

Name C. A. BAIRD

Address 14 YEAN ST
BURBASO

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, 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,

Carol A. 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.

☒

1.2
Name Ben Hicks

Address 2 Acer Ct

Bowral

NSW

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

- 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 MARK JOHNSONAddress 9 Bocks RDOAKVILLENSW 2765Date: 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, 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,



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 SC JOHNSONAddress 9 BOCKS RDOAKVILLENSW 2765Date: 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, 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,



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 S. W. Lush
 Address 20 Railway Pde
Bowral.

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

- 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.

☒

1.6

Name

Address

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, 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,

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 STEPHEN BROWNAddress 19 KIMBERLEY &
BOWRAEDate: 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, 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,



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 NEIL WARNERAddress 12 GOVERNMENTROADMITTAGONGDate: 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, 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,



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 B. DONTAKKYAddress 6 BRIDGE PKWYBURRADADate: 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, 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,



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 Kirenkumar SolankiAddress 13 Elizabeth St.MittagongNSW 2275Date: 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

- 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,

CSL

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 Trudi Spencer

Address 4 Siemens st
Mt Hagen

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

- 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 Janine MCPHERSONAddress 71 Blencowes Lane
Wildes MeadowDate: 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, 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,

Janine MCPHERSON

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 Lynne MooreAddress 490 Woodlands Rd
Woodlands 2575Date: 7/6/2017Attn: Executive Director, Resource Assessments Department of Planning
and EnvironmentGPO 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,

Lynne E. Moore

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 JessopAddress 875 Old South RdMittagong
NSW 2575Date: 17/6/2017Attn: Executive Director, Resource Assessments Department of Planning
and EnvironmentGPO 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,



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.

☒

1-15
Name Mike Langan

Address 30 LA Tamborine Rd
Robinson

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

- 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.

☒

116
Name L. FLOWER

Address 17 DE LAURET ST

RENEWICK

NSW 2575

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, 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,



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 Sylvia Flower
Address 17 De Laurel St
Renwick

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, 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,

Sylvia Flower

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 OLIVER

Address 23 ROBINIA DR
BOWRAL NSW

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, 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,



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 P. P. Per
 Address P.O. Box 2256
Bowral
NSW 2576

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, 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,



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 JOHN PEARLAddress 28 CLIFF STBOWRAL 2576NSWDate: 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, 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,

John E Pearl

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 P McEWAN
Address 33 MERILBAH RD
BOWRAL

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, 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,



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 Lesley Pearl
 Address 28 Cliff St
Bowral 2576

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, 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,

Lesley Pearl

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 Lisa EbelingAddress 6 Lyell StMitragongDate: 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, 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,



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 Joan Vucance

Address PO Box 1631
Bowral 2576

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, 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,



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

Liz Ikononidis

Address

3 Wilshire
Ave
Cronulla

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, 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,



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 G. IKONOMIDISAddress 3 Wilshire Ave
CRONULLA 2230Date: 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, 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,



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 MCLARENAddress 123 FITZROY RDLIAMA HEIGHTS2533Date: 16 / 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,



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.

☒

148
Name BEVERLEY HARCASLE

Address 1 Gloria Place
St Penith
NSW 2750

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, 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,

Beverley Harcastle

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 P. LANYI
Address 6 DALTON ST.
MITTAGON

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, 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, P. Lanyi

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.

☒

130
Name Elaine Moss

Address Honella-Dan
Ave Trojear
NSW

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, 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 Moss

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 MANDY MILESAddress 575 JACKS CORNER RD
KANGAROO VALLEY NSWDate: 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, 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,

M. Miles

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 DALJIT SINGH
 Address 34 CORNWALL AVE
TURRAMURRA
NSW 2074
 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, 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,



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 Stephanie IkenomidisAddress 3 Wilshire AveCronullaNSWDate: 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, 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,



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 HOFFMANAddress 102 BURNHARDT RDBURNHARDT2576

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,



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 LI MANNAAddress 14 EAST STBardwell valleyDate: 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, 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,



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 CAROL RIZZUTOAddress 4 Centennial Cr.Bomaderry2541.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, 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,



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 PhippsAddress 10 Oxley dr
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, 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,



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 Geoff HalwardAddress 84 WATTLE CREEK DRTHIRBA PARKNSWDate: 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, 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,



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 Doreen JONESAddress 3 JARARA RDW - CAMBENARRA2540Date: 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, 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,

Doreen Jones

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 Rosemary Hanna
 Address 11 Cleary Lane
Witless Meadow
2577

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, 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,

RJ Hanna

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.



1.97
Name R. GORE

Address 49B KANGALAN RD
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.
- 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,



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 WHETTONAddress 49 WOODBINE STBOWRALNSW 2576

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, 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,

David Whetton

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 SturgesmoreAddress 128 OLD GOSFORD RDWIMBORERAI 2260NSWDate: 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, 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,



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 Kayte Barnard

Address 32 Noongah st
Bargo NSW

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, 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,

K Barnard

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 Melinda ProuseAddress 2 Susan St27th Westworthville2145Date: 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, 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,



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 Shand SmithAddress 30 Glebe AKingswood NSW 274Date: 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, 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,



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.

☒

147
Name Robert Firth

Address 2/24 Milson Rd
Cremorne Point
NSW 2090

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,



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 Campbell
 Address 76 Dieessel 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, 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,

Helen Campbell.

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 JOHN ROBERTSON
 Address 138 LIEBMAN RD
MEDWAY

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, 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,



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 Jeff PetersenAddress 86 Duncan StMANOUPRADate: 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, 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,



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.

☒

1.21

Name Angus Sutherland
Address 12 Matthew St
Cessnock NSW

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, 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,



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 Tony Coetman Smith
 Address 74 Years Rd
Clenquarry
NSW

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, 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,



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 Max MacbeviliusAddress 41B Robertson RdMoss ValeDate: 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, 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,

M. Macbevilius

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 John
 Address Campbell St
Pictou
N.S.W.

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, 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,

John

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.

☒

1.55

Name Ines Dunn
Address 310 Joagja Rd.
Mandemur 2575

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, 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,

Ines Dunn

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 F. Chapman

Address 50 Toongoon Rd

BURRADO

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, 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,

F. Chapman

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.

☒

157
Name Pam Moor

Address 4 Yean St

Burradoo

0576

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, 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,

P. Moor

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 THOMPSONAddress 58 THOMPSON STBONRAZNSW 2576Date: 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

- 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,

Peter Thompson

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 D. REIDAddress 21-23 PATTEN STMITTAGONGDate: 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, 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,

D. Reid

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 Abbie Rath
 Address 38 Wattle
St Colo Vale
NSW

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, 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,



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 Carolyn GrenfellAddress 14A Holly Road
Burradoo
2576Date: 17/6/2017Attn: Executive Director, Resource Assessments Department of Planning
and EnvironmentGPO 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,



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 MonteithAddress 12 ROSS STBUNDABERGDate 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

- 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,

Bruce Monteith

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 C. McFADZEANAddress 88 Oxley Rd
MurrumbidgeeDate: 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, 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,

Jim Ladzina

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 8 RAGLAN ST

BERRIMA

NSW 2577

Date: 10 / 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,



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 STUART MACLEODAddress 17 METEOR PLRAB 72566Date: 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, 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,



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: 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, 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,



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 Rhonda HewettAddress 6 DENBIGH DRIVE
EAST BOWRAL
2576Date: 17/6/2017Attn: Executive Director, Resource Assessments Department of Planning
and EnvironmentGPO 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,

Rhonda Hewett

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
 Address 6 Densigh Dr
East Bowral NSW
2576

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, 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,

Gina Pontoni

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. ScottAddress 68 Osborne RdBurwoodNSW 2576Date: 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, 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. Scott

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 ANTHONY KINCAddress 56 BERRIMASWells
2575Date: 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, 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,



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 Domenic Costanzo
 Address 50 Ivory St
Crace ACT
2911

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

- 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 TINA TRIALIAAddress 4 OXLEY DRIVE
BONNIE NSW 2576Date: 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, 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,



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 Taryn Brown
 Address 88 Harrington Ave
Castle Hill
NSW 2154
 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, 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,

Taryn Brown

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. DawsonAddress 10 Myosotis StBarrabaDate: 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, 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,



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 BlakeAddress 6/21 Oxley Dr.
Bowral 2576Date: 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, 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,

Kate 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 BLUEAddress 6/21 Oakley Dr
Bowral NSW 2576Date: 18/6/2017Attn: Executive Director, Resource Assessments Department of Planning
and EnvironmentGPO 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,



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. KNEZEVICAddress 18 PARMENTER COURTBOWRAL~~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, 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,

V. Knezevic

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 NealeAddress 66 Mount Rd
Bowral NSWDate: 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, 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,

David Neale

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 P. ANTILLIAddress 2 KIMBERLEY D,
BOURNA.Date: 18/6/2017Attn: Executive Director, Resource Assessments Department of Planning
and EnvironmentGPO 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,



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 Claudia AuserAddress 861 Maryland RdGreystanesDate: 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, 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,

Claudia Auser

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 Michelle Dobson
 Address 16 Villiers St
Mayfield

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, 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,



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 Eliza CannonAddress 16 Kellaway AveCamden2570Date: 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, 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,



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 Scarlet Rose Weate-JonesAddress 3 GoreAvenue Kirrawee2232Date: 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, 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,



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 GARY ANDERSONAddress 95 WHERI DRIVE
WALDARA VIC 3618Date 8 / 6 / 2017Attn: Executive Director, Resource Assessments Department of Planning
and EnvironmentGPO 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,



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 Stephanie DAVIDAddress 11 BOZ MORSE ST.2576Date: 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, 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,

Stephanie

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 Kerry Anderson
 Address 95 Vessers Dr.
Waldara Vic
3678
 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, 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,

K. Anderson

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 Steven HumeAddress 6/3 VictoriaSt DavidDate: 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, 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,



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 Steve HapthoAddress 22 Ross StNewportDate: 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, 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,



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.

☐

1.89
Name Deborah Gilroy
Address 13 Edwards St.
Mt Hagen 2575

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, 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,

D. Gilroy

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 Margaret RenaudAddress PO Box 28Fairy Meadow2519Date: 16 / 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,

Margaret Renaud

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 Barbuto
 Address 32 Osborne Rd
Burradoo
NSW 2576

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, 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,



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 54/502N Moss Vale Rd
BOWRAH

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, 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,

Ann Beaumont

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 Conner Johnson
 Address 19 Lyrebird Close
SHELL HARBOUR

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,

Conner Johnson

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 BarkerAddress 40 Handley's
Lane High RangeDate: 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, 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,

Kellie 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 BaileyAddress 40 HANDLEY'S 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, 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,



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 ANNA ALESSI
 Address 8 Fredman ct
Dingley Village
VIC 3172

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,

Anna Alessi

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 MARILYN CAVANAGHAddress 20 GIBRALTOR Rd
BOWRAL NSWDate 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, 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,



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 Daniel CowleyAddress 20/1 Pitt StreetRundwick 2031SydneyDate: 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, 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,

Daniel Cowley

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 Laura Battersby
 Address 64 Blue Gum Rd
Bundamba

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, 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,



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.

☒

1-100

Name JULIE BATTERBY
Address 64 BLUE GUM RD
BUNDANOON NSW

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, 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,



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 J. JOHNSONAddress 19 DRAYTON AVE
CASTLE HILLDate: 18/6/2017Attn: Executive Director, Resource Assessments Department of Planning
and EnvironmentGPO 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,

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 P. RyanAddress 2/95 Mount St -
Cooee
2034Date: 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, 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,

P. Ryan

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 SAVAGEAddress 102 MARAM RD
Forest LodgeDate: 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, 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, 1

RSavage

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 Rufina FerrerAddress 38 MerrigangSt Barrow2576Date: 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, 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,



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 J PennAddress 103/1 Coronation AvePeterborough2049Date: 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, 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,



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 MerchantAddress 604, 3-7a AlamedaSt KildaVic 3182Date: 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, 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,

James Merchant

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 DELE RICHARDS
 Address 18 Asot Rd.
BOOKAL

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, 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,



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 Juliet BehrensAddress 3 Ende PlHoplesACT 2605Date: 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, 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,



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 Markus MollisonAddress 57 Humea.DaggeDate: 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, 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,

Markus Mollison

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 HERNIMAN
BRONKHORST

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, 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,



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.

☒

1-111

Name Marion Fogers
Address 177 Monaro Cir
Redhill ACT 2603

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, 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,

Marion Fogers

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 STEWART ROGER SAddress 177 MONARO CRRED HILLDate: 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, 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,



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.

☐

1.113

Name Natasha Cardell

Address 4 Harnett Lane

Mittagong

NSW 2575

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, 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,

Natasha Cardell

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.

☒

1-114

Name Pat Barker

Address 3 Yume Close

Jewells

Newcastle

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, 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,

Pat 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.

☒

1-115

Name PAUL McLEAN

Address 5/23 OXLEY DR
BOWRAL

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

- 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,

Amelia

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 Meghan HarmanAddress 743/2 The Crescent
Wentworth Point
NSW 2127Date: 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, 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,

M. Harman

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.

☒

1.117

Name JANE HUNT

Address 613 VICTORIA ST

BOWRAL

NSW

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, 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,



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 MURRAY WATZENAddress ALBION221 PENROSE RDBUNDANOON.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, 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,



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.

☒

1.1/9

Name Colin Muldon

Address 9 Duke St

Bonural

2576

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, 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,

C. Muldon

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.

☒

1-120

Name MARK JOHNSON

Address 36 BERKE CRES

MACCREGOR

ACT 2615

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, 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,



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.

☒

1.121

Name Linden Johnson

Address 36 Berne Cres

MacGregor

ACT 2615

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, 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,

L. Johnson

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 Made Sahr
 Address 20 Vowledge Way
Mohandineer Q
4214

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, 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,



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 GILL GRAHAMAddress 1 ELM STREET
BOWRALDate: 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, 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,



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.

☒

1.12.4

Name Robert Niman

Address 2A Dalmar St
Croydon 2132

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, 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,



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.

☒

1-125

Name NATHAN ROBERTS

Address 59 FARRIOR AVE

ENNAOINE

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, 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,



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.

☒

1126

Name AVIL CHETTY

Address 561 CROWN ST

SURRY HILLS NSW

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, 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,



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.

☒

1127

Name Jonathan Palmer
Address Post office Box
2802 NSW Bowral
2576

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, 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,



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

Address

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, 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,



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.

☐

1-12-9

Name Alex Zahra

Address 18 Heyser St

Abbotsbury

2176

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, 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,

Alex Zahra

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.

☒

1.130

Name Shenshan Abdishev

Address 18 SANDHIA AVE

GLIMWOOD. 2768

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, 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,



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.

☒

1-131

Name P. Jennings
Address 9/4 Shore St.
Bowral
2576

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, 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,

Al. Helena Jennings

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 Victor DurziAddress 35 Gleveland AveAustralDate: 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, 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,



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.

☒

1.133

Name Megan Durzi
Address 35 Elverth Ave
Austral 2179

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, 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,

Megan Durzi

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.

☒

1-134

Name Soujz Gallzher
Address 755 Botany Road
Rosebery

Date: 14 / 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,



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.

☐

1-135

Name Jim Simonovik

Address 49 Gungahlin St

ASHLEY 2400 NSW

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, 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,



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.

☒

1-136

Name GARRY HINES

Address 67 ENDEAVOUR CIR
HARRINGTON PARK

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, 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,



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.

☒

1-137

Name Clare Slattery
Address 9a Aitken Road
Bowral 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, 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,



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.

☒

1-138

Name Wayne Quagman

Address 7 Jeffery St
Canterbury.

Date: 12 / 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,



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.

☒

1.139

Name Megan Mante

Address 32 TALLOWOOD

WAY FRICKS FOREST

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,



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.

☒

1140

Name J. MILLAR
Address P.O box 136
Barnal
2576

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, 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,

Julian

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.

☒

~~7153~~ 1-191

Name MAUREEN CHAMBERLAIN

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, 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,

Maureen Chamberlain

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 Bradley Mullins
 Address 571 Newy Mtns
Hwy, Tumut.

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, 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,



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.

☒

1-143

Name Allira Owens

Address 29 Smarts Road

Tumut NSW

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, 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,



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.

☒

1.144

Name Paula Nielsen

Address 22 Weemata Cres

Koonawarra

NSW 2530

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, 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,



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 William PastorAddress 5 Bound RoadMittagongNed 2575Date: 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, 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,

W. K. Pastor

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.

☒

1146

Name Rose Streeter

Address 12 Bormia St

Boural

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, 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,

R Streeter

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 ANNE MOORE
 Address P.O. Box 1494
BOWRAL

Date: 27 / 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,

Anne P. Moore.

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.

☒

7-148

Name Alex Crane

Address 3 Arthur St
Randwick

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, 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,



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 Sara-JaneAddress 46 Raglan St
HilltopDate: 18/6/2017Attn: Executive Director, Resource Assessments Department of Planning
and EnvironmentGPO 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,



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.

☒

1.150

Name Prof Colin Murray-Wallace

Address School of Earth & Environmental Sciences
University of Wollongong

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, 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,



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.

☒

1151

Name Jim WASTLE

Address JOSIE AL BARKS DR

RIVSLAND 4

NSW

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, 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,

J. Wastle

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.

☒

1-152

Name Matt Peterson

Address 14/54 Moore St

Turner ACT 2612

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, 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,



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.

☒

~~1-153~~
Name B. Dragos
Address 454 Myd Island Rd
SACKVILLE

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, 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,



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.

☒

1.154

Name JEFF COHEN

Address 80 WATTLE FLATS RD
CANYONCREEK

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, 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,



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 Catherine CrawfordAddress 2/32 CharlesRD Fernhill 2519Date 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, 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,



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.

☒