

NSW Government Planning & Infrastructure
GPO Box 39
SYDNEY NSW 2001

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

Name: W.X. & H.J. Martin
E-mail: martinx@northnet.com.au
Address: “Bourbah” Mullaley 2379

We have not made any reportable political donations.

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

We are members of the Caroon Coal Action Group. We object to the proposed Shenhua Watermark Coal Mine at Breeza NSW. We have reviewed the submission prepared by Earth Systems for the Caroon Coal Action Group (CCAG) and write in support of the CCAG submission.

We are staggered that a project of this enormity has so many inconsistencies and deficiencies in its EIS as detailed in the [Earth Systems] CCAG submission including the absence of “key project layout, baseline and impact assessment figures”.

We look forward to the responses on each matter.

It is particularly disturbing that the EIS, while mentioning best practice or leading practice in a few sections, is silent on the adoption of best practice in the majority of sections and it appears that ‘near enough is good enough’ type practices or a ‘let’s wait and see’ approach is adopted in many sections. This is unacceptable to us, and we believe, the citizens of this Nation.

As outlined in the Earth Systems work, many of the appendices are deficient in construct and apart from having relevant heading’s, lack relevant and credible content in their treatment of the issues. An example is the Agricultural Impact Statement (Appendix Z) which is particularly deficient in its assumptions, method and output. For example the time horizons in relation to production and historic weather inputs are unrealistically short to the point that outputs are misleading. It also fails to calculate the economic detriment to agriculture outside the proposed mining area.

Another example of a deficiency is the failure to deal effectively with the proposed permanent disruption of the current important natural process of nutrient transmission by surface water from the slopes to the alluvium.

In our view it is reasonable to expect the land, water and air at and surrounding the Watermark site to feed and clothe people for thousands of years and any decision to approve the detrimental impacts of this mine will jeopardise this future bounty!

Once an extractive process starts [the mine], nobody can reverse the social, economic and environmental impacts, in particular to the water resources as the system enters a new state and is permanently corrupted. Please stop and think!

