

# WILPINJONG EXTENSION PROJECT

## Key points of objection:

The impact of coal mining on Climate Change is too great and has not been adequately considered. The world is now beginning to transition away from coal in order to meet pollution reductions needed to ameliorate climate change. There is no need for this coalmine to be given a six year life extension.

The social impacts of the project on the community of Wollar far exceed any other social benefits the mine may bring. The proponent, the Department, nor the previous PAC have not properly assessed these impacts, and they must be properly assessed before any determination is made.

The NSW Government represents the interests of the people of NSW, not the interests of the coal and gas mining companies, who are now mining to export for financial gain without taking into account the effect on the population and the future of the state, economically and environmentally. It is the responsibility of the government to protect our country towns and communities, and look at the long-term effects such expansion of mining will have. Is it really justified to have such a heart-rending effect on the town of Wollar?

The Review of this project by the previous Planning Assessment Commission identified “the need for a long term strategic plan” for the coalmines around Mudgee, and for NSW generally. This is urgent need, as the current assessment approach fails to properly account for the cumulative regional impacts of multiple mining operations. The current PAC should delay its determination of the Wilpinjong Extension Project until the “long term strategic plan” recommended by the previous PAC has been completed.

The costs to Aboriginal cultural heritage of this mining project far outweigh any perceived benefits it would bring. The Rocky Hill complex contains an ochre quarry, rock art sites, and significant artefacts, but will be entirely destroyed by the proposed Wilpinjong mine expansion.

The proposed biodiversity offsets don't meet current NSW policy, which requires that when critically endangered habitat is destroyed, it's offset must be “like for like”. That is, the same area of the same remnant ecosystem must be protected somewhere else. The proponent has not attempted to do this. So-called “supplementary measures” (such as paying into a fund) must only be a last resort, according to the policy.