

To Department of Planning

Mt Owen continuation project

Application No5850

I strongly object to the application to proceed in the hunter valley, but by making this objection it relates to past practices and the environment, health and safety of the communities, and the concern of future growth in the form of diversification of employment in the area.

After many years of making submissions to the department, the comment of no trust in the department is a statement is hard to make but the facts that have now come forth in the actions of the department has raised concern, what was expected of the department to assess projects objectively and to be open and transparent has been compromised. So to feel the fact of writing submissions to the department from a objector or a person, residents living in the line of fire of development are treated with no respect and to find the department are aligned with the proponent to ensure at all cost to gain approval is a concern for the department. So by writing this submission, I have no confidence it will be treated on merit and that it will make any impact on the decision of the department because history has already accounted the approval rate on the department is 99.9% in favour of the proponent. So therefore now it is the department who have to prove to me they warrant respect and they deserve to be trusted, from the process of assessment through to the process of determination by the planning assessment commission.

So therefore these concerns I wish to raise on the application,

1. Noise management and compliance is out of date, it is not acceptable to have one day a month for compliance of consent introduced by the department of planning or the alternative which is a disgrace is the one day every three months by the EPA by attended monitoring. If they cannot be compliant 365 days a year, under attended monitoring they should not be working, the management monitors data must be available on request to the public and placed in all reports, the department must have full access to the monitor for compliance, these management monitors must come the attended monitors, and calibration and noise parameters, span size must be in control of the attended monitoring companies, and verification and certification, performance reports be available to department weekly and available to the public on monthly reports. The fact is the exceedance on the Glendell attended monitoring, in which the management monitor was compliant December 2014.
2. Air quality the "cumulative air quality" must be used to shut the industry, the UHAQN monitor if in exceedance automatically shuts down all mines, none this crap who owns the dust that behaviour is ancient history, pollution is pollution get over it. Now if the mine knowing states the fact of omission that they will impact on residence, it stating they are willing to commit harm on others, so therefore does not warrant the approval, if they state they are able to control the hazard, past practices have not proven this at all.
3. At a CCC meeting this mine removed vegetation in the past without approval and were not fined, the meeting got heated, so the trust factor related to protection of our native vegetation is compromised.
4. 1994 this mine reduced the Ravensworth state forest from 450ha to 238ha, and the department and the mine thinks this a successful achievement, we make comment on agricultural practices in the past and the removal of vegetation and yet we allow a mine to do this as acceptable behaviour, so stop throwing stones at one industry when you are

committing it the destruction of a total area beyond recognition and changing the shape of the geological structure for ever more with no remorse. With so little native vegetation on the valley floor it is time to protect it, from harm, and the biodiversity joke now has become the biggest act of vandalism of our area, save it for mining later and we can purchase it in another area and that is acceptable, or pay \$93,000 and you get a ticket at the table to undermine others, to work in secret and it would be acceptable to make this comment without minuting the meetings, this seems to be an inherited behaviour but this could be just past practices, so this could be a matter to be seen on merit, if there is minutes that the public can comment on, because in reality the industry is the minority in this matter, it should be for all Australian to make comment on the protection of the land for others to see and not to remove a species to extinction, to be held account for your actions is the future generations decision and they might not be so lenient towards others self-greed.

5. Impacts on residents, stop treating residents in the line of fire as cannon fodder to be eliminated on request by a mine. This practice is not acceptable and it is time, the department realise that fact continual extermination of communities does have a negative impact on the local region, and that mines eventually must be halted to maintain communities, they are the growth of the future.
6. Final voids –please explain why the mine must have them and the how are we going to use them in the future, and what is the groundwater location to the void- how is the environmental loss accessed by the void taking water, how much water will be removed from the water network system and how is this calculated, how is the water quality of the void been assessed on the impacts on the surface and underground water, and will this make this area uninhabitable in the future. The water study has not looked at the cumulative impacts of final voids and this needs to be addressed, stop making concessions relating to a single mine.

Regards