

Submission Cover Sheet

Fingerboards Mineral Sands Project Inquiry and Advisory
Committee - EES

854

Request to be heard?: No

Full Name: Patricia McPherson

Organisation:

Affected property:

Attachment 1:

Attachment 2:

Attachment 3:

Comments: See attached submission

FINGERBOARDS MINERAL SANDS MINE PROJECT

SUBMISSION

INTRODUCTION

I am a resident of East Gippsland and whilst I strongly **oppose** the mineral sands mine project in its entirety I don't have the expert knowledge and data to challenge/refute the technical claims presented in the EES. I leave that to the many credible and knowledgeable experts in the community.

The focus of my brief submission is the ethical principle FIRST DO NO HARM and the legal responsibility of DUTY OF CARE.

These apply primarily to Kalbar Operations Pty Ltd.

I have chosen just two of the plethora of areas of potential harm outlined in the EES, **radiation and dust contamination**, to illustrate this company's lack of duty of care by its attempts, through questionable 'modelling' and resort to generalized guidelines and 'regulations' to JUSTIFY it.

Additionally, these two ethical principles and duty of care apply equally to **the Inquiry and Advisory Committee**, in particular Autonomy which I have addressed in the last paragraph of this submission.

PREAMBLE

The Environmental Effect Statement (EES) is a litany of harms with no explicit or measurable commitment to Kalbar's duty of care in dealing with these harms.

In addition, it is strikingly unbalanced in that the harms outweighs the dearth of benefits that the minerals will presumably produce.

It cites tiles/paint/sunscreen (if you please) and mobile technology; magnets and a component involved in electric vehicles.

It cites benefits in terms of construction and operation.

It cites benefits to SE Asia.

These 3 are benefits to the **MARKET**.

This operationalizes the ideological construct of Thatcherism, that there is no such thing as the individual or community; there is only the market.

Well, there are individuals and there is a community adjacent to and beyond Glenaladale and almost every facet of this project brings a harm to every one of them.

HARMS AND EVIDENCE OF KALBAR'S 'PROPOSED' DUTY OF CARE

Harm: Contamination from leakage of radioactive substances from tailings dams or overflows during rain events.

Duty of care cited in EES:

NONE. THERE WILL BE NO ONGOING MONITORING. WHY?

* Radiation exposure on the Mitchell River 'modelling' is cited as being less than the screening values of the Australian Radiation Protection and Nuclear Safety Agency's Guide for radiation protection of the environment.

* The naturally occurring concentration of metals in the ground water is

higher than those predicted to be contained in seepage water.

- * Dissolved concentrations of aluminium and copper in tailings seepage are within drinking water guidelines.
- * Human health risk assessment and 'predictive modelling' is cited to have found that there were no 'exceedances' of the regulated radiation levels and residents are unlikely to be exposed to non-compliant levels of contamination.

Harm: Contamination risk of toxic dust from the mining operation on workers; AND from the stockpile of processed ore and from the tailings stockpile during wind events – especially to the vegetable growing industry and the Woodglen Reservoir (the adjacent community drinking water supply).

Duty of Care cited in EES:

NONE. NO FURTHER ASSESSMENT IS REQUIRED. WHY?

- * There are no standards to meet for dust deposition levels on vegetables.
- * Modelling indicated no excessive air quality levels during construction.
- * Modelling of dust deposition is cited to be below air quality 'criteria' during operations EXCEPT for 4 days (presumably they are the only days that wind blows in Glenaladale)!

(Word in the community is that this modelling was based on a wind station in a wind shadow and only functioned 77% of the time the data was gathered for the EES).

DUTY OF CARE OF THE INQUIRY AND ADVISORY COMMITTEE

This relates to the ethical principle of AUTONOMY which is Latin for self rule and defined as control by the individual.

This is particularly pertinent because of an amendment to the East Gippsland Shire Council's Planning and Environment Act 1987 that takes the individual's and the community's voice away by restricting their input/objections the Mineral Sands Project to the EES process only.....and after that there is no redress – the market has won.

The Committee has an obligation to respect the autonomy of the individuals who are harmed by the proposed mineral sands mine; to respect decisions concerning their own lives and a positive duty to empower them.

It does this through its report from this Inquiry.

This is its duty of care.

I urge the Committee members to look beyond the market and ensure that each proposed action produces more good than harm to the individuals and the community of Glendale and its environs.

Signed:


Pat McPherson