| Date | Complaint received from | Nature of complaint | Outcome of investigation |
|---|---|---|---|
| 08/1/23 | Public (EPA) | Email received from the EPA on 24/01/23 regarding concern around sediment laden water entering Bungonia Creek with a drop pin and photo provided. | Bungonia creek monitoring: TSS results show no impact on the creek from the main gully system. Latest TSS results obtained on 10/11/22 were 29mg/L and 25mg/L for Bungonia Creek up and Bungonia Creek down respectively.<br>24/1/23: Drone flight attempted- very difficult to locate the position of the blowhole and maintain drone signal from within the mine. No intrusion of water was visible.<br>30/1/23: Service conducted and data download on the Main Gully Overflow monitor and weather station for rain data. There have been no overflow events for the months of Dec 2022 and January 2023.<br>It was determined that the sediment laden water observed was not contributed to by the mines Main Gully water surface water catchment but rather the underground 'blowhole' cave (also known as B68 Main Gully Spring) system which is fed by the greater area. |
| 24/2/23 | Public (NPWS) | Email received from National Parks and Wildlife regarding the sighting of a metal pipe in Bungonia Creek by a member of the public on 19/2/23. | Bungonia Creek was inspected by a Boral Environmental Representative on 17/2/23 and 22/2/23 with no sighting of the metal pipe.<br>24/2/23: National Parks agreed that it would currently be highly unlikely for such material to escape over the edge of the Mine's South Pit and that such material could have washed down the creek from an upstream location during a rain event.<br>National parks was happy that the creek had been inspected and Boral has requested photos in the event that such an observation arises again to assist with determining the source. |
| 15/6/23 | Public (Council) | Emailed received from the council on 15/5/23 notifying the site that there had been a Pampas Grass sighting and providing a map. | 16/6/23: The site confirmed that it is in compliance with the site's Weed Management Plan which is displayed on the Boral website. Under this management plan, Pampas is sprayed during the December to May period and again during the September to November period. Council suggested that Boral remove the heads from any remaining accessible Pampas plants. |

| Date | Complaint received from | Nature of complaint | Outcome of investigation |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | The Weed Management Plan was sent to Council in a follow up email and a contractor was engaged to remove any remaining heads from accessible Pampas grass, with the next spray for Pampas grass scheduled for the September to November period via foot and drone for any inaccessible plants. |
| 14/3/25 | Public | Community Member contacted Boral notifying the site that they can hear a fan like noise coming from the mine. | 14/3/25 Boral received a call from a community member with a noise complaint. Peppertree Site and Production Managers went to the location and could hear rocks falling onto the surge however the noise in the complaint was described as a fan. The kiln, top, bottom section of production and reclaimer were not working at the time of complaint as such the noise has not been identified. The noise complaint was made for between 5am – 7:45am. The weather conditions were categorised as strong to severe inversion conditions for this time. |
| 6/5/2025 | Public | Community member contacted the EPA with a complaint about the water quality at Bungonia Creek. | On 6/5/25 Boral received an email from the EPA stating that they had been contacted by a member of the public with a complaint regarding the water quality at Bungonia Creek. Photos were submitted from Sunday the 4th May showing silty water. Main Gully had been checked three days prior to this, with images from the inspection showing good water quality (not silty) and no overflow event. There was no rain between Main Gully inspection and the day the member of the public was there and took photos. 22/5/25 the EPA were sent water testing results that showed no difference to previous results. |
| 14/07/2026 | Employee | Employee reported that while driving to work on Marulan South Road, an oncoming truck flicked up two rocks, damaging his windscreen. | Boral replaced the broken windscreen. |

| Date | Complaint received from | Nature of complaint | Outcome of investigation |
|---|---|---|---|
| 16/07/2026 | Public | A complaint was received from a Marulan South Road resident regarding truck braking noise at approximately 1:35 am. Investigation indicated that trucks were slowing down near the second speed check sign towards the mine, resulting in braking activity close to nearby residences. A request was made to relocate the sign further west to reduce noise impacts. | The speed check sign was identified as council owned and the matter referred to Council. |
| 23/07/2026 | Public | A local resident raised concerns regarding the behavior of some trucks associated with increased truck movements, alleging incidents of speeding and tailgating. | Truck drivers were reminded again of the speed limits and general acceptable driving behaviours. |
| 21/09/2026 | Public | A local resident raised that trucks are blocking his driveway. He also mentioned truck drivers using aggressive language/ swearing while using their phone. | The concerns raised relate to driver behaviour, road safety, and access impacts on neighbouring residents. Relevant transport contractors were notified, and driver conduct was reviewed in accordance with site requirements and road safety obligations. |

| Date | Complaint received from | Nature of complaint | Outcome of investigation |
|---|---|---|---|
| 26/09/2026 | Public | At approximately 10:00 pm, the EPA received a noise complaint from campers staying in Bungonia National Park. The complainant reported being disturbed by truck engine noise and reversing beepers from quarry operations. | Operational activities were occurring at the time of the complaint; however, available evidence indicated the site remained compliant with noise requirements. The complaint was most likely influenced by atmospheric conditions that enhanced the audibility of quarry noise over longer distances rather than by a breach of approved noise limits. |