

MINUTES OF THE PULP MILL PUBLIC MEETING

28th November 2007

7.30pm Memorial Hall, George Town

1. Background

The public meeting was held as a result of a petition received by the General Manager on the 13th September 2007 requesting a public meeting be held on the impact of the proposed Gunns Ltd pulp mill on the East Tamar.

Council advertised the holding of the public meeting on two occasions – 31st October 2007 and 3rd November 2007. Council received 21 submissions regarding the proposed construction of the Gunns Pulp Mill at Long Reach, with 13 being in support of the pulp mill.

The main issues stated in the submissions are as follows:

Forestry

1. Pulpwood will be mostly sourced from Forestry Tasmania, private forest owners and Gunns' owned or managed resource. In addition, Gunns intends to utilise about 300,000 GMT/a of sawmill residues as pulpwood supply for the mill.
2. Both Gunns and Forestry Tasmania have in place environmental and forest management systems that are certified under ISO14001 and the Australian Forestry Standard (AFS). These credentials will ensure that the environmental impacts of both Gunns and Forestry Tasmania are systematically managed to ensure that sustainable yields for The wood supply for the mill will be sourced from forests covered by the RFA and will have no impact on rare threatened fauna and flora and forest communities.
3. Concern regarding the conversion of prime farmland to forestry plantations needed to fuel this mill, with their attendant issues of pesticide usage, vast uptake of water from local catchments, degradation of hillsides resulting in silting and pollution of streams and this in turn impacts not only on endangered species, but the health of residents.
4. The loss of 17 hectares of threatened native vegetation and the threat to 12 state and 2 nationally significant flora species for this pipeline is not insignificant.
5. The mill will consume 4.5 million tons of wood chips each year, and not solely from plantation timber. Forests such as the Florentine, Styx, the Blue Tier are on the 'hit' list.
6. Gunns have stated that between 3.2 and 4.0Mt of pulpwood will be processed by the pulp mill per annum. A mixture of wood from native forests, pine and eucalypt plantations will be used. The quantities of plantation wood used in the mill are likely to increase over time as plantations become available for harvesting.
7. The TFGA estimate that 40% of commercial wood production is on private land and much of that from commercial farming enterprises.
8. Forest operations and harvesting are controlled by the Regional Forest Agreement, made between the Commonwealth and State Governments that create sustainable timber harvesting in forest outside reserves of high conservation value forest. These reserves cover 47% of the native forest and include wilderness and old growth forest as well as threatened and endangered species of flora and fauna. No old growth logs will be used for the mill, no high quality wilderness areas will be subjected to harvesting for the mill.

Transport/Roads

9. Transport of logs and other associated traffic is the single most important aspect of the mill to impact on the general public and visitors state-wide.
10. The site for the mill is adjacent to existing woodchip facilities owned by Gunns. This co-location of the mill with existing woodchip facilities was important to reduce cost, and minimise double-handling and transport impacts.
11. The road conditions are not handling the volume of heavy traffic now, and will not be able to handle the increase from the mill.
12. The promised federal funding for the roads that these trucks will be travelling on is totally inadequate and ignores the total state-wide needs.
13. The availability of wharf facilities at Bell Bay, and the increase in log truck traffic showed that it is a better location than Hampshire, as the Bell Bay Precinct is zoned Heavy Industrial and already has many heavy industries within the area.

Water

14. Water taken from the Trevallyn dam will impact on available water for power supply, and importantly from the 'flush of the Tamar during the '80 day/year' overflow periods.
15. It is hard to comprehend that the environmental and social impacts of the Pipers River Dam outweigh the negatives and losses of taking water from power generation, domestic, agriculture and input into the Tamar.
16. Using water from Trevallyn is not secure, due to the record and long-term low levels of the Great Lake, increased cropping water usage of South Esk and long term rural contracts that are being looked at being reduced, and the possible diversion of water to the midlands.
17. Extremely concerned that this mill will use such a large amount of water when we have drought conditions across the nation and are being encouraged to save water.
18. Tasmanian Farmers and Graziers Association (TFGA) says despite some criticism that Gunns will get water much cheaper than some farmers, direct comparisons are not relevant. Mr Swain (of TGFA) concluded that the water currently has two uses – it can go down the Cataract Gorge for environmental flow, or it can go through the power station and generate power. To double-check the commercial rate, a comparison can be made with the purchase of other raw (not treated) within the State.

Air / Pollution

19. Dioxins, because they are produced by nature and other industrial processes, are present in our every-day environment. International studies have conclude that approximately 95% of human exposure occurs through our consumption of food. The mill approved by both the State Parliament and the Federal Government has dioxin limits that are even lower than the Tasmanian guidelines.
20. Older pulp mills (some with less strict emission guidelines) are located in wine regions overseas (France, Portugal, Spain, Germany, Chile and USA) and have not been reported to cause problems for vineyards and wine.
21. Experts have warned that there will be an increase in the already high incidence of asthma and other lung problems if the pulp mill goes ahead. I don't think we

- should allow a project that has the potential to jeopardise our health. The fact that there area already heavy industries in our area is no reason to add to them.
22. Odour has been linked to adverse health effects (eg. Asthma, nausea, hay fever, respiratory infections), and pulp mills have odour.
 23. The mill will burn timber to create power to operate the mill, sending particles into our atmosphere creating 2% of Australia's Green House gas emissions.
 24. The mill should not be built in the Tamar Valley, as it is an area prone to inversion layers, fog and pollution.
 25. The IIS does not validly predict air pollution. The IIS prediction for class 1 pollutants largely fail US EPA air modelling standards. The IIS under-predicts particle pollution for Launceston by 500%.
 26. The visibility, odour and noise from a mill of this size is a major concern, especially for those living in close proximity or across the river from the site.
 27. Emissions from pulp mills are a health hazard. The mill will bring about angina, heart attacks, respiratory illness, premature births and others afflictions.
 28. There is no such thing as a pulp mill which does not smell. This has been confirmed by Peter Manins, a CSIRO air pollution expert.
 29. The mill location has a significant risk of producing odours and emissions due to the nature of it's topography, meteorology, inversion weather and large population in the Tamar Valley.
 30. The mill will belch out emissions equivalent to 11,000 domestic log heaters, which will undo all the work that locals and Councils have done lately to try to clear the air in the Tamar Valley.
 31. The plant will produce Sodium Chlorate, and produce excessive amounts of dioxins and furans which are in contravention of the Stockholm Convention.
 32. The issue of Greenhouse Gas has been addressed by the developer of the pulp mill, and has been subjected to review by the Australian Greenhouse Gas office. This mill will be positive in the struggle to reduce GHG and will see a saving of over a million tonnes of CO2 equivalent gasses saved each year. This is greater than the annual saving predicted in the initial years of the Commonwealth's light bulb program.
 33. The State Government permit conditions reflect the Emission Limit Guidelines issued by the State Government in 2004. The thorough assessment process of the mill ensures that there is no adverse impact to the air quality of the Tamar Valley.
 34. The National Pollution Inventory reported that for George Town, .0022kg (22 grams) were emitted. This emission level had no impact on the health of the municipality.
 35. Due to the pulp mill generating its own electricity and being capable of exporting surplus electricity onto the electrical grid, and woodchip shipments to Asia being replaced by much fewer pulp ships, the operation of the pulp mill is predicted to results in a significant reduction in greenhouse gas emissions.
 36. The emission limit guidelines for the mill have been set so that the mill will not cause odour annoyance to its neighbours.
 37. The pulp mill may add one or two micrograms per cubic metre of airborne particle concentrations to the air, but this is compared to that of wood smoke with contributes 50 to 200 micrograms per cubic metre.

38. The Bell Bay Pulp Mill's odour controls will be better than any other mill in the world, and the likelihood of unpleasant odour events occurring is extremely low.
39. As stated by Smart Viticulture, "Reduced sulphur odours will not be discernible".
40. Due to the pulp mill generating its own electricity and being capable of exporting surplus electricity onto the electrical grid, and woodchip shipments to Asia being replaced by much fewer pulp ships, the operation of the pulp mill is predicted to result in a significant reduction in greenhouse gas emissions. The mill would reduce net greenhouse gas emissions by approximately 1.1-1.3 million tonnes CO2-equivalent per year.
41. The exceedingly low concentrations of chlorophenols from the flue gas emissions predicted in Tamar Ridge Estates vineyards will preclude any possibility of wine taint by grape, vine or wine sorption at Tamar Ridge and nearby vineyards.

Marine Environment

42. The Commonwealth Department of Environment found "Based on the available evidence, the Department has not identified any likely significant impacts on the marine environment in Commonwealth waters from the pulp mill".
43. The mill will not use elemental chlorine, the process that will be used is an elemental chlorine free (ECF) process. The bleaching agent (predominantly chlorine dioxide) is 99.6-99.8% free of elemental chlorine. The small amount that is present means dioxin formation is virtually eliminated.
44. To contemplate a pulp mill in the Tamar Valley, pumping thousands of gallons of toxins in the river, which then flows into the sea, is a death sentence for the area and the fishing industry, if not for Tasmania.
45. 65,000 tonnes of effluent will be pumped into Bass Strait
46. Tidal flows in Bass Strait are very sluggish, and it is estimated to take 160 days to flush the area. This means that the build up of effluent in the area will be huge and will have devastating effects on marine flora and fauna. Many species rely on sight to catch their prey, and the effluent will handicap them.
47. During some months of the year, there is very little movement of the water in the area where the effluent is to be discharged so the concentration will be even worse at this time.
48. At a rate of 73,000,000 litres per day, the cumulative effect of the effluent disposal must surely have an adverse effect on marine life – including fish, penguins and seals.
49. The National Pulp Mill Research Program has confirmed that dioxins and furans are not detectable in modern pulp mill effluent.
50. The pulp mill approved by both the State Parliament and the Federal Government has dioxin limits that are even lower than the Tasmanian guidelines.
51. The Joint Food and Agriculture Organisation and WHO Expert Committee on Food Additives recommended a provisional tolerable monthly intake or PTMI of 70pg dioxin toxic equivalents (TEQ)/kg body weight. The pulp mill treated effluent emission level is a fraction of this at 3.4pg/L.
52. While the mill will discharge an average of approximately 24 thousand million litres (24GL) of treated effluent to Bass Strait each year, the total amount of dioxin and furans discharged with it each year is estimated to be only 0.074 grams.

53. Treated effluent may wash up on the beaches within George Town municipality, however, it will be so diluted (approximately 5000 times) it will be un-noticeable. It is very unlikely that concentrations of contaminants beyond the specified critical levels will reach the beach, the Tamar estuary or Commonwealth waters. The plume will reach these areas, but with sufficient dilution to be below the water quality guideline concentrations set for this development.
54. There is no risk to human health, marine life or our Northern beach from the treated effluent of the pulp mill. The effluent will be diluted so many times before making it to the shore that the impact is not scientifically significant.
55. If the RPDC process had continued, the limit for Dioxins entering Bass Strait would have remained at 20pg/L. However, by adopting the alternative assessment process, this limit has been reduced by the Commonwealth to 3.4pg/L. It would appear that by lowering a limit that already safeguarded the health, safety and wellbeing of the citizens of the Tamar Valley, the approval process in fact has enhanced rather than put at risk by that approval.
56. The State Consult (Dr David Provis) has looked at the Bass Strait site and found "it is very unlikely that concentrations of contaminants beyond the specified critical levels will reach the beach and the Tamar estuary.
57. The Mill will not have an adverse impact on marine life or the marine environment.
58. An assessment of the Australian fur seal was undertaken as a sentinel species in the assessment of the impacts of dioxins in the treated effluent, which found that adverse effects are not anticipated.

General

59. If the unthinkable happens and the mill goes ahead, George Town Council must insist that constant independent monitoring of all aspects of the mill is undertaken and if faults occur the mill should be closed immediately.
60. Concern that after the mill has been built and the extra workers have returned to where they came from, there will be a glut of housing and it could be a case of 'history repeating itself' and George Town will have the 'welfare' image once again.
61. The process of 'selling' the mill has not been fair to the community, as there has only been one public meeting in George Town.
62. If the project goes ahead, it will be at a considerable cost to our way of life and Tasmania's 'clean and green' image will be questioned.
63. Both sides of the Tamar River are home to vast areas of vineyards and fruit and vegetable growing. Many of these businesses rely on their status as organic enterprises and this must surely be jeopardised by their proximity to a pulp mill.
64. The people of George Town do not want the workers accommodation in its current location, and would prefer for it to be placed adjacent to the mill site.
65. A thriving tourism industry and a pulp mill cannot work together. Tasmania (and George Town) have only recently been recognised by outsiders as a 'special place' of natural beauty and heritage. At a time when George Town has only recently overcome its industrial image, and is attracting more tourists, this pulp mill will mean a perceived return to the industrial image.
66. Tasmanians are getting a poor return for their forest resource.
67. Support for the pulp mill must be withdrawn under the circumstances.

68. George Town has much to offer and will grow and prosper without the mill, and residents will suffer because of this mill.
69. Democracy has not be upheld – as Gunns have been poor corporate citizens.
70. The mill will have an adverse effect on the quality of life in the area, including loss of visual amenity, general amenity and tourism.
71. The Pulp Mill poses a serious health risk to the citizens of George Town if the mill is built
72. The objections to the lowly populated Hampshire site have not adequately considered the residents and stakeholders of the Tamar Valley. It has been made on a commercial basis – ie. log transport and how it impacts on the bottom line of the mill.
73. Our area will again be torn up to place an underground pipeline from Trevallyn to Bass Strait.
74. When it is possible and economical to make sewerage water into safe drinking water, I cannot see why the water cannot be desalinated and recycled. Surely the cost of this would be less than the cost of infrastructure, maintenance and monitoring of disposal at sea – not to mention the possible environmental costs of such disposal.
75. The site of the mill will mean clearing of a significant area of native vegetation in the only part of the Tamar Valley where the river edge is virtually untouched since Bass & Flinders visited, and I understand it was, until recently, a part of the national estate.
76. All claims relating to financial assistance being provided to Gunns to undertake a detailed impact assessment and to confirm the project's viability must be dismissed. No subsidies are being made payable to Gunns.
77. The process undertaken by the State Parliament and Federal Minister examined issues of public health, community and environmental impact.
78. The community affected by the mill live and work in the Tamar Valley, they work in the industry driving log trucks, working the forests and mills. Their children attend schools in the area, they all breathe the air and enjoy a wine or fresh Tasmanian seafood. They work in the tourism industry, others are farmers and landowners. This community is keen to ensure the mill will have no adverse impacts on our environment, public health, other industries and families. But they are also keen to have the substantial economic and social benefit of adding 2% to the state economy, the jobs to be created and the benefits of creating a future for their kids and communities.
79. The mill's additional electrical energy that will be generated and supplied into the national grid will replace energy produced predominately from fossil fuels.
80. Despite claims of subsidies, adverse impact on other industries and financial risk, a detailed examination shows that the pulp mill will be a major benefit to the state's economy and to other industries.
81. To actively oppose a mill that will reduce greenhouse gas would be a risk to both our world and local environment and a risk to the health of this and future generations.
82. The pulp mill invests in the future through value adding to its renewable, sustainable forest resource, and does not destroy forest of any description. The pulp mill is based on diverting woodchips that are currently being exported to the pulp mill for value added processing.

83. The Commonwealth and State Governments have had a major input into the development of stringent environmental guidelines which will ensure the mill will be safe in terms of Human health and the Environment.
84. George Town will receive a tremendous boost from having the pulp mill sited in our municipality, and the technology that will be used to control odour will mean that residents and ratepayers will not suffer any adverse impacts.
85. The detailed economic modelling tested by ITS Global on behalf of the Government of Tasmania has concluded that the mill would yield substantial positive benefits to the region, the State and Australia as a whole, through greater economic activity and employment.
86. A model developed by the University of Tasmanian Professor Graeme Wells for the Launceston Environment Centre shows that company tax to be paid over the 20 year life of the project will exceed \$1.6 billion at the pulp price expected to be received.
87. The value adding that the pulp mill will provide is consistent with the Tasmanian and Australian governments' strategy for forest products. The balance of trade deficit in forest and wood products is approximately \$2 billion per annum.
88. It is estimated that an injection of an additional \$1.5 million per day for Tasmanian businesses will be a result of the pulp mill. In relation to Tourism, the mill will create 560,000 additional hotel room nights, 1,500,000 meals to be served, 200 extra visits a weekend to vineyard cellar doors, with 10,000 additional cases of Tasmanian wine sold each year. The mill will also generate 500 additional airline seats into Launceston each week.
89. The World Bank's 2007 draft pulp mill guidelines confirm that by not using elemental chlorine, the formation of dioxins and furans is reduced to minute amounts "below the level of scientific significance".

RPDC Process / Legislation

90. Gunns pulled out of the RPDC as they could not comply with the strict and necessary guidelines stipulated by the RPDC, not anything to do with the time frame as was originally reported
91. The State, Federal and some local government have bent due process to their own ends, disenfranchising the majority of the community.
92. The fast tracking of the assessment process has been interpreted by many as a shortcut and compromise to the RPDC process, which was seen as independent, thorough and trustworthy.
93. Gunns, Federal and State Governments and George Town Council have not adequately addressed the safety and welfare concerns of the people of the George Town Municipality in relation to toxic discharge into the air, onto the land, into the river, Bass Strait, Northern Tasmanian coastline and the Tamar estuary. In addition, they have not assessed the risk to road users from additional heavy vehicles on the roads.
94. The community have been left with an entirely unsatisfactory fast-track review by Sweco Pic on one hand, and Malcolm Turnbull and the Federal Government on the other. The former have declared it passes 92% of the requirements. However, the remaining 8% consists of some of the most important environmental issues.
95. The George Town Council's approval was initially qualified by its trust in the RPDC process. The removal of the project from the RPDC process and

- consequential fast-tracking of the project shows contempt for the democratic process.
96. All reports produced via alternate processes have been made available to the public.
 97. While it would have been ideal for the project to be assessed by the RPDC as a project of state significance, the alternative method adopted by the State Government was to test the project against the already established emission guidelines, and this was carried out in accordance with Legislation passed by the State Parliament and completed by expert consultants Sweco Pic.
 98. The RPDC statement made in 2004 is still true, in that “There is no scientific evidence to suggest that a BEK pulp mill operating within the emission levels set in the Tasmanian Guidelines would have unacceptable environmental impacts, including adverse impacts on human health”
 99. The State Parliament, by a very clear majority, has approved the project, in addition to the Federal Government through the Environmental Minister. These approvals cannot be overturned by a change of Government.
 100. The petition giving rise to this public meeting implies that the Project of State Significants (POSS) process undertaken by the RPDC was a better process than the approval by both Houses of State parliament and by the Commonwealth. Yet, none of the RPDC had been elected by the people of Tasmania, all were appointed. None were as responsible to their electorate as each Member of Parliament is.
 101. The alternate process clearly does not create any additional risks than the flawed RPDC process.
 102. The RPDC is being held in high regard by petitioners to the mill, despite the fact that the RPDC had never carried out an integrated assessment of a Project of State Significance themselves.
 103. The mill will conform to the RPDC advice in that it will have no health impacts.
 104. The emission guidelines for the pulp mill were developed by the RPDC and approved by the Tasmanian Government and endorsed by the Commonwealth safeguard public health. The report by Sweco Pic mill’s compliance with these guidelines has ensured that appropriate permit conditions have been developed by appropriate authorities to ensure the mill will be safe.
 105. The assessment of the mill by the EPBC Act and the Tasmanian Pulp Mill Assessment Act 2007 show that there is no increased risk of adverse impacts to the environment, or to the health and well-being of the citizens of George Town.

Employment

106. It is a concern that the George Town Council and the Mayor have embraced the mill, as after the initial construction phase, only a few hundred jobs will remain for the residents, and perhaps a clever Government and Council could attract a cleaner industry to the local community.
107. While there may be increased employment during the building of the proposed mill, the long term employment is not worth jeopardising the future of our tourism industry.
108. The mill will cost more than it contributes to the economy and Tasmanian businesses as a result of the pulp mill. The mill will be financially viable and add significant wealth to the company, its shareholders and its suppliers. Its financial

success will flow onto the Tasmanian community, creating jobs, additional taxes and new income streams.

109. The Tourism industry is expected to benefit from the increased economic activities, not be adversely affected as some critics have claimed.
110. The mill will lead to the creation of an estimated 1600 additional new jobs, an increase in gross state product of 2.5% each year, and a large increase in state tax revenue – by 2030 an additional \$48 million per year..
111. The mill will provide a major boost to Tasmanian employment, unseen since the Hydro Electric construction program of the 1960's and 70's that was stopped by the greens.
112. The independent modelling has confirmed the mill will increase the number of Tasmanians employed by an average of 1,620 each year for more than 30 years.
113. Tasmania's gross state product (GSP) would be \$6.7 billion higher in net present value terms over the project life, with over 1600 additional jobs sustained on average while the mill operates. Many of these jobs both direct and indirect will be here within the George Town municipality.
114. During construction phase, it is expected tht there will be 500,000 days of work for Tasmanians in construction, undertaken by 2,800 construction workers including more than 150 apprentices and trainees.
115. The mill will provide a fantastic boost to our regional economy, creating long term sustainable jobs and broadening both the tax base and the manufacturing industry in the state.
116. Neither George Town nor Tasmania can afford to lose this opportunity to create these jobs because some people are unhappy with the assessment process.

2. Introduction

- The Mayor Doug Burt welcomed attendees to the meeting, and introduced the Chairperson of the Public Meeting, Lynn Mason, the immediate past President of the Local Government Association of Tasmania. Lynn is also a former Telstra Business Woman of the Year. Welcome also to George Town Councillors in attendance.
- Lynn Mason gave a summary of housekeeping, followed by a detailed report of the meeting procedures which would be strictly adhered to throughout the course of the meeting. Lynn advised that due to the number of speakers, the order of the meeting would be altered to allow for Motions for debate to be brought forward to Item 4 on the agenda. This change was made to ensure that the motions were fully debated and not rushed through at the end of the meeting. Dependent upon time, speakers listed in item 4 will be given the opportunity to speak.

3. Presentation by Convenors of Petition

Debbie Rainbow and Cheryl Wills

Debbie Rainbow introduced herself to the meeting and spoke of her major concerns which focussed on road transport.

- The increase of log trucks on the highway and the impact on the already poor condition of many sections of the highway. She believes the growth of road transport is underestimated.

- An estimated 655 loaded trucks a day which will be travelling on the highway, in addition to the current road usage. This, coupled with additional trucks carrying chemicals is of great concern.
- The stress by parents of those children who would be travelling on the highway to school each day, with trucks continually passing vehicles in overtaking lanes, and travelling at close proximity behind other users of the highway.

Cheryl Wills addressed the meeting and spoke of her major concerns.

- The 64,000 tonnes of effluent which will be discharged into the Bass Strait each day.
- The environment impact on the rivers with regard to swimmers and marine life, especially the seals on Tenth Island. She questioned whether anyone actually knows the full environment impact of this.
- Social and Psychological Impact on society.
- Reiterated the issues relating to the additional log trucks on the highways.
- Stressed that for the future and health of all members of the community that common sense prevail and that the pulp mill be stopped.

4. **Council Position**

Mayor Doug Burt

Historical position

- First official position of Council was a motion at the November 2004 Council meeting, that Council support the proposed pulp mill, provided it could meet the environmental guidelines. Evidence was there for all to see – a project of this size would bring a better quality of life and higher living standards for the community.
- The Government wrote to RPDC to ask that world standard guidelines be developed for the Pulp Mill. These guidelines were released in 7 June 2004 for public comment; with a the final guidelines being released on the 25th October 2004.
- In October 2004 Gunns wrote to the Government to advise that Council approved the feasibility study to investigate the commercial viability of construction a pulp mill in Tasmania. On 22 November 2004, the pulp mill project was declared a project of state significance.
- RPDC invited comment from the Government between November and December 2004 and then the general public during the course of 2005. During this time, Council was actively involved in this process. A Value Management Workshop was held to raise the Tamar Valley Councils and community understanding of the impacts and opportunities associated with the project.
- At Council's Annual General Meeting on the 5th December 2005; it was resolved that a public meeting be held regarding the proposed pulp mill in February 2006; or following Gunn's release of it IIS.
- The public meeting was held in August 2006 and matters raised from this public meeting formed part of Councils submission to RPDC. Gunns then withdrew from the RPDC process citing lack of definitive timeframe for the assessment.
- Premier Lennon then introduced Pulp Mill Assessment Bill into the house of assembly.
- GT Council became more heavily involved in the project, writing to Planning Minister Steve Kons with specific issues which Council required to be addressed.

- Mayor Burt stressed the important of community's awareness that Council's recommendations were almost taken up in their entirety, including access flyover where the mill meets the East Tamar Highway.
- Mayor Burt concluded by advising that the days of large polluting industries are long gone, which is why the mill has his full support.

5. Speakers for the Submissions

All persons who had previously presented submissions to the Council were invited to speak to these.

6. Motions

At the public meeting four (4) motions were received:

Motion 1

Moved: Lawrence Archer
 Seconded: Pat Bottle

That this public meeting encourages the George Town Council to continue support for the construction of the Pulp Mill at Long Reach to the standards demanded by the State and Federal Governments.

Speaker against: Debbie Rainbow
 Speaker for Pat Bottle
 Speaker against Dr Andrea Ernst
 Speaker for Dennis Lawrence
 Speaker against Peter Whish-Wilson
 Summary Lawrence Archer

For: 91
 Against: 141

MOTION LOST

Motion 2

Moved: Debbie Rainbow
 Seconded: Bob McMahon

That this meeting calls upon the George Town Council to actively oppose the proposed Pulp Mill on the grounds that the health, safety and well being of the citizens of the East Tamar has been put at risk by the fast-track approval of the project and can no longer be adequately protected or ensured.

Speaker against: Pat Bottle

MOTION CARRIED

Motion 3

Moved: Laurie Crerar
 Seconded: Bob McMahon

That George Town Council

- (1) assess, consult and advise on all projected major hazards and inform the community on completion;

- (2) ensure that baseline studies for all major environmental hazards are completed for future testing for communities health and well being; and
- (3) Provide world health sure guard information for industrial pollution levels and safe distances for community living.

Speaker against Mike Reynolds
 Speaker for Bob McMahon
 Speaker against Lawrence Archer
 Speaker for Andrea Ernst
 Summary Laurie Crerar

MOTION CARRIED

Motion 4

Moved: Cheryl Wills
 Seconded: Debbie Rainbow

That Mayor Doug Burt be censured for his bias in his handling of the pulp mill issue.

Speaker against Bob Poolley
 Speaker for Debbie Rainbow
 Speaker against Harvey Gibbons
 Speaker for Heiner Siebert
 Speaker against Peter Cox
 Summary Cheryl Wills

MOTION LOST

7. Request to Speak

Those members of the public who had forwarded request to speak at the meeting were invited to do so. Those issues discussed included:

- Why did Gunns not let due course take its time and continue with the RPDC process.
- 780 submissions were made to the RPDC. The belief is that these submissions were put aside.
- The adverse effect on the Tamar Valley.
- Effect on the highways and Batman Bridge.
- (find letter Sven read out)
- Belief that the Pulp Mill is a bomb waiting to be detonated. A proper examination is required of the risks involved with the pulp mill.
- Council has betrayed the people of the municipality. West Tamar Council and Launceston City Council have both withdrawn support of the pulp mill, and George Town Council should do the same.
- The assessment process is inadequate and offers no protection for industries such as fruit growers. Concerns that the mill will emit chemicals that will affect produce, deeming it unfit for sale.

- What information has Council sought with regard to community health risks.
- Concerns that the Government is elected to represent the people, and the Government does not want to listen. To date, a fair assessment has not been forthcoming.
- Responsible water usage. The pulp mill will use 40 billion litres of water a year; the majority of which will be pumped into the Tamar River.
- A combination of fresh water and salt water is toxic to marine life.
- Effluent into Bass Strait; effect on the Tamar Valley; smell; and fishing industry.
- Toxic substances into the water at Hillwood.
- Threat to the endangered wildlife.
- Concern that Council demoralises those members of the public who question the health and safety aspects of the pulp mill.
- Concerns regarding the proposed Men's Working Quarters.
- The mill will be located in the most important part of the river in terms of bird life.
- Steps must be taken to ensure that the future is environmentally sound.
- Concerns regarding the cutting down of old growth forests.

8. Close

The Chairperson thanked everyone for their discipline throughout the meeting and passed the chair to the Mayor.

Mayor Burt extended his thanks to the community.

Meeting closed at 10.05pm