (iii) the address of the public authority for the environment protection where the grounded proposals of the public regarding the report on the environment impact assessment study are submitted"*;

According to art. 41 of the Order no. 860/2002, the public debate meeting is held in the presence of the representatives of the relevant public authority for the environment protection, in the area where the project should be implemented and out of the working hours.

The practical method for organizing public debate meetings was provided by the Ministry of Environment and Waters Management, according to the capacities of the environmental protection authority in this field based on the provisions of the Order no. 860/2002 and the relevant environmental protection legislation.

In addition, please note that the Roşia Montană Gold Corporation (RMGC) has been engaging in a public consultation process since the beginning of its work, meeting with many stakeholders of all types, NGOs, and other interested parties.

*

The Ministry of Economy and Commerce (former Ministry of Industries) has initiated, in time, development strategies and programs for the mining areas in Romania and, together with the National Agency for Mineral Resources permitted the establishment of joint ventures between Romanian mining companies and foreign investors, for the redevelopment of certain mining operations.

As an example, we would like to mention the following provisions of:

- (i) Law no. 15/1990 regarding the re-organization of state-owned companies as autonomous companies and commercial companies, with its subsequent amendments and alterations;
- (ii) The national exploration program regarding the directions required for the development of exploration of mineral resources between 1994 and 1996, endorsed by the Governmental Decision no. 60/1994;
- (iii) The Action Plan of the 2000 Governmental Program established for 2001 – 2004 period,

- endorsed by the Governmental Decision no. 456/2000;
- (iv) Strategy of Mining Industry established for the 2004 – 2010 period, endorsed by the Governmental Decision no. 615/2004;
- (v) Strategy for accelerating the 2005 privatization and attracting investments process that was developed for the companies in the property of the Ministry of Economy and Commerce as well as several measures adopted for its application that were endorsed by the Governmental Decision no. 184/2005;
- (vi) Romania's Industrial Policies established for 2005 – 2008 period and the Action Plan developed for the implementation of Romania's Industrial Policy during 2005-2006, endorsed by the Governmental Decision no. 1172/2005;
- (vii) Strategy established for the reorganization, privatization and attraction of investments for the following state-owned companies from mining industry: mining operations of metalliferous ores (non-coal/other than coal mining operations): S.C. "Cupru Min" - S.A. Abrud, S.C. "Moldomin" - S.A. Moldova Nouă, Compania Națională a Cuprului, Aurului și Fierului "Minvest" - S.A. Deva, S.C. "Băița" - S.A. Ștei, Compania Națională a Metalelor Prețioase și Neferoase "Remin" - S.A. Baia Mare, S.C. "MINBUCOVINA" - S.A. Vatra Dornei, and their subsidiaries, endorsed by Governmental Decision no. 590/2006.

In this case, the Mining License for the Roșia Montană Perimeter no. 47/1999 (Roșia Montană License) has been issued based and pursuant to the procedures included in the former Mines Law no. 61/1998 valid at the time of issuance.

The Mining License for Roșia Montană was granted to Regia Autonomă a Cuprului Deva (currently, CNCAF Minvest Deva), as titleholder, and to S.C. Euro Gold Resources S.A. (currently, RMGC), as affiliate to the license. With respect to National Agency for Mineral Resources (NAMR) representation during the development of the procedure of leasing the mining activities that are now included in the scoping of the Roșia Montană License, this has been executed in full compliance with the law, art. 4(2) of Governmental Decision no. 368/1999 regarding the re-organization of the NAMR that was valid at that time and was stipulating: *“The president is heading the entire activity, is ensuring the fact that the duties of the National Agency for Mineral Resources are met and is representing the Agency in the relationships with the ministries and other specific central authorities, with the local public authorities, and with the legal and neutral persons”*

The Roșia Montană License has been endorsed by the Governmental Decision no. 458/10.06.1999 published in the Official Gazette of Romania Part I no. 285/21.06.1999. The transfer of Roșia Montană License from Minvest to RMGC has been performed pursuant to the provisions of the art. 14(1) of Mine Law no. 61/1998, being endorsed by the NAMR Order no. 310/9.10.2000 published in the Official Gazette of Romania Part I no. 504/13.10.2000, which stipulates within the art. 2 that *“Minvest SA will remain an affiliated company pursuant to the provisions of the license”*

*

While Romanian law calls for one public consultation meeting, in the case of the Roșia Montană Project, 14 meetings were held, with a focus on the lower Arieș and Mureș basin areas and adjacent communities.

Public consultation and information during the environmental impact assessment procedure, including the publication of the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Report documentation for consultation purposes, have been made in compliance with the provisions of (i) Articles 11 (2), 12 and 15 of Government Decision no. 918/2002 regarding the Environmental Impact Assessment Framework Procedure and the Approval of the List of Public or Private Projects Forming the Object of This Procedure (“Government Decision no. 918/2002”)[1], (ii) Chapter 3 regarding the public information and participation in the environmental impact assessment procedure of Order no. 860/2002 of the Minister of Waters and Environmental Protection Regarding the Environmental Impact Assessment and Environmental Permitting Procedure (“Order no. 860/2002”), and of the principles established by the Aarhus Convention on access to information, public participation in decision-making and access to justice in environmental matters[2], and also of the provisions of Directive 85/337/EEC on Environmental Impact Assessment of the Effects of Certain Public and Private Projects on the Environment.

S.C. Roșia Montană Gold Corporation S.A. (RMGC), together with the Ministry of Environment and Water Management, have mutually agreed upon the program and locations of the public consultations.

Order no. 860/2002 stipulates as follows:

"Article 27. - (1) Within 5 business days from the receipt of the environmental impact assessment report and, as applicable, of the safety report, the public authorities for environmental protection, in agreement with the project titleholder, shall establish and announce in the mass media the opportunities for public participation in the decision-making process related to the project.";

"Article 41. - The public debate meeting shall take place in the presence of the representatives of the competent authority for environmental protection, in the most convenient way for the public, on the territory where the project is intended to be implemented, and after the working hours."

When organizing the public debates meetings, RMGC, based on the consultation with the competent authorities, aimed at the best possible information of the public interested in this project, and when establishing the meeting locations, the company mainly took into consideration the settlements located inside the project impact area. Although Baia Mare is not included in the impact perimeter, the interested public from this area and from other locations could participate in any of the public debate meetings organized by the project titleholder.

References:

[1] Please note that Government Decision no. 918/2002 was abrogated by Government Decision no. 1213/2006 Regarding the Environmental Impact Assessment Framework Procedure for Certain Public and Private Projects, published in the *Official Gazette*, Part 1, no. 802 of 25/09/2006 ("Government Decision no. 1213/2006").

However, considering the provisions of Article 29 of Government Decision no. 1213/2006, stipulating that "The projects transmitted to a competent environmental protection authority for the issuance of the environmental permit and forming the object of the environmental impact assessment, prior to the coming into force hereof, shall be subject to the environmental impact assessment procedure in force at the time of application", please note that the provisions of Government Decision no. 918/2002 are still applicable to RMGC's project.

[2] The Aarhus Convention was ratified in Romania by Law no. 86/2000 for the Ratification of the Convention on Access to Information, Public Participation in Decision Making and Access to Justice in Environmental Matters, signed at Aarhus on June 25, 1998.

Item no.

61

No. to identify the observations received from the public

No.
114567/
14.09.2006

Proposal

The questioner thinks that the approval of this project by MEWM would be a mistake and proposes the adoption of a law in order to forbid the use of these substances;

Solution

As regarding your request, we mention that art. 44 (3) of the Minister of Waters and Environment Protection Order no. 860/2002 on the environment impact assessment and the issuance of environmental agreements Procedures ("Order no. 860/2002") provides that *"based on the results of the public debate, the relevant authority for the environmental protection evaluates the grounded proposals/comments of the public and requests the titleholder the supplementation of the report on the environmental impact assessment study with an appendix comprising solutions for the solving of the indicated issues"*.

Consequently, considering the fact that your proposal is just an allegation which does not indicate possible problems, nor provide additional information, we mention that the decision on the issuance or refusal of the environment approval cannot be made only by considering a simple proposal, but according to certain objective criteria provided by the wording of art. 45 of the Order no. 860/2002 and only after examining,

- (i) the report on the environmental impact assessment study;
- (ii) the conclusions of the parties involved in the assessment;
- (iii) the possibilities to implement the project;
- (iv) the titleholder answers to the grounded proposals/comments of the public.

Furthermore, without entering into the debate of the opportunity of such an initiative, we should underline that the Ministry of Environment and Waters Management, by the Wastes Management and Hazardous Chemical Substances Direction, has requested, in the decision of the technical analysis commission, during the framing stage, that this project *"must be in compliance with the provisions of the new CE Directive on the management of the wastes in the extractive industry"*. Or, the very preamble of the Directive no. 21/2006/EC on the management of the wastes resulting from the extractive industry provides the need to reduce the concentration of cyanide in the decantation ponds, due to its toxic and harmful effects, to the lowest degree possible, by using the best techniques. According to art. 13 paragraph 6 of the above mentioned Directive, there are established the maximum limits of the cyanide concentration allowed in the decantation ponds and their periodical reduction until 2018, but its use is not forbidden.

We also specify that this enactment has to be adopted in the national legislations of the member states, therefore in the Romanian legislation as well, until 2008. In conclusion, by its content, such a legislative initiative would come against art. 21 (1) of the Law no. 24/2002 on the norms of legislative techniques for the drafting of the laws, which provides that "the legislative solutions considered by the new regulation must take into account the applicable regulations of the European Union, ensuring the compliance with the latter".

Item no.

62

No. to identify
the
observations
received from
the public

No.
115998/
07.12.2006

Proposal

It is presented the declaration adopted by the Romanian Spirituality Congress on the 3th of December 2006 at Alba Iulia regarding the stopping of the project of exploration and exploitation of the gold and silver ore deposits

Solution

With respect to your comments, according to art. 44 (1) of the Order of the Minister of Waters and Environmental Protection no. 860/2002 regarding the environment impact assessment and the issuance of environmental agreement procedures (Order no. 860/2002) "*during the public debate meeting the project titleholder [...], provides grounded answers to the justified proposals of the public, which were received under a written form, previously to the respective hearing*";

At the same time, art. 44 (3) of Order no. 860/2002 provides that "*based on the results of the public debate, the relevant authority for the environmental protection evaluates the grounded proposals/comments of the public and requests to the titleholder the supplementation of the report on the environmental impact assessment study with an appendix comprising solutions for the solving of the indicated issues*".

Considering the legal wordings quoted above, as your allegation (i) does not identify nor indicate issues related to the project initiated by Rosia Montana Gold Corporation (RMGC) and undergoing the environment impact assessment procedure, (ii) refers to decisional capacities under the competence of certain public authorities, issues to which RMGC is not in the position to answer, we mention that the project titleholder cannot and does not have the capacity to provide an answer or make any comments in this respect.

Item no.	63
No. to identify the observations received from the public	No. 165302/ 12.09.2006
Proposal	<p>The questioner does not agree to the Roşia Montană project implementation formulating the following remarks and comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The report includes only partially the “Cultural Patrimony Management Plan regarding Historical Centre of the Roşia Montană locality”. <p>There are several stipulations we have to make considering the point of view expressed by the questioner with regard to the document prepared by SC OPUS – Atelier de Arhitectură Ltd.</p> <p>Pursuant to the scoping guidelines for the Report on Environmental Impact Assessment sent by the Ministry of Environment and Water Management (MEWA) under register number 8070/24.05.2005 (“Guidelines”) to S.C. Roşia Montană Gold Corporation S.A (RMGC), the project titleholder was asked to present a Management Plan for Historic Monuments and Protected Areas, as an annex to the Environmental Impact Assessment Study for the Roşia Montană Project.</p> <p>Taking these requirements into account, the project’s titleholder contracted this work to the National History Museum of Romania (NHMR), pursuant to the provisions of the Ordinance issued by the Ministry of Culture and Religious Affairs no. 2504/07.03.2001 certifying this institution as the coordinator of all heritage research and studies associated with the Roşia Montană Project.</p> <p>Through the professional services agreement concluded between RMGC and the National History Museum of Romania (NHMR), the latter being an expert consultant, and having Paul Damian, PhD, Deputy Scientific Director as its representative, the institution was committed “to prepare a specific documentation to be included in the Environmental Impact Assessment for Roşia Montană Project, Cultural Heritage section”. This specific documentation was to be prepared “in compliance with applicable Romanian, European and international standards for the environmental impact assessment studies”.</p>
Solution	<p>In its turn, NHMR subcontracted SC OPUS - Atelier de Arhitectură Ltd. for the development of “a documentation exclusively prepared for the Study Area of Roşia Montană Historic Centre”; to be precise only a section of the entire document requested by MEWM through the official letter regarding the assessment’s scoping guidelines. Within this framework, OPUS prepared the document called “The Historic Center of Roşia Montană - Cultural Heritage Management Plan. Draft I. A document for public disclosure”.</p> <p>We must emphasise the fact that the final version of the “Management Plan for the Protected Areas and Historic Monuments of Roşia Montană Area” underwent several phases of editing according to instructions formulated by the EIA certified team of experts, coordinated by Mrs. Marilena Pătraşcu, overall expert reviewer, in order to meet all legal requirements that were included in “Guidelines”.</p> <p>We note that the Environmental Impact Assessment Study for Roşia Montană mining Project was prepared by “natural and legal entities that were independent of the project’s [...] titleholder”, and “certified by environmental competent authority” [1]. “The liability regarding the accuracy of information disclosed to the environmental competent authorities and public lies with the project’s [...] titleholder”, and the liability regarding the accuracy of the Environmental Impact Assessment lies with its authors. [2]</p> <p>Chapters 1 (<i>Introduction</i>) and 9 (<i>Non Technical Summary</i>) include the list of all certified natural and legal entities who participated to the development of the Report on Environmental Impact Assessment Study. In order to express the gratitude for all their efforts, a list of uncertified natural and legal entities that have assisted the certified specialists, was been added to the respective list. The liability for the development of the Environmental Impact Assessment and for the accuracy of the interpretation of the information included in the report lies only with “highly competent certified natural and legal entities”</p>

and with “certified legal entities” [3], which have participated in the development of the Environmental Impact Assessment based on the agreement concluded with the titleholder, and not with the assistant (or sub-) consultants. **Therefore, the decision regarding the selection and use of information provided by the assistant consultants rests with the certified experts.**

Signing the Report on Environmental Impact Assessment Study (or its “chapters”) by certified experts is not a legal requirement [4].

For all necessary clarifications related to the detailed changes made to the content of the documentation prepared by SC OPUS - Atelier de Arhitectură Ltd., please find enclosed an annex that includes a comparison of the text submitted by OPUS through the official report no. 1007/09.05.2006 to the National History Museum of Romania, and the final published version of the Report on Environmental Impact Assessment, specifically volume 33 – Management Plan for the Protected Areas and Historic Monuments of Roşia Montană Area, which was submitted during the month of May 2006 to the Ministry of Environment and Water Management.

Reference:

[1] In compliance with the provisions of Governmental Emergency Ordinance no. 195 of December 22nd, 2005 on environmental protection, published in the Official Gazette of Romania, part I, no. 1,196 of December 30th, 2005 endorsed with all of its amendments by Law no. 265 of June 29th, 2006 which in its turn has been published in the Official Gazette of Romania no. 586 of June 6th, 2006, art. 21, letter (a).

[2]. Idem 2, art. 21, letter (d).

[3]. According to the 5th article from the Ministerial Ordinance issued by the Minister of Agriculture, Forestry, Waters, and Environment, no.97 of May 18th, 2004 with regard to the alteration and amendment of the Ordinance issued by the Minister of Agriculture, Forestry, Waters, and Environment no. 978/2003 on the Regulations governing the certification of natural and legal entities that prepare environmental impact assessment studies and environmental balances, published in the Official Gazette no. 504 of June 4th, 2004.

[4] The provision on the liability of the expert coordinator “**upon their signing**”, regarding the “quality of the studies and the reports submitted” mentioned within article 5 (2) of the Ordinance issued by the Minister of Agriculture, Forestry, Waters, and Environment, no. 978 of December 2nd, 2003 (published in the Official Gazette no. 3 of January 5th, 2004) **it has been removed** through the Ordinance issued by the Minister of Agriculture, Forestry, Waters, and Environment no. 97 of May 18th, 2004 (for the alteration and amendment of the Ordinance issued by the Minister of Agriculture, Forestry, Waters, and Environment no. 978/2003 regarding the Regulations governing the certification of natural and legal entities that prepare environmental impact assessment studies and environment balances, published in Official Gazette no. 504 of June 4th, 2004).

Item no.	64
No. to identify the observations received from the public	No. 120301/ 22.01.2007
Proposal	<p>The questioner addresses the MEWM the request not to grant the environment permit for Roşia Montană project.</p> <p>The Union's members expressed their concern, declaring that through this project implementation, Romania will suffer huge damages, the Roman galleries, forests, lakes, important flora and fauna species will be destroyed.</p> <p>The biggest danger could be that one generated by the cyanide evaporation from the tailings management facility.</p>
Solution	<p>As for the allegation that the project will destroy the Roman galleries at Roşia Montană, the truth is quite the opposite: Roşia Montană gold Corporation (RMGC) has financed – at a cost of US\$ 10 million to date – a program of rescue archaeology. As required by law, RMGC has contracted Romanian and international experts from diverse backgrounds to perform the archaeological, architectural, oral history, and ethnological investigations of the RMP – affected area as the first archaeological program of this scale in Romania in the last decade. Forty-one buildings in Roşia Montană are classified as historic monuments under Law 422/2001, including a Romanian Catholic Church and a Greek Catholic Church. The archaeological vestiges on Carpeni Hill, the Roman galleries from Piatra Corbului, the Roman funerary enclosure from Tăul Găuri and the Cătălina Gallery – were zoned as protected areas. According to the legal regulations, the Historical Centre Roşia Montană is classified as a protected area as well. All 41 historic structures will remain unaffected by the RMP mine plan.</p> <p>At Roşia Montană about 140 km of underground galleries have been surveyed. The underground archeological investigations have been performed by a team of French specialists, coordinated by Dr. Beatrice Cauuet, a well-known in Europe mining archaeologist. The scientific publishing started and will continue through the following years. The investigated underground networks are very important having almost 7 km of ancient mining works. Thus, the restoration operations will be extremely ample, very expensive, to which an important maintenance cost must be added on long term. For example, even if the connected mining networks from the central-southern part of Cărnic massif represents a beautiful ensemble, the same type of mining works exists in several points of this ensemble, so that a certain repetition within this mining area may be noticed. A large number from these types of works can be encountered within the sectors which will be protected, for example the Coş, Păru-Carpeni and Piatra Corbului areas, all having unique and representative elements which argue the scientific decision of <i>in situ</i> preservation. In this context, the integral restoration of such mining ensemble is not compulsory taking into account both the very high costs of such action and the costs which follow in the stage of maintenance and utilization as a cultural and tourism resource.</p> <p>In order to organize a museum <i>in situ</i> with preservation of some mining vestiges, the selection of remarkable areas with several types of mining works specific for the ancient mines from Roşia Montană is more indicated. In order to valorize the ancient mining works, a concentration of the existing technical and financial resources for the restoration of a more restricted sector may be taken into account. This sector must be situated with priority within an area near to the other historical monuments which follow to be emphasized, such as the historical centre of Roşia Montană commune. In this vision, the Cătălina Monuleşti ancient mining network situated in Coş massif seems to be the most suitable for such aim as compared to the large interconnected works crossed by modern mining works which are encountered in the southern versant of Cărnic massif. The Cătălina Monuleşti network does not include within its perimeter all types of mining works put into evidence in Cărnic, Orlea or Ţarina massifs, respectively inclined planes of access from surface, investigation galleries equipped with steps, mining chambers with pillars, spiral shafts and vertical works. In turn, a reconstitution program may be assured in order to construct underground copies of some representative mining structures, which have been investigated, are in a precarious state of preservation and do not allow a coherent and sustainable program for their including into a public visit circuit. In this way, the authenticity of the mining vestiges which follow to be</p>

put into evidence in Coș, Carpeni and Piatra Corbului sectors will be completed.

Finally, there are also other areas more restricted within the site, situated outside the impact perimeter of the mining project, such as the eastern versant of Cârnic – Piatra Corbului sector and Păru Carpeni sector which could be suitable for an arranging program having in regard the public access. In particular, in Piatra Corbului sector there are Roman mining works excavated by means of fire, extraordinary vestiges, impressive through their large dimensions. Their location in the close vicinity of the future open pit must be taken into account in order to provide measures of adequate protection.

As for the charges relating to bio-diversity, here are the facts:

- overall, approximately 1600 hectares (ha) are required for the RMP of which 205 (ha) are required for mining operations. Of the 205 ha required almost half (95 ha) has already been impacted by historical mining activities. Apart from the mining operations, the RMGC has designed the project to minimize tree cutting wherever possible. During the life of the mine a program of re-forestation will take place around the fragmented forest remnants to increase the extent of the forested areas. Corridors will also be planted joining these forested areas to promote biodiversity by creating links between the forested areas for the animals to move along. In addition, we have undertaken a progressive rehabilitation plan for the mine as areas required for the project are completed;

- during the baseline studies, no endangered or protected species of plants or species were found in the RMP area. The RMP has been designed to increase biodiversity of the area on long term, while the project will require land take of a relatively large area and will affect forests, lakes and local biodiversity in the short term. The improvements to water quality from the implementation of the project will significantly improve aquatic habitat conditions for flora and fauna species. The local streams will see a return of water life that is currently not sustainable in the existing polluted environment (damaged by past poor mining practices);

- the biodiversity management plan allows for the enhancement of the existing areas of biodiversity interest and for the creation of a biodiversity curtain around the mine site. It also allows for the re-establishment of biodiversity in the mine site area and on the waste dumps once the RMP's mining operations are complete;

- as for the impacts of cyanide (CN=), there is no possibility of cyanide evaporation from the tailings management facility ("TMF") to affect either RMGC employees or local residents. The industry has developed significant knowledge of HCN ("hydrocyanic acid cyanide") in the ambient air. Experts have reviewed the all areas of the project to determine HCN levels to ensure compliance with Romanian and EU law. Once released from the TMF, the CN is subject to certain chemical reactions at low pressure to form ammonia. The mathematical modeling of the HCN concentrations within the ambient air (if the HCN released in the air is not subject to chemical reactions) emphasized the highest concentrations being at ground level, within the industrial site, namely within the area of the TMF and within certain areas of the process plant could reach a maximum concentration of 382 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3/\text{h}$, which is 2.6 times lower than the limit value stipulated by the national legislation for labor protection. The HCN concentration within the ambient air from the populated areas close by the RMP would be a maximum of 4 to 80 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3/\text{h}$, while the limit stipulated by the national legislation for labor protection is 5,000 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3/\text{h}$ (Romanian and EU legislation on air quality does not stipulate limits for the population's health protection).
