

## Troy Deighton

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Monday, 18 March 2019 9:30 AM  
**To:** IPCN Enquiries Mailbox  
**Cc:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** FW: Vickery Extension Project: Whitehaven Coal response to IPC 5th and 7th March 2019  
**Attachments:** 190125 Ken Crawford to Mary OKane.pdf

**Categories:** Aaron

Dear David,

I do not seem to have an answer to my question; will the Liverpool Plains community have an opportunity to respond to Whitehaven Coal's response? It appears as if Whitehaven Coal is having the last word to the IPC. Whereas, the community feels shut down. This is not fair to all concerned.

The volume of supplementary documents and additional information does not make up for the manner in which Whitehaven Coal has avoided the very relevant questions in my submission. The spur rail location is in the worst possible location.

I am appealing to Professor Mary O'Kane, Chair of the Independent Planning Commission, to review my surface water/ groundwater water implications for aquifer recharge if the Project gains 'development consent'. I would be very pleased to meet with her in Sydney at her convenience, to discuss these matters with her in person. I feel that she would understand the substance of my arguments against the new Project; she being the former Chief Scientist. Please pass this invitation on to her.

Regards Ken Crawford

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Friday, 8 March 2019 1:40 PM  
**To:** 'ipcn@ipcn.nsw.gov.au' <ipcn@ipcn.nsw.gov.au>  
**Cc:** [REDACTED]

**Subject:** Vickery Extension Project: Whitehaven Coal response to IPC 5th and 7th March 2019

Attention David Way,

Dear David,

Will the Liverpool Plains community be given an opportunity to respond to Whitehaven's response to the IPC? With due respect, the risks to Land and Water of the Liverpool Plains has been handled in a segmented manner and not with an holistic, integrated and multidisciplined approach. This will not do! The cumulative risk to aquifer recharge particularly, in side-slope catchment and the potential for poor floodplain management in an area already designated a 'hotspot' has again been overlooked. The location of the proposed railway is simply wrong.

It is no use referring to the Draft Floodplain Management 2016 because it has not been gazetted. In my opinion it will never be because of errors on the ground in this location. No proper 'ground truthing'. Whitehaven Coal has shown a complete lack of respect for the Seventh Wonder of the Hydrogeological World (Australia) by crossing at this location. They do seem to understand the national and international significance of this area. It is an exclusion zone for mining and mining infrastructure. Furthermore, an understanding of the Gins Leap Gap and the groundwater is pivotal in understanding why the spur railway is untenable.

Why don't they listen?. This is the northern area of the world famous Liverpool Plains! Australia hasn't got much of this class of country and it can easily be destroyed. It is up to the Independent Planning Commission to stop them.

The extremely important high risk of aquifer compaction and subsidence in this location again has not been addressed. The location of the rail loop and loader is far too close the Namoi River and Gulligal lagoon. Think about it! These are headwaters of the Murray Darling Basin. This an ecological disaster waiting to happen. The whole of the Murray Darling Basin will be against this decision if the location gets 'development consent'. It should not. There are many other hydrological, ecological and biological arguments against this Project too numerous to mention. Local implications with illegal diversions where the line crosses Deadman's Gully are a major concern and have not been addressed appropriately.

I have attached my letter to Professor Mary O'Kane, Chair of the IPC as a reminder of the many issues Whitehaven Coal still hasn't addressed in the EIS and responses. Please pass this on to Mary O'Kane and the Commissioners for the Vickery Extension Project.

Regards Ken Crawford

