

Thank you for your letter, and the opportunity to comment.

As there is not a lot of time, I will try to keep my Responses brief, and will not be able to address all the concerns:

- **The number of submissions is not reflective of the Community's outrage regarding the mine.**
 - Many people, including neighbours and business people I have spoken with, **are unaware that submissions were requesting and that the decision is pending!**
 - Wyee has been forgotten in regards to communication from the proponent. I can recall one, possibly two delivered newsletter over many years – **the last one a day before official submissions closed!** We did not receive the DVD referred to in the response, nor were asked to be included in the survey/s. **Alarming considering we are a residential area in close proximity to the mine.**
 - People I have spoken with are also of the opinion that it would not matter what was submitted as the decision is already made (due to commissions that will be received, and that adverse impacts will not directly affect those making the decisions, train sleepers for the loop already in the rail corridor) and this is just going through the motions. I do not want to believe this – I like to think that one person can make a difference.
 - I disagree with the proponent's response regarding dividing the Community / reducing Community spirit.
 - Wyee in particular has had a few battles in recent years including the high pressure gas pipeline, water pipeline link and the lack of facilities (SEWER, drainage, kerb & guttering, footpaths / cycleway).
 - We have stood together time-after-time, and projects proceed (or not in the case of facilities) regardless of Community input/objection. Over time people now throw their arms in the air and say why bother – it does not matter what we think. Others are frustrated that it has come to this. We do not want facilities based on the mine going ahead.
 - **Please take on board real concerns / impacts outlined from real families – please put yourself in their/our shoes.**
- **The proponent's response outlines that the dust modelling in the EA demonstrates that the mine will meet all existing EPA dust emission criteria, BUT**
 - **Has the collective effect of nearby mines been included?**
 - The proponent may purport to meet criteria on its own, but does it add to emissions from other mines in the area? This development may add to the impact already being experienced by residents from established mines - taking markers over acceptable levels.
 - Just because there are related industries in the area, it should not mean the residents have to endure more.
- **Train movements and associated noise and dust.**
 - The rail owners / operators are of course unlikely to classify coal dust as a high priority impact risk, as they are being **paid** by mines for the transportation of coal! **Instead, suburbs along the line will be impacted on a number of levels (many may not be aware either!).**
 - I have been thinking about this every night, usually when a huge freight train passes by a little after midnight (starting more than 500 hundred metres away mind you). **It abruptly breaks the silence and can sound like a plane about to crash. Please consider this before you agree to send many more heavy / noisy trains 100kms down the line through residential areas interrupting sleep, as many will be at night.** Would you like it past your home and through your Community?
 - **Regardless of what the "studies" say – coal train movements will greatly impact families, including my own family, especially those with small children - and we are not even directly on the rail corridor!**
 - The proponent's response continues to emphasise and imply that the additional number of trains will be a smaller number of trains in comparison to current movements, availability and capacity. **Electric commuter trains are much lighter, quieter, have fewer carriages and travel past much faster than diesel coal trains - it is an absolute nonsense to compare train numbers in this manner!**
 - **Coal and freight trains however impact a wider area than commuter trains in regards to noise, vibrations (especially with the change from wooden to concrete sleepers), amenity disruptions, times it takes to pass by, and dust with coal trains!**
 - My previous comments comparing the increased number of carriages (rather than trains) - which showed a greater impact on the rail line, have not been included in the submission summary.

- Just because the Northern Railway line has been discussed in regards to increasing freight transport in the future, does not mean that this will ever happen – or happen in the near future. Nor should it be a justification for coal trains (as by the proponent's reasoning, train movements are expected to increase anyway)
- **At least two new schools (McKillop Catholic College K-12 & Lakes Grammar K-12) have been built in the area in recent times.**
 - These schools have been building student numbers.... we were going to send our child/ren to one of these schools, but will not confirm until there is a decision on the mine.
 - If the mine is approved, we will look elsewhere, as the schools are within close proximity to the mine sites, and on major roads associated with said mine. Other parents have told me the same, and that they will remove their children from the school.
 - **We cannot risk even the slightest chance of adverse mine impacts on our children – would you with your own children?**
 - **Will further schools outside the area be established / funded to accommodate students moving away from the mine district?**
- **General comments regarding the response from the proponent:**
 - Some of the proponent's responses do not address the concerns - especially where there are several parts to an issue raised in the submission.
 - **Just because the mine proponent has an answer for something or they strongly refute the concerns, does not necessarily mean they are correct.**
 - Answers are also referred to other sections throughout the response (e.g. see section 5.1.3) - so you have to look for them or don't bother. I understand responses are repeated, but it distracts.
 - The enormous amount of documentation is too much for the average lay person to take in, and some of the technical analysis is hard to decipher. BUT if the respective experts cannot agree amongst themselves, is this enough for reasonable doubt regarding the true impacts? **Can we take the chance that the proponent's experts are wrong?**
 - Do we know how many reports were commissioned by the proponents prior to the final ones with data they approved / included?

If it is decided that the State as a whole should benefit by impacting a pocket of residents, I ask that this be added to the upcoming ballot paper. Those to benefit should know the how and why. I am sure that there are those that would not want to benefit based on the suffering of others.

The Communities surrounding this development are depending on you and your team to make the right decision.

Whilst we may not necessarily get our points across eloquently, or have the same technical expertise, we do have a vested interest in the area – many of us have lived here for decades (so we have long-term analysis on the area and likely impacts) and should also be considered as important contributors to the debate like the experts are. Thank you for facilitating this.

Our responses may seem hysterical / alarmist in some cases, **but this decision will impact our way of life and livelihood.**

If, hand on your heart, after reviewing all the documentation and submissions (including personal letters – not just the clinical tables), **you** would happily move **yourself, your children**, your extended family / parents into the area (near the railway line) following the approval of this mine – then that is your decision.

If however you would not, **then I beg you to reject it.** Not just for my family, but for others in the Community who have chosen to live in this wonderful area?

Come and visit with us.

Thank you for your time.