

From: [Lesley Baker](#)
To: [Elle Donnelley; office@stokes.minister.nsw.gov.au](mailto:Elle_Donnelley@office@stokes.minister.nsw.gov.au)
Subject: Cadia Valley Operations Processing yModification
Date: Friday, 1 May 2015 5:02:38 PM

Thank you for giving me the chance to comment on yet another modification request from C.V.O. (Cadia Valley Operations) outside their original conditions of consent relating to their current C.V.O. (I am a CCC member

I strongly object to this current modification request on the grounds that although C.V.O. states "...net benefit to the local region and the state of N.S.W..." The actual fact no extra ore will be removed. It will be only over a shorter time period. Allowing for the seemingly rubbery time frame and extraction rates. Giving no substantial net benefit outside of original project expectations, other than to make a viable mining operation profitable in the short term for C.V.O

Sadly the continuous impacts on our own business and the adverse mental and physical affects this is having on my family seems to be never considered by C.V.O. when continually using this peppercorn method of application modification.

The current inability of C.V.O. to manage inputs of the mine at the moment eg:-
Having to rely on residents reporting concerns occurring with mine activities:-
DUST, NOISE ETC

The seemingly omitted impacts of the dust generated from collapsing of the high wall in the subsidence zone (currently occurring). This will only increase in events due to increased extraction.

The seemingly omitted impacts of tailings leaching in "Ground Water systems" (currently occurring) which will be greater affected by increased production of tailings:-

EG:- Shallow bore (MB27 did show evidence of some influence from influence from Southern Tailings Storage Facility. The increase EC, NA and SO4 concentration at 27 **suggest that the influence tailings dam water may not be stabilising. MB27 also appears to be influenced by Southern Tailings Storage Facility and deep groundwater.**

The seemingly omittance of any safety concerns in relation to workers in the mine - increased production equals uncreased risk. This seems very inadequate given recent potentially severe incidents in their mining operation - Partial mine collapse and workers close call on access road over subsidence.

The continual threat of potential devaluation of properties along proposed high voltage power route. Even with C.V.O. stating it is not needed, with their track record that could change next week.

I also believe it would be wrong to give C.V.O. consent to the proposed modification taking in to account C.V.O's past record with flow triggers.

Eg:- Diggers Creek breached its flow trigger and on investigations from

C.V.O. the original report used to work out trigger protocols -paid for by C.V.O. were found to be wrong by another report by C.V.O. ???

With current pollution occurring to groundwater and surface water streams from tailings (which has been occurring for several years) C.V O. just couldn't get a report to say it wasn't happening.

The destruction and segmentation of local communities resulting in the loss of the local school and amalgamation of Bush Fire Brigade etc.

The use of the boiled sweet method of community enhancement producing no real enhancement of a community that is being adversely affected by mine operations.

I would like to ask the question as to does the Minister feel that C.V.O's method of obtaining original consent to mine the n continually requesting modifications is a way of obtaining mining consent by it slowly increasing impacts which weren't fully highlighted in original application and would C.V.O. have been given consent originally if full disclosure of impacts were given.

Thank you for giving me this opportunity to put in this submission.

**Christopher Baker, "Bonnie Glen", Lawson Road, Panuara.
'Phone 0458128090**

..