

COMMUNITY ALLIANCE FOR



POSITIVE SOLUTIONS INC. (CAPS)

P.O Box 69, Yarloop, WA 6218
0409335011 or 0409370235
Email: caps6218@yahoo.com
Web: www.caps6218.org.au

Hon Bill Marmion MLA
Minister for Environment; Water
Level 29, 77 St. Georges Terrace
PERTH WA 6000

6th June 2012

Dear Minister Marmion,

Re: Implementation Time Limit Extension Alcoa Wagerup Refinery Expansion

The purpose of this letter is to formally identify the lack of judiciousness and fairness in the rationale behind the granting of the time limit extension for the Alcoa Wagerup Refinery Expansion. The basis for this challenge centers on an apparent failure to sufficiently regard evidence that shows harm to the people and the environment in the area around the Wagerup refinery. The sum total of this evidence constitutes a mix of significant and new environmental factors, which have arisen since the 2006 expansion approval granted to Alcoa Wagerup. On the basis of the evidence presented herein, we earnestly request an independent review and reversal of the decision allowing the time limit extension as a matter of priority and urgency.

Under objective scrutiny of the produced evidence you should have rejected the application for an extension of time of the environmental approval because:

- A. New and significant factors have arisen since the approval;
- B. Alcoa failed to consult with us as stakeholders before approval;
- C. The assessment was based on biased, unverified data.

In your letter (dated 29/12/2011) you gave written assurance that you would meet the requirements of Section 46 of the Environmental Protection Act and further, in regard to the EPA report (1430), would "...ensure it is made publicly available as required under Section 46 (7)".

However, it appears you have failed to meet those requirements. In so doing, your Office has placed Alcoa's requirements before your Ministerial responsibility to your constituents, the people of Western Australia, who elect you into office in good faith.

The EPA report (2012)¹, states the following, insufficiently verified "facts":

¹ EPA (2012). Report and Recommendations of the Environmental Protection Authority – Wagerup Alumina Refinery – Extension of Time Limit for Substantial Commencement – s46 change to condition 4 of Ministerial Statement 728. (Report 1430). Perth: EPA.

Yarloop

Warroona

Hamel

Harvey

Cookernup

Wagerup

Other
Impacted
Areas

1. “The environmental factors of the proposal have not significantly changed, nor have any new significant environmental factors arisen since the approval” (of 2006).

2. “Alcoa consulted with all relevant government authorities and stakeholders prior to seeking your approval”.

A. Evidence for the change of significant environmental and social factors

Since 2004, Community Alliance for Positive Solutions (CAPS) have produced for the EPA and your department significant amounts of compelling evidence (part of which, is referred to herein), which attests to ongoing, significant social and environmental impacts. In addition, Alcoa have failed to comply with any of the 42 conditions set by the Government for the approval.

1. Original approval for 2.35Mtpa increased to 6Mtpa without due process.

Contrary to the EPA’s claims, the following points raised in this letter are either *new significant environmental factors* or qualify as *environmental factors that have significantly changed*. The EPA has failed to acknowledge or address any of these factors, some of which have come to light *since* the ERMP² (Alcoa’s Environmental Review Management Plan of 2005 which was based on a production increase from 2.35 Mtpa (Million tonnes per annum) to 4.7 Mtpa). Other significant environmental factors have been ongoing and remained unchanged, since initial concerns were raised, prior to 2006.

It is, therefore, with fervent consternation that we question the rationale of the State Government, when on the 19th June 2007 it allowed a Variation Agreement of the State Agreement to increase the production ‘ceiling’ of the refinery from 4 Mtpa to 6 Mtpa (Ripper, 2007)³, which will have a cumulative effect on the environment and health of the community. This significant increase has been allowed without community consultation or any requirement for another ERMP to be undertaken prior to approval by the EPA and the Minister for the Environment.

The agreement on production increase should not have happened without addressing these significant environmental, health and social issues first.

2. Increased production makes breaches of environmental conditions more likely.

2.1 Dust

The EPA has received many assurances from Alcoa that it has implemented an impressive and costly “...*range of measures to ensure such an incident would not reoccur...*” (in response to dust incident, Perth Court No.MH2369 20/12/2004). The EPA has since that time continued to accept Alcoa’s assertions, without independent substantiation or ongoing monitoring, regardless of the mounting evidence proving contrary to these claims.

² Alcoa (2005). Environmental review and management plan - Wagerup refinery unit three. Perth, Alcoa World Alumina.

³ Ripper, E. (05.06.2007). Deed of Undertaking and Variation Agreement (Ref: M68724). Letter to Community Alliance for Positive Solutions (CAPS) Inc.

Furthermore, the DEC Study⁴ presents clear proof that there is a direct link between the air that passes through Yarloop (and surrounding districts) and the emissions from the refinery and mud lakes, with plumes remaining for up to eighteen hours at a time at ground level. The testimonials by impacted residents giving evidence to this are significantly higher in 2012. It also states that there were “*odor sources*” not accounted for in Alcoa’s emission inventory and that the study did not take into account the liquor burner emissions as it was turned off for the duration of the study.

The liquor burner is a major contributor to toxic emissions. Had the liquor burner been operating at the time of the study, as it does twenty four hours a day, seven days a week, the findings of the emissions inventory would have been significantly different.

The emissions produced by the refinery and the RSA’s are a combination of over 260 identified chemicals and ten other unidentified substances. The effect and therefore the impact of these toxic substances, when combined with each other, are unknown;

- How do they react with each other?
- What additional substances are produced when they combine?
- What are the effects of these substances on the environment and human health in the short-term and long-term?

Alcoa’s RSA is a constant source of toxic dust emissions. This has been captured on camera, (known as dust events) by local residents. Due to this irrefutable evidence the DEC have been obliged to undertake a number of legal actions against the company, some of which are currently under investigation. Alcoa Wagerup continually fail to adequately manage the RSA and prevent ongoing dust events and furthermore, an expansion will only exacerbate the danger they present.

Therefore, (in addition to what is directly referred to in this document) it is with compelling, well documented and scientifically supported evidence in the public domain, that we refute Alcoa’s strongly asserted yet uncorroborated *claim* to have “...*absolute confidence in the safety of their Western Australian operations and ... in their view, that the air quality around their alumina refineries is safe.*” (Cransberg, 2012).⁵

In this regard, it is pertinent to acknowledge that “*controversy and outrage will not be resolved just because Alcoa says there is no hazard or health risk.*” (URS 2003⁶)

Besides, it was acknowledged as early as 2004 that, “...*it would be grossly irresponsible to inflict any further stress and risk on the communities and workforce at Wagerup by allowing any expansion ... let alone an increase of nearly double the current scale of production*” (Sharp, 2004)⁷.

2.2 Noise

⁴ DEC (2008). Winter 2006 Study: Intensive Air Quality Investigation at Wagerup. Perth: DEC.

⁵ Cransberg, A. (26/3/2012). Email to Alcoa employees

⁶ URS, (2003). Comments on the Review Report of Alcoa’s Revised Land Management Proposal (January 2002). Perth, W.A.: letter.

⁷ Sharp, C. (2004). *Report on the Standing Committee on Environment and Public Affairs in relation to the Alcoa refinery at Wagerup inquiry*. Perth, W.A.: Legislative Council.

In the ERMP Alcoa admit that with current processing methods, its night noise levels cannot operate within the permitted 35 decibels and that therefore they are "...unable to meet the regulatory criteria". In response to residents' complaints, the company's solution is to seek exemptions (through Regulation 17), to increase the permitted night noise levels to 47 decibels. In addition, Alcoa intend to buy out all remaining residents in Area A and subsequently *claim* to have created a buffer zone (or 'noise abatement zone') from outside of which no other residents will be impacted by the night time noise. However, the current noise levels are above 35db (night noise level) approximately three kilometres outside of Area A and are being monitored.

If Alcoa had implemented any significant strategy capable of efficiently combating emissions, then accordingly, a significant environmental change by way of reduction of emissions, *should have* taken place, "...in accordance with Alcoa's commitment to the DEC" (Perth Court No. PE 45808 Heard 24/8/2010). However, the environmental impact of emissions has, in fact increased due to increased production (since the ERMP) while Alcoa continues to have inadequate control measures in place.

3. Potential of PM_{2.5} to impact on health and the environment

Fine particulate matter (PM_{2.5}) is an air pollutant that is a concern for people's health when levels in the air are high. PM_{2.5} are tiny particles in the air that reduce visibility and cause the air to appear hazy when levels are elevated. Outdoor PM_{2.5} levels are most likely to be elevated on days with little or no wind or air mixing.

According to the EPA (2006)⁸ PM_{10s} have been modelled but not PM_{2.5s} as "*PM_{2.5} concentrations are not significant and are independent of refinery activities...and it is not appropriate for use in air quality assessments*". The EPA has failed to acknowledge the potential of PM_{2.5} to impact on human health and the environment.

4. Exposure to radioactive particles

According to research, the mining of bauxite results in ongoing minor exposure to radioactive isotopes which include radium, thorium and uranium. In addition, the Bayer process in the refinery concentrates the naturally occurring radioactive materials present in bauxite (Damiano, 1997).⁹ These highly toxic and radioactive materials remain in residue storage areas (RSAs).

In addition, heavy metals, as well as caustic, attach themselves to these particles. Medical research has proven that long-term exposure to fine particle air pollution is associated with cardiovascular disease and death (Miller et al, 2007).¹⁰

It is known that continuous low-level exposure to radiation causes delayed effects that can appear over a period of two to ten years after exposure. This includes inhaling or ingesting radioactive materials through dust inhalation or drinking water. The known long-term effects

⁸ EPA (2006). Wagerup Cogeneration Project - Alinta Cogeneration (Wagerup) Pty Ltd Report and Recommendations of the EPA (Bulletin 1223). Perth: EPA.

⁹ Damiano J. (1997). *Managing Health in the Aluminum Industry*. Middlesex University Press. London.

¹⁰ Miller, K., Sheppard, S., Sullivan, J., Anderson, G. & Kaufman, (2007). No Escape from Diesel Exhaust. *The New England Journal of Medicine*, Vol. 356 No. 5. pp. 447-458.

include thyroid cancer, leukaemia, bone cancer, lung cancer and genetic effects which result in malformed offspring (University of Toronto, 2004).¹¹

5. Elevated cancer rates of local residents

Alcoa had alarming indications of the health impact of its operations as early as 2004, when it published findings which revealed a higher mortality rate and cancer incidence of mesothelioma and a higher incidence rate of thyroid/endocrine cancer among refinery workers (Healthwise, 2004; Alcoa, 2004).^{12,13}

In addition, the Telethon Health Study (2008)¹⁴ revealed elevated rates of symptoms related to chemical exposure for residents of Hamel/Wagerup/Yarloop and Cookernup. Further, the study showed that cancer rates in Cookernup are the highest in the State even though the survey was ‘*flawed*’ as it did not take into account those who had left the area or those who had already died of cancer.¹⁵

6. General impact on health of local residents

In response to interviews conducted in Yarloop 16th - 17th April 2005, Dr John Croft (2005)¹⁶ stated in regard to individuals raising concern for their health due to the impact of Alcoa’s operations that “*never before have I had 100% of a community (surveyed) raise a single issue, especially one which was not solicited in my questioning of the respondents*”. In addition, findings of the Wagerup Medical Practitioners Forum (EPA, 2006)¹⁷ indicated that within the Yarloop community “... *there is considerable weight of medical opinion that there is a medical problem*” and subsequently, in their appeal to the ERMP, did not support the expansion (Walkington, 2005).¹⁸

New data regarding the general health impact on the local community would have been available for collating but was not accessed.

7. Water needs for increased production

In the ERMP Alcoa modelled future water consumption *from data based on historical weather patterns and rainfall*. However, subsequently, weather patterns and rainfall have changed significantly since 2006. Declining rainfall (a trend of 30 years) and increasing population demands indicate drastic measures are required to reach sustainable aquifer levels.

¹¹ University of Toronto, (2004). *Radiation Protection Service Training Module*. Toronto: University of Toronto.

¹² Healthwise (2004). Healthwise cancer incidence & mortality study. Melbourne, Centre for Occupational and Environmental Health - Monash University.

¹³ Alcoa (2004). Employee Update – Healthwise Cancer and Mortality Study – Report 2004. Perth: Alcoa.

¹⁴ Telethon Institute for Child Health Research (2008). Wagerup & Surrounds Community Health Study. Perth: Telethon Institute for Child Health Research

¹⁵ CAPS has kept an ongoing log of reported cancer cases to date.

¹⁶ Croft, J. (2005). Results of interviews conducted in Yarloop. Perth, Community Capacity Building Branch - Department of Local Government and Regional Development.

¹⁷ Environmental Protection Authority (2006). EPA Bulletin 1215 - Wagerup Alumina Refinery - Increase in Production to 4.7 Mtpa; and Wagerup Cogeneration Plant

¹⁸ Walkington, P. (2005). Environmental Protection Authority briefing note: Site visit on 7 July 2005 for the Alcoa Wagerup refinery unit 3 expansion. Perth, EPA.

Alcoa failed to provide updated information on how it is planning to meet the water needs for the expansion.

Diminishing water supplies are impacting directly on local communities as evidenced by the increasing water restrictions being imposed on the average householder, reductions in water allocation to farmers and the increasing means by which Alcoa sources water. Alcoa's Wagerup operations current water allocation, regardless of actual use, is greater than the combined water use consumed by residents living Bunbury, Albany, Broome, Greenbushes, Carnarvon, Harvey Wokalup and Katanning. According the Australian Bureau of Statistics (2004)¹⁹ this represents 120556 people. Obviously factors affecting growth, such as the mining boom will have influenced these data. Nonetheless, Alcoa currently consume enough water to supply about 94000 people a year.

The people of Western Australia are being educated and “nursed” into the acceptance of:

1. Less farming immediately adjacent to RDA facility - a significant loss of highly productive land,
2. Nutrient addition to soils exposed to alkaline salts,
3. The community imposition to take on water saving practices so as not to impact on production,
4. Selective replanting of vegetation types which tolerate alkaline environments,
5. Loss of traditional water supply through over abstraction practices.

Alcoa's water usage licenses are diverse and extend over a various range of sources, allowing around 27 GL per year (for the three refineries in W.A), 12.7 GL (47%) of which may be taken from ground water. This is causing significant falls in the water levels in the aquifers. Even with the contribution from additional sources (such as processed water), there is no clear evidence that the aquifer levels will return to a sustainable flat line. With this steady decline in water availability, agriculture and other water dependent rural land uses will not be possible, drastically impacting on primary and food production and subsequent land values (Walker, 2011).²⁰ According to Alcoa any substantial changes to existing water reuse practices was considered too costly.

Sampling undertaken between 1999 and 2008 clearly indicate that the quality of shallow and moderately deep aquifer waters which underlay the RDA area have gradually become contaminated, and that the pH in bores located west of the RDA are up to TEN times higher than the pH levels typical of the natural surrounds. Of increasing concern is the fact that in some bores the pH trend is rising. The fate and transport of these contaminants off site is largely unknown. Ground water quality data generated by Alcoa is considered non-representative (i.e. too specific) and clearly subject to a high degree of extrapolation and interpretation.

The real question, in view of the fact that we know there is substantial contaminated soil and water below the RDA area, is how reliable and representative Alcoa data are to be able to render an informed decision on the risks posed to community and ecosystem health and

¹⁹ Australian Bureau of Statistics (2004). Population by Age and Sex, Western Australia Jun 2004 [Cat: 3235.5.55.001]. Canberra: ABS.

²⁰ Walker, C. (2011). *Groundwater issues circulating around Alcoa*. Western Australia: Presentation.

function. Further, are these data reasonable and could they be considered suitable for use in prediction models which would show spatial and temporal contaminant movement within the various affected aquifers?

The government of Western Australia have accepted Alcoa Wagerup continued operations an ignorance of the fact they continue to pollute ground waters below and beyond the RDA area. Twice yearly bore sampling programs are not considered adequate. The deterioration of groundwater quality and quantity pose significant risks with regard to the future water resources for this state and demands urgent attention.

8. The ERMP failed to include the considerable water usage at the refinery's Willowdale Mine Site.

The water usage on the mine will increase accordingly, with any expansion and therefore impact on future water requirements.

9. Power needs for increased production

The ERMP's account of the Co-Generation (Power Station) quotes 2 x 140Mw units. However, these have since been upgraded to 2 x 175Mw with a capacity of producing 480 Mw. With the completion of unit 3, Alcoa will install another 2 x 175 Mw. This will bring the total capacity to 960Mw. This will result in a significant increase in CO₂ and other GHG emissions over and above those stated in the ERMP.

9.1 No buffer zone around Alcoa Wagerup Power Plant

According to the EPA's State Industrial Buffer Policy, *any* power generation plant which exceeds 20 Mw requires a buffer of between 3 to 5 Km. The Department of Planning has failed to enforce this requirement as Alcoa Wagerup has no formally recognized buffer in place for its existing 480Mw capacity and yet Alcoa Pinjarra has a 6km buffer and Worsely a 15km buffer.

9.2 Inadequate salt waste residue storage now and for expansion

Currently, this co-generation plant produces 35 million litres (*megalitres*) of Salt Waste Water per year. This waste is pumped into the RSA (Residue Storage Area or mud lakes), adding to an already large, toxic stockpile. When stage 2 of the co-generation plant is completed, the amount of salt wastewater produced will increase to 70 megalitres per year.

10. Social and commercial impact on community

On the misleading pretext of intending to "... *expand the land buffer around the Wagerup Refinery*", Alcoa sought and obtained the rights to the acquisition of land in Yarloop stating its objective as being "...*to secure land use compatibility ...*". Alcoa sought to ensure the land was compatible and would continue to be *compatible to its own land use needs* by committing to "... *lease premises or ...resell the property with restrictive covenants in place to ensure consistency of land use*" (Alcoa, 2001).²¹ Alcoa also state that it sees no point in disrupting harmonious relationships "... *as long as opportunities for redevelopment or subdivision are removed ...*" (Alcoa 2001).²² In stating these terms, Alcoa have removed any

²¹ Alcoa, (2001). Letter to R. Nixon, Foreign Investment Policy Division, The Treasury, Government of Australia,

²² *ibid.*

chance of commercial development and therefore potential growth of the township and the community of Yarloop, with the clear understanding that this would in fact, *disrupt harmonious relationships throughout the community and render the town unsustainable*.

10.1 Land management and acquisition programs

As early as 2001, the State Government, in response to increasing community health and lifestyle concerns, in consultation with Alcoa, formulated and implemented various ad hoc, unique land management policies designed to provide an opportunity for residents to leave the impacted area and relocate to another town.

The policies themselves have brought about *significant changes* to land management practices in the area with large subsequent effects on both the community and the environment. (Sharp, 2004).²³

10.2 Unjust property acquisition

The initial policy brought about divisions in the community by distinguishing between land management Areas A and B. Divisions arose as the result of an uneven formula which apportioned to property owners supposed land value and measured compensation in Area A, and supposed land value only in Area B. Due to growing concerns in the community emanating from areas outside areas A and B, a new policy was implemented: the SPPP (Supplementary Property Purchase Program). This further extended the boundaries of the area in which Alcoa could buy up properties, and formally linked property transactions under this program with health concerns. However, due to the magnitude of these costly claims, Alcoa has ceased to offer this option.

Alcoa have neither bought all the properties within Area A and B, nor all those within the SPPP area. Since 2001, of those landholders wishing to sell their properties and leave the impacted area, only *some* have been bought by Alcoa. Conversely and, also, contrary to the directives laid down by these policies, Alcoa have been randomly purchasing to date, properties *outside* the boundaries laid down by the SPPP.

10.3 Land management programs had negative impact on community

Not only did land management practices fail to operate as might be expected from a formally approved buffer zone and to enable the safe removal of people from the impacted area, they also continue to disrupt the harmony of the community. Through significant and inconsistent changes to land management plans, whole communities have been displaced without adequate compensation, and properties have been devalued significantly. Subsequently, this has culminated in the destruction of amenities and infrastructure, as well as the viability of local primary producers, such as dairy and vegetable farmers (Flint, 2006).²⁴

²³ Sharp, C. (2004). *Report on the Standing Committee on Environment and Public Affairs in relation to the Alcoa refinery at Wagerup inquiry*. Perth, W.A.: Legislative Council.

²⁴ Flint, J. (2006). Surviving in the shadow of Alcoa, *The Sunday Times*, October, 8th, p. 50.

B. Failure to consult with all relevant stakeholders

CAPS are an incorporated body and have been raising Alcoa Wagerup-related concerns with the EPA and many other related government bodies **for the last eight years** (since 2004). CAPS is a recognized and “...*relevant stakeholder*” (EPA, 2012)²⁵ representing the largest community stakeholder group in the process, essentially comprised of neighbours to Alcoa’s Wagerup refinery. However, contrary to the EPA’s claim (Rpt 1430) CAPS *have not* been included in any consultation process with Alcoa. In fact, Alcoa have refused to meet with CAPS on a number of occasions. In order to present what we consider as a façade of collaboration and community consultation, Alcoa created groups such as the CCN and Tripartite Group (since dissolved), falsely presenting them as representative community fora.

CAPS have made recommendations and offered workable solutions to enable Alcoa to continue its operations, with the state of the environment and health of residents being paramount. Our goals, guiding principles and recommendations have been tabled at various Ministerial levels, including the Office of The Minister for Environment and Water, on several occasions (the most recent copy having been personally handed to your Personal Advisor in December 2011). We recommend you review the document if you are not yet familiar with its contents.

C. Decision based on biased, unverified data

The Government has based its decision regarding the expansion on the information provided by Alcoa’s ERMP (2005). However, the document shows considerable anomalies, *some* of which the DEC highlighted in its Winter Study (2006). The DEC report states that the modelling used by Alcoa in the ERMP was flawed and will “... *need to be reconsidered as part of Alcoa’s undertakings...*” before any expansion. The DEC concluded that Alcoa needs to improve its environmental management policy and will “...*be required to advise how it will change the environmental management of its operation*”. The significant changes required by the DEC in section four have not been met.

Conclusion

The Government has been negligent in its duty to enforce the objective of the Environmental Protection Act (1986), which is “... to protect the environment of the State.” Principles of the Act include the Precautionary Principle, which states that “*Where there are threats of serious or irreversible damage, lack of full scientific certainty should not be used as a reason for postponing measures to prevent environmental degradation.*”

Alcoa must be held accountable for the impact of its industrial practices in our country. It is the role of the Government to enforce this and thus ensure the safety and well being of its populace and environment. We consider that, in this capacity, the EPA and the Minister for Environment are failing to fulfill their duty. In allowing any expansion of the Alcoa Wagerup refinery, you have proven yourselves negligent in fulfilling your Ministerial obligations.

²⁵ EPA (2012). Report and Recommendations of the Environmental Protection Authority – Wagerup Alumina Refinery – Extension of Time Limit for Substantial Commencement – s46 change to condition 4 of Ministerial Statement 728. (Report 1430). Perth: EPA.

The plight of Yarloop has been a long and arduous one where a whole community has suffered in varying degrees due to the impact of one industry alone. It can only be assumed that Alcoa has been allowed to operate being unaccountable to any one or any body, including the Government.

While we understand that the legal ramifications a re-assessment of the decision to extend the timeframe for the environmental approval would have, we would like to reinforce the strong concerns about Alcoa's environmental track records and the right to a healthy future for all Yarloop and surrounding residents. Now is the opportunity for the government to get it right and immediately commence with the planning for a new location for the Yarloop community while preparing for a proper transition and for compensation on just terms.

We the undersigned, believe that it is through genuine acknowledgement of community concerns and subsequent addressing of those concerns through meeting all 42 conditions in conjunction with CAPS recommendations, that the basis can be formed for a harmonious and genuine tripartite group which will ensure the future of industry as well as the health and well being of the community and the environment, for generations to come.

We await your reply and an urgent response to the matters raised herein.

Yours sincerely

Vince Puccio
Merv McDonald AFSM
Co-Chairs Community Alliance for Positive Solutions Inc.

NB: Evidence supporting all of these facts is on public record. If you are unable to locate any items, you may refer to the CAPS website for confirmation or alternatively, contact us directly, for assistance.

Cc: Hon Colin Barnett MLA, Hon Giz Watson MLC, Hon Julia Gillard MP, Hon Wayne Swan MP, Hon Brendon Grylls MLA, Hon Mark McGowan MLA, Hon Eric Ripper MLA, Hon Kevin Rudd MP, Hon Bill Marmion MLA, Hon Robyn McSweeney MLC, Mr John Quigley MLA, Hon Robin Chapple MLC, Hon C.C. Porter MLA, Hon P.C. Collier MLC, Hon Adele Farina MLC, Hon Colin Holt MLC, Hon Barry House MLC, Dr Janet Woollard MLA, Mr Ben Wyatt MLA, Hon John Day MLA, Hon Dr Kim Hames MLA, Mr Mick Murray MLA, Mr Murray Cowper MLA, Mr D.A. Templeman MLA, Hon G.M. Castrilli MLA, Hon N.F. Moore MLC, Hon Sally Talbot MLC, Hon A.N. Albanese MP, Senator Scott Ludlam, Senator Rachel Siewert, Senator Nick Xenophon, Senator Kim Carr, Hon Stephen Conroy MP, Senator Chris Evans, Senator Donald Farrell, Senator Bill Heffernan, Senator Christine Milne, Mr Adam Brandt MP, Hon Tony Burke MP, Hon Greg Combet MP, Hon Simon Crean MP, Hon Mark Dreyfus QC, Hon Martin Ferguson MP, Hon Gary Gray MP, Mr Don Randall MP, Hon Robert Katter MP, Mr Robert Oakeshott MP, Hon Bill Shorten MP, Hon Stephen Smith MP, Hon Warren Truss MP, Hon Malcolm Turnbull MP, Mr Andrew Wilkie MP, Mr Tony Windsor MP, Dr Paul Vogel (EPA), Mr Keiran McNamara (DEC), Mr Robert Atkins (DEC), Mr Dale Park: (President W.A. Farmers Federation). Tanya Jackson (President Shire of Harvey), Noel Dew (President Shire of Waroona).

Attachments (2)