

**WARKWORTH CONTINUATION PROJECT – 361/15 – DETERMINATION & MOUNT THORLEY CONTINUATION PROJECT – 362/15 – DETERMINATION**

This submission may not relate specifically to the four issues in question but I ask you to read the indisputable facts provided.

Rio Tinto's most compelling argument to gain approval for the MTW mining extensions was the threat that 1300 employees would lose their jobs if approval was not granted.

This claim featured predominantly in the EIS report and DPE assessment.

The PAC echoed these claims in stating that MTW was the largest employer in the Singleton district.

Rio Tinto has conceded that it wishes to divest its coal interests in the Hunter Valley and is anticipating a higher sale price for MTW when exiting the industry if this approval is granted.

A recent CCC meeting was advised that there is no compulsion on the part of a purchaser to honour the meaningless and dishonest promises from Rio Tinto to maintain that workforce, which is about 50% greater than similar sized mines in the Hunter.

A new owner is only required to comply with consent conditions covering the mine operating plan.

So what now is the overbearing justification in approving the extensions. The low value of coal and royalties, the extremely high cost of production (high strip ratio and overburden transportation) and the cessation of mining at MTO in three years has made the project uneconomical.

Have the 2000 people who supported the mine extensions been conned as the previous PACs appear to have been?

Should another township be sacrificed for the benefit of a foreign-owned miner supplying foreign customers?

Stewart Mitchell

