

field

My name is Graham Quade, and I live at [redacted] which is close to the proposed Cleanteq Sunrise mine site. (Located here)

I have come along to speak today because I have some concerns about the draft consent conditions as proposed by the Department of Planning.

Firstly I want to make it clear that I am aware of the positive impacts a mine like the one proposed can have on a region. There will be jobs created and wages earned that will hopefully be spent in the local area. It is for these reasons that I am not opposed to the mine.

to which we have heard about at length

[redacted] where we live has been in my family for three generations. My grandfather purchased the farm in 1960. We moved back to [redacted] in 2010 to raise our children of which we have 3. Even though farming seasons are a bit of a rollercoaster, we love the fact that our kids have room to ride their motorbikes, light fires, go camping and all those things that bush kids grow up doing. It really is a fantastic way of life for us and our kids out here, and I am worried that if we don't have adequate protections in place this may all be lost.

My first concern relates to the modelling that Cleanteq has done with regards to emissions, dust and noise produced at the site. These models are all based on weather data from Condobolin which is 45km away.

As a farmer I need to be accredited to handle and apply agricultural chemicals safely and efficiently. At my re-accreditation course last year I asked if I could just use the closest weather station (Condobolin) when recording temperature, humidity, wind speed and direction. The answer was a definite 'no' due to the fact that there are too many variations over that distance. I was also told that legally I had to record the data with my portable weather station in the corner of the paddock I was spraying, and not back at the sheds where I refill to ensure further accuracy.

It seems to me that a mine which is predicted to produce dust, noise and emissions should use more relevant local data for their models. An example of this variation happened just last week when storm activity saw very strong winds and up to 70mm of rain fall close to the mine site in 2 hours, while the Condo weather station recorded just 9.8mm for the 7 day period. If the weather

observations aren't taken from the actual site, then in my opinion they could be just as irrelevant if they were taken from Parkes, Forbes, or anywhere else within a 100km radius. I have no confidence in the modelling because the weather data is not specific to the site.

Which brings me to my next concern.

Once the mine is up and running, there is a possibility that we will be adversely impacted by dust noise or emissions. If this occurs this will impact our quality of life, property value and enjoyment of living in a rural environment.

The Department of Planning has removed the voluntary acquisition condition which I feel was a necessary safety net that would allow us to sell up at a fair price and move to live somewhere where we weren't negatively impacted by a mine on our doorstep. I am very worried about this, because it could mean that we are left with a farm we can't live on, that has decreased significantly in value because nobody else wants to live there either. The mine would be great for the region, unless of course you are one of the near neighbours.

An analogy that springs to mind is when there is a major road infrastructure project proposed in Sydney such as the New M5 East Tunnel. Almost everyone agrees that it will be good to relieve traffic congestion, getting away from the airport quicker etc. It is fantastic for the vast majority of people that live nearby or travel south from the city. However there are a few houses along the way that will now have to put up with one of those huge ventilation stacks close by, which will impact their quality of life, value of their properties etc. I'm imagining those few people would be very supportive of the project, just not at their expense. That's how I feel.

If Cleanteq is so confident with its modelling, and as predicted our property isn't affected, there should be no worries about putting the voluntary acquisition ^{condition} clause back in as it will never have to call on it again. Verbal assurances from employees that may not be there in 3 years time give me no confidence whatsoever.

Thanks very much for giving me the opportunity to speak today, and I'm sure you will take my concerns on board. Graham Quade