

Director General
Mining Projects Development Assessment
Department of Planning & Infrastructure
GPO Box 39
SYDNEY NSW 2001

Name (Please print)..... Montyantz Rustandi.....
Address..... 43 Church st Gloucester 2472.....
Date..... 25/10/2013.....

ROCKY HILL COAL PROJECT
Application No. SSD 5156

I totally oppose the abovementioned project for the following reasons.

- 1) Green House Gas emissions. The EIS describes the global warming potential of methane as 21 times the CO2 equivalent but methane is now considered as being closer to 80 times the CO2 equivalent. This means the EIS has substantially underestimated the greenhouse gas emissions.
- 2) Health. To establish an open-cut coal mine so close to residential areas (in some cases less than 1km from proposed mine site) is in my opinion irresponsible. There is now sufficient scientific evidence to prove that the air quality in the area will become very poor due to coal dust in the atmosphere and this can lead to asthma, chronic lung disease, cardiovascular disease and lung cancer. The World Health Organisation has recently stated that airborne pollution DOES CAUSE CANCER. The prevailing wind is predominantly from the south as shown in the wind rose graphs, a fact misrepresented in the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) dust deposition and particle concentrations graphs (figure 4.23 – figure 4.28). Southerly winds will blow airborne pollutants toward Gloucester Township and temperature inversions, common during winter, will compound the problem.
- 3) Noise, including regular blasting is also a health concern. Sleep interruption and deprivation and infrasound has the potential to cause many health issues including anxiety and depression in the community.
- 4) Viability of the proposal. Gloucester Shire Council employed an economic firm – Economists at large to study the viability of establishing the Rocky Hill coal mine. This survey quoted - 'our analysis based on best available data suggests the project is NOT financially viable, with a net present value negative \$10.8m'. 'Cost benefit analysis is required for project assessment under the Director General's requirements for the project as well as treasury and Dept of Planning guidelines'. Interesting to read too that the coal they are wanting to mine is not the best grade - just a lower rank of coaking coal.

I have made no reportable political donations.

Signature