

28

Mike Campbell OAM

Aust. Coal Alliance (Wyang) has consistently opposed a new T4 Terminal at Newcastle based on the fact that coal itself, whilst sustaining a peak in Newcastle will suffer a large decline as a resource in the world in the near future. There is currently a downturn in the industry therefore allowing current and immediate increases in production and export to be shipped from port using current infrastructure. We say that it would be economic folly to build another terminal due to an uncertain climate. The true economics that exposes the downside of further coal stockpiling and movement in the port is the effect upon the local inhabitants. Governments and corporations continue to minimise and marginalise efforts by local community organisations and medical research that often shows up dramatic peaks in coal dust emanation from stockpiles or train movements. Human health continues to be regarded as marginal in the equation put forward by proponents of T4. Wallartah 2 mine for instance minimises any projected problems of coal dust from train movements between Wyong and the Port of Newcastle. The impact on suburbs along this line have not been adequately debated. We oppose T4 being rushed along and would prefer a longer, more embracing study being held, bringing in all of affected suburbs etc. Please delay a decision on T4 to allow broader community participation.

28 M. Campbell OAM (Australian Coal Alliance)

Newcastle T4 Planning & Assessment Commission Assessment Newcastle 13<sup>th</sup> July 2015

Address by Michael A. Campbell (OAM) for the Australian Coal Alliance Wyong and the Community Environment Network, Central Coast.

Recognise Aboriginal lands (Awabakal and Gomeroi, Wanarua present here today)

Dear Commissioners

If this PAC were being conducted under the auspices of a United Nations body the obvious question would be...."the world has voted on the future of coal burning leading to the current effects of increasing climate change.....why are we here then considering an expansion of exports beyond current capacity?"

But here we are divorced from world scientific view and divorced from the United Nations desire to battle the problem of a sustainable future. This is incredibly embarrassing and we must apologise to all the young thinking people and their motivated teachers moving through our high schools and universities in the Hunter region and Australia. This debate negates all the intelligent scientific education evolving within our broad education system. It also blunts the quest and the thirst for new ideas within these young minds .All of the innovative work is being done overseas, what with the cuts to █████ and the non funding of critical research units .Do we want all of our youth exiting this great country? This debate moves well beyond determining a simple coal handling facility. These fresh young eyes are upon us as we decide upon their very future.

Commissioners, in your determination on this project, you must consider each word and sentence you sign off on. You have been given an irksome task by the Government, as those ministers are shielded from political flak should this be approved. You will be blamed..that is why the determining PAC was invented....to shield ministers from constituency backlash.

Economic Health of the Hunter

We have just come from the Warkworth /Mt.Thorley extension hearings in Singleton wherein the future economic health of the region was under scrutiny. As I stated there we are all victims of corporate greed and mismanagement..that is communities, traditional owners and their culture, towns and ecological landscapes, water and agricultural land and the very ordinary miners and their families. It is like a chess game where the investorship of these multi-national miners take the spoils.

For instance, some miners at the December review PAC in Singleton expressed before the Commission that when Rio Tinto was gouging coal during the boom price years recently, they effectively, according to these miners, cut short their contracts by about six years. That is winners and losers in this rampaging quest for returns for shareholders and obscene bonuses for those that engineered it. That is not planning for the workforce or for future needs it is simply greed, and we are to reward these people again. I have a feeling that this T4 application is to prepare once more for a short lived mini-boom of coal to allow a further gouging for quick returns. T4 is certainly not designed for planning for a gradual exit of coal from our shores. It is also not designed to help a gradual transformation of jobs from mining to rehabilitation in the Hunter.

### Rehabilitation in the Hunter

I raise this issue because it is relevant to T4 as when we were here in Newcastle last August at the review PAC there was an emphasis on employment and future work in the coal industry. This was put as a vital need underpinning the need for another coal loader.

So we look at jobs and we all know, including miners, that their work has already or is coming to an end in the near future. Yet rehabilitation of the moon like landscapes and the problem of voids remains outside the guidelines of our discussions around T4 or any new mine plan.

We can't have it both ways. We can't suggest that jobs are at stake for mining or infrastructure and ignore the jobs needed in rehabilitation over the next 20 to 30 years. And the statutes are there in black and white both at State and Federal Government level.

This is precisely where we need to turn this T4 discussion on its head. Building T4 does not equate to planning work and investment in the region. Rehabilitation though has all the requirements for planning and rejuvenation of the Hunter region.

Firstly I quote from the current NSW Trade and Investment website.....

"NSW Trade & Investment – division of Resources & Energy (DRE) is committed to ensuring that the people of NSW do not incur a financial liability as a result of coal, mineral and petroleum exploration and production activities. Therefore all titleholders engaged in these activities are required to lodge a security deposit. The security deposit must cover the Government's full costs in undertaking rehabilitation in the event of default by the titleholder."

That is a clear and unambiguous statement. The NSW Government by its actions will ensure the "full costs" of rehabilitation in the Hunter. A press article from last year's Newcastle Herald suggested that at least \$1.6 Billion exists in the state's rehabilitation fund. This needs checking out.

And from the Federal Government's Mine Rehabilitation Handbook from the opening Foreword by the Minister The Hon .Ian Macfarlane MP...quote

"The Australian mining industry is well aligned to the global pursuit of sustainable development. A commitment to leading practice sustainable development is critical for a mining company to gain and maintain its 'social licence to operate' in the community" (unquote)

The Rehabilitation handbook then goes on to say.....

"Key factors that need to be considered in pre-mining studies include legal requirements ,climate, topography ,soils and community views. The post mining land use for an area should be defined in consultation with relevant interest groups including government departments,local government councils ,non-government organisations, Traditional Owners and private landholders". (unquote)

I also quote from the Singleton Argus an excellent and lengthy article by Louise Nichols of May 26 this year..

"If the United States was able to tackle the issue of final voids back in 1977 where mines must return the land to its pre-mining landform. Why have we decided to virtually ignore the problem? Final voids...is now a significant issue to be faced by our community. The Department of Planning told the Warkworth review PAC there were approximately 30 voids currently approved (how do you approximate voids?) and the one planned for the expanded MTW project covering 950 hectares and 300 metres in depth. PAC estimated that this would be equivalent to one-sixth of the size of Sydney Harbour."

Louise Nichols, whom I hope still has her career, went on to say..."Finding anyone willing to comment on the issue in the Hunter Valley also proved extremely difficult".

Further from the same Argus article...

"John Richards, managing director, [REDACTED] operators of two open cut mines) speaking at the Tom Farrell Institute Mine Rehabilitation Conference recently in Singleton talked about the Hunter's void problems due to their high salinity. The proposed MTW void is estimated to take 1000 years to fill.(with saline water)..or it will cost \$2 Billion, according to the company and the department, to backfill." ( Unquote)

We don't have the right to leave the voids for 1000 years to fill with water. That was never in the plan and it does not comply with State or Federal commitments. What it tells us though is that there is \$2 Billion dollars to be spent on the MTW void in repair. That is easily \$1.5 Billion in wages across the board.

Rehabilitation means jobs continue in machinery plant operations and maintenance , in transport, dust suppression, backfilling on a large scale, landscaping, in forestry propagation, planting and maintenance, toxic water treatment, water systems and maintenance ,horticulture etc etc and the list goes on regarding large scale reparation of voids and landscapes. Plenty of work for the used up mining population. And plenty of work for smart young university trained people to help overcome the problems therein.

The review PAC for the MTW extension told the Planning Department that "the commission does not accept that a mining legacy of large voids across the Hunter is acceptable". The Planning Department told the Commission that it would..."not be reasonable to impose a condition that requires Rio Tinto to completely or even partially backfill the final void".

Who does the Department think they are working for. The people of NSW or Rio Tinto? They are not considering the future of work in the Hunter and therefore are railing against large employment prospects. They are also railing against the very charter of the Trade & Investment arm of the Resources and Energy Department. The Department has an odd history of interpretation of integrated planning policies.

Coal, Economics and the Mineral Council.

I need now to quote from an article from the SMH Business Day section of March 17 this year by Michael West. It is slightly long but refers directly to the prospects of T4. I quote...

"Economics consulting truly is art. Look no further than the masterpiece of consulting from the Centre for International Economics, which managed to deliver entirely different outcomes for different clients by deploying the same data in a different way.

"The Centre had two clients late last year who wanted to know about the implications of NSW planning decisions on coal exports from the state.

"Exhibit A: the first client was the NSW Minerals Industry Taskforce, a group of mining executives and the Minerals Council which was desirous of some large numbers to support their cries for lower royalties, more government spending and their wish list of changes to the planning process. No 1 on the industry taskforce's list is TO DO AWAY WITH THE PLANNING ASSESSMENT COMMISSION". (unquote) Is Mr. Galilee presenting at this important PAC? I wonder why! Maybe he is sick.

"Exhibit B: Ironically, the Centre for International Economics second client was none other than the Planning Assessment Commission.

"The commission needed advice on the Newcastle T4 coal export terminal proposal and whether the huge volumes of coal predicted to be shipped by the port and the miners was actually plausible".

"So here we have two clients wanting to know about state planning decisions and their impact on coal exports (employing the same consultant).

"The first part was easy. A cut and paste job about coal volumes and market forecasts. But then it got trickier.

"In the (second) report the (Centre for International Economics) found; 'The proponent does not offer any evidence to suggest that the increased rate at which coal can or will be extracted and transported to the Port is plausible'. Unquote. Michael West, in this absorbing and amusing article finishes by saying...

"Having told the Planning Assessment Commission that export volumes justifying a new terminal were not plausible, it took a lot of flair (by the Centre of International Economics) to say to the industry taskforce that planning was holding back these same implausible exports". (unquote)

I'll finish by quoting Professor Ross Garnaut..

"Hopes that other countries would not take action to reduce the costs of climate change has contributed to the misjudgements that caused overinvestment in Australian resources production capacity over the past four years" (unquote)

No to T4. T4 is merely a figment in the imagination of a handful of big time miners and investors. It is a slap in the face for new emerging minds and aspirations. It represents a symbol of past enterprise and therefore an anathema for future jobs for the mining communities of the Hunter which will be about rehabilitation and expansion of green industries.

This debate is about honesty, about education, jobs, about communities and Aboriginal heritage, its about a healthy Hunter, and about working in concert with the wider world and the United Nations hope to tackle climate change and the vast scientific opportunities therein. It's about the vibe. I rest my case.


