

A previous version of this document (*Cooljarloo Mine – Falcon Extension Mining Proposal and Application for Section 45C Amendment*, 8 November 2006) was circulated to various Western Australian government agencies. This table lists the resultant comments and Tiwest’s responses (in italics and Prefixed by “*Tiwest –*”). Their comments, where appropriate, have also been incorporated into the content of the report itself.

Agency	Comments
<p><b>The Environmental Management Branch of the Department of Environment and Conservation (DEC) with input from staff of the Midwest Region</b></p>	<p>Based on the information provided within the document, we are of the view that the project does not appear likely to lead to significant impacts on biodiversity values additional to those considered in the assessment of the approved Cooljarloo project.</p> <p>The DEC provides the following specific advice in relation to the Mining Proposal document and associated identification of issues and management of potential impacts on biodiversity.</p> <p><b>Additional management commitments &amp; studies required –page 6</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>□ DEC supports Tiwest’s proposal to undertake further survey work on vegetation communities and significant species including <i>Andersonia gracilis</i>, <i>Anigozanthus viridis subsp. terraspectans</i> and <i>Macarthuria keigheryi</i> to “support the development of floristic community composition data required for rehabilitation purposes” (page 57) during 2006 and 2007. DEC would like to review the results on completion of these field surveys.</li> </ul> <p><i>Tiwest – Agreed. The field work associated with the 2006 spring survey has been completed and the report due to issue at the end of January. A copy will be forwarded to relevant DEC divisions. The required field work to support the development of detailed vegetation criteria for rehabilitation performance assessment will be undertaken during 2007 and submitted in late 2007 or early 2008.</i></p> <p><b>Management of Risks to Environment and Community Value</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>□ <b>Table 11 (page 48)</b> states that “Two of the four populations of <i>Andersonia gracilis</i> in the vicinity of the mine footprint will be avoided completely and all four populations will be retained; only one will be subject to partial removal”. This statement doesn’t make sense and contradicts the comment in <i>Table 14 page 60</i> which states that “However only two populations will be impacted (partially removed)”. While it is not anticipated that the impacts of the expansion on this species will be significant, DEC would like the document to provide clarification in relation to the number of populations of <i>Andersonia gracilis</i> that will be impacted as a result of the current mining proposal.</li> </ul> <p><i>Tiwest – There are four communities of A. gracilis within 100m of proposed disturbance footprint. Of these only two are partially within the disturbance footprint and, as such, will be partially removed. That is, some plants from each population (of the two to be impacted) will be cleared but a significant proportion will remain undisturbed. As such, the number of individual plants will be temporarily reduced but the number of separate populations within the tenements will remain the same (report text will be amended to clarify).</i></p> <p><b>5.4.2 Flora Significant Species and Communities</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>□ This section should acknowledge that <i>Andersonia gracilis</i> is Declared Rare Flora and as such the proponent is required to apply to the Minister for the Environment for a “permit to take”. The DEC understands that the proponent is aware of this requirement.</li> </ul> <p><i>Tiwest - Agreed.</i></p>

Agency	Comments
	<p><b>Management of Mulch Harvesting</b>            DEC notes that the current proposal is to harvest 185ha of vegetation “<i>outside areas that will be cleared in mining activities</i>” (Page 59). The Department is currently reviewing Tiwest’s ‘Mulch harvesting Management Plan and Procedures’ and will provide advice back to the company in relation to proposed harvesting in early 2007.</p> <p>Mulch harvesting outside the mining footprint area results in increased vegetation disturbance, and has the potential to cause long term loss of vegetation quality or composition if regeneration is not effective. Continued harvesting in these areas to assist rehabilitation is not regarded by the Department as critical to the acceptability of the proposal (except to the extent that inability to harvest mulch will require alternative strategies for successful rehabilitation especially species that may be reliant on propagation material from mulch), especially if it has the potential to cause additional impacts. Any harvesting allowed should be monitored, and only allowed to be continued if DEC is satisfied that impacts on flora species and communities within harvesting areas can be managed in an acceptable manner. Appropriate conditions should be set to ensure this occurs.  <i>Tiwest – Agreed. Existing commitments relating the management of mulch harvesting will adequately address this.</i></p> <p><b>Management of <i>Phytophthora cinnamomi</i></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>□ <i>Page 61</i> – The proposal states that access from Wongonderrah Road is proposed to be minimised through fencing – the Department does not support the use of fences and gates in areas of native vegetation. The Department’s view is that fencing and gates pose a threat to wildlife by inhibiting movement and potentially causing physical injury. Previous experience has also shown that fences and gates may exacerbate disturbance, with further tracks being created to get around them. DEC would like the proponent to consider alternatives such as signage.  <i>Tiwest – It is preferable fence areas that provide potential public access point for safety and Phytophthora dieback hygiene reasons but alternative strategies can be determined in consultation with DEC. Concepts such as the rehabilitation of redundant access tracks and obscuring others may meet requirements for discouraging third party access as well as offering opportunities for environmental offsets.</i></li> <li>□ Management Commitments, page 61 – DEC supports Tiwest’s commitment to review and revise its Cooljarloo management plans in regard to the management of rare flora, dieback and rehabilitation to ensure the Falcon tenements and areas of disturbance are encompassed by these plans.</li> </ul> <p><b>5.4.5 Groundwater</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>□ Page 65-66 - The proposal indicates that the proponent has considered groundwater drawdown effects to groundwater dependent vegetation and the likelihood of significant localised drawdown during mining. DEC supports the management commitments offered by Tiwest. The potential for groundwater mounding to occur at the Falcon site should be indicated.  <i>Tiwest – The potential for groundwater mounding was considered during impact assessment but was considered to be of low risk. Mounding is possible during pit backfill via the placement of wet sand tailings and following reconstruction of the soil profile as a result of altering soil transmissivity but the likelihood of adverse impact resulting is considered low. Mounding during sand tailings placement is considered low risk as typically more than 80% of the tailings water is recovered from the pit areas and returned to the process. In addition, sand tailings will be placed at a time when the water table is already lowered due to mining. The water placed during sand tailing deposition will help speed the recovery of watertable to pre-mining levels. Groundwater mounding following profile reconstruction</i></li> </ul>

Agency	Comments
	<p><i>could form as a result of altering (reducing) lateral through flow restricting groundwater flow thereby locally raising the water table. Hydraulic conductivity is taken into account during the selection of materials to be used in the reconstructed soils profile as discussed in Section 5.4.7 of the document.</i></p> <p><b>5.4.6 Fauna</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>□ <b>Table 17, page 67</b> - Baseline survey for the cricket, <i>Austrosaga spinifer</i>, listed as a Priority 3 by DEC is strongly supported and further information or a determination is required as to whether this species occurs on the Falcon and Cooljarloo tenements where suitable habitat exists. A quantification of the amount of disturbance to preferred habitat is required.</li> </ul> <p><i>Tiwest – The 2006 surveys did not return this species (report due end of January 2007). However, targeted searches are planned for autumn 2007 (results will be forwarded to DEC) once and if the specific habitat of this species (ie more refined than “Heath and Woodlands on Sand”) is/can be confirmed. However, given that Tiwest do not propose to impact the conservation status of any vegetation community it is not considered that the species, if present, is at risk from this proposal. Should the outcomes of the proposed work show otherwise, a management strategy would be developed in consultation with DEC.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>□ <b>Table 17, page 68</b> – While impacts to Carnaby’s Cockatoo breeding habitat will not occur, it is considered necessary to ensure the successful recovery of Banksia species as an important food source for the threatened Carnaby’s Cockatoo. The rehabilitation plan should demonstrate a proactive approach in providing for the successful recovery of Banksia’s in revegetation areas including appropriate targets. Similarly, while the Quenda, Woylie and Tammar Wallaby are no longer found within the Cooljarloo area these species have been recently re-introduced to Nambung National Park and consideration of future rehabilitation providing suitable habitat to allow these species to extend their range is encouraged. Continuing support for the Western Shield program is noted and supported in a wider approach to conservation of threatened fauna species within the Cooljarloo and adjacent areas.</li> </ul> <p><i>Tiwest – The importance of various plant species to fauna as food sources is already considered within the model currently in use at Cooljarloo for the determination of vegetation criteria for rehabilitation, specifically, the determination of both “Keystone species” and “Desirable Species”.</i></p> <p><b>5.4.7 Soil and Landform Reconstruction and Rehabilitation</b></p> <p><b>Pages 20 and 71-</b> While DEC has provided advice to the proponent in the past on the <i>Rehabilitation Procedures &amp; Completion Standards for the 27200 Ore Body</i>, the Department has not yet received the current <i>Integrated Mining and Rehabilitation Plan</i>. DEC is currently reviewing the Mulch Harvesting Management Plan and Procedures and will provide advice on the Plan when it is forthcoming.</p> <p>DEC continues to have a strong interest in the development of an adaptive continuous improvement approach to rehabilitation of mined areas, utilising the results of monitoring and research aimed to inform ongoing development of rehabilitation strategies, methods and techniques. The DEC’s view is that the objective of rehabilitation in areas of native vegetation for this project should be the re-establishment of self sustaining native vegetation communities that as closely as possible, have similar floristic diversity and composition to the pre-mining environment.</p>

Agency	Comments
	<p>DEC looks forward to seeing evidence of the adoption of this approach and the appropriate rehabilitation objectives and targets, within the revised Integrated Mining and Rehabilitation Plan and the 'Procedures and Completion Standards' document.  <i>Tiwest – Tiwest remain committed to the continued development of rehabilitation standards and techniques in close liaison with DEC.</i></p> <p><b>Water Quality</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> <b>Appendix 1, page 28</b> - The Mt Jetty Creek flows into the Nambung River which sustains a number of cave communities within the downstream Nambung National Park. It is recommended that an EMP be developed based on the recommendations in the Parsons and Brinckerhoff Surface and Groundwater Investigation and this plan should include provision for water quality monitoring points on the Mt Jetty Creek.  <i>Tiwest – Agreed. The existing Cooljarloo Environmental Management Program addresses management and monitoring of Mullering Brook and Emu Lakes. It is considered appropriate that this be amended to include Mt Jetty Stream for the duration of the Falcon project. Water monitoring proposed includes the monitoring of water level, quality and flow at up to three monitoring locations.</i></li> </ul> <p><b>Offsets</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> DEC understands that Tiwest own the property on the corner of Munbinea and the Hill River. This land has, rare flora species, a high degree of endemism/diversity and could potentially provide a corridor between Wongonderrah Nature Reserve and Nambung National Park. The Department would like to discuss the possibility of acquiring this land from Tiwest for the purpose of joining as a nature corridor for the purpose of conservation.  <i>Tiwest – Agree to discuss environmental offsets for future mining proposals.</i></li> </ul> <p><b>Minor points on matters of detail</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> <b>Figure 4.6 Significant Flora of the Falcon Tenement-</b> The text in this figure is indecipherable.</li> </ul> <p>Queries should be addressed to Joseph Grehan (Project Coordinator) or Nic Woolfrey (Principal Coordinator – Development Approvals).</p>
<p><b>The Department of Environment and Conservation (DEC) Industry Regulation Branch</b></p>	<p>The proponent should be advised that the Cooljarloo Dust Management Plan has been adopted into the conditions of <i>Environmental Protection Act 1986</i> licence 5319/9 and as such, a revised Dust Management Plan should be submitted to the DEC with sufficient time to allow for a licence amendment prior to commencement of operations at Falcon.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The scope of the revised Dust Management Plan should be extended to cover the Falcon operations with particular regard to new open mine pits, feed preparation units and haul roads. In addition, the location of any new depositional dust gauges should be incorporated into the attached map.</li> </ul> <p><i>Tiwest – Agreed.</i></p>

Agency	Comments
	<p>Queries should be addressed to Steve Checker (Natural Resource Management Officer) of the DEC Midwest Region at the Geraldton Office.</p>
<p><b>Department of Environment and Conservation (DEC), Environmental Impact Assessment Branch</b></p>	<p>When Tiwest have collated/addressed the responses it will be necessary for the final document to come to the EPA for the Chairman's decision on the level of assessment to be formally set and advertised.</p> <p>As a general comment there are several typos that should be edited out before the final document is issued. More specific issues include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There are a number of references to 2006 spring flora and fauna surveys which I presume would have been completed by now. Will the results be incorporated into the final 45c document? It would introduce greater certainty into the proposal and would help to argue for a lower level of assessment;</li> </ul> <p><i>Tiwest – The field component of these studies have been completed and a draft of the report is expected by the end of January. Once complete, the report will be forwarded to DEC.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fig 4.4-would be useful to add in the outline of the orebody to show where intersected by the palaeo drainage. This issue is touched on in section 5.4.7 page 72 para 4. How is it intended to reinstate the palaeosystems-replace the grey clays?</li> </ul> <p><i>Tiwest – The intent is to replace the material like for like in terms of hydrological (lateral and vertical permeability). This would be via two mechanisms. The first comprises direct placement of same (overburden) materials through the sequencing of material movements. The second would be to replace the material with material that fulfils a similar function (verified through material testing).</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Table 9 lists species not recorded but requiring additional survey. What is the timing and extent of this proposed work?</li> </ul> <p><i>Tiwest – Surveys have been completed during spring 2006 and the report is in preparation (draft due end of Jan 2007).</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Section 5.3.2 point 2 should include the condition 9 referred to in Ministerial statement 37;</li> </ul> <p><i>Tiwest – Report text amended.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Section 5.4.1 last sentence before Table 11 should be modified to read "...issues are provided in the following sub-sections of 5.4."</li> <li>• page 59, in 'Management of Mulch Harvesting' 1st para last sentence there are some words missing;</li> </ul>

Agency	Comments
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Table 14(item g) mentions that stabilisation will be by oats and "checmial"-presumed chemical? Can you expand on this?  <i>Tiwest – Agreed, (all three points) report amended. To expand on chemical agents used for soil stabilisation, Tiwest are currently investigating alternatives to mulch. “Chemicals” currently in use include “Terolas” a bitumen emulsion based product used successfully in mineral sands operations in Queensland and Western Australia, and “Soilloc” a long chain polymer primarily used for stabilisation of cropping (wheat) paddocks. Soilloc has already proven unsuccessful. Others will be trialled as appropriate. Another agent trialled with some success is Slimes (the clay fraction of tailings).</i></li>   <li>• Page 61 under 'Monitoring and Management' second dot point refers to annual baiting. Is this the right word? Can you clarify?  <i>Tiwest – Yes. “Baiting” refers to the technique of placing a recoverable, susceptible medium within high risk areas as bait for <u>P. cinnamomi</u> thereby providing an indication of presence / absence of the pathogen. Typically pears and banksia leaves are used.</i></li>   <li>• Page 72 para 3: states "Some seepage was observed at the interface of the upper sand horizon and the orange clay layer..." One needs to read this a couple of times to understand that the seepage is lateral. If the word "along" instead of "at" the interface was used the meaning would be clearer;  <i>Tiwest – Agreed, document amended.</i></li>   <li>• Section 5.4.9 discusses potential noise effects and states that reduction strategies could be developed and implemented if found to be necessary. What is likely to be the noise source(s) and how could it be attenuated?  <i>Tiwest – noise originates from three main sources, mining machinery, the feed preparation unit and booster pumps. Noise attenuation measures are not expected to be required as the operation has not altered substantially since the previous survey which indicated that levels were well within acceptable limits. Irrespective a noise survey and associated modelling study was commissioned during 2006. The outcomes of this are pending. Should this study indicate that noise attenuation is required the attenuation measures would be identified via a testing of the relevant equipment to determine the main source and composition of the noise thereby enabling the most effective and efficient reduction measures to be implemented.</i></li> </ul> <p>Brief comments on groundwater aspects:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Predicted drawdowns ranges from 5 m within 50m radius to 1 m within 500m radius seems to be reasonable (page 65).</li> <li>- Proponent’s commitments No. 15 to 19 (page 66) are acceptable if carried out properly.</li> <li>- Attachment 1: Groundwater investigation (Chapter 4), groundwater modelling (Chapter 5) and recommendations (Section 6.2) are reasonable.</li> </ul>

Agency	Comments
	<p>Queries should be addressed to Doug Betts (Environmental Impact Assessor).</p>
<p><b>Department of Industry and Resources (DoIR), Minerals Branch Environment Division</b></p>	<p>I have reviewed the Falcon Mining Proposal &amp; Application for Section 45C Amendment. The document is comprehensive and generally addresses the requirements as outline in the Departments Guidelines for Mining Proposals in Western Australia.</p> <p>Further information should be included as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Information is required detailing the proposed disturbance (Ha) per tenement M70/1162 and M70/1163 as per the Table located on 24 of the above mentioned Guidelines. Table 2 in the Mining Proposal provides combined Tenement disturbance details only. This information will be utilised to calculate Environmental Bonds for the project should it be managed under the provisions of the Mining Act 1978 and Regulations 1981. <i>Tiwest – document amended.</i></li> <li>• Landform drainage design should be based on a one in 100 year, 72 hour duration storm event. Reference is made in the Mining Proposal to one in 50 year ARI. <i>Tiwest –Review of the proposed design for protection bund indicates that it is sufficient to meet the requirements of a 1:100 ARI 72 hr rainfall event.</i></li> </ul> <p>Queries should be addressed to Eugene Bouwhuis (Environmental Inspector).</p>
<p><b>Department of Water</b></p>	<p>The proposal mentioned that the groundwater requirement for this project would be a total of 10.9 GL coming from the Yarragadee and the Superficial aquifer.</p> <p>Tiwest currently has a groundwater licences authorising a total abstraction of 15GL from the Yarragadee and superficial aquifer and these licences would expire in 2014. The department has identified that the current groundwater licences held by Tiwest have the right allocation limits and proper monitoring conditions to cover the extension of mine proposed. The Department has no objection against the proposal.</p> <p>Queries should be addressed to Tasnim Sandooyea (Natural Resources Management Officer) of the DoW Geraldton Office.</p>

**Nick Sibbel**

---

**From:** Miles, Ben [Ben.Miles@dec.wa.gov.au]  
**Sent:** Friday, 5 October 2007 4:13 PM  
**To:** Nick Sibbel  
**Cc:** Gentle, Tim  
**Subject:** FW: Tiwest Falcon extension project- further advice on biol surveys  
**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Due By:** Wednesday, 10 October 2007 12:00 AM  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

Nick

Not sure if you got the following email regarding survey work.

regards

**Ben Miles** | Environmental Officer  
 Mining and Industrial Assessments Branch  
 Environmental Protection Authority Service Unit  
 Department of Environment and Conservation

The Atrium Level 8 168 St George's Tce, Perth WA  
 Locked Bag 33, Cloisters Square, WA 6850  
 D (08) 6467 5265 | F (08) 6467 5562  
[ben.miles@dec.wa.gov.au](mailto:ben.miles@dec.wa.gov.au)

---

**From:** Woolfrey, Nicholas [mailto:Nicholas.Woolfrey@dec.wa.gov.au]  
**Sent:** Friday, 5 October 2007 2:35 PM  
**To:** Gentle, Tim  
**Cc:** Caporn, Norm; Miles, Ben; McKernan, Beth; Atkins, Ken  
**Subject:** RE: Tiwest Falcon extension project- further advice on biol surveys

Tim / Nick

Obviously management of potential impacts on flora values outside the direct impact footprint due to altered hydrology and groundwater drawdown is the focus of the impact assessment, and required management strategies etc for this project, particularly given recent anecdotal information on vegetation impacts in the area that occurred last summer. Joseph Grehan has provided some advice on this matter in earlier emails (around February 2007 I believe) which I think may have been addressed in subsequent documentation but we would like the opportunity to review in the actual draft environmental management / review document to ensure that this aspect will be comprehensively addressed ..

Mulch harvesting is also a significant matter that requires appropriate management and as far as I am aware, DEC is still waiting for a written response from Tiwest to the advice provided on 12 January 2007. I understand that a briefing to DEC on this aspect is planned in the near future.

The only possible 'additional' issues we might have in relation to the flora and fauna surveys undertaken to date (flora surveys as summarized and referred to in Woodman, (March 2007) are as follows:

There appears to be a need for additional contextual information (likely to be provided by species targeted surveys) on the local and regional occurrence and impact of the proposal on two priority 2 species; *Schoenus badius* and *Schoenus griffinianus*, which the March 2007 Woodman report indicates will be subject to a moderate or high regional level impact from the proposal. Additional surveys for *Schoenus badius* are recommended in the Woodman report (but not *griffinianus* presumably because of a significant presence outside the impact area). These surveys will need to be undertaken at a time / in a season when these taxa can be reliably identified and should lead to the provision of quantitative information on the impacts of the project in a local and regional context including local (and if appropriate regional) populations sizes and locations.

The potential impacts (direct and indirect) of the proposal on *Stylidium hymenocraspidum* need to be clearly defined in documentation. This species is mentioned in the report (p29) as occurring within the project area and having a highly restricted distribution but is not included in Table 4 of the Woodman report and therefore it is unclear whether or not there is potential for the species to be directly or indirectly impacted and the significance of any impacts. Additional surveys to

provide additional information on the distribution of this taxon would appear beneficial based on available information.

Should you wish to discuss this advice in further detail it is recommended you contact me or Beth McKernan at the Geraldton office.

Regards

**Nicholas (Nic) Woolfrey**

Principal Coordinator - Dev't Assessment & Liaison  
Environmental Management Branch  
Department of Environment & Conservation  
Phone 9334 0130 Fax 9334 0140

Tim,

After reviewing the letter and consulting with Nic I can provide you with the following advice in relation to the risks associated with drawdown and the potential impacts to vegetation of conservation significance within the Falcon tenements:

While the report by Parsons Brinckerhoff (October 2006) titled '*Falcon Surface and Groundwater Investigations*' is fairly comprehensive in modeling the predicted drawdown of groundwater over a period of time (to January 2012) as well as the predicted maximum drawdown in the superficial aquifer (*Figure 20*) it does not provide an estimate for the following:

- The potential impact to priority species which are phreatophytic within the area to be impacted, should the predicted maximum drawdown of the superficial aquifer eventuate i.e. a quantitative assessment presented as a *Species Impact Table*;
- The predicted impact to any restricted communities within the impact zone. On this point the report by Woodman (August 2006) does not present quantitative data in relation to the representation the floristic communities outside the Falcon project tenements, therefore no estimate is provided of the overall impact on these communities should the predicted maximum drawdown of the superficial aquifer eventuate;
- The potential for groundwater drawdown to impact the adjacent Wongonderrah Nature Reserve is unclear with a question mark outside the 0.75 groundwater contour in *Figure 20*;
- There is a discrepancy between *Figures 16 & 20* with the area covered by the 0.75 contour in *Figure 20* which is supposed to be the maximum also covered by a 1 metre contour in *Figure 16*;
- The location of and predicted impact to vegetation overlying perched aquifers is unclear.

The *Management Commitments* presented on *page 65* are supported; however the information gaps outlined above mean that an accurate assessment of the potential impacts on vegetation of conservation significance is impossible at this stage. While groundwater drawdown thresholds presented in *Table 16* on *page 65* are useful as a generalised guide; information relating to the vegetation type, the effects of seasonal variables and the presence of aquicludes and aquitards is essential to predict more accurate thresholds.

I'll give you a call to discuss.

Regards,  
Joe

**Joseph Grehan**

Project Coordinator  
Resource Development - Environmental Impact Assessment

Environmental Management Branch  
Department of Environment and Conservation  
17 Dick Perry Avenue  
Kensington WA 6151  
Phone (08) 9423 2261  
Fax (08) 9334 0140  
Mobile 0428 310 358  
email: [joseph.grehan@dec.wa.gov.au](mailto:joseph.grehan@dec.wa.gov.au)

This email, together with any attachments, is intended for the addressee only. It may contain confidential or privileged information. If you are not the intended recipient of this email, please notify the sender, delete the email and attachments from your system and destroy any copies you may have taken of the email and its attachments. Duplication or further distribution by hardcopy, by electronic means

10/01/2008

or verbally is not permitted without permission.