

David M Newby

Oldbury Farm, Oldbury Road, Moss Vale NSW 2577 ABN: 24 786 706 240

Postal Address: PO Box 720, Moss Vale NSW Australia 2577

Telephone: (02) 4869 2818 Fax: (02) 4869 3028

June 26, 2017

I lodged my objection dated June 5, 2017, to both projects by mail and on-line. I attach a copy of that notice of objection. You will see that one reason for objection is the threat that Hume Coal's plans for water pose to my business, and my State Heritage listed property and its important gardens.

I lodge this by way of further objection.

On June 14, 2017, my notice of objection having been lodged, I received a letter from Hume Coal (which is dated May 23, 2017) headed "Groundwater bore 'make good' consultation".

The letter is said to inform me that if the Hume Coal Project is approved, my groundwater bores have been identified by Hume Coal as "requiring remedial mitigation".

In an attachment, Hume Coal then sets out what "remedial mitigation" it proposes. This is the supposed cure for loss of water in the aquifer, this in an area that has been under a State embargo on new wells for a decade and more, because of a deep-seated concern about the future viability of groundwater.

Hume Coal's May 23 correspondence says that its projects will reduce water levels excessively, and estimates recovery times between 18.9 and 38 years.

I have been dealing with Hume Coal for many years, and its proposals are typically glib, ignoring the real problem – which will be the lack of water. Hume Coal's proposals for my three bores are respectively:-

1. Smallest bore – increase pumping
2. Second bore – deeper pump
3. Large bore – replace irrigation bore

These are not remedies, simply fantasies. If groundwater is not there, pumps will not work. Moreover, there is no possibility of deepening or replacing bores without State approval, and it has been made clear to me in my dealings with the water authorities in NSW that no such approvals will be given.

In short, Hume Coal acknowledges the significance of groundwater depletion, and proposes meaningless or unavailable “remedial mitigation”. For this reason alone its’ projects should be reused approval.

Sincerely

David Newby