

## Dean, Julie (DEM)

---

**From:** andy bennett <andybenno@hotmail.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, 21 August 2019 3:04 PM  
**To:** DEM:Mining Reg Rehab  
**Subject:** Woodside Mine - Public Submission

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

Hi,

I write this email with the intention to convey my response to the proposed mining operations by Terramin near Woodside. I am a local resident on a small acreage less than 10 km from the proposed area. I attended the meeting held in Woodside on Monday 19<sup>th</sup> August. I have been involved in both mining and agricultural businesses over a 30 year career, so I consider myself relatively well equipped to consider the matter objectively.

There can be no doubt that the area is in a beautiful region, with world class food and wine being produced. Tourism is also clearly an important benefit to the local community, as a direct result of the food and wine quality. A number of environmental risks have also been validly raised by the community (groundwater contamination, noise and air pollution and traffic management being the main ones). Perhaps the main risk that I think came out of the 19<sup>th</sup> August meeting was the risk to reputation and image. Mining appears to have a bad image amongst some members of the community.

However, I believe this image is unfairly attributed. Particularly in comparison to the over-clearing and subsequent land degradation and weed infestations caused by agriculture over a wide area. Mining is a part of the history of the region, part of the reason for its original growth and prosperity. Yet, mining as proposed by Terramin at Woodside appears to be one of the smallest, simplest and lowest impacts of any project that I have been involved with, and if it goes ahead it will have to be the most heavily regulated (and rightly so) due to its proximity to other human interactions. To put it in context, it will have far less impact and adverse risk implications than the numerous quarries in the Hills – which co-exist harmoniously with the very same businesses that are refuting Terramin proposal.

I believe that the mine at Woodside would bring a significant and long-term benefit to the region – it would create new history for generations to enjoy, it would encourage new families to move into the region through creation of new jobs, it would bring more people through the nearby cellar doors and farms. In doing so, some of the risks postulated by the opponents of the mine would indeed be benefits- *more* tourism, *higher* land values, *better* facilities and services. The key outcome from what I have heard and read about the project, is that the tiny operational footprint of the proposed mine at Woodside can co-exist harmoniously with existing businesses and add further value to the beautiful region...with appropriate management and regulation.

My observations from the meeting on 19<sup>th</sup> August are that there is a pre-programmed anti-mining mindset amongst some of the community, who are (I think) in the vocal minority. The presentations at this meeting by various groups were allowed equal billing and the format was well organised, which is a credit to whoever organised the event. I noticed in particular that many people completely “turned off” when Terramin presented – the person sitting next to me spent the 10 minutes of Richard Taylor’s talk on his phone. Many were simply not willing to listen, and so these people will never understand how beneficial the mine could be to the region, nor how misinformed they are about its risks. Disappointingly, both local member Dan Cregan and federal member Rebekah Sharkie fall into the same category. Both of their strong opposition has shown that they are unwilling to listen to both sides of the situation. Credit to the Minister for Resources for having an open mind and listening at this event, one of the few voices of reason.

Should the mine proceed, I would like to see open and transparent information about the mines activities – particularly with water quality, which I see as the main real residual risk. I would like to see active local employment programs

and traineeships for our young adults. Given that the ore is hosted within a limestone unit, is there a possibility for a dolomite/lime style by-product that can be supplied to the local landowners?

In summary, what I see is a lot of well organised scaremongering by the vocal minority peddling untruths about the project. I see a small-footprint mine that can coexist harmoniously with the community and businesses. I see economic and social benefits to the region, far wider than the proposed 5 year term.

Andy Bennett

PO Box 570

Mt Barker SA 5251