Questions public hearing – Szeged –

KÉRDÉSEK ÉS ÉSZREVÉTELEK, AMELYEK A VERESPATAKON TERVEZETT BÁNYANYITÁSSAL KAPCSOLATBAN TARTOTT NYILVÁNOS FÓRUMON HANGZOTTAK EL

SZEGED, 2006. 08. 28.

Farkas István:
Köszönöm szépen a szót elnök úr. Én Farkas István vagyok a Magyar Természetvédők Szövetségétől, ügyvezető elnöke. Mielőtt feltenném a kérdésemet egy észrevételt szeretnék tenni az elemzést írt képviselőim és közmeghallgatást szervező intézmények felé. Kérem, hogy jegyzőkönyvezzék a hozzászólásomat. Diszkriminálva érzem magam, mert hogy nem áll rendelkezésemre a teljes hatásvizsgálati anyagnak a fordítása az anyanyelvemen. A román közvélemény számára az anyagok teljes mértékben rendelkezésre álltak. Míg a magyar közvélemény számára csak egy 24 oldalas kivonat volt elérhető. Ezzel véleményem szerint az Esspo-i egyezmény második cikkejében biztosított ... És most jön a kérdésem és véleményem. A Magyar Természetvédők Szövetsége 2002 óta vesz részt a verespataki bányanyitással kapcsolatos folyamatokban. Szakértőink részletesen megvizsgálták, a 24 oldalas anyagot és egy kb. 60 oldalas választ fognak készíteni és elküldeni a román kormány és a magyar kormány számára. Írásos kérelmünket be szeretnénk adni. Az a kérdésünk a román kormány képviselői számára, hogy mikor van a határideje az írásos véleményeknek a leadásának? Egy augusztus 30-i és szeptember 30-i határidő is köröződött.
Ezért szeretnénk megkérdezni, hogy mikorra tudjuk leadni a véleményünket. Összefoglalva a véleményünket az anyagról, elmondható, hogy a tervezett beruházás a hatásokat nem mutatja be szakmailag megfelelő módon és kellő objektivitással. Úgy találjuk, hogy a tanulmány tele van ellentmondásokkal. Pl.: egy helyen 161 millió tonna zagy tározásáról beszélnek, míg egy más helyen 214, 9 millió tonna zagy tározásáról van szó. Ugyancsak nem derül ki számunkra egyértelműen, a tározó völgyzárógát magassága. Egyszer 185 m, máshol 200 méter magasnak említik. Ezeket és más ellentmondásokat írásban és később akár szóban is kollegáim mélyebben kifejtik.
A ... Report kivételével a hatástanulmány többi részében nem találtuk meg a különböző fejezetek szerzőit, amely számunkra megkérdőjelezi a tanulmány korrekt és elfogulatlan, független voltát. Szeretnénk, hogy a RMGC fejtse ki, hogy az egyes fejezeteket, tehát a hatástanulmány egyes fejezeteit konkrétan, személy szerint ki készítette. Szerepelnek-e a szakértők a környezeti hatástanulmány végzésére alkalmas román, környezetvédelmi, minisztériumi listán? Mi tartunk attól, hogy olyan szakértők is részt vettek a munkában, akik az Aurul nagybányai létesítményeit biztonságosnak minősítették. S tudjuk milyen eredménnyel zárult az a kísérlet. Összegezve úgy találjuk, hogy a hatástanulmány nem teljesíti azokat a követelményeket, amelyeket egy ilyen léptékű beruházás környezeti hatástanulmányára vonatkoznak. Ezért kérjük a román kormányt, hogy ne adja meg a engedélyt a verespataki arany-, és ezüstbánya beruházásra.

Málovics György:
Jó napot kívánok! Köszönöm szépen a szót. Málovics György vagyok a Védegylet Egyesülettől. Először is csatlakoznék az előttem szólóhoz. Mégpedig abban, hogy nem érezzük magunkat, mi magyarországi, civil szervezetek kellően informálva, amely számunkra az egész eljárás, demokratikus mivoltát megkérdőjelezi és így a beruházó cég és magának a beruházásnak az őszinteségét is. Nekem a határon átnyúló hatásokhoz lenne egy kérdésem. A kockázatokról szóló fejezet 120. oldalán egy esetleges gátszakadás okozta folyószennyezés hatásait taglalják és ott azt írják, hogy mire ez a szennyeződés eléri a magyarországi szakaszt

addig a cianid aránya a felszíni vízben 0,03 mg/liter, illetve 1,3 mg/liter között lenne. Kérdéseim a következők lennének. Egyrészt nem látjuk alátámasztottnak az állítást, mert ennek alátámasztására pusztán egy táblázatot közölnek, amelyben néhány scenarió végeredményét írják fel. Azonban nagyon hiányos ez a táblázat. Az említett városoknál pl.: hiányoznak a folyamkilométerek, illetve a vizsgált folyószakaszokon a vállalkozás milyen vízhozammal számol. Valamint mi nem találjuk a táblázatban az eredményeket alátámasztó érdemi adatokat. A másik, hogy ezen adatok egy átlagosan 4-5 mg/liter kiömlési cianid koncentrációra vonatkoznak. Kérdésünk, hogy miért csak 4-5 mg/liter cianid koncentrációval számolnak. Mivel a nagybányai katasztrófánál anno nagyságrendekkel magasabb volt a cianid koncentráció, másrészt viszont az EU előírása is 10 mg/literre vonatkoznak. Ami pedig egy teljesen mást helyzetet teremt, tehát minimális elvárásunk lett volna a hatástanulmánnyal kapcsolatban, hogy egy ilyen scenariót is felvázoljanak számunkra.
Emellett a nagybányai ciánszennyezés tapasztalatai alapján azt mondhatjuk, hogy ott Lónyánál 13,5 mg/liter volt a ciánkoncentráció. 550 km-rel lejjebb – ugye itt arról beszélünk, hogy durván 500 km után ér a szennyezés Magyarországra – Tiszaszigetnél 1,49 mg/liter volt a cianidkoncentráció. Ez a határérték a felszíni vizekre vonatkozóan megszabott uniós határérték, amely 0,1 mg/liter 15-szöröse. Mi azt gondoljuk, hogy hasonló adatokkal lehetne itt is számolni. Valamint az 1,3 mg/liter, amit Önök a hatástanulmányban egy felső határértéknek állítanak be, még mindig 13-szor magasabb, mint az uniós határérték. Így mi nem gondoljuk azt, hogy nem lehet határon túli hatásokról beszélni. Ezekre a kérdésekre várnám a válaszokat. Köszönöm szépen!

Török Róbert:
Köszönöm szépen a lehetőséget, Török Róbert vagyok a Greepeac-től. Két rövid kérdéssel fordulnék John Astonhoz és szeretném megkérni arra, hogy 5 percen belül válaszoljon, ugyanis szeretnénk többen is kérdéseket feltenni. Szeretnénk, hogyha mindenki beleférne az időbe és arra azt is szeretnénk, hogy egzakt választ kapjunk a kérdéseinkre. Elsőként csatlakoznék ahhoz a véleményhez, mely szerint nem elégséges az az információmennyiség, amelyet a hatástanulmány magyarra fordított, magyar kivonata tartalmaz, hogy nem kapunk annyi információt, mint mondjuk a romániai állampolgárok. Két kérdésem közül az első. Milyen tapasztalatai vannak az RMGC-nek a ciántechnológiájú aranybányászattal kapcsolatban? Vannak-e egyáltalán talapsztalataik? Második kérdésem pedig, hogy a hatástanulmánynak melyik része elemzi a Körös-Maros Nemzeti Parkra gyakorolt potenciális hatásokat? Legalább az angol nyelvű változatban szeretném ezt elolvasni.

Sohn Kavanagh:
Az első kérdésem arra vonatkozik, hogy az a cég, aki elkészítette ezt a környezeti hatástanulmányt, ezt a céget a román kormány nem fogadta el. Jól tudom? A második kérdésem az egy régészeti jellegű kérdés. Úgy gondolom, hogy egy római kori bánya megérdemelné, hogy sokkal több régészeti szempontú kutatást is végezzenek és tanulmányt is végezzenek. Véleményem szerint ez sokkal több időt venne igénybe, mint amit az Önök cége szánt. A negyedik kérdés. Mint adófizető kérdezem, hogyha egy ökológiai katasztrófa bekövetkezne, akkor Önöknek milyen katasztrófaterve van erre az esetre? Mit tennének ebben az esetben? És Én, mint EU tagországban élő adófizető, miért fizetnék ezért? Mert én egy EU-s adófizető polgár vagyok. Ugyanehhez a kérdéshez kapcsolódik, hogy egy ilyen katasztrófa esetén Brüsszelben az EU-s illetékes hatóságokat, hogy értesítenék egy ilyen katasztrófáról? Pénzalapot képeztek-e az Európai Unióban erre az esetre? Az utolsó kérdésem egy jóval bonyolultabb kérdés. Úgy tűnik, hogy 10 temetkezési helyet mozdítottak el az eredeti helyről azért, hogy ezt a projektet megvalósíthassák. Remélem, hogy ezeknek a hozzátartozóknak a

családjait kárpótolták ezért, hogyha az őseiknek van egy pénzben kifejezhető ára. Köszönöm szépen!

Demény Szabolcs (Greenpeace aktivistája):
Üdvözlök mindenkit! Először is John Aston úrnak tennék föl egy véleményt. Hagyjuk az arányokat. Lásd az USA-ban történt gátszakadást. Szerintem erről felesleges beszélni. A második. Több tonna higany keletkezik az érc bányászása során. Ennek a higanynak a sorsa mi lesz? Mi történik vele? Következő kérdésem. Sorolják fel, hogy mely védett növény és állatfajok élnek a területen! Azok védelmében milyen intézkedéseket kívánnak tenni. Egy listát szeretnénk erről kapni. Tegnap jöttem haza Veresbányáról. Több ezer ember nyilvánította ki a véleményét a beruházás ellen. És végezetül kedves John Aston és a Gold Corporation. Nem ura vagyunk a Földnek, hanem a gyermekei.

Pálfi András (Greenpeace):
Szeretném kifejezni a nemtetszésemet az előttem szólókhoz hasonlóan. Rendkívül szerényen tájékoztattak minket az egész projekttel kapcsolatban. Mindössze 24 oldalas az általánosságok szintjén mozgó és kevés adatot tartalmazó tanulmányból csak magyar nyelven hozzáférhető. Lenne még két kérdésem. A zagytározó ciánszintjének fenntartása problémásnak bizonyul. Milyen kezelőberendezéseket létesítenek és ennek költségeire hol a fedezet? Mit kezdenek a meddő és zagykezelő létesítményekből kihordott, por okozta levegőszennyezéssel? A Meinvest bányászati tevékenysége során jelentős mértékben szennyeződött a levegő, amit a hatástanulmány 10-dik fejezete is elismer. Mit fognak másként tenni. Köszönöm.
Hasonlóan rövid választ kérnék.

Fidrich Róbert (Magyar Természetvédők Szövetségének programvezetője):
Jó napot kívánok! 2000. januári nagybányai ciánszennyezés óta foglalkozom cián és aranybánya és hasonló témákkal. A verespataki beruházásról meg kb. 4-5 éve, mióta erről az egész témáról értesültem. Akkor úgy volt, hogy a világbank fogja majd támogatni ezt a beruházást. Azóta a világbank úgy döntött, hogy nekik nem ér meg ennyit ez a beruházás. Úgyhogy ők nem támogatják. Én is szeretném az előttem levőkhöz hasonlóan elmondani, hogy szerintem is nagyon problémás az, hogy magyar nyelven nem hozzáférhető a teljes hatástanulmány. Ezt még számomra, saját magamnak is – aki azért úgy érzem, elég jól tudok angolul – de egy ilyen szakmai szöveget még annak is nagyon nehéz olvasni angol nyelven, aki 5-6 éve foglalkozik ezzel a témával, hátha még egy olyan lakos, aki nincs annyira otthon ebben a témában. Sokak számára például a TMF a zagytározónak a szép kis technikai nyelvezete egyszerűen újbeszéltnek tűnik. Nyugodtan lehetne mondani, hogy zagytározó. És ha ezt magyarul mondja az ember, sokkal jobban meg is érthető. Nagyon fontos az egésszel kapcsolatban, hogy ebből az 5 ezer oldalas anyagból lényegében semmi olyan érdemi információ nem derül ki, amely a környezeti és egészségügyi hatásokra vonatkozna. Nagyon bőbeszédű ez az anyag, pont a legfontosabb részek hiányoznak belőle. Akkor most konkrét megjegyzéseim és kérdéseim lennének. A 10-dik fejezeten a határokon átterjedő hatások 4.1-es szakaszában, amely a felszínhálózat szennyeződése, szivárgása TMF-ből, vagyis a zagytározóból című rész. Az olvasható, hogy a szarvaspataki gát, fordító...ból Szarvaspatakon hívják ott, lesz a zagytározó. Tehát a szarvaspataki gát sérülésével összefüggő nagytömegű zagyeleresztése következtében a szilárd bázisú zagy a szarvaspataki gáttól lefelé 0,8-1,6 km távolságra jut el. A kockázatokról szóló fejezetben szintén olvashatjuk ezt, hogy csak 1,6 km-re jut el egy esetleges gátsérülés esetén a zagy. Ennek az állításnak az alátámasztásának azonban nem közölnek semmi használható információt azon kívül, hogy egy állítólagos GMpelon modellt használtak ennek a végeredménynek az előállítására. Hiányoznak azonban a modellhez használt bemeneti adatok. A GMpelon modellre való

hivatkozás, hogy pontosan micsoda és milyen módon jutottak erre a végkövetkeztetésre. Vajon miért van az, hogy csak egy 60 m mély szakasz átszakadásával számoltak? Korábbi gátszakadások tapasztalatai azt mutatják, hogy akár egy teljes gát is át tud szakadni. Miért hiányoznak a gát teljes 185 m magas részének átszakadására vonatkozó modellek eredményei. Érdekes, hogy egy lehetséges gátszakadás esetén a tanulmány szerint a zagy nem jut el a gáttól mindössze 2 km-re elterülő, 13 ezer fős agrobánya határig, hanem az agrobányánál szépen megáll ez az egész. Itt fogná magát pár száz méterre az agrobányai város szélétől és nem menne tovább ez a zagy. Vajon miért? Talán azért, mert direkt így választották meg a modell alapadatait, hogy ez legyen az eredmény? Tényleg megáll a város határában egy valódi gátszakadás esetén a zagy? Korábbi gátszakadás példái azt mutatják, hogy a szarvaspataki völgyben tervezett 185 m magas gátnál jóval kisebb gátak átszakadásai is több halálos áldozatot követelnek. Néhány példát mondanék csak.
1972-ben Gyulafehérvártól nem messze levő Csertés település határában átszakadt egy rézbánya zagytározójának 30 méteres gátja, amelynek következtében a kiömlő iszap elöntötte a falut, 80 ember halálát okozva. Ezt tavaly a kolozsvári ENSZ konferencián mondta a román környezetvédelmi minisztérium képviselője. De sokkal nagyobb 1985-ben az észak-olaszországi Stava település határában levő fluoridbányánál is volt egy gátszakadás. Ott 50 méter magas volt a két gát együtt amely átszakadt. Mind a két gát átszakadt. 200 ezer köbméternyi iszap ömlött ki 90 km/h sebességgel felgyorsulva. 4,3 km hosszúságban a völgyben mindent beterített a zagy. Lerombolt 62 épületet és a baleset következtében 268 ember halt meg. 43,5 hektáron tett pusztítást. Ez a gát annakidején, tehát az észak-olaszországit úgy tervezték, hogy ez egy 9 m-s gát lesz, úgy adták be a környezeti engedélykérelmet. 69-ben már 25 m magas volt a gát a hetvenes években egy újabb 25m magas gátat építettek rá és ez az 50 m-es gát szakadt át és ez okozta 268 embernek a halálát. Ezek a gátak sokkal kisebb gátak voltak, mint a szarvaspataki, mint amit terveznek. Köszönöm szépen!

Jávor Benedek (Védegylet):
Köszönöm szépen! Elsősorban a létesítmény működése és bezárása kapcsán felmerülő költségekkel kapcsolatos anyagi garanciákra vonatkozóan szeretnék föltenni egy kérdést. Ahogy említette John Aston úr a bevett európai gyakorlat és ezt a jogszabályok is előírják, azt tartalmazzák, hogy az ilyen jellegű veszélyes beruházások esetén a cégnek az engedélyezési eljárás előtt, az engedély kiadása előtt megfelelő pénzügyi garanciákat kell bemutatnia annak érdekében, hogy rendelkezésre álljanak azok a források, amelyek az esetleges csőd, a cég megszűnése vagy más esemény kapcsán fedezik a bányabezárás kapcsán a bányarekultiváció költségeit. A környezeti hatástanulmányban nem szerepel semmiféle konkrétum arra vonatkozóan, hogy ez a letét milyen formában, hol, milyen összegben kerül letételre. A bánya bezárására vonatkozó becslések a hatástanulmányban mintegy 70 millió dollárra vannak becsülve. Független szakértői tanulmányok azt mutatják, hogy ez egy látványosan alulbecsült adat. A bánya technikai bezárásának a költségei a nemzetközi tapasztalatok alapján 200 és 900 millió dollár közé becsülhetők, amelyben még nincsenek benne a környezeti rehabilitáció költségei. Ez pusztán a technikai bezárás, a földborítás létrehozása, a bányarekultiváció létrehozása. A hatástanulmányban szerepelő összeget alulbecsültnek tartjuk, de még erre vonatkozóan sincs semmi konkrétum a hatástanulmányban. Hogy pontosan milyen formában, hogyan, milyen bankszámlán, milyen biztosítékok mellett kerül ez letétre. Erre vonatkozóan szeretnénk egyértelmű megállapításokat kapni az engedélyezési eljárás során. Ugyanígy semmiféle konkrétum nem olvasható a hatástanulmányban arra vonatkozóan, hogy milyen biztosítási konstrukciókat tervez a RMGC arra vonatkozóan, hogy egy esetleges környezeti katasztrófa esetén ennek az elhárításnak a költségei ne a magyar és a román adófizetőket terheljék, hanem egy ilyen teljes körű pénzügyi garanciát nyújtó, biztosítással rendelkezzen a

cég. Erre vonatkozóan semmilyen, egy félmondatú megjegyzést sem találtunk a hatástanulmányban. Nagyon kíváncsiak vagyunk, hogy milyen árajánlatokat kértek, milyen modelleket végeztek az RMGC-nél vagy hatástanulmány készítői. Arra vonatkozóan, hogy lehetséges-e, hogy a biztosítási piacon ilyen biztosításra sor kerül annak érdekében, hogy az esetleges bekövetkező baleset vagy a bányabezárása után fellépő, előre nem kalkulált környezeti hatásoknak az elhárításának a költségei azok ne a román és a magyar adófizetőket terheljék, hanem erre a beruházó cég forrásai nyújtsanak fedezetet. Köszönöm!

Dönsz Teodóra (Magyar Természetvédők Szövetsége):
Mielőtt a kérdéseimet föltenném, azelőtt szeretnék 3 rövid észrevételt tenni. Egyrészt Én is aggályosnak tartom azt, ahogy az előttem szólók többen jelezték már, hogy a környezeti hatásvizsgálati dokumentációknak mindössze egy 24 oldalas kivonata volt elérhető magyar nyelven, tehát nem volt ugyanolyan esélyünk részt venni a hatásvizsgálati folyamatban, mint a romániai közvéleménynek. Másrészt akár magyarul, akár angolul rendelkezésre álló információk is számos helyen hiányosak. Egészségügyi hatásokra vonatkozólag, társadalmi, környezeti vonatkozásokra való tekintettel ezek megakadályoznak minket abban, hogy reálisan föl tudjuk mérni a felajánlott kompromisszumot és mérlegelni tudjuk. Harmadrészt pedig, szeretném megkérni John Aston urat, hogy használja a mikrofont és ne beszéljen mellé. Az előző kérdésre adott válaszával kapcsolatban szeretném megkérdezni, hogy hogyan viszonyul méretében a spanyolországi bányaprojekt és a Verespatakra tervezett bánya. Továbbá szeretném megkérdezni, hogy mire alapozzák a kockázatokról szóló 7. fejezet 17. oldalán található azon állítást, amely szerint:
Zagytározó gátak átszakadásai közül, amelyeknek a környezeti hatással járó balesetek 75 %-át teszik ki, mindössze kevesebb mint egyharmadukhoz köthető cianid jelenléte. Ugyanis a 18. oldalon közzétett 7.4-es táblázatban, amely az aranybányáknál 1975-2005 között bekövetkezett nagyobb baleseteket sorolja fel, a felsorolt 15 balesetből 9 esetében jelzik a cianid jelenlétét. Akárhogy is számolok ez nem egyharmad, hanem több. Vagy! Ez az állítás a nem aranybányákhoz köthető balesteket is figyelembe veszi? Ahol tényleg nem is jöhet szóba cianid jelenléte. És még egy kérdés! Mi alapján állítják, a kockázatokról szóló, már említett 7. fejezet 17. oldalán, hogy ciánszennyezések még nem okoztak halált? Ezzel a kérdéssel kapcsolatban talán a szerzők által is szelektív listaként definiált 7.4-es táblázat alapján állapítják ezt meg? Hogyha igen, akkor mi ennek a táblázatnak a forrása? Miért pont ezeket a baleseteket szerepeltetik a táblázatban? Csakhogy néhány példát mondjak, ahol cianid okozta halálesetekről beszélhetünk. Az egyik az 1998-as kirgizisztáni, kurgori baleset, ahol a táblázatban 0 haláleset szerepel, még a helyi lapok szerint 2 ember halt meg a baleset következtében és még az orosz védelmi minisztérium is elismer 1 halálos áldozatot. A 2000. évi nagybányai ciánszennyezés következtében többek között 1240 tonna hal pusztult el. A halak és más élőlények halála nem számít? Kérdezem?
2003. januárjában Nikaraguában egy kanadai cég bonanzai bányájában történt ciánszennyezés. Ez elszennyezte a Banabana folyót. A helyi bennszülött közösségek egészségügyi dolgozóinak jelentése szerint 12 ember halt meg. Akik feltehetően ittak a szennyezett folyó vizéből. Illetve 2004. júniusában a Peking egyik elővárosában az aranybányából kiszivárgott hidrogéncianid-gáz 3 ember halálát okozta és további 15 embert kellett kórházba szállítani. Tehát ezek alapján megismétlem a kérdésemet, hogy mi alapján állítják azt a hetedik fejezetben, hogy ciánszennyezések még nem okoztak halált? Köszönöm szépen!

Ferenc Tibor (Greenpeace):
Jó napot kívánok! Azt szeretném megkérdezni, hogy mit akarnak kezdeni azzal a problémával, hogy a tervezett zagytározó területén vannak olyan földek, többek között

magyar társtulajdonosok kezében is, amelyekkel kapcsolatban az esély arra, hogy eladják Önöknek 1 a 100 millióhoz.

Szentistványi István (Védegylet Egyesület):
Jó napot kívánok! Először is csatlakoznék én is ahhoz a hiányérzetünkhöz, amit a magyar anyagnak szűkössége jelentett. Így az egész véleményezési eljárás magyarországi közmeghallgatások előtt jelentősen megnehezült ez által, hogy magyar nyelven csak ezt az egy fejezetet, illetve most utólag látjuk ezt a kis összefoglalót a teljes szövegről. Ez szerintük az Esspo-i egyezmény második cikkejével valamelyest ellenkezik ez az eljárási mód. Az eredeti kérdésemnek a második fele nem került még szóba, úgyhogy inkább ezzel kapcsolatban szeretnék feltenni egy kérdést. Méghozzá tudomásunk van róla, hogy annak idején az RMGC a MININVEST és a román kormány által megkötött szerződések, engedélyek és különböző megállapodások egy része titkossá lett minősítve illetve nem került a nyilvánosság elé, azok közül melyeket a helyi civil egyesület (Bornusmajor) többször is írásban is megkért. Ezt mi úgy értékeljük, hogy az Arhausi Egyezménnyel illetve azzal az EU direktívával a környezeti hatásvizsgálatra vonatkozó EU direktívával is ellentétes és szeretnénk erre vonatkozóan információt kérni. Egyrészt milyen típusú és jellegű kérdések nem lettek a nyilvánosság számára hozzáférhetőek? Illetőleg van-e erre esély vagy remény, hogy ezeket ezen egyezmény illetőleg, direktíva szellemében vagy keretében megismerhessük vagy megismerhessék az érintettek? Köszönöm szépen!

Lezsák Sándor képviselő úr:
Köszönöm szépen a szólás lehetőségét. Az elhangzott jogos kérdések, észrevételek meggyőztek engem és a válaszok is, hogy kezdeményezzük ennek a közmeghallgatásnak a megismétlését. Ugyanis valóban hiányosak az ismereteim. Önöknek kötelességük közzétenni magyar nyelven a teljes dokumentációs anyagot. De kérdésekkel készültem én is. Az egyik. Románia aláírta azt az egyezményt, amelye a cianidos bányászati, technológiai eljárásokat részben korlátozza, illetve tiltja. Felülvizsgálták-e az álláspontjukat a román parlament elé kerül-e a közeljövőben olyan parlamenti döntésre határozati javaslat, amely ezt az egyezményt megszűnteti, illetve semmissé teszi. Ez az egyik kérdésem. A másik. A spanyolországi és az itt felsorolt példákkal kapcsolatban tudomásunk van-e arról, hogy készül az Európai Unióban egy olyan határozattervezet, amely az Európai Unió területén tiltani fogja a cianidos bányászati technológiát, bányászati eljárásokat. Illetve felülvizsgálták-e azt, hogy Románia területén több mint húsz olyan bánya üzemel, amely cianidos bányászati technológiával dolgozik. Román környezetvédő barátainktól tudom, hogy nagyon nehezen jutnak hozzá információkhoz, ismeretekhez és bizony a tiltakozás az erősen meddő. További kérdésem az az, hogy tudatában vannak-e Önök, beruházók, tervezők büntetőjogi felelősségüknek. Egy olyan szerencsétlenség esetén, amely megtörtént Nagybányán. Én a Tisza mellett élek, Tisza menti képviselő vagyok és 2000 februárjától élem meg ennek a drámának a következményeit. Az ott élők ma is háborúban gondolnak arra, hogy a román és a magyar állam közötti terv tárgya az a közel 30 milliárdos kártétel azt tulajdonképpen a jogutód, a megszűnt AURUL tulajdonos nem akarja elismerni. Illetve arra hivatkozik, amit ő is itt megfogalmazott. Román tudós szakemberek is egyszerűen nevetségesnek tartanak. És itt kérdezem azt, hogy mennyiben lényeges Önöknek a tudomány álláspontja. Itt az elnök úr utalt arra a bevezetőben, hogy ez szakmai fórum és nem politikai fórum. Ezzel teljesen egyetértek. Nem a politikának kell dönteni, hanem a tudománynak, a szakmának kell dönteni ezekben a kérdésekben. Azt mondja a főnön, hogy egy olyan gát épül, egy a nem tudom én mennyihez esély van arra, hogy egyáltalán valamilyen szerencsétlenség történjen. A Román Tudományos Akadémiának más az álláspontja. Ismereteink szerint ez a terület földrengésveszélyes terület. Ezt a Román Tudományos Akadémiától érkezett és az Önök nyilvánossága elé tárt adatok

bizonyítják. A Magyar Tudományos Akadémia elnöke Vizy E. Szilveszter levelet írt a Román Tudományos Akadémia elnökének. Ő a válaszában ugyancsak jelezte, hogy bizony erős fenntartásaik vannak a tervezett beruházással kapcsolatban. Azok a vizsgálatok, azok a munkabizottságok jelentései egyáltalán nem szerepelnek az eddig megismert dokumentációs anyagban. Nincs bizalom közöttünk Nagybánya óta és ne is kívánják, hogy legyen bizalom amíg tulajdonképpen ilyen bizonytalan következtetéseket hallunk. 180 m magas gát. Nekem mindig az jut eszembe, amit II. János Pál pápa mondott:

- A kommunizmus bukása még nem igazolás a kapitalizmus gátlástalanságaira.

Paulovics Péter (CSEMETE Egyesület):

Jó estét kívánok! Nagyon sajnálom, hogy nem tudtam korábban erről a 70 oldalas fordításról, magyar nyelvű anyagról, összefoglalóról, akkor én is azt tekintettem volna át. Így mivel a határon áterjedő hatásokra vonatkozó fejezet az magyarul is megvolt. Én azt néztem meg és szeretném ezen keresztül egyrészt megvilágítani azt, hogy mennyiben látom ezt a környezeti hatásvizsgálatot felületesnek. Egy részt emelnék ki belőle.

Idézem: „A vízfolyást megközelítő hosszúsága a Maros (Mures) vízgyűjtő területén, a tervezett bánya helyétől Románia határáig számítva kb. 500 km. Miután elhagyja Románia területét a Maros kb. 20 km – a fordító hozzáteszi 40 km – megtétele után torkollik Szegednél a Tiszába, mielőtt az átfolyik Szerbiába, majd a Tisza (eredetileg a szöveg Belgrádot jelöli meg) Titelnél beleömlik a Dunába. Hát ez így több sebből vérzik ez a szöveg. Én úgy gondolom, hogyha a fejezetnek az a címe, hogy a „Felszíni vízhálózat szennyezése: a helyszín jellemzése" és már kitérnek erre a dologra, akkor ezt illenék – mert én egy egészen kis utánajárással, illetve fejből tudom, hogy 50,3 km a hazai szakasz, ebből 21 km a közös határvíz – tudni az Aranyos folyó torkolata 467 folyókilométerre van a szegedi Maros torkolattól. Tehát magyarul vannak ezek az adatok. Ezt csak azért emelem ki, mert szerintem rávilágít arra, hogy az a része a hatástanulmánynak amihez én nem férhettem hozzá magyar nyelven, az is milyen alapossággal készülhetett el. Arról nem is beszélve, hogy egy 17 km-es magyarországi Tisza-szakasz is érintett ez a szennyeződés, ami itt ugye nem említődik meg és hogy Titelnél van a Tisza-torkolat. A másik dolog amire kitérnék, ez közben merült fel. Ugye hallottunk egy olyan szakértői véleményt, hogy nincs igazán természetvédelmi érték, egyáltalán természeti érték a területen. Tartok a kezemben egy tanulmányt John Ecroyd és Andrew Johns tollából. 2006 július elején jártak, mindössze két napot Verespatak közvetlen környékén. Botanikusok az urak. Több, egészen pontosan 8 fajgazdag növénytársulást tapasztaltak ezen a két napon. 8 orchidea fajt figyeltek meg. Ebből 6 vöröslistás. Sokminden értéket. Növénytársulások amik leírják. Nem tudom, hogy a szakértő úr ismeri-e ezt az anyagot, vagy hogy milyen időszakban járt. Én valahonnan úgy értesültem, hogy egy egész rövid időszakot is 1998-ban töltöttek az élővilág felmérésével. Lehet, hogy azt ki lehetne terjeszteni. Az az érzésem, hogy ami Romániában nem számít igazándiból nagy értéknek, hiszen nagy területen előfordul az még Európának nagyon sok területén szigorúan védett területté lenne nyilvánítva, ha még ott lenne.

Ez a terület valójában sokkal értékesebb annál, mintsem ahogy az EAI fogalmaz, egy ember által erős hatásnak kitett területről van szó, amely egyrészt a mezőgazdasági, másrészt a történelmi, ipari hatások miatt valójában degradált. Azért nem erről van szó egészen. Ezt sokkal alaposabban körbe kéne járni ezt a kérdést, hiszen gyakorlatilag eltűnteti a beruházás a felszínt. Köszönöm szépen!

Dr. Tóth Imre (Geoenviron):

Jó estét kívánok! Földrajz tanár voltam, tehát nyugdíjas földrajz tanár. Ilyen értelemben nem elsősorban a biológiával foglalkoznék. Egyesületünk a Geoenviron éjszaka érkezett vissza a Keleti-Kárpátokból. A Tisza forrásaitól a torkolatig foglalkozunk, ez a munkaterületünk. Így a

Maros is természetesen hozzánk tartozik. Néhány évvel ezelőtt nem kívánatos személynek nyilváníttattunk, ugyanis egyesületünk a Maros forrásának újraértékelését mi végeztük el. Csak 500 m-rel van magasabban a Maros. Ezt a román kollegáknak mondom. Sajnos ezt még nem nagyon láttam leírva román anyagokban. De ezt mi már valljuk és tudjuk, hogy így van. Egy kérdésem van mindössze. Én úgy hiszem, hogy gyorsan tudnak majd rá válaszolni. Lélektanilag felkészült-e már a beruházó arra, hogy az általam remélhetőleg bölcs, román vezetők azt fogják mondani, hogy nem. Ebben az esetben én azt javasolnám, hogy a beruházó jó lenne, ha a Kárpát-medencén kívül keresné meg a következő projektnek a területét.

Varga Tímea (Védegylet):
Üdvözlöm az urakat! A 10. fejezet Határokon átterjedő hatások 4.2-s részéhez szeretnék egy kérdést feltenni. A szállításhoz a működési szakaszon belül a Cianidszállítás c. részéhez. Ebben a részben azt írják, hogy végleges útvonala a cianidszállításnak még nincs kijelölve. Ezzel ellentétben a hetes, kockázatokról szóló fejezet 131-133 oldalán azt elemzi, hogy DEGUSSZA nevezetű céggel szállítatják majd a cianidot. Az a kérdésem, hogy melyik változat igaz ebben az esetben. Illetve a szállítással kapcsolatos kockázatokról szeretnék még egy kérdést feltenni. Itt szó van vasúti, közúti illetve tengeri szállításról. Ezeknek a kockázatait miért nem elemzik pontosabban. Magyarországot érintve a magyar tranzitszállításra vonatkozó pontos kockázatbecslések miért nincsenek meg? Melyek tartalmazzák a magyar vasúti balesetek statisztikáit, a tervezet útvonal kritikus pontjainak megnevezését? Milyen terv van egy esetleges szállítási baleset következményeinek felszámolására?

Egri Sándor (Kárpátok-Tisza Nemzetközi Fejlesztési Fórum):
Köszönöm szépen a lehetőséget! Mindenekelőtt engedjék meg, hogy nagy tisztelettel köszöntsem Kocsis Tibor filmrendezőt az Új Eldorádó c. film rendezőjét. Stílusosan a kép baloldalán, a kamera mögött helyezkedik el. Kocsi Tibor és filmjét a tavalyi nemzetközi tudományos filmszemlén a mi mozgalmunk a filmszemle különdíjával tüntette ki a természet, a táj és az ember maradandóságának megőrzéséért. Engedjék meg, hogy felhívjam figyelmüket és szintén köszöntsem Juhász Attilát, a vajdasági Zenta polgármesterét. Most nem látom, a megnyitón még itt volt, valószínűleg időközben már el kellett, hogy menjen. Ez a külön köszöntés nem csak azért jár nekik, mert alapítója a Kárpátok-Tisza Nemzetközi Fejlesztési Fórumnak, hanem azért is, mert felhívja a figyelmet a Szerbia felelősségére.
Semmi kétségünk a tekintetben, hogy mi a tét az Önök számára. Önök számára a tét, 330 tonna arany 1600 tonna ezüst. Ez Európa ma ismert legnagyobb nemesfémkincse. A világ második legnagyobb nemesfémkincse. Ezt Önök gyorsan a befektetők és a saját hasznukra meg akarják szerezni. Hogyha nem vigyázunk, akkor ennek következményei lesznek. Ledarálnak 400 millió tonna kőzetet, 1600 hektáron tönkreteszik a környezetet. Ez a terület a felszíni bányát és a zagytározó területét foglalja magába. Ön említett az egyik válaszában egy olyan kitételt, egy olyan kérdésre tért ki, hogy mi lesz azokkal a tulajdonosoknak a területeivel, akik semmiképpen nem adják el Önöknek. Ön azt említette, hogy akkor gátakkal fogják körbevenni, de ezen az 1600 hektáron nem egy, nem két tulajdonos, hanem sokszáz tulajdonos kicsi területe helyezkedik el elszórtan.
Mi az Ön véleménye a magántulajdon szentségéről? Mi lesz ezeknek a fölterületeknek a sorsa, amelytől semmiféleképpen nem válnak meg tulajdonosaik? Nagy megtiszteltetés számunkra, hogy felhívta a figyelmet a Nagybányáról kiindult cianid és egyéb nehézfémszennyeződések következményére. Azt említette, hogy nem találkozott olyan szakemberrel, aki a nehézfémszennyeződések következményeivel foglalkozna. Engedje meg, hogy felhívjam a figyelmet a Kárpátok-Tisza Nemzetközi Fejlesztési Fórum vezetőségi tagjára dr. Nagy Sándor Alexre a debreceni egyetem tanszékvezetőjére, aki munkatársaival

együtt vizsgálta a Tisza és mellékfolyói mentén az árterületen, kubikgödrökben és a holtágakban visszamaradt halakban a nehézfémeknek a jelenlétét. Sajnos Önnek van igaza. Kimutatták. Természetesen ez nem káros még az egészségre, de a következmény megvan. Ettől nem óv meg bennünket az Önök technológiája sem. Bizonyára az idő rövidsége miatt nem volt módja ismertetni, amikor a nagybányai cianidos tározóval vetítette vagy mérte össze a verespataki derítőnek a méretét. Elfelejtette elmondani, hogy a Verespatakon épülő vagy tervezett derítő alapterülete százszorosa annak a nagybányai zagytározó területének, amelyből 2000. január utolsó napján a szennyeződés kiindult.

Azaz Verespatakon ebből az 1600 hektárból 600-800 hektár a tározó területe. Térfogata pedig ezerszer nagyobb a nagybányai tározó térfogatának. A bevezetőben említették, hogy valószínűleg a mi számunkra a legnagyobb problémát a 183 m magas gát és ennek statikai és egyéb tulajdonságai okozzák. Engedje meg, hogy ezt a tévedését eloszlassam most. Mi nekünk nincsen problémánk önökkel, mert önök kitűnő szakemberek, nagyszerű mérnökök nagyon jól tudnak építeni kőből, cementből, betonból. Valószínűleg a világ minden pontján tudnak bányászni. Minekünk egyedül a cianidos technológiával van problémánk. Ezt mi azért nézzük más szemszögből, mert mi átéltük 2000. februárjában, amikor 1240 tonna halat pusztított el a nagybányáról kiszabadult cianid. Semmilyen garanciát nem látunk arra, hogy amíg Európában cianidos technológiát ilyen mértékben, mint amit önök Verespatakon terveznek, alkalmaznak, addig életben maradnak folyóink, életben marad folyóink élővilága. Verespatak környékén 9 települést ítéltek önök pusztulásra. Teljes pusztulásra ítélték Szarvaspatakot. Mi lesz a több, mint 100 millió tonna zaggyal, ami az önök tevékenységét követően a helyszínen marad? Ezt itt fogják hagyni nekünk. Önök és az önök befektetői rövid úton meggazdagodnak vagy úgy érzik, hogy pénzükhöz jutnak. Mi pedig, akik a Tisza mentén élünk a Maros völgyében élünk teljesen lehetetlen helyzetbe kerülünk. Mert folyamatos veszélyként leselkedik ránk ez a többszáz millió tonna zagy. Az Aranyoson, a Maroson, a Tiszán, a Dunán, a Fekete-tengeren. Nem szólt ön a jövő nagy kihívásáról, amely nem más, mint a stratégiai vízkészletek megőrzése. Ennek az évszázadnak a legnagyobb kérdése nem az üzemanyag megoldása lesz, hanem a stratégiai ivóvízkészlet válik ha úgy tetszik hadászati cikké. Ebből egyenlőre mi Magyarországon, mi nagy hatalomnak számítunk. Ezt a pillanatnyilag áldásos állapotot a legkomolyabban veszélyezteti Verespatakra tervezett beruházás. Szeretném megkérdezni, hogy az 5000 oldalas hatástanulmánynak a biodiverzitásról szóló fejezetét jegyző STAMTEC cégnek hol van a székhelye? Megtud-e nevezni két-három szakembert, aki a biodiverzitásról szóló fejezetet írta? Ezt annak tudatában kell megkérdeznem, mert az állatokra vonatkozó rész a madarakkal kezdődik. A madarak pedig többnyire rovarokkal táplálkoznak. Hogyha nem vizsgálnak valamit – ezek szerint nem vizsgálták a lepkéket, nem vizsgálták a rovarokat, hogy milyen élőlényeket kell megvédeni azon a helyszínen –, akkor természetesen nyugodtan kijelentheti a hatástanulmány és kijelenthetik önök, hogy nincs a területen védelemre méltó állat vagy növényfaj. Engedje meg, hogy a technikai kérdéseken túl néhány emberi kérdéssel is foglalkozzak. Mi lesz azokkal a templomokkal, amelyeknek egyházi közösségei nem járulnak hozzá templomaik elköltöztetéseihez. Mi lesz a temetőkkel? Nem tudom, hogy ismeri-e, hogy a nagybányai Bányaipai Kutató Intézet elkezdte vizsgálni a nem cianidos technológia alkalmazásának lehetőségét az arany feltárásában. Hajlandó-e az önök cége támogatni a nagybányai ezirányú kutatásokat. Szeretném megkérdezni, hol jegyezték be az önök cégét, az RMGC-t? Hol van a székhelye? Igaz vagy nem igaz, hogy Barbadoson van bejegyezve az Önök cége? A székhelye Kanadában egy kétszobás lakásnak a címe? A tulajdonviszonyokat tekintve az RMGC 80 %-os tulajdonosa a Gabriel nevű cég, annak hol a székhelye, hol van bejegyezve? A Gabrielnek a főrészvényese a New Mount nevű cég, amely aranybányászattal foglalkozik szerte a nagyvilágban. Milyen indokkal jelentett csődöt Üzbegisztánban?

Tisztában vannak-e az önök kanadai befektetőik, hogy mire adták a pénzüket? Tisztában vannak-e az ember okozta természeti katasztrófa veszélyeivel, a humánkatasztrófa veszélyeivel? Az 1600 hektáros környezetpusztítással? A falurombolással? Hallottak-e a kanadai befektetők a 2000-ben a Szamoson, a Tiszán levonult cianid és nehézfémszennyeződés következményeiről? Tisztában vannak-e a kanadai befektetők azzal, hogy a nagybányáról kiindult katasztrófa előidézője az ausztrál-román AURUL TRANS GOLD öncsődöt jelentett? Így senki nem fogja megfizetni a magyar állam 29 milliárd forintos kártérítési követelését.

Mátyás Mónika (környezetmérnök):
Engem kifejezetten a hatástanulmány érdekel. Ehhez lenne két szakmai kérdésem. Az egyik. Úgy tudom, hogy az ilyen kaliberű és ilyen típusú beruházások jogszabályi kötelezettség, hogy kijelöljenek egy környezeti felelőst, aki majd a monitoring projektben környezetvédelmi dolgokat fogja ellenőrizni. A hatástanulmány 16. kötetében van is erre egy nagyon-nagyon rövid utalás. Viszont ugyanebben a szövegben nem találtam meg a jogszabályi hivatkozást. Azt szeretném kérdezni, hogy mi a jogi garancia arra, ismerik-e azt a jogszabály, hogyan gondolják, hogyan tervezik? Lesz-e ilyen felelős, aki a környezetvédelmi monitoringot fogja figyelemmel követni. A másik kérdésem pedig a vízvédelmi monitoringra vonatkozik. Ugyanebben a tanulmányban találtam egy utalást arra, hogy van egy külön dokumentum arra, amely a vízvédelmi mintavételi pontokat tartalmazza. Viszont nem adták meg ebben a tanulmányban a nevét, azt hogy mely dokumentum tartalmazza, hogy hol lesznek ezek a mintavételi pontok. Igazából erről nem kaptam információt hol elérhető ez.

Szalay Tímea (Csalán Egyesület):
Elsőként szeretném felhívni a figyelmet, hogy nagyon hálásak lettünk volna, hogy Magyarországon egy magyarországi közmeghallgatáson a fóliákon esetleg magyar. Alapvetően két kérdésre szeretnék kitérni. Az egyik, hogy milyen felmérésekre alapozzák azt a megállapítást, hogy fenntartható. A közösségi terv ötödik fejezetének 43. oldalon lévő állításban az szerepel, hogy Verespatak nem alkalmas mezőgazdasági tevékenység folytatására illetve kertészkedésre, holott a biodiverzitás állapotfelmérésben pontosan az szerepel, hogy a mezőgazdaság tette tönkre úgymond a biológiai sokféleséget. Ez némileg ellentmondó megállapítás, úgy gondolom. Emellett jártunk Verespatakon és láttuk, hogy a szénafesztivál keretében a lakosságnak komoly bevételt jelent az, hogy eltudják adni az ott megtermelt mezőgazdasági javakat. Ehhez még hozzá tenném, hogy esetleg a statisztikai adatokban ennek a bevételnek a hiánya lehet, hogy pontosan a monoindusztriális övezetnek köszönhető, amelyet az RMGC alakított ki Verespatak környékén és lehet, hogy a háztáji mezőgazdasági tevékenységeket igazából soha nem kutatták megfelelően. A másik, amelyet még megjegyeznék. Itt folyamatosan arról van szó, hogy milyen valószínűtlen az, hogy átszakad az a gát, mégis átszakadt már az a gát. Én azt szeretném megkérdezni, hogy valóban avval számol-e a cég az RMGC, hogy soha nem fog átszakadni az a gát. Vagy ha esetleg még is átszakadna, akkor milyen hatásai lesznek azok ránk nézve.

Hegyi Judit (Csalán Egyesület):
Két rövid kérdésem lenne. Az egyik, hogy AEI fejezet 4.8-dik alfejezetében az a megállapítást írták le, hogy a román kormány, az EU és a világbank támogatná ezt a verespataki bányabefektetést. Azt szeretném kérdezni, hogy mire alapozzák, ugyanis úgy tudjuk, hogy 2002-ben a világbank lépett vissza a beruházás támogatásától. A második kérdésem pedig arra vonatkozna, hogy mivel nekünk ezzel a cianidos technológiával kapcsolatban vannak ellenérzéseink, ezért mennyibe kerülne egy másik, ugyanilyen

hatásfokú, de kevésbé káros technológia. Mennyivel kerülne többe, mint ez a cianidos technológia. Köszönöm szépen:

Visy Zsolt (Pécsi Egyetem tanára):
Tisztelt Hölgyeim és Uraim! Köszönöm a szót. Meglehetősen más szempontból fogom a véleményemet elmondani és a kérdéseimet föltenni, mint az eddigiek. Ezt teszem azért, mert én nem a természet vagy környezetvédelem szakembere vagyok, hanem régész. Teszem azért, mert a kulturális örökség egyik résztvevője vagyok és a Magyarországi KAMASZ Régészeti Szakbizottságnak az elnöke. Teszem ezt azért, mert néhány évvel ezelőtt, 1998 és 2000 között kulturális helyettes államtitkárként sok mindent tudtunk tenni a Kárpát-medence műemlékeiért, régészetéért. Ezen belül az Erdélyben található kulturális örökségért is, amelynek egy igen tekintélyes hányada vagy magyar vagy a magyar történelemmel kapcsolatos. Mindezek után én azt hiszem, hogy érdemes megnézni a dolgot ebből a két szempontból is. Felkérésre áttanulmányoztam a teljes, hangsúlyozom a teljes angol nyelvű, kulturális fejezetet. Valami 300 oldal a környezetvédelmi tanulmányból. Nem tudom, hogy rajtam kívül a teremben ezt valaki megtette-e. Ebben a tanulmányban sok mindennel foglalkoztak azok, akik írtak róla. Írtak régészetről, írtak műemlékvédelemről, néprajzról. Szellemi örökséggel kapcsolatban elég gyenge megjegyzések vannak. Vallási örökség, ipari régészet. Valójában sorra vettek nagyon sok mindent és azt mondhatnám, hogy a leltár első tekintetre tökéletes és jó. Még második tekintetben is nagyon sok pozitívumot tudok elmondani. Különösen a régészeti kutatások minőségét tekintve, amelyek nem magas színvonalúak, hanem a publikálásuk is megtörtént. Miután tegnap előtt, vagy valamelyik napon ismételten ott jártam és régészekkel találkoztam. Megnéztem az ásatásokat. Meggyőződhettem arról, hogy ebben a tekintetben a régészetet semmilyen vád nem érheti. Más a probléma. Nem az, hogy a régészet, hogy megy, hogy nem megy, hanem más a probléma. Alapvetően az a probléma, hogy a bányavállalkozás úgy tekinti, hogy a kulturális örökséget és azon belül a leghangsúlyosabbat, a régészeti örökséget, mint kipipálható tényezőt. Megadjuk a pénzt, amire egyébként a romániai törvények ugyanúgy kötelezik őket, mint például a magyarországi autópályákkal kapcsolatos előzetes feltárásokra. Miután a feltárás megtörtént néhány kivételtől eltekintve, amelyet a román régészet nagyon helyesen kikötött, hogy nem pusztítható el, módosítottak a terven. Nem sorolom. Egy-két fontosat. Valóban nemzetközi szintű emlék kimarad a tervből, de szigetszerűen a bányaterület határán vagy pedig olyan helyen, hogy a megmaradások és a látogathatóságok, későbbi történetük igen csak kétséges. Viszont az összes többi elpusztul. Mi pusztul el? Elpusztulnak a temetők teljes egészében, holott ezeknek az egységét is érdemes lenne bemutatni. Elpusztul több olyan szent kerület és épület, amelyet nem sikerült védelem alá helyezni. De, talán ami a legfontosabb. Elpusztulnak azok a bányajáratok, a római kori bányajáratok, amelyek mint egy 10 km hosszan kanyarodnak a hegyek gyomrában, és noha a Csetárca nevű hegy nagy részén elpusztult ez a terület, a Kádnik nevű hegynek a belsejében még ott vannak szinte érintetlenül. Tudunk róla, feltárások vannak és előzetes kutatások, de nem lehet mindent feltárni.
A kulturális eredmények, az összefoglalóban megfogalmazott gondolat, hogy ezeket menet közben majd fel lehet tárni, amikor úgymond az első réteget leborotválták, persze robbantásokkal, elképzelhetetlen, hogy ezeknek akárcsak a föltárása, de még arra is a megfigyelésére, észlelésére sor kerülhessen. Igen jelentős régészeti emlékek mennek veszendőbe. A település képe siralmas. A néhány évvel korábbihoz képest is azt mondhatnám, hogy már nem siralmas, hanem szinte halálra ítélt településképét mutatja. Miért? Azért mert minden tulajdonos beleértve természetesen a bányavállalatot is, amely a házak, épületek, köztük jelentős számú műemlék, több mint 40 műemlék, egyedileg nyilvántartott műemlék van a területen köztük két templom. Igaz, hogy házként vannak nyilvántartva, de műemlék. Ezeknek egy részét ők birtokolják, tulajdonolják. Azóta, hogy ez a program a tervekben és a

gondolatokban és a képzeletben elindult senki sem törődik velük, tehát az állapotuk romlik. A kiürített házakat az RMGC nem állítatja helyre abban a tudatban, hogy majd úgy is lebontatja őket, holott ezek között műemlékek is vannak, mint mondtam, amire viszont kötelező a fenntartás és a gondozás, ápolás. Erre vonatkozóan egyetlen sort nem lehet olvasni a tervben. Magával a kulturális programmal kapcsolatban néhány általános és konkrét megjegyzésem van. Nem csipkelődni akarok, de mint a természet és környezetvédelmi programban is néhányan fölsoroltak tévedéseket és durva leírásokat, a kulturálisban is van.
Tudvalevőleg volt egyszer Osztrák-Magyar Monarchia és hát volt valami hasonló. Meglehetősen durva tévedés, vagy hogy mondjam elírás, hogy magyarok helyett osztrák etnikai jelenlétet említenek. Itt a bevezetőben valakik. Talán még ennél is furcsább, minden magyar és általában gondolom minden jelenlevőtől fogja értékelni azt a megállapítást, amit be kéne keretezni, hogy a hunok finnugor származású nép voltak. Talán nem kellett volna összetéveszteni a luteránus vallást és templomot az unitárius vallás templomával, amely nem ugyanaz. Luteránus vallási közösség nincs Verespatakon. Az általánosabb problémák azok olyanok, amelyeket kerít és találkoztam az eddigi válaszok során. Tehát. Vagy pontatlan választ kapott a kérdező vagy el lent kenve, vagy a legveszélyesebb esetben azt a választ, hogy erről majd később lehet konzultálni és nyitottak vagyunk mindenféle megbeszélésre. Én azt hiszem, hogy itt van a helye annak, hogy ezekről beszéljünk.
Ne halasszuk későbbi időre, egyébként is el ne felejtsük, hogy csupán egy olyan terv, amiről nem szabad készpénz gyanánt értekezni és beszélni, hiszen hol van még attól. Független attól, hogy bárki, bármit gondol. A megvalósítás az egy későbbi dolog lehet. A terv kulturális részében, tehát a programnak és ennek az anyagnak a kulturális részében is tapasztalhattam ilyen furcsa tévedéseket, elírásokat. Az egyik. Ez arra vonatkozik, hogy a régészeti jelenségek milyen fontosak. Valóban, így van, de a szerző kinyilvánítja, hogy ennek ellenére a római anyag és ezek az emlékek messze nem érik el a világszínvonalat vagy akár a nemzetközi színvonalat, mert hiszen világszerte nagyon sok bánya van és igen sok római kori, antik bányát is ismerünk. Valóban ismerünk sokat, bár ismernénk többet. Fogunk is. De! Ez az állítás téves, demagóg és félrevezető. Ugyanis arról van szó, hogy az egyik egyetlen e helyszín Las Meduras, világörökségi helyszín, római kori aranybánya messze nem éri el kvalitásaiban azt, ami Verespatakon van. Ha összevetem azokat a dolgokat, amelyek még ezekhez kapcsolódnak, akkor egészen megdöbbentő lesz mindenki számára, amit most fogok mondani. Verespatakon igazolható, hogy több mint kétezer év óta gyakorlatilag folyamatos az aranybányászás. A bronzkorban is valószínűleg volt, de ezt anyagi vagy régészeti lelettel nehéz igazolni. Kétezer év is elég. Ott vannak a római kori galériák vagy bányajáratok, ott vannak a különböző épületek, különleges szent kerületek az oltárok tucatjaival, ott vannak azok a temetők kőkerettel és halottsíros anyag, ami valóban egyedül álló és még sorolhatnám, és ott vannak a középkori emlékanyagok, ott van a középkori bányászatnak a nyoma és föl egészen az újkorig. Tehát mintegy folyamatos, kétezer éve átívelő egységes bányászati folyamattal találkozhatunk, amelyet a római korban még az is alátámaszt, hogy a rómaiak azért foglalták el Dáciát, mert ott az arany. Hadrianus azért nem adta föl a többivel szemben, mert valószínűleg az arany vonzotta. Marcus Aurelius, ezt talán senki nem tudja rajtam kívül, Marcus Aurelius kénytelen volt elárverezni a ..... háborúk idején 168-ban a császári családnak és az udvarnak a kincseit, hogy a hadjáratot finanszírozza. Miért? Azért mert a dáciai aranybányák megszűntek működni. Elnézést kérek. Erről a témáról még nem volt szó. Igyekszek nagyon rövid lenni és rövidre fogni, de a lényeg még ezután következik.
Következésképpen itt egy különleges helyzet van, és akkor most említem meg talán a legfontosabbat ebben a vonatkozásban. Ez pedig a dáciai viaszos táblák. A verespataki viaszos táblák. Amelyek egyedülálló dokumentumai annak a római kori, 2. századi bányászközösségnek, amelyik itt élt és dolgozott, és amelytől ezek a régészeti leletek származnak. Egy különleges helyzet van. Egyébként a 25 megmaradtból 13 a Nemzeti

Múzeumban van Budapesten. Egy különleges helyzet van tehát. Az oltárok és az egyéb etigráfiai emlékek és a viaszos táblák önmagában egy olyan szellemi értéket képviselnek, amelyek a 2003-as UNESCO döntés alapján világörökségi szintet kaptak, hiszen ez a döntés meghatározta a szellemi világörökség fogalmát. Ide tartoznak, ugye mindenki tudja talán a Mátyás Király kori nagy könyvtárak. Ezek a dolgok mind azt sugallják, hogy itt egy kivételes kulturális érték van, amelyekhez egy természeti értékek is és a környezeti értékek is hozzátaroznak. Azok az állásfoglalások, amelyek Magyarországon, Romániában és az ICOMOS szervezetében megfogalmazódtak, mind ebbe az irányba mutatnak.
Érdekes és feltűnő, kicsit durva, hogy ezekre való hivatkozások, bibliográfiai hivatkozások egyetlen egy esetben sem találhatók meg az anyagban. Talán ezt érdemes megjegyezni közben. 2002, 2003-ban, 2005-ben három ICOMOS közgyűlés hozott határozatot ebben az ügyben. Minden esetben legsúlyosabb aggodalmát fejezve ki a tervezett programmal szemben és természetesen fölajánlva a segítségét. A 2005-ös, tavaly ősszel Sziánban hozott közgyűlési határozatban úgy aposztrofálja a határozat Verespatakot, mint amely világörökségi értékekkel rendelkezik. A döntés természetesen, kizárólagosan a román államra tartozik. De tudom a román ICOMOS nemzeti bizottság elnökétől, egy nemrégi levélből, hogy szeptemberben éppen a sziáni határozat alapján fognak tárgyalni erről a kérdésről. Ez pedig az jelenti, hogy a világörökségi gondolat bent van. A Román Tudományos Akadémia élesen állásfoglalt mind a természeti, mind a kulturális örökség megsértése ellen néhány évvel ezelőtt.
A bányászati törvény, amit néhány éve fogadott el Románia tiltja a jelentős régészeti leletekkel rendelkező területeken folyó bányászatot. Ez még egyetlen esetben sem hangzott el még ma este talán. Tudjunk róla. 1038 tudós írta alá néhány évvel ezelőtt azt a tiltakozást, amelyben összefogásukkal azt kérik, könyörögnek és tiltakoznak, ha kell, hogy Verespatak beinduljon. Uraim és hölgyeim! A verespataki beruházás 80 %-ban külföldre vándorló hasznot jelent. Ebből 19,3 % marad román állami kézen. Alig egyötöde az egész haszonnak. Ott marad egy rekultiválandó vagy helyreállítandó táj. Ott van az óriási ciánveszély és egyéb. Elnézést, hogy én említem meg, de a savbeoldódási veszélyt eddig még senki nem említette meg ma este, ha jól emlékszem. Pedig nagyon fontos és úgy tudom, hogy a környezetvédelmi tanulmányból ez is valamilyen okból kimaradt. Nincs eléggé taglalva. Visszatérve a különböző közösségek élesen ellene fordultak ennek a tervnek. Az egyházak az elébb szó volt róla. Nem csak az embereket kell megkérdezni. Az egyik csoport ezt mondja a másik azt. Ez van Verespatakon is. Hangsúlyozom, hogy mindegyik egyház és a legélesebben éppen az ortodox egyház volt az, amelyik kikelt a terv ellen. Leghatározottabban fejezte ki azt, hogy soha nem adja el a saját területeit.

Tokodiné Kun Zsuzsanna:
Üdvözlök mindenkit ebben a késői órában. Két kérdés merült föl bennem. 86-ban is ..... projektben vettem részt, aminek fő alkotóeleme a cián. A hidrogéncianid áldásos hatásairól had ne beszéljek én itt. Szívesen, de nem most itt. Azt a projektet mi leállítottuk. Tehát röviden ennyi. A másik. Fejlesztő vagyok Ötleteket, találmányokat valósítok meg. Nemrégen fejeztem be egyet. A gyakorlatból tudom, hogy amikor az élesztés történik, akkor a papíron lefektetett tervek nagyon sokat módosulnak Pontosan azért, mert nem várt természeti dolgok léphetnek fel. Gondolok itt. Még senki nem beszélt ma erről a témáról. Lehet, hogy félreértettem, de nagyon szeretnék rá választ kapni. Zárórétegként, ha jól hallottam mesterséges anyagot helyeznek el. Milyen rétegben képzelik elhelyezni. Csak a zagytározóba vagy már a gátépítés alatt. Vagy valamit félreértettem? Még egy zárókérdés. Miért nem lehetett ezt a tanulmányt hamarabb közzé tenni, hisz én is csak egész véletlenül pályázatfigyelés során bukkantam erre a tanulmányra, hatásvizsgálatra. Én ezt az egészet nagyvonalúnak tartom műszaki szempontból. A többit mindenki tegye hozzá, amit gondol.

Tömöri Balázs (Greenpeace):
Jó estét kívánok! John, egy kicsit dühös vagyok Mert ötödik alkalommal próbálod itt kijátszani a román-magyar viszonyra utaló kártyádat. Ezt szeretném visszautasítani és kikérném magunknak. Mi nem hoztuk fel ezt a témát itt. Nem is beszélünk erről. Itt természetvédelmi, környezetvédelmi, egészségügyi, egészségvédelmi kérdéseket feszegetünk. Fölraktad azt a transzparenst, amin bemutattad, hogy Magyarországot csak egy csekély szakasza érinti a cianiddal esetlegesen szennyeződő folyóvíznek Azt akarod erre mondani, hogy tegyünk arra, hogy Romániában mi van? Nem ez volt az első tisztességtelen kártyád azt gondolom ezen az esten. Átpasszoltad nekünk a labdát. Vegyünk részt mindenben, amiben csak akarunk. Mi nem vagyunk bányászok, bányatechnológiában ismerősök, jártasok. Nem nekünk kell megmondani, hogy milyen más technológiákat javaslunk egy zagytározóra. Terminus technikuszokat, szakmai kifejezéseket használsz megnehezítve az egész véleménynyilvánítást az egész tájékozódásunkat. Földrajz-angol szakos tanár vagyok és mégis csak 750 oldalt tudtam ebből a félelmetes anyagból elolvasni, de az is elég volt arra, hogy egy-két konkrét kérdést föltegyek. Az egyik a kockázatokról szóló fejezetben a 60. oldalon azt írjátok, hogy a hidrogéncianid párolgásának hatásait vizsgálták, mégpedig a Transgold és nem talált semmiféle ártalmas hatást. Komolyan azt gondoljátok, hogy a Transgoldnak bármi féle hite maradt Magyarországon a 2000-es ciánkatasztrófa után? Azt gondolom, hogy ez nem jó választás.Részletes adatok, módszertan, ilyesmi. Referencia nem szerepel sehol. Másik amit akartam mondani és ezzel fejezném be.
Nemrég jöttem haza Verespatakról és szeretném a helyi Albonusmajor egyesület nevében két kijelentésedet kikérni magunknak és nekik. Az Albonusmajor maximalizálja a föld árát. Ezt mondtad. Ez nem így van. Személyesen vettem részt egy olyan megbeszélésen, ahol svájci részvényeseitek elsőkézből ettől a civil szervezettől kaptak olyan információkat, amelyek birtokában már rég megszabadultak volna a részvényeiktől. Nevezetesen nem tudták ezek a részvényesek, hogy a világbank réges-rég elfelejtette ez a projektet. Nem gondolom, hogy ez tisztességes a részvényeseitek felé és ezt majd el fogjuk mondani az évi rendes közgyűlésen is. Azt mondod, hogy tisztességtelen játékot játszanak. Azt gondolom, hogy az is tisztességtelen, hogy nincs lehetőség bányászattól eltérő vállalkozási tevékenységet folytatni a településen. Az embereknek nem marad más megélhetési forrásuk. Az a kevés, aki eladja a földjét nektek ebben az időszakban többek között e miatt is kényszerül ránk. A föld árának maximalizálásáról nincs szó. Ne mond nekem azt, hogy ti a profit maximalizálására mentek, hajtotok John. Száz szakértőt foglalkoztattok. A legjobb elérhető, hozzáférhető technológiát alkalmazzátok. Mind azon dolgoztok, hogy a helyi közösségeknek munkát teremtsetek. Ezt mondod. Azt gondolom, hogy egy kicsit a piacgazdaságból az elmúlt két évtizedben képet kapva, ez valószínűleg ez az állítás így nem állja meg a helyét. Azt gondolom, hogy ez a BMW amit ti ott meg akartok ott lovagolni, az nem a ti lovatok. Arra kérlek benneteket John, hogy fontoljátok meg, hogy hogyan tudtok ebből a projektből minél hamarabb kiszállni. Vissza Barbadosba!

Háry Ildikó (Greenpeace):
Üdvözlöm régi jó ismerősömet, Johnt. Kicsit nehezményezem azt, hogy állandóan a mai nap folyamán, délután írásban kérted a kéréseinket. Egy hónappal ezelőtt én öt kérdést feltettem számotokra és a mai napig nem kaptam még választ, pedig azt ígérted, hogy erre a közmeghallgatásra már ott lesz az e-mail címemen a levelesládámban. Még nem találtam meg. Tehát nem tudom, hogy mennyire számíthatok arra, hogy ha mi bármilyen kérdést felteszünk számotokra, mi arra választ is kapunk.
Megkerestél engem a szünetben és megkérdezted, hogy mindenféleképpen meg akarom-e akadályozni ezt a bányanyitást vagy meg akarom ismerni a hatástanulmányt. Mindenféleképpen megakadályozom ezt a bányanyitást. Ami tőlem telik azt minden

megteszek, ez már ígértem a múltkor is most is elmondom. Sajnos nagyon sok ember nem hallotta ezt, ezért mondom el mindenki előtt. Az idő meg - bocsásson meg - annyira nem érdekel, ha a hazámról van szó és környezetvédelemről, mert akár hajnalig is itt leszek, ha nem kapok választ a kérdéseimre. Úgyhogy elnézést kérek ezért.
Arra hivatkoztál, hogy nem te írtad a hatástanulmányt, kérlek akkor olvasd el, hiszen mi ebből vágunk ki folyamatosan olyan kérdéseket amik nonszensz állításokra utalnak. Fel is tennék egy-két kérdést. Az RMGC nem tervezi, hogy a szarvaspataki zagytározó alját normálisan megvédje, mert nem csak felülről párologva illetve kiömölve folyhat ki a zagy, hanem szivároghat a talajvízfelé, amit te nem tudsz megakadályozni, hogyha nem véded normálisan geotextíllel illetve fóliákkal, ahogy ez elő van írva. Ez az agyag nem teljesen biztonságos. A hatástanulmányban nincs érdemi információ a védelemre, pedig a nagybányai ciánszennyezésről készült 2000. márciusi UNP jelentés szerint még az Aurul zagytározó is védve volt. Ami nem semmi ahhoz képest, hogy egy negyvenszer akkora zagytározót nem akartok védeni, lehet hogy sokba kerül, de megéri. Igazából most inkább nem szeretném tovább húzni az időt. Még holnap találkozunk, úgyhogy még folytatni fogom ezt a beszélgetést. Szeretném, hogyha pozitívan tekinthetnék erre a rendszerre, erre a kezdeményezésre. Bocsánat megint személyeskednem kell. Képzeld el, hogy te magyar vagy. Mi össz-vissz a szennyezést kapjuk, semmi mást ebből az egészből. Gondolj bele, hogy el tudod képzelni, hogy te magyar mit válaszolnál erre a kezdeményezésre. Mi nem úgy védjük a környezetet mint te Rosa Montana házait. Sajnos én is tegnap jöttem haza onnan és nagyon-nagyon lehangoló a helyzet ott és remélem, hogy holnap be is fogom tudni mutatni ezeket a házakat, amit te oly nagyon védesz.

Gallé László (Szegedi Tudomány Egyetem):
Tisztelt Hölgyeim és uraim. Én röviden fogok beszélni, mert a legtöbb potenciális kérdésemet már megkérdezték és elmondták előttem. Ezek ökológiára és természetvédelemre vonatkoznak. Először is szeretném felhívni egy ellentmondásra a figyelmet. A kedves kollegától azt hallottuk, hogy mintegy 400 növényfaj populációt találtak a területen, ha a fordítás jó volt. Utána pedig azt hallottuk, hogy nulla biodiverzitás van a területen, ami persze ökológiailag nonszensz, mert ilyen nincs. Tehát itt egy nagy ellentmondás van. Ha a 400 igaz, akkor ez a Kárpát-medence növényállományának több mint 10 %-át jelenti, tehát ez arra utal, hogy egy hihetetlenül értékes lelőhelyről van szó. 400 növényfaj nem lehet invaziv faj. Ezek biztos, hogy bennszülött fajok jelentős részben. A másik. Ezzel szemben áll az 1000 állatfaj amit találtak. Ez arra utal, hogy valószínűleg tényleg a gerinctelen fauna fölmérése nem tökéletes, hiszen 400 növényfajhoz ennél lényegesen több állatfajnak kell tartoznia. Becslésem szerint legalább 3000-4000-nek. Ezért azt szeretném kérni, ha lehetséges csak röviden fölsorolni, hogy milyen gerinctelen állatcsoportokra vonatkozott a felmérés. Következő kérdésem. Kicsi a valószínűsége, mint hallottuk, de megvan, hogy esetleg kiömlik a zagy. Ez ugye a Maros folyót és a Tiszát is érinti. Kérdésem. Készült-e ökológiai állapotfelmérés arra való tekintettel, hogy milyen hatásokat fog ez okozni a két folyóban? Ilyen szempontból szárazföldi életközösségekre vonatkozóan készült-e felmérés, hiszen ez már a szárazföldi életközösségeket is fogja érinteni. Itt újra felhívnám a figyelmet a pécskai tájvédelmi körzetre, a Körös-Maros Nemzeti Parkra. Következő kérdésem, hogy sikerült-e figyelembe venni a román és magyar kutatók közös kutatásait a Maros mentén, amiről több kötet is megjelent. Remélem, ismerik őket. És végül, pedig egy nagyon általános megjegyzés. Elhangzott, hogy kiábrándító, mely szerint a magyarok között nem találni olyat, aki elfogadná vagy támogatná ezt a beruházást. Az előttem szóló számból vette ki a szót, hogy valóban hogy mi ezzel bizonyos kockázatot vállalunk. Ezt a kockázatot vállalnánk egy össznépi, egy nagy cél érdekében. Engem személy szerint nem nagyon lelkesít az, hogy a kockázatot azért

vállaljuk, hogy a világ leghaszontalanabb fémjéből valamely bankok trezorjában néhány tízezerrel több darab tömb heverjen teljesen hiába.

Kalle professzor úr:
Az ön jó híre Romániában is elérkezett, úgyhogy én meg vagyok hatva, hogy önt itt a jelenlévők között látom. A hatásvizsgálati tanulmányt elsősorban egy műszaki, adminisztrációs, közigazgatási tanulmány és nem egy mélyre ható tudományos vizsgálat eredménye. Nem az a cél, hogy a Verespatak térségében megjelenő ökológiai kölcsönhatásokat vagy jelenségeket felfedje. A projekt megvalósítási időszakában a biodiverzitás monitoring projektje is elindul és remélem, hogy ez mélyrehatóbb lesz, mint a magyar biodiverzitás monitoring. Pillanatnyilag néhány reprezentatív szempontot vettünk figyelembe és mint ahogy mindannyian tudjuk a biodiverzitás a fogalom szintjén nem fogható, akárcsak az esztétika.
Nagyon nehéz a mennyiségi meghatározást megtalálni a műszaki nehézségek miatt. Ugyanakkor néhány mutatót felsorakoztatunk a tanulmányban. Mindannyian tudjuk, hogy Verespatak térsége nem egy hochpot a biodiverzitás szempontjából, mint például a tordai hasadék. Ott 1300 növényfajta található egy kisebb területen, mint ami a verespataki térség. Biodiverzitási mutatókkal állunk szemben és olyan állatfajtákkal, amelyeket nem azonosítottak be, mint a jelenlevőket. Ismereteim szerint a tordai hasadékban 2000 állatfajtát sikerült beazonosítaniuk. Mégegyszer mondom, az egyenes viszonyítást néha nagyon nehéz kimutatni épp azért, mert technológiai nehézségek akadnak.

Makrai László (CSEMETE):
Jó estét kívánok! Részemről a szerencse, hogy a professzorom után szólhatok. Talán az ő szavaival is tudnék indokolni. Azt gondolom, hogy a kollega, aki talán biológus, hogyha az amazoniai esőerdőt hasonlította volna mondjuk a tordai hasadékhoz és ezt megtette volna, akkor talán arra jutott volna, hogy érdemesebb akkor megcsinálni a tordai hasadékban ezt a bányát, mint az amazóniai esőerdőkben. Tehát kiváló hasonlat szerintem és emiatt fontos ügyre tekintenék. Én a 2004-es évben ezt gyűjtöttem, a 10 Maros menti szegedi szakasz mentén a polgármestereknek az aláírását. Tiltakozó aláírását. Kivittem a cég központjába a gyulafehérvári hatósághoz is, valamint elküldtem a romániai és magyar államnak. Románul és magyarul lefordítva. Azzal, hogy a 10 polgármester tiltakozik a megépülő beruházással szemben. Aston úrnak mondanám, hogy volt egy konferencia 2004 nyarán, amelyre hívtuk őt is, amelyre hívtunk vegyész professzorokat, köztük Meskó Attila akadémikust, amelyben lett volna lehetőség arra, hogy konkrét fizikai illetve vegyészeti technológiai kérdéseket át tudtuk volna nézegetni. Akkor szerintem még nem állt úgy a cégnek a technológiai háttere, hogy ezt meglehett volna tenni. Aston úr el sem jött erre a megbeszélésre. Egyébként nagy jelentősége és nagy fejleménye a magyar civil szervezetek részéről és a magyar szervek részéről is az, hogy két éve már sikerül eltolni ezt a beruházást. Ugyanis két évvel ezelőtt még teljesen más szabványok vonatkoztak rá úgy uniós szinten, mint román-magyar szinten erre a beruházásra és a határértékre való tekintettel. Hogyha már most ebből indulunk ki és ezt rögzítjük, akkor már jelentős eredményt tudtunk elérni.
Én azt gondolom. A román viszonyokra visszatérve, a cianidszállításra illetve a katasztrófaelhárításra azt gondolom, hogy mindenki ismeri a romániai útviszonyokat és infrastrukturális viszonyokat. Ugye Mócföldön kb. olyan viszonyok vannak mint a Székelyföldön útviszonyokban. Gyakorlatilag terepjáró nélkül közlekedni képtelenség. Nagyon kíváncsi volnék arra, hogy hogyan tudnak elvégezni egy katasztrófaelhárítást, egyáltalán szállítani mondjuk oda bármi mennyiségű veszélyes anyagot. Áttérve a technológiai kérdésekre, az aktív cianidmentesítésnek az elképzeléséről szólt néhány sor a magyar tanulmányban. Azt gondolom, hogy emiatt, hogy passzív mentesítésről van szó, ami

úgy gondolom, hogy levegőztetést jelenthet. De ez nem volt bővebben kifejtve, ebből tudok kiindulni. Nos ha így van, akkor az nem túlságosan megnyugtató számomra. A meddőhányónak a fölhalmozott rétegei, amelyek meglehetősen bizonytalan kémiai összetételűek szerintem, és bizonytalan savbázis és adott potenciával bírnak.
Azt gondolom, hogy meglehetősen bizonytalan és modellezni sem nagyon lehet azt, hogy milyen reakciók fognak bekövetkezni ebben a zagyban, ebben az elegyben. Végképp nem tudjuk azt szerintem és önök sem tudják, mivel látok rá példákat arra, hogy helyszíni vizsgálatokat kell majd végezni, teszteket kell majd végezni hogy az altalaj és a takaró réteg hogyan viszonyul majd ehhez a savbázis illetve potenciális viszonyokhoz. Azaz azt gondolom, hogy ez a reaktívnak minősíthető zagy reakcióba tud lépni úgy a feküvel, mint az agyaggal és amivel érintkezni fog. Ez esetben pedig kiszámíthatatlan az a reakció és az az eredmény ami a későbbiekben a savas szivárgásokat fogja előidézni szerintem ebben a nagy elegyben.
A másik az, hogy képtelenség azt gondolom megítélni azt is, és képtelenség izolálni egy olyan rendszert, amelyek egy vizes elegyet képeznek. Éppen Aston úr azt mondta, hogy szükséges öntözni a zagynak a felszínét azért, hogy ne legyen belőle széllel távozó por. Na most, hogyha ez így van, akkor még bizonytalanabbá válik az egésznek az elegyei és a reakciók is azt gondolom, hogy teljesen kaotikussá válhatnak. Illetve .....sá, ami jósolható. Hogyha valóban ilyen környezetvédelmi és örökségvédelmi beruházásról van szó, akkor javasolnám, hogy pályázzák meg az ISPA vagy bármilyen kohéziós alaphoz. Nyilván az Európai Unió értékelni fogja azt, hogy önök ilyen beruházást fognak végezni Romániában, hogyha tényleg erről van szó és nem pedig csak egy panelnek gondolta ezt Aston úr. Egy technológiai kitérést még. Nem volt szó a robbantásokról. Az első technológiai lépés az, hogy a kőzetföltárás mikrorobbantásokkal fog folyni. A mikrorobbantással kapcsolatban semmi féle vibrációs, rezonanciás gátakat én nem találtam, magyar anyagban legalább is. Lehet, hogy az angolban van, de azt elvették tőlem, mielőtt még áttudtam volna nézni, mert azt mondták, hogy az a központi kiadvány és nem tudtam már a végén átböngészni ezt. Javasolnám azt, amiről már szó is volt, az alapcsövezésnek a megoldását. Azt gondolom, hogy magában így ez a borítás nem alkalmas. A fordítás felelősségéről csak annyit mondanék, hogy az RMGC eleget tett ennek a kötelezttségének és angolul rendelkezésre bocsátotta a tavasz folyamán ezt az anyagot. Én nem láttam ugyan, de valószínűleg úgy volt, ha így mondják. A felelősség azonban azt gondolom, hogy a hazai szakminisztériumot érinti, aki nem tette meg a fordítást és sajnos itt is néhány példányban tudtunk csak hozzájutni ahhoz az anyaghoz, ami azt gondolom, hogy fontos lett volna a számunkra. Nem csak a szakértők számára, hanem az általános közvélemény számára, ahhoz hogy ezt megtegyék. Egyébként pedig gratulálnék Aston úrnak, mert 2004-ben még nem rendelkezett még ennyi panellal, amit most említett. Tehát fejlődik a kommunikációs és a piár képessége. Akkor még más beosztásban volt a cégnél. Köszönöm.

..... asszony:
Jó estét kívánok! Egy nagy bányaipari beruházásról beszélünk. Elég komplex probléma ez. A potenciális, határon átnyúló hatás okán. Egyetértek abban, hogy a projekt minden elemét ki kell vesézni a megvalósítás teljes folyamata során. Az építkezések során, a kitermelési során és a bányák bezárása során. Ott a helyszínen kell megvizsgálni, hogy milyen potenciális szennyezési hatás következhet be. Valamint a hatásfórum pontjait is elemezzük ki. Hiszen ezeknek lehet igazán határon átnyúló hatása. Lehet, hogy ma este nem sikerül kiveséznünk teljes mértékben ezeket a kérdéseket. Én értem azt, hogy miért van ez így. A határon átnyúló hatásból kiindulva eltértünk, mert egy olyan egységes Európában, amibe mi is szeretnénk belépni 2007-ben, nyilván minden olyannak kell érdekelni bennünket ami más országban történik. A magyar állampolgárokat kell érdekelnie, hogy mi történik Romániában, a romániai

állampolgárokat pedig az ami Magyarországon történhet bizonyos beruházások kapcsán, vagy akár, hogy más országokban mi történik. Szeretnék egy témára visszatérni.
Hiszen ebben a projektben ezzel kapcsolatosan felelősség hárul rám. Mert értem, hogy az anyag, a tanulmány elolvasásában nehézségek adódtak, hiszen nem került lefordításra a teljes anyag. A mai előadás sem magyarul hangzik el. A lehetőségeken belül szeretnék bizonyos magyarázatot elmondani, ami a felelősségünket illeti. Én egy országos kutatóintézetet (Ipari, Környezetvédelmi, Ökológiai Intézet) képviselek itt. Több mint 30 éves tapasztalattal rendelkezik ez az intézet és környezeti hatástanulmányokra akkreditált. E projektben a felelősségünk szigorúan csak arra korlátozódik, hogy véleményezzük azt, hogy a szennyvíztisztítására alkalmazott technológia megfelel-e a legjobb gyakorlattal rendelkező BREF előírásoknak. Mondjuk el, hogy úgy, ahogy a projekt bemutatásra került ez a technológia biztosítani tudja azt, hogy megfelelő hatékonyságú technológia. Az hogy a legkisebb legyen a környezetre gyakorolt hatás. Néhány lényeges elvből indulunk ki. Ebből kiindulva tudjuk, hogy a hatást a forrásnál kell csökkenteni. Ott, ahol kinyerik a fémet az ércből. Biztosak kell legyünk abban, hogy a technológiai folyamatokat, a használt vizet vissza tudjuk fordítani. A potenciálisan szennyező anyagokat a folyamatban újra tisztítani tudjuk. El kell kerülnünk azt, hogy a környezetbe szennyezett anyag kerüljön. Csak akkor lehessen ilyen, amikor abszolút elkerülhetetlen. Ilyen esetben is meg kell arról.....

.... nagybányai katasztrófát, balestet követően, aminek kapcsán én személy szerint bocsánatot kérek a magyar állampolgároktól. Hiszen szerencsétlen esemény volt és nagy károkat okozott, de a baleset után úgy ítéltem meg, ha van egy műszaki probléma, akkor arra egy vagy több megoldást kell találni. Kikísérleteztük. Itt nyíltan, mint vegyész mondom el. Ipari szinten, nagybányán a Transzgold-nál kikísérleteztük azt az öt technikai folyamatot, amelyik a zagy semlegesítését és a vízülepítési technológiát jellemzi. Azok, akik a technológiával foglalkoznak, hogy gyakran könnyebb a nagy méretű koncentrációt csökkenteni, mint az alacsony koncentrációkból még csökkenteni. Minden olyan technológiánál, ahol a cián bányában megjelenik, kikísérleteztük azokat a technológiákat, amelyeket a BREF ajánl, mint a legjobb elérhető technológiát: a hipokloriddal való kezelés; aztán az a folyamat, amit Verespataknál alkalmazunk; a klór sav visszanyerése, aztán az oxigéndús vízzel való kezelés; vagy mint két kezelés együttalkalmazása, azaz az aktív oxigénnel való kezelés.
Mindezen eljárásokat a BREF, mint a legjobban elérhető technológiákat ajánlja. Mindegyiket alkalmazzák ipari szinten. Pontosan értem azokat a fenntartások a technológiával szemben. De azt szeretném elmondani, hogy e projekt keretében egy jó technológiára bukkantak. Kifejezetten kértem azt, hogy ezt a technológiát bizonyos pontjaiban változtassák meg, vagy javítsák. Minden esetben sikerült meggyőznöm a tervezőket erről. Ezért azt kell mondanom, hogy a környezeti hatástanulmánnyal kapcsolatosan, amit ez a projekt tartalmaz egy olyan biztonságos technológia, amit én is elfogadok. Most meg szeretném mutatni, hogy miért is találom ilyennek. Verespatakon három fajta víztartalmú zagy keletkezik. A terv kezdetétől fogva az európai törvény nagyon nagy mértékben változott. 2006. májusában elfogadtak egy olyan irányelvet, amely bányaipari hulladékokra vonatkozik, amely zagytározókban található zagyra vonatkozóan meghatározza a megengedett ciántartalmat. Könnyen felszabaduló ciántartalomról beszélnek és cianmaradványokról vagy olyan formákról, amelyek a környezetbe juthatnak. Egy új bányászat engedélyezéséhez a megengedett mennyiség az 10 mg/liter. Ebben a projektben egy második vízforrás az, ami ülepítésre kerül a tározóban.
Ezen kívül a kiszivárgó víz az, amit figyelembe kell venni. A zagynak a kezelésére az érc feldolgozó egységében két technológiát tartalmaznak. Hogyha az a véleményük, hogyha nem kérik a teljes ábrát, akkor itt abbahagyom. Viszont azt gondolom, hogy konkrét technikai kérdésekre konkrét választ kell adjunk, hiszen itt a környezeti hatásról beszélünk. Itt a forrásnál csökkentjük ezt a hatást, a keletkezésnél. A kérdés az az volt, hogy a vegyi eljárás

milyen folyamat, amit alkalmaznak. Nem csak a helyszínről beszélünk, hanem amikor a zagyból bizonyos elemek kijuthatnak a természetben különböző pontokon, akkor mi történik. Én úgy ítéltem meg, hogy hasznos lenne tisztázni ezeket a szempontokat is. Ezen felül pedig a hatásról beszélünk és a technológiában hatást már a keletkezésénél, a forrásnál semlegesítik. Ez egy óriási különbség azzal szemben, hogy más bányáknál milyen helyzet állt elő. Az elgondolkodtathat bennünket. Tehát nagyon röviden azzal fogom zárni, hogy a zagykezelése megtörténik az első tározóban, utána pedig az ülepítőbe továbbítják. Mégpedig az irányelvnek megfelelő feltételek közös és visszaforgatják a folyamatban. Normális működési körülmények között az ülepítők nem engednek ki a természetbe ciános vizet, aminek hatása lehet. Ez lesz ebben a kitermelési folyamatban. A legfontosabb vízforrás a folyamathoz, hogy használják a vizet. Az ülepítőben természetes bomlás is történik. Ennek a hatására is csökken a ciántartalom. A másodlagos tározóba kerülnek és újra visszaszivattyúzzák őket, visszajuttatják őket az ülepítőbe. Ez azt jelenti, hogy nem lehet káros hatása a környezetre. Csak akkor lehet a környezetbe a vizet visszajuttatni, ha 0,1 mg/liter ciántartalma van. Ebben a projektben egy olyan ciánkezelő berendezést is beterveztek, amelyet arra használnak, hogy a nagyon alacsony ciántartalmú vizeket továbbkezelik, továbbtisztítják. Egyetlen más bányaipari létesítményekben sincs egy ilyen második tisztító rendszer. Én azt hiszem, hogy mindezek tudatában biztonságban lehet elmondani azt, hogy a keletkezésnél sikerül hatástalanítani a ciánt. A mi feladatunk és az önök feladata az, hogy ezt a projektet monitoring rendszerben figyeljük meg a megvalósítás során, hogy tartsák be mindazt, amit beterveztek.

Retkes Zoltán, elméleti matematikus:
Nem nekem kell így mondani, hogy így hivatkozhatom a szakmámra. Az első és nagyon fontos megjegyzésem az lenne. Én vagyok az első valószínűleg, aki tiszta lélekkel és őszintén gratulál annak a projektnek, amelyben van egy olyan szakértő, aki azt kimeri jelenteni, hogy 1 a 100 millióhoz annak a valószínűsége, hogy katasztrófa következik be. Gondolom ezt a következő kísérletsorozattal támasztotta alá. Óvatosan a két zápfoga közé tett egy ciánkapszulát fölpattant egy megvadult kanca hátára és azt vizsgálta, hogy összeroppan-e 1 perces lovaglás közben a kapszula és ezt lebonyolította egymilliószor egymás után és azt tapasztalta, hogy egymillió esetből vagy százmillióból egyetlen egyszer roppant össze a kapszula a foga között. Gondolom ez így történhetett. Mindez persze nem elég, mert ez alapján semmit nem jelenthet ki. Mert ezt a kísérletsorozatot legalább 100 milliárdszor kéne megismételni ahhoz, hogy bármit állíthasson. Ez az első. Evvel kapcsolatban úgy gondolom, hogy pontot tehetünk ennek a kockázati esélynek a végére úgy, ahogy van. A másik. A vizsgálatok alapvetően egy háromszázéves elmélet, a Newton-i mechanika egyszerű, mechanikus, materialisztikus szemléleti módjára építenek, amennyiben én jól hallottam itt az elhangzottakat. Persze én azokhoz a kérdésekhez teljesen laikus vagyok, amik itt szakmailag elhangoznak. Egy dologra fölhívnám az önök figyelmét. Ezek szerint, ha jól értettem 400 ilyen kapszula van szétrakva a föld nevű élőlénynek a külső burkán. Csakhogy a földnevű élőlénynek van egy saját belső ritmusa. Én nem vagyok geológus, de nézzenek utána, hogy így van, hogy az ovalitása folytonosan változik. Másrészt a földrengésekről annyit, hogy egy epicentrum, ha 400 km-re van, az utórezgések simán leborítanak mindent, mint ahogy 6 évvel ezelőtt is Szegeden történt. Beogradban volt az epicentrum. Itt a tízemeletesnek a tetején jócskán kellett kapaszkodni. Visszatérve a Newton-i mechanikához. Gondolom, tudnak arról, hogy ettől van finomabb megközelítés is. Arra lennék kíváncsi, hogy a hatástanulmányba van-e sugártechnikai mérés. Biztosan tudnak róla, hogy bizonyos anyagok egy kritikus tömeg fölé fölhalmozódva ugyanúgy viselkednek, mint a radioaktív anyagok. Egyszerűen exponenciális sebességgel olyan hullámzást bocsátanak szét (gömbhullámok formájában), amelyeknek a hatásmechanizmusával, úgy gondolom senki nem számolt itt eddig. Ennél még finomabb mechanika is létezik. Ez nagyjából a kvantummechanika, 70-80 évvel ezelőtti állapotának

felelne meg. Ha mondjuk egy ilyen mérés is belekerülne, egy sugártechnikai mérés a hatástanulmányba. Ennél van azonban sokkal modernebb megoldás, ami igazából arról szól, hogyan is működik a természet, mint körfolyamat. Ez egy információelméleti leírás. Nézzenek utána az orosz elméleti fizikában, ami az információknak azon terjedési mechanizmusát modellezi, ahogy a természet valójában működik. Ami egy elég bonyolult rendszer uraim.

Nemes Noémi (Greenpeace):
Jó estét mindenkinek! Három olyan kérdést szeretnék feltenni, amit itt már elhangzott, de mivel nem kaptunk konkrét válaszokat, ezért konkrétan felteszem a kérdéseket. Ha nem, holnap is próbálkozni fogunk. Az egyik a robbanóanyagokkal kapcsolatban elhangzott korábban. Azt tudjuk, hogy hetente 20 ezer tonna robbanóanyagot fognak felhasználni. A kérdés az lenne, hogy vizsgálták-e egyáltalán és ha igen mekkora vibrációs hatást fejtenének ki ezek a robbantások a gátra. Itt a létező legjobb nemzetközi sztenderdekről beszéltek. Hogyha ezeket figyelembe veszik, akkor hogyan építettek egy olyan zagytározót, aminek nincs szigetelése. Valóban világra szóló minőségű, ha Európa legnagyobb ciános technológiai zagytározója éppen megsérti a vonatkozó európai jogszabályokat?
Ez az európai jogszabály egyébként, az 1999/31. hulladéklerakókról szóló irányelv, amit a román jogrendbe is átültettek. Ez a törvény előírja, hogy a hulladéklerakókat szigetelni kell, mégpedig nyolc réteggel. Az lenne a kérdésem, hogy a hatástanulmány mely része írja le pontosan, hogy a zagytározó és a meddőhányók 8 rétegű, szintetikus védelmet kapnak. Szeretném tudni, hogy ez hol van? A harmadik kérdés pedig a 70 millió dolláros rekultivációra vonatkozik. Teljesen irreálisnak tartjuk ezt az árat, ha csak azzal összevetjük, hogy a meddőhányók lezárása termőfölddel 108 és 132 millió dollár között lenne. A zagytározóé pedig 43 és 790 millió dollár közé esne. Ehhez képest a 70 millió, azt hiszem, hogy mindenki érzékeli, hogy semmi. Tényleg komolyan gondolják ezt a nevetséges, alacsony árat? És ha igen, akkor a rekultiváió mely része marad el? Ki lesz egyáltalán a bezárt bánya tulajdonosa? Hány évig tervezik, hogy ott maradnak a rekultiváció végbemeneteléhez? Akkor végezetül említette John Aston, hogy bárhol a világon kapna munkát. Mi viszont itt élünk és nem fogunk innen elmenni. Nekünk itt van a munkahelyünk és nem engedjük, hogy a Kárpát-medencében ilyen, a Ti vállalatotok a mi környezetünket szennyezze. Köszönöm szépen!

Udvarnagyi Eszter:
Egy nagyon rövid kérdésre egy nagyon rövid választ szeretnék kapni. Igazándiból az érdekelne engem, hogy készítettek-e integrált terjedési modellt a szennyező anyagokra és ebben figyelembe vették-e a legújabb, úgymond irányzatot. A bányákat, mint egy diffúz szennyezőforrást tekintsék. Ehhez kacsolódik részben az a kis apró kérdésem, hogy kívánják-e figyelembe venni, a ..... franciaországi ciános aranybányának a bezárása kapcsán kidolgozott egyszerűsített, kockázatbecslési technológiának az alkalmazását?

Tanár úr (utolsó észrevétel):
Köszönöm ezt a lehetőséget. Nem hiszem, hogy ez a legjobb Rosia Montana számára. Azt hiszem, hogy igen is van alternatíva. Erre akartam célozni az elején is. Erre majd visszatérek. Konkrét dolgokra reagált Aston úr. A vita készségének egy kiváló módja az, hogy akár a személyeskedés gyanúját is, vagy érzelgősség gyanúját is fölveti. Holott nem erről volt szó. Én teljesen tényszerűen, tárgyszerűen beszéltem. Ezzel diszkvalifikálni szerette volna, amit mondtam. Én tényszerűen fogok válaszolni. Említettem, hogy az ICOMOS-on belül van egy régészeti, műemlékvédelmi szakbizottság. Ennek is van természetesen angol (ICAHM) neve. Ennek a magyar szervezetében töltök én vezető pozíciót és mint ilyen, ennek a nemzetközi

vonatkozásában is ott vagyok. Ezt én röviden megemlítettem, de talán elkerülte a figyelmét. Ugyanis azon a lioni inkriminált találkozón tartott egy megbeszélést. Határozatot is hozott. Én erre külön nem akartam utalni, de ha már ön megemlítette, akkor had idézzek csupán egyetlen mondatot belőle.

A lényegi döntést, amelyet ha úgy tetszik a világ, vagy a földünknek a legfelső régészeti szakmai kollégiumán hozott az ez. Nem pedig az a viták hevében ott kialakuló kicsit visszakozó nézet, amely valóban megtörtént és amelyre ön utalt. Következő dolog. A robbantást én megemlítettem, illetve ön azt mondta, hogy a robbantásokat, mint korábbi ügy és hát sajnálatos dolog, de eddig még az RMGC nem okozott kárt a római galériákban. Sajnálatosan történt ilyen, ezt tudjuk jól mind a ketten és még sokan mások, hiszen kísérleti robbantásokat hajtottak végre két évvel ezelőtt, ha jól emlékszem. Ennek során római aknanyílások is sérültek, szabaddá váltak. Én nagyon nagy örömmel olvastam, olvasom és hallom. Az RMGC szeretné megmenteni Rosia Montana-t, és a kultúráért és a természeti örökségért küzd. Együtt küzdjünk, én ezt javaslom. Nézetem szerint nem nekünk és nem itt kell kimondani a zárszót, hanem Romániának a román kormánynak, a román államnak. Tehát hogyha az RMGC is ezt tartja fontosnak, akkor tartsa tiszteletben a román állam döntését. Én egy nagyon rövid számítást végeztem az arany értékéről, amit összesen a számítások szerint kijöhet. Ha jól tudom a néhány évvel ezelőtti 480 dollár/uncia árról mostanra 611 dollár/uncia között mozog jelenleg a dollár ára. Hatalmas növekedés. Érdemes aranyat bányászni. De még hogy ha ezt veszem számításba, akkor kb. 6 milliárd dollár a teljes bevétel ez után. Tessék inteni, ha nem így van, mert akkor nem mondom tovább, mert rosszul számolok. De ha így van, akkor ebből le kell venni 1 milliárd dollárt, ami a beruházás, a munka meg a kivitelezésre vonatkozik. Az 5 milliárdon osztozik négy az egy arányban a Garbriel.... és Románia. Tehát Románia összesen 15 év alatt 1 milliárd dollár nyereséget kasszírozhat. Ezek szerint durva megközelítéssel évente kb. 63 millió dollárt. Én azt hiszem, Romániának ezt kell értékelni. 15 év alatt teremtek az ott élő embereknek meg magamnak valamivel jobb helyzetet. Van ennyi pénzem évente, de csak 15 évig, tovább nem. Az ott élők 15 évig kapnak munkát, de utána nem jutnak munkához, vagypedig a kulturális örökség és a természeti örökség együttes felhasználásával céltudatosan azt az alternatívát választom, hogy világörökségi helyszínné nyilvánítttatom, ha lehet és tudom és ezért küzdök minden erőmmel a kulturális táj kategóriában. Ebben az esetben viszont nem 15 évre, hanem 115 évre vagy még tovább teremt mérsékelt, boldog megélhetést az ottani lakosoknak és az ott élőknek. Csak egy utolsó megjegyzés. Bocsánat. Piso professzort 41 éve ismerem. Véletlen pont ugyanennyi műemlék van és nem 40, ahogy ezt ön mondta Verespatakon. Jó barátok vagyunk. De egyrészt. Azt a levelet Alföldi Géza professzor kezdeményezte és írta. Nem Piso professzor. Piso professzor valóban ellenzi ezt, de én is vagyok annyira olyan szakember, hogy nem hiszem, hogy engem különösebben befolyásolna ő, akár Piso professzor, vagy más mit mond. Egyébként követtem a tanácsát, de megelőzően, mint mondta. Nem ezután fogok Verespatakra menni, hanem voltam a múlthéten. Igen is fölkerestem a régészeket, beszéltem velük, tárgyaltam, említettem ezeket. Tehát megfogadtam a tanácsát. Kérem, hogy ön is.

QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS RAISED
DURING SZEGED PUBLIC HEARING/ DEBATE OF ROSIA MONTANA PROJECT EIA

SZEGED, 28. 08. 2006

COMMENT	ANSWER
Except the Report of …, I haven't seen any signature of the authors of the different chapters about the impact study, which makes us think at the impartial, independent and correct manner of writing the whole paper. We would like Roşia Montana Gold Corporation to investigate who the authors of the mentioned chapters of this impact study are. We would like to know if the authors of those chapters are on the list of the specialists within the Romanian Ministry of Environment authorized for doing the studies about the ecologic effects. We think that in drawing-up this material, specialists who qualified "Aurul" complex of Baia Mare a safe place from an ecologic point of view have also taken part. We all are aware about the result of that experiment. In conclusion, we think that this impact study does not match the necessary requirements in the case of such a big investment, in what concerns the effects upon the environment.	According to the **legal requirements in force**, the environmental impact assessment for the Roşia Montană mining project was conducted by "natural and legal persons independent of the project [...] titleholder" and "certified by the competent environmental protection authority" [1]. The law does not stipulate the obligation to specify the authors' participation in drafting the EIA chapters. In accordance with the legal provisions in force [2], the Report on the Environmental Impact Assessment Study contains in Chapter 1. *General Information*, Section 2 – contact data of the certified authors of the environmental impact assessment study and of the related report, and this information is briefly presented also in Chapter 9. *Non-Technical Summary*. Since June 2004, the legal provisions in force stipulate that certified experts are no longer required to sign the Report on the Environmental Impact Assessment Study (or "parts" thereof).[3] "The liability for the accuracy of the information supplied to the competent authorities for environmental protection and to the public belongs to the project [...] titleholder", and the liability for the accuracy of the environmental impact assessment belongs to its authors [4], i.e., in the case of the team of certified experts, to the "natural persons certified at the highest level of competence" and "certified legal persons"[5], that participated in the environmental impact assessment based on the agreement concluded with

	the project titleholder. (MMGA_776 Permitting) Details related to all companies involved in the impact study may be found at the beginning of the non-technical summary. The 5 pages presenting all the organizations involved in the study contain company names, the names of their representatives and web pages.
The chapter regarding risks - page 120 – talks about the pollution of water caused by a possible breaking of the barrage and about the fact that when the pollution will reach the Magyar territory, the content of cyanide at the water surface will be somewhere between 0.03 mg/liter and 1.3 mg/liter. I have some questions to ask. On one hand we don't know what the arguments for defending this data are, because the only argument is a table in which the final amounts for certain possible situations are presented. We think that this table is not at all complete. For instance in the case of the mentioned towns, neither the length of the rivers in kilometers nor the quantity of water produced by the industry for the studied part of the river exists. The technical data on which the arguments which have led to the respective arguments are based are not mentioned. At the same time, the data refers to a medium flow of cyanide with a concentration of 4-5 mg/liter. Our question is why calculation was only made for a concentration of 4-5 mg/liter? Taking into consideration the fact that in the case of the catastrophe in Baia Mare, more significant flows took place and that the EU provisions refer to a concentration of 10 mg/liter, the results produced would be totally different, so we would have expected that such a scenario regarding the impact study, which regards us, exists. Besides, basing on the experience of the cyanide pollution in Baia Mare, the cyanide concentration in Lonea was 13.5 mg/liter. 550 km downstream	All details related with the aspects mentioned in the above question (dam failure) are described in section 7 of the Environmental Impact Assessment Report (EIA) report includes an assessment and analysis of risks and includes various dam break scenarios. The dam break modeling showed that, in the extraordinarily unlikely event that the dams, the spillways and catch basin all fill, and then any tailings run out would be extremely diluted. The design criteria for the dam have been established to address consequence of a dam failure. 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. The Roşia Montană TMF is therefore designed to hold a total flood volume over four times greater than the Romanian government guidelines. 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,

– we are now talking about the fact that the pollution reaches Hungary after about 500 kilometers – at Tizsasziget, the cyanide concentration was 1.49 mg/liter. This value is 15 times bigger than the limit of the value established by the EU for the surface level of the water, which is 0.1 mg/liter. We think that the same calculation has to be taken into consideration for this case too. The value of 1.3 mg/liter, representing the high limit of the concentration presented by you in the impact study is still 13 times bigger than the value established by the EU. Thus, we think that talking about the effects which will take place abroad would be adequate.	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 (MCE). The MCE is the largest earthquake that could be considered to occur at the site based on the historical record. In addition, Section 7 of the EIA report includes an assessment of the risks cases that have been analyzed and include various dam break scenarios. Specifically, the dam break scenarios were analyzed for a failure of the starter dam and for the final dam configuration. The dam break modelling results indicate the extent of tailings run out. Based on the two cases analyzed, the tailings will not extend beyond the confluence of the Corna valley stream and the Abrud River. However, the project recognizes that in the highly unlikely case of a dam failure that a Emergency Preparation and Spill Contingency Management Plan must be implemented. This plan was submitted with the EIA as Plan I, Volume 28. For a more detailed technical analysis, please refer to Chapter 7, Section 6.4.3.1, "*TMF Potential Failure Scenarios" of the EIA.* In order to assess the TMF water quality - decant water and seepage through the and under the tailings dam - specific test work was conducted summarized in the „Tailings management facility geochemistry and water quality Report 2005" by the MWH Inc Mining Group. The tailings facility water will <u>not</u> be acidic; however, it will be mildly alkaline. It is not chemically possible for the form of cyanide in the TMF to cause

	mobilization or leaching of the heavy metals downstream. RMGC will carry out all activities in accordance with the International Cyanide Management code, an internationally recognized practice for cyanide management in the gold mining industry. 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 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 by RMGC 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 modeling 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 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 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 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 as Annex 5.1. **Test work aimed at identifying the main factors influencing the water quality during both the operational and after-closure phase of the waste facility. A detail characterization of tailings and decant water chemistry discharged in TMF is presented in section 3.2 and 3.3 of the EIA report (Table 3-1, 3-2 and 3-3) Plan F - Tailings Facility Management Plan.**
What kind of experience does Roşia Montana Gold Corporation have in what concerns the cyanide mining technique? Does it have such experience?	The mine project from Roşia Montană has been elaborated by a team of Romanian and foreign specialists with a recognized experience at national and international level. The managing team who coordinates the designing

	and development has an experience of over 40 years in the development of similar projects with same extraction, processing, closure technologies as well as ecological improvement of mining perimeter. Also, the consulting companies involved into the designing of the Roşia Montană project are international companies with much experience in the mining field and which have implemented mining projects all over the world. The project was conceived to conform to the BAT, and this fact may be verified consulting the BREF document for mining industry elaborated by IPPC Office from Seville in June 2004 and published on website: www.eippcb.jrc.es/pages/FActivities.htm
The second question is: in which part of the impact study the potential effects upon Criş-Mureş National Park are analyzed?	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 by RMGC to provide additional detail to that

	provided in the EIA 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 modeling work is presented under the title of the *Mureş River Modelling* Program and the full modelling report is presented as **Annex 5.1.**
In my opinion, in the case of such an old mine which dates from the Roman times, more archeological research should be done. In my opinion this takes a longer period of time than your company has offered.	In compliance with the provisions of the Government Ordinance no. 43/2000 on the protection of the archaeological heritage and the designation of certain archaeological sites as areas of national interest, modified, an investor shall provide the necessary funds for the preventive archaeological investigation and related heritage surveys if he/she plans to implement a project in areas with an archaeological potential. As an investor, SC Roşia Montană Gold Corporation has assumed this legal obligation from 2000 until the present day. RMGC's declared purpose is to ensure the necessary conditions for the investigation, registration, protection and public enhancement of the cultural heritage from the Roşia Montană area, in compliance with the provisions of the Government Ordinance no. 43/2000 on the protection of the archaeological heritage and the designation of certain archaeological sites as areas of national interest, as modified by Law 378/2001, Law 462/2003, Law 258/2006 and with the provisions of Law 422/2001 on the protection of historical monuments, as modified by Law 259/2006. All the preventive archaeological researches undertaken in Roşia Montană since 2001 have been conducted within the "Alburnus Maior" National Research Program, and permits for preventive archaeological excavations have been issued, in compliance with the legislation in force. These archaeological investigations have been carried out by representatives of 21 specialized institutions from Romania and 3 others from abroad, under the scientific coordination of the Romanian National Museum of History. It is to be noted the significant contribution of the team of mining archaeologists from the

	University Le Mirail (Toulouse, France), led by Dr. Beatrice Cauuet. Mining archaeology studies are an innovation in Romania, Roşia Montană being in fact the first site in Romania where such investigations are conducted by a team of qualified and experienced archaeologists. All archaeological investigations have been conducted in compliance with the legislation in force. Researches carried out during each archaeological campaign are authorized by the Romanian Ministry of Culture and Religious Affairs, on the basis of the annual archaeological research plan approved by the National Commission of Archaeology (NCA). The archaeological research included a survey of all the areas, which are accessible and, at the same time, suitable for dwellings and other human activities, and took into account preliminary data taken from archives and bibliographical data and observations made during field surveys, magnetometer and electrical resistivity surveys, as well as data collected during the photogrammetric flights. Detailed information on the chance finds and the preliminary archaeological investigations (at surface and underground) conducted in the Orlea massif were published in the EIA (Environmental Impact Assessment for the Roşia Montană Project, volume 6: *Cultural Heritage Baseline Report*, Annex I, pages 231-235). The Cultural Heritage Baseline Report (volume 6, page 46) states that archaeological investigations (both at surface and underground) will continue in the Orlea massif area, which is in an area with an identified archaeological potential. The report also mentions the fact that the investigations undertaken so far in the respective area were only preliminary. The following statement in the report is to be noted: “Site development plans for the Project will not result in impacts or construction activities in the Orlea area, which will be researched starting 2007. As a result, construction activities will not begin in these areas until proper archaeological investigation consistent with Romanian law and international best practice is concluded.” (*Cultural Heritage Baseline Report* – page 46). In 2004, during these preliminary archaeological investigations conducted in

	the underground, a significant discovery was made in the Orlea massif, whose archaeological value was confirmed in the summer of 2005. More precisely, the French team of archaeologists led by Dr. Beatrice Cauuet found a chamber equipped with a mine drainage wheel, and then a whole drainage system serving to discharge water from the underground. This device identified in the Păru Carpeni sector was established to date back to the Roman period, it has been thoroughly investigated, and special measures were taken for its preservation *in situ.* This item is not going to be affected by the construction of the future Orlea pit. Preventive archaeological investigations (at surface) in the Orlea area and mining archaeological investigations (in the underground) are scheduled for the period 2007-2012, as stated in the *Cultural Heritage Baseline Report* (volume 6, page 48). According to the List of Historical Monuments published in the Official Gazette of Romania no. 646 bis/16.07.2004, the future industrial area from the Orlea massif comprises two archaeological sites classified as group A historical monuments: the Alburnus Maior Roman settlement, located in the Orlea area (code AB-I-m-A-00065.01) and the Roman mining operation at Alburnus Maior, the Orlea massif (code AB-I-m-A-00065.02). Under Law 422/2001, amended by Law 259/2006, the declassification procedure can be legally initiated after the archaeological sites are discharged based on the permit issued by the National Commission of Archaeology within the Ministry of Culture and Religious Affairs. The archaeological discharge procedure, as defined by the legislation in force, stipulates that a piece of land comprising archaeological artifacts can be restored to its habitual use (Law 258/2006, art. 5, paragraph 2). Therefore, it is true that in the second phase of the operations, RMGC plans to mine the gold-silver deposits located in the Orlea massif. Law 258/2006 also stipulates (article 7a) that “the investor is under the obligation to provide the necessary funds in order to ‘draw up a feasibility study and a technical project meant to establish the measures later to be presented in detail and the necessary funds for carrying out preventive

	archaeological investigations or archaeological monitoring (as appropriate), and also to finance the protection of the archaeological heritage or the archaeological discharge procedure (as appropriate) for the area impacted by works and the implementation of these measures". Consequently, this proposed mining operation in the Orlea massif can become operational only once preventive (surface and underground) archaeological investigations are completed. These investigations are meant to provide comprehensive data on the Roman site located in the Orlea area. As it is well-known (see the archaeological site record card included in the Cultural Heritage Baseline of EIA Report, i.e. Annex I –archaeological record cards produced for the archaeological state of Roşia Montană identified sites, site record card no. 9 – Orlea (page 231-235) – this area has never been subject to archaeological investigations or expert studies meant to establish in detail the characteristics and spatial distribution of the archaeological remains located in this area. Therefore, RMGC has committed to financing a program of preventive archaeological investigations to be conducted by specialists, program that will be developed between 2007 and 2012. A decision as to the approval of the archaeological discharge of the area will be made based on the results of these preventive investigations. There are no laws to prohibit preventive archaeological investigations for areas where cultural heritage artifacts have been identified, as is the case for the Orlea area. Given that the development of the Orlea pit is scheduled for a later date, starting from 2007, this area will be subject to preventive archaeological investigations. Therefore, the construction works required for the development of the project in this area will not be initiated before the completion of the archaeological investigations conducted in line with the national legislation and the international practices and recommendations.
in case of an ecologic catastrophe – I am asking this question from the point of view of a tax payer – what plans do you have for eliminating the effects of the catastrophe? What steps would	The details of Roşia Montană Gold Corporation's ("RMGC") Environmental Financial Guarantee ("EFG") are discussed in the section of the Environmental Impact Assessment titled "Environmental and Social

you take in such a case? Would I, as a normal citizen, tax payer in the EU member states, be obliged to pay for that? Because I am an EU member state tax payer. Related to this question, how would you inform the responsible EU authorities in Brussels about such a catastrophe? Were such funds allocated within the EU?	Management and System Plans" (Annex 1 of the subchapter titled "Mine Rehabilitation and Closure Management Plan"). In România, 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. RMGC has retained one of the world's leading insurance brokers, which is well established in România and has a long and distinguished record of performing risk assessments on mining operations. The broker will use the most appropriate property and machinery breakdown engineers to conduct

	risk analysis and loss prevention audit activities, during the construction and operations activity at Roşia Montană, to minimize hazards. The broker will then determine the appropriate coverage, and work with A-rated insurance companies to put that program in place on behalf of RMGC, for all periods of the project life from construction through operations and closure. RMGC is committed to maintaining the highest standards of occupational health and safety for its employees and service providers. Our utilization of Best Available Techniques helps us to ensure this goal is achieved. No organization gains from a loss, and to that end we will work to implement engineering solutions to risk, as they are far superior to insurance solutions to risk. Up to 75% of loss risk can be removed during the design and construction phase of a project. Yet we recognize that with a project as large as that being undertaken at Roşia Montană, there is a need to hold comprehensive insurance policies (such policies are also a prerequisite for securing financing from lending institutions). Core coverage includes property, liability, and special purpose (e.g. delayed start up, transportation, non-owned). Thus in the event of legitimate claims against the company, these claims will be paid out by our insurers. All insurers and insurance coverage related to the mining operations at Roşia Montană will be in full compliance with Romania's insurance regulations. Detailed financial guarantees are in place, in the form of the EFG, which require Roşia Montană Gold Corporation ("RMGC") to maintain adequate funds for environmental cleanup. The EFG is updated annually and will always reflect the costs associated with reclamation. 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 EFG must be in place to receive an operating permit to begin mining operations. An analysis is underway to determine the EFG required during each year of operation. The minimum amount at the start is expected to be approximately US $ 25 million and increase from that level annually. 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 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.
It seems you have changed the location of 10 cemeteries for accomplishing this project. I hope you took into consideration the fact that you will have to make up for the members of the families of those who have been buried there, although such memories cannot be paid in money.	Contrary to what the opponents of the mining project claim, no one wants to destroy churches or graveyards. Two churches and two prayer houses out of a total of 10 places of worship located within the project's footprint must be relocated or restored under the mine plan. Those churches will be moved in accordance with the wishes of the congregation, at the expense of RMGC. Churches construction is a central element in the new community of Piatra Albă being built by the company. To put the number of graves in context, 410 graves of the Roşia Montană's

	1905 graves will be affected by the mining project, as the company has to the maximum extent possible designed the mining operations to leave established graveyards in place. Six out of the existing twelve cemeteries will be affected by the project. In the case of any grave, there must be a very strong reason for that grave to be removed. The communities have created during their development initial rules, later turned into laws that deal with this unfortunate event. And yet it is also true that communities are themselves living entities, and without the RMP – with unemployment rising from 70% today to more than 90% -- refusing to bring new development to Roşia Montană could mean the end of the village's ability to support itself. 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. **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; 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.
within the mining process of metals, more mercury tons are obtained. Where will it go? What will happen to it?	RMGC will strictly manage waste resulting from the mining operations in accordance with applicable regulations and a waste management structure sensitive to the environment. The Waste Management Plan (Plan B) and Section 3 of the EIA describe how – structured in response to requirements of the EU Mine Waste Directive and MO 863. To address the possibility that this collective concentrate of gold and silver may contain small quantities of mercury, vessels will be introduced directly in the mercury retort (with volume of 0.3 m^3). Mercury will be volatilized at a temperature of maximum 650^0C and taken out of the vessels with a vacuum pump. Mercury vapors will be directed to a cooling-condensing plant and a column with activated carbon. The column is filled with sulfur-impregnated carbon to catch any traces of mercury vapors left uncondensed. After recovery, any sulfur and mercury impregnated carbon will be deposited in the temporary deposit of dangerous wastes under strictly safe conditions. It will be sold as a by-product – not re-used. Procedures for maneuvering, storing and transport of mercury under safe conditions will be included in *The Emergency Preparedness and Spill Contingency Plan* (see *Plan I* from the ensemble of *Plans of environmental and social management system*).

	Of course, some of the information presented is necessarily based on results of laboratory testing; more detailed data can be obtained only in the operation phase. In these instances, use of a word such as “likely” indicates a fair and balanced judgment based on all available information and expert knowledge. Significant but currently unavoidable uncertainties in the assumptions and conclusions are listed in Section 8 of the Waste Management Plan, along with the cautious approach chosen in this case. Consistent with the regulations of the EU Mine Waste Directive, the Waste Management Plan will be regularly reviewed and updated – incorporating improved and more detailed information on waste streams obtained during the operation period.
I would like you to enumerate the plant and animal species protected by law, and which are present in those areas! Which are the protection measures that you will take regarding their protection? We would like to receive a list of those measures.	All species observed within Project area and in its close vicinity have been listed in tables where their preservation status is mentioned, as per EU Habitats and Birds Directives, together their relative abundance (Plants – Annex 1, Chapter 4.6. EIA, electronic format, vertebrates – table 3-9 to 3-12, p. 68-74, Biodiversity Baseline Report, benthonic invertebrates, table 3-4, p. 49-50, Biodiversity Baseline Report). However, many of them remain rather common, widely spread at national level, and having large, stable populations (the plant species that are frequent and very frequent represent 86.5% of the species met within Project perimeter). Considering the utility of the analyzed document as an instrument of technical administrative assessment that will subsequently facilitate and assist the decision making process, the issue of preparing a scientific exhaustive study that will deplete to the smallest detail all biodiversity aspects was never discussed. 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]. A detailed map of the habitats located within Project's area is included in Annex 2 of this report. **References:** [1] art.3. (2), 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. (1) 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. [...] (1) .[...] 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. (4). 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, (1). 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 project of the maintenance of the level of cyanide in the residues proves to be superficial. Which are the treating	A summary description of the tailings processing system, as well as the use and management of the cyanide can be found in the Non-technical Summary,

systems you have and where from will you take the necessary funds to cover them?	Chapter 9 of the EIA (Report on the Environmental Assesment (EIA)) or detailed in Chapter 2, Technological Processes, Section 4.1.2.2 The main technological processes. The most efficient and cost-effective process for extracting the gold and silver from ores such as the ones in Rosia Montana is based on full cyanide-leaching of the ore. There are numerous examples of similar ores throughout the world, which require the use of cyanide-based technology for efficient precious metals recovery. The implementation of the cyanide-based technology for gold and silver recovery from the ore in Rosia Montana is based on a detailed testwork program conducted by AMMTEC Limited and AMDEL Limited. The tests were scheduled and reviewed by GRD MINPROC Limited, and later on, the conclusions of the testing program were reviewed and reconfirmed by S.N.C. LAVALIN and AUSENCO. The issuance of the cyanide leaching technology for the ore in Rosia Montana considered the best practices used in Europe and worldwide. The technology for metals recovery by using cyanide leaching in CIL **is** Best Available Techniques **BAT** (please see Chapter 3.1.6.2.2 and Chapter 5.2 of the Guidelines of BREF [1] UE Document on BAT for Management ... in Mining Activities, March 2004). The cyanide, in a solid briquette form, will be transported in specially-designed and manufactured isotainers. The cyanide will be dissolved only into the transportation containers, in alkaline solution, sourced from and re-circulated back into a mixing tank. The mixing tank is designed to have enough capacity to store the entire quantity of a transportation container. The cyanide solution, as soon as it is dissolved in the container, will be transferred from the mixing tank into a large volume storage tank. The fine ground ore, resulting from the overflow of the ball mills' cyclones, is transferred to the tank of the feeding pump for the CIL circuit, where it's mixed with cyanide and lime suspension, required to balance the level of pH. The active carbon is added in the CIL tank to support the leaching process and the

	adsorption of the dissolved metals. The slurry is subject to a leaching process taking place within two parallel rows of 7 CIL tanks each, containing agitators. The size of the CIL tanks is D = 18 m x H = 20 m. The CIL tanks are sized to ensure enough time of contact between the cyanide solution, the ground ore and the active carbon. Sodium cyanide solution may be added in the CIL tanks number 2 and 4 of each row if needed, in order to maintain the required cyanide concentration. The slurry is circulated into the gravitational cyanide-leaching circuit, and the carbon advances continuously counter the flow of the slurry, pumped by the vertical pumps. The time for advancing from a tank into another is adjusted so that the load of gold and silver on the carbon is ensured to be from 7,000 to 8,000 g/t. Once in the feeding tank of the thickener, the slurry is mixed with flocculants which support the sedimentation of the solids. The thickener ensures the increase of the solid content within the sediment and, at the same time, the development of the supernatant almost clarified. The Supernatant discharged from the thickener will be directed towards the grinding circuit, to reuse and recover the cyanide. The thickened slurry is pumped towards the cyanide detoxification circuit, working on SO_2/air procedure, where the WAD cyanide concentration will decrease to the level approved through the European Directive. The management of the tailings and the detoxification technology are **BAT techniques**, according to Chapter 3.1.6.3, 3.1.6.3.2 and 4.3.11.8 (The Guidelines of the EU Document of BAT for Management ... in Mining Activities, March 2004). The treated tailings are pumped back into the tailings dam. The cyanide is extremely toxic therefore its manufacturing, transport, handling and neutralization must be handled with care. However, the use of 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, i.e. 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. The main quantity of the cyanide will be recovered in the processing plant as shown in Figure 4.1.15 and described in Section 2.3.3, Chapter 4.1 Water of the EIA Report. Even so, there will be a residual quantity of cyanide. The treated tailings represent the only source of the Project for process residual water. The residual cyanide concentrations found in the treated tailings slurry will have to comply with the EU Directive for mine waste which stipulates a maximum value of 10 mg/L CN_{WAD} (weak acid dissociable). The cyanide will exist as potential pollutant of the surface waters only on the plant site and during the mining phase and for the first one or two years after closure. Modeling of the predicted concentrations in the TMF has shown that treated process plant tailings flow is expected to contain 2 to 7 mg/L total cyanide. Further degradation will reduce the concentrations to below applicable

	standards in surface water (0.1 mg/l) within 1-3 years of closure. A secondary effect of this treatment is also the removal of many of the metals which may potentially occur in the process waste water stream. An assessment of the likely chemical makeup of the tailings leachate, conducted on testworks, is summarized in Table 4.1-18 (Section 4.3.), Chapter 4.1 Water, of the EIA report. After discharge, the water is circulated back into the process; the decant water in the TMF during the entire period of storage, is subject to passive treatment processes, including natural degradation of the cyanide, hydrolyses, volatilization, photo-oxidation, bio-oxidation, mixing / separation, adsorption, dilution due to rainfalls etc. According to the data sourced during the operation of various mines, different cyanide reduction efficiencies are outlined (from 23-38% to 57-76% for total cyanides and from 21-42% to 71-80% for WAD), depending on the season (temperature). An average of approx. 50% decrease of CN_t concentration was considered for the TMF during operations' phase. The Model compiled for the degradation process shows that the cyanide concentration may decrease to even 0.1 mg CN_t/L during the first three years of closure. The main part (90%) of the decomposed cyanide (average of 50%) is broken down by volatilization / hydrolosis, as cyanic acid. The mathematic modeling of the cyanic acid concentration in the TMF showed a maximum hourly concentration of 382 µg/m^3 in comparison to 5000 µg/m^3, the concentration allowed by the Order no. 462 of the Ministry of Environment and Waters' Management. 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)
What will you do in the case of the air pollution obtained because of the extraction of the sterile mine and residue treatment? During the McInvest mining activity the air has been polluted many times in significant quantities, which is also mentioned in chapter 10 of the impact study. What will you do in this case?	The atmospheric dispersion modeling has been performed using the best available techniques in order to simulate the transport of the pollutants generated by the mining activities outside the Project area. AERMOD incorporates through a new and simple approach the current concepts regarding the flowing and dispersion in complex terrains. If needed, the plume is modeled either with a trajectory impacting the terrain or with a trajectory following the terrain topography. AERMOD could forecast concentrations of pollutants from multiple sources for a wide variety of sites, meteorological conditions, types of pollutants and mediation periods. For this project, the concentrations on short term have been calculated using the maximum hourly rates of emission for activities simultaneously developed and for the averages calculated for intervals of 1 hour, 8 hours and 24 hours. The annual concentrations have been calculated using all active sources from respective year. The measures for dust emission control from the open pits and the transport roads of ore and waste rock: - Utilization of a sequential blasting technology which reduces drastically the height of the dust front and dispersion area; - Ceasing of the activities generating dust during the periods with intense winds or when the automatic monitor for particles mounted in Roşia Montană protection area indicates an alert situation; - Implementation of a program for dust control on the unpaved roads during the drought seasons by means of watering trucks and inert substances for dust fixation. These measures will reduce the dust emissions with 90%; - Minimizing of the unloading height at manipulation / discharge of materials;

	- Prescribing and application of speed limitation on traffic; - Implementation of a program of periodically maintenance of vehicles and power - propelled equipments; - Automatic monitoring of the air quality and meteorological parameters; - Implementation of supplementary measures for dust emission control: ore and waste rock watering at loading into trucks. Details: The report at Environment Impact Assessment Study (Vol.12, Chapter 4.2, Sub–chapter 4.2.4) and Air Quality Management Plan (Vol. 24, Plan D) include in detail the technical and operational measures for reduction / elimination of the dust emission generated by Project activities.
Chapter 10 regarding the effects abroad, number 4.1 about pollution at the surface level of the water, caused by residue flow from the warehouse, reminds about the fact that the warehouse will be the place the inhabitants name Corna. So, in the case of a fissure in the barrage and a flow of significant quantities of residues, the solid residues will reach a distance of 0.8 – 1.6 kilometers downstream. This distance of 1.6 kilometers is also mentioned in the chapter regarding risks in the case of a fissure in the barrage. Though, we didn't find any argument to support this theory, except the fact that the use of a GMpelon is necessary for obtaining those results. But the parameters for using that type are missing. When references are made to the GMpelon type, we don't know exactly what it is and how those results have come up. Why were calculations made for a fissure at a depth of only 60 meters? Previous examples about fissures in barrages show that the barrage can wholly fissure. Why are the results of the variant regarding the fissure of the total 185 meter depth of the barrage missing? It is very interesting that, according to this study, in the case of a fissure in the barrage, residues reach 2 km away from the area inhabited by 13 thousand inhabitants, and they stop there. Is it	Avoidance of transboundary impact is achieved by "overbuilding" the Roşia Montana Project to mitigate risk, and constructing project facilities to exacting standards, under monitoring of EU authorities, agents of the banks underwriting the project and other international overseers. As a key element in this effort, the EIA report considered accidents that could occur at the Roşia Montană project that could have possible transboundary impacts. These are presented in Chapter 10 of the EIA report. The accidents considered included: - A dam failure with an associated release of tailings water and/or tailings material - An accident involving delivery of Cyanide to the project site via established transportation corridors. A specific evaluation of the impacts associated with an assumed scenario for failure was analyzed to determine whether it would result in transboundary impacts. Based on this analysis it was concluded that the environmental accidents considered will have negative impacts at local/regional level, but will not have a negative transboundary effect. A transboundary accident caused by the Corna dam failure is unlikely, given

here where residues decide to simply stop? How come? Is it because of the use of the exact data necessary for obtaining such a result? Does the residue flow really stop at the limit of an inhabited area? Previous examples have shown that in the case of the fissure of certain barrages significantly smaller than the one designed in Corna, which measures 185 meters, the flow of residues has done more victims. I will only mention some examples. In 1972, close to a town near Alba Iulia, a fissure in the 30 meter height barrage of the residue tank of a copper mine appeared, and the residues which flowed with the mud in the valley have made not less than 80 victims among the inhabitants of the small town. These facts have been mentioned last year by the representative of the Romanian Ministry of Environment with the occasion of a conference. But a greater incident has taken place in 1985 in Stava, a town in the northern part of Italy, because of a fissure in the barrage of the warehouse for the residues of a fluoride mine. The total height of the two barrages was 50 meters. Both barrages have fissured, which caused the flow of 200 thousand cubic meters of mud, which flowed with a speed of 90 km/hour. The residues have covered a surface of 4.3 km of the valley. 62 buildings were destroyed and 268 people were dead because of the incident. 43.5 hectares of land were devastated. In the beginning, the barrage was projected for a height of 9 meters; that is how the authorization demand was filed. Then, in 1969 the barrage got a height of 25 meters and in the 70s another barrage of 25 meters was raised on the old one, thus reaching a height of 50 meters. The 50 meter barrage fissured and caused the death of 268 people. These barrages were lot smaller that the ones designed in Corna, than those designed by you.	that its design has involved special safety measures. Some of the design parameters go beyond the recommendations of the Romanian and European design standards for this type of structure. Among other things, the dam was designed to retain runoff resulting from the combined action of two successive extreme rain events of 450 mm/m^2/24 h, corresponding to a total of 900 mm/m^2, a quantity that has never been registered in Romania (the flood volume for each PMP is 2,7 million cubic meters). Also, the dam was designed to withstand an 8 Richter Scale earthquake, with an average return period of 1:475 years [1], with the result that such an earthquake would leave the dam undamaged to the extent that operations could continue as usual. Even after closure, the dam was designed to withstand a 1 in 10,000 year earthquake with minimal damage According to the previsions made as part of the technical assessments undertaken for the EIA Report, the PMP will have an average return period ranging from 1:100, 000, 000 to 1:1 000, 000, 000 years [2]. It should be noted that a return period of more than 1:100 000 indicates a very low probability of occurrence of this event (a 24 hour rain event). Special safety measures have been taken. The impoundment was designed to withstand any hazardous natural phenomenon that might occur. However, hypothetical scenarios have been imagined, based on the assumption that the construction methodology would not be complied with, thus resulting in dam failure. These scenarios represent the worst case scenarios that could be identified, taking into account the technical characteristics of the TMF. The scenarios are presented in detail in Chapter 7, the EIA Report, subchapter (6.4.3, pages 117-121). This subchapter also includes a presentation of the potential consequences of such an accident. The data concerning the cyanide concentration distribution, presented in the EIA Report, have been obtained using a conservative mixture model, that does not take into account the dispersion and the attenuation that occurs as the plume travels downstream. Later on, a much precise and realist

	simulation was carried out, based on the INCA, taking into account the dispersion, volatilization and decomposing of cyanide as the cyanide plume travels downstream (Whitehead 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 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 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 modelling work is presented under the title of the Mureş River Modelling Program and the full modelling report is presented in Annex (5.1). [3] By way of summary, the probability of occurrence of a dam failure with potential transboundary impact is less than 10^{-12}, meaning that such an event could occur once every 10^{12} years, which constitutes an extremely low risk. The risk assessment methodology is described in Chapter (7), the EIA Report, subchapter 2.1, p. 15-23. Cyanide transport will exclusively involve special, ISO certified SLS containers, 16 to each. The container size is ISO compliant, allowing for road and railroad transport and the use of standard container handling devices. The container has a protective frame. For ease of handling, the protective framework is provided with legs, which allows separation from the transport trailer for temporary storage. The collar is 5.17 mm thick, which, together with the protective framework, provides additional protection to the load in case of accident [4] Chapter 10 in the EIA Report states that the other environmental accidents that might occur will have negative impacts at local/regional level, and will not have transboundary negative effects. References: [1] Chapter 7- *Risks*, Subchapter 2.2.2.2., p. 27 and Subchapter 2.4.3., p. 38 [2] Chapter 4.1 *Wate*r, Figure 4-18, p. 18, The EIA Report [3] **"A Water Quality Modelling Study of Roşia Montană and the Abrud, Arieş and Mureş River Systems: Assessing Restoration Strategies and the Impacts of Potential Pollution Events"** by Professor Paul Whitehead, Danny Butterfield and Andrew Wade, University of Reading, School of Human

	and Environmental Sciences, December 2006 [4] Chapter 7 *Risks,* Subchapter 5, page 99
I would like to ask a question about the pecuniary guarantees regarding expenses related to the working and closing of the area. As Mr. John Aston said, the acknowledged European practice and the legal provisions show the fact that in the case of an investment with such a high risk, before starting the procedure for obtaining the authorizations, the investor must offer guarantees according to which, in the case of a bankruptcy, of closing the company's activity or of such other events, a fund which should cover expenses related to the closing of the mine and of the mining process should exist. In the impact study there is no such reference to the existence, form or quantity of such an amount. Expenses done because of closing the mine have been estimated in the impact study to 70 million dollars. Independent specialized studies show that this amount is underestimated. According to the international experience, expenses done by closing the activity from a technical point of view, amount between 200 and 900 million dollars, amounts which do not include the expenses for the rehabilitation of the environment. This only represents the technical closing, expenses related to the place covering and mine usage. In our opinion, the amount presented in the impact study is underestimated and we don't find any concrete disposals about that either. It is not mentioned in what way, by what means, in which bank account or with which guarantees this amount is deposited. Regarding this problem we would like to be notified during the authorization procedure.	Information regarding our closure plan, the cost of the program and our Environmental Financial Guarantee ("EFG") are fully discussed in the Environmental Impact Assessment. The closure section can be found in Plan J of Vol. 29 and Plan L of Vol. 31, within the EIA. The EFG is discussed in the section of the EIA titled "Environmental and Social Management and System Plans" (Annex 1 of the subchapter titled "Mine Rehabilitation and Closure Management Plan"). With respect to GD 349/2005, it transposes the EU Landfill Directive 1999/35/EC into Romanian Law. It is not applicable to the extractive wastes generated by the Roşia Montană project, which are covered by the new EU Mine Waste Directive 2006/21/EC. Roşia Montană Gold Corporation ("RMGC") recognizes that mining, while permanently changing some surface topography, represents a temporary use of the land. Thus from the time the mine is constructed, continuing throughout its lifespan, closure-related activities – such as rehabilitating the land and water, and ensuring the safety and stability of the surrounding area – will be incorporated into our operating and closure plans. 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. There are two separate and distinct EFGs under Romanian law. The first, which is updated annually, focuses on covering the projected reclamation costs associated with the operations of the mine in the following year. These costs are of no less than 1.5 percent per year, of total costs, reflective of annual work commitments. The second, also updated annually, sets out the projected costs of the eventual closure of the Roşia Montană mine. The amount of the EFG to cover the final environmental rehabilitation is determined as an annual quota of the value of the environmental rehabilitation works provided within the monitoring program for the post-closure environmental elements. Such program is part of the Technical Program for Mine Closure, a document to be approved by the National Agency for Mineral Resources (“NAMR”). 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.) The annual updates capture the following four variables: • Changes in the project that impact reclamation objectives; • Changes in Romania's legal framework, including the implementation of EU directives; • New technologies that improve the science and practice of reclamation; • Changes in prices for key goods and services associated with reclamation. Once these updates are completed, the new estimated closure costs will be incorporated into RMGC's financial statements and made available to the public. 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.
we didn't find any reference within the study, to the insurance ways proposed by Roşia Montana Gold Corporation, in order for the damages not to be paid by the Romanian and Magyar tax payers in the case of an ecologic catastrophe; thus the investor shall hold a guarantee fund which he will use for this case. We didn't find any remark regarding this problem. We are curious about the bids they have asked and about the types of models Roşia Montana Gold Corporation or the authors of this study have adopted. Is there such an offer on the insurance market, which treats the problem of insuring expenses in case of ecological accident or end of the mine's activity, so that damages can be paid by the fund obtained for this purpose and not by the Romanian and Magyar tax payers.	Information regarding our closure plan, the cost of the program and our Environmental Financial Guarantee ("EFG") are fully discussed in the Environmental Impact Assessment. The closure section can be found in Plan J of Vol. 29 and Plan L of Vol. 31, within the EIA. The EFG is discussed in the section of the EIA titled "Environmental and Social Management and System Plans" (Annex 1 of the subchapter titled "Mine Rehabilitation and Closure Management Plan"). With respect to GD 349/2005, it transposes the EU Landfill Directive 1999/35/EC into Romanian Law. It is not applicable to the extractive wastes generated by the Roşia Montană project, which are covered by the new EU Mine Waste Directive 2006/21/EC. Roşia Montană Gold Corporation ("RMGC") recognizes that mining, while permanently changing some surface topography, represents a temporary use of the land. Thus from the time the mine is constructed, continuing throughout its lifespan, closure-related activities – such as rehabilitating the land and water, and ensuring the safety and stability of the surrounding area – will be incorporated into our operating and closure plans. 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. There are two separate and distinct EFGs under Romanian law. The first, which is updated annually, focuses on covering the projected reclamation costs associated with the operations of the mine in the following year. These costs are of no less than 1.5 percent per year, of total costs, reflective of annual work commitments. The second, also updated annually, sets out the projected costs of the eventual closure of the Roşia Montană mine. The amount of the EFG to cover the final environmental rehabilitation is determined as an annual quota of the value of the environmental rehabilitation works provided within the monitoring program for the post-closure environmental elements. Such program is part of the Technical Program for Mine Closure, a document to be approved by the

	National Agency for Mineral Resources (“NAMR”). 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.) The annual updates capture the following four variables: • Changes in the project that impact reclamation objectives; • Changes in Romania’s legal framework, including the implementation of EU directives; • New technologies that improve the science and practice of reclamation; • Changes in prices for key goods and services associated with reclamation. Once these updates are completed, the new estimated closure costs will be incorporated into RMGC’s financial statements and made available to the public. 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.
In what concerns the effects upon health, taking into consideration the sociological and ecological impacts, we can't analyze compromises.	The health issue has been and continues to be dealt with very seriously. In this respect, health baseline conditions have been assessed for Roşia Montană commune as well as for other areas located nearby or farther away. Thus, the assessment has taken into account all chronic diseases and most of the acute diseases for a period of five years [1] and for more than 40 localities [2] situated in the investigated area. Medical data has been collected from all general practitioners in the area, as well as from the two hospitals in the study area. Demographic data has also been collected to assess the dynamics of important indicators such as: life expectancy, mortality, birth rate etc. The findings have shown that the population from Roşia Montană has the lowest life expectancy when compared to other localities in the area, as well as when compared at regional and national level [3]. At the same time, the commune presents a high mortality rate [4] and low natality rate [5] as compared to the nearby area. Also, the assessment of the population's current health status shows a higher frequency of severe chronic diseases (respiratory, cardiovascular) in the local residents from Roşia Montană as compared to the residents from the other forty or so localities situated in the investigated area [6]. In conclusion, it is quite clear that the health assessment for the population living in the investigated area is a comprehensive one [7], and also the fact that the afore mentioned population health status is currently deteriorated.

	References: [1] Subchapter 5.1.2, Chapter 5, *Morbidity Study*, page 54, vol. 5, *Health Baseline Report* [2] Table 5-1, Subchapter 5-1, Chapter 5, *Morbidity Study*, page 52-53, 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] Table 3-3, Figure 3.3, Chapter 3, *Demographic Data*, page 16, vol. 5, *Health Baseline Report* [5] Table 3-1, Figure 3.1, Chapter 3 *Demographic Data*, page 13, vol. 5, *Health Baseline Report* [6] Annex, page 137, vol. 5, *Health Baseline Report* [7] Vol. 5 *Health Baseline Report (MMGA_0278 Health)* Based on a complex assessment (volume 5), the health status of the population will be not affected on a 100 km radius. The assessment of possible risks for human health has been carried out on the basis of the estimated concentration distribution of hazardous substances in Roşia Montană, taking into account more than 40 localities in the neighboring area, covering more than 200 km^2. The assessment considers the known current distributions and concentrations of hazardous substances within the study area, and the future predictions with relation to the proposed mining activities. It is clear that the estimated concentrations, which are lower than the maximum permissible concentrations (MPC), do not cause significant adverse effects on the local population's health [1]. However, while the proposed mining activities have not started at Roşia Montană, the local population is currently faced with health problems, in the sense that the health status of the local residents in the commune is deficient

	as compared to that of the neighboring population groups. Consequently, clear measures must be taken to improve the health of the Roşia Montană local residents. At the same time, as mentioned above, sitting and operating the proposed mine will not cause any other supplementary adverse effects on the local population's health, as long as the distribution of the pollutant concentrations that have been studied complies with the dispersion models shown in the present study (EIA). Reference: [1] Chapter 6.6, *Results and Discussions*, page 124-129, vol. 5, *Health Baseline Report*
How the mine project in Spain is connected to the one in Roşia Montană in terms of size.	The mine at Rio Narcea in Spain, unlike the one at Baia Mare, is comparable to ours for many reasons, as explained by presenters during the public meetings held last year. Rio Narcea's mine in Spain was permitted under European mining law, which is also the case with the Rosia Montana project, while the Baia Mare mine *was not* permitted under European law and its design *would never* be permitted under the strict rules in place in Europe today. In fact, the Roşia Montană project is subject to even stricter standards than Rio Nacea's mine in Spain *because* of the Baia Mare accident. The Romanian Government, in our Terms of Reference, requested that we follow the new European Directive on Mining Waste 2006/21/ECeven before it became law in Europe or Romania.
on what does he base when he writes, in the 7th chapter about risks, page 17, that: "In the case of barrage fissures at the residue storing valley, the causes which constitute 75% of the ecologic accidents, the presence of cyanide is found in less than a third of the cases." But table no 7.4, page 18, which enumerates significant accidents which took place at the gold mines between 1975-2005, show that of the 15 enumerated accidents, cyanide is	The design of the Roşia Montană project has incorporated the lessons learned from early tailings dam failures that are mentioned in the question. The proposed construction of the Tailings Management Facility (TMF) dam, which would retain the tailings material, is based on design criteria that comply with Romanian and international standards. These criteria, included in chapter (7), subchapter (3.2.5.1), the EIA Report, are meant to ensure maximum safety levels during the construction, operational and closure stages. The aforementioned subchapter presents the flood control criteria, safety factors

present in 9 of the cases. No matter how many calculations we do, this percent represents much more than a third of the cases. Or did this study include the accident which did not take place at the gold mines and within which any existence of cyanide is not possible.	for slope stability and seismic design criteria. The structure of the TMF system is also described (the starter dam –subchapter (3.2.5.2), the main dam (3.2.5.3), the secondary containment dam –subchapter (3.2.5.4), TMF diversion works-subchapter (3.2.5.5). The TMF design criteria involve a number of extra safety measures, in addition to the ones characterizing most similar facilities in the world. As a result, the TMF is an extremely robust and safe structure, with an extremely low risk of failure. The centerline method of construction and the pervious dam design concept (subchapter 3.2.5.5) increase the dam's stability and safety level. In the light of all these, risks have been assessed and potential accident scenarios have been imagined, including an assessment of the seriousness of the potential consequences. Between 1975 and 2000 there have been more than 30 major accidents associated with all types of mining operations. Table 7.4 [1] only shows the 15 accidents associated with gold mining operations. Given that there are about 875 gold and silver operations in the world, of which about 460 utilize cyanide [2], the fact that most accidents are associated with cyanide should not have been a surprise. As only *major accidents* have been included (the ones that involve the use of hazardous substances-as stipulated by the Seveso Directive), it is only natural that all cyanide accidents should be listed and only a part of the other types of accidents. According to the documentary data referring to major tailings dam failures throughout the world (*Chronology of major tailings dam failures)*, 25 such accidents have been reported in the last ten years, of which 6 involve gold mining operations (four of them also involve cyanide). It should be noted that since the Baia Mare accident (2000), no other accident has been reported until April 2006 (when an accident happened at Zhen'an County Gold Mining Co. Ltd. Shangluo, Shaanxi Province, China).

	Compared to other tailings dams in the world, where accidents have happened, the proposed TMF on the Corna Valley is much more robust and has various safety elements. Unlike many other similar structures in the world, the tailings dam will be semi permeable, which will ensure the reduction of water content in the tailings slurry. In the extremely unlikely event of an accident, the tailings slurry will travel for a relatively short distance (compared to other similar cases), owing to the reduced water content of the tailings slurry and to the method of deposition of the tailings waste, in accordance with the tailings' grain size: thicker tailings near the dam and finer tailings upstream. Based on the criteria previously mentioned, the dam has been designed to withstand an earthquake measuring 8 on the Richter scale. No such event has ever been experienced on the Romanian territory and it is hard to imagine the mechanism that could cause such an event in the future. The main design elements that ensure the dam's increased safety include the following: – the dam has been designed to retain water resulting from 2 PMP – with each dam rise, a spillway will be constructed to discharge, in a controlled way, the excess water resulting from a potential extreme event. This will eliminate the potential for erosion of the downstream slopes; – the rockfill starter dam has an impervious core and an embankment slope measuring 2H:1V downstream and 1.75H:1V upstream; – The main TMF dam will be constructed using the centerline and downstream construction method. The downstream slopes will measure 3H: 1V. Usually, the slopes for such hydrotechnical structures range between 1.5H:1V and 1.75H:1V; – a drainage system is planned at the bottom of the waste rock dump to reduce water levels in the waste materials ;

	– a monitoring system set up on the dam's crest or on its vicinity, to provide timely information regarding potential instability situations, excessive rise of the groundwater in the dam body, excessive increase of the water volume stored in the decant pond. – implementation of a strict Quality Assurance program, during the entire construction period. In order to simulate the tailings discharge in case of dam failure, the Jeyapalan model was used, of internationally acknowledged reliability. This model has been exclusively developed to simulate the flow of non-Newtonian fluids (tailings, slurries etc). Due to the inherent limitations of the model, (resulting from a simplification of real-life conditions by using a limited number of input parameters) the effects of the accident have been overestimated. The Jeyapalan model does not take into account the shape of the dam or that of the breach, the site topography, discharge of the receiving body of water, the friction coefficients or other physical parameters. Therefore, in most cases, the results will indicate the "worst case" scenario. **Starter Dam Failure (elevation:739 m)** Accident description It is assumed that a fracture will occur and extend 40 m down from the crest, affecting one third of the length of the dam. In order to measure the distance covered by the tailings released, we used the Jeyapalan model, of internationally acknowledged reliability. The model does not consider the fact that rockfill material downstream of the affected area will be carried along, thus reducing the distance covered by the tailings. The input parameters for the tailings material: • yield strength 4.08 kPa

	• plastic viscosity 2.45 kPa*s (these are estimated average values based on minimum and maximum values indicated by Jeyapalan) • Weight 13.5 kN/m^3 Slope gradient: 0,7% and the estimated volume of the tailings release 5.3 Mm^3 *Modeling results and potential consequences* The modeling indicates that the flow slide will advance up to 0, 6 km downstream of the tailings dam. Under these circumstances, the flow slide will advance up to 0, 8 km downstream of the starter dam and upstream of the confluence with the Abrud river. he tailings material movement will be, for the most part, stopped by the secondary containment dam. **Failure of the main dam (elevation: 840 m)** *Accident description* It is assumed that a fracture will form and extend 40 m down from the crest. For simulation purposes the Jeyapalan model was used. The model does not take into consideration the dislodged rockfill material, which would slow down the flow and will reduce the distance covered by the tailings material. The input parameters used for the tailings material: • yield strength 4.08 kPa • plastic viscosity 2.45 kPa*s (these are estimated average values based on minimum and maximum values indicated by Jeyapalan) • Weight 13.5 kN/m^3 Slope gradient : 0,7% the estimated volume of the tailings release 27.7 Mm^3 *Modeling results and potential consequences*

	The modeling indicates that the flow slide will advance up to 1,6 km downstream of the dam toe. The flow slide will get near the confluence with the Abrud River. ***References*** [1] Chapter(7), page (19), The EIA Report [2] *A Global Perspective of Cyanide*, Dr. T. I. Mudder and Mr. Mike Botz, M.S., P.E. "**A GLOBAL PERSPECTIVE OF CYANIDE" By Dr. T. I. Mudder and Mr. Mike Botz, M.S., P.E. -** www.mineralresourcesforum.org „**Chronology of major tailings dam failures"**- www.wise-uranium.org/mdaf.html MWH, 2006. "**Technical Memorandum, Dam Break Analyses Jeyapalan Model"**, February (2006). Jeyapalan, J.K., Duncan, J.M., Seed, B.H., "**Analysis of Flow Failures of Mine Tailings Dams**",Journal of Geotechnical Engineering, ASCE, Vol.(109), No. GT2, Feb., (1983), pp. (150-171) Jeyapalan, J.K., Duncan, J.M., Seed, B.H., 1982, "**Investigation of Flow Failures of Mine Tailings Dams**." EIA, chapter (7), subchapter (2.13), pages (17-19) EIA, Chapter (7,) subchapter (6.4.3.1), pages (117-119)
On what do you base when you say, in chapter 7 about risks, page 17, that cyanide pollution did never do victims? Was that data as selective as that of table 7.4? Which is the source of that table? Why does that date appear in the table? I will only enumerate some examples about victims of cyanide pollution. One of them is the Kîrghistan accident in 1998, of Kurgor, for which your table does not show any victim, but the local mass media reminds about the death of two persons caused by	The design of the Roşia Montană project has incorporated the lessons learned from early tailings dam failures that are mentioned in the question. The proposed construction of the Tailings Management Facility (TMF) dam, which would retain the tailings material, is based on design criteria that comply with Romanian and international standards. These criteria, included in chapter (7), subchapter (3.2.5.1), the EIA Report, are meant to ensure maximum safety levels during the construction, operational and closure stages. The aforementioned subchapter presents the flood control criteria, safety factors

pollution because of the accident, and the Russian ministry of defense admits that there was a victim. As a result of cyanide pollution in Baia Mare in the year 2000, 1240 tons of fish was destroyed. I am asking you if the death or destruction of fish and of other living creatures is or not important. In Nicaragua in 2003, a cyanide pollutant accident took place at a mine in Bonanza, ownership of a Canadian company. As a result, the river Banabana was polluted, and according to the affirmations of people in charge of Health, 12 persons among the aborigines were dead because of the pollution, because it seems that they had drunk some water from the polluted river. Another case took place in June 2004 when, as a result of cyanide acid gas flows from a gold mine in a town near Beijing, 3 persons were dead and other 15 were emergency cases. So, I repeat my question: on what do you base when you make the affirmations in chapter 7, according to which cyanide pollution does not make victims?	for slope stability and seismic design criteria. The structure of the TMF system is also described (the starter dam –subchapter (3.2.5.2), the main dam (3.2.5.3), the secondary containment dam –subchapter (3.2.5.4), TMF diversion works-subchapter (3.2.5.5). The TMF design criteria involve a number of extra safety measures, in addition to the ones characterizing most similar facilities in the world. As a result, the TMF is an extremely robust and safe structure, with an extremely low risk of failure. The centerline method of construction and the pervious dam design concept (subchapter 3.2.5.5) increase the dam's stability and safety level. In the light of all these, risks have been assessed and potential accident scenarios have been imagined, including an assessment of the seriousness of the potential consequences. Between 1975 and 2000 there have been more than 30 major accidents associated with all types of mining operations. Table 7.4 [1] only shows the 15 accidents associated with gold mining operations. Given that there are about 875 gold and silver operations in the world, of which about 460 utilize cyanide [2], the fact that most accidents are associated with cyanide should not have been a surprise. As only *major accidents* have been included (the ones that involve the use of hazardous substances-as stipulated by the Seveso Directive), it is only natural that all cyanide accidents should be listed and only a part of the other types of accidents. According to the documentary data referring to major tailings dam failures throughout the world (*Chronology of major tailings dam failures)*, 25 such accidents have been reported in the last ten years, of which 6 involve gold mining operations (four of them also involve cyanide). It should be noted that since the Baia Mare accident (2000), no other accident has been reported until April 2006 (when an accident happened at Zhen'an County Gold Mining Co. Ltd. Shangluo, Shaanxi Province, China).

	Compared to other tailings dams in the world, where accidents have happened, the proposed TMF on the Corna Valley is much more robust and has various safety elements. Unlike many other similar structures in the world, the tailings dam will be semi permeable, which will ensure the reduction of water content in the tailings slurry. In the extremely unlikely event of an accident, the tailings slurry will travel for a relatively short distance (compared to other similar cases), owing to the reduced water content of the tailings slurry and to the method of deposition of the tailings waste, in accordance with the tailings' grain size: thicker tailings near the dam and finer tailings upstream. Based on the criteria previously mentioned, the dam has been designed to withstand an earthquake measuring 8 on the Richter scale. No such event has ever been experienced on the Romanian territory and it is hard to imagine the mechanism that could cause such an event in the future. The main design elements that ensure the dam's increased safety include the following: – the dam has been designed to retain water resulting from 2 PMP – with each dam rise, a spillway will be constructed to discharge, in a controlled way, the excess water resulting from a potential extreme event. This will eliminate the potential for erosion of the downstream slopes; – the rockfill starter dam has an impervious core and an embankment slope measuring 2H:1V downstream and 1.75H:1V upstream; – The main TMF dam will be constructed using the centerline and downstream construction method. The downstream slopes will measure 3H: 1V. Usually, the slopes for such hydrotechnical structures range between 1.5H:1V and 1.75H:1V; – a drainage system is planned at the bottom of the waste rock dump to reduce water levels in the waste materials ;

	– a monitoring system set up on the dam's crest or on its vicinity, to provide timely information regarding potential instability situations, excessive rise of the groundwater in the dam body, excessive increase of the water volume stored in the decant pond. – implementation of a strict Quality Assurance program, during the entire construction period. In order to simulate the tailings discharge in case of dam failure, the Jeyapalan model was used, of internationally acknowledged reliability. This model has been exclusively developed to simulate the flow of non-Newtonian fluids (tailings, slurries etc). Due to the inherent limitations of the model, (resulting from a simplification of real-life conditions by using a limited number of input parameters) the effects of the accident have been overestimated. The Jeyapalan model does not take into account the shape of the dam or that of the breach, the site topography, discharge of the receiving body of water, the friction coefficients or other physical parameters. Therefore, in most cases, the results will indicate the "worst case" scenario. **Starter Dam Failure (elevation:739 m)** Accident description It is assumed that a fracture will occur and extend 40 m down from the crest, affecting one third of the length of the dam. In order to measure the distance covered by the tailings released, we used the Jeyapalan model, of internationally acknowledged reliability. The model does not consider the fact that rockfill material downstream of the affected area will be carried along, thus reducing the distance covered by the tailings. The input parameters for the tailings material: • yield strength 4.08 kPa

	• plastic viscosity 2.45 kPa*s (these are estimated average values based on minimum and maximum values indicated by Jeyapalan) • Weight 13.5 kN/m^3 Slope gradient: 0,7% and the estimated volume of the tailings release 5.3 Mm^3 *Modeling results and potential consequences* The modeling indicates that the flow slide will advance up to 0, 6 km downstream of the tailings dam. Under these circumstances, the flow slide will advance up to 0, 8 km downstream of the starter dam and upstream of the confluence with the Abrud river. he tailings material movement will be, for the most part, stopped by the secondary containment dam. **Failure of the main dam (elevation: 840 m)** *Accident description* It is assumed that a fracture will form and extend 40 m down from the crest. For simulation purposes the Jeyapalan model was used. The model does not take into consideration the dislodged rockfill material, which would slow down the flow and will reduce the distance covered by the tailings material. The input parameters used for the tailings material: • yield strength 4.08 kPa • plastic viscosity 2.45 kPa*s (these are estimated average values based on minimum and maximum values indicated by Jeyapalan) • Weight 13.5 kN/m^3 Slope gradient : 0,7% the estimated volume of the tailings release 27.7 Mm^3 *Modeling results and potential consequences*

	The modeling indicates that the flow slide will advance up to 1,6 km downstream of the dam toe. The flow slide will get near the confluence with the Abrud River. ***References*** [1] Chapter(7), page (19), The EIA Report [2] *A Global Perspective of Cyanide*, Dr. T. I. Mudder and Mr. Mike Botz, M.S., P.E. "**A GLOBAL PERSPECTIVE OF CYANIDE" By Dr. T. I. Mudder and Mr. Mike Botz, M.S., P.E. -** www.mineralresourcesforum.org „**Chronology of major tailings dam failures"**- www.wise-uranium.org/mdaf.html MWH, 2006. "**Technical Memorandum, Dam Break Analyses Jeyapalan Model"**, February (2006). Jeyapalan, J.K., Duncan, J.M., Seed, B.H., "**Analysis of Flow Failures of Mine Tailings Dams**",Journal of Geotechnical Engineering, ASCE, Vol.(109), No. GT2, Feb., (1983), pp. (150-171) Jeyapalan, J.K., Duncan, J.M., Seed, B.H., 1982, "**Investigation of Flow Failures of Mine Tailings Dams**." EIA, chapter (7), subchapter (2.13), pages (17-19) EIA, Chapter (7,) subchapter (6.4.3.1), pages (117-119)
Romania has signed the convention according to which it partially or totally restricts the technological cyanide mining procedures. The question is if all opinions were enough analyzed, if in the close future there will be a proposal for debating in the Parliament upon the opportunity of giving up the convention.	The procedure to use cyanide for the separation of the gold in the open environment does not make the object of legal regulations, national or European, which should forbid the use of such technique. The subject of using the cyanide for the separation of gold in open environment made the subject of numerous debates initiated by the Department "Environmental protection and natural resources" within the

	United Nations, inclusively in Berlin, on November 22-26, 1999, where environmental legislations and norms were debated, inclusively international conventions, but from the analysis of the final report of the debates, titled "*Report on the international round table on mining and the environment*", please note that this procedure was not forbidden. Please consider that the Ministry of Environment and Waters Management, by the Hazardous Chemical Substances and Wastes Management Department requested, by the Guidelines sent to S.C. Roşia Montană Gold Corporation S.A. (RMGC), with a view to the performance of the Environmental Impact Assessment Report for the Roşia Montană Project, that "*must be in compliance with the provisions of the new CE Directive on the management of wastes in the extractive industry*". The Directive no. 21/2006/EC on the management of the wastes resulting from the extractive industry specifies only the need to reduce the cyanide concentration in the decantation ponds, due to its toxic and harmful effects, to the lowest degree possible, by using the best techniques. Also, art. 13 paragraph 6 of the above mentioned Directive, establishes the maximum limits of the cyanide concentration allowed in the decantation ponds and their gradual reduction until 2018, but does not forbid the use of cyanides in the process of extracting the gold. We underline that Directive no. 21/2006/EC has as term of adoption into the legislations of the EU member states, therefore in the Romanian legislation as well, the year 2008. (MMGA_0015 LEGAL)

In what concerns the examples form Spain, I am curious if the fact that the European Union has prepared a draft bill according to which the cyanide mining procedures will be forbidden on the EU territories was taken into consideration. Was the fact that on the Romanian territory there are more than 20 mines which use cyanide based technology taken into consideration? I found out from my ecologist Romanian colleagues that it is very hard to reach information and scientific data and their objections are useless.	The procedure to use cyanide for the separation of the gold in the open environment does not make the object of legal regulations, national or European, which should forbid the use of such technique. The subject of using the cyanide for the separation of gold in open environment made the subject of numerous debates initiated by the Department "Environmental protection and natural resources" within the United Nations, inclusively in Berlin, on November 22-26, 1999, where environmental legislations and norms were debated, inclusively international conventions, but from the analysis of the final report of the debates, titled "*Report on the international round table on mining and the environment*", please note that this procedure was not forbidden. Please consider that the Ministry of Environment and Waters Management, by the Hazardous Chemical Substances and Wastes Management Department requested, by the Guidelines sent to S.C. Roşia Montană Gold Corporation S.A. (RMGC), with a view to the performance of the Environmental Impact Assessment Report for the Roşia Montană Project, that "*must be in compliance with the provisions of the new CE Directive on the management of wastes in the extractive industry*". The Directive no. 21/2006/EC on the management of the wastes resulting from the extractive industry specifies only the need to reduce the cyanide concentration in the decantation ponds, due to its toxic and harmful effects, to the lowest degree possible, by using the best techniques. Also, art. 13 paragraph 6 of the above mentioned Directive, establishes the

	maximum limits of the cyanide concentration allowed in the decantation ponds and their gradual reduction until 2018, but does not forbid the use of cyanides in the process of extracting the gold. We underline that Directive no. 21/2006/EC has as term of adoption into the legislations of the EU member states, therefore in the Romanian legislation as well, the year 2008.
My next question refers to investors and I would like to ask them if they are acquainted with their responsibilities from the point of view of the criminal law. What if a catastrophe similar to that in Baia Mare takes place? I live on Tisa shore, I am a deputy, the representative of the Tisa area, and starting with February 2000 I have felt the nightmare of this catastrophe. The inhabitants are still thinking with indignation about the fact that the dispute between the Romanian state and the Magyar one, the compensation of almost 30 billions in fact belongs to the heir, that is AURUL company; AURUL has stopped its activity and its owner does not want to assume responsibility	Please note there is no connection between the Baia Mare project and Roşia Montană Project making the object of the current environmental assessment procedure. Baia Mare was a disaster that must not happen again. To avoid this type of accident, at Roşia Montană, the Tailings Management Facility 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 (5-7 parts per million or ppm or mg/l), which is below the regulatory limit of 10 ppm recently adopted by the EU in the Mining Waste Directive. The Environmental Financial Guarantee (“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 Mining Waste Directive (“MWD”) and the Environmental Liability Directive (“ELD”). The Mining Waste Directive was adopted after Baia Mare accident happened, having the purpose for such accidents not to happen again. The Mining 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; 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. There are two separate and distinct EFGs under Romanian law. The first, which is updated annually, focuses on covering the projected reclamation costs associated with the operations of the mine in the following year. These costs are of no less than 1.5 percent per year, of total costs, reflective of annual work commitments. The second, also updated annually, sets out the projected costs of the eventual closure of the Roşia Montană mine. The amount of the EFG to cover the final environmental rehabilitation is determined as an annual quota of the value of the environmental rehabilitation works provided within the monitoring program for the post-closure environmental elements. Such program is part of the Technical Program for Mine Closure, a document to be approved by the National Agency for Mineral Resources (“NAMR”). Both EFGs to be set up by RMGC shall be entirely at the disposition of the Romanian authorities and the amounts covered by the EFGs are not affected in case RMGC falls into bankruptcy.

	Information about the financing being utilized to support the mining project at Roşia Montană can be found in the section of the Environmental Impact Assessment titled "Environmental and Social Management and System Plans," and in Annex 1 of the subchapter titled "Mine Rehabilitation and Closure Management Plan."
Moreover, it refers to what it is written here. Even the Romanian scientists laugh at us. And that is where my question comes up, about how important the opinion of scientists and specialists is for you. Mister President has turned our attention from the beginning to the fact that this is a scientific forum, and not a political one. I totally agree with that. It is not politics that has to decide in the case of this kind of problems, but science, the exact branch of science has decisional rights. It was said that a barrage which has the lowest chances of creating accidents will be built. But the opinion of the Romanian Science Academy is different. According to our information, this territory presents seismic risks. We have got this information from the Romanian Academy of Sciences and it is proved by documents you have. The President of the Magyar Academy of Sciences, Szilveszter E. Vizy has sent a letter to the President of the Romanian Academy of Sciences who, at his turn, in his answer, wrote that he had great reserves regarding that investment. The research, the reports of the work commission are not included in the material of the documentation. Since the Baia Mare accident, we do not trust each other and don't expect that this situation will change as long as the conclusions of those incidents will be so doubtful. In what concerns the height of 180 meters of the barrage, I will always remember what Pope John Paul II said: "The end of communism does not excuse the abuses of capitalism."	Our project in Roşia Montană bears no comparison to the mine in Baia Mare. From design to management of the facility itself, financial assurance, public reporting, stakeholder involvement, verification procedures, and compliance – all of which are followed to the highest standards in our project – the two projects are vastly different. Also, to our knowledge, no one died as a result of the Baia Mare accident. The mine at Rio Narcea in Spain, unlike the one at Baia Mare, is comparable to ours for many reasons, as explained by presenters during the public meetings held last year. Rio Narcea's mine in Spain was permitted under European mining law, which is also the case with the Rosia Montana project, while the Baia Mare mine *was not* permitted under European law and its design *would never* be permitted under the strict rules in place in Europe today. In fact, the Roşia Montană project is subject to even stricter standards than Rio Nacea's mine in Spain *because* of the Baia Mare accident. The Romanian Government, in our Terms of Reference, requested that we follow the new European Directive on Mining Waste 2006/21/ECeven before it became law in Europe or Romania. The Baia Mare accident has fundamentally changed the rules and regulations in Europe for the production, transportation and use of cyanide. The new stricter standards (toughest in world) make it impossible for any new mining project with a design and operating procedures similar to the Baia Mare mine to ever be permitted in Europe.

	The Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) study we submitted last year is the first in Romania to be EU compliant and is designed so that not a single exemption from existing or planned laws is necessary. To illustrate our commitment to high standards, wherever Romanian and EU requirements differ, RMGC has chosen to abide by the stricter of the two. In addition, while existing gold mines will have as long as 10 years to come into compliance with stricter regulatory standards, our Roşia Montană Project will meet these standards from the first day of operation. A large part of the changes since the Baia Mare accident is the introduction of the International Cyanide Management Code, to which Gabriel/RMGC is a signatory, and which stipulate strict guidelines for the production, transportation and use of cyanide. The Code also includes requirements related to financial assurance, accident prevention, emergency response, training, public reporting, stakeholder involvement and verification procedures. The International Cyanide Management Code can be referenced at www.cyanidecode.org. As for a specific comparison, the Roşia Montană Project ("RMP") differs from Baia Mare on every key indicator – such as cyanide detoxification in the process plant, design and construction of the Tailings Management Facility (TMF) and embankments, management of the facility itself, financial assurance, public reporting, stakeholder involvement and verification procedures. In short, the Roşia Montană Project is in no way comparable to Baia Mare. [2] The cyanide used in the RMP will be subject to a cyanide destruction 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. Because detoxification will take place before the

	tailings are deposited to the TMF, they will contain very low concentrations of cyanide (5-7 parts per million or ppm or mg/l) which is well below the regulatory limit of 10 ppm recently adopted in the EU Mining Waste Directive 2006/21/EC. This system of use and disposal of cyanide in gold mining is classified as Best Available Techniques, as defined by EU Directive 96/61/EC (IPPC). This is a key difference with Baia Mare: Baia Mare did not have a cyanide destruction mechanism (detoxification process) in the process plant, as the RMP has. As a result, the concentration of cyanide in the tailings disposed in the TMF at Baia Mare was between 120-400 ppm of cyanide. The near-zero content of the RMP solution would therefore, in the unlikely event of a spillage, mean that the quantity of cyanide in the water would be a small fraction of what was experienced at Baia Mare. The proposed dam at the Roşia Montană 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. Baia Mare was not designed to the same high standards and did not have the requisite capacity to withstand the storm event in 2000. In order to ensure sufficient capacity to avoid overtopping, the elevation of each stage of the TMF through the life of the project is determined as the sum of the design volume required to: (1) store process water and tailings for the maximum normal operation volume of tailings and the average decant pond volume; (2) store run-off resulting from two PMP – Possible Maximum Precipitation -- storms and, (3) Provide a tailings beach and additional freeboard for wave protection to the tailings volume at each stage during operations; a conservative freeboard criterion is based on the PMF storage plus 1 metre of wave run-up.

	The TMF has been designed to meet the more stringent PMP event. Furthermore, in order to ensure that the TMF can store a full PMF volume at all times, it is actually designed to safely hold the flood waters from two consecutive PMP events. The Roşia Montană TMF is therefore designed to hold a total flood volume over four times greater than the Romanian government guidelines and 10 times more than the rainfall that was recorded during the Baia Mare dam failure. An emergency spillway for the dam will be constructed in the unlikely event that pumps fail due to malfunction or power interruption at the same time as the second PMP event. 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. The TMF for RMP will be built along the centerline method, by using borrowed rockfill and waste rock – which is BAT for the industry. The EIA describes how the dam will be built with solid rock materials, designed and engineered by MWH, one of the leading dam designers in the world and reviewed and approved by certified Romanian dam safety experts, (members of ICOLD committee). Prior to operation, the dam must be certified for operations by the National Commission for Dams Safety (CONSIB) and must be controlled, according to art. 17 to GEO no. 244/2000 on dams safety, by the persons empowered by MEWM.. RMGC has utilized the world's foremost experts in these areas to ensure the safety of the project's workers and the surrounding communities. Baia Mare was built of coarse tailings materials -- not rockfill -- and therefore was not able to handle the additional weight of the storm event in 2000. RMP will have a free draining structure above the starter dam, and a system of under-drains, granular filter zones and pumps – as per BAT – to collect, control and monitor any seepage. Specifically, the tailings ponds and tailings dam have been designed to the highest standards to prevent pollution of

	groundwater, and to continuously monitor the groundwater and extract any pollution detected – a system verified by hydro-geologic studies. Specifically, the design features include an engineered clay liner system within the TMF basin to meet a permeability specification 10^{-6} cm/s, a cut-off wall within the foundation of the starter dam to control seepage, a low permeability core for the starter dam to control seepage, and 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. In terms of management, Baia Mare was rated a Category C facility – requiring other conditions for surveillance and monitoring. Roşia Montană Project, however, is Category A, meaning that a full EIA detailing baseline conditions, project impacts and mitigation measures, is required before receipt of permits, as well as future monitoring and reporting requirements. Finally, Baia Mare lacked a Cyanide Management Plan. By comparison, the Roşia Montană Project has a Cyanide Management Plan, in compliance with the International Cyanide Management Code (ICMC) – BAT for today's projects. In conclusion, we hope we have provided a detailed account of why our project in Roşia Montană isn't only vastly different from the mine in Baia Mare but that it is also designed to be a model of responsible mining, incorporating Best Available Techniques and implementing the highest environmental standards. Reference: [1] We mention that GD no.918/2002 was abrogated by GD no.1213/2006 on the framework-procedure for environmental impact assessment for certain public and private projects, published in the Official Gazette, part I no.802 of 25/09/2006 ("GD no. 1213/2006"). However, considering the provisions of art. 29 in GD no. 1213/2006 specifying

	that "*The project submitted to a relevant environment protection authority in order to obtain the environment approval and subject to the environmental impact assessment prior to this decision coming into force, shall be subject to the procedure for environmental impact assessment and issue of environment approval in force upon the submitting of the request*" we mention that as regards RMGC project the provisions of GD no.918/2002 are still incident. [2] Please see Baia Mare information sheet in the Annex, for a detailed comparison between Roşia Montană and Baia Mare, including results of the UNDP assessment of Baia Mare.
I have read the chapter about the transborder effects, which was initially written in the Magyar language and I would like to mention how superficial that material seemed to me. I refer especially to a certain part from which I quote: "The approximate length of the water course in the hydrologic basin of Mureş river from the place projected for the mine to the border is 500 kilometers. After leaving the Romanian territory, Mureş river flows for another 20 kilometers (n. tr. 40 kilometers) and flows into Tisa in Szeged town, before reaching Serbia's territory, then Tisa (initially Belgrad was mentioned) flows into the Danube at Titel." This text has many mistakes. I only needed a minimum documentation, and I knew without documenting, to find out that its length on the Magyar territory is of 50.3 kilometers, out of which 21 kilometers is the length of the common border. You have to know that the mouth of Arieş River is at a distance of 467 kilometers of water from the mouth of Mureş river of Azeged. This data is in the Magyar language. I would like to mention this data in order to make an idea about the rest of the material which has not been translated into the Magyar language and about which we can only suppose that was done in a very precise manner. Not to mention the fact that Tisa River was affected by pollution on a surface of 17 kilometers on	The distance from the TMF of the Rosia Montana Project along the river system to the Hungarian Boarder is **595km** and the distance to the Tisza River is 637km. This is based on 1. From **Corna TMF to Abrud river: 1.8 km** [measured from the Urbanism Certificate map which is based on information provided by the National Agency of Cadastre and Land Registration (ANCPI)] 2. **Abrud River from Gura Cornei to Poarta Iancului: 12 km** [Cadastral Register of Romanian Waters - National Administration Apele Romane] 3. **Aries river from Poarta Iancului to Turda before Mures river: 117 km** [Cadastral Register of Romanian Waters - National Administration Apele Romane] 4. **Mures river from Turda to Nadlac (Ro-Hu border): 464 km** [Cadastral Register of Romanian Waters - National Administration Apele Romane] 5. **Mures river from Turda to Tisza River: 506 km** [Cadastral Register

the Magyar territory, which was not mentioned here, and the flow mouth of Tisa is at Titel.	of Romanian Waters - National Administration Apele Romane] Therefore 1.8 + 12 + 117 + 464 = 594.8 km – rounded gives 595 km from RM to the Hungarian Boarder And 1.8 + 12 + 117 + 506 = 636.8 km – rounded gives 637 km from RM to the Tisza River.
we have heard the opinion of a specialist according to which, on this territory, there aren't any natural values protected by law, or any kind of natural values. I have here a scientific documented drawn up by two botanists, John Ecroyd and Andrew Johns, who in July 2006 went to Roşia Montană for two days. They have discovered not less than 8 vegetal associations rich in species, 8 orchid species out of which 6 are on the red protection list. They have found other important plants too. I don't know if the specialist is acquainted with this material and I don't know when he explored the place. All I know is that in 1998 a short period was given for researching living creatures in that area. Maybe his research should be extended. It seems that in Romania plants which are not evaluated as natural values would be in Europe protected by law, if they existed there anymore. This territory is in fact much more valuable than this study has established, being a territory much more influenced by people's activities in the agricultural field as well as in the field of history and industry, which have lead to its degradation. The problem must be detailed because the investment will lead to the complete vanishing of the territory surface	All species observed within Project area and in its close vicinity have been listed in tables where their preservation status is mentioned, as per EU Habitats and Birds Directives, together their relative abundance (Plants – Annex 1, Chapter 4.6. EIA, electronic format, vertebrates – table 3-9 to 3-12, p. 68-74, Biodiversity Baseline Report, benthonic invertebrates, table 3-4, p. 49-50, Biodiversity Baseline Report). However, many of them remain rather common, widely spread at national level, and having large, stable populations (the plant species that are frequent and very frequent represent 86.5% of the species met within Project perimeter). Considering the utility of the analyzed document as an instrument of technical administrative assessment that will subsequently facilitate and assist the decision making process, the issue of preparing a scientific exhaustive study that will deplete to the smallest detail all biodiversity aspects was never discussed. 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]. A detailed map of the habitats located within Project's area is included in Annex 2 of this report.

	References: [1] art.3. (2), 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. (1) 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. [...] (1) .[...] 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. (4). 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, (1). 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.
I would like to ask you a question regarding chapter 10, about the transborder effects, paragraph 4.2, about the cyanide transportation. You say that the final destination of the cyanide transport hasn't been finalized yet. In contradiction whit what you said in chapter 7 about risks, pages 131-133, where the cyanide transport is said to be done by DEGUSSZA company.	A final preferred cyanide transportation route will not be selected until closer to the date that cyanide will be transported, as the regional routes and infrastructure are in a constant state of change and we want the best route. A detailed route survey to identify all potential transportation alternatives and hazards, together with needed mitigation measures, will be completed before operations begin in consultation with administration and road traffic

My question is which of the two affirmations is correct?	authorities. The survey will be conducted as close to the beginning of operations as possible to take advantage of the most updated rail and highway network improvements, as per EU guidelines, and always observing the route utilization norms, restrictions and recommendations imposed by the road administrator, traffic police and other public authorities as required by Romanian applicable laws. RMGC is committed to meeting all requirements to ensure safe transportation of any hazardous materials. Our company and our suppliers will adhere to the guidelines of the Cyanides Sector Group of the EU (CEFIC) for storage, handling and distribution of alkali cyanides. CEFIC sets the standards and requires compliance with EU Directives regulating the transport of thousands of different hazardous substances shipped daily throughout the EU. RMGC is also a signatory of the International Cyanide Management Code (ICMI), an internationally recognized practice for cyanide management in the gold mining industry; we will also require our suppliers to sign and abide by ICMI, and Roşia Montană plant operations will be ICMI certified. An ongoing, rigorous and independent audit of the cyanide management system will be followed as well.
And I have another question which refers to cyanide transport risk. You talk about the railway, terrestrial way and maritime way. Why isn't there any study about the transport risk in those cases? And why isn't there an estimation of the damages which can take place on the Hungarian territory, in its quality of transit area; this report should include a statistics about the railway accidents in Hungary and the names of the critical points on the route. What kind of project do you have for avoiding such an accident?	During operations, our plans are to maximize the use of rail to a depot near the project site whenever possible. When using trucks, our operating procedure will most likely be to group the transport into convoys of 12 trucks once per week to reduce the possible risk of accident. The shipment will occur only after an assessment of current conditions and confirmation of ability to receive shipment at site. RMGC and its suppliers will fully comply with ADR (European Agreement concerning the international carriage of dangerous goods by road) and RID, (the European regulations covering the international carriage of dangerous goods by road or rail). Transportation routes will be selected, in consultation with administration and

	road traffic authorities as to avoid hazards, and constant communication during the transit process will help ensure secure delivery to the intended site. Upon delivery, the briquettes will be dissolved directly into a safe container and remain completely contained within the process and plant site. There will be enough storage capacity at the Roşia Montană site to guarantee continuous operation and also allow flexibility of delivery to avoid unusual hazards such as poor road or weather conditions. The degree of impact on Zlatna will vary based upon this important assessment. In one alternative route, Zlatna could be selected as a railhead for the delivery of cyanide with road transport to the project site. The EIA notes that RMGC will undertake a survey to provide new information; this survey will include a robust mitigation strategy and allow more detailed provisions for specific cases. The proposed new survey will provide information on conditions at Zlatna and the community will be consulted regarding their concerns. The Transport impact assessment will identify the classes of impact, including increase in heavy traffic volumes, noise and vibration as well as potential for accidents and spill of dangerous substances. RMGC is committed to respecting the Romanian and EU relevant legislation and also to imposing the observation of such obligations also by its suppliers in order to ensure that all requirements for safe transportation of any hazardous materials are met. Also, our company and our suppliers will adhere to the guidelines of the Cyanides Sector Group of the EU (CEFIC) for storage, handling and distribution of alkali cyanides. CEFIC sets the standards and requires compliance with EU Directives regulating the transport of thousands of different hazardous substances shipped daily throughout the EU. RMGC is also a signatory of the International Cyanide Management Code (ICMI), an internationally recognized practice for cyanide management in the gold mining industry; we will require our suppliers to sign and abide by ICMI and the Roşia Montană plant will be ICMI certified. An ongoing, rigorous and independent audit of the cyanide management system will be followed as well.

There's no doubt about your stake. Your stake consists of 330 tons of gold and 1600 tons of silver. It is currently the biggest precious metal deposit in Europe and the second biggest one worldwide. This is why you wish to possess this deposit as soon as possible. But if we do not take care, it will not lack consequences. You will grind 400 million tons of rock and you will destroy the environment on an area of 1600 hectares. This territory represents the surface mines and the waste deposit area. You have mentioned in one of your answers the fate of those landowners who won't sale their land for anything in the world, asserting that given the situation, you will surround their lands with dikes. But on this area of 1600 hectares, several hundreds of such owners live, on lands scattered on this territory. What is your opinion about the sanctity of private property? What will be the fate of these lands that the owners will for no reason leave?	When acquiring the private property lands necessary for the development of Roşia Montană Project, RMGC's approach is primarily based on the principle of a "willing seller-buyer basis". To this extent, RMGC provided fair compensation packages for the affected inhabitants of the impacted area, in full compliance with the World Bank policies in this field, as detailed in the Relocation and Resettlement Action Plan developed by RMGC, which may be found on company's official website. The company will seek options to redesign the mine plan to allow those owners to retain their property, unaffected by the mine. In the Environmental Impact Assessment Report, Alternatives chapter, several alternatives are being considered, including different choices for the location of the tailing dam facilities, other than in Corna Valley. Of course it may prove, at the end of all of these efforts, that a very small number of property owners - perhaps a few families - will refuse to sell their holdings. At that point, the decision falls to Romanian relevant authorities as to whether they will exercise the legal instruments available to them to expropriate the properties. That decision will turn on whether a small number of people, perhaps a handful, should prevail (via a de facto veto power) over the majority will of local residents and public development interests as a whole to benefit from $2.5 billion USD infused into Romania, much of it into a rural region that has been designated a "Disadvantaged Zone" and knows only extreme poverty at present. Mention should be made that art. 6 of the Mining law no. 85/2003 expressly provides expropriation as one of the legal methods for a titleholder to acquire the usage right over the lands necessary for the development of mining activities in the exploitation perimeter. Also, art. 1 of Law no. 33/1994 on the expropriation for public utility cause provides that "*the expropriation of immovable property*, […], *can be made only*

	for cause of public utility", and art. 6 of the same law provides that "*there are causes of public utility: geological exploration and prospecting; extraction and processing of useful mineral substances*". In conclusion, the expropriation, in exchange of a fair and prior compensation, made in accordance with the legal and constitutional provisions, represents one of the modalities of obtaining the usage right over the lands necessary for the development of a mining project, being expressly provided by art. 6 of the Mining Law no. 85/2003 and by art. 6 of Law no. 33/1994.
There's no guarantee that our waters and our aquatic environment shall be protected, as long as cyanide mining will continue in Europe, like you yourselves have proposed in Roşia Montana. 9 localities shall vanish from the neighborhood of Roşia Montana, like Corna for example. What will become of the over 100 million tons of waste following the gold mining? You shall leave them to us. You will get rich quickly or you think that you will get what you deserve and us, the ones who live in Tisa and Mureş valleys will find ourselves helpless, continuously threatened by the several hundred million tons of waste. They stand for a danger for Tisa, for Mureş, for Arieş, for the Danube and the Black Sea	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 by RMGC to provide additional detail to that provided in the EIA 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 modeling work is presented under the title of the *Mureş River Modelling* Program and the full modelling report is presented as **Annex 5.1.**
You haven't mentioned anything about the future's biggest challenge, which is nothing else but the protection of water sources. The main problem of this century is not solving the fuel crisis, but maintaining drinking water sources. From this point of view, Hungary is a strong country. But this wellbeing is endangered by the Roşia Montana investment.	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 by RMGC to provide additional detail to that provided in the EIA 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 modeling work is presented under the title of the *Mureş River Modelling* Program and the full modelling report is presented as **Annex 5.1.**
I'd like to ask you where the head office of STAMTEC is - the	The biodiversity baseline conditions studies have been initiated in1999 under

company that registered the chapter on biodiversity within the impact study of 5000 pages. Could they tell us the names of 2 or 3 specialists who have contributed to this chapter on biologic diversity? I have to find out these names, because the animal part begins with birds. And birds eat mainly insects. The assertion in the impact study according to which there is no plant or animal worth being protected by law on this territory can only be true if no research has been made. It means that no research has been made regarding butterflies, insects or any living creatures worth being protected by law on this territory.	the coordination of Knight Piesold. Between 2000 and 2006, STANTEC involved several teams of Romanian experts in the process of preparing/reviewing/completing these baseline reports. The first draft of the report has been prepared under the coordination of Stantec (a Canadian-based, multinational company, dedicated to the preparation Environmental Impact Assessments; see www.stantec.com). The company has been founded in 1954 and provides professional services in designing, consultancy, ecologic reconstruction, and project management, etc. The company has more than 6,000 employees and over 80 offices/locations in North America and the Caribbean. Even from the initial stage Stantec, has contracted Romanian experts that have worked together in preparing biodiversity baseline reports (Mr. Mircea Gomoiu, PhD, Academician; Mr. Mihai Valcu, PhD in Biology; Mr. Virgil Iordache, PhD in Biology; Mr. Gogu Mircea, Biologist, PhD; Mr. Calin Hodor, Biologist). The initial report prepared by Stantec has been reviewed and updated between 2005 and 2006 by teams lead by Institutul de Cercetari si Amenajari Silvice (ICAS) (The Institute of Forest Research and Developments) and by Mr. Sergiu Mihut, PhD (USI) who are certified by Ministry of Environment and Water Management in preparing environmental assessments. According to the provisions included in current in force law, Minister Order no. 978/2003, amended and altered by Minister Order no. 97/2004 and by Governmental Emergency Ordinance no. 195/2005, the EIA Report must be prepared by certified Natural or Legal Persons, but this is not a mandatory condition for the experts that contribute to the preparation of Baseline Conditions Reports, Management Plans, or any Land Surveys. The bibliography will be included in Annex 1.
What will become of those churches whose parishioners shall not contribute to their moving in another place? What will	Firstly, there are only 6 cemeteries that will be affected by the project. In the case of any grave, there must be a very strong reason for that grave to be

become of burial places?	removed. The communities have created during their development initial rules, later turned into laws that deal with this unfortunate event. Contrary to what the opponents of the mining project claim, no one wants to destroy churches or graveyards. To put the number of graves in context, only 410 graves of the Roşia Montană's 1905 graves will be affected by the mining project, 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 Alba's new cemetery. Two churches and two prayer houses out of a total of 10 places of worship located within the project's footprint must be relocated or restored under the mine plan. Those churches will be moved in accordance with the wishes of the congregation, at the expense of RMGC. Churches construction is a central element in the new community of Piatra Albă being built by the company. **References:** [1] the relocation of graves and cemeteries is governed by the following regulatory acts: (vi) 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; (vii) 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'); (viii) 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"); (ix) 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; (x) 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; 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.
I'd like to ask you where your company, Roşia Montana Gold Corporation is registered. Where is its registered office? Is it true that it is registered in Barbados? And that its head office is in a 2 room apartment in Canada? Your 80% share partner is Gabriel Company. Where is its head office and where is it registered?	Gabriel Resources, Ltd. may be reached at 1510-110 Yonge Street, Toronto, Ontario, Canada, M5C 1T4. Their website is: www.gabrielresources.com
The main shareholder of Gabriel is New Mount, a company whose activity is gold mining worldwide. Why did it declare bankruptcy in Uzbekistan? Are your investors correctly informed about all the details related to their investments? Are they aware of the risks of ecologic accidents with catastrophic consequences on the environment and on humans? Or with risks of destroying over 1600 land hectares? Or of ravaging villages? Have your Canadian investors heard about the consequences of pollution with cyanides and hard metals of Tisa and Someş rivers in 2000? Do they know that, following the Baia Mare catastrophe, the Australian-Romanian company AURUL TRANS GOLD, responsible for causing the pollution has declared itself bankrupt? So that no one will pay the 29 billion florints damages to the Hungarian state.	Please note there is no connection between the Baia Mare project and Roşia Montană Project making the object of the current environmental assessment procedure. Baia Mare was a disaster that must not happen again. To avoid this type of accident, at Roşia Montană, the Tailings Management Facility 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 (5-7 parts per million or ppm or mg/l), which is below the regulatory limit of 10 ppm recently adopted by the EU in the Mining Waste Directive.

	The Environmental Financial Guarantee (“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 Mining Waste Directive (“MWD”) and the Environmental Liability Directive (“ELD”). The Mining Waste Directive was adopted after Baia Mare accident happened, having the purpose for such accidents not to happen again. The Mining 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; 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. There are two separate and distinct EFGs under Romanian law. The first, which is updated annually, focuses on covering the projected reclamation costs associated with the operations of the mine in the following year. These costs are of no less than 1.5 percent per year, of total costs, reflective of annual work commitments. The second, also updated annually, sets out the projected costs of the eventual closure of the Roşia Montană mine. The amount of the EFG to cover

	the final environmental rehabilitation is determined as an annual quota of the value of the environmental rehabilitation works provided within the monitoring program for the post-closure environmental elements. Such program is part of the Technical Program for Mine Closure, a document to be approved by the National Agency for Mineral Resources ("NAMR"). Both EFGs to be set up by RMGC shall be entirely at the disposition of the Romanian authorities and the amounts covered by the EFGs are not affected in case RMGC falls into bankruptcy. Information about the financing being utilized to support the mining project at Roşia Montană can be found in the section of the Environmental Impact Assessment titled "Environmental and Social Management and System Plans," and in Annex 1 of the subchapter titled "Mine Rehabilitation and Closure Management Plan."
the impossibility that the dike breaks is being discussed on and on, although such accidents have taken place. I'd like to ask if Roşia Montana Gold Corporation takes responsibility that the dike won't break and if it does, what are the consequences for us?	The details of Roşia Montană Gold Corporation's ("RMGC") Environmental Financial Guarantee ("EFG") are 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"). In România, 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. RMGC has retained one of the world's leading insurance brokers, which is well established in România and has a long and distinguished record of performing risk assessments on mining operations. The broker will use the most appropriate property and machinery breakdown engineers to conduct risk analysis and loss prevention audit activities, during the construction and operations activity at Roşia Montană, to minimize hazards. The broker will then determine the appropriate coverage, and work with A-rated insurance companies to put that program in place on behalf of RMGC, for all periods of the project life from construction through operations and closure. RMGC is committed to maintaining the highest standards of occupational health and safety for its employees and service providers. Our utilization of Best Available Techniques helps us to ensure this goal is achieved. No organization gains from a loss, and to that end we will work to implement engineering solutions to risk, as they are far superior to insurance solutions to risk. Up to 75% of loss risk can be removed during the design and construction phase of a project.

	Yet we recognize that with a project as large as that being undertaken at Roşia Montană, there is a need to hold comprehensive insurance policies (such policies are also a prerequisite for securing financing from lending institutions). Core coverage includes property, liability, and special purpose (e.g. delayed start up, transportation, non-owned). Thus in the event of legitimate claims against the company, these claims will be paid out by our insurers. All insurers and insurance coverage related to the mining operations at Roşia Montană will be in full compliance with Romania's insurance regulations. Detailed financial guarantees are in place, in the form of the EFG, which require Roşia Montană Gold Corporation ("RMGC") to maintain adequate funds for environmental cleanup. The EFG is updated annually and will always reflect the costs associated with reclamation. 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 EFG must be in place to receive an operating permit to begin mining operations. An analysis is underway to determine the EFG required during each year of operation. The minimum amount at the start is expected to be approximately US $ 25 million and increase from that level annually. 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 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.
On request, I have studied the whole material in English, referring to the cultural patrimonies, namely approximately 300 pages from the impact study. I don't know if there is anyone in this room who has done the same thing. Within this study, the authors have discussed many issues. They have mentioned the archaeological patrimony, the protection of the architectural patrimony, de the folklore patrimony. However, there is hardly any mention about the spiritual patrimony, the religious inheritance and about the industrial archaeology. Indeed, many issues have been tackled and, at a first glance, this could be considered a perfect paper. Even as a second impression I can say many positive things about this paper. Especially regarding the quality of the research done in the field of archaeology, which are not of high quality, but they have merely been published. After one more day, when I went on a visit on-site, I have met a few archeologists. I have seen the diggings and I assured myself that in this particular case, the archaeology studies cannot be questioned. The problem was of a different kind. It's not about how the archaeological research is being carried out, but the main problem here is that the investor assumes the right to destroy the most important cultural patrimony, that is the archaeological patrimony. We are providing them with the amounts of money, for which, the Romanian authorities are entitled to request the corresponding	Considering the importance of Roşia Montană's cultural heritage and the existing legal provisions, S.C. Roşia Montană Gold Corporation S.A has allotted a budget of over US$ 10 million for the archaeological research of the heritage undertaken in the period 2001-2006. Taking into account the results of this research, the specialists' opinions and the decisions made by the competent authorities, the company has estimated a budget of US$ 25 million for the works to be carried out in the following years for the conservation and restoration of Roşia Montană 's cultural heritage, as publicly stated in the Environmental Impact Assessment from May 2006 (see the EIA Report, volume 32- Cultural Heritage Management Plan for the Roşia Montană area, pages 83-85). These are some of the plans for the coming years: the continuation of the archaeological research in the Orlea area, but especially the establishment of a **Modern Mining Museum**, which will include exhibitions of **geology, archaeology, industrial and ethnographic heritage,** and the **Cătălina Monuleşti gallery** and the **monument from Tău Găuri** will be arranged for tourist access; the **conservation and restoration of the 41 historical monument buildings and of the protected area Historic Centre of Roşia Montană.** At present, after the comprehensive archaeological research conducted in the last 8 years, the nature, features and spatial distribution of the heritage assets from the Roşia Montană area (archaeological sites, historic buildings, but also churches and cemeteries) are better understood. The comprehensive archaeological research conducted in the period 2000-2006 have allowed the

projects, as in the case of the highway construction in Hungary. After the presentation of the projects, these were immediately altered, except for a few cases specially stipulated by the authorities, cases in which the destruction of the sites is forbidden. I shall refrain from listing them right now. The ones of international significance have been omitted from the drafts, but they can still exist as isles at the borders of the mine territory or in the special locations, which, if emphasized now, they risk disappearing later on. All the others shall be destroyed. But what exactly is being destroyed? Cemeteries shall be completely destroyed, regardless of their high significance. All those sites that did not make the list of the national patrimony protected by law shall be destroyed. But what seems even more important is the fact that the galleries built by the Romans for mountain ore extraction are destined to vanish, galleries that are over 10 km long. Although these have already disappeared from the Cetarca Mountain, they still exist in the Cîrnic Mountain, preserved almost intact. We know about their existence, there are previous documentation and presentation materials on these, but not all of them can be included in the inventory list. There are statements in the summary that do not seem credible to us, namely statements according to which these labyrinths shall become distinct immediately after removing the first layer of the mountain, by means of detonations, nor do we believe in the idea according to which at least the possibilities of development for these shall be analyzed. Archaeological values of far too much significance shall be destroyed. The image of the town is deplorable. As compared to the image from a previous period, a few years back, I can't say it is deplorable, but simply sentenced to death. Why is that? Because many of the buildings here, among which there are over 40 architectural cultural patrimonies, 2 churches	creation of a comprehensive picture of these national cultural heritage assets and of areas with a spiritual significance as well as the adoption of specific measures for their protection. Thus, in compliance with the requirements of the Ministry of Environment and Waters Management and of the Ministry of Culture and Religious Affairs, specific management plans have been prepared for the management and conservation of the heritage assets from the Roşia Montană area, in the context of the implementation of the Roşia Montană project. These management plans have been included in the documentation for the Report on the Environmental Impact Assessment Study for the Roşia Montană project. (see the EIA Report, volume 32-33, Plan M – Cultural Heritage Management Plan, part I – Management Plan for the Archaeological Heritage from Roşia Montană Area; part II – Management Plan for the Historical Monuments and Protected Zone from Roşia Montană; part III – Cultural Heritage Management Plan). Roşia Montană 's values can be summed up as follows: - the Roman galleries from the massifs located on the southern part of the Corna valley have been thoroughly researched and specific conservation measures have been proposed for the Cătălina Monuleşti and Piatra Corbului areas; the Roman galleries from the northern part of the Rosia valley have been subject to preliminary archaeological investigations and specific conservation measures have been proposed for outstanding finds such as those from the Păru Carpeni mining sector; the Orlea – Țarina area is going to be thoroughly researched in the period 2007-2012. As for the segments of ancient galleries found in the southern part of the Cârnic massif, given that they are spatially dispersed and access id very difficult, and implies a high risk regarding the public's safe access as well as the enormous maintenance costs,, after being thoroughly investigated, it has been concluded that they cannot be preserved and enhanced by opening them for tourist tours;

and other buildings of architectural significance belong now to the investor. Since this project has become part of the mind and imagination of the people, nobody takes care of these buildings anymore, their state becoming more and more deplorable. RMGC does not renew the deserted houses, aware of the fact that they are to be pulled down anyway, although numerous monuments are among these buildings, which, according to law, must be maintained and taken care of. In the study there is no reference to this issue. There would be some other general comments I would like to make, concrete observations related to the cultural program. Just like in case of the materials on environmental aspects, in the chapter on culture countless errors can be identified. From history we know that an Austro-Hungarian monarchy used to be located in these parts. A serious error was committed when mentioning exclusively the presence of an Austrian population, in the present study, and nothing about the Hungarian population. Perhaps an even more serious error is committed when mistaking the Lutheran for the Unitarian religion. I think it is clear enough for everybody that the Huns are born from the Finno-Ugrian people. In Roşia Montană there are no inhabitants of Lutheran religion. The more general problems refer to the answers I have heard during this hearing. They have been imprecise, unclear and, in the most unpleasant situations, those “on this subject matter, you may consult with us later on ” kind of answers, or the famous “we are open to any kind of discussions on this subject”. I think this is the right place to discuss all these problems. Let us not postpone these discussions and let us not forget event for a moment that we are talking here about a project for which the financial evaluation papers are missing, the project	- 13 archaeological sites have been identified and researched during the preventive archaeological investigations undertaken in the period 2001-2006; once these comprehensive researches were completed, a decision was made for the archaeological discharge of some on these sites, while other structures will be preserved in situ (e.g. the funerary precinct of Tăul Găuri; the Roman remains from the Carpeni hill); - the development of the mining project would not affect the 41 historic buildings from Roşia Montană. Measures will be taken for the restoration and conservation of these structures; - out of the 10 churches and prayer houses from Roşia Montană and Corna, the mining project will affect only those that are located on the Corna valley whereas those from the Roşia valley will be preserved in their entirety; - out of the 12 cemeteries existing in Roşia Montană, 6 are going to be affected by the implementation of the mining project, while approximately 410 tombs of the total 1905 will have to be relocated. For further information on the main archaeological remains, the historical monuments, as well as for a series of remarks regarding their protection and the specific measures stipulated in the management plans, please see the Annex called **“Information on the Cultural Heritage of Roşia Montană and Related Management Aspects**” (MMGA_0364 ARH) Although their presence was known for more than 150 years, the Roşia Montană Roman galleries had never been archaeologically investigated prior to 1999. Basically, prior to 2000, this type of archaeological remains have never been subject to a specialized research, but only mentioned empirically. Equally, surface archaeological remains have not been properly researched before 2000**,** the existing body of data was formed by chance finds uncovered during agricultural activities and construction works.

being far from complete, regardless of what some people may believe. The project shall be started much later. I have found similar errors in the project referring to the cultural aspects as well. That is, the significance of the archaeological sites is much praised, and for good reasons. But, in the author's opinion, the patrimony sites from here cannot be classified as world or international patrimony, which other sites from different Roman times mines take pride in. Indeed we can list many such antique mines, but the above comment is wrong, it is a demagogic and confusing assertion. The situation concerns a single mine of this kind, located in Las Meduras, a gold mine dating from the Roman times, but which cannot be compared to the value of the one in Roşia Montană. If I were to take into account that information on these data, you should be amazed to find out the following: in Roşia the existence of continuous gold exploitation for over 2000 years was historically confirmed. Such activities might have been carried out in the Bonze Era as well, but this fact is very difficult to prove. However the 2000 years are sufficient. We can find here galleries and entrances dating back from the Roman times, temples and cemeteries bearing Roman inscriptions, mining tracks can also be found here dating from the Middle Age and up to the Modern Age. Accordingly, we have proofs to certify the uninterrupted practice of mining for over 2000 years, evidence to also support the theory according to which the purpose of the Roman occupation of Dacia was the gold. Hadrian did not capitulate for fear of losing this gold, Mark Aurelius, maybe no one besides me knows this detail, Mark Aurelius was capable of offer at auction during the 168 wars the treasures of the Court belonging to the royal family to finance his army. And why is that? Because the gold mines in Dacia have ceased their activity. I am sorry, but nothing was mentioned on this subject	Consequently, prior to the researches undertaken at the beginning of 2000, Roşia Montană was known to be an ancient mining site with a significant archaeological potential, where no proper archaeological excavations had been conducted as would be required for a detailed identification of various components and characteristics, and for the identification of the location and spatial distribution of the ancient mining remains within the site. Despite all these, mining of the gold and silver deposit at Roşia Montană by the Romanian state continued for more than 60 years, even after the ratification of Law No. 5/2000 that lists the Roman gold and silver mining galleries among the cultural heritage assets, but without further specification of location, characteristics or distribution. As part of the implementation of a new mining project in the area, preventive archaeological researches in Roşia Montană began in 2000, with the participation of archaeological teams from the Alba Iulia Union National Museum and the Bucharest National Institute for Historical Monuments, while a team of mining archaeologists from the University of Toulouse, coordinated by dr. Beatrice Cauuet, was called upon to conduct an expert assessment of the ancient galleries. Starting with 2001, taking into account the results of the preliminary studies conducted in the preceding year, the National Research Program "Alburnus Maior" was established under Order No. 2504 of 7 March 2001 of the Ministry of Culture and Religious Affairs. One of its objectives was to conduct specialist archaeological investigations of the Roman and medieval mining galleries in the area, and to inventory and propose conservation/restoration solutions for the representative sectors. Since 2000, the central government, i.e. the Ministry of Culture and Religious Affairs has been involved in matters related to the Roşia Montană Roman galleries, in accordance with its statutory powers. Under the current Romanian legal provisions, the company has provided the necessary financial resources for the assessment and study of these types of

so far... I shall try to be more concise, but the most important part is still to come. After drawing the necessary conclusions, we reach a special situation, i.e. the most important one in my presentation. Namely the Dacian waxen slates. More precisely the Dacian waxen slates from Roşia Montana. These represent undeniable documents dating from those times about the miners' community which was settled here and which left us with this archaeological patrimony. From the 25 pieces remaining, 13 are hosted by the history museum from Budapest. We are confronted thus with a special situation. The altars and the other ethnographic objects, as well as the waxen slates represent such an important spiritual patrimony that in 2003, UNESCO decided to grant the latter the title of world cultural patrimony, establishing thus a new scale of values within the spiritual patrimonies. We can also include here the great libraries from the time of King Matei Corvin. All these lead to the conclusion that we are talking here about a significant cultural patrimony, to which the natural values also belong, as well as thos relating to environment. All opinions in Hungary, in Romania and within ICOMOS (International Council on Monuments and Sites) indicate this idea. Interesting and curious enough, there are no bibliography references to this subject. It might be useful to notice that in 2002, 2003 and 2005 three common meetings of ICOMOS have led to certain decisions concerning this issue. On each of the three occasions, they have expressed their worries concerning this project and have offered their support. In 2005, last autumn, within one of these common meetings, Roşia Montană is discussed as a location of countless examples of cultural values bearing world significance. The decision is completely in the hands of the Romanian government, but I	archaeological remains. Based on the conclusions of the researchers and on the decisions of the competent authorities – the Ministry of Culture and Religious Affairs, the National Archaeology Commission, and the National Commission for Historical Monuments - the Company has also financed the acquisition of facilities, work equipments, health and safety equipment, expenses in connection with the workforce, as well as expenses connected with the creation of a permanent team of workers employed at ensuring access and underground assistance to the archaeologist team and maintenance of the underground works. Consequently, the EIA Study includes the budget allocated for this type of works. During the eight years of research at Roşia Montană, more than 140 km of underground mining works of Roman and later periods have been investigated, two thirds of which are located in the Cârnic and Cetate Hills and where a total of about 7 km include ancient mining works involving excavation by iron tools (chisel and hammer) or fire. The modern and recent workings, identifiable based on a study of their walls (traces of drilling blasting, general shape of the works, comparison with archived mining plans) have been dated generally between the 17th and early 20th century, based on radio-carbon analysis on charcoal or preserved wood. The 7 km of galleries dated back to the Roman Age constitute the sum of all works that have been identified and mapped, from all the areas researched, and not a continuous system of galleries. Thus, according to the findings of the team involved in the research, most of the Roman galleries have been revisited and partially re-mined by generations of miners, throughout the centuries. We should also mention that mining archeology excavations that allow dating, interpretation and restoration, also contribute to the gallery's vulnerability. More specifically, the reopening of old works makes them accessible to all and, therefore, exposes them to degradation. To an equal extent, the conduct of complete excavation will naturally involve the removal of the "archaeological deposit" and, once digging is completed, only empty galleries and other works

have been informed by the president of the national council ICOMOS from Romania that there are plans for discussion on this subject in September. This means that there are concerns related to the world patrimony. The Romanian Science Academy has already expressed its opinion on nature protection and cultural protection, a few years ago. The Law on mining which was signed by Romania some years ago forbids mining activities in the areas with important archaeological sites. This subject has not been mentioned yet tonight. Let us dig deeper into this subject. A few years ago, 1038 scientists have signed that document which opposes the opening of the mine from Roşia Montană. Ladies and Gentlemen! The investment from Roşia Montană represents an income from which a ratio of 80% is to leave the country. Form this income, 19,3% remains to the Romanian Government, that means only 1/5 of the entire income. What is left behind is a desolated landscape, the arising of the danger imposed by the waste materials high in cyanides and other such substances. I'm sorry, but I must be the first tonight to mention the danger of acid infiltration. Although this is also a very important topic, from my observations, this aspect has also been omitted from the impact study. Coming back to the main subject of discussion, various communities have strongly opposed the beginning of this project. Even the church is among these, but all parties must be heard, all opinions must be shared. This is how things are in Roşia too. I must stress out the fact that each church, but especially the Orthodox Church has declaimed against this project. Clear observations have been expressed regarding the issue of renouncing its territories.	will be left, which become unstable, while all the chronological information (artifacts) will be recovered during excavations. Detailed information on chance finds and preliminary archaeological research (both surface and underground) in the area of Orlea Massif was published in the Environmental Impact Assessment Study for the Roşia Montană Project, vol. 6 – Cultural Heritage Baseline Study, Annex I p. 231-236. The Cultural Heritage Baseline Study - Volume 6 p.48 - specifies that, with regard to the Orlea area, preventive surface and underground archaeological research is planned to continue in an area of identified archaeological potential. It also specifies that the research undertaken to date is preliminary in character. Also, given that mining activities in the Orlea area are to be developed at a later stage, surface archaeological research in this area is planned to start in 2007. Construction activities in the Orlea area, necessary for the development of the proposed mining project, cannot start until the archaeological investigations have been completed, in accordance with the Romanian legal provisions and international practices and guidelines. (Cultural Heritage Baseline Report, vol. 6, p. 46). As stipulated by the current legislation, between 2007 and 2012 RMGC will finance a preventive archaeological research program conducted by qualified archaeologists. Based on the results of such research, it will then be decided whether to start the procedures for archaeological discharge. There are no legal provisions that might prohibit the conduct of preventive archaeological research in the case of identified archaeological heritage areas, as is the case of the Orlea area The archaeological investigations undertaken by the team of French specialists have led to the identification, in the protected areas delineated in the Project's footprint, i.e. Cătălina Monuleşti, Coş, Piatra Corbului and Păru Carpeni of mining works that, for the most part, are also present in the other

	mining segments that will be affected by the Project once they are researched. Consequently, the Company has committed to providing financial and logistic support for conservation and restoration work in these areas. RMGC will provide the necessary financial resources for the continuation of archaeological research in the Păru Carpeni mining sector. The chambers equipped with hydraulic wheels, as well as the hydraulic installations and ancillary equipment will also be preserved in situ and restored with funds provided by RMGC. Additionally, the Company has allocated funds for the construction of replicas of hydraulic wheels, identical to the ancient ones. We believe that all these actions provided by RMGC will increase the range of tourist attractions in the area. As for the Roman mining galleries discovered in the mining sectors of Cătălina Monuleşti and Păru Carpeni, comprehensive rehabilitation, consolidation and development works have been planned, in order to allow their in situ preservation and their development for tourism. This decision was based on the value and significance of the exceptional archeological remains preserved in the galleries, i.e. the wooden Roman installations designed for dewatering the mines (the so-called Roman wheels). At the same time, the gallery at Cătălina Monuleşti is famous because – in the mid 19th century – the most significant set of waxed tablets was discovered here (according to archive sources, more than 11 such pieces were discovered, out of a known total of 32 such artifacts discovered to date). Most of the ancient mining works in the Cârnic massif, as well as in other mining sectors, are only accessible, and in difficult conditions, to specialists, and actually partially inaccessible to the public at large. Moreover, under the EU safety rules regulating similar activities in museums all over Europe, rules that have been transposed into Romanian legislation, Roman galleries that pose safety risks cannot be opened for public access. Note that a number of other similar Roman gallery segments will be preserved in situ. As an impact mitigation measure, apart from the full research and publication of the

	research results, specialists have considered it appropriate to develop a 3D graphic model and 1:1 replicas of these structures, to be included in the mining museum proposed to be developed at Roşia Montană. Taking into account the characteristics of the researched network of galleries, extensive and very expensive restoration works are needed, plus considerable long-term maintenance costs. In accordance with the requirements of the Ministry of Environment and Waters Management, and of the Ministry of Culture and Religious Affairs, as part of the documentation developed for the Environmental Impact Assessment Study for the Roşia Montană Project, specific management plans have been developed for the management and conservation of the heritage assets of the Roşia Montană area in the context of Project implementation, and implicitly in regard to the historic mining galleries (see EIA Report, vol. 32-33, Plan M – Cultural Heritage Management Plan, Part I – Management Plan for the Archaeological Heritage of the Roşia Montană Area, Part II – Management Plan for the Historical Monuments and Protected Zones in Roşia Montană, Part III – Cultural Heritage Management Plan). These management plans include a detailed description of the duties and responsibilities that the Company has assumed, as part of the project development, in accordance with the decisions of the central cultural administration, in regard to the protection and conservation of heritage assets in Roşia Montană area: surface and underground archaeological remains, historic monument buildings, protected areas, intangible heritage elements, cultural landscape elements, etc. In addition to the commitments made by RMGC regarding protection and preservation of the archaeological remains and historical monuments, there are numerous obligations and responsibilities for both the local public authorities in Roşia Montană and Alba county, and the central public authorities, i.e. the Romanian state. The cultural heritage management plans included in the Report on the Environmental Impact Assessment Study,

	include further information on the matter (see the EIA Report vol. 32, Management Plan for Historical Monuments and Protected Zone from Roşia Montană, pages 22-23, 49, 55-56, 71-72 and, vol. 33, Management Plan for the Archaeological heritage from Roşia Montană area, pages 28-29, 67-68, p. 103 – Annex 1). Given the significance of the cultural heritage at Roşia Montană and in accordance with the legal requirements, the allocated heritage research budget for 2001-2006 by S.C. Roşia Montană Gold Corporation S.A. amounted to more than US $10 million. Moreover, based on the research results, the specialist opinions and competent authority decisions, the budget estimated by the Company for the research, conservation and restoration of the cultural heritage at Roşia Montană in future years, provided the Project is implemented, will be US$ 25 million, as disclosed in the Environmental Impact Assessment published in May 2006 (see EIA Report vol. 32, Archaeological Heritage Management Plan for the Roşia Montană area, p. 84-85). Therefore, the company plans to continue work in Orlea area, and, above all, as indicated in the National Research Program “Alburnus Maior”, to create a **modern Mining Museum** with **geological, archaeological, industrial and ethnographic heritage** exhibits, 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.** As recommended by the team of French archaeologists and in accordance with international practices in the field, the best solution for enhancing the Roşia Montană cultural heritage is to preserve in situ the most important archaeological remains or to create exact replicas. With regard to the latter, the museum will also recreate a setting similar to the underground environment, in accordance with the EU and national safety rules, so as to make it suitable for public access. The hydraulic wheels will also be preserved, both the original installation, restored and consolidated, and the

	exact replicas, at a scale of 1:1. As an alternative, the company considered the preparation of a specialized study comprising financial estimates for the conservation in their entirety of the galleries from the Cârnic massif and for opening them to tourists. Moreover, note that the costs for the development and maintenance of a public circuit in this massif are prohibitive and such an investment would not be economically feasible (see Annex “Costs Estimate for the Development of Ancient Mining Networks from Cârnic Massif”, prepared by the UK-based companies Gifford, Geo-Design and Forkers Ltd). As for the alleged presence of galleries and sites of Dacian origin, mention should be made that the archaeological researches undertaken to date have not revealed concrete evidence in support of such an allegation. There is not enough data to justify the claim that the artifacts uncovered in the Roşia Montană area are of Dacian origin, nor have any remains been uncovered that would support the idea of ancient mining works predating the Roman conquest. During the last 8 years, the Roman galleries have been investigated by a team of specialists. It should be mentioned that this type of research, known as preventive/rescue archaeological research is done everywhere in the world in close connection with the economic development of certain areas. In addition, both the costs for the research and for the enhancement and maintenance of the areas conserved 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 [1] (Malta-1992). For further information on the history of the research and the main discoveries related to the historic galleries at Roşia Montană, as well as for the specialists’ conclusions on the matter, and assessments of a potential tourist circuit

	including the historic mining structures at Cârnic, or for the opinions formulated in 2004 by Edward O'Hara, General Rapporteur on the Cultural Heritage of the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe, please consult the annex entitled "Information on Roşia Montană Cultural Heritage and Related Management Aspects". Detailed information on the complex issue of the mining works at Roşia Montană, on their results and on their potential for enhancement, are available in the EIA Report, vol. 6, Cultural Heritage Baseline Report (pages 32, 36-55, 83-109). [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 1986 ... I have participated in a project discussing mainly the cyanides. Do not challenge me to start talking about the benefits presented by the hydrocyanic acid. It would be my pleasure to do so but not here and now. I have stopped that project back then. To sum up, that was it. Second question. I work in research, that means I put into practice ideas and inventions. Not too long ago, I have finished an investment. I know from my experience, that whenever you try to put a theory into practice, the clear cut written plans can undergo major changes, because the main issue does not concern natural events and things, predictable situations. Nobody has mentioned today, up till now at least, this topic. Maybe I'm missing something, but I would really like to receive an answer to this question. If I heard right, you are planning on using a cover layer on closure, an artificial material. In which of the layers have you planned on using this? Only for the deposit space or for the dam construction as well? Or is it a misunderstanding? And one last question: Why was it not possible to make this study available to the public earlier? I	The closure and rehabilitation of the TMF is discussed in detail in the Mine Rehabilitation and Closure Plan (Plan J in the EIA). Chapter 4.5 is devoted to the cover system on the tailings and the dam area, while Chapters 4.4.4. and 4.4.5 deal with the water quality and treatment issues. Though more details are available in the EIA, we offer a brief description of the TMF closure and rehabilitation process below. In the final years of operation, tailings will be deposited in a manner consistent with the final grading plans for the completed tailings surface. Upon cessation of ore processing, the supernatant water of the decant pond will be removed and, after treatment for cyanide, pumped to the Cetate pit to accelerate flooding of the pit. The tailings surface will be covered with a store and release cover of a total thickness of around 120-190 cm, depending on the results obtained from the test plots (which will be conducted during operation in order to investigate different cover systems and to demonstrate their suitability for waste dumps and the TMF). Its design criteria comprise the minimization of oxygen ingress into the tailings (to avoid acidification) and rainwater infiltration. The tailings cover surface will be graded so as to assist surface water runoff in discharge channels and ditches. The tailings dam will be

happened to come across it accidentally, while making observations concerning a business plan. I for one believe that, technically speaking, this is a pretty bold approach. As or the rest, anyone may add comments as they consider appropriate.	reshaped if necessary and covered with a simple soil cover, as the dam material will not be prone to acidification. Rearding the time when the EIA was made available to the public, Public consultation and information during the environmental impact assessment procedure, including the publication of the Environmental Impact Assessment 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 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. In accordance with the provisions of Order no. 860/2002, the public debates have been scheduled together with the Ministry of Environment and Water Management, on business days, but after working hours, in order to allow the interested public to participate, as follows: (i) ”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;” (ii) ”Article 27. - (1) Within 5 business days from the receipt of the report on the environmental impact assessment study and, as applicable, of the security 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. (2) Under the guidance of the competent public authority, the project titleholder shall organize the public debate to present the report on the environmental impact assessment study, in accordance with the provisions of Articles 39-44." 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 Roşia Montană Gold Corporation SA'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.
In the chapter on risks involved, on page 60 there is some mentioning about the fact that the Transgold Company has conducted research regarding the effects of the hydrogen cyanide evaporation and that no harmful effects were identified. Did you really think that Transgold is considered trustworthy in the public opinion from Hungary after the catastrophe involving cyanides back in 2000? I don't think this was your best choice. I	The tailings stored in the TMF will contain 5-7 ppm WAD cyanide concentration, below the standard level imposed by the recently approved EU Directive for mining waste which is 10 ppm WAD cyanide. The tailings stored in the TMF are subject to a series of chemical reactions which, in time, lead to changes of the cyanide concentration in the TMF (neutralization). After discharge in the tailings dam, the water content solutions will go through three different processes

could find no reference to the scientific data details, the technical methods, nothing.	1 - The main part of the water and tailings resulting from the technological process and discharged into the tailings dam, containing cyanide of the above mentioned concentration, will be circulated back and reused in the processing plant. 2 – Part of the water will evaporate in accordance with the pH level and the geometry of the tailings dam. The evaporation increases during summer. The quantity of cyanide evaporated varies in accordance with the above mentioned variables. 3 - A percentage of up to 40% will be retained at first, due to being attached to solid particles. Once the tailings are buried, a neutralizing environment occurs, and a series of mechanisms will decompose the cyanide, in time. The seepage from the tailings dam will be captured completely by the secondary containment dam, located downstream from the tailings dam and will be pumped back to the tailings dam, so that no water with cyanide content will reach the water system. The TMF was designed on the basis of 4 extremely important elements, including the protection parameters of the groundwater. These are: a starter dam of low permeability, a colluvium like layer of low permeability in the tailings dam pond, a secondary containment system and collection basin and a final treatment system for any water seepage. The modeling of the cyanide mass balance must be semi-quantitative until the real solution and the concentrations in the air can be obtained from the mining process. The model was developed on the basis of the information obtained from the designed technological flow, from the model of cyanide degradation and from other available sources, including similar mine sites where similar processes are developed. Due to its limitation, the mass cyanide balance identifies and estimates in an appropriate manner, the most significant compounds for the cyanide balance and shows the purpose of the cyanide

	within the ore processing and within the TMF. The estimation of the mass balance within the tailings dam, as well as the related dispersion in the air is essentially simple. The tailings discharged in the TMF and the cyanide concentration within these tailings are mostly known. The total cyanide concentration is estimated to be 7 mg/L, at the point it leaves the cyanide detoxification plant. This involves a WAD cyanide concentration between 4 and 6 mg/L. Based on the discharge rate and the concentration, it is estimated that the TMF will receive approximately 97 tones of total cyanide per year. Based on the volume of the pores in the tailings, almost one third of this quantity will be contained by the tailings, and 66 tone/year will be contained by the water in the tailings dam, which will be circulated back into the technological processes. The cyanide degradation within the tailings dam is a well known process. A great part of the degradation is actually, volatilization. Generally, ***90% is considered volatilization,*** the rest being represented by other chemical processes. This Model was developed especially for this Project, as showed in Section 4.1.4.8, Volume 8, Chapter 2, Technological Processes. According to this Model, almost half of the cyanide quantity is lost through degradation during a one year period of time. If it is considered that 90% of this loss is due to emissions in the air, means that almost ***30 tone/year*** is lost in the year. The Model of cyanide balance is presented in detail and supportive to the hypothesis in Volume 8, Chapter 2, Technological Processes, Section 4.1.3. Even though there are several suppositions regarding the cyanide balance within the tailings dam, the figures represent approximate averages on short intervals. There will also be exceptions recorded from this estimation but, for the time being, the mass balance is fairly accurate for this phase of the Project. One of the most probable exceptions will be that a lower level of cyanide discharged in the TMF is recorded. For the phase of the Project, as a

	safety measure, there have been assumed to be high cyanide concentrations leaving the detox process. The selected INCO SO2/Air process for the cyanide neutralization proposed, on regular basis, WAD cyanide concentrations smaller than 2 mg/L. Obviously, if lower cyanide concentrations at discharge are recorded, then the cyanide emissions into the air from the tailings dam is lower.
I find this procedure a bit difficult, according to which during the entire day, you have asked for the requests to be handed over to you in writing. I have come up with 5 questions for you one month ago, questions which have not been answered yet, although you promised me I would have the answers in my e-mail inbox before the beginning of this hearing. I still haven't found them.	The analysis of Order no. 860/2002 issued by the Minister of Waters and Environmental Protection for the approval of the environmental impact assessment and environmental permitting procedure, indicates that there is no legal deadline for preparing the answers. There is only one legal provision regarding the preparation of the answers, under Article 44: "(1) During the public debate meeting, the project titleholder shall describe the proposed project and the assessment made in the environmental impact assessment study, ***shall answer the public's questions and shall respond with arguments to the justified proposals coming from the public, received in writing before the meeting***; (2) The competent authority for environmental protection shall record the justified proposals of the public, made during the meeting, using the form presented in Annex no. IV.1, which also includes the justified proposals received before the public meeting; (3) Based on the public meeting outcome, the competent authority for environmental protection shall assess the justified proposals/comments of the public and request the project titleholder to attach an annex to the report on the environmental impact assessment study, annex containing solutions to the problems raised by the public, according to the form presented in Annex no. IV.2." To conclude, these answers will be prepared within the shortest possible time, starting from the moment when the request is transmitted from the public authority for environmental protection.
RMGC has no intention of protecting the base of the waste dump reservoir from Roşia Montană, but the waste material is	The proposed dam at the Roşia Montană Tailings Management Facility (TMF)

not drained away only by means of evaporation on the surface, but also by infiltration in the water table, process that cannot be avoided unless you are using from the very beginning a foil layer or a geotextile fabric layer, as required by the necessary applicable conditions. This fabric does not ensure however complete protection. Within the study there is no record concerning this protection measure, although according to the report on cyanides pollution, drawn up by UNP in March 2000, event the deposit space from Aurul was protected in the basis area. What intrigues us is the fact that you don not show any willingness to protect a deposit space approximately 40 times bigger, knowing that although this implies greater costs, the investments are worth it.	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. Baia Mare was not designed to the same high standards and did not have the requisite capacity to withstand the storm event in 2000. In order to ensure sufficient capacity to avoid overtopping, the elevation of each stage of the TMF through the life of the project is determined as the sum of the design volume required to: (1) store process water and tailings for the maximum normal operation volume of tailings and the average decant pond volume; (2) store run-off resulting from two PMP – Possible Maximum Precipitation -- storms and, (3) Provide a tailings beach and additional freeboard for wave protection to the tailings volume at each stage during operations; a conservative freeboard criterion is based on the PMF storage plus 1 metre of wave run-up. The TMF has been designed to meet the more stringent PMP event. Furthermore, in order to ensure that the TMF can store a full PMF volume at all times, it is actually designed to safely hold the flood waters from two consecutive PMP events. The Roşia Montană TMF is therefore designed to hold a total flood volume over four times greater than the Romanian government guidelines and 10 times more than the rainfall that was recorded during the Baia Mare dam failure. An emergency spillway for the dam will be constructed in the unlikely event that pumps fail due to malfunction or power interruption at the same time as the second PMP event. 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. The TMF for RMP will be built along the centerline method, by using borrowed rockfill and waste rock – which is BAT for the industry. The EIA describes

	how the dam will be built with solid rock materials, designed and engineered by MWH, one of the leading dam designers in the world and reviewed and approved by certified Romanian dam safety experts, (members of ICOLD committee). Prior to operation, the dam must be certified for operations by the National Commission for Dams Safety (CONSIB) and must be controlled, according to art. 17 to GEO no. 244/2000 on dams safety, by the persons empowered by MEWM.. RMGC has utilized the world's foremost experts in these areas to ensure the safety of the project's workers and the surrounding communities. Baia Mare was built of coarse tailings materials -- not rockfill -- and therefore was not able to handle the additional weight of the storm event in 2000. RMP will have a free draining structure above the starter dam, and a system of under-drains, granular filter zones and pumps – as per BAT – to collect, control and monitor any seepage. Specifically, the tailings ponds and tailings dam have been designed to the highest standards to prevent pollution of groundwater, and to continuously monitor the groundwater and extract any pollution detected – a system verified by hydro-geologic studies. Specifically, the design features include an engineered clay liner system within the TMF basin to meet a permeability specification 10^{-6} cm/s, a cut-off wall within the foundation of the starter dam to control seepage, a low permeability core for the starter dam to control seepage, and 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.
There are small chances of turbidity leakage, but there still are such chances. These leakages affect both the Mureş River, and the Tisa River. Are there any ecology evaluations on such accidents and the consequences it could have on both rivers? From the same perspective, are there any evaluations drawn up regarding the consequences on the land living creatures? These will also be affected in the case of an ecological	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 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.

catastrophe. I would like to draw your attention here again on the area protected by law in the Mureş-Tisa National Park. Have you taken into consideration the amount of research conducted up till now, both by the Romanian and the Hungarian people about the Mureşului Valley, a subject on which many volumes have been published? I do hope you are familiar with these materials.	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 by RMGC 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 modeling 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 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 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 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 as Annex 5.1. **Test work aimed at identifying the main factors influencing the water quality during both the operational and after-closure phase of the waste facility. A detail characterization of tailings and decant water chemistry discharged in TMF is presented in section 3.2 and 3.3 of the EIA report (Table 3-1, 3-2 and 3-3) Plan F - Tailings Facility Management Plan.**
regarding the cyanide transport and the defense system in case of a natural disaster, I believe that everybody is informed with the situation concerning the road system and the infrastructure in Romania, Ţara Moţilor (The Moţilor County) is approximately in the same situation as the Ţinutul Secuiesc (The Secuiesc County). Practically, one cannot drive anything else but a jeep there. I am very anxious to find out what are the defensive solutions offered in case of natural catastrophe, as well as the means of transportation for the different quantities of hazardous substances.	Regarding cyanide transportation, RMGC is committed to respecting the Romanian and EU relevant legislation and also to imposing the observation of such obligations also by its suppliers in order to ensure that all requirements for safe transportation of any hazardous materials are met. In addition, our company and our suppliers will adhere to the guidelines of the Cyanides Sector Group of the EU (CEFIC) for storage, handling and distribution of alkali cyanides. CEFIC sets the standards and requires compliance with EU Directives regulating the transport of thousands of different hazardous substances shipped daily throughout the EU. RMGC is also a signatory of the International Cyanide Management Code (ICMI), an internationally recognized practice for cyanide management in the gold mining industry; we will also require our suppliers to sign and abide by ICMI, and Roşia Montană plant operations will be ICMI certified. An ongoing,

	rigorous and independent audit of the cyanide management system will be followed as well. Since RMGC will not be certified for cyanide transportation, it will not do so. A company with expertise, that is qualified according to the Romanian relevant legislation on transportation of dangerous goods and traffic on public roads and also under CEFIC and ICMI standards, will be selected and under review by both producer and user. Cyanide in a solid, briquette form (not as a liquid), will be transported within specially-designed “isotainers” that are resistant to accident or damage and that shall be authorized and regularly inspected according to the applicable legislation on the transportation of dangerous goods and that also shall comply with the applicable norms on public roads traffic. Plans are to maximize the use of rail for transportation, to a rail depot near the project site. A detailed route survey to identify all potential transportation alternatives and hazards, together with needed mitigation measures, will be completed before operations begin. The survey will be conducted as close to the beginning of operations as possible to take advantage of the most updated rail and highway network improvements, as per EU guidelines and always observing the route utilization norms, restrictions and recommendations imposed by the road administrator, traffic police and other public authorities as required by Romanian applicable laws. When using trucks, our operating procedure will most likely be to group the transport into convoys of 12 trucks once per week to reduce the possible risk of accident. The shipment will occur only after an assessment of current conditions and confirmation of ability to receive shipment at site. RMGC and its suppliers will fully comply with ADR (ADR is the European Agreement concerning the international carriage of dangerous goods by road) and RID (Regulations concerning the international carriage of dangerous goods by rail), the European regulations covering the international carriage of

	dangerous goods by road or rail. Transportation routes will be selected, in consultation with administration and road traffic authorities as to avoid hazards, and constant communication during the transit process will help ensure secure delivery to the intended site. Upon delivery, the briquettes will be dissolved directly into a safe container and remain completely contained within the process and plant site. There will be enough storage capacity at the Roşia Montană site to guarantee continuous operation and also allow flexibility of delivery to avoid unusual hazards such as poor road or weather conditions. Under the CEFIC guidelines and ICMI code, the supplier and transportation company are required to perform surveys of alternative routes. Before transportation begins, they are responsible for ensuring safety on the route and at delivery; weather conditions such as heavy rains would be seriously taken into account when planning routes. Rail rather than highway transportation is preferred for this and other reasons. EU regulations covering the shipment of hazardous materials are specific and well-tested. These include some of the following requirements: • Shipments must stop during severe weather conditions and not re-start until conditions are confirmed as good. • Road and rail transport are covered under the EU ADR and RID regulations. • EU certification of transportation company drivers • Drivers must have an ADR license, class 6 • Drivers must have a current “sodium cyanide training certificate” • All suppliers should be affiliated with CEFIC Must have valid ADR-Certificate for sodium cyanide for the “isotainers”
Moving further on from the technological problems, in the study presented in Hungarian, a few lines were referring to the project on active cyanide extraction. In my opinion, we are talking	A summary description of the tailings processing system, as well as the use and management of the cyanide can be found in the Non-technical Summary, Chapter 9 of the EIA (Report on the Environmental Assesment (EIA)) or

about a passive extraction for now, which means, I do believe, merely ventilation. But this was not explained in detail, and I may consider it a starting point. If this is the case, it is not a very reassuring situation for me. The cumulated layers of dirt-heaps, in my opinion, are quite uncertain from the perspective of the chemical composition and present an uncertain acidity-alkalinity potential. I also see as quite uncertain – and these cannot be modeled – the chemical reactions in this turbidity. We definitely do not know, from my point of view, and I think you do not know either, as I have noticed examples indicating just that, that certain on-site analysis need to be performed on the effect of these chemical reagents on soil. I truly believe that this reactive turbidity can trigger a chemical reaction both with the seam floor, and with the clay or any other material it contacts. In such a situation, it cannot be predicted what the chemical reaction and result might be, which will in time lead to acid infiltration in this large turbidity. Another aspect is that, from my point of view, the isolation of a system containing a watery turbidity is absurd. Mister Aston himself has claimed that the turbidity surface needs irrigation, in order to prevent the evaporation in air. If things are like this, I think that the chemical reactions can become chaotic. If we are talking indeed about an ecological investment and an investment aiming at preserving the cultural inheritance, I suggest applying for ISPA funds or for other related funds. The European Union will of course appreciate your diligence in trying to initiate such an investment in Romania, if this is indeed the intention and Mister Aston has not considered using this as a stalking horse.	detailed in Chapter 2, Technological Processes, Section 4.1.2.2 The main technological processes. The most efficient and cost-effective process for extracting the gold and silver from ores such as the ones in Rosia Montana is based on full cyanide-leaching of the ore. There are numerous examples of similar ores throughout the world, which require the use of cyanide-based technology for efficient precious metals recovery. The implementation of the cyanide-based technology for gold and silver recovery from the ore in Rosia Montana is based on a detailed testwork program conducted by AMMTEC Limited and AMDEL Limited. The tests were scheduled and reviewed by GRD MINPROC Limited, and later on, the conclusions of the testing program were reviewed and reconfirmed by S.N.C. LAVALIN and AUSENCO. The issuance of the cyanide leaching technology for the ore in Rosia Montana considered the best practices used in Europe and worldwide. The technology for metals recovery by using cyanide leaching in CIL **is** Best Available Techniques **BAT** (please see Chapter 3.1.6.2.2 and Chapter 5.2 of the Guidelines of BREF [1] UE Document on BAT for Management ... in Mining Activities, March 2004). The cyanide, in a solid briquette form, will be transported in specially-designed and manufactured isotainers. The cyanide will be dissolved only into the transportation containers, in alkaline solution, sourced from and re-circulated back into a mixing tank. The mixing tank is designed to have enough capacity to store the entire quantity of a transportation container. The cyanide solution, as soon as it is dissolved in the container, will be transferred from the mixing tank into a large volume storage tank. The fine ground ore, resulting from the overflow of the ball mills' cyclones, is transferred to the tank of the feeding pump for the CIL circuit, where it's mixed with cyanide and lime suspension, required to balance the level of pH. The active carbon is added in the CIL tank to support the leaching process and the adsorption of the dissolved metals.

	The slurry is subject to a leaching process taking place within two parallel rows of 7 CIL tanks each, containing agitators. The size of the CIL tanks is D = 18 m x H = 20 m. The CIL tanks are sized to ensure enough time of contact between the cyanide solution, the ground ore and the active carbon. Sodium cyanide solution may be added in the CIL tanks number 2 and 4 of each row if needed, in order to maintain the required cyanide concentration. The slurry is circulated into the gravitational cyanide-leaching circuit, and the carbon advances continuously counter the flow of the slurry, pumped by the vertical pumps. The time for advancing from a tank into another is adjusted so that the load of gold and silver on the carbon is ensured to be from 7,000 to 8,000 g/t. Once in the feeding tank of the thickener, the slurry is mixed with flocculants which support the sedimentation of the solids. The thickener ensures the increase of the solid content within the sediment and, at the same time, the development of the supernatant almost clarified. The Supernatant discharged from the thickener will be directed towards the grinding circuit, to reuse and recover the cyanide. The thickened slurry is pumped towards the cyanide detoxification circuit, working on SO_2/air procedure, where the WAD cyanide concentration will decrease to the level approved through the European Directive. The management of the tailings and the detoxification technology are **BAT techniques**, according to Chapter 3.1.6.3, 3.1.6.3.2 and 4.3.11.8 (The Guidelines of the EU Document of BAT for Management ... in Mining Activities, March 2004). The treated tailings are pumped back into the tailings dam. The cyanide is extremely toxic therefore its manufacturing, transport, handling and neutralization must be handled with care. However, the use of 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, i.e. 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. The main quantity of the cyanide will be recovered in the processing plant as shown in Figure 4.1.15 and described in Section 2.3.3, Chapter 4.1 Water of the EIA Report. Even so, there will be a residual quantity of cyanide. The treated tailings represent the only source of the Project for process residual water. The residual cyanide concentrations found in the treated tailings slurry will have to comply with the EU Directive for mine waste which stipulates a maximum value of 10 mg/L CN_{WAD} (weak acid dissociable). The cyanide will exist as potential pollutant of the surface waters only on the plant site and during the mining phase and for the first one or two years after closure. Modeling of the predicted concentrations in the TMF has shown that treated process plant tailings flow is expected to contain 2 to 7 mg/L total cyanide. Further degradation will reduce the concentrations to below applicable standards in surface water (0.1 mg/l) within 1-3 years of closure. A secondary

	effect of this treatment is also the removal of many of the metals which may potentially occur in the process waste water stream. An assessment of the likely chemical makeup of the tailings leachate, conducted on testworks, is summarized in Table 4.1-18 (Section 4.3.), Chapter 4.1 Water, of the EIA report. After discharge, the water is circulated back into the process; the decant water in the TMF during the entire period of storage, is subject to passive treatment processes, including natural degradation of the cyanide, hydrolyses, volatilization, photo-oxidation, bio-oxidation, mixing / separation, adsorption, dilution due to rainfalls etc. According to the data sourced during the operation of various mines, different cyanide reduction efficiencies are outlined (from 23-38% to 57-76% for total cyanides and from 21-42% to 71-80% for WAD), depending on the season (temperature). An average of approx. 50% decrease of CN_t concentration was considered for the TMF during operations' phase. The Model compiled for the degradation process shows that the cyanide concentration may decrease to even 0.1 mg CN_t/L during the first three years of closure. The main part (90%) of the decomposed cyanide (average of 50%) is broken down by volatilization / hydrolosis, as cyanic acid. The mathematic modeling of the cyanic acid concentration in the TMF showed a maximum hourly concentration of 382 µg/m^3 in comparison to 5000 µg/m^3, the concentration allowed by the Order no. 462 of the Ministry of Environment and Waters' Management. 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)
Another technical problem I would like to bring forward: there was no mention about detonations. A first technological step would consist in discovering the uncovering the sedimentary layers with the help of a microexplosion. Regarding microexplosions, I could find no reference to the resonance and vibration limit values, at least not in the Hungarian material. There might be some reference to these in the English version, but this was taken away from me, before I had a chance to read it, explaining that that was the basic material, so that I could not consult it. I would recommend – as already mentioned before – finding a solution for the lining system. I believe that the current covering method is not adequate.	For the detonation the Nonel technology will be used. The load blasting order will be performed with micro delay, from the hole center to the base part and to the upper one, and from the center hole of the first row to the side extremities and to the following rows, technology that assures the significant decrease of the seismic intensity and an increased effectiveness of the rock movement explosions. 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. 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 (Acoustic Aliance Consulting) 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). When the sequential starter is adequately delayed, only small amounts of explosive are detonated simultaneously. The use of blast sequences controlled with the NONEL delay system allows multiple small explosions, which nonetheless act as one loading, without generating a movement of material outside the blasting area larger than the coverage of each individual explosion.

	Millisecond delays techniques are efficient, due to the fact that the movement of rock outside the action radius of a single hole is approximately 3 milliseconds per meter. For example, if two blasting holes rows are drilled at a distance of 8 meters, the second row of holes will explode approximately 24 milliseconds after detonation of the first row. Thus, the time of detonation of the second row of holes can be set up such as to maximize the rock movement efficiency. When mine blasting is properly executed, an outside observer can see the land going up and down, like a wave front, as if someone induced a smooth oscillation to a carpet placed on the floor. As the wave moves, a series of small intensity explosions will propagate the rock crushing wave. In conclusion, the special technologies used (within various perimeters) will not produce adverse effects on the constructions from Roşia Montană commune; however, due to the state of advanced deterioration, and in the absence of rapid intervention from the competent bodies, these constructions will become impossible to recover. ***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***.
My first comment would be that I am probably the first person to offer my sincere congratulations from the bottom of my heart for such a project, supported by a brave specialist who can honestly claim that the probability of a catastrophe is 1 in a 100 million. I suppose that this is demonstrated based on the following sequence of events: the specialist has carefully placed a cyanide capsule between two of his teeth and has mounted a wild mare, monitoring whether within one minute time, that capsule breaks or not, and has repeated this time after time, one million times all in all, and at the end he has	Extreme natural events have been considered throughout the design of the Roşia Montană project. These include but are not limited to extreme rainfalls (including rainfall and snow melt), extreme draught, hurricane and extreme earthquakes. In addition, consideration has been given to climate change factors during the development of the extreme natural events. To illustrate this, special measures have been taken to prevent and mitigate the potential negative effects caused by heavy rainfalls. What is of interest, in view of the project, is the quantity of water flowing over the ground surface as a result of the floods. The measures have been detailed in Chapter (7), *Risks*,

notices in a million repetitions or in a hundred million experiments, the capsule broke only once between his teeth. I think this is how it must have gone. And still, this means nothing at all, because, based on this study, he cannot claim anything, for in order to draw some conclusions, this sequence of experiments should be repeated at least 100 billion times. This is to begin with. And regarding this, I think we may put an end to the discussions concerning the ecological risks. Then there is a second problem: the research is based after all on a simple mechanical theory, a materialist and 300 years old theory, Newton's law on motion, if I understood correctly the observations heard before. I do not have an eye for these specific issues brought forward up till now. But I would like to mention that, as I understood, 400 such capsules are spread all over this living thing called Earth. The problem is that this living thing called Earth also has an inner biological rhythm. I am no geologist, but you can find ample documentation on this. And concerning the seismic movements, I would add that, if an epicenter is located 40 de km away, the tectonic secondary replicas can demolish everything, just as it has happened 6 years ago in Szeged. The earthquake epicenter was in Beograd, and here, on the tenth floor, you had to grab hold firmly. Coming right back to the Newton mechanics, I suppose you are familiar with much more refined methods than this one. I am curious to know if in the impact study, some kind of reference to radiation measuring is included. You must know of course that certain substances, exceeding a critical mass, react like radioactive substances. These eliminate globular waves at an exponential rate, with the effect mechanism of which nobody has dealt so far. But there are of course much more refined mechanical methods. This one I have just presented would apply to a situation 70-80 years back, based on the quantum	Subchapter (2.4.3), p. (38-42) '*Measures to Prevent, Reduce and Remediate the Effects of Floods and High Waters'.* Overall, the measures include: – the development of structures over almost the entire surface of the Roşia and Corna catchment areas. As a result, runoff on the surface covered by the site will be almost entirely retained (including open pits, waste rock dumps, tailings management facilities and other types of impoundments). The Corna dam was designed to retain the total amount of water resulting from two successive PMPs (450 mm/24 h+450 mm/24 h), so as to avoid overtopping. Estimates indicate that the Probable Maximum Precipitation, defined as "theoretically the greatest depth of precipitation for a given duration that is physically possible over a given size storm area at a particular geographical location at a certain time of year" without taking into consideration long-term climate changes (WMO, 1986) with a chance occurance of 1 in more than 100 million years [1]. – As a safeguard relating to runoff volume, the project includes construction of diversion channels within both the Roşia and Corna valley drainage basins to route rainfall runoff around the mine waste materials. As an additional measure – and based on the absence of any diversion channels – the design provides ample freeboard in the case that excessive rainfall combines with wind conditions to generate waves. To ensure increased stability, we have also buttressed the dam itself, with a ration of H:V well beyond any existing requirements, as outlined below: - The Corna Dam (the main dam) will be a rockfill structure built using the centerline method of construction. The dam will have a downstream slope of 3H:1V. Typically, the slopes for such hydraulic structures range between 1.5H:1V and 1.75H:1V.

mechanics. If such a measuring procedure would be included in the impact study as well... But there are much more modern solutions referring to the study of nature's functioning in a circular motion. This is a description of international science. Do some research in the abstract Russian physics, which models the spreading of information mechanisms just like a nature function, which is a rather complex system, gentlemen!	As for the broader range of extreme events, the following discussion present a summary of the conditions considered in the Rosia Montana Project design. Chapter 4 of "*Report on the Environmental Impact Assessment Study* " *subchapter(4.1) "Water", p. (20),* as well as the *Mine Rehabilitation and Closure Plan, p.(123)* reflect all future potential changes of the basic climatic parameters and of the extreme events. The Water Management and Erosion Control Plan as well as Mine Rehabilitation and Closure Plan include continuous assessment procedures of learned data and climatic change forecasts, in such a manner that any implications regarding the management and design activities to be immediately identified and managed. Climatic conditions that have been taken into account during the design activity developed for Corna Tailings Management Facility, with specific reference to extreme precipitations (the main factor that causes failures worldwide), are sufficient, even in the case of summation of forecasted values for extreme events (increase estimated at 15% for the period of project's development, the *Mine Rehabilitation and Closure Plan, p. (123), subchapter (4.1). "Water", p.(20) from the Report on Environmental Impact Assessment Study*). Finally, the probability of major landslides to appear in that specific area is also very low, as a result of the stable petrographic composition that hosts especially compacted rocks, without large volumes of rocks that have an unstable composition. At most, There may appear superficial landslides and rocks fragmentations, generating a minimal influence on the objectives (p.50 subchapter 2.6 Section 7 Risks).
The first question concerned the explosive materials. We know for a fact that 20 thousand tones of explosives are to be used on a weekly basis. I would like to know if you have studied the	The environmental impact assessment (EIA) process has included preliminary cumulative estimates for stationary motorised equipment and linear (vehicular) sources were prepared in order to provide an initial understanding of the

effect of these vibrations on the dam.	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 modelling 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*. The analysis of the data included in Ipromin's study, entitled *„Geo-mechanical study for the measurement of the effects of quarrying operations on the constructions located inside the protected area"* indicates that, in the case of the excavation technologies to be used in the Roşia Montană mining perimeter, the oscillation velocity (the most important parameter of the seismic wave generated by the blasting) is significantly reduced as we move away from the centre of the explosion. As shown in Table no. 1 and Figure no. 1, the oscillation velocity at a distance of 500 meters from the centre of the explosion corresponds, on the MKS scale, to natural earthquakes of 1st and 2nd degree. The dam of the Corna tailings management facility (TMF) is located approximately 2.5 km away from the Cetate open pit and approximately 3km away from the Cârnic open pit. The further we move from the centre of the explosion, the lower the oscillation velocity, and it can be stated that this velocity will be very low in the TMF area.

	The size of the TMF dam has been designed such as to resist even an exceptional earthquake (8 degrees on the Richter scale); therefore the seismic waves generated by the open pit blasting are significantly reduced by the distance and do not impact the dam or endanger its resistance. ***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***
You have spoken here about the highest international standards. If you have already taken into consideration all these standards, how did you come to building a tank uninsulated from the turbidity? Indeed we would be talking about a world renowned quality if the largest turbidity tank, part of a cyanide technology would infringe the corresponding European regulation. This regulation in fact is the normative no. 31/1999, on waste dumps, which has been adopted by the Romanian legislation. This law stipulates the 8 layers insulation of the waste dumps. My question is: which part of the impact study contains a detailed description according to which the dirt-heaps and the turbidity tank shall be protected by 8 synthetic covering layers. I would like to know where we can find the appropriate documentation on this.	The Government Decision no. 351/2005, which you refer to, approves the Program for the gradual disposal of the exhaustions, emissions and effluence of particularly hazardous substances and does not stipulate the criteria for building/ operating the tailings management facilities. Nevertheless, we inform you that RMGC took all the necessary measures for the observation of the mandatory legal provision also regarding the gradual disposal of the exhaustions, emissions and effluence of particularly hazardous substances. The municipal waste storage activity is governed by the Government Decision no. 349/2005, published in the Official Gazette Part I no. 394 dated 10/05/2005, a normative act which transposes in the internal legislation the provisions of the Directive 1999/31/CE on the waste storage, published in the Official Journal of the European Community no. 182/1 dated 16.07.1999. Currently, at the European Union level, the storage activity of the waste resulting from the extraction industry is distinctly brought under regulation by the Directive no. 2006/21/CE (”Directive nr. 2006/21/CE”), published in the Official Journal of the European Community no. L 102 dated 11.04.2006. RMGC drafted the report on the environmental impact assessment project by observing the mandatory requests and conditions provided in the Directive no.

	2006/21/CE. We inform you that, irrespective of the moment when the Directive no. 2006/21/CE will be transposed in the internal legislation, RMGC will comply with any mandatory legal condition for the mining activity as regards the waste storage.
The third question refers to the subsequent recultivation, with costs amounting to 70 million dollars. This amount seems unrealistic, if we take into consideration the fact that the soil covering of the dirt-heaps alone would require amounts somewhere between 108-132 million dollars, and the covering of the turbidity tank would involve amounts between 43-790 million dollars. As compared to these, I think you can all notice that the 70 million dollars means practically nothing. Indeed have you given this ridiculous amount a serious thought? And if you have, which part of the recultivation will be taken out from the project? Who will own the closed mine? According to the project, how much time will you remain on-site for recultivation? John Aston said he could find a job anywhere in the world. However, we are living here and we don not intend to move away. Our jobs are here and we shall not allow for your company to pollute our environment.	The costs for mine closure and environmental rehabilitation are not deliberately under-evaluated. 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 “deliberately undervalued” – 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.
I have already mentioned a national and archaeological	None of the Roman mining galleries nor any associated remains (such as

patrimony committee within ICOMOS. There is an English name for this of course: ICAHM. I hold a leadership position within the corresponding Hungarian organization, but I am a member of the world organization as well. I was referring to this state, but you might have missed it, because during that incriminating meeting from Lyon you made an exchange of experience and you took a decision then too. I did not mean to refer to this fact, but since you brought it forward, I would like to quote a sentence from this. The fundamental decision was taken within the first archaeology college in the world and not within the disputes you are referring to. Further on, I have talked about the detonation, although you have referred to more than one detonation, as unfortunate but already completed acts, but up till now, RMGC has not caused any losses in the Roman galleries. Unfortunately such things have happened, and this situation is know by me too, by you as well and by other people, because, if I recall it well, 2 years ago, more experimental detonations have been performed. Because of these explosions, the roman mine entrances were affected and they opened. I am very glad to have read, to read and to hear that RMGC wishes to save Roşiei Montana and fights to protect its cultural and natural patrimony. My suggestion is that we lead this fight together. I think that it is not with us and not here that these discussions should stop. This has to be done by Romania and the Romanian Government, i.e. the Romanian state. As a conclusion, if RMGC agrees on this, then it should respect and observe the decision taken by the Romanian state.	structures built within the Roşia Montană sites) are included on the UNESCO World Heritage List. • • Detailed information on the complex issue of the research of the historic mining works at Roşia Montană and their results are available in the EIA Report for the Roşia Montană project, volume 6 – *Cultural Heritage Baseline Report*, pages 32, 36-55, 83-109. Although their presence was known for more than 150 years, the Roşia Montană Roman galleries had never been archaeologically investigated prior to 1999. Basically, prior to 2000, this type of archaeological remains have never been subject to a specialized research, but only mentioned empirically. • • Starting from 1999, the Toulouse team, specialized in mining archaeology, has conducted the scientific survey of the mining remains found on the Roşia Montană site. The 7 km of galleries dated to the Roman period represent the total length of this type of works identified and mapped in all the massifs investigated, they do not form a single unit. The research of these structures led to a better understanding thereof and determined some well-grounded decisions with regard to their conservation and enhancement. Based on the results of the research conducted so far (completed research for the Cetate, Cârnic, Jig, and underway in the Orlea massif), a decision was made for the conservation and enhancement of the following areas comprising Roman mining works: - the Cătălina Monuleşti gallery - located in the Historical Centre of the Roşia Montană village. This gallery is the place where most of the wax tablets and an ancient mine dewatering system have been found; - the Păru Carpeni mining sector - located in the south-eastern part of the Orlea massif, where a system of overlapped chambers was found, these chambers were equipped with Roman wood-made mine water drainage devices (wheels, channels, etc.);

	- the Piatra Corbului area - located in the south-western part of the Cârnic massif; this area bears traces of the ancient and medieval galleries dug by the fire setting technique; - the Văidoaia massif area - located in the north-western part of the Roşia Montană village, where areas or open-cast mining can still be found dating back to the ancient period. • As for the parts of ancient galleries on the southern part of the Cârnic massif, once the research there is completed and considering the difficult access to this area, the state of preservation of these remains as well as their nature and distribution, and the fact that such mining works have been identified in other areas from the above-mentioned sites, it was concluded that it is very difficult to arrange these galleries for public access. Many insurmountable obstacles have been encountered regarding the safety and maintenance conditions for the access to these galleries first of all for the specialists. This option is consequently all the more difficult and unlikely as regards their development for public access. Thus, the current situation clearly points out that most of the ancient mining works from the Cârnic massif and from the other mining sectors are hardly accessible to specialists and almost inaccessible to the public. Moreover, the safety standards for public visits in museums all across the European Union, which will be adopted in Romania as well, do not allow these galleries constantly exposed to high risk factors to be developed for public access. However, note that significant segments of Roman galleries will be preserved *in situ*, as mentioned above. As an impact mitigation measure, in addition to the thorough investigation of the area and publication of its results, specialists have deemed it appropriate to make a 3-D representation of these structures as well as replicas of these structures (at a 1:1 scale). These will be then included in the mining museum, which will be developed at Roşia Montană. As an alternative, the company considered the preparation of a specialized

	study comprising financial estimates for the conservation in their entirety of the galleries on the Cârnic massif and for opening them to tourists. Moreover, note that the costs for the development and maintenance of a public circuit in this massif amount to a value that is not justified from an economic point of view (see Annex "Costs Estimate for the Development of Ancient Mining Networks from Cârnic Massif", prepared by the UK-based companies Gifford, Geo-Design and Forkers Ltd.) Research conducted so far in the Orlea massif area (the only area currently comprising ancient mining remains according to the List of Historical Monuments 2004) was preliminary in nature. A thorough investigation of this area is planned for the period 2007-2012, and once this research is completed, the necessary measures will be taken – according to the legislation in force – either the preservation *in situ* of certain sectors or the implementation of the archaeological discharge procedure for the others. Detailed information on the chance archaeological finds and on the preliminary archaeological research conducted in the Orlea massif (both at surface and in the underground) has been published in the Environmental Impact Assessment Study for the Roşia Montană project, volume 6, *Cultural Heritage Baseline Report,* Annex I, pages 231-236. Note that the Cultural Heritage Baseline Report states that: Site development plans for the Project will not result in impacts or construction activities in the Orlea area, which will be researched starting 2007. As a result, construction activities will not begin in these areas until proper archaeological investigation consistent with Romanian law and international best practice is concluded." (*Cultural Heritage Baseline Report*, volume 6- page 46). Note that the development of the Roşia Montană project does not imply the uncontrolled destruction of the galleries from the Roşia Montană area. On the contrary, the existence of this special category of archaeological remains has been considered in the preparation of this project. Thus, preliminary archaeological investigations and extensive studies have been conducted and

	appropriate measures have been taken based on their findings. As indicated in the reports and studies published by experts in the field, the Roman galleries at Roşia Montană are important, but not unique. Following the inventory of the Roman mining sites existing in Transylvania and Banat- undertaken as part of the Environmental Impact Assessment Study for the Roşia Montană project, it is quite difficult to state that the Roşia Montană site is of unique importance, at least if we consider the history of mining in the Roman Empire, and especially in the province of Dacia. There are at least 20 other sites with relatively similar features and some of them (Ruda Brad, Bucium – the Vâlcoi Corabia area and Haneş – Almaşul Mare area) have already produced concrete evidence proving that their archaeological potential is, to a certain extent, comparable to that of the ancient Alburnus Maior site. This aspect should also be taken into consideration when assessing the significance of the Roşia Montană as a site. In conclusion, with regard to your question, we can say that under no circumstances will the Roman galleries at Roşia Montană be destroyed. However, we are now facing some sort of a paradox. Given the state of preservation and the nature of the Roman galleries, their physical existence would be threatened if they were not investigated. This type of investigation known as preventive/rescue archaeological research is conducted everywhere in the world in close connection with the economic interest for certain areas. In addition, both the costs for the investigation and for the enhancement and maintenance of the areas conserved must be covered by the investors through a private-public partnership for the protection of the cultural heritage, in accordance with the provisions of the European Convention of Malta (1992) on the Protection of the Archaeological Heritage [1]. Considering the importance of Roşia Montană' s cultural heritage and the current legal provisions, S.C. Roşia Montană Gold Corporation S.A. has allotted a budget of over US$ 10 million for the archaeological research of the heritage in the Roşia Montană area conducted in the period 2001-2006.

	Moreover, taking into account the results of the research, the specialists' opinions, and the competent authorities decisions, the company has allowed a budget of US$ 25 million for the conservation and restoration of the cultural heritage of Roşia Montană , an operation to be carried out in the coming years if the mining project were implemented, as publicly stated in the Environmental Impact Assessment Study for the RMP, volume 32, Management Plan for the Archaeological Heritage from Roşia Montană Area, pages 83-85). Thus, among the plans for the future there are: the continuation of the archaeological research of the Orlea massif area, and especially the development of a **modern Mining Museum with geological, archaeological, industrial and ethnographic heritage displays, and the Cătălina Monuleşti gallery and the monument at Tăul Găuri will be developed for tourist access as well as the conservation and restoration of the 41 historical monument buildings and of the protected area Historical Centre Roşia Montană**. **For further information on the history of the archaeological research and on the main discoveries related to the ancient galleries from Roşia Montană as well as for experts' conclusions on this matter and for the assessments made with a view to including the ancient mining networks from the Cârnic massif in a tourist circuit, or for the opinions expressed in 2004 by Edward O'Hara, General Rapporteur on the Cultural Heritage from the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe, please see the annexes called: „Information on the Cultural Heritage of Roşia Montană and Related Management Aspects" and „Costs Estimate for the Development of Ancient Mining Networks from Cârnic" as well as the enclosed Romanian version of the "O'Hara Report**" Reference: [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

I have made a general calculus regarding the amount of gold obtained from exploitations. According to my information, the dollar has increased in value up to 611 USD/ounce as compared to 480 USD/ounce, a few years back. We are talking here about a huge increase. The exploitation of a gold mine is thus profitable. But if I am to take only this aspect into consideration, the total income would amount then to approximately 6 billion dollars. Please correct me if I am wrong in this. If however my calculi are correct, then we can take out 1 billion USD, representing the investments, the work and the setting to work. The 5 billion are divided on a 1:4 ratio between Garbriel and Romania. As a conclusion, within 15 years, Romania can gain a total profit of 1 billion USD. Consequently, by means of a general calculus, on an annual basis: approximately 63 million USD. I for one think that Romania should consider this. Within 15 years I could offer the people there and myself a better situation. I have that kind of money, but only for 15 years, not more. The ones living there shall have jobs for the next 15 years, but nothing more after these years. Another solution would be declaring it cultural and natural patrimony of the human race, and I shall fight for this with all my strength. In this case however, the land shall offer a peaceful life to its inhabitants not only for 15 years, but for 115 years.	The Roşia Montană Project (RMP) will be a catalyst for local and regional economic development. As with any major industrial development, impacts will be positive and negative. In the case of Roşia Montană, beneficial impacts will be maximized by involving local and regional governments and other relevant parties from the community in development initiatives as part of a participatory approach. Negative impacts will be mitigated through measures as described in the Environmental Impact Assessment Study Report (EIA). Roşia Montană Gold Corporation (RMGC) recognizes that sustainable development is a multi-dimensional concept which combines five key interrelated areas of capital: **Financial Capital** Economic Development Impact, fiscal management, taxes o Average of 1200 jobs during construction over 2 years, the majority of which sourced locally; o 634 jobs during operations (direct employment including contracted employment for cleaning, security, transportation, and other, for 16 years, most of which sourced locally; o Some 6000 indirect jobs for 20 years, locally & regionally[1]; o US$ 1billion in profit share, profit tax, royalties and other taxes and fees to Romanian local, regional & national government; o 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); o The set up of a micro-credit finance facility in the area to allow access to affordable financing; o To promote local & regional business development, set up a business centre and incubator units, offering

	mentoring, training (entrepreneurial, business plans, fiscal & administrative management, etc), legal, financial & administrative advice. **Physical Capital** Infrastructure – including buildings, energy, transport, water and waste management facilities: o Increases in revenue to government agencies, on 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; o 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 Resettlement and Relocation Action Plan (RRAP) contains full details of these initiatives. **Human Capital** Health and education: o A private dispensary & health clinic in Piatra Albă (see RRAP), accessible to wider community through health insurance; o Upgrading of a wing of Abrud hospital, accessible to the wider community through the national Romanian health system; o Implementation of the SMURD (Mobile Emergency Service for Resuscitation and Extrication) medical system in the area; o The building of a new school, residential & civic centre in Piatra Albă. This is fully described in the RRAP; o Health awareness campaigns (in partnership with local

	authorities & NGOs) covering: reproductive health, diet, and lifestyle amongst others; o Partnerships with education providers & NGOs concerning access to & improvement of education facilities in the area, eg: Ovidiu Rom & local authorities. **Social Capital** Skills training, community relationships and social networks and the institutional capacity to support them, preservation of cultural patrimony: o Efforts to develop and promote Roşia Montană's cultural heritage for both locals and tourism; o Providing adult education opportunities and skills enhancement including training programs, funds and scholarships, to increase employment chances both direct with RMGC and indirect; o Programs assisting vulnerable people & groups, and to consolidate social networks particularly in Roşia Montană (Good Neighbor Program, Social Program); o Partnerships with NGOs working with the youth in the area to improve and increase the capacity of the community. **Natural Capital** Landscape, biodiversity, water quality, ecosystems: o Measures contained in the RMP management plans and SOPs will result in mitigation of environmental impacts and conditions as identified in the EIA; o The improved environmental condition will enhance the quality of life in Roşia Montană; o Training & assistance in integrating environmental considerations into business plans; o Awareness-building regarding positive environmental performance of business activities;

	o Environmental standards associated with loans through the micro-credit finance facility including monitoring of environmental performance; o Business Code of Conduct requiring suppliers to RMP to comply with RMGC's environmental performance standards. These five capital spheres in turn support the three pillars of sustainable development -- social, environmental and economic. 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. RMGC will collaborate on community development issues with interested parties from the Community. RMGC's commitment to collaboration will extend to local, regional and national authorities. 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 organizations and potentially affected stakeholders. Feedback has been used in the preparation of the Management Plans of the EIA as well as the drafting of partnerships and development programs. A comprehensive monitoring programme is currently being developed by RMGC to evaluate our socio-economic mitigation and enhancement measures. This monitoring programme will include the input and

	considerations of impacted and potentially impacted stakeholders. To institutionalize this input, RMGC – in association with a number of local stakeholder groups – is in the process of setting up local and regional partnerships to aid RMGC and the community in monitoring the progress of the RMP. RMGC's monitoring programme will be conducted in a transparent manner, allowing parties to evaluate progress of the effectiveness and to suggest implementing improvements. This process will continue throughout the life of the project with the aim of maximizing benefits and minimizing negative impacts. A preliminary framework that will assist in guiding the development of the monitoring plan has been set up (see Volume 14, Section 4.8, Social and Economical Environment, Table 7-1, of the Roşia Montană project EIA). Partnerships include initiatives concerning education and youth development and training, such as: • Roşia Montană NGO Partnership; • Roşia Montană Youth Partnership; • Apuseni Youth Resource Center; • Roşia Montană Educational Partnership. Other partnerships concern monitoring and management of environmental aspects, including The Roşia Montană Research Center for Environment and Health. Bio-physical aspects will be monitored and co-managed with the Roşia Montană Biodiversity Partnership and the Roşia Montană Forestry Partnership. To further promote and develop the economic opportunities presented by the RMP, RMGC is also cooperating with local Stakeholders regarding setting up a business center.

	It is expected that training programs offered by RMGC and its partners, as well as employment experience gained during the RMP, will result in a highly trained and skilled workforce across a range of disciplines. This should place people in a competitive position for work with other mining companies. Such skills are also transferable to the non-mining sector. Beyond direct skill-building, the presence of the RMP as a major investment will improve the area's economic climate, encouraging and promoting 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 realize the RMP. The Zonal Urbanism Plan (PUZ) detailing the land surface required by the RMP affects only about 25% of Roşia Montană commune, leaving open many opportunities to establish business ventures in the community. Even now, some businesses have already been established on the remaining 75% of the Commune; once the PUZ is finalized, business start-up will be further encouraged.[2] For more information, please see Roşia Montană Sustainable Development Programs and Partnerships annex 4. References: [1] The multiplier effect for the RMP is in the order of 1 Direct job to 30 Indirect Full Time Job Equivalents over twenty years. A complex methodology used to derive this multiplier effect is available via RMGC. However, the more conservative 1 : 10 Direct : Indirect figure is used 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. [2] Information on existing industries, such as agriculture and tourism, is provided in Volume 14, 4.8 Social and Economical Environment, and in Volume 31, Plan L - Community Sustainable Development Management Plan. This information was assembled primarily so that an assessment could be completed on the potential effects of the proposed project on these industries.