Both personal testimonies and extensive science that we've heard so far this afternoon underline the severity and seriousness of the short term and long term impacts on local residents' health and wellbeing. No amount of ~~financial gifts that Wollongong Coal may give to nearby schools and sports clubs~~ however well intentioned profits offsets will compensate for the increase in respiratory and cardiovascular disease and subsequent reduction in life expectancy caused by a heavily polluted environment.

The cardinal test, members of the panel, is would you have your families live in an environment where currently, before expansion one truck every two minutes roars down your street?

This becomes a human rights issue all too common in third world countries where companies' rights take precedence over long term residents' rights to a clean and relatively quiet environment. There is no precedent in Australia for a colliery to be operating in such a densely populated residential area. Hence, a responsible government would be limiting Wollongong Coal's production levels in light of growing evidence of its detriment to health and to the environment.

It is not an uncommon scenario for companies, who promise much economically, to be given approval to operate in spite of known risks to people and the environment. Frequently, if at all, the brakes are only applied when an individual is so sick that they have nothing left to lose but to endure a protracted, painful and expensive law suit.

It is negligent to ignore the 2 high risk findings BS 1113 and BS 1213 of the IRA on the swamp CCuS4. There is a "high risk of environmental impacts due to fracturing of the bedrock beneath the swamp and/or fracturing of the controlling rockbar at the base of the swamp". Furthermore, "a medium risk assessed as having moderate consequences relates

to swamp BCUS4 assessed as being at a medium risk of environmental impacts due to subsidence induced tilting". (Addendum Report 3.4.1)

end of quote

The Office of Environment and Heritage states that there has been an under-estimation of the project's consequences in terms of the consequence categories for swamps used in the risk matrix as well as the area of assumed impact within swamps. This is not satisfactory when 4.5 million people's drinking water is at stake. There can be no remediation. No amount of financial compensation will restore the minimum standard and quality for drinking water. It is folly to be seduced or comforted by the installation by Wollongong Coal of swamp piezometers to measure mining related impacts to these swamps, to the water catchment. The damage cannot be remediated, it cannot be undone despite any number of piezometers installed. Swamp offset policy, full of officialdom is meaningless when our drinking water is compromised.

I reinforce that

Furthermore, we don't have confidence in a company whose previous modifications to approvals have been criticized by subsequent PAC panels. In Oct 2015, the EDO deemed that Wollongong Coal was not a fit and proper holder of a mining licence in NSW under S 380A(2) of the Mining Act.

In the Addendum Report, p 18, how does Gillespie in the revised cost benefit analysis, arrive at the conclusion that no material impacts are considered likely in relation to air quality, traffic and transport? These claims are not credible; they are farcical when expansion plans allow for an immediate tripling in existing production with potentially a 9 times increase in the volume of existing production. Gillespie estimates the project would have net social benefits to Australia of a minimum of ~~$25~~ $23m minus the cost of greenhouse

$0.15m,

emissions and hence is considered desirable and justified from an economic efficiency perspective. That last impressive sounding term ignores the deteriorating health and wellbeing of thousands of residents in close confines in neighbouring suburbs and ignores the real and dangerous risk to the drinking water catchment for 4.5m people. Economic efficiency perspective is hollow jargon.

Everyone who is capable of work is entitled to work; this is enshrined in the 1948 UN Declaration of Human Rights. The United Nations Industrial Development Organisation announced ~~in~~ on the 22 of June this year, that clean energy creates more jobs than the fossil fuel industry. Two weeks ago, Foreign Correspondent on ABC tv reported in detail on widespread conversion to clean, sustainable and renewable energy by numerous responsible nations worldwide. This change from fossil fuels to renewable energy is inevitable, it's not debatable. More jobs will be available and damage to our planet from greenhouse emissions will be slowed down. A developed, thinking and responsible society doesn't live for the now but for the future.

Our next generations trust us to care for it and not wilfully harm it. We ~~HAVE~~ to act responsibly for them. They are depending on us. We cannot let them down.

Extraordinary times call for extraordinary measures. Never before, in modern history times, have we received such loud, scientifically based and grave warnings of the catastrophic effects of ongoing fossil fuel mining. Leadership is not for the faint hearted.

I trust that your children and grandchildren will be proud of your leadership and the decision you make to safeguard a fragile and most precious resource under our present guardianship, clean water.