

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Mandalong Southern Extension. Application No. SSD 5144.

I strongly object to this proposal, stating my opinions and reasons as follows because I know from past experience mining activities in the Mandalong Valley have severely damaged agricultural land, our local environment, the fabric of the local community, business, loss of local employment in the Valley and landowners health with all the added stress and expense.

I have made no donations to political party's in the past in the last two years.

Surface Water Impacts. (As identified by Umwalt). EIS

Water quantity and quality for downstream users (licensed) and the environment.

Flood regimes. Maps are too small for landowners and other interested parties to make a detailed and accurate assessment of how and to what extent each property is or will be affected by flowing or ponded flood waters from adjacent property's. These maps should include the entire valley floor back down to the M1 not be cut off at the edge of the new application area, for people in the Valley trying to understand the complex water issues. Hazard Category Maps are very hard to understand, with no water flow speeds or velocity illustrated for residents trying to assess the dangers involved. There is no disaster or evacuation plan put forward for the Safety of all community members.

Water depths maps (metres) > 1.900 fails to show the MAXIMUM depth. In the 1 in 100 storm event it should show. 1.900 - 5.800.AHD. As was shown in the first E.I.S. But Dr. Perrins (Hughes Trueman Study) removed the upper limit from his flood study replacing it with > which would leave most landholders confused not realising that this stated depth was the low end of the range. I find remarkable that all MAXIMUM depths shown have the same > 1.900. AHD depth. There is no analysis of stream flow velocities or out of channel flows.

(Umwalt EIS) Quote.

"On this basis it is considered that the proposed Development will not result in adverse cumulative impacts on water use (licence holders), flows and the Environment". Unquote. (Note) the above, but in various Consultants Reports in the EIS identifies impacts on the water issues.)

Provision should be made for landowners and water users for the worse case of partial or total loss of stream flow due to mining under Moran's Creek as there is a fault shown on the Longwall maps beneath creek bed. Along with other creeks within the application area.

Aerial Laser Scanning. As this relates to water depths above, we have proof that this system of scanning the ground contours is not accurate (more cost effective than manual ground survey) and gives false readings, as we have been advised by a Centennial staff

member that the ALS scanning will not give a true and accurate reading in areas where there is ponded water or extremely thick vegetation.

If you require a more accurate ground landform profile a ground survey would be needed. We were provided with a coloured Final Landform Map stating that the MAXIUM.

Subsidence was - 0.750m also showing a diminished affectation zone around Longwalls.

When ground surveys carried out by Centennial staff clearly record -0.930m. This discrepancy then questions the computer generated modelling of the flood and the stated MAXIUM flood heights, hazard modelling and flood storage.

I do not have faith in all computer generated modelling and predictions as in the natural world nature will not follow computer predicted outcomes.

Water Quality ? Worst case, total loss of water due to longwall cracks to the surface on or in Moran's Creek and the water resurfaces again but with enriched salt content rendering unsuitable for irrigation or normal garden use. (as has been the case with "Bowman's Creek in Hunter Valley) How would the Company rectify this problem ?

Documents state there is limited potential for changes to water quality including flows volumes in the surrounding area, but dose not address all the cumulative impacts downstream.

Property Subsidence Plans. Consent Condition (15)

There is an urgent need for extra protection for individual landholders in the way the Company prepares these documents. It should be mandatory for the Company to obtain the landowners signature on their PSMP when they had all their views and original Consultants reports included intact before s138 application. (this is a safeguard to make sure that nothing is altered or deleted from Consultants findings as has been done in the "past")

Maps provided in PSMP'S should not only show the property but also the neighbouring property's features and subsided landform, and contours (not cut of at boundary as is the practice) this is vitally important tool in planning further farm development.

And providing understanding of any altered flood pathways, ponding or drainage to be undertaken.

There should be a strict set of guidelines for the Assessment of each Property for the many different types of Agricultural Business or enterprise carried out on each property. By Qualified Consultants not engaged by the company?

There should be no provision for a modification by the Company on the above Consent Condition.

Flooding Stockton & Moran's Creek adjacent to M 1 Freeway.

Floodwaters exiting the lower end of the Mandalong Valley are shown discharging under the M1 via one bridge only. When in actual fact there are three bridges or six counting both north and south lanes.

The MAXIUM flood hight shown here on the first flood study was 1.900 = 5.800m.AHD. Why were the other two bridges to the north of Stockton Creek hidden on all the flood study's, the past and present flood maps? We have provided Centennial with the plans of the six bridges and they said that they would get back to us when they had an answer to the above question but never have.

I find it puzzling as to why the then Main Roads build these bridges then restrict the flow of flood waters exiting the Mandalong Valley by constructing rock barriers to impede the discharge. (photos available)

If the three exit points for floodwaters were shown or reflected in flood study's discharge calculations this would surely lower MAXIUM flood heights and reduce flood hazard results to property's on the floodplain.

Q

Cracking. Volume 3.

Surface cracks of the magnitude of 20mm and 70 mm and up to 400mm. RPS Consultants have rated this as "LOW" potential during "WORST CASE" conditions with un repaired water filled cracks. Therefore significance of shearing or land slip is unlikely.

Note.1. But the above word "Unlikely" dose not explain how this affectation would be repaired. Would it involve the same massive and costly repair to the Environment at nearby Mount Sugarloaf that is currently repairing damage due to Longwall Mining.

Note.2. This identified cracking also raises our concerns as to the accuracy of predictions of subsidence due to longwalls beneath Moran's Creek. And the loss of stream flow.

Far Field Horizontal Displacement and Strains. Volume 5. Page 122.
(Reviews by Reid,1998,Seedsman and Watson 2001).

States FFDs generally only have the potential to damage long, linear features such as pipe lines,bridges,towers and dam walls.What has not been identified here any long concrete foundation house slabs from 10 to 30 m. They should be recognised here, as having potential to damage residences from FFD's in the the entire mining lease area.

FFDs and Transgrid towers. I have serious concerns for landowners property's on which transmission towers may need to be re-located, documents fail to identify impacts to be forced on the owners. Centennial pass it off by saying this may require a separate approval at a later stage.

Envisaged problems for landowners.

1. Need to alter property title deed to create a new Transmission line easement.
2. Clearing the easement, creating another environmental scar on the landscape.
3. High risk of soil erosion,waterway siltation & loss of habitat.
4. This is a major undertaking and should be included in this Assessment or approval held up till this and all identified matters here are included in this EIS.

Social Impact upon the Mandalong Valley.

The initial impact from mining activities in the Valley has been a significant impact socially, ranging from people selling out uncertainty and fear for their future, disruption of Business activities and loss of income. Community road safety fears over the dangers from increasing personal and truck movements on the narrow sections of Mandalong Road from Deaves Road to the proposed new site.

Noise MONITORING.

Question I now ask is was the noise monitoring data collected according to the correct guide lines for Industrial Noise Monitoring? My reasons, are below.

Last time MONITORING data was recorded for our Residence we had a visit from a Centennial staff member to inform us of the times noise would be recorded, but they would Monitor from the Mandalong Road side at our gate as they were not going to pay for access as our Residence is 200 m from our gateway.

Previous Monitoring was 12 meters from our Residence adjacent to our rockery where the Monitoring logger was chained to our flag pole for a week shielded by semi dwarf shrubs and large Future rocks on the eastern side and a large feature rock on the western side. I now question the sites for the collection of noise data as well as the times

Conclusion. Centennial Coal's Mandalong Southern Extension Project. Volumes 1- 7.

1. I formally request that an Inquiry be held to investigate all the matters contained within all 7 Volumes. As such a lot of the data is very hard to understand.
2. I hold grave concerns for the accuracy of the information supplied by Centennial to their chosen Consultants, as they all state they worked from the data supplied by Centennial and their findings are their professional opinions which reflect certain assumptions which may or may not prove to be correct.
3. Another concern I have with all the consultants reports contained within all 7 volumes is whether or not they have been selectively edited by Centennial staff prior to printing Where the Consultants have identified a particular impact with which Centennial disagree.
4. My greatest concern is just about every identifiable impact associated with mining through all 7 volumes is that it's minimal, minor threat, no serious loss, no predicted impact, no adverse threat ect creating a false impression to the person reading this EIS that everybody is a beneficiary from such a project, everyone except the impacted Landowner. In fact there is no benefit to the community.
- 5.

My personal thoughts, opinions and statements quoted in this submission are made only to state my objection to the Mandalong Southern Extension Project as to why it should not proceed. There is no intended malice towards Centennial or Centennial personal or their Consultants.



8/12/2013.