

# Submission Cover Sheet

Fingerboards Mineral Sands Project Inquiry and Advisory  
Committee - EES

# 303

---

**Request to be heard?:** Yes

**Full Name:** Daniel Banks

**Organisation:**

**Affected property:**

**Attachment 1:** AAAAAAAAAAAA-d

**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 project and I am strongly opposed to such an undertaking, I am a fifth generation farmer and can trace our families beginnings in this immediate area to 1865, we still have my great great grandmothers original selection in the family farm, my sons aged 2 and 9 are 6<sup>th</sup> generation, I am a qualified butcher and chef, and have also worked as an extended tour-guide running camping tours through the Kimberley, Pilbarra and northern territory for 12 years.

I am not anti mining, this mine however is not suitable due to its location and community impact.

At no point have KALBAR or any of their representatives made any effort to engage in any form of discussion on the impact this project could have on my family given that we live less than 2kms from the proposed mine-site itself, and parts of our cattle farm is less than 1km from the proposed site.

KALBAR have either engaged in a massively dishonest campaign of misinformation or are inept and incompetent to engage in this kind of activity, they have not reported nearly 40% of houses in the affected area of the mine, why isn't the land they will have to confiscate off families not covered in the projects footprint?

When I asked them for a copy of the EES, they told me I was not able to get a copy as I wasn't close enough to the affected area.

If this mine goes ahead, when an incident happens on the site that affects the rivers and surrounding farmland, and it will, as stated in their own EES, who will fix the mess?

Why is it even thought ok to consider that kicking 80 odd households off their livelihoods and out of their lives is ok to sell more to CHINA? In today's geopolitical climate it would be a brave politician that gave the green light to an internationally owned company, with no moral obligation to the communities that it is destroying and poisoning, for money that will for the most part, go overseas with little tax paid on it, meanwhile robbing 80 families of their lifestyle, livelihoods and futures

KALBAR'S water use plan is in tatters after reading the first 70 pages, see below

Kalbar have publicly stated that the mine will only require 3gl of water per annum to run the mine.

Volume 1 main report part 1 chapter 3 project description page 28 sub 3.7.3.1 states as follows,

Approximately 300,000L of water will be lost during the process per hour, the mine will operate 24hrs a day 365 days a year as per their outlines, math time

$300,000 \times 24\text{hrs a day} = 7,200,000$  million litres a day will be lost.

$7,200,000 \times 365\text{days} = 2,628,000,000$  litres of water lost per annum,

Also stating that this makes up 35% of total water usage as only 65% of the water used will be reclaimed

More math time,

so if 2,628,000,000 litres is 35% of water needed per year, then the actual amount needed is,

$2,628,000,000 \text{ divided by } 0.35 = 7,508,571,428.57$  or 7.5 ggalitres per annum

KALBAR also state that the majority of water sourced would come from the proposed bore field, which strangely does not make up part of the impacted mine site

More maths, even if we got a double 51%-49% split, that would equate to 3.6 gigalitres a year from the Mitchell river, and a staggering 3.9 gigalitres of water per annum from a bore field that was only tested over a short time span and few bores, how can any claim be taken with any certainty of the results presented in this EES with the glaring omissions and false information present in the first 200 pages of the document

So therefore KALBAR's claim of 3 gigalitres of water consumption per year needed is not correct.

### 3.7.3.2

Dust suppression needing 400 megalitres a year will be sourced from existing farm dams on the plateau, that is flat, sandy, and has very few decent sized dams, most dams in the projected area are little bigger than household pools, let alone containing 400 megalitres combined and that would be replenished by rainfall alone each year.

#### Community impact

The EES mentions the fact that this EES process has an effect on the local communities mental health but makes no mention of the projected impact of 20 years of mining 24hrs a day, 365 days will have on the affected community for those that will have to suffer the acknowledged constant humming and vibrations that will permeate their existence for 20 continuous years, without respite.

The true number of "sensitive receptors" (houses within the affected area), has been massively under reported in the EES, a further case of KALBAR providing false information.

It is not acceptable in any way to allow compulsory acquisition of private land that falls outside of the mining projects boundary, for infrastructure for the mine. Surely this should also be classified in the projected mine footprint,

KALBAR also state that ground water tables will be impacted up to 40 metres in depth, great lets turn this rich lush green landscape into the new Esperance of the early 90's with massive salinity problems as the salt water comes back inland.

I look forward to having an opportunity to speak in person at the appropriate time.

Regards

Daniel Banks

Iguana creek