
Request to be heard?: No

Full Name: Margaret Ruth McConachy & David Lynton McConachy

Organisation:

Affected property:

Attachment 1:

Attachment 2:

Attachment 3:

Comments: Dear Inquiry and Advisory Committee members, We write responding to the Environment Effects Statement for the Fingerboards mineral sand mine project. As members of the wider local community we believe the mine and its operation will be detrimental to lives of many people who make up our society and to our local environment. A powerful social licence to oppose the mine exists. We are ratepayers. We are voters. We are taxpayers. Our society depends on its members to act as a group and thus, because we belong here, we are obliged to passionately oppose this mine. Regarding the EES, the facts that Kalbar want people to know are included, but answers are needed to questions which have been superficially dealt with or passed over entirely. 1. Psychological impact: Locals love their farms and lifestyles. How will the mine truly affect those living close to it? Can infrastructure outside the mine boundary be erected without acquisition of private land and unacceptable stress on local people? 2. Dust contamination: Seriously contaminated mine dust will affect the water, the food bowl and the large community over which it will settle. Northwesterly winds will contaminate greater Bairnsdale. Choking recent bushfire smoke is proof. How important is the health of our population? How will the cost to taxpayers of health problems compare with the revenue obtained from the mine operation? 3. Noise contamination: Has the effect of the noise of operations been properly assessed? 4. Water availability: In an area prone to drought, the amount of water used by the mine is 3GL per year. We live about 30 km SE of the proposed mine site and are not connected to town water. Twice during the last 12 years we have had to buy essential water. Will water available from the Mitchell River flow needed by local farmers of vegetables, crops and animals who are similarly affected during low rainfall years be seriously impacted by the requirements of the mine? 5. Water contamination: How can the mine and 90 hectare elevated tailing dam not fail to contaminate the rivers, water courses and Gippsland lakes situated at lower elevations? 6. Environmental effects: How can removal of large numbers of mature trees (over 700) and the loss of rich indigenous vegetation and animal habitat be justified? 7. Employment: How can the small number of short term local jobs provided by the mine be commended when a large number of ongoing local jobs in agricultural pursuits, including processing, are being jeopardised by the mine? What will be lost if this project proceeds? Isn't it the right of the community to have clean, uncontaminated water, food and air? We should expect our government to support this right. We should also expect that the well being of its people is at the top of any government agenda. We appreciate your consideration. David McConachy MB,BS, DPRM, FAFRM(RACP) Margaret McConachy BSc, GradDipEd