

Thank-you fir giving me the opportunity to talk to you.

It is indeed pleasing for Centennial that the coal price is so high that they want to take advantage of it.

I am pleased for the extra workers they would like to put on. It seems the ideal opportunity to adhere to the initial consent conditions. To properly divert and treat the water in the agreed time frame, and stop pouring the totally unacceptable levels of pollution into the Cox's River and thereby to our drinking water.

To ask for a 2 year extension to continue to pour toxic mine waste into our water catchment is completely unacceptable.

To increase production by 22% will significantly increase the amount of discharge especially if projected to a 2 year extension.

Neither the Cox's river nor the citizens drinking the Sydney water should be subjected to this.

Any approval for an increase in coal extraction must be contingent upon withdrawing the application to continue the untreated discharge.

It is for good reason no other city in the world allows coal mining in their water catchment. And for good reason that this government promised to protect the drinking water by banning mining in water catchments.

## Swamps:

It is clear that the environmental impact statement upon which approval for this mine was based was grossly inadequate.

The scientific report from the office of environment and heritage clearly outlines the significant dangers.

Coastal Upland Swamp in the Sydney Basin Bioregion - endangered ecological community listing

NSW Scientific Committee - final determination 2014

18. Subsidence and warping of the land surface associated with longwall mining of underground coal seams potentially changes hydrological processes involving both ground water and surface water. Longwall mining results in fracturing of bedrock layers between the coal seam and the surface, as well as subsidence, upsidence, tilting and buckling of the ground surface and valley closure (Department of Planning 2008). Horizontal and vertical displacements may occur up to 1-3 km outside the footprint of the mine workings (ACARP 2001, 2002) and may continue several years after seam extraction, although most movement occurs soon afterwards (Holla & Barclay 2000).

The independent monitoring panel (original PAC) clearly had concerns regarding Centennial's EIS by stating in its advice to the Dept. of Planning

Prof Jim Galvin

"the out-comes have caused the panel to question if swamps located on lineament zones may be responding to mining in ways not fully accounted for in the extensive studies undertaken by Centennial Coal"

"part one of the pre-amble lists a number of factors that Centennial coal contends must occur together in order for a mining related impact to manifest itself with-in a temperate highland peat swamp....In the absence of supporting data the Panel does not concur with this contention"

But it seems that the Dept of planning and PAC despite their concerns accepted Centennials EIS. Of minimal negligible impacts and opted for monitoring devices.

I believe each long wall is approved independently, so that monitoring and adjustment could take place.

But the condition of approval was negligible impact.

The departments response to the extension application

Existing performance criteria and offset provisions.

6.2.3.A comprehensive monitoring program directed towards identifying whether performance measures have been met.

Clearly they have not

I was extremely shocked to read the department's response to the statement.

'The IMP has noted a significant drop in the water levels of two of the swamps above current mining areas

"The dept. acknowledges that there have been impacts on swamps from mining at Springvale and is concerned that these may be long term impacts requiring offsets. However the Dept also notes that ~~impacts to~~ these impacts were predicted and are allowed under the existing consent".

On page 7 of the development consent it clearly states that changes in water levels in swamps are to be negligible.

A significant drop in water level that is probably permanent is far from negligible.

It is stated that if the monitoring finds that the adverse impacts are found then the mining practice should be altered.

This does not seem to have been a requirement of the planning department, who have just installed more monitoring, and another \$2m for offset payments.

To allow an increase in production clearly would impact on how well the monitoring could function as fluctuations and decreases in water flow are not always immediately obvious.

I believe the company is in breach of its present approval. Environmental impacts were promised to be minimal. They must change the method of extraction, by not mining underneath the endangered swamps, or perhaps severely narrowing the tunnels under the swamps to the 6-10 metres that was the method of mining 100 years ago. (that would create more jobs)

Offsets are totally inappropriate when dealing with a swamp that feeds a world heritage river.

There are no like for like swamps available, and it does nothing to save a river by saving a swamp in a different catchment.

The swamps feed the rivers so they continue to flow in drought. Once the swamps are gone the rivers will and are becoming dry. The whole vegetation along them will change.

The dry peat in the swamp becomes a tinderbox,

Bush-fires will be far more prevalent and severe.

This is the world heritage National park, that is being destroyed.

Centennial coal is a foreign owned company. They have no interest in our national park or the Newnes forest. When the coal is gone in 10 years so will they be. But Lithgow citizens will still be here. Don't let poor mining practices destroy your whole future.

It's up to planning to act in the interest of NSW citizens

The offset payment of \$2m or \$4m is an absolute affront to the whole population of NSW. I doubt it would even pay for a feasibility study into how to repair a damaged swamp. It won't go anywhere near paying for the clean-up of 1 bushfire, let alone the increase in bushfires for generations.

With \$450m-550 of coal to be extracted each year I don't think offset payment is going to induce them to protect our swamps.

If Centennial wants to increase its output it must be insisted they adopt mining practices that do not destroy the swamps.

Peggy Fisher

Lane Cove Coal and gas watch.

Mr Andrew Game Osborne.  
The amount of coal & damage is the problem.