

Dear Ms Newman,

Our details are:

Names.....Philip Dwyer.....and Andrea Low .....

Address.....47 Crebert St., Mayfield East, NSW, 2304 .....

Phn 02 40234428

We oppose the approval of the PWCS T4 Coal Loader ( application Number 10\_ 0215 ) for the reasons set out below.

We understand that:

1, The PWCS application is about 4,500 pages long. In the face of such a big series of documents I / we support the call for:

- a, A further substantial extension of time to lodge submissions;
- b. a full day workshop in Newcastle, run by NSW Planning, where the Community can hear and question representatives from PWCS; and for that to take place before T4 submissions close;
- c. The production of a Comprehensive Newcastle Ports Master Plan, so that the Community can assess the Cumulative Impacts of T4 with all the other existing Businesses around the Port; and the proposed new businesses that the Government - across all its departments, has knowledge of. This needs to be produced before T4 submissions close.
- d. If the Workshop and the production of the Comprehensive Port Master Plan happen after the T 4 submissions close, then there should be a new submissions period declared.

2. We know from attending the Oct 2011 Public Meeting arranged by Correct Planning and Consultation for Mayfield Group, or from reports of that meeting, that 200+ Community people voted unanimously to state that:

they did not want any more Coal Loaders in Newcastle.

CPCFM can confirm details of that meeting via John Hayes, its Media Spokesman, at [jlhayes@bigpond.com](mailto:jlhayes@bigpond.com)

Now that is Democracy and Community Consultation in action.

We are not sure that PWCS freely acknowledged that meeting - and its outcome, in its approx 4,500 pages.

3. We know first hand, or have been told, that PWCS claim that they have carried out extensive Community Consultation, Meetings and Publicity about T 4 both before and after lodging their application for a New Coal Loader with NSW Planning.

We dispute that PWCS attempts ( as described immediately above ) have been comprehensive, meaningful or successful.

We say this because PWCS have not disclosed in any of those Meetings, Briefings or Publicity many of the very serious consequences of the Proposed T4 Coal Loader;

- a. An especially bad example of this is in their N Herald advert ( Attached ).

Their employment claims are overstated, or just plain wrong - and those claims do not match up with what PWCS state in their approx 4,500 pages of documents.

The simple facts are there will be no significant increase, or no increase at all, in PWCS's fulltime workers if T4 proceeds.

b. We don't think PWCS told the Community in any of those meetings and briefings about the 41 more loaded coal trains plus 41 empty trains through Newcastle and Maitland every day, increasing dust related health problems such as asthma and other respiratory ailments.

c. We know, or have been told, that there are many other serious claims made by PWCS that are misleading or wrong; and that PWCS have been silent on other issues that the Community should be informed about

So, we say this application:

should not proceed now;

and that the Director General of NSW Planning should direct PWCS undertake Open, Honest and Meaningful Community Consultation - under the close supervision of the NSW Dept of Planning;

and then order a new extended period for Public Submissions

4. Because Port Waratah Coal Service's 4th Coal Terminal (T4) is a proposal for a massive new coal terminal in Newcastle, NSW, I / we see that, if approved, T4 would allow an additional 120 million tonnes per annum of coal to be transported through our suburbs and shipped out of Newcastle. Our key issues and concerns include :

- \* Serious health issues due to long term exposure to more and more Coal Dust and more and more Coal Gas

- \* Impacts on Habitat, Endangered and Threatened Species, and Migratory Birds

- \* Air Quality, dust, noise, vibration and more

- \* Impacts from Dredging and increased Water Pollution

- \* Impacts of Increased Coal Mining in NSW

- \* The minimal employment opportunities due to automation

- \* The very small economic benefit for Newcastle

- \* The coal freight rail impacts on passenger services

- \* The cumulative impacts of more and more coal, especially when combined with more and more other industrial activity in Newcastle & The Hunter

This new coal terminal will

- \* Double the dust and the noise for communities already affected by the coal trains in Newcastle and beyond

- \* Destroy rare migratory bird habitat, endangered ecological communities and habitat for nationally threatened species

- \* Double the greenhouse pollution impact of the coal exported from NSW.

Matters needing further investigation include:

- \* Locally, the fourth coal terminal project would see 41 more loaded coal trains plus 41 empty trains through Newcastle and Maitland every day, increasing dust related health problems such as asthma and other respiratory ailments.

- \* Pollution from coal affects all major body organ systems and contributes to the leading causes of morbidity and mortality.

- \* The Fourth Coal Terminal would facilitate many more large coal mines (the equivalent of at least 15 'mega-pits') in the Hunter and Liverpool Plains which threaten food and water security by destroying prime agricultural land, irreversibly damaging ground water systems and polluting waterways.

- \* The proposal also carries the risk of mobilising toxic contaminants on the Toxic Dumping Grounds of Kooragang Island, the former BHP Steelworks site, and in the South Arm of the Hunter River, and too little is known about the risks to ensure the communities of Newcastle will be protected from toxic accidents, seepage and accidents. There is no plan to fully remediate the sites.

- \* The coal exported would provide the capacity to feed at least 15 more large power stations around the world emitting an additional 288 million tones of carbon pollution each year and fuelling climate change.

- \* This project would damage internationally important wetlands that provide critical habitat for protected migratory bird species and nationally threatened species including the Green and Golden Bell Frog and the Australasian Bittern.

- \* An area within the site is currently owned by the National Parks service, and provides irreplaceable habitat for migratory shore birds. The proposal will mean loss of habitat and disruption to an ecologically significant proportion of a population of four migratory shorebird species listed under international conservation conventions.

- \* At least 11 species of migratory birds recognised by international treaties rely on the habitat at "Deep Pond" and its proximity to the Hunter estuary Ramsar site. Most of Deep Pond, the only freshwater refuge in the Hunter estuary, would be lost to this project.

? The Environmental Assessment fails to meet the requirements set out by both the State and Federal agencies, and the proposal represents an unacceptable risk to the Australasian Bittern.

? After construction, the coal terminal will provide no additional employment. Rather, it is likely to result in the loss of other economic activities in the port, such as tourism, fishing and other shipping

5. PWCS argues that the T4 application should be looked at in isolation:

and not in conjunction with all of the impacts up and down the Hunter Valley, and over the range at the Liverpool Plains etc;

and that certainly the use of the coal after shipping by PWCS is not the responsibility of PWCS.

However this argument does not hold up for a number of reasons including:

a. PWCS is a joint Venture Company owned by a number of the Miners and Shippers

b. The claimed legal obligation that PWCS has to expand capacity is contained in a Document it freely entered into by PWCS with many of those same Coal miners and Shippers.

So PWCS can't have it both ways - " We are legally obliged by Miners to expand - but you can't look at what the Miners, Train Coys and shipper do, when assessing our application".

6. We would love to have the time, resources and Technical support to provide a more

comprehensive submission, but we don't.

If we had the help of NSW Planning with:

workshops,

a second round of closely supervised Community Consultations,

and a substantially increased period to lodge additional or upgraded submissions,

we feel we could help to ensure the opportunity for a more balanced assessment of the T4 proposal.

Please acknowledge receipt of this submission by return email.

Please also respond by early email to the several requests we have made in this submission

Signed .....Philip Dwyer.....and Andred Low.....

Dated .....6.....May 2012

Assoc. Prof. Philip Dwyer  
Director - Centre for the History of Violence  
School of Humanities & Social Science  
University of Newcastle  
Callaghan NSW 2308  
Australia  
<http://www.newcastle.edu.au/staff/profile/philip.dwyer.html>