# Sara Wilson - Moolarben Coal Complex Stage 2

From:	"Lyndal Sullivan" <lyndal.sullivan@gmail.com></lyndal.sullivan@gmail.com>
To:	<pre><plan_comment@planning.nsw.gov.au></plan_comment@planning.nsw.gov.au></pre>
Date:	3/3/2012 10:10 AM
Subject:	Moolarben Coal Complex Stage 2

Mining and Major Industry Projects, Dept of Planning and Infrastructure 3<sup>rd</sup> March 2012

### Dear Sir/Madam,

## Re Moolarben Coal Complex Stage 2 \_ Preferred Project Report: Project No: 08\_0135

I wish to lodge my objections to the stage 2 proposal as outlined in the above report. I have been a frequent visitor to this area for more than 10 years and am familiar with the issues.

My major concern is the impact on the <u>groundwater system</u>. The subsequent impact on the Goulburn River is unacceptable and irreversible in the long term. Government has a responsibility to ensure developments do not damage our rivers, and to take account of their protection for more than the next 100 years.

(In 2003 I walked from The Drip down the river to Wollar Creek, and was seriously alarmed at the high saline levels in the water then from the existing Ulan mine, which was significantly higher than 3 years earlier. I have a copy of the letter I wrote to the Minister at the time.)

### Other significant concerns are:

### 2. Damage to an Endangered Ecological Community

If approval is given to destroy an EEC, it makes a complete mockery of the whole Threatened Species Conservation Act and the cost to government that has gone into listing this Box Woodland as an EEC (also by implication all other EECs). The previous NSW government did not have a good record of protecting EECs, will this government continue along the same path?

### 3. Clearing of native vegetation

A further 1546 ha of native vegetation damaged is not acceptable. It is particularly not acceptable to disturb vegetation along creeklines - Murragamba and Eastern creeks. The Department would be well aware of the scientific evidence about the importance of retaining riparian vegetation for the long term health of watercourses.

### 4. Unacceptable biodiversity offsets proposed

The offsets proposed are outside the Hunter Valley Catchment – this is not an equitable 'offset'. The biodiversity assets of this catchment/ bioregion need protection.

The offsets should include the corridor along the Goulburn River and be protected for the long term by being transferred to the National Park (including areas known as the Drip and Corner Gorges). The river corridor must be far greater than 500m – as I understand that there is no evidence to ensure the protection of the river and gorges with a buffer of less than 1km.

### 5. Adequate monitoring and enforcement by EPA

The current case before the court re breaches to the stage 1 conditions of consent would indicate the need for even more rigid conditions and greater buffers to ensure protections. In the absence of evidence that practices will change dramatically or that the EPA will have resources to monitor

regularly, greater buffers of natural vegetation are necessary to absorb the damage caused by erosion, pollution and clearing.

Thank you for the opportunity of making this submission

Yours faithfully

Lyndal Sullivan 48 Mort Street, Katoomba 2780

lyndal.sullivan@gmail.com.au