

PETER + JULIE BROWN
599 ROXBURGH ROAD
MUSWELLBROOK 2333
10-10-2013

MR MATTHEW SPROTT,
PLANNING OFFICER,
DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING--INFRASTRUCTURE
23- 33 BRIDGE STREET,
SYDNEY 2000

RE - BENGALLA MINE MODIFICATION (CONTINUATION)

SIR,

We are writing this submission to you in regard to the above mentioned project modification/extension/expansion to place our objections.

As a close neighbour to this project we are already affected by this project. Issues associated with this project are detrimental to us as neighbours and we therefore object to its extension/modification.

We are already impacted in several ways by this project. Any intensification of this project and extension of this mines life will make worse + prolong these issues. The cumulative effects of this and the other surrounding projects make life for us HELLISH.

The modelling produced for this project, as with all these projects, is at least understated if not fraudulent. They obviously wear 'Rose coloured glasses' and we therefore do not agree with this modelling. As this project comes closer to us and the production/workforce intensifies these issues that are a common source of complaint/nuisance will increase dramatically.

Issues with dust, noise, blasting + blast fuming as well as deisel emissions are relevant ~~are relevant~~ at the moment, and will only get worse in the future with this project, as we outline below.

① DUST. - Dust from this project is a constant issue for us as neighbours. The operation at Bengalla is DRAGLINE/EXCAVATOR/ TRUCK FLEET etc. The dragline operation spreads dust unabated constantly which can not be suppressed. The rest of the operation makes little or no effort to limit dust. This is going to get worse

(page 2. continued.)

for us going forward.

② NOISE. - Noise from this project will obviously intensify with this project. We are already at times affected by Audible noise, Low frequency, vibration and Infrasound from Bengalla's operation. The clanging/banging of the dragline chains, Engine noise, continuum etc. is clearly audible at times, and will be even closer operationally going forward. The C.H.P.P. is a secondary source of INFRASOUND at our property and ramping up of the production will only worsen this.

③ BLASTING. - As the project moves closer to us and intensifies, the regularity of blasting, as well as distance to source will be more of a constant issue. Blast fuming will, as expected, be more of an issue as well.

④ DIESEL EMISSIONS. - At present, like all similar projects, the mine is a huge contributor to diesel emissions and petro-chemical residues. These are a problem to all of us that rely on rain water for our source of water. The intensification of this project will provide more emissions and more residues.

⑤ CUMULATIVE EFFECTS. - This project will, of course, add to the cumulative effects of the mines on our lives. When is ENOUGH, ENOUGH !!! The majority of people in employment at these projects do not live in close proximity to the huge polluting abomination. For us who do, we are bombarded with noise, dust, pollutants and our lives are significantly impacted. We are treated as collateral damage in the pursuit of profit, for uncaring, unconscionable multinational company's, putting profit before people and incongruous to people's lives.

The modelling provided for the cumulative effects of this project looks to be done without consultation with the other projects in close proximity.

The dust modelling from Mt. Arthur has us between the 30 mg. and 50 mg Contours, (2016). Bengalla's so called modelling for cumulative effects does not even have us close to 30 mg contour.

The noise modelling from Mt. Arthur, once again, would also indicate that any additional noise from Bengalla, when overlayed to Mt Arthur's noise contours, has made little or no contribution, and in fact according to Bengalla's modelling

(Page 3. Continued.)

the noise improves during the day/evening period.

These are just some of the reasons we feel that the modelling provided for this project is inaccurate at best.

Bengalla's movement westward will see an increase in the stripping ratios. This could over time be up to 100% increase on present stripping ratios. If only a 50% increase on average this would represent a need to increase movement of overburden by 50% on present coal targets. A ROM coal target increase of nearly 50% on present levels (10.7 mt to 15.0 mt) would therefore see this further increase of a similar percentage. This would take the yearly production (coal + overburden) to roughly a 95% increase on present ground disturbances.

We do not believe the modelling reflects this!

It is also of our belief that their dumping emplacement profiles do not represent the 30% + increase in mining spoils that you get when mining, and further modifications will be sought in the future for dumping emplacements.

We do not therefore support their modelling, we reject their assertions, and obviously, in light of this, object to the modification and intensification of this project on the grounds the impacts on us will be greater than they assert.

Yours Sincerely



PETER BROWN