

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, 22 February 2017 2:15 PM  
**To:** DSD: Mining Act Review  
**Subject:** MINING ACT REVIEW DISCUSSION PAPER

I wish to express my opposition to proposed changes to the Mining Act as outlined in the associated discussion paper. My wife and I are residents of Black Point and our family and friends have been coming here for over 55 years.

Our major concern relates to the Government freeing up access to more agricultural land which could potentially result in more mines on YP which, in turn, means more residents living close to massive, open cut, heavy metal mines with all the attendant dust, noise, water and other environmental pollution that these mines often generate. Exempting agricultural land from mining will not only protect our food producing areas, but also safeguard our local communities and the broader environment.




The environment and lifestyle on Yorke Peninsula attracts tourism from all over Australia and is too important to be exposed to the risks associated with the relatively short term interests of mining companies. There is no shortage of evidence around Australia of this.

Other concerns regarding the Discussion Paper are:

- o Community consultation during the approval and post-approval processes is inadequate. The Government must be serious about gaining and addressing real community concerns. Many that I speak to have no knowledge or understanding of the proposed changes. The emotional, psychological and financial effects on local residents impacted by these proposed changes should not be ignored.
- o Community concerns/opposition to a project are often given token attention before being dismissed. The Act must formally acknowledge and endorse the concept of social licence – ie that to get approval for a project, the company must demonstrate it has broad community support. Absence of a social licence must constitute grounds for rejecting a proposal.
- o An independent process is required whereby a community which feels its concerns have not been taken into account by the Minister when approving a project can ask a court to independently assess the MERITS of the project and overturn the Minister's decision if the court decides the project is not in the best interests of the community.
- o As part of the assessment process, companies must be required to provide a detailed cost/benefit analysis which factors in the real, long-term costs of an operation to the health and well-being of the local community and the environment. The simple mention of the word "jobs" should not be enough to get Government support.
- o Breaches of Govt requirements by exploration/mining companies often go undetected or unpunished because of inadequate monitoring and regulation. There must be rigorous, on-site Govt monitoring of exploration/mining operations, specific penalties for breaches, and regular reporting by the regulators to the community on each exploration/mining project. A Mining Ombudsman, answerable to Parliament, must be appointed to provide an independent umpire to whom residents can refer unresolved complaints against a company.
- o Mine closure and rehabilitation plans must reflect leading practice standards, rather than the minimalist standards now accepted by Government. Leaving behind a massive open-pit and huge waste rock dumps that have simply been rounded off and covered over with soil is not good enough. If it is uneconomic for a company to backfill the pit and remove the waste rock dumps then the project should not receive Government approval. The leading practice standard – that, at mine closure, the land should be returned as closely as possible to that which existed pre-mining – must be mandatory.

  
Yours Sincerely

Tony and Sue Wilkins

Sent from my iPad