

Knowing all of above I cannot understand how you could conclude that Burnie would be a better site from a marine perspective and I am sure with the information above we have a good argument to support that both sites are on an even footing. [REDACTED] believe otherwise. then please give me [REDACTED] substantiated argument that counters mine above.

Another issue here is that I do not believe we have to have a cut off date associated with the site assessment. We should be able to now provide more supporting information that further substantiates the conclusions we made about site selection that further reinforces our argument ie.:

1. Aboriginal archeological studies have confirmed little of significance at Bell Bay
2. Marine studies confirm heavy metals and other nasties off 5 mile bluff

The guidelines require "details to demonstrate clear strategic justification for the proposed location of the project. There is a need to demonstrate that sound strategic planning principles have been adopted in determining the most appropriate site". Given that this decision was made and announced in February, my interpretation is that we should only be referring to data that was available at that time, which is why I have attempted to "document" the decision making process.

Using subsequent information is a double-edged sword - do we also discuss the European heritage sites at Bell Bay, state significant vegetation, existing air quality in George Town etc.? We can't use one without the other. Particularly given [REDACTED] comments on the existing air quality at George Town, I would not want to be relying on this data to justify the decision making process as it will allow every identified potential impact to be dragged into the assessment.

Another issue you have not taken into account here is the difficulty in accessing the coast with an effluent pipeline from Hampshire. I would like you to show me on a map where you would go as there is municipal area and intensive private property blocking access or rivers would need to be crossed creating other environmental issues. The entire coastline at Burnie is penguin habitat which would cause major environmental issues anywhere if you tried to cross it.

Again I quote from the JP report in regards to effluent disposal pipeline to the coast "While this imposes a significant cost on the mill, there should not be any major problems in establishing this pipeline. It is assumed that the easement for the rail line which runs past the mill site to the coast could be used for the pipeline". There was never any discussion about any other route option up until this point and as such, the implications were not considered in the site assessment process.

Under air emissions and greenhouse gas emissions have you considered the greenhouse gas emissions associated with hauling an extra 1.5 million tonnes of wood the extra distance to Burnie.

The issue with air quality is the plant emissions. This was specifically raised in the JP report and the preliminary air quality modelling.

[REDACTED] please take these considerations on board and revise the analysis.

Again, as author of this report, I am not prepared to include information which firstly is not supported by any documentation and secondly that I am fully aware was not considered. As I have stated

Les Baker
General Manager - Bell Bay Pulp Mill Project
Executive Director - Gunns Plantations

Telephone: (03) 6335 5201
Facsimile: (03) 6334 7909