



To the Research Director,

The New Acland expansion project, which has already been through the land court process, should not be subject to this process again, as all of the requirements through this process for the progress of the project in the initial stages.

To revisit this will have huge impacts to the company, as a business due to the effects of delays imposed on the operations and production (product = income) and also as people, given the job losses which will fall out of this, and the added stress in the work environment due to delays, business disruption, added work load and future uncertainty for the project the business and the current and future jobs.

As a peer support officer, I am seeing firsthand, the stress and damage this is having on families relying on this projects approval for their livelihood.

This project has endured already endured numerous changes in government which have led to the delay of the progress of this project which staff at new hope have work diligently on – in their own time as a result of the added pressures required to achieve the progress of this project. To revisit this process again is to impose additional time and labour and cost to the project which has already been achieved. Changing the goal posts now, again, is not fair or reasonable in any world it should not be the case.


Transitional arrangements for projects in the latter stages of the approvals process should not be subject to revisiting any of the satisfied, or completed stages of the approval process particularly around water usage, considering the fact has been established that Acland Coal mine pays for, and utilises recycled water from Toowoomba, and is working on “make good arrangements” with the local community, in the event anyone is negatively impacted – which our hydrogeological model is being developed with the effort to prove this is not the case.

Further delay to the approval of this project would ultimately cost me my job.

With no exaggeration, the knocks on effects of this look like;

- I would not be able to stay in the area, and would need to sell my family home & uproot my family to find new work, as I am living here because my work is based here.
(There would be nothing else local I could do with my skills and qualifications that would pay the bills and put food on the table etc).
- Given my wife and I are foster carers, being a family of 8 children, for DOC's we have – with the help of my job invested in a house appropriate for this. Without my job we could not afford to keep this place, and without my job, we could not afford to maintain all of the children we have with what foster care pays. - This in simple terms means some of the kids we in our family have would have to be removed from our placement – to another placement, which, given they are in a stable environment, a good family, good schooling, a sport, their own bedroom, a good life, would be detrimental to their future...
As a family unit, we would need to relocate and the progress we have made in life as a family, to date, would suffer a severe blow, with the sacrifices we have made to get to where we are to be wasted effort.

If you have any questions, or concerns with anything I have written, I am eager to discuss, on the contact details above.

Roland Henry
 04/10/2016.