

Brain disorders, IQ lowering

Anemia

Kidney damage

Developing baby's nervous system

High blood pressure

Miscarriages and premature birth

Nausea and vomiting

Seizures

Comas

Adominal, muscle and joint pain

Lack of energy

Behavioral problems

Impaired growth

Reduced sperm count

Lead is released into soil, water and the atmosphere via mining and is Australia's largest source of lead emissions i.e. pollution.
Almost all lead still used globally comes from recycled sources and not from mining hence its very low value so why at Lue.

- The concerns over Bowdens total lack of experience to manage such a proposed mine.
- The relatively short mine life with massive profits (not withstanding jobs etc) but leaving an environmental and health disaster for Lue and beyond forever.
- Why are Bowdens buying 2 full page ads in The Mudgee Guardian with complete untruths. These ads refer to the mine being a Silver mine based on Revenue, a complete distortion of the facts when referring to material mined, in fact the add deny's it's a lead mine. Again I note by volume its a Lead 42%, Zinc 57.5% Silver .5% mine. Obviously Silver is way more valuable, but what a sneaky and dishonest way to fiddle with the facts, They report the Lue Community supports the mine – not true

They use the term "Not Adversely" affecting the health of the surrounding community, a very ambiguous statement.

Their adds don't refer to the habitats of the Koala, Honeyeaters, etc because they are all bad news, nor the Cynanide plant, adjacent property values, truck routes etc.

In conclusion I make the very important observation – Bowdens employ and pay for all the consultants reports, and the E.I.S, so naturally via negotiations and continual communication are able to ensure favourable outcomes in such reports to suit their purpose.

Therefore if Bowdens believe their application to mine Lead, Zinc and very minimal Silver is safe, will the Director's of Bowdens and all the critical

Consultants provide unconditional and legally binding "PERSONAL GUARANTEES" underwriting the accuracy of the EIS. My educated guess is NO and therefore one must view the EIS as a flawed document notwithstanding the alternative findings from "Experts" provided by the Lue Action Group & hopefully the Department of Planning itself.