

Les Baker
<Les.Baker@gunns.com.au>

21 04/2006 06:07 AM

To
cc
Su
bje
ct

Re: Fw: Site Selection

[REDACTED]

I believe you are missing some information here that has not been adequately communicated from our end. My background has been from senior management positions in Associated Pulp and Paper mills which was a wholly owned subsidiary of North Limited. At various times I have been in charge of business development for the pulp and paper division and area manager for the forest products business in the north west. I was based in Burnie for 15 years and have intimate knowledge of the region and APPM. I was also the project leader for the Hampshire mill and Burnie port facility. [REDACTED] was a senior engineer at the APPM Burnie mill and developed Hampshire with me.

At one stage in about 1991 we commissioned Jaakko Poyry to investigate and report on the suitability of Hampshire for a pulp mill and then chose the site for the chip mill. Part of our work at the time for the approvals process was an aboriginal archeological study of the area. We found in the study an area rich in artefacts. You say that they have been disturbed from the plantation activity which is correct but that does not diminish the quality of the site from a heritage perspective as we are talking about flint stones here not rock paintings.

This statement that the site is not diminished is not correct and would be laughed out of the panel hearings. The site has been significantly disturbed. Artefacts which were on the surface are now probably not so, and no longer accessible. The continuity of any artefacts has been completely changed and had there been any significant sites, scarred trees etc., these will have been significantly disturbed or destroyed. This was compared to a site which had minimal disturbance.

The construction activities associated with a pulp mill would certainly have an impact and certainly with what we know about Hampshire there would be a requirement under the Tasmanian Aboriginal Relics Act to get a permit to relocate relics. Nothing was known about Bell Bay so how could [REDACTED] conclude in [REDACTED] analysis that Bell Bay is the preferred site from a heritage perspective. The following is quoted from a memo to [REDACTED] from [REDACTED] re: Long Reach site from Oct 2004. This was the basis of the assessment done at the time and is the only documented evidence of heritage consideration as part of the site selection. Should we be required to justify our case, this is the only information to support the decision. "The proposed development site is within a high sensitivity zone for aboriginal sites. In addition, the National Estate Listing (see 6 following) identifies that this area may contain indigenous cultural heritage sites, not yet identified. There are recorded artefact scatters and isolated artefacts within 500m of the site."

European heritage at the time of the decision was not suspected or known about at Bell Bay as well. So on the information known [REDACTED] cannot say one site was better than the other and in fact there is a defensible argument to say that what we knew at the time, Bell Bay would be in front.

The decision was not whether one site was "better" than another. The decision was one site with a known heritage record that had been subsequently highly disturbed vs another site with high probability of Aboriginal sites which was undisturbed. I stand by that decision.

The other issue relates to marine environment. From my experience with APPM I was privy to knowledge about the impact of the APPM mill on the marine environment as over many years [REDACTED] who were the [REDACTED] had marine studies and benthic survey's conducted. DPIWE may have these in their archives. The effluent pipe from the mill only went out about 200m into Emu Bay and you could see an open end to the pipe at low tide. Emu Bay had little aquatic life as it was essentially sand and a very altered environment because of port construction including dredging and breakwaters. Further out say 1-2 km the marine environment was in good condition with a lot of reef and marine life. The harbour master from the port [REDACTED] would often swim out after work 1-2 km where he could stand on reefs and catch abalone, crayfish and fish. You can walk out at low tide off the Wynyard golf course and harvest abalone. By any test you cannot say that the marine environment at Burnie is degraded, you have no information that you can draw this conclusion from and I have information to support my case.

On the other hand we know there has been a lot of heavy industry in the Bell Bay region discharging into the river over many years and this would ultimately end up offshore in the region of 5 mile bluff. Recent studies have shown high levels of heavy metals in the region of 5 mile bluff which should not come as a surprise because we knew this was in the Tamar river.