

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.

I am a student at North Lakes High School and my main concern is for my health and the health of my friends, which will be put into major jeopardy if the ADA is approved. I am also concerned a great deal about the impact the proposed mine will have on the wildlife in the area especially to their drinking water. What is the management plan for this?

My friends dad has told me that Kores(the company behind the proposed mine and ADA) has admitted that 1 in 100,000 will die annually as a direct result of the mine. No death that can be prevented is acceptable so of course this is totally 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. All of my friends could conceivably become one of these statistics. When I talk to my friends about this they are angry and want to know who to blame. I tell them this information is admitted to by the very company proposing the mine Kores and that if the ADA is passed it will be the liberal government allowing it. They believe it is impossible 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.

Is it impossible the ADA will be approved?

What are our future health prospects when we 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 my friends ask me I don't have any other than for them to ask the government. I have suggested that they ask their friends and for them to ask their parents and to discuss it on social media to try and figure out what we can do and what kind of personal protective equipment the government might be forced to supply us to protect our health if the ADA is approved. We might have grounds for a class action down the track if our concerns are ignored now. We like to try and enforce our rights where we can these days and not just sit back to be walked over without a fight.

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 friends dad 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 me 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. My friends and I have seen documentaries on the lies big companies like oil and mining companies will tell to get approvals for exploration and actual extraction.

What lies are Kores telling to try and get this ADA approved?

## **POINTS OF OBJECTION**

### **Costs/Benefits**

The ADA vastly overstates the economic benefit to the region. The long term cost to public health and to greater airborne diseases in the population highlights this ADA as 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 trashed 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 friends and I don't want to have relocate to a different area if the mine is approved BUT we will also remember that it was the Liberal government who allowed this mine to be approved. At the next elections they will be of voting age and will vote accordingly to hold the Liberal government accountable by remembering who forced them into an unwanted and highly disruptive relocation of their families.

My friends dad says politics is a numbers game and so is social media which is an area that myself and my friends are completely saturated in right now. We live in it. Our generation does 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 young 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, which they are a part of, 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**

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.

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 friend's pop died from lung cancer caused by exposure to coal dust!

My friend's nan has late stage COPD(emphysema) and currently is housed at Lake Haven and the 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 can you possibly let this happen?

How will the mine operators or the government prevent my friends 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 and global warming. Already in 2016 we have seen the hottest months on record for that time of year. Blue Haven 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 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. Remember these are my friends we are talking about. If the ADA is approved we will make it our personal mission to ensure that the share rate for these stories will be incredibly high and maintained. Do not underestimate the anger to rage response of youth.

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. Mine and my friends health should not be placed at a lower importance to a coal mine proposed to be situated literally on our doorstep. We WILL make sure Everyone hears about it. We have not even started to expose this ridiculously ill-considered proposal.

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 my friends living on the western section of Blue Haven and we do like our sleep. We’re like angry cats when we don’t get it and just the possibility that our sleep might be compromised by someone else’s decision makes us angry. 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. At our age we are really starting to get political.

“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 Jilliby Creek/Wyong creek catchment) are predicted to have recovered (and not be of concern)”, reads like a bad joke. These ‘snippets’ contained in the ADA will be broadcast widely and frequently to emphasise the ineptness of the government’s decision making if the ADA is approved. How is the ADA even being considered while it contains elements such as this?

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,

Jordyn Mitchell

78 Woolana Avenue

Budgewoi, NSW