

Notes for PAC Presentation 31/1/17 K Wray

Unsuitability of the existing haulage route

Dangerous

Impact on the community

Lack of confidence in the studies done by Gunlake Consultants

No details supplied for the studies

No assumptions supplied

The results support Gunlake's preferred options.

DPE accepted Gunlake's studies without question

No ability for us to verify the studies

DPE needs to have the studies looked at by fully independent experts.

The DPE's use of "unviable" needs clarity.

The normal use of unviable means that the project would make a loss

DPE seems to use the term in the sense of "more expensive".

Alternative transport options have been declared as making the project unviable, but this has not been demonstrated satisfactorily.

Is it the DPE's function to dismiss a transport option if it is deemed "unviable"?

Gunlake's decision to sideline the CCC.

No serious involvement of the CCC in the preparation of the EIS.

Preference given to one on one meetings, publication of a "Fact Sheet", and hiring a PR company to promote the company's preferred options.

Gunlake's Lack of concern for the community.

Gunlake's history of lack of concern. They only ameliorate a problem if are ordered to by authorities or if it only costs petty cash.

DPE has commented that they are aware that Gunlake is not presently operating in full accordance with its current project approval and are investigating. This is an example of Gunlake's attitude towards the community ie., get away with what you can. They are not good community citizens.