Garry Owers BAppSc (Hons) 376 Bagotville Road, Meerschaum Vale NSW, 2477. P. 02 6683 4065

4th March 2013

Major Planning Assessments Department of Planning and Infrastructure GPO Box 39 Sydney 2001 plan comment@planning.nsw.gov.au

Re: Submission – Objection to Preferred Project Report Application No: 10-0001 Cobbora coal project

Dear Sir/Madam,

I welcome the opportunity to comment on the proposed project. This project will lock in the increase the release of carbon dioxide to the atmosphere while destroying native ecosystems in order to increase profits for rich mining companies. I object to the proposal on the following grounds: -

- 1. The economic assessment of the project and response to submissions has not adequately addressed the cost of a state-owned coal mine to the taxpayers of NSW.
- 2. The project cannot guarantee a 'reliable, secure and economically stable domestic coal supply (to) NSW generators' nor can it guarantee 'affordable electricity in NSW.'
- 3. The justification for the mine is based on contracts negotiated by the ALP Government as part of the Gentrader deal. These could be filled through other arrangements.
- 4. The PPR does not justify the increase in water demand for mining operations from the previous prediction of 3,700 ML per year up to 4,340 ML per year.
- 5. The increased pump rate from the Cudgegong River and access to higher natural flows has not been adequately assessed.
- 6. The PPR will increase the area of destroyed woodland by 92 ha including an additional 11 ha of threatened ecological communities.
- 7. The ecological footprint of the mine is too high and cannot be adequately offset. The PPR does not identify a final offset package because this is not achievable.

- 8. The increased height of over burden emplacements by 20m will increase dust emissions. The air quality model needs to be redone using all available meteorological information.
- 9. The proposal to implement the draft '*Rail Infrastructure Noise Policy*' will disadvantage local residents affected by increased noise from the proposed rail loop.
- 10. The issue of train length on the Ulan line has not been addressed as identified in the ARTC 2012 2020 Rail Corridor Capacity Strategy.
- 11. The project does not satisfy any of the four criteria for Ecological Sustainable Development
- 12. The increase in carbon dioxide to the atmosphere cannot be justified at a time when we should be reducing emissions and changing to proven sustainable energy sources, this project will delay the shift to sustainable while assisting to cause catastrophic climate change.

Yours sincerely,

Allan

Garry Owers