

Hi, my name is Jenny Webb. I am Deputy Mayor of Forbes Shire Council, and have always declared a pecuniary interest on Council in regards to Cleanteq Sunrise Mines as 4 of the proposed bores and pumping station is located on our property" Monwonga". Today I speak on behalf of my husband Tim and I as Resident and Farmer in the district and my opinions and views are personal and I am not representing Council here today.

We have a grazing operation in the Warroo district west of Forbes. Typically we carry in the range of 10 to 12 thousand merino sheep depending on time of year and seasonal conditions. Predominately these stock are watered from 6 bores equipped with solar pumps. In summer these sheep require about 70 000 litres every day. This has happened sustainably for generations and we would like to see it happen for generations to come.

Currently Cleanteq have 2 bores and 2 proposed bores on our land over approximately 4 km. These 4 bores are part of 6 in total from which they expect to extract up to 32 hundred mega litres per year to be pumped to Fifield. Only 2 of these 6 bores have been drilled and pump tested. What if there is no water in the other proposed 4 bores? I am curious to know what their strategy is if they cannot locate water. Cleanteq talk about strategically pumping this bore field, but history shows that all these bores are linked and pumped from the one aquifer.

reporting to small to Ivanplats

Having pumped irrigation water from Cleanteq's western bore for periods of 2 to 3 weeks at a time, and having monitored all these bores quarterly for about 6 years, Tim and I have seen firsthand the large drawdown of 13 to 14 metres and slow recharge to normal standing water levels. All this with the extraction of only 8 ~~to 9~~ mega litres a day for a matter of a couple of weeks, not 52 weeks of the year for the lifespan of the mine as proposed.

10mg a day

Our stock bores, while the closest to these bore fields, are by no means the only ones that will be detrimentally effected from the drawdown of these waters. In the recent bore census, there were over 155 bores across 73 properties. All our neighbours to the north are particularly reliant on ground water for their stock as their country is heavy, flat and surface water catchment not possible

If ground water is lost in a 10 to 15 km radius of this bore field, it will put at risk Billions of dollars of food and fibre production into the future. Our operation alone in one lifetime has and will generate in excess of one hundred million dollars for the local economy, and we are only one of many graziers and irrigators that would be effected.

Funds from this agricultural production flow directly into the tax paying economy of Forbes, which in turn supports employment, businesses and schools such as Bedgerebong which has served this community for over 125 years. Collectively, these rural landholders would pay over \$200,000 in rates to FSC and put into the Forbes Economy over \$30M a year. I believe there is nowhere near enough up to date hydrological information to support the proposed extraction and certainly not enough safe guards in place such as independent real time monitoring, trigger levels, and compensatory measures in place to give the farming and mining community any certainty of their futures. It would be in no one's interest, mining or agriculture, to see the underground water level drop to unsustainable levels.

FSC primary industry is Agriculture

gives us positive assurance into the agricultural industry

hope to meet  
I will be meeting with the Honourable Niall Blair, Minister for Regional Water, in a few weeks' time, and I want to impress upon him the importance of an independent body to capture real time water monitoring and how critical it is to have appropriate trigger levels established to safeguard both the farming and mining community. We have heard firsthand problems arising with Bores around Bore fields at other Mines, so it is my belief that it should not be left to the mining industry, in this case Cleanteq, to take the charge in what they believe is the best preventative action or fair compensation if the water supply to the landholder is adversely impacted.

Primary Industries

To be clear, we are certainly not against this mining venture and can see the benefits it can bring to this area, but we cannot understand why Cleanteq does not/ or cannot obtain enough surface water for their operations and function under the same constraints as everyone else to minimise risks to agricultural businesses around them.

The other issue of concern was during the construction phase. I believe that Cleanteq have informed the Department of Planning that the water haulage from the bore field site to the Fifield mines is now off the plan, and would like to thank Cleanteq and the Councils involved in removing around 35 B Double trucks daily, on unsuitable roads and through our villages, but has this been changed as yet to Mod 4. The other issue of concern will be the noise generated from the generator when pumping water from our bore fields to Fifield. Yes, we are but only a few residents close, but should we have to put up with continual noise pollution.

I would urge the planning commission to look at the bigger long term picture here, and not just the perceived short term benefits when considering the issues before them. Let's hope common sense prevails.

Thank you for the opportunity to voice a small part of our concerns here today.

Tim and Jenny Webb

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

- \* Fight a state significant project
- \* Need better compensation in legal fees — up to \$7,000
- \* Pipeline ~~plans~~ / ~~electrification plan~~ / ~~contracts~~ / Easements / Power Line Easement

iterate with Steve Loon (SM) we need better compensation in legal fees, we are currently in negotiation for both pipeline & power line easements & we have only up to \$2000 - which isn't many hrs of legal professional advise.