

**Full name:** Diana Rickard

**Postcode:** 0838

**Submission contents:**

I object to this project going ahead because the proponent: - has not provided enough evidence of adverse effects on significant habitat of vulnerable and threatened species, - has falsely represented GhG emissions released and how much water will be extracted and - has not consulted with Indigenous custodians of Country. Ecological impacts will be long-lived and even catastrophic if the proponent continues to ignore the substantial risks of this project while fabricating evidence lowering the risk it presents to biodiversity. The project will have a huge impact on the environment yet Imperial has not prepared a comprehensive Environmental Impact Statement, or even a Supplementary Environment Report. I've had my fill of greedy capital corporate raiders with absolutely no duty of care or due diligence for any social/cultural or environmental interests of their short-term, high-risk actions. Not only are the 'greenies' they decry responsible for cleaning up and paying for the mess these despoilers leave but future generations of people and other living beings are inheriting a dying planet caused by the negligence of our government decision-makers listening to the smooth, false talk of 'Progress'. We stand to lose our precious, clean water and make the mining tenements into waste lands while our climate changes beyond what we can bear. What else are we prepared to risk? When will we learn to live more frugally and cooperatively with the environment we depend on? The EPA needs to reject this project - even if more comprehensive evidence of its merits miraculously emerge. Fossil fuel extraction is dirty, damaging and demeaning. It is now supposedly in transition. The EPA should be encouraging, educating and edifying governments to spent time and public money on environmentally-friendly energy - not on destructive and non-renewable fossil fuels. We need more earthcare and far, far less warfare. How about it, EPA?