

BSPCCC Meeting 7 - Minutes

Meeting:	Bowdens Silver Project CCC - Meeting 7
Date:	Thursday, 24 October 2019
Location:	The Stables Meeting Room, 82 Market Street, Mudgee
Time:	5.00 – 7.00 PM
Independent Chair:	Darryl Watkins, (DW)
Attendees:	Bradley Bliss J.P., Wellington Valley Wiradjuri Aboriginal Corporation (BB) Tom Combes, Community Member (TC) John Lydiard, Community Member (JL) Sonia Christie, Community Member (SC) Sally Dryburgh, Community Member (SD) Mick Boller, Lue Action Group (MB) Philip Freeman, Chamber of Commerce Kandos-Rylstone (PF) Cr John O'Neill, Mid-Western Regional Council (JO) Blake Hjorth, Bowdens Silver (BH) Jane Munro, Bowdens Silver (JM) Korena Flanagan, (KF) Independent Minute Taker
Apologies:	Anthony (Tony) McClure, Silver Mines Ltd (TM)

Actions

Action	Responsible
DW to provide update to MB regarding correspondence.	DW
Clarification of who makes decision regarding exhibition timing	DW
DW to invite the Department of Planning and the Biodiversity Conservation Trust to the next meeting	DW
Provide information about water diversion.	JO
Provide information about water table impacts to JL.	BH

Investigate placement of information materials in the Rylstone council chambers.	BH
Provide copies of the community newsletter to PF.	BH
Advise DW if TM is unable to attend the next meeting	JM
Open invitation to PF for a project introduction briefing from Bowdens Silver	PH/JM/BH

Minutes

Minutes	Action
<p>Welcome and Apologies (DW)</p> <p>The Chair welcomed the CCC members and thanked them for their attendance.</p> <p>The Chair noted apologies from Anthony McClure.</p> <p>BB gave Welcome to Country.</p>	
<p>Code of Conduct (DW)</p> <p>The Chair reaffirmed the Code of Conduct.</p>	
<p>Meeting 6 - Action Items (DW)</p> <p>The Chair reviewed the Action Items from Meeting 6.</p> <p>DW advised that he invited the Department. The Department advised that its usual process was to attend during the EIS public exhibition process or post the public exhibition. This enabled them to address issues and questions around the process. DW advised he would invite them again to the next meeting in early 2020.</p> <p>Regarding a neutral venue for the next Open Day, JM noted that TM is aware and would consider an appropriate location when the next event was planned, but there has been no date set for the next event.</p>	
<p>CCC Membership Update (DW)</p> <p>The Chair advised that Keith Perrett had resigned from the committee and welcomed BH as a permanent member of the committee.</p> <p>The Chair welcomed PF.</p> <p>PF and BH provided the Committee information about their respective backgrounds and reasons they wanted to join the CCC.</p>	
<p>Bowdens Silver Project update (DW)</p> <p>MB sought clarification about correspondence regarding comments that had been made by TM about the Lue Action Group in relation to the Open Day. MB asked that receipt of the correspondence be recorded in the minutes.</p> <p>DW apologised for being unaware of the correspondence and the oversight and undertook to provide an update to MB privately.</p> <p>MB briefed the Committee on the background to the correspondence. He further noted that there were two Open Days held by Bowdens on 7th May 2017 and another on 15th June 2019.</p> <p>He noted that there had been six subsequent meetings of the CCC and the issue had never been raised. He noted the dates of these meeting were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 9th May 2017 - 5th September 2017 - 14th February 2018 - 10th April 2018 - 14th August 2018 - 13th February 2019 	<p>DW to provide update to MB regarding correspondence.</p>

<p>MB also reported that at the 27th June 2019 CCC meeting aggressive behaviour at a previous Community Open Day event was noted.</p>	
<p>EIS Update (JM)</p> <p>JM provided an update on the progress of the EIS, noting that it was taking longer than anticipated.</p> <p>JM reported that the Board was now beginning to think beyond the EIS – with work beginning on pre-planning and pre-development stages of the project concurrently with preparation of the EIS.</p> <p>She reported that work on feasibility and optimisation would be on-going throughout 2020, while the EIS would be finalised and submitted to the Department for an adequacy review. JM provided an explanation of the adequacy review process to the Committee – explaining that the Department would review the EIS as prepared by the company to make sure that it had adequately addressed the Secretary’s Environmental Assessment Requirements (SEARs).</p> <p>JM reported that the process should be completed in the next few months, there was no fixed date for submission of the EIS but the company was very close to completion.</p> <p>The feasibility and optimisation process will look at reducing operating and capital costs, with the company looking to optimise operating costs to \$10 an ounce.</p> <p>JM reported that TM had been in the US and will be heading to Asia and Europe to negotiate financing.</p> <p>The company is also talking to potential customers and suppliers for development of the major componentry.</p> <p>It is also looking at employment and engineering for the project, with JM noting that the company wants to employ as many local people as it can.</p> <p>These processes would ramp up and continue while EIS process is underway, with JM noting that the EIS process can take some time – in some cases up to two years.</p> <p>JM reported that the company was confident the project would be approved.</p> <p>BH provided an update on the company’s exploration activities.</p> <p>He reported that a gravity survey was completed and that the company was hoping to do more drilling. Geologists want to test further to identify where mineralisation comes from and identify if there is a higher grade at both Bowdens and Barabolar. Also looking at doing some exploration at Tuena.</p> <p>JM provided PF with background information. DW noted that if PF wants a further briefing that the company will facilitate.</p>	<p>PF/JM/BH</p>
<p>Q&A and Discussion (ALL)</p> <p><u>Questions regarding the EIS process report to the CCC:</u></p> <p>BB asked again about survey reports for the pipeline of which the local indigenous community had not received copies. He said that under indigenous community consultation guidelines the reports are supposed to be provided to the community for comment.</p>	<p>Clarification of who makes decision regarding exhibition timing - DW</p>

<p>BB said that the company has said that the 2nd August report is basically what they will include in EIS. Yet the indigenous community has not been provided with a copy of the water pipeline survey report.</p> <p>BB noted that the community has requested information formally and has also requested a meeting but is yet to receive a response and that the community was beginning to express concern.</p> <p>JM responded that the company had sought advice from its consultant regarding the issue and was advised that what has been provided meets requirements. She noted that BB has a different view. She assured BB that the meeting would occur and that a date had not yet been set.</p> <p>DW asked for clarification about how the issue and current impasse can be progressed.</p> <p>BB and JM agreed that the issue would need to be addressed during the EIS process as JM maintained that the company's consultants advised the process had been undertaken correctly.</p> <p>BB asked about remaining 20 per cent pipeline that is yet to be surveyed. He reported that traditional knowledge holders report that this area contains areas of cultural significance and that they have raised the possibility of taking the company to the Land and Environment Court.</p> <p>JM acknowledged that the issue had been raised before. She reported that linear infrastructure was dealt with differently in the EIS process. She reported that the Department had advised the company that it will accept surveys of 80 per cent of the pipeline route for the purpose of the EIS. She advised the committee that there will be consent conditions attached to the project should it be approved. She assured the committee that the remaining 20 per cent of the pipeline route would be surveyed. She reported that the company would love to hear from the community in advance regarding areas that may be of concern. There was a discussion about cultural sensitivity of revealing the areas and their purpose.</p> <p>JM and BH reported that the survey would occur when it is required and the pipeline would be diverted if required.</p> <p>BB asked about Ulan Coal having to provide farmers with water.</p> <p>JM reported she had heard this, but that was a matter for Ulan Coal.</p> <p>SC raised exploration at Barabolar. She noted that the community was concerned because whenever the company mentions exploration there it impacts property prices.</p> <p>BH noted that this area was only at exploration stage, and it was very early in the process.</p> <p>BH reported that he speaks to a lot of people in the area to explain the exploration work and that the company was yet to identify a mineable resource.</p> <p>DW asked for clarification of the location. BH reported that it is about 10 kilometres further north and that it was historic work over time because it is in the company's exploration licence area.</p> <p>MB asked why the company alters the name of localities.</p> <p>BH reported that the company's geologist came up with the name.</p> <p>MB noted that local people do not like it. SC reported that the naming issue causes concern because it is not specific to a place. JM reported that it was the culture of geologists to name places in which they were undertaking survey work.</p> <p>DW asked for clarification of EIS lodgement timing. JM reported that the company is unable to provide a definitive timeline but that it would be close to the end of the</p>	<p>DW to ask Biodiversity Conservation Trust to come to the next meeting</p> <p>JO to provide information about water diversion.</p> <p>BH/JM to provide information about water table impacts to JL.</p> <p>BH to investigate placement of information materials in the Rylstone council chambers.</p> <p>BH to provide copies of the community newsletter to PF.</p>
--	--

<p>year. She reported that submission of the EIS for adequacy review would definitely occur this year for Departmental review. Timing on the public exhibition of the final EIS would then depend on the Department and any additional work required from the adequacy review. She reiterated that she could not provide a specific time, but that the EIS would be submitted for adequacy review before the end of the year.</p> <p>TC noted that KP had provided a commitment to the CCC that the company would not submit the EIS in the lead-up to Christmas. JM confirmed that public exhibition of the EIS would not occur over Christmas.</p> <p>DW further explained the adequacy review process and how it could impact timing for the EIS exhibition.</p> <p>SC asked for clarification around the public exhibition period – noting that the EIS should be exhibited for 60 days, not 30 days.</p> <p>DW reported that he had sought clarity from the Department on the issue and Departmental officers had advised they would make a decision regarding exhibition length upon receipt of the EIS.</p> <p>JL reported that KP advised it was a decision for the company.</p> <p>DW said he will seek further clarification from the Department.</p> <p>PF sought clarity around EIS process and how requirements and community concerns are addressed in EIS. JM explained the EIS process in detail.</p> <p>DW asked BH for an update on community consultation since the last CCC meeting.</p> <p>BH reported the company had been talking to people along the pipeline route and talking to people about monitoring reports.</p> <p>MB asked if any of those conversations had occurred with CCC members from Lue.</p> <p>BH confirmed he had discussed with JL.</p> <p>MB noted that no-one from the Lue community had told him that they had spoken to the company.</p> <p>BH noted that he has had discussions with land holders in the nearby area.</p> <p><u>General questions:</u></p> <p>SC noted that the date for this CCC meeting was not on the company's website.</p> <p>BH noted that SC had raised that and that it was fixed as soon as it had been raised and apologised for the oversight.</p> <p>SC noted correspondence that had been sent to DW.</p> <p>SC noted Item 6.1 of the scoping report regarding community consultation for the pipeline. She noted that the pipeline had been discussed at previous CCC meetings. She further noted that the item says that that the company had consulted with the community at the CCC and information stands and that there were no objections and that overall the community response had been positive. She questioned the accuracy of this statement given comments from CCC members in previous meetings.</p> <p>JM asked if CCC members could point to an objection in the minutes.</p> <p>SC reported that the overall feeling was not necessarily positive and that she believed it was a misrepresentation to say that it was discussed with CCC members and that there was no objection.</p>	
---	--

<p>JM noted that the scoping report is a point in time and that the Department understands that there is more work to do to talk to people about the pipeline. JM noted that she did not hear an objection and that scepticism or a lack of confidence is not an objection. JM asked SC to clarify if she was more concerned about reference to a positive response. SC reiterated that she did not think it accurate.</p> <p>SC noted that Moolarben modification 15 EIS had been submitted and that there was no mention of water from this project going to Bowdens and that it is bad for the project if there is not water.</p> <p>JM responded that it would be a matter for Moolarben Coal.</p> <p>JL asked for clarification of this response asking if it was a matter for the company if it doesn't have access to water.</p> <p>JM reported that there were commercial discussions on-going. She noted that Moolarben's modification submission is a matter for them and that Bowdens had no response.</p> <p>JL sought to clarify if this meant Bowdens would still be getting water from Moolarben.</p> <p>SC noted that this issue does impact the wider community.</p> <p>JL noted that without water the Bowdens mine could not go ahead.</p> <p>CCC members asked JO if he could provide an update on water diversions. He said he would come back to the meeting with more information.</p>	
<p>Communication with Broader Community (ALL)</p> <p>DW asked CCC members if they had any feedback on issues community members wanted to raise.</p> <p>PF reported that people in his community were not clear about issues including water and what is being mined and that answers to these questions are not readily available. For example, people were concerned they did not understand if there would be damage to the water table now and into the future and that people were looking for succinct answers and supporting evidence. He reported that members of the Chamber of Commerce were not necessarily for or against the mine but were seeking clarification on issues especially water. They do not want to see the mine go wrong in terms of water impacts and wanted to understand where to draw the line and if those lines would be drawn before mining starts.</p> <p>DW noted that a lot of those questions are yet to be answered because the company was still undertaking work to determine the answers.</p> <p>JM responded that planning a mine takes a long time. Once initial planning is done, then work needs to be undertaken to predict environmental impact then work is done on how to mitigate and control impacts, noting that this is a huge process and the company is still waiting on some reports that close off some of those issues. She explained that the company will then provide the reports to the Government as part of the EIS. If the project is approved then all government departments that have an interest will contribute to this process by putting further requirements on the project called consent conditions. The EPA issues licences that provide limits and company will be held accountable for meeting those limits. The expectation of having specific answers is unrealistic at this stage but all this information will be included in the EIS.</p> <p>DW advised PF that outside of CCC meetings he was able to go directly to the company to clarify issues his community has raised or on which he would like information. This offer still stands for all CCC members.</p>	

<p>JO asked about the status of a computer model of the mine.</p> <p>BH reported that it was close to finalisation. At the Open Day the company had a first draft of a model and that it has been under further development since June. He reported that the concept is that people will be able to move around and look at the mine from different perspectives at certain time points. The company is investigating how to best host the site to provide access to the community.</p> <p>TC noted that the picture on the latest update brochure issued by Bowdens was of his property and that he was annoyed about it.</p> <p>BB asked about end-of-life rehabilitation of the mine site.</p> <p>JM advised she had not looked at the specific report in relation to rehabilitation. She reported that a local Landcare group had been asked for input but they had chosen not to provide it. She confirmed that the company wanted to do the best they can and that this was a common theme from consultation.</p> <p>SC asked if modelling was adapted to take climate change into consideration.</p> <p>JM advised it was and that three or four different scenarios were modelled which is the standard to ensure scientific integrity.</p> <p>SC advised that she thought the wind monitoring device on the ridge was in an odd position, following a recent visit by CCC members to inspect the site.</p> <p>JM advised that company asked the modeller to calculate wind impacts for that particular day. Model predictions were accurate to conditions.</p> <p>SC noted that local experience was over the past years there had been changes in wind direction and speed on the ridge.</p> <p>There was discussion about accuracy of modelling, with community representatives on the CCC noting that given the location of the monitoring devices there was no way to tell if monitoring was accurate for that day at that location.</p> <p>JM noted that the modelling was consistent with the experience on the day.</p> <p>SC asked about biodiversity offsets for clearing endangered grass at Box Woodland, noting that the Biodiversity Conservation Trust was charged with determining appropriate offsets and suggested that the Trust asked to come and address a future meeting. SC sought to clarify the area that would be used for offset.</p> <p>JM reported that properties had been defined by the engaged consultant. She noted there were multiple ways that offsets can be made and ultimately it would come down to dealings with relevant landholders.</p> <p>JL asked for clarification around impacts on the water table and the easement for the pipeline.</p> <p>Regarding the pipeline easement, BH explained that it would allow access, construction, pumping, rehabilitation and monitoring. BH advised that farmers could still use the land to farm, but no structures could be built because the company would still need to access the pipe underneath for maintenance.</p> <p>JL noted that the pipeline was currently a line on a map and asked that if a farmer asked for the route to be adjusted if that could occur? BH responded that it could.</p> <p>On water impacts, JL asked for clarification on what impact the lowering of the water table 10 to 15 metres would have on dams and trees. The company undertook to follow up.</p> <p>Regarding Lawson Creek JL noted that when asked about impacts of lowering the water table by one metre on the creek the company responded that it was not sure. JL said he was therefore concerned that the company is not sure of</p>	
---	--

<p>available data. JM noted that neither she nor BH were qualified to answer his questions and would follow up with relevant staff. JL noted he had identified a site where monitoring could be undertaken, saying that there was no way to fully understand the impacts unless the area was drilled for monitoring.</p> <p>TC read and tabled two letters from community members.</p> <p>The first was regarding community sponsorship and concerns about the motivation for this sponsorship. The letter noted that it appeared as if it was a quid pro quo to garner support for the mine and questioned whether this was appropriate. The letter writer wished to stay anonymous.</p> <p>JM noted that the person who had written the letter had made some insinuations and that the company had a policy around community sponsorships.</p> <p>BH noted that the company was working towards being part of the community for the next 16 or more years. He noted that if the company wanted to be part of the community it needed to interact with the community. He said that activities sponsored by the company were good things for the community and that if the company did not provide sponsorship it makes it difficult for community groups to do what they do.</p> <p>DW said the company has sought advice from this forum in the past about what/who Bowdens should sponsor and he recalled no suggestions were offered by CCC members.</p> <p>TC noted that the CCC could understand why a community member would question this but acknowledged that he could also see BH's point of view.</p> <p>SC suggested it was about winning hearts and minds.</p> <p>JM noted that very few people would feel obliged to support the mine because of community sponsorship.</p> <p>PF noted that the issue of sponsorship does divide community groups.</p> <p>TC noted that Lue Fire brigade voted to not to accept sponsorship from the company.</p> <p>MB made an observation that a local coal mine said it sponsored community to \$1.4 million but had not paid any tax.</p> <p>JM noted that this was a matter for that company not Bowden's.</p> <p>TC also read a letter from Lue Action Group objecting to and raising concerns about the mine – including about water, concern about lead mining, transportation, rehabilitation planning. TC tabled the letter.</p> <p>DW gave company representatives an opportunity to respond to the points raised in the letter. JM chose not to.</p> <p>PF asked if it was possible to put information about the mine into the local council chamber in Rylstone – looking at water table impact, air quality, and noise.</p> <p>BH said he would investigate.</p> <p>DW said there was good information on the website and if that did not suffice then CCC members can ask the company for information in between meetings.</p> <p>JM provided PF, as a new CCC member, with information about the Bowdens project.</p> <p>TC noted that despite the picture of his property on the front of the newsletter, it provided good information.</p> <p>DW asked BH to drop some to PF at his workplace and he undertook to do so.</p>	
--	--

<p>MB congratulated the Bowdens environmental officer, noting his wife had contacted them about a koala and they were on-site in 20 minutes and noted he would be interested to see how the EIS deals with koalas.</p> <p>DW asked if Bowdens could provide information about the web model and when it would go live.</p> <p>JM reported that the company's vision is to have computers set up and access for people but that this was technologically challenging.</p> <p>SD said that the information should be accessible and simple and suggested one way might be a physical 3D model.</p>	
<p>Agenda Items for Meeting 8 (DW) Committee agreed to hold the next meeting on 27th February.</p>	<p>DW to invite Department to this meeting</p>
<p>Final Comments (DW) Members noted it would be beneficial for TM to attend.</p>	<p>JM to advise DW if TM is unable to attend on the above date.</p>
<p>Close Meeting The Chair thanked CCC members for their attendance. The meeting was closed at 7 pm.</p>	

TO: Darryl Watkins

Chair

Bowdens CCC

Dear Darryl,

I write to make a formal protest about comments relating to the Lue Action Group made by SVL representative Mr. T. McClure at the Bowdens CCC, held on Thursday, 27th June at the MWRC Chambers.

During the meeting Mr McClure made several disparaging and completely unsubstantiated remarks about the activities of the Lue Action Group and its members.

Referring to a previous Open Day at the Lue Hall, Mr. McClure alleged that some presenters were intimidated and that LAG supporters were "particularly aggressive". I attended that meeting and did not witness behaviour that any reasonable person would describe in those terms. A member of the Police Force arrived during the meeting. To the best of my knowledge, no one was arrested or warned or cautioned.

Mr McClure also stated that the Lue Action Group was disseminating lies. As a past Chairman of LAG and a member since its inception in 2011 I can unreservedly state that the group has striven to present factual information which can always be substantiated. The group has engaged consultants at the cost of tens of thousands of dollars to ensure that this is the case. Not one shred of information put out by the LAG has ever been refuted by SVL or its predecessor, KCN.

To imply that the LAG is an uninhibited group of aggressive and ill-informed persons is a slur which I cannot allow to pass without correction. Attempting to marginalise a community and its representatives affected by a proposal is a long established tactic used by mining proponents.

I might point out that the group contains persons who are highly respected leaders in their communities. Many are highly educated and have included a Supreme Court Judge, a solicitor, teachers, nurses, an artist, farmers, librarians, graziers, doctors and business people.

In a meeting where there were many, many points of contention, these incorrect and totally unsubstantiated assertions were uncontested.

I wish to make it clear as the LAG representative on the committee that I do not accept them and they must be unreservedly withdrawn and a written apology issued.

Regards

Mick Boller 28th June 2019.

Dear Tom,

I write to you concerning the current sponsorship program by Bowden's Silver.

I do not object to generosity and I am grateful to those that donate money to a community but I do raise questions about motive and influence.

My concerns are why has Bowdens Silver gone out into the community and sponsored so heavily? What impact does this have? I constantly hear of what Bowdens are doing in the community. There is a long list of community events and organizations that have been sponsored or supported by Bowdens Silver over the past few years. I believe they employed a coordinator for this sponsorship program and he is also a local Councillor and he would carry significant influence within the community. This person also has a has a very aggressive online presence.

I and a number of others that I know have concerns that a company with virtually no income is currently one of the largest sponsors of community events in the District! why would they do this? the company may be able to answer those questions. I do not wish to be cynical, but Philanthropy is generally considered to be the domain of people and companies after they have made money, or while they are making money, not before.

This is also not marketing. I would not imagine that Bowdens Silver plans to sell its product locally.

I understand that an important part of the approval process and the Environmental Impact Statement involves Social Assessment. In other words, What do the community think of this project? I ask " What influence does sponsorship have on this assessment and will this sponsorship ultimately have a bearing on the issue of Social Licence? Is this something that the department of planning should be concerned about? This certainly looks like quid pro quo? is this appropriate?

Would you be so kind as to raise this issue at your next Community Consultative Committee Meeting please,

Warm Regards,

CCC Meeting. Bowdens Mine Project. 24/10/2019

Mr Chairman,

On behalf of the Lue Action group I again present that we object to the Bowdens Mine Project.

Once again we find a delay to the presentation of an Environmental Impact Statement. Once again the people from Lue are left unsure of their future. Once again the Community is left in limbo about how they will continue to live in the Lawson Creek Valley. How long must they endure this threat to their homes, lifestyles and businesses?

It doesn't take much thought to understand why there are these continual delays. The project is riddled with problems that are impossible to solve.

First, it is too close to the village of Lue. Pushing up a few mounts to block the noise will not work. The ambient noise at Lue is too low. The mines proximity to Lue is and will always be "too close"

Secondly, there is the water issue. Bowdens claim they will not use bores, instead they will pump water from the mine pit. It's the same water for goodness sake. Its groundwater. Bowdens also send out the smokescreen that they will pump water from the Ulan Coal fields. It's an outrageous idea, has widespread opposition and delivers only 15% of the annual water requirement anyway. The rest of the water comes right out of the already parched and drought ravaged Lawson Creek Valley. We have storage dams built for these kinds of projects. Store the water in the good times for continuation of the supply in the bad times. While the NSW government and other forward thinking businesses draw plans for increased storage, Bowden's have scrapped ideas for use of stored water. It seems they have no idea of our climate and how drought works. While the world ramps up its fight against climate change, Bowden's is happy to simply say that groundwater is an endless resource. Like a child that turns the tap on and thinks everything is okay. It must be okay... water is still coming out!

Third, is the mineral that will be mined. 83,000 tonnes of lead will be mined at this site under the current proposal. That is 41% of the mineral. 58% is Zinc. They call it a Silver mine. That's a good one! less than half a percent of the ore is silver. Processed with a Cyanide plant. 2km from a village? Upstream from Mudgee and in the headwaters of the Macquarie System. Open cut mining, Cyanide processing and the waste into a tailings dam that will sit in the valley forever. That's not world best practice, it might have been, it's not now. The world is moving forward and getting smarter.

Fourth is the transport. Bowdens advertise that no product will be transported through Rylstone and Lue but they neglect to tell the people from Mudgee that it will all go through their town. I know they are not happy about that. Who would be? It is a simple rob Peter to pay Paul.

Fifth is the plan for rejuvenation. There is no plan for rejuvenation. Walk away and leave the hole and the tailings dam is the Bowden's idea for rejuvenation. It is disgraceful that you would leave the planet like that when you are done. The excuse we are told it is money, too expensive to do the right thing.

It's a bad project, plain and simple. If it wasn't we would have seen this thing get off the ground years ago but with multiple owners, years of EIS delays and financially doubtful this mine is still a bad idea and the Lue Action Group objects to it.

Tom Combes. President. Lue Action Group.

24/10/19