

① Deidre Olofsson

7/12/17

Wambo Mod 17.

This is a objection related to the material provided on department of planning website.

Response to Submission overview from department

EPA! 27/9/17

- bML discharge from the premise via sediment
- lack of information on concentrations of pollutants or water quality
- lack of EIS on water discharge

Report of Industry' Reference No 17/42655

- draft conditions provide insufficient detail baseline data, to preventing performance measures of the 2012 AEP
- not adhering to policy of not providing baseline groundwater data

DPT. reference 17/39713

- The proponent has not adequately addressed matters previously in relation to water resources and there is insufficient baseline data

OEH 17/470827 6.10.17

- Project may cause unexpected subsidence impacts that could affect threatened biodiversity

I ESC

- water drawdown could impact private bores
- lack or limited information on surface or ground water data
- Cumulative impacts assessment related to water has not been addressed

As there was no submission from NSW health department on the application

- has the project been assessed for health perspective due to cumulative impacts of noise and air quality
- has it been assessed under the new air quality modelling 2017

### In conclusion of information

1. lack of data and information provided has impacted departments and experts to provide the public with clear direction of intent of value of modification in terms of impacts, economic value
2. Lack of information on the rehabilitation value as a future assess or the cost analysis of maintenance, monitoring and impacts on water quality and stability.
3. Lack of data and information related to impacts to private residences, on water quality, future viability of the assessment.
4. Concerns related to KPI's on the proponent to adhere to policies or consents if the data baseline is insufficient and how can compliance be implemented by a department

The concern here is that the department of Planning has referred an application to a commission to make a determination and knowingly that all the evidence has not been provided, what would be considered a failure and flawed system of assessment. Has the department considered its action of referring an application which is incomplete the perceived perception on data provided which could be considered misuse of public expenditure.

Would this evidence stand up in the legal system is the question to be asked, and what would be the outcome. How can a assessment or merit be done when evidence is not clearly provided.

The concern also is that a commission that states it is independent has commenced the process of assessment when there is clear indicators of insufficient data and

that the quality of information maybe perceived to hinder others to make a decision of been transparent and educated conclusion of the facts.

On recent correspondence with PAC on concerns related to skills and training to assess an application, has the commissioner the ability to determine his application is the perceived perception, will be his be on merit and if the process transparent, is the meeting process related to the application fair and just, does records management reflect this.

as this is not the first time an application referred to the PAC with insufficed information show a clear indicator of a flawed system and a break down of procedural process and standards, where a review or investigation is required as member of the public should have confidence in the system but a system which is under a concern causes distress, may lead to decisions that may be tested.

7/12/17

WAMBO Project. No 17. modification

Reason of objection should not be taken lightly. To be perfectly clear the reasons have been identified to the skills