

**Submission  
No 15**

**INQUIRY INTO KOORAGANG ISLAND ORICA  
CHEMICAL LEAK**

**Name:** Ms Coleen Greene

**Date received:** 7/11/2011

---

The enquiry's attention is drawn to an extract from Turnstone Project current website

"Orica Mining Services, Kooragang Island is a subsidiary of Orica Australia, an Australian owned company operating in over 40 countries. The company has interests in the mining, chemical and fertiliser sectors and in consumer goods. Orica's Kooragang Island site produces the feedstock for commercial mining explosives. It needed to engage with the community because of its products and its sensitive location, close to the community of Stockton and adjacent to the Hunter River. Kooragang Island also has an important wetland and nature reserve which is home to protected migratory birds. Orica inherited the site, previously used by other industrial groups, which had current and historical issues to address. Turnstone Projects was asked by Orica Australia Mining Services to develop a community engagement strategy. This strategy has provided Orica with a number of immediate and long-term benefits:

1. Locally, there is now a formal process to engage with mutually agreed representatives of the community, particularly to address social and environmental issues
  2. That Orica had a community engagement strategy was an important factor in a decision by the Land and Environment court to reduce a penalty resulting from a license breach to \$10,500 from a possible \$50,000
  3. Corporate agreement that the engagement approach used at Kooragang Island would be adopted internationally for relevant sites within the Mining Services Group.
- Read an article about this project from Land & Water Australia's RIP RAPmagazine, edition 30, 2006." back to partners

It is submitted that this enquiry determine

1. Is the above information copied from Turnstone website correct.?
2. Did Orica implement Turnstone Project engagement procedures and if so why did the procedures fail in this instance ?
3. What did Orica present to the Land and Environment Court that influenced that 2006 Court decision?
3. Why in 2006, the Land and Environment Court was satisfied the procedures would "address social and environmental issues" ?

Yours faithfully,

Coleen Greene