

Good Afternoon IAC

I am Annette Sullivan and this is my husband Les Sullivan

We want to make it clear that we are not against mines as I worked at the ERPM mine in Boksburg South Africa. We are however against a mine being established in the middle of a vegetable growing community.

We chose to retire on Raymond Island because of the fresh country air, away from the smoke and built up areas, It's reputation as the foodbowl of Melbourne, It's thriving tourism industry due to the clean lakes system, fauna and flora.

Now 20 years later consideration is being given to a mine that could destroy it all.

In the words of Kalbar this is highly unlikely and damage would be negligible, but as far as we can see nobody has addressed the what if:

and the impact of the mine on job losses, devaluation of properties, people leaving of Bairnsdale and surrounding areas and the tourism decline due to pollution of the lakes that will follow

Then

- a) who is responsible in the event of a major incidence during the life of the mine if the mine has been sold on from Kalbar, as stated by the previous CEO Victor Hugo?
- a) who will pay for damage once it has occurred e.g.
- b) who will decontaminate the water, land and lakes
- c) who is going to refill the aquifer
- d) who will restore the land to its original purpose e.g. farming and a lake system
- e) who will control the processes and ensure the restoration.

The article in the Great Eastern Mail in September 2020 paints a horrific picture of "the mine that ate Bairnsdale" which could happen as there are no guarantees that these events will not occur.

Why is it acceptable to put the whole community at risk for the sake of a mine. The example of the sandmine in Kanagulk near Horsham as well as the Benambra Gold Mine which is still leaching contaminated water into the Tambo river, show the industry is in general relying on **cost deferral** when comes to rehabilitation of the land and why should the Fingerboards Mine rehabilitation be any different.

Government statistics show that only one mine out of 150 has been fully rehabilitated.

But, lets say all goes according to plan the mine is going ahead and mineral sands are exported to China. We have been told that the Net Market Value of the mine will be around \$300 million per year of which 10 million in royalties flow on to the Victorian government. What is the benefit to Bairnsdale? This amount would not even cover the constant repairs to roads damaged by B-double trucks.

Rio Tinto withdrew from mining the area as they felt it was too divisive to the community. What has changed? We already have had instances of aggression against MFG members in the community. What about the consideration of aboriginal heritage sites in the area and the impact of any losses on Gunaikurnai aboriginal people.

All inhabitants of East Gippsland will be impacted by any failure of the mine and then will have to contribute to its restoration.

You have to ask yourself, why the Victorian government would want to go ahead with the mine. The consequences of a failure are too horrific to contemplate and one can therefore only conclude that the Victorian Government must have a commitment to the BRI (Belt and Road Initiative) with China to make this mine go ahead.

With this in mind we appeal to the IAC to strongly oppose the mine and say no to the Victorian Government.

Annette and Les Sullivan
annettesullivan2@gmail.com