Supplementary Submission - Centrifuges.

Sharon Clerke 893.

Why would the centrifuge option not have been included in Kalbar's EES when in 2018 testing was already underway for this option?

How could Kalbar have made such a huge mistake regarding water recovery from the fine tailings in their EES? A 2 billion litre water discrepancy.

Does this not red flag serious concerns over Kalbar's credibility?

When will the environmental effects of the centrifuge option be assessed?

Flocculants are toxic to fish and huge amounts will be required. What of the discharge into both the Mitchell, Perry River and the Gippsland Lakes?

Noise, noise and more noise. Where are the accumulative figures in the noise modelling for the project fully operational including centrifuges for day and night? Vibration from centrifuges?

Is it not obvious that Kalbar will to go through this whole process and later if approved produce a new work plan reverting back to the TSF option?

How can the centrifuge option 'only' not be seen as a complete insult to the IAC and the whole EES process?

How does the IAC accept the centrifuge option 'only' knowing that the TSF may very well be introduced into the mine project at a later date?

If a work plan is submitted after the panel hearings who will get to view this document?

Is it not correct that a work plan can easily be changed without the community having any impute or knowledge of the changes?

Centrifuges have never been used on mineral sands mines. So why would a company with no experience in mineral sands mining believe that this idea is appropriate for the Glenaladale deposit?

Kalbar's experience with mineral sands mining? Zero.

Kalbar's experience with centrifuges in mineral sands mining? Zero.

Where are the manufacturer's specifications for these centrifuges that Kalbar have used to advise their witnesses re; their witness statements?

Why have specification manuals from Alpha Laval not been supplied to all witnesses and others that have requested them?

Why would the proponent not be happy to supply these if the information they have provided is accurate?

Specifications for centrifuges would be large documents (manuals) not a few glossy pages supplied by Kalbar, who seem to think this is acceptable.
Who has actually seen any detailed specifications?

What are the legal implications of Kalbar's witnesses relying on only information supplied by Kalbar and not doing their due diligence? Disclaimers?

We the community were told many years ago to believe and trust in the EES process. How can we believe in this when Kalbar have already been shown as producing a complete sham of an EES, are continually late in providing documents, change the project continually, flouted the IAC's requests for documents eg. EPA and have done NO community consultation on the centrifuge option?

Why has Kalbar's office been closed for the last 12 months?

Where is the community consultation regarding the centrifuge option?

Kalbar's CEO seems more concerned about orange signs on trees and the location of a cattle truck to even consider community consultation and yet is happy to attend the East Gippsland Field Days of which the vast majority of attendees will not visit their site.

Why have no community meetings been planned by Kalbar? Covid restrictions now allow up to 200 people to attend these types of events.

Can the IAC request this of Kalbar?

Centrifuges will never be used and the TSF option will again raise its ugly head. Work plans will be changed after the whole process is over and the people of East Gippsland will not be consulted or even be aware of any work plan changes.

What an insult to the IAC, the hundreds submitters, Mine Free Glenaladale and the whole EES process.

Yet again I sit here typing another submission on the flaws and cracks that appear daily with this absurd proposal which should never have even got to this stage.

Madness is what people say.

Greed is more the truth.