



To DSD,
Loudounbrae Farming's submission to the mining review.

Loudounbrae Farming is a family owned and operated farming enterprise located at Maitland on the Central Yorke Peninsula. Our business employees directly 3 full time staff and 2 casuals on a weekly basis. We also contribute heavily to local businesses with the spin off jobs created in local dealerships, engineering businesses and chemical resellers and numerous of these in Adelaide itself. In total our small business located on 800Ha on average contributes 1.7million in revenue for the state. This figure with added help from government could see this number greatly increased. Multiply this figure out across the area of the entire peninsula and a net contribution of over \$1 billion is achievable.

Yorke Peninsula is a wonderfully productive place to perform dry land Agriculture and is the envy of many farmers Australia wide. So my first dot point to follow in relation to the mining review and my greatest outcome for the review would be.

1. An exclusion on mining in SA on High Production Agricultural Land.

Now I'm a realist and I also know that our current government doesn't value our contribution to the state so here follows what I perceive to some big issues.

Despite Government claims, we believe the intention of the Review is to free up access to agricultural land for mining companies. As the Deputy Chief Executive of the Department of State Development stated, "land access is our number one, two and three priority" (The Advertiser, 10th May 2014).

This means agricultural land not pastoral land, which is already accessible to miners. Farmers need to stand up to Government and the Mining Industry and demand changes to the Act that provide real protection for valuable cropping land and the wider environment.

- The Review must be carried out by an independent person or committee, not by the State Department (DSD) responsible for promoting mining and approving exploration/mine proposals.
- The time frames for this review are unacceptable. It seems the Government wants to rush the process through as quickly as possible, thereby minimising community input.
- The mining consultation and planning process should be far more transparent for all the major parties concerned. The rights of those who occupy the land in its current state should be treated with far more respect if mining is allowed.

- The dual role of the Minerals section of DSD must be separated. The fact that one agency has responsibility for promoting, approving and regulating all exploration/mining in South Australia results in an inevitable bias in favour of the mining industry.
- In line with GPSA's Mining Policy, the remaining 4.3% of agricultural land in this State must be exempt from exploration/mining (with the exception of extractive minerals such as dolomite, sand, gravel etc. which, in contrast to copper, iron and gold mines are relatively benign). This is the only way to provide long-term, guaranteed protection for our key food-producing regions.
- S9AA of the Mining Act must be removed. This section effectively over-rides the exemption given to agricultural land from exploration/mining by allowing companies to take farmers to court if they refuse to waive that exemption.
- Agriculture remains a vital contributor to the South Australian economy and will continue to do so well into the future. In contrast, because our mineral resources are finite, mining is a short term venture. Once the minerals are extracted, companies move on, leaving behind a damaged land.
- Community consultation during the approval and post-approval processes is woefully inadequate. To take just one example: a company normally takes years to prepare its Mining Lease Proposal which, when finalised, can run into thousands of pages of highly technical material. But the community is generally given on 6 – 8 weeks to read, disape that can never be returned to productive agriculture.
- Companies often obtain extension after extension when deadlines are not met, sometimes resulting in years of delay. (Rex, for example, obtained approval for its Hillside mine in July 2014. As yet, nothing has happened!). The emotional, psychological and financial effects on local residents impacted by these delays are ignored. Definite time limits must be imposed on exploration/mining companies with penalties or mining licence cancellations imposed for failing to meet these limits. I have firsthand seen the impact on the families involved in this scenario and it is an outrage that there is no compensation for their mental states and cost to business as they are held in limbo while they endure this process.
- 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 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. As Detailed in my opening paragraph the existing business / land holder also contributes in many ways with jobs.

- 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.

UNLESS THE REVIEW RESULTS IN REAL PROTECTIONS FOR AGRICULTURAL LAND, LOCAL COMMUNITIES AND THE ENVIRONMENT, FUTURE GENERATIONS COULD BE LEFT WITH A LONG-TERM LEGACY OF OPEN PITS AND WASTE LAND.

As a fifth generation farmer I don't want to see our industry be dealt a crippling blow due to a half generation mine. There is no reason we won't be here in another five generations provided we have the support now to continue providing food for the world. We need to get the review into the mining act correct so all industries have a future. Our states approach to clean energy should also be implemented into the mining review with nothing less than best practice and rehabilitation back to the lands prior use.

Kind Regards, Loudoun Hills Care taker Ben Francis.

