

## **HUME COAL PROJECT- MINE AND ASSOCIATED INFRASTRUCTURE -SSD7172**

The EIS of the Hume Coal Project is very confused. It does not convince me that this would worth the investment for Australia.

### **1. What does 'low impact' mean?**

Hume Coal claims that this is a low impact project, but, what is meant by low impact? I could not find any clear indication of the meaning of this term.

### **I need a clear indication of what is 'low impact' and what is the basis for this judgement?**

The low impact to them could be high impact to us, or high impact for the future.

POSCO holds a different value as to the benefit for Australia.

Please refer to the attachment 1; attachment 2, which are about POSCO. They do not have the same humanitarian values as we do. And I do not think they care about the land and environment earth citizens. How the EIS has been compiled could tell me they developed this just because government asked for it. I am very sorry to make this comment.

The 'low impact' for the environment for 20 years ago or 10 years ago could result in very severe impact 5 years later, 20 years later. And it could be too late or too hard to fix this then.

The low impact for a healthy person could be severe impact for a very sick person. Sometimes, a seriously sickness person cannot take any impact.

The climate change situation is telling us the earth is very sick now. **Who can tell me how much impact earth can take? How much impact the Southern Highlands could take?**

### **2. Water Impact**

For the 71 property owners who own 93 bores, the impact to them is already happening from what I have seen in the different community meetings. The property values are down, and soon they will be short of water for the survival of their businesses, the quality of the water, the uncertain future, etc. For POSCO, they could not seem to see how this could not be called low impact for us.

How can they avoid underground water being contaminated? What is low impact to our underground water?

How will they prevent the water contaminating the land? Just to say they will not is not enough, especially based on POSCO's value and record. I think people have the right to ask for more detail in the EIS report. They need to provide clear way in the EIS to prove that the land will be well cared for. Could they provide more detailed information about how this

will be prevented? As long as the land is not contaminated, we will lose our 1<sup>st</sup> rate underground water. This is already more than low impact for local people.

### **What is the water treatment process about?**

The EIS states the washing water will be put back to the land. But, what will be the process through which all the chemical to be used in the water will be cleared?

What do they mean by the low impact of the water? Compared with Asian countries or African countries?

The water quality should be 0 impact and **zero risk**.

### **3. Noise impact**

Could we assess the 2 years construction with 45db -75db noise as low impact?

I do not think this will be low impact to the restaurant Zen Oasis, which is opposite to the Medway road. The common feedback of appreciation for the Zen Oasis pertains to the tranquil garden, as well as good food. The 2 years noise may kill their 13 years business. Who will compensate for their business loss?

The EIS claims that the noise level will hardly be 75db. However, if you have run such a business as Zen Oasis you will know that it took a long time to build up a business, and it can be destroyed in one moment. To destroy the business does not even require frequently 75db for Zen Oasis.

This is a rural area. Why do people choose to live here? There are many reasons. However, the people living here deserve to have fresh air, which they always have treasured for ages.

There are so many properties will suffer the day and night noise if the project go ahead. They think to put double-glazed glass windows will be the solution. I suppose that is why they said this would be a low impact project.

Obviously, they do not understand how precious the fresh air is for Australians.

I am not a resident there, I have no business in the area. However, when I looked at the statement about the business situation, I felt there was something they needed to understand.

Another few points:

This is a rural area. I think they should do the noise impact based on the rural area standard. However, in the sleeping time, they use the Industrial Noise Policy to evaluate.

In the EIS, PSNL: Project-Specific Noise Level – I could not understand the formula for this and how it was derived?

**The Government should provide a better model and solution.**

#### **4. Trust:**

**Do we really trust Hume Coal with the future of our land?**

This is the question to be asked in the social media.

Security issue: Hume coal claims they will only take 35% of the coal. I am aware that the Government will monitor this. But how?

**Could the Government give us a clear statement, how will the mining be monitored before it begins?** The people have the right to know how the Government will spend money to monitor it: **What will be the System? Methodology? Procedure? Which Department will be responsible?**

Sorry to ask for this. However, look at what is happening at Whitehaven Coal's Vickery mine.

---

<http://www.abc.net.au/news/rural/2017-05-02/landowners-allege-government-pressing-to-mine-vickery-entirely/8490168>

Whitehaven Coal's Vickery mine: Landowners allege being told Government pressing to 'mine the whole resource' - ABC 02/05/2017

---

**Is that the current strategy in the mining industry?** Say 35 per cent first in order to get the green light, and then push after this.

Should people live in such worry? The consequence from such long-term pressure would become a mental health issue.

#### **Rehabilitation**

Yes, I was told in one session that the Government will ask Hume Coal to keep secure funding for rehabilitation. My question is:

**How much is enough for rehabilitation?**

Looking at what has been done in India, it would not be surprising if POSCO were to just walk away again, if they could not make enough profit. (Please refer to attachment 3).

We need to have the worst scenario to calculate how much money could secure the tax payer's money. It is unfair to use Australian tax payer's money to fix their problem.

**I will request clear documentation with clear figures** (how much to be put in the bank) for the rehabilitation plan.

## 5. Assessment scenario

Could I ask which scenario the Government will use for assessment?

S1. The government will give the green light if the government could not see any problem

S2. The government **will not approve before there is assessment that there will be no issue associated with any aspect.**

We need realize that even if there is no problem with any aspect in advanced, there is no guarantee that there will be no problem in the future.

Will the Government approve something which could risk the Southern Highland's future and our water to try something of which we are unsure?

Could we afford any consequence if the worst case happened, even if it's just 0.1% probability?

Or should we focus on industry repairing the earth, to help to stop the damage, and to invest in tomorrow?

**Do we need to pay for the damage for yesterday's industrial problems?**

## 6. Time

I fully understand people would like to have answers as soon as possible. However, this is a very critical project. I personally would rather the Government evaluates all the information thoroughly and clearly, and apply fairness and equity in making the decision.

**Last point:**

**Is it worth to put our people and our earth at risk for yesterday's industry?**

I need the Government to respond to this.