

Submission Cover Sheet

Fingerboards Mineral Sands Project Inquiry and Advisory
Committee - EES

167

Request to be heard?: Yes

Full Name: Brendan Casey

Organisation:

Affected property: area of proposal

Attachment 1: mineral_sands_su

Attachment 2:

Attachment 3:

Comments: see attached submission

Kalbarr Mineral Sands EES

Dear Inquiry and Advisory Committee members, I am writing this submission about the Environment Effects Statement (EES) for the Fingerboards Mineral Sands mine project. I strongly oppose the mine, due to the proponent's failure to responsibly consider the likely impact on the Giant Burrowing Frog *Heleioporus australiacus*.

The EES does not make the effort required to address a Matter of National Environmental Significance, as the information within the EES is potentially misleading in regard to *H. australiacus*.

1. The survey effort to detect *H. australiacus* was grossly inadequate (EES Ch. 10 Table 10.2).

2. The reference to 'targeted surveys' is misleading as the surveys were random and opportunistic (EES Ch. 10 Table 10.11).

3. New information about the habitat *H. australiacus* includes calling from pools within cleared landscapes (07 and 13 May 2020, Stony Creek, 4.5 km north of proposed mine site).

4. The description of 'low quality habitat' (EES Ch. 9 Table 9.2) is misleading as the species was recently detected nearby calling from 'low quality habitat'.

5. The statement *Approximately 15.2 ha of potential habitat (ephemeral tributary streams and adjoining vegetations) for the giant burrowing frog would be removed, although these areas are of low quality and there is a low likelihood that the giant burrowing frog would utilise these areas* (EES Ch. 9) is misleading because; 1. the species does occupy 'areas of low quality' within the area of the proposal and 2. there is a high likelihood *H. australiacus* would utilise 'areas of low quality' within the area of the proposal.

Kalbarr Mineral Sands EES

6. The statements *The potential habitat present in the project area is sub-optimal for this species* and *The giant burrowing frog has been recorded previously in 2003* and *Habitat to be removed is unlikely to be important for breeding or dispersal for the swift parrot, grey-headed flying fox, and giant burrowing frog* (EES Ch. 9) are misleading as the EES is incorrect to describe the proposed site as 'low quality habitat' for *H. australiacus*.

7. The statement *Those species that cannot easily disperse, such as the giant burrowing frog, if present (unlikely)... and None of the EPBC Act listed fauna species are likely to permanently or frequently use habitat resources* (EES Ch. 9) is misleading as EES fails to consider that *H. australiacus* is likely to occupy the proposed site.

Background information for Inquiry and Advisory Committee members. An acoustic monitoring program targeting *H. australiacus* about 5 km north of the proposed mine began in May 2018 and ended May 2020. After more than 11 700 attempts across four habitats for almost two years, the call of *H. australiacus* was heard from one site on three occasions between 07 and 13 May 2020. The call habitat was an ephemeral pool within cleared land.