Fingerboards Mineral Sands Project Inquiry and Advisory Committee - EES

Request to be heard?: No

Full Name: Ann Guy

**Organisation:** 

Affected property:

Attachment 1:

Attachment 2:

Attachment 3:

**Comments:** 

Dear Inquiry and Advisory Committee members I am writing this submission about the EES for the Fingerboards mineral sands mine project. I strongly oppose the mine for the reasons outlined below. Water: It is stated that 3 billion litres of water is required annually for up to 15 years to service this mine. My concerns are that this will be drawn from the head waters of the Mitchell River. I have lived in the Lindenow area since 1972 and during that time have been involved in agricultural pursuits where water is needed. Almost every year the Mitchell is put on restrictions and this does not only impact on the immediate Mitchell Valley but right through to Lindenow South and Bairnsdale and other households and enterprises dependent on mains water. How can another 3 billion litres be removed without disastrous effects on the river and also on the aquifers? Flooding: It is not uncommon for the Mitchell to flood after heavy rain in the catchment. A look at the Mitchell flood plain shows that over time silt has been washed down right through to the silt jetties on the Gippsland Lakes. Water rises fast and spreads out from where the mine is planned right across the vegetable flats and through Bairnsdale affecting everything in its path including the caravan park and on down to Paynesville and Raymond Island. If the mine is in operation when a flood occurs this means that the loose contaminated dirt and tailings waste will be washed down and the whole of the Mitchell Valley has the potential to be contaminated. This does not have to be a 1/100 year flood. We are informed that climate change will make severe weather events more common and certainly I have seen the caravan park at Bairnsdale evacuated several times during the last 30 years, and once the whole of the morass was under water. Compulsory acquisition of private land. I refer to the Draft Planning Scheme Amendment – attachment C. It is unacceptable to allow the compulsory acquisition of private land to be used by the mine for infrastructure that is located outside the mining project boundary for such things as new powerlines, rail sidings, bore pumps and vegetation removal etc. Why wasn't this part of the mine project area? Surely this is a matter for the East Gippsland shire planning department? Thank you for giving me the opportunity to make this submission. Ann Guy