

Submission Cover Sheet

Fingerboards Mineral Sands Project Inquiry and Advisory
Committee - EES

668

Request to be heard?: No - but please email me a copy of the
Timetable and any Directions

Full Name: John Cameron

Organisation:

Affected property:

Attachment 1: Public_Submission

Attachment 2:

Attachment 3:

Comments: see attached submission

Dear Inquiry and Advisory Committee members,

I am writing this submission about the EES for the Fingerboards mineral sands mine which I strongly object to for the reasons outlined below.

I have lived in the area my entire life and worked in the horticulture industry for more than 20 years. Whilst there are many risks and reasons why I object to this mine I would like to focus on the risks to the horticulture industry and it provides my employment and livelihood for myself and my family.

The horticulture industry on the Lindenow Flats is a thriving industry that supports 1000's of jobs and provides significant economic benefit, directly and indirectly to the region. The economic benefit, the connection local farmers have with the community and the fact the industry is sustainable and can provide continuity are reasons why this industry should be supported above a mine. A mine at the Fingerboards is an inappropriate location for a mine given the locality of the veggie growers and therefore the two cannot co-exist.

There are perceived risks along with environmental risks that make this mine not appropriate. If you imagine produce grown in the area becomes tainted by a mine a mere 500 meters from crops, then this will have serious financial impacts across the area. Vegetables are promoted as healthy and good for people; organic produce is on the uptake as people become more focused on what they are eating. People do not want to eat produce that may be tainted with dust and contaminants from a mine. No amount of washing a vegetable will get dust out of vegetables like lettuces and cabbages as the dust settles on them as they grow.

The water used to irrigate vegetable crops comes from the Mitchell River, if run off and contamination gets into the river, there is potential for that to impact on the water quality and subsequently the quality of the produce as it grows.

The project involves a tailings dam, which for some reason despite being declared safe in other mines always seem to fail and result in environmental impacts. In the case of this Fingerboards proposal the dam is a massive 90 hectares. If that fails, the impact will be enormous. I have read the EES section in relation to the tailings dam and could not find any information on how they are planning to construct a dam of such a size, that contains dangerous flocculants and other chemicals and prevent it from failing. Yet what I did read is they have said the risk of failing is low. How is that?

Finally, this proposed mine is using over 3-4 gig of water per year, which they are taking from the ground water and the Mitchell River. For years, veggie farmers have fought for water security, for years the availability of water has been a factor in restricting the expansion of the industry. So, to give water to mine instead of the existing horticulture industry is not right. The horticulture industry could use the water to grow and develop and provide more jobs and financial gains for the region. It is safer to stick with what we know works that adding in a new industry that is not only destructive to the environment but takes away from existing industries. Furthermore, what will the impact of the extraction of such a large volume of water every year from aquifers and the river have? According to the EES not much, as a local who has intrinsic knowledge of

water from bores and the river and how it all goes together, what water restrictions and low flows means I'm not so sure Kalbar have got it right.

On a final note in the interest of other landowners in the area, who are going to directly impacted by this ridiculous proposal I also strongly object to the compulsory acquisition of there land. If landholders want to give up the land for the mine then that is their choice, if they don't then that's their choice. It is utterly wrong that any landholder should be subject to having the land compulsory acquired for a benefit beyond their own. That section in the EES is pretty much the final insult to the community.

Sincerely
John