

NSW Government Planning and Infrastructure
GPO Box 309
Sydney NSW 2001

Attention: Director Mining and Industry Projects
Re: Watermark Coal Mine
App No: SSD-4975 Watermark Coal Project

Disclose reportable donation: I have not made a reportable political donation.

Privacy Statement: I have read the Department's Privacy Statement and agree to the Department using my submission in the ways it describes. I understand this includes full publication on the Department's website on my submission, any attachments, and any of the personal information in those documents, and possible supply to third parties such as state agencies, local government and the proponent. I agree to the above statement.

Submission

I am a member of the Caroonah Coal Action Group. I object to the proposed Shenhua Watermark Mine at Breeza NSW.

I am a farmer on the Breeza Plain, thirty kilometres south of Cunnedah, with property within the Shenhua Coal Project

My objections are listed below.

SURFACE WATER

The Watermark catchment runs directly through our properties. These properties rely totally on the Watermark catchment for stock and domestic water.

The Shenhua EIS quotes 'the project will impact Watermark Gully through a reduction in the contributing catchment area by approximately 25%. This consequently affects the magnitude and frequency of flows along the watercourse. At Year 30, the maximum reduction in the associated catchment will be reached resulting in low flows of 15.1 Mega litres per day at the downstream boundary. This is a decline of 7.8 Mega litres per day from the pre-mining flow conditions. Following cessation of mining the catchment area draining to Watermark Gully will exceed pre-mining conditions increasing flows to 26.5 Mega litres per day'.

The Shenhua EIS quotes: 'the salt load to Watermark Gully increases by 4% and 30%, year 25 and 30. This represents a likely upper limit of the salt load impact'

Question1. Where will my stock and domestic water come from with a 25% reduction.

Considering the legal constraints of 10% harvest of water, why does the Shenhua mine have access to 25%.

Question2. Considering quote 'Watermark Gully becomes a very wide shallow flow path' the recharge to the aquifers and the vital profiles these waters have across the plains soils, who will take charge of reduction of incomes to farmers on the plains?

Question3. What effect will the 13% increase of flow make after mining?

Question4. What effect will the salt level increases have on crop production and long term effects to the soils?

Is the State Government ready for compensation payments which ultimately will be their responsibility?

WATER REDIRECTION

Quote 'water will be redirected ' runoff will only be released from site if the quality is acceptable and DURING A RAINFALL EVENT THAT EXCEEDS THE DESIGN CAPACITY OF THE SEDIMENT DAM'.

Question 1. Where will the water be redirected to? You must never change the tributaries to a floodplain that has occurred over millions of years. It is the very basis of its productivity.

Question 2. If this is allowed to occur, what effect will this contaminated sediment have on the soil, crops, livestock and humans in its path? Already cattle vendor declarations require proximity to mines. Again is the State Government ready for compensation?

Question 3. Definitions for the following loose words used in this EIS

1. Potential
2. Minor
3. 'as far as practical'
4. negligible

WATER

As potable water will be taken to the site for the use of

Drinking and showering

Kitchen

Emergency etc.

What plans have been put in place for the homes within the area, including the village of Breeza to protect them from what Shenhua obviously believe is contaminated water.

AIR QUALITY

Residential air quality monitors. What about owners and their employees who work in the outside environment? Advance notice may be great in theory, but are we to stop our business operations every time Shenhua want to blast? Are we to stop our everyday operations when the air quality is compromised? Have the authorities taken into account the health effects on the town and village residents on the rail lines with the increase of coal rail volume.

NOISE

What is 'feasible and reasonable' noise management? A plan will be developed. Surely this should have been incorporated in the EIS. Who is going to police this?

BLASTING

Management plan 'will be developed'. Again this should have been incorporated into the EIS. Who is going to police?

REHABILITATION

Final void to be left with an 80 metre hole, which will be below the natural ground surface. Shenhua state to rehabilitate will be \$438 million and will further extend the noise/ dust. Suddenly money matters over the health of the region and an admission of noise and dust.

ECOLOGY

To allow the clearing of 4084 ha of vegetation is a national disgrace. If we as farmers remove one tree we replace with four. The effect of the flora/ fauna in the area will be catastrophic and the reduction EFFECT ON THE RAINFALL AND CLIMATE has already been proven in the Hunter Valley.

KOALA

The translocation of the koala from this area will not only be a proven disaster but takes away from the present residents the joy of these animals. The Australian Koala Foundation the national experts in this field also disputes the number of koalas in the local government area.

ABORIGINAL HERITAGE

I am not an indigenous person but I take enormous exception and with huge sadness and anger that our State Government or any of its departments would allow for 'any' of the sights, significant or not to be moved in any way. This is Australian heritage and it is about time that came before foreign money.

TRAFFIC AND TRANSPORTATION

Closure of roads is totally unacceptable. Another 'will be' plan.

Frankly if these 'will be' plans are not available in the EIS it is a flawed EIS.

The Social Fabric and Sense of Community will be decimated if this mine is allowed to go ahead. Already Shenhua have demonstrated they are Irresponsible Landlords with the visual negligence of weed control, feral animals and allowance of hunters, not knowing boundaries, becoming trespassers on neighbouring properties.

If the Government approves this project, they are knowingly approving the detrimental impacts of this mine at the cost of the landholders and the community. Once the mine starts, you cannot stop or mitigate the impacts to the water resources. The system enters a new state and is changed.

Susan Lyle
Ranken Park
Curlewis 2381
Email:jslyle@activ8.net.au