Name	C.1) RAIR	7
Address_	14	YEAN	
	Rive	RASOD	
	ate:	6 / 2017	

GPO Box 39 Sydney NSW 2001

This is a submission to the Hume Coal Project EIS. SSD 7172

I object to this project and believe it should be rejected due to

THE POOR ECONOMICS OF THE HUME COAL PROJECT.

From the data in the EIS it is apparent that the project is unprofitable, with negative investment returns.

- This is a small mine and costly to operate.
- The product mix revealed in the EIS results in lower revenue than previously put forward, with nearly half the production low value thermal coal.
- The only way that the mine can improve its profitability would be to significantly increase production, makingthe EIS invalid in its present form.
- BAEconomics have not been asked to undertake the sensitivity analysis of how much output prices would need to fall for the project to have a zero NPV because Hume Coal considers it to be "commercial in confidence". (EIS Appendix Q page 42). This is unacceptable and an apparent inability to meet the 2015 guidelines for an EIS.

THE REJECT EMPLACEMENT AND BULKHEAD ISSUES

- The Metropolitan Colliery emplaced at least some of their rejects in mined voids in recent years. This operation required extensive experimentation over a number of years.
- They had the advantage of knowing the exact composition of their reject material and voids that were well away from curent mining areas.
- The Airly Colliery considered this method of reject disposal but decided it posed unacceptable safety and other concerns.
- In contrast the Hume EIS assumes that reject emplacement behind bulkheads is a risk freeprocess. The
 design of the bulkheads is complex and their construction in an operating environment is
 problematic.

This is a very risky proposal and I urge the Government to reject this project.

Carolla Baird

If you wish to maintain your privacy in this submission from the department's website please tick this box:	
I have not made a reportable political donation.	

Name Ron Llicks
Address 2 Acer Ct
Address 2 MC2
Bowal
NSW
Date:/)/-6-/ 2017

GPO Box 39 Sydney NSW 2001

This is a submission to the Hume Coal Project EIS. SSD 7172

I object to this project and believe it should be rejected due to

THE POOR ECONOMICS OF THE HUME COAL PROJECT.

From the data in the EIS it is apparent that the project is unprofitable, with negative investment returns.

- This is a small mine and costly to operate.
- The product mix revealed in the EIS results in lower revenue than previously put forward, with nearly half the production low value thermal coal.
- The only way that the mine can improve its profitability would be to significantly increase production, makingthe EIS invalid in its present form.
- BAEconomics have not been asked to undertake the sensitivity analysis of how much output
 prices would need to fall for the project to have a zero NPV because Hume Coal considers it to
 be "commercial in confidence". (EIS Appendix Q page 42). This is unacceptable and an
 apparent inability to meet the 2015 guidelines for an EIS.

THE REJECT EMPLACEMENT AND BULKHEAD ISSUES

- The Metropolitan Colliery emplaced at least some of their rejects in mined voids in recent years. This operation required extensive experimentation over a number of years.
- They had the advantage of knowing the exact composition of their reject material and voids that were well away from curent mining areas.
- The Airly Colliery considered this method of reject disposal but decided it posed unacceptable safety and other concerns.
- In contrast the Hume EIS assumes that reject emplacement behind bulkheads is a risk free process. The
 design of the bulkheads is complex and their construction in an operating environment is
 problematic.

This is a very risky proposal and I urge the Government to reject this project.

If you wish to maintain your privacy in this submission from the department's website please tick this box:	
I have not made a reportable political donation.	ď

Name MARK JOHNSON

Address 9 BOCKS RD

OAKVILLE

WSW 2765

Date: 17/6/2017

Attn: Executive Director, Resource Assessments Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39
Sydney NSW 2001

This is a submission to the Hume Coal Project EIS. SSD 7172

I object to this project and believe it should be rejected due to

THE POOR ECONOMICS OF THE HUME COAL PROJECT.

From the data in the EIS it is apparent that the project is unprofitable, with negative investment returns.

• This is a small mine and costly to operate.

Signed,

- The product mix revealed in the EIS results in lower revenue than previously put forward, with nearly half the production low value thermal coal.
- The only way that the mine can improve its profitability would be to significantly increase production, makingthe EIS invalid in its present form.
- BAEconomics have not been asked to undertake the sensitivity analysis of how much output
 prices would need to fall for the project to have a zero NPV because Hume Coal considers it to
 be "commercial in confidence". (EIS Appendix Q page 42). This is unacceptable and an
 apparent inability to meet the 2015 guidelines for an EIS.

THE REJECT EMPLACEMENT AND BULKHEAD ISSUES

- The Metropolitan Colliery emplaced at least some of their rejects in mined voids in recent years. This operation required extensive experimentation over a number of years.
- They had the advantage of knowing the exact composition of their reject material and voids that were well away from curent mining areas.
- The Airly Colliery considered this method of reject disposal but decided it posed unacceptable safety and other concerns.
- In contrast the Hume EIS assumes that reject emplacement behind bulkheads is a risk freeprocess. The
 design of the bulkheads is complex and their construction in an operating environment is
 problematic.

If you wish to maintain your privacy in this submission from the department's website please tick this box:	
I have not made a reportable political donation.	

Name SU SOMMON

Address 9 BOCKS RD

OAKVILLE

NSW 2765

Date: /7 / 6 / 2017

Attn: Executive Director, Resource Assessments Department of Planning and Environment

GPO Box 39 Sydney NSW 2001

Signed,

This is a submission to the Hume Coal Project EIS. SSD 7172

I object to this project and believe it should be rejected due to

THE POOR ECONOMICS OF THE HUME COAL PROJECT.

From the data in the EIS it is apparent that the project is unprofitable, with negative investment returns.

- This is a small mine and costly to operate.
- The product mix revealed in the EIS results in lower revenue than previously put forward, with nearly half the production low value thermal coal.
- The only way that the mine can improve its profitability would be to significantly increase production, makingthe EIS invalid in its present form.
- BAEconomics have not been asked to undertake the sensitivity analysis of how much output
 prices would need to fall for the project to have a zero NPV because Hume Coal considers it to
 be "commercial in confidence". (EIS Appendix Q page 42). This is unacceptable and an
 apparent inability to meet the 2015 guidelines for an EIS.

THE REJECT EMPLACEMENT AND BULKHEAD ISSUES

- The Metropolitan Colliery emplaced at least some of their rejects in mined voids in recent years. This operation required extensive experimentation over a number of years.
- They had the advantage of knowing the exact composition of their reject material and voids that were well away from curent mining areas.
- The Airly Colliery considered this method of reject disposal but decided it posed unacceptable safety and other concerns.
- In contrast the Hume EIS assumes that reject emplacement behind bulkheads is a risk freeprocess. The
 design of the bulkheads is complex and their construction in an operating environment is
 problematic.

If you wish to maintain your privacy in this submission from the department's website please tick this box:	
I have not made a reportable political donation.	

Name_	5.	W.	Lus	· H2	
Addres	s 20	Ro	س ائند	ay	Poli
_	B	りいへ	al.		
_		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		_	
	Date:/ 7 /	6 / 201	7		

GPO Box 39 Sydney NSW 2001

This is a submission to the Hume Coal Project EIS. SSD 7172

I object to this project and believe it should be rejected due to

THE POOR ECONOMICS OF THE HUME COAL PROJECT.

From the data in the EIS it is apparent that the project is unprofitable, with negative investment returns.

- This is a small mine and costly to operate.
- The product mix revealed in the EIS results in lower revenue than previously put forward, with nearly half the production low value thermal coal.
- The only way that the mine can improve its profitability would be to significantly increase production, making the EIS invalid in its present form.
- BAEconomics have not been asked to undertake the sensitivity analysis of how much output
 prices would need to fall for the project to have a zero NPV because Hume Coal considers it to
 be "commercial in confidence". (EIS Appendix Q page 42). This is unacceptable and an
 apparent inability to meet the 2015 guidelines for an EIS.

THE REJECT EMPLACEMENT AND BULKHEAD ISSUES

- The Metropolitan Colliery emplaced at least some of their rejects in mined voids in recent years. This operation required extensive experimentation over a number of years.
- They had the advantage of knowing the exact composition of their reject material and voids that were well away from curent mining areas.
- The Airly Colliery considered this method of reject disposal but decided it posed unacceptable safety and other concerns.
- In contrast the Hume EIS assumes that reject emplacement behind bulkheads is a risk freeprocess. The
 design of the bulkheads is complex and their construction in an operating environment is
 problematic.

This is a very risky proposal and I urge the Government to reject this project. Signed,	
If you wish to maintain your privacy in this submission from the department's website please tick this box:	
I have not made a reportable political donation.	V

Name_ Juc. 2 1 Con Get T
Address Zeo Rancasos Ro
Rock (Cocyclos'
Date: / 7/ 6 / 2017

GPO Box 39 Sydney NSW 2001

This is a submission to the Hume Coal Project EIS. SSD 7172

I object to this project and believe it should be rejected due to

THE POOR ECONOMICS OF THE HUME COAL PROJECT.

From the data in the EIS it is apparent that the project is unprofitable, with negative investment returns.

- This is a small mine and costly to operate.
- The product mix revealed in the EIS results in lower revenue than previously put forward, with nearly half the production low value thermal coal.
- The only way that the mine can improve its profitability would be to significantly increase production, makingthe EIS invalid in its present form.
- BAEconomics have not been asked to undertake the sensitivity analysis of how much output
 prices would need to fall for the project to have a zero NPV because Hume Coal considers it to
 be "commercial in confidence". (EIS Appendix Q page 42). This is unacceptable and an
 apparent inability to meet the 2015 guidelines for an EIS.

THE REJECT EMPLACEMENT AND BULKHEAD ISSUES

- The Metropolitan Colliery emplaced at least some of their rejects in mined voids in recent years. This operation required extensive experimentation over a number of years.
- They had the advantage of knowing the exact composition of their reject material and voids that were well away from current mining areas.
- The Airly Colliery considered this method of reject disposal but decided it posed unacceptable safety and other concerns.
- In contrast the Hume EIS assumes that reject emplacement behind bulkheads is a risk freeprocess. The
 design of the bulkheads is complex and their construction in an operating environment is
 problematic.

This is a very risky proposal and I urge the Government to reject this project. Signed,	
If you wish to maintain your privacy in this submission from the department's website please tick this bo	c:
I have not made a reportable political donation.	Q

Name STEPHEN BROWN
Address 19 KIMBURCET O
BOWDAR
Date: 17/6/2017

GPO Box 39 Sydney NSW 2001

This is a submission to the Hume Coal Project EIS. SSD 7172

I object to this project and believe it should be rejected due to

THE POOR ECONOMICS OF THE HUME COAL PROJECT.

From the data in the EIS it is apparent that the project is unprofitable, with negative investment returns.

- This is a small mine and costly to operate.
- The product mix revealed in the EIS results in lower revenue than previously put forward, with nearly half the production low value thermal coal.
- The only way that the mine can improve its profitability would be to significantly increase production, makingthe EIS invalid in its present form.
- BAEconomics have not been asked to undertake the sensitivity analysis of how much output prices would need to fall for the project to have a zero NPV because Hume Coal considers it to be "commercial in confidence". (EIS Appendix Q page 42). This is unacceptable and an apparent inability to meet the 2015 guidelines for an EIS.

THE REJECT EMPLACEMENT AND BULKHEAD ISSUES

- The Metropolitan Colliery emplaced at least some of their rejects in mined voids in recent years. This operation required extensive experimentation over a number of years.
- They had the advantage of knowing the exact composition of their reject material and voids that were well away from curent mining areas.
- The Airly Colliery considered this method of reject disposal but decided it posed unacceptable safety and other concerns.
- In contrast the Hume EIS assumes that reject emplacement behind bulkheads is a risk free process. The
 design of the bulkheads is complex and their construction in an operating environment is
 problematic.

This is a very risky proposal and I urge the Government to reject this project.

If you wish to maintain your privacy in this submission from the department's website please tick this box:	
I have not made a reportable political donation.	Q

Name_	NEIL WAFNER
Address	12 GOVERNMENT
	LOAD
_	MATAGONG
	Date: [// 6 / 2017

GPO Box 39 Sydney NSW 2001

This is a submission to the Hume Coal Project EIS. SSD 7172

I object to this project and believe it should be rejected due to

THE POOR ECONOMICS OF THE HUME COAL PROJECT.

From the data in the EIS it is apparent that the project is unprofitable, with negative investment returns.

- This is a small mine and costly to operate.
- The product mix revealed in the EIS results in lower revenue than previously put forward, with nearly half the production low value thermal coal.
- The only way that the mine can improve its profitability would be to significantly increase production, makingthe EIS invalid in its present form.
- BAEconomics have not been asked to undertake the sensitivity analysis of how much output
 prices would need to fall for the project to have a zero NPV because Hume Coal considers it to
 be "commercial in confidence". (EIS Appendix Q page 42). This is unacceptable and an
 apparent inability to meet the 2015 guidelines for an EIS.

THE REJECT EMPLACEMENT AND BULKHEAD ISSUES

- The Metropolitan Colliery emplaced at least some of their rejects in mined voids in recent years. This
 operation required extensive experimentation over a number of years.
- They had the advantage of knowing the exact composition of their reject material and voids that were well away from current mining areas.
- The Airly Colliery considered this method of reject disposal but decided it posed unacceptable safety and other concerns.
- In contrast the Hume EIS assumes that reject emplacement behind bulkheads is a risk freeprocess. The
 design of the bulkheads is complex and their construction in an operating environment is
 problematic.

his is a very risky proposal and I urge the Government to reject this project.	
If you wish to maintain your privacy in this submission from the department's website please tick this box:	
I have not made a reportable political donation.	X

Name B Monthonkey
Address 6 ERIDGE PKC
BURRADER.
Date:() / 6 / 2017

Attn: Executive Director, Resource Assessments Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39 Sydney NSW 2001

This is a submission to the Hume Coal Project EIS. SSD 7172

I object to this project and believe it should be rejected due to

THE POOR ECONOMICS OF THE HUME COAL PROJECT.

From the data in the EIS it is apparent that the project is unprofitable, with negative investment returns.

- This is a small mine and costly to operate.
- The product mix revealed in the EIS results in lower revenue than previously put forward, with nearly half the production low value thermal coal.
- The only way that the mine can improve its profitability would be to significantly increase production, makingthe EIS invalid in its present form.
- BAEconomics have not been asked to undertake the sensitivity analysis of how much output
 prices would need to fall for the project to have a zero NPV because Hume Coal considers it to
 be "commercial in confidence". (EIS Appendix Q page 42). This is unacceptable and an
 apparent inability to meet the 2015 guidelines for an EIS.

THE REJECT EMPLACEMENT AND BULKHEAD ISSUES

- The Metropolitan Colliery emplaced at least some of their rejects in mined voids in recent years. This operation required extensive experimentation over a number of years.
- They had the advantage of knowing the exact composition of their reject material and voids that were well away from current mining areas.
- The Airly Colliery considered this method of reject disposal but decided it posed unacceptable safety and other concerns.
- In contrast the Hume EIS assumes that reject emplacement behind bulkheads is a risk freeprocess. The
 design of the bulkheads is complex and their construction in an operating environment is
 problematic.

This is a very risky proposal and I urge the Government to reject this project.

If you wish to maintain your privacy in this submission from the department's website please tick this box:	
I have not made a reportable political donation.	\triangleleft

Name Kirenkumar Solank
Address 13 Rizabeth St.
Mittagong
NSW 2275
Date:/ ブ / 6 / 2017

Attn: Executive Director, Resource Assessments Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39
Sydney NSW 2001

This is a submission to the Hume Coal Project EIS. SSD 7172

I object to this project and believe it should be rejected due to

THE POOR ECONOMICS OF THE HUME COAL PROJECT.

From the data in the EIS it is apparent that the project is unprofitable, with negative investment returns.

- This is a small mine and costly to operate.
- The product mix revealed in the EIS results in lower revenue than previously put forward, with nearly half the production low value thermal coal.
- The only way that the mine can improve its profitability would be to significantly increase production, makingthe EIS invalid in its present form.
- BAEconomics have not been asked to undertake the sensitivity analysis of how much output
 prices would need to fall for the project to have a zero NPV because Hume Coal considers it to
 be "commercial in confidence". (EIS Appendix Q page 42). This is unacceptable and an
 apparent inability to meet the 2015 guidelines for an EIS.

THE REJECT EMPLACEMENT AND BULKHEAD ISSUES

- The Metropolitan Colliery emplaced at least some of their rejects in mined voids in recent years. This operation required extensive experimentation over a number of years.
- They had the advantage of knowing the exact composition of their reject material and voids that were well away from current mining areas.
- The Airly Colliery considered this method of reject disposal but decided it posed unacceptable safety and other concerns.
- In contrast the Hume EIS assumes that reject emplacement behind bulkheads is a risk freeprocess. The
 design of the bulkheads is complex and their construction in an operating environment is
 problematic.

This is a very risky proposal and I urge the Government to reject this project.

If you wish to maintain your privacy in this submission from the department's website please tick this box:	
I have not made a reportable political donation	

Name Trud Spences
Address 4. Siemen 81
Methagons.
, , , ,
Date: / 7/6/2017

GPO Box 39 Sydney NSW 2001

This is a submission to the Hume Coal Project EIS. SSD 7172

I object to this project and believe it should be rejected due to

THE POOR ECONOMICS OF THE HUME COAL PROJECT.

From the data in the EIS it is apparent that the project is unprofitable, with negative investment returns.

- This is a small mine and costly to operate.
- The product mix revealed in the EIS results in lower revenue than previously put forward, with nearly half the production low value thermal coal.
- The only way that the mine can improve its profitability would be to significantly increase production, makingthe EIS invalid in its present form.
- BAEconomics have not been asked to undertake the sensitivity analysis of how much output
 prices would need to fall for the project to have a zero NPV because Hume Coal considers it to
 be "commercial in confidence". (EIS Appendix Q page 42). This is unacceptable and an
 apparent inability to meet the 2015 guidelines for an EIS.

THE REJECT EMPLACEMENT AND BULKHEAD ISSUES

- The Metropolitan Colliery emplaced at least some of their rejects in mined voids in recent years. This operation required extensive experimentation over a number of years.
- They had the advantage of knowing the exact composition of their reject material and voids that were well away from current mining areas.
- The Airly Colliery considered this method of reject disposal but decided it posed unacceptable safety and other concerns.
- In contrast the Hume EIS assumes that reject emplacement behind bulkheads is a risk freeprocess. The
 design of the bulkheads is complex and their construction in an operating environment is
 problematic.

Signea,	
-02	
$\mathcal{L}(f)$	

If you wish to maintain your privacy in this submission from the department's website please tick this box:	
I have not made a reportable political donation.	Ø

Name Vanine	1	10ph	V 50)N
Address 71 B	len	رو (ما	es	Lane
Wilde	5	Mea	dou	J
			-	
Date: (7) 6 /	2017			

GPO Box 39 Sydney NSW 2001

This is a submission to the Hume Coal Project EIS. SSD 7172

I object to this project and believe it should be rejected due to

THE POOR ECONOMICS OF THE HUME COAL PROJECT.

From the data in the EIS it is apparent that the project is unprofitable, with negative investment returns.

- This is a small mine and costly to operate.
- The product mix revealed in the EIS results in lower revenue than previously put forward, with nearly half the production low value thermal coal.
- The only way that the mine can improve its profitability would be to significantly increase production, makingthe EIS invalid in its present form.
- BAEconomics have not been asked to undertake the sensitivity analysis of how much output
 prices would need to fall for the project to have a zero NPV because Hume Coal considers it to
 be "commercial in confidence". (EIS Appendix Q page 42). This is unacceptable and an
 apparent inability to meet the 2015 guidelines for an EIS.

THE REJECT EMPLACEMENT AND BULKHEAD ISSUES

- The Metropolitan Colliery emplaced at least some of their rejects in mined voids in recent years. This operation required extensive experimentation over a number of years.
- They had the advantage of knowing the exact composition of their reject material and voids that were well away from current mining areas.
- The Airly Colliery considered this method of reject disposal but decided it posed unacceptable safety and other concerns.
- In contrast the Hume EIS assumes that reject emplacement behind bulkheads is a risk freeprocess. The
 design of the bulkheads is complex and their construction in an operating environment is
 problematic.

This is a very risky proposal and I urge the Government to reject this project.

JM Ph Son

If you wish to maintain your privacy in this submission from the department's website please tick this box:	
	_/
I have not made a reportable political donation.	
2 Have not made a reportable political dollation.	

Name	Lynn	ré Moor	٤	
Address_	490	Woodla	ds	Rd
_	Was	dlands	25	75
-				
D	ate:///6	5 / 2017		

GPO Box 39 Sydney NSW 2001

This is a submission to the Hume Coal Project EIS. SSD 7172

I object to this project and believe it should be rejected due to

THE POOR ECONOMICS OF THE HUME COAL PROJECT.

From the data in the EIS it is apparent that the project is unprofitable, with negative investment returns.

- This is a small mine and costly to operate.
- The product mix revealed in the EIS results in lower revenue than previously put forward, with nearly half the production low value thermal coal.
- The only way that the mine can improve its profitability would be to significantly increase production, makingthe EIS invalid in its present form.
- BAEconomics have not been asked to undertake the sensitivity analysis of how much output
 prices would need to fall for the project to have a zero NPV because Hume Coal considers it to
 be "commercial in confidence". (EIS Appendix Q page 42). This is unacceptable and an
 apparent inability to meet the 2015 guidelines for an EIS.

THE REJECT EMPLACEMENT AND BULKHEAD ISSUES

- The Metropolitan Colliery emplaced at least some of their rejects in mined voids in recent years. This operation required extensive experimentation over a number of years.
- They had the advantage of knowing the exact composition of their reject material and voids that were well away from curent mining areas.
- The Airly Colliery considered this method of reject disposal but decided it posed unacceptable safety and other concerns.
- In contrast the Hume EIS assumes that reject emplacement behind bulkheads is a risk freeprocess. The
 design of the bulkheads is complex and their construction in an operating environment is
 problematic.

This is a very risky proposal and I urge the Government to reject this project.

Signed,

The E. Nore

If you wish to maintain your privacy in this submission from the department's website please tick this box	
I have not made a reportable political donation.	

Name Penelope Jesson
Address 875 Old South Rd
Mittagona
Mittagong NIW 2575
Date: 1 7/6/2017

GPO Box 39 Sydney NSW 2001

This is a submission to the Hume Coal Project EIS. SSD 7172

I object to this project and believe it should be rejected due to

THE POOR ECONOMICS OF THE HUME COAL PROJECT.

From the data in the EIS it is apparent that the project is unprofitable, with negative investment returns.

- This is a small mine and costly to operate.
- The product mix revealed in the EIS results in lower revenue than previously put forward, with nearly half the production low value thermal coal.
- The only way that the mine can improve its profitability would be to significantly increase production, makingthe EIS invalid in its present form.
- BAEconomics have not been asked to undertake the sensitivity analysis of how much output prices would need to fall for the project to have a zero NPV because Hume Coal considers it to be "commercial in confidence". (EIS Appendix Q page 42). This is unacceptable and an apparent inability to meet the 2015 guidelines for an EIS.

THE REJECT EMPLACEMENT AND BULKHEAD ISSUES

- The Metropolitan Colliery emplaced at least some of their rejects in mined voids in recent years. This operation required extensive experimentation over a number of years.
- They had the advantage of knowing the exact composition of their reject material and voids that were well away from current mining areas.
- The Airly Colliery considered this method of reject disposal but decided it posed unacceptable safety and other concerns.
- In contrast the Hume EIS assumes that reject emplacement behind bulkheads is a risk freeprocess. The design of the bulkheads is complex and their construction in an operating environment is problematic.

This is a very risky proposal and I urge the Government to reject this project.

If you wish to maintain your privacy in this submission from the department's website please tick this box:	
I have not made a reportable political donation.	

Name Mires LAN 41 CIN
Address 3 o Lis TAMBORON AD
ROBERSON
Date:/ 7 / 6 / 2017

GPO Box 39 Sydney NSW 2001

This is a submission to the Hume Coal Project EIS. SSD 7172

I object to this project and believe it should be rejected due to

THE POOR ECONOMICS OF THE HUME COAL PROJECT.

From the data in the EIS it is apparent that the project is unprofitable, with negative investment returns.

- This is a small mine and costly to operate.
- The product mix revealed in the EIS results in lower revenue than previously put forward, with nearly half the production low value thermal coal.
- The only way that the mine can improve its profitability would be to significantly increase production, makingthe EIS invalid in its present form.
- BAEconomics have not been asked to undertake the sensitivity analysis of how much output prices would need to fall for the project to have a zero NPV because Hume Coal considers it to be "commercial in confidence". (EIS Appendix Q page 42). This is unacceptable and an apparent inability to meet the 2015 guidelines for an EIS.

THE REJECT EMPLACEMENT AND BULKHEAD ISSUES

- The Metropolitan Colliery emplaced at least some of their rejects in mined voids in recent years. This operation required extensive experimentation over a number of years.
- They had the advantage of knowing the exact composition of their reject material and voids that were well away from curent mining areas.
- The Airly Colliery considered this method of reject disposal but decided it posed unacceptable safety and other concerns.
- In contrast the Hume EIS assumes that reject emplacement behind bulkheads is a risk free process. The
 design of the bulkheads is complex and their construction in an operating environment is
 problematic.

This is a very risky proposal and I urge the Government to reject this project.

If you wish to maintain your privacy in this submission from the department's website please tick this box:	
I have not made a reportable political donation.	

Name L. FLOWER
Address 17 DE LANKET 57
RENWICK
NSW 2575
Date:///6/2017

GPO Box 39 Sydney NSW 2001

Signed,

This is a submission to the Hume Coal Project EIS. SSD 7172

I object to this project and believe it should be rejected due to

THE POOR ECONOMICS OF THE HUME COAL PROJECT.

From the data in the EIS it is apparent that the project is unprofitable, with negative investment returns.

- This is a small mine and costly to operate.
- The product mix revealed in the EIS results in lower revenue than previously put forward, with nearly half the production low value thermal coal.
- The only way that the mine can improve its profitability would be to significantly increase production, makingthe EIS invalid in its present form.
- BAEconomics have not been asked to undertake the sensitivity analysis of how much output
 prices would need to fall for the project to have a zero NPV because Hume Coal considers it to
 be "commercial in confidence". (EIS Appendix Q page 42). This is unacceptable and an
 apparent inability to meet the 2015 guidelines for an EIS.

THE REJECT EMPLACEMENT AND BULKHEAD ISSUES

a/11 1

- The Metropolitan Colliery emplaced at least some of their rejects in mined voids in recent years. This operation required extensive experimentation over a number of years.
- They had the advantage of knowing the exact composition of their reject material and voids that were well away from current mining areas.
- The Airly Colliery considered this method of reject disposal but decided it posed unacceptable safety and other concerns.
- In contrast the Hume EIS assumes that reject emplacement behind bulkheads is a risk freeprocess. The
 design of the bulkheads is complex and their construction in an operating environment is
 problematic.

fflort	
If you wish to maintain your privacy in this submission from the department's website please tick this box:	
I have not made a reportable political donation.	d

Name Sulvia House
Address 17 De Lauret St
Renewick
Date: / 7_ / 6 / 2017

GPO Box 39 Sydney NSW 2001

This is a submission to the Hume Coal Project EIS. SSD 7172

I object to this project and believe it should be rejected due to

THE POOR ECONOMICS OF THE HUME COAL PROJECT.

From the data in the EIS it is apparent that the project is unprofitable, with negative investment returns.

- This is a small mine and costly to operate.
- The product mix revealed in the EIS results in lower revenue than previously put forward, with nearly half the production low value thermal coal.
- The only way that the mine can improve its profitability would be to significantly increase production, makingthe EIS invalid in its present form.
- BAEconomics have not been asked to undertake the sensitivity analysis of how much output
 prices would need to fall for the project to have a zero NPV because Hume Coal considers it to
 be "commercial in confidence". (EIS Appendix Q page 42). This is unacceptable and an
 apparent inability to meet the 2015 guidelines for an EIS.

THE REJECT EMPLACEMENT AND BULKHEAD ISSUES

- The Metropolitan Colliery emplaced at least some of their rejects in mined voids in recent years. This operation required extensive experimentation over a number of years.
- They had the advantage of knowing the exact composition of their reject material and voids that were well away from curent mining areas.
- The Airly Colliery considered this method of reject disposal but decided it posed unacceptable safety and other concerns.
- In contrast the Hume EIS assumes that reject emplacement behind bulkheads is a risk freeprocess. The
 design of the bulkheads is complex and their construction in an operating environment is
 problematic.

This is a very risky proposal and I urge the Government to reject this project.

Sepien Cause

If you wish to maintain your privacy in this submission from the department's website please tick this box:	
I have not made a reportable political donation.	

Name	JULI	4	041	<u>_</u>
Address_	23 6	OBI	PICA	_PR
obstantament.	Bow	RAL	1251	N
		/ 2017		

GPO Box 39 Sydney NSW 2001

This is a submission to the Hume Coal Project EIS. SSD 7172

I object to this project and believe it should be rejected due to

THE POOR ECONOMICS OF THE HUME COAL PROJECT.

From the data in the EIS it is apparent that the project is unprofitable, with negative investment returns.

- This is a small mine and costly to operate.
- The product mix revealed in the EIS results in lower revenue than previously put forward, with nearly half the production low value thermal coal.
- The only way that the mine can improve its profitability would be to significantly increase production, makingthe EIS invalid in its present form.
- BAEconomics have not been asked to undertake the sensitivity analysis of how much output
 prices would need to fall for the project to have a zero NPV because Hume Coal considers it to
 be "commercial in confidence". (EIS Appendix Q page 42). This is unacceptable and an
 apparent inability to meet the 2015 guidelines for an EIS.

THE REJECT EMPLACEMENT AND BULKHEAD ISSUES

- The Metropolitan Colliery emplaced at least some of their rejects in mined voids in recent years. This operation required extensive experimentation over a number of years.
- They had the advantage of knowing the exact composition of their reject material and voids that were well away from current mining areas.
- The Airly Colliery considered this method of reject disposal but decided it posed unacceptable safety and other concerns.
- In contrast the Hume EIS assumes that reject emplacement behind bulkheads is a risk free process. The
 design of the bulkheads is complex and their construction in an operating environment is
 problematic.

This is a very risky proposal and I urge the Government to reject this project.

Signed,

If you wish to maintain your privacy in this submission from the department's website please tick this box:

I have not made a reportable political donation.

Name James Felfer
Address P.O. Box 2256

PSW 721

Date: 17/6/2017

Attn: Executive Director, Resource Assessments Department of Planning and Environment

GPO Box 39 Sydney NSW 2001

This is a submission to the Hume Coal Project EIS. SSD 7172

I object to this project and believe it should be rejected due to

THE POOR ECONOMICS OF THE HUME COAL PROJECT.

From the data in the EIS it is apparent that the project is unprofitable, with negative investment returns.

- This is a small mine and costly to operate.
- The product mix revealed in the EIS results in lower revenue than previously put forward, with nearly half the production low value thermal coal.
- The only way that the mine can improve its profitability would be to significantly increase production, makingthe EIS invalid in its present form.
- BAEconomics have not been asked to undertake the sensitivity analysis of how much output
 prices would need to fall for the project to have a zero NPV because Hume Coal considers it to
 be "commercial in confidence". (EIS Appendix Q page 42). This is unacceptable and an
 apparent inability to meet the 2015 guidelines for an EIS.

THE REJECT EMPLACEMENT AND BULKHEAD ISSUES

- The Metropolitan Colliery emplaced at least some of their rejects in mined voids in recent years. This operation required extensive experimentation over a number of years.
- They had the advantage of knowing the exact composition of their reject material and voids that were well away from current mining areas.
- The Airly Colliery considered this method of reject disposal but decided it posed unacceptable safety and other concerns.
- In contrast the Hume EIS assumes that reject emplacement behind bulkheads is a risk free process. The
 design of the bulkheads is complex and their construction in an operating environment is
 problematic.

Signed,	11.	
	The first the second se	
Te vou wie	b to maintain your privacy in this submission fro	

If you wish to maintain your privacy in this submission from the department's website please tick this box:	
I have not made a reportable political donation.	Ø

Name_	JOHN	PER	ARC.
Addres	s 28	CLIFF	ST
-	Bowk	LAL	2576
	NSW		
	Date: / 7/6	5 / 2017	

GPO Box 39 Sydney NSW 2001

This is a submission to the Hume Coal Project EIS. SSD 7172

I object to this project and believe it should be rejected due to

THE POOR ECONOMICS OF THE HUME COAL PROJECT.

From the data in the EIS it is apparent that the project is unprofitable, with negative investment returns.

- This is a small mine and costly to operate.
- The product mix revealed in the EIS results in lower revenue than previously put forward, with nearly half the production low value thermal coal.
- The only way that the mine can improve its profitability would be to significantly increase production, making the EIS invalid in its present form.
- BAEconomics have not been asked to undertake the sensitivity analysis of how much output
 prices would need to fall for the project to have a zero NPV because Hume Coal considers it to
 be "commercial in confidence". (EIS Appendix Q page 42). This is unacceptable and an
 apparent inability to meet the 2015 guidelines for an EIS.

THE REJECT EMPLACEMENT AND BULKHEAD ISSUES

- The Metropolitan Colliery emplaced at least some of their rejects in mined voids in recent years. This operation required extensive experimentation over a number of years.
- They had the advantage of knowing the exact composition of their reject material and voids that were well away from current mining areas.
- The Airly Colliery considered this method of reject disposal but decided it posed unacceptable safety and other concerns.
- In contrast the Hume EIS assumes that reject emplacement behind bulkheads is a risk free process. The
 design of the bulkheads is complex and their construction in an operating environment is
 problematic.

This is a very risky proposal and I urge the Government to reject this project.

Signed, E Peul.

If you wish to maintain your privacy in this submission from the department's website please tick this box:

I have not made a reportable political donation.

Name / MClwBhclat	0
Address 33 MERILBAH	K
BowRAL	

Date: /1/6/2017

Attn: Executive Director, Resource Assessments Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39

Sydney NSW 2001

This is a submission to the Hume Coal Project EIS. SSD 7172

I object to this project and believe it should be rejected due to

THE POOR ECONOMICS OF THE HUME COAL PROJECT.

From the data in the EIS it is apparent that the project is unprofitable, with negative investment returns.

- This is a small mine and costly to operate.
- The product mix revealed in the EIS results in lower revenue than previously put forward, with nearly half the production low value thermal coal.
- The only way that the mine can improve its profitability would be to significantly increase production, makingthe EIS invalid in its present form.
- BAEconomics have not been asked to undertake the sensitivity analysis of how much output
 prices would need to fall for the project to have a zero NPV because Hume Coal considers it to
 be "commercial in confidence". (EIS Appendix Q page 42). This is unacceptable and an
 apparent inability to meet the 2015 guidelines for an EIS.

THE REJECT EMPLACEMENT AND BULKHEAD ISSUES

- The Metropolitan Colliery emplaced at least some of their rejects in mined voids in recent years. This operation required extensive experimentation over a number of years.
- They had the advantage of knowing the exact composition of their reject material and voids that were well away from curent mining areas.
- The Airly Colliery considered this method of reject disposal but decided it posed unacceptable safety and other concerns.
- In contrast the Hume EIS assumes that reject emplacement behind bulkheads is a risk freeprocess. The
 design of the bulkheads is complex and their construction in an operating environment is
 problematic.

This is a very risky proposal and I urge the Government to reject this project.

Signed,

If you wish to maintain your privacy in this submission from the department's website please tick this box:	

I have not made a reportable political donation.



Name	Ledey Rearl
Address_	28 Cliff St
	Bowlal 2576
	ate://) / 6 / 2017

GPO Box 39 Sydney NSW 2001

Cianad

This is a submission to the Hume Coal Project EIS. SSD 7172

I object to this project and believe it should be rejected due to

THE POOR ECONOMICS OF THE HUME COAL PROJECT.

From the data in the EIS it is apparent that the project is unprofitable, with negative investment returns.

- This is a small mine and costly to operate.
- The product mix revealed in the EIS results in lower revenue than previously put forward, with nearly half the production low value thermal coal.
- The only way that the mine can improve its profitability would be to significantly increase production, makingthe EIS invalid in its present form.
- BAEconomics have not been asked to undertake the sensitivity analysis of how much output
 prices would need to fall for the project to have a zero NPV because Hume Coal considers it to
 be "commercial in confidence". (EIS Appendix Q page 42). This is unacceptable and an
 apparent inability to meet the 2015 guidelines for an EIS.

THE REJECT EMPLACEMENT AND BULKHEAD ISSUES

- The Metropolitan Colliery emplaced at least some of their rejects in mined voids in recent years. This operation required extensive experimentation over a number of years.
- They had the advantage of knowing the exact composition of their reject material and voids that were well away from current mining areas.
- The Airly Colliery considered this method of reject disposal but decided it posed unacceptable safety and other concerns.
- In contrast the Hume EIS assumes that reject emplacement behind bulkheads is a risk freeprocess. The
 design of the bulkheads is complex and their construction in an operating environment is
 problematic.

signed,	d. Rearl.	
If you	wish to maintain your privacy in this submission from the department's website please tick this box:	
I have	not made a reportable political donation.	V

Name_	Lisc	x E	be	ling
Addres	ss_6_	Lye	11	St
_	I	MiHa	901	<u> </u>
) / 6 / 201	0)

GPO Box 39 Sydney NSW 2001

This is a submission to the Hume Coal Project EIS. SSD 7172

I object to this project and believe it should be rejected due to

THE POOR ECONOMICS OF THE HUME COAL PROJECT.

From the data in the EIS it is apparent that the project is unprofitable, with negative investment returns.

- This is a small mine and costly to operate.
- The product mix revealed in the EIS results in lower revenue than previously put forward, with nearly half the production low value thermal coal.
- The only way that the mine can improve its profitability would be to significantly increase production, makingthe EIS invalid in its present form.
- BAEconomics have not been asked to undertake the sensitivity analysis of how much output
 prices would need to fall for the project to have a zero NPV because Hume Coal considers it to
 be "commercial in confidence". (EIS Appendix Q page 42). This is unacceptable and an
 apparent inability to meet the 2015 guidelines for an EIS.

THE REJECT EMPLACEMENT AND BULKHEAD ISSUES

- The Metropolitan Colliery emplaced at least some of their rejects in mined voids in recent years. This operation required extensive experimentation over a number of years.
- They had the advantage of knowing the exact composition of their reject material and voids that were well away from current mining areas.
- The Airly Colliery considered this method of reject disposal but decided it posed unacceptable safety and other concerns.
- In contrast the Hume EIS assumes that reject emplacement behind bulkheads is a risk free process. The
 design of the bulkheads is complex and their construction in an operating environment is
 problematic.

This is a very risky proposal and I urge the Government to reject this project.

2 ce	
If you wish to maintain your privacy in this submission from the department's website please tick this box:	
I have not made a reportable political donation.	V

Name Total Vhurne
Address Po Box 163/
Bowlar 2576
Date: /7/6/2017

GPO Box 39 Sydney NSW 2001

This is a submission to the Hume Coal Project EIS. SSD 7172

I object to this project and believe it should be rejected due to

THE POOR ECONOMICS OF THE HUME COAL PROJECT.

From the data in the EIS it is apparent that the project is unprofitable, with negative investment returns.

- This is a small mine and costly to operate.
- The product mix revealed in the EIS results in lower revenue than previously put forward, with nearly half the production low value thermal coal.
- The only way that the mine can improve its profitability would be to significantly increase production, makingthe EIS invalid in its present form.
- BAEconomics have not been asked to undertake the sensitivity analysis of how much output
 prices would need to fall for the project to have a zero NPV because Hume Coal considers it to
 be "commercial in confidence". (EIS Appendix Q page 42). This is unacceptable and an
 apparent inability to meet the 2015 guidelines for an EIS.

THE REJECT EMPLACEMENT AND BULKHEAD ISSUES

- The Metropolitan Colliery emplaced at least some of their rejects in mined voids in recent years. This operation required extensive experimentation over a number of years.
- They had the advantage of knowing the exact composition of their reject material and voids that were well away from current mining areas.
- The Airly Colliery considered this method of reject disposal but decided it posed unacceptable safety and other concerns.
- In contrast the Hume EIS assumes that reject emplacement behind bulkheads is a risk freeprocess. The
 design of the bulkheads is complex and their construction in an operating environment is
 problematic.

This is a very risky proposal and I urge the Government to reject this project.
This is a very risky proposal and raige the Government to reject this project.
Signed,
-//
<i>√</i>
If you wish to maintain your privacy in this submission from the department's website please tick this box:

If you wish to maintain your privacy in this submission from the department's website please tick this box:

I have not made a reportable political donation.

1. 11
Name Liz Konomi plus
Address 3 Wilshure
Ave
Crosulla
Date:(8 / 6 / 2017

Attn: Executive Director, Resource Assessments Department of Planning and Environment

GPO Box 39

Sydney NSW 2001

This is a submission to the Hume Coal Project EIS. SSD 7172

I object to this project and believe it should be rejected due to

THE POOR ECONOMICS OF THE HUME COAL PROJECT.

From the data in the EIS it is apparent that the project is unprofitable, with negative investment returns.

• This is a small mine and costly to operate.

Signed.

- The product mix revealed in the EIS results in lower revenue than previously put forward, with nearly half the production low value thermal coal.
- The only way that the mine can improve its profitability would be to significantly increase production, makingthe EIS invalid in its present form.
- BAEconomics have not been asked to undertake the sensitivity analysis of how much output
 prices would need to fall for the project to have a zero NPV because Hume Coal considers it to
 be "commercial in confidence". (EIS Appendix Q page 42). This is unacceptable and an
 apparent inability to meet the 2015 guidelines for an EIS.

THE REJECT EMPLACEMENT AND BULKHEAD ISSUES

- The Metropolitan Colliery emplaced at least some of their rejects in mined voids in recent years. This operation required extensive experimentation over a number of years.
- They had the advantage of knowing the exact composition of their reject material and voids that were well away from current mining areas.
- The Airly Colliery considered this method of reject disposal but decided it posed unacceptable safety and other concerns.
- In contrast the Hume EIS assumes that reject emplacement behind bulkheads is a risk free process. The
 design of the bulkheads is complex and their construction in an operating environment is
 problematic.

· C. Chanamolat	
If you wish to maintain your privacy in this submission from the department's website please tick this box:	
I have not made a reportable political donation	

Name	e G. IKONO	MIDH
	3 Wilshire 1	
	CRONULCA	2230
	ate: 18/6/2017	-

Attn: Executive Director, Resource Assessments Department of Planning and Environment
GPO Box 39
Sydney NSW 2001

This is a submission to the Hume Coal Project EIS. SSD 7172

I object to this project and believe it should be rejected due to

THE POOR ECONOMICS OF THE HUME COAL PROJECT.

From the data in the EIS it is apparent that the project is unprofitable, with negative investment returns.

• This is a small mine and costly to operate.

Signed,

- The product mix revealed in the EIS results in lower revenue than previously put forward, with nearly half the production low value thermal coal.
- The only way that the mine can improve its profitability would be to significantly increase production, makingthe EIS invalid in its present form.
- BAEconomics have not been asked to undertake the sensitivity analysis of how much output
 prices would need to fall for the project to have a zero NPV because Hume Coal considers it to
 be "commercial in confidence". (EIS Appendix Q page 42). This is unacceptable and an
 apparent inability to meet the 2015 guidelines for an EIS.

THE REJECT EMPLACEMENT AND BULKHEAD ISSUES

- The Metropolitan Colliery emplaced at least some of their rejects in mined voids in recent years. This operation required extensive experimentation over a number of years.
- They had the advantage of knowing the exact composition of their reject material and voids that were well away from curent mining areas.
- The Airly Colliery considered this method of reject disposal but decided it posed unacceptable safety and other concerns.
- In contrast the Hume EIS assumes that reject emplacement behind bulkheads is a risk freeprocess. The
 design of the bulkheads is complex and their construction in an operating environment is
 problematic.

If you wish to maintain your privacy in this submission from the department's website please tick this box:	
I have not made a reportable political donation.	

Name	VW melin
Address_	123 ATTOMA NO
	CIAMA HEIGHT
_	5-235
Da	ate: 4/6/2017

GPO Box 39 Sydney NSW 2001

This is a submission to the Hume Coal Project EIS. SSD 7172

I object to this project and believe it should be rejected due to

THE POOR ECONOMICS OF THE HUME COAL PROJECT.

From the data in the EIS it is apparent that the project is unprofitable, with negative investment returns.

- This is a small mine and costly to operate.
- The product mix revealed in the EIS results in lower revenue than previously put forward, with nearly half the production low value thermal coal.
- The only way that the mine can improve its profitability would be to significantly increase production, makingthe EIS invalid in its present form.
- BAEconomics have not been asked to undertake the sensitivity analysis of how much output
 prices would need to fall for the project to have a zero NPV because Hume Coal considers it to
 be "commercial in confidence". (EIS Appendix Q page 42). This is unacceptable and an
 apparent inability to meet the 2015 guidelines for an EIS.

THE REJECT EMPLACEMENT AND BULKHEAD ISSUES

- The Metropolitan Colliery emplaced at least some of their rejects in mined voids in recent years. This operation required extensive experimentation over a number of years.
- They had the advantage of knowing the exact composition of their reject material and voids that were well away from current mining areas.
- The Airly Colliery considered this method of reject disposal but decided it posed unacceptable safety and other concerns.
- In contrast the Hume EIS assumes that reject emplacement behind bulkheads is a risk free process. The
 design of the bulkheads is complex and their construction in an operating environment is
 problematic.

This is a very risky proposal and I urge the Government to reject this project.

If you wish to maintain your privacy in this submission from the department's website please tick this box:	
I have not made a reportable political donation.	Image: Control of the

Rauseus I Park another
Name BEVERLEY HARDCASTLE
Address 1 Gloria Place
Six Pennith
USW 2750
Date: 18/6/2017

GPO Box 39 Sydney NSW 2001

This is a submission to the Hume Coal Project EIS. SSD 7172

I object to this project and believe it should be rejected due to

THE POOR ECONOMICS OF THE HUME COAL PROJECT.

From the data in the EIS it is apparent that the project is unprofitable, with negative investment returns.

- This is a small mine and costly to operate.
- The product mix revealed in the EIS results in lower revenue than previously put forward, with nearly half the production low value thermal coal.
- The only way that the mine can improve its profitability would be to significantly increase production, makingthe EIS invalid in its present form.
- BAEconomics have not been asked to undertake the sensitivity analysis of how much output
 prices would need to fall for the project to have a zero NPV because Hume Coal considers it to
 be "commercial in confidence". (EIS Appendix Q page 42). This is unacceptable and an
 apparent inability to meet the 2015 guidelines for an EIS.

THE REJECT EMPLACEMENT AND BULKHEAD ISSUES

- The Metropolitan Colliery emplaced at least some of their rejects in mined voids in recent years. This operation required extensive experimentation over a number of years.
- They had the advantage of knowing the exact composition of their reject material and voids that were well away from current mining areas.
- The Airly Colliery considered this method of reject disposal but decided it posed unacceptable safety and other concerns.
- In contrast the Hume EIS assumes that reject emplacement behind bulkheads is a risk free process. The
 design of the bulkheads is complex and their construction in an operating environment is
 problematic.

This is a very risky proposal and I urge the Government to reject this project.

Signed,

If you wish to maintain your privacy in this submission from the department's website please tick this box:

Name PLANYI
Address 6 DALTON ST
MITTAGON
Date: 8/6/2017

GPO Box 39 Sydney NSW 2001

This is a submission to the Hume Coal Project EIS. SSD 7172

I object to this project and believe it should be rejected due to

THE POOR ECONOMICS OF THE HUME COAL PROJECT.

From the data in the EIS it is apparent that the project is unprofitable, with negative investment returns.

- This is a small mine and costly to operate.
- The product mix revealed in the EIS results in lower revenue than previously put forward, with nearly half the production low value thermal coal.
- The only way that the mine can improve its profitability would be to significantly increase production, makingthe EIS invalid in its present form.
- BAEconomics have not been asked to undertake the sensitivity analysis of how much output
 prices would need to fall for the project to have a zero NPV because Hume Coal considers it to
 be "commercial in confidence". (EIS Appendix Q page 42). This is unacceptable and an
 apparent inability to meet the 2015 guidelines for an EIS.

THE REJECT EMPLACEMENT AND BULKHEAD ISSUES

- The Metropolitan Colliery emplaced at least some of their rejects in mined voids in recent years. This operation required extensive experimentation over a number of years.
- They had the advantage of knowing the exact composition of their reject material and voids that were well away from curent mining areas.
- The Airly Colliery considered this method of reject disposal but decided it posed unacceptable safety and other concerns.
- In contrast the Hume EIS assumes that reject emplacement behind bulkheads is a risk freeprocess. The
 design of the bulkheads is complex and their construction in an operating environment is
 problematic.

This Sign	a very risky proposal and I urge the Government to reject this project.	
1	If you wish to maintain your privacy in this submission from the department's website please tick this box:	
1	I have not made a reportable political donation.	図

Name Tlain o Moss
Address Nolla-Dan
Ave Trojegr
- USW
Date: [5] 6 / 2017

GPO Box 39 Sydney NSW 2001

This is a submission to the Hume Coal Project EIS. SSD 7172

I object to this project and believe it should be rejected due to

THE POOR ECONOMICS OF THE HUME COAL PROJECT.

From the data in the EIS it is apparent that the project is unprofitable, with negative investment returns.

- This is a small mine and costly to operate.
- The product mix revealed in the EIS results in lower revenue than previously put forward, with nearly half the production low value thermal coal.
- The only way that the mine can improve its profitability would be to significantly increase production, makingthe EIS invalid in its present form.
- BAEconomics have not been asked to undertake the sensitivity analysis of how much output prices would need to fall for the project to have a zero NPV because Hume Coal considers it to be "commercial in confidence". (EIS Appendix Q page 42). This is unacceptable and an apparent inability to meet the 2015 guidelines for an EIS.

THE REJECT EMPLACEMENT AND BULKHEAD ISSUES

& may

- The Metropolitan Colliery emplaced at least some of their rejects in mined voids in recent years. This operation required extensive experimentation over a number of years.
- They had the advantage of knowing the exact composition of their reject material and voids that were well away from current mining areas.
- The Airly Colliery considered this method of reject disposal but decided it posed unacceptable safety and other concerns.
- In contrast the Hume EIS assumes that reject emplacement behind bulkheads is a risk freeprocess. The
 design of the bulkheads is complex and their construction in an operating environment is
 problematic.

This is a very risky proposal and I urge the Government to reject this project.

If you wish to maintain your privacy in this submission from the department's website please tick this box:	
I have not made a reportable political donation.	9

Name_	MAN	by m	ILES	
Addres	s 575	JACKS	CORNER	RA
	KAN	TAKOO	VALLEY	ran
_	Date: / 8	/6/2017		

Attn: Executive Director, Resource Assessments Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39
Sydney NSW 2001

This is a submission to the Hume Coal Project EIS. SSD 7172

I object to this project and believe it should be rejected due to

THE POOR ECONOMICS OF THE HUME COAL PROJECT.

From the data in the EIS it is apparent that the project is unprofitable, with negative investment returns.

- This is a small mine and costly to operate.
- The product mix revealed in the EIS results in lower revenue than previously put forward, with nearly half the production low value thermal coal.
- The only way that the mine can improve its profitability would be to significantly increase production, makingthe EIS invalid in its present form.
- BAEconomics have not been asked to undertake the sensitivity analysis of how much output
 prices would need to fall for the project to have a zero NPV because Hume Coal considers it to
 be "commercial in confidence". (EIS Appendix Q page 42). This is unacceptable and an
 apparent inability to meet the 2015 guidelines for an EIS.

THE REJECT EMPLACEMENT AND BULKHEAD ISSUES

- The Metropolitan Colliery emplaced at least some of their rejects in mined voids in recent years. This operation required extensive experimentation over a number of years.
- They had the advantage of knowing the exact composition of their reject material and voids that were well away from current mining areas.
- The Airly Colliery considered this method of reject disposal but decided it posed unacceptable safety and other concerns.
- In contrast the Hume EIS assumes that reject emplacement behind bulkheads is a risk free process. The
 design of the bulkheads is complex and their construction in an operating environment is
 problematic.

igned,	
	h. Chi.a
	on - one

If you wish to maintain your privacy in this submission from the department's website please tick this box:	
I have not made a reportable political donation	\square

Name DATSIT SINGH

Address 34 CORNWARL ANE

NOW 2074

Date: 18/6/2017

Attn: Executive Director, Resource Assessments Department of Planning and Environment

GPO Box 39 Sydney NSW 2001

Signed.

This is a submission to the Hume Coal Project EIS. SSD 7172

I object to this project and believe it should be rejected due to

THE POOR ECONOMICS OF THE HUME COAL PROJECT.

From the data in the EIS it is apparent that the project is unprofitable, with negative investment returns.

- This is a small mine and costly to operate.
- The product mix revealed in the EIS results in lower revenue than previously put forward, with nearly half the production low value thermal coal.
- The only way that the mine can improve its profitability would be to significantly increase production, making the EIS invalid in its present form.
- BAEconomics have not been asked to undertake the sensitivity analysis of how much output
 prices would need to fall for the project to have a zero NPV because Hume Coal considers it to
 be "commercial in confidence". (EIS Appendix Q page 42). This is unacceptable and an
 apparent inability to meet the 2015 guidelines for an EIS.

THE REJECT EMPLACEMENT AND BULKHEAD ISSUES

- The Metropolitan Colliery emplaced at least some of their rejects in mined voids in recent years. This operation required extensive experimentation over a number of years.
- They had the advantage of knowing the exact composition of their reject material and voids that were well away from current mining areas.
- The Airly Colliery considered this method of reject disposal but decided it posed unacceptable safety and other concerns.
- In contrast the Hume EIS assumes that reject emplacement behind bulkheads is a risk free process. The
 design of the bulkheads is complex and their construction in an operating environment is
 problematic.

_	100/	
	If you wish to maintain your privacy in this submission from the department's website please tick this box:	
	I have not made a reportable political donation	

Name) 1 ephan	u 1	benomedes
Addre	ess 3 1/	/ Ilshun	Lenomed 13
	Cron	-119	
		N52	√
	Date: () //	6 / 2017	

GPO Box 39 Sydney NSW 2001

This is a submission to the Hume Coal Project EIS. SSD 7172

I object to this project and believe it should be rejected due to

THE POOR ECONOMICS OF THE HUME COAL PROJECT.

From the data in the EIS it is apparent that the project is unprofitable, with negative investment returns.

- This is a small mine and costly to operate.
- The product mix revealed in the EIS results in lower revenue than previously put forward, with nearly half the production low value thermal coal.
- The only way that the mine can improve its profitability would be to significantly increase production, makingthe EIS invalid in its present form.
- BAEconomics have not been asked to undertake the sensitivity analysis of how much output
 prices would need to fall for the project to have a zero NPV because Hume Coal considers it to
 be "commercial in confidence". (EIS Appendix Q page 42). This is unacceptable and an
 apparent inability to meet the 2015 guidelines for an EIS.

THE REJECT EMPLACEMENT AND BULKHEAD ISSUES

- The Metropolitan Colliery emplaced at least some of their rejects in mined voids in recent years. This operation required extensive experimentation over a number of years.
- They had the advantage of knowing the exact composition of their reject material and voids that were well away from current mining areas.
- The Airly Colliery considered this method of reject disposal but decided it posed unacceptable safety and other concerns.
- In contrast the Hume EIS assumes that reject emplacement behind bulkheads is a risk free process. The
 design of the bulkheads is complex and their construction in an operating environment is
 problematic.

This is a very risky proposal and I urge the Government to reject this project.

If you wish to maintain your privacy in this submission from the department's website please tick this box:	
I have not made a reportable political donation.	,

Name_ TOVIT HOFFM	AN
Address 102 BUNNADOO	· R
BURNADOS	
2576	
Date: /6/2017	

Attn: Executive Director, Resource Assessments Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39
Sydney NSW 2001

This is a submission to the Hume Coal Project EIS. SSD 7172

I object to this project and believe it should be rejected due to

THE POOR ECONOMICS OF THE HUME COAL PROJECT.

From the data in the EIS it is apparent that the project is unprofitable, with negative investment returns.

- This is a small mine and costly to operate.
- The product mix revealed in the EIS results in lower revenue than previously put forward, with nearly half the production low value thermal coal.
- The only way that the mine can improve its profitability would be to significantly increase production, makingthe EIS invalid in its present form.
- BAEconomics have not been asked to undertake the sensitivity analysis of how much output
 prices would need to fall for the project to have a zero NPV because Hume Coal considers it to
 be "commercial in confidence". (EIS Appendix Q page 42). This is unacceptable and an
 apparent inability to meet the 2015 guidelines for an EIS.

THE REJECT EMPLACEMENT AND BULKHEAD ISSUES

- The Metropolitan Colliery emplaced at least some of their rejects in mined voids in recent years. This operation required extensive experimentation over a number of years.
- They had the advantage of knowing the exact composition of their reject material and voids that were well away from curent mining areas.
- The Airly Colliery considered this method of reject disposal but decided it posed unacceptable safety and other concerns.
- In contrast the Hume EIS assumes that reject emplacement behind bulkheads is a risk freeprocess. The
 design of the bulkheads is complex and their construction in an operating environment is
 problematic.

nis is a very risky proposal and urge the Government to reject this project.	
gned,	
If you wish to maintain your privacy in this submission from the department's website please tick this box:	
I have not made a reportable political donation	

Name	SILVANA U MANNA
Address_	14 5W22 2L
700	Bardwell valley
	ate: 18 / 6 / 2017

Attn: Executive Director, Resource Assessments Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39
Sydney NSW 2001

This is a submission to the Hume Coal Project EIS. SSD 7172

I object to this project and believe it should be rejected due to

THE POOR ECONOMICS OF THE HUME COAL PROJECT.

From the data in the EIS it is apparent that the project is unprofitable, with negative investment returns.

• This is a small mine and costly to operate.

no

Signed.

- The product mix revealed in the EIS results in lower revenue than previously put forward, with nearly half the production low value thermal coal.
- The only way that the mine can improve its profitability would be to significantly increase production, makingthe EIS invalid in its present form.
- BAEconomics have not been asked to undertake the sensitivity analysis of how much output
 prices would need to fall for the project to have a zero NPV because Hume Coal considers it to
 be "commercial in confidence". (EIS Appendix Q page 42). This is unacceptable and an
 apparent inability to meet the 2015 guidelines for an EIS.

THE REJECT EMPLACEMENT AND BULKHEAD ISSUES

- The Metropolitan Colliery emplaced at least some of their rejects in mined voids in recent years. This operation required extensive experimentation over a number of years.
- They had the advantage of knowing the exact composition of their reject material and voids that were well away from curent mining areas.
- The Airly Colliery considered this method of reject disposal but decided it posed unacceptable safety and other concerns.
- In contrast the Hume EIS assumes that reject emplacement behind bulkheads is a risk freeprocess. The
 design of the bulkheads is complex and their construction in an operating environment is
 problematic.

If you wish to maintain your privacy in this submission from the department's website please tick this box:	
I have not made a reportable political donation	Ø

Name CAROL RIZZITO
Address 4 Centernial Col
Bomadery
2541.

Date: 18/6/2017

Attn: Executive Director, Resource Assessments Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39

GPO Box 39 Sydney NSW 2001

Signed,

This is a submission to the Hume Coal Project EIS. SSD 7172

I object to this project and believe it should be rejected due to

THE POOR ECONOMICS OF THE HUME COAL PROJECT.

From the data in the EIS it is apparent that the project is unprofitable, with negative investment returns.

- This is a small mine and costly to operate.
- The product mix revealed in the EIS results in lower revenue than previously put forward, with nearly half the production low value thermal coal.
- The only way that the mine can improve its profitability would be to significantly increase production, makingthe EIS invalid in its present form.
- BAEconomics have not been asked to undertake the sensitivity analysis of how much output prices would need to fall for the project to have a zero NPV because Hume Coal considers it to be "commercial in confidence". (EIS Appendix Q page 42). This is unacceptable and an apparent inability to meet the 2015 guidelines for an EIS.

THE REJECT EMPLACEMENT AND BULKHEAD ISSUES

- The Metropolitan Colliery emplaced at least some of their rejects in mined voids in recent years. This operation required extensive experimentation over a number of years.
- They had the advantage of knowing the exact composition of their reject material and voids that were well away from current mining areas.
- The Airly Colliery considered this method of reject disposal but decided it posed unacceptable safety and other concerns.
- In contrast the Hume EIS assumes that reject emplacement behind bulkheads is a risk freeprocess. The
 design of the bulkheads is complex and their construction in an operating environment is
 problematic.

If you wish to maintain your privacy in this submission from the department's website please tick this box:	
I have not made a reportable political donation,	V

Name Alex Phipps	
Address 10 Oxley dr	
Bowcal	
Date: /6/2017	

GPO Box 39 Sydney NSW 2001

This is a submission to the Hume Coal Project EIS. SSD 7172

I object to this project and believe it should be rejected due to

THE POOR ECONOMICS OF THE HUME COAL PROJECT.

From the data in the EIS it is apparent that the project is unprofitable, with negative investment returns.

- This is a small mine and costly to operate.
- The product mix revealed in the EIS results in lower revenue than previously put forward, with nearly half the production low value thermal coal.
- The only way that the mine can improve its profitability would be to significantly increase production, makingthe EIS invalid in its present form.
- BAEconomics have not been asked to undertake the sensitivity analysis of how much output
 prices would need to fall for the project to have a zero NPV because Hume Coal considers it to
 be "commercial in confidence". (EIS Appendix Q page 42). This is unacceptable and an
 apparent inability to meet the 2015 guidelines for an EIS.

THE REJECT EMPLACEMENT AND BULKHEAD ISSUES

- The Metropolitan Colliery emplaced at least some of their rejects in mined voids in recent years. This operation required extensive experimentation over a number of years.
- They had the advantage of knowing the exact composition of their reject material and voids that were well away from current mining areas.
- The Airly Colliery considered this method of reject disposal but decided it posed unacceptable safety and other concerns.
- In contrast the Hume EIS assumes that reject emplacement behind bulkheads is a risk free process. The design of the bulkheads is complex and their construction in an operating environment is problematic.

This is a very risky proposal and I urge the Government to reject this project.

- 0	

If you wish to maintain your privacy in this submission from the department's website please tick this box:	
I have not made a reportable political donation.	V

Name GROPP HALLAN.

Address BH WATTLE CREEK DR

TMTREA PARK

[5]

Date: (9/6/2017)

Attn: Executive Director, Resource Assessments Department of Planning and Environment

GPO Box 39 Sydney NSW 2001

This is a submission to the Hume Coal Project EIS. SSD 7172

I object to this project and believe it should be rejected due to

THE POOR ECONOMICS OF THE HUME COAL PROJECT.

From the data in the EIS it is apparent that the project is unprofitable, with negative investment returns.

- This is a small mine and costly to operate.
- The product mix revealed in the EIS results in lower revenue than previously put forward, with nearly half the production low value thermal coal.
- The only way that the mine can improve its profitability would be to significantly increase production, makingthe EIS invalid in its present form.
- BAEconomics have not been asked to undertake the sensitivity analysis of how much output prices would need to fall for the project to have a zero NPV because Hume Coal considers it to be "commercial in confidence". (EIS Appendix Q page 42). This is unacceptable and an apparent inability to meet the 2015 guidelines for an EIS.

THE REJECT EMPLACEMENT AND BULKHEAD ISSUES

- The Metropolitan Colliery emplaced at least some of their rejects in mined voids in recent years. This operation required extensive experimentation over a number of years.
- They had the advantage of knowing the exact composition of their reject material and voids that were well away from current mining areas.
- The Airly Colliery considered this method of reject disposal but decided it posed unacceptable safety and other concerns.
- In contrast the Hume EIS assumes that reject emplacement behind bulkheads is a risk freeprocess. The design of the bulkheads is complex and their construction in an operating environment is problematic.

This is a very	risky proposal	and lur	ge the Go	vernment	to reject t	his project.
Signed,						
	VIII.					

If you wish to maintain your privacy in this submission from the department's website please tick this box:	
I have not made a reportable political donation.	×

Name Danca JONES

Address 3 JARARA RD

W CAMBENARRA

2540

Date: \$6/2017

Attn: Executive Director, Resource Assessments Department of Planning and Environment

GPO Box 39 Sydney NSW 2001

This is a submission to the Hume Coal Project EIS. SSD 7172

I object to this project and believe it should be rejected due to

THE POOR ECONOMICS OF THE HUME COAL PROJECT.

From the data in the EiS it is apparent that the project is unprofitable, with negative investment returns.

- This is a small mine and costly to operate.
- The product mix revealed in the EIS results in lower revenue than previously put forward, with nearly half the production low value thermal coal.
- The only way that the mine can improve its profitability would be to significantly increase production, makingthe EIS invalid in its present form.
- BAEconomics have not been asked to undertake the sensitivity analysis of how much output
 prices would need to fall for the project to have a zero NPV because Hume Coal considers it to
 be "commercial in confidence". (EIS Appendix Q page 42). This is unacceptable and an
 apparent inability to meet the 2015 guidelines for an EIS.

THE REJECT EMPLACEMENT AND BULKHEAD ISSUES

- The Metropolitan Colliery emplaced at least some of their rejects in mined voids in recent years. This operation required extensive experimentation over a number of years.
- They had the advantage of knowing the exact composition of their reject material and voids that were well away from curent mining areas.
- The Airly Colliery considered this method of reject disposal but decided it posed unacceptable safety and other concerns.
- In contrast the Hume EIS assumes that reject emplacement behind bulkheads is a risk free process. The
 design of the bulkheads is complex and their construction in an operating environment is
 problematic.

This is a very risky proposal and I urge the Government to reject this project.

Signed,

Ddding.

If you wish to maintain your privacy in this submission from the department's website please tick this box:

I have not made a reportable political donation.

Name		Dr.	emo	ny	04	on a
Addre	SS	17	Cle	an.	p La	ne
	h	li	Nes	n	leas	- low
,		, - ,			'?	_
-						Prictions

Date: 16/2017

Attn: Executive Director, Resource Assessments Department of Planning

GPO Box 39 Sydney NSW 2001

This is a submission to the Hume Coal Project EIS. SSD 7172

I object to this project and believe it should be rejected due to

THE POOR ECONOMICS OF THE HUME COAL PROJECT.

From the data in the EIS it is apparent that the project is unprofitable, with negative investment returns.

• This is a small mine and costly to operate.

and Environment

- The product mix revealed in the EIS results in lower revenue than previously put forward, with nearly half the production low value thermal coal.
- The only way that the mine can improve its profitability would be to significantly increase production, makingthe EIS invalid in its present form.
- BAEconomics have not been asked to undertake the sensitivity analysis of how much output
 prices would need to fall for the project to have a zero NPV because Hume Coal considers it to
 be "commercial in confidence". (EIS Appendix Q page 42). This is unacceptable and an
 apparent inability to meet the 2015 guidelines for an EIS.

THE REJECT EMPLACEMENT AND BULKHEAD ISSUES

- The Metropolitan Colliery emplaced at least some of their rejects in mined voids in recent years. This operation required extensive experimentation over a number of years.
- They had the advantage of knowing the exact composition of their reject material and voids that were well away from current mining areas.
- The Airly Colliery considered this method of reject disposal but decided it posed unacceptable safety and other concerns.
- In contrast the Hume EIS assumes that reject emplacement behind bulkheads is a risk free process. The design of the bulkheads is complex and their construction in an operating environment is problematic.

This is a very risky proposal and I urge the Government to reject this project.

If you wish to maintain your privacy in this submission from the department's website please tick this box:	
I have not made a reportable political donation.	D

Name K GORE	
Address 49B KANGALEDN	RI
BOWRAL	
Date: 12 / 6 / 2017	

Sydney NSW 2001

Signed,

This is a submission to the Hume Coal Project EIS. SSD 7172

I object to this project and believe it should be rejected due to

THE POOR ECONOMICS OF THE HUME COAL PROJECT.

From the data in the EIS it is apparent that the project is unprofitable, with negative investment returns.

- This is a small mine and costly to operate.
- The product mix revealed in the EIS results in lower revenue than previously put forward, with nearly half the production low value thermal coal.
- The only way that the mine can improve its profitability would be to significantly increase production, making the EIS invalid in its present form.
- BAEconomics have not been asked to undertake the sensitivity analysis of how much output prices would need to fall for the project to have a zero NPV because Hume Coal considers it to be "commercial in confidence". (EIS Appendix Q page 42). This is unacceptable and an apparent inability to meet the 2015 guidelines for an EIS.

THE REJECT EMPLACEMENT AND BULKHEAD ISSUES

- The Metropolitan Colliery emplaced at least some of their rejects in mined voids in recent years. This operation required extensive experimentation over a number of years.
- They had the advantage of knowing the exact composition of their reject material and voids that were well away from current mining areas.
- The Airly Colliery considered this method of reject disposal but decided it posed unacceptable safety and other concerns.
- In contrast the Hume EIS assumes that reject emplacement behind bulkheads is a risk freeprocess. The design of the bulkheads is complex and their construction in an operating environment is problematic.

Marone	
If you wish to maintain your privacy in this submission from the department's website please tick this box:	
I have not made a reportable political donation.	d

Name	DAVID	WHETTON
Address_	49 WC	DOBINE 5
_	BOWK	CAL
	NS W	2576

Date: / \(\) / 6 / 2017

Attn: Executive Director, Resource Assessments Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39

Sydney NSW 2001

This is a submission to the Hume Coal Project EIS. SSD 7172

I object to this project and believe it should be rejected due to

THE POOR ECONOMICS OF THE HUME COAL PROJECT.

From the data in the EIS it is apparent that the project is unprofitable, with negative investment returns.

- This is a small mine and costly to operate.
- The product mix revealed in the EIS results in lower revenue than previously put forward, with nearly half the production low value thermal coal.
- The only way that the mine can improve its profitability would be to significantly increase production, makingthe EIS invalid in its present form.
- BAEconomics have not been asked to undertake the sensitivity analysis of how much output prices would need to fall for the project to have a zero NPV because Hume Coal considers it to be "commercial in confidence". (EIS Appendix Q page 42). This is unacceptable and an apparent inability to meet the 2015 guidelines for an EIS.

THE REJECT EMPLACEMENT AND BULKHEAD ISSUES

- The Metropolitan Colliery emplaced at least some of their rejects in mined voids in recent years. This operation required extensive experimentation over a number of years.
- They had the advantage of knowing the exact composition of their reject material and voids that were well away from current mining areas.
- The Airly Colliery considered this method of reject disposal but decided it posed unacceptable safety and other concerns.
- In contrast the Hume EIS assumes that reject emplacement behind bulkheads is a risk free process. The design of the bulkheads is complex and their construction in an operating environment is problematic.

Signed,		
	Distellan	

If you wish to maintain your privacy in this submission from the department's website please tick this box:	
I have not made a reportable political donation.	

	Name Dan Sonnouse
	Address D8 OD GOSFORD PD
	LIMBERAL 2260
	NSW
	Date: (8/6/2017
Attn: Executive Director, Resource Assessments Deparament and Environment	tment of Planning
GPO Box 39 Sydney NSW 2001	
This is a submission to the Hume Coal Project	t EIS. SSD 7172
I object to this project and believe it should be rejected. THE POOR ECONOMICS OF THE HUME COAL PROJECT.	
From the data in the EIS it is apparent that the project is This is a small mine and costly to operate.	unprofitable, with negative investment returns.
The product mix revealed in the EIS results in lower revenearly half the production low value thermal coal. The only way that the mine can improve its profitability of production, making the EIS invalid in its present form. BAEconomics have not been asked to undertake the sene prices would need to fall for the project to have a zero Nobe "commercial in confidence". (EIS Appendix Q page 42 apparent inability to meet the 2015 guidelines for an EIS	would be to significantly increase sitivity analysis of how much output IPV because Hume Coal considers it to). This is unacceptable and an
THE REJECT EMPLACEMENT AND BULKHEAD ISSUES	
The Metropolitan Colliery emplaced at least some of the operation required extensive experimentation over a nur They had the advantage of knowing the exact composition well away from current mining areas. The Airly Colliery considered this method of reject disponding the concerns. In contrast the Hume EIS assumes that reject emplacement design of the bulkheads is complex and their construction problematic.	nber of years. on of their reject material and voids that were sal but decided it posed unacceptable safety and ent behind bulkheads is a risk freeprocess. The
This is a very risky proposal and I urge the Government t	o reject this project.
Signed,	
P.E.	
If you wish to maintain your privacy in this submission from the	e department's website please tick this box:
I have not made a reportable political donation.	

Name Kayte Barnard
Address 32 Nonegal St
Barge NSW-

Date: | 4 / 6 / 2017

Attn: Executive Director, Resource Assessments Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39
Sydney NSW 2001

This is a submission to the Hume Coal Project EIS. SSD 7172

I object to this project and believe it should be rejected due to

THE POOR ECONOMICS OF THE HUME COAL PROJECT.

From the data in the EIS it is apparent that the project is unprofitable, with negative investment returns.

- This is a small mine and costly to operate.
- The product mix revealed in the EIS results in lower revenue than previously put forward, with nearly half the production low value thermal coal.
- The only way that the mine can improve its profitability would be to significantly increase production, makingthe EIS invalid in its present form.
- BAEconomics have not been asked to undertake the sensitivity analysis of how much output
 prices would need to fall for the project to have a zero NPV because Hume Coal considers it to
 be "commercial in confidence". (EIS Appendix Q page 42). This is unacceptable and an
 apparent inability to meet the 2015 guidelines for an EIS.

THE REJECT EMPLACEMENT AND BULKHEAD ISSUES

- The Metropolitan Colliery emplaced at least some of their rejects in mined voids in recent years. This operation required extensive experimentation over a number of years.
- They had the advantage of knowing the exact composition of their reject material and voids that were well away from curent mining areas.
- The Airly Colliery considered this method of reject disposal but decided it posed unacceptable safety and other concerns.
- In contrast the Hume EIS assumes that reject emplacement behind bulkheads is a risk freeprocess. The
 design of the bulkheads is complex and their construction in an operating environment is
 problematic.

This is a very risky proposal and I urge the Government to reject this project.

If you wish to maintain your privacy in this submission from the department's website please tick this box:	
I have not made a reportable political donation.	

Name Meinda Prouse
Address 2 Susan SL
Ith. Westworth ville
2145
Date: 19 / 6 / 2017

Attn: Executive Director, Resource Assessments Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39
Sydney NSW 2001

This is a submission to the Hume Coal Project EIS. SSD 7172

I object to this project and believe it should be rejected due to

THE POOR ECONOMICS OF THE HUME COAL PROJECT.

From the data in the EIS it is apparent that the project is unprofitable, with negative investment returns.

- This is a small mine and costly to operate.
- The product mix revealed in the EIS results in lower revenue than previously put forward, with nearly half the production low value thermal coal.
- The only way that the mine can improve its profitability would be to significantly increase production, makingthe EIS invalid in its present form.
- BAEconomics have not been asked to undertake the sensitivity analysis of how much output
 prices would need to fall for the project to have a zero NPV because Hume Coal considers it to
 be "commercial in confidence". (EIS Appendix Q page 42). This is unacceptable and an
 apparent inability to meet the 2015 guidelines for an EIS.

THE REJECT EMPLACEMENT AND BULKHEAD ISSUES

- The Metropolitan Colliery emplaced at least some of their rejects in mined voids in recent years. This operation required extensive experimentation over a number of years.
- They had the advantage of knowing the exact composition of their reject material and voids that were well away from current mining areas.
- The Airly Colliery considered this method of reject disposal but decided it posed unacceptable safety and other concerns.
- In contrast the Hume EIS assumes that reject emplacement behind bulkheads is a risk freeprocess. The
 design of the bulkheads is complex and their construction in an operating environment is
 problematic.

This is a very risky proposal and I urge the Government to reject this project.

If you wish to maintain your privacy in this submission from the department's website please tick this box:	
I have not made a reportable political donation.	V

N	Name Shand Smith
A	address 30 alebe P
	Name Shand Snith Address 30 alebe P Kingswood USW
	Date: \ \ 87 6 / 2017
Attn: Executive Director, Resource Assessments Departm and Environment GPO Box 39 Sydney NSW 2001	nent of Planning
This is a submission to the Hume Coal Project	EIS. SSD 7172
I object to this project and believe it should be rejected of THE POOR ECONOMICS OF THE HUME COAL PROJECT.	due to
From the data in the EIS it is apparent that the project is un	profitable, with negative investment returns.
This is a small mine and costly to operate. The product mix revealed in the EIS results in lower revenue nearly half the production low value thermal coal. The only way that the mine can improve its profitability work production, makingthe EIS invalid in its present form. BAEconomics have not been asked to undertake the sensiti prices would need to fall for the project to have a zero NPV be "commercial in confidence". (EIS Appendix Q page 42). The apparent inability to meet the 2015 guidelines for an EIS.	uld be to significantly increase ivity analysis of how much output because Hume Coal considers it to
THE REJECT EMPLACEMENT AND BULKHEAD ISSUES	
The Metropolitan Colliery emplaced at least some of their reperation required extensive experimentation over a number They had the advantage of knowing the exact composition of well away from curent mining areas. The Airly Colliery considered this method of reject disposal other concerns. In contrast the Hume EIS assumes that reject emplacement design of the bulkheads is complex and their construction in problematic.	er of years. of their reject material and voids that were but decided it posed unacceptable safety and behind bulkheads is a risk freeprocess. The
This is a very risky proposal and I urge the Government to re	eject this project.
Signed,	
If you wish to maintain your privacy in this submission from the de	epartment's website please tick this box:
I have not made a reportable political donation.	

274

Name Robert Firth
Address 2/24 Milson Rd
Cremone Point
NSW 2090
Date: /6/2017

GPO Box 39 Sydney NSW 2001

This is a submission to the Hume Coal Project EIS. SSD 7172

l object to this project and believe it should be rejected due to

THE POOR ECONOMICS OF THE HUME COAL PROJECT.

From the data in the EIS it is apparent that the project is unprofitable, with negative investment returns.

- This is a small mine and costly to operate.
- The product mix revealed in the EIS results in lower revenue than previously put forward, with nearly half the production low value thermal coal.
- The only way that the mine can improve its profitability would be to significantly increase production, makingthe EIS invalid in its present form.
- BAEconomics have not been asked to undertake the sensitivity analysis of how much output
 prices would need to fall for the project to have a zero NPV because Hume Coal considers it to
 be "commercial in confidence". (EIS Appendix Q page 42). This is unacceptable and an
 apparent inability to meet the 2015 guidelines for an EIS.

THE REJECT EMPLACEMENT AND BULKHEAD ISSUES

- The Metropolitan Colliery emplaced at least some of their rejects in mined voids in recent years. This
 operation required extensive experimentation over a number of years.
- They had the advantage of knowing the exact composition of their reject material and voids that were well away from current mining areas.
- The Airly Colliery considered this method of reject disposal but decided it posed unacceptable safety and other concerns.
- In contrast the Hume EIS assumes that reject emplacement behind bulkheads is a risk freeprocess. The
 design of the bulkheads is complex and their construction in an operating environment is
 problematic.

Signed,	Ω	
	$\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{L}}$	
	1000 Cm	

If you wish to maintain your privacy in this submission from the department's website please tick this box:	
I have not made a reportable political donation.	

Name Helen Compbell
Address 76 Des Bie soel St
Belconnen
ACT

Date: /6/2017

Attn: Executive Director, Resource Assessments Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39
Sydney NSW 2001

This is a submission to the Hume Coal Project EIS. SSD 7172

I object to this project and believe it should be rejected due to

THE POOR ECONOMICS OF THE HUME COAL PROJECT.

From the data in the EIS it is apparent that the project is unprofitable, with negative investment returns.

- This is a small mine and costly to operate.
- The product mix revealed in the EIS results in lower revenue than previously put forward, with nearly half the production low value thermal coal.
- The only way that the mine can improve its profitability would be to significantly increase production, makingthe EIS invalid in its present form.
- BAEconomics have not been asked to undertake the sensitivity analysis of how much output
 prices would need to fall for the project to have a zero NPV because Hume Coal considers it to
 be "commercial in confidence". (EIS Appendix Q page 42). This is unacceptable and an
 apparent inability to meet the 2015 guidelines for an EIS.

THE REJECT EMPLACEMENT AND BULKHEAD ISSUES

- The Metropolitan Colliery emplaced at least some of their rejects in mined voids in recent years. This operation required extensive experimentation over a number of years.
- They had the advantage of knowing the exact composition of their reject material and voids that were well away from current mining areas.
- The Airly Colliery considered this method of reject disposal but decided it posed unacceptable safety and other concerns.
- In contrast the Hume EIS assumes that reject emplacement behind bulkheads is a risk freeprocess. The
 design of the bulkheads is complex and their construction in an operating environment is
 problematic.

This is a very risky proposal and I urge the Government to reject this project.

If you wish to maintain your privacy in this submission from the department's website please tick this box:	
I have not made a reportable political donation.	

Name_	JONON	ROBERISON)
Address	138	LIFBMAN	Re
_	MEDL	IAY	
_	Date: 16 /	2017	

Attn: Executive Director, Resource Assessments Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39
Sydney NSW 2001

This is a submission to the Hume Coal Project EIS. SSD 7172

I object to this project and believe it should be rejected due to

THE POOR ECONOMICS OF THE HUME COAL PROJECT.

From the data in the EIS it is apparent that the projectis unprofitable, with negative investment returns.

- This is a small mine and costly to operate.
- The product mix revealed in the EIS results in lower revenue than previously put forward, with nearly half the production low value thermal coal.
- The only way that the mine can improve its profitability would be to significantly increase production, makingthe EIS invalid in its present form.
- BAEconomics have not been asked to undertake the sensitivity analysis of how much output
 prices would need to fall for the project to have a zero NPV because Hume Coal considers it to
 be "commercial in confidence". (EIS Appendix Q page 42). This is unacceptable and an
 apparent inability to meet the 2015 guidelines for an EIS.

THE REJECT EMPLACEMENT AND BULKHEAD ISSUES

40/00

- The Metropolitan Colliery emplaced at least some of their rejects in mined voids in recent years. This operation required extensive experimentation over a number of years.
- They had the advantage of knowing the exact composition of their reject material and voids that were well away from curent mining areas.
- The Airly Colliery considered this method of reject disposal but decided it posed unacceptable safety and other concerns.
- In contrast the Hume EIS assumes that reject emplacement behind bulkheads is a risk freeprocess. The
 design of the bulkheads is complex and their construction in an operating environment is
 problematic.

This is a very risky proposal and I urge the Government to reject this project.

If you wish to maintain your privacy in this submission from the department's website please tick this box:	
I have not made a reportable political donation.	V

Name Jest Peterson
Address 86 Duncon &
MAROURRA
777100111-71
Date: 18/6/2017

Attn: Executive Director, Resource Assessments Department of Planning and Environment

GPO Box 39

Sydney NSW 2001

This is a submission to the Hume Coal Project EIS. SSD 7172

I object to this project and believe it should be rejected due to

THE POOR ECONOMICS OF THE HUME COAL PROJECT.

From the data in the EIS it is apparent that the project is unprofitable, with negative investment returns.

- This is a small mine and costly to operate.
- The product mix revealed in the EIS results in lower revenue than previously put forward, with nearly half the production low value thermal coal.
- The only way that the mine can improve its profitability would be to significantly increase production, makingthe EIS invalid in its present form.
- BAEconomics have not been asked to undertake the sensitivity analysis of how much output prices would need to fall for the project to have a zero NPV because Hume Coal considers it to be "commercial in confidence". (EIS Appendix Q page 42). This is unacceptable and an apparent inability to meet the 2015 guidelines for an EIS.

THE REJECT EMPLACEMENT AND BULKHEAD ISSUES

- The Metropolitan Colliery emplaced at least some of their rejects in mined voids in recent years. This operation required extensive experimentation over a number of years.
- They had the advantage of knowing the exact composition of their reject material and voids that were well away from current mining areas.
- The Airly Colliery considered this method of reject disposal but decided it posed unacceptable safety and other concerns.
- In contrast the Hume EIS assumes that reject emplacement behind bulkheads is a risk free process. The design of the bulkheads is complex and their construction in an operating environment is problematic.

This is a very risky proposal and I urge the Government to reject this project.

If you wish to maintain your privacy in this submission from the department's website please tick this box:	
I have not made a reportable political donation.	

Name	Ana	205	Suth	مامح
Addre	ss 12	Ma	thew	Sl
				N5W
	Date!	\$ 16	/ 2017	

Sydney NSW 2001

This is a submission to the Hume Coal Project EIS. SSD 7172

I object to this project and believe it should be rejected due to

THE POOR ECONOMICS OF THE HUME COAL PROJECT.

From the data in the EIS it is apparent that the project is unprofitable, with negative investment returns.

- This is a small mine and costly to operate.
- The product mix revealed in the EIS results in lower revenue than previously put forward, with nearly half the production low value thermal coal.
- The only way that the mine can improve its profitability would be to significantly increase production, makingthe EIS invalid in its present form.
- BAEconomics have not been asked to undertake the sensitivity analysis of how much output prices would need to fall for the project to have a zero NPV because Hume Coal considers it to be "commercial in confidence". (EIS Appendix Q page 42). This is unacceptable and an apparent inability to meet the 2015 guidelines for an EIS.

THE REJECT EMPLACEMENT AND BULKHEAD ISSUES

- The Metropolitan Colliery emplaced at least some of their rejects in mined voids in recent years. This operation required extensive experimentation over a number of years.
- They had the advantage of knowing the exact composition of their reject material and voids that were well away from current mining areas.
- The Airly Colliery considered this method of reject disposal but decided it posed unacceptable safety and other concerns.
- In contrast the Hume EIS assumes that reject emplacement behind bulkheads is a risk freeprocess. The design of the bulkheads is complex and their construction in an operating environment is problematic.

If you wish to maintain your privacy in this submission from the department's website please tick this box:	
I have not made a reportable political donation.	凶

Name Tony Crattan Sull	_
Address Fry Rox	
Colenguarry	
NSW	
Date: /7/6/2017	

GPO Box 39 Sydney NSW 2001

This is a submission to the Hume Coal Project EIS. SSD 7172

I object to this project and believe it should be rejected due to

THE POOR ECONOMICS OF THE HUME COAL PROJECT.

From the data in the EIS it is apparent that the project is unprofitable, with negative investment returns.

- This is a small mine and costly to operate.
- The product mix revealed in the EIS results in lower revenue than previously put forward, with nearly half the production low value thermal coal.
- The only way that the mine can improve its profitability would be to significantly increase production, makingthe EIS invalid in its present form.
- BAEconomics have not been asked to undertake the sensitivity analysis of how much output
 prices would need to fall for the project to have a zero NPV because Hume Coal considers it to
 be "commercial in confidence". (EIS Appendix Q page 42). This is unacceptable and an
 apparent inability to meet the 2015 guidelines for an EIS.

THE REJECT EMPLACEMENT AND BULKHEAD ISSUES

- The Metropolitan Colliery emplaced at least some of their rejects in mined voids in recent years. This operation required extensive experimentation over a number of years.
- They had the advantage of knowing the exact composition of their reject material and voids that were well away from current mining areas.
- The Airly Colliery considered this method of reject disposal but decided it posed unacceptable safety and other concerns.
- In contrast the Hume EIS assumes that reject emplacement behind bulkheads is a risk freeprocess. The
 design of the bulkheads is complex and their construction in an operating environment is
 problematic.

F	
This is a very risky proposal and I urge the Government to reject this project.	
Signed,	
If you wish to maintain your privacy in this submission from the department's website please tick this box	
I have not made a reportable political donation.	Ø
Thate not made a reportable political dollation.	

Name Max Mackevilius
Address 4/B Robertson Rd
Moss Vale
Date:///6/2017

Attn: Executive Director, Resource Assessments Department of Planning and Environment

GPO Box 39

Sydney NSW 2001

This is a submission to the Hume Coal Project EIS. SSD 7172

I object to this project and believe it should be rejected due to

THE POOR ECONOMICS OF THE HUME COAL PROJECT.

From the data in the EIS it is apparent that the project is unprofitable, with negative investment returns.

- This is a small mine and costly to operate.
- The product mix revealed in the EIS results in lower revenue than previously put forward, with nearly half the production low value thermal coal.
- The only way that the mine can improve its profitability would be to significantly increase production, makingthe EIS invalid in its present form.
- BAEconomics have not been asked to undertake the sensitivity analysis of how much output
 prices would need to fall for the project to have a zero NPV because Hume Coal considers it to
 be "commercial in confidence". (EIS Appendix Q page 42). This is unacceptable and an
 apparent inability to meet the 2015 guidelines for an EIS.

THE REJECT EMPLACEMENT AND BULKHEAD ISSUES

- The Metropolitan Colliery emplaced at least some of their rejects in mined voids in recent years. This operation required extensive experimentation over a number of years.
- They had the advantage of knowing the exact composition of their reject material and voids that were well away from current mining areas.
- The Airly Colliery considered this method of reject disposal but decided it posed unacceptable safety and other concerns.
- In contrast the Hume EIS assumes that reject emplacement behind bulkheads is a risk free process. The
 design of the bulkheads is complex and their construction in an operating environment is
 problematic.

This is a very risky proposal and I urge the Government to reject this project.

M-Mahoring

If you wish to maintain your privacy in this submission from the department's website please tick this box:	
 I have not made a reportable political donation.	

Name Alwa
Address Compbell St
Picton
NSW
Date://) / 6 / 2017

Attn: Executive Director, Resource Assessments Department of Planning and Environment

GPO Box 39

Sydney NSW 2001

This is a submission to the Hume Coal Project EIS. SSD 7172

I object to this project and believe it should be rejected due to

THE POOR ECONOMICS OF THE HUME COAL PROJECT.

From the data in the EIS it is apparent that the project is unprofitable, with negative investment returns.

- This is a small mine and costly to operate.
- The product mix revealed in the EIS results in lower revenue than previously put forward, with nearly half the production low value thermal coal.
- The only way that the mine can improve its profitability would be to significantly increase production, makingthe EIS invalid in its present form.
- BAEconomics have not been asked to undertake the sensitivity analysis of how much output
 prices would need to fall for the project to have a zero NPV because Hume Coal considers it to
 be "commercial in confidence". (EIS Appendix Q page 42). This is unacceptable and an
 apparent inability to meet the 2015 guidelines for an EIS.

THE REJECT EMPLACEMENT AND BULKHEAD ISSUES

- The Metropolitan Colliery emplaced at least some of their rejects in mined voids in recent years. This operation required extensive experimentation over a number of years.
- They had the advantage of knowing the exact composition of their reject material and voids that were well away from current mining areas.
- The Airly Colliery considered this method of reject disposal but decided it posed unacceptable safety and other concerns.
- In contrast the Hume EIS assumes that reject emplacement behind bulkheads is a risk freeprocess. The
 design of the bulkheads is complex and their construction in an operating environment is
 problematic.

This is a very risky proposal and I urge the Government to reject this project.

If you wish to maintain your privacy in this submission from the department's website please tick this box:	
I have not made a reportable political donation.	

Name	Incs Dunn.
Address_	310 Joaqja Rd
_	Mandemak 2575
	<i>V</i>
D:	ate: / 7 / 6 / 2017

GPO Box 39 Sydney NSW 2001

This is a submission to the Hume Coal Project EIS. SSD 7172

I object to this project and believe it should be rejected due to

THE POOR ECONOMICS OF THE HUME COAL PROJECT.

From the data in the EIS it is apparent that the project is unprofitable, with negative investment returns.

- This is a small mine and costly to operate.
- The product mix revealed in the EIS results in lower revenue than previously put forward, with nearly half the production low value thermal coal.
- The only way that the mine can improve its profitability would be to significantly increase production, making the EIS invalid in its present form.
- BAEconomics have not been asked to undertake the sensitivity analysis of how much output prices would need to fall for the project to have a zero NPV because Hume Coal considers it to be "commercial in confidence". (EIS Appendix Q page 42). This is unacceptable and an apparent inability to meet the 2015 guidelines for an EIS.

THE REJECT EMPLACEMENT AND BULKHEAD ISSUES

- The Metropolitan Colliery emplaced at least some of their rejects in mined voids in recent years. This operation required extensive experimentation over a number of years.
- They had the advantage of knowing the exact composition of their reject material and voids that were well away from current mining areas.
- The Airly Colliery considered this method of reject disposal but decided it posed unacceptable safety and other concerns.
- In contrast the Hume EIS assumes that reject emplacement behind bulkheads is a risk free process. The design of the bulkheads is complex and their construction in an operating environment is problematic.

This is a very risky proposal and I urge the Government to reject this project.

gro Dun.

If you wish to maintain your privacy in this submission from the department's website please tick this box:	
I have not made a reportable political donation.	J

Name F. CHAPMAN	0
Address TOON GOON	MD
BURRADOO	

Date: / つ/6/2017

Attn: Executive Director, Resource Assessments Department of Planning and Environment

GPO Box 39 Sydney NSW 2001

This is a submission to the Hume Coal Project EIS. SSD 7172

I object to this project and believe it should be rejected due to

THE POOR ECONOMICS OF THE HUME COAL PROJECT.

From the data in the EIS it is apparent that the project is unprofitable, with negative investment returns.

- This is a small mine and costly to operate.
- The product mix revealed in the EIS results in lower revenue than previously put forward, with nearly half the production low value thermal coal.
- The only way that the mine can improve its profitability would be to significantly increase production, making the EIS invalid in its present form.
- BAEconomics have not been asked to undertake the sensitivity analysis of how much output
 prices would need to fall for the project to have a zero NPV because Hume Coal considers it to
 be "commercial in confidence". (EIS Appendix Q page 42). This is unacceptable and an
 apparent inability to meet the 2015 guidelines for an EIS.

THE REJECT EMPLACEMENT AND BULKHEAD ISSUES

Allhapman

- The Metropolitan Colliery emplaced at least some of their rejects in mined voids in recent years. This operation required extensive experimentation over a number of years.
- They had the advantage of knowing the exact composition of their reject material and voids that were well away from current mining areas.
- The Airly Colliery considered this method of reject disposal but decided it posed unacceptable safety and other concerns.
- In contrast the Hume EIS assumes that reject emplacement behind bulkheads is a risk freeprocess. The
 design of the bulkheads is complex and their construction in an operating environment is
 problematic.

This is a very risky proposal and I urge the Government to reject this project.

If you wish to maintain your privacy in this submission from the department's website please tick this box:	
I have not made a reportable political donation.	

Name	Pam	MOOR
Address_	4 Yo	ian St
	Bun	× acloo
		0576

Date: (7/6/2017

Attn: Executive Director, Resource Assessments Department of Planning and Environment

GPO Box 39 Sydney NSW 2001

This is a submission to the Hume Coal Project EIS. SSD 7172

I object to this project and believe it should be rejected due to

THE POOR ECONOMICS OF THE HUME COAL PROJECT.

From the data in the EIS it is apparent that the project is unprofitable, with negative investment returns.

- This is a small mine and costly to operate.
- The product mix revealed in the EIS results in lower revenue than previously put forward, with nearly half the production low value thermal coal.
- The only way that the mine can improve its profitability would be to significantly increase production, making the EIS invalid in its present form.
- BAEconomics have not been asked to undertake the sensitivity analysis of how much output
 prices would need to fall for the project to have a zero NPV because Hume Coal considers it to
 be "commercial in confidence". (EIS Appendix Q page 42). This is unacceptable and an
 apparent inability to meet the 2015 guidelines for an EIS.

THE REJECT EMPLACEMENT AND BULKHEAD ISSUES

1. exec

- The Metropolitan Colliery emplaced at least some of their rejects in mined voids in recent years. This operation required extensive experimentation over a number of years.
- They had the advantage of knowing the exact composition of their reject material and voids that were well away from current mining areas.
- The Airly Colliery considered this method of reject disposal but decided it posed unacceptable safety and other concerns.
- In contrast the Hume EIS assumes that reject emplacement behind bulkheads is a risk free process. The
 design of the bulkheads is complex and their construction in an operating environment is
 problematic.

This is a very risky proposal and I urge the Government to reject this project.

If you wish to maintain your privacy in this submission from the department's website please tick this box:	
I have not made a reportable political donation.	d

Name	PATE THORN HILL
Addre	ss 58 THOMP 800 35
	BONRAZ
	WEN 2576
	Date:/ 7/6/2017

GPO Box 39 Sydney NSW 2001

This is a submission to the Hume Coal Project EIS. SSD 7172

I object to this project and believe it should be rejected due to

THE POOR ECONOMICS OF THE HUME COAL PROJECT.

From the data in the EIS it is apparent that the project is unprofitable, with negative investment returns.

- This is a small mine and costly to operate.
- The product mix revealed in the EIS results in lower revenue than previously put forward, with nearly half the production low value thermal coal.
- The only way that the mine can improve its profitability would be to significantly increase production, makingthe EIS invalid in its present form.
- BAEconomics have not been asked to undertake the sensitivity analysis of how much output
 prices would need to fall for the project to have a zero NPV because Hume Coal considers it to
 be "commercial in confidence". (EIS Appendix Q page 42). This is unacceptable and an
 apparent inability to meet the 2015 guidelines for an EIS.

THE REJECT EMPLACEMENT AND BULKHEAD ISSUES

- The Metropolitan Colliery emplaced at least some of their rejects in mined voids in recent years. This operation required extensive experimentation over a number of years.
- They had the advantage of knowing the exact composition of their reject material and voids that were well away from current mining areas.
- The Airly Colliery considered this method of reject disposal but decided it posed unacceptable safety and other concerns.
- In contrast the Hume EIS assumes that reject emplacement behind bulkheads is a risk free process. The
 design of the bulkheads is complex and their construction in an operating environment is
 problematic.

This is a very risky proposal and I urge the Government to reject this project.

Signed, An muhit

If you wish to maintain your privacy in this submission from the department's website please tick this box:	
I have not made a reportable political donation.	囡

Name_	D. REI	0	
Addres	s 21-23	PATTEN	57
_	MITTHE	20119	
_			
	Date:/7/6/	2017	

Sydney NSW 2001

Signad

This is a submission to the Hume Coal Project EIS. SSD 7172

I object to this project and believe it should be rejected due to

THE POOR ECONOMICS OF THE HUME COAL PROJECT.

From the data in the EIS it is apparent that the project is unprofitable, with negative investment returns.

- This is a small mine and costly to operate.
- The product mix revealed in the EIS results in lower revenue than previously put forward, with nearly half the production low value thermal coal.
- The only way that the mine can improve its profitability would be to significantly increase production, makingthe EIS invalid in its present form.
- BAEconomics have not been asked to undertake the sensitivity analysis of how much output prices would need to fall for the project to have a zero NPV because Hume Coal considers it to be "commercial in confidence". (EIS Appendix Q page 42). This is unacceptable and an apparent inability to meet the 2015 guidelines for an EIS.

THE REJECT EMPLACEMENT AND BULKHEAD ISSUES

- The Metropolitan Colliery emplaced at least some of their rejects in mined voids in recent years. This operation required extensive experimentation over a number of years.
- They had the advantage of knowing the exact composition of their reject material and voids that were well away from current mining areas.
- The Airly Colliery considered this method of reject disposal but decided it posed unacceptable safety and other concerns.
- In contrast the Hume EIS assumes that reject emplacement behind bulkheads is a risk free process. The design of the bulkheads is complex and their construction in an operating environment is problematic.

oigiicu,	•	
	$(\mathcal{P},\mathcal{Q},\mathcal{Q},\mathcal{Q},\mathcal{Q})$	
	Menel	

If you wish to maintain your privacy in this submission from the department's website please tick this box:]
I have not made a reportable political donation.	

Name Abbir Rath
Address 38 Watte
St Colo Vale
NSW
Date:/ } / 6 / 2017

Attn: Executive Director, Resource Assessments Department of Planning and Environment
GPO Box 39
Sydney NSW 2001

This is a submission to the Hume Coal Project EIS. SSD 7172

I object to this project and believe it should be rejected due to

THE POOR ECONOMICS OF THE HUME COAL PROJECT.

From the data in the EIS it is apparent that the project is unprofitable, with negative investment returns.

- This is a small mine and costly to operate.
- The product mix revealed in the EIS results in lower revenue than previously put forward, with nearly half the production low value thermal coal.
- The only way that the mine can improve its profitability would be to significantly increase production, makingthe EIS invalid in its present form.
- BAEconomics have not been asked to undertake the sensitivity analysis of how much output
 prices would need to fall for the project to have a zero NPV because Hume Coal considers it to
 be "commercial in confidence". (EIS Appendix Q page 42). This is unacceptable and an
 apparent inability to meet the 2015 guidelines for an EIS.

THE REJECT EMPLACEMENT AND BULKHEAD ISSUES

- The Metropolitan Colliery emplaced at least some of their rejects in mined voids in recent years. This operation required extensive experimentation over a number of years.
- They had the advantage of knowing the exact composition of their reject material and voids that were well away from curent mining areas.
- The Airly Colliery considered this method of reject disposal but decided it posed unacceptable safety and other concerns.
- In contrast the Hume EIS assumes that reject emplacement behind bulkheads is a risk freeprocess. The
 design of the bulkheads is complex and their construction in an operating environment is
 problematic.

Signed,	1.6	
	AST	
_		

If you wish to maintain your privacy in this submission from the department's website please tick this bo	эх:
I have not made a reportable political donation.	\square

Name Corolin Grentell
Address 14 A Holly Rocco
Burradoo
2576
Date: 1 7/6/2017

GPO Box 39 Sydney NSW 2001

This is a submission to the Hume Coal Project EIS. SSD 7172

I object to this project and believe it should be rejected due to

THE POOR ECONOMICS OF THE HUME COAL PROJECT.

From the data in the EIS it is apparent that the project is unprofitable, with negative investment returns.

- This is a small mine and costly to operate.
- The product mix revealed in the EIS results in lower revenue than previously put forward, with nearly half the production low value thermal coal.
- The only way that the mine can improve its profitability would be to significantly increase production, makingthe EIS invalid in its present form.
- BAEconomics have not been asked to undertake the sensitivity analysis of how much output
 prices would need to fall for the project to have a zero NPV because Hume Coal considers it to
 be "commercial in confidence". (EIS Appendix Q page 42). This is unacceptable and an
 apparent inability to meet the 2015 guidelines for an EIS.

THE REJECT EMPLACEMENT AND BULKHEAD ISSUES

- The Metropolitan Colliery emplaced at least some of their rejects in mined voids in recent years. This operation required extensive experimentation over a number of years.
- They had the advantage of knowing the exact composition of their reject material and voids that were well away from curent mining areas.
- The Airly Colliery considered this method of reject disposal but decided it posed unacceptable safety and other concerns.
- In contrast the Hume EIS assumes that reject emplacement behind bulkheads is a risk free process. The design of the bulkheads is complex and their construction in an operating environment is problematic.

This is a very risky proposal and I urge the Government to reject this project.

If you wish to maintain your privacy in this submission from the department's website please tick this box:	
I have not made a reportable political donation.	

Name Bruce Monterth
Address 12 2088 8T
2001AZUUS
Date / - / 6 / 2017

GPO Box 39 Sydney NSW 2001

This is a submission to the Hume Coal Project EIS. SSD 7172

I object to this project and believe it should be rejected due to

THE POOR ECONOMICS OF THE HUME COAL PROJECT.

From the data in the EIS it is apparent that the project is unprofitable, with negative investment returns.

- This is a small mine and costly to operate.
- The product mix revealed in the EIS results in lower revenue than previously put forward, with nearly half the production low value thermal coal.
- The only way that the mine can improve its profitability would be to significantly increase production, makingthe EIS invalid in its present form.
- BAEconomics have not been asked to undertake the sensitivity analysis of how much output prices would need to fall for the project to have a zero NPV because Hume Coal considers it to be "commercial in confidence". (EIS Appendix Q page 42). This is unacceptable and an apparent inability to meet the 2015 guidelines for an EIS.

THE REJECT EMPLACEMENT AND BULKHEAD ISSUES

- The Metropolitan Colliery emplaced at least some of their rejects in mined voids in recent years. This operation required extensive experimentation over a number of years.
- They had the advantage of knowing the exact composition of their reject material and voids that were well away from curent mining areas.
- The Airly Colliery considered this method of reject disposal but decided it posed unacceptable safety and other concerns.
- In contrast the Hume EIS assumes that reject emplacement behind bulkheads is a risk free process. The design of the bulkheads is complex and their construction in an operating environment is problematic.

This is a very risky proposal and I urge the Government to reject this project.

If you wish to maintain your privacy in this submission from the department's website please tick this box:	
I have not made a reportable political donation.	ď

Name C1. MITADZEAN

Address 88 Oxley Rd

Millergorg

Date:/// 6 / 2017

Attn: Executive Director, Resource Assessments Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39

Sydney NSW 2001

This is a submission to the Hume Coal Project EIS. SSD 7172

I object to this project and believe it should be rejected due to

THE POOR ECONOMICS OF THE HUME COAL PROJECT.

From the data in the EIS it is apparent that the project is unprofitable, with negative investment returns.

- This is a small mine and costly to operate.
- The product mix revealed in the EIS results in lower revenue than previously put forward, with nearly half the production low value thermal coal.
- The only way that the mine can improve its profitability would be to significantly increase production, makingthe EIS invalid in its present form.
- BAEconomics have not been asked to undertake the sensitivity analysis of how much output
 prices would need to fall for the project to have a zero NPV because Hume Coal considers it to
 be "commercial in confidence". (EIS Appendix Q page 42). This is unacceptable and an
 apparent inability to meet the 2015 guidelines for an EIS.

THE REJECT EMPLACEMENT AND BULKHEAD ISSUES

- The Metropolitan Colliery emplaced at least some of their rejects in mined voids in recent years. This operation required extensive experimentation over a number of years.
- They had the advantage of knowing the exact composition of their reject material and voids that were well away from curent mining areas.
- The Airly Colliery considered this method of reject disposal but decided it posed unacceptable safety and other concerns.
- In contrast the Hume EIS assumes that reject emplacement behind bulkheads is a risk freeprocess. The
 design of the bulkheads is complex and their construction in an operating environment is
 problematic.

This is a very risky proposal and I urge the Government to reject this project.

Signed,

Ju Lagea

If you wish to maintain your privacy in this submission from the department's website please tick this box:

I have not made a reportable political donation.



Name PETER GLASS

Address & RAGCAN ST

BERRIMA

NSV 2577

Date: 8/6/2017

Attn: Executive Director, Resource Assessments Department of Planning and Environment

GPO Roy 39

GPO Box 39 Sydney NSW 2001

This is a submission to the Hume Coal Project EIS. SSD 7172

I object to this project and believe it should be rejected due to

THE POOR ECONOMICS OF THE HUME COAL PROJECT.

From the data in the EIS it is apparent that the project is unprofitable, with negative investment returns.

- This is a small mine and costly to operate.
- The product mix revealed in the EIS results in lower revenue than previously put forward, with nearly half the production low value thermal coal.
- The only way that the mine can improve its profitability would be to significantly increase production, makingthe EIS invalid in its present form.
- BAEconomics have not been asked to undertake the sensitivity analysis of how much output prices would need to fall for the project to have a zero NPV because Hume Coal considers it to be "commercial in confidence". (EIS Appendix Q page 42). This is unacceptable and an apparent inability to meet the 2015 guidelines for an EIS.

THE REJECT EMPLACEMENT AND BULKHEAD ISSUES

- The Metropolitan Colliery emplaced at least some of their rejects in mined voids in recent years. This operation required extensive experimentation over a number of years.
- They had the advantage of knowing the exact composition of their reject material and voids that were well away from current mining areas.
- The Airly Colliery considered this method of reject disposal but decided it posed unacceptable safety and other concerns.
- In contrast the Hume EIS assumes that reject emplacement behind bulkheads is a risk freeprocess. The design of the bulkheads is complex and their construction in an operating environment is problematic.

This is a v	ery risky proposal and I urge the Government to reject this project.
Signed,	

If you wish to maintain your privacy in this submission from the department's website please tick this box:		
I have not made a reportable political donation	d	

Name STUAR MACLEAN
Address 17 METEON PL
RAB7
2566
Date: 🦿 / 6 / 2017

Attn: Executive Director, Resource Assessments Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39
Sydney NSW 2001

This is a submission to the Hume Coal Project EIS. SSD 7172

I object to this project and believe it should be rejected due to

THE POOR ECONOMICS OF THE HUME COAL PROJECT.

From the data in the EIS it is apparent that the project is unprofitable, with negative investment returns.

- This is a small mine and costly to operate.
- The product mix revealed in the EIS results in lower revenue than previously put forward, with nearly half the production low value thermal coal.
- The only way that the mine can improve its profitability would be to significantly increase production, makingthe EIS invalid in its present form.
- BAEconomics have not been asked to undertake the sensitivity analysis of how much output
 prices would need to fall for the project to have a zero NPV because Hume Coal considers it to
 be "commercial in confidence". (EIS Appendix Q page 42). This is unacceptable and an
 apparent inability to meet the 2015 guidelines for an EIS.

THE REJECT EMPLACEMENT AND BULKHEAD ISSUES

- The Metropolitan Colliery emplaced at least some of their rejects in mined voids in recent years. This operation required extensive experimentation over a number of years.
- They had the advantage of knowing the exact composition of their reject material and voids that were well away from curent mining areas.
- The Airly Colliery considered this method of reject disposal but decided it posed unacceptable safety and other concerns.
- In contrast the Hume EIS assumes that reject emplacement behind bulkheads is a risk freeprocess. The
 design of the bulkheads is complex and their construction in an operating environment is
 problematic.

igned,
5-112
a of
a of

If you wish to maintain your privacy in this submission from the department's website please tick this box:	
I have not made a reportable political donation.	

Name SUE VOEGELI Address 23 MAIN ST., ROBERTSON 2577

Date: / 7/6/2017

Attn: Executive Director, Resource Assessments Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39

GPO Box 39 Sydney NSW 2001

This is a submission to the Hume Coal Project EIS. SSD 7172

I object to this project and believe it should be rejected due to

THE POOR ECONOMICS OF THE HUME COAL PROJECT.

From the data in the EIS it is apparent that the project is unprofitable, with negative investment returns.

- This is a small mine and costly to operate.
- The product mix revealed in the EIS results in lower revenue than previously put forward, with nearly half the production low value thermal coal.
- The only way that the mine can improve its profitability would be to significantly increase production, makingthe EIS invalid in its present form.
- BAEconomics have not been asked to undertake the sensitivity analysis of how much output
 prices would need to fall for the project to have a zero NPV because Hume Coal considers it to
 be "commercial in confidence". (EIS Appendix Q page 42). This is unacceptable and an
 apparent inability to meet the 2015 guidelines for an EIS.

THE REJECT EMPLACEMENT AND BULKHEAD ISSUES

- The Metropolitan Colliery emplaced at least some of their rejects in mined voids in recent years. This operation required extensive experimentation over a number of years.
- They had the advantage of knowing the exact composition of their reject material and voids that were well away from current mining areas.
- The Airly Colliery considered this method of reject disposal but decided it posed unacceptable safety and other concerns.
- In contrast the Hume EIS assumes that reject emplacement behind bulkheads is a risk freeprocess. The
 design of the bulkheads is complex and their construction in an operating environment is
 problematic.

This is a very risky proposal and I urge the Government to reject this project.

If you wish to maintain your privacy in this submission from the department's website please tick this box:	
I have not made a reportable political donation.	

Name & honder Hewett
Address 6 DENBIGH Deive
EAST BOWFAL
2576
Date: 1a/6/2017

GPO Box 39 Sydney NSW 2001

This is a submission to the Hume Coal Project EIS. SSD 7172

I object to this project and believe it should be rejected due to

THE POOR ECONOMICS OF THE HUME COAL PROJECT.

From the data in the EIS it is apparent that the project is unprofitable, with negative investment returns.

- This is a small mine and costly to operate.
- The product mix revealed in the EIS results in lower revenue than previously put forward, with nearly half the production low value thermal coal.
- The only way that the mine can improve its profitability would be to significantly increase production, makingthe EIS invalid in its present form.
- BAEconomics have not been asked to undertake the sensitivity analysis of how much output
 prices would need to fall for the project to have a zero NPV because Hume Coal considers it to
 be "commercial in confidence". (EIS Appendix Q page 42). This is unacceptable and an
 apparent inability to meet the 2015 guidelines for an EIS.

THE REJECT EMPLACEMENT AND BULKHEAD ISSUES

- The Metropolitan Colliery emplaced at least some of their rejects in mined voids in recent years. This operation required extensive experimentation over a number of years.
- They had the advantage of knowing the exact composition of their reject material and voids that were well away from curent mining areas.
- The Airly Colliery considered this method of reject disposal but decided it posed unacceptable safety and other concerns.
- In contrast the Hume EIS assumes that reject emplacement behind bulkheads is a risk freeprocess. The
 design of the bulkheads is complex and their construction in an operating environment is
 problematic.

This is a very risky proposal and I urge the Government to reject this project.

De la hunt

If you wish to maintain your privacy in this submission from the department's website please tick this box:	
I have not made a reportable political donation.	

Name	Gina Pontoni	
Addre	ess 6 Densigh I	2~
	East Bowral	NSW
	2576	_
	Date:/7/6/2017	

GPO Box 39 Sydney NSW 2001

This is a submission to the Hume Coal Project EIS. SSD 7172

I object to this project and believe it should be rejected due to

THE POOR ECONOMICS OF THE HUME COAL PROJECT.

From the data in the EIS it is apparent that the project is unprofitable, with negative investment returns.

- This is a small mine and costly to operate.
- The product mix revealed in the EIS results in lower revenue than previously put forward, with nearly half the production low value thermal coal.
- The only way that the mine can improve its profitability would be to significantly increase production, makingthe EIS invalid in its present form.
- BAEconomics have not been asked to undertake the sensitivity analysis of how much output prices would need to fall for the project to have a zero NPV because Hume Coal considers it to be "commercial in confidence". (EIS Appendix Q page 42). This is unacceptable and an apparent inability to meet the 2015 guidelines for an EIS.

THE REJECT EMPLACEMENT AND BULKHEAD ISSUES

- The Metropolitan Colliery emplaced at least some of their rejects in mined voids in recent years. This operation required extensive experimentation over a number of years.
- They had the advantage of knowing the exact composition of their reject material and voids that were well away from current mining areas.
- The Airly Colliery considered this method of reject disposal but decided it posed unacceptable safety and other concerns.
- In contrast the Hume EIS assumes that reject emplacement behind bulkheads is a risk free process. The design of the bulkheads is complex and their construction in an operating environment is problematic.

This is a very risky proposal and I urge the Government to reject this project.

Signed, Jeva Ponton.

If you wish to maintain your privacy in this submission from the department's website please tick this box:	
I have not made a reportable political donation,	P

Name_	t Soft
Addres	s 68 Depone Q
	Sunadoa
	NSW 2576
	Date: / 7/6/2017

GPO Box 39 Sydney NSW 2001

Signed,

This is a submission to the Hume Coal Project EIS. SSD 7172

I object to this project and believe it should be rejected due to

THE POOR ECONOMICS OF THE HUME COAL PROJECT.

From the data in the EIS it is apparent that the project is unprofitable, with negative investment returns.

- This is a small mine and costly to operate.
- The product mix revealed in the EIS results in lower revenue than previously put forward, with nearly half the production low value thermal coal.
- The only way that the mine can improve its profitability would be to significantly increase production, makingthe EIS invalid in its present form.
- BAEconomics have not been asked to undertake the sensitivity analysis of how much output
 prices would need to fall for the project to have a zero NPV because Hume Coal considers it to
 be "commercial in confidence". (EIS Appendix Q page 42). This is unacceptable and an
 apparent inability to meet the 2015 guidelines for an EIS.

THE REJECT EMPLACEMENT AND BULKHEAD ISSUES

- The Metropolitan Colliery emplaced at least some of their rejects in mined voids in recent years. This operation required extensive experimentation over a number of years.
- They had the advantage of knowing the exact composition of their reject material and voids that were well away from current mining areas.
- The Airly Colliery considered this method of reject disposal but decided it posed unacceptable safety and other concerns.
- In contrast the Hume EIS assumes that reject emplacement behind bulkheads is a risk freeprocess. The
 design of the bulkheads is complex and their construction in an operating environment is
 problematic.

If you wish to maintain your privacy in this submission from the department's website please tick this box:	
I have not made a reportable political donation.	4

Name ANTHOWY KINC
Address SG BERRIMA
Well-
2575
Date: / } / 6 / 2017

GPO Box 39 Sydney NSW 2001

Signed,

This is a submission to the Hume Coal Project EIS. SSD 7172

I object to this project and believe it should be rejected due to

THE POOR ECONOMICS OF THE HUME COAL PROJECT.

From the data in the EIS it is apparent that the project is unprofitable, with negative investment returns.

- This is a small mine and costly to operate.
- The product mix revealed in the EIS results in lower revenue than previously put forward, with nearly half the production low value thermal coal.
- The only way that the mine can improve its profitability would be to significantly increase production, makingthe EIS invalid in its present form.
- BAEconomics have not been asked to undertake the sensitivity analysis of how much output
 prices would need to fall for the project to have a zero NPV because Hume Coal considers it to
 be "commercial in confidence". (EIS Appendix Q page 42). This is unacceptable and an
 apparent inability to meet the 2015 guidelines for an EIS.

THE REJECT EMPLACEMENT AND BULKHEAD ISSUES

- The Metropolitan Colliery emplaced at least some of their rejects in mined voids in recent years. This operation required extensive experimentation over a number of years.
- They had the advantage of knowing the exact composition of their reject material and voids that were well away from current mining areas.
- The Airly Colliery considered this method of reject disposal but decided it posed unacceptable safety and other concerns.
- In contrast the Hume EIS assumes that reject emplacement behind bulkheads is a risk free process. The
 design of the bulkheads is complex and their construction in an operating environment is
 problematic.

If you wish to maintain your privacy in this submission from the department's website please tick this box:	
I have not made a reportable political donation.	0

Name Demenie Costanzo
Address 50 Ivory 85
Crace ACT
2911
Date: / / 6 / 2017
tment of Planning

GPO Box 39 Sydney NSW 2001

This is a submission to the Hume Coal Project EIS. SSD 7172

I object to this project and believe it should be rejected due to

THE POOR ECONOMICS OF THE HUME COAL PROJECT.

From the data in the EIS it is apparent that the project is unprofitable, with negative investment returns.

- This is a small mine and costly to operate.
- The product mix revealed in the EIS results in lower revenue than previously put forward, with nearly half the production low value thermal coal.
- The only way that the mine can improve its profitability would be to significantly increase production, makingthe EIS invalid in its present form.
- BAEconomics have not been asked to undertake the sensitivity analysis of how much output
 prices would need to fall for the project to have a zero NPV because Hume Coal considers it to
 be "commercial in confidence". (EIS Appendix Q page 42). This is unacceptable and an
 apparent inability to meet the 2015 guidelines for an EIS.

THE REJECT EMPLACEMENT AND BULKHEAD ISSUES

- The Metropolitan Colliery emplaced at least some of their rejects in mined voids in recent years. This operation required extensive experimentation over a number of years.
- They had the advantage of knowing the exact composition of their reject material and voids that were well away from current mining areas.
- The Airly Colliery considered this method of reject disposal but decided it posed unacceptable safety and other concerns.
- In contrast the Hume EIS assumes that reject emplacement behind bulkheads is a risk free process. The design of the bulkheads is complex and their construction in an operating environment is problematic.

This is a v	ery risky proposal and I urge the Government to reject this project.	
\$igned,		
If you	vish to maintain your privacy in this submission from the department's website please tick this box:	
I have	not made a reportable political donation.	

Name TIMA TELAUS
Address 4 UXULY Denus
BONEAL MN 757
Date: / 76 / 2017

GPO Box 39 Sydney NSW 2001

This is a submission to the Hume Coal Project EIS. SSD 7172

I object to this project and believe it should be rejected due to

THE POOR ECONOMICS OF THE HUME COAL PROJECT.

From the data in the EIS it is apparent that the project is unprofitable, with negative investment returns.

- This is a small mine and costly to operate.
- The product mix revealed in the EIS results in lower revenue than previously put forward, with nearly half the production low value thermal coal.
- The only way that the mine can improve its profitability would be to significantly increase production, making the EIS invalid in its present form.
- BAEconomics have not been asked to undertake the sensitivity analysis of how much output
 prices would need to fall for the project to have a zero NPV because Hume Coal considers it to
 be "commercial in confidence". (EIS Appendix Q page 42). This is unacceptable and an
 apparent inability to meet the 2015 guidelines for an EIS.

THE REJECT EMPLACEMENT AND BULKHEAD ISSUES

- The Metropolitan Colliery emplaced at least some of their rejects in mined voids in recent years. This operation required extensive experimentation over a number of years.
- They had the advantage of knowing the exact composition of their reject material and voids that were well away from curent mining areas.
- The Airly Colliery considered this method of reject disposal but decided it posed unacceptable safety and other concerns.
- In contrast the Hume EIS assumes that reject emplacement behind bulkheads is a risk freeprocess. The
 design of the bulkheads is complex and their construction in an operating environment is
 problematic.

This is a very risky proposal and I urge the Government to reject this project.

If you wish to maintain your privacy in this submission from the department's website please tick this box:	
I have not made a reportable political donation.	U

Name	Tay Brown Ave
Addre	ss 88 Hamneston Ave
	NSW 2174
	Date: (6 / 6 / 2017

GPO Box 39 Sydney NSW 2001

This is a submission to the Hume Coal Project EIS. SSD 7172

I object to this project and believe it should be rejected due to

THE POOR ECONOMICS OF THE HUME COAL PROJECT.

From the data in the EIS it is apparent that the project is unprofitable, with negative investment returns.

- This is a small mine and costly to operate.
- The product mix revealed in the EIS results in lower revenue than previously put forward, with nearly half the production low value thermal coal.
- The only way that the mine can improve its profitability would be to significantly increase production, makingthe EIS invalid in its present form.
- BAEconomics have not been asked to undertake the sensitivity analysis of how much output
 prices would need to fall for the project to have a zero NPV because Hume Coal considers it to
 be "commercial in confidence". (EIS Appendix Q page 42). This is unacceptable and an
 apparent inability to meet the 2015 guidelines for an EIS.

THE REJECT EMPLACEMENT AND BULKHEAD ISSUES

- The Metropolitan Colliery emplaced at least some of their rejects in mined voids in recent years. This operation required extensive experimentation over a number of years.
- They had the advantage of knowing the exact composition of their reject material and voids that were well away from curent mining areas.
- The Airly Colliery considered this method of reject disposal but decided it posed unacceptable safety and other concerns.
- In contrast the Hume EIS assumes that reject emplacement behind bulkheads is a risk free process. The
 design of the bulkheads is complex and their construction in an operating environment is
 problematic.

This is a very risky proposal and I urge the Government to reject this project.

	If you wish to maintain your privacy in this submission from the department's website please tick this box:	
	I have not made a reportable political donation.	
-		

Name_ W Racionsav	
Address 10 My 050028	53
Bounse	
	.
Date: / § / 6 / 2017	

Attn: Executive Director, Resource Assessments Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39
Sydney NSW 2001

This is a submission to the Hume Coal Project EIS. SSD 7172

I object to this project and believe it should be rejected due to

THE POOR ECONOMICS OF THE HUME COAL PROJECT.

From the data in the EIS it is apparent that the project is unprofitable, with negative investment returns.

- This is a small mine and costly to operate.
- The product mix revealed in the EIS results in lower revenue than previously put forward, with nearly half the production low value thermal coal.
- The only way that the mine can improve its profitability would be to significantly increase production, makingthe EIS invalid in its present form.
- BAEconomics have not been asked to undertake the sensitivity analysis of how much output
 prices would need to fall for the project to have a zero NPV because Hume Coal considers it to
 be "commercial in confidence". (EIS Appendix Q page 42). This is unacceptable and an
 apparent inability to meet the 2015 guidelines for an EIS.

THE REJECT EMPLACEMENT AND BULKHEAD ISSUES

- The Metropolitan Colliery emplaced at least some of their rejects in mined voids in recent years. This operation required extensive experimentation over a number of years.
- They had the advantage of knowing the exact composition of their reject material and voids that were well away from curent mining areas.
- The Airly Colliery considered this method of reject disposal but decided it posed unacceptable safety and other concerns.
- In contrast the Hume EIS assumes that reject emplacement behind bulkheads is a risk free process. The design of the bulkheads is complex and their construction in an operating environment is problematic.

This is a very risky proposal and I urge the Government to reject this project.

0/1/

If you wish to maintain your privacy in this submission from the department's website please tick this box:	
I have not made a reportable political donation.	

Name Kate Blake	
Address 6/21 Oxley Dr	, I
Bowrad 257	6
Date: 8/6/2017	-

GPO Box 39 Sydney NSW 2001

This is a submission to the Hume Coal Project EIS. SSD 7172

I object to this project and believe it should be rejected due to

THE POOR ECONOMICS OF THE HUME COAL PROJECT.

From the data in the EIS it is apparent that the project is unprofitable, with negative investment returns.

- This is a small mine and costly to operate.
- The product mix revealed in the EIS results in lower revenue than previously put forward, with nearly half the production low value thermal coal.
- The only way that the mine can improve its profitability would be to significantly increase production, makingthe EIS invalid in its present form.
- BAEconomics have not been asked to undertake the sensitivity analysis of how much output prices would need to fall for the project to have a zero NPV because Hume Coal considers it to be "commercial in confidence". (EIS Appendix Q page 42). This is unacceptable and an apparent inability to meet the 2015 guidelines for an EIS.

THE REJECT EMPLACEMENT AND BULKHEAD ISSUES

- The Metropolitan Colliery emplaced at least some of their rejects in mined voids in recent years. This operation required extensive experimentation over a number of years.
- They had the advantage of knowing the exact composition of their reject material and voids that were well away from current mining areas.
- The Airly Colliery considered this method of reject disposal but decided it posed unacceptable safety and other concerns.
- In contrast the Hume EIS assumes that reject emplacement behind bulkheads is a risk freeprocess. The
 design of the bulkheads is complex and their construction in an operating environment is
 problematic.

This is a very risky proposal and I urge the Government to reject this project.

Late Blake

If you wish to maintain your privacy in this submission from the department's website please tick this box:	
I have not made a reportable political donation.	

Name VINCENT BLOVE
Address 6/21 Oxley Dr Bound NSW 2576
Bourd NSW 2576
Date: 18 / 6 / 2017

GPO Box 39 Sydney NSW 2001

This is a submission to the Hume Coal Project EIS. SSD 7172

I object to this project and believe it should be rejected due to

THE POOR ECONOMICS OF THE HUME COAL PROJECT.

From the data in the EIS it is apparent that the project is unprofitable, with negative investment returns.

- This is a small mine and costly to operate.
- The product mix revealed in the EIS results in lower revenue than previously put forward, with nearly half the production low value thermal coal.
- The only way that the mine can improve its profitability would be to significantly increase production, makingthe EIS invalid in its present form.
- BAEconomics have not been asked to undertake the sensitivity analysis of how much output
 prices would need to fall for the project to have a zero NPV because Hume Coal considers it to
 be "commercial in confidence". (EIS Appendix Q page 42). This is unacceptable and an
 apparent inability to meet the 2015 guidelines for an EIS.

THE REJECT EMPLACEMENT AND BULKHEAD ISSUES

- The Metropolitan Colliery emplaced at least some of their rejects in mined voids in recent years. This operation required extensive experimentation over a number of years.
- They had the advantage of knowing the exact composition of their reject material and voids that were well away from current mining areas.
- The Airly Colliery considered this method of reject disposal but decided it posed unacceptable safety and other concerns.
- In contrast the Hume EIS assumes that reject emplacement behind bulkheads is a risk freeprocess. The
 design of the bulkheads is complex and their construction in an operating environment is
 problematic.

This is a very risky proposal and I urge the Government to reject this project.

Signed,	1/1/2	
	VNW D	

If you wish to maintain your privacy in this submission from the department's website please tick this box:	
I have not made a reportable political donation.	V

Name V- 1/2	NEZEVIC	
Address 18	PARMENTER	COURT
	OWRAL	
Ba	ala -	
Date:	/6/2017	

GPO Box 39 Sydnev NSW 2001

This is a submission to the Hume Coal Project EIS. SSD 7172

I object to this project and believe it should be rejected due to

THE POOR ECONOMICS OF THE HUME COAL PROJECT.

From the data in the EIS it is apparent that the project is unprofitable, with negative investment returns.

- This is a small mine and costly to operate.
- The product mix revealed in the EIS results in lower revenue than previously put forward, with nearly half the production low value thermal coal.
- The only way that the mine can improve its profitability would be to significantly increase production, makingthe EIS invalid in its present form.
- BAEconomics have not been asked to undertake the sensitivity analysis of how much output
 prices would need to fall for the project to have a zero NPV because Hume Coal considers it to
 be "commercial in confidence". (EIS Appendix Q page 42). This is unacceptable and an
 apparent inability to meet the 2015 guidelines for an EIS.

THE REJECT EMPLACEMENT AND BULKHEAD ISSUES

V Myanh

- The Metropolitan Colliery emplaced at least some of their rejects in mined voids in recent years. This operation required extensive experimentation over a number of years.
- They had the advantage of knowing the exact composition of their reject material and voids that were well away from current mining areas.
- The Airly Colliery considered this method of reject disposal but decided it posed unacceptable safety and other concerns.
- In contrast the Hume EIS assumes that reject emplacement behind bulkheads is a risk free process. The
 design of the bulkheads is complex and their construction in an operating environment is
 problematic.

This is a very risky proposal and I urge the Government to reject this project.

If you wish to maintain your privacy in this submission from the department's website please tick this box:	
I have not made a reportable political donation.	

Name_	David	Ne	ule	<u></u>
Addres	s 66	Mon	nt	12.
_	BIND	AL	NS	h
	Date: 8 /	6 / 2017	7	

GPO Box 39 Sydney NSW 2001

This is a submission to the Hume Coal Project EIS. SSD 7172

I object to this project and believe it should be rejected due to

THE POOR ECONOMICS OF THE HUME COAL PROJECT.

From the data in the EIS it is apparent that the project is unprofitable, with negative investment returns.

- This is a small mine and costly to operate.
- The product mix revealed in the EIS results in lower revenue than previously put forward, with nearly half the production low value thermal coal.
- The only way that the mine can improve its profitability would be to significantly increase production, makingthe EIS invalid in its present form.
- BAEconomics have not been asked to undertake the sensitivity analysis of how much output
 prices would need to fall for the project to have a zero NPV because Hume Coal considers it to
 be "commercial in confidence". (EIS Appendix Q page 42). This is unacceptable and an
 apparent inability to meet the 2015 guidelines for an EIS.

THE REJECT EMPLACEMENT AND BULKHEAD ISSUES

- The Metropolitan Colliery emplaced at least some of their rejects in mined voids in recent years. This operation required extensive experimentation over a number of years.
- They had the advantage of knowing the exact composition of their reject material and voids that were well away from current mining areas.
- The Airly Colliery considered this method of reject disposal but decided it posed unacceptable safety and other concerns.
- In contrast the Hume EIS assumes that reject emplacement behind bulkheads is a risk freeprocess. The
 design of the bulkheads is complex and their construction in an operating environment is
 problematic.

This is a very risky proposal and I urge the Government to reject this project.

pomi	Nede.	_

If you wish to maintain your privacy in this submission from the department's website please tick this box:	
I have not made a reportable political donation.	Ø

Name PANICLIFF	
Address 2 KIMD ENCED	う
BOWRAL.	
Date: /9/6/2017	
tment of Planning	

Attn: Executive Director, Resource Assessments Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39
Sydney NSW 2001

This is a submission to the Hume Coal Project EIS. SSD 7172

I object to this project and believe it should be rejected due to

THE POOR ECONOMICS OF THE HUME COAL PROJECT.

From the data in the EIS it is apparent that the project is unprofitable, with negative investment returns.

- This is a small mine and costly to operate.
- The product mix revealed in the EIS results in lower revenue than previously put forward, with nearly half the production low value thermal coal.
- The only way that the mine can improve its profitability would be to significantly increase production, makingthe EIS invalid in its present form.
- BAEconomics have not been asked to undertake the sensitivity analysis of how much output
 prices would need to fall for the project to have a zero NPV because Hume Coal considers it to
 be "commercial in confidence". (EIS Appendix Q page 42). This is unacceptable and an
 apparent inability to meet the 2015 guidelines for an EIS.

THE REJECT EMPLACEMENT AND BULKHEAD ISSUES

- The Metropolitan Colliery emplaced at least some of their rejects in mined voids in recent years. This operation required extensive experimentation over a number of years.
- They had the advantage of knowing the exact composition of their reject material and voids that were well away from current mining areas.
- The Airly Colliery considered this method of reject disposal but decided it posed unacceptable safety and other concerns.
- In contrast the Hume EIS assumes that reject emplacement behind bulkheads is a risk freeprocess. The
 design of the bulkheads is complex and their construction in an operating environment is
 problematic.

his is a very risky proposal and I urge the Government to reject this project.	
- CA	
If you wish to maintain your privacy in this submission from the department's website please tick this b	ox:
I have not made a reportable political donation.	

Name	Clan	dia Auser	
Address_	861	merylands	Rd
	Grey:	starys	
Da	te: \ X / 6	/ 2017	

GPO Box 39 Sydney NSW 2001

This is a submission to the Hume Coal Project EIS. SSD 7172

I object to this project and believe it should be rejected due to

THE POOR ECONOMICS OF THE HUME COAL PROJECT.

From the data in the EIS it is apparent that the project is unprofitable, with negative investment returns.

- This is a small mine and costly to operate.
- The product mix revealed in the EIS results in lower revenue than previously put forward, with nearly half the production low value thermal coal.
- The only way that the mine can improve its profitability would be to significantly increase production, making the EIS invalid in its present form.
- BAEconomics have not been asked to undertake the sensitivity analysis of how much output
 prices would need to fall for the project to have a zero NPV because Hume Coal considers it to
 be "commercial in confidence". (EIS Appendix Q page 42). This is unacceptable and an
 apparent inability to meet the 2015 guidelines for an EIS.

THE REJECT EMPLACEMENT AND BULKHEAD ISSUES

- The Metropolitan Colliery emplaced at least some of their rejects in mined voids in recent years. This operation required extensive experimentation over a number of years.
- They had the advantage of knowing the exact composition of their reject material and voids that were well away from current mining areas.
- The Airly Colliery considered this method of reject disposal but decided it posed unacceptable safety and other concerns.
- In contrast the Hume EIS assumes that reject emplacement behind bulkheads is a risk free process. The design of the bulkheads is complex and their construction in an operating environment is problematic.

This is a very risky proposal and I urge the Government to reject this project.

'leve' And

If you wish to maintain your privacy in this submission from the department's website please tick this box:	
I have not made a reportable political donation.	U

Name Michelle Dobson
Address 16 Villiere St

My field

Date: 18/6/2017

Attn: Executive Director, Resource Assessments Department of Planning and Environment

GPO Box 39 Sydney NSW 2001

This is a submission to the Hume Coal Project EIS. SSD 7172

I object to this project and believe it should be rejected due to

THE POOR ECONOMICS OF THE HUME COAL PROJECT.

From the data in the EIS it is apparent that the project is unprofitable, with negative investment returns.

- This is a small mine and costly to operate.
- The product mix revealed in the EIS results in lower revenue than previously put forward, with nearly half the production low value thermal coal.
- The only way that the mine can improve its profitability would be to significantly increase production, makingthe EIS invalid in its present form.
- BAEconomics have not been asked to undertake the sensitivity analysis of how much output
 prices would need to fall for the project to have a zero NPV because Hume Coal considers it to
 be "commercial in confidence". (EIS Appendix Q page 42). This is unacceptable and an
 apparent inability to meet the 2015 guidelines for an EIS.

THE REJECT EMPLACEMENT AND BULKHEAD ISSUES

- The Metropolitan Colliery emplaced at least some of their rejects in mined voids in recent years. This operation required extensive experimentation over a number of years.
- They had the advantage of knowing the exact composition of their reject material and voids that were well away from curent mining areas.
- The Airly Colliery considered this method of reject disposal but decided it posed unacceptable safety and other concerns.
- In contrast the Hume EIS assumes that reject emplacement behind bulkheads is a risk free process. The
 design of the bulkheads is complex and their construction in an operating environment is
 problematic.

	oblematic.	
ħ	is is a very risky proposal and I urge the Government to reject this project.	
iig	gned,	
	If you wish to maintain your privacy in this submission from the department's website please tick this box:	
	I have not made a reportable political donation.	\triangleleft

Name_	Flo	2a	Cann	on
Address	16	Kei	laway	Ave
_	Car	mde	er_	·
	25	70		
	Date: (8/6	/ 2017	

GPO Box 39 Sydney NSW 2001

Signed.

This is a submission to the Hume Coal Project ElS. SSD 7172

I object to this project and believe it should be rejected due to

THE POOR ECONOMICS OF THE HUME COAL PROJECT.

From the data in the EIS it is apparent that the project is unprofitable, with negative investment returns.

- This is a small mine and costly to operate.
- The product mix revealed in the EIS results in lower revenue than previously put forward, with nearly half the production low value thermal coal.
- The only way that the mine can improve its profitability would be to significantly increase production, makingthe EIS invalid in its present form.
- BAEconomics have not been asked to undertake the sensitivity analysis of how much output
 prices would need to fall for the project to have a zero NPV because Hume Coal considers it to
 be "commercial in confidence". (EIS Appendix Q page 42). This is unacceptable and an
 apparent inability to meet the 2015 guidelines for an EIS.

THE REJECT EMPLACEMENT AND BULKHEAD ISSUES

- The Metropolitan Colliery emplaced at least some of their rejects in mined voids in recent years. This operation required extensive experimentation over a number of years.
- They had the advantage of knowing the exact composition of their reject material and voids that were well away from current mining areas.
- The Airly Colliery considered this method of reject disposal but decided it posed unacceptable safety and other concerns.
- In contrast the Hume EIS assumes that reject emplacement behind bulkheads is a risk free process. The
 design of the bulkheads is complex and their construction in an operating environment is
 problematic.

This is a very risky proposal and I urge the Government to reject this project.

El.	
If you wish to maintain your privacy in this submission from the department's website please tick this box:	
I have not made a reportable political donation.	V

Name Scarlet Rose Weate - Jones
Address 3 Gove
Avenue Kirramee
2232
Date: () / 6 / 2017

GPO Box 39 Sydney NSW 2001

This is a submission to the Hume Coal Project EIS. SSD 7172

I object to this project and believe it should be rejected due to

THE POOR ECONOMICS OF THE HUME COAL PROJECT.

From the data in the EIS it is apparent that the project is unprofitable, with negative investment returns.

- This is a small mine and costly to operate.
- The product mix revealed in the EIS results in lower revenue than previously put forward, with nearly half the production low value thermal coal.
- The only way that the mine can improve its profitability would be to significantly increase production, makingthe EIS invalid in its present form.
- BAEconomics have not been asked to undertake the sensitivity analysis of how much output prices would need to fall for the project to have a zero NPV because Hume Coal considers it to be "commercial in confidence". (EIS Appendix Q page 42). This is unacceptable and an apparent inability to meet the 2015 guidelines for an EIS.

THE REJECT EMPLACEMENT AND BULKHEAD ISSUES

- The Metropolitan Colliery emplaced at least some of their rejects in mined voids in recent years. This operation required extensive experimentation over a number of years.
- They had the advantage of knowing the exact composition of their reject material and voids that were well away from current mining areas.
- The Airly Colliery considered this method of reject disposal but decided it posed unacceptable safety and other concerns.
- In contrast the Hume EIS assumes that reject emplacement behind bulkheads is a risk free process. The
 design of the bulkheads is complex and their construction in an operating environment is
 problematic.

This is a very risky proposal and I urge the Government to reject this project.

If you wish to maintain your privacy in this submission from the department's website please tick this box:	
I have not made a reportable political donation.	3

Name GARY	ADDIS	Coo
Address C\S	WIHERI	DRIVE
WALDARA	VIC	361
	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	_
Date:\	6 / 2017	

GPO Box 39 Sydney NSW 2001

This is a submission to the Hume Coal Project EIS. SSD 7172

I object to this project and believe it should be rejected due to

THE POOR ECONOMICS OF THE HUME COAL PROJECT.

From the data in the EIS it is apparent that the project is unprofitable, with negative investment returns.

- This is a small mine and costly to operate.
- The product mix revealed in the EIS results in lower revenue than previously put forward, with nearly half the production low value thermal coal.
- The only way that the mine can improve its profitability would be to significantly increase production, makingthe EIS invalid in its present form.
- BAEconomics have not been asked to undertake the sensitivity analysis of how much output prices would need to fall for the project to have a zero NPV because Hume Coal considers it to be "commercial in confidence". (EIS Appendix Q page 42). This is unacceptable and an apparent inability to meet the 2015 guidelines for an EIS.

THE REJECT EMPLACEMENT AND BULKHEAD ISSUES

- The Metropolitan Colliery emplaced at least some of their rejects in mined voids in recent years. This
 operation required extensive experimentation over a number of years.
- They had the advantage of knowing the exact composition of their reject material and voids that were well away from current mining areas.
- The Airly Colliery considered this method of reject disposal but decided it posed unacceptable safety and other concerns.
- In contrast the Hume EIS assumes that reject emplacement behind bulkheads is a risk free process. The
 design of the bulkheads is complex and their construction in an operating environment is
 problematic.

This is a very risky proposal and I urge the Government to reject this project.

If you wish to maintain your privacy in this submission from the department's website please tick this box:	
I have not made a reportable political donation.	×

Name Stophance DAVID
Address // BBZ 19005 ST. 2576 —
Date: / 🎖 / 6 / 2017

GPO Box 39 Sydney NSW 2001

Signed,

This is a submission to the Hume Coal Project EIS. SSD 7172

I object to this project and believe it should be rejected due to

THE POOR ECONOMICS OF THE HUME COAL PROJECT.

From the data in the EIS it is apparent that the project is unprofitable, with negative investment returns.

- This is a small mine and costly to operate.
- The product mix revealed in the EIS results in lower revenue than previously put forward, with nearly half the production low value thermal coal.
- The only way that the mine can improve its profitability would be to significantly increase production, makingthe EIS invalid in its present form.
- BAEconomics have not been asked to undertake the sensitivity analysis of how much output
 prices would need to fall for the project to have a zero NPV because Hume Coal considers it to
 be "commercial in confidence". (EIS Appendix Q page 42). This is unacceptable and an
 apparent inability to meet the 2015 guidelines for an EIS.

THE REJECT EMPLACEMENT AND BULKHEAD ISSUES

- The Metropolitan Colliery emplaced at least some of their rejects in mined voids in recent years. This operation required extensive experimentation over a number of years.
- They had the advantage of knowing the exact composition of their reject material and voids that were well away from curent mining areas.
- The Airly Colliery considered this method of reject disposal but decided it posed unacceptable safety and other concerns.
- In contrast the Hume EIS assumes that reject emplacement behind bulkheads is a risk free process. The
 design of the bulkheads is complex and their construction in an operating environment is
 problematic.

This is a very risky proposal and I urge the Government to reject this project.

Λ

Stephen -	
If you wish to maintain your privacy in this submission from the department's website please tick this box:	
I have not made a reportable political donation.	

Name Kescy Andison
Name resru hovon
Address 95 Usshers Dr
thaldara Vic
3678
Date:/\displays / 6 / 2017

GPO Box 39 Sydney NSW 2001

This is a submission to the Hume Coal Project EIS. SSD 7172

I object to this project and believe it should be rejected due to

THE POOR ECONOMICS OF THE HUME COAL PROJECT.

From the data in the EIS it is apparent that the project is unprofitable, with negative investment returns.

- This is a small mine and costly to operate.
- The product mix revealed in the EIS results in lower revenue than previously put forward, with nearly half the production low value thermal coal.
- The only way that the mine can improve its profitability would be to significantly increase production, makingthe EIS invalid in its present form.
- BAEconomics have not been asked to undertake the sensitivity analysis of how much output
 prices would need to fall for the project to have a zero NPV because Hume Coal considers it to
 be "commercial in confidence". (EIS Appendix Q page 42). This is unacceptable and an
 apparent inability to meet the 2015 guidelines for an EIS.

THE REJECT EMPLACEMENT AND BULKHEAD ISSUES

- The Metropolitan Colliery emplaced at least some of their rejects in mined voids in recent years. This operation required extensive experimentation over a number of years.
- They had the advantage of knowing the exact composition of their reject material and voids that were well away from curent mining areas.
- The Airly Colliery considered this method of reject disposal but decided it posed unacceptable safety and other concerns.
- In contrast the Hume EIS assumes that reject emplacement behind bulkheads is a risk free process. The
 design of the bulkheads is complex and their construction in an operating environment is
 problematic.

This is a very risky proposal and I urge the Government to reject this project.

Signed,	
	Λ ρ .
8.	Modeson

If you wish to maintain your privacy in this submission from the department's website please tick this box:	
I have not made a reportable political donation.	

Name	Herer Honory
Address_	6/301c600
******	St Dowal
	ate: 1 9 / 6 / 2017

GPO Box 39 Sydney NSW 2001

This is a submission to the Hume Coal Project EIS. SSD 7172

I object to this project and believe it should be rejected due to

THE POOR ECONOMICS OF THE HUME COAL PROJECT.

From the data in the EIS it is apparent that the project is unprofitable, with negative investment returns.

- This is a small mine and costly to operate.
- The product mix revealed in the EIS results in lower revenue than previously put forward, with nearly half the production low value thermal coal.
- The only way that the mine can improve its profitability would be to significantly increase production, makingthe EIS invalid in its present form.
- BAEconomics have not been asked to undertake the sensitivity analysis of how much output
 prices would need to fall for the project to have a zero NPV because Hume Coal considers it to
 be "commercial in confidence". (EIS Appendix Q page 42). This is unacceptable and an
 apparent inability to meet the 2015 guidelines for an EIS.

THE REJECT EMPLACEMENT AND BULKHEAD ISSUES

- The Metropolitan Colliery emplaced at least some of their rejects in mined voids in recent years. This operation required extensive experimentation over a number of years.
- They had the advantage of knowing the exact composition of their reject material and voids that were well away from curent mining areas.
- The Airly Colliery considered this method of reject disposal but decided it posed unacceptable safety and other concerns.
- In contrast the Hume EIS assumes that reject emplacement behind bulkheads is a risk freeprocess. The
 design of the bulkheads is complex and their construction in an operating environment is
 problematic.

This is a very risky proposal and I urge the Government to reject this project.

If you wish to maintain your privacy in this submission from the department's website please tick this box:	
I have not made a reportable political donation	

Name Stere Hastna
Address ZZ ross st
Newfort
Date: \$ \(\) 6 / 2017

GPO Box 39 Sydney NSW 2001

This is a submission to the Hume Coal Project EIS. SSD 7172

I object to this project and believe it should be rejected due to

THE POOR ECONOMICS OF THE HUME COAL PROJECT.

From the data in the EIS it is apparent that the project is unprofitable, with negative investment returns.

- This is a small mine and costly to operate.
- The product mix revealed in the EIS results in lower revenue than previously put forward, with nearly half the production low value thermal coal.
- The only way that the mine can improve its profitability would be to significantly increase production, makingthe EIS invalid in its present form.
- BAEconomics have not been asked to undertake the sensitivity analysis of how much output
 prices would need to fall for the project to have a zero NPV because Hume Coal considers it to
 be "commercial in confidence". (EIS Appendix Q page 42). This is unacceptable and an
 apparent inability to meet the 2015 guidelines for an EIS.

THE REJECT EMPLACEMENT AND BULKHEAD ISSUES

- The Metropolitan Colliery emplaced at least some of their rejects in mined voids in recent years. This operation required extensive experimentation over a number of years.
- They had the advantage of knowing the exact composition of their reject material and voids that were well away from curent mining areas.
- The Airly Colliery considered this method of reject disposal but decided it posed unacceptable safety and other concerns.
- In contrast the Hume EIS assumes that reject emplacement behind bulkheads is a risk freeprocess. The
 design of the bulkheads is complex and their construction in an operating environment is
 problematic.

nis is a very risky proposal and I urge_the Government to reject this project.	
If you wish to maintain your privacy in this submission from the department's website please tick this box:	
I have not made a reportable political donation.	

Name Deborah Gilroy	
Name Deborah Gilroy Address 13 Edwards 1	
mi Hagong 2575	
Date: 18/6/2017	

GPO Box 39 Sydney NSW 2001

This is a submission to the Hume Coal Project EIS. SSD 7172

I object to this project and believe it should be rejected due to

THE POOR ECONOMICS OF THE HUME COAL PROJECT.

From the data in the EIS it is apparent that the project is unprofitable, with negative investment returns.

- This is a small mine and costly to operate.
- The product mix revealed in the EIS results in lower revenue than previously put forward, with nearly half the production low value thermal coal.
- The only way that the mine can improve its profitability would be to significantly increase production, makingthe EIS invalid in its present form.
- BAEconomics have not been asked to undertake the sensitivity analysis of how much output
 prices would need to fall for the project to have a zero NPV because Hume Coal considers it to
 be "commercial in confidence". (EIS Appendix Q page 42). This is unacceptable and an
 apparent inability to meet the 2015 guidelines for an EIS.

THE REJECT EMPLACEMENT AND BULKHEAD ISSUES

D. G. Morg

- The Metropolitan Colliery emplaced at least some of their rejects in mined voids in recent years. This operation required extensive experimentation over a number of years.
- They had the advantage of knowing the exact composition of their reject material and voids that were well away from curent mining areas.
- The Airly Colliery considered this method of reject disposal but decided it posed unacceptable safety and other concerns.
- In contrast the Hume EIS assumes that reject emplacement behind bulkheads is a risk freeprocess. The
 design of the bulkheads is complex and their construction in an operating environment is
 problematic.

This is a very risky proposal and I urge the Government to reject this project.

If you wish to maintain your privacy in this submission from the department's website please tick this box:	
I have not made a reportable political donation.	

Name Mangaret Renaud
Address POBOX 28
Fairy Meadow
25/9
Date: 6 / 6 / 2017
tment of Planning

Attn: Executive Director, Resource Assessments Depar and Environment GPO Box 39 Sydney NSW 2001

This is a submission to the Hume Coal Project EIS. SSD 7172

I object to this project and believe it should be rejected due to

THE POOR ECONOMICS OF THE HUME COAL PROJECT.

From the data in the EIS it is apparent that the project is unprofitable, with negative investment returns.

- This is a small mine and costly to operate.
- The product mix revealed in the EIS results in lower revenue than previously put forward, with nearly half the production low value thermal coal.
- The only way that the mine can improve its profitability would be to significantly increase production, makingthe EIS invalid in its present form.
- BAEconomics have not been asked to undertake the sensitivity analysis of how much output prices would need to fall for the project to have a zero NPV because Hume Coal considers it to be "commercial in confidence". (EIS Appendix Q page 42). This is unacceptable and an apparent inability to meet the 2015 guidelines for an EIS.

THE REJECT EMPLACEMENT AND BULKHEAD ISSUES

- The Metropolitan Colliery emplaced at least some of their rejects in mined voids in recent years. This operation required extensive experimentation over a number of years.
- They had the advantage of knowing the exact composition of their reject material and voids that were well away from current mining areas.
- The Airly Colliery considered this method of reject disposal but decided it posed unacceptable safety and
- In contrast the Hume EIS assumes that reject emplacement behind bulkheads is a risk free process. The design of the bulkheads is complex and their construction in an operating environment is problematic.

ŧη	is is a very risky proposal and I urge the Government to reject this project.	
Sig	ned,	
	maronaud	
	If you wish to maintain your privacy in this submission from the department's website please tick this box:	
	I have not made a reportable political donation.	\Box

Name David Barbuto
Address 32 Osborne D/
Burradoo NOV 2576
<u>NSU 037</u> 6

Date:// /6/2017

Attn: Executive Director, Resource Assessments Department of Planning and Environment
GPO Box 39

GPO Box 39 Sydney NSW 2001

This is a submission to the Hume Coal Project EIS. SSD 7172

I object to this project and believe it should be rejected due to

THE POOR ECONOMICS OF THE HUME COAL PROJECT.

From the data in the EIS it is apparent that the project is unprofitable, with negative investment returns.

- This is a small mine and costly to operate.
- The product mix revealed in the EIS results in lower revenue than previously put forward, with nearly half the production low value thermal coal.
- The only way that the mine can improve its profitability would be to significantly increase production, makingthe EIS invalid in its present form.
- BAEconomics have not been asked to undertake the sensitivity analysis of how much output
 prices would need to fall for the project to have a zero NPV because Hume Coal considers it to
 be "commercial in confidence". (EIS Appendix Q page 42). This is unacceptable and an
 apparent inability to meet the 2015 guidelines for an EIS.

THE REJECT EMPLACEMENT AND BULKHEAD ISSUES

- The Metropolitan Colliery emplaced at least some of their rejects in mined voids in recent years. This operation required extensive experimentation over a number of years.
- They had the advantage of knowing the exact composition of their reject material and voids that were well away from current mining areas.
- The Airly Colliery considered this method of reject disposal but decided it posed unacceptable safety and other concerns.
- In contrast the Hume EIS assumes that reject emplacement behind bulkheads is a risk freeprocess. The
 design of the bulkheads is complex and their construction in an operating environment is
 problematic.

problematic.	
This is a very risky proposal and urge the Government to reject this project. Signed,	
If you wish to maintain your privacy in this submission from the department's website please tick this box:	
I have not made a reportable political donation.	

Name ANN BEAUMONT
Address 54/502/ Moss Vale Rod BOXDRAG
BOWRAL
Date: 18 / 6 / 2017

Attn: Executive Director, Resource Assessments Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39
Sydney NSW 2001

This is a submission to the Hume Coal Project EIS. SSD 7172

I object to this project and believe it should be rejected due to

THE POOR ECONOMICS OF THE HUME COAL PROJECT.

From the data in the EIS it is apparent that the project is unprofitable, with negative investment returns.

• This is a small mine and costly to operate.

Signed,

- The product mix revealed in the EIS results in lower revenue than previously put forward, with nearly half the production low value thermal coal.
- The only way that the mine can improve its profitability would be to significantly increase production, makingthe EIS invalid in its present form.
- BAEconomics have not been asked to undertake the sensitivity analysis of how much output prices would need to fall for the project to have a zero NPV because Hume Coal considers it to be "commercial in confidence". (EIS Appendix Q page 42). This is unacceptable and an apparent inability to meet the 2015 guidelines for an EIS.

THE REJECT EMPLACEMENT AND BULKHEAD ISSUES

- The Metropolitan Colliery emplaced at least some of their rejects in mined voids in recent years. This operation required extensive experimentation over a number of years.
- They had the advantage of knowing the exact composition of their reject material and voids that were well away from current mining areas.
- The Airly Colliery considered this method of reject disposal but decided it posed unacceptable safety and other concerns.
- In contrast the Hume EIS assumes that reject emplacement behind bulkheads is a risk free process. The design of the bulkheads is complex and their construction in an operating environment is problematic.

This is a very risky proposal and I urge the Government to reject this project.

Lex	NG Leaumon	
If you wish to main	tain your privacy in this submission from the department's website please tick this box:	

Name CONNED Johnson
Address 9 Lyresiph CLOSE SHELL HARBUR
SHELL HARBUR

Date: /6/2017

Attn: Executive Director, Resource Assessments Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39
Sydney NSW 2001

This is a submission to the Hume Coal Project EIS. SSD 7172

I object to this project and believe it should be rejected due to

THE POOR ECONOMICS OF THE HUME COAL PROJECT.

From the data in the EIS it is apparent that the project is unprofitable, with negative investment returns.

- This is a small mine and costly to operate.
- The product mix revealed in the EIS results in lower revenue than previously put forward, with nearly half the production low value thermal coal.
- The only way that the mine can improve its profitability would be to significantly increase production, makingthe EIS invalid in its present form.
- BAEconomics have not been asked to undertake the sensitivity analysis of how much output
 prices would need to fall for the project to have a zero NPV because Hume Coal considers it to
 be "commercial in confidence". (EIS Appendix Q page 42). This is unacceptable and an
 apparent inability to meet the 2015 guidelines for an EIS.

THE REJECT EMPLACEMENT AND BULKHEAD ISSUES

- The Metropolitan Colliery emplaced at least some of their rejects in mined voids in recent years. This operation required extensive experimentation over a number of years.
- They had the advantage of knowing the exact composition of their reject material and voids that were well away from current mining areas.
- The Airly Colliery considered this method of reject disposal but decided it posed unacceptable safety and other concerns.
- In contrast the Hume EIS assumes that reject emplacement behind bulkheads is a risk freeprocess. The design of the bulkheads is complex and their construction in an operating environment is problematic.

This is a very risky proposal and I urge the Government to reject this project.

If you wish to maintain your privacy in this submission from the department's website please tick this box:	
I have not made a reportable political donation.	

Name Kellie Barker
Address 40 Handley's
Lone Highrouge
Date://8/6/2017

Attn: Executive Director, Resource Assessments Department of Planning and Environment

GPO Box 39

Sydney NSW 2001

This is a submission to the Hume Coal Project EIS. SSD 7172

I object to this project and believe it should be rejected due to

THE POOR ECONOMICS OF THE HUME COAL PROJECT.

From the data in the EIS it is apparent that the project is unprofitable, with negative investment returns.

- This is a small mine and costly to operate.
- The product mix revealed in the EIS results in lower revenue than previously put forward, with nearly half the production low value thermal coal.
- The only way that the mine can improve its profitability would be to significantly increase production, makingthe EIS invalid in its present form.
- BAEconomics have not been asked to undertake the sensitivity analysis of how much output
 prices would need to fall for the project to have a zero NPV because Hume Coal considers it to
 be "commercial in confidence". (EIS Appendix Q page 42). This is unacceptable and an
 apparent inability to meet the 2015 guidelines for an EIS.

THE REJECT EMPLACEMENT AND BULKHEAD ISSUES

- The Metropolitan Colliery emplaced at least some of their rejects in mined voids in recent years. This operation required extensive experimentation over a number of years.
- They had the advantage of knowing the exact composition of their reject material and voids that were well away from current mining areas.
- The Airly Colliery considered this method of reject disposal but decided it posed unacceptable safety and other concerns.
- In contrast the Hume EIS assumes that reject emplacement behind bulkheads is a risk freeprocess. The
 design of the bulkheads is complex and their construction in an operating environment is
 problematic.

This is a very risky proposal and I urge the Government to reject this project.

Lethe Barker

If you wish to maintain your privacy in this submission from the department's website please tick this box:	
I have not made a reportable political donation.	

Name bh Bailey
Address 40 HANDLEYS LANE
HIGH RANGE
Date: /6/2017

Attn: Executive Director, Resource Assessments Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39
Sydney NSW 2001

This is a submission to the Hume Coal Project EIS. SSD 7172

I object to this project and believe it should be rejected due to

THE POOR ECONOMICS OF THE HUME COAL PROJECT.

From the data in the EIS it is apparent that the project is unprofitable, with negative investment returns.

- This is a small mine and costly to operate.
- The product mix revealed in the EIS results in lower revenue than previously put forward, with nearly half the production low value thermal coal.
- The only way that the mine can improve its profitability would be to significantly increase production, makingthe EIS invalid in its present form.
- BAEconomics have not been asked to undertake the sensitivity analysis of how much output
 prices would need to fall for the project to have a zero NPV because Hume Coal considers it to
 be "commercial in confidence". (EIS Appendix Q page 42). This is unacceptable and an
 apparent inability to meet the 2015 guidelines for an EIS.

THE REJECT EMPLACEMENT AND BULKHEAD ISSUES

- The Metropolitan Colliery emplaced at least some of their rejects in mined voids in recent years. This operation required extensive experimentation over a number of years.
- They had the advantage of knowing the exact composition of their reject material and voids that were well away from current mining areas.
- The Airly Colliery considered this method of reject disposal but decided it posed unacceptable safety and other concerns.
- In contrast the Hume EIS assumes that reject emplacement behind bulkheads is a risk free process. The
 design of the bulkheads is complex and their construction in an operating environment is
 problematic.

This is a very risky proposal and I urge the Government to reject this project.

X

Name ANNA AGSI
Address 8 Framan al
Dingle 4 Village
VC 3172

Date: /6/2017

Attn: Executive Director, Resource Assessments Department of Planning and Environment

GPO Box 39

GPO Box 39 Sydney NSW 2001

This is a submission to the Hume Coal Project EIS. SSD 7172

I object to this project and believe it should be rejected due to

THE POOR ECONOMICS OF THE HUME COAL PROJECT.

From the data in the EIS it is apparent that the project is unprofitable, with negative investment returns.

- This is a small mine and costly to operate.
- The product mix revealed in the EIS results in lower revenue than previously put forward, with nearly half the production low value thermal coal.
- The only way that the mine can improve its profitability would be to significantly increase production, makingthe EIS invalid in its present form.
- BAEconomics have not been asked to undertake the sensitivity analysis of how much output
 prices would need to fall for the project to have a zero NPV because Hume Coal considers it to
 be "commercial in confidence". (EIS Appendix Q page 42). This is unacceptable and an
 apparent inability to meet the 2015 guidelines for an EIS.

THE REJECT EMPLACEMENT AND BULKHEAD ISSUES

- The Metropolitan Colliery emplaced at least some of their rejects in mined voids in recent years. This operation required extensive experimentation over a number of years.
- They had the advantage of knowing the exact composition of their reject material and voids that were well away from current mining areas.
- The Airly Colliery considered this method of reject disposal but decided it posed unacceptable safety and other concerns.
- In contrast the Hume EIS assumes that reject emplacement behind bulkheads is a risk freeprocess. The
 design of the bulkheads is complex and their construction in an operating environment is
 problematic.

This is a very risky proposal and I urge the Government to reject this project.

If you wish to maintain your privacy in this submission from the department's website please tick this box:	
I have not made a reportable political donation.	

Name MARILYM CAVAMALI
Address 20 GIBRALTON Re
BOWRAL USLE
Date / 8 / 6 / 2017

Attn: Executive Director, Resource Assessments Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39 Sydney NSW 2001

This is a submission to the Hume Coal Project EIS. SSD 7172

I object to this project and believe it should be rejected due to

THE POOR ECONOMICS OF THE HUME COAL PROJECT.

From the data in the EIS it is apparent that the project is unprofitable, with negative investment returns.

- This is a small mine and costly to operate.
- The product mix revealed in the EIS results in lower revenue than previously put forward, with nearly half the production low value thermal coal.
- The only way that the mine can improve its profitability would be to significantly increase production, makingthe EIS invalid in its present form.
- BAEconomics have not been asked to undertake the sensitivity analysis of how much output
 prices would need to fall for the project to have a zero NPV because Hume Coal considers it to
 be "commercial in confidence". (EIS Appendix Q page 42). This is unacceptable and an
 apparent inability to meet the 2015 guidelines for an EIS.

THE REJECT EMPLACEMENT AND BULKHEAD ISSUES

Mul

- The Metropolitan Colliery emplaced at least some of their rejects in mined voids in recent years. This operation required extensive experimentation over a number of years.
- They had the advantage of knowing the exact composition of their reject material and voids that were well away from curent mining areas.
- The Airly Colliery considered this method of reject disposal but decided it posed unacceptable safety and other concerns.
- In contrast the Hume EIS assumes that reject emplacement behind bulkheads is a risk freeprocess. The
 design of the bulkheads is complex and their construction in an operating environment is
 problematic.

This is a very risky proposal and I urge the Government to reject this project.

If you wish to maintain your privacy in this submission from the department's website please tick this box:	
I have not made a reportable political donation.	世

Name Daniel	Cow	61
Address 20/1	Pitt	Street
Randwich	2	231
Sydney		
Date: / 🗸 / (6 / 2017	

GPO Box 39 Sydney NSW 2001

This is a submission to the Hume Coal Project EIS. SSD 7172

I object to this project and believe it should be rejected due to

THE POOR ECONOMICS OF THE HUME COAL PROJECT.

From the data in the EIS it is apparent that the project is unprofitable, with negative investment returns.

- This is a small mine and costly to operate.
- The product mix revealed in the EIS results in lower revenue than previously put forward, with nearly half the production low value thermal coal.
- The only way that the mine can improve its profitability would be to significantly increase production, makingthe EIS invalid in its present form.
- BAEconomics have not been asked to undertake the sensitivity analysis of how much output
 prices would need to fall for the project to have a zero NPV because Hume Coal considers it to
 be "commercial in confidence". (EIS Appendix Q page 42). This is unacceptable and an
 apparent inability to meet the 2015 guidelines for an EIS.

THE REJECT EMPLACEMENT AND BULKHEAD ISSUES

fact but

- The Metropolitan Colliery emplaced at least some of their rejects in mined voids in recent years. This operation required extensive experimentation over a number of years.
- They had the advantage of knowing the exact composition of their reject material and voids that were well away from current mining areas.
- The Airly Colliery considered this method of reject disposal but decided it posed unacceptable safety and other concerns.
- In contrast the Hume EIS assumes that reject emplacement behind bulkheads is a risk freeprocess. The
 design of the bulkheads is complex and their construction in an operating environment is
 problematic.

This is a very risky proposal and I urge the Government to reject this project.

If you wish to maintain your privacy in this submission from the department's website please tick this box:	
I have not made a reportable political donation.	Q

Name (Na B	other	24
Address 64		_	
_ba	ndan	aon	
Date:	18/6/2	2017	

Attn: Executive Director, Resource Assessments Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39 Sydney NSW 2001

This is a submission to the Hume Coal Project EIS. SSD 7172

I object to this project and believe it should be rejected due to

THE POOR ECONOMICS OF THE HUME COAL PROJECT.

From the data in the EIS it is apparent that the project is unprofitable, with negative investment returns.

- This is a small mine and costly to operate.
- The product mix revealed in the EIS results in lower revenue than previously put forward, with nearly half the production low value thermal coal.
- The only way that the mine can improve its profitability would be to significantly increase production, makingthe EIS invalid in its present form.
- BAEconomics have not been asked to undertake the sensitivity analysis of how much output prices would need to fall for the project to have a zero NPV because Hume Coal considers it to be "commercial in confidence". (EIS Appendix Q page 42). This is unacceptable and an apparent inability to meet the 2015 guidelines for an EIS.

THE REJECT EMPLACEMENT AND BULKHEAD ISSUES

- The Metropolitan Colliery emplaced at least some of their rejects in mined voids in recent years. This operation required extensive experimentation over a number of years.
- They had the advantage of knowing the exact composition of their reject material and voids that were well away from current mining areas.
- The Airly Colliery considered this method of reject disposal but decided it posed unacceptable safety and other concerns.
- In contrast the Hume EIS assumes that reject emplacement behind bulkheads is a risk freeprocess. The
 design of the bulkheads is complex and their construction in an operating environment is
 problematic.

This is a very risky proposal and I urge the Government to reject this project.

If you wish to maintain your privacy in this submission from the department's website please tick this box:	
I have not made a reportable political donation.	×

Name JULIE BATTERBY
Address 64 BLUZ 4UM AD
BUNDALOON NOW
Date: 8/6/2017

Attn: Executive Director, Resource Assessments Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39
Sydney NSW 2001

This is a submission to the Hume Coal Project EIS. SSD 7172

I object to this project and believe it should be rejected due to

THE POOR ECONOMICS OF THE HUME COAL PROJECT.

From the data in the EIS it is apparent that the project is unprofitable, with negative investment returns.

- This is a small mine and costly to operate.
- The product mix revealed in the EIS results in lower revenue than previously put forward, with nearly half the production low value thermal coal.
- The only way that the mine can improve its profitability would be to significantly increase production, makingthe EIS invalid in its present form.
- BAEconomics have not been asked to undertake the sensitivity analysis of how much output
 prices would need to fall for the project to have a zero NPV because Hume Coal considers it to
 be "commercial in confidence". (EIS Appendix Q page 42). This is unacceptable and an
 apparent inability to meet the 2015 guidelines for an EIS.

THE REJECT EMPLACEMENT AND BULKHEAD ISSUES

- The Metropolitan Colliery emplaced at least some of their rejects in mined voids in recent years. This operation required extensive experimentation over a number of years.
- They had the advantage of knowing the exact composition of their reject material and voids that were well away from current mining areas.
- The Airly Colliery considered this method of reject disposal but decided it posed unacceptable safety and other concerns.
- In contrast the Hume EIS assumes that reject emplacement behind bulkheads is a risk freeprocess. The
 design of the bulkheads is complex and their construction in an operating environment is
 problematic.

This is a very risky proposal and I urge the Government to reject this project.

If you wish to maintain your privacy in this submission from the department's website please tick this box:	
I have not made a reportable political donation.	

I have not made a reportable political donation.

	1 1 11 12 22 18
Nar	ne
Add	ress 19 DRAYTON AUG
	CASTLE HILL
	Date: /8/6/2017
Attn: Executive Director, Resource Assessments Department and Environment GPO Box 39 Sydney NSW 2001	nt of Planning
This is a submission to the Hume Coal Project Els	S. SSD 7172
I object to this project and believe it should be rejected due THE POOR ECONOMICS OF THE HUME COAL PROJECT. From the data in the EIS it is apparent that the project is unpro	e to
This is a small mine and costly to operate. The product mix revealed in the EIS results in lower revenue to nearly half the production low value thermal coal. The only way that the mine can improve its profitability would production, makingthe EIS invalid in its present form. BAEconomics have not been asked to undertake the sensitivity prices would need to fall for the project to have a zero NPV be be "commercial in confidence". (EIS Appendix Q page 42). This apparent inability to meet the 2015 guidelines for an EIS.	han previously put forward, with be to significantly increase y analysis of how much output cause Hume Coal considers it to
THE REJECT EMPLACEMENT AND BULKHEAD ISSUES	
The Metropolitan Colliery emplaced at least some of their reject operation required extensive experimentation over a number of they had the advantage of knowing the exact composition of the well away from current mining areas. The Airly Colliery considered this method of reject disposal but other concerns. In contrast the Hume EIS assumes that reject emplacement be design of the bulkheads is complex and their construction in an problematic.	of years. heir reject material and voids that were t decided it posed unacceptable safety and hind bulkheads is a risk freeprocess. The
This is a very risky proposal and I urge the Government to reje Signed,	ct this project.
(
If you wish to maintain your privacy in this submission from the depar	tment's website please tick this box:

Name P. R. XAN
Address 2/95 Mount SC-
Corgee
2034
Date: 1 6 / 2017

GPO Box 39 Sydney NSW 2001

Signed,

This is a submission to the Hume Coal Project EIS. SSD 7172

I object to this project and believe it should be rejected due to

THE POOR ECONOMICS OF THE HUME COAL PROJECT.

From the data in the EIS it is apparent that the project is unprofitable, with negative investment returns.

- This is a small mine and costly to operate.
- The product mix revealed in the EIS results in lower revenue than previously put forward, with nearly half the production low value thermal coal.
- The only way that the mine can improve its profitability would be to significantly increase production, makingthe EIS invalid in its present form.
- BAEconomics have not been asked to undertake the sensitivity analysis of how much output
 prices would need to fall for the project to have a zero NPV because Hume Coal considers it to
 be "commercial in confidence". (EIS Appendix Q page 42). This is unacceptable and an
 apparent inability to meet the 2015 guidelines for an EIS.

THE REJECT EMPLACEMENT AND BULKHEAD ISSUES

- The Metropolitan Colliery emplaced at least some of their rejects in mined voids in recent years. This operation required extensive experimentation over a number of years.
- They had the advantage of knowing the exact composition of their reject material and voids that were well away from current mining areas.
- The Airly Colliery considered this method of reject disposal but decided it posed unacceptable safety and other concerns.
- In contrast the Hume EIS assumes that reject emplacement behind bulkheads is a risk freeprocess. The
 design of the bulkheads is complex and their construction in an operating environment is
 problematic.

This is a very risky proposal and I urge the Government to reject this project.

If you wish to maintain your privacy in this submission from the department's website please tick this box:	
I have not made a reportable political donation.	

Name ROSLYN SAVA	ノモ
Address 102 Maran	RD
Forest Lodge	-
	_
Date: / 8/6/2017	

Sydney NSW 2001

Signed,

1

This is a submission to the Hume Coal Project EIS. SSD 7172

I object to this project and believe it should be rejected due to

THE POOR ECONOMICS OF THE HUME COAL PROJECT.

From the data in the EIS it is apparent that the project is unprofitable, with negative investment returns.

- This is a small mine and costly to operate.
- The product mix revealed in the EIS results in lower revenue than previously put forward, with nearly half the production low value thermal coal.
- The only way that the mine can improve its profitability would be to significantly increase production, making the EIS invalid in its present form.
- BAEconomics have not been asked to undertake the sensitivity analysis of how much output prices would need to fall for the project to have a zero NPV because Hume Coal considers it to be "commercial in confidence". (EIS Appendix Q page 42). This is unacceptable and an apparent inability to meet the 2015 guidelines for an EIS.

THE REJECT EMPLACEMENT AND BULKHEAD ISSUES

I have not made a reportable political donation.

- The Metropolitan Colliery emplaced at least some of their rejects in mined voids in recent years. This operation required extensive experimentation over a number of years.
- They had the advantage of knowing the exact composition of their reject material and voids that were well away from current mining areas.
- The Airly Colliery considered this method of reject disposal but decided it posed unacceptable safety and other concerns.
- In contrast the Hume EIS assumes that reject emplacement behind bulkheads is a risk free process. The design of the bulkheads is complex and their construction in an operating environment is problematic.

This is a very risky proposal and I urge the Government to reject this project.

RBango	
If you wish to maintain your privacy in this submission from the department's website please tick this box:	Ī

Name Ruffina Force

Address 38 Morrigano

5+ Bangl

2576

Date: 18/6/2017

Attn: Executive Director, Resource Assessments Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39

GPO Box 39 Sydney NSW 2001

This is a submission to the Hume Coal Project EIS. SSD 7172

I object to this project and believe it should be rejected due to

THE POOR ECONOMICS OF THE HUME COAL PROJECT.

From the data in the EIS it is apparent that the project is unprofitable, with negative investment returns.

- This is a small mine and costly to operate.
- The product mix revealed in the EIS results in lower revenue than previously put forward, with nearly half the production low value thermal coal.
- The only way that the mine can improve its profitability would be to significantly increase production, makingthe EIS invalid in its present form.
- BAEconomics have not been asked to undertake the sensitivity analysis of how much output
 prices would need to fall for the project to have a zero NPV because Hume Coal considers it to
 be "commercial in confidence". (EIS Appendix Q page 42). This is unacceptable and an
 apparent inability to meet the 2015 guidelines for an EIS.

THE REJECT EMPLACEMENT AND BULKHEAD ISSUES

- The Metropolitan Colliery emplaced at least some of their rejects in mined voids in recent years. This operation required extensive experimentation over a number of years.
- They had the advantage of knowing the exact composition of their reject material and voids that were well away from curent mining areas.
- The Airly Colliery considered this method of reject disposal but decided it posed unacceptable safety and other concerns.
- In contrast the Hume EIS assumes that reject emplacement behind bulkheads is a risk free process. The design of the bulkheads is complex and their construction in an operating environment is problematic.

This is a very risky proposal and I urge the Government to reject this project.

If you wish to maintain your privacy in this submission from the department's website please tick this box:	
I have not made a reportable political donation.	V

	1.0
	Name
	Address 103 / 1 Caronahon Ave
	lekroham
	Address 103 i 1 Cononation Are Retiretion 2049
	Date: 16 / 6 / 2017
Attn: Executive Director, Resource Assessments and Environment GPO Box 39 Sydney NSW 2001	Department of Planning
This is a submission to the Hume Coal Pr	roject EIS. SSD 7172
This is a small mine and costly to operate. The product mix revealed in the EIS results in lowe nearly half the production low value thermal coal. The only way that the mine can improve its profital production, makingthe EIS invalid in its present for BAEconomics have not been asked to undertake the prices would need to fall for the project to have as be "commercial in confidence". (EIS Appendix Q parapparent inability to meet the 2015 guidelines for THE REJECT EMPLACEMENT AND BULKHEAD ISSUES. The Metropolitan Colliery emplaced at least some operation required extensive experimentation over They had the advantage of knowing the exact compared away from current mining areas. The Airly Colliery considered this method of reject other concerns.	jectis unprofitable, with negative investment returns. r revenue than previously put forward, with bility would be to significantly increase m. ne sensitivity analysis of how much output zero NPV because Hume Coal considers it to age 42). This is unacceptable and an an EIS. of their rejects in mined voids in recent years. This ra number of years. position of their reject material and voids that were disposal but decided it posed unacceptable safety and accement behind bulkheads is a risk freeprocess. The
This is a very risky proposal and I urge the Governr Signed,	nent to reject this project.
If you wish to maintain your privacy in this submission fi	rom the department's website please tick this box:
I have not made a reportable political donation.	

Name_	VAMES	Merchan	nt_
Address		, 3-7a	Alrak
	51	x. Ida	
	VIC	3,82	
	Date: / 🗸 /	6 / 2017	

Attn: Executive Director, Resource Assessments Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39
Sydney NSW 2001

This is a submission to the Hume Coal Project EIS. SSD 7172

I object to this project and believe it should be rejected due to

THE POOR ECONOMICS OF THE HUME COAL PROJECT.

From the data in the EIS it is apparent that the project is unprofitable, with negative investment returns.

- This is a small mine and costly to operate.
- The product mix revealed in the EIS results in lower revenue than previously put forward, with nearly half the production low value thermal coal.
- The only way that the mine can improve its profitability would be to significantly increase production, makingthe EIS invalid in its present form.
- BAEconomics have not been asked to undertake the sensitivity analysis of how much output prices would need to fall for the project to have a zero NPV because Hume Coal considers it to be "commercial in confidence". (EIS Appendix Q page 42). This is unacceptable and an apparent inability to meet the 2015 guidelines for an EIS.

THE REJECT EMPLACEMENT AND BULKHEAD ISSUES

10/1

- The Metropolitan Colliery emplaced at least some of their rejects in mined voids in recent years. This operation required extensive experimentation over a number of years.
- They had the advantage of knowing the exact composition of their reject material and voids that were well away from curent mining areas.
- The Airly Colliery considered this method of reject disposal but decided it posed unacceptable safety and other concerns.
- In contrast the Hume EIS assumes that reject emplacement behind bulkheads is a risk free process. The
 design of the bulkheads is complex and their construction in an operating environment is
 problematic.

This is a very risky proposal and I urge the Government to reject this project.

- 1 / Qi ohm	
If you wish to maintain your privacy in this submission from the department's website please tick this box:	
I have not made a reportable political donation.	V

Name 1	EL=	1214	7RV.	15°
Address		A54		12d
	130	OKAI		
 Date	:17/6/	2017		

GPO Box 39 Sydney NSW 2001

Signed,

This is a submission to the Hume Coal Project EIS. SSD 7172

I object to this project and believe it should be rejected due to

THE POOR ECONOMICS OF THE HUME COAL PROJECT.

From the data in the EIS it is apparent that the project is unprofitable, with negative investment returns.

- This is a small mine and costly to operate.
- The product mix revealed in the EIS results in lower revenue than previously put forward, with nearly half the production low value thermal coal.
- The only way that the mine can improve its profitability would be to significantly increase production, makingthe EIS invalid in its present form.
- BAEconomics have not been asked to undertake the sensitivity analysis of how much output
 prices would need to fall for the project to have a zero NPV because Hume Coal considers it to
 be "commercial in confidence". (EIS Appendix Q page 42). This is unacceptable and an
 apparent inability to meet the 2015 guidelines for an EIS.

THE REJECT EMPLACEMENT AND BULKHEAD ISSUES

- The Metropolitan Colliery emplaced at least some of their rejects in mined voids in recent years. This operation required extensive experimentation over a number of years.
- They had the advantage of knowing the exact composition of their reject material and voids that were well away from current mining areas.
- The Airly Colliery considered this method of reject disposal but decided it posed unacceptable safety and other concerns.
- In contrast the Hume EIS assumes that reject emplacement behind bulkheads is a risk freeprocess. The
 design of the bulkheads is complex and their construction in an operating environment is
 problematic.

This is a very risky proposal and I urge the Government to reject this project.

If you wish to maintain your privacy in this submission from the department's website please tick this box:	
I have not made a reportable political donation.	Ø

Name_	Inliet Behvers
Addres	s 3 rode Pl
	Holes
_	ALT 260+
÷	Date: 1 / 6 / 2017

GPO Box 39 Sydney NSW 2001

This is a submission to the Hume Coal Project EIS. SSD 7172

I object to this project and believe it should be rejected due to

THE POOR ECONOMICS OF THE HUME COAL PROJECT.

From the data in the EIS it is apparent that the project is unprofitable, with negative investment returns.

- This is a small mine and costly to operate.
- The product mix revealed in the EIS results in lower revenue than previously put forward, with nearly half the production low value thermal coal.
- The only way that the mine can improve its profitability would be to significantly increase production, makingthe EIS invalid in its present form.
- BAEconomics have not been asked to undertake the sensitivity analysis of how much output
 prices would need to fall for the project to have a zero NPV because Hume Coal considers it to
 be "commercial in confidence". (EIS Appendix Q page 42). This is unacceptable and an
 apparent inability to meet the 2015 guidelines for an EIS.

THE REJECT EMPLACEMENT AND BULKHEAD ISSUES

- The Metropolitan Colliery emplaced at least some of their rejects in mined voids in recent years. This operation required extensive experimentation over a number of years.
- They had the advantage of knowing the exact composition of their reject material and voids that were well away from current mining areas.
- The Airly Colliery considered this method of reject disposal but decided it posed unacceptable safety and other concerns.
- In contrast the Hume EIS assumes that reject emplacement behind bulkheads is a risk free process. The design of the bulkheads is complex and their construction in an operating environment is problematic.

This is a very risky proposal and I urge the Government to reject this project.	
signed,	
If you wish to maintain your privacy in this submission from the department's website please tick this box:	
I have not made a reportable political donation.	

Name Martin Miller
Address 57 Hmarca
Dagsa
Date:/8-/6/2017

Sydney NSW 2001

This is a submission to the Hume Coal Project EIS. SSD 7172

I object to this project and believe it should be rejected due to

THE POOR ECONOMICS OF THE HUME COAL PROJECT.

From the data in the EIS it is apparent that the project is unprofitable, with negative investment returns.

- This is a small mine and costly to operate.
- The product mix revealed in the EIS results in lower revenue than previously put forward, with nearly half the production low value thermal coal.
- The only way that the mine can improve its profitability would be to significantly increase production, makingthe EIS invalid in its present form.
- BAEconomics have not been asked to undertake the sensitivity analysis of how much output prices would need to fall for the project to have a zero NPV because Hume Coal considers it to be "commercial in confidence". (EIS Appendix Q page 42). This is unacceptable and an apparent inability to meet the 2015 guidelines for an EIS.

THE REJECT EMPLACEMENT AND BULKHEAD ISSUES

- The Metropolitan Colliery emplaced at least some of their rejects in mined voids in recent years. This operation required extensive experimentation over a number of years.
- They had the advantage of knowing the exact composition of their reject material and voids that were well away from current mining areas.
- The Airly Colliery considered this method of reject disposal but decided it posed unacceptable safety and other concerns.
- In contrast the Hume EIS assumes that reject emplacement behind bulkheads is a risk free process. The design of the bulkheads is complex and their construction in an operating environment is problematic.

This is a very risky proposal and I urge the Government to reject this project.

Walus Wallewan

If you wish to maintain your privacy in this submission from the department's website please tick this box:	
I have not made a reportable political donation.	¥

Name_	PORTER
Address	MERRICAN C
	Rough AR
_	
	Date: /8/6/2017

GPO Box 39 Sydney NSW 2001

This is a submission to the Hume Coal Project EIS. SSD 7172

I object to this project and believe it should be rejected due to

THE POOR ECONOMICS OF THE HUME COAL PROJECT.

From the data in the EIS it is apparent that the project is unprofitable, with negative investment returns.

- This is a small mine and costly to operate.
- The product mix revealed in the EIS results in lower revenue than previously put forward, with nearly half the production low value thermal coal.
- The only way that the mine can improve its profitability would be to significantly increase production, makingthe EIS invalid in its present form.
- BAEconomics have not been asked to undertake the sensitivity analysis of how much output
 prices would need to fall for the project to have a zero NPV because Hume Coal considers it to
 be "commercial in confidence". (EIS Appendix Q page 42). This is unacceptable and an
 apparent inability to meet the 2015 guidelines for an EIS.

THE REJECT EMPLACEMENT AND BULKHEAD ISSUES

- The Metropolitan Colliery emplaced at least some of their rejects in mined voids in recent years. This operation required extensive experimentation over a number of years.
- They had the advantage of knowing the exact composition of their reject material and voids that were well away from curent mining areas.
- The Airly Colliery considered this method of reject disposal but decided it posed unacceptable safety and other concerns.
- In contrast the Hume EiS assumes that reject emplacement behind bulkheads is a risk freeprocess. The
 design of the bulkheads is complex and their construction in an operating environment is
 problematic.

This is a v	very risky proposal and I urge the Government to reject this project.	
Signed,		
If you	wish to maintain your privacy in this submission from the department's website please tick this box:	
I have	e not made a reportable political donation.	

Name Manion Rogers
Address 177 Monaro Cu,
Gedhill.ACT2603
Date: //6 / 2017

GPO Box 39 Sydney NSW 2001

This is a submission to the Hume Coal Project EIS. SSD 7172

I object to this project and believe it should be rejected due to

THE POOR ECONOMICS OF THE HUME COAL PROJECT.

From the data in the EIS it is apparent that the project is unprofitable, with negative investment returns.

- This is a small mine and costly to operate.
- The product mix revealed in the EIS results in lower revenue than previously put forward, with nearly half the production low value thermal coal.
- The only way that the mine can improve its profitability would be to significantly increase production, makingthe EIS invalid in its present form.
- BAEconomics have not been asked to undertake the sensitivity analysis of how much output
 prices would need to fall for the project to have a zero NPV because Hume Coal considers it to
 be "commercial in confidence". (EIS Appendix Q page 42). This is unacceptable and an
 apparent inability to meet the 2015 guidelines for an EIS.

THE REJECT EMPLACEMENT AND BULKHEAD ISSUES

for, or fogur

- The Metropolitan Colliery emplaced at least some of their rejects in mined voids in recent years. This operation required extensive experimentation over a number of years.
- They had the advantage of knowing the exact composition of their reject material and voids that were well away from curent mining areas.
- The Airly Colliery considered this method of reject disposal but decided it posed unacceptable safety and other concerns.
- In contrast the Hume EIS assumes that reject emplacement behind bulkheads is a risk freeprocess. The
 design of the bulkheads is complex and their construction in an operating environment is
 problematic.

This is a very risky proposal and I urge the Government to reject this project.

If you wish to maintain your privacy in this submission from the department's website please tick this box:	
I have not made a reportable political donation.	

Name	TEAR	T ROGE	1
Address_	177	MOWARO	_ck
	REI	D 1411 C	`
			
Da	ate:/%/	6 / 2017	

Sydney NSW 2001

This is a submission to the Hume Coal Project EIS. SSD 7172

I object to this project and believe it should be rejected due to

THE POOR ECONOMICS OF THE HUME COAL PROJECT.

From the data in the EIS it is apparent that the project is unprofitable, with negative investment returns.

- This is a small mine and costly to operate.
- The product mix revealed in the EIS results in lower revenue than previously put forward, with nearly half the production low value thermal coal.
- The only way that the mine can improve its profitability would be to significantly increase production, makingthe EIS invalid in its present form.
- BAEconomics have not been asked to undertake the sensitivity analysis of how much output
 prices would need to fall for the project to have a zero NPV because Hume Coal considers it to
 be "commercial in confidence". (EIS Appendix Q page 42). This is unacceptable and an
 apparent inability to meet the 2015 guidelines for an EIS.

THE REJECT EMPLACEMENT AND BULKHEAD ISSUES

- The Metropolitan Colliery emplaced at least some of their rejects in mined voids in recent years. This operation required extensive experimentation over a number of years.
- They had the advantage of knowing the exact composition of their reject material and voids that were well away from current mining areas.
- The Airly Colliery considered this method of reject disposal but decided it posed unacceptable safety and other concerns.
- In contrast the Hume EIS assumes that reject emplacement behind bulkheads is a risk free process. The
 design of the bulkheads is complex and their construction in an operating environment is
 problematic.

This is a very risky proposal and I urge the Government to reject this project.

If you wish to maintain your privacy in this submission from the department's website please tick this box:	
I have not made a reportable political donation.	

I have not made a reportable political donation.

	Maked a O. 1.11
N N	lame Natasha (ardell
A	ddress 4 Harett Lare
	Mittagona
	NSW 2575
	Date: \8/6/2017
Attn: Executive Director, Resource Assessments Departm and Environment GPO Box 39 Sydney NSW 2001	ent of Planning
This is a submission to the Hume Coal Project	EIS. SSD 7172
I object to this project and believe it should be rejected of THE POOR ECONOMICS OF THE HUME COAL PROJECT.	due to
From the data in the EIS it is apparent that the project is unp	profitable, with negative investment returns.
This is a small mine and costly to operate. The product mix revealed in the EIS results in lower revenue nearly half the production low value thermal coal. The only way that the mine can improve its profitability wou production, makingthe EIS invalid in its present form. BAEconomics have not been asked to undertake the sensitive prices would need to fall for the project to have a zero NPV be "commercial in confidence". (EIS Appendix Q page 42). Tapparent inability to meet the 2015 guidelines for an EIS.	uld be to significantly increase vity analysis of how much output because Hume Coal considers it to
THE REJECT EMPLACEMENT AND BULKHEAD ISSUES	
The Metropolitan Colliery emplaced at least some of their reportation required extensive experimentation over a number They had the advantage of knowing the exact composition of well away from current mining areas. The Airly Colliery considered this method of reject disposal for the concerns. In contrast the Hume EIS assumes that reject emplacement design of the bulkheads is complex and their construction in problematic.	er of years. If their reject material and voids that were but decided it posed unacceptable safety and behind bulkheads is a risk freeprocess. The
This is a very risky proposal and I urge the Government to re	eject this project.
Signed,	
If you wish to maintain your privacy in this submission from the dep	partment's website please tick this box:

	Name_RA BORLOR
	Address 3 Yome Close
	Jewells
	Stadius
	Date: \ \ \ / 6 / 2017
Attn: Executive Director, Resource Assessments Department and Environment GPO Box 39 Sydney NSW 2001	rtment of Planning
This is a submission to the Hume Coal Project	t EIS. SSD 7172
I object to this project and believe it should be rejected	ed due to

THE POOR ECONOMICS OF THE HUME COAL PROJECT.

From the data in the EIS it is apparent that the project is unprofitable, with negative investment returns.

This is a small mine and costly to operate.

- The product mix revealed in the EIS results in lower revenue than previously put forward, with nearly half the production low value thermal coal.
- The only way that the mine can improve its profitability would be to significantly increase production, makingthe EIS invalid in its present form.
- BAEconomics have not been asked to undertake the sensitivity analysis of how much output prices would need to fall for the project to have a zero NPV because Hume Coal considers it to be "commercial in confidence". (EIS Appendix Q page 42). This is unacceptable and an apparent inability to meet the 2015 guidelines for an EIS.

THE REJECT EMPLACEMENT AND BULKHEAD ISSUES

- The Metropolitan Colliery emplaced at least some of their rejects in mined voids in recent years. This operation required extensive experimentation over a number of years.
- They had the advantage of knowing the exact composition of their reject material and voids that were well away from curent mining areas.
- The Airly Colliery considered this method of reject disposal but decided it posed unacceptable safety and other concerns.
- In contrast the Hume EIS assumes that reject emplacement behind bulkheads is a risk free process. The design of the bulkheads is complex and their construction in an operating environment is problematic.

This is a very risky proposal and I urge the Government to reject this project.

If you wish to maintain your privacy in this submission from the department's website please tick this box:	
I have not made a reportable political donation.	d

P
Name PAVL MCLEAN
Address 5/23 OYLEY DR
BOWRAL
Date: 1 / 6 / 2017

GPO Box 39 Sydney NSW 2001

This is a submission to the Hume Coal Project EIS. SSD 7172

I object to this project and believe it should be rejected due to

THE POOR ECONOMICS OF THE HUME COAL PROJECT.

From the data in the EIS it is apparent that the project is unprofitable, with negative investment returns.

- This is a small mine and costly to operate.
- The product mix revealed in the EIS results in lower revenue than previously put forward, with nearly half the production low value thermal coal.
- The only way that the mine can improve its profitability would be to significantly increase production, makingthe EIS invalid in its present form.
- BAEconomics have not been asked to undertake the sensitivity analysis of how much output
 prices would need to fall for the project to have a zero NPV because Hume Coal considers it to
 be "commercial in confidence". (EIS Appendix Q page 42). This is unacceptable and an
 apparent inability to meet the 2015 guidelines for an EIS.

THE REJECT EMPLACEMENT AND BULKHEAD ISSUES

- The Metropolitan Colliery emplaced at least some of their rejects in mined voids in recent years. This operation required extensive experimentation over a number of years.
- They had the advantage of knowing the exact composition of their reject material and voids that were well away from current mining areas.
- The Airly Colliery considered this method of reject disposal but decided it posed unacceptable safety and other concerns.
- In contrast the Hume EIS assumes that reject emplacement behind bulkheads is a risk freeprocess. The
 design of the bulkheads is complex and their construction in an operating environment is
 problematic.

This is a very risky proposal and I urge the Government to reject this project.

Signed,

If you wish to maintain your privacy in this submission from the department's website please tick this box:	
I have not made a reportable political donation.	X

Name <u>Meghan Harman</u>

Address 743/2 The Crescent

wentworth Point

NSW 2127

Date: 18/6/2017

Attn: Executive Director, Resource Assessments Department of Planning and Environment

GPO Box 39 Sydney NSW 2001

This is a submission to the Hume Coal Project EIS. SSD 7172

I object to this project and believe it should be rejected due to

THE POOR ECONOMICS OF THE HUME COAL PROJECT.

From the data in the EIS it is apparent that the project is unprofitable, with negative investment returns.

- This is a small mine and costly to operate.
- The product mix revealed in the EIS results in lower revenue than previously put forward, with nearly half the production low value thermal coal.
- The only way that the mine can improve its profitability would be to significantly increase production, makingthe EIS invalid in its present form.
- BAEconomics have not been asked to undertake the sensitivity analysis of how much output
 prices would need to fall for the project to have a zero NPV because Hume Coal considers it to
 be "commercial in confidence". (EIS Appendix Q page 42). This is unacceptable and an
 apparent inability to meet the 2015 guidelines for an EIS.

THE REJECT EMPLACEMENT AND BULKHEAD ISSUES

- The Metropolitan Colliery emplaced at least some of their rejects in mined voids in recent years. This operation required extensive experimentation over a number of years.
- They had the advantage of knowing the exact composition of their reject material and voids that were well away from current mining areas.
- The Airly Colliery considered this method of reject disposal but decided it posed unacceptable safety and other concerns.
- In contrast the Hume EIS assumes that reject emplacement behind bulkheads is a risk free process. The
 design of the bulkheads is complex and their construction in an operating environment is
 problematic.

This is a very risky proposal and I urge the Government to reject this project.

m, unu

If you wish to maintain your privacy in this submission from the department's website please tick this box:	
I have not made a reportable political donation.	

Name_	JANE HUNT
Addres	s 6/3 VICTORIN ST
_	BowRAL
_	NSW
	Date: (6 / 2017
tment o	f Planning

Attn: Executive Director, Resource Assessments Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39
Sydney NSW 2001

This is a submission to the Hume Coal Project EIS. SSD 7172

I object to this project and believe it should be rejected due to

THE POOR ECONOMICS OF THE HUME COAL PROJECT.

From the data in the EIS it is apparent that the project is unprofitable, with negative investment returns.

- This is a small mine and costly to operate.
- The product mix revealed in the EIS results in lower revenue than previously put forward, with nearly half the production low value thermal coal.
- The only way that the mine can improve its profitability would be to significantly increase production, makingthe EIS invalid in its present form.
- BAEconomics have not been asked to undertake the sensitivity analysis of how much output
 prices would need to fall for the project to have a zero NPV because Hume Coal considers it to
 be "commercial in confidence". (EIS Appendix Q page 42). This is unacceptable and an
 apparent inability to meet the 2015 guidelines for an EIS.

THE REJECT EMPLACEMENT AND BULKHEAD ISSUES

- The Metropolitan Colliery emplaced at least some of their rejects in mined voids in recent years. This operation required extensive experimentation over a number of years.
- They had the advantage of knowing the exact composition of their reject material and voids that were well away from curent mining areas.
- The Airly Colliery considered this method of reject disposal but decided it posed unacceptable safety and other concerns.
- In contrast the Hume EIS assumes that reject emplacement behind bulkheads is a risk freeprocess. The
 design of the bulkheads is complex and their construction in an operating environment is
 problematic.

This is a very risky proposal and I urge the Government to reject this project.

mino Kint.

1000	
If you wish to maintain your privacy in this submission from the department's website please tick this box:	
I have not made a reportable political donation.	\triangleleft

Name MURRAM WATEN.
Address ALEZOLA
221 PENROSE RD
BNDANOCH.
Date: / // 6 / 2017
ttn: Executive Director, Resource Assessments Department of Planning and Environment PO Box 39 ydney NSW 2001
This is a submission to the Hume Coal Project EIS. SSD 7172
object to this project and believe it should be rejected due to THE POOR ECONOMICS OF THE HUME COAL PROJECT.
From the data in the EIS it is apparent that the project is unprofitable, with negative investment returns. This is a small mine and costly to operate. The product mix revealed in the EIS results in lower revenue than previously put forward, with learly half the production low value thermal coal. The only way that the mine can improve its profitability would be to significantly increase roduction, makingthe EIS invalid in its present form. The AEconomics have not been asked to undertake the sensitivity analysis of how much output rices would need to fall for the project to have a zero NPV because Hume Coal considers it to be "commercial in confidence". (EIS Appendix Q page 42). This is unacceptable and an pparent inability to meet the 2015 guidelines for an EIS.
HE REJECT EMPLACEMENT AND BULKHEAD ISSUES
the Metropolitan Colliery emplaced at least some of their rejects in mined voids in recent years. This peration required extensive experimentation over a number of years. hey had the advantage of knowing the exact composition of their reject material and voids that were well away from current mining areas. he Airly Colliery considered this method of reject disposal but decided it posed unacceptable safety and their concerns. In contrast the Hume EIS assumes that reject emplacement behind bulkheads is a risk freeprocess. The esign of the bulkheads is complex and their construction in an operating environment is roblematic.
his is a very risky proposal and I urge the Government to reject this project.
igned,
If you wish to maintain your privacy in this submission from the department's website please tick this box:

If you wish to maintain your privacy in this submission from the $\mathbf{\omega}$ I have not made a reportable political donation.

	Name Colin Mildon
	Address 9 Duke St
	Address 9 Duke St. Bonnal.
	2576
	Date: 16 / 2017
Attn: Executive Director, Resource Assessments De and Environment GPO Box 39 Sydney NSW 2001	V
This is a submission to the Hume Coal Pro	oject EIS. SSD 7172
I object to this project and believe it should be rej	ected due to
THE POOR ECONOMICS OF THE HUME COAL PROJECT	ст.
From the data in the EIS it is apparent that the proje	ectis unprofitable, with negative investment returns.
The product mix revealed in the EIS results in lower in nearly half the production low value thermal coal. The only way that the mine can improve its profitabil production, makingthe EIS invalid in its present form. BAEconomics have not been asked to undertake the prices would need to fall for the project to have a ze be "commercial in confidence". (EIS Appendix Q page apparent inability to meet the 2015 guidelines for an	lity would be to significantly increase sensitivity analysis of how much output ro NPV because Hume Coal considers it to e 42). This is unacceptable and an
THE REJECT EMPLACEMENT AND BULKHEAD ISSUES	
The Metropolitan Colliery emplaced at least some of operation required extensive experimentation over a They had the advantage of knowing the exact compowell away from curent mining areas. The Airly Colliery considered this method of reject diother concerns. In contrast the Hume EIS assumes that reject emplaced design of the bulkheads is complex and their construproblematic.	number of years. sition of their reject material and voids that were isposal but decided it posed unacceptable safety and ement behind bulkheads is a risk freeprocess. The
This is a very risky proposal and I urge the Government	ent to reject this project.
Signed,	
C. milda	-
If you wish to maintain your privacy in this submission from	m the department's website please tick this box:
I have not made a reportable political donation.	

Name	mAI	RK	do H	NSON
Address	36	BEV	WE	cRES
	MA	CG RÉ	GOR	
		Acc	T	2615
•				

Date: i8 / 6 / 2017

Attn: Executive Director, Resource Assessments Department of Planning and Environment

GPO Box 39 Sydney NSW 2001

This is a submission to the Hume Coal Project EIS. SSD 7172

I object to this project and believe it should be rejected due to

THE POOR ECONOMICS OF THE HUME COAL PROJECT.

From the data in the EIS it is apparent that the project is unprofitable, with negative investment returns.

- This is a small mine and costly to operate.
- The product mix revealed in the EIS results in lower revenue than previously put forward, with nearly half the production low value thermal coal.
- The only way that the mine can improve its profitability would be to significantly increase production, makingthe EIS invalid in its present form.
- BAEconomics have not been asked to undertake the sensitivity analysis of how much output prices would need to fall for the project to have a zero NPV because Hume Coal considers it to be "commercial in confidence". (EIS Appendix Q page 42). This is unacceptable and an apparent inability to meet the 2015 guidelines for an EIS.

THE REJECT EMPLACEMENT AND BULKHEAD ISSUES

- The Metropolitan Colliery emplaced at least some of their rejects in mined voids in recent years. This operation required extensive experimentation over a number of years.
- They had the advantage of knowing the exact composition of their reject material and voids that were well away from current mining areas.
- The Airly Colliery considered this method of reject disposal but decided it posed unacceptable safety and other concerns.
- In contrast the Hume EIS assumes that reject emplacement behind bulkheads is a risk freeprocess. The
 design of the bulkheads is complex and their construction in an operating environment is
 problematic.

This is a very risky proposal and I urge the Government to reject this project.

Signed,

If you wish to maintain your privacy in this submission from the department's website please tick this box:

I have not made a reportable political donation.

V

Name Linden Johnson
Address 36 Barne Cres
MacGragos
ACT 2615
Date:16 / 6 / 2017

GPO Box 39 Sydney NSW 2001

This is a submission to the Hume Coal Project EIS. SSD 7172

I object to this project and believe it should be rejected due to

THE POOR ECONOMICS OF THE HUME COAL PROJECT.

From the data in the EIS it is apparent that the project is unprofitable, with negative investment returns.

- This is a small mine and costly to operate.
- The product mix revealed in the EIS results in lower revenue than previously put forward, with nearly half the production low value thermal coal.
- The only way that the mine can improve its profitability would be to significantly increase production, makingthe EIS invalid in its present form.
- BAEconomics have not been asked to undertake the sensitivity analysis of how much output
 prices would need to fall for the project to have a zero NPV because Hume Coal considers it to
 be "commercial in confidence". (EIS Appendix Q page 42). This is unacceptable and an
 apparent inability to meet the 2015 guidelines for an EIS.

THE REJECT EMPLACEMENT AND BULKHEAD ISSUES

- The Metropolitan Colliery emplaced at least some of their rejects in mined voids in recent years. This operation required extensive experimentation over a number of years.
- They had the advantage of knowing the exact composition of their reject material and voids that were well away from current mining areas.
- The Airly Colliery considered this method of reject disposal but decided it posed unacceptable safety and other concerns.
- In contrast the Hume EIS assumes that reject emplacement behind bulkheads is a risk freeprocess. The design of the bulkheads is complex and their construction in an operating environment is problematic.

This is a very risky proposal and I urge the Government to reject this project.

If you wish to maintain your privacy in this submission from the department's website please tick this box:	
I have not made a reportable political donation.	U

Name Made Sahr
Address D Vowlidge War
Moludonar 9
4214-
Date: / 6 / 2017
rtment of Planning
t EIS. SSD 7172

and Environment GPO Box 39

GPO Box 39 Sydney NSW 2001

Signed,

This is a submission to the Hume Coal Project EIS. SSD 7172

I object to this project and believe it should be rejected due to

THE POOR ECONOMICS OF THE HUME COAL PROJECT.

Attn: Executive Director, Resource Assessments Depa

From the data in the EIS it is apparent that the project is unprofitable, with negative investment returns.

- This is a small mine and costly to operate.
- The product mix revealed in the EIS results in lower revenue than previously put forward, with nearly half the production low value thermal coal.
- The only way that the mine can improve its profitability would be to significantly increase production, makingthe EIS invalid in its present form.
- BAEconomics have not been asked to undertake the sensitivity analysis of how much output
 prices would need to fall for the project to have a zero NPV because Hume Coal considers it to
 be "commercial in confidence". (EIS Appendix Q page 42). This is unacceptable and an
 apparent inability to meet the 2015 guidelines for an EIS.

THE REJECT EMPLACEMENT AND BULKHEAD ISSUES

I have not made a reportable political donation.

- The Metropolitan Colliery emplaced at least some of their rejects in mined voids in recent years. This operation required extensive experimentation over a number of years.
- They had the advantage of knowing the exact composition of their reject material and voids that were well away from current mining areas.
- The Airly Colliery considered this method of reject disposal but decided it posed unacceptable safety and other concerns.
- In contrast the Hume EIS assumes that reject emplacement behind bulkheads is a risk freeprocess. The
 design of the bulkheads is complex and their construction in an operating environment is
 problematic.

This is a very risky proposal and I urge the Government to reject this project.

3,5,1,0,0,	MAlika	
If you	wish to maintain your privacy in this submission from the department's website please tick this box:	

Name GILL GRAHAM
Address ELM STREET
BOWRAL
Date & /6/2017

Attn: Executive Director, Resource Assessments Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39 Sydney NSW 2001

This is a submission to the Hume Coal Project EIS. SSD 7172

I object to this project and believe it should be rejected due to

THE POOR ECONOMICS OF THE HUME COAL PROJECT.

From the data in the EIS it is apparent that the project is unprofitable, with negative investment returns.

- This is a small mine and costly to operate.
- The product mix revealed in the EIS results in lower revenue than previously put forward, with nearly half the production low value thermal coal.
- The only way that the mine can improve its profitability would be to significantly increase production, makingthe EIS invalid in its present form.
- BAEconomics have not been asked to undertake the sensitivity analysis of how much output
 prices would need to fall for the project to have a zero NPV because Hume Coal considers it to
 be "commercial in confidence". (EIS Appendix Q page 42). This is unacceptable and an
 apparent inability to meet the 2015 guidelines for an EIS.

THE REJECT EMPLACEMENT AND BULKHEAD ISSUES

- The Metropolitan Colliery emplaced at least some of their rejects in mined voids in recent years. This operation required extensive experimentation over a number of years.
- They had the advantage of knowing the exact composition of their reject material and voids that were well away from current mining areas.
- The Airly Colliery considered this method of reject disposal but decided it posed unacceptable safety and other concerns.
- In contrast the Hume EIS assumes that reject emplacement behind bulkheads is a risk freeprocess. The design of the bulkheads is complex and their construction in an operating environment is problematic.

This is a very risky proposal and I urge the Government to reject this project.

If you wish to maintain your privacy in this submission from the department's website please tick this box:	
I have not made a reportable political donation.	∇

Signed.

Name Robert Nimac
Address 2 A Daimar St
Croydon 2132
D-1 18/5/2017
Date: 18/6/2017

Attn: Executive Director, Resource Assessments Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39
Sydney NSW 2001

This is a submission to the Hume Coal Project EIS. SSD 7172

I object to this project and believe it should be rejected due to

THE POOR ECONOMICS OF THE HUME COAL PROJECT.

From the data in the EIS it is apparent that the project is unprofitable, with negative investment returns.

- This is a small mine and costly to operate.
- The product mix revealed in the EIS results in lower revenue than previously put forward, with nearly half the production low value thermal coal.
- The only way that the mine can improve its profitability would be to significantly increase production, makingthe EIS invalid in its present form.
- BAEconomics have not been asked to undertake the sensitivity analysis of how much output prices would need to fall for the project to have a zero NPV because Hume Coal considers it to be "commercial in confidence". (EIS Appendix Q page 42). This is unacceptable and an apparent inability to meet the 2015 guidelines for an EIS.

THE REJECT EMPLACEMENT AND BULKHEAD ISSUES

I have not made a reportable political donation.

- The Metropolitan Colliery emplaced at least some of their rejects in mined voids in recent years. This operation required extensive experimentation over a number of years.
- They had the advantage of knowing the exact composition of their reject material and voids that were well away from current mining areas.
- The Airly Colliery considered this method of reject disposal but decided it posed unacceptable safety and other concerns.
- In contrast the Hume EIS assumes that reject emplacement behind bulkheads is a risk free process. The
 design of the bulkheads is complex and their construction in an operating environment is
 problematic.

This is a very risky proposal and I urge the Government to reject this project.

	Al.	0.07.	(
	Name	Wh' M	77 1031173	
	Address_	59	FAMULU ARE	<u> </u>
	_	وع	FRITUIN AR	
		ate: 🕢	/6/2017	
Attn: Executive Director, Resource Assessments Dep and Environment GPO Box 39 Sydney NSW 2001	artment of F	Plannin	g	
This is a submission to the Hume Coal Proje	ect EIS. SS	D 717	'2	
I object to this project and believe it should be reject THE POOR ECONOMICS OF THE HUME COAL PROJECT				
From the data in the EIS it is apparent that the project		la with	negative invecto	nent returns
This is a small mine and costly to operate. The product mix revealed in the EIS results in lower revealed in the production. The only way that the mine can improve its profitability production, makingthe EIS invalid in its present form. BAEconomics have not been asked to undertake the seprices would need to fall for the project to have a zero be "commercial in confidence". (EIS Appendix Q page 4 apparent inability to meet the 2015 guidelines for an E	y would be to ensitivity ana NPV because 42). This is ur	signific lysis of Hume	cantly increase how much outpute Coal considers i	ut
THE REJECT EMPLACEMENT AND BULKHEAD ISSUES				
The Metropolitan Colliery emplaced at least some of the operation required extensive experimentation over a number of the proof of the advantage of knowing the exact compositive well away from current mining areas. The Airly Colliery considered this method of reject dispother concerns. In contrast the Hume EIS assumes that reject emplacent design of the bulkheads is complex and their construction problematic.	umber of yea tion of their r posal but deci ment behind	rs. eject m ided it p bulkhea	naterial and voids cosed unaccepta ads is a risk freep	s that were ble safety and
This is a very risky proposal and I urge the Government	t to reject thi	s proje	ct.	
Signed,				
If you wish to maintain your privacy in this submission from t	the department	's websit	e please tick this bo	х:
I have not made a reportable political donation.				

Name_	AVIL	CHET!	びソ
Addres	s 561	CROWN	S7
S	urry	HILLS	NSO
_	Date: j K	/6/2017	

GPO Box 39 Sydney NSW 2001

Signed,

This is a submission to the Hume Coal Project EIS. SSD 7172

I object to this project and believe it should be rejected due to

THE POOR ECONOMICS OF THE HUME COAL PROJECT.

From the data in the EIS it is apparent that the project is unprofitable, with negative investment returns.

- This is a small mine and costly to operate.
- The product mix revealed in the EIS results in lower revenue than previously put forward, with nearly half the production low value thermal coal.
- The only way that the mine can improve its profitability would be to significantly increase production, makingthe EIS invalid in its present form.
- BAEconomics have not been asked to undertake the sensitivity analysis of how much output
 prices would need to fall for the project to have a zero NPV because Hume Coal considers it to
 be "commercial in confidence". (EIS Appendix Q page 42). This is unacceptable and an
 apparent inability to meet the 2015 guidelines for an EIS.

THE REJECT EMPLACEMENT AND BULKHEAD ISSUES

- The Metropolitan Colliery emplaced at least some of their rejects in mined voids in recent years. This operation required extensive experimentation over a number of years.
- They had the advantage of knowing the exact composition of their reject material and voids that were well away from current mining areas.

 The Airly Colliery considered this method of reject disposal but decided it posed unacceptable safety and other concerns.

In contrast the Hume EIS assumes that reject emplacement behind bulkheads is a risk freeprocess. The
design of the bulkheads is complex and their construction in an operating environment is
problematic.

This is a very risky proposal and I urge the Government to reject this project.

(Hy

If you wish to maintain your privacy in this submission from the department's website please tick this box:	
I have not made a reportable political donation.	Ø

Name	lanath	an Poli	nd		
Addr	ss Post	office NSW	Bo	7	
·	2802	NSW	130	wra	1
	257	-6		<u>.</u>	
	Date: 🕢	/6/2017			

GPO Box 39 Sydney NSW 2001

This is a submission to the Hume Coal Project EIS. SSD 7172

I object to this project and believe it should be rejected due to

THE POOR ECONOMICS OF THE HUME COAL PROJECT.

From the data in the EIS it is apparent that the project is unprofitable, with negative investment returns.

- This is a small mine and costly to operate.
- The product mix revealed in the EIS results in lower revenue than previously put forward, with nearly half the production low value thermal coal.
- The only way that the mine can improve its profitability would be to significantly increase production, makingthe EIS invalid in its present form.
- BAEconomics have not been asked to undertake the sensitivity analysis of how much output prices would need to fall for the project to have a zero NPV because Hume Coal considers it to be "commercial in confidence". (EIS Appendix Q page 42). This is unacceptable and an apparent inability to meet the 2015 guidelines for an EIS.

THE REJECT EMPLACEMENT AND BULKHEAD ISSUES

- The Metropolitan Colliery emplaced at least some of their rejects in mined voids in recent years. This
 operation required extensive experimentation over a number of years.
- They had the advantage of knowing the exact composition of their reject material and voids that were well away from current mining areas.
- The Airly Colliery considered this method of reject disposal but decided it posed unacceptable safety and other concerns.
- In contrast the Hume EIS assumes that reject emplacement behind bulkheads is a risk free process. The
 design of the bulkheads is complex and their construction in an operating environment is
 problematic.

This is a very risky proposal and I urge the Government to reject this project. Signed,	
If you wish to maintain your privacy in this submission from the department's website please tick the	is box:
I have not made a reportable political donation.	

Name 1, m	Ċ
Address 7 Diversion	C) B
[XE(EQ	

Date: \\> / 6 / 2017

Attn: Executive Director, Resource Assessments Department of Planning and Environment

GPO Box 39 Sydney NSW 2001

This is a submission to the Hume Coal Project EIS. SSD 7172

I object to this project and believe it should be rejected due to

THE POOR ECONOMICS OF THE HUME COAL PROJECT.

From the data in the EIS it is apparent that the project is unprofitable, with negative investment returns.

- This is a small mine and costly to operate.
- The product mix revealed in the EIS results in lower revenue than previously put forward, with nearly half the production low value thermal coal.
- The only way that the mine can improve its profitability would be to significantly increase production, making the EIS invalid in its present form.
- BAEconomics have not been asked to undertake the sensitivity analysis of how much output
 prices would need to fall for the project to have a zero NPV because Hume Coal considers it to
 be "commercial in confidence". (EIS Appendix Q page 42). This is unacceptable and an
 apparent inability to meet the 2015 guidelines for an EIS.

THE REJECT EMPLACEMENT AND BULKHEAD ISSUES

- The Metropolitan Colliery emplaced at least some of their rejects in mined voids in recent years. This operation required extensive experimentation over a number of years.
- They had the advantage of knowing the exact composition of their reject material and voids that were well away from current mining areas.
- The Airly Colliery considered this method of reject disposal but decided it posed unacceptable safety and other concerns.
- In contrast the Hume EIS assumes that reject emplacement behind bulkheads is a risk free process. The design of the bulkheads is complex and their construction in an operating environment is problematic.

This is a very risky proposal and I urge the Government to reject this project.

Signed,	14.7	
If you v	wish to maintain your privacy in this submission from the department's website please tick t	—

If you wish to maintain your privacy in this submission from the department's website please tick this box:	
I have not made a reportable political donation.	

Name_	Alex Zahra
Addres	s 18 Heysen St
_	Abbotsbury
_	2176
	Date: 12 / 6 / 2017

GPO Box 39 Sydney NSW 2001

This is a submission to the Hume Coal Project EIS. SSD 7172

I object to this project and believe it should be rejected due to

THE POOR ECONOMICS OF THE HUME COAL PROJECT.

From the data in the EIS it is apparent that the project is unprofitable, with negative investment returns.

- This is a small mine and costly to operate.
- The product mix revealed in the EIS results in lower revenue than previously put forward, with nearly half the production low value thermal coal.
- The only way that the mine can improve its profitability would be to significantly increase production, makingthe EIS invalid in its present form.
- BAEconomics have not been asked to undertake the sensitivity analysis of how much output
 prices would need to fall for the project to have a zero NPV because Hume Coal considers it to
 be "commercial in confidence". (EIS Appendix Q page 42). This is unacceptable and an
 apparent inability to meet the 2015 guidelines for an EIS.

THE REJECT EMPLACEMENT AND BULKHEAD ISSUES

- The Metropolitan Colliery emplaced at least some of their rejects in mined voids in recent years. This operation required extensive experimentation over a number of years.
- They had the advantage of knowing the exact composition of their reject material and voids that were well away from current mining areas.
- The Airly Colliery considered this method of reject disposal but decided it posed unacceptable safety and other concerns.
- In contrast the Hume EIS assumes that reject emplacement behind bulkheads is a risk free process. The design of the bulkheads is complex and their construction in an operating environment is problematic.

This is a very risky proposal and I urge the Government to reject this project.

Olex 3 show	
If you wish to maintain your privacy in this submission from the department's website please tick this box:	
I have not made a reportable political donation.	

Name Shemshan Abotshou
Address 8 SARDINIA AM
41-mmood. 2768
Date: 🎮 / 6 / 2017

Sydney NSW 2001

This is a submission to the Hume Coal Project EIS. SSD 7172

I object to this project and believe it should be rejected due to

THE POOR ECONOMICS OF THE HUME COAL PROJECT.

From the data in the EIS it is apparent that the project is unprofitable, with negative investment returns.

- This is a small mine and costly to operate.
- The product mix revealed in the EIS results in lower revenue than previously put forward, with nearly half the production low value thermal coal.
- The only way that the mine can improve its profitability would be to significantly increase production, makingthe EIS invalid in its present form.
- BAEconomics have not been asked to undertake the sensitivity analysis of how much output prices would need to fall for the project to have a zero NPV because Hume Coal considers it to be "commercial in confidence". (EIS Appendix Q page 42). This is unacceptable and an apparent inability to meet the 2015 guidelines for an EIS.

THE REJECT EMPLACEMENT AND BULKHEAD ISSUES

- The Metropolitan Colliery emplaced at least some of their rejects in mined voids in recent years. This operation required extensive experimentation over a number of years.
- They had the advantage of knowing the exact composition of their reject material and voids that were well away from curent mining areas.
- The Airly Colliery considered this method of reject disposal but decided it posed unacceptable safety and other concerns.
- In contrast the Hume EIS assumes that reject emplacement behind bulkheads is a risk freeprocess. The design of the bulkheads is complex and their construction in an operating environment is problematic.

This is a very risky proposal and I urge the Government to reject this project. Signed,	
If you wish to maintain your privacy in this submission from the department's website please tick this box:	
I have not made a reportable political donation.	

Name V. Frangs		
Address 9/4 Short 57		
Bororel		
2576		
Date: 18/6/2017		

GPO Box 39 Sydney NSW 2001

This is a submission to the Hume Coal Project ElS. SSD 7172

I object to this project and believe it should be rejected due to

THE POOR ECONOMICS OF THE HUME COAL PROJECT.

From the data in the EIS it is apparent that the project is unprofitable, with negative investment returns.

- This is a small mine and costly to operate.
- The product mix revealed in the EIS results in lower revenue than previously put forward, with nearly half the production low value thermal coal.
- The only way that the mine can improve its profitability would be to significantly increase production, makingthe EIS invalid in its present form.
- BAEconomics have not been asked to undertake the sensitivity analysis of how much output
 prices would need to fall for the project to have a zero NPV because Hume Coal considers it to
 be "commercial in confidence". (EIS Appendix Q page 42). This is unacceptable and an
 apparent inability to meet the 2015 guidelines for an EIS.

THE REJECT EMPLACEMENT AND BULKHEAD ISSUES

- The Metropolitan Colliery emplaced at least some of their rejects in mined voids in recent years. This operation required extensive experimentation over a number of years.
- They had the advantage of knowing the exact composition of their reject material and voids that were well away from curent mining areas.
- The Airly Colliery considered this method of reject disposal but decided it posed unacceptable safety and other concerns.
- In contrast the Hume EIS assumes that reject emplacement behind bulkheads is a risk free process. The
 design of the bulkheads is complex and their construction in an operating environment is
 problematic.

This is a very risky proposal and I urge the Government to reject this project.

old. Telana Jenning J.

<u> </u>	
If you wish to maintain your privacy in this submission from the department's website please tick this box:	
Y have not made a consulable nelitical denotion	
I have not made a reportable political donation.	

Name_	Victor	Durzi	
Addres	s 35 Gle	ventl Ave	
	N 1 1		
-	Huttal		
_			
	Date: % / 6 / 2	2017	
Attn: Executive Director, Resource Assessments Department or and Environment	f Planning		
GPO Box 39 Sydney NSW 2001			
This is a submission to the Hume Coal Project EIS.	SSD 7172		
I object to this project and believe it should be rejected due to)		
THE POOR ECONOMICS OF THE HUME COAL PROJECT.			
From the data in the EIS it is apparent that the project is unprofita	able, with negat	tive investment r	eturns.
This is a small mine and costly to operate. The product mix revealed in the EIS results in lower revenue than nearly half the production low value thermal coal. The only way that the mine can improve its profitability would be production, makingthe EIS invalid in its present form. BAEconomics have not been asked to undertake the sensitivity ar prices would need to fall for the project to have a zero NPV because "commercial in confidence". (EIS Appendix Q page 42). This is apparent inability to meet the 2015 guidelines for an EIS.	to significantly nalysis of how ruse Hume Coal	nuch output considers it to	
THE REJECT EMPLACEMENT AND BULKHEAD ISSUES			
The Metropolitan Colliery emplaced at least some of their rejects operation required extensive experimentation over a number of y. They had the advantage of knowing the exact composition of their well away from current mining areas. The Airly Colliery considered this method of reject disposal but do other concerns. In contrast the Hume EIS assumes that reject emplacement behind design of the bulkheads is complex and their construction in an opproblematic.	ears. r reject materia ecided it posed d bulkheads is	al and voids that unacceptable so a risk freeproces	were
This is a very risky proposal and I urge the Government to reject t Signed,	his project.		
If you wish to maintain your privacy in this submission from the departme	nt's website pleas	se tick this box:	

If you wish to maintain your privacy in this submission from t I have not made a reportable political donation.

Name Megan Duzi
Address 5 Fleverth Aue
Austral 2179
,
Date:\

GPO Box 39 Sydney NSW 2001

This is a submission to the Hume Coal Project EIS. SSD 7172

I object to this project and believe it should be rejected due to

THE POOR ECONOMICS OF THE HUME COAL PROJECT.

From the data in the EIS it is apparent that the project is unprofitable, with negative investment returns.

- This is a small mine and costly to operate.
- The product mix revealed in the EIS results in lower revenue than previously put forward, with nearly half the production low value thermal coal.
- The only way that the mine can improve its profitability would be to significantly increase production, makingthe EIS invalid in its present form.
- BAEconomics have not been asked to undertake the sensitivity analysis of how much output
 prices would need to fall for the project to have a zero NPV because Hume Coal considers it to
 be "commercial in confidence". (EIS Appendix Q page 42). This is unacceptable and an
 apparent inability to meet the 2015 guidelines for an EIS.

THE REJECT EMPLACEMENT AND BULKHEAD ISSUES

- The Metropolitan Colliery emplaced at least some of their rejects in mined voids in recent years. This operation required extensive experimentation over a number of years.
- They had the advantage of knowing the exact composition of their reject material and voids that were well away from current mining areas.
- The Airly Colliery considered this method of reject disposal but decided it posed unacceptable safety and other concerns.
- In contrast the Hume EIS assumes that reject emplacement behind bulkheads is a risk free process. The
 design of the bulkheads is complex and their construction in an operating environment is
 problematic.

This is a very risky proposal and I urge the Government to reject this project.

Signed, WM cere Den

If you wish to maintain your privacy in this submission from the department's website please tick this box:	
I have not made a reportable political donation.	

Name Souja Gallahie			
Name Soujz Gallahar Address 755 Bolany Road			
Rosaber 1			
Date: 4 / 6 / 2017			
ment of Planning			

GPO Box 39 Sydney NSW 2001

This is a submission to the Hume Coal Project EIS. SSD 7172

I object to this project and believe it should be rejected due to

THE POOR ECONOMICS OF THE HUME COAL PROJECT.

From the data in the EIS it is apparent that the project is unprofitable, with negative investment returns.

- This is a small mine and costly to operate.
- The product mix revealed in the EIS results in lower revenue than previously put forward, with nearly half the production low value thermal coal.
- The only way that the mine can improve its profitability would be to significantly increase production, makingthe EIS invalid in its present form.
- BAEconomics have not been asked to undertake the sensitivity analysis of how much output
 prices would need to fall for the project to have a zero NPV because Hume Coal considers it to
 be "commercial in confidence". (EIS Appendix Q page 42). This is unacceptable and an
 apparent inability to meet the 2015 guidelines for an EIS.

THE REJECT EMPLACEMENT AND BULKHEAD ISSUES

- The Metropolitan Colliery emplaced at least some of their rejects in mined voids in recent years. This operation required extensive experimentation over a number of years.
- They had the advantage of knowing the exact composition of their reject material and voids that were well away from current mining areas.
- The Airly Colliery considered this method of reject disposal but decided it posed unacceptable safety and other concerns.
- In contrast the Hume EIS assumes that reject emplacement behind bulkheads is a risk freeprocess. The
 design of the bulkheads is complex and their construction in an operating environment is
 problematic.

This is a very risky proposal and I urge the Government to reject this project.

Signed,

you wish to maintain your privacy in this submission from the department's website please tick this box:	Ī

I have not made a reportable political donation.

Name	SIMONOLIK	1
Address 49	Beneara	5+
AS4167	2400	NSV
	LS/6/2017	

GPO Box 39 Sydney NSW 2001

This is a submission to the Hume Coal Project EIS. SSD 7172

I object to this project and believe it should be rejected due to

THE POOR ECONOMICS OF THE HUME COAL PROJECT.

From the data in the EIS it is apparent that the project is unprofitable, with negative investment returns.

- This is a small mine and costly to operate.
- The product mix revealed in the EIS results in lower revenue than previously put forward, with nearly half the production low value thermal coal.
- The only way that the mine can improve its profitability would be to significantly increase production, makingthe EIS invalid in its present form.
- BAEconomics have not been asked to undertake the sensitivity analysis of how much output
 prices would need to fall for the project to have a zero NPV because Hume Coal considers it to
 be "commercial in confidence". (EIS Appendix Q page 42). This is unacceptable and an
 apparent inability to meet the 2015 guidelines for an EIS.

THE REJECT EMPLACEMENT AND BULKHEAD ISSUES

- The Metropolitan Colliery emplaced at least some of their rejects in mined voids in recent years. This operation required extensive experimentation over a number of years.
- They had the advantage of knowing the exact composition of their reject material and voids that were well away from curent mining areas.
- The Airly Colliery considered this method of reject disposal but decided it posed unacceptable safety and other concerns.
- In contrast the Hume EIS assumes that reject emplacement behind bulkheads is a risk freeprocess. The
 design of the bulkheads is complex and their construction in an operating environment is
 problematic.

This is a very risky proposal and I urge the Government to reject this project.

If you wish to maintain your privacy in this submission from the department's website please tick this box:	
I have not made a reportable political donation.	

Name GARRY HINES
Address 67 ENDEAVOUR CIR
HARRINGTON PARK
Date:-25/6/2017

GPO Box 39 Sydney NSW 2001

This is a submission to the Hume Coal Project EIS. SSD 7172

I object to this project and believe it should be rejected due to

THE POOR ECONOMICS OF THE HUME COAL PROJECT.

From the data in the EIS it is apparent that the project is unprofitable, with negative investment returns.

- This is a small mine and costly to operate.
- The product mix revealed in the EIS results in lower revenue than previously put forward, with nearly half the production low value thermal coal.
- The only way that the mine can improve its profitability would be to significantly increase production, making the EIS invalid in its present form.
- BAEconomics have not been asked to undertake the sensitivity analysis of how much output
 prices would need to fall for the project to have a zero NPV because Hume Coal considers it to
 be "commercial in confidence". (EIS Appendix Q page 42). This is unacceptable and an
 apparent inability to meet the 2015 guidelines for an EIS.

THE REJECT EMPLACEMENT AND BULKHEAD ISSUES

- The Metropolitan Colliery emplaced at least some of their rejects in mined voids in recent years. This operation required extensive experimentation over a number of years.
- They had the advantage of knowing the exact composition of their reject material and voids that were well away from curent mining areas.
- The Airly Colliery considered this method of reject disposal but decided it posed unacceptable safety and other concerns.
- In contrast the Hume EIS assumes that reject emplacement behind bulkheads is a risk freeprocess. The
 design of the bulkheads is complex and their construction in an operating environment is
 problematic.

This is a very risky proposal and I urge the Government to reject this project.

If you wish to maintain your privacy in this submission from the department's website please tick this box:	
I have not made a reportable political donation.	Ø

Name	Cla	12 S	at	12/4	
Addres	ss 90	Aitke	1	Road	
_	Bou	wral	2	576	
_					
	Date:	/6/2017			

GPO Box 39 Sydney NSW 2001

This is a submission to the Hume Coal Project EIS. SSD 7172

I object to this project and believe it should be rejected due to

THE POOR ECONOMICS OF THE HUME COAL PROJECT.

From the data in the EIS it is apparent that the project is unprofitable, with negative investment returns.

- This is a small mine and costly to operate.
- The product mix revealed in the EIS results in lower revenue than previously put forward, with nearly half the production low value thermal coal.
- The only way that the mine can improve its profitability would be to significantly increase production, makingthe EIS invalid in its present form.
- BAEconomics have not been asked to undertake the sensitivity analysis of how much output
 prices would need to fall for the project to have a zero NPV because Hume Coal considers it to
 be "commercial in confidence". (EIS Appendix Q page 42). This is unacceptable and an
 apparent inability to meet the 2015 guidelines for an EIS.

THE REJECT EMPLACEMENT AND BULKHEAD ISSUES

- The Metropolitan Colliery emplaced at least some of their rejects in mined voids in recent years. This operation required extensive experimentation over a number of years.
- They had the advantage of knowing the exact composition of their reject material and voids that were well away from curent mining areas.
- The Airly Colliery considered this method of reject disposal but decided it posed unacceptable safety and other concerns.
- In contrast the Hume EIS assumes that reject emplacement behind bulkheads is a risk freeprocess. The
 design of the bulkheads is complex and their construction in an operating environment is
 problematic.

This is a very risky proposal and I urge the Government to reject this project.

Signed,	1	1	
		Hutt	
	lin	SUM	

If you wish to maintain your privacy in this submission from the department's website please tick this box:	
I have not made a reportable political donation.	P

Name	Way	ME	afr	A64	M
Addre					
		460			,
				7	
•	Date:	1 /6	/ 2017	7	

GPO Box 39 Sydney NSW 2001

This is a submission to the Hume Coal Project EIS. SSD 7172

I object to this project and believe it should be rejected due to

THE POOR ECONOMICS OF THE HUME COAL PROJECT.

From the data in the EIS it is apparent that the project is unprofitable, with negative investment returns.

- This is a small mine and costly to operate.
- The product mix revealed in the EIS results in lower revenue than previously put forward, with nearly half the production low value thermal coal.
- The only way that the mine can improve its profitability would be to significantly increase production, makingthe EIS invalid in its present form.
- BAEconomics have not been asked to undertake the sensitivity analysis of how much output
 prices would need to fall for the project to have a zero NPV because Hume Coal considers it to
 be "commercial in confidence". (EIS Appendix Q page 42). This is unacceptable and an
 apparent inability to meet the 2015 guidelines for an EIS.

THE REJECT EMPLACEMENT AND BULKHEAD ISSUES

- The Metropolitan Colliery emplaced at least some of their rejects in mined voids in recent years. This operation required extensive experimentation over a number of years.
- They had the advantage of knowing the exact composition of their reject material and voids that were well away from current mining areas.
- The Airly Colliery considered this method of reject disposal but decided it posed unacceptable safety and other concerns.
- In contrast the Hume EIS assumes that reject emplacement behind bulkheads is a risk freeprocess. The design of the bulkheads is complex and their construction in an operating environment is problematic.

This is a very risky proposal and I urge the Government to reject this project.

If you wish to maintain your privacy in this submission from the department's website please tick this box:


I have not made a reportable political donation.

I have not made a reportable political donation.

Name Mogan Manto
Name Megan Mante Address 32 TALLOWOOD WAY FRIENCHS FORFST
Address 32 / FALLIWOOD
WAY FRIEXCHS FOREST
Date: /6/2017
ttn: Executive Director, Resource Assessments Department of Planning and Environment PO Box 39 ydney NSW 2001
This is a submission to the Hume Coal Project EIS. SSD 7172
object to this project and believe it should be rejected due to
HE POOR ECONOMICS OF THE HUME COAL PROJECT.
From the data in the EIS it is apparent that the project is unprofitable, with negative investment returns.
This is a small mine and costly to operate. The product mix revealed in the EIS results in lower revenue than previously put forward, with hearly half the production low value thermal coal. The only way that the mine can improve its profitability would be to significantly increase production, makingthe EIS invalid in its present form. AEconomics have not been asked to undertake the sensitivity analysis of how much output prices would need to fall for the project to have a zero NPV because Hume Coal considers it to be "commercial in confidence". (EIS Appendix Q page 42). This is unacceptable and an apparent inability to meet the 2015 guidelines for an EIS.
HE REJECT EMPLACEMENT AND BULKHEAD ISSUES
the Metropolitan Colliery emplaced at least some of their rejects in mined voids in recent years. This peration required extensive experimentation over a number of years. hey had the advantage of knowing the exact composition of their reject material and voids that were well away from current mining areas. The Airly Colliery considered this method of reject disposal but decided it posed unacceptable safety and their concerns. In contrast the Hume EIS assumes that reject emplacement behind bulkheads is a risk free process. The lesign of the bulkheads is complex and their construction in an operating environment is problematic.
his is a very risky proposal and I urge the Government to reject this project.
igned,
If you wish to maintain your privacy in this submission from the department's website please tick this box:

 $oldsymbol{ol{ol{ol}}}}}}}}}}}}}}}$

	Name J. MILLAR
	Name J. MILLAN Address_ P.O box 176
	Banar
	2576
	Date: 2 // 6 / 2017
GP	n: Executive Director, Resource Assessments Department of Planning and Environment O Box 39 dney NSW 2001
Tł	nis is a submission to the Hume Coal Project EIS. SSD 7172
	bject to this project and believe it should be rejected due to E POOR ECONOMICS OF THE HUME COAL PROJECT.
Fre	om the data in the EIS it is apparent that the project is unprofitable, with negative investment returns.
The near the property BA pri be	is is a small mine and costly to operate. e product mix revealed in the EIS results in lower revenue than previously put forward, with arly half the production low value thermal coal. e only way that the mine can improve its profitability would be to significantly increase oduction, makingthe EIS invalid in its present form. Economics have not been asked to undertake the sensitivity analysis of how much output ces would need to fall for the project to have a zero NPV because Hume Coal considers it to "commercial in confidence". (EIS Appendix Q page 42). This is unacceptable and an parent inability to meet the 2015 guidelines for an EIS.
	E REJECT EMPLACEMENT AND BULKHEAD ISSUES
op The we The oth In de-	e Metropolitan Colliery emplaced at least some of their rejects in mined voids in recent years. This eration required extensive experimentation over a number of years. ey had the advantage of knowing the exact composition of their reject material and voids that were all away from curent mining areas. e Airly Colliery considered this method of reject disposal but decided it posed unacceptable safety and ner concerns. contrast the Hume EIS assumes that reject emplacement behind bulkheads is a risk freeprocess. The sign of the bulkheads is complex and their construction in an operating environment is oblematic.
Th	is is a very risky proposal and I urge the Government to reject this project.
Sig	ned,
	guillan
	If you wish to maintain your privacy in this submission from the department's website please tick this box:
	I have not made a reportable political donation.



Name MAUROD CHAMBE KLAIN

Address 4 DERWENT AVE

AVONDALE NSW

2530

Date: 25/6/2017

Attn: Executive Director, Resource Assessments Department of Planning and Environment

GPO Box 39 Sydney NSW 2001

This is a submission to the Hume Coal Project EIS. SSD 7172

I object to this project and believe it should be rejected due to

THE POOR ECONOMICS OF THE HUME COAL PROJECT.

From the data in the EIS it is apparent that the project is unprofitable, with negative investment returns.

- This is a small mine and costly to operate.
- The product mix revealed in the EIS results in lower revenue than previously put forward, with nearly half the production low value thermal coal.
- The only way that the mine can improve its profitability would be to significantly increase production, makingthe EIS invalid in its present form.
- BAEconomics have not been asked to undertake the sensitivity analysis of how much output
 prices would need to fall for the project to have a zero NPV because Hume Coal considers it to
 be "commercial in confidence". (EIS Appendix Q page 42). This is unacceptable and an
 apparent inability to meet the 2015 guidelines for an EIS.

THE REJECT EMPLACEMENT AND BULKHEAD ISSUES

- The Metropolitan Colliery emplaced at least some of their rejects in mined voids in recent years. This operation required extensive experimentation over a number of years.
- They had the advantage of knowing the exact composition of their reject material and voids that were well away from current mining areas.
- The Airly Colliery considered this method of reject disposal but decided it posed unacceptable safety and other concerns.
- In contrast the Hume EIS assumes that reject emplacement behind bulkheads is a risk freeprocess. The
 design of the bulkheads is complex and their construction in an operating environment is
 problematic.

This is a very risky proposal and I urge the Government to reject this project.

Marson Chambelai

If you wish to maintain your privacy in this submission from the department's website please tick this box:	
I have not made a reportable political donation.	Ø

Name	rool	ey 1	Mc/1	ins
Address	571 /	veu	Y	Mhrs
.14	1 1 M	Tum	0/.	
	/,			,
				-

Date: 24/6/2017

Attn: Executive Director, Resource Assessments Department of Planning and Environment

GPO Box 39 Sydney NSW 2001

This is a submission to the Hume Coal Project EIS. SSD 7172

I object to this project and believe it should be rejected due to

THE POOR ECONOMICS OF THE HUME COAL PROJECT.

From the data in the EIS it is apparent that the project is unprofitable, with negative investment returns.

- This is a small mine and costly to operate.
- The product mix revealed in the EIS results in lower revenue than previously put forward, with nearly half the production low value thermal coal.
- The only way that the mine can improve its profitability would be to significantly increase production, makingthe EIS invalid in its present form.
- BAEconomics have not been asked to undertake the sensitivity analysis of how much output
 prices would need to fall for the project to have a zero NPV because Hume Coal considers it to
 be "commercial in confidence". (EIS Appendix Q page 42). This is unacceptable and an
 apparent inability to meet the 2015 guidelines for an EIS.

THE REJECT EMPLACEMENT AND BULKHEAD ISSUES

- The Metropolitan Colliery emplaced at least some of their rejects in mined voids in recent years. This operation required extensive experimentation over a number of years.
- They had the advantage of knowing the exact composition of their reject material and voids that were well away from current mining areas.
- The Airly Colliery considered this method of reject disposal but decided it posed unacceptable safety and other concerns.
- In contrast the Hume EIS assumes that reject emplacement behind bulkheads is a risk freeprocess. The
 design of the bulkheads is complex and their construction in an operating environment is
 problematic.

This is a very risky proposal and I urge the Government to reject this project.

Signed,

Allulli

If you wish to maintain your privacy in this submission from the department's website please tick this box:	
I have not made a reportable political donation.	d

Name Allina Owers
Address 29 Smarts Road
Tunut NSW
Date: 74 / 6 / 2017

GPO Box 39 Sydney NSW 2001

This is a submission to the Hume Coal Project EIS. SSD 7172

I object to this project and believe it should be rejected due to

THE POOR ECONOMICS OF THE HUME COAL PROJECT.

From the data in the EIS it is apparent that the project is unprofitable, with negative investment returns.

- This is a small mine and costly to operate.
- The product mix revealed in the EIS results in lower revenue than previously put forward, with nearly half the production low value thermal coal.
- The only way that the mine can improve its profitability would be to significantly increase production, makingthe EIS invalid in its present form.
- BAEconomics have not been asked to undertake the sensitivity analysis of how much output prices would need to fall for the project to have a zero NPV because Hume Coal considers it to be "commercial in confidence". (EIS Appendix Q page 42). This is unacceptable and an apparent inability to meet the 2015 guidelines for an EIS.

THE REJECT EMPLACEMENT AND BULKHEAD ISSUES

- The Metropolitan Colliery emplaced at least some of their rejects in mined voids in recent years. This operation required extensive experimentation over a number of years.
- They had the advantage of knowing the exact composition of their reject material and voids that were
 well away from current mining areas.
- The Airly Colliery considered this method of reject disposal but decided it posed unacceptable safety and other concerns.
- In contrast the Hume EIS assumes that reject emplacement behind bulkheads is a risk free process. The
 design of the bulkheads is complex and their construction in an operating environment is
 problematic.

This is a very risky proposal and I urge the Government to reject this project.

If you wish to maintain your privacy in this submission from the department's website please tick this box:	
I have not made a reportable political donation.	4

Name Paula Nielsen	
Address 22 Welmala Cres	
Address NX Weymun Cres	
<u>Koonawara</u>	
NSU 2530	
Date: 24/6/2017	
ttn: Executive Director, Resource Assessments Department of Planning and Environment PO Box 39 ydney NSW 2001	
This is a submission to the Hume Coal Project EIS. SSD 7172	
object to this project and believe it should be rejected due to HE POOR ECONOMICS OF THE HUME COAL PROJECT.	
from the data in the EIS it is apparent that the projectis unprofitable, with negative investment returns	.
he product mix revealed in the EIS results in lower revenue than previously put forward, with early half the production low value thermal coal. he only way that the mine can improve its profitability would be to significantly increase roduction, makingthe EIS invalid in its present form. AEconomics have not been asked to undertake the sensitivity analysis of how much output rices would need to fall for the project to have a zero NPV because Hume Coal considers it to e "commercial in confidence". (EIS Appendix Q page 42). This is unacceptable and an pparent inability to meet the 2015 guidelines for an EIS.	
HE REJECT EMPLACEMENT AND BULKHEAD ISSUES	
he Metropolitan Colliery emplaced at least some of their rejects in mined voids in recent years. This peration required extensive experimentation over a number of years. hey had the advantage of knowing the exact composition of their reject material and voids that were well away from curent mining areas. he Airly Colliery considered this method of reject disposal but decided it posed unacceptable safety a ther concerns. In contrast the Hume EIS assumes that reject emplacement behind bulkheads is a risk free process. The esign of the bulkheads is complex and their construction in an operating environment is roblematic.	
his is a very risky proposal and I urge the Government to reject this project.	
igned,	
If you wish to maintain your privacy in this submission from the department's website please tick this box:	
I have not made a reportable political donation.	

	A. for
	Name William Perter
	Address 5 Bound Clase
	Mittagone
	udal 2575
	Date: 24/6/2017
Attn: Executive Director, Resource Assessments Deparant and Environment GPO Box 39 Sydney NSW 2001	rtment of Planning
This is a submission to the Hume Coal Project	t EIS. SSD 7172
I object to this project and believe it should be rejected. THE POOR ECONOMICS OF THE HUME COAL PROJECT.	ed due to
From the data in the EIS it is apparent that the project is	unprofitable, with negative investment returns.
This is a small mine and costly to operate. The product mix revealed in the EIS results in lower revenearly half the production low value thermal coal. The only way that the mine can improve its profitability production, makingthe EIS invalid in its present form. BAEconomics have not been asked to undertake the sene prices would need to fall for the project to have a zero Nobe "commercial in confidence". (EIS Appendix Q page 42 apparent inability to meet the 2015 guidelines for an EIS	would be to significantly increase assitivity analysis of how much output NPV because Hume Coal considers it to 2). This is unacceptable and an
THE REJECT EMPLACEMENT AND BULKHEAD ISSUES	
The Metropolitan Colliery emplaced at least some of the operation required extensive experimentation over a nur They had the advantage of knowing the exact composition well away from curent mining areas. The Airly Colliery considered this method of reject disposther concerns. In contrast the Hume EIS assumes that reject emplacemed design of the bulkheads is complex and their construction problematic.	mber of years. on of their reject material and voids that were osal but decided it posed unacceptable safety and ent behind bulkheads is a risk freeprocess. The
This is a very risky proposal and I urge the Government t	to reject this project.
Signed,	
W. K. Pator	
If you wish to maintain your privacy in this submission from the	e department's website please tick this box:
I have not made a reportable political donation.	

	1. Clark
Name	Rose Streeter
Addre	Rose Streeter 255 12 Bornia St Boural
	boural
	Date: 18 / 6 / 2017
	Date: 10 / 6 / 2017
Attn: Executive Director, Resource Assessments Department and Environment GPO Box 39 Sydney NSW 2001	of Planning
This is a submission to the Hume Coal Project EIS.	SSD 7172
I object to this project and believe it should be rejected due t THE POOR ECONOMICS OF THE HUME COAL PROJECT.	:0
From the data in the EIS it is apparent that the project is unprofi	table, with negative investment returns.
This is a small mine and costly to operate. The product mix revealed in the EIS results in lower revenue that nearly half the production low value thermal coal. The only way that the mine can improve its profitability would be production, makingthe EIS invalid in its present form. BAEconomics have not been asked to undertake the sensitivity a prices would need to fall for the project to have a zero NPV becabe "commercial in confidence". (EIS Appendix Q page 42). This is apparent inability to meet the 2015 guidelines for an EIS.	e to significantly increase analysis of how much output ause Hume Coal considers it to
THE REJECT EMPLACEMENT AND BULKHEAD ISSUES	
The Metropolitan Colliery emplaced at least some of their reject operation required extensive experimentation over a number of They had the advantage of knowing the exact composition of the well away from current mining areas. The Airly Colliery considered this method of reject disposal but other concerns. In contrast the Hume EIS assumes that reject emplacement behindesign of the bulkheads is complex and their construction in an oproblematic.	years. eir reject material and voids that were decided it posed unacceptable safety and nd bulkheads is a risk freeprocess. The
This is a very risky proposal and I urge the Government to reject	this project.
Signed,	
RStreater	
If you wish to maintain your privacy in this submission from the departm	nent's website please tick this box:
I have not made a reportable political donation.	

Name	AHME	Mo	ORE
_		Box	1494
5	DW R.	14.	
	ate: \ / 6 /	/ 2017	

GPO Box 39 Sydney NSW 2001

This is a submission to the Hume Coal Project EIS. SSD 7172

I object to this project and believe it should be rejected due to

THE POOR ECONOMICS OF THE HUME COAL PROJECT.

From the data in the EIS it is apparent that the project is unprofitable, with negative investment returns.

- This is a small mine and costly to operate.
- The product mix revealed in the EIS results in lower revenue than previously put forward, with nearly half the production low value thermal coal.
- The only way that the mine can improve its profitability would be to significantly increase production, makingthe EIS invalid in its present form.
- BAEconomics have not been asked to undertake the sensitivity analysis of how much output
 prices would need to fall for the project to have a zero NPV because Hume Coal considers it to
 be "commercial in confidence". (EIS Appendix Q page 42). This is unacceptable and an
 apparent inability to meet the 2015 guidelines for an EIS.

THE REJECT EMPLACEMENT AND BULKHEAD ISSUES

- The Metropolitan Colliery emplaced at least some of their rejects in mined voids in recent years. This operation required extensive experimentation over a number of years.
- They had the advantage of knowing the exact composition of their reject material and voids that were well away from current mining areas.
- The Airly Colliery considered this method of reject disposal but decided it posed unacceptable safety and other concerns.
- In contrast the Hume EIS assumes that reject emplacement behind bulkheads is a risk freeprocess. The
 design of the bulkheads is complex and their construction in an operating environment is
 problematic.

This is a very risky proposal and I urge the Government to reject this project.

me P. Maore.

-	If you wish to maintain your privacy in this submission from the department's website please tick this box:	
	I have not made a reportable political donation.	X

Name Alex Cranl
Address 3 Arthur of
Randwick
Date: 8 / 6 / 2017

GPO Box 39 Sydney NSW 2001

This is a submission to the Hume Coal Project EIS. SSD 7172

I object to this project and believe it should be rejected due to

THE POOR ECONOMICS OF THE HUME COAL PROJECT.

From the data in the EIS it is apparent that the project is unprofitable, with negative investment returns.

- This is a small mine and costly to operate.
- The product mix revealed in the EIS results in lower revenue than previously put forward, with nearly half the production low value thermal coal.
- The only way that the mine can improve its profitability would be to significantly increase production, makingthe EIS invalid in its present form.
- BAEconomics have not been asked to undertake the sensitivity analysis of how much output
 prices would need to fall for the project to have a zero NPV because Hume Coal considers it to
 be "commercial in confidence". (EIS Appendix Q page 42). This is unacceptable and an
 apparent inability to meet the 2015 guidelines for an EIS.

THE REJECT EMPLACEMENT AND BULKHEAD ISSUES

- The Metropolitan Colliery emplaced at least some of their rejects in mined voids in recent years. This operation required extensive experimentation over a number of years.
- They had the advantage of knowing the exact composition of their reject material and voids that were well away from current mining areas.
- The Airly Colliery considered this method of reject disposal but decided it posed unacceptable safety and other concerns.
- In contrast the Hume EIS assumes that reject emplacement behind bulkheads is a risk freeprocess. The design of the bulkheads is complex and their construction in an operating environment is problematic.

This is a very risky proposal and I urge the Government to reject this project.

If you wish to maintain your privacy in this submission from the department's website please tick this box:	
I have not made a reportable political donation.	

Nar	me Sava Jane		
Add	ress 46 Roglan St		
Add	Hilltop		
	MILIOP		
	Date: \% 6 / 2017		
Attn: Executive Director, Resource Assessments Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39 Sydney NSW 2001			
This is a submission to the Hume Coal Project Els	S. SSD 7172		
I object to this project and believe it should be rejected due to THE POOR ECONOMICS OF THE HUME COAL PROJECT.			
From the data in the EIS it is apparent that the project is unpro	ofitable, with negative investment returns.		
This is a small mine and costly to operate. The product mix revealed in the EIS results in lower revenue to nearly half the production low value thermal coal. The only way that the mine can improve its profitability would production, makingthe EIS invalid in its present form. BAEconomics have not been asked to undertake the sensitivity prices would need to fall for the project to have a zero NPV be be "commercial in confidence". (EIS Appendix Q page 42). This apparent inability to meet the 2015 guidelines for an EIS.	be to significantly increase y analysis of how much output ecause Hume Coal considers it to		
THE REJECT EMPLACEMENT AND BULKHEAD ISSUES			
The Metropolitan Colliery emplaced at least some of their reject operation required extensive experimentation over a number of They had the advantage of knowing the exact composition of the well away from curent mining areas. The Airly Colliery considered this method of reject disposal but other concerns. In contrast the Hume EIS assumes that reject emplacement be design of the bulkheads is complex and their construction in a problematic.	of years. Their reject material and voids that were their decided it posed unacceptable safety and thind bulkheads is a risk freeprocess. The		
This is a very risky proposal and I urge the Government to reje	ect this project.		
Signed, Muha M			
If you wish to maintain your privacy in this submission from the depart	tment's website please tick this box:		
I have not made a reportable political donation.			

Name Prof Colin Murray - Wallace
Address School of Boths Environmental
University of Wollingung
Date: 18 / 6 / 2017

Attn: Executive Director, Resource Assessments Department of Planning and Environment
GPO Box 39
Sydney NSW 2001

This is a submission to the Hume Coal Project EIS. SSD 7172

I object to this project and believe it should be rejected due to

THE POOR ECONOMICS OF THE HUME COAL PROJECT.

From the data in the EIS it is apparent that the project is unprofitable, with negative investment returns.

- This is a small mine and costly to operate.
- The product mix revealed in the EIS results in lower revenue than previously put forward, with nearly half the production low value thermal coal.
- The only way that the mine can improve its profitability would be to significantly increase production, makingthe EIS invalid in its present form.
- BAEconomics have not been asked to undertake the sensitivity analysis of how much output
 prices would need to fall for the project to have a zero NPV because Hume Coal considers it to
 be "commercial in confidence". (EIS Appendix Q page 42). This is unacceptable and an
 apparent inability to meet the 2015 guidelines for an EIS.

THE REJECT EMPLACEMENT AND BULKHEAD ISSUES

- The Metropolitan Colliery emplaced at least some of their rejects in mined voids in recent years. This operation required extensive experimentation over a number of years.
- They had the advantage of knowing the exact composition of their reject material and voids that were well away from curent mining areas.
- The Airly Colliery considered this method of reject disposal but decided it posed unacceptable safety and other concerns.
- In contrast the Hume EIS assumes that reject emplacement behind bulkheads is a risk free process. The design of the bulkheads is complex and their construction in an operating environment is problematic.

This is a very risky proposal and I urge the Government to reject this project.

If you wish to maintain your privacy in this submission from the department's website please tick this box:	
I have not made a reportable political donation.	Ø

Name Jim INASTLE	
Address JOSE AL BANKS	יכ
KINGSLANGLY	
NEW.	
Date: 25/6/2017	

GPO Box 39 Sydney NSW 2001

This is a submission to the Hume Coal Project EIS. SSD 7172

I object to this project and believe it should be rejected due to

THE POOR ECONOMICS OF THE HUME COAL PROJECT.

From the data in the EIS it is apparent that the project is unprofitable, with negative investment returns.

- This is a small mine and costly to operate.
- The product mix revealed in the EIS results in lower revenue than previously put forward, with nearly half the production low value thermal coal.
- The only way that the mine can improve its profitability would be to significantly increase production, makingthe EIS invalid in its present form.
- BAEconomics have not been asked to undertake the sensitivity analysis of how much output prices would need to fall for the project to have a zero NPV because Hume Coal considers it to be "commercial in confidence". (EIS Appendix Q page 42). This is unacceptable and an apparent inability to meet the 2015 guidelines for an EIS.

THE REJECT EMPLACEMENT AND BULKHEAD ISSUES

1. North

- The Metropolitan Colliery emplaced at least some of their rejects in mined voids in recent years. This
 operation required extensive experimentation over a number of years.
- They had the advantage of knowing the exact composition of their reject material and voids that were well away from current mining areas.
- The Airly Colliery considered this method of reject disposal but decided it posed unacceptable safety and other concerns.
- In contrast the Hume EiS assumes that reject emplacement behind bulkheads is a risk freeprocess. The
 design of the bulkheads is complex and their construction in an operating environment is
 problematic.

This is a very risky proposal and I urge the Government to reject this project.

If you wish to maintain your privacy in this submission from the department's website please tick this box:	
I have not made a reportable political donation.	Ø

Name	Malt	Peters	<u>~</u>
Addre	ss 14/54	Moor	e . 5F
	Turn	ACT	2612

Date: 25/6/2017

Attn: Executive Director, Resource Assessments Department of Planning and Environment

GPO Box 39 Sydney NSW 2001

Signed,

This is a submission to the Hume Coal Project EIS. SSD 7172

I object to this project and believe it should be rejected due to

THE POOR ECONOMICS OF THE HUME COAL PROJECT.

From the data in the EIS it is apparent that the project is unprofitable, with negative investment returns.

• This is a small mine and costly to operate.

1

- The product mix revealed in the EIS results in lower revenue than previously put forward, with nearly half the production low value thermal coal.
- The only way that the mine can improve its profitability would be to significantly increase production, makingthe EIS invalid in its present form.
- BAEconomics have not been asked to undertake the sensitivity analysis of how much output
 prices would need to fall for the project to have a zero NPV because Hume Coal considers it to
 be "commercial in confidence". (EIS Appendix Q page 42). This is unacceptable and an
 apparent inability to meet the 2015 guidelines for an EIS.

THE REJECT EMPLACEMENT AND BULKHEAD ISSUES

- The Metropolitan Colliery emplaced at least some of their rejects in mined voids in recent years. This operation required extensive experimentation over a number of years.
- They had the advantage of knowing the exact composition of their reject material and voids that were well away from current mining areas.
- The Airly Colliery considered this method of reject disposal but decided it posed unacceptable safety and other concerns.
- In contrast the Hume EIS assumes that reject emplacement behind bulkheads is a risk freeprocess. The
 design of the bulkheads is complex and their construction in an operating environment is
 problematic.

This is a very risky proposal and I urge the Government to reject this project.

If you wish to maintain your privacy in this submission from the departr	nent's website please tick this box:
I have not made a reportable political donation.	

Name 13	Droco	5
Address 4.C4	Mydislar	100
SACK	VILLE	
, -/ -	0,	

Date: 24/6/2017

Attn: Executive Director, Resource Assessments Department of Planning and Environment

GPO Box 39 Sydney NSW 2001

This is a submission to the Hume Coal Project EIS. SSD 7172

I object to this project and believe it should be rejected due to

THE POOR ECONOMICS OF THE HUME COAL PROJECT.

From the data in the EIS it is apparent that the project is unprofitable, with negative investment returns.

- This is a small mine and costly to operate.
- The product mix revealed in the EIS results in lower revenue than previously put forward, with nearly half the production low value thermal coal.
- The only way that the mine can improve its profitability would be to significantly increase production, makingthe EIS invalid in its present form.
- BAEconomics have not been asked to undertake the sensitivity analysis of how much output
 prices would need to fall for the project to have a zero NPV because Hume Coal considers it to
 be "commercial in confidence". (EIS Appendix Q page 42). This is unacceptable and an
 apparent inability to meet the 2015 guidelines for an EIS.

THE REJECT EMPLACEMENT AND BULKHEAD ISSUES

I have not made a reportable political donation.

- The Metropolitan Colliery emplaced at least some of their rejects in mined voids in recent years. This operation required extensive experimentation over a number of years.
- They had the advantage of knowing the exact composition of their reject material and voids that were well away from current mining areas.
- The Airly Colliery considered this method of reject disposal but decided it posed unacceptable safety and other concerns.
- In contrast the Hume EIS assumes that reject emplacement behind bulkheads is a risk freeprocess. The
 design of the bulkheads is complex and their construction in an operating environment is
 problematic.

This is a very risky proposal and I urge the Government to reject this project.

Signed,

If you wish to maintain your privacy in this submission from the department's website please tick this box:



Name_	JEF	f Coh	5N	<u>, </u>		
Address	80	W17	4	_FLA	75	NO
_	CA	Nyun	CLI	<u> </u>		
г	Tate LL	6 / 2017				

 $\sqrt{}$

Attn: Executive Director, Resource Assessments Department of Planning and Environment

GPO Box 39 Sydney NSW 2001

This is a submission to the Hume Coal Project EIS. SSD 7172

I object to this project and believe it should be rejected due to

THE POOR ECONOMICS OF THE HUME COAL PROJECT.

From the data in the EIS it is apparent that the project is unprofitable, with negative investment returns.

- This is a small mine and costly to operate.
- The product mix revealed in the EIS results in lower revenue than previously put forward, with nearly half the production low value thermal coal.
- The only way that the mine can improve its profitability would be to significantly increase production, makingthe EIS invalid in its present form.
- BAEconomics have not been asked to undertake the sensitivity analysis of how much output
 prices would need to fall for the project to have a zero NPV because Hume Coal considers it to
 be "commercial in confidence". (EIS Appendix Q page 42). This is unacceptable and an
 apparent inability to meet the 2015 guidelines for an EIS.

THE REJECT EMPLACEMENT AND BULKHEAD ISSUES

- The Metropolitan Colliery emplaced at least some of their rejects in mined voids in recent years. This operation required extensive experimentation over a number of years.
- They had the advantage of knowing the exact composition of their reject material and voids that were well away from current mining areas.
- The Airly Colliery considered this method of reject disposal but decided it posed unacceptable safety and other concerns.
- In contrast the Hume EIS assumes that reject emplacement behind bulkheads is a risk free process. The design of the bulkheads is complex and their construction in an operating environment is problematic.

This is a very risky proposal and I urge the Government to reject this project.

Signed,	Wa	
If you v	wish to maintain your privacy in this submission from the department's website please tick this box:	

I have not made a reportable political donation.

Name Catherine Crawford
Address 2/32 Charles
20 Fernhill 2519
Date: 1 / 6 / 2017

GPO Box 39 Sydney NSW 2001

This is a submission to the Hume Coal Project EIS. SSD 7172

I object to this project and believe it should be rejected due to

THE POOR ECONOMICS OF THE HUME COAL PROJECT.

From the data in the EIS it is apparent that the project is unprofitable, with negative investment returns.

- This is a small mine and costly to operate.
- The product mix revealed in the EIS results in lower revenue than previously put forward, with nearly half the production low value thermal coal.
- The only way that the mine can improve its profitability would be to significantly increase production, makingthe EIS invalid in its present form.
- BAEconomics have not been asked to undertake the sensitivity analysis of how much output
 prices would need to fall for the project to have a zero NPV because Hume Coal considers it to
 be "commercial in confidence". (EIS Appendix Q page 42). This is unacceptable and an
 apparent inability to meet the 2015 guidelines for an EIS.

THE REJECT EMPLACEMENT AND BULKHEAD ISSUES

- The Metropolitan Colliery emplaced at least some of their rejects in mined voids in recent years. This operation required extensive experimentation over a number of years.
- They had the advantage of knowing the exact composition of their reject material and voids that were well away from curent mining areas.
- The Airly Colliery considered this method of reject disposal but decided it posed unacceptable safety and other concerns.
- In contrast the Hume EIS assumes that reject emplacement behind bulkheads is a risk freeprocess. The
 design of the bulkheads is complex and their construction in an operating environment is
 problematic.

This is a very risky proposal and I urge the Government to reject this project.

	11		igned,
	Lel	2	
 		~ ~	

If you wish to maintain your privacy in this submission from the department's website please tick this box:	
I have not made a reportable political donation.	V