

Director, Mining Projects
Development Assessment Systems
and Approvals
Department of Planning & Infrastructure
Box 39 GPO
SYDNEY NSW 2001

Name (print)..... Kim Maree Flack
Address..... 27 Ravenshaw St
Gloucester
Date..... 27.10.2013.....

Dear Sir

ROCKY HILL COAL PROJECT - Application No. SSD 5156

I'm a Gloucester resident and I oppose this development.

A major concern is the risk to human health for the nearby residents and the people of Gloucester. Wind rose diagrams in the Specialist Consultants Studies Compendium (SCSC 2B-26 Fig. 4.1) show prevailing winds are predominantly from the south, a fact not properly disclosed in the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). Southerly winds will blow airborne pollutants toward Gloucester Township.

The EIS estimates total suspended particles (TSP) emissions during year 2.5 as totalling almost 778 tonnes of which 304 tonnes is particle size PM10 (EIS table 4.26). However EIS table 4.27 estimates TSP as 912.6 tonnes per year during year 4.25 which presumably would include approximately 357 tonnes PM10 particles. PM10 includes particles from the combustion of diesel fuel. Up to an estimated 10 semi-trailer tanker loads (approximately 340 thousand litres) of diesel will be delivered and presumably burned each week (EIS 2.9.3).

Key Insights was commissioned to prepare a socio-economic assessment for the EIS. The report section titled "Health impacts associated with air pollution (SCSC 14, 5.2.1) concedes *"Particulates can affect a person's health by aggravating respiratory diseases; irritating upper airways and eyes; increasing the risk of death from chronic respiratory and cardiovascular diseases"* and *"Diesel particulates are known to cause irritation and are considered a probable human carcinogen . . ."* This last statement is in stark contrast with the World Health Organisation which identifies the burning of diesel as a **Class One Carcinogen**.

The proposed Rocky Hill mine will produce nearly 7 tonnes of PM10 particles per week at peak production which will include a considerable amount of diesel particulates. Gloucester therefore has southerly winds predominating with temperature inversions common during winter. These winds will blow this pollution towards and over Gloucester. Although the EIS states (4.4.9.5) *"The conservative assessment of the potential acute and chronic health risks of increased levels of PM2.5 and NO₂ associated with the Proposal has established that the potential health risks are negligible or acceptable at the receptor with the highest impacts expected."* I cannot comprehend how anyone could arrive at such a conclusion. I believe the **potential acute and chronic health risks** are anything but negligible or acceptable. Gloucester residents are not expendable. In my opinion this mine must not be approved.

I have made no reportable political donations.

Yours faithfully,

A. M. Flack