

As [REDACTED] you were personally involved in the earliest discussions on the site selection assessment including insisting on the methodology used (or more correctly the methodologies not to be used) as part of the assessment [REDACTED] had several discussions with Greg on the issue and the criteria used as part of the assessment. At no time was any of this information discussed. [REDACTED] was also provided with a copy of the site assessment text several months ago and provided written comment. This information was not discussed in his notes/comments.

By suggesting [REDACTED] responsibility to collect data from DPIWE for the site assessment [REDACTED] intimates that [REDACTED] had some input into the site selection assessment and were collecting information for this purpose (which, as you are aware, was certainly not the case) or that [REDACTED] collecting information subsequent to the decision. As I have stated previously [REDACTED] not involved in the site selection assessment, and as there is very little documented evidence to meet the Guideline requirements [REDACTED] attempted to document the site selection assessment as best [REDACTED] using the available information. As [REDACTED] no evidence that any of DPIWE information was used in the assessment, and to the contrary the documented assessment makes no mention of such [REDACTED] unable to utilise it [REDACTED]

I appreciate Gunn's position on this matter, but cannot see any other interpretation of your requirements to include information which was not considered (and documented) [REDACTED] assessment. Whilst the outcomes may not be what you want, [REDACTED] protecting Gunn's interests by presenting the most defensible outcome from the data available. As [REDACTED] and Julian Green have repeatedly stated, Addressing Section 5 (Site Selection) of the Guidelines is a critical requirement of [REDACTED] The assessment process undertaken and documented by Gunn falls well short of the Guideline requirements and assessment which would be typically undertaken for such a project. By tampering or attempting to enhance that process you run a serious risk of jeopardising the validity of the site selection and consequently threatening the project approvals. I am sure [REDACTED] offer the same advice.