

2nd November 2015

To Department of Planning

Bylong Coal Project: SSD 14 6367

I formally object to the project approval, on these grounds.

1. The loss of high significant agricultural land which is the important structure for continual diversification of the economy to maintain economic growth for the future.
2. The loss of agricultural land for food production and water, which cannot be replaced. The soils for agricultural land are of highest significance, should be valued in high regard and of state and national significance.
3. The dewatering of the area to get access to the resource is not accounted for in the assessment, how much water will be removed from the system, what will be the impact on other uses. The other issues of dewatering impact on the environment, the cumulative impact this would have on the area and impact on recharge of aquifers.
4. The cumulative impact of final voids in the area, what type of final void will be produced in the land form a evaporative sink or a flow through cell, how is the company or the government going to manage the voids in the future in continual maintenance and monitoring, what is the full cost analysis report of the final void for maintenance and monitoring, repairs to environmental failures or contamination to water ways. The issue of final voids requires a full impact assessment by an independent expert advisory committee, which would entail, water, soil, health, contamination of pollutants to the environment, costing report related to economic impacts in the future and growth.
5. How can the company prove that all hazards produced on the mine site remains in the confinement of the lease area, when the facts are that the hazards from blasting, extraction process, noise generation from the process leaves the zone and enter private properties. These hazards cause harm to others, effects productivity of others not associated to the application, down-time costs, health costs and change of operational plans for other industries, these costs were not located in the report, as these costs effect the diversification of the economy, and loss of income for other industries and the state.
6. Monitoring of noise- the use of unattended monitoring owned and managed by the industry, which are surveillance devices, which records all generated noise in the area, private conversation- which is invasion of privacy and could be considered that the information collected could be used against the



individual, there has been already one recognized breach of the surveillance devices act in relation noise monitors, yet the department has not ensured protection of the landholders. The accuracy of the unattended monitoring system, can the parameters be changed to suit the company, the EPA does not recognize these apart of compliance, so therefore how can you prove beyond a reasonable doubt the community is protected from the hazard. Monthly attended monitoring, can this be manipulated by the company to have prior knowledge of the event, so therefore the company is always compliant. In fact the department should provide a full report of a number of exceedances and fines related to noise monitoring in the last ten years in the state, related to extractive industries and then collate to the number of complaints related to noise, to determine the true indication of the protection of the communities in the state and how effective the system is, of 12 days a year for compliance of an industry. Self-regulation is it satisfactory to protect someone health and safety.

7. WHO and the EAC have stated the PM causes impact on health, so therefore what is the costing report related to health impacts of the cumulative area. How has the department of planning and the company identified as expendable individuals for this application and please provide the reasons to that this is acceptable to cause harm.

8. The cultural heritage of the area, related to the structures and the land, and the communities that reside there is of importance, we sweep these importance under the carpet as a whim of the communities who are inked to the area but consider the reaction if the rural people stated the Sydney Harbor bridge or the rocks was of no significance, just remove them, a black hole would be more benefit for the rural economy.

9. The term mitigation of the premise would resolve impacts, is making false statements, from experience mitigation does not achieve results of removal of the hazard entering the premise.

10. The concern of the company using photos in a report which was not associated to a property, this was highlighted in a media story recently, how can a department place an application out on exhibition when this has happened, how can we be assured there is no other issues in this report which is not factual.

11. In closing statement, I doubt these issues raised will have any bearing on the outcome from the department of planning, which will be an approval anyway, the joke which is discussed in our community, is that if we decided to have a coal mine in the backyard it would get approval, because as the movie holes describes we are always looking for treasure but we forget what treasure we have in the fertile soils and water is of greater importance for existence.