

Nicholas Hall - Marstel Submisison from Wickham Great Lifestyle of Wickham

From: Lyn Kilby <lki7@bigpond.net.au>
To: <nicholas.hall@planning.nsw.gov.au>
Date: 12/23/2011 3:11 PM
Subject: Marstel Submisison from Wickham Great Lifestyle of Wickham

23 December 2011-

To Nicholas Hall

Re: Marstel Bulk Liquid Fuel Storage Facility Mayfield

Project Application (08 _0130)

Nicholas Hall

NSW Planning

nicholas.hall@planning.nsw.gov.au

The questions our community of Wickham wish the regulator to address.

1. Who of the three companies are accountable for a system failure?

Logistics may become redundant on any day or night ?

A scenario is:

one man on the MASTEL site, with a computer system in Melbourne . A relieving contract truck drive. The probability of all failing is a possibility.

- a. Who is responsible for safety when the on site STOLT worker becomes ill?
- b. Who is responsible when the computer system fails in Melbourne due to weather event or computer crashing
- c. A relieving Truck driver (filling in on a shift) breaks protocol with safety, OH&S & there is a truck fire due to SHELL spill.
- d. Any of these incidences are possible at one time.

Our community believes there is high risk and system failure possible, could this leave the area of Newcastle vulnerable. Human error and systems down are never written in a proposal. Even though volumes of fuel is ever present.

2. Who are the procedural observers of the systems. The 3 companies involved need to ensure accountability both on site and off site. I ask the regulator to expect more from SHELL and the trucking companies not just MARSTEL/STOLT in their isolated planning process. This should not be an isolated proposal when there are other players.

3. The time is now in the preparation of this submission. STAGE 2&3 are not isolated and for another proposal at another time, this proposal needs Stage 2 & 3 embedded in some way, for cumulative impact measure. This is a "virgin site" linked with the local suburbs and poor infrastructure.

What are the licence changes required within this proposal, to prepare and ensure that future STAGE 2 & 3 adjust appropriately to cumulative impacts of immediate Newcastle through to Maitland, the densely populated area.

4. Added layers of risk. The systems are high risk. MARSTEL alone has risk. SHELL/ fuel has risk, trucking companies add to the risk.

Where in the MARSTEL proposal can the regulator layer in protection for community regarding:

All 3 companies together, are causes of cumulative risk. Marstel should not present this document alone.

Marstel exists because of SHELL and the trucking company. Does the freight for SHELL and this storage terminal propose a joint proposal? and Why not?

Why is such an integrated Industry looking only at one operative? 3 companies are integral to all operations both locally and regionally.

More is required on safety by our regulator, to manage the cumulative impact of the companies at stage 1. The long term planning and development is in no doubt in Marstel's vision for Stage 2&3. This proposal is clearly about get it done in a limited way and Stage 2 & 3 will be easy to propose and pass at planning level.

5. The infrastructure in Newcastle and across the region will fail. Road and rail are not improved to meet the demand of this industry. The cost to the community throughout will be noise, vibration, fumes and road fatality all within the "Australian Standard". The EPA still has a lot of work to do and until processes are improved within the EPA, planning is not protecting the community adequately.

6. Is STOLT/ MARSTEL setting up for zero emission?

7. The Proposal should explain how the MATRSTEL PLAN fits with the overall PORT CORPORATION PLAN.

As there is no port plan:

How is the regulator addressing cumulative impact? Measuring stresses on community as it co-exists along side this site?

This proposal is not offering any significant employment? What does the regulator consider valuable to community: Is it freight by truck?, Is it to meet Australian standards but still have a certain amount of pollutants going into the local air and the Hunter River? Is it just to satisfy Rio Tinto, Xtrata and others?

The community needs a long term Newcastle Port Plan, explaining the interrelationship and accountability within the Coal Chain. Marstel's Proposal in isolation is inappropriate.

Thank you for the chance to share people's view

Lyn Kilby
GLOW

--