An assessment of the prejudice caused by the fact that Rosia Montana area has been declared an industrial area and that bans the initiation of any other business incompatible with the mining project.

See the contestation enclosed in copy.

There is no such ban on the formation of new businesses as the questioner suggests.

The designation of an industrial area in part of Roşia Montană does not limit business development in the locality, as the industrial area (or "project footprint") is limited to 25% of Roşia Montană, and an even smaller 5% of the area including Campeşti, Roşia Montană and Abrud. Businesses of all kinds are free to form through the normal means of permitting and registration with local authorities.

Studies were made by the relevant governmental authorities when the area was designated „disadvantaged area” in order to enable investment in the area, which was the case of the Roşia Montană Project.

The alteration of the urbanism plans and the designation of an industrial area for RMP is a mandatory legal requirement as per:
(i) art 6 (1) of the GD no. 525/1996 for the approval of the General Urbanism Regulation (“authorizing the building of permanent constructions, other than the facilities necessary for the exploitation and processing of resources in the areas delineated according to the law, which contain identified underground resources, is forbidden”) and ;

(ii) art. 41 (2) of the Mining Law no. 85/2003 (“the county councils and the local councils will amend and/or update the existing territory arrangement plans and the general urbanism plans, so as to allow the development of all operations necessary for the development of the mining activities granted into concession”).
The questioner makes the following remarks and comments: She is disturbed by the resettlement of those 9 graveyards. She doesn’t find it normal to have the graveyards and churches resettled.

**Solution**

Proposally, 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 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 Roșia Montana’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:

(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;


(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.
Many churches and graveyards will be resettled. In what can we still believe? What can we offer to future generations?

Through history communities have created during their development rules, later turned into laws that deal with this unfortunate event. What the RMP project offers to future generations is a chance to continue a way of life in a village where that future – with 70% unemployment today, rising above 90% if RMGC’s proposed mine is not allowed to proceed – would be very much in doubt. In the event of Roşia Montană’s demise, the graves and churches there would likely be left behind, as in other abandoned villages in the Romanian countryside. Development of the RMP will keep the village alive and bring economic opportunity to the region.

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 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 Albă’s new cemetery.

Two churches and two prayer houses out of a total of ten 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.

The idea of this project may not be deemed as antichristian, as long as its main principle is that of responsible mining. We believe that resources development is not an act against God, if it is performed in a responsible manner. This project provides to future generations not only jobs, but also a cleaner environment, personal development opportunities, small enterprise support, and support provided for the development of one of the most underdeveloped areas of Romania.

Through the construction of the Piatra Alba site we offer higher living standards and high quality social and cultural services. The Central Area of the site will include public buildings, town hall, police, post office, bank, church, school, kindergarten, cultural center, museum, medical center, drug store, commercial areas, entertainment and leisure areas or attractive areas for the development of tourism in the region, inn, hotel, fair area, sports field, gym hall, skating rink, football field, park, playgrounds for children.

On the other hand, we should not forget about the protected area in Roşia Montană. It will have an area of more than 130 hectares and will include the architectural values of this community (restored and developed), which will be organized as an open air museum, a mining museum with geology, archaeology, ethnography, and industrial patrimony exhibitions and a significant underground section located around Catalina Monuleti gallery. In this part of the town we will promote the development of traditional tourism (boarding houses, small businesses). The historical lakes are located on the extreme N-E side: Tăul Mare, Tăul Brazi and Tăul Anghel. This area is proper for the development of modern tourism for recreation. Nevertheless, our proposals must be approved by the community.
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;


(iii) The hygiene norms and recommendations concerning the population’s life environment, published in the Romanian Official Gazette, Section I, no. 140/03.07.1997, as subsequently amended and supplemented ("Order 536/1997");

(iv) GD no. 955/2004 on the approval of the framework Rules for the organization and operation of the public services for the administration of the public and private domain of local interest, published in the Romanian Official Gazette, Section I, no. 660/22.07.2004;

(v) Order no. 261/1982 on the approval of the standard Rules for the administration of graveyards and the crematories of the localities, published in the Official Gazette no. 67/11.03.1983;

(vi) Rules for the organization and operation of the parish and monastery graveyards within the eparchies of the Romanian Orthodox Church, approved by Decision of the Religious Affairs Department no. 16.285/31.12.1981.
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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>MMDD's item no. for the question which includes the observation identified by the RMGC internal code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MMDD's identification no. for the question which includes the observation identified by the RMGC internal code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rosia Montana, 24.07.2006</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RMGC internal unique code</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MMGA_0114</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposal</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The minor, a 6 year old, makes a comment with respect to the children of Rosia Montana, the future of this commune. She is uttering her will to drink milk not cyanide. She states that she has 1sqr.m. of land in Cetate and in Orlea and wants to know how the open pits will be mined in these locations?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Solution</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>We believe that the children of Roșia Montană will have a far stronger future when their parents no longer live in a community with 70% unemployment and suffer the health impacts of prior unremedied mining pollution.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

 Owners of 1 square meter of land - a parcel so small it can only be of symbolic value - must make their case to Romanian Government authorities that this is sufficient cause to stop a project that will infuse over the life of the project $2.5 billion USD into Romania.

Moreover, in case the petitioner makes the proof of the ownership right over the 1 square meter land plot, located within the perimeter of the exploitation concession license having RMGC as a titleholder, the titleholder benefits, inclusively in regard of this land plot, of the legal means to obtain usage right over the lands necessary for the development of the mining activities, in accordance with art. 6 of the Mining Law no. 85/2003.

Naturally, mining operations in the area can only start after the company has acquired usage right over the necessary lands.
The questioner asks the following questions and makes the following comments and remarks: As regards to the resettlement program, he would like to know if the intention of RMGC is to expropriate churches from Rosia Montana because the Holy Synod has stated on November 11, 2003 that its lands and churches are not for sale.

As the questioner notes, the comments by the Holy Synod date to 2003. Based on those comments, the Roșia Montană Project was redesigned to reduce impact on the churches in the community.

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.

The fact is that 98% of people in the industrial zone of the village have scheduled surveys to assess their property - a sign that they are considering the sale of their homes. We trust that if the community indicates its support of the RMP, the churches in the community will reflect the preferences of their congregations. The churches have followed the human communities providing them religious service and support.

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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>RRAP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MMDD's item no. for the question which includes the observation identified by the RMGC internal code</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMDD's identification no. for the question which includes the observation identified by the RMGC internal code</td>
<td>Rosia Montana, 24.07.2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMGC internal unique code</td>
<td>MMGA_0120</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Proposal**

How a family may be relocated by using Lei 450-500 million paid by Gold, when in Cluj Napoca a studio apartment costs between Lei 1.2 and 1.7 billion?

**Solution**

The formula by which property values are ascertained follows World Bank guidelines, and is based on replacement value within the same conditions. For the purposes of the Roşia Montană, replacement value was determined by surveying replacement costs in 14 real estate markets from a 250 km radius around Roşia Montană, and making an average. Cluj, while within the radius, is at the top end of the range, to expect valuations to conform to the Cluj market only would defeat the purposes of the average. By the same measure, it would have been inequitable and unfair to use the low end of the regional range - Zlatna, as it happens - to determine "replacement value." The average number for the 14 markets was judged the fairest way to assess replacement value. The current prices have been set taking the level of Alba-Iulia as the reference for the various categories of land and homes. During the last 6 months the prices have been revised twice based on the above mentioned type of survey.
| MMDD’s item no. for the question which includes the observation identified by the RMGC internal code | 41 |
| MMDD’s identification no. for the question which includes the observation identified by the RMGC internal code | Abrud, 25.07.2006 |
| RMGC internal unique code | MMGA_0137 |

**Proposal**
The questioner supports investments in mining industry, but he would like to be made for the interest of the Romanian government, of local communities, without area’s depopulation and soul amputations of those impacted.

**Solution**
The development of the new mine is confined to an area composed of only 4 of Roșia Montană’s 16 comuna. Roșia Montană will not be depopulated; indeed the level of economic investment (563 direct jobs and approximately 6,000 indirect jobs) will be a strong economic catalyst in an area currently experiencing extreme unemployment (above 70%).

As for the soul of the place, Roșia Montană stands a much stronger chance of building a vibrant future with the new mine as its economic engine than without it, as unemployment in the absence of RMGC will rise above 90%.

The Romanian Government, through Minvest, is already part of this mining development project and will largely benefit of this project through the taxation instruments. The local communities will be the scene of an intense development, given the market created by the mine during the operations.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>RRAP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MMDD's item no. for the question which includes the observation identified by the RMGC internal code</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMDD's identification no. for the question which includes the observation identified by the RMGC internal code</td>
<td>Abrud, 25.07.2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMGC internal unique code</td>
<td>MMGA_0139</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Proposal**

Where are the 410 graves from the impacted graveyards going to be relocated?

**Solution**

The company understands community sensitivities on such issues. Romanian law establishes the accepted methods for exhumation of remains and reburial [1], and the company is pledged to follow those laws to the letter. To put the number of graves in context, 410 graves of the Roșia Montană's 1,905 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. Graves will be relocated according to the wishes of the family and at RMGC's expense. Abandoned graves will be relocated, with full respect and reverence, to Piatra Alba's new cemetery.

**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;


(iii) The hygiene norms and recommendations concerning the population’s life environment, published in the Romanian Official Gazette, Section I, no. 140/03.07.1997, as subsequently amended and supplemented ("Order 536/1997");

(iv) GD no. 955/2004 on the approval of the framework Rules for the organization and operation of the public services for the administration of the public and private domain of local interest, published in the Romanian Official Gazette, Section I, no. 660/22.07.2004;

(v) Order no. 261/1982 on the approval of the standard Rules for the administration of graveyards and the crematories of the localities, published in the Official Gazette no. 67/11.03.1983;

(vi) Rules for the organization and operation of the parish and monastery graveyards within the eparchies of the Romanian Orthodox Church, approved by Decision of the Religious Affairs Department no. 16.285/31.12.1981.
The questioner makes the following remarks and comments: There are families that do not want to resettle their homes and graves.

**Solution**

The project is not designed against the will of the community and has been developed so far with the support of the community.

The property purchase program established by the company has been designed according to World Bank guidelines, and is based on a "willing seller, willing buyer" model, offering individual development opportunities and various support programs. 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.

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 relevant Romanian 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 in investment in 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.

What the RMP project offers to future generations is a chance to continue a way of life in a village where that future – with 70% unemployment today, rising above 90% if RMGC's proposed mine is not allowed to proceed – would be very much in doubt. In the event of Roșia Montană’s demise, the graves and homes there would likely be left behind, as in other abandoned mining villages in the Romanian countryside. Development of the RMP will keep the village alive – in fact and in spirit - and bring economic opportunity to the region.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>RRAP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MMDD’s item no. for the question which includes the observation identified by the RMGC internal code</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMDD’s identification no. for the question which includes the observation identified by the RMGC internal code</td>
<td>Campeni, 26.07.2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMGC internal unique code</td>
<td>MMGA_0191</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Proposal
The questioner wants to learn how the project is going to be achieved, because both the Holy Synod of Romanian Church and all Episcopates: Roman Catholic, Greek Catholic, Unitarian and Calvinist ones, have decided that they will not sell their properties as long as a parishioner of the respective faith exists at Rosia Montana. Will the Project be achieved over locals?

The comments by the Holy Synod and other churches date to 2003. Based on those comments, the Roşia Montană Project was redesigned to reduce impact on the churches in the community.

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.

### Solution
The fact is that 98% of people in the industrial zone of the village have scheduled surveys to assess their property - a sign that they are considering the sale of their properties. We trust that if the community indicates its support of the RMP, the churches in the community will reflect the preferences of their congregations. The churches have followed the human communities providing them religious service and support.
Domain | RRAP
--- | ---
MMDD's item no. for the question which includes the observation identified by the RMGC internal code | 80

MMDD's identification no. for the question which includes the observation identified by the RMGC internal code | Campeni, 26.07.2006

RMGC internal unique code | MMGA_0199

Proposal | The questioner would like to have his rights observed and he does not want to sell and leave from Rosia Montana.

RMGC acknowledges the property right of every person. All acquisitions of usage right over the properties necessary for RMP development are and will be done with the observance of the legal methods provided for by art. 6 of the Mining Law no. 85/2003: (i) sale-purchase, for the price agreed upon by the parties; (ii) land exchange, with the relocation of the affected owner and the reconstruction of the buildings on the newly granted land, at the expense of the titleholder benefiting from the land released, as per the convention between the parties; (iii) renting of the land for a fixed-term period, based on agreements between the parties; (iv) land concession, etc.

The company will also seek options to redesign the mine plan to allow this owner to retain his/her property, unaffected by the mine.

The construction and operation of the Roșia Montană Project requires the acquisition of properties in four of Roșia Montana’s 16 sub-comuna. For the most part, therefore, property ownership in the larger part of Roșia Montana will not be affected by the project.

In order to acquire the necessary properties, the company has established a property purchase program compliant with the RRAP guidelines developed by the World Bank. When acquiring the private property lands necessary for the development of Roșia 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 the company’s official website.

Solution | As the mining project proceeds in phases, it is not necessary to acquire all properties at the outset. Accordingly, the company has focused on properties required for the construction and operation of the mine in its first five years. To date, more than 56% of the properties needed to construct the project and operate the mine for the first five years have been acquired.

Of those properties needed but not yet acquired, 98% have been so far presented for surveying by their owners – a step that implies an interest in selling the property to the company. The survey rate suggests that little more than a handful of properties are held by people who might prove unwilling to entertain a sale.

Of that small number, some will lie in areas not needed for construction and early operation of the mine. For the near-term, therefore, owners of these properties need not prove any impediment to the mine development, and they can continue to live as they wish.

Of the even smaller number of homes that are located in areas in which the construction and early operation of the mine will take place, the company will seek options to redesign the mine plan to allow those owners to retain their property, unaffected by the mine.

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.

In this respect, 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 the 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 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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>RRAP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MMDD’s item no. for the question which includes the observation identified by the RMGC internal code</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMDD’s identification no. for the question which includes the observation identified by the RMGC internal code</td>
<td>Campeni, 26.07.2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMGC internal unique code</td>
<td>MMGA_0202</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Proposal**

In order to achieve its Project, RMGC must own 100% of the land and currently it only owns 17% of Rosia Montana’s lands.

**Solution**

It is true that RMGC must acquire usage right over 100% of the property in the mine project area, which involves 4 of the 16 sub-comuna in Roșia Montană.

However, this does not mean RMGC should own 100% of the lands necessary for the project development, but to acquire usage right over it, by any of the methods provided for by art. 6 of the Mining Law no. 85/2003: (i) sale-purchase, for the price agreed upon by the parties; (ii) land exchange, with the relocation of the affected owner and the reconstruction of the buildings on the newly released land, on the expense of the titleholder benefitting from the land released, as per the convention between the parties; (iii) renting of the land for a fixed-term period, based on agreements between the parties; (iv) land concession, etc.

Moreover, it is not necessary, to acquire usage right over all 100% prior to commencing the project. Presently, RMGC owns more than 56% of the properties required for the construction phase and the first five years of operation. The program through which properties are being purchased is designed in accord with World Bank guidelines.
### Domain

- **RRAP**

### MMDD's item no. for the question which includes the observation identified by the RMGC internal code

- 86

### MMDD's identification no. for the question which includes the observation identified by the RMGC internal code

- Campeni, 26.07.2006

### RMGC internal unique code

- MMGA_0209

### Proposal

The questioner makes the following remarks and comments: The company claims that the alteration of the 2000 Urbanism Plan affects only 25% of Rosia Montana, but this 25% represents exactly the percentage belonging to the Alburnus Maior's members.

### Solution

There is no connection between the 25% of Roșia Montană - 4 out of its 16 sub-comuna - that is affected by the RMP and properties owned by supporters of Alburnus Maior who actually live in Roșia Montană. The alteration of the urbanism plans was not made in consideration of Alburnus Maior supporters or other inhabitants of the area, but is a mandatory legal requirement as per:

1. **art 6 (1) of the GD no. 525/1996 for the approval of the General Urbanism Regulation ("GD no. 525/1996")** (*authorizing the building of permanent constructions, other than the facilities necessary for the exploitation and processing of resources in the areas delineated according to the law, which contain identified underground resources, is forbidden") and ;

2. **art. 41 (2) of the Mining Law no. 85/2003** (*"the county councils and the local councils will amend and/or update the existing territory arrangement plans and the general urbanism plans, so as to ensure the carrying out of all operations necessary for the development of the mining activities granted into concession").
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>RRAP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MMD’s item no. for the question which includes the observation identified by the RMGC internal code</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMD’s identification no. for the question which includes the observation identified by the RMGC internal code</td>
<td>Campeni, 26.07.2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMGC internal unique code</td>
<td>MMGA_0219</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Proposal

The questioner states the following remarks, comments, and questions: How many people are currently living at Piatra Alba, taking into account the fact that the relocation and resettlement plan has been initiated in 2002? She states that no one has chosen resettlement although the company claims that 20 families have been registered in this program, and that is not presented in the assessment study.

### Solution

Construction of the new Piatra Albă community is scheduled to begin in Summer 2007, with the exact date depending on approvals from the local authorities in Roşia Montană. While the number will grow as construction nears, thus far, 30 families have expressed so far interest in relocating to Piatra Albă (15 already signed the final contracts), which will combine modern amenities (including a new school, medical clinic, city hall, and recreational facilities) and traditional architectural designs.
What will the company do with the rest of people: i.e. 20 individuals decide to leave for Piatra Alba and what will the rest, up to 2158 individuals, do? Rosia Montana will remain without any inhabitants.

The new mine affects 4 of Roşia Montană’s 16 sub-comuna, so the implication that the village will be without inhabitants is incorrect - Roşia Montană’s current population amounts to 3,900 inhabitants. Piatra Albă will serve as home to many more than the comparably small number of families (30 so far) who have expressed interest in living there at this point.

The people living in the Historical Area asked the company to buy their properties although this implies a massive financial effort without being needed by the development of the project. When the RMGC project commences and brings both direct and indirect employment to the Roşia Montană region, there will be a net inflow of people to the area – a sharp reversal of the de-population that has accompanied the area’s decade-long decline.
The Community Management Plan does not take into account the fact that the population does not want to live at Piatra Alba and it has been prepared with no support. The population, who has decided to sell their properties, took its money and left as far as possible from Rosia Montana and that raises questions about the Project.

Under the Resettlement and Relocation Action Plan, property sellers in Roşia Montana are free to relocate wherever they wish or to resettle near their old homes. The construction of Piatra Albă, which will begin in Summer 2007, will add to their relocation options (30 options so far). This was chosen among a number of alternatives and was the subject of a thorough analysis and consultation with the local authorities and the community representatives.

The Roşia Montană residents who have sold their houses to RMGC have moved for many reasons, including to be closer to their relatives and to pursue opportunities in different towns or cities, at their convenience. It is not reasonable to claim that these residents’ decisions raise questions about the mine, especially since the RMGC project is designed to meet and exceed E.U. standards and international best practice.

Additionally, it is important to note that 12 of Roşia Montană’s 16 sub-comuna will not be affected by the project and that the chance for those who remain in the area to benefit from the new mine is considerable.
According to the resettlement and relocation plan (Chapter 3.52 – 3.59) it won’t resort to expropriation only if there the company doesn’t reach an amicable agreement with the owners. The questioner wants to know if RMGC is replacing Government or it has people within the Government and if it considers that a private business with huge benefits for others is a public utility.

To put the resettlement issue in its larger context, the construction and operation of the Roşia Montană Project requires the acquisition of properties in four of Roşia Montană’s 16 sub-comuna. For the most part, therefore, property ownership in the larger part of Roşia Montană will not be affected by the project.

In order to acquire the necessary properties, the company has established a property purchase program compliant with the RRAP guidelines developed by the World Bank. 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 and guidelines in this field.

As the mining project proceeds in phases, it is not necessary to acquire all properties at the outset. Accordingly, the company has focused on properties required for the construction and operation of the mine in its first five years. To date, more than 56% of the properties needed to construct the project and operate the mine for the first five years have been acquired.

Of those properties needed but not yet acquired, 98% have been presented for surveying by their owners – a step that implies an interest in selling the property to the company. The survey rate suggests that little more than a handful of properties are held by people who might prove unwilling to entertain a sale.

Of that small number, some will lie in areas not needed for construction and early operation of the mine. For the near-term, therefore, owners of these properties need not prove any impediment to the mine development, and they can continue to live as they wish.

Of the even smaller number of homes that are located in areas in which the construction and early operation of the mine will take place, the company will seek options to redesign the mine plan to allow those owners to retain their property, unaffected by the mine.

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 relevant Romanian 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: 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 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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>RRAP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MMDD's item no. for the question which includes the observation identified by the RMGC internal code</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMDD's identification no. for the question which includes the observation identified by the RMGC internal code</td>
<td>Zlatna, 02.08.2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMGC internal unique code</td>
<td>MMGA_0336</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Proposal**

The questioner wants to know if there is any procedure to be followed for someone who doesn’t have properties in Rosia Montana but wants to build a house at Piatra Alba site.

**Solution**

People interested in building at Piatra Alba should contact the local administration in Roșia Montană to seek approval for purchase of property and construction. While the company is designing and constructing the public areas of Piatra Albă, the local Romanian authorities determine how private individuals can purchase and build in the community.
There are families who do not agree with the resettlement from Rosia Montana and claim that they will never agree with it. What will happen with the project in this case?

The project is not designed against the will of the community and has been developed so far with the support of the community.

When acquiring the private property lands necessary for the development of Roșia 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.

As the mining project proceeds in phases, it is not necessary to acquire all properties at the outset. Accordingly, the company has focused on properties required for the construction and operation of the mine in its first five years.

Of the even smaller number of homes that are located in areas in which the construction and early operation of the mine will take place, the company will seek options to redesign the mine plan to allow those owners to retain their property, unaffected by the mine.

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 relevant Romanian 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.

In this respect, 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.
### Domain

| MMDD's item no. for the question which includes the observation identified by the RMGC internal code | 197 |
| MMDD's identification no. for the question which includes the observation identified by the RMGC internal code | Cluj Napoca, 07.08.2006 |
| RMGC internal unique code | MMGA_0394 |

### Proposal

The surface on which the project is going to be developed belongs to the public or private domain of the Rosia Montana commune and of its inhabitants?

In accordance with Romanian law, surface rights to construct the new mine must be acquired from property holders. RMGC is currently acquiring those rights through its Resettlement and Relocation Action Plan (RRAP), which was designed to comply with World Bank guidelines.

The ownership of some land needed stays with the local authority, either Public or Private Domains and for some other with the individuals. There are also other institutional owners as Remin Baia –Mare, various denominations, Minvest Deva, Public Mail Service, etc.

### Solution

Art. 6 of the Mining Law no. 85/2003 provides for different legal methods to acquire the usage right over the lands necessary for mining projects development, covering both public and private domain, as follows:

1. **Sale-purchase**, for the price agreed upon by the parties;
2. **Land exchange**, with the relocation of the affected owner and the reconstruction of the buildings on the newly granted land, on the expense of the titleholder benefiting from the land released, as per the convention between the parties;
3. **Renting of the land for a fixed-term period**, based on agreements between the parties;
4. **Land concession**, etc.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Domain</strong></th>
<th>RRAP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>MMDD's item no. for the question which includes the observation identified by the RMGC internal code</strong></td>
<td>212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MMDD's identification no. for the question which includes the observation identified by the RMGC internal code</strong></td>
<td>Cluj Napoca, 07.08.2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RMGC internal unique code</strong></td>
<td>MMGA_0427</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Proposal</strong></th>
<th>The questioner believes that impact on churches is, in fact the destruction of churches through relocation.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Solution</strong></td>
<td>Contrary to what the opponents of the mining project claim, no one wants to destroy the churches of Roșia Montană.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What the RMP project offers to future generations is a chance to continue a way of life in a village where that future - with 70% unemployment today, rising above 90% if RMGC’s proposed mine is not allowed to proceed - would be very much in doubt. In the event of Roșia Montană’s demise, the churches there would likely be left behind, as in other abandoned mining villages in the Romanian countryside. Development of the RMP will keep the village alive - in fact and in spirit - and bring economic opportunity to the region.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
If RMGC helps to relocate 2000 locals from Rosia Montana, then for whom the project is made?

RMGC’s Resettlement and Relocation Action Plan (RRAP) is intended to help relocate and/or resettle residents in the project impact area, which is limited to 4 of Roșia Montană’s 16 sub-comuna. The RMGC mining project brings new employment opportunities and other benefits to the remaining residents of Roșia Montană and the surrounding areas as well as to those residents who relocate to Piatra Albă.

This project provides to future generations not only jobs, but also a cleaner environment, personal development opportunities, small enterprise support, and support provided for the development of one of the most underdeveloped areas of Romania.

So, the implication that the village will be without inhabitants is incorrect - Roșia Montană’s population amounts 3,900 inhabitants.

The people living in the Historical Area asked the company to buy their properties although this implies a massive financial effort without being needed by the development of the project. Likewise, Piatra Albă will serve as home to many more than the comparably small number of families (30 so far) who have expressed interest in living there at this point. When the RMGC project commences and brings both direct and indirect employment to the Roșia Montană region, there will be a net inflow of people to the area - a sharp reversal of the de-population that has accompanied the area’s decade-long decline.

Through the construction of the Piatra Albă site we offer higher living standards, high quality social and cultural services. The Central Area of the site will include public buildings, town hall, police, post office, bank, church, school, kindergarten, cultural center, museum, medical center, drug store, commercial areas, entertainment and leisure areas or attractive areas for the development of tourism in the region, inn, hotel, fair area, sports field, gym hall, skating rink, football field, park, playgrounds for children.
What is it understood through direct and indirect impacts?

The contents of the Environmental Impact Assessment Report, drafted in accordance with the provisions of Order no. 863/2002 - Annex II - Methodological Guide of the screening stage and of completion of the report to the assessment study - Part II The structure of the report to the environmental impact assessment study, responds in detail to the question, by assessing both direct and indirect impact.

In this respect, please refer to EIA Report - Chapter 4 - Potential impacts, in which is thoroughly assessed the impact in relation to: Water - Subchapter 4.1; Air - Subchapter 4.2; Noise and Vibrations - Subchapter 4.3; Soil - Subchapter 4.4; Subsoil Geology - Subchapter 4.5; Biodiversity - Subchapter 4.6; Landscape - Subchapter 4.7; Social and Economical Environment - Subchapter 4.8; Cultural and Ethnical Conditions and Heritage - Subchapter 4.9 and Transport - Subchapter 4.10.

Each of those subchapters provides an overview of potential impacts (both direct and indirect), proposed mitigations, and related management plans. For instance, the socio-economic impacts resulting from the project are divided and assessed based on two components:

1. Direct impacts - Socio-economic impacts related with land acquisition (physical and economic displacement), which are addressed in the Resettlement and Relocation Action Plan (RRAP);
2. Indirect impacts - Socio-economic and environmental impacts not related with land acquisition, which are addressed in the Community Sustainable Development Program.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>RRAP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MMDD's item no. for the question which includes the observation identified by the RMGC internal code</td>
<td>234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMDD's identification no. for the question which includes the observation identified by the RMGC internal code</td>
<td>Cluj Napoca, 07.08.2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMGC internal unique code</td>
<td>MMGA_0474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal</td>
<td>A church is going to be directly or indirectly impacted if priests or the community won’t agree with its relocation? Tourists will visit a church from a cyanide lake and they will be directly or indirectly impacted while swimming across this lake?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solution</td>
<td>As there will not be a cyanide lake in Roșia Montană, the questioner need not fear for his or her safety, or for the one of the persons coming into the RMP impact area during the project’s lifespan. The facts of the matter are that 2 churches and 2 prayer houses out of a total of 10 places of worship located within the project’s footprint must be relocated under the mine plan. Those churches will be moved in accordance with the wishes of the congregation, at the expense of RMGC. Church construction is a central element in the new community of Piatra Albă being built by the company.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solution</td>
<td>What the RMP project offers to future generations is a chance to continue a way of life in a locality where that future - with 70% unemployment today, rising above 90% if RMGC’s proposed mine is not allowed to proceed - would be very much in doubt. In the event of Roșia Montană’s demise, the churches there would likely be left behind, as in other abandoned mining villages in the Romanian countryside. Development of the RMP will keep the village alive - in fact and in spirit - and bring economic opportunity to the region.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domain</td>
<td>RRAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMDD's item no. for the question which includes the observation identified by the RMGC internal code</td>
<td>255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMDD's identification no. for the question which includes the observation identified by the RMGC internal code</td>
<td>Cluj Napoca, 07.08.2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMGC internal unique code</td>
<td>MMGA_0531</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Proposal**

The titleholder must buy also the lands on which the project is going to be developed not only the houses. How much of this land is owned by the company?

**Solution**

The questioner is correct that RMGC must acquire both the homes and the lands. Following guidelines set forth by the World Bank, RMGC is in the process of purchasing the property required to build and operate the mine.

However, this does not mean RMGC should own 100% of the lands necessary for the project development, but to acquire usage right over it, by any of the methods provided for by art. 6 of the Mining Law no. 85/2003: (i) sale-purchase, for the price agreed upon by the parties; (ii) land exchange, with the relocation of the affected owner and the reconstruction of the buildings on the newly granted land, on the expense of the titleholder benefiting from the land released, as per the convention between the parties; (iii) renting of the land for a fixed-term period, based on agreements between the parties; (iv) land concession, etc.

At present, more than 56% of total number of properties and more than 60% of the total surface needed to construct and operate the mine has been acquired. The questioner can monitor RMGC’s acquisition of new properties in the future by referring to new quarterly reports posted on the company’s website.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>RRAP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| MMDD's item no. for the question which includes the observation identified by the RMGC internal code | 262 |
| MMDD's identification no. for the question which includes the observation identified by the RMGC internal code | Cluj Napoca, 07.08.2006 |
| RMGC internal unique code | MMGA_0544 |

### Proposal
The questioner makes the following observations and comments: The company has to develop 4 open pits: Carnic, Orlea, Jig and Cetate, but the questioner owns the Carnic pit and 3ha of land in Orlea, therefore the company has to re-draft the project and resume the public consultations process.

### Solution
It is true that RMGC must acquire the properties necessary to develop the four pits. However, the project has been designed with this necessity in mind, and our multi-year project does not require all properties to be purchased at the onset. Because the project design anticipates these factors, it is not necessary to redesign or to repeat the public consultation process.

The owner who stated that comment actually can’t own Cârnic area, as RMGC already acquired the usage right over it from the owner registered with the Land Book.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>RRAP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MMDD’s item no. for the question which includes the observation identified by the RMGC internal code</td>
<td>272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMDD’s identification no. for the question which includes the observation identified by the RMGC internal code</td>
<td>Cluj Napoca, 07.08.2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMGC internal unique code</td>
<td>MMGA_0576</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Proposal**
The questioner makes comments regarding the resettlement and states that she won’t live Rosia Montana, the place where she was born. She won’t leave the tombs where are buried her only child—dead at age 18—her husband, her brothers, parents and grand-parents. She doesn’t want their tombs to be resettled, she wants them to remain for ever in the graveyard where they are buried.

**Solution**
This questioner is known to the company, as a woman who lives in the Protected Area established by the project. Her loved ones burials are also placed in the Protected Area. As a result, she has not to leave her home, or to move the graves of her relatives.
The questioner makes the following comments: The questioner is not against projects that are beneficial to people, but is against the resettlement. The questioner stresses the fact that he cannot leave his house and cannot take part in the demolition of the church, in the destruction of the tombs where his parents and ancestors are buried. The questioner points out the fact that he is a true Christian and he cannot take part in the destruction of the mountains which are God's work!

The beginning statement of the comment is extremely relevant: when assessing the development needs of the area he is not against the mining project proposed by the company, although at the individual level, he would not like to leave the area.

The company has considered this approach and attitude when the properties acquisition strategy was designed:

- individual development opportunities;
- small business compensation and financial support;
- professional training and career development;
- properties replacement values compensation, including land restoring cost and eventual crop lost;
- scholarship;
- resettlement sites in both rural area (Piatra Albă - Roşia Montană) and urban one (Furcilor Hill - Alba Iulia);
- relocation / resettlement assistance for properties search, registration formalities, health care support, jobs search and training, small savings and investment assistance.

The idea of this project may not be deemed as antichristian, as long as its main principle is that of responsible mining. We believe that resources development is not an act against God, if it is performed in a responsible manner. This project provides to future generations not only jobs, but also a cleaner environment, personal development opportunities, small enterprise support, and support provided for the development of one of the most underdeveloped areas of Romania.

As for the religious concerns raised by the questioner, mining is a profession pursued for generations by many Romanians of deep religious belief - indeed, in many rural Romanian graveyards, many gravestones show the miner's pick on a Christian grave.

And 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, the vast majority of Roşia Montană’s 1,905 graves will not 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. (410 graves need to be moved during the lifetime of the mine).

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.

2 of Roşia Montană’s 10 churches must be relocated under the mine plan. Those churches will be moved in accordance with the wishes of the congregation, at the expense of RMGC. Church construction is a
What the RMP project offers to future generations is a chance to continue a way of life in a village where that future – with 70% unemployment today, rising above 90% if RMGC’s proposed mine is not allowed to proceed – would be very much in doubt. In the event of Roşia Montană’s demise, the graves and churches there would likely be left behind, as in other abandoned mining villages in the Romanian countryside. Development of the RMP will keep the village alive - in fact and in spirit - and bring economic opportunity to the region and this will not impose the community to give up its spiritual values and traditions.

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;
(iii) The hygiene norms and recommendations concerning the population’s life environment, published in the Romanian Official Gazette, Section I, no. 140/03.07.1997, as subsequently amended and supplemented (“Order 536/1997”);
(iv) GD no. 955/2004 on the approval of the framework Rules for the organization and operation of the public services for the administration of the public and private domain of local interest, published in the Romanian Official Gazette, Section I, no. 660/22.07.2004;
(v) Order no. 261/1982 on the approval of the standard Rules for the administration of graveyards and the crematories of the localities, published in the Official Gazette no. 67/11.03.1983;
(vi) Rules for the organization and operation of the parish and monastery graveyards within the eparchies of the Romanian Orthodox Church, approved by Decision of the Religious Affairs Department no. 16.285/31.12.1981.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>RRAP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>MMDD's item no. for the question which includes the observation identified by the RMGC internal code</strong></td>
<td>292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MMDD's identification no. for the question which includes the observation identified by the RMGC internal code</strong></td>
<td>Turda, 09.08.2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RMGC internal unique code</strong></td>
<td>MMGA_0620</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Proposal**

How can they ignore so easily the opinion of the Church, which, as we well know, opposes the resettlement?

**Solution**

The comments by the Holy Synod date to 2003. Based on those comments, the Roşia Montană Project was redesigned to reduce impact on the churches in the community.

As a result, only 2 of Roşia Montană’s 10 churches must be relocated under the mine plan. Those churches will be moved/restored in accordance with the wishes of the congregations, at the expense of RMGC. Churches construction is a central element in the new community of Piatra Albă being built by the company.

The fact is that 98% of people in the industrial zone of the village have scheduled surveys to assess their property - a sign that they are considering the sale of their homes. We trust that if the community indicates its support of the RMP, the churches in the community will reflect the preferences of their congregations.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>RRAP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MMDD’s item no. for the question which includes the observation identified by the RMGC internal code</td>
<td>292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMDD’s identification no. for the question which includes the observation identified by the RMGC internal code</td>
<td>Turda, 09.08.2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMGC internal unique code</td>
<td>MMGA_0621</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Proposal**: Why didn’t RMGC buy houses in the protected area, houses that won’t be impacted by the project, we are talking about the patrimonial houses and other houses? They are in very poor condition because of the activities carried out by the company in the area.

**Solution**: Although not affected by the development of the RMGC proposed mining activities, the company has acquired a lot of properties in the protected area, as a result of the public consultation process. The people living in this part of the village asked the company to be given the opportunity to sell their properties to the company. The company has also bought houses classified as historical monuments which were in a poor state of conservation at the time of their acquisition. Furthermore, the condition of the houses in the village has not been negatively affected by the company but rather by years of economic decline in the Roșia Montană area. The company is developing a zonal urbanism plan for the Historical Center of Roșia Montană, which indicates for each and every listed house the refurbishment works that will be done by the company. Restoration works are currently underway for 11 such houses.
What surface is allowed for agricultural works in the Piatra Alba area and how is it compared to the current agricultural surface, where is it mentioned in the EIA, on what page? If it is not mentioned, then why?

According to the relevant legal provisions, the interested public may submit justified proposals on the environment impact assessment. Art. 44 (2) of the Order no. 860/2002 on the Environment Impact Assessment Procedure and the issuance of the environmental approval provides to this end that “based on the results of the public debate, the relevant authority for the environmental protection evaluates the grounded proposals/comments of the public and requests the titleholder the supplementation of the report to the environmental impact assessment study with an annex containing solutions for the solving of the underlined issues”.

The question of the attendant to the public consultations identifies and specifies no problems in regard of the project initiated by RMGC subject to the environmental impact assessment procedure, but requests information on Piatra Albă resettlement site, whose development is ongoing, and which is outside the requirements relating to the EIA document.

Nonetheless, considering RMGC has expressed its full availability to discuss any issues relevant for the proposed project, please note the following:

The planning for Piatra Albă sets aside 60 hectares for agricultural development, outside of the 58 hectares in the PUZ area. In addition, each property intended for housing includes a small agricultural plot, in keeping with local tradition, right behind the house plot. Every party interested in living in Piatra Albă is asked to register their desire for agricultural land as well. The 60 hectares (even more, if needed) are part of an agreement with the local administration of Roșia Montană, in order to meet this type of demand.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>RRAP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MMDD’s item no. for the question which includes the observation identified by the RMGC internal code</td>
<td>298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMDD’s identification no. for the question which includes the observation identified by the RMGC internal code</td>
<td>Turda, 09.08.2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMGC internal unique code</td>
<td>MMGA_0637</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Proposal**

How many hectares has the company bought so far, apart from the 48% it owns, of the total surface needed for the development of the whole project, leaving aside the protected area? How many hectares does RMGC hold out of the 1248 ha necessary for the project? Where is this aspect addressed in the EIA? And if it is not mentioned, then why?

**Solution**

Thus far the company has acquired more than 56% of the properties required to construct and operate the mine for its first five years. As this percentage changes over time, it is addressed in the company’s quarterly reports, available online, rather than in the EIA document. Order no. 863/2002 - Annex II - Methodological Guide of the screening stage and of completion of the report to the assessment study - Part II (the structure of the report to the environmental impact assessment study) which sets out the content and structure of the EIA Report does not provide for such an information to be included in the EIA Report.

Mention should be made that RMGC does not need to buy 100% of the lands necessary for the project development, but to acquire usage right over it, by any of the methods provided for by art. 6 of the Mining Law no. 85/2003: (i) sale-purchase, for the price agreed upon by the parties; (ii) land exchange, with the relocation of the affected owner and the reconstruction of the buildings on the newly granted land, on the expense of the titleholder benefiting from the land released, as per the convention between the parties; (iii) renting of the land for a fixed-term period, based on agreements between the parties; (iv) land concession, etc.

In terms of land surface, the company has acquired more than 60% of the land required for the same purpose.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>RRAP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MMDD’s item no. for the question which includes the observation identified by the RMGC internal code</td>
<td>338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMDD’s identification no. for the question which includes the observation identified by the RMGC internal code</td>
<td>Lupsa, 16.08.2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMGC internal unique code</td>
<td>MMGA_0696</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposal</th>
<th>The four churches that are to be resettled must be resettled as they are, they must not be replaced by concrete blockhouses.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Solution</td>
<td>Only two churches - not four - must be relocated. The other two ones are prayer houses. They will be rebuilt/restored according to the desires of the congregations with full respect and reverence. We would also like to point out that we have designed and redesigned the project to ensure that none of Roșia Montană’s 41 historical structures will be affected. If the churches will be rebuilt, this will happen in accordance with the specific technologies and materials.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domain</td>
<td>RRAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMDD’s item no. for the question which includes the observation identified by the RMGC internal code</td>
<td>340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMDD’s identification no. for the question which includes the observation identified by the RMGC internal code</td>
<td>Lupsa, 16.08.2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMGC internal unique code</td>
<td>MMGA_0716</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Proposal**

The questioner would leave the area in exchange of a compensation paid by the company rather than be affected by pollution and suffer because of the project.

**Solution**

Any Roșia Montană eligible resident is free to sell his or her property to RMGC. When acquiring the private property lands necessary for the development of Roșia 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 and guidelines in this field.

However, the new project will remediate existing pollution (rather than create further pollution) as it will operate to the strongest E.U. standards and industry best practices. Should the seller choose to relocate to the new community of Piatra Albă, he or she will see Roșia Montană’s environment become cleaner as a result of modern mining. We do not encourage the people living either under or outside the foot-print of the project to leave the area. The development opportunities created in the area by the company make the area attractive.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>RRAP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MMDD's item no. for the question which includes the observation identified by the RMGC internal code</td>
<td>341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMDD's identification no. for the question which includes the observation identified by the RMGC internal code</td>
<td>Lupsa, 16.08.2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMGC internal unique code</td>
<td>MMGA_0717</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Proposal**

Considering the fact that the miners raise animals, the questioner proposes that a veterinary clinic be also included in the relocation project, a clinic that would be available to all the communities in the neighboring area and where both large-size animals and the small ones be treated. The questioner considers that this measure would be beneficial to the community.

**Solution**

According to the relevant legal provisions, the interested public may submit justified proposals on the environment impact assessment. Art. 44 (3) of the Order no. 860/2002 on the Environment Impact Assessment Procedure and the issuance of the environmental approval provides to this end that “based on the results of the public debate, the relevant authority for the environmental protection evaluates the grounded proposals/comments of the public and requests the titleholder the supplementation of the report to the environmental impact assessment study with an annex containing solutions for the solving of the underlined issues”.

The question of the attendant to the public consultations identifies and specifies no problems in regard of the project initiated by RMGC subject to the environmental impact assessment procedure, but requests information on Piatra Albă resettlement site, whose development is ongoing, and which is outside the requirements relating to the EIA document.

Nonetheless, considering RMGC has expressed its full availability to discuss any issues relevant for the proposed project, this suggestion has been passed on to the team developing Piatra Albă for possible inclusion. It is RMGC’s intention to make Piatra Albă as responsive as possible to community practices, interests, and occupations. However, the usual veterinary assistance, by nature, is made where the animals are raised, mainly in areas where the access is slightly difficult, which is the case in Roșia Montană.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>RRAP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MMDD's item no. for the question which includes the observation identified by the RMGC internal code</td>
<td>349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMDD's identification no. for the question which includes the observation identified by the RMGC internal code</td>
<td>Bucuresti, 21.08.2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMGC internal unique code</td>
<td>MMGA_0723</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Proposal**

There are so many churches and graveyards in the Rosia Montana area that would disappear from the face of the earth. What does the company plan to do with the deceased people from Rosia Montana? How will they be exhumed and where will they be resettled?

Some graveyards are in the proposed area for the project development and, similar to other industrial projects or highways that cross graveyards, discussions will be made with families of the deceased and with the church, as well as with the local authorities, for relocating those cemeteries, in compliance with the legislation and with respective churches practice.

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. Church 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 Montana’s 1,905 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 cemeteries, out of the existing twelve 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 Montana 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 Alba’s new cemetery, for which 13 hectares have been set aside.

**Solution**

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;


(iii) The hygiene norms and recommendations concerning the population’s life environment, published in the Romanian Official Gazette, Section I, no. 140/03.07.1997, as subsequently amended and supplemented (“Order 536/1997”);

(iv) GD no. 955/2004 on the approval of the framework Rules for the organization and operation of the public services for the administration of the public and private domain of local interest, published in the Romanian Official Gazette, Section I, no. 660/22.07.2004;

(v) Order no. 261/1982 on the approval of the standard Rules for the administration of graveyards and the crematories of the localities, published in the Official Gazette no. 67/11.03.1983;
(vi) Rules for the organization and operation of the parish and monastery graveyards within the eparchies of the Romanian Orthodox Church, approved by Decision of the Religious Affairs Department no. 16.285/31.12.1981.
Why has the company purchased houses in Rosia Montana before the project initiation? The precarious condition of the houses purchased by Rosia Montana Gold Corporation is worsening every year, they have almost disappeared. The company said it would preserve them, it would protect the heritage. These houses are dated since the 18th, 19th centuries, there are 9 churches, and RMGC has not preserved any of them so far, and it will not preserve any of them in future either, if the project is not approved.

The acquisition by the project’s titleholder of the usage right over all area necessary for development of mining activities, as required by art. 6 of the Mining Law no. 85/2003, is a long-term process developed simultaneously with the permitting process, in order for the RMP to meet its timetable.

Technically, the owners’ request to sell houses from the Protected Area was based on the fact they had also owned properties elsewhere, under the footprint of the Project and such properties have been sold to RMGC.

As part of its commitment to preserving Roşia Montană’s cultural heritage, RMGC has designed its project so that all 41 historical structures in Roşia Montană are unaffected by the mine. Contrary to the claim by this questioner, preservation of properties both inside and outside of the protected area has already begun. A design team is now under contract to restore 11 historical structures in the protected area, and a 10-person team is dedicated to maintenance of properties in the protected area and outside, with a particular focus on the historical structures. A complete and comprehensive preservation/conservation effort is planned across the life of the project, but the effort is already underway.
**Proposal**

What does the company do with the private and public properties, the churches and graveyards?

Art. 6 of the Mining Law no. 85/2003 provides for different legal methods to acquire the usage right over the lands necessary for mining projects development, covering both public and private domain, as follows:

(i) sale-purchase, for the price agreed upon by the parties;
(ii) land exchange, with the relocation of the affected owner and the reconstruction of the buildings on the newly granted land, at the expense of the titleholder benefiting from the land released, as per the convention between the parties;
(iii) renting of the land for a fixed-term period, based on agreements between the parties;
(iv) land concession, etc.

The publicly owned properties needed for the project will be obtained through the legal instruments, concession agreements and/or direct acquisition, following the procedures based on a public tender approach, used in all Romanian local administrations.

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/restored 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, the vast majority of the graves in Roșia Montană will not 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 (410 graves need to be moved during he lifetime of the mine).

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.

What the RMP project offers to future generations is a chance to continue a way of life in a village where that future - with 70% unemployment today, rising above 90% if RMGC’s proposed mine is not allowed to proceed - would be very much in doubt. In the event of Roșia Montană’s demise, the graves and churches there would likely be left behind, as in other abandoned mining villages in the Romanian countryside. Development of the RMP will keep the village alive - in fact and in spirit - and bring economic opportunity to the region.

**References:**

[1] the relocation of graves and cemeteries is governed by the following regulatory acts:

(i) Law no. 489/2006 on the freedom of religion and the general regime of religious affairs, published in the Romanian Official Gazette, Section I, no. 11/08.01.2007;
(iii) The hygiene norms and recommendations concerning the population’s life environment, published in the Romanian Official Gazette, Section I, no. 140/03.07.1997, as subsequently amended and
supplemented (“Order 536/1997”);

(iv) GD no. 955/2004 on the approval of the framework Rules for the organization and operation of the public services for the administration of the public and private domain of local interest, published in the Romanian Official Gazette, Section I, no. 660/22.07.2004;

(v) Order no. 261/1982 on the approval of the standard Rules for the administration of graveyards and the crematories of the localities, published in the Official Gazette no. 67/11.03.1983;

(vi) Rules for the organization and operation of the parish and monastery graveyards within the eparchies of the Romanian Orthodox Church, approved by Decision of the Religious Affairs Department no. 16.285/31.12.1981.
The project implies the procedure of expropriation in the public interest. Taking into consideration the benefits versus risks and costs for the Romanian state, what is the public interest in this case? Why does the company believe that the Romanian government will declare this project of public use?

RMGC is doing all it can to acquire the necessary property to build and operate the RMP by way of its property purchase program, designed to meet World Bank standards. The company is also committed whenever feasible to redesign the mine plan to exclude properties whose owners do not wish to sell.

Ultimately, however, it is possible that a few property owners will seek to stop the project by refusing to sell their land. At that point, the decision falls to the relevant Romanian authorities to exercise the legal instruments available to them to expropriate the properties by deciding whether development of Romania’s mineral wealth—using advanced E.U. and international standards—in a development benefiting from $2.5 billion USD infused into Romania, much of it into a rural region designated a “Disadvantaged Zone”, constitutes a strategic national interest.

Given the poverty in rural Romania and the experience of other developing nations, RMGC believes that rational exploitation of mineral wealth can be a catalyst for economic growth in Romania.

In this respect, 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 the 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 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.
Proposition
Population resettlement and relocation have a major social impact. Considering the profit and loss of the Romanian government in relation to this project, population resettlement has no justification at all. Why does RMGC believe that the Romanian government will approve this?

Solution
Projects that need resettlement and relocation are not unusual. The World Bank has financed directly more than 500 projects that needed this approach during the last 10 years. The social impact is addressed in the Resettlement and Relocation Plan designed by the company in accordance with the World Bank’s guidelines, as best practices available.

We believe that bringing new economic opportunities to a community with 70% unemployment and improving residents’ health by remedying past environmental damage will have a major positive social impact. We also believe that it is important to note that our project will economically benefit Romania as a whole.

Ultimately, however, it is possible that a few property owners will seek to stop the project by refusing to sell their land. At that point, the decision falls to the relevant Romanian authorities to exercise the legal instruments available to them to expropriate the properties by deciding whether development of Romania’s mineral wealth—using advanced E.U. and international standards—in a development benefiting from $2.5 billion USD infused into Romania, much of it into a rural region designated a “Disadvantaged Zone”, constitutes a strategic national interest.

In this respect, 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 the 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 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.
Now, the company wants to expropriate the inhabitants, to force them to move. The speaker emphasizes that he lives in Rosia Montana, he has properties there and does not want to move. What will the company do with him?

The company’s RRAP is based on voluntary sale of property, designed under World Bank Standards.

To put the issue in the larger context, the construction and operation of the Roşia Montană Project requires the acquisition of properties in four of Roşia Montană’s 16 sub-comuna. For the most part, therefore, property ownership in the larger part of Roşia Montană will not be affected by the project.

In order to acquire the necessary properties, the company has established a property purchase program compliant with the RRAP guidelines developed by the World Bank.

As the mining project proceeds in phases, it is not necessary to acquire all properties at the outset. Accordingly, the company has focused on properties required for the construction and operation of the mine in its first five years. To date, more than 56% of the properties needed to construct the project and operate the mine for the first five years have been acquired.

Of those properties needed but not yet acquired, 98% have been so far presented for surveying by their owners – a step that implies an interest in selling the property to the company. The survey rate suggests that little more than a handful of properties are held by people who might prove unwilling to entertain a sale.

Of the even smaller number of homes that are located in areas in which the construction and early operation of the mine will take place, the company will seek options to redesign the mine plan to allow those owners to retain their property, unaffected by the mine.

Ultimately, however, it is possible that a few property owners will seek to stop the project by refusing to sell their land. At that point, the decision falls to the relevant Romanian authorities to exercise the legal instruments available to them to expropriate the properties by deciding whether development of Romania’s mineral wealth—using advanced E.U. and international standards—in a development benefiting from $2.5 billion USD infused into Romania, much of it into a rural region designated a “Disadvantaged Zone”, constitutes a strategic national interest.

In this respect, 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 developing of the 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 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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>RRAP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MMDD's item no. for the question which includes the observation identified by the RMGC internal code</td>
<td>383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMDD's identification no. for the question which includes the observation identified by the RMGC internal code</td>
<td>Bucuresti, 21.08.2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMGC internal unique code</td>
<td>MMGA_0798</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Proposal**

What will the company do with the 10 churches and 10 graveyards existing in Rosia Montana. What will it do with the dead from the 10 graveyards? Will it cover them under the tailings?

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 1,905 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.

**Solution**

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.


(iii) The hygiene norms and recommendations concerning the population’s life environment, published in the Romanian Official Gazette, Section I, no. 140/03.07.1997, as subsequently amended and supplemented (“Order 536/1997”);

(iv) GD no. 955/2004 on the approval of the framework Rules for the organization and operation of the public services for the administration of the public and private domain of local interest, published in the Romanian Official Gazette, Section I, no. 660/22.07.2004;

(v) Order no. 261/1982 on the approval of the standard Rules for the administration of graveyards and the crematories of the localities, published in the Official Gazette no. 67/11.03.1983;

(vi) Rules for the organization and operation of the parish and monastery graveyards within the eparchies of the Romanian Orthodox Church, approved by Decision of the Religious Affairs Department no. 16.285/31.12.1981.
Also, those who demolish their houses with the tacit approval of the local authorities, and exhume their dead should be ashamed, especially since no agreement exists in this respect.

The demolition of the houses is made exclusively after getting the demolition permit from the local authorities.

Contrary to what the opponents of the mining project claim, no one wants to destroy homes or graveyards. Homes are being sold voluntarily, and being bought by the company under rules established by the World Bank. To put the number of graves in context, the vast majority of Roșia Montană’s 1,905 graves will not be affected by the mining project, as the company has to the maximum extent possible designed the mining operations to leave established graveyards in place. However, 410 graves need to be moved.

All reburials will be done at the request of the families, and the expense of RMGC. The process will follow to the letter Romanian law on reburials [1] with the company’s commitment to act with respect and reverence. Abandoned graves will be relocated, also with full respect and reverence, to Piatra Albă’s new cemetery, for which 13 hectares have been set aside.

What the RMP project offers to future generations is a chance to continue a way of life in a village where that future – with 70% unemployment today, rising above 90% if RMGC’s proposed mine is not allowed to proceed – would be very much in doubt. In the event of Roșia Montană’s demise, the graves and churches there would likely be left behind, as in other abandoned villages in the Romanian countryside.

Development of the RMP will keep the village alive and bring economic opportunity to the region.

References:
[1] the relocation of graves and cemeteries is governed by the following regulatory acts:
(i) Law no. 489/2006 on the freedom of religion and the general regime of religious affairs, published in the Romanian Official Gazette, Section I, no. 11/08.01.2007.
(iii) The hygiene norms and recommendations concerning the population’s life environment, published in the Romanian Official Gazette, Section I, no. 140/03.07.1997, as subsequently amended and supplemented (“Order 536/1997”);
(iv) GD no. 955/2004 on the approval of the framework Rules for the organization and operation of the public services for the administration of the public and private domain of local interest, published in the Romanian Official Gazette, Section I, no. 660/22.07.2004;
(v) Order no. 261/1982 on the approval of the standard Rules for the administration of graveyards and the crematories of the localities, published in the Official Gazette no. 67/11.03.1983;
(vi) Rules for the organization and operation of the parish and monastery graveyards within the eparchies of the Romanian Orthodox Church, approved by Decision of the Religious Affairs Department no. 16.285/31.12.1981.
The questioner says that the company representatives are lying when they declare that only one dead was resettled from Rosia Montana, when there were actually 5, and underlines that exhumations are allowed 7 years after the burial.

Apart from any misunderstanding about the number of graves moved thus far, any grave moved as a result of the Roşia Montană Project will be treated with reverence and respect, and in accordance with Romanian law. With regard to the possibilities to conduct exhumations sooner than the 7-year period after the burial, these are expressly regulated by art. 22 of the Order no. 261/1982 and art. 151 of the Order no. 536/1997. As for the exact numbers, with regard to your question, please note that the number of moved graves has increased to 20 graves.

To put the number of graves in context, the vast majority of Roşia Montană’s 1,905 graves will not 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. However, under the proposed project, 410 graves need to be moved.

All reburials will be done at the request of the families, and the expense of RMGC. Abandoned graves will be relocated, also with full respect and reverence, to Piatra Albă’s new cemetery.

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.
(iii) The hygiene norms and recommendations concerning the population’s life environment, published in the Romanian Official Gazette, Section I, no. 140/03.07.1997, as subsequently amended and supplemented (“Order 536/1997”);
(iv) GD no. 955/2004 on the approval of the framework Rules for the organization and operation of the public services for the administration of the public and private domain of local interest, published in the Romanian Official Gazette, Section I, no. 660/22.07.2004;
(v) Order no. 261/1982 on the approval of the standard Rules for the administration of graveyards and the crematories of the localities, published in the Official Gazette no. 67/11.03.1983;
(vi) Rules for the organization and operation of the parish and monastery graveyards within the eparchies of the Romanian Orthodox Church, approved by Decision of the Religious Affairs Department no. 16.285/31.12.1981
Proposal
What will happen with the people who do not want to leave Rosia Montana, if the environmental permit is obtained for this project? The company declared that, in this situation, the project will no longer be implemented or a different project will be initiated. Are people going to be resettled by force?

Solution
The construction and operation of the Roșia Montană Project requires the acquisition of properties in four of Roșia Montană’s 16 sub-comuna. For the most part, therefore, property ownership in the larger part of Roșia Montană will not be affected by the project.

In order to acquire the necessary properties, the company has established a property purchase program compliant with the RRAP guidelines developed by the World Bank. RMGC’s approach is primarily based on the principle of a “willing seller-buyer basis” and to this extent, RMGC provided fair compensation packages for the affected inhabitants of the impacted area, in full compliance with the World Bank policies and guidelines in this field.

Of those properties needed but not yet acquired, 98% have been presented for surveying by their owners – a step that implies an interest in selling the property to the company. The survey rate suggests that little more than a handful of properties are held by people who might prove unwilling to entertain a sale.

Of that small number, some will lie in areas not needed for construction and early operation of the mine. For the near-term, therefore, owners of these properties need not prove any impediment to the mine development, and they can continue to live as they wish.

Of the even smaller number of homes that are located in areas in which the construction and early operation of the mine will take place, the company will seek options to redesign the mine plan to allow those owners to retain their property, unaffected by the mine.

Ultimately, however, it is possible that a few property owners will seek to stop the project by refusing to sell their land. At that point, the decision falls to the relevant Romanian authorities to exercise the legal instruments available to them to expropriate the properties by deciding whether development of Romania’s mineral wealth—using advanced E.U. and international standards—in a development benefiting from $2.5 billion USD infused into Romania, much of it into a rural region designated a “Disadvantaged Zone”, constitutes a strategic national interest.

In this respect, 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 the 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 right of use 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.
The questioner wants to repeat the message transmitted by the Holy Synod, in 2003, to all the parties interested in the Rosia Montana project, namely that, from the standpoint of the Romanian Orthodox Church, the resettlement of churches and graveyards is unacceptable. According to the declaration of the Holy Synod made during this public meeting, the resettlement of the churches and graveyards is unacceptable and, for this reason, the Romanian Orthodox Church is against the implementation of the project proposed by RMGC. The questioner requests the company representatives not to be ironic about the religion of over 20 million Romanians.

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, the vast majority of Roşia Montană’s 1,905 graves will not 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. Criticisms made by the Holy Synod in 2003 predate mine redesign that has limited the number of churches and graves that must be moved, which accounts for the local support the RMP receives from churches in the village of Roşia Montană. However, under the proposed project, 410 graves need to be moved.

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.

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.

What the RMP project offers to future generations is a chance to continue a way of life in a village where that future – with 70% unemployment today, rising above 90% if RMGC’s proposed mine is not allowed to proceed – would be very much in doubt. In the event of Roşia Montană’s demise, the graves and churches there would likely be left behind, as in other abandoned villages in the Romanian countryside. Development of the RMP will keep the village alive and bring economic opportunity to the region.

References:
[1] the relocation of graves and cemeteries is governed by the following regulatory acts:
(i) Law no. 489/2006 on the freedom of religion and the general regime of religious affairs, published in the Romanian Official Gazette, Section I, no. 11/08.01.2007.
(iii) The hygiene norms and recommendations concerning the population’s life environment, published in the Romanian Official Gazette, Section I, no. 140/03.07.1997, as subsequently amended and supplemented (“Order 536/1997”);
(iv) GD no. 955/2004 on the approval of the framework Rules for the organization and operation of the public services for the administration of the public and private domain of local interest, published in the Romanian Official Gazette, Section I, no. 660/22.07.2004;
(v) Order no. 261/1982 on the approval of the standard Rules for the administration of graveyards and the crematories of the localities, published in the Official Gazette no. 67/11.03.1983;
(vi) Rules for the organization and operation of the parish and monastery graveyards within the
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>RRAP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MMDD’s item no. for the question which includes the observation identified by the RMGC internal code</td>
<td>398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMDD’s identification no. for the question which includes the observation identified by the RMGC internal code</td>
<td>Bucuresti, 21.08.2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMGC internal unique code</td>
<td>MMGA_0853</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Proposal**

What will the locals who cannot earn their living from mining, and who have been practicing agriculture, do? The EIA does not include a description of the impact generated by the change in destination of farming land.

**Solution**

As the RMGC project affects only 4 of Roşia Montană’s 16 sub-comuna, agricultural activities will be largely unchanged by the mining project. However, if a resident wishes to relocate to Piatra Albă, 60 hectares have been set aside for agricultural development (outside of the 58 hectares in the community area). In addition, each property intended for housing in Piatra Albă includes a small agricultural plot, in keeping with local tradition.

The farming in the area of Roşia Montană has always been one of subsistence and mostly done in Virtop area and on limited surfaces in Corna.

With regard to the impact generated by RMP in respect of agriculture, this is described in the EIA Report (Chapter 4 – Potential Impacts, Subchapter 4.8 - Social and Economic Environment).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>RRAP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MMDD's item no. for the question which includes the observation identified by the RMGC internal code</td>
<td>398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMDD's identification no. for the question which includes the observation identified by the RMGC internal code</td>
<td>Bucuresti, 21.08.2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMGC internal unique code</td>
<td>MMGA_0854</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Proposal**

The size of the resettlement area, Piatra Alba, is not sufficient for the farmers’ agricultural cultures. This is a negative and long-term aspect, because only part of the population can be employed in mining activities, and the rest of the locals will need to continue their farming activities. The change in the use of land refers only to the infrastructure, but these are social problems. People are aware of all risks; they have sold their houses and moved away, because the Rosia Montana area does not have the big economic potential stated by the company.

**Solution**

It is true, of course, that not all local people will work at the mine, nor is that even desirable. For those who engage in agricultural pursuits, their work will be largely unaffected since the mining project affects only 4 of Roșia Montană’s 16 sub-comuna. In addition, the planning of the new community, Piatra Albă, sets aside 60 hectares for agricultural development, outside of the 58 hectares in the community area. Furthermore, each property intended for housing includes a small agricultural plot, in keeping with local tradition.

The farming in the area of Roșia Montană has always been one of subsistence and mostly done in Vârtop area and on limited surfaces in Corna. For the actual impact of the RMP in respect of agriculture, please refer to the EIA Report, Chapter 4 – Potential Impacts, Subchapter 4.8 - Social and Economical Environment.

In contrast to the difficult economic conditions present today in Roșia Montană the new mine will have enormous economic impact on the area, especially given the current state of the economy in the Roșia Montană region. The mine will infuse more than $2.5 billion into the Romanian economy over the life of the mine.
**Proposal**

What is the cost of resettlement, what is the price of a grave, according to the company’s representatives? If someone wanted to buy the grave of the grandparents of one of the company’s representatives, how much would it cost?

The company, as a matter of policy, does not pay for graves. There is of course a cost in the larger sense for the resettlement of any grave, and there must be a very strong reason for that grave to be removed.

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, the vast majority of Roşia Montană’s 1,905 graves will not 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. However, 410 graves need to be moved during the lifetime of the mine.

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.

**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.


(iii) The hygiene norms and recommendations concerning the population’s life environment, published in the Romanian Official Gazette, Section I, no. 140/03.07.1997, as subsequently amended and supplemented (“Order 536/1997”);

(iv) GD no. 955/2004 on the approval of the framework Rules for the organization and operation of the public services for the administration of the public and private domain of local interest, published in the Romanian Official Gazette, Section I, no. 660/22.07.2004;

(v) Order no. 261/1982 on the approval of the standard Rules for the administration of graveyards and the crematories of the localities, published in the Official Gazette no. 67/11.03.1983;

(vi) Rules for the organization and operation of the parish and monastery graveyards within the eparchies of the Romanian Orthodox Church, approved by Decision of the Religious Affairs Department no. 16.285/31.12.1981.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>RRAP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MMDD's item no. for the question which includes the observation identified by the RMGC internal code</td>
<td>414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMDD's identification no. for the question which includes the observation identified by the RMGC internal code</td>
<td>Bucuresti, 21.08.2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMGC internal unique code</td>
<td>MMGA_0883</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Proposal**

The company does not respect the Romanian people’s orthodox faith. There are churches and graves in Rosia Montana, which cannot be moved, like they moved the Giulesti graveyard, and the Ciurel lake.

The company does respect the orthodox faith and equally all and any other denomination active in a legal manner.

The company would never accept the relocation of graves other than in accordance with the legal and religious practices.

It is not true that Romanian law prohibits the movement of graves. In many parts of the country, graves have been relocated. Romanian law establishes the accepted methods for exhumation of remains and reburial [1], and the company is pledged to follow those laws to the letter.

To put the number of graves in context, the vast majority of Roşia Montană’s 1905 graves will not 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. However, under the proposed project, 410 graves need to be relocated, and that will be done according to the wishes of the family and at RMGC’s expense. Abandoned graves will be relocated, with full respect and reverence, to Piatra Alba’s new cemetery.

Many opponents of the project forget that mining in Roşia Montană has been present along with the Christian traditions for thousand years. The symbols still present in Roşia Montană community’s life are the mining logo on the funeral crosses and on houses, and Sainte Varvara, still seen as the holly protector of the miners.

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.

**Solution**

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.


(iii) The hygiene norms and recommendations concerning the population’s life environment, published in the Romanian Official Gazette, Section I, no. 140/03.07.1997, as subsequently amended and supplemented (“Order 536/1997”);

(iv) GD no. 955/2004 on the approval of the framework Rules for the organization and operation of the public services for the administration of the public and private domain of local interest, published in the Romanian Official Gazette, Section I, no. 660/22.07.2004;

(v) Order no. 261/1982 on the approval of the standard Rules for the administration of graveyards and the crematories of the localities, published in the Official Gazette no. 67/11.03.1983;

(vi) Rules for the organization and operation of the parish and monastery graveyards within the eparchies of the Romanian Orthodox Church, approved by Decision of the Religious Affairs Department no. 16.285/31.12.1981.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>RRAP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MMDD’s item no. for the question which includes the observation identified by the RMGC internal code</td>
<td>428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMDD’s identification no. for the question which includes the observation identified by the RMGC internal code</td>
<td>Bucuresti, 21.08.2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMGC internal unique code</td>
<td>MMGA_0925</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Proposal**

How can you explain that many of those who have sold their properties have gone as far away as possible from Rosia Montana: was it because they trust the project or because they fear a possible disaster?

**Solution**

The Roşia Montană residents who have sold their houses to RMGC have moved for many reasons, including to be closer to their relatives and to pursue opportunities in different towns or cities. It is not reasonable to claim that these residents left out of fear of a disaster, especially since the RMGC project is designed to meet and exceed E.U. standards and international best practice.

Likewise, Piatra Albă will serve as home to a number of families who have expressed interest in living at Piatra Albă, which will combine modern amenities (including a new school, medical clinic, city hall, and recreational facilities) and traditional architectural designs.
The questioner voices disagreement with those who are in favour of the relocation of cemeteries, thus showing complete disregard for Christian values.

The company does respect the orthodox faith and equally any and all other denomination active in a legal manner.

It is not true that Romanian law prohibits the movement of graves. In many parts of the country, graves have been relocated. Romanian law establishes the accepted methods for exhumation of remains and reburial [1], and the company is pledged to follow those laws to the letter. The company would never accept moving graves other than in accordance with the legal and religious practices.

To put the number of graves in context, the vast majority of Roșia Montană’s 1,905 graves will not be affected by the mining project, as the company has to the maximum extent possible designed the mining operations to leave established graveyards in place. The 410 graves that need to be moved will be relocated according to the wishes of the family and at RMGC’s expense. Abandoned graves will be relocated, with full respect and reverence, to Piatra Albă’s new cemetery.

Many opponents of the project forget that mining in Roșia Montană has been present along with the Christian traditions for thousand years. The symbols still present in Roșia Montană community’s life are the mining logo on the funeral crosses. On houses, Sainte Varvara is still seen as the holly protector of the miners.

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.
(iii) The hygiene norms and recommendations concerning the population’s life environment, published in the Romanian Official Gazette, Section I, no. 140/03.07.1997, as subsequently amended and supplemented (“Order 536/1997”);
(iv) GD no. 955/2004 on the approval of the framework Rules for the organization and operation of the public services for the administration of the public and private domain of local interest, published in the Romanian Official Gazette, Section I, no. 660/22.07.2004;
(v) Order no. 261/1982 on the approval of the standard Rules for the administration of graveyards and the crematories of the localities, published in the Official Gazette no. 67/11.03.1983;
(vi) Rules for the organization and operation of the parish and monastery graveyards within the eparchies of the Romanian Orthodox Church, approved by Decision of the Religious Affairs Department no. 16.285/31.12.1981.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>RRAP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MMD’s item no. for the question which includes the observation identified by the RMGC internal code</td>
<td>442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMD’s identification no. for the question which includes the observation identified by the RMGC internal code</td>
<td>Deva, 23.08.2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMGC internal unique code</td>
<td>MMGA_0943</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Proposal**
The questioner wants to know who is the owner of the land affected by the proposed investment and whether the legal provisions have been complied with.

**Solution**
The ownership of land is relatively complex in Roşia Montană. One could identify private, institutional, state’s, churches, ‘private companies’ ownership. As part of the acquisition process, the company has allocated significant resources to help clarify and define the legal status of the various properties.

RMGC is in complete compliance with all legal provisions associated with the acquisition of property in Roşia Montană. In this respect, RMGC observes the legal methods for a titleholder to acquire the usage right over the lands necessary for mining projects development, covering both public and private domain, as provided by art. 6 of the Mining Law no. 85/2003: (i) sale-purchase, for the price agreed upon by the parties; (ii) land exchange, with the relocation of the affected owner and the reconstruction of the buildings on the newly granted land, on the expense of the titleholder benefiting from the land released, as per the convention between the parties; (iii) renting of the land for a fixed-term period, based on agreements between the parties, (iv) land concession, etc.

Construction and operation of the RMGC requires the acquisition of property in 4 of Roşia Montană’s 16 sub-comuna. The acquisition program prepared by the company, which follows World Bank guidelines, is designed to provide equitable valuations for all properties and replacement value in a radius of 250km around Roşia Montană.
Why does RMGC blackmail local inhabitants in Rosia Montana with extraordinary sums of money, a lot more than the normal market price, in exchange of their houses, stables and lands?

Prior to the initiation of the RMGC Resettlement and Relocation Action Plan (RRAP), there was effectively no real estate market in Roşia Montană. When people left the area, as they have been doing for over two decades due to economic conditions, they often simply abandoned their homes. The RMGC project has created an opportunity to realize the value of properties built and maintained over people’s lifetimes.

Prices paid for properties, under World Bank guidelines, are determined by replacement value—that is, not what the property might be worth in Roşia Montană but what it would cost to replicate (and, in some cases, establish for the first time) a comparable and acceptable lifestyle elsewhere in the region (as defined by an area 250km around Roşia Montană). Costs in the surrounding area are considerably higher than those in Roşia Montană where depressed economic conditions have caused home prices to decline.

Therefore, the compensation paid covers the replacement value of the properties within the above mentioned area and not the real market value of the properties in Roşia Montană, by far much lower.
Proposal

Why should the churches and graves be destroyed?

The company does respect the orthodox faith and equally all and any other denomination active in a legal manner.

The company would never accept relocation of graves other than in accordance with the legal and religious practices.

Many opponents of the project forget that mining in Roşia Montană has been present along with the Christian traditions for thousand years. The symbols still present in Rosia Montana community’s life are the mining logo on the funeral crosses, on houses, Sainte Varvara, still seen as the holy protector of the miners.

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, the vast majority of Roşia Montană’s 1,905 graves will not 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. However, under the proposed project, 410 graves need to be moved.

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.

Solution

2 of Roşia Montană’s 10 churches must be relocated under the mine plan. Those churches will be moved in accordance with the wishes of the congregation, at the expense of RMGC. Church construction is a central element in the new community of Piatra Albă being built by the company.

What the RMP project offers to future generations is a chance to continue a way of life in a village where that future – with 70% unemployment today, rising above 90% if RMGC’s proposed mine is not allowed to proceed – would be very much in doubt. In the event of Roşia Montană’s demise, the graves and churches there would likely be left behind, as in other abandoned villages in the Romanian countryside. Development of the RMP will keep the village alive and bring economic opportunity to the region.

References:

[1] the relocation of graves and cemeteries is governed by the following regulatory acts:

(i) Law no. 489/2006 on the freedom of religion and the general regime of religious affairs, published in the Romanian Official Gazette, Section I, no. 11/08.01.2007;


(iii) The hygiene norms and recommendations concerning the population’s life environment, published in the Romanian Official Gazette, Section I, no. 140/03.07.1997, as subsequently amended and supplemented (“Order 536/1997”);

(iv) GD no. 955/2004 on the approval of the framework Rules for the organization and operation of the public services for the administration of the public and private domain of local interest, published in...
the Romanian Official Gazette, Section I, no. 660/22.07.2004;
(v) Order no. 261/1982 on the approval of the standard Rules for the administration of graveyards and the crematories of the localities, published in the Official Gazette no. 67/11.03.1983;
(vi) Rules for the organization and operation of the parish and monastery graveyards within the eparchies of the Romanian Orthodox Church, approved by Decision of the Religious Affairs Department no. 16.285/31.12.1981.
The questioner underlines the fact that this is not a project of national interest and local inhabitants cannot be asked to leave, even in the situation where just one of them wants to stay. If this project had been of national interest, the National Bank of Romania would have got involved. But the Bank does not want the gold at Rosia Montana.

Determining whether a project is or not of a national interest is not conditioned of support of the National Bank of Romania (the NBR). In fact, the NBR has limited and precise attributions [1], as provided by the Law no. 312/2004 for the approval of the NBR Statute, and involvement in projects considered of national interest is out of the scope and statutory powers of the NBR.

To put the issue of relocation in its larger context, the construction and operation of the Rosia Montana Project requires the acquisition of properties in four of Roşia Montană’s 16 sub-comuna. For the most part, therefore, property ownership in the larger part of Rosia Montana will not be affected by the project.

In order to acquire the necessary properties, the company has established a property purchase program compliant with the RRAP guidelines developed by the World Bank.

As the mining project proceeds in phases, it is not necessary to acquire all properties at the outset. Accordingly, the company has focused on properties required for the construction and operation of the mine in its first five years. To date, more than 56% of the properties needed to construct the project and operate the mine for the first five years have been acquired.

Of those properties needed but not yet acquired, 98% have been presented for surveying by their owners—a step that implies an interest in selling the property to the company. The survey rate suggests that little more than a handful of properties are held by people who might prove unwilling to entertain a sale.

Of that small number, some will lie in areas not needed for construction and early operation of the mine. For the near-term, therefore, owners of these properties need not prove any impediment to the mine development, and they can continue to live as they wish.

Of the even smaller number of homes that are located in areas in which the construction and early operation of the mine will take place, the company will seek options to redesign the mine plan to allow those owners to retain their property, unaffected by the mine.

Ultimately, however, it is possible that if a few property owners seek to stop the project by refusing to sell their land, at that point, the decision falls to relevant Romanian authorities as to whether they will exercise the legal instruments available to them to expropriate the properties and will decide whether development of Romania’s mineral wealth—using advanced E.U. and international standards—constitutes a strategic national interest or if development as a whole to benefit from $2.5 billion USD infused into Romania, much of it into a rural region that was designated a “Disadvantaged Zone” and knows only extreme poverty at present is a regional interest.

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 performance of the 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, […], 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 right of use 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.

References:
[1] Art. 2 (2) of the NBR Satatute provides for the following powers of the NBR:
a) to issue and apply the monetary and exchange rate policy;
b) to authorize, regulate and supervise the credit institutions from the prudential point of view, as well as to promote and monitor the good functioning of the payment system in order to ensure financial stability;
c) to issue currency as legal payment means on the Romanian territory;
d) to establish the foreign currency regulations and supervise the observance of the same;
e) to administrate the international reserves of Romania.
**Proposal**

The right to property is enshrined in the Constitution and there are people who do not want to leave Rosia Montana. If RMGC cannot think of other ways, except using bulldozers, than it should wait until it can.

The company’s RRAP is based on voluntary sale of property, designed under World Bank Standards. When acquiring the private property lands necessary for the development of Roșia 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.

To put the issue in larger context, the construction and operation of the Roșia Montană Project requires the acquisition of properties in four of Roșia Montană’s 16 sub-comuna. For the most part, therefore, property ownership in the larger part of Roșia Montană will not be affected by the project.

In order to acquire the necessary properties, the company has established a property purchase program compliant with the RRAP guidelines developed by the World Bank.

As the mining project proceeds in phases, it is not necessary to acquire all properties at the outset. Accordingly, the company has focused on properties required for the construction and operation of the mine in its first five years. To date, more than 56% of the properties needed to construct the project and operate the mine for the first five years have been acquired.

Of those properties needed but not yet acquired, 98% have been presented for surveying by their owners – a step that implies an interest in selling the property to the company. The survey rate suggests that little more than a handful of properties are held by people who might prove unwilling to entertain a sale.

**Solution**

Of that small number, some will lie in areas not needed for construction and early operation of the mine. For the near-term, therefore, owners of these properties need not prove any impediment to the mine development, and they can continue to live as they wish.

Of the even smaller number of homes that are located in areas in which the construction and early operation of the mine will take place, the company will seek options to redesign the mine plan to allow those owners to retain their property, unaffected by the mine.

Ultimately, however, it is possible that if a few property owners seek to stop the project by refusing to sell their land, at that point, the decision falls to relevant Romanian authorities as to whether they will exercise the legal instruments available to them to expropriate the properties and will decide whether development of Romania’s mineral wealth—using advanced E.U. and international standards—constitutes a strategic national interest or if development as a whole to benefit from $2.5 billion USD infused into Romania, much of it into a rural region that was designated a “Disadvantaged Zone” and knows only extreme poverty at present is a regional interest.

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 performance of the 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 right of use 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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>RRAP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MMDD's item no. for the question which includes the observation identified by the RMGC internal code</td>
<td>466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMDD's identification no. for the question which includes the observation identified by the RMGC internal code</td>
<td>Arad, 25.08.2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMGC internal unique code</td>
<td>MMGA_0994</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Proposal**

The new village proposed by RMGC resembles an American village, but we are Romanians, not Americans.

**Solution**

Though some of the design team members are from the Rocky Mountain region of the United States, Piatra Albă’s architecture is clearly Romanian and honors, in particular, the stylistic traditions of Transylvania. In fact, the lead architect on the Piatra Albă project is a Romanian.

Based on many public consultation and information meetings, the final design has benefit of a lot of inputs in choosing the slope and form of the roofs, windows sizes, shapes, proportions, etc. A trained eye would recognize the elements already present in the historical area of Roşia Montană, transferred to Piatra Albă – central plaza, gathering places and spots, etc. The community has wanted a more modern look of Piatra Albă with modern amenities (including a new school, medical clinic, city hall, and recreational facilities), instead of restoring the full traditional look of the buildings and houses.
It is well known that, from the very beginning, there were people who did not agree to leave Rosia Montana. Considering the fact that this is not a project carried out at national level nor is it a project of national interest, what will happen to the people who oppose resettlement?

The company’s RRAP is based on voluntary sale of property, designed under World Bank Standards. To put the issue in larger context, the construction and operation of the Roșia Montană Project requires the acquisition of properties in four of Roșia Montană’s 16 sub-comuna. For the most part, therefore, property ownership in the larger part of Roșia Montană will not be affected by the project.

In order to acquire the necessary properties, the company has established a property purchase program compliant with the RRAP guidelines developed by the World Bank.

As the mining project proceeds in phases, it is not necessary to acquire all properties at the outset. Accordingly, the company has focused on properties required for the construction and operation of the mine in its first five years. To date, more than 56% of the properties needed to construct the project and operate the mine for the first five years have been acquired.

Of those properties needed but not yet acquired, 98% have been presented for surveying by their owners – a step that implies an interest in selling the property to the company. The survey rate suggests that little more than a handful of properties are held by people who might prove unwilling to entertain a sale.

Of that small number, some will lie in areas not needed for construction and early operation of the mine. For the near-term, therefore, owners of these properties need not prove any impediment to the mine development, and they can continue to live as they wish.

Of the even smaller number of homes that are located in areas in which the construction and early operation of the mine will take place, the company will seek options to redesign the mine plan to allow those owners to retain their property, unaffected by the mine.

Ultimately, however, it is possible that if a few property owners seek to stop the project by refusing to sell their land, at that point, the decision falls to relevant Romanian authorities as to whether they will exercise the legal instruments available to them to expropriate the properties and will decide whether development of Romania’s mineral wealth—using advanced E.U. and international standards—constitutes a strategic national interest or if development as a whole to benefit from $2.5 billion USD infused into Romania, much of it into a rural region that was designated a “Disadvantaged Zone” and knows only extreme poverty at present is a regional interest.

However, 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 performance of the 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 right of use 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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>RRAP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MMDD's item no. for the question which includes the observation identified by the RMGC internal code</td>
<td>470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMDD's identification no. for the question which includes the observation identified by the RMGC internal code</td>
<td>Arad, 25.08.2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMGC internal unique code</td>
<td>MMGA_1007</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Proposal**

How does the company plan to relocate cemeteries and what exactly will happen with them?

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, 410 graves of the Roşia Montană’s 1,905 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 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 initially 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.

**Solution**

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;


(iii) The hygiene norms and recommendations concerning the population’s life environment, published in the Romanian Official Gazette, Section I, no. 140/03.07.1997, as subsequently amended and supplemented (“Order 536/1997”);

(iv) GD no. 955/2004 on the approval of the framework Rules for the organization and operation of the public services for the administration of the public and private domain of local interest, published in the Romanian Official Gazette, Section I, no. 660/22.07.2004;

(v) Order no. 261/1982 on the approval of the standard Rules for the administration of graveyards and the crematories of the localities, published in the Official Gazette no. 67/11.03.1983;

(vi) Rules for the organization and operation of the parish and monastery graveyards within the eparchies of the Romanian Orthodox Church, approved by Decision of the Religious Affairs Department no. 16.285/31.12.1981.
The questioner is in favour of the project and wants to know if RMGC has considered the option of allowing the people who do not want to leave Rosia Montana to move into the abandoned houses located within the protected area.

According to the relevant legal provisions, the interested public may submit justified proposals on the Environment Impact Assessment. Art. 44 (2) of the Order no. 860/2002 on the Environment Impact Assessment Procedure and the issuance of the environmental approval provides to this end that „based on the results of the public debate, the relevant authority for the environmental protection evaluates the grounded proposals/comments of the public and requests the titleholder the supplementation of the report to the environmental impact assessment study with an annex containing solutions for the solving of the underlined issues“. As the question of the attendant to the public consultations identifies and specifies no problems in regard of the project initiated by RMGC, subject to the environmental impact assessment procedure, RMGC is not in position to answer and has not the capacity to make any comments to this end.

Nonetheless, considering RMGC has expressed its full availability to discuss any issues relevant for the proposed project, please note the following:

Even abandoned homes have some chain of ownership. Any individual is free to work with local Romanian authorities in Rosia Montana to determine who owns an abandoned property with the intent to purchase it.
The questioner does not agree with the development of the Rosia Montana project and makes the following observations and comments:

The report should be accompanied by a map showing the current situation of property ownership in Rosia Montana;

A "current" map of property ownership in Roşia Montană would require almost constant updating. Consequently, RMGC issues quarterly reports that indicate the percentage of properties it has acquired in the sections of Roşia Montană that will be affected by the mining project. RMGC’s quarterly statements are available on our website. See Ownership map.
Domain

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RRAP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**RRAP**

### MMDD's item no. for the question which includes the observation identified by the RMGC internal code

1359

### MMDD's identification no. for the question which includes the observation identified by the RMGC internal code

No. 110274/24.08.2006

### RMGC internal unique code

MMGA_1191

---

**Proposal**

The destruction of churches and cemeteries in Corna and Rosia Montana.

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 1,905 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.

6 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 initially 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.

---

**Solution**

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;


(iii) The hygiene norms and recommendations concerning the population’s life environment, published in the Romanian Official Gazette, Section I, no. 140/03.07.1997, as subsequently amended and supplemented (“Order 536/1997”);

(iv) GD no. 955/2004 on the approval of the framework Rules for the organization and operation of the public services for the administration of the public and private domain of local interest, published in the Romanian Official Gazette, Section I, no. 660/22.07.2004;

(v) Order no. 261/1982 on the approval of the standard Rules for the administration of graveyards and the crematories of the localities, published in the Official Gazette no. 67/11.03.1983;

(vi) Rules for the organization and operation of the parish and monastery graveyards within the eparchies of the Romanian Orthodox Church, approved by Decision of the Religious Affairs Department no. 16.285/31.12.1981.
Proposal

Negative social effect through uprooting, relocation of settlements, churches, cemeteries;

Solution

The company has considered the social impact mitigation as the central element of the resettlement and relocation strategy. For the actual impact of the RMP in this respect, please refer also to the EIA Report, Chapter 4 – Potential Impacts, Subchapter 4.8 - Social and Economic Environment.

At the individual level, the resettlement and relocation were turned into individual development opportunities through:
- small business compensation and financial support;
- professional training and career development;
- properties replacement values compensation, including land restoring cost and eventual crop lost;
- scholarship;
- relocation / resettlement assistance for properties search, registration formalities, health care support, jobs search and training, small savings and investment assistance.

At the community level, resettlement sites in both rural area (Piatra Albă – Roşia Montană) and urban one (Furcilor Hill- Alba Iulia) offering higher living standards.

This project provides to future generations not only jobs, but also a cleaner environment, personal development opportunities, small enterprise support, and support provided for the development of one of the most underdeveloped areas of Romania.

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.

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.

What the RMP project offers to future generations is a chance to continue a way of life in a village where that future – with 70% unemployment today, rising above 90% if RMGC’s proposed mine is not allowed to proceed – would be very much in doubt. In the event of Roşia Montană’s demise, the homes, graves and churches there would likely be left behind, as in other abandoned mining villages in the Romanian countryside. Development of the RMP will keep the village alive – in fact and in spirit – and bring economic opportunity to the region.

References:
[1] the relocation of graves and cemeteries is governed by the following regulatory acts:
(i) Law no. 489/2006 on the freedom of religion and the general regime of religious affairs, published in the Romanian Official Gazette, Section I, no. 11/08.01.2007;
(ii) Law no. 98/1994 establishing and sanctioning breaches of the hygiene and public health rules, published in the Romanian Official Gazette, Section I, no. 317/16.11.1994, as subsequently
amended and supplemented ("Law no. 98/1994");

(iii) The hygiene norms and recommendations concerning the population’s life environment, published in the Romanian Official Gazette, Section I, no. 140/03.07.1997, as subsequently amended and supplemented ("Order 536/1997");

(iv) GD no. 955/2004 on the approval of the framework Rules for the organization and operation of the public services for the administration of the public and private domain of local interest, published in the Romanian Official Gazette, Section I, no. 660/22.07.2004;

(v) Order no. 261/1982 on the approval of the standard Rules for the administration of graveyards and the crematories of the localities, published in the Official Gazette no. 67/11.03.1983;

(vi) Rules for the organization and operation of the parish and monastery graveyards within the eparchies of the Romanian Orthodox Church, approved by Decision of the Religious Affairs Department no. 16.285/31.12.1981.
The massive resettlement of the population, churches and cemeteries is intolerable;

The company has considered social impact mitigation as the central element of the resettlement and relocation strategy. For the actual impact of the RMP in this respect, please refer also to the EIA Report, Chapter 4 – Potential Impacts, Subchapter 4.8 - Social and Economic Environment.

At the individual level, the resettlement and relocation were turned into individual development opportunities through:
- small business compensation and financial support;
- professional training and career development;
- properties replacement values compensation, including land restoring cost and eventual crop lost;
- scholarship;
- relocation / resettlement assistance for properties search, registration formalities, health care support, jobs search and training, small savings and investment assistance.

At the community level, resettlement sites in both rural area (Piatra Albă – Roșia Montană) and an urban one (Furcilor Hill - Alba Iulia) offering higher living standards.

The idea animating this project may not be deemed as antichristian, as long as its main principle is that of responsible mining. We believe that resources development is not an act against God, if it is performed in a responsible manner. This project provides to future generations not only jobs, but also a cleaner environment, personal development opportunities, small enterprise support, and support provided for the development of one of the most underdeveloped areas of Romania.

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.

Currently, the most powerful driver of negative social effects is Roșia Montană’s 70% unemployment and the region’s declining economic conditions. Without the RMGC mining project, unemployment in Roșia Montană would exceed 90%. These economic circumstances make the long term survival of the village—in the absence of the RMGC mining project—doubtful.

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:
(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,
(iii) The hygiene norms and recommendations concerning the population’s life environment, published in the Romanian Official Gazette, Section I, no. 140/03.07.1997, as subsequently amended and supplemented (“Order 536/1997”);

(iv) GD no. 955/2004 on the approval of the framework Rules for the organization and operation of the public services for the administration of the public and private domain of local interest, published in the Romanian Official Gazette, Section I, no. 660/22.07.2004;

(v) Order no. 261/1982 on the approval of the standard Rules for the administration of graveyards and the crematories of the localities, published in the Official Gazette no. 67/11.03.1983;

(vi) Rules for the organization and operation of the parish and monastery graveyards within the eparchies of the Romanian Orthodox Church, approved by Decision of the Religious Affairs Department no. 16.285/31.12.1981.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>RRAP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MMDD’s item no. for the question which includes the observation identified by the RMGC internal code</td>
<td>1922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMDD’s identification no. for the question which includes the observation identified by the RMGC internal code</td>
<td>No. 110902/25.08.2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMGC internal unique code</td>
<td>MMGA_1252</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Proposal**

Also in area there are orthodox and Greek-Roman churches which are already protected by legislation.

**Solution**

Prior to the 2006 submission of RMGC’s EIA, the project was redesigned to keep the Greek Orthodox Church, which carries historical structure status, outside the mining area. This indicates how the stakeholder process has initiated design changes to take into account community consensus. This church, and the Roman-Catholic Church located within the protected area Roșia Montană Historical Centre, is the only two buildings of this kind which are protected by legislation.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>RRAP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MMDD's item no. for the question which includes the observation</td>
<td>2795, 2796, 2797, 2798, 2799, 2800, 2801, 2802, 2803, 2804, 2805, 2806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>identified by the RMGC internal code</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMDD's identification no. for the question which includes the</td>
<td>No.111857/25.08.2006, No.111863/25.08.2006, No.111864/25.08.2006,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>observation identified by the RMGC internal code</td>
<td>No.111865/25.08.2006, No.111866/25.08.2006, No.111867/25.08.2006,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.111759/25.08.2006, No.111758/25.08.2006, No.111757/25.08.2006,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.112163/25.08.2006, No.112164/25.08.2006, No.112165/25.08.2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMGC internal unique code</td>
<td>MMGA_1261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal</td>
<td>Within EIA, there is no a study regarding the resettlement and relocation;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solution</td>
<td>The EIA guidelines (Order no. 863/2002 – Annex II - Methodological Guide of the screening stage and of completion of the report to the assessment study – Part II - The structure of the report to the environmental impact assessment study) do not require the inclusion of the Resettlement and Relocation Action Plan (RRAP). However, the RRAP (which follows World Bank Guidelines) is available on the RMGC website. Throughout the public consultation process, RMGC encouraged interested parties to access the RRAP via the website.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domain</td>
<td>RRAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMDD's item no. for the question which includes the observation identified by the RMGC internal code</td>
<td>3020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMDD’s identification no. for the question which includes the observation identified by the RMGC internal code</td>
<td>No. 112893/25.08.2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMGC internal unique code</td>
<td>MMGA_1304</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Proposal**

The project implies the resettlement of a large part of the local population.

To put the resettlement question in its larger context, the construction and operation of the Roșia Montană Project requires the acquisition of properties in four of Roșia Montană’s 16 sub-comuna. For the most part, therefore, property ownership in the larger part of Roșia Montană will not be affected by the project. For the actual impact of the RMP in this respect, please refer also to the EIA Report, Chapter 4 – Potential Impacts, Subchapter 4.8 - Social and Economic Environment.

In order to acquire the necessary properties, the company has established a property purchase program compliant with the RRAP guidelines developed by the World Bank. 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 RRAP developed by RMGC, which may be found on company’s official website.

**Solution**

As the mining project proceeds in phases, it is not necessary to acquire all properties at the outset. Accordingly, the company has focused on properties required for the construction and operation of the mine in its first five years. To date, more than 56% of the properties needed to construct the project and operate the mine for the first five years have been acquired.

Of those properties needed but not yet acquired, 98% have been presented for surveying by their owners – a step that implies an interest in selling the property to the company. The survey rate suggests that little more than a handful of properties are held by people who might prove unwilling to entertain a sale.

Of that small number, some will lie in areas not needed for construction and early operation of the mine. For the near-term, therefore, owners of these properties need not prove any impediment to the mine development, and they can continue to live as they wish.

Of the even smaller number of homes that are located in areas in which the construction and early operation of the mine will take place, the company will seek options to redesign the mine plan to allow those owners to retain their property, unaffected by the mine.
The relocation of population, churches and cemeteries represents a social and spiritual genocide;

The company has considered social impact mitigation as the central element of the resettlement and relocation strategy. For the actual impact of the RMP in this respect, please refer also to the EIA Report, Chapter 4 – Potential Impacts, Subchapter 4.8 - Social and Economical Environment.

At the individual level, the resettlement and relocation were turned into individual development opportunities through:
- small business compensation and financial support;
- professional training and career development;
- properties replacement values compensation, including land restoring cost and eventual crop lost;
- scholarship;
- relocation/resettlement assistance for properties search, registration formalities, health care support, jobs search and training, small savings and investment assistance.

At the community level, resettlement sites in both rural area (Piatra Albă – Roşia Montană) and an urban one (Furcilor Hill -Alba Iulia) offering higher living standards.

The idea animating this project may not be deemed as antichristian, as long as its main principle is that of responsible mining. We believe that resources development is not an act against God, if it is performed in a responsible manner. This project provides to future generations not only jobs, but also a cleaner environment, personal development opportunities, small enterprise support, and support provided for the development of one of the most underdeveloped areas of Romania.

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.

Currently, the most powerful driver of negative social effects is Roşia Montană’s 70% unemployment and the region’s declining economic conditions. Without the RMGC mining project, unemployment in Roşia Montană would exceed 90%. These economic circumstances make the long term survival of the village—in the absence of the RMGC mining project—doubtful.

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:
(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,
(iii) The hygiene norms and recommendations concerning the population’s life environment, published in the Romanian Official Gazette, Section I, no. 140/03.07.1997, as subsequently amended and supplemented (“Order 536/1997”);

(iv) GD no. 955/2004 on the approval of the framework Rules for the organization and operation of the public services for the administration of the public and private domain of local interest, published in the Romanian Official Gazette, Section I, no. 660/22.07.2004;

(v) Order no. 261/1982 on the approval of the standard Rules for the administration of graveyards and the crematories of the localities, published in the Official Gazette no. 67/11.03.1983;

(vi) Rules for the organization and operation of the parish and monastery graveyards within the eparchies of the Romanian Orthodox Church, approved by Decision of the Religious Affairs Department no. 16.285/31.12.1981.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>RRAP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MMDD’s item no. for the question which includes the observation identified by the RMGC internal code</td>
<td>3115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMDD’s identification no. for the question which includes the observation identified by the RMGC internal code</td>
<td>No. 112129/25.08.2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMGC internal unique code</td>
<td>MMGA_1390</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Proposal**

The human rights within the communities from Rosia Montana are infringed.(reference to the forced resettlements)

The World Bank has financed more than 500 projects during the last 10 years that required resettlement plans, many of them on a much larger scale than in Roșia Montană. Resettlement is not unusual for large projects implementation and when carried in accordance with the applicable rules and legal enactments, does not represent per se an infringement of any human right. As a general rule, infringements of rights should be ascertained by a final and binding decision awarded by competent courts of law.

In consideration of concerns in relation to human rights and out of respect for the residents of Roșia Montană, the company’s RRAP is based on voluntary sale of property, designed under World Bank Standards. During the implementation of this management plan, the public consultation and disclosure have been the key instrument in identifying the right solutions and directions.

**Solution**

To put the issue of resettlement in its larger context, the construction and operation of the Roșia Montană Project requires the acquisition of properties in four of Roșia Montana’s 16 sub-comuna. For the most part, therefore, property ownership in the larger part of Roșia Montană will not be affected by the project.

In order to acquire the necessary properties, the company has established a property purchase program compliant with the RRAP guidelines developed by the World Bank.

Of those properties needed but not yet acquired, 98% have been presented for surveying by their owners – a step that implies an interest in selling the property to the company. The survey rate suggests that little more than a handful of properties are held by people who might prove unwilling to entertain a sale.
According to the relevant legal provisions, the interested public may submit justified proposals on the environment impact assessment. Art. 44 (3) of the Order no. 860/2002 on the Environment Impact Assessment Procedure and the issuance of the environmental approval provides to this end that “based on the results of the public debate, the relevant authority for the environmental protection evaluates the grounded proposals/comments of the public and requests the titleholder the supplementation of the report to the environmental impact assessment study with an annex containing solutions for the solving of the underlined issues”.

As the statement of the attendant to the public consultations (i) does not contain any specific indications on the alleged facts, and (ii) identifies and specifies no problems in regard of the project initiated by RMGC, subject to the environmental impact assessment procedure, RMGC is not in position to answer and has not the capacity to make any comments to this end.

Nonetheless, considering RMGC has expressed its full availability to discuss any issues relevant for the proposed project, please note the following:

RMGC is in complete compliance with all legal provisions associated with the acquisition of property in Roșia Montană. In this respect, RMGC observes the legal methods for a titleholder to acquire the usage right over the lands necessary for mining projects development, covering both public and private domain, as provided by art. 6 of the Mining Law no. 85/2003: (i) sale-purchase, for the price agreed upon by the parties; (ii) land exchange, with the relocation of the affected owner and the reconstruction of the buildings on the newly granted land, on the expense of the titleholder benefiting of the cleared land, as per the convention between the parties; (iii) renting of the land for undetermined period, based on agreements between the parties, (iv) land concession, etc.

The company’s RRAP is based on voluntary sale of property, designed under World Bank Standards.

Of the small number of homes that are located in areas in which the construction and early operation of the mine will take place, the company will seek options to redesign the mine plan to allow those owners to retain their property, unaffected by the mine.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>RRAP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MMDD's item no. for the question which includes the observation identified by the RMGC internal code</td>
<td>3227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMDD's identification no. for the question which includes the observation identified by the RMGC internal code</td>
<td>No. 111146/25.08.2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMGC internal unique code</td>
<td>MMGA_1408</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Proposal**

Taking into account the fact that the Rosia Montana mining project aims to resettle the churches and cemeteries from an area that is inadmissible from orthodox culture and tradition point of view, the Holy Synod of the Romanian Orthodox Church pronounces against the Rosia Montana Gold Corporation project and hopes that this area will remain intact in its holiness, purity and beauty.

But this statement is also very important because it gives us the opportunity to state more accurately our attitude and principles: The Company is committed to developing the mining project with the community and for its benefit, and in the same time with respect for its values. We believe that economic development should not come into conflict with spirituality and traditional values.

**Solution**

This statement made by Holy Synod in 2003 is very important for all the past, present or future actions of the Company. In the last years the mining project was redesigned for many times in order to mitigate the impact especially for churches and graves.

Our principle does not imply offering economic benefits (jobs, high living standards, etc.) in exchange of community giving up its core, spiritual values.

Mining itself is one of the core values of this community, being present in Roșia Montană along with the Christian traditions for thousand years. The symbols still present in Roșia Montană community’s life are the mining symbols on the funeral crosses, on houses, Sainte Varvara, still seen as the holly protector of the miners.

The company does not intend to destroy churches, monuments or graveyards – our main concern is to mitigate the impacts generated by the proposed mining project.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>RRAP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MMDD's item no. for the question which includes the observation identified by the RMGC internal code</td>
<td>3245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMDD's identification no. for the question which includes the observation identified by the RMGC internal code</td>
<td>No. 111115/25.08.2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMGC internal unique code</td>
<td>MMGA_1434</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Proposal**

The project will affect the properties of 2000 persons, 730 houses, 138 apartments, 16,000 ha of agricultural land, remarkable Roman vestiges, several churches and 9 ancient cemeteries.

**Solution**

The numbers stated by the questioner are inaccurate, as the urbanism certificate no. 78/26.04.2006 provides for the following details in respect of the PMP area:

- number of houses 489, 126 apartments;
- 1,258 hectares of various land usage categories land.

The construction and operation of the Roşia Montană Project requires the acquisition of properties in four of Roşia Montană’s 16 sub-comuna. For the most part, therefore, property ownership in the larger part of Roşia Montană will not be affected by the project.

In order to acquire the necessary properties, the company has established a property purchase program compliant with the RRAP guidelines developed by the World Bank.
Demolition and relocation of half a living and dead population from Rosia Montana;

It is not unusual that large projects need elements of resettlement and relocation. Think only of harbors, airports, highways, hydro-power generation units, mines.

The World Bank has developed what is considered the standard of this process which is followed closely by the custodians of these large investments. The focus is on the impacts mitigation measures designed and applied during the implementation of the projects, for and with the communities.

The mitigation plans and measures secure a smooth transition to the new location of the community impacted by the project and could easily cover a long period of time after the resettlement is done. Thorough monitoring and evaluation processes carried on indicate the corrective or improvement actions of the initial mitigation plans.

In spite of some opposition outside the area, in Roșia Montană the project is largely accepted and requested by the community and is seen at regional level as the only viable solution for the difficulties in the area, able to generate a wide range of individual and collective benefits.

Contrary to what the opponents of the mining project claim, no one wants to destroy homes or graveyards of Roșia Montană.

The property purchase program established by the company has been designed according to World Bank guidelines, and is based on a “willing seller, willing buyer” model.

To put the number of graves in context, the vast majority of Roșia Montană’s 1,905 graves will not be affected by the mining project (410 graves to move), as the company has to the maximum extent possible designed the mining operations to leave established graveyards in place.

All reburials will be done at the request of the families, and the expense of RMGC. The process will follow to the letter Romanian law on reburials [1], with the company’s commitment to act with respect and reverence. Abandoned graves will be relocated, also with full respect and reverence, to Piatra Albă’s new cemetery, for which 13 hectares have been set aside.

What the RMP project offers to future generations is a chance to continue a way of life in a village where that future – with 70% unemployment today, rising above 90% if RMGC’s proposed mine is not allowed to proceed – would be very much in doubt. In the event of Roșia Montană’s demise, the graves and churches there would likely be left behind, as in other abandoned mining villages in the Romanian countryside. Development of the RMP will keep the village alive – in fact and in spirit – and bring economic opportunity to the region.

References:
[1] the relocation of graves and cemeteries is governed by the following regulatory acts:
(i) Law no. 489/2006 on the freedom of religion and the general regime of religious affairs, published in the Romanian Official Gazette, Section I, no. 11/08.01.2007;
(ii) Law no. 98/1994 establishing and sanctioning breaches of the hygiene and public health rules, published in the Romanian Official Gazette, Section I, no. 317/16.11.1994, as subsequently
amended and supplemented ("Law no. 98/1994");

(iii) The hygiene norms and recommendations concerning the population’s life environment, published in the Romanian Official Gazette, Section I, no. 140/03.07.1997, as subsequently amended and supplemented ("Order 536/1997");

(iv) GD no. 955/2004 on the approval of the framework Rules for the organization and operation of the public services for the administration of the public and private domain of local interest, published in the Romanian Official Gazette, Section I, no. 660/22.07.2004;

(v) Order no. 261/1982 on the approval of the standard Rules for the administration of graveyards and the crematories of the localities, published in the Official Gazette no. 67/11.03.1983;

(vi) Rules for the organization and operation of the parish and monastery graveyards within the eparchies of the Romanian Orthodox Church, approved by Decision of the Religious Affairs Department no. 16.285/31.12.1981.