

# Submission Cover Sheet

Fingerboards Mineral Sands Project Inquiry and Advisory  
Committee - EES

# 829

---

**Request to be heard?:** Yes

**Full Name:** Graeme Hine

**Organisation:** Hine Vegetables

**Affected property:**

**Attachment 1:**

**Attachment 2:**

**Attachment 3:**

**Comments:** See attached submission

## Hine Vegetables

Dear Inquiry and Advisory Committee members,

I am writing this submission about the EES for the Fingerboards mineral sand mine project. As a resident and farmer for over 40 years in the Wuk Wuk – Woodglen area, I am totally opposed to this mine for the following reasons. None of the first EES study team visited or visual looked at the mine site. My argument is how can you put out a EES assessment study when you haven't visited or even looked at the mine site. With pending climate change, water is already a scarce commodity and government authorities regularly check bores knowingly the water table is dropping in all aquifers. Heritage listed Mitchell River is already over taxed by suppling water from Woodglen thru to Bairnsdale, Paynesville, Lakes Entrance, Bruthen, and Nowa Nowa, and our very important horticultural industry in East Gippsland. The horticultural industry in this area the most important industry East Gippsland has for employing staff and has been for many decades and will be in the future without harming the environment. Toxic dust blowing from the mine site will put our whole industry at risk not to mention our export crops namely Broccoli, Asparagus, Cauliflower, and Broccolini. Vegetables are checked regularly for chemicals, heavy metals, and other substances and if they are to be found over health organisations standard limits it will put our East Gippsland horticulture industry at major risk. Our export industry could be forever lost if we lose our clean green image. Air quality from the mines toxic dust blowing down wind will be a major health threat to residents and staff and destroying our heritage listed river. Like many other vegetables growers in the region I have quality assurance programs in place such as Freshcare and HARPs, toxic dust from the mine will seriously put these programs at risk if any toxic dust is found at all while conducting these tests. EES clearly states named gully's will be used for catchment and tailing dams and this is clearly wrong and the question has to be asked, is it legal. The EES booklet shows horticulture area on the Lindenow flats that is utilised now, this has been grossly under estimated as it does not even show my farm as being a vegetable farm. Our farm produces 450,000 kilos of beans, 500,000 kilos of sweet corn, 150,000 kilos of broccoli, 200,000 kilos of Broccolini, and 200,000 kilo of Asparagus, which 40 percent goes export, I find this very disturbing and extremely misleading in the EES report and our property lies only 6 kilometres downwind from the mine site. The EES should show what type of toxic and radiation dust that will be released into the environment. I find this a major cover up that the company doesn't want people to know how serious this could affect the environment, fauna, and flora, not to mention the residents and workers living in this pristine environment. The Mitchell River is a heritage listed river, this mine is in such close proximity to the river, which then flows thru to the Gippsland Lakes, which is Victoria's major tourist spot during the summer months, and to put this all at risk is absolutely inexcusable. To put this all at risk, for the sake of a mine with a 15-year life, is just a quick run for money by a greedy foreign owned mining company. Kalbar's own test shows on average 2.5 parts of Zircon per metre, this is extremely low compared to Aluka in Northwest Victoria and Western Australia, which they have 12 to 14 parts per metre of sand. How can this be viable while putting a major vegetable growing area and a major tourist area at risk. Also, the compulsory buying of private land for infrastructure outside the mine boundary is totally unacceptable and why isn't this before the East Gippsland shire council to determine.

So, in summing up, this should have never got off the ground, let alone a EES study which is totally flawed, incorrect, misleading, and environmentally damaging. So, with all the evidence before us this should be given a BIG NO. I would also like to thank the panel members for the opportunity to make this submission.

Yours Truly  
Graeme Hine.