

1610 Dooralong Road

Lemon Tree NSW 2259

12th June 2013

Director, Mining Projects

Development Assessment Systems & Approvals

Dept. Planning & Infrastructure

GPO Box 39 SYDNEY NSW 2001

**Subject: OBJECTION TO PROPOSAL WALLARAH 2 COAL PROJECT APPLICATION
NO. SSD – 4974**

Dear Sir/Madam.

We wish to formally register our objection to the proposal by Wyong Area Joint Coal Venture (WAJCV) to undertake Longwall Mining under the valleys around Wyong NSW noting that the original application by WAJCV was rejected by the Government in March 2011 on grounds of unsustainability (ESD principles) and the Government's application of the Precautionary Principle.

There is little in the new application that has changed. In the main it is a reworking of the previous rejected application. The current NSW Government's "Aquifer Interference Policy" as intended should nullify the application at hand.

In evaluating the WAJCV proposal, the following should be taken into account:

1. Water Catchment was protected under a proclaimed NSW Statute in 1950 (Gazette no 153 of the LGA 1919, 1950). The now extinguished Part 3a of the EPA Act overrode this Statute, so effectively the original protective measure should now be in place.
2. Some 300,000 people in the Wyong and Gosford LGA's rely upon the 53% of their potable water emanating from these critical valleys. Recently the completed \$80 million Mardi-Mangrove pipeline was funded by the Federal Government specifically to transfer water from this system to the Mangrove Dam on the escarpment during flood rains. The valleys above this mine regularly flood as agreed in the proponent's submission.
3. In 1999 groundwater consultants, ERM Mitchell McCotter, found that transient pathways for water to travel downwards to the coal strata were evident and so bulk water would not be impeded on its downward path.
4. Kores claim that there will be no effect upon the water supply due to impervious layers between the surface and the mine seam. Professor Phillip Pells, Senior Lecturer at the University of NSW dismisses these claims. Kores do admit to a so-called tiny loss of water rated at 2ml per day per square metre. This extrapolates over the whole mine area some 8 megalitres per day or 3000 megalitres each year once mining is complete. The professional uncertainties characterised within the Kores submission paint a very tentative picture for protection of the coast's natural potable water supply.

5. The Peer Review by Professor Bruce Hepplewhite (page 258, Appendix H) questions many of the terms used and assumptions made during the geological modelling upon which subsidence and water loss are based.

6. Some 46 panels are to be mined, including in the Hue Hue Subsidence Area where 150 houses (Appendix H Map on page 240) mostly of modern brick design exist on subdivided acres and will be subjected to subsidence up to one metre but may well suffer further subsidence due to the existence of Awaba Tuff strata below the mine on which the remaining pillars are supported. Much discussion within the application refers to the uncertain nature and caution needed re the soft bedded Awaba Tuff leading to a scenario of adaptive management as mining begins to proceed. *The Department of Infrastructure and Planning should be alarmed by this and immediately inform the unsuspecting owners of the properties in the Hue Hue Subsidence District.*

7. A total of 245 houses (Appendix H, Page 130) will be impacted by subsidence from a conservative one metre to 1.6 metres throughout the mine area. A total of 755 Rural Building Structures will be impacted (Appendix H, page 179) and 420 Farm Dams suffering subsidence to some degree (Appendix H, Page 187). This demonstrates that the projected damage inside the mining lease area would be catastrophic. The hinterland of the valleys are to be subsided 2.6 metres; Little Jilliby Jilliby Creek at the southern end is predicted to fall 2 metres; the main artery into the Jilliby/Dooralong Valley, Jilliby Road is destined to be subsided 1.75 metres in places. As this road is the main access out of the Dooralong Valley and that the valley floods on a regular basis, such subsidence will leave all valley residents isolated for protracted periods.

6. Dust and noise from mine head operations and rail movements will impact on the established suburbs of Blue Haven, Wyee and all along the rail corridor from Morisset through Cardiff and southern suburbs to the port of Newcastle. The proponent fails to adequately address these ramifications. New burgeoning suburbs being created in northern Wyong shire will be impacted by the proposed mining operations. An operation as proposed by WAJCV amid these developments fails to acknowledge the known high rates of asthma and bronchitis in the vicinity of such operations that has been a major concern of the medical profession for decades.

7. Nineteen species of avian migratory waders in the area are protected under the Federal EPBC Act with binding agreements with China,(CAMBA) Japan(JAMBA) and Korea itself(ROKAMBA). The proposal directly conflicts with these agreements.

In conclusion, it is our view that, notwithstanding the extensive Requirements of the Director-General, in most areas Kores have failed to address these adequately. The proposal should be rejected outright as the long term damage to the water, infrastructure, amenity and health of the Central Coast of NSW is alarming.

Yours sincerely,

Robert and Robyn McAulay

