AIRLY MINE EXTENSION PROJECT - SSD 5581 21st September 2015

This submission is an objection to the Airly Mine Extension Proposal

I object to the proposal to extend mining east into A232, as this will effectively double the mining lease area, and was not an idea proposed during the first 20 years of the mine.
This would mean that the mine was extracting coal under all of the Airly-Genowlan mesa.
I want to see the eastern half left as it is, in an undisturbed state, with the SCA added to the National Parks estate. I don't want coal mining under every bit of ground where coal occurs. Some places of environmental significance should be left untouched for the future. Coal occurs commonly in eastern Australia, whereas the biodiversity and geodiversity of the Airly-Genowlan mesa are unique. If you want coal get it from some other degraded areas such as farmland which can be more readily rehabilitated and used again.
The conservation value of Mugii Murum-ban SCA should be valued greater than the commercial value of the coal beneath it.

The Department considers that the risk of subsidence impact to the critically-endangered Pultenaea and Heathland EEC is "low'. It should be "negligible", as the consequence of any impact would be high.

The Department considers that mine-water would be "unlikely" to have greater-than- negligible impact on the downstream aquatic environment within the Gardens of Stone NP.
This sounds too vague to me, and greater protection should be provided. The mine water discharged from the all the other Centennial Coal mines is high in salt and contains toxins, so why would this mine be any different except that there might be less of the water discharged.

The construction of an additional 40,000 tone ROM coal stockpile and a 5.2 million cubic metre reject emplacement dump would be a blight on the landscape.

Subsidence is predicted up to 125mm in the panel and pillar zone where 67% of coal is extracted. This mining method is proposed for the bulk of the proposed mining area, comprising the ridge top areas above the cliff lines.
I believe that if any mining goes ahead it should be first workings only on the ridge-top areas, same as proposed for the Cliff Line Zone, without second workings. This would result in much smaller ground subsidence causing less environmental impacts, such as is the practice at Centennial Coal's Clarence Colliery.
The predicted impacts of cracking and collapse of 2% of cliffs and pagodas is not acceptable in this day and age. The aim should be for negligible impacts.

Subsidence of 200 to 500mm in the Interaction Zone which already has some cracks from old mining, is for just 1 Mt reserve of coal in that area. Leave it alone!

Cracking of the ground from mine subsidence is bound to have adverse groundwater impacts, especially under the New Hartley mine old workings where subsidence is predicted to be up to

500mm. The National Trust listed New Hartley historic ruins are also under threat from the mine subsidence.

Centennial's plan to extract 52% of the coal under the State Conservation Area is not a proper balance between profit and the cost of irreversible environment damage.

I don't believe that Centennial Coal should be giving money to the local Council and "community" as this is a form of bribery and a way of trying to get approval of developments.

Regards...
Andrew Valja
[redacted]