

I strongly oppose the proposal for the Bowden's Silver/Zinc/Lead mine project.

I am the property co-owner with my wife of the rural holding noted R87 in the Bowden's Silver Mine EIS otherwise known as Wyuna, Bara Lue Road, Lue.

We are a direct and closest neighbour to Bowden's owned land, and we have around 1.5km frontage to the beautiful Lawson Creek.

The reasons for my objection are as follows:

- 1) My wife and I will face significant financial loss and severe health risks as our property is located approximately only 1.1km from the tailings dam and waste rock area, we are also approximately 2km from the mine pit. Our property, future lifestyle dreams and financial plans would be ruined. Our retirement dreams are in conflict with this proposal, and we cannot co-exist.
- 2) The mine location itself is too close to the Lawson Creek, thriving highly productive agricultural lands and Agri tourism businesses, the Lue Village and Lue Primary School and is in direct conflict with existing use and the sense of place for the people of Lue.
- 3) The DPE failed to conduct what the economic loss would be of fading tourism, farming, agriculture, and local businesses impacted by the mine. DPE only conducted a biased one-sided view taking Bowden's position from data provided by Gillespie's and ignored the findings from their own consultants (CIE).
- 4) All the conditions set by the DPE are mostly recommendations not commitments; they lack enforceable content. These all just appear aspirational, rather than actual commitments and appears there are no consequences. There are NO consequences for non-compliance. This is not acceptable and a failing of the DPE. The use of generic conditions is grossly inadequate and unsuitable for a green field, open cut lead mine that has presented so many red flags. They are not tangible, deliverable or even likely to be effective and do not address the serious concerns of the community.
- 5) The Project appears to have unacceptable planning, particularly regarding visual and social impacts, which I believe cannot be satisfactorily mitigated. They lack enforceable content and even guidance to their substance.

- 6) According to the Assessment report, our property (R87) is predicted to experience noise levels that exceed the PNTLs by 3-5 dB because of mining operations. 'Moderate exceedances of the PNTLs would occur at our property for the 18 months of site establishment and construction'.
- 7) Our property would experience exceedance daily noise from the relocation of the transmission lines. We would also suffer noise exceedances in the daytime, evening/nighttime from moving of waste rock, construction of tailings dam and mine operation. This is not acceptable.
- 8) We will have a very clear and unsightly view of the relocated gigantic transmission lines from all over our property. Today we look over our paddocks, Lawson Creek and beautiful unspoiled rolling tree covered hills.
- 9) DPE has tried to downplay the impact by saying we will be moderately impacted. This is not accurate; we will be significantly impacted!

All the above has caused unimaginable stress, fear, and anxiety to myself and my family.

As stated, our property is approximately only 1.1km from the tailings dam and waste rock storage area. We are told the tailing dam is designed to spill so in heavy rains such as we had in December 2022 where we had over 200mm in the space of a day, how would this be managed. The tailings dam holds toxic materials such as cyanide, arsenic and lead particles, and Bowden's predicts 1.6mL of leakage every single day during normal conditions.

Every day and night we would live in fear for our health and safety for our family, friends, workers, and guests. The Tailings Dam leakage and lead dust spread is disastrous for our health and safety being so close. It will be a ticking time bomb for us and everyone that relies on Lawson Creek.

We cannot co-exist.

The DPE and Bowden's boast about strict conditions in the ABC media.

On reading these Conditions I find that they are far from strict and best described as passive, ineffective, and non-enforceable guidelines only.

‘NOTIFICATION OF EXCEEDENCES OF CONDITIONS’

‘As soon as practical and no longer than 7 days after obtaining monitoring results showing an exceedance of any noise, blasting or air quality, Bowden’s must provide details to affected landowners. And if the exceedance is of any air quality, then they must also provide a brochure “Mine Dust and You”.

This means that if Bowden’s discover that they have exceeded the amount of dust, or lead dust that they have 7 days to notify us and the people of Lue. There are no consequences if they don’t comply. How is such a generic condition allowable for such a dangerous project like this, where lead and heavy metal concentrates are known to be by products of this process? This is unacceptable.

VISUAL AMENITY AND LIGHTING

‘The Applicant must take all reasonable steps to minimise’ where are the consequences for failure to comply. Reasonable is a subjective word and should not be used in this case as who decides what is reasonable?

NOISE

‘All reasonable and feasible mitigation is to be implemented to achieve the noise management levels.’ Where are the consequences for exceeding these noise levels? We are just over one kilometre to the tailings dam and waste rock storage area, and very much closer to the new imposing Maloney’s Road. We need trigger action responses to noise exceedances and strict penalties for when these exceedances occur.

AIR QUALITY AND ODOUR

‘The applicant must ensure that no offensive odours are emitted from the site’. What are the consequences if they do?

There are NO consequences for non-compliance in all of the conditions. They are vague and unenforceable.

DPE recently said on the ABC “it will achieve balance about maximising resource recovery & minimising associated impacts to the surrounding landowners”. This is not the case from ours and many other’s perspectives. I believe the DPE are misrepresenting the truth by saying landowners will have minimised impact when in fact we will suffer immensely from risk to health and hardship. I say that the impact will be unbearable for us.

ASSESSMENT REPORT

The CIE economic analysis report dated 10th January 2022 highlights the poor data integrity of Bowden's own data from their consultants Gillespie Economics (GE). In the report it stated, 'It is worth noting that a similar approach to that adopted by GE has also previously not been supported by the IPC in relation to the Mangoola Coal Continued Operations Project⁷ and the Tahmoor South Project.⁸'. How can such a risky project such as Bowden's Silver Mine be supported when their own data integrity is not credible or trusted?

Bowden's do not appear to have the capacity, skills, working capital, governance integrity or proven experience to run such a risky project.

DPE state's that Bowden's mine is of strategic importance ignoring all the environmental, social, health, economic, and visual damage that will occur be irreversible. They ignore the existing use of the region and sense of place of the landowners, and the fact that the land is highly productive agricultural land.

The local community that adds the value and wealth to the region have all spoken out opposing the mine. There is no strategic importance when the mine will force the closure to so many thriving surrounding businesses, farms, short stay accommodation experiences and tourist hot spots.

Many subject matter experts in their field have unanimously opposed the planned mine, as have many of the DPE's own experts.

The IPC should act on this professional advice and reject the mine proposal.

SPECIAL CONDITIONS FOR R87

Due to being immediately next door to the planned mine and the significantly documented health and safety concerns with lead dust and lead acid drainage, only 1,100 metres from the tailing dam that will be built over a fault line, and knowingly will leak, planned exceeded noise and visual impacts, our property (87) Wyuna, 30 Bara Lue Road, Lue should be protected by far stronger conditions below.

CONDITIONS

The DPE claims that there are strong conditions attached to the approval of this project.

Strong conditions do not use the words, reasonable, minimise, manage, monitor, mitigate etc. The conditions should be quantitative and assessable and show actual penalties for exceedances and failures in process and damage caused by incorrect modelling and human error.

Our experiences with Bowden's have always been that exceedances were downplayed, glossed over and it was suggested that we would only be somewhat affected. Our proximity to the mine site, tailings dam, rock placement area and new Maloney's Road would ensure that we are grossly affected and our property would be good for nothing should the mine go ahead .

I ask, should the project be approved, that the special condition in regard to our property R87, be strengthened so that conditions are appropriate under the circumstances and expected exceedances. Currently the conditions are vague and generic and do not reflect the gross exceedances that we expect to experience.

We ask that they are as follows:

Should the project be approved, and upon our written request, that we (R87) be granted voluntary land acquisition rights at twice the market value for our property, (valuation to be done as if the mine were not there) and in addition all the heads of compensation set out in the Land Acquisition (Just Terms Compensation) Act. This must be a trigger action response, and not one that requires onerous, costly proof of the burden on our part.

This option should be made available for all properties who experience any exceedances of dust or noise or who suffer from failure of water supply due to the mining operation. The notion of compensatory water, whilst absolutely necessary in this case, creates an untenable demand on the resources of the DPE. In the recent Hume Coal case, the project failed for this reason...is just not practical and has resulted in the failure of the Hume Coal project application in the Southern Highlands.

Alternatively, that we be compensated for our loss of future income for at least 23 years and possibly in perpetuity for the business/s that we have worked hard to establish (values provided in original objection against DA application SSD5765) as follows:

AGRI TOURISM SHORT TERM RENTAL:

CROPPING/OATS:

CATTLE PRODUCTION:

This compensation option should also be offered to any affected landowners who are forced to close their businesses due to the mine's operation, without the burden of proof being borne by them.

We (the community) have been let down by the DPE and we trust that the IPC will ensure a just and fair outcome in making their decision on the future of this project. Again, I ask that you refuse this project for all of the above reasons.

We cannot coexist with the mine.

We ask the IPC to support the thriving existing livelihoods, the strong local social community, protect the environment and the successful tourism businesses by rejecting the Bowden's mine proposal.

Refer location map below of 87 (Wyuna) in proximately to the tailings dam, waste rock area and overall mine.

