

To Whom it may Concern,

Wallarrah 2 Coal Project SSD 4974 Amended Development Application.

I wish to object to the current Amended Development Application (ADA) on exhibition for the Wallarah 2 Coal proposal and also to the further progression of the mine proposal itself. I request a response to my concerns listed below.

My main concern is for our childrens health, and that of their friends, which will be put into major jeopardy if the ADA is approved. The mine cannot go ahead as Kores has admitted that 1 in 100,000 will die annually as a direct result of the mine. This is unacceptable. The Central Coast has an approximate population of 330,029 so at least three people will die per year as a direct result of this mine. We have three children. We know many families in the Blue Haven and surrounding suburbs area who are horrified when we show them this information admitted to by the very company proposing the mine Kores. They believe it is inconceivable that the government will approve this ADA based on the negative health impacts for the Blue Haven and Wyee townships and the risk of compromising the integrity of the whole central coast water supply by mining underneath supply creeks. Especially after the local councils spent so much of our tax-payer money building the mangrove to mardilink which will be undermined if the ADA is approved.

Is it inconceivable the ADA will be approved?

What will we tell our children about their future health prospects when they will be subject to coal dust, p10 emissions and diesel exhaust fumes above safe levels if the ADA is approved?

I need you to supply me with answers as when the children ask me I will not have any other than for them to ask the government. I have suggested the children ask their friends and for them to ask their parents and to discuss it on social media to try and figure out what kind of personal protective equipment the government might be forced to supply to protect their health if the ADA is approved. They might have grounds for a class action. You know how kids are about their rights these days?

The application lists economic benefits and job figures for the whole project and does not confine itself clearly to this Amendment alone. The ADA should be rejected on this basis.

My husband has conducted research and discovered that the proponent KORES is withdrawing from overseas development due to massive debt ratios as recently expressed in the Korean press. This tells us and our community that the future job prospects, development and most importantly environmental repair, compensation and rehabilitation alluded to by KORES have little hope of being realised. It also indicates that KORES will desperately pursue the passing of the amendment using any means at its disposal with the intention of selling it to a third party to recover losses. In this context Kores will say and do anything to get the amendment passed and residents of the Central Coast will have to live in hope that the buyer commits to what Kores signed off on.

POINTS OF OBJECTION

Costs/Benefits

The ADA vastly overstates the economic benefit to the region (page 85) states that the royalties to the State, over the proposed 28 years life of the mine, are \$200 Million, which equates to just over \$7 million per annum. My husband tells me that with falling coal prices, and then taking into consideration Government concessional rebates to coal companies, this figure is inflated. Furthermore if the costs of repair and rehabilitation are taken into account, particularly in the Jilliby Valley water catchment and Hue Hue subdivisions following subsidence, they easily negate the benefits to the State and local authorities. By adding the long term cost to public health and to greater airborne diseases in the population it begins to look like a ridiculously risky enterprise in both negative health impacts and real dollar terms for the region.

The ADA does not address the number of families who located to the area (specifically Blue Haven) for its quiet semi-rural aspects and quality of air. All of these aspects will be ruined if the ADA is approved. What is the management plan for this?

How does the government and the ADA propose to compensate for these elements that once removed cannot be returned?

My husband and I attended public and private meetings involving Blue Haven residents and had discussions with literally hundreds of other families. Most of these not only intend to relocate to a different area if the mine is approved BUT will also remember that it was the Liberal government who allowed this mine to be approved. At the next elections they will vote accordingly to hold the Liberal government accountable by remembering who forced them into an unwanted and highly disruptive relocation of their families.

As my husband has pointed out, politics is a numbers game and so is social media which is an area that I excel in. Women do love to communicate – especially when it is about something they don't like. In considering approving this mine you are also considering making the mistake of providing large numbers of angry people a prime example of the most popular and most shared content on the internet. The mistake would be making a very unpopular decision affecting thousands of innocent families who now have a way to complain about this to literally millions of others through social media. Approval of this amended development application WILL activate many to action. Especially those Blue Haven families who are NOT in a position to be able to move from the area and who will be outraged and incensed at the peril and danger their families will have thrust upon them completely against their will AND with a feeling of not having been listened to.

Employment

Pages 86 and 87 of the ADA state job creation beginning with 79 through to direct and indirect job figures in year 2 of 1,111 jobs. This application states very clearly that this assessment is only looking at this Amendment and not the whole Project yet the job figures are obviously being included for the whole project such as a larger "intersectoral linkages" job quotation during construction of 1605 direct and indirect jobs.

The ADA should be rejected on this point. Why is the ADA still being considered with this inaccuracy?

Because the original rail spur is not being built and will be replaced by a conveyor system (essentially being the main thrust of this Amendment) it does not create an additional 1605 jobs for the whole Project as configured above. As in the original EIS the job prospects are not defined and again highly inflated and misleading.

Once again **Why** is the ADA still being considered with this inaccuracy?

Dust and Health and Noise

Dust remains a real issue for health in the Blue Haven and Wyee precincts despite partial coverage of infrastructure. There is no attempt to cover coal wagons which will travel through the southern suburbs to Newcastle affecting all those communities of southern Lake Macquarie and Newcastle as has been demonstrated in the Hunter to Port line. There has been great concern about the mapping of coal dust and the lack of authorities to control those emissions. This project exacerbates the problem adding to that congestion toward the Newcastle terminal. Why is the ADA still being considered without the transmission of coal dust being addressed?

My father died from lung cancer caused by exposure to coal dust!

My mother has late stage COPD(emphysema) and currently is housed at Lake Haven Royal Freemasons Benevolent Society and introduction of coal dust and other p10 emissions into the local air will literally kill her. How will this be prevented if the ADA is approved?

How will the mine operators or the government prevent my children from contracting respiratory disease as a result of the mine?

Pm10 emissions from the site are conservative and do not take into account the changing nature of intense wind and storm events in the recent years like the category 2 cyclone in 2015. BlueHaven and Wyee townships are now as close as 200 and 400 metres respectively from the new proposal bringing even greater problems for families in the area for both constant dust and noise 24 h/per day. There are many schools, pre-schools and establishments within 5 kms of the facility and they will suffer from emissions from the site. This will be added to the negative effect of the coal dust. What is the management plan to prevent this? This is unacceptable and will get the most attention from social(and mainstream) media forums creating a massive groundswell of negativity for the government for effectively sentencing a generation of Blue Haven school children to degenerative respiratory diseases and early painful deaths. If the ADA is approved I will make it my personal mission to ensure that the share rate for these stories will be incredibly high and maintained.

Please refer back to the submission by Dr.Peter Lewis, Area Director of Public Health for North Sydney and the Central Coast wherein he outlines greater risks to children and health sufferers in this region should this project be approved. The ADA should be rejected based on this evidence. I will not allow my childrens health to be placed at a lower

importance to a coal mine proposed to be situated literally on their doorstep without Everyone hearing about it.

The ADA admits to noise exceeding acceptable limits for “residences to the north of Bushells Ridge Road at Wyee” and general noise 24 h/per day for those living in Blue Haven and Wyee areas are major issues of concern for residents of Blue Haven like myself. This is an **Unresolved** issue from the EIS 2014. It is also unacceptable. What is the management plan for this? How will this unresolved issue be resolved?

This noise pollution will negatively impact on a large number of shift workers who reside in Blue Haven and who work at the many local Clubs, Aged Care facilities and Wyong Hospital. Many of these are my friends. The noise, being a 24 hour a day issue, will also impact on all the normal hours workers and be a constant source of dissatisfaction and complaint. There will be plenty of people who will remember who created this disaster(by passing the ADA) for those affected and remind them of who NOT to vote for at the next elections.

“The project predicts risk of reduced availability of water for the Central Coast Water Supply” according to the PAC wherein they... ” recommended there should be no net impact on potential catchment yield” .The Central Coast water catchment supply in the Wyong valleys is at real risk of destruction due to massive subsidence and loss of potable water to the mine area below. What protections are in place for our water supply?

The consultant’s(MER) suggestion that, “after more than 500 years, water levels in the workings (in the Jiliby Creek/Wyong creek catchment)are predicted to have recovered(and not be of concern)” , reads like a bad work of fiction to residents in the area. These ‘snippets’ contained in the ADA will be broadcast widely and frequently to emphasise the ineptness of the governments decision making if the ADA is approved.

Wallahah 2 have failed continually to consult with any of the people directly affected by the proposal. They have failed to hold any open public meeting explaining the project. Wallarah 2 have failed to bring to the public any concept drawing of the new conveyor system and loading facility near Blue Haven.

This Amendment should be rejected and the whole project put aside due to the many areas of risk and the danger to the health of children attending nearby schools. As stated at the start of this letter I request a response to my concerns.

Yours faithfully,

Thea Malone

7 Barwon Close

Blue Haven, NSW

Mobile: 0437 103 319