

Stratford Complaint Summary

Period: 12 Months to June 2022

Total No. of Complaints: 10 (6 noise, 0 air quality, 0 Blast Overpressure, 3 lighting, 1 Other)

Total No. of Complainants: 5

Date/Time of Complaint	Complainant Location	Method of Complaint	Nature of Complaint	Investigation/Outcome
28/06/2021	Approx. 1.5km east of operations, Bowens Road Stratford	Direct text to MP mobile	Lighting	<p>Complaint via text: "I've asked a number of times to keep the big lights off Bowens Rd, its a hazard and dangerous, go and check as it dazzles you".</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SCPL forwarded details of complaint to Shift Supervisor to ensure light mitigation measures were being implemented. • BRN lighting plant was situated below surface RL. Day shift supervisor moved lighting plant lower into the pit to minimise any potential external glow. • SCPL provided a return text on 29/6/2021 to advise the complaint had been recorded and offered a follow-up call if required. • An inspection was undertaken along Wenham Cox Rd and Bowens Rd during the evening and confirmed no direct lighting plants were visible facing towards the road.
7/07/2021	Approx. 1.5km east of operations, Bowens Road Stratford	Direct text to MP mobile	Noise	<p>Complaint via text: "The noise tonight is completely unacceptable. These complaints need to be taken seriously".</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SCPL forwarded details of complaint to Mining Supervisor to review operations and ensure noise mitigation measures were being implemented. • SCPL provided a return text on 07/07/2021 to advise the complaint had been recorded and offered a follow-up call if required. • SCPL advised they would continue to implement appropriate mitigation measures for noise. SCPL will cooperate and provide further information as requested.
12/08/2021 8:34hrs	Approx. 4Km west of the CHPP	Direct text to TK mobile	Lighting	<p>Complaint via text: "A question - why does it seem the lights at electrical substation opposite Upper Avon Rd & Bucketts Way intersection are always on at night? Am I right? It struck me that they could be movement sensitive or similar. They certainly add to the full glare. Also, what proportion of rail loading is done at night when the full light orchestra is performing?".</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SCPL inspected electrical switch yard and switched off the lights in question. • SCPL provided a return call ECC informed the complainant that the lights at the substation were accidentally left on by a electrical contractor and were now switched off. ECC informed the complainant that the lights at the CHPP were required to be on while the CHPP is operating and that the lights are required to safely operate at night.
12/10/2021	22:21hrs	Community Hotline	Noise	<p>Complaint description: "Noise and lights - can't sleep".</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Acting ECS called complainant back at 2:42pm 14/10/21. • Complainant wanted to discuss compensation due to noise impacts. • Acting ECS advised that the request would be escalated.
18/10/2021	21:42hrs	Community Hotline	Noise	<p>Complaint description: "Trucks are very loud tonight, there is a heavy drumming".</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ECS called complainant back at 8:30am 19/10/21. Complainant had poor reception and advised would call back later. • Complainant returned call at 3pm. • Items discussed included development consent conditions and mitigation and compensation rights, noise assessment in the EIS, noise monitoring requirements and reporting of exceedances, current status of the operations and noise mitigation measures. • ECS suggested any concerns of elevated noise emissions should continue to be reported to SCPL to allow for a timely response to be implemented. • Complainant advised no further information was required at this stage.
21/10/2021	22:00hrs	Community Hotline	Noise	<p>Complaint description: "Noise (shift worker calling) droning of the machine"</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ECC called complainant back at 12:30PM 22/10/21. Complainant stated the noise originating from the SCPL CHPP had increased dramatically in the last week. Complainant explained that the most noticeable noise was best described as a 'reverberation' from what sounded like a conveyor or similar. The complainant also noted Dozer track slap and truck engine noise. • ECC advised the complainant of operations at SCPL at the time of complaint and SCPL would continue to implement appropriate mitigation measures for noise. • Weather conditions: Weather conditions: Strong inversion (4.1°C/100m) present at the time of complaint. Consistent very light (1.8m/s) SW wind conditions at the time of complaint. • Low level LF noise noted on noise recordings. Minor truck engine noise noted on monitor.

26/10/2021	19:16hrs	Community Hotline	Noise	<p>Complaint: "Why are the noise monitors out when you are not doing major work???"</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ECC returned complainants call at 9:31AM. Complainant stated that he thought it was unusual that the mine had arranged the noise monitoring personel to complete monitoring when there was no operations at the mine. ECC informed the complainant that there was operations as per the previous nights at the mine, including CHPP washing, train unloading and loading, 3 excavators servicing 3 haul truck fleets, 2 pit dozers and 2 dump dozers.
26/10/2021	22:61hrs	Community Hotline	Noise	<p>Complaint description: "Machine noise - loaders"</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ECC called complainant back at 9:41am, Complainant did not answer. Monthly routine monitoring was completed on the evening of the complaint. Monitoring results adjacent to the complainants residence (compliance limit 35dBA) at 7:24pm had an Leq reading of 29dBA and 10:52pm with an Leq reading of 28dBA. ECC called complainant at 10:14am. Complainant stated that the ongoing noise of the mine, specifically the loader is impacting the complainants sleep quality. ECC explained that there was attended noise monitoring being conducted shortly after the complaint and noise levels were below the compliance limit. ECC advised they would continue to implement appropriate mitigation measures for noise at the CHPP and broader mine site. ECC informed the complainant of the projected mine life at SCPL and what the short term mining activities looked like at SCPL. Weather conditions: Weather conditions: no temperature inversion present at the time of complaint. Consistent very light (1.5m/s) SW wind conditions at the time of complaint.
24/03/2022 16:37hrs	8.8km South of SCPL CHPP	Community Hotline	Various	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Senior Environment & Community Advisor (SECA) returned complainants call at 4:25PM. No answer. The Complainant returned SECAs call at 4:37PM. The Complainant listed his concerns to be dust, lighting, noise, blasting and damage to his property from blasting from both Stratford and Duralie Coal mines. The Complainant stated that they have multiple long running issues with Yancoal in regards to the property management surrounding his property. SECA advised that the mining complaints line is for issues directly relevant to mining activities and associated activities. All complaints regarding property will continue to be managed through Yancoals property management team and the managing agents of the neighbouring leased properties. The Complainant stated that he had contacted the complaints line multiple times and had not received a call back. SECA informed The Complainant that the complaints line has been functioning and all complaints received by the complaints line are forwarded directly to the SECA and no complaints from The Complainant had been received by Stratford Coal or Duralie Coal. SECA advised that he would investigate the call logs of the complaints line and investigate any potential failure of the complaints line process. SECA requested specific dates for the listed noise, dust and blasting concerns, the complainant said that they he had a record and would be able to provide the specific details at a later date. The Complainant stated that there was a constant glow of lights from Stratford CHPP and the constant glow was penetrating his bedroom window. SECA advised that investigation of the light source and severity would need to be undertaken but would be difficult to identify due to distance. SECA agreed to investigate further. The complainant stated that cracking had appeared in his home and believed it was due to blasting at Stratford and Duralie Coal. SECA offered to arrange a property investigation to investigate the cracking. Complainant thanked SECA and said he would confer with his wife and respond to the offer of the property investigation. SECA thanked The complainant for their call.
22/04/2022 04:00hrs	8.8km South of SCPL CHPP	Driect to TK mobile	Lighting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Complainant called Senior Environment & Community Advisor (SECA) mobile phone directly at 8:20AM The Complainant stated the lighting emissions from Stratford Coal are impacting his quality of sleep. The complainant explained that the glow from the Startford Coal operations are visible from his bedroom window and that the glow has been increasing over the past 12 months. SECA explained that because the light was a glow rather than a direct light it would be difficult to diagnose the the source of the complainants lighting concern. SECA outlined the operations requirements for fixed lighting plants and recent inspections found no new CHPP lights had been installed and all operational mobile lights were downward facing. The complainant formally requested that a property investigation be undertaken to investigate whether wall cracks appearing in his residence were due to blasting at Stratford and Duralie Coal. SECA agreed to a property investigation in accordance with both Duralie and Stratford Development Consents. SECA thanked The complainant for their call.