

Department of Planning and Infrastructure

stephen.o'donoghue@planning.nsw.gov.au.

http://majorprojects.planning.nsw.gov.au/index.pl?action=view_job&job_id=4975

**RE Shenhua Watermark EIS STATE significance assessment- response Watermark Coal Mine SSD-4975,
Watermark Coal Project**

This is not a form letter this is a formal submission which captures the concerns of individuals and families- Gomeroi and other Aboriginal parties

Please accept my submission regarding the proposed Shenhua Watermark Coal project as I am very concerned about this project being approved on cultural, social and environmental grounds. As a land holder of the region and as a Traditional Gomeroi man I am deeply concerned that the project will be approved and do not believe that the studies have been through enough to mitigate the impacts to the region. I have watched my rural area change where families both Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal have lived off the land. The purchase and effective 'wipe out of an entire community' to be replaced by a dirty industry –open cut coal is an enormous adverse impact to our way of life. The Government has been approving large scale mines for the region- cumulatively this will transform our community and adversely impact the flora fauna and viability of lands around us. I have a bore- the water study has been insufficient to really understand the impacts to landholders up from and lower than the mine project operations. Long term aquifer impacts as of a major concern. As a traditional owner I know this lands I know its water and I know that the assessment is at a superficial understanding of the integrated ecology and the way in which all aspects tie in together. I am also deeply concerned about the archaeological assessment of the area and the proposed destruction of two highly sensitive and significant grinding groove sites within the project disturbance footprint. Shenhua has inadequately tried to identify alternative approaches to protecting and avoiding harm.

Aboriginal cultural heritage concerns

The Shenhua Watermark project if approved in its current form will destroy two highly significant sites both large grinding groove complexes. The enormity of the three pit open cut mine is highly concerning and will create irreparable damage to the environment, community life and our food resources and water resources.

The archaeological assessment to inform the EIS is flawed and has failed to document and record all archaeological sites- the adequacy of coverage has been a constant concern and this has resulted in a non-trust of the assessment nor its outcomes- the predictive model is severely flawed due to the percentage of coverage and the archaeological values of the site are compromised.

I do not believe these concerns will be adequately addressed as once approved- the damage and destruction will be approved. Shenhua Watermark have also made no attempt to explore how they

could modify or reduce their mine pits to avoid the grinding groove sites though it is stressed that both should be saved.

Denial of traditional peoples rights and interests

They have excised out of the project area Native Title land tenure in order to remove the possibility of negotiating with Gomeroi people who are at risk of having irreparable loss due to the invasive practices of open cut mining. Indirect impacts to unextinguished native title lands have not been captured and considered transparently in the EIS and vibration and blasting places these areas at risk.

The grinding groove complexes are large and are not in a typical area where grinding grooves may be found. They have hundreds of spear markings rather than axes grindings indicating a large men's area.

Kamilaroi are well documented as one of the few Aboriginal people to have gone to war against the invasion of non-Aboriginal people. The location is incredibly important – with an inter-relationship between the Dreaming hills Mooki River and Lake Goran.

There are numerous environmental concerns

The EIS study fails to protect our Koala population – the size and location of the proposed project will have a devastating impact on the koala population – NSW government are supposed to protect the koala -approval of this mine is inconsistent with these statements and policy directions.

The EIS also fails to demonstrate how our birdlife will be protected- some of these birds are totems- we need the habitat for them even when rehabilitation of areas occurs the lower forest growth does not come back for many years -the impact to breeding programs is significant and the ecological balance is at risk.

The impact to underground water is inadequate- stating that they will use existing farming licences is poorly through through as there are more water licences than water supply sold throughout Nsw. Guarantees to management contamination and water quality are poorly applied. The amount of truck movement and people movement alone will increase the numbers of road kill and this is not mitigated nor are there programs in place to ensure that our cultural foods and totems which need to be protected will not become carnage on the roads.

Dust and vibration from the mining activity and truck movements is also of concern on water quality human air quality. Throughout the consultation process Shenhua and Hansen Bailey continually said these impacts will be addressed in the EIS. I do not believe that the studies reflect the level of concern and the need to look at cumulative long term impacts.

Social concerns

The Social impact assessment does not provided real commitments by Shenhua to address social and cultural impacts the document reads like a list of possibilities and not commitments. Mining companies should to be provided with a carte blanche approach to destroying the area and not mitigate with firm commitments.

For example there are no long term commitments and offsets are listed as life of mine not in perpetuity. The social impact assessment also completely missed the impact to the region of Shenhua buying out the farms in the area and the impact this will bring to social services and town viability numbers, A fly in fly out community will change the social fabric of our communities the history of boom bust cycles of mining are in the living memory of people in the region- the mine EIS fails to carefully plan for this – learn and refer to the experiences of other areas and develops measureable and demonstrated strategies to reduce this risk. The development of mitigation is considered setting the bar very low and not providing for clear and contemporary strategy to ensure that the benefits that arise from the mine re economic benefits to the state is not at the detrimental and devastating cost to the local community including our aged and Aboriginal communities where there is a history of further disadvantage rather than a shared benefit to families.

There are approximately 15000 Gomeroi people we have an active local Aboriginal community and we do not believe this project will protect what is important, we do not believe that the environmental impacts can be mitigated and our precious resource water can be maintained. Of deepest concern to us as a people is the destruction of not one but two very large and very significant grinding groove complexes of extremely high cultural value. For these reasons we ask to Minister to please not approve the project as the cost environmentally, socially and culturally are just too great. The EIS studies poorly reflect the level of concerns across all director general requirements.

Yours faithfully

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Michum Neave', with a stylized, flowing script.

Michum Neave

Attention: Director Mining and Industry Projects
Re: Watermark Coal Mine
App No: SSD- 4975, Watermark Coal Project

Name: Lisa Norman
grantnorman@bigpond.com
Address: 'Rowena' Spring Ridge NSW 2343

I have not made any reportable political donations.

Privacy Statement: I have read the Department's Privacy Statement and agree to the Department using my submission in the ways it describes. I understand this includes full publication on the Department's website of my submission, any attachments, and any of my personal information in those documents, and possible supply to third parties such as state agencies, local government and the proponent. I agree to the above statement.

Submission:

I am a member of SOS Liverpool Plains and live on the southern side of the proposed Shenhua Watermark Coal project at Breeza NSW. We are also located in the BHP Caroon Coal project exploration area and the Santos coal seam gas exploration area PEL 1. I believe that the Shenhua Watermark Coal cannot properly be assessed alone. The cumulative effects of all proposed projects in this area should be considered together to show the true effects.

It is known that this project will have many impacts on our community, all of which are a huge concern. These impacts include agricultural productivity, health, surface and groundwater, noise, aboriginal heritage, fauna and ecology of the area. I have decided to address just two in my submission today, as time allows.

Health - there will be an increase in noise due to the project as well as extra train movements. Low frequency noise, as is produced by machinery is known to be detrimental to health and be a factor in cardiovascular disease, psychological problems and stress. Due to the known damaging effects of these low frequency noises it is unacceptable that Shenhua are not including an assessment of these in its EIS.

Local residents will also be subject to coal dust, which contains heavy metals which also have adverse effects on health. Adults living in coal communities are known to have higher mortality from lung cancer, chronic heart, respiratory and kidney diseases. A Health Impact Assessment is underway for the Gunnedah Basin. Until the results of this assessment are known it would be negligent of the State Government to consider approving this project.

Water: If water contaminated with heavy metals found in coal, were to find its way into our water sources, it would have disastrous effects on surrounding communities. It is considered most probable that contaminated water from the sediment dam will be released when, due to rainfall events, the dam exceeds capacity. This release of contaminated water onto our black soils and into our precious ground water systems is

unacceptable. The Mooki River, which is at the head of the Murray Darling Basin, could also be affected from such an occurrence which would be far reaching and once again, totally unacceptable.

Unless there can be ABSOLUTE guarantees that contamination to our water WILL NOT occur, which Shenhua cannot give us, then this project should not go ahead. The surrounding farmland, water courses and underground aquifers are too precious to be put at risk. 'Should be' and 'expected' are not good enough to be included in an environmental impact statement on a project in such a fragile and important system.

Conclusion:

The Shenhua Watermark Coal Project should not be assessed alone but along with the cumulative effects of other proposed projects for the area - namely the Caroon Coal Project by BHP and the coal seam gas project by Santos.

The Shenhua Watermark Coal Project should not be assessed until the results of the Health Impact Assessment for the Gunnedah Basin are known.

The Shenhua Watermark Coal Project should not be assessed until there are absolute guarantees that ground and surface water will not be contaminated as a result.

NSW Government Planning & Infrastructure
GPO Box 39
SYDNEY NSW 2001

Attention: Director Mining and Industry Projects
Re: Watermark Coal Mine
App No.: SSD – 4975, Watermark Coal Project

Name: Noel Peterson
Address: Carroll Rd Breeza 2381.

Disclose reportable donations: I have made a reportable political donation Yes/No. If yes access disclosure of political donations and gifts information by clicking on the link below

http://www.planning.nsw.gov.au/assessingdev/pdf/form_political_donations_disclosure_minister_or_dg.pdf

Privacy Statement: I have read the Department's Privacy Statement and agree to the Department using my submission in the ways it describes. I understand this includes full publication on the Department's website of my submission, any attachments, and any of my personal information in those documents, and possible supply to third parties such as state agencies, local government and the proponent. I agree to the above statement? Yes/No

If you answer no, you do not wish your personal details to be included in the submission, your personal and contact details should be provided on a separate page and not included in your submission.

I object to the proposed Shenhua Watermark Coal Mine at Breeza NSW.

This project will have significant impact on the Breeza community and region. Some of these impacts include:

1. Air quality - We strongly disagree with the Shenhua air quality modelling results because the Village is West of the area to be mined and our prevailing winds and storm paths are Westerly. To my knowledge Shenhua based its modelling on a single dust monitor situated on the East side of the Breeza Hill just inside the Village boundary, Therefore does not give an accurate indication of wind and storm born particulate fallout. This is unacceptable. Further studies need to be carried out with extra monitors placed in and around the Village before mining commences.

2- Health. The adverse effects of mining on the health of populations close to mine sites has been well documented and yet no study done on the health of the People of Breeza, Given that we are so close to the proposed mine site and the risk to our health is great there needs to be a health monitoring program agreed to by Shenhua and the Government before mining commences. We need a guarantee of compensation in case of a worst case scenario events.

3. Water – There is a high risk of coal dust contamination to the rain water tanks in Breeza, This is the only source of household water for most of the residence in The Village. There are no contingency plans in place either by the Government or Shenhua if this were to occur. A water supply plan must be agreed to by the Government, Shenhua and the residence of Breeza before mining commences.

There is a risk of contaminated water being released from the sediment dam during rainfall events where it exceeds the capacity. With the unpredictable rainfall events this situation is considered most probable and the releasing of contaminated water across the black soil plains and into our ground water systems is unacceptable.

It is stated in the proposal that:

- there is a potential for the reduction of catchment flows to surrounding waterways including the Mooki River, Watermark Gully, Native Dog Gully and Lake Goran with 25% loss at Watermark
- groundwater levels are predicted to largely recover rapidly

These predictions and forecasts by the Proponent are of great concern to us.

4 Blast damage. The adverse effects of underground tremors known as the ripple effect to damage residential structures, Graves and head stones has been known to occur at other mine sites. To my knowledge there are no contingency plans in place if such an event should occur in Breeza. We need a guarantee from Shenhua that monitors will be placed around the Village and if damage occurs because of blasting Shenhua will meet all cost involved to repair all structures, graves and headstones.

5. Koala - The Australian Koala Foundation (AKF) disputes the number of koalas located in the local government area and feel there are a lot less than stated. AKF are opposed to the translocation of the koalas from the Shenhua area.

6. Ecology - A total of 4,084 ha of vegetation will be removed progressively over the life of the project. This is a very large loss of vegetation and most certainly not allowed under any circumstances.

7. Future Expansion – It is stated in the EIS that a final void will remain in the Western Mining Area and will cover an area of approx. 100 hectares. It will have a maximum depth of 80 metres below the natural ground surface. This is the outcome that is recommended by the mining company as it is the most cost effective method plus it allows opportunity for access to coal resources. This raises concerns for our community as we are not talking about a one off mine but an opportunity for future expansion with further risk to water resources, agricultural land and people's health.

8. Noise – the proposed mine is located near the village of Breeza in Northern NSW which is a quiet rural area. Infrasound/low frequency noise (ILFN) produced by machinery is known to be a problem in these types of areas due to the lack of background noise. ILFN is known to cause cardiovascular disorders, psychological problems and stress. It is of great concern to the community that Shenhua is not completing any assessment on low frequency noise as stated in the EIS "Acoustics Impact Assessment 4.6 Low Frequency Noise - no separate assessment of low frequency noise levels is required".

9. Heritage - The project will destroy significant Aboriginal heritage sites. The relocation of any significant object from its natural environment is not recommended due to the potential damage that can occur.

10. Increased Train Movement - All towns and properties along the rail line will be impacted by additional noise and dust from increased coal train movements.

If the Government approves this project, they are knowingly approving the detrimental impacts of this mine at the cost of the landholders and the community. Once the mine starts, you cannot stop or mitigate the impacts to the water resources, the system enters a new state and is changed.

[New South Wales Government](#)[Department of Planning](#)[Skip to content](#)[Home](#) > [Development Assessments](#) > [Major Project Assessments](#)

Aina Ranke, of ASHTONFIELD NSW, made the following submission on the project:

SSD-4975, Watermark Coal Project



Objects to this project

As a long time resident of the Hunter Valley, I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the proposal for Shenhua Watermark to develop an open cut coal mine on the Liverpool Plains.

As a rich agricultural area, as the Hunter Valley once was, growing a diversity of agricultural crops, the Liverpool Plains are crucial to the food security of not only Australia, but the area's contribution to global food security.

It is common knowledge that water supply is essential to food production, and that the black soils of the Liverpool Plains and the underlying aquifers are far too precious to put at risk.

With the introduction of the Strategic Regional Land Use Policy, and the state wide Aquifer Interference Policy, both of which I applaud, it is just common sense that digging a huge open cut coal mine in the middle of a critical food and fibre producing area is a bad idea.

The entire Hunter Valley is paying for the rush to rape the earth - prime agricultural land ruined, water quality ruined, communities fractured, a beautiful rural landscape transformed into a naked moonscape, and physical and mental health problems through poor air quality, where dust pollution levels well exceed national pollution standards.

It makes economic, social and food security sense to permanently protect the rich black soil plains of the Liverpool Plains and to halt mining permanently in this crucial agricultural region. Approval of the Shenhua Watermark project would represent a significant policy failure.

NSW Government Planning & Infrastructure
GPO Box 39,
SYDNEY, NSW 2001

Mr. Allan Robert Riordan.
a.riordan@bigpond.com
1880 Normans Road.
PIALLAWAY, NSW 2342.

12th April 2013.



PCU043834

Attention: Director Mining and Industry Projects

Re: Watermark Coal Mine

App No: SSD – 4975, Watermark Coal Project



Disclose reportable donations: I have NOT made a reportable political donation.

Privacy Statement: I have read the Department's Privacy Statement and agree to the Department using my submission in the ways it describes. I understand this includes full publication on the Department's website of my submission, any attachments, and any of my personal information in those documents, and possible supply to third parties such as state agencies, local government and the proponent. I agree to the above statement – Yes, however I request that the information included on "attachment A" is not published on the department's website or forwarded to any other third party for publication. The information on "Attachment A" is of a personal nature and would be a security risk to my operation.

I am a member of the Caroon Coal Action Group/SOS Liverpool Plains and a long term Liverpool Plains landholder. I strongly object to the proposed Shenhua Watermark Coal Mine at Breeza NSW.

This project has had and will continue to have a significant detrimental impact, not only on myself and family, but on the local farming community and the wider region as a whole.

I have many concerns regarding the impact the "Watermark Coal Mine Project" will have! On one of the most productive food growing bowls in Australia, if not the world.

I am the proud caretaker/owner of the property called "Nullabeen", which joins the northern "Project Boundary" of the proposed "Watermark Coal Project". My adjoining farm "Durante" is situated below "Nullabeen" and according to the "C Mine Plan Justification Report" both farms are completely within the 10km Locality Buffer Line, and form part of the Gunnedah Formation zone. I have farmed this land continually for the past 40 years and have raised my 4 children on this land. During this time my family and I have been actively involved in the local community.

Some of my concerns are:

1. Water: a) Contaminated run off. b) Changes to the Water Catchment Flow.

For the past 40 years I have lived on, cared for and farmed this beautiful productive black soil plain. I have seen many floods come down through "Watermark" and sweep across the plain. The flood

water flows into the water systems that replenish the local wetlands, rivers and underground water aquifers. The underground water is widely used for irrigation to grow the food that feed the people. The water that runs through Watermark and across the middle of my farm is a natural part of the delicate balances of the eco system of the Breeza Plain.

a) **The runoff of contaminated water**, from the sediment dams and mining sites in general.

It is **NOT** a matter of “**If**” but a case of “**How Often**” the contaminated water will flow across the Breeza Plain and into our water ways. The residue from the sediment dams will deposit on our fertile cropping soil and polluting our waterways for generations to come.

b) **Changes to the natural Water Catchment Flow:**

Any changes to the catchment area will impact on the natural flow of water. Farmers on the plain depend on the regular run off, of the rain to replenish their dams and aquifers.

It is stated in the “Surface Water Impact Assessment” there is a potential for reduction of catchment flow to surrounding waterways including the Mooki River, which also runs through my “Durante” property, and a 25% loss in run off from Watermark. This is a significant loss in the water flow from our catchment area.

2. **Air Pollution:**

With the wind direction being predominantly from the south and south west in this area, the coal dust and other dust pollutions associated with open cut mining, will be carried onto the farming land of the Breeza Plain.

Some of the foods that we produce on our very productive land, which will be directly affected by these air bourn pollutants and polluted waters are:

Bread Wheat:

- Bread is the staple food of virtually everybody’s diet.

Durum Wheat:

- This is milled to produce some of Australia’s best quality pasta.

Canola:

- This is consumed in a number of ways. The seed is used in multi grain breads as a whole seed.
- The seed is also crushed to extract the oil to produce margarine and cooking oils.
- Over the past few years we have grown a new variety of Canola which produces oil that is seen as a healthier option than the old varieties. This variety of Canola is sold to Cargill Australia Ltd who crushes the seed to supply all the cooking oil used by Kentucky Fried Chickens.

Sunflower seed:

- Is also consumed in a number of ways.
- The seed is also crushed to extract the oil to produce margarines and cooking oils.
- The sunflower seed kernel is used in multi grain breads, breakfast muesli, muesli bars.
- The sunflower seed kernel is also sold in health food stores as an alternative to peanuts.

Linseed: (Flax seed)

- The linseed is a source of Omega 3, and often purchased in health food stores by individuals, to supplement their breakfast cereals.
- The whole seeds is also used in most multi grain breads, mueslis, and snack food bars.
- The seed is also crushed to produce Linseed oil.

Chick Peas:

- Are used in many Mediterranean recipes.
- Chick peas are the main ingredient in Hommos.
- Chick peas are fast becoming recognised as a healthy alternative in modern day cuisine.
- Chick peas are exported in large quantities to South East Asia.

Barley:

- Malting Barley is used in the production of Beer.
- Barley is used in many multi grain breads.
- Feed Barley is consumed in the feed lot industry to feed meat chickens and beef cattle.

Sorghum:

- Sorghum is used in some multi grain breads.
- Sorghum is mainly consumed in the feed lot industry to feed meat chickens and beef cattle.

Is it the State Government's priority to provide access to low grade coal for China, or the continued production and supply of clean high quality food for Australian citizens?

Over the 40 years we have grown hundreds and thousands of tonnes of food to feed the people of this great nation. We have worked with the Department of Agriculture, and seed companies, developing new varieties of higher yielding and pest resistant crops. We have always worked towards developing "best farming practices" and further expansion of the farm.

30 years ago we purchased "Tullawong" which joined the eastern boundary of "Durante". 15 years ago we expanded the farming operation again, and purchased the property called "Nullabeen", which joins "Durante's" western boundary. The western portion of Nullabeen rises up off the flood plain and gives direct all weather access to the highway. The height advantage of "Nullabeen" gives spectacular view across the Breeza Plain and beyond. There are Koala bears in the well-established gum trees located on "Nullabeen's" western boundary reserve area. "Nullabeen" was the logical place to develop our farming headquarters as it is the only part of the farm not subject to flooding.

The development of the western portion of "Nullebean" has been a long and expensive process with a total infrastructure investment of around \$1.1 million dollars so far. This included a 4,200 tonne silo complex with grain drying and grain transfer systems, fully imported from the United States. It also includes a 24 meter x 24 meter machinery shed, plus individual silos, sheds and large farm fuel storage.

With the main headquarters of the farming operation now located on the western boundary on Nullabeen, there was one final step to go to complete the 15 year plan. That final step was to build a home, up off the flood plain, taking advantage of spectacular views that Nullabeen offers, crisp clean air, and local wild life at my back door, not to mention direct highway access.

The original family home is located on Durante in the middle of the flood plain, some 10 klms away from the sheds and silos on Nullabeen. This old family home has reached the end of its useful life.

I had the plans of my home drawn-up with GJ Gardner Homes in Tamworth, and the building pad developed.

The final step of building my new home on Nullabeen, where I would spend my remaining years overlooking the farm I had spent my life developing, have all been thrown into turmoil. The final step cannot go ahead with the proposed "Watermark Coal mine" to be situated in full view of the new home. No family member wants to live directly across the road, from a major open cut coal mine.

With the wind direction being predominantly from the south and south west, my new home and farm headquarters would be clouded in coal dust and other pollutions associated with open cut mine. Our drinking water would be polluted, as it runs off our roof. No windows could be open due to the dust. The picture perfect, Breeza Plain Valley would be filled with pollution the same as many parts of the Hunter Valley is today.

With the question marks around the air quality, how safe is it going to be living and working in it every day???

3. Land Values:

I, like most farmers on the Breeza Plain have built their lives on the farms they call home.

We have developed our farms, to be passed onto the next farming generation, so they will continue to feed the people of this great nation for many years to come. Farming is not a profession that looks only for the short term gains, but builds for the long term sustainable future of generations to come. I am the fourth generation of Riordan farmer's in the Gunnedah district. My two sons are the fifth generation and will take over the reins in the foreseeable future.

With the proposed "Watermark Coal Project" as my neighbour, and the uncertainty of the environmental impact the mine will have on the Breeza Plain, it is obvious the mine will have a negative impact on land values.

4. Noise Pollution:

We would be subjected to continuous noise pollution with the mine operational, 24 hours and day, 7 days a week.

The traffic on the single lane highway with its 110km speed limit goes directly past my farm. With the increased traffic along the highway all hours of the day and night it will bring about increased risks to all motorists entering on and turning off the highway at the intersection of Long Mountain Road and the highway, located on the intersection of my west & northern boundaries of Nullabeen.

Conclusion:

I strongly object to the proposed Shenhua Watermark Coal Mine at Breeza NSW.

The uncertainty of the environmental impact this mine will have, on one of the most productive food growing area in Australia is unacceptable.

Is the Government looking at the short term gain instead of long term sustainability of this unique area with its black soil plains supported by a reserve of under-ground water?

Is it the Government's vision to turn the Liverpool Plains district into a dust bowl? We have witnessed firsthand the impact the coal mining industry has had on the air quality, and landscape of the once beautiful Hunter Valley. There are documented reports relating to increased health issues of people living in the mining areas of the Hunter Valley.

I believe it is totally unjust, that the farmers of the Breeza Plains, are expected to accept all the risks, disruptions to our way of life, loss of land values and most of all an uncertain future, when the exploration lease was granted, during a term of government, when decisions were made by corrupt individuals for their financial gain and the financial gain of other corrupt individuals.

Even though the government may see the "Watermark Coal Project" application for final approval, as meeting the government requirements "on paper", it does not take away the following facts:

- The whole process of approval for mining leases and developments, at the time when the "Watermark" exploration lease was approved, has a cloud of corruption over it.
- During heavy rain events that cause flooding, there will be over flow from the mining sediment ponds onto the Breeza plains and into our water ways.
- Due to major changes to our catchment area there will be decreased general runoff of water onto the Breeza Plains which replenish the waterways and aquifers.
- There will be coal dust and air pollution caused by the mine that will deposit on the crops that we grow; it will be in the water that we drink and in the air that we breathe.
- The Breeza Plain will be clouded in mining dust.
- There is an uncertainty regarding the farming future on the Breeza Plain.

I urge the government to think long term. With Australia's increasing population to feed, we cannot afford to put at risk such highly productive farm land for the short term gains in mining.

There are alternatives to the "Watermark Coal Project" to obtain the coal to supply China.

There are no future alternative to this unique fertile soil of the Breeza Plain, with its underground water aquifers, that produces high quality food to feed the people of Australia.

I, like most of the community have many concerns and there are so many questions that cannot be answered with certainty.

Allan Riordan.



Farmer's on the Breeza plains.

Andrew Riordan.



Ross Riordan.



NSW Government Planning & Infrastructure
GPO Box 39
SYDNEY NSW 2001

Attention: Director Mining and Industry Projects
Re: Watermark Coal Mine
App No.: SSD - 4975, Watermark Coal Project

Name: Dr Pauline Roberts
E-mail: pjr@divstrat.com.au
Address: PO Box 599 Inverell NSW 2360

Disclose reportable donations: I have never made a reportable political donation.

Privacy Statement: I have read the Department's Privacy Statement and agree to the Department using my submission in the ways it describes. I understand this includes full publication on the Department's website of my submission, any attachments, and any of my personal information in those documents, and possible supply to third parties such as state agencies, local government and the proponent. I agree to the above statement.

I am a member of the Caroon Coal Action Group and SOS Liverpool Plains. I object in the strongest terms to the proposed Shenhua Watermark Coal Mine at Breeza NSW. As to the EIS, which represents the only input a community member can have over this kind of polluting, industrial project, I find myself commenting on how the EIS should be improved which suggests tacit agreement with the project proposed. So, to reiterate, I do not give my approval to this mine or the current process involved in granting mining licences in NSW in any sense. However, I do appreciate that if submissions are not made, the current woeful inadequacies of the EIS will just be part of the political rubber-stamping that is the granting of a mining licence in NSW. I only hope that the Federal Government's EPBC Water Amendment Bill passes shortly, and common sense, with regard to our precious water resources here on the Liverpool Plains, and elsewhere, can finally prevail.

Caught therefore between 'the devil and the deep blue aquifer', I have reviewed the submissions prepared by Earth Systems for the Caroon Coal Action Group (CCAG) and that of Soil Futures Consulting for SOS Liverpool Plains and I am writing personally in support of both of their submissions.

I hope that the lack of any Social Licence to operate a mine on the Liverpool Plains will also be taken into account. Five communities in the area have voted overwhelmingly (>95%) to be coal and coal seam gas free. This is grass roots democracy in action from people who are already producing high quality food products for the people of Australia and have a vested interest in preserving the soil, water supplies and ecosystems of the area. They would like to continue to

feed Australians using their skills in an unpolluted and unindustrialised rural agricultural landscape for centuries to come.

1. Water – quantity and quality

In his recent Paper to all Federal and State Government MPs, Peter Serov, previously a senior researcher at the Office of Water with a speciality in *stygo fauna*, (*the equivalent, environmentally of an 'aquatic canary in the coal mine water'*), wrote:

“I am deeply concerned by:

- ☐ *the almost complete lack of science currently being conducted into groundwater ecosystems in Australia, and New South Wales in particular;*
- ☐ *the lack of science and environmental baseline monitoring that is being conducted by the government and industries prior to the approval of major developments that cause substantial aquifer interference;*
- ☐ *the lack of general environmental understanding by decision makers in relation to groundwater, its ecosystems and its connectivity throughout the landscape;*
- ☐ *and the lack of appreciation of groundwater's ecological functions and conservation value.”*

[Reference: Servov, Peter, “The Lack of Discussion on the Loss of Groundwater Ecosystems to Mining Industries.” 2013, full text appended at end.]

The EIS for this industrialisation project does nothing to allay this professional's concerns, nor those of the wider community. Surface and underground water supplies are too precious to put at risk anywhere, let alone somewhere that reliably produces food for all Australians, often two crops a year. This EIS contains many discrepancies with respect to water and cumulative impacts on surface and sub-surface supplies and many unproven suppositions with respect to connectivity underground that have not been proven scientifically. The surface water benchmarking is wholly inadequate and suggests a fundamental lack of understanding with respect to water quality requirements (as presaged by Peter Serov). Many of the models used are unproven in this kind of flood plain scenario and the mine planning and development based upon these kinds of models have been called into question after 'rain events' in central Queensland.

What is going to happen when an 'unusual rain event' – *unusual* it seems to only miners not locals, sweeps toxic mine waste across thousands of hectares of crops? Who will pay for the contaminated food and landscape? Where is such provision for compensation in the risk analysis and clean up of contaminated soil? The Queensland government seems to have used “*the solution to pollution is dilution*” as its mantra with respect to mine waste flooding into rivers after heavy rainfall, and has been heavily criticised for such a lax environmental attitude after impacts on

down-stream ecosystem and residents' health. Such environmental vandalism might, sadly, be acceptable in Queensland but surely not on the food producing Liverpool Plains of NSW.

Indeed, the proponents of this mine clearly intend to discharge waste water if “*a rainfall event [that] exceeds the design capacity of the sediment control systems*” [occurs] and since history shows us these mine problems do occur, and regularly, the EIS should address what the mine proponents intend to do about the contamination thereby caused. Ringing up the EPA for a variation to their pollution licence should no longer be considered an option.

In addition, what confidence can we have in the validity of the “*mine water balance models*” if quantity assessments are questionable and there is no proper assessment of quality other than for salinity? Where are the models for heavy metal and radioactive contamination in our water, soils and air from this mine? Where are the models that discuss the effect, longevity etc of mono- and poly-aromatic hydrocarbon contamination and other common contaminants of coal? What are the standards for water quality in this country when it comes to mine waste water and how are they enforced? There is far too much emphasis on quantity here – although in water rich areas such as the Liverpool Plains clearly this is important - but these models and assessments need to include a full suite of *quality* considerations and the full, cumulative impact of toxic material exhumation on water supplies.

It is not to say that salinity (ie. mainly sodium chloride) is not an issue in this EIS, it is, and farmers have worked very hard on the Liverpool Plains to minimise impact of rising salinity. It is rather depressing to see industrialisation alter this delicate balance once more when salinity in the Murray Darling Basin is already a key threat to agriculture down stream of the Namoi catchment.

It really is about time this country got serious about its water supplies. As has been pointed out many times over the past 6 years at State and Federal level, coal is not just carbon but by its very nature it has many inorganic and organic minerals and compounds associated with it, many of them toxic to all branches of our ecosystem and especially *aquatic* ecosystems. This wilfull contamination via coal extraction can not be underestimated yet nowhere in the EIS is this fact ever even mentioned. Nowhere in the EIS is consideration made. Why is this the case? Are the proponents out of date? Do the coal chemists not know the composition of the seams to be mined? The community deserves to hear the full story of each seam's coal chemical make up, this is not rocket science and the data should be made available and for comment. How can an assessment as to Environmental Impact – especially to water systems - be made without these data? This is a serious omission and not one that should be covered by Commercial in Confidence due to its ultimate impact on the environment and water supplies.

If Farmers on the Liverpool Plains can undertake their own, comprehensive, baseline groundwater monitoring (far in excess of that undertaken by the EIS proponents) because they are so concerned for their water supplies and appreciate that, in a court of law, evidence before the fact counts, why can not a Chinese government-owned corporation undertake the same? Why is comprehensive, on-going water testing not a feature of the EIS so we know the quality of the supplies the NSW Govt is proposing to contaminate?

And my final question on this area, should rigorous standards be put in place, who from government will be there to ensure compliance? If the Hunter Valley and the sad state of the Hunter River is anything to go by, it will all be self-regulation and self-compliance at the mines due to the shortages of government technical staff to actually oversee the 'standards' set. Nowhere in the EIS or the planning process is regulatory oversight truly addressed, and until it is, compliance with any of the conditions is largely either by whistleblowers, community activists or wishful thinking. This makes a mockery of the EIS, unless it is just intended to be a paper exercise.

2. Health Impacts

The NSW Government says it will “*develop a cumulative impact assessment methodology to manage the cumulative health and amenity impacts of mining and coal seam gas proposals*” within a timeframe of March 2013. What does this mean? Is this methodology open to public scrutiny and comment? So far despite 6 years of campaigning, NSW government seems unable to act to cover coal trains to prevent dust contamination. Will this environmental impact be part of this methodology? Does the NSW government actually finally intend to monitor PM2.5s which cause many of the human and animal respiratory problems associated with mines in the Hunter Valley rather than the less-lethal PM10s? Where in the EIS does it discuss the particulate matter impact of burning hundreds of thousands of litres of diesel fuel 24/7 during open cut mining operations? How can the EIS Social impacts section be taken seriously if none of these impacts has been attended to after years of complaints from current mining communities in the Hunter Valley and elsewhere? Where is the base-line data for soil, air, surface water, ground water, tank water quality now before any industrial activity is allowed to take place. Bench marking should be at least 2 years before any operations start to allow for consecutive data points.

The 'negligible health impacts on animals' discussed in the EIS is laughable. Where is the rigorous testing, where is the data to support these claims? Where is the analysis of milk and meat from these animals farmed on mining land using a full range of contaminant testing? A community which prides itself in the quality of its meat and grain deserves to see the data to support these unlikely claims. A quick review of National Pollutants Inventory tables for Singleton will show what toxic contaminants should be checked for.

3. No social licence

There are certainly question marks regarding the proposed biodiversity offsets and the very idea that one area can be 'swapped' for another is somewhat simplistic and hopeful. What is also to be done about the human biodiversity loss and the massive demographic change that will occur if the area changes from agriculture to mining industrialisation? Where in the EIS does it take into account the overwhelming rejection of this mine by the people of the area who will be affected the most? If social impact is at all important, why has this application been allowed to progress this far despite continued and concerted community opposition via rallies, State and Federal parliamentary delegations, petitions, hundreds of submissions, letters, petitions and appearances by local people at Select, Standing and Senate committees? I would like an explanation of that point.

Once again I strongly object to coal and coal seam gas mining on the Liverpool Plains. I hope that the NSW government has the foresight and integrity to reject this proposal outright.

Dr Pauline Roberts
02 6721 3667

Appendix.

Re: The Lack of Discussion on the Loss of Groundwater Ecosystems to Mining Industries.

By Peter Serov (02) 67711458

15th March 2013

To Whom it May Concern.

Re: The Lack of Discussion on the Loss of Groundwater Ecosystems to Mining Industries.

I am writing to you to express my deep concern for the loss of the unique species and ecosystems that rely on our groundwater resources that is being caused by poor management practices and attitudes from both industry and Government alike. These ecosystems and species are generally not seen or their connections with groundwater understood but they have high biodiversity value and perform a vital role in maintaining groundwater flow and quality.

I am deeply concerned by:

- ☐ the almost complete lack of science currently being conducted into groundwater ecosystems in Australia, and New South Wales in particular;
- ☐ the lack of science and environmental baseline monitoring that is being conducted by the government and industries prior to the approval of major developments that cause substantial aquifer interference;
- ☐ the lack of general environmental understanding by decision makers in relation to groundwater, its ecosystems and its connectivity throughout the landscape;
- ☐ and the lack of appreciation of groundwater's ecological functions and conservation value.

Groundwater constitutes an estimated 97% of all non-frozen freshwater on earth and supports a vast range of ecosystems that cover a large percentage of the landscape from the coast to the mountain tops. These include: unique subterranean communities (stygo fauna) including caves and aquifer ecosystems; most rivers; wetlands; native

vegetation; and even marine and estuarine environments. Groundwater dependent ecosystems (GDEs) are reliant on the high water quality and consistency of groundwater levels and pressure to survive. In turn, these ecosystems provide a huge range of environmental services that benefit the environment and ultimately, us. These communities also contain many highly sensitive, specialised and highly localised, endemic flora and fauna that cannot be found elsewhere and have little tolerance for change. They also include species that represent remnants of ancient environments as well as many living fossils. The uniqueness of Australia's biodiversity is encapsulated and magnified tenfold by its groundwater dependent biodiversity.

Background

I am a professional freshwater/groundwater ecologist with nearly 30 years of experience in the field. I have worked in all states and various government agencies including museums, universities and regulatory government bodies for much of that time. Until recently I was with the NSW Office of Water (15 years) where my main job was the identification, risk assessment and ecological valuation of groundwater ecosystems across New South Wales. This project was conducted in order for the department to fulfil its obligations to manage Groundwater Dependent Ecosystems (GDEs) under the Water Act 2000, the NSW GDE Policy and other legislative requirements. A component of this project was providing advice to the Major Projects Unit on groundwater ecosystems and the potential impacts from various developments. One of the final products of this project was the development of a groundwater ecosystem environmental risk and ecological valuation guidelines document co-written by a colleague from the Office of Environment and Heritage and myself (Principal author). This was developed to be used by the government for determining the current and future ecological values and risks to groundwater and the environment from various developments including mining. The document is entitled "The Risk Assessment Guidelines for Groundwater Dependent Ecosystems" and was published by the National Water Commission to providing guidance on the protection and management of GDEs. It sets out management objectives and principles to:

- ☐ ensure that the most vulnerable and valuable ecosystems are protected;
- ☐ manage groundwater extraction within defined limits thereby providing flow sufficient to sustain ecological processes and maintain biodiversity;
- ☐ ensure that sufficient groundwater of suitable quality is available to ecosystems when needed;
- ☐ ensure that the precautionary principle is applied to protect groundwater dependent ecosystems, particularly the dynamics of flow and availability and the species reliant on these attributes;
- ☐ ensure that land use activities aim to minimise adverse impacts on groundwater dependent ecosystems.

This document was enthusiastically endorsed by the Federal Government (National Water Commission) and from experts in the field from around Australia, and yet has had no publicity or support within NSW Government. Unfortunately, the actions and attitudes of the current government and responsible departments have meant that **these objectives and principles have not and will not be met.**

Impacts of Groundwater Extractive Industries

The one issue that has been completely overlooked by the politicians, environmentalists, farmers, the media as well as the Scientific Panel set up to assess the impacts of the Coal Seam Gas (CSG) Industry, is the impacts of mining in general, and CSG specifically, on groundwater ecosystems. While there has been concerns raised by many about the massive increase in mining and CSG industries and subsequent concessions given to groups with a monetary concern and strong lobbying power such as the farmers about prime agricultural land, horse studs and vineyards, **there has been almost no comment made about (and no concessions given for) the impact of these activities on groundwater dependent ecosystems or the environment in general.**

These ecosystems make up a large component of all environments across the landscape. They are also very sensitive to environmental change, are the ideal 'Canary in the Mine' indicators of such changes and have been used by others states for over a decade to manage developments, particularly mining.

One of the reasons groundwater is not appropriately represented in the current debates is the lack of general understanding and education of what groundwater is, how it functions or the ecosystems it supports. Groundwater in an aquifer is body of underground water but it is not isolated or stationary. Neither is it devoid of life or an inexhaustible supply of clean water. It flows in much the same way as a river from its surface recharge zone to its surface discharge areas and will transport impacts such as pollutants or reductions of quantity throughout the subsurface environments to the surface land and waters. Therefore, **there is always a flow-on effect from one point of impact on the groundwater quantity or quality to the rest of the landscape.** The repercussions of this reality are wide ranging, long lasting, and in many cases irreparable.

The parameters that make groundwater a separate entity to many surface water environments and which has contributed to the development of many specialised, highly endemic ecosystems, communities and species, is the relatively

consistent nature of its flow, pressure, level, and water chemistry. For example, constant groundwater levels support many wetlands, caves, rivers and tree communities, constant pressure supports the unique Mound Springs of the Great Artesian Basin, and high quality, consistent water chemistry supports a vast array of subterranean species and communities with most being new to science. The environmental impacts of current and future developments in the mining industry are multi-faceted, complex and pose enormous environmental risks that have not been adequately considered either for their short term, local or long term, broad scale, cumulative impacts.

Current Legislation

The other troubling issue is the lack of interest or commitment by the NSW State Government to comply with its own legislation and policies requirements. The NSW State Government has an obligation under the WMA 2000 and the Groundwater Dependent Ecosystem Policy to (excerpt from the WMA and GDE Guidelines – see attached) “manage GDEs in such a way that it:

- ☐ applies the principles of ecologically sustainable development;
- ☐ **protects, enhances and restores water sources, their associated ecosystem, ecological processes and biological diversity and their water quality;**
- ☐ integrates the management of water sources with the management of other aspects of the environment, including the land, its soils, its native vegetation and its native fauna;

The *Water Management Act 2000* also provides water management principles that are relevant to the management of GDEs:

- ☐ water sources, floodplains and **dependent ecosystems (including groundwater and wetlands)** should be **protected and restored** and, where possible, land should not be degraded;
- ☐ habitats, animals and plants that benefit from water or are potentially affected by managed activities should be protected and (in the case of habitats) restored;
- ☐ the quality of all water sources should be protected and, wherever possible, enhanced;
- ☐ the cumulative impacts of water management licences and approvals and other activities on water sources and their dependent ecosystems, should be considered and minimised;
- ☐ the principles of adaptive management should be applied, which should be responsive to monitoring and improvements in understanding of ecological water requirement.

Many groundwater ecosystems are not currently protected or even considered in NSW, even though the policies and rules are there and much research has been conducted to identify and highlight their importance to landscape and groundwater health. In fact, NSW was once ahead of all other states in the development of Groundwater Dependent Ecosystems research, policy and management, however, this has not been the case for many years. Retrograde government attitudes have shifted towards groundwater resource development at all cost rather than sustainable management of the resource for the environment or future use. There has been a progressive and intentional reduction in government funding, staff and resources resulting in the groundwater dependent ecosystem project ceasing to exist in any capacity. This shift has meant that the intent of the GDE Policy has been watered down to be effectively toothless, meaningless and completely ineffective for the sake of economic progress and convenience.

The recent concessions given to the powerful lobby groups of a 2 km buffer zone around residential areas, horse studs, vineyards and prime agricultural lands has nothing to do with science and everything to do with politics and money. These concessions however do not go, in anyway, far enough to protect the on-going integrity and functioning of the aquifers as there has been no mention anywhere of protecting either current prime conservation lands such as National Parks and nature reserves or individual high conservation value groundwater ecosystems (as outlined in the GDE Policy and Guidelines). In addition, the buffer zones that have been offered only protect the landowners from localised drawdown of their water supplies. It does not protect them from regional groundwater declines resulting from large scale aquifer interference activities or from changes in water quality resulting from modifications in aquifer connectivity's or direct pollution from industry.

Other states such as Western Australia have actively acknowledged the importance of groundwater and its associated ecosystems to the environment and have been protecting their GDE's for over a decade through a range of policies which are enforced. They have also been using their groundwater biodiversity as an asset to be valued by the community and as a monitoring tool to successfully regulate major developments such as the mining industry. I call for the same consistent approach for the protection, conservation and appropriate ecological management of our high conservation value aquifers and individual groundwater ecosystems Australia wide. I also call for the establishment of aquifer conservation reserves for the protection of aquifers with high conservation value subterranean and surface biodiversity for exactly the same reasons that we have preserved wetlands, National Parks and Marine reserves. Those reasons are to preserve our unique biodiversity for its own sake and to have a functioning environment for now and tomorrow for the benefit of all, not just a few.

Conclusion

Finally, the Federal Environment Minister, the mining industry and the State Government keep pointing out the importance of job and revenue creation through aquifer impacting industries but there has been no consideration of the importance of sustaining our biodiversity or a functioning groundwater system for the environment and our rural populations. The future cost to the environment is not considered at all. What price do we put on the quality and quantity of our groundwater sources and the ecosystem they supports and that supports us, particularly after the jobs and industry has left and the resource is unusable? If we manage the resource and the ecosystems appropriately now by protecting the resource (in terms of water quality, quantity and biodiversity) by investing in long term measures to detect detrimental changes in each parameter before a negative impact occurs then the relative costs to industry, government, the environment, and society will be tiny and the resource will continue. Compare this to the enormous financial, health, productivity, and emotional cost that would result from leaving the problem to be fixed (if possible at all) at some date in the future once the damage had been done. In most cases, once these unique and specialised environments, species and the functions they perform and the resource we rely on, has been lost we won't be able to replace them or repair the damaged aquifers.

Thank you for the opportunity to present these concerns to you and for your consideration of these important issues.
Yours Sincerely

Peter Serov

NSW Government Planning & Infrastructure
GPO Box 39
SYDNEY NSW 2001

Attention: Director Mining and Industry Projects
Re: Watermark Coal Mine
App No.: SSD – 4975, Watermark Coal Project

Name: Valmai & Ivan Rowney

E-mail:

Address: Warden Street Breeza NSW 2381

Disclose reportable donations: I have made a reportable political donation? No

Privacy Statement: I have read the Department's Privacy Statement and agree to the Department using my submission in the ways it describes. I understand this includes full publication on the Department's website of my submission, any attachments, and any of my personal information in those documents, and possible supply to third parties such as state agencies, local government and the proponent. I agree to the above statement? Yes

I am a resident of Breeza and object to the Shenhua Watermark Coal Mine.

We came to Breeza in 1983 with the full intention to live out our life here because this is what we want. Now we feel like a threatened species. It is making our life anxious. No longer can we hope for a healthy, peaceful and quiet life. We also feel threatened by dust; contaminated dust on our roof which will wash into our tanks that is used for drinking, cooking and hot water. We use the rain water in the hot water system as it does not damage the pipes and system. We also worried about our bore water. This water is used for toilet flushing, washing and gardens. We grow a lot of our own vegetables and have a nice variation of fruit trees. Five different fruits; nut, pecan and grape vines as well as lawn, flowers, ornamental trees and shrubs. If these bores drop or are contaminated by salt or chemicals we will lose our garden as it will be impossible to survive without a good supply of bore water.

Then there is the Mooki River; a contaminated little stream you say. It is not! I have taken my grandchildren to swim and play in it for years with no contamination. I would like to be able to take my great grandchildren to do the same. We also fish in the river. My family enjoyed a yellow belly from the Mooki for Easter 2013. There are turtles, shrimp, crays and carp all well and healthy.

The noise from the diesel engines is also a concern. We are aware that Low Frequency Noise (ILFN) can cause cardiovascular, psychological problems and stress. During construction and mining, operations are 24 hours; 7 days a week therefore there this is a concern for the Breeza residents as this noise will be constant.

Then there is the extra traffic on roads that are not in good shape now. Extra trains with their diesel fumes and coal dust. My husband and I both came here because the air is clean. I seldom get asthma now which I suffered prior to coming to Breeza. My husband has a lung problem that we are afraid will be made much worse due to the unclean air. We get a lot of west and south west winds which will bring your dust over our home.

So you can see your mine will and is causing us a lot of anxiousness.

Valmai & Ivan Rowney
Warden Street
BREEZA NSW 2381

[New South Wales Government](#)[Department of Planning](#)[Skip to content](#)[Home](#) > [Development Assessments](#) > [Major Project Assessments](#)

Martin Salvador, of BREEZA NSW, made the following submission on the project:

SSD-4975, Watermark Coal Project



Objects to this project

I am a resident of Breeza and have been since 1969 and I object to the proposed shenhua Watermark Coal Mine at Breeza NSW.

This project will have significant impact on the Breeza community and region. Some of these impacts include:

1. Air quality - We strongly disagree with the Shenhua air quality modelling results because the village is west of the area to be mined and our prevailing winds and storm paths are westerly. To my knowledge Shenhua based its modeling on a single dust monitor situated on the east side of the Breeza hill just inside the village boundary. The assessment does not give an accurate indication of wind and storm born particulate fallout. This is unacceptable. Further studies need to be carried out with extra monitors placed in and around the village before mining commences.

2. Health- the adverse effects of mining on the health of populations close to the mine sites has been documented and yet no study done on the health of the people of Breeza. Given that we are so close to the proposed mine site and the risk to our health is great there needs to be a health monitoring program agreed to by Shenhua and the Government before mining commences. We need a guarantee of compensation in case of a worst case scenario event.

3. Water - there is a high risk of coal dust contamination to the rain water tanks in Breeza, this is the only source of household water for most of the residences in the village. There are no contingency plans in place either by the Government or Shenhua if this was to occur. A water supply plan must be agreed by the Government, Shenhua and the residents of Breeza before mining commences.

There is a risk of contaminated water being released from the sediment dam during rainfall events where it exceeds the capacity. With the unpredictable rain fall events this situation is considered most probable and the releasing of contaminated water across the black soil plains and into our ground water systems is unacceptable. It is stated in the proposal that:

- there is a potential for the reduction of catchment flows to surrounding waterways including the Mooki River, Watermark Gully, Native Dog Gully and Lake Goran with 25% loss at Watermark
- groundwater levels are predicted to largely recover rapidly
- a reduced rate up upward flow from the Permain to the alluvium is predicted.

These prediction and forecasts by the Proponent are of great concern to our community.

4. Blast Damage- the adverse effects of underground tremors known as the ripple effect to damage residential structure, graves and dead stones has been known to occur at other mine sites. To ;my knowledge there are no contingency plans in place if such an event should occur in Breeza. We need a guarantee from Shenhua that monitors will be placed around the village and if damage occurs because of blasting Shenhua will meet all cost involved to repair all structures, graves and headstones.
5. Koala - The Australian Koala Foundation (AKF) disputes the number of Koalas located in the local government area and feel there are a lot less than stated in the report. AKF are opposed to the trans-location of the koalas from the Shenhua area.
6. Ecology- A total of 4,084 ha of vegetation will be removed progressively over the life of the project. This is a very large loss of vegetation and most certainly not allowed under any circumstances.
7. Future Expansion - It is stated in the EIS that a final void will remain in the Western Mining Area and will cover an area of approx. 1200 hectares. It will have a maximum depth of 80 meters below the natural ground surface. This is the outcome that is recommended by the mining company as it is the most cost effective method plus it allows opportunity for access to coal resources. This raises concerns for our community as we are not talking about a one off mine but an opportunity for future expansion with further risk to eater resources agricultural land and people's health.
8. Noise - The proposed mine is located near the village of Breeza in Northern NSW which is a quiet rural area. Infra-sound/low frequency noise (ILFN) produced by machinery is known to be a problem in these types of areas due to the lack of background noise. ILFN is known to cause cardiovascular disorders, psychological problems and stress. It is of great concern to the community that Shenhua is not completing any assessment on low frequency noise as stated in the EIS Acoustics Impact Assessment 4.6 Low Frequency Noise - no separate assessment of low frequency noise levels is required".
9. Heritage - The project will destroy significant Aboriginal Heritage sites. The relocation of any significant object from its natural environment is not recommended due to the potential damage that can occur.
10. Increased Train Movement - All towns and properties along the rail line will be impacted by additional noise and dust from increased coal train movements. If the Government approves this project, they are knowingly approving the detrimental impacts of this mine at the cost of the landholders and the community. Once the mine starts, you cannot stop or mitigate the impact to the water resources the system enters a new state and is changed forever.

Martin Salvador
"Penryn" Breeza NSW 2381

Attention: Director Mining and Industry Projects
Re: Watermark Coal Mine
App No.: SSD – 4975, Watermark Coal Project

Name: Kevin Samspon
E-mail:
Address: 1 Martin Street Breeza NSW 2381

Disclose reportable donations: I have made a reportable political donation No

Privacy Statement: I have read the Department's Privacy Statement and agree to the Department using my submission in the ways it describes. I understand this includes full publication on the Department's website of my submission, any attachments, and any of my personal information in those documents, and possible supply to third parties such as state agencies, local government and the proponent. I agree to the above statement? Yes

I am a resident of Breeza. My family including my grandchildren all reside in the village. I am opposed to the Shenhua Watermark Coal Mine as I am very concerned that the water quality and quantity will be affected by the proposed mine. My family uses both bore water and rainwater therefore I cannot support approval of this project when there is such a high risk to this essential resource. I am also concerned about the dust and noise from the mine and how this will impact the health of the residents and the lifestyle that they currently enjoy. My family and I are regular visitors to the Mooki River and enjoy fishing and swimming there. The river has a good source of fish and bait. Any risk of damage to the river is unacceptable.

This project will have significant impact on the Breeza community and region. These impacts include:

1. Air quality – I strongly disagree with the Shenhua air quality modelling results because the village is west of the area to be mined and our prevailing winds and storm paths are westerly. To my knowledge Shenhua based its modelling on a single dust monitor situated on the east side of the Breeza hill just inside the village boundary. The assessment does not give an accurate indication of wind and storm born particulate fallout. This is unacceptable. Further studies need to be carried out with extra monitors placed in and around the village before mining commences.

2. Health – the adverse effects of mining on the health of populations close to the mine sites has been documented and yet no study done on the health of the people of Breeza. Given that we are so close to the proposed mine site and the risk to our health is great there needs to be a health monitoring program agreed to by Shenhua and the Government before mining commences. We need a guarantee of compensation in case of a worst case scenario event.

3. Water – there is a high risk of coal dust contamination to the rain water tanks in Breeza, This is the only source of household water for most of the residences in the village. There are no contingency plans in place either by the Government or Shenhua if this was to occur. A water supply plan must be agreed by the Government, Shenhua and the residents of Breeza before mining commences.

There is a risk of contaminated water being released from the sediment dam during rainfall events where it exceeds the capacity. With the unpredictable rainfall events this situation is considered most probable and the releasing of contaminated water across the black soil plains and into our ground water systems is unacceptable.

It is stated in the proposal that:

- there is a potential for the reduction of catchment flows to surrounding waterways including the Mooki River, Watermark Gully, Native Dog Gully and Lake Goran with 25% loss at Watermark

- groundwater levels are predicted to largely recover rapidly
- a reduced rate of upward flow from the Permian to the alluvium is predicted

These predictions and forecasts by the Proponent are of great concern to our community.

4. Blast Damage – the adverse effects of underground tremors known as the ripple effect to damage residential structure, graves and head stones has been known to occur at other mine sites. To my knowledge there are no contingency plans in place if such an event should occur in Breeza. We need a guarantee from Shenhua that monitors will be placed around the village and if damage occurs because of blasting Shenhua will meet all cost involved to repair all structures, graves and headstones.
5. Koala - the Australian Koala Foundation (AKF) disputes the number of koalas located in the local government area and feel there are a lot less than stated. AKF are opposed to the translocation of the koalas from the Shenhua area.
6. Ecology - A total of 4,084 ha of vegetation will be removed progressively over the life of the project. This is a very large loss of vegetation and most certainly not allowed under any circumstances.
7. Future Expansion – It is stated in the EIS that a final void will remain in the Western Mining Area and will cover an area of approx. 100 hectares. It will have a maximum depth of 80 metres below the natural ground surface. This is the outcome that is recommended by the mining company as it is the most cost effective method plus it allows opportunity for access to coal resources. This raises concerns for our community as we are not talking about a one off mine but an opportunity for future expansion with further risk to water resources, agricultural land and people's health.
8. Noise – the proposed mine is located near the village of Breeza in Northern NSW which is a quiet rural area. Infrasound/low frequency noise (ILFN) produced by machinery is known to be a problem in these types of areas due to the lack of background noise. ILFN is known to cause cardiovascular disorders, psychological problems and stress. It is of great concern to the community that Shenhua is not completing any assessment on low frequency noise as stated in the EIS "Acoustics Impact Assessment 4.6 Low Frequency Noise - no separate assessment of low frequency noise levels is required".
9. Heritage - The project will destroy significant Aboriginal heritage sites. The relocation of any significant object from its natural environment is not recommended due to the potential damage that can occur.
10. Increased Train Movement - All towns and properties along the rail line will be impacted by additional noise and dust from increased coal train movements.

If the Government approves this project, they are knowingly approving the detrimental impacts of this mine at the cost of the landholders and the community. Once the mine starts, you cannot stop or mitigate the impacts to the water resources, the system enters a new state and is changed.

Kevin Sampson
1 Martin Street
Breeza NSW 2381

5 May 2013

The Director
Department of Planning and Infrastructure
GPO Box 39
SYDNEY NSW 2001

Dear Sir/Madam

RE: SSD-4975, Watermark Coal Project

My wife and I operate a small mixed farming operation around the Mullaley area of the Liverpool Plains. We are very concerned about the encroaching approach of the extractive industries on to highly productive agricultural land.

The Watermark Coal Project has the potential to destroy our previous water resources, and consequently our ability to produce food for our fellow Australians and export to the world.

We are submitting this letter as in opposition to the proposed Watermark Coal Project.

We believe that if the Watermark Coal Project is approved it will have a number of negative impacts to our business, our community and our region.

Some of our concerns include:

- Adverse effects on our water resources. This includes concerns regarding the erosion of recharge zones; contaminated water being released from sedimentary dams; reduction of catchment flows.
- Destruction of ecology of over 4,000ha of vegetation over the life of the current mine proposal.
- Removal of koala's from their local habitat
- Destruction of local aboriginal heritage
- Excessive dust that will be emitted from the project will have a large negative financial impact on local farmers, particular those who grow cotton to which colour distortion is heavily penalised.
- Decrease in quality of life for residents of Breeza, due to the increased industrialisation of their community, and greatly increased noise.

We support the Caroon Coal Action Group's (CCAG's) submission regarding the SSD-4975 Watermark Coal Project

In addition, we have concerns about the amount of oversights that remain in the Agricultural Impact Statement, in particular in terms of:

- the lack of consideration to surrounding areas of the project,
- lack of detail in terms of mitigating any water concerns
- lack of current and credible data in the proponents assertions
- lack of consideration of all legislation and regulations including the Murray Darling Basin.

We support the NSW Farmers submission relating to the Agricultural Impact Statement.

We would urge the Department to ensure that this project is considered under the amendments in the EPBC Act.

Thankyou for your consideration of our concerns.

Kind regards

Paul & Judi Sheedy

NSW Government Planning & Infrastructure
GPO Box 39
SYDNEY NSW 2001

Attention: Director Mining and Industry Projects
Re: Watermark Coal Mine
App No.: SSD – 4975, Watermark Coal Project

Name: David Simson
E-mail:
Address: PO Box 392 Quirindi NSW 2343

Disclose reportable donations: I have made a reportable political donation No

Privacy Statement: I have read the Department's Privacy Statement and agree to the Department using my submission in the ways it describes. I understand this includes full publication on the Department's website of my submission, any attachments, and any of my personal information in those documents, and possible supply to third parties such as state agencies, local government and the proponent. I agree to the above statement? Yes

I am a Carroona Coal Action Group member and object to the Shenhua Watermark Coal Mine at Breeza. I write in support of the Carroona Coal Action Group submission prepared by Earth Systems. My main concerns are:

1. Risks to our water supplies
2. Rehabilitation / Restoration of Mine Sites

I am a retired farmer of 81 years and have spent my entire life working on and with the land. My family have been involved with the land and agricultural industries in Australia consistently since 1842. Bearing in mind these facts, I consider I have established a considerable understanding of the fragility of the Australian environment, soils, water, flora, fauna and the unreliability of seasons plus low rainfall. Therefore I consider I am well versed to make comments/advice on the subjects listed above.

Firstly we will deal with water without same man can do nothing i.e. not even survive.

I wish to stress we live on the driest continent on earth and **SHOULD NOT** be running the risks currently occurring in relation to coal mining open cut and underground long wall mining plus coal seam gas with its terrible system “fracking” which has been granted an unconditional green light in New South Wales.

1. Risks to Our Water Supplies

- (a) Water supplies, both above and below ground level in Australia, are so precious that the dangerous activities being carried out by the mining companies should be stopped immediately.
- (b) We know that some of our creeks and rivers are already polluted by mining activities and the current extensions proposed in the Liverpool Plains area could see pollution ending up in the Darling River and then the Murray River. The Murray Darling River system, being the most important river system in Australia, pollution of same will be a monstrous disaster with devastation spin offs in all directions.
- (c) If and when the availability and supply of underground water and aquifers are gone by pollution, penetration by bore holes or mining activities or overuse and waste water from Miners, it will be a very sad day for Australian people, for it will mean the loss of vast areas of Australian land for **ANY** use including the production of agricultural items; food and clothing.
- (d) A land with no water and no food can support **NIL** as far as population or life of any sort is concerned.

2. Rehabilitation and Restoration of Mine Sites

(a) It is physically and technically impossible to restore mine sites to anything approaching their former fertility or production potential, for a start, there is a shortfall of backfill of millions of tonnes caused by the removal of coal from the site.

(b) The thought that the backfill can be returned to the hole in anything approaching the order it came out in, with the top soil on the top, is nothing short of a dream i.e. a total impossibility.

(c) The leaching that will occur on site, renders it an impossibility for the use of fertiliser to improve the fertility of the site at all.

(d) The effect on the flow of water above and below ground will be dramatic in its effect on the natural flow patterns of the water before mining took place.

(e) In regard to underground long wall mining sites the same criteria will apply, basically and will have this situation brought about by major subsidence, plus some additional problems, e.g. uneven top soil cover brought about by levelling projects and or considerable leaching occurring.

(f) The effectiveness of capping and sealing of bore holes that have punctured aquifers or other underground water supplies, even if done very carefully and efficiently, the damage has been done and it would be an impossibility to rectify the situation.

(g) It should be remembered that the miners have got what they wanted from the site and their wish will be to vacate same as quickly and cheaply as they can, as far as any restoration is concerned.

A good example of this is taking place at the Werris Creek mine site at the moment, where a good case of window dressing is occurring for the general public to observe and think what a good job of restoration is being carried out, due to the inability to see anything behind the large “show” bank hiding the awful devastation behind said bank.

Restoration may occur naturally after million or years have elapsed. The Liverpool Plains and similar areas in Australia on which we are limited, should and must be declared prohibited areas from mining **NOW**.

(h) For God’s sake, let’s stop this terrible destruction of Australia before it is too late as we are nearly to the end of the eleventh hour now.

NSW Government Planning & Infrastructure
GPO Box 39
SYDNEY NSW 2001

Attention: Director Mining and Industry Projects
Re: Watermark Coal Mine
App No.: SSD – 4975, Watermark Coal Project

Name: Janet Simson
E-mail: Not applicable
Address: PO Box 392 Quirindi NSW 2343

Disclose reportable donations: I have made no reportable political donations.

Privacy Statement: I have read the Department's Privacy Statement and agree to the Department using my submission in the ways it describes. I understand this includes full publication on the Department's website of my submission, any attachments, and any of my personal information in those documents, and possible supply to third parties such as state agencies, local government and the proponent. I agree to the above statement? Yes

I am a Caroona Coal Action Group member and a Liverpool Plains Landholder. I object to the proposed Shenhua Watermark Coal Mine at Breeza NSW and I totally agree with every point outlined in the Caroona Coal Action Group submission prepared by Earth Systems.

I am most concerned that a project of this enormity has so many inconsistencies and deficiencies in its EIS as detailed in the CCAG submission. This project will have significant impact on the Breeza community and the Liverpool Plains. I am not against mining but believe it should not be allowed on prime agriculture land or in proximity to the black soil flood plains.

We must protect our precious water resources all over Australia as we are the driest continent on our planet. My main concern is that there has not been due recognition about the dangers of CSG and coal extraction. There has been no recognition of the unique water and soils or the studies that have resulted in sustainable farming techniques. It is quite obvious that the waste water from mining will be able to pollute the aquifers and the precious Murray Darling system of rivers.

Australia is geologically the oldest continent in the world and the black soil flood plains of the Liverpool Plains have taken millions of years to evolve. We must protect prime agricultural land and ensure this land continues to be sustainable. Farmers of the Liverpool Plains adopted farming processes that ensure the soil structure and water supply is protected. I cannot see that it is possible to restore the land to this condition following mining (Earth Systems Independent Review 8.4.1.Rehabilitation and Mine Closure Strategy).

Health and social issues as a result of mining are well documented and are of great concern to our whole community. Other issues of concern are the environmental issues such as the protection of the flora and fauna. I do not agree with the translocation of the koalas from the Watermark area. The removal of 4,084 ha of vegetation progressively over the life of the project most certainly should not be allowed under any circumstances. This project will destroy significant Aboriginal heritage sites. The relocation of any significant object from its natural environment should not be recommended due to the potential damage that will occur.

If Government approves this project, they are knowingly approving the detrimental impacts of this mine at the cost of the landholders and the community. Once the mine starts, you cannot stop or mitigate the impacts to the water resources, the system enters a new state and is changed.

[New South Wales Government](#)[Department of Planning](#)[Skip to content](#)[Home](#) > [Development Assessments](#) > [Major Project Assessments](#)

Chris Smith, of SINGLETON NSW, made the following submission on the project:

SSD-4975, Watermark Coal Project



Supports this project

I visited and inspected the Watermark project and surrounding area in November 2012 and noted on the visit the project area does not cover any of the valuable Liverpool Plains Agricultural Land. The land is outside the areas designated Strategic Agricultural Land. The project land is to be used for mining purposes and is hilly and sandy in nature and not used or suitable for cropping or food generation. The land is suitable for a mining operation and is well located near existing rail and port infrastructure which needs to be fully utilised to pay for the huge investment made in this states future.

With 3 children approaching adulthood I support the Watermark Project as a future long term employer in the area as well as the provider of valuable export income. The proponent has addressed all the areas required in the Environmental Assessment and is committed to developing a sustainable open cut mining operation that will be able to compete with other such operations elsewhere in the world. An approval of the project will also help to repair NSW's damaged reputation in the international investment community due to recent, politically motivated, project refusal's. NSW needs to be seen as being open for business despite what the delusional, illogical minority say in the mass media.

I support the project and the proponents plans and urge the NSW Dept of Planning and Infrastructure to approve the project so that investment can continue in this State and my children may have the same opportunities I have had for full and meaningful employment.

Attention: Director Mining and Industry Projects
Re: Watermark Coal Mine
App No.: SSD – 4975, Watermark Coal Project

Name: Bill and Sue Steedman
E-mail:
Address: 216 Warden Street Breeza NSW 2381

Disclose reportable donations: I have made a reportable political donation No

Privacy Statement: I have read the Department's Privacy Statement and agree to the Department using my submission in the ways it describes. I understand this includes full publication on the Department's website of my submission, any attachments, and any of my personal information in those documents, and possible supply to third parties such as state agencies, local government and the proponent. I agree to the above statement? Yes

We are residents of Breeza. We are opposed to the Shenhua Watermark Coal Mine as we are concerned that the water quality and quantity will be affected by the proposed mine. We use both bore water and rainwater therefore I cannot support approval of this project when there is such a high risk to this essential resource. We are concerned about the dust and noise from the mine and how this will impact the health of the residents and the lifestyle that they currently enjoy. As we rely on the tank water for drinking and some other household uses I am concerned that the coal dust pollutants will make this water unusable. We also have a vegetable garden that is watered by bore water. We are concerned that the dust from the mine will make Sue's asthma worse. It is currently manageable; however with dust from the mine and the increased coal trains it is likely this will impact our current lifestyle.

This project will have significant impact on the Breeza community and region. These impacts include:

1. Air quality – I strongly disagree with the Shenhua air quality modelling results because the village is west of the area to be mined and our prevailing winds and storm paths are westerly. To my knowledge Shenhua based its modelling on a single dust monitor situated on the east side of the Breeza hill just inside the village boundary. The assessment does not give an accurate indication of wind and storm born particulate fallout. This is unacceptable. Further studies need to be carried out with extra monitors placed in and around the village before mining commences.

2. Health – the adverse effects of mining on the health of populations close to the mine sites has been documented and yet no study done on the health of the people of Breeza. Given that we are so close to the proposed mine site and the risk to our health is great there needs to be a health monitoring program agreed to by Shenhua and the Government before mining commences. We need a guarantee of compensation in case of a worst case scenario event.

3. Water – there is a high risk of coal dust contamination to the rain water tanks in Breeza, This is the only source of household water for most of the residences in the village. There are no contingency plans in place either by the Government or Shenhua if this was to occur. A water supply plan must be agreed by the Government, Shenhua and the residents of Breeza before mining commences.

There is a risk of contaminated water being released from the sediment dam during rainfall events where it exceeds the capacity. With the unpredictable rainfall events this situation is considered most probable and the releasing of contaminated water across the black soil plains and into our ground water systems is unacceptable.

It is stated in the proposal that:

- there is a potential for the reduction of catchment flows to surrounding waterways including the Mooki River, Watermark Gully, Native Dog Gully and Lake Goran with 25% loss at Watermark
 - groundwater levels are predicted to largely recover rapidly
 - a reduced rate of upward flow from the Permian to the alluvium is predicted
- These predictions and forecasts by the Proponent are of great concern to our community.

4. Blast Damage – the adverse effects of underground tremors known as the ripple effect to damage residential structure, graves and head stones has been known to occur at other mine sites. To my knowledge there are no contingency plans in place if such an event should occur in Breeza. We need a guarantee from Shenhua that monitors will be placed around the village and if damage occurs because of blasting Shenhua will meet all cost involved to repair all structures, graves and headstones.

5. Koala - the Australian Koala Foundation (AKF) disputes the number of koalas located in the local government area and feel there are a lot less than stated. AKF are opposed to the translocation of the koalas from the Shenhua area.

6. Ecology - A total of 4,084 ha of vegetation will be removed progressively over the life of the project. This is a very large loss of vegetation and most certainly not allowed under any circumstances.

7. Future Expansion – It is stated in the EIS that a final void will remain in the Western Mining Area and will cover an area of approx. 100 hectares. It will have a maximum depth of 80 metres below the natural ground surface. This is the outcome that is recommended by the mining company as it is the most cost effective method plus it allows opportunity for access to coal resources. This raises concerns for our community as we are not talking about a one off mine but an opportunity for future expansion with further risk to water resources, agricultural land and people's health.

8. Noise – the proposed mine is located near the village of Breeza in Northern NSW which is a quiet rural area. Infrasound/low frequency noise (ILFN) produced by machinery is known to be a problem in these types of areas due to the lack of background noise. ILFN is known to cause cardiovascular disorders, psychological problems and stress. It is of great concern to the community that Shenhua is not completing any assessment on low frequency noise as stated in the EIS "Acoustics Impact Assessment 4.6 Low Frequency Noise - no separate assessment of low frequency noise levels is required".

9. Heritage - The project will destroy significant Aboriginal heritage sites. The relocation of any significant object from its natural environment is not recommended due to the potential damage that can occur.

10. Increased Train Movement - All towns and properties along the rail line will be impacted by additional noise and dust from increased coal train movements.

If the Government approves this project, they are knowingly approving the detrimental impacts of this mine at the cost of the landholders and the community. Once the mine starts, you cannot stop or mitigate the impacts to the water resources, the system enters a new state and is changed.

Bill and Sue Steedman
216 Warden Street
Breeza NSW 2381

Department of Planning and Infrastructure

stephen.o'donoghue@planning.nsw.gov.au.

http://majorprojects.planning.nsw.gov.au/index.pl?action=view_job&job_id=4975

RE Shenhua Watermark EIS STATE significance assessment- response Watermark Coal Mine SSD-4975, Watermark Coal Project

This is not a form letter this is a formal submission which captures the concerns of individuals and families- Gomeroi and other Aboriginal parties

Please accept our submission regarding the proposed Shenhua Watermark Coal project as we are very concerned about this project being approved on cultural, social and environmental grounds.

The Shenhua Watermark project if proposed in its current form will destroy two highly significant sites both large grinding groove complexes. The enormity of the three pit open cut mine is highly concerning and will create irreparable damage to the environment, community life and our food resources and water resources.

The archaeological assessment to inform the EIS is flawed and has failed to document and record all archaeological sites- the adequacy of coverage has been a constant concern and this has resulted in a non-trust of the assessment nor its outcomes- the predictive model is severely flawed due to the percentage of coverage and the archaeological values of the site are compromised.

We do not believe these concerns will be adequately addressed as once approved- the damage and destruction will be approved. Shenhua Watermark have also made no attempt to explore how they could modify or reduce their mine pits to avoid the grinding groove sites though it is stressed that both should be saved. They have excised out of the project native Title land tenure in order to remove the possibility of negotiating with Gomeroi people. Indirect impacts to unextinguished native title lands have not been captured and vibration and blasting place these areas at risk.

The grinding groove complexes are large and are not in a typical area where grinding grooves may be found. They have hundreds of spear markings rather than axes grindings indicating a large men's area.

Kamilaroi are well documented as one of the few Aboriginal people to have gone to war against the invasion of non-Aboriginal people. The location is incredibly important – with an inter-relationship between the Dreaming hills Mooki River and Lake Goran.

There are numerous environmental concerns

The EIS study fails to protect our Koala population – the size and location of the proposed project will have a devastating impact on the koala population – NSW government are supposed to protect the koala approval of this mine is inconsistent with these statements.

The EIS also fails to demonstrate how our birdlife will be protected- some of these birds are totems- we need the habitat for them even when rehabilitation of areas occurs the lower forest growth does not come back for many years the impact to breeding programs is significant and the ecological balance is at risk

The impact to underground water is inadequate- stating that they will use existing farming licences is poorly through through as there are more water licences than water supply sold throughout Nsw. Guarantees to management contamination and water quality are poorly applied.

Dust and vibration from the mining activity and truck movements is also of concern on water quality human air quality. The amount of truck movement and people movement alone will increase the numbers of road kill and this is not mitigated nor are there programs in place to ensure that our cultural foods and totems which need to be protected will not become carnage on the roads.

Social concerns

The Social impact assessment does not provided real commitments by Shenhua to address social and cultural impacts the document reads like a list of possibilities and not commitments. Mining companies should to be provided with a carte blanche approach to destroying the area and not mitigate with firm commitments.

For example there are no long term commitments and offsets are listed as life of mine not in perpetuity. The social impact assessment also completely missed the impact to the region of Shenhua buying out the farms in the area and the impact this will bring to social services and town viability numbers, A fly in fly out community will change the social fabric of our communities the history of boom bust cycles of mining are in the living memory of people in the region- the mine EIS fails to carefully plan for this – learn and refer to the experiences of other areas and develops measureable and demonstrated strategies to reduce this risk. The development of mitigation is considered setting the bar very low and not providing for clear and contemporary strategy to ensure that the benefits that arise from the mine re economic benefits to the state is not at the detrimental and devastating cost to the local community including our aged and Aboriginal communities where there is a history of further disadvantage rather than a shared benefit to families.

There are approximately 15000 Gomeroi people we have an active local Aboriginal community and we do not believe this project will protect what is important, we do not believe that the environmental impacts can be mitigated and our precious resource water can be maintained. Of deepest concern to us as a people is the destruction of not one but two very large and very significant grinding groove complexes of extremely high cultural value. For these reasons we ask to Minister to please not approve the project as the cost environmentally, socially and culturally are just too great.

Yours faithfully

Name

Adress

NSW Government Planning & Infrastructure
GPO Box 39
SYDNEY NSW 2001

Attention: Director Mining and Industry Projects
Re: Watermark Coal Mine
App No.: SSD – 4975, Watermark Coal Project

Name: Heather Sulman
Address: "Jarango" Round Hill Road Piallaway NSW

Disclose reportable donations: I have made a reportable political donation. No

Privacy Statement: I have read the Department's Privacy Statement and agree to the Department using my submission in the ways it describes. I understand this includes full publication on the Department's website of my submission, any attachments, and any of my personal information in those documents, and possible supply to third parties such as state agencies, local government and the proponent. I agree to the above statement? Yes

I object to the proposed Shenhua Watermark Coal Mine at Breeza NSW.

This project will have significant impact on the Breeza community and region. Some of these impacts include:

1. Air quality - We strongly disagree with the Shenhua air quality modelling results because the Village is West of the area to be mined and our prevailing winds and storm paths are Westerly. To my knowledge Shenhua based its modelling on a single dust monitor situated on the East side of the Breeza Hill just inside the Village boundary, Therefore does not give an accurate indication of wind and storm born particulate fallout. This is unacceptable. Further studies need to be carried out with extra monitors placed in and around the Village before mining commences.

2- Health. The adverse effects of mining on the health of populations close to mine sites has been well documented and yet no study done on the health of the People of Breeza, Given that we are so close to the proposed mine site and the risk to our health is great there needs to be a health monitoring program agreed to by Shenhua and the Government before mining commences. We need a guarantee of compensation in case of a worst case scenario events.

3. Water – There is a high risk of coal dust contamination to the rain water tanks in Breeza, This is the only source of household water for most of the residence in The Village. There are no contingency plans in place either by the Government or Shenhua if this were to occur. A water supply plan must be agreed to by the Government, Shenhua and the residence of Breeza before mining commences.

There is a risk of contaminated water being released from the sediment dam during rainfall events where it exceeds the capacity. With the unpredictable rainfall events this situation is considered most probable and the releasing of contaminated water across the black soil plains and into our ground water systems is unacceptable.

It is stated in the proposal that:

- there is a potential for the reduction of catchment flows to surrounding waterways including the Mooki River, Watermark Gully, Native Dog Gully and Lake Goran with 25% loss at Watermark
- groundwater levels are predicted to largely recover rapidly
- a reduced rate of upward flow from the Permian to the alluvium is predicted

These predictions and forecasts by the Proponent are of great concern to us.

4 Blast damage. The adverse effects of underground tremors known as the ripple effect to damage residential structures, Graves and head stones has been known to occur at other mine sites. To my knowledge there are no contingency plans in place if such an event should occur in Breeza. We need a guarantee from Shenhua that monitors will be placed around the Village and if damage occurs because of blasting Shenhua will meet all cost involved to repair all structures, graves and headstones.

5. Koala - The Australian Koala Foundation (AKF) disputes the number of koalas located in the local government area and feel there are a lot less than stated. AKF are opposed to the translocation of the koalas from the Shenhua area.

6. Ecology - A total of 4,084 ha of vegetation will be removed progressively over the life of the project. This is a very large loss of vegetation and most certainly not allowed under any circumstances.

7. Future Expansion – It is stated in the EIS that a final void will remain in the Western Mining Area and will cover an area of approx. 100 hectares. It will have a maximum depth of 80 metres below the natural ground surface. This is the outcome that is recommended by the mining company as it is the most cost effective method plus it allows opportunity for access to coal resources. This raises concerns for our community as we are not talking about a one off mine but an opportunity for future expansion with further risk to water resources, agricultural land and people's health.

8. Noise – the proposed mine is located near the village of Breeza in Northern NSW which is a quiet rural area. Infrasound/low frequency noise (ILFN) produced by machinery is known to be a problem in these types of areas due to the lack of background noise. ILFN is known to cause cardiovascular disorders, psychological problems and stress. It is of great concern to the community that Shenhua is not completing any assessment on low frequency noise as stated in the EIS "Acoustics Impact Assessment 4.6 Low Frequency Noise - no separate assessment of low frequency noise levels is required".

9. Heritage - The project will destroy significant Aboriginal heritage sites. The relocation of any significant object from its natural environment is not recommended due to the potential damage that can occur.

10. Increased Train Movement - All towns and properties along the rail line will be impacted by additional noise and dust from increased coal train movements.

If the Government approves this project, they are knowingly approving the detrimental impacts of this mine at the cost of the landholders and the community. Once the mine starts, you cannot stop or mitigate the impacts to the water resources, the system enters a new state and is changed.

Heather Sulman.

"Jarango" Round Hill Road.

Piallaway. NSW

NSW Government Planning & Infrastructure
GPO Box 39
SYDNEY NSW 2001

Attention: Director Mining and Industry Projects
Re: Watermark Coal Mine
App No.: SSD – 4975, Watermark Coal Project

Name: Lea Sulman
Address: "Jarango" Round Hill Road Piallaway NSW

Disclose reportable donations: I have made a reportable political donation. No

Privacy Statement: I have read the Department's Privacy Statement and agree to the Department using my submission in the ways it describes. I understand this includes full publication on the Department's website of my submission, any attachments, and any of my personal information in those documents, and possible supply to third parties such as state agencies, local government and the proponent. I agree to the above statement? Yes

I object to the proposed Shenhua Watermark Coal Mine at Breeza NSW.

This project will have significant impact on the Breeza community and region. Some of these impacts include:

1. Air quality - We strongly disagree with the Shenhua air quality modelling results because the Village is West of the area to be mined and our prevailing winds and storm paths are Westerly. To my knowledge Shenhua based its modelling on a single dust monitor situated on the East side of the Breeza Hill just inside the Village boundary, Therefore does not give an accurate indication of wind and storm born particulate fallout. This is unacceptable. Further studies need to be carried out with extra monitors placed in and around the Village before mining commences.

2- Health. The adverse effects of mining on the health of populations close to mine sites has been well documented and yet no study done on the health of the People of Breeza, Given that we are so close to the proposed mine site and the risk to our health is great there needs to be a health monitoring program agreed to by Shenhua and the Government before mining commences. We need a guarantee of compensation in case of a worst case scenario events.

3. Water – There is a high risk of coal dust contamination to the rain water tanks in Breeza, This is the only source of household water for most of the residence in The Village. There are no contingency plans in place either by the Government or Shenhua if this were to occur. A water supply plan must be agreed to by the Government, Shenhua and the residence of Breeza before mining commences.

There is a risk of contaminated water being released from the sediment dam during rainfall events where it exceeds the capacity. With the unpredictable rainfall events this situation is considered most probable and the releasing of contaminated water across the black soil plains and into our ground water systems is unacceptable.

It is stated in the proposal that:

- there is a potential for the reduction of catchment flows to surrounding waterways including the Mooki River, Watermark Gully, Native Dog Gully and Lake Goran with 25% loss at Watermark
- groundwater levels are predicted to largely recover rapidly
- a reduced rate of upward flow from the Permian to the alluvium is predicted

These predictions and forecasts by the Proponent are of great concern to us.

4 Blast damage. The adverse effects of underground tremors known as the ripple effect to damage residential structures, Graves and head stones has been known to occur at other mine sites. To my knowledge there are no contingency plans in place if such an event should occur in Breeza. We need a guarantee from Shenhua that monitors will be placed around the Village and if damage occurs because of blasting Shenhua will meet all cost involved to repair all structures, graves and headstones.

5. Koala - The Australian Koala Foundation (AKF) disputes the number of koalas located in the local government area and feel there are a lot less than stated. AKF are opposed to the translocation of the koalas from the Shenhua area.

6. Ecology - A total of 4,084 ha of vegetation will be removed progressively over the life of the project. This is a very large loss of vegetation and most certainly not allowed under any circumstances.

7. Future Expansion – It is stated in the EIS that a final void will remain in the Western Mining Area and will cover an area of approx. 100 hectares. It will have a maximum depth of 80 metres below the natural ground surface. This is the outcome that is recommended by the mining company as it is the most cost effective method plus it allows opportunity for access to coal resources. This raises concerns for our community as we are not talking about a one off mine but an opportunity for future expansion with further risk to water resources, agricultural land and people's health.

8. Noise – the proposed mine is located near the village of Breeza in Northern NSW which is a quiet rural area. Infrasound/low frequency noise (ILFN) produced by machinery is known to be a problem in these types of areas due to the lack of background noise. ILFN is known to cause cardiovascular disorders, psychological problems and stress. It is of great concern to the community that Shenhua is not completing any assessment on low frequency noise as stated in the EIS "Acoustics Impact Assessment 4.6 Low Frequency Noise - no separate assessment of low frequency noise levels is required".

9. Heritage - The project will destroy significant Aboriginal heritage sites. The relocation of any significant object from its natural environment is not recommended due to the potential damage that can occur.

10. Increased Train Movement - All towns and properties along the rail line will be impacted by additional noise and dust from increased coal train movements.

If the Government approves this project, they are knowingly approving the detrimental impacts of this mine at the cost of the landholders and the community. Once the mine starts, you cannot stop or mitigate the impacts to the water resources, the system enters a new state and is changed.

Lea Sulman.

"Jarango" Round Hill Road.

Piallaway. NSW