

I Object to the proposed Mount Thorley Warkworth Continuation Project.

This proposal seeks to mine the same coal from the same land as the previous proposal which was disallowed by the Land & Environment Court and reinforced by the Supreme Court.

Both Courts have said NO.

The PAC should say NO. If this is allowed to go ahead it will be in contempt of court.

The EISs for the Thorley extension and the Warkworth Continuation are worded almost identically.

Given that there are two legal entities involved here, there are two proposals.

But in fact they are one and the same proposal as the previous proposal which was disallowed by the Land and Environment Court.

The fact that Rio Tinto used their corporate muscle to pressure the NSW Government, and particularly the now-disgraced Premier Barry O'Farrell and Hartcher (now under investigation by ICAC) to change the planning rules in favour of big mining does not make this proposal any better than the last one, which was disallowed by the Land and Environment Court.

If this goes ahead, the effects on the village of Bulga and in particular the Warkworth Sands Woodlands, will be as Judge Preston foresaw in his judgement – catastrophic – and further the economics are not there to justify it.

The falling price of coal means that the Warkworth mine with a strip ratio of nearly 10 to 1 is unprofitable.

The only reason Rio need this to go ahead is because they are trying to sell it.

But few are interested in the current climate and they certainly wouldn't be interested if there was no future mining lease.

Rio claim it is about saving 1300 jobs, however Rio is quite clear in its messages to its shareholders, that cutting the labour force is essential to reduce costs. They proudly point to driverless trucks and trains at their operations in WA that have saved millions of dollars – no mention of the workers that lost their jobs !

Rio is using Mount Thorley Warkworth workers as pawns in their struggle to sell off unprofitable assets.

Rio claims that if this project does not go ahead 1300 jobs will be lost.

However, the MTW Annual review states that there are 1033 employees.

In a newspaper article (attached)describing harassment and bullying of MTW workers by management, MTW states that 75% of the 1300 are employees..that's 975.

Don't they know what it actually is ?

MTW is a long way behind in its rehabilitation. Those 1300 or so workers could be gainfully employed for years rehabilitating the abomination they have created. After all most of the mining work involves shifting slag from one location to another (and at a strip ratio of 10 to 1 there's a lot of slag), rehabilitation begins with exactly the same operation, except in reverse.

So if those 1300 jobs are to be lost, Rio must be saying that they will walk away from the moonscape they have created in the Hunter Valley and not rehabilitate it.

If that is their intention, it is illegal and disgusting.

I have a particular interest in noise – I am forced to because of the noise these guys make at night which keeps my wife and me awake.

This was recognised in the Land and Environment Court – that MTW could not keep within their noise limits and if the mine was allowed to proceed further west, it would be impossible.

Noise from these two mines alone is not the only issue.

The cumulative noise level has risen to above the NSW INP and the mining SEPP amenity criteria. If this project is allowed to go ahead, the cumulative noise will be even higher and well in excess of the amenity criteria specified in the mining SEPP.

Attached to this document is a lengthy document, with its own detailed attachments, specifically concerning the issues of noise demonstrating how the current consultants have massaged the numbers to make it appear better and included statements about noise which are totally incorrect and untrue.

Also attached is a very cogent document that outlines in detail why this project should not go ahead – the judgement by Judge Preston in the Land and Environment court.

Also attached : the reinforcement of the Land and Environment judgement : The judgement handed down by the Supreme Court, as a result of the joint appeal of the Land and Environment Court judgement by Rio Tinto and NSW Dept of Planning.
That appeal was summarily dismissed with costs.

Is the PAC going to approve this mining proposal in the face of those judgements ?

It certainly shouldn't.

Alan Leslie
339 The Inlet Road
Bulga, NSW 2330
02 65 74 53 05