



The Mining Act 1971 should be changed to state clearly and emphatically that the arable land of South Australia be exempt from mineral exploration and mineral mining,- ie: all the area depicted in yellow on the map on page 22 of the Discussion Paper. There should be no right to waiver. Extractive minerals could be permitted.

Failing that the landowner should have a right of veto to stop mining projects going ahead.

If there is some ambiguity as to the meaning of the term "Exempt Land", then the term "Prohibited" could be adopted.

I am against altering the Exempt Land Section (apart from changing the term Exempt to Prohibited"), except for section f/ "land that is situated – b/ within 150 metres of - , a spring, well, reservoir or dam, ADD, OR UNDERGROUND FRESHWATER LENSES. I think 150metres should be changed to 9 kilometres to allow for the drawdown effect of de-watering mine pits.

The term "cultivated field" or "Cultivated paddock" should stay in the "Exempt Section" and mining should not be allowed within 9 kilometres of this land to allow for the drawdown effect of de-watering mine pits.

The Mining Act grants mining companies exclusive use of our land and permits the eviction of any other business in it's way, ie farming , winegrowing, and could affect Eyre Peninsula's a world class seafood industry through contamination.

Mining development on Lower Eyre Peninsula is not "Sensible Sustainable Development".

Mining in affects arable land through it's huge demand for water for it's mining operations and the massive dewatering process in their mining pits.

Lincoln Minerals should not have been allowed to have an exploration licence to drill in the Uley Basin, it being land " that is dedicated or reserved, pursuant to statute, for the purpose of waterworks". They used this scarce fresh water resource in their drilling operations. The Uley Basin is Eyre Peninsula's major source of fresh potable water. The Environment , Resources and Development

Court provided no protection for this vital resource as Lincoln Minerals was also granted a Water Licence.

I believe that the ERD Court may have a conflict of interest with its dual rolls as Regulator and Promoter. The ERD Court failed to protect EP's water supply. This is an example of why an independent Regulator or an Ombudsman should be appointed to make environmental decisions free from the influence of the Department of State Development.

In section 9 of the Mining Act, "Exempt Land – (1) Subject to this section –(ba) Land – (i) that is dedicated or reserved , pursuant to statutes, for the purpose of waterworks; " I would like to see included " AND WITHIN 9KILOMETRES OF A PRESCRIBED WELLS AREA"

Centrex Metal's tenements of 11 mine sites, extend from the Koppio Hills down to Green Patch, which is near a Prescribed Wells Area. Greenpatch is a vital recharge area for the Uley Basin and de- watering of mining pits in this area could affect the underground fresh water supply of Eyre Peninsula.

Already the Eyre Peninsula Natural Resources Management Board is having difficulty in finding enough fresh water to supply demand on Eyre Peninsula. This became evident in their New 2016 Water Allocation Plan (WAP). The Draft WAP tried to reduce the ratio of the amount of water to be kept for the environment (storage) in the Uley South Lens, ( the lens that supplies the majority of EP's freshwater), from the 60% that was in 2000 WAP, to, 30% in new WAP, and from the 40% extraction that was in 2000 WAP, to 70% extraction in the new 2016 WAP. Public protest caused them to alter the ratio (of annual recharge) to 48.5% for the environment and 51.5% for extraction in the final 2016 WAP- they were still unable to go back to the more sustainable ratio of 60% environment / 40% extraction that was in the 2000 WAP.

The Koppio Hills area is not on mains water but provides its own water supply (thus relieving pressure on underground basins) via springs, wells, dams, and various perched fresh water lenses.

The Koppio Hills are an integral part of Eyre Peninsula's agricultural industry. This area can sustain livestock throughout a drought. Northern areas of EP rely

on this area for agistment for their livestock during a drought. The groundwater is vital.

Mining should not be allowed to use SA's fresh water supplies as they propose to do in the South East, Yorke Peninsula and on Eyre Peninsula.

Each mine pit in SA could have a cone of groundwater drawdown develop, eventually extending up to 9km from the pits,(for hundreds of years).

This was stated in Iron Road's Central Eyre Project Referral Statement, " the proposed mine pit will intersect the water table and management of water inflows will be required. Dewatering will be required via an active ground water pumping system and in-pit sumps. "

The result of this dewatering will be, quote same referral, "During mining and following mine closure, a cone of groundwater drawdown from pit de-watering is expected to develop, eventually extended up to 9km from the pits (over hundreds of years)."

The CEIP Referral Statement also states; " Groundwater in the vicinity of the site is unutilised due to high salinity, given the high salinity of groundwater, the beneficial uses are limited to maintenance of ecosystems, and industrial use. (Jacobs 2014 formerly SKM) ". It also states; "rainfall run-off is minimal due to high infiltration rates into sandy soils and localised run-off retention with-in the dunal landscape" In other words the groundwater in the Warramboos area is saline, the sandy soil allows high infiltration rates of rainfall, (run off is minimal except with-in the dunal landscape). So, if the saline watertable is removed ,and a cone of groundwater drawdown develops, where does the rainwater, which normally sits on top of the saline underground watertable, go? It would disappear creating a desert. The saline groundwater is not " unutilised" it supports rainwater and allows this area to produce high protein hard wheat.

Agriculture and Mining cannot co-exist as they compete for the one resource vital to both, WATER.

Also in Iron Road's referral statement it states; "As discussed in 3.3.10, this " (lowering of the watertable) "is expected to return Lake Warramboos to a more natural state with improved habitat values" (Jacobs 2014)

The opposite view is stated in the Baseline Survey of the Wetlands of Eyre Peninsula 20005-20007, it states " Acid Sulphate soils. In oxygen- depleted zone (anoxic zone) in wetland sediments, the dark grey nature of the material (of soils and sediments) is due to the presence of sulphide, most commonly as iron sulphide. Formation and residency of iron sulphide is a normal part of wetland sediment development and its geochemical evolution. Concomitant with sulphide development, there also may be chemical fixing of heavy metals and arsenic. Anthropogenically induced aeration of such sulphide rich material, however either through excavations of soils or drains, or through lowering of the water table by draining, leads to exposure of such material to oxygen – the result is that the sulphide is oxidised to sulphate, and there is concomitant production of H+, hence the soils and sediments become acidic."

In other words, mining and draining the saline water will make the Lake Warrambo Complex acidic, not more natural. I use these as examples of what could happen to the environment, and the PEPR assessment doesn't seem to worry about it.

The PEPR assessment needs to be strengthened to protect the environment. Greater transparency is needed to ensure environmental sustainability.

The land owner should be provided with a notice of entry outlining the nature of operations proposed on the land at least 21 days before entering.

I think the term "mining operator" should stay as that is what the Mining Act intends them to be.

I agree that the Department should publish the relevant information it has available relating to a proposed project (or if it could direct the company to release such information), and there should be clear powers in the Mining Act for the Minister (or his delegate) to release this kind of information for all projects. Access should be open, free, and online to the following documents; all licence and lease applications (at appropriate times given commercial sensitivities); public submissions (and /or summaries of those submissions); the terms and conditions of grant of a licence or lease; approved programs for environment protection and rehabilitation(PEPRs); compliance and incident reports submitted to the Regulator by explorers and operators.

Operators should be required to disclose geological information ; and disclose exactly how many mine sites there is in their lease and where.; and whether they have a market or contract for their commodity. No restrictions should be placed.

Landowners should have the Exploration PEPR (Program for Environment, Resources and Rehabilitation) supplied with all access forms from initial contact.

Landowners should have the right to issue a notice under section 9AA(1) of the Mining Act to indicate the terms on which they would be willing to negotiate, and to commence court proceedings in relation to the determination of waivers. This could be done after the close of statutory submissions or retention lease proposal. The cost of the Wardens Court and Environment, Resources & Development Court to be at mining companies expense.

The notice of declared equipment under section 59 of the Mining Act should stay, and it should be made clearer that the landowner has the right to object to the use of declared equipment.

I agree that the Minister should be allowed to condition PEPR's so that mining operations cannot commence until after payment of the bond, and also that the payment for the rehabilitation of the mine site is paid up front.

The Mining Act should have clear powers to provide for the pursuit of an operator, or management, in relation to any environmental damage that has occurred on a site after the tenement has expired.

The Department should be able to prohibit or delay the expiry of a tenement until an explorer or operator has complied with all outstanding obligations and outstanding liabilities.

I agree the process should be open for public comment prior to acceptance of the surrender or expiry date to ensure all outstanding liabilities are brought to the attention of the Department and the community.

I agree to the enhancing of the Departments compulsive tools by:- increasing penalties, : preventing renewals, transfers, cancellations surrenders and

transfers until environmental obligations have been complied with; and – imposing personal liability for Directors for company non-compliance.

I agree with expanding the Mining Register to include; Compliance directions, Rehabilitation directions, Public liability insurance limits and insurance compliance certificates, Notices for failure to comply, Incident reports, PEPRs, Compliance reports, Bond amounts, Minimum expenditure obligations and expenditure reports containing actual exploration expenditure. Include Rehabilitation expenditure.

I would like to see the publishing of all relevant government, explorer and operator documents online to increase industry transparency and accountability.

I agree with the Department increasing accountability of explorer and operators by ; Ensuring timely payment of rents; Prohibiting tenement renewals, cancellations, surrenders or transfers until all outstanding obligations are performed. I would like to add, and Rehabilitation is completed.

I agree the Mining Act needs to require planning and payment for Rehabilitation to begin straight away by the explorer or operator and be part of mine planning and be progressive throughout the life of the mine and continue after mining has ceased until rehabilitation is complete. It should be paid up front so that there is no cost to the tax payer. There should be no transfer of assets permitted until rehabilitation is complete.

The Government should impose unconditional bonds for 100% of the rehabilitation liabilities.

The Mining Act should include rights to adequately address monies owed to the Crown.

The cost of all this should be bourn by the Mining Industry and not taken out of royalties.

The Mining Industry should pay for any nett increase in costs caused by new regulations. All other business's have to pay for the costs of complying with new Government regulations.

Yes, I think that private mines should be regulated in a similar way to other mining activities.

Yes I agree that there should be an efficient and cost effective process for revoking inactive private mines.

I agree that the EARF should only be used as a funding source of last resort.

I think there should be a mechanism in the Mining Act that clearly allows for the careful transfer of mine infrastructure with ongoing monitoring and maintenance obligations to a third party approved by the Regulator.

The mining operator should be made to pay a bond up front for rehabilitation to help post-surrender assets and infrastructure.

The Mining Act should have a process that allows for the transfer of socially beneficial or productive assets and infrastructure to government agencies, non-governmental organisations (NGOs), councils or communities prior to the surrender of the tenement.

I would like to see the Mining Registrar continue to be publish notices in the Government Gazette and local newspapers. Also the Act could allow certain information to also be disseminated online.

Yes I agree that the Mining Register should include the following instruments; mineral claims; leases and licences; transfers of proprietary interests in a mining tenement; mortgages; caveats ; dealings/ instruments required to be registered under the Mining Act; dealings/ instruments not required to be registered under the Mining Act but which the tenement holder may choose to register; and instruments issued under the Mining Act (compliance and rehabilitation directions, bonds, penalties).

I think the Mining Register should allow parties to see a history of dealings, instruments, transfers, tenement changes, caveats and mortgages over the life of the tenement. I agree with the Mining Act adopting a modern caveat model. I would still like to see some involvement of the Minister as he is answerable to the people.

I agree with the proposed transparency reforms and disclosure initiatives around the Mining Register.

I think Department information and information submitted to the Department by tenement holders should be disclosed as soon as possible.

**I am not in favour of sub-dividing exploration licences with commercial freedom, and I am not in favour of any alteration to ELs or ELAs.**

I would not like to see the current EL renewals process changed.

I am not in favour of removing the mineral claim or any of the procedures undertaken when establishing a mineral claim.

I would like to see the maximum of 21 years granted to extractive minerals leases and minerals leases retained, by having to re-apply for the licence checking can be done on how their rehabilitation is being done.

I am not in favour of streamlining or any alteration of the current regulatory assessments for Miscellaneous Purposes Licenses and Retention Leases.

Special mining enterprises and indentured operations should be scrapped and all proposed mining ventures should come under the Mining Act.

I am not in favour of decreasing tenement assessment times.

A revised PEPR should be submitted to the Regulator for approval for any proposed changes to mining operations, and a landowner should be notified immediately.

Surrender, suspension and cancellation of tenements should not be approved until all rents, royalties and fees have been paid, and all land has been rehabilitated. The Minister should be involved. It could be streamlined by the payment of a bond up front at the time of application for a mining lease. Suspensions should be a separate process.

I think the removal of moss rock should stay in the Mining Act and require an extractive mineral lease (EML).

I think the Director of Mines and the Chief Inspector of Mines should get the Minister's consent before sub-delegating his powers. I am not in favour of getting rid of any regulatory powers. Landowners are expected to give up their land to be ruined for agriculture, cones of drawdown could occur up to 9 kilometres from the mine pits ( for hundreds of years), it's serious business.



There should be full cost recovery for all services and regulations in administrating the Mining Industry, as in other industries.

Yes I think there should be something better than operators self- assessment of their royalties to be paid. Maybe estimated assessment would be better.

Yes I am in favour of collecting and sharing important geological, environmental, planning and regional information to ensure we have a fully informed industry, community and landowners.

China thinks food is the most valuable commodity of all. Food security and safety is No 1 in China ahead of defence. China sees Australia as having a pure clean environment, producing clean green produce.

I believe that South Australia's clean green status will be damaged by allowing mining in our arable land .Demand for clean green horticulture and agriculture was recently tagged as a "Bright Spot" for growth in S.A. I think the Mining Act should protect arable land.

Julie Bassham 

10/10/10