

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Planning NSW

Sydney

plan_comments@planning.nsw.gov.au

Submission T4 Coal Terminal PPR (MP10_0125)

I strongly object to coal mining and in particular open cut mining however realise that once the coal is dug it needs to be passed on to the end user.

The role of Port Waratah Coal Services and in particular T4 is as the name states a service provider.

My observations over a long period of time is that PWCS and its staff work exceedingly hard to provide their service to the highest standards . I note that the standards are constantly rising and in many cases PWCS is setting the new standards.

PWCS is a good communicator with the community and in my time of involvement I have always found PWCS prepared to listen and where possible find ways to incorporate the community input for the betterment of all. That includes the community, staff and the shareholders.

As a supporter of decreasing coal production I am very concerned when groups of activists blindly embark on campaigns to for example "Close Carrington Coal terminal" when in fact doubling Carrington terminal through put based on best practices could save the birds, the frogs and lots of our ecology. Not to mention lower dust levels.

I had written a sizable objection to the PPR raising lots of issues as I did in my original submission however following my attendance at the Community Group meeting with PWCS last night in which they explained their concern about the "Close Carrington Terminal campaign" I have binned my document and penned this letter.

I now make the following points.

1. I will continue to work for the reduction of coal mining and coal consumption.
2. I will continue to work towards the development and use of other energy to replace coal.

3. I will continue to encourage better ways of mining, transport and handling of coal in order that the impacts on the community, industry staff and the environment are further reduced.

I ask that if the service of exporting has to continue that:-

1. PWCS continues to actively continue to seek better ways of conducting the task
2. That efforts to reduce dust and similar health issues are given prominence in the improvement projects
3. The issue of washing the coal trains on leaving the terminal is given a very high priority as I believe that the only source of dust from coal trains in the Hunter Valley is based on the dust and coal contained in the departing wagons. 200 plus kg per train. I have observed absolutely no evidence that coal dust is emitted from the top of coal wagon loads that have been loaded in a sound manner. Loads that do not conform to sound practice loading should be rejected.
4. That a supper efforts be made to protect the birds, frogs and other wildlife as they are poor defenceless creatures trying to continue an existence in a very harsh environment. They have just as much right to be here as you and I do and as yet can not write a letter of objection!
5. Keep the scale of the terminal to a minimum by exploring and employing practices such as direct ship loading even for part of your through put. Norfolk Southern Pier 6 is a 100% direct ship loading terminal in one of the USA's largest coal ports. Port of Hampton Roads. It can load ships faster than the ships can take it.
6. There is no point in having a coal terminal in Newcastle if there are no jobs. The terminal design and operation should be employment centric.
7. Tourism may generate more than \$2.80 a tonne!

I trust my input will be considered and where relevant re-consider the points raised in my original submission.

I will continue to take steps in my life to reduce the need for coal to support my lifestyle.

[REDACTED]

I declare I have no vested commercial interests and have made no political donations.