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Public Submission

Section A: Contact Details

Please complete the following information. Your contact details will be used by the South Australian Government to acknowledge your submission. Those marked with an asterisk * are mandatory. Anonymous submissions will not be accepted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>M/s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*Name</td>
<td>HEATHER JOAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Surname</td>
<td>NIELD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Street / PO Box</td>
<td>PO Box 18 Rudall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Town / Suburb</td>
<td>Rudall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*State</td>
<td>SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Email Address (Mandatory for electronic submissions)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>08 8620 2056</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please indicate below which of the applications your submission relates to:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.A. Mining Application (MP)</th>
<th>S.A. Development Application (EIS)</th>
<th>Commonwealth EPBC Act (EIS)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Select those (one or more) which apply to your submission

Section B: Privacy

Please select one of the following options:

✓ I understand that my submission, including my personal contact details, will be published on the government website and provided to the applicant.

OR

I understand that my submission will be published on the government website and provided to the applicant, but I require that the government withholds my name and contact details. I understand that it is my responsibility to ensure personal information is not included in the body of my submission, any footers or headers or any attachments.
Australian politicians and leaders have lost faith in our country by allowing land, industries railways, silos and now minerals to be owned and controlled from overseas, destroying our living and our land.

We cannot do this in other countries.

Our next generation will be disadvantaged in farming if the Warramboo mine is allowed and the Iron Road Corridor starts.

We have a high standard of food processing we should not import inferior food detrimental to our health and livelihood.

The proposed Iron Road through good Agriculture land must never happen.

Farmers are trying to get their land closer to avoid big machinery on the road.

The Proposed Iron Road Railway will cause havoc stress and financial loss.

Once completed, return you submission by 2 February 2016:

By mail to:
CEIP Submissions
Mining Regulation
Attn: Business Support Officer
GPO Box 320
ADELAIDE SA 5001

By email to:
ds.d.ceipconsultation@sa.gov.au

On line submission:
www.ceipconsultation.sa.gov.au

Upload a pdf or word document at:
www.ceipconsultation.sa.gov.au
Closing down so many farm crossings will put more big machinery on road, also with sheep crossings this will mean more sheep on the roads, greater stress for traffic farmers and shearsers and when sheep are crossing the main train line, hoping the mobs can cross before being killed or derailing the train, sheep need to be attended throughout the year e.g. crutching, tailing, lambing, selling, etc.

Enormous waste of time and extra running seeding and harvest.

Daily school bus and routine crossings will be a nightmare causing unnecessary stress.

If there is an emergency fire or accident the train will not stop the iron road. This alone should make this unnecessary, impractical, non viable the iron road suggestion must not happen on agricultural land.

Once completed, return you submission by 2 February 2016:

By mail to:
CEIP Submissions
Mining Regulation
Attn Business Support Officer
GPO Box 320
ADELAIDE SA 5001

By email to:
dsd.ceipconsultation@sa.gov.au

On line submission:
www.ceipconsultation.sa.gov.au

Upload a pdf or word document at:
www.ceipconsultation.sa.gov.au
22 December 2015

CEIP Submissions
Mining Regulation
Department of State Development
GPO Box 320
Adelaide SA 5001

Attention: Business Support Officer

Dear Sir/Madam

RE: CENTRAL EYRE IRON PROJECT (IRON ROAD) – MINING LEASE PROPOSAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

The City of Port Lincoln has considered project summary and other information provided by Iron Road Limited in relation to the Central Eyre Iron Project. Council has noted with interest the progress of the Iron Road project investigations and proposals in recent years.

I now confirm that Council on 21 December 2015, resolved as follows:

"That Council responds to the public consultation documentation in relation to the Central Eyre Iron Project with the following comments:

- Council notes the significant environmental and feasibility investigations and assessment undertaken on the project and on-going stakeholder engagement by Iron Road Limited;
- Council supports the responsible development of Eyre Peninsula mineral resources and related major infrastructure, however, acknowledges that other stakeholders and authorities will be more directly affected or responsible and/or better informed to influence and determine the environmental and land use impacts of the project;
- Council recognises that significant mining investment on Eyre Peninsula would:
  • require a significant skilled and semi-skilled workforce, and
  • consequently liveable towns and regional centres that will attract and retain the required workforce.
- Council has responded in its planning by:
  • including provision for a possible phase of rapid population growth in the Port Lincoln Residential Development Plan Amendment,
  • identifying in its Draft Strategic Directions Plan (November 2015) that natural resource industries (including mining) should be facilitated and supported, and
  • committing to the investment of over $9 million to acquire and refurbish the Port Lincoln Leisure Centre including Indoor Aquatic Facility, as a regional infrastructure investment supporting ‘liveability’."

Level One, Civic Centre, 60 Tamman Terrace, Port Lincoln SA 5606 | T: 08 8621 2300 | F: 08 8621 2399 | E: plcc@plcc.sa.gov.au | www.portlincoln.sa.gov.au
I trust that this submission will be considered in the final determinations relating to the project and look forward to the announcement of Government decisions following the consultation and assessment process.

Please let me know if you have any questions about our submission.

Yours sincerely

Rob Donaldson
CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER
Submission letter – Proposed Warrnambool Iron Mine and Transport Corridor
To: CEIP Submissions, Mining Regulation, Attn Business Support Officer, GPO Box 320
Adelaide, SA 5001
From: Ken and Carole Wetherby, Soil Survey and Land Use Specialists
PO Box 59, Cleve, South Australia 5640
Date: December 30, 2015

The mine

The future will be bleak to say the least for Eyre Peninsula. The mine will eventually be exhausted, the hole will have taken up thousands of hectares that will not be used again for anything. Government should never have the right to displace families that have provided our State, especially Eyre Peninsula, with suitable incomes. These families should be allowed to continue to support our State for a long time to come.

Although the footprint of the mine is defined the effect on the surrounding properties is not. For example, the land adjacent to the mine will decrease in value due to real or perceived hazards as seen by prospective buyers, ie farm access, long term amenity for homes/affect of mine dust and salt on crops.

The waste rock heap will create a major dust problem if not kept watered – the water planned for this purpose is highly saline and the salt residue from the evaporation will create a salt crust which could be blown onto surrounding crops. Without water the planned waste rock heap will be barren and dusty – with the highly saline water it will still be barren as well as a source of salt. It has been suggested that topsoil from the overburden could be used to rehabilitate the waste rock heap. The shallow topsoil gets scraped away and stockpiled. The mine pit is dug, rock and rubble go in a heap. When the mine is exhausted the plans are to spread the topsoil over the rock rubble. As an experienced Soil Scientist I can say that plan will never be successful. The soil will quickly move down through the rock rubble at the first rain. Also great care would be required to keep the calcareous B horizon below the topsoil out of the stockpiled topsoil. Experience with mine explorers in the Murray Mallee and on Eyre Peninsula has shown that this plan will not work.

The mine pit will quickly fill with highly saline water once pumping ceases, (pumping will be required to dewater the pit in order for mine operations to proceed). This will create a dangerous deep and highly saline lake in a populated area.

No mention is made regards filling the hole created by the mine once the ore body is exhausted. This should be a requirement, and insured by a bond or levy on each tonne of ore removed. The thought of Eyre Peninsula turning into a moonscape unfit for any land use is unimaginable.

The transport corridor

In the Iron Road Proposal presented at an Iron Road meeting in Rudall the area for the train corridor was falsely identified as drift/scrub land instead of viable producing farm land.

Explosives will need to be used. As far as the farmers know no independent scientific data has been presented regarding the damage blasting will inflict on the Eyre Peninsula’s very fragile water supply.
If only half of the approximately 46 farmers involved in the rail route are forced off their land all communities will suffer. Businesses will suffer badly. We have been told there is to be a 'village' built for the workers in the mine. This means there will not be families brought to the district so our schools, etc will not benefit in any way if this project goes ahead.

No mention is made of the effect the proposed rail-line will have on salinisation of land adjoining the two rivers or the paleochannels the rail-line will cross. Comparison of early vegetation surveys before the construction of the existing railway and more recent aerial photographs shows that salt scalds have developed both upstream and downstream where the line crosses both the Driver and Dutton rivers. This is due to deep compaction in saturated or near saturated material below the line. The same scenario no doubt exists for the paleochannels but they have not been mapped.

The inconvenience to landowners whose properties are bisected by the proposed corridor have been widely discussed, however solutions offered are generally highly impractical, very costly and dangerous. The thought of 20 or 30 open crossings is frightening. Also traffic interruptions on the Lincoln Highway, Cleve/Lock portion of the Birdseye highway and the Kimba/Darke Peak/Rudall/Kinaird Hill road would have a major affect on tourism and fertiliser/grain transport (if there are any farms left).

In short, the proposal and EIS are poorly thought out and highly impractical.

[Signature]

Receipt of this document would be appreciated
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Please complete the following information. Your contact details will be used by the South Australian Government to acknowledge your submission. Those marked with an asterix (*) are mandatory. Anonymous submissions will not be accepted.
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</tr>
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<td>08 8620 2056</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please indicate below which of the applications your submission relates to:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.A. Mining Application (MP)</th>
<th>S.A. Development Application (EIS)</th>
<th>Commonwealth EPBC Act (EIS)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
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<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Select those (one or more) which apply to your submission

Section B: Privacy

Please select one of the following options:

☑ I understand that my submission, including my personal contact details, will be published on the government website and provided to the applicant.

OR

☐ I understand that my submission will be published on the government website and provided to the applicant, but I require that the government withholds my name and contact details. I understand that it is my responsibility to ensure personal information is not included in the body of my submission, any footers or headers or any attachments.
Public Submission
Mining Proposal (MP) and Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)

CENTRAL EYRE IRON PROJECT BY IRD MINING OPERATIONS PTY LTD AND IRON ROAD LIMITED.

USE THIS FORM TO: Provide a written submission to the SA Government regarding the MP or EIS

Iron Road's Central Eyre Iron Project (CEIP) is a proposed iron ore mining and infrastructure project located on Eyre Peninsula. The scope of the proposed project includes an iron ore mine (MP) to be located east of Warramboo near Wudinna and associated rail, power, water, port and accommodation infrastructure developments to be located between the proposed mine and proposed site of a new deep sea port near Port Neill (EIS).

The Government has received applications for these developments in accordance with the requirements of the Mining Act 1971 (for the mine), the Development Act 1993 (for the associated infrastructure) including actions that trigger the Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act (1999)(EPBC).

Written submissions are invited from members of the public on these applications.

Making a Submission

We value your input and look forward to reading your submission. Please follow the steps below to make an effective submission.

1. Review Iron Road's applications for the CEIP, available at www.ceipconsultation.sa.gov.au

2. Decide whether or not to include personal information in your submission


When you make a written submission, that submission becomes a public record. Your written submission will be provided to the applicant and will be published on the government CEIP consultation website. This includes:

- the content of your submission and any attachments - including any personal information about you which you have chosen to include in those documents.

If you wish for your personal information to be withheld, you must:

- request that your name and contact details be withheld from publishing by ticking the relevant box in the form below; and
- not include personal or identifying information in your submission or attachments.

We will not publish offensive, threatening, defamatory or other inappropriate material.

3. Make a submission

To make a written submission, you have the option to use this public submission form which includes a cover sheet.

Alternatively, make an online submission by accessing the government CEIP consultation website (www.ceipconsultation.sa.gov.au) and following the instructions.

Provide your written submission to government using any of the following methods:

By mail to:
CEIP Submissions
Mining Regulation
Attn: Business Support Officer
GPO Box 320
ADELAIDE SA 5001

By email to:
dsd.ceipconsultation@sa.gov.au

On line submission:
www.ceipconsultation.sa.gov.au

Upload a pdf or word document at:
www.ceipconsultation.sa.gov.au
**Section C: Your Submission**

Points to consider when making your submission:

- Provide information on any aspect of the existing environment that either has not been included in the MP and/or EIS, or that you consider has been inadequately described.
- Are there any environmental, social or economic impacts or benefits associated with the MP and/or EIS that have not been identified?
- If applicable, are the proposed environmental, social or economic outcomes acceptable? If not, try and describe what outcome you would find acceptable?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Reference and Page No (if known)</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Groundwater example</td>
<td>MP 7.1.3 p53</td>
<td>Example</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure example</td>
<td>EIS 6.3.2 p103</td>
<td>Example</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deceptive Statements</td>
<td></td>
<td>2% of farming land will be impacted by CEIP is a deceptive statement. E.g., Destroy 0.2% of an engine, and it may not operate at all. One property owner on the Iron Road Railway will lose 25% of his property. The diagonally cut paddocks are not viable to use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contamination</td>
<td>Exyre pen has a “clean grain” record in due respect to what is being stated; this can be ruined by unseen accidents or circumstances.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corridor</td>
<td>The feasibility study that once the Iron Road Corridor is operating, this could bring in iron ore from 25% of Australian land mass. This would make it impossible to have yet another overseas grain buyer put grain on a 24 hour 7 days a week mining train. Whyalla is a mining town, not the proposed Cape Hardy. The proposed corridor to Cape Hardy must never happen.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population trends</td>
<td>I do not believe local communities will benefit. The more of Australia that is overseas owned and controlled the more foreigners will invade our country, less work for Australians.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total water destruction</td>
<td>The proposed open cut mining set in place to operate at Uley, Vanlina and later at Koppio will without doubt destroy forever Exyre pen sole remaining water supply. The Warrambooy mine could fill with deadly poisonous water the same as many other mines in QLD and elsewhere.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Government of South Australia**
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Reference and Page No (if known)</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fire Hazard</td>
<td></td>
<td>As with any other good cropping land not used this will be a continual fire hazard threat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noxious weeds</td>
<td></td>
<td>Noxious weeds will definitely spread the entire corridor length, a permanent cost to land owners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corridor crossings</td>
<td></td>
<td>It is not possible to cut across farmers paddocks stock crossings, machinery drive ways, daily school bus routes etc without causing astronomical danger, delays and permanent ongoing cost to land owners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dwindling Rural population</td>
<td></td>
<td>The suggestion that allowing mining on farming land will increase the population in the country is a complete myth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>At least 5 farming families will be removed forever, along with the land in permanent destruction. The increase in farm size with less people in rural districts is a political economic problem, that overseas invasive mining will never rectify but rather aggravate.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section D: Any other comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Warrambool Mine, Iron Road Corridor.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I totally disagree with the concept of destroying forever valuable agriculture land for the benefit of profiteering overseas mining monoliths. There is still plenty of iron ore available without destroying the life blood of our nation.

Australia has a debt we will never pay and rapidly we are being owned and controlled from overseas.

Our politicians and leaders have lost Faith in our nation.

Agriculture land, essential for human living, should at least be exempted from open cut mining invasion, the same as our National Parks.

However if this Warrambool Iron ore is so essential for human existence, it should be retained for Australia’s use only, processed at Whyalla at a much later date when it will bring real profit, and the route to Whyalla would be largely through grazing land. D70.
Warramboo Mine - Iron Road Corridor.

Long term financial loss to Australia.

To give away iron ore at $50 a tonne, then buy it back at $500 a tonne in the processed form is a financial loss no country can continue.

I believe overseas invasive mining has indirectly caused economic crisis high the downfall of our Nation. We have allowed wages and inflation to get out of control causing complacency and inefficiency, closing down our secondary industries and being owned and controlled from overseas.

This is the last straw to allow overseas mining invasion to destroy forever Agriculture land.

No open cut invasive mining on Agriculture land.

Once completed, return you submission by 2 February 2016:

By mail to:
CEIP Submissions
Mining Regulation
Attn: Business Support Officer
GPO Box 320
ADELAIDE SA 5001

By email to:
dsd.ceipconsultation@sa.gov.au

On line submission:
www.ceipconsultation.sa.gov.au

Upload a pdf or word document at:
www.ceipconsultation.sa.gov.au
Cover Sheet

Section A: Contact Details

Please complete the following information. Your contact details will be used by the South Australian Government to acknowledge your submission. Those marked with an asterix * are mandatory. Anonymous submissions will not be accepted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Mr</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*Name</td>
<td>Dariel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Surname</td>
<td>Archer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>BGC Contracting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Street / PO Box</td>
<td>20 Walters Drive Osborne Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Town / Suburb</td>
<td>Perth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*State</td>
<td>WA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Postcode</td>
<td>6017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Email Address (Mandatory for electronic submissions)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:darcher@bgc.cc">darcher@bgc.cc</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>0419195954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submission Date</td>
<td>27/01/2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please indicate below which of the applications your submission relates to:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.A. Mining Application (MP)</th>
<th>S.A. Development Application (EIS)</th>
<th>Commonwealth EPBC Act (EIS)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☑</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Select those (one or more) which apply to your submission

Section B: Privacy

Please select one of the following options:

☑ I understand that my submission, including my personal contact details, will be published on the government website and provided to the applicant.

OR

□ I understand that my submission will be published on the government website and provided to the applicant, but I require that the government withholds my name and contact details. I understand that it is my responsibility to ensure personal information is not included in the body of my submission, any footers or headers or any attachments.

☑ I have attached my written submission
Iron Road’s Central Eyre Iron Project (CEIP) is a proposed iron ore mining and infrastructure project located on Eyre Peninsula. The scope of the proposed project includes an iron ore mine (MP) to be located east of Warramoo near Wudinna and associated rail, power, water, port and accommodation infrastructure developments to be located between the proposed mine and proposed site of a new deep sea port near Port Neill (EIS).

The Government has received applications for these developments in accordance with the requirements of the Mining Act 1971 (for the mine), the Development Act 1993 (for the associated infrastructure) including actions that trigger the Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act (1999)(EPBC).

Written submissions are invited from members of the public on these applications.

Making a Submission

We value the community’s input, information provided in submissions is vital to the assessment processes.

Please follow the steps below to make an effective submission.

1. Review Iron Road’s applications for the CEIP, available at www.ceipconsultation.sa.gov.au

2. Decide whether or not to include personal information in your submission


When you make a written submission, that submission becomes a public record. Your written submission will be provided to the applicant and will be published on the government CEIP consultation website. This includes:

- the content of your submission and any attachments - including any personal information about you which you have chosen to include in those documents.

If you wish for your personal information to be withheld, you must:

- request that your name and contact details be withheld from publishing by ticking the relevant box in the form below; and
- not include personal or identifying information in your submission or attachments.

We will not accept offensive, threatening, defamatory or other inappropriate material.

3. Make a submission

To make a written submission, please use this cover sheet to accompany your written submission. Your submission can be provided in any written form, including a letter or email.

Alternatively, make an online submission by accessing the government CEIP consultation website (www.ceipconsultation.sa.gov.au) and following the instructions.

Provide your written submission to government using any of the following methods:

By mail to:
CEIP Submissions
Mining Regulation
Attn: Business Support Officer
GPO Box 320
ADELAIDE SA 5031

By email to:
dsd.ceipconsultation@sa.gov.au

Online submission:
www.ceipconsultation.sa.gov.au

Upload a pdf or word document at:
www.ceipconsultation.sa.gov.au
27 January 2016

RE: CENTRAL EYRE IRON PROJECT

To whom it may concern.

I am writing in response to the call for public submissions on the Iron Road “Central Eyre Project” by the S.A departments of State Development and Planning Transport and Infrastructure.

BGC Contracting is one of the largest Private Contracting companies in Australia with Offices in Perth, Brisbane and Whyalla. Since 2012 BGC Contracting have operated our Whyalla Office supporting our projects with Arrium Mining. With a workforce of over 380 local employees, BGC Contracting are an integral part of the economy and local community. As well as mining services BGC Contracting offer Civil Construction and maintenance services to a growing list of customers in S.A. BGC Contracting are members of the S.A Chamber of Minerals and Energy and host an annual giving program to local charities. It is the company’s vision to continue to invest, maintain and build our business in South Australia.

Iron Road’s “Central Eyre Project” represents a world class deposit of high grade Magnetite. Magnetite is a highly valued commodity in the steel smelting industry due to its high levels of quality, grade and low levels of impurity and other materials producing low levels of emissions during smelting. The project represents an outstanding opportunity for the state of South Australia to mobilise large-scale economic benefits including employment, business investment, consumer confidence and support for further development of similar projects. The global investment community recognises S.A as a highly prospective destination – with several key projects being planned. Through the development of Central Eyre - Iron Road are taking a leadership role in mobilising the future economic prosperity of this region.

Please feel free to contact me for further comment at any time

Yours faithfully

Daniel Archer
Business Development Manager
Our ref  GCM
Your ref  452

21 January 2016

CEIP Submissions
Mining Regulation
Attn: Business Support Officer
GPO Box 320
ADELAIDE SA 5001

e mail: dsd.cejpconsultation@sa.gov.au

Dear Sir/Madam

Submission: Central Eyre Iron Project

This letter sets out Finlaysons’ submissions regarding the proposed development of the Central Eyre Iron Project (CEIP) by IRD Mining Operations Pty Ltd (in respect of the mine) and Iron Road Limited (in respect of the associated infrastructure).¹

It is appropriate that we disclose at the outset of this letter that Finlaysons has acted for IRD in respect of the CEIP since late 2010.

As such we are very familiar with the content of the mining proposal and EIS.

This places us in a unique position to make a professional assessment of IRD’s applications in relation to CEIP in accordance with the Mining Act 1971 and the Development Act 1993, including actions that trigger the Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999, as well as the economic and social benefits, and environmental impacts, of the project.

IRD’s mining proposal (for the mine) and EIS (for the associated infrastructure) are comprehensive and professionally prepared documents which fully address the relevant statutory requirements for their preparation. In particular:

- the existing environment relative to the mine and the associated infrastructure has been properly described;

¹ IRD Mining Operations Pty Ltd and Iron Road Limited are collectively referred to as IRD
potential environmental, social and economic impacts of the mine and associated infrastructure have been identified;

- the impact events identified in the mining proposal and the EIS are appropriate as are the environmental criteria and outcomes for each impact;

- the benefits identified in the mining proposal and the EIS are appropriate as are the environmental criteria and outcomes for each benefit;

- for the mining proposal – the mine closure and completion outcomes and criteria are appropriate; and

- the community consultation process outlined in the mining proposal and the EIS reflects an appropriate process.

Grant of the mining lease and development approval for the infrastructure component of the CEIP will bring major social and economic benefits to the Eyre Peninsula and the broader South Australian community:

- job creation for 1,950 construction workers and 700 operational workers;

- 300 workers to be accommodated in a long-term employee village in Wudinna;

- an expected additional 196 jobs in Wudinna;

- an expected addition of around 0.3% to the State’s employed labour force;

- a reverse in the population decline at Wudinna and a return to population levels it had in the 1980s, with the following potential benefits:
  - maintenance of local schools and other essential services;
  - assistance to Wudinna DC in securing State or Federal funding for various infrastructure projects;
  - an increase in membership of sporting and volunteer organisations; growth of local businesses and industries; and
  - the creation of a drought proof economy, not solely reliant on agriculture;

- generation of an average annual increase to GSP of around $2.7 billion over the project’s estimated life of 25 years; and

- approximately 26% of direct construction expenditure on CEIP and 19% of direct operational expenditure to be spent on the Eyre Peninsula.

---

^ All information in this paragraph sourced from the IRD publication “Executive Summary Mining Lease Proposal Environmental Impact Statement”.

4326898 V1
IRD has worked conscientiously to ensure, as far as possible, that the environmental impacts of CEIP are minimised and that environmental benefits also accrue from the project:

- the innovative use of In Pit Crushing and Conveying (IPCC) will reduce dust and noise impacts and require lower use of diesel;
- IPCC combined with tailings dewatering will eliminate the need for a tailings dam;
- the Integrated Waste Landform design will allow for immediate and progressive rehabilitation and provide another opportunity for local businesses in the area of seed collection, plant propagation and vegetation monitoring;
- third party water supply opportunities – the mine is developing a major untapped water supply system that could be piggy-backed off for community or business use; and
- the requirement for a significant environmental benefit (due to native vegetation disturbance and/or removal) has the potential to make a meaningful difference to environmental outcomes in the region.

Further potential economic benefits of CEIP include:

- the upgrade of the electricity network/grid will provide a more stable electricity supply network for the general public and businesses across the region;
- CEIP infrastructure can be utilised for community emergency assistance – at the mine, the mine fire trucks, equipment and staff could be used in a farming/native vegetation fire situation, rescue or major road accidents, whilst the tugs at the port could be used in marine emergencies;
- the rail and port infrastructure has been designed for ease of use by third parties, in particular bulk grain export and containerised imports and exports; and
- road upgrades will be at the cost of IRD and represent a significant local government, localised business and contractor opportunity.
The high quality of IRD’s mining proposal and EIS, coupled with the benefits of CEIP to the Eyre Peninsula and wider South Australian economies, dictate the prompt grant of the mining lease and development approval for the associated infrastructure.

Yours faithfully

[Signature]

George McKenzie
Partner
george.mckenzie@finlaysons.com.au
+618 8235 7452
21 January 2016

CEIP Submissions
Mining Regulation
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- IPCC combined with tailings dewatering will eliminate the need for a tailings dam;
- the Integrated Waste Landform design will allow for immediate and progressive rehabilitation and provide another opportunity for local businesses in the area of seed collection, plant propagation and vegetation monitoring;
- third party water supply opportunities – the mine is developing a major untapped water supply system that could be piggy-backed off for community or business use; and
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Further potential economic benefits of CEIP include:

- the upgrade of the electricity network/grid will provide a more stable electricity supply network for the general public and businesses across the region;
- CEIP infrastructure can be utilised for community emergency assistance – at the mine, the mine fire trucks, equipment and staff could be used in a farming/native vegetation fire situation, rescue or major road accidents, whilst the tugs at the port could be used in marine emergencies;
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Yours faithfully

George McKenzie
Partner
george.mckenzie@finlaysons.com.au
+61 8 8235 7452
Lock, Erik (DSD)

From: Dallas Hay <dh@sharpairlines.com.au>
Sent: Friday, 22 January 2016 10:02 AM
To: DSD:CEIP Consultation
Subject: Support for Central Eyre Iron Project

To Whom It May Concern.

I am writing on behalf of Sharp Airlines Pty Ltd in support of the development of Iron Road’s proposed Central Eyre Iron Project.

Sharp Airlines first had contact with the then Geology Manager six years ago and has watched the proposed development grow over that time to being possibly the largest mining and infrastructure developments in South Australia.

South Australia and Regional South Australia in particular are suffering from a significant economic downturn, and amongst other factors the down turn in mining activity is contributing heavily to this.

This project if approved will employ locals, increase regional employment, create many business opportunities for contractors, subcontractors, tourist operators and improve the way of life for thousands of people.

It will also commence to re-invigorate South Australia generally.

If the project fails in the approval process, it will further highlight a failing State economically, and further stifle the limited investment that appears to be flowing into South Australia.

As a business and a Regional Airline operator providing services to remote locations, this project is vital to ensure that South Australia keeps vibrant businesses within the State and the economic benefits that those businesses contribute.

Put simply and respectfully this is not “rocket science” and the project for all the good reasons should be approved.

With Regards

Dallas Hay | Chief Executive Officer

T 1300 556 694 | M 0458 885 185 | E dh@sharpairlines.com.au | W sharpairlines.com.au

sharp airlines | Our people make the difference

25 years of

Celebrating 25 years of quality service.
Good afternoon

Please find attached our response to the above project with comments

Regards
Jane

Jane Jusup
Real Estate Support Officer

Direct: 08 8404 5262
jane.jusup@apowernetworks.com.au

1 Anzac Highway Keswick SA 5035
www.sapowernetworks.com.au

-----Original Message-----
From: ricop121@etsa.com.au [mailto:ricop121@etsa.com.au]
Sent: Thursday, 14 January 2016 1:21 PM
To: RES: Real Estate Admin
Subject:

This E-mail was sent from "RICOP121" (Aficio MP CS000).

Scan Date: 14.01.2016 12:21:15 (+0930)
Queries to: ricop121@etsa.com.au

This email and any file attachments are highly confidential. If you have received this email in error please notify the sender and delete the email. You should note the contents of the email do not necessarily represent the views of SA Power Networks, nor can we guarantee that the email is free of any malicious code. If you have any doubts about the source or authenticity of the email, please contact us on 13 12 61.

This email and any file attachments are highly confidential. If you have received this email in error please notify the sender and delete the email. You should note the contents of the email do not necessarily represent the views of SA Power Networks, nor can we guarantee that the email is free of any malicious code. If you have any doubts about the source or authenticity of the email, please contact us on 13 12 61.
Our Ref: REB 123.15

14 January 2016

dsd.ceipconsultation@sa.gov.au

Dear Sir/Madam

PUBLIC CONSULTATION CENTRAL EYRE IRON PROJECT

Thank you for providing the opportunity to SA Power Networks to comment on the above project.

SA Power Networks has had discussions/consultation directly with the developer. Any necessary changes/upgrades to our infrastructure will generally be paid for by the customer and not the broader community - in line with our Connection Policy/charging guidelines.

SA Power Networks may be impacted by proposed zoning changes in its capacity of operator of the State’s electricity distribution network or, alternatively, as a landowner/occupier. Irrespective of the tenure arrangement, all of SA Power Networks’ land interests will be directly related to the operation of the electricity distribution network.

It is not practical for SA Power Networks to review every DPA to the extent necessary to comment on its individual property ownerships/occupations or infrastructure impacts. Accordingly, this response has been prepared to draw attention in a general way to the matters which SA Power Networks believes should be taken into consideration in progressing the proposal.

SA Power Networks takes its obligations to meet future electricity demand very seriously. You will appreciate that any infill or green field development will necessarily require a corresponding upgrade of the electricity distribution network (which may involve the setting aside of land for a new substation in, say, a residential area).

Whilst the DPA may flag potential development of this nature, prospective developers and those approving developments should give consideration to the current network capacity, the long lead times in meeting any increased load demand, and the requirement for developers to contribute towards augmentation of the upstream electricity network along with funding direct costs associated with extension/connection of electrical infrastructure specifically for their development. Developers should contact SA Power Networks’ Builders and Contractors line directly in this regard on phone number: 1300 650 014.

It is preferred that developers refer to the SA Power Networks Distribution Annual Planning Report for up to date augmentation information. This is a public report available at the following link, http://www.sapowernetworks.com.au/centric/industry/our_network/annual_network_plans/distribution_annual_planning_report.jsp

If requiring further clarification or information please contact Jane Jusup, Real Estate Support Officer on 8404 5262, thank you again for the opportunity to comment.

Yours sincerely,

Maria Antoniou
Real Estate Advisor
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Zonge Engineering & Research Organization (Aust) Pty Ltd

Mrs Kelly Keates

39 Raglan Ave

Edwardstown SA 5039

<a href="k.j.keates@zonge.com.au"
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17-Dec-15

5th Australian Mining Application (MP), 5th Australian Development Application (EIS), Commonwealth EPBC Act (EIS)

0 - I understand that my submission, including my personal contact details, will be published on the government website and provided to the applicant; OR

As a South Australian invested in our successful future I support the Iron Road applications and believe that they will bring economic and employment benefits to our state.

(No file uploaded)

(No file uploaded)

(No file uploaded)

Id: #267613
Public Submission

Response to Iron Road’s CEIP Mining Lease Proposal

Jennifer Sampson
‘The Warramboo Township and surrounding area comprised around 47 people and 30 dwellings at the 2011 Census’. This data is based on Mesh Block ID 40064060000 (ABS 2012b, Mesh Block Counts), which from the following map shows that it is a very small area, which doesn't truly represent those in the community that identify with being a part of the Warramboo suburb. The Census in Table 3-3 (MLP Appendices Vol 3 p 24) clearly shows that the suburb of Warramboo’s Number of usual Residents is 300. What reason does Iron Road have for referencing the Mesh Block statistic? Clearly the proposed mine at Warramboo will impact on more locals than just within the Mesh Block.

2.2.1

Scant regard has been given to the services that are offered at the township of Warramboo. The MLP fails to recognise several businesses and services that operate from the town, namely

- Stringer Engineering
- Robert Norris Plumbing Gas Tiling
- EP Abrasive Blasting & Restoration
- Eyre Peninsula Carpet Care
- Cash for Scrap
- Fencing Contractor
- Viterra Warramboo silos
- Warramboo refuse depot
- Local hall, which houses a gymnasium for the local group
Table 2-1 fails to list a liquor licence for Warramboo. The Warramboo Community Club operates as a licensed Club. Who was consulted for the background information on the township of Warramboo? How was the existing environment researched? When was the town visited to collect information about the existing environment? Table 2-1 also fails to acknowledge that the township of Lock has a swimming pool.

**Chapter 5 Stakeholder Consultation**

In my opinion, Iron Road has failed to provide a satisfactory consultation process for the local community. Iron Road has fallen short on providing answers to all questions asked of them. They have not been respectful of the farming community’s seasonal timelines. They have talked a lot and made empty promises to the locals. They have failed to consult with all local community groups that will be directly affected by the proposed mine.

5.3

How will Iron Road ‘seek to leave the (Warramboo) community with lasting positive benefits following mine closure’? What will be the lasting benefits for the Warramboo community? How will Iron Road ‘strive to leave the (Warramboo) community with no lasting negative impacts’? Road closures will have immediate and lasting negative impacts on the Warramboo community, for example, farmers will lose access routes, sporting clubs will lose membership bases, clubs and community groups will lose volunteers.

Iron Road has not met the ‘Accessible and Timely’ principle of SACOME’s *Code of Practice for Stakeholder and Community Engagement*. For example: Talking Topic Round Table Session 1 – Water, as indicated on Table 5-6, had to be rerun. Iron Road held it on a day that was a clearing sale day for a local farming family. Most of the community were involved in this through volunteering and/or as buyers. As Iron Road’s local employee would know this type of event in a small community usually requires most members to be present in one capacity or another and the day is busy and long. Compounding this was that the notifications of the Talking Topic meeting only arrived in the mail on the day of the meeting, so most didn’t know of the meeting until after the event. The meeting went ahead, but was eventually rerun after I objected about the timing and accessibility due to reasons stated above. Repeatedly, community members have asked that Iron Road be mindful of the farming calendar, especially the seeding and harvest seasons. Yet, incredibly, we found that Iron Road submitted their MLP just prior to harvest. How could Iron Road overlook the harvest season when submitting their MLP? Who takes responsibility for this, as those engaging with the local community have been made well aware of the busyness of harvest for farmers?

5.4

Iron Road continues to wrongly state that only six families will be affected with loss of land within the proposed mine footprint. On a recent regional radio interview Iron Road continued to perpetuate this misinformation. Even table 2-2 (Chapter 2.2.2) lists the exempt land within the Proposed Mining Lease Boundary as being held by 7 entities. All the exempt land is farmed by generational family farmers. Therefore, it stands to reason that more than six families will be affected. How did Iron Road consult with those directly affected? What information was given that indicated that only six
families would be affected? Is this statement of fact merely an assumption made by Iron Road? From experience, generational family farms will often involve family units of grandparents, parents, adult children, and can also reach beyond the property boundaries with some family units living off-farm. It also needs to be acknowledged that although a tract of land may be held by a named entity, it doesn’t necessarily mean that that named entity is the only business involved with the land. It is quite common for farm businesses to operate under a mix of company/partnership/trust structures. What consultation was undertaken to determine the individuals and contractors that each business employs over the course of a year for seasonal and general farm work? The proposed mine will also have an impact on these people and their families.

Table 5-2 presents several issues that also needs comment.

- ‘Focus Groups’ is listed as an example of Engagement Opportunities. Feedback to the CEIP CCC intimated that the Focus Groups, upon review, were deemed to be poorly set up and run and that Iron Road had been advised that information collated through this flawed process needed to be gathered again. What is Iron Road’s understanding of that review? When and by whom was that review undertaken? What were the findings of that review? It was quite a confronting exercise if individuals wanted to be part of the Focus Groups, with formal applications required. I believe that the application form was off putting for some members of the community.

- How well attended were the public meetings at Lock? At a CEIP CCC meeting, I had specifically asked Iron Road to inform me when these meetings were occurring, but I was never informed when and where they were to be held. I had told Iron Road that I would inform neighbours south of our farm about the meetings so that they could attend. As I wasn’t informed I was not able to give the details to my neighbours and they missed the opportunity to attend.

- ‘Community and sporting groups and clubs/associations’ are identified as stakeholder groups. When did Iron Road meet with the sporting groups of the Warramboo community? Where were these meetings held? What was the feedback from these groups? Warramboo has a cricket club, a tennis club, a football club jointly with Kyancutta and a netball club jointly with Kyancutta. It is stated that ongoing discussions with members of the Warramboo Community Club is an example of Engagement Opportunities. As a member of the Warramboo Community Club I am unaware of this ongoing consultation. When did this specific engagement take place? I do not consider attending the CCC meetings in the capacity of a neighbouring farmer means that I have been consulted with regarding the Warramboo Community Club. This club has its specific issues and to my knowledge Iron Road hasn’t engaged with the committee of the Club. This is borne out by the fact that Iron Road in the MLP did not recognise that the Warramboo Community Club is a licensed club.

5.5.2

The only one-on-one meeting that we had with Iron Road late in 2015 was unsatisfactory. The Iron Road representatives spoke briefly about the submission process and also air quality in relation to Dust. Our sons asked questions about dust monitoring, modelling, and costs associated around Iron Road’s idea that neighbouring farms should use crop yield monitoring programmes to monitor any affects and strategies designed to prevent an
anticipated situation or occurrence. Questions remain unanswered. How many dust monitors will be installed around and adjacent to the mining lease? Who bears the cost of farmers having to use the crop yield monitors to measure effects of the proposed mine? What will the cost be to set up these programmes? When asked if dust was going to affect our crop yields, they replied ‘No’, yet when asked to sign that statement I’d written in my notes, the Iron Road employee declined saying that he had no authority to sign it. Yet, he had no qualms is saying it. How can the local community trust the mining company when they won’t back up their rhetoric with signed statements? Iron Road was also asked about a presence of a Board (for example) to mediate between farmers and miners. The Iron Road representatives were keen to explore this idea volunteered by my son. What has Iron Road done to facilitate this? Who would Iron Road see as being independent to act on our behalf? How could this pre-emptive measure be implemented?

5.5.4

The CEIP CCC was facilitated by an independent Chair, but it is wrong to state that the chair was unanimously elected. During the discussion on a suitable chairperson three or four names were considered. One which some were keen to have was not acceptable to Iron Road. The meeting reached a general agreement around another name and that person was approached. No vote was taken as the CCC doesn’t put anything to a vote. To me it was more; those that preferred the other option fell silent.

Personally, I found the experience of being a member of the CCC frustrating. During the days before each meeting, I talked to many locals to gauge their concerns to present to the meeting. The CEIP CCC was often known as the ‘talkfest’. The very nature of our community is politeness to visitors, and I felt that this value was exploited to an extent. The local Iron Road employee even said on a radio interview to the effect that the company has been well received in the community. A CCC meeting was a place to raise community concerns. At one particular meeting, after strongly voicing concerns about a topic of discussion, I was asked by the independent Chair to not be negative and instructed that if I did not wish to be there I was free to leave the CCC. Why was robust debate of issues discouraged? As I was a representative of adjacent landholders, why was I shut down whilst trying to do so? Iron Road promoted ideas to members of the CCC which never came to fruition. When will the CCC as a group visit a farming/mining community, as noted in the minutes? Where is the comparison between Wudinna DC and Franklin Harbour DC in relation to the SIA? How much longer do I have to wait to see the promised list of jobs (details of job descriptions and number of workers required) that will be created at the proposed mine? I have been promised this list many months ago, and only a statement about number of jobs under general categories was given.

Chapter 7 Public Safety

7.6.1

‘Depending on stakeholder views and regulatory requirements at the time, the haul road into the pit may be removed.’ What does this statement mean? What circumstances would trigger this?
7.6.1

What will be the height and construction material of the external fence to the mining lease? Will it be restrictive to livestock and native fauna? On the closure of the proposed mine, how will straying stock be retrieved from within the mining lease fence? What protocols will need to be followed? Who will maintain the external fence on closure of the proposed mine? From experience, we know that the government doesn’t maintain fencing around Hambidge Wilderness Protection Area. That maintenance falls to the adjacent farmer.

7.7.2

What communication will Iron Road have with adjacent landholders to the IWL in respect to possible failure of the IWL? How will these landholders be notified of procedures to be followed in the case of a failure in the IWL? To what indicators will these landholders have to be alert that may suggest a failure in the IWL?

Chapter 8 Traffic

8.3.2

Lock Road is described as providing ‘access to a small number of farm properties’. One of our properties is on Lock Road and another is on Skinner Road which is a continuation of Lock Road into the Elliston District Council. Therefore we know how busy Lock road is. How did Iron Road ascertain that it provides access to a small number of farms? When did they conduct the survey to ascertain this? Our experience is that Lock Road is used by traffic travelling from the west of Kimba/east of Kyancutta through to Lock and onto Port Lincoln. Many locals use this road for that purpose also. During harvest this road is busy with grain trucks, several carting to Viterra’s Lock strategic grain site and further south, many times in a day.

8.6.1

Iron Road says that design measures for local roads will be implemented to minimise the impact the proposed mine will have on local roads and access for locals. At the CEIP CCC meetings this has been discussed with the Iron Road representatives. It appears that the MLP fails to acknowledge designs measures that were important to locals. Where has Iron Road implemented design measures identified through community consultation in their proposed changes to local roads?
8.7.2

Figure 8-7 shows the Module Delivery and Diversion Routes. Once again as I have experienced before, Iron Road is announcing without consulting and will be trespassing without asking permission. The short diversion route they have indicated that they will use towards the northern end of Lock Road diagonally across to Nantuma Road is private property. Seeing this private road listed as a diversion route for the first time was a bit of a shock. The photo shows it is a dry weather only access road, which belongs to our farming enterprise and runs through one of our paddocks. Considerable road works would need to be done to make this private road acceptable as a diversion road. How would Iron road upgrade the road? Will the upgrade encroach further into our land? When and from whom did Iron Road get permission to state that this as a diversion road? This reminds me of a previous time when Iron Road trespassed onto our property, and when they were informed of this, they made no apology to us, but Wudinna DC excused them by saying that they had given them wrong information. An acknowledgement from Iron Road of our concerns would have gone some way to restoring trust, but wasn't forthcoming.

8.7.5

Who is responsible for the cost of repairing any wear and tear to the pavement condition? How will Iron Road make restitution for the possible damage that may occur with the increased traffic generated by the mine? Who will monitor the pavement condition? What is deemed as damage to the road condition? As we have seen locally over the past few years, Wudinna DC is loath to attribute blame for the deteriorating road condition of Kimba Road on increased traffic associated with Iron Road.

8.7.8

The closure of Dolphin Road must not happen. Iron Road has been told that this would prevent the farming enterprise (Hagedorn’s) to the west of Dolphin Road from having access to paddocks. Figure 8-10 shows the mining lease boundary on the west side (from Nantuma Road to Warramboo), part of this is Dolphin Road. The solution to the problem that Iron Road has created for our community is to work with the Wudinna DC and realign Dolphin Road along the western boundary through to Warramboo. This will fix the problem they have created for Hagedorn’s and also will alleviate problems caused to the O’Brien’s. With the proposed closure of Dolphin Road, Kimba Road and Lock Road, O’Brien’s have had their farm access between their properties severed. The MLP states that this inconvenience will only result ‘in an increased travel time of eight minutes’.
How did Iron Road come to this conclusion? Who advised them of this? Iron Road’s local employee refers to himself as a farmer, as such he should understand the logistics of moving farm machinery, especially during seeding and harvest. For the O’Brien’s in particular this extra travel around through Warramboo, down the Tod Highway, out along Nantuma Road to the open section of Lock Road so that they then can continue onto their property could add upwards of an hour or more onto their travel time one way. How can the closure of Dolphin road be considered as minimising the impacts for locals?

Again referring to Figure 8-10, the sealing of Nantuma Road from the Tod Highway to the proposed CEIP construction camp and the sealing of Frischke and Kimba Roads through to a Northern gate of the proposed mine, will leave a section of road from Kimba Road along Mays Road and Nantuma Road to the proposed construction camp entrance unsealed. It is obvious to community members that having the sealed road towards the mine off of the Eyre Highway will mean that DIDO traffic from Whyalla/Port Augusta will come into the proposed construction camp and mine site via Frischke and Kimba Roads. The unsealed section needs to be sealed as well. Also, by sealing these roads, Iron Road will then be meeting their commitment to optimise the benefits for the local community as well as for themselves. What is the benefit of running the sealed Kimba Road only to a boundary of the proposed mine, when it can be continued around via Mays Road to the main entrance on the south of the mining lease? When will the sealing of Nantuma Road occur? What access route will we have to Warramboo from our property when this occurs? Iron Road has indicated that when work is done on Nantuma Road, there will be some realignment and straightening of bends. This will be a major work, so we need to have access routes indicated to us.

Chapter 10 Non-Aboriginal Heritage

10.5.1

It is stated that no additional sites of Non-identified Heritage values were likely to be identified. Who was consulted for this information? When was the local community consulted about this? This photo shows an old stone chimney, which is of great heritage value to our family. It was built by Otto Schulze (great-uncle to my husband) in 1920 on Section 4 Hundred of Warramboo, and can be found inside a paddock boundary adjacent to the Tod Highway. It is located within 5 km of the proposed mining lease boundary. The stone and clay structure is what remains from shelter built by the pioneering families when they camped away from home while clearing scrub blocks. My father-in-law camped in the attached shelter to the chimney when he was a young man clearing scrub to create farming land. The original attached shelter was made of 4 gallon kerosene tins cut open and erected to form a room. Those tins were removed many decades ago. Considering the fragility of the structure, I fear that any blasting at the proposed mine site would compromise the chimney, with the possibility of it being razed to the ground. The MLP states that structures such as this ‘could be impacted by construction, operation or closure of the mine.’
measures will Iron Road put in place during the life of the proposed mine to protect the integrity of this chimney which has significance to our heritage? How will Iron Road safeguard the chimney against vibration associated with blasting at their proposed mine site? If consulted, I’m sure other community members may also identify similar structures on farming land that was cleared.

10.5.2

Who will monitor the Warramboo cemetery for any signs of damage from the proposed mine’s daily operation? When will a comprehensive assessment of the grave sites and their headstones be undertaken for a reference point (baseline) of their condition prior to the proposed mine’s construction? As a community member who’s attended burials at the cemetery, the quiet amenity during the ceremony is valued. How will Iron Road ensure that they are respectful towards families and friends attending burials at the cemetery? What protocols will be put in place to ensure that these ceremonies are not interrupted by mining noise and blasting? How will Iron Road ensure that dust associated with mining doesn’t settle on the grave sites and cause damage to the various stone?

Chapter 11 Native Fauna & Pest Species

11.7.4

The invertebrate pest Common White Snail has been identified. What measures will be put in place to control this pest? It can have huge ramifications for cropping programmes and harvesting of crops. How will the movement of this pest be monitored? The train will need strict monitoring, as anecdotally, the snail will attach itself to this type of transport and fall along the corridor and the mining lease. Who will control this pest from spreading into adjacent farming land?

What limits will be put in place in relation to keeping of pets on the mining lease and in the mining village? Will domestic cats and dogs be prohibited from entering the mining lease? What monitoring and control measures will be put in place in relation to Silver Gulls?

Chapter 12 Vegetation, Weeds and Plant Pathogens

12.6.2

Who monitors the mining lease and IWL after closure? How often will monitoring take place? What monitoring programme across the seasons will be put in place? For how many years will this monitoring programme run?
12.7.5

At CEIP CCC meetings discussion in relation to SEBs was a big part of a couple of meetings. The independent Chair encouraged us to put forward ideas for local initiatives around SEBs. Individuals were asked to forward these onto the Wudinna DC for collation. I questioned any influence we as individuals would have on the SEB outcomes, and was reassured by Iron Road representatives at the meetings that our ideas would be considered. There has been no response/feedback about the progress of this matter even though it happened many months ago. The MLP clearly states that Iron Road is working with the EP NRM Board and the Nature Foundation about potential programmes that will provide suitable offsets. How does Iron Road see individuals as having an influence on SEB programmes? When will our ideas be discussed at the meetings with the NRM Boards and the Nature Foundation? Some of us spent considerable time and effort into formulating ideas. When do we receive feedback? What happened to our ideas that were presented at the CEIP CCC meetings? Has Iron Road followed up on these discussions with the Wudinna DC?

12.7.6

‘The integrated waste landform design enables progressive trials of rehabilitation and revegetation as the landform is developed.’ In the meantime, how is the dust associated with the bare earth on the IWL going to be controlled? How many years of trialling will it take to get this right? What happens if an acceptable solution isn’t found? Who continues the revegetation programme when the mine is closed? For how long will this continue?
Chapter 13 Soil and Land Quality

The soils may be nutrient poor in this area, but with good management and use of modern farming practices the soils do provide significant economic returns. Farmers understand that it is in their best interests to manage their land in a sustainable way. On the most part, we are generational farmers, so our tenure of the land is based on well considered use of the land for both cropping and livestock in order to support the current users and to ensure it is a viable concern for generations to come. Methodologies for improving the land are adopted, with most farmers engaging agronomists and consultants to equip themselves with sound advice. Farmers have an eye to the future, knowing that farming practices adopted today will impact on the sustainability of the land for farming forever.

All the mining rhetoric around use of the mining site post closure appears to be based on the hope that the modelling may eventually work through trial and error. What example can Iron Road cite that shows such a proposed mine can return to agricultural use post closure? What timeline is in place to ensure that Iron Road fully rehabilitates the land? How will Iron Road accept generational responsibility if the rehabilitation fails with each attempt?

13.3.2

Table 13-3 neither makes mention of uranium nor any other radioactive elements. Lead (Pb) isotope 206 is the end product of decay sequences of radioactive elements. Which isotope of Lead was identified? Was Lead used as a marker for the presence of Uranium? What isotopic form of Strontium (Sr) was identified? If Sr87 (the radioactive isotope) was identified, was this used to help determine the deposit’s geologic age? What analysis was undertaken to determine the presence and concentration of Boron in samples? Boron presents risks to cropping yields, and any dust drift onto adjacent landholders farming land may have impacts.

13.7.1

The MLP states ‘If elevated soil salinity off site does occur due to the release of saline material, the consequences are considered to be minor, reversible damage to local property.’ Who is responsible for remediation of local property? How is this undertaken and who pays for the cost of remediation of land? Will compensation be ongoing until full remediation is completed?
13.7.3

The MLP states ‘Sedimentation to agricultural land on and off the mine site is considered to represent a low impact, localised issue and able to be rectified in the short term.’ Who is responsible for remediation of agricultural land? How will this be undertaken and who pays for the cost of remediation of land? Will compensation be ongoing until full remediation is completed?

13.7.4

The MLP states ‘The consequences of incorrectly managing stockpiles are considered to be moderate; localised and able to be resolved in the long term.’ If this localised consequence eventuates, how will it be resolved?

Chapter 14 Waste Disposal and Management

14.7.1

Iron Road is proposing to send a considerable volume of waste to the Wudinna landfill. How will this waste be collected and transported? Whose responsibility is it to deliver it to the Wudinna landfill depot? Within the mining lease a vast tract of land is to be covered by the IWL. There appears to be the capacity to use some of this land to create a landfill site on the mining lease. The landfill will then be covered by the IWL. What is prohibiting Iron Road from creating a landfill as such within their mining lease? Has Iron Road considered this? If not, why not?

Chapter 15 Air Quality

Have comprehensive baseline studies been undertaken for the current air quality? This chapter is full of predictions and scenarios. What confidence can we have in modelling? Our existing air quality is very good or good, and this is what we stand to lose. Iron Road can only minimise dust to certain standards, which means that as a community our very good air quality will be compromised.

15.3

Plate 15-5 is misleading. Knowing the truck in the picture and the location, I can say with certainty that the truck has just entered the sealed road (Tod Highway) from across the railway on Zerk Road, which is an unsealed road. The truck-generated dust relates to the unsealed road and not the sealed road. Why has Iron Road included photos and captions that mislead the reader?
15.7

Tables and Figures in this chapter identify Sensitive Receivers and presume dust results given various scenarios. Our home is one of those identified sensitive receivers. When will Iron Road conduct baseline studies at these sensitive receiver sites?

15.7.6

What studies have been undertaken on cereal crops to support Iron Road’s assertion that ‘the cumulative effect of leaf shading, increase leaf temperature and blocking of stomata is expected to be insignificant’? What cumulative effect will dust with low levels of heavy metals have on cereal crops? What cumulative effect will dust with low levels of heavy metals have on medic pastures? When rain events wash the dust with low levels of heavy metals into the top soil on farming land, what effect will this have on crop production and pasture growth? What cumulative effect will dust with low levels of heavy metals, which settle on watering points, have on livestock? Also, what effect will it have on our woolclip? Iron Road has suggested the use of crop yield monitoring systems to support the landowner’s claim of dust impacts on crops and pastures. Who will pay the cost to set up this monitoring system? Iron Road also has suggested that it is considering partnering with the Minnipa Agricultural Centre to research effects of dust. Who will pay for this research? How will the research be monitored and reported? Research of this nature would take more than a season to gain sufficient data to make plausible inferences. When will this research be undertaken? Will findings be published prior to the proposed mine’s construction?

Chapter 16 Noise

Have comprehensive baseline studies been undertaken for the current noise levels? A community value identified at an initial CEIP CCC meeting is quietness of our rural setting. Iron Road can only minimise noise to certain standards, which means that as a community our quiet rural character will be compromised day and night.
Tables and Figures in this chapter identify Sensitive Receivers and present predicted noise level results given various scenarios. Our home is one of those identified sensitive receivers. When will Iron Road conduct baseline studies at these sensitive receiver sites?

Chapter 17 Airblast and Vibration

17.3.2

Figure 17-1 identifies Sensitive Receivers and the distance of those receivers to the nearest potential noise and vibration source. Our home is one of those identified sensitive receivers. When will Iron Road conduct baseline studies at these sensitive receiver sites to determine the current levels of noise and vibration?

17.9

Iron Road proposes to ‘manage the impacts and risks of airblast and ground vibration’ in compliance with relevant standards. Yet, as a community we will lose our valued existing environment, which has a ‘lack of human-induced noise and vibration’. What importance does Iron Road place on the loss of local community values? How can Iron Road compensate for these losses?

Chapter 18 Surface Water

18.3.2

Large intense rainfall events do occur during summer storms. The last three recorded on our property being in Feb 2000, Feb 2011 and Feb 2014. It is not a rare event. The last event in Feb 2014 when 82mm fell in a 24 hr period left lakes of water in the low lying areas. This photo shows our paddock after that intense rain. The IWL will be adjacent to this land on Nantuma Road. What erosion effects will such an intense rainfall event have on the IWL? How much run off will be generated by the IWL? In the
event that the bunds around the IWL fail, what damage will be done to our property? In the event of such damage, how will it be rectified?

18.6.2

One of the control and management strategies listed within Table 18-1 is the removal of salt collected in the ponds and bunds. How will the salt be removed? Where will the salt be taken to dispose of it? How often will the salt be disposed of? If during an intense rainfall event the bunds do fail, how much salt will be washed onto our farming land? How would this be remediated, by whom and at what cost?

Chapter 19 Groundwater

19.7.1

Considering our property is located to the southeast of the IWL, when will Iron Road outline to us ‘the potential of water logging and salinisation of soils’? Again, Iron Road has never mentioned this to us over the past years, so it is extremely concerning to read that our farming land is susceptible to this risk. What compensation would Iron Road give to landholders if this very serious risk eventuates?

Chapter 20 Visual Amenity

20.2.2

The included selection of viewpoint locations of the IWL in the MLP failed to show our suggestion along Lock Road that would typify the view that we would be faced with daily from our farm. This photo is looking northwest from our farm driveway with Lock Road in the foreground and ‘Hilltop’ farm in the background. ‘Hilltop’ will be buried under the IWL. We haven’t been shown the montage that would depict the viewpoint we would see every day. When will Iron Road present the requested montage to us? How much higher will the IWL be in comparison to ‘Hilltop’ farm? For the shading effect to cause this viewpoint to lose up to 15 minutes of sunlight, that would suggest the IWL will be an imposing presence on our landscape.
20.7.4

Our farm house will be relatively close to the main entrance to the mine lease. A community value identified by the CEIP CCC was that of starlit night skies. How will the main entrance be illuminated at night? What light spill will be emitted from lighting of the main entrance and the associated construction camp that will be used to house contractors and maintenance workers during the life of the proposed mine?

Chapter 21 Land Use and Tenure

21.2

What are the results of baseline studies for air quality and noise? Did these studies take measurements for a twelve month period? When were these baseline studies conducted?

21.5

The use of aircraft for agricultural purposes is only necessary when the seasonal conditions and economics dictate that this method of pest control in crops is warranted. This photo shows the use of an airplane for aerial crop spraying on our property. What flight exclusion zones will be in place in the vicinity of the mining lease? Being an adjacent landholder, how will any flight exclusion zones impact on our ability to use aerial agricultural practices?

21.7.2

How long does Iron Road’s obligation to maintenance and rehabilitation of the mine site after closure extend? Who makes this decision? Who takes responsibility if rehabilitation strategies are unsuccessful?

21.7.3

Loss of stability of the IWL has never been discussed with us (as adjacent landholders) by Iron Road. What protocols will be in place if damages occur to third party property? If our adjoining property is affected what compensation will be forthcoming? Will this compensation be ongoing until the damaged land is restored to its previous condition?
I have been told by Iron Road, in answer to my question, that there would be no rain shadow effect from the IWL. Now I see that there will be considerable shading of some of our cropping land adjacent to the IWL. This has never been mentioned to us. What effect will the IWL have on rainfall to the land adjacent to the IWL? Table 21-6 lists one impact event being ‘Land quality reduced off-lease as a consequence of microclimatic changes adjacent IWL (wind, shade)’. How will this affect our land? What ongoing compensation would be available to the landholder?

Chapter 22 Social Environment

22.2.3

The SIA was conducted by Rose Bowey (Rose Bowey and Associates) (Appendix Q Social Impact Assessment). One of the local stakeholders identified in this consultation is ‘the Wudinna Community Consultative Committee’. What is this committee? Who are its members? What are its Terms of Reference? How were its members engaged in consultation with Rose Bowey? The CEIP Community Consultative Committee was not afforded the same courtesy. Why was the CEIP CCC not engaged in this consultation process? Why wasn’t our independent Chair asked to formally set up such consultation with the CEIP CCC? In accordance with the CEIP CCC’s Terms of Reference ‘The Independent Chair will act as the spokesperson of the CEIP CCC’. I did make an appointment to meet with Rose Bowey after it was mentioned by Iron Road at a CEIP CCC meeting that she would be visiting Wudinna. I had to make that appointment through the Iron Road representative. I met with Rose as a landholder who felt that I needed to have my voice heard. I did not meet with her as a member of the CEIP CCC as I knew this was outside of my role on that committee. Prior to Rose Bowey’s visit to Wudinna, I did not see any public information posted to make locals aware of the opportunity to meet with her. It appears that Iron Road had given Rose a brief as to which stakeholders she should meet with. Was this the case? How did Iron Road inform the locals that Rose Bowey would be available to speak with affected stakeholders? Other than on Iron Road’s say-so, how did Rose Bowey gather information from other affected landholders at Warramboo? Which businesses at Warramboo were involved in Rose Bowey’s consultation? On meeting with Rose Bowey at Wudinna, I was surprised to find the meeting was conducted within the Iron Road office, with the Iron Road employee present at his desk. He was free to listen to all that I said and even on occasion added his thoughts to Rose’s and my discussion. When I asked Rose why her consultation wouldn’t be looking at some areas of concern that I had, she replied that it wasn’t in the scope of her brief as she was on a limited budget. Did Rose Bowey visit Warramboo? Why was her assessment dictated by financial constraints?

22.3.1

Figure 22-3 (Historic and Predicted Population Change in Wudinna DC) makes bold predictions about the population in the Wudinna DC. How can the ‘predicted population trend based on 1986-1996’ line dip below 0? Once the mine is closed, where will the ‘Upper predicted population trend if CEIP does progress’ line fall to? Indications, from media examples interstate, would suggest that the population of the Wudinna DC will nosedive on closure of the mine. To me, this graph is of little value and quite misleading with its representation in that it fails to show predictions post closure.
(considering all other chapters have referenced post closure scenarios). In the SIA ‘Populations Projections’ Figure 3-4, the Department of Planning and Local Government 2011, predicts that by 2026 the Wudinna DC population may be 1210. Why didn’t Figure 22-3 include this prediction made by the Dept. of Planning and Local Government?

22.7.2

The following has been stated ‘Iron Road will develop policies and/or offer incentives to encourage the operational workforce to relocate to Wudinna, or other nearby townships, which may occur over time.’ Then, it goes on to state ‘Research by the Chamber of Minerals and Energy (2005, 2008), Rolfe and Ivanova (2007a) and Rolfe et al (2007b) point to a range of factors that can affect workers’ locational choices, including partner and family commitments (such as job opportunities), existing social networks, access to education, health and recreational services, the availability and cost of housing, a preference for living in larger centres and other lifestyle factors and suggest that a LDC work style is a matter of lifestyle choice (refer to the Social Impact Assessment Technical Report in Appendix Q). As noted in the RDAWEP Regional Plan (2013), a proactive marketing strategy may be required to promote the area’s attributes in order to encourage workforce families to relocate.’ Why don't the same considerations apply to those that have to leave their farms through no fault of their own? Many of these lifestyle choices are relevant to the farming families that will be forcibly bought out at Warramboo, in that they relate to reasons for staying on their land other than just their ‘job’ as farmers. The MLP suggests that to attract a workforce to live locally more will have to be done other than just offer jobs. If this can be done to attract workers, then the same degree of diligence needs to be shown to those landholders that will, through no fault of their own, need to leave the area. Therefore, when mentioning compensation (incentives), the report should extend the bounds of compensation to landholders regarding loss of land, loss of partner’s career or job, family’s reluctance to move, loss of access to family and friends and other social networks, loss of work/life balance, loss of recreational networks, loss of preference for living in their rural farming community, loss of family heritage, and include other financial and logistical disadvantages. What limits will Iron Road put on compensation to the displaced landholders? These landholders will be losing so much of that which they truly value. How will Iron Road acknowledge these losses, other than through lip service? What tangible incentives will Iron Road offer these landholders?

22.7.5

The ‘potential changes to the social fabric and sense of community as a result of the proposed mine’ is a huge concern for the community of Warramboo. A farming community such as ours is close-knit and supportive; we value our sense of community and the sense of safety and security our community offers. The poem ‘My new Neighbour’ outlines community values that will be difficult to find in the proposed mine, by its very nature.
My New Neighbour
By Jenny Sampson

I am a farmer,
And a miner is my new neighbour.
Will my new neighbour pull-up at our boundary and have a yarn?
Will my neighbour drop-in during shearing, just to see how things are going,
And will he stand with me and skirt a couple of fleeces at the wool table,
And will he stay for smoko - a cuppa and home-cooked sausage rolls?
Will my new neighbour take the time to catch-up and compare notes?

I am a farmer,
And a miner is my new neighbour.
Will my new neighbour lend a hand with the little things?
Will my neighbour relay a message back home when I’m way out the back and can’t get a signal,
And will he lend me a jerry can of fuel,
And will he help get the motor up and running when I’m on the block far from home?
Will my new neighbour return a favour, or drop off a carton of beer just to say “Thanks mate”?

I am a farmer,
And a miner is my new neighbour.
Will my new neighbour work with me to improve our businesses?
Will my neighbour bid with me in shares for a stone roller at a clearing sale,
And will he work alongside me when boundaries again need fencing,
And will he let me know when the clay-spreading contractor is down our way?
Will my new neighbour share what he heard about prices and good deals?

I am a farmer,
And a miner is my new neighbour.
Will my new neighbour rejoice in my family’s milestones?
Will my neighbour wet the new baby’s head with me,
And will he arrive all smiles, ready for a drink and few laughs at birthday celebrations,
And will he shake my hand in congratulations when my child graduates?
Will my new neighbour reminisce with me at gatherings of friends and family?

I am a farmer,
And a miner is my new neighbour.
Will my new neighbour know to help me get back up when I am down?
Will my neighbour quietly and gently support me when I lay a loved one to rest,
And will he generously reach out in times of terrible illness, just to lighten my load,
And will his grown child sit and weep with my grown child when life’s tragedies befall them?
Will my new neighbour take comfort in sharing with me his sadness and sorrows?

I am a farmer,
And a farmer was my neighbour.
My neighbour knew me and I knew him.

Chapter 23 Economic

23.7.1

More recently, media and financial commentators are of the opinion that the mining boom is over. The value of iron ore has dramatically dropped. Considering that the iron ore concentrate prices are well below the suggested conservative price range quoted in the MLP, how does this affect the predicted annual revenue range? The MLP fails to recognise that the revenue generated by farming is largely spent within the community. Farmers outlay considerable funds locally in farm machinery, spray chemicals and fertiliser, fuel, fencing materials, etc. The local service towns exist because of the farming community. Farming enterprises are locally owned and their employees live locally. Iron road is suggesting that the CEIP will contribute on average $300,000 to local government annually. This equates to $7.5m over the life of the proposed mine. Is this sum a total contribution to all the District Councils? It is evident that the Wudinna DC alone will have huge responsibilities financially to upgrade and extend its services and infrastructure. This includes an expansion and upgrade to the airport and facilities, local roads to mine access points being upgraded and sealed, upgrade of some unsealed roads, development of services and infrastructure to support the mining village, and an earlier extension to the landfill depot by 15 years. These expenses, I imagine, would outstrip many times over the offering from Iron Road. How will Iron Road compensate the community for the huge financial drain the proposed mine will place on The Wudinna DC?
Being a respondent to the phone survey, I felt that some of the questions were ambiguous. For instance, Qs 14 ask whether the project is important to the respondent, the community and the region. From my point of view the project is going to have a huge negative impact on farming and our local community. **So, how am I to answer this?** To say it is not important doesn't reflect the negative impacts it will have, yet to say that it is important sounds like I want the project. The questioner could see my predicament and was not sure how to record my answer. The questioner also didn’t have any broad understanding of the project and was not aware of much about the project’s location and size. The survey took me about half an hour to complete as I had to explain my answers in detail so that I could feel as if my views were recorded satisfactorily.

I conducted a survey within our community a year prior to Iron Road’s survey, the results of which are in the pages below. I gathered responses from 145 people across age groups and both sexes, and recorded their postcode to give an indication of their residence. Once the responses were collated in table form I then presented the data in simple tables and graphs to better show the results. The results showed overwhelmingly the opinion of the responders.

- **87% disagreed**: *The Proposed Iron Ore Mine at Warramboo Will Save Our Community*
- **77% disagreed**: *Farming and Mining can Co-exist*
- **97% agreed**: *Lock the Gate to Invasive Mining on Arable Agricultural Land*

I presented the survey results to the CEIP Community Consultative Committee, Iron Road representatives and the Wudinna District Council for their following meeting. The CCC showed interest in the results and many thought that it was a fair indication of what they also were hearing within the community. Iron Road has never responded or made comment on it. The Wudinna DC tabled it at a meeting but made no comment. This is what has baffled me the most. The Wudinna DC has never formally gone to their constituents to gauge the community’s opinion on the whole issue of the proposed mine. Representatives of Wudinna DC are on the CCC, so they know that there are very strong feelings in the community from the feedback that is presented to these meetings. The Wudinna DC has recently signed a Memorandum of Understanding with Iron Road. **What is covered by this MoU? How does it affect our community? What agreements has Iron Road come to with the Wudinna DC? As Iron Road purportedly has a MoU with a grain company, about which we are not to know the details, will Iron Road give all the details of their MoU with Wudinna DC?**
A survey conducted by Jenny Sampson (Farmer and concerned community member), Warramboo SA

I conducted a survey on Saturday 10\textsuperscript{th} May 2014 at the Warramboo Community Club.

Central Eyre played against Wirrulla in Football and Netball on the day.

The survey comprised of three statements to which the responders gave their opinion by answering either Agree, Undecided or Disagree.

I asked each responder individually and they gave their response verbally, which I recorded on data sheets.

The total time spent on collecting the data was approximately 3 hours across the day and evening.

I told each responder that I was collecting people’s responses so that I was better informed on how the community felt about proposed mining on EP.

I read the statements and recorded the responses without discussion, (though much discussion usually followed once the responses were recorded).

The three statements were derived from media articles:

1. The Proposed Iron Ore Mine at Warramboo Will Save Our Community
2. Farming and Mining can Co-exist
3. Lock the Gate to Invasive Mining on Arable Agricultural Land

Along with their response, I also recorded their residential postcode, gender and age group.

I have entered the data collected into tables and from that have generated graphs to better show how the community feels.

Key to Postcode:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Postcode</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5650</td>
<td>Warramboo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5651</td>
<td>Kyancutta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5652</td>
<td>Wudinna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5633</td>
<td>Lock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5661</td>
<td>Wirrulla</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5606</td>
<td>Port Lincoln</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5640</td>
<td>Cleve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5641</td>
<td>Kimba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5670</td>
<td>Elliston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5671</td>
<td>Port Kenny</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5680</td>
<td>Streaky Bay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5540</td>
<td>Port Pirie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5453</td>
<td>Clare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5098</td>
<td>Ingle Farm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2447</td>
<td>Macksville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Agree</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Undecided</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Disagree</strong></td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Proposed Iron Ore Mine at Warramboo will Save Our Community

The Proposed Iron Ore Mine at Warramboo will Save Our Community

- Agree: 2%
- Undecided: 11%
- Disagree: 87%
Table 1: The Proposed Iron Ore Mine at Warramboo will Save Our Community
**Farming and Mining can Co-exist**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>5650</th>
<th>5651</th>
<th>5652</th>
<th>5661</th>
<th>5662</th>
<th>5606</th>
<th>5640</th>
<th>5641</th>
<th>5670</th>
<th>5671</th>
<th>5680</th>
<th>5540</th>
<th>5453</th>
<th>5098</th>
<th>2447</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## Table 2: Farming and Mining can Co-exist

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16-25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-45</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-55</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56-65</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-25</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-35</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-45</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-55</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56-65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56-65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Postcode</th>
<th>5650</th>
<th>5651</th>
<th>5652</th>
<th>5633</th>
<th>5661</th>
<th>5606</th>
<th>5640</th>
<th>5641</th>
<th>5670</th>
<th>5671</th>
<th>5680</th>
<th>5540</th>
<th>5453</th>
<th>5098</th>
<th>2447</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Residential Address by Postcode
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>5650</th>
<th>5651</th>
<th>5652</th>
<th>5633</th>
<th>5661</th>
<th>5606</th>
<th>5640</th>
<th>5641</th>
<th>5670</th>
<th>5671</th>
<th>5680</th>
<th>5540</th>
<th>5453</th>
<th>5098</th>
<th>2447</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Lock the Gate to Invasive Mining on Arable Agricultural Land**

- **Agree**: 97%
- **Undecided**: 2%
- **Disagree**: 1%
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>M Age</th>
<th>F Age</th>
<th>M Disagree</th>
<th>F Disagree</th>
<th>M Undecided</th>
<th>F Undecided</th>
<th>M Agree</th>
<th>F Agree</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16-25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-35</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-45</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-55</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56-65</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-35</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-45</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-55</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56-65</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Lock the Gate to Invasive Mining on Arable Agricultural Land
Final Comments

I am a farmer, but out of necessity, I have spent countless hours reading, attending meetings and writing about mining. Many of my neighbours have done likewise. The stress put on farmers and their families affected by mining proposals cannot be overstated. It appears that the community of Warramboo is being sacrificed for the short term gain of others. Most farmers are generational farmers and consider themselves as custodians of their land. To think that all the work put in over many years to ensure a sustainable future for food production can be undone and lost in one generation (25 yrs), is disheartening and totally without logic.

More recently, financial and political commentators are of the opinion that the mining boom is behind us. It has been said that we are now on the brink of a ‘dining boom’. Less than 5% of SA land is available for agricultural. It is critical that this arable land is protected and that our sustainable industry needs to be acknowledged as a high priority. Mining will continue to have its place in our economy, with vast tracts of land available beyond farming land. Invasive mining and farming cannot co-exist. A piece of land cannot be mined for iron ore as well as support cropping and pastures.

The proposed mine pit at Warramboo will not be filled. Forever it will be a huge hole in our community. The integrated waste landform will always be a looming presence reminding generations of the lost potential of the land. Surrounding land will lose value as families will not wish to live adjacent to a mine. Owners of this land will see their equity fall as land values decrease, thus compromising their whole farming enterprise.

The timing of the release of this proposal is of grave concern. Harvest is the busiest time of the year for farmers. It is a stressful time when we work long hours each day for several weeks. It is critical to get the crops harvested and the grain delivered and marketed. Following harvest it is important for the farming community to take some time out, to recharge their depleted batteries, to assess the year passed and have time with family and friends. To have these tomes of reading foisted upon us at this time with submissions due on 2nd February 2016, shows unacceptable disrespect from the mining company for the community in which they believe they are earning their place. On numerous occasions the mining company has been asked to be mindful of the busiest times in the farming calendar, and in particular, to avoid seeding and harvest when engaging us in consultation. Yet, we found ourselves in this very situation.

The Mining Lease Proposal is full of modelling and predictions. Depending on one’s perspective, this either will make for mildly interesting reading or will ring alarm bells. Nothing in the proposal is for certain and many negative consequences may eventuate in our local community knowing it isn’t a perfect world in which we live.

In reading this submission, I ask that all my concerns are seriously noted and that due diligence is used in deliberation of the Mining Lease Proposal.

I, too, can make predictions. The Land of the Crying Shame outlines my prediction.
The Land of the Crying Shame
By Jenny Sampson

See up there under the shade of the tree
The old man with a lad sat on his knee
He hand gestures from this to that place
And in his mind sees every old face
He talks of men past calling 'em by name
As he tells the story of this;
    The Land of the Crying Shame

His forebears left school and took up horse teams
To mark out rich plots and fulfil grand dreams
Long days of sweat and grime from toil
Taming bush scrub and seeding soil
Raising strong families to share quiet hope
As farms and communities grew;
    The belief that they would cope

Bushfire and searing drought will come and go
While sweet drenching rain makes everything grow
Fields ripple in waves of golden grain
Nurtured soil delivers rich return again
Proud producers survey their lands
As stock on lush pastures graze;
    The reward of well laid plans

Generations before and those to come
No more proudly stand and claim this as home
Offered a pittance and told to leave
With heavy hearts they will always grieve
Legislators must carry the blame
As rural folk marched the city streets;
    They raged, “IT'S A CRYING SHAME!”

Intrusive mining rods now core and probe
Urged on by fat wallets from round the globe
Razing blades scalp soil and plants from the earth
Hungry deep shovels gorge on promised worth
Noise and glaring lights intruding through lives
As heavy despair hangs like dust;
    The sorrow of lost paradise

Locals shake their heads in disgust
Prices are down and the company goes bust
Utter chaos it's out of control
Precious farmland now a raw gaping hole
Yet another repeats this horrid mistake
As elected men chase a quick buck;
    The anguish of bitter heartache

Ah see now they are picking their way back
The bowed man with the lad in his track
So many friends have long since gone
His family packed up and all moved on
Each new child he brings all the same
As he tells the story of this;
    The Land of the Crying Shame
21/12/2015

Sth Australian Mining Application (MP)

1 - I understand that my submission will be published on the government website and provided to the applicant, BUT I require that the government withholds my name and contact details. I understand that it is my responsibility to ensure personal information is not included in the body of my submission, any footers or headers or any attachments.

IWL and air quality MLP Chapter 3

From a cursory view of the proposed height and footprint, it would seem the IWL is not large enough to accommodate all the waste materials. The project description does not clearly state how waste will be managed and stored with discrepancies in the project description between different sections of Chapter 3. Table 3-7 says total of 7,415.2 Mt to be stored in IWL but Section 3.5.2 and Figure 3-19 indicate that only 1,800 Mm3 (3,960 Mt) will be stored in the IWL and the additional 1,570 Mm3 (3,454 Mt) will be backfilled into the pit (“Extra Zone A”) and stockpiled directly north of the IWA (“Extra Zone B”). Has the IWL been adequately sized to accommodate all of the project waste or only 3,960 Mt of it? Which case has the air quality modelling been completed on? Has the air quality modelling been completed on the basis that the IWL will contain 7,415.2 Mt of waste or 3,454 Mt? Does the air quality modelling include the potential storage of almost half the project’s total waste volume outside of the IWL (i.e. in “Extra Zones A & B”)?
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Cape Hardy Port / Port Neill Township

I think this whole project would be good for the township of Port Neill for the following reasons: *
Employment of 100 workers (port only) (and more during construction) would be good for Port Neill and local businesses in town (holiday accommodation, Port Neill Hotel, Caravan Park, etc.) as it will bring more people to Port Neill, which is in decline at the moment. * House prices will rise in Port Neill - the current housing market is very slow / stagnant at the moment. * The Port Neill Primary School is in danger of closing due to low number of primary school children. It is hoped that some workers will move to Port Neill, bringing their families with them, and thus stop the school from closing.

* I believe that the whole project will be good for Eyre Peninsula and South Australia. Young people will be able to gain employment locally again and not have to move away for jobs. You can only sub divide farm land so far. There is no room for expansion of land in EP.
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CEIP – Submission – 21st January 2016

As a resource industry professional involved from 2010 to 2014 in the Central Eyre Iron Project at Warramboo, I can attest to the magnitude and the economic potential of the Iron Road Ltd’s magnetite concentrate venture. Projects of such magnitude are usually developed in West Australia and so the CEIP offers unique opportunity for the South Australia to reap benefits of exploiting such massive ore resource. Apart from the long term flow of Royalties to the state, the benefits not only incorporate the export of a top quality magnetite ore product but also the associated development of new infrastructure in area of the state where it is badly needed. CEIP will generate substantial employment opportunities whilst under instruction and will continue to do so when production commences. From my personal experience the people of Eyre Peninsula are excited about such opportunities as CEIP will offer young people local employment and would slow down if not stop the drift from the farms to the cities.

Iron Road approached all the work in the most responsible way and ongoing environmental and heritage surveys and monitoring assured minimum impact on the environment. All the stakeholders were also engaged on an ongoing basis. This work completed to date documents the commitment of Iron Road to follow all State and Federal laws and regulations and bodes well for the future Central Eyre Magnetite mine project.
I would therefore like to express my full support for the CEIP project which, from my resource industry experience exceeding 35 years, is one of the best I was fortunate to work on. South Australia needs to have projects like these developed for the future benefits of all the good people of the state.
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Economic

Euro Exploration Services PL is an Adelaide based resource industry service company, established in
1995. The company has had a long term association with Iron Road Ltd and their CEIP project. In the
event of a successful development of Iron Road’s CEIP project it is Euro’s expectation that this will
deliver on-going and long term benefits to our company. This will primarily involve sub-contract
employment for geoscientific personnel - geologists and field technicians. In our experience with
IronRoad there has been a commitment to utilising local personnel wherever possible and Euro would
expect to continue this will continue, providing significant income revenue into the local community.

Employment

Iron Road and the CEIP project have shown a commitment to support local and South Australian
employees with training/education opportunities that Euro Exploration and Iron Road have developed
over the life of the CEIP project. As an indication of likely personnel numbers Euro has supplied up to 30
staff directly related to CEIP project over the last half decade, in the geoscientific area. Although future
demands may vary, it is our view that a project of this magnitude will present very significant
opportunities for our company in our traditional geoscience areas and also in new areas associated with
project development.

Local Economy

Euro has been associated with many other facets of the CEIP project over its recent past and can attest
to the financial injection that the project has made into local businesses. (Caravan Parks, Hotels, Fuel
Stations, Mechanic workshops, supermarket, chemist, tyre dealers)
2016 and beyond

As a long standing supplier to a multitude of resource companies within SA, Euro Exploration Services can see greater opportunities for support for further exploration and resource developments in the region as locals witness economic benefits of the CEIP project. These will undoubtedly inject significant new funds into the broader Eyre Peninsula region.

When I first saw this submission form I thought this has been set up for people to write negative comments with no feel for a fair/positive comment to be added. The word "Issues" in the heading makes you feel like you only need to write anything you have an issue with. No positive feel at all..............??????
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Employment

It is the Chamber’s intention to put forward a positive comment on the MLP for the Iron Road Project. (CIEP) This project will increase employment opportunities right across the whole of the Eyre Peninsula, not only through direct employment in the project, but also through a plethora of support industries. The company has been very particular in its community consultation regarding the positive impacts for the communities of the Eyre Peninsula. It is understood that the construction phase will employ a significant work force and that once operations commence the work force will still be quite substantial. Whilst there will be some expected fly in fly out operators, there is also a concerted effort by the company to have locally based people working in the mine. Coastal towns that are already favoured areas for miners to reside in during their down times are expected to have the same attraction for miners and support personnel fro the CEIP project. Employed people living in our Eyre Peninsula towns enhance the local business scene.

Economy

It is expected that the economies of the smaller towns on the Eyre Peninsula will be significantly impacted in a positive way by the project. Aside from the townships in the immediate vicinity of the mine, such as Wudinna, Kyancutta, Lock and Kimba, the economic impacts should continue to flow to other towns further south, such as Tumby Bay and Port Lincoln. Expected support industries and drive in drive out miners are expected to bring wealth and blossoming economies in our townships. This is a positive outcome that will be felt State wide.

Cape Hardy
The proposal to have a multi commodity port 27 km north of Tumby Bay opens many opportunities for local farmers to export grain through an alternative port. This makes our farmers richer and ensures that localised spending increases local businesses in the towns of Eyre Peninsula. Port Lincoln, as the regional hub is expected to benefit from this expected synergy between mining and farming.

Environment

Iron Road has been clear on the impacts that the mine will have on the local environment. There will be a loss of some agricultural land, but it is insignificant in comparison with the amount of arable land available on the Eyre Peninsula. Whilst there have been environmental issues, such as the large hole, dust, noise and increased traffic, there are many more positive than negatives. The environment will change in the vicinity of the mine. The environment in the vicinity of the transport corridor will change, but once in place and people are over the matter of "change" there are significant benefits locally. It is of course expected that Iron road would maintain the high standard of environmental responsibility as laid down in the MLP.

Power

The commencement of the mine may act as catalyst for upgrading the existing Eyre Peninsula power line to 275 kv. Whilst it is understood that there is no guarantee that this may happen, it is a good teaser for the State government to upgrade the rest of the transmission line. This will encourage new and existing industries to expand and operate with a reasonable electricity capacity that has previously been restricted by the old 132v line.

Whilst Port Lincoln and the Port Lincoln Chamber of Commerce & Tourism may seem a long way from the CEIP project, it is expected to be impacted in a positive way from a business perspective. With an increase in wealth across the region, Port Lincoln, as the regional hub will gain significant benefit from the extra people, the extra wealth and the extra business generated throughout the region.
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Lack of new projects in South Australia EIS 2.4.1

The project will supply job opportunities during construction and operations.

Lack of employment opportunities on the Eyre Peninsula EIS 2.4.1

Improved regional infrastructure providing a catalyst to additional development on the Eyre Peninsula.

SA Government debt EIS 2.4.1

The project will provide royalty payments to the SA Government.

I when I was working as the company Riskmin I provided several services to Iron Road including annual EHS audits, development of their OHS Management System and developed their initial Risk Register. I visited the proposed mining area several times and gained a good understanding of the proposed projects and its benefits to the local region and the state of SA.
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Lack of support for local people and towns EIS Chapter 2 section 2.1

I consulted to the Cowal Gold Project in NSW from 2002 to 2006 during advanced exploration, construction and its initial operations phases. The town of West Wyalong the nearest town and base for almost Cowal personnel before the project was commenced was a dying town with shops and hotels closing and people leaving. There was drought conditions and farmers were suffering. Once the project went into construction and operation the town recovered into a thriving community. Many mine employees were local people and many were local farmers who could earn money to save their properties. If this project proceeds towns such as Wudinna will get a boost like West Wyalong did as described above.

I made an initial submission on 21 January 2016 but thought of this example subsequently.
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We are one of the families that own land where the proposed CEIP rail line will go. We do not want to sell our land for the purpose of building a railway line.

We have told Iron Road that we do not want to sell our land and yet they seem to think that we have no right to refuse their plans.

Here are some of the reasons we believe Eyre Peninsula does not need another mine.

Eyre Peninsula is known for its clean, green image with agriculture and aquaculture. We are not even allowed to grow GM Canola. We have a low crime rate, almost 100% of our students in Cleve are employed when leaving school, there is little or no unemployment in Cleve, and almost everyone is a volunteer in numerous ways.

Eyre Peninsula has a mainly sandy light soil type that can drift if not looked after correctly and we get mainly winter rain yet we have improved our farming methods to now produce 40% of the state's wheat. We have learnt over generations and are still learning how to make it more productive and we cannot jeopardise all this hard work by allowing a train carrying a dusty, possibly harmful, substance through our crops continually for 25 years. We have to think that at some time with 4-6 trains travelling continually at 80 kph there will be a catastrophic accident, causing pollution, fire or death.

FIRE Hazard

The proposed railway line and above ground pipeline is an impassable structure for a fire truck fighting a fire as there are few proposed crossing lanes in the farming area. In the case of smoke obliterating vision when fighting a blaze men will not know where these crossings are to be found. They can cut a fence but cannot get over a pipeline. It is a death trap.

How can farmers move stock in the case of fire through narrow gates that may be on the other side of the paddock and in line with the approaching fire.

CEIP writes Pg 7-10 "There are predominantly low fuel loads resulting in quick burning grass fires" This is untrue there are predominantly high fuel loads resulting in fast extremely hot smokey fires, especially in cereal crops before and after harvest. There is virtually no paddock left bare because we continuously crop and do not fallow on Eyre Peninsula's sandy soil because of the risk of causing erosion. We have seen what devastation can happen in an agricultural area due to fire after the recent Pinery fire and that is an area where they do fallow.

CEIP writes Pp 11/12 "climatic change predictions indicate that bushfire events will increase in frequency and intensity in the Eyre Peninsula region" "There is minimal native vegetation within the region generally resulting in low fuel loads".

Where the proposed rail line is planned it goes right through some of the best cereal producing farmland on Eyre Peninsula with an extremely high fuel load and apparently more bushfire events with increased intensity .

CEIP writes pp 13/85 "Sparks from rail operation (e.g. bogle failure where wheel set locks up)."
If this happened on a train travelling at 80kph it would be a catastrophe. The fire front could be a distance of unimaginable length and the farming families who are the local volunteers would have to fight it.

CEIP writes Pp13/85 “The straight section of track adjacent to Hambridge (and therefore reduced fire risk).”

They have kept the rail line straight next to Hambridge to reduce the fire risk but we still have the track turning in the farming land where the greater fire hazard is contained with the greater potential loss of lives, dwellings, firefighters, and crops.

CEIP writes Table 13/24 the bushfire residual risk is classed as medium. A medium risk in my opinion means that it is a disaster waiting to happen.

HABITAT

CEIP writes 3/17 “Maximising opportunities for improved habitat for threatened species by restoring linkages between remnant vegetation.”

At the moment Eyre Peninsua has a unique passage of linked road side vegetation that is used by many native animals. I cannot see that a fenced rail line and above ground pipeline can assist in restoring linkages of vegetation because it will actually make fewer pathways for animals to cross and replanted native vegetation is very slow growing on E.P.

We have a very diverse population of bird life and Chris Smith who lives on Pederson road has taken photos of Crimson, Yellow, White and Orange chats, [not supposed to be found in this area], Pardalotes, Woodswallows, Budgerigars, cockatiels and many other birds living happily near her home. The noise of a train rattling past will move them on.

There are also, [my identification only] some Darke Peak Mallee [Eucalyptus cretata] growing on Pederson and Brooks Road. This only grows in rare areas and because this is an old Driver River pathway they are still there.

Water

CEIP 3.3 15 Gl of saltwater per year for processing x 25 years = 375 GL = 75% of Sydney Harbour. This is a great deal of water and a great deal of salt that will remain after the mine.

The current use for the whole Western Region and Eyre Peninsula is only 27.7 GL.

CEIP Table 10-15 write that they will use water sprays or suitable chemical wetting agent on susceptible earthen material loads, active earthen stockpiles particularly during dry or windy conditions.

Will this happen for 25 years. It will be an extraordinary job keeping everything wetted down. Then later when Iron Road cease to exist who picks up on cleaning up this mess. We hear of mining companies becoming insolvent or selling on to another company. Is the next company bound to keep any of these clean up commitments?
DRIVER RIVER FRAGILITY AND WATER FLOW AND SALINITY

The rail corridor runs over the Driver River Basin a very fragile structure. In much of this area we have limestone which is easily smashed and with the extreme weight and continual pounding of the ground by heavy ore trains, sections of the shallow ground water channels will surely be damaged completely.

15.3.6 CEIP write that the Driver River is considered to be in a poor ecological condition but actually this creek carries water down from the hills through farming land into the sea and it is doing its job. The salt bearing land is not increasing at an alarming rate and when we have a big rain event it performs as it should and carries the water through to the sea. We cannot allow the driver river to be challenged in any way it may have a devastating impact on EP.

15 5.1 CEIP write that during higher flow events the culverts will restrict flow.

The water has to go somewhere and if the culverts block the water it will spread out over agricultural land also spreading the salt.

15 5.4 CEIP write that the railway line will form a barrier to sheet flow and that sheet flows will only be able to cross the railway line at point locations.

Again the water and salt spreads out over agricultural land because there are times almost every year that the creek runs high and fast and often the main Port Lincoln highway is blocked to traffic by the passage of water.

16.3.3 CEIP write that the Kielpa domain where one of the production well is situated is in the Polda Trough and that recharge to fractured rock systems on the EP is not well understood and recharge may occur where basement material outcrops and sub-crops as well as occur via vertical and lateral leakage from adjacent aquifers.

This means that the interaction of the aquifers is apparently not understood and no one really knows the result of taking such a massive amount of water from a well in the Polda Trough. It may result in the mixing of fresh and salt water and to in any way put Polda Basin at risk would be totally irresponsible it is a major freshwater source.

16.4 CEIP write that specific geotechnical investigation will be carried out in areas of the rail corridor where there is potential for the rail to affect shallow ground water flows. Surely these geotechnical investigations should have already been done at the beginning of such a project and not left to this stage.

16.2 CEIP write that the current groundwater level would be reduced and the level of interaction between the aquifer and river may be altered so they acknowledge there may irrecoverable damage.

If the ground has been compacted when the water level has dropped permanent damage may occur to the passage of saltwater and then when the water level again rises this will cause salty patches to occur elsewhere because channels have been blocked and the water will have to find other pathways.
CEIP Figure 16-5 shows the extent of the drawdown it is incredibly huge and may take 350 years or more to recover.

CEIP Table 16-4 “Drawdown may reduce this saline groundwater inflow.”

If interaction between aquifer and river is altered after the life of the mine the salt may come up in different areas because of movement of the earth due to compaction from heavy train use.

CEIP 16.7.1 “It is possible that drawdown effects may be greater than predicted”.

Iron Road cannot be certain of the draw down effects and this is totally irresponsible.

MUSGRAVE PRESCRIBED WELLS AREA

CEIP 16.7.2 “Drawdown is greater than predicted” “which may impact groundwater receptors” within the Musgrave Prescribed Wells Area.

This fresh water is of critical community value and even a low risk is too high because once damaged or salt water enters the fresh system it cannot be returned to its pristine condition.

CEIP write that it is considered possible that a leak or spill could occur during [construction] operation of CEIP infrastructure. Pp 16.24.

How can this be considered minor or low risk to groundwater. Chemical or salt water contamination into groundwater surely cannot be undone.

I am not an engineer and so do not understand table 16-6. I see the compaction of our soil from just normal traffic use. The earth structure under a heavy loaded train line being pounded every day by continual use must affect this underground soil and rock structure which carries the underground water on its historical course. In table 16-7 they say that the risks are possible and will affect agriculture. We have seen this happen before look at the wheat fields in WA where mining has happened and salt is now encroaching on the land in a devastating way.

24-1 “Groundwater drawdown and seepage to groundwater” will also have an effect on our natural environment as many of our trees have their roots down into the shallow fresh water in some areas of E.P. and if it becomes saline they will be lost forever.

I have included a map showing the Driver River Basin Area and it can clearly be seen that the proposed rail line runs through this critical fragile area.

Road traffic

CEIP Table 18-3. The figure of 13 heavy vehicles travelling from Rudall to Lock can be misleading because during harvest numbers could be in the hundreds on any day. It is a direct route to the Rudall Viterra strategic site for grain storage. Trucks and road trains come from a vast area to this site and they will all have to cross the rail line. It will be the same on other narrow arterial roads traffic will be very heavy at times.

Swaffer road, Range View Road, Birdseye Highway, Pipe Road, all have a school bus crossing the rail line twice every day. They do not all have active crossing flashing lights planned. This is totally
unacceptable. How much value does Iron Road put on the lives of our biggest asset our children. The train is going to be travelling at 80 kph, there are trees which restrict vision lining the road sides, and these are narrow roads. It is not only the local people who travel on our back roads but visitors who would not be aware of the fast train and who could easily have an accident. CEIP 18.7.1 & 2 “The overall risk of a train collision with a [vehicle] or member of the public is considered to be high.”

The railway line has been designed to accommodate 6 trains per day and they will be travelling at 80 kph, the roads are narrow, the roadsides are tree lines therefore visibility is impeded there are no lights or signalling at many crossings it is a recipe for disaster and Iron Road even acknowledge the accident risk is high.

"Intersection capacity".

Farmers are going to be moving very wide machinery across these intersections. They must be made wide enough to accommodate future changes to the agricultural industry.

Farms are not all in one block. Machinery has to be moved along the roads and during seeding, harvest, and weed spraying they are continually moving from sheds and paddock to paddock. If there are major delays and no access is available during construction it will be extremely difficult to proceed with normal farming activities.

Fly in fly out

The mine is intending to use 100% long distance commuters fly in fly out or DIDO employees for the construction phase 21-3. After watching a recent television program on Mt Newman they showed that their town is dying because the men work long shifts and stay in their village. When their work finishes they fly back to their families. They are of no benefit to the towns, they do not bring in families and there is no benefit to businesses and schools.

ROUTE OF TRAIN LINE

The supposedly proposed route which is very unclear because it is a vague line drawn on the map and seems to change course often depending on who you talk to will impact grain growers because it does cut across paddocks. It is going to reduce the value of land because crops are now sown north and south in straight lines using controlled trafficking to stop soil compaction by not driving over paddocks away from these lines. With a curved railway line the paddock loses its shape and productive land is lost.

The line will be fenced with few crossing areas and how do you cross an above the ground pipeline??

We may have water pipes and telephone cables crossing the areas where the railway line is supposedly planned.
DUST.

CEIP 10-21 To stop dust during construction of the corridor it is proposed to use water trucks wetting down the area. This proposed salt water which will have to be used continually may cause contamination to farm land after a rain event.

CEIP Table 10-13 The amount of NO2 to spread from the rail line for a distance of 140m is predicted to be below the acceptable criteria, is this a carcinogenic substance that will keep building up in the soil over the predicted 25 years?

CEIP Table 10-15 says the dust is going to be treated with chemicals and water or covered.

Is this dust non-toxic or is it toxic. No one will be limiting the dust when the mine closes and we have seen governments having to pick up the clean up bill. Eyre Peninsula is a very windy area and there will be dust and it will be picked up on a catastrophic windy day and carried miles over humans as well as farming and fishing areas.

CEIP 10.7.2 “Excessive dust emissions from rail wagons”.

We have seen red dust on the road between Cowell and Whyalla (10.5.3) blown from trucks that were covered and which have now been superseded by piping the ore in a slurry. This red dust is still visible after several years and it is well known by farmers that stock paddocked where the red dust falls will not eat the vegetation. If this dust falls on a cereal crop and makes its way into the silo system the whole Eyre Peninsula grain industry will be challenged. This dust can come from returning supposedly empty wagons travelling at 80ks. It must be impossible to get all the dust from a wagon and therefore it seems feasible that dust will be continually generated.

CEIP 13.7 dust may also impact on the native flora but it is written it may not hurt “the already degraded environment”. I think we still have quite a divergent flora on our roadside. Again is it toxic dust which will keep building up over the years and if the rail line eventually joins up to other mines who knows what other dust will be blowing from the rail wagons.

EMPLOYMENT AND INCOME FROM GRAIN GROWING ON E.P.

This year Viterra received 2.4 million tonnes of grain from its sites on E.P. There is also large quantities of grain sold to private traders. The money generated from this grain goes straight into the economy through the farmers hands not through multinationals or overseas companies so Australia is the winner.

The grain industry employs full time and seasonal workers driving machinery etc., grain marketers locally located through to companies on the ASX, silo receival and storage workers, truck and train drivers carting the 2.4 million tonnes of grain farm to silo – silo to port, workers at the Port site through to ship workers. Farmers buy millions of dollars worth of Machinery, Fertilizer, Chemicals (stringently tested), Fuel, Insurance etc., from dealers in their local towns and the schools, health care and local businesses are all reliant on a strong agricultural industry. Therefore how can a dollar figure be put on all this activity every time money changes hands it creates wealth for our country and to put this agricultural area at the risk of more salinity or contamination is insane.
I strongly urge that the mine and rail line do not open. Agriculture and aquaculture and tourism are serving Eyre Peninsula very well. E.P. has a very fragile soil and groundwater component and also the movement of seawater in the Bight is slow to remove any major change through discharge into the sea. We have seen degradation to agricultural land in many parts of the world as well as Australia from mining and the passage of heavy rail cars and huge clean up bills landing in the hands of Government after mine closures. Any contaminated grain found by an overseas buyer could cost the grain trade dearly.

I am not anti-mining but I feel that mining in already limited agricultural areas in Australia is not in our nations interest. It is putting in jeopardy the jobs of many agricultural workers for the profit of a few. The world will always need clean food and water. It is our most valuable commodity.
Fig 4: Driver River Basin
Groundwater Flownet and Saline Discharge Areas

Notes on the Use of the Map
1. Coverage is based on RES Landbase (2010). Additional non-geospatial information, the area shown in the Landbase, that of the River, but uncorrected in that shown.
2. Boundaries between mapping units should be treated as transition zones.
3. This information is derived from limited field work and laboratory testing and interpreted as part of the project expression of judgment may be and where data are available.
4. The maps are intended as general in regional overview and used as a guide to the approximate extent of features described at specific locations.
5. Unless possible to provide the scale of the map be used to identify that scale of publication.
6. Addressing any INPA, RIS and other information therefore should be sought prior to using this information for current and future studies.

IMPORTANT NOTICE: Although all reasonable care has been taken in preparing this information, neither the government of the River, or any other source, accepts responsibility or liability for the interpretation or use of the information displayed on this map or presented in any accompanying document. Information on the map or accompanying documents is subject to change without notice.

This map shows that the proposed line travels through the Driver River Basin.
Our family has been farming in this Rudall area for 98yrs. We are not against mining in remote areas. We are definitely against it in cultivated agriculture land in S.A. Only 10% of land in SA is used for this purpose.

Our reasons against the CEIP plan

We are in the proposed corridor lane.

We own our land under freehold title which the SA government made us do. That means we do not have to sell to any private company if we do not want to. The government can forcibly acquire it then give or sell on to a private co. This to me is terribly wrong.

We have only 2 visits from a company who representative iron road. He showed us a proposed route of the corridor.

We were told only 2 trains & passing at mine site & port.

Statement says now 3 trains & 2 passing lanes

Told at meetings at Rudall we would have access over line on our properties or under with culverts. They did not seem to have any idea of the size of the crossings we need. We have Machines up to 36 metres long & 36 metres wide to cross the line. These have increased in size by 25% in the last 10 years, and they only going to get bigger & in our economical agricultural climate we have to keep up or go broke.

We still do not know exactly where this corridor is going on our land. The map we have seen shows the corridor diagonally crossing one parcel of land, then following fence down to birdseye hyw. on east side of Pederson Road but in statement it says its going to cross birdseye hyw. on the west side.

WE use Niel, Pederson, Brooks, Macgowan Roads (which are not gazetted as ROAD TRAIN roads) with road trains under permits from the National Heavy Vehicle Authority. We run 2 roadtrains. Asked about this at a Rudall meeting and an Iron Road rep. said he will get road trains banned. We are not the only farm enterprise & grain carriers using these roads and road trains are the best way to carry grain.

THERE has not been any sort of PAPER TRAIL at all with this company

There has not been any talk about money COMPENSATION over this corridor over the land they want.

No one has told us about powerline crossing one of our properties. Iron Road said it was not up to them to inform us of this. Who is?

State government wants to reduce to a neutral carbon ommissions, is this extra power produced going to help them achieve this.

Water. Salt water pumped across agricultural land is a disastar waiting to happen. Rusted out pipes that burst. Does anyone know for sure what is going to happen after water has been taken out. Look at disasters around the world that have happened. Cave ins,
fresh water mixing with salt because fracturing of limestone rock formations, tailing
dam leakages.

FIRE

The photos of the flora of the land, corridor was passing through, grew up to 4/5 ton per hectre
cereal crops this year. Think of the very heavy fuel load left with stubbles. If the train
drags its brakes, which will happen & it sparks a fire along track for several kms. on a
very windy dry day it will lead to a CATASTROPHIC FIRE & with the fuel load it will
burn to the gulf. It would make the PINERY fire a picnic. As a life member of the CFS
& talking to other members we believe it will happen one day.

If a fire is started by other means and jumps corridor how do we get to the other side quickly
without doing long detours to get there. By then it is too late.

As farmers we have a local team that calls HARVEST BANS when conditions are severe & we stop
harvesting. I hope the trains have to stop also because of steel on steel rolling stock
or brake locks causing sparks.

DUST

Do we know if this material being mined contains a carcinogenic substances. If so the dust blowing
off mine site (look at Lincoln Hyw at Iron Duke it is still on road & local bluebush
which sheep will not eat) & off wagons gets on to our produce & is detected we are
in a lot of trouble. Our clean green image is shot. Grain buyers will stay shy of SA
grain. DISASTER. IT is not only cereals but Lupins, Canola, Beans, Peas, Lentils of
which a lot go east and to Victoria. These go to feed lots for sheep, cattle, pigs &
human consumption which you will eat. Think of the uproar, scandal & the court
case that will follow. Who pays for this? If this causes a down turn in the agriculture
industry the job losses will be tremendous as so many businesses rely on us. The
government know this because if agriculture is profitable so is the economy if not
the reverse happens. The experts agree agriculture is next boom & growth industry
for the world. Why jeopardise this.

INSURANCE

Will the Company have enough Public Liability insurance to cover the loss of income for all farmers
if this contamination does occur? If this does happen & the co. goes into
receivership what then?

Environment. I do not think they will stabilise sand hills after cutting through them. Every thing they
have said is fine until you have a strong North hot wind that upsets every thing, I
know as I have been trying for years but Mother Nature beats me. This photo shows
what happened when crawlers crossed this hill while putting up the Yadnarie
/Wudinna powerline over 15 years ago.

Iron Road say they will get filling for corridor if needed along the route. Ask the
District Council of Cleve, they cannot find good rubble in this area to form or fill sand
holes on roads in our district. How are Iron Road going to & they will have to destroy more agricultural land trying to get it.

Impacts

Our Road Train traffic over rail line 2015 harvest was 264 loads to Rudall. 50% of these loads would have to cross the line 2 times. Crossings would have been Birdseye Hyw. Pederson, Kilepa/Kilaroo Roads. That means we would have crossed the line 800 to 900 times & that is only us. We would have crossed it in 12 hour day 68 times at 1 Crossing or 136 times @ 2 crossings. That is 17 roadtrains to Rudall

Seeding we run 2 heavy vehicles on roads impacted by proposed line. That means for 4 months of the year there is more traffic on roads plus 2 sprayers using the roads most times of the year. We have our grandkids drive some of these vehicles across this line, how do we know when a train is coming as they will only be travelling really slow & take a reasonable time to cross.

School Bus

My grandkids would cross this line 2 times a day@ Birdseye Hyw. or Swaffer Road depending which way bus travelled as it changes it circuit route west of Rudall each term. The school bus would cross line 2 times every trip.

Construction Closing Pederson Rd.during construction can not be done as we have blocks North & this is the only road wide enough to get our machinery up. If we had to go a different way that we could navigate. It would be like sending a vehicle from Adelaide to Murray Bridge Via Clare. This is example only.

Any extra heavy traffic on our gravel roads would have a severe effect. Look at our roads after harvest, lots of sandholes & corrugations. That means council or iron road to fix. If council has to fix that means I pay again through extra rates.

They tell us a Grain Co is willing to use port & line. They would have to build storage and buy train & carriages. Iron ore has priority when loading, so if a boat is loading grain & an ore boat comes they will swap. They will not tell us who the company is & I dont think they could put up with that arrangement. Think this is to try to get farmers on side.

FIFO WORKERS

After watching ABC programme on fifo workers at Mt. Newman WA where the locals say town is dying because they do not spend in town & fly home. Statement says 67 jobs in Cleve. I would like to know where & what.

Corridor through our land would mean lower value & less equity for our bank another drawback.

Water from borefield is salty as sea and sprayed on overburden hill. When it is hit by heavy rain it will run off onto more good agricultural land.
Compaction of ground caused by train on corridor will stop under ground water flow and means rising of water table which is salty & more agricultural land will be lost. This has happened on the other railway line down bottom end of Eyre Peninsula.

Affected agricultural land. They say 0.2% of land affected. As we do not know how much more land we will lose because we wont be able to seed because of our seeder size 24.4 metres wide. There will 3 corner pieces, long narrow strips that wont be able to be seeded, so it could be double the land taken out of production. How would you like your wages reduced by the same amount that you would not be able to earn for the rest of your working life. We need to be also compensated for this loss of income.

Railway crossings. All crossings need flashing light signals plus warning lights 400 to 500 metres out so we have time to stop. If only stop signs at passive crossings ,as sure as I am writing this submission there will be people killed. From the huge profit they say they will make ,some should be spent on solar powered battery operated signals. Most people don't stop at stop signs as the other train is slow & you have plenty of time to cross. Stopping road trains too many times is to be avoided.

There are farmers that walk sheep from block to block over the proposed line that do not have land neighboring the line. When travelling sheep could be stretched out over 400 metres what happens. They say corrals need to be used to put sheep in before crossing, but how do you know when a train is coming & if a train comes while they are trying to yard sheep, they will spook & it will not happen. Try and ring with a mobile phone it will not work when there is no service. More inconvenience to the farmer affected

Timing of this statement for reply was not for the farmers benefit. As 1 of the stakeholders knows we have just finished harvest after 2 months solid long hours of work, everybody very tired, festive season, schoolholidays (only chance family can have time together) & we have to read and reply to this statement.

If we had the time iron road has had to put this statement together, we could find experts & practicable people to print a statement in farmers favour as good as their statement is for them. Some of their statements leave a lot to be desired.

Port impact I have no knowledge of, so hope some else has written about it as I am sure there will be something overlooked.

Contact with Iron Road

We have been to meetings & seen them at field days & the story about corridor changes every time. We have not the time to be messed about. When they have something concrete to tell us we will listen. They have rang to meet us but wont see my son because he caught them out at a meeting. As said before no paper work, not even a detailed map of corridor for us to study the impact on our farm. We want carry out infrastructure upgrade but cant until we know what's what. The only map we see is in the statement which only shows a mark. WE have no idea if corridor is against road or starts 500 meters out in paddock. A shareholder talked to them at a field day
and asked about farmers feelings only to be told they will be easy, that’s the
message they seem to be spreading as a lot of people seem to have heard that some
farmers that are not affected by corridor don’t care.

CORRIDOR GETS GRANTED

Why can’t it go through the 2 reserves. Make a great firebreak as it would not have to be fenced and
allow CFS volunteers easy access to fire & an escape route. I have seen the reply to
this, but it is practical so won’t be looked at. Uni students did a fauna survey in
reserves & adjacent farm land, they found plenty of fauna on farmland not much in
reserve, which means we are keeping alive more fauna than reserves.

2. Following the existing line is the best option. Their argument about more people in Darke Peak,
Rudall does not add up as the main line from Adelaide to Perth passes through
towns like Mallala etc.

If it stays on proposed route I would like it re routed along Wickstein Rd. Hebermanns RD.
Standpipe Rd. Pederson Rd. That way it could stay along side of roads instead of
cutting blocks in half diagonally leaving corner pieces, which are no good for up &
back GPS farming. They say they want the line against existing fences & roads.

A way out proposal build to national rail grid & ship out of Darwin.

Before work starts we need the corridor to be fenced to save us more damage like in the photo of
the construction of power line many years ago.

What happens if company sells to an overseas interest, do they have to obey construction rules.

How long after approval do they have to start work? I mean not just pegging out route.
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The Warramboo Community Club would like to make the following comments in relation to Iron Road’s application to mine.

In the SIA it was stated that there isn’t a Liquor licence in Warramboo. This is untrue, as we have licenced premises and hold a Club licence. At no time was our club approached by Rose Bowey and Associates regarding our club and how the mine could impact on our future. This was conveyed to Iron Road on the release of a draft copy of the SIA and no correction was made or attempted to alter this section in the SIA.

**Question: Why wasn’t our club contacted by Rose Bowey?**

With the closure of Kimba Road and other local roads the effect it will have on our members and other patrons will be great. For them to access our club extra travel will have to be done. With this in mind it appears that these people could choose to go elsewhere on alternative routes.

On page 5-6 (MLP volume 1 chapter 5 Stakeholder consultation) Iron Road said that there is ongoing discussion with our club. After some contact (3 years ago) about using our club, we asked for this to be put in writing, but no such undertaking has ever been received. No contact has been made since.

**Question: When have ongoing these discussions taken place and with whom?**

If the proposed mine eventuates our Community Club will lose valued volunteers. Voluntary work involves irregular many hours across the year at working bees, preparing the grounds for sporting fixtures, working in bar service, cooking and kitchen duties to name a few. Also there are many official roles on committees and as club representatives.

**Questions: How will mine workers on long shifts and living in Wudinna be able to make any valuable contribution to the Warramboo community as volunteers?**

**Question: What will Iron Road do for the Warramboo community to compensate for this loss of community service?**
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It is hard to submit to this proposal when it appears that the end result is already finalised when the minister is on record saying that we need these projects.

A lot of the material in this proposal is based on modelling only. What happens when something isn’t going to plan? An Iron Road consultant reckons that they will go to plan B but how long can they go before they get it right and not do damage to the community in the meantime?

Consultation has been undertaken with regard to road networks and road closure in the region. When talking to the local councillor there seems to be some confusion. When questioned about various local roads at the Wudinna meeting in December 2015 the response I received from an Iron Road employee was that they haven’t finalised their plans for the mine site. So my question is how can one question their commitment when they publish a proposal for public comment yet they don’t have final plans regarding local roads?

**When will we be told what is actually happening to local roads?**

**Page 5-18 MLP (chpt 5 stakeholder consultation)**

Review of draft SIA by DC Wudinna and CEIP CCC with feed back incorporated into the final SIA

Statements and tables that were wrong, Iron Road was told about but it fell on deaf ears as nothing was changed or altered in the final SIA eg Warramboo Community Club is a licensed club

**Page 22-3 MLP (chpt 22 Social Environment)**

22.2.3 Stakeholder consultation and engagement

'Consulted with members of Wudinna CCC.' **Who was in this group?**

An employee of Rose Bowey and Associates did not even meet with the CEIP CCC as we were told that it did not fit in her brief but she did consult with other groups. **Why was this so?** Reading through her paper it appears that she talked to a lot of community members, but was a lot of this information supplied by Iron Road or one of its employees?

In the SIA Wudinna DC was compared to Roxby Downs. When questioned why this was so, the reply was that it is a good comparison. Cowell has recently experienced a mining boom population expansion also and when questioned why Wudinna and Cowell weren’t compared it appeared that Iron Road weren’t interested in this. Roxby Downs was a specially built tow ship for mining so once again this comparison to Wudinna was baffling.

Outcomes expectations for CEIP CCC appear to be well documented but being part of its formulation was quite different. A lot of our concerns weren’t considered as they were deemed not acceptable to Iron Road’s way of thinking. Throughout this process it appear to be an Iron Road employee directing which way it should head by ticking all the boxes for Iron Road.

To a casual observer (passing comment on to me) that the CCC was only a talk fest and what were we achieving. With some questions, answers took a very long time to get back to us. When questions about certain aspects of the project the standard line was that it will be world’s best practice and when asked to expand on this it would be said that they were still working on it.
At one meeting I was declared by our Chair to be too negative and should think about resigning from the CCC. To get this response was considered to be downgrading as I felt at the time we were there only for Iron Road to get their SOCIAL LICENCE and that we weren’t allowed to ask hard questions on which have huge impacts on our local community.

Page22-63 MLP (chpt 22 Social Environment)
Iron Road states that if living next to the mine becomes too hard for some that they will sit and talk about buying that local out. In all conversations with the company this was the first time this has been raised. From listening about past experiences with IR this would be interesting. Living where we live, this is both a work and a lifestyle choice. Iron Road would like one on one engagement with landowners about dust, noise, light etc. Why not a general engagement with the whole community because these problems would not be isolated ones?

Page21-17 MLP (chpt21 Land use tenure)
21.7.4 Shading of adjacent agricultural land

This chapter goes on about the effects of shading affecting crops but then to say it is more likely to be dominated by other factors of rainfall, soil type etc. This is consistent with general farming knowledge and observations of crop success in the shadow of Darke Peake (pers. comm. T. Scholz) the waste dump is not a natural hill. It went to say it was rated as a medium impact. Next paragraph it is considered unlikely that the final IWL will result in a discernible change to predicted shadow impacts as the model was based on........ then overall risk is considered to be low

Once again this was based on modelling so what effect will this landform have on predicted rainfall, wind etc?

If adjacent landowners to the proposed mine site are affected by environmental conditions attributed to mining activities. What is Iron Road planning to do in the way of compensating these affected landowners?

Adjacent land values in general decline when located next to a mine, so this reduces ones equity. (The public document ‘Economic Development and Infrastructure Committee : Inquiry into Greenfields mineral exploration and project development in Victoria. Melb 14 Dec 2011) Examples of farmers dealing with miners given in this document have relevance to our situation at Warrambooo. So in future years when a landowner plans to expand in another area his borrowing base is decreased.

Will Iron Road consider financial help as this drop in his equity is not of his doing?

Page20-3 MLP (chpt 20 Visual Amenity)

20.2.2 Site visit and photography

These photo montages (pages20-34) were only a select few of many from a list of areas given. When asked why the one from a certain view point wasn’t available the answer given was that permission wasn’t given from the landowner. When talking to the landowner concerned he said that he wasn’t even asked about his. When will these montages be released for public viewing?
In fig 5.1 proposed module delivery and diversion routes map

On the diversion route I question where did they get their map from as part of this route runs through our private property and one of the roads is one IR is planning to close.

In my opinion Iron Road hasn’t got a good track record in checking the accuracies of things. When they were doing road side drilling they drilled on my property without permission. When informing them of this and told them to stop drilling they continued as though nothing had happened. Wudinna DC at least apologised and DSD took note of the incident. To this day there hasn’t been one word from IR concerning this issue.

Iron Road continue to say that negotiations for land acquisitions are continuing but talking to members of the public who are affected by this operation are questioning also if this is so

I lease land on the corridor and when asking for information regarding this parcel of land I have been informed that Iron Road only have to talk to the owner. When enquiring with the owner about what’s happening his comment to me was that other than the initial contact there has not been any. This can also be said of others also. When I asked for a hard copy of the IMP hard copy I was told I could only have one if I paid for it as it was only available to owners.

P604/2077 MLP (chpt19 ground water)

19.7.1 Impacts on agricultural production due to ground water.

Indicates that impact due to enhanced recharge is considered to be negligible.

In the event that the model predications are incorrect damage can happen.

It goes on about land acquisition of land and ground water pumping.

As my farm will be directly affected again I could be forced off my farm through no fault of my own. It also states that they could pump the ground water.

Where will this salty water be pumped to?

Page 187/2808 IMP (chpt 6 stakeholder engagement)

IMPs are being developed in conjunction with each landowner. To date, IMPs have not been developed for all landowners.

How many IMPs have been completed, and how many affected landowners?

In addition to the above individual meetings IR hosted information sessions specifically for affected landowners along the proposed infrastructure corridor.

When were they held, where were they held, how were they advertised and how many actually attended?

Landowners on the northern end didn’t seem to know about them happening.
Community survey was conducted via telephone

An elderly resident was going to be surveyed till he told the surveyor his age. He was told that he was too old to participate and the call was terminated.

How many other people did this happen to also?

Predicted railway operation noise

It states that it will be for 12 short periods (60 to 90 seconds) when it passes a single point

Currently we live 10 kms from an existing railway and we can hear this periodically for longer. It says that the noise will be within guide lines, but going from something every now and then to 12 times a day will impact us hugely and also it will be loading close by. Once again Iron Road is going on modelling and they won't have to live with this.

Railway line road crossing and road diversions

Have Iron Road considered more road overpasses than crossings over local roads? As locals are already going to be inconvenienced by increased travelling times and then to be held up by trains as well.

Waste management

It was stated that with extra waste from Iron Road the life expectancy of the Wudinna DC waste dump will be reduced by 15 years.

Why can't Iron Road store their own waste under their own Integrated Waste Landform?

Plate 10-3 Truck generated dust on sealed road

Perhaps Iron Road should tell the location of this photo as in this case the road train was just coming onto Tod Highway from a local service road. To say that dust was being generated on a sealed road is not correct as the service road actually runs parallel to the highway before crossing the current railway to enter the highway.
10.5.2 Vibration at Warramboo cemetery

In the Warramboo cemetery I have parents, grandparents and great grandparents buried there. In Iron Road’s proposal it states that blasting from the proposed mine will not impact on this site. Once again this is based on modelling.

What does Iron Road plan to do if it is found that damage is occurring at the cemetery due to the mine?

Page 17-7 MLP (Airblast and Vibration)

17.7. Ground Vibration and Airblast from Blasting

In the proposal it is indicated that outside of the mine site blasting will have low impact but there is a risk that vibrations and airblast levels due to blasting will be higher than predicted with the consequences considered to be minor. Within the community are a lot of stone constructed homes which could effectively be damaged by any vibration.

What will Iron Road plan to do if this to become a reality?

How many base line studies been completed into dust, air quality, noise and light?

Given the known presence of uranium and other radioactive materials in the Gawler Craton bedrock and associated Paleochannels in the district, why are these substances precluded from any analytical results?

Does Iron Road plan to do Base line studies on the adjacent properties for all of the above before mining commences?

Iron Road talks about working with Minnipa Ag Centre in regards to the effects of dust on crops but what about its effect on pastures, livestock and effects on collected rain water for consumption?

Page 22-5 MLP (chpt22 Social Environment)

Fig 22-3 Historical and predicted population change in Wudinna DC

How can it be shown that the predicted population trend (based on 1986-1996 data if CEIP does not progress) will fall below 0 (red line) by 2041? The green line trend is based on 1996-2011 trends? What happens to the blue line after 2041? It is all good to go on predicted trends but looking around the area now the population appears to be getting younger and young families with children.

What financial liability will the Wudinna DC have in the meeting of council controlled infrastructure (roads, waste water etc) to service both the accommodation village and construction camp or will Iron Road finance this aspect of the development?
A lot of things said in the Mining Lease Proposal and Environmental Impact Statements are said to be based on modelling. In the perfect world everything goes to plan but in reality some things do go wrong. It was said that if adjacent landowners are not happy with what’s happening Iron Road is willing to talk about buying your land. If I live in the town and my neighbour digs a big hole and continually disrupts my lifestyle I could complain to the local council, police or the EPA and something is done about it. With mining the effect on current life style, nature and the surrounding agricultural land happens sometime in the future and then it is too late to correct this mistake. Current guide lines for dust, noises etc. are continually changing to suit the mining practice current situation (you just have to look at Iron Knob to see the effect on the environment currently).

Agricultural land is something that can’t be manufactured so to be lost forever is wrong. All over the world environmental damage from mining is becoming ever so evident with life time consequences that it should not be ignored.

Iron Road states that only six families are affected by the proposed mine. This statement can be challenged in that within these families are other family members and businesses which are affected directly and indirectly by the proposal. **How can Iron Road justify this?**

The proposed mine has affected a lot of people within the community. The stress it has inflicted on the directly affected parties cannot be overstated. These people have to live with the uncertainty of what is to happen to their future life as some of them are 4th generation living on the farm and are told that they have to move but have not been given a time line. With the people that are left to live within the adjacent land the unknown factors and fears for their future is affecting people’s health and wellbeing.

Iron Road’s timing of releasing their proposal must also be questioned. To put this out at this time of the year (harvest time) is one of the busiest times of the year for a farmer and knowing that the government has time restraints, I question Iron Road’s commitment to be part of our community. To respond to something as long as this in the current time frame, not only with the length of time harvest takes but incorporating into Christmas and New Year break it appears that the company hopes for very few responses. Throughout last year I kept asking Iron Road for community updates, the response was that there isn’t anything new to report about so no need for these to happen. A lot is said in the proposal that many of the community weren’t aware of and it has come as a surprise to some. To respond to various aspects within the proposal is hard in that it is based mostly on modelling with some disclaimers about some of the information contained and that various levels are within current government guide lines.
Warramboo Mine Site Corridor and Port Submission

Our submission is not to object to mining but mining in good agricultural areas. Agriculture, in my mind, is a clean and renewable industry and has an unlimited life span. Mining, on the other hand, is very disruptive to agriculture’s image and once land is lost to mining it is gone forever. The Warramboo Mine has a life span of 30 years only then decommissioned infrastructure will be left along with all the issues it will have created over its lifespan for the agricultural industry to deal with. My big concern is if the Warramboo Mine is to go ahead, this will be just the first of many site across EP. I feel that our agriculture industry deserves far more respect that this and in my mind mining has no fit in agriculture areas.

My particular objection is to the corridor between the mine as we are directly and significantly affected by this corridor. The corridor effectively slices our business in half so the daily disruption to our business will be enormous. I am hearing that the compensation that we should be appreciative to take is only a few thousand dollars. This amount is quite frankly an insult to us as individuals and as business owners. The level of disruption for us should reflect a much higher compensation value.

My concerns are:

Salt water being pumped used then dumped within the mine site with huge potential to destroy other agricultural land around the mine site to salinity forever.

Agriculture along with all other local business will be required to pay much higher wages to compete for workers and our cost of living will reflect this.

Infestations of new weeds and snails along the corridor which I am doubtful Iron Road will control to my level of satisfaction.

Iron ore will contaminate my agriculture land from the corridor and end up with recieval rejection in grain production and residue issues in wool and livestock for sale.

We will have a long loss of income due to 27 Acres being removed from our agricultural production. This is gone forever and will never be recovered.

There will be a daily disruption to our business management in restricted access to our land from one side to the other for sheep movements, machinery movements, grain cartage and day to day running.

We are told there will be hourly trains travelling this corridor.

The valuation of our land is expected to drop through no fault of our own.

Major earthworks in sandy soils will give great potential for wind erosion, not only in the construction phase but throughout the corridor’s life and beyond.

There will be an increased accident risk to our school children due to numerous crossings to be crossed on a daily basis.
Existing rail tracks are notorious for having a major impact on creating salinity due to compaction because of insufficient drain crossings and poorly installed drainage crossings.

Our home is 700 m from the corridor and we are concerned about noise pollution as well as structural damage to our house and sheds due to vibration from the train.

The consultation process has not been sufficient to date as Iron Road is proceeding with their application for their mining lease while we in the corridor have no real visual understanding how our proposed crossings will look and work and whether all potential issues with these crossings have been addressed. My potential issues are:

- tunnel length for getting sheep through
- having adequate lighting
- having adequate drainage
- ensuring the construction will be practical for its use
- wind erosion in sandy soils
- Tunnels will require loss of cleaning of buck bush, turnips, sand and maybe water. Who will do this?

We don’t know about the above grounds crossings either – will they be big enough for machinery in 20-30 years time. Our machinery is always changing so this needs to be addressed prior to construction.

We really have had insufficient consultation and proposed ideas about this. I believe their application is completely and utterly premature because there is no real level of certainty about the corridor or those in the corridor. The last two times that Maloney Field Services have contacted me to get together has been when I was about to start seeding or harvest (which are the busiest times of the year for me). This is unacceptable. This may be their intentions to leverage me into quick decisions therefore getting what they want and not what we require.

Dust link – www.bulkhandling.com.au/news/ - only 25 percent effective. It’s not hard to find information on the internet to confirm that at even today’s best management practices that dust control from mine sites remains a major issue. Agriculture is here first and thriving, why should we settle for mining to come in and take over, leaving us to deal with all the issues they create.

Grain, wool and meat production is our livelihood and the contamination from the corridor will threaten our business existence.
Section C: Your Submission

Points to consider when making your submission:

- Provide information on any aspect of the existing environment that either has not been included in the MP and/or EIS; or that you consider has been inadequately described.
- Are there any environmental, social or economic impacts or benefits associated with the MP and/or EIS that have not been identified?
- If applicable, are the proposed environmental, social or economic outcomes acceptable? If not, try and describe what outcome you would find acceptable?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Reference and Page No (if known)</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Groundwater example</td>
<td>MP 7.1.3 p53</td>
<td>Example: No to overseas companies, open cut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure example</td>
<td>EIS 6.3.2 p103</td>
<td>Example: Mining on agricultural land, other iron ore mines across Australia. Agriculture land essential for food &amp; fibre. Production. Corridor going through farm land.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td></td>
<td>Example: No need at all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1. Huge environment damage while constructing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rail/road line, corridor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Enormous Bush f ire threat along corridor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Spread of Noxious weeds along corridor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>how going to control them on going for years &amp; must be done regularly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>some weeds to be done monthly during summer months.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crossings</td>
<td>Manual, Backup (Almost) to Electronic control of crossing, especially farm crossings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Section C: Your Submission**

Points to consider when making your submission:

- Provide information on any aspect of the existing environment that either has not been included in the MP and/or EIS; or that you consider has been inadequately described.
- Are there any environmental, social or economic impacts or benefits associated with the MP and/or EIS that have not been identified?
- If applicable, are the proposed environmental, social or economic outcomes acceptable? If not, try and describe what outcome you would find acceptable?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Reference and Page No (if known)</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Groundwater example</td>
<td>MP 7.1.3 p53</td>
<td>Example</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>EIS 6.3.2 p103</td>
<td>Example</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fauna:**

- Ants - Rare.
- Near rail line on sec 38 Hol.
- There are 3 sites.
- Thorny devils (lizard) found along corridor.
Section C: Your Submission

Points to consider when making your submission:

- Provide information on any aspect of the existing environment that either has not been included in the MP and/or EIS; or that you consider has been inadequately described
- Are there any environmental, social or economic impacts or benefits associated with the MP and/or EIS that have not been identified?
- If applicable, are the proposed environmental, social or economic outcomes acceptable? If not, try and describe what outcome you would find acceptable?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Reference and Page No (if known)</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Groundwater example</td>
<td>MP 7.1.3 p53</td>
<td>Example</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure example</td>
<td>EIS 6.3.2 p103</td>
<td>Example</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port.</td>
<td>Infrastructure contamination of grain &amp; mineral, Debt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salt</td>
<td>Huge salt spread. Problem with train line construction, &amp; pipe line to mine, stop valves every km. Incase of pipe failure, accidents unforeseen events can occur</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rail crossings</td>
<td>Enormous confusion of crossings for Emergency Vehicles, Doctor's Appointments &amp; alike.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 Wasting time for Machinery crossings road because reducing of Normal Farm crossings.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 Vandalism &amp; risk for crossing livestock due to lack of crossings &amp; noise from trains coming near crossings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue</td>
<td>Reference and Page No (if known)</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groundwater example</td>
<td>MP 7.1.3 p58</td>
<td>Example</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure example</td>
<td>EIS 6.3.2 p103</td>
<td>Example</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CROWDvey FREIGHT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>I am concerned about how the corridor will affect my grain to silo and stock to market freight. Road-train routes are already limited. Costs will go up if there is any more downtime. I will have to spend a lot of money and time on internal infrastructure if I have to make two rail crossings, causing grain south.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erosion</td>
<td></td>
<td>The proposed cuttings through existing sand dunes will cause massive erosion problems. We have spent many years stabilising erosion issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pest Weed Control</td>
<td></td>
<td>The areas which will be cut off and un-farmable will be too narrow to control pest weed problems. We spend our spare time controlling pest weeds and feral animals. They will only escalate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue</td>
<td>Reference and Page No (if known)</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School bus</td>
<td></td>
<td>The school bus run we have is one of the longest in the region. Roads are rough and the children spend a lot of time travelling. Any extension of time will be detrimental to our children's health and education. If this in any way compromises the future of the bus run, where will it leave us all?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main's Water Supply</td>
<td></td>
<td>The main's water to the whole farm affected including house, yards, stock runs under where the proposed corridor. I can not have any disruptions as it could jeopardise my family life and livelihood. I would insist on having SAWATER putting a whole new meter and infrastructure on my side of the corridor so there will be no worries about water leaks and security.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machinery and Stock Movements</td>
<td></td>
<td>How well can we move machinery &amp; stock without any solid idea of where any culverts &amp; passes will be. Will these culverts &amp; passes be new?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue</td>
<td>Reference and Page No (if known)</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machinery Stock</td>
<td></td>
<td>a means of getting stormwater pumped out of them or will we be left stranded after heavy rains</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stock Movements Court</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Services</td>
<td></td>
<td>I need to know that any emergency services such as Ambulance and fire will have right of way over a train. We are already very isolated with limited access routes to affected areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I will not stand by and watch neighbors get burnt out or perish otherwise if services can’t reach them. I am the local C.E.S. captain.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dust Contamination</td>
<td></td>
<td>I believe that dust from train carriages will affect my grain crops, smother pasture and affect my wool quality and yield.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I can’t work out if carriages are going to be covered, stabilised or not.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salt</td>
<td></td>
<td>Salt issues at the mine site and along the corridor are a major concern to us. What will be the outcome of thousands of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue</td>
<td>Reference and Page No (If known)</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salt</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tonne of salt being around the mine site going to be in the future. What will it do for ground water basins etc. Affects of compaction caused by the railway will also increase salinity problems in the River River basin. We don't need any more complications. Farming and making a living is hard enough without another entity complicating things and destroying the farming future. Eye Peninsula already has water issues for the future. How will you replace the water.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ground Water</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of life</td>
<td></td>
<td>We are about to build a new 5 bedroom home not far from the Corridors. I do not want unnecessary vibration and noise issues. Still not sure where the line is running as it has changed a bit since the staff.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Public Submission

Section A: Contact Details

Please complete the following information. Your contact details will be used by the South Australian Government to acknowledge your submission. Those marked with an asterix (*) are mandatory. Anonymous submissions will not be accepted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>MRS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*Name</td>
<td>KAYE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Surname</td>
<td>O'BRIEN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Street / PO Box</td>
<td>BOX 153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Town / Suburb</td>
<td>WUDINNA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*State</td>
<td>SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Postcode</td>
<td>5652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Email Address (Mandatory for electronic submissions)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>08 86812043</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please indicate below which of the applications your submission relates to:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.A. Mining Application (MP)</th>
<th>S.A. Development Application (EIS)</th>
<th>Commonwealth EPBC Act (EIS)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Select those (one or more) which apply to your submission

Section B: Privacy

Please select one of the following options:

☑️ I understand that my submission, including my personal contact details, will be published on the government website and provided to the applicant.

OR

☐ I understand that my submission will be published on the government website and provided to the applicant, but I require that the government withholds my name and contact details. I understand that it is my responsibility to ensure personal information is not included in the body of my submission, any footers or headers or any attachments.
Central Eyre Iron Project - Public Submissions

Public Submission
Mining Proposal (MP) and Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)

USE THIS FORM TO: Provide a written submission to the SA Government regarding the MP or EIS

Iron Road’s Central Eyre Iron Project (CEIP) is a proposed iron ore mining and infrastructure project located on Eyre Peninsula. The scope of the proposed project includes an iron ore mine (MP) to be located east of Warramboo near Wudinna and associated rail, power, water, port and accommodation infrastructure developments to be located between the proposed mine and proposed site of a new deep sea port near Port Neill (EIS).

The Government has received applications for these developments in accordance with the requirements of the Mining Act 1971 (for the mine), the Development Act 1993 (for the associated infrastructure) including actions that trigger the Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act (1999)(EPBC).

Written submissions are invited from members of the public on these applications.

Making a Submission

We value your input and look forward to reading your submission. Please follow the steps below to make an effective submission.

1. Review Iron Road’s applications for the CEIP, available at www.ceipconsultation.sa.gov.au

2. Decide whether or not to include personal information in your submission


When you make a written submission, that submission becomes a public record. Your written submission will be provided to the applicant and will be published on the government CEIP consultation website. This includes:

- the content of your submission and any attachments - including any personal information about you which you have chosen to include in those documents.

If you wish for your personal information to be withheld, you must:

- request that your name and contact details be withheld from publishing by ticking the relevant box in the form below, and

- not include personal or identifying information in your submission or attachments.

We will not publish offensive, threatening, defamatory or other inappropriate material.

3. Make a submission

To make a written submission, you have the option to use this public submission form which includes a cover sheet.

Alternatively, make an online submission by accessing the government CEIP consultation website (www.ceipconsultation.sa.gov.au) and following the instructions.

Provide your written submission to government using any of the following methods:

By mail to:
CEIP Submissions
Mining Regulation
Attn: Business Support Officer
GPO Box 320
ADELAIDE SA 5031

By email to:
dsd.ceipconsultation@sa.gov.au

On line submission:
www.ceipconsultation.sa.gov.au

Upload a pdf or word document at:
www.ceipconsultation.sa.gov.au
Response to Iron Roads mining Proposal at Warramboo.

Communication
As a concerned parent who has assisted in buying land and helping to set up 4 sons farming around the mine site. I think the communication with them especially and other farmers not sitting on the rim of the mine but have adjoining farms needing to get machinery access to the mine site (Murphy Rd, Warramboo-kind of shock road) has been pretty poor. The communication to the district has been one-sided. Iron Roads good news, but no direct news to anyone outside Warramboo of the bad news. Warramboo anyone outside Warramboo of the people feel they have been vindiously ignored a they are the ones who will have to put up with the increased traffic. Salt water draining underground why haven't IR visited every farmer or person in Warramboo? It concerns everyone as its Social Community will be completely shut down (with no access roads) or people.

Equity
As a retired farmer that worked hard to pay for our farms, what will Iron Road mine do for the value of these farms? In other states a mine has devalued or made these farms unsaleable.

Dust
We have been told repeatedly, there will be no dust by the Environmentalist who is employed by Iron Road. And has not lived here and hasn't seen our North Winds in a drought year! What happens if the mine starts, the bush will be lost in this project. What will be lost in this project about the Southern Right Whales migration at Pt. Neil. But farmers hardly get a mention in caring for the environment.
Local Services

Are Iron Road going to be allowed to start anything with out a Hospital or Medical Centre? Most people in Wudinna do not know where the Village will be! Only told if you ask! Wudinna is a retired town! How will be able to afford to live here if a mine startup.

Also the airport we have been told Iron Road were putting money into the upgrade. But in Volume 1 of E1 P3 2.24 Under Transport - Air. They have stated Wudinna airport will be upgraded to accommodate commercial flights. That upgrade will be undertaken by the Wudinna District Council who is the owner operator of this airport. Another Communication problem!

Why hasn't Iron Road put in Writing a given the people concerned some proof of what they have been told. Even minutes of meetings that were promised?

What happens to the Warramboo people if the mine is sold a the Rules change? Will this be in Writing?

Closure

Wudinna would be like all the towns in Queensland (and we have traveled seen) that when the miner pullout eventually to do with the mine goes broke all the Shops shut. Honeymoon a desert town with more out of work no jobs. The Town would be better as it is. Go ahead Town! As most of Iron Roads information is done on modelling, seeing will be believing!

Kaye Maureen O'Brien