

To:
The Coordinator-General
c/- EIS project manager - New Acland Coal Mine Stage 3 project
newaclandproject@coordinatorgeneral.qld.gov.au

Dear Madam/Sir

Thank you for the opportunity to make formal submission to the Co-ordinator-General on the Environmental Impact Statement for the New Acland Coal Mine Stage 3 Expansion. Please accept this submission, the deadline for which I have had some technical difficulties meeting.

If the proposed project is allowed to proceed, the resultant mine will:

- have unacceptable impacts on local farmland by destroying a large amount of our best cropping land,
- damage and deplete aquifers,
- destroy koala habitat, and
- increase already high levels of dust and noise pollution in Acland, Jondaryan and along the rail corridor, aggravating already unacceptable health risks.

In this regard I note that:

- damaging and destroying farmland, aquifers and local communities will reduce Australia's ability to feed itself and to be resilient in the face of climate change, just as we are needing to increase - not decrease - resilience and security of food supplies and communities (particularly with climate change),
- koalas are now listed as vulnerable under the Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act (Cth). This means that greater conservation measures for koala habitat are therefore required - not the habitat destruction that is proposed for this project.
- there is no safe level of particulate pollution from coal dust

It is demonstrable that the economic benefits of the mine have been presented in a flawed manner in the EIS. These economic impacts have had adverse effects on the local economy for more than a decade.

Most importantly, the mine poses an unacceptable burden on our climate, given the 1.99 billion tonnes CO₂-e of emissions burning the coal will produce.

If the proposed project is allowed to proceed, there will be huge emissions of greenhouse gases and that will doom our planet to being uninhabitable. The greenhouse gases from the proposed project will arise from:

1. destruction of plants and animals during clearing of the sites
2. disturbing the soil
3. disturbing and extracting the coal
4. mining, processing and transporting the coal
5. burning the coal

While most of these emissions will be carbon dioxide (the main cause of climate change and ocean acidification that is already underway) disturbing and extracting

underground coal will release methane, a greenhouse gas more potent than carbon dioxide.

Continued growth in greenhouse gas emissions increases the real, catastrophic risks for all countries (including Australia and India), businesses and people. It is in everyone's interests to contribute to action to limit the increase in global average temperature compared with pre-industrial levels.

There is mounting evidence that even our current target of 2oC warming will be catastrophic – and we are currently heading for 4oC warming. Even with the 0.8 oC warming we have to date:

- we are already experiencing dramatic environmental changes and associated social and economic costs. These include ocean acidification (and we are very close to the level at which marine ecosystems collapse); shifting rainfall and temperature patterns; more intense storms, droughts, and heatwaves; and greater bushfire risks. These in turn are posing substantial risks to water and food supplies, health, property, infrastructure, and natural ecosystems – and those risks are being increasingly realised.
- positive feedback loops previously unknown are becoming evident (even at 0.8oC) and increase the likelihood of runaway climate change.

Mining and using even more fossil fuels such as coal will only worsen the situation. To have the best chance of ensuring a habitable planet, we need to minimise the risk associated with any level of climate change and work for a 100% chance of survival (or as close as we can get it, given the inertia we have already built into global warming and ocean acidification).

The only solution to these problems is stop mining coal. That is, do not proceed with the proposed project. (Any Environmental Management Plan that aims to avoid and reduce greenhouse gas emissions during the mining does not deal with the threshold issue : at the end of the day, the project is about generating greenhouse gas emissions. There is no way to completely avoid or mitigate the greenhouse gas emissions of such a project, and offsets can never be 100% guaranteed to immediately reverse those emissions as they occur.)

If the proponent wants to supply energy, then a project to supply renewable energy would do the job without making a substantial contribution to catastrophic climate change.

Finally, as a member of the community, I believe that this project is on balance detrimental to our State, and therefore it should not be approved.

Yours sincerely

[submitted electronically via <http://www.sixdegrees.org.au>]

G King

sustainabilitycoach@iinet.net.au

PO Box 6025

Griffith 2604