THIS COMPANY KORES (Wallarah 2) SINCE 2005 HAS NEVER AT ANY STAGE SOUGHT A MEETING WITH ANY GROUP DIRECTLY AFFECTED OR ANY INDIVIDUAL IN THEIR HOME AFFECTED DIRECTLY BY SUBSIDENCE. THEY HAVE HAD ANY NUMBER OF OPPORTUNITIES TO DO THAT BUT OPTED FOR GLOSSLY SALES LIKE BROCHURES TO MASSAGE THE WIDER COMMUNITY. THIS COMPANY HAS NOT SOUGHT A SOCIAL LICENCE TO OPERATE. IT AUTOMATICALLY MADE ENEMIES OF THE VALLEY AND HUE HUE ROAD COMMUNITIES AND NEVER SOUGHT TO APPEASE THAT SITUATION. THEY DO NOT DESERVE THE LUXURY OF A GOVERNMENT HANDING THEM THE RIGHT TO MINE.

LET’S GET TO SUBSIDENCE

(SHOW CURRENT PAPER CLIPPINGS OF SUBSIDENCE)

Subsidence over the life of this mine is totally unacceptable.

Planning and Infrastructure Preliminary Assessment February 2014 begins with the Executive Summary statement of PAGE 2 “The Department has found that subsidence impacts on creeks and rivers are likely to be minor, and there is a very low risk to groundwater resources...........” This is not supported by documentation on subsidence contained in the EIS where the floodplain is likely to subside 1.75 metres in lower Jilliby Jilliby Creek etc. DPI’s statement is not supported by documentation..it is a mere slurred opinion.

PAGE 11 Previous PAC approval. Supporting the above statement, page 11 of the DPI approval states clearly “The PAC (2010)raised concerns about uncertainties in the EA around subsidence predictions... the site water balance..limited assessment of impacts associated with discharge of treated mine water...etc”

PAGE 17 Department of Health (minor concerns!)

PAGE 18 Description of subsidence

PAGE 21 Planning gives us two subsidence scenarios Two predictions...first the original Table 3 indicators of Max Conventional Subsidence effects (vertical) of Hue Hue area (1000mm), Valley area (they mean floor!) of 2000mm and Forest area of 2600. The preceeding paragraph... DPI offer lesser “typical predicted” figures as a) 1000mm, b)1400 and c)2000, respectively. No evidence of their suddenly termed “typical predicted” vertical subsidence is supplied. This is a typical attempt by DPI to allay fears, to minimise using supposition. Any agent, for or against the proposal at any time, are able to import this theme. This is no more than an unsubstantiated import by DPI wherein they apply there own arbitrary assessment!

PAGE 28 (Para.7) Indicates deep ponding effects from Dunks Lane flat roughly northwards across the valley to Dicksons Road and affect on minor stream flow velocities...when has this creek at that level point flowed with any real velocity? This points up the problem of either the proponent or DPI
for that matter surveying on ground assessment or detailed input from locals as to the flooding regimes of the lower Jilliby Jilliby Creek catchment.

BEFORE THE PAC MAKES A DECISION.. WE WANT YOU TO COME BACK HERE AMONG THE AFFECTED COMMUNITY WITH A LARGE MAP OF PANEL INDICATION AT A PROPER PUBLIC MEETING. NOTHING LESS WILL SUFFICE BEFORE YOU MAKE A DECISION.

PAGE 31 (para 5) Flooding increases in the valley are predicted but once again they are brushed over and lack any real on ground collaborative assessment.

PAGE 41 “Minor Infrastructure”.... these are not minor .. if you look at the graph, how can minor vertical subsidence to the critical infrastructure to the valley ......Jilliby Road (main route).1750mm...transmission lines...2100 to 2500mm. DPI once again have no idea of these impacts..neither the proponent or DPI have approached the community to explain this assessment.

(then Dooralong Turf Submission) I spoke of the problems to be encountered by Dooralong Turf. I gave the the PAC the letter submitted by Mr. Bill Keegan...and pointed out the contents of page 51 of the D.G’s EA Report of subsidence impacting this turf farm over two years from year 22 of the project indicating a” total gross value of production from the impacted turf farming properties is $1.3 million per annum... for any period of time that the turf farm is out of production”...“The AIS predicts that there would also be other (losses of $17,636,m...$14,897 per annum...and $2,739 per annum)”. This particular affect upon this farm which also employs several people...is not sustainable. This farm becomes a real victim, yet they have been operating well before any declaration of this being a Mine Subsidence Area.

I also handed to the PAC the Mine Subsidence Statistics of those claims accepted or rejected over the last few years. The graph clearly shows that only about only one third to one quarter of claims are accepted by the MSB. This clearly is a breach of promise by the Government...this promise is also underpinning this EIS and residents again are wondering about the value of sections relating to subsidence and compensation.