

S G Barry and T M Harris

1020 Burnt Yards Road

Burnt Yards, NSW, 2792

“Property 65”

## Submission regarding Cadia East Gold/Copper Project – Modification 14

We object to a number of proposals raised in the above development application;

- Water

Expansion of the southern tailings dam will have a negative effect on the inflows into Flyers Creek. The disrupted landscape and lessened inflows will also have a cumulative effect on the Belabula River. These negative impacts should be considered in conjunction with the negative impacts of the proposed McPhillamy’s gold project – not be seen in isolation.

Cadia’s proposed ore increase in output in Mod 14 roughly equates to 50% of the Mine’s originally proposed and approved annual output, exponentially rising to 32Mtpa with consequent increase in water usage to 160 ML/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 ML/day.**

- Dust

Cadia has a demonstrated, proven inability to suppress dust escaping from its workings. This situation has existed for many years.

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

Despite Cadia’s efforts as described at great length in monthly reports, dust is still regularly blanketing the community and Cadia continually treats major dust events just as a matter of recording. Significant dust events recently occurred on the 26th Jan 2021 and 12<sup>th</sup> Feb 2021. The gravity of these breaches is often lost in their report’s details.

The March 2018 embankment collapse demonstrated the glaring incompetence of Cadia engineers. Why would we have confidence that future engineering outcomes would be any better.

Cadia’s current air quality criteria is determined in effect by PA 06-0295 and is based upon air quality standards in place at the time of the original approval 30 years ago. These standards did not consider fine particles which are more dangerous and travel further. This air quality standard is now obsolete and less onerous than standards expected by the World Health Organisation and the current NSW EPA impact assessment

Cadia barely complies with the current air quality standards and definitely will not comply, even at the current production rate, with the planned 2025 NSW EPA requirements.

- 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. Canobolas towers do not offend as much 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 and these fugitive lighting issues have persisted constantly for many years.

- Sodium Hydrosulphide Production Plant

Cadia is already one of the world's most productive and profitable gold and copper mines. Why does Cadia seek to introduce a Sodium Hydrosulphide Production Plant given the potential negative impacts on Cadia residents and the wider community?

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 ?

- Lack of appropriate 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 DPIE or Cadia. We only received a letter from the DPIE in the post on 12<sup>th</sup> February 2021. The last newsletter from Cadia – dated January 2021 which was received only a week ago – only contained a half page about modification 14.

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** .

- Loss of productive land

Should the expansion of the STSF occur there will be a significant loss of valuable and productive farming land and valuable habitat for endangered species such as the Superb Parrot.

- Concluding comments

The original EIS was published in 2009. Within 12 years we are at Modification 14! This suggests a complete lack of forward planning at Newcrest or is this just a strategy to creep changes through. Endless, futile and exhausting consultation is one of the favoured weapons of the mining industry.

Newcrest has, by incremental stealth, exponentially expanded its domain over this area/community in a fashion akin to an incurable cancer. We ask, for instance, why Cadia is allowed to infiltrate local schools, spreading mining propaganda and seeking “social licence”.

For a period there was a level of acceptance that the mine was here and there are some community benefits. However it is increasingly apparent that those benefits come at a disproportionate cost to a few. . The community's willingness to bear the personal costs for the benefits to the region is being sorely tested.