



**John Gerathy
"Errowanbang"
Errowanbang 2791**

**OBJECTION AND SUBMISSION to CADIA East Gold/Copper Project
MODIFICATION No 14
MP06-0295-Mod 14**

I OBJECT unequivocally to the items highlighted pink on the attached Page 9 of the MOD 14 Application Report as detailed and submitted below. Attachment 1.

Background

When Cadia's mine was proposed in the mid 90s , I wrote on behalf of my parents , who then owned Errowanbang , an original William Lawson (explorer) property being No 54 in Figure 1-2b , the attached letter dated 29 March 1996 (Attachment 2) to the Commission of Enquiry Cadia Hill Mine.

Errowanbang is a heritage listed property on Blayney Council's Heritage Register and by the National Trust of Australia. Indeed the National Trust conducted an open day at Errowanbang on 30th March 2019 when around 650 National Trust members and others attended.

The matters , set out in my said letter , of concern to my parents remain my concern today , however, after 23 years of the mine's operation these concerns are shown to be well placed as they have come to stark fruition with Cadia failing repeatedly to meet SSDA conditions regarding all of the said matters of concern as elucidated below in this submission.

On 18 November 2019 Newcrest released to Investors and Analyst Presentations a paper titled "VISION for CADIA " " Building Cadia for a 50 YEAR FUTURE " (Attachment 2)

This document , issued by Francesca Lee , Newcrest's 'Company Secretary ` now also Newcrest's 'Chief Legal, Risk and Compliance Officer ` casts a totally different light on Newcrest's intentions for CADIA that is being portrayed by Newcrest generally to the community and as portrayed by Newcrest in this Mod 14 Application also as it has been portrayed by Newcrest in recent Modification Applications/Approvals.

This "Vision for Cadia " is essential reading for any person assessing Mod 14.

Newcrest has by incremental stealth exponentially expanded its domain over the Cadia/Flyers Creek/Errowanbang area/community in a fashion akin to a creeping weed infestation , like Sticky Nightshade !

SUBMISSION 1

This "Vision for Cadia " document , although sought to be refuted by Newcrest (email 13 July 2020 -Attachment 2), demonstrates why this Modification should not be approved unless and until a full blown SSDA Modification Application setting out the expansion proposals in this publication , including a mine life to 2065 , can be fully ventilated with the community and properly assessed particularly in the context of increasing ore processing to 35Mtpa and lifting the failed NTSF embankment by 40 metres.

Newcrest disingenuous ?

Under the Headings enumerated below I address my Objections /Submissions re :-

- 1. Notification/Consultation**
- 2. Water issues**
- 3. PROPOPOSAL TO LIFT THE NTSF WALL BY 40M**
- 4. Dust issues -Complaints to CVO and the EPA**
- 5. Health and stock issues**
- 6. Sodium Hydrosulphate Solutioning Plant**

7. Night Light Pollution
8. Commercial Justification

1. Notification /Consultation

The Cadia community of 280 property owners , their families and employees , identified in Figure 1-2b of the Application , **mostly did not receive any Notification of the Exhibition Period** from either the DPI&E or Newcrest/Cadia. **I did not receive any notification.**

Why the Exhibition Period was chosen by DPI&E , being during the Christmas and school holidays with the four day Australia Day long weekend intervening , and with only 14 days for submission/objection to the voluminous Application comprising over 1000 pages of technical yet crucially important material , **is inexplicable** .

This approach used to be expected of underhand property developers seeking project approval under the public's radar.

The Cadia community which , has settled , fostered ,improved ,worked and lived in this area for 200 years , only to see it destroyed by an ever voracious mine , **needs to be fully informed and heard as to Newcrest's proposals extending out to 2065** and in terms of the devastation of what has been their pristine environment **forever** .

Attachment 3 is correspondence between myself , other Cadia Residents , DPI&E (Emily Murray) , the Minister for Planning , the Secretary of DPI&E and Cadia/Newcrest . I request this correspondence be read , particularly my email/letter to Jane Chung the Communications Director for Newcrest/Cadia dated 7 February 2021 , which addresses the fact that I , like most of the Cadia Residents , had not received any Notice of Exhibition from Newcrest /Cadia nor the DPI&E for Modification 14 Application.

I had not received Exhibition Notice of Modifications 11 ,12 or 13.

Notification/consultation of and with the community regarding these proposals is virtually non-existent in the real sense of notification and consultation.

In my email of 7 February 2021 , I comment :-

“ CVO's attitude towards Cadia Residents and the wider community can only, at best, be perceived as disingenuous . “

When reviewing all relevant material I stand by that comment .

Community Notification /Consultation is an essential element of Planning especially SSDAs. **Meaningful public participation is dependent on accurate and transparent processes.**

SUBMISSION 2

WITHOUT NOTIFICATION THERE CAN BE NO SATISFACTORY CONSULTATION !

Mod 14 Application should not be approved. The fourteen days extension granted on 4/2/2021 still did not allow the community sufficient time to read , let alone assess , and make submissions/objections to this voluminous application.

2 . Cadia's Water Issues

Cadia's proposed ore output increase in Mod 14 roughly equates to 50% of the Mine's original proposed and approved annual output, exponentially rising to 32Mtpa with consequent increases in water usage to 160 MI/day currently – which already puts huge impacts on local water supply -rivers, creeks (including Flyers Creek), springs and bores.

The 3Mtpa increase in ore output will require 10% more water -176 MI/day.

The original proposal only required 86.6MI/day , Cadia needs double this amount of water for 35Mtpa and the system cannot reasonably meet this additional demand.

I refer to the Minutes of Blayney Council's Meeting of 11 December 1995 ('Council's Minutes') Attachment 4.

These minutes give a succinct overview of what was proposed by Newcrest as put then to the Community and a Commission of Enquiry. It is worth noting the contents of Council's Minutes not only for water issues but also other pertinent facts as herein referred to.

Given the experience and evidence of degradation of surface and groundwater supply as witnessed by the Community , this Application despite its reports does not satisfactorily demonstrate how this additional water will be sourced nor how the huge additional impact on the Community's water supply will be redressed .

It was only in January 2020 that Flyers Creek on my property Errowanbang (being properties 54 & 2125 in the Application) **ceased flowing for the first time in my family's 50 year ownership**. We are firmly of the opinion, although we were then then experiencing a drought period , the drought was not as severe as other droughts we had experienced before , that Cadia's water drawdowns from Flyers Creek created this flow cessation .

This event occurred under Cadia's recently approved 32Mtpa increase . It had never happened under any lesser processing tonnage limit .

Flyers Creek is recognised by Cadia as a perennial creek !

What assurance , given these facts , can the Applicant or DPI&E give that flow cessation will not become a regular feature of Flyers Creek on Errowanbang under a 35Mtpa limit ?

As a result of Flyers Creek ceasing to flow our stock and domestic water drawn from Flyers Creek was full of mud/silt which fouled our cattle troughs and house WCs for many days.

Recent correspondence between Cadia , Jann Harries (property 2124) and myself concerning dramatic drops in water flow in Flyers Creek is Attachment 5. This matter was raised with Cadia before either Jann Harries or myself were aware of the Mod 14 Application . Cadia's response relies on water license approvals irrespective of impact. **This reliance does not resolve the issue- that Cadia is drawing too much water from Flyers Creek at given points in time.**

Cadia's use of and reliance upon overall licensed water sources can give rise to large volumes of water being pumped from Flyers Creek , sucking upstream flow during pumping in rain events which on the day of the event takes out our downstream Flyers Creek flood gates but Cadia's pumping volume causes the stream to dissipate to pre rain event levels within 36-48 hours , leaving the stream without the benefit of water making its way downstream over a period of days/weeks.

An extract from Cadia's Newsletter for October 2018 (Attachment 5) demonstrates how easily downstream flow can be inadvertently decreased below 3.5ML/day. This is not the same as excessive pumping by Cadia after a rain event where normal flows are aberrated as happens with major cotton farm pumping from the Darling /Barwon Rivers- the rivers flow backwards !

What are the capacities of Cadia's pumps on Flyers Creek ?

How can they be governed ?

Questions for DPI&E in assessing Mod 14.

Flow degradation has a severe detrimental effect on the environment and ecology of Flyers Creek which is compounded and exacerbated by contamination, including salinity and heavy metal concentrations , emanating from the mines caving and crushing operations as well as leaching from its permeable tailings dams.

I refer to Water Analysis of Flyers Creek and a bore water on Errowanbang on 15/5/ 2020. Attachment 6. Both the creek and bore have become saline and not suitable for use except for stock and then preferably blended with other water (where from ?) . The creek has been forever used at Errowanbang on its gardens and domestic orchard. One can only assume the salinity and other contaminants emanate from Cadia's mining operations over the past 22 years.

Cadia has the evidence and it should be published under its EPA License 5590 and SSDA 0295 Approvals.

Accordingly I dispute and OBJECT to Cadia's submissions on water . I see the mine's detrimental affect first hand in Flyers Creek with cessation of creek flow and contamination of Flyers Creek and bore water on Errowanbang.

I also refer to leaching of contaminants from the NTSF and STSF as discussed in 3 below .

Cadia's effect on surface and ground water –creeks , bores and springs has been the subject of several reports during 2017-2020 and Cadia are required to keep records of their daily water drawdowns .

Cadia should be required to produce all current reports and records including going forward but in a form that expresses drawdowns from particular sources as a percentile of the total water drawdown on that day and also as a percentile of the allowable volume permitted annually from that particular source.

SUBMISSION 3

A.

Any Mod 14 Approval (which is objected to) must be conditioned to require Cadia to release all of its water reports and water drawdown records , to the Department and Cadia Residents and report , within a monthly reporting regime to Cadia Residents by an independent certifier , on all water drawn down by Cadia from all sources including its plant , pits , rivers , dams ,creeks , watercourses and bores , both in terms of volume and respective percentage from any particular source of the total licensed drawdown at that time and as a percentile of each drawdown of the allowable annual volume permitted from that particular source .

B. In addition to water usage , Cadia's operations and tailings dams pollution of both the surface streams and aquifers must cease before any further approvals by DPI&E can be made.

3. NTSF Uplift

Cadia disclosed in its Newsletter of August 2019 that the Open Pit -PTF and STSF had sufficient tailings capacity to see out the mine's approved life up to 2031.

Embankment extension of the suspect NTSF was not and is not needed to cater for tailings dumping during the mine's APPROVED 2031 life. Cadia can operate profitably with current ore tonnages and the STSF and PTF until 2031 during which time Cadia can prepare Applications to seek approval for extension of the life of the mine , increased annual tonnage if demonstrably necessary and use of the NTSF (extended or not) and other tailings dams.

Cadia has conducted extensive drilling on Meribah , properties 41 , 53 and others , immediately adjoining my property 2125 as well as other residents properties including Jann Harries' property 2124 , seeking to establish another tailings facility below the STSF. The STSF is leaking contaminants. Of the 40-50 drill holes a number are reportedly for water monitoring of the STSF contamination leaks.

The Meribah drill plan together with my notes of meeting with Cadia officers , Jane Chung and Matt Armstrong regarding Meribah drilling proposal is Attachment 7.

Despite the fact that Errowanbang (property 2125) adjoins Meribah and is likely to become an immediate neighbour to Cadia's proposed tailings dam on Meribah , NONE of this information is within Mod 14 . If Cadia wants to increase its annual ore tonnage and lift the suspect NTSF embankment by 40 metres , neither of which is needed at this time , one would expect the Meribah proposal would be included and explained in the Mod 14 Application.

Not so ! No transparency ! Disingenuous!

How can DPI&E assess Mod 14 without a full appreciation of Cadia's intentions for Meribah and as set out in its '50 Year Vision` Attachment 2 ?

It is not necessary nor correct, legally or morally, to approve any further works on the NTSF, save perhaps as submitted below for water storage creating dust suppression , until a great deal more enquiry is made via future SSDA Modification Application(s) to extend the mine's life beyond 2031.

There is undisputed high contaminant permeability of the NTSF and STSF into the aquifer. Cadia has not been able to stop this leaching of contaminants.

Cadia does not know where the source of the leaching is in the NTSF yet proposes to lift the embankment 40M despite having not having the ability to stop leaching from this dam.

It is presumptuous to approve any lifts to the NTSF's embankment , particularly given the existing contamination and general history of the NTSF including the critical extraordinary enquiry by the Independent Technical Review Board ('ITRB') and that Board's equivocal support for further lifts of the NTSF upstream. Refer to the ITRB's "Conclusion " and particularly the last two paragraphs thereof – Attachment 8.

Submission 4

I OBJECT to any works on the NTSF , save to the extent required to flood the dam to ensure complete dust suppression and potentially provide augmentation of water supply , subject to resolution of leaching of contaminants through the permeable base or embankments.

The NTSF slump failure is not minor as Cadia in their Application Mod 14 suggests . The **280 metre long embankment collapse** has caused , over the past three years , untold environmental and ecological damage to the local area and community . the area is regularly covered in particulate dust including silica. Cadia's erroneous statements in Mod 14 to the contrary are far from honest.

I refer to Gemma Green's submission's photographs of dust inundation.

If the NTSF is raised by another 40 metres it will , being higher , be susceptible to higher wind velocities raising greater volumes of dust .

The ITR Board notes in its report at 9.3 that “there was no loss of life due to the timely evacuation of the site “ , however , can such an outcome be assured in the future when the embankment wall is proposed to be extended up another 40M on suspect foundations?

Vale's Brumadinho dam disaster (Attachment 9) demonstrates the untold human , environmental and ecological damage that can be expected from a dam embankment collapse. **Vale's dam was , like the NTSF , built in stages upon poor or not planned for lifts. This is the case of the NTSF which has already failed dismally.**

Council's Minutes although apparently referring to a single tailings dam , as was then proposed , stated the depth of the wall was to be 91m. What would the depth of the NTSF be if a 40M lift proceeds ?

Cadia proposes centreline/upstream extensions to the NTSF's embankment as there is no room for downstream buttressing , resulting in the necessity to increase the steepness of the bank downstream from 3 :1 to 2:1 or even steeper at 1.75:1 as has been mooted by Cadia.

This would create a steep bold rock wall 40M higher than existing unmitigated monstrosity which would :-

- dominate the landscape - a visual environmental obscenity **forever**
- obliterate views of Mount Canoblas from many community vantage points **forever**
- defy rehabilitation **forever**
- create a risk to people , particularly youths , seeking to climb the face **forever**.

On top of these problems the embankment will supposedly hold back a huge volume of tailings including silica , susceptible to liquefaction (“ quicksand “) hundreds of feet deep , which pose issues :-

- in the event of further slumps or total collapse of the embankment an environmental and ecological disaster for the local stream , the Belubula, Lachlan and Darling Rivers (refer to Vale's 300 km downstream pollution).
- that an ultimate topdressing , as proposed by Cadia , with 20-30 cm soil to cap the hundreds of acres of tailings waste , will be eroded by either wind , rain , solar or otherwise degrade exposing the community to an everlasting dust problem. Refer to photo Attachment 10 taken on the NTSF immediately after the dust event on

26/1/2021 , which demonstrates the type of degradation of the surface that can happen from rain , within months not years . Degradation of the surface over years (1000 +) from the elements other than rain (wind , solar or plant degradation) cannot be discounted by the assessors of this Application Mod 14.

- there is no fully costed Closure Plan under Ancold Guidelines for the STSF or NTSF ! What are Cadia's intentions ? Does DPI&E know ? Can DPI&E approve Mod 14 proposing works on both NTSF and STSF without this knowledge ?
I THINK NOT !!!
- this surface exposes the future Cadia community to the ever present danger of walking or driving upon the dam's "quicksand " surface , even if an exclusion zone ,
forever.

It is only logic that the bigger and deeper a dam is the bigger and deeper the risk it poses !

It will be a game person who approves the proposed 40M upstream uplift of the NTSF without the benefit of a full EIS and SSDA Application to extend the life of the mine and addressing fully all the issues this collapsed dam raises.

Previous Modification Applications approving the uplifts of the NTSF and STSF did not , like the current situation , come to my attention until long after their approval . This is despite the fact that I was in regular contact with Cadia's senior officers from September through December 2019 in relation to water , dust and NTSF issues .

Refer to Attachment 11 being correspondence , including formal agreements , between Cadia's then General Manager Peter Sharpe and myself , on behalf of the community, regarding ALL of the issues Cadia's operations were creating for the community .

Cadia's agreements with the Cadia/Errowanbang/Flyers Creek communities to resolve community concerns regarding water issues , dust , tailings dams , community health , pastures and stock concerns remain largely unanswered and unresolved.

It is patently clear from all my meetings and correspondence with Cadia in that period and subsequently that I have made known my absolute objection to the 40M NTSF embankment lift. Notwithstanding this regular communication Cadia did not advise me of it's SSDA Modifications processed and approved during this period , the ITBR 2019 Report nor of this Mod 14 Application.

So much for information and consultation as required under the Act. DISINGENUOUS !!!!

SUBMISSION 5

- That no approval be given to uplift the NTSF embankment by 40M**
- That no approval be given to any uplift of the NTSF save for a few metres to create a dam to hold water and completely suppress dust emanating from its surface- (this dam could be used to augment Cadia's water supply).**

- iii. **That no approval be given to any uplift the NTSF embankment unless and until Cadia has applied for and had approved an SSDA Application to extend the ore output and the life of the mine.**

4. Air Quality - Dust Innundation -Breach of SSDA Consent Condition 17.

Complaints by Cadia Residents to the EPA , record , with photographs and videos supplied, serious dust events since mid 2018 emanating from the NTSF and STSF surfaces which events have not ceased despite attempts by Cadia with aerial and panther spraying/ mulching of both dams ! I refer to the correspondence in Attachment 11 referred to above in particularly in relation to dust from the NTSF and STSF.

Cadia failed for nearly two years , after the March 2018 NTSF slump (embankment collapse), to apply sufficient funds or works to control this dust . Following constant complaint and pressure from Cadia Residents , Cadia in April 2020 started to apply proper resources to try and control silica dust emissions from the NTSF and STSF and report monthly to Residents.

Attachment 12 has an email dated 16 April 2020 from Cadia's Acting GM with the first of its " Cadia Project Update : Tailings Dam Dust Management Updates " - "as requested by our community members"

Attachment 12 also has an email from me dated 27 April 2020 with photo of a dust storm on 26 April 2020 and Cadia's response of same date.

Despite Cadia's efforts as described at great length in these monthly reports dust is still regularly blanketing the community and Cadia continually treats major dust events just as a matter of recording . The gravity of their breaches is sought to be lost in their reports' works details. What is the environmental , personal , emotional , medical , pastures & stock affect ?

Initially Cadia had a dust monitor located at Errowanbang in 2018 because I had explained, that the **N/W wind vortex** over the ridge separating Errowanbang homestead from Meribah's permanent dust monitor **deposited more dust at Errowanbang than at the Meribah monitor** . However , because of the extent of the dust deposits on the Errowanbang monitor's solar panel , the monitor rarely recorded and was removed in 2019. Despite agreement with Cadia on 27 October 2019 to replace the monitor with an updated model , no monitor has been replaced by Cadia at Errowanbang.

Cadia's 10 th and latest "Update -Tailings Dam Management " 27 January 2021 is Attachment 12 **and reports a dust event on Australia Day 26/1/21** .

Cadia blames rain for this last event !

What a conundrum for Cadia , most people associate rain with mud not dust !

There have been dust events on 12/2/2021 and again yesterday the 18/2/21.

I refer to Gemma Green's , my neighbour in properties 62 , 2136 and others, **Objection/Submissions** , to be lodged with DPI&E re Mod 14 Cadia, which I have read, support and adopt generally and particularly refer the Assessors to her photographic record of the many dust events in the Flyers Creek/Errowanbang area since March 2018.

I refer to Frances and Michael Retallack's (property 2133) Objection/Submissions to be lodged with DPI&E re Mod 14 Cadia ,which I have read, support and adopt generally and in particular concur in relation to their submissions including on Air Quality , Tailings , Closure of Tailings Dams , Water and Water Contamination and Personal Health.

Submission 6

- A. That Cadia's Air Quality Criteria be updated to reflect the current EPA guidelines and be kept up to date ;**
- B. Cadia's production be limited to comply with prescribed air quality standards and**
- C. Given Cadia's current dust events in breach of SSDA Condition 17 no increase in annual ore processing rate be approved.**

The lack of enforcement by the EPA of SSDA Consent Conditions 17 & 19 is a matter of considerable concern and to be the subject of representation to the Minister for Energy and Environment.

SUBMISSION 7

The DPI&E must in assessing this Mod 14 Application call for and consider all records of the EPA and Cadia/Newcrest dealing with dust complaints since March 2018 .

5. Health Issues -Dust Regulations.

Appendix F Air Quality Assessment Figure E.3 does not allay the fact that anticipated incremental PM2.5 for CVO operations exceeds acceptable mortality risks to Cadia residents. Refer to the submission from Frances and Michael Retallack .

The jury is certainly still out on the effect of silica dust on humans, stock and pastures .

However it is indisputable that :-

- Silicosis is a disease/condition worse than asbestosis.
- The district is regularly covered in silica dust from the mine's tailing dams.
- Silica dust , unlike wind driven earth dust , stubbornly sticks to all surfaces .

- Cadia has done nothing to stop raw (carcinogenic) silica being constantly emitted from its operating plant and vents , despite numerous requests by Cadia Residents and other members of the community.
- Cadia has required its employees and contractors to shave and wear dust masks on site.

Cadia has been repeatedly asked to provide independent advice on community health related to the mine's activities , including community medical testing , as well as the effect of dust (silica and heavy metals) and water contamination on pastures and stock . No such advice has ever been provided. Refer to Agenda/Minutes of Community Meeting with The General Manager Peter Sharpe and other senior officers of CVO on 27 October 2019 and Cadia's response as well as my email of 20/9/2019 and Terms of Agreement with Cadia (Peter Sharpe dated 28/9/2019.. Attachment 11 .

SUBMISSION 8

Cadia must stop the emission of particulate dust and water contamination from the NTSF, STSF , PTF and Cadia's plant and vents before any approval is given to extend the mine's ore output and Modification 14 be so conditioned.

SUBMISSION 9

Mod 14 should , invoking SSDA Conditions 17 & 19 , impose a condition on Cadia to prevent any raw silica emission from the mine.

6. Sodium Hydrosulphide Solutioning Plant (salt plant)

Cadia is already one of the world's most productive and profitable gold and copper mines.

Why does Cadia/Newcrest seek to introduce a Sodium Hydrosulphide Solutioning Plant given the potential negative impacts on Cadia Residents and the wider community ?

What will Newcrest save by not transporting salt to Cadia ? Little when the cost of the salt plant and its operation is taken into account.

On the other hand ,what affect will be had on Cadia's current salt supplier , its employees and contractors , including freight drivers ?

What affect will the loss of the salt contract have on the wider community of the supplier ?

Cadia claims there will be no odour/smell emanating from the salt or Molybdenum plants, however , who can guarantee Cadia Residents , many of whom are downwind (prevailing) of the proposed plants that they will not be permanently affected by what is commonly known as rotten egg gas ?

SUBMISSION 10

A. The Sodium Hydrosulphide Solutioning Plant should not be approved and

B. Any Sodium Hydrosulphide Solutioning Plant approval should be conditioned for air quality as under SSDA Conditions 17 & 19 AND the same condition should be applied to the Molybdenum Plant.

7. Night Light Pollution

Lighting of any salt plant would create night time light pollution as indeed will lighting of the Molybdenum Recovery Plant .

Cadia has recently installed very bright expansive security lighting to **a warehouse at Ridgeway which is creating serious night time light pollution** visible for kilometres in a large darkened rural area surrounded by forestry . The faint red lights on the 20 km distant Mt Canoblas towers do not offend as the warehouse security lighting does .The community for over 200 years has been accustomed to pristine night time sky vistas. The security lighting is an environmental abuse.

SUBMISSION 11

Mod 14 Approval be conditioned to provide for Cadia to reduce light pollution from all offending facilities.

8. Commercial Justification

Cadia is already one of the worlds' most productive and profitable gold and copper mines and has been so for many years with lower processing ore tonnages per annum.

When there is editorial comment regarding Australian mining enterprises Newcrest is now mentioned with , BHP , Rio Tinto and Fortesque.

It is in this context that Cadia's publication 'Vision for Cadia ` ` Building Cadia for a 50 year Future ` should be read thoroughly by the Assessors.

Why does Cadia/Newcrest seek to extend mine processing tonnage to 35Mtp and also introduce a Sodium Hydrosulphide Solutioning Plant (salt plant) despite all of the existing real and undoubted greater negative impacts on the environment Cadia Residents and the wider community from both tonnage increase and salt production?

The repeal of Clause 12AA of SEPP (Mining ,Petroleum Production and Extractive Industries) 2007 reduces the weight to be given to the commercial value of the mine or gold & copper resources in assessing this Mod 14 Consent Application .

Cadia's argument for increased tonnage relies heavily on creating another 35 jobs at the mine. That may have some merit especially for Newcrest's revenue or executive bonuses BUT what about the negative impact on the broader community when a rolled up increase of approximately 50 highly paid mining contractors and supplementary trades , some with families , compete with lower paid frontline workers (nurses , nurses aides , teachers , teacher's aides , police , ambulance workers ,council workers and others working in the service industries of the Orange area) and others in the community for accommodation , life necessities and discretionary spending etc in the Orange district.

GENERAL and PRINCIPAL SUBMISSIONS 12

A. Newcrest/Cadia need to put their house in order before any further Modifications to the SSDA Mine Consent 0295 can be approved or even considered

Newcrest/ Cadia must:-

1. Stop particulate/silica dust emission from the tailing dams.
2. Stop raw silica emission from its plants' operations.
3. Alleviate the mine's impact on local surface and ground water - rivers, creeks, springs and bores in terms of both water supply and contamination.
4. Reduce noise emanating from its operations.
5. Control the driving performance of drivers of vehicles , both trucks and motor vehicles, employed by or servicing the mine.
6. Source additional water supplies – such as has been suggested by tapping into the proposed McPhillamy Mine 's water pipeline from Lithgow's Lake Lyell Dam

B.

Until these matters have been satisfactorily addressed no extensions to the mine's tonnage or NTSF embankments should be approved and indeed the existing 32Mt/PA tonnage approvals should be reviewed for compliance with existing conditions of consent and reduced to 28-30Mtpa .

C.

Cadia/Newcrest should work closely with Cadia Residents and the wider community to arrive at an ore processing rate (28-30Mtpa) that enables mining to continue profitably for the longer term while resolving current water , contamination , dust and tailings dams issues now and for a compatible long term(up to 50 years) future with Residents. DPI&E should actively encourage , by imposing conditions , requiring meaningful and binding negotiations between CVO , Cadia Residents and the wider community.

I declare I have not made any financial or other contributions to any political party in the past two years.

Dated - 19 February 2021

John Gerathy
Director Hamdaisy P/L
Errowanbang
Errowanbang 2791.
0425 225 940