

Marulan Quarry Project Community Consultative Committee

**Fourth Meeting, Thursday 18 June, 2020
6.30pm-8.00pm Teleconference**

Attendees

Present

Ian Colley (Independent Chair)

Vergilio Serra (Global Quarries)

Justin Flaherty (Global Quarries - Minute taker)

Graham Edwards (GQ)

Graeme Dally

Wendy Dally

Bill Kenchington

Shane Hill

George Emerzidis

Darryl Pearson

Don Angelosante

Apologies

Stephanie Mowle – GM Council

Lauren Evans – DPIE

Welcome and Introductions

IC notified that Wendy Dally has been approved by the NSW Department of Planning (DPIE) as a full member of the Committee.

Wendy presented an Acknowledgement of Country at the start of the meeting.

Minutes of the Last Meeting

Minutes of 3rd meeting were approved.

SH – Don Angelosante doesn't have email address, and would like the minutes to be posted (155 Winfarthing Rd Marulan NSW 2759). IC agreed to do this.

Action 1: Minutes to be posted to Don

Updates from GQ

IC - invited GQ to note whether any earlier action items have been completed yet.

VS – hit a bump with the design, having at the last meeting advised that it would take 8-12 weeks, noted that it may be more like the 12-week. More core drilling is underway to support this. EIS on hold until the design is finalized. Today no new information can be presented but GQ is happy to hear new concerns.

IC – Does 8-12 weeks mean that 4 weeks from today we will receive the design, including a map and other information?

GE joined the teleconference at this point.

VS – the map will allow GHD to assess impacts, design and reduce impact to the community

GD – why can't we see the map if it is already done? A general site map has been available since January, it was submitted with the amended application to state planning.

SH – guidelines of the CCC require open communication. GQ should have provided the map

VS – the map was a preliminary design. Consultants are drafting the detailed design. We will circulate the map

GD – we already have the map that was submitted. Why didn't you give us this earlier, we have been asking for it since the first meeting? It is a matter of trust.

DP – drilling started on the long weekend. What hours do you think you can work? Are you exempt from standard working hours? Drilled all day Saturday and till midnight, and all day on the public holiday. No consideration was given to noise impact. We will get council onto GQ.

VS – it is private land. GQ will check into the hours. GQ will check into the hours recorded in the drilling log. Work hours are 7-5 and drilling will continue for a few more days.

DP – was there blast testing on the 16th of June?

VS – I can guarantee that we weren't working on the public holiday, but I will check. No blasting has happened. If you believe they are working outside hours please feel free to contact council.

(DP read out his time log of the drilling).

Action 2: VS to check work hours, and ensure these are within council regulations.

BK – I know you didn't want older items repeated but I have six items to emphasise.

IC – is this something new we need to address? There is not much point repeating issues that have already been raised when GQ is not in a position to respond satisfactorily until the design is completed. Major areas of concern have been noted. Have you any new items?

VS – all the issues and concerns raised here are taken on board and have been referred to GHD to be incorporated into the EIS. It is not the case that we are not listening.

BK – I wanted to confirm the road entry and exit design. Will the access point be moved closer to Narambulla Creek. I want to ensure that the access gate on Winfarthing Rd is barriered off.

VS – once the quarry is operational the gate can be closed. It can be welded to ensure no entry.

BK – (to Graham Edwards) Do you have a draft 3D plan of the quarry itself?

GE – we have rough drafts of a quarry hole not a quarry design, it doesn't include a vast amount of information that potentially will change once the proper design is completed.

BK – you said you wouldn't work on eastern side of hill. There must have been a plan for this.

GE - There is a rough draft with hand sketches – nothing has been drawn up formally. Until then you are jumping at shadows.

BK – I don't accept that.

GE – there have been unexpected delays due to covid and when presentation drawings are available they will be shared

VS – to be clear, we are not prepared to provide any design work until it has been properly completed?

BK – will the wildlife corridor be maintained?

VS – it will be forwarded to GHD for inclusion in bio diversity study

IC – I think that is one of the issues that have been raised before, even at the first meeting. Is there anything new issues that need to be noted?

Bill – what is the name of the quarry proponent GQ Limited or GQ Australia Limited – was it deregistered?

VS – It is GQ Australia Pty Ltd

GD - GQ Pty Ltd has been deregistered

Bill – the trig station is in low use today. How will GQ demonstrate that there will be no disruption to the trig station.

VS – we are in an application process for purchase or lease of Crown lands. Then we will have discussions about the trig station.

Bill – Will the trig station be removed? VS - Yes

DA – will there be a soil density test for my property – multiple tests over 27 acres should be conducted

VS – we are working with GHD as to how to go about the issue

DA – I'm close to the quarry and I want to know if there is something to ensure my property is safe or if there will be remediation if I am affected.

VS – part of the design is about blasting and its effects will be worked out

JF – this has been raised and answered before

IC – VS said it will be addressed. It was raised in the first meeting, I believe.

SH – there was a Current Affair story recently on a Melbourne quarry where houses in the neighbourhood were affected and it revealed that consideration must be given to soil composition

VS – I can't comment on that quarry

DA – can Graham answer that question? I'm worried about my property. Can you give me a guarantee when you start testing around here?

GE – I can't give a full answer without knowing the soil conditions at this point. It is standard operating procedure to assess the impact on existing properties

DA – my house has been here for 22 years, Darryl's over 50 years

GE– You will be importing ENM material. If stored will it create dust?

VS – This will be considered in the design and the EIS

SH – for the operation of drill rig. DP has kept a log and he will sign a statutory declaration that a pump was started at 6.30am and ran until midnight. It's a commercial enterprise if there is paid work going on. Drill rig procedures need to be approved by Council and their guidelines must be adhered to. A Council compliance officer said there is no exemption. Night work was carried out without notice and residents affected. Residents understand that drilling etc needs to be done. Please be considerate. We need to be notified in advance.

VS – I have noted and will take this into consideration. We will communicate better next time

Action 3: GQ will notify local residents in advance of major work being undertaken on site.

NoW presentations

WD – I'd like to read out a number of points. (Wendy read out a number of excerpts from the Department of Planning Guidelines on the operation of Community Consultative Committees and other related documents. These are appended below at Attachment A.)

When will GQ start:

- Keeping us informed on the actual progress of the project by providing concrete information?

- Consult & Discuss?
- Establish good working relationships by promoting information sharing?
- Respond to matters and concerns raised?
- Informing us about amended application to the Department?
- Provide and seek information and feedback to all community individuals, stakeholder groups and businesses?

GQ has provided 4 newsletters plus the original information flyer. Their repeated statement is to engage/ consult with local residents/ community members. This has not happened.

When will GQ engage/consult? The newsletters also state that GQ will hold a 2nd meeting for the community shortly after the SEARs is released. This was first mentioned in the May edition. The SEARs were released on 13-5-2019. This has not happened. When will GQ hold this meeting? It's over 12 months since this was first indicated.

Following the formation of the Community Consultative Committee, NoW Inc has raised some 235 questions/ broad general concerns. Minimal specific information has been supplied by GQ. These are all documented in the minutes of the CCC. The questions/ concerns were either asked at the meetings or tabled in written form for a response at the next meeting.

There have only been some 75 responses by GQ.

- 39 answers have indicated that the responses to these will be included in their Environmental Impact Statement which we will have access to when the EIS is released for public submissions.
- 18 were only partly answered as the GQ representative didn't have the all of the information required to give a complete answer. The final response will be in their EIS.
- 7 were answered in full.
- 6 were not answered at all.
- 5 were not answered as the GQ was unaware of the content. e.g. amended application to the Department re change of road entry to the quarry site.

When will GQ respond to our questions and concerns as outlined in the CCC Guidelines.

At the community drop-in session on 25th May 2019, a document with 61 questions/ concerns were handed to Ann-Marie Kirkman of GHD Pty Ltd by the President of NoW Inc, Graeme Dally. There has still been no answers given to any of these. When will GQ respond?

At this drop-in session, NoW Inc members and others arrived together turning the session into a "meeting". There were many questions asked by the community members. Many of these were along similar lines. 30 questions/ concerns/ statements and their responses were compiled from the notes taken at the meeting.

The responses given by GQ or GHD to these were contradictory in nature (as documented in the notes taken) leaving the "locals" confused and upset. When will GQ clear up these contradictions.

On the Information Flyer, February 2019. After receiving the flyer, Wendy and Graeme Dally sent A-M Kirkman at GHD Pty Ltd a list of 35 questions. No answers have been received. When will these be provided, as indicated by GHD.

The DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING -SEARs REPORT 13-5-2019. The Department emphasised the importance of continued and effective and genuine community consultation during the preparation of the EIS. This process should provide the community with a clear understanding of the proposal and its potential impacts and include active engagement with the community regarding the key issues of concern.

The INTERNAL REVIEW OF SIA SCOPIONG REPORT. This review is limited to desktop study only and has not independently sought the views of potentially affected people and groups. Stress and mental health impacts have not been considered. There is little focus on nearby residents, rural – residential communities and other stakeholder groups which would be most affected by the project, and there is little discussion regarding the views, values and concerns of these residents and stakeholders (as they relate to the project) and how they might be impacted.

The AMMENDED SEARs 10th March 2020

You must consult with

- Affected landowners
- Community groups

The EIS must describe the consultation process and demonstrate its effectiveness.

As mentioned earlier, all of our questions/ concerns were broad in nature and based upon our research, as GQ / GHD have only given us minimal concrete information.

There is a total of some 326 questions / concerns raised by NoW Inc. Many of these required detailed responses.

We have been trying to work within the CCC guidelines and the Community Participation Plan. Unfortunately, to us, it appears as though Global Quarries Australia Pty Ltd isn't following the recommendations of the 2019 SEARs, Internal review of SIA and SEARs 2020.

As indicated the responses that we have received, have been few and mostly unsatisfactory.

As of Wednesday 10th June 2020, the chairman of the CCC Mr Ian Colley has stated in an email to me that the meeting on the 18th will probably only be short as GQ has nothing to present. This has been typical of their behaviour to us.

When will GQ respond to our questions and concerns as indicated in the various documents listed

GD – my question is to Ian. What is consultation?

IC – First let me pick up some of the points Wendy has raised. GQ has consistently noted that most of the questions and concerns raised can only be answered when the research and reporting to be done by GHD is completed. This has been noted many times. It's also important to note that this committee is unusual since it has been formed prior to the approval of any proposal. Many of the CCC guidelines address concerns (eg monitoring of complaints) that are relevant during the operational phase of a project, not the design phase. Let me remind everyone that when we first met late last year, we expected the EIS information to be available early in 2020. We had planned on 2 or 3 meetings before having this information available. This has not happened.

Let me also point out that I did suggest, after the issues and concerns were fully identified in early

meetings, that we not meet until the relevant information was available, given that the GQ studies were not completed. It has been CCC NoW members that insisted on holding the meetings in any case even though GQ has made it clear that it cant answer many of the specific questions until the design work is done.

GD – So what is consultation?

IC - Consultation in these circumstances is for GQ, as the proponent, to invite community stakeholders to identify issues, questions and concerns about the project. It would then respond to such concerns in a timely fashion. These responses may or may not be accepted by the community but they should be actively addressed.

GD – I'd like to move a motion of no confidence in GQ. Wendy and I have a business.

IC – It's important to note that CCC's aren't voting forums, they are for consultation. However, I will take the motion as a statement of what is important to community members of the CCC.

GD – We have no confidence in GQ for a number of reasons. They have failed to keep the community informed. They claimed they couldn't give a map. Website closed down for at least 6 weeks. There is confusion as to the proponent's identity. Businesses were not consulted. Individual land owners were not consulted. NOW Inc was not consulted. Incomplete coverage of residents. Technical language used to confuse the community. GQ has not wanted meetings.

VS – The CCC was formed prior to EIS approval. You must understand we can't answer questions without the complete design. We understand the community's frustration. We apologise for the delay. You mentioned that the SEARS had been amended and Ian was across this. I brought the amended application to the notice of the CCC. The website was down for one week, maybe 2, not 6 weeks. We must be patient, we understand your frustrations. We advise if there is no new information ahead of all meetings.

GD – you haven't consulted with local land owners, businesses and NOW. Wendy and I have a business.

VS – there are no businesses around the quarry, and we have consulted with NOW. I have personally delivered information to other residents.

GD – the Global Quarries web site was down for 6 weeks.

VS – It was down for a maximum of 2 weeks, I check it every week.

SH – has the turkey farm been consulted? It is behind my property VS – give me the road and I will look into it

IC – I think GQ is clear about the frustration around the lack of detail on what the proposal for the quarry is and its implications. We understand at this point that the design component will be available in 4-6 week's time, and should be followed the studies that will address many of the specific concerns. I suggest that we meet again in two month's time – mid August. If the information is not available then, we can postpone that meeting for a while until we get the information.

VS – the design will be done in 4 weeks but it will not answer all questions. GHD will use the design to finish its reports and this will take time. I'm meeting GHD Tuesday to determine timing where questions can be addressed. The design component will be made available to members when completed on the understanding that GHD will have to complete their work on it afterwards. It will be put into terms for lay people.

DA – can someone else please answer the questions? Can Vergilio’s Directors come?
IC – I don’t think the issue is about Directors, Vergilio is more than capable of answering the questions, once the studies are complete. But Vergilio, please feel free to invite the Directors.
SH – if you plan to do more night work or drilling can we be informed?
IC – VS has undertaken to inform everyone. How far in advance can this be done?
VS – we shall notify directly of any further works
SH – this is a two way street and we need to alert residents

IC – can we accept a meeting in 2 months time or do we wait for the studies
GD – wants a set date subject to the design
IC – I suggest August 27th (9 weeks), with a possible extension to be advised two week’s prior. Do we agree that this is reasonable.
SH – I would strongly push for face to face meeting, even with social distancing
IC – face to face should certainly be possible by August

(SH noted that Darryl left at 7.30)

GD – according to guidelines can you contact local businesses, stakeholders and others who have not been contacted?
VS – we will find businesses in adjacent streets and take suggestions for more streets where they may be located. We will circulate a list and ask for additions. We will then circulate information to them.
GD – yes, you can send me the list.
GD – when is next meeting for residents?
VS – we are working with GHD to determine the date for next (second) community meeting
BK – asked for his 6 points raised to be put into the minutes

SH – can there be wider communication e.g. advertise in local papers, radio.

IC – requested that VS notify the communications that GQ would undertake

Action 4: VS to notify how the community meeting would be advertised.

Next steps

Action 5: The next meeting is scheduled for 27 August, and will be a face-to-face meeting.

FOLLOW UP ACTIONS FROM THE PREVIOUS MINUTES – Incomplete or to be monitored

Third Meeting

Action 1: GQ to decide a suitable time for early notice of information to CCC before formal submission of the EIS

First Meeting

Action 1 For documents sent out to members to be sent out as editable PDFs so members can comment.

Action 2 A clearer map of the traffic options will be made available

Action 3 A Map of the actual quarry will be provided to all members at the next meeting

Action 4 GQ will make sure that no one is on the land shooting.

Action 5 GQ will not lock the neighbours' access gates moving forward. But noting that various utilities such as Telstra, electricity and gas companies may be locking the access.

Action 6 The EIS report will be made available when completed.

Action 7 Is the area in the middle of a wildlife corridor. GQ will get back to the committee on this

Action 8 GQ will clarify power source to members

Action 9 GQ to provide details of insurance once approval is granted.

NEIGHBOURS of WINFARTHING Inc.

CONCERNS – Global Quarries Community Consultative Committee No. 4 18th June 2020

1. Community Consultative Committee – GUIDELINES

The following are extracts from the CCC Guidelines published by the Department of Planning and Environment for State Significant Developments.

“The Department of Planning and Environment (the Department) is committed to community engagement in the NSW planning system. It recognizes that people should have a say in matters that affect their lives, and that community engagement results in better planning outcomes.

The Department encourages proponents to consult widely with the community and stakeholder groups at all stages of these projects.

This is to ensure that the community and stakeholder groups are:

- Kept informed of the status of projects, any new initiatives, and the performance of proponents.
- Consulted on the development of projects, management plans and proposed changes to approved projects.
- Able to provide feedback to proponents on key issues that may arise during the development or implementation of projects.

Effective community engagement can occur in many ways, and proponents should be innovative when they engage with the community and use a range of tools and techniques. They should also tailor their engagement to reflect the scale and nature of the project and its potential impacts.

If there is doubt about the application of this guideline, the matter should be referred to the department for resolution.

The purpose of the community consultative committee is to provide a forum for discussion between a proponent and representatives of the community, stakeholder groups and the local council on issues directly relating -to a specific State significant project.

More specifically, the purpose of the committee is to:

1. Establish good working relationships and promote information sharing between the proponent, local community, stakeholder groups and councils on individual State significant projects.
2. Allow the proponent to keep the community informed about projects, seek community views on projects, and respond to matters raised by the community.
3. Allow community members and local councils to seek information from the proponent and give the proponent feedback on the development and implementation of projects to assist with the delivery of balanced social, environmental and economic outcomes for the community, including:
 - Community concerns about the project
 - The resolution of community complaints
 - Any community initiatives

If a proponent's community engagement strategy accords with best practice and is appropriately tailored to the particular characteristics of the project, there should be no need for a Community Consultative Committee in the early stages of the project. In cases where proponents are required to establish CCCs in the SEARs, the Department will not exhibit the project application before the proponent has complied with the relevant SEARs.

Committee meeting agenda items would normally be expected to include:

Proponent reports and overview of activities including:

- * progress of the project
- * community complaints and responses to these complaints
- * information provided to the community and any feedback.

If the independent chairperson has concerns about the effectiveness of the committee, they may refer the matter to the Department.

The Department will examine these concerns what, if any, action should be taken.

If the committee is found to be ineffective, the Department may decide to dissolve or reconstitute the committee.

The proponent must provide the committee with timely, accurate and comprehensive reports on the project, including the status of the project, existing operations, environmental performance and community relations.

The proponent must also provide the committee with copies of:

- **Reports on community concerns or complaints and the proponents' response to these matters.**

The proponent should consult with the committee before it lodges any applications with the Department and notify committee members when these applications are lodged.

The proponent must respond to any questions asked or advice given by the committee about the proponents' performance or community relations. These reports must be given to members within 28 days of the committee meeting, unless the meeting's minutes specify otherwise."

(End of extracts)

NOW Inc Comments follow:

The community members of this CCC, Neighbours of Winfarthing Inc, individual landowners and local businesses are concerned that neither Global Quarries Pty Ltd OR Global Quarries Australia Pty Ltd (we are still in the dark as to which entity) appear to not be following the guidelines quoted above.

When will GQ start:

- **Keeping us informed on the actual progress of the project by providing concrete information?**
- **Consult & Discuss?**
- **Establish good working relationships by promoting information sharing?**
- **Respond to matters and concerns raised?**
- **Informing us about amended application to the Department?**
- **Provide and seek information and feedback to all community individuals, stakeholder groups and businesses?**

2. GQ has provided 4 “newsletters” plus the original information flyer.

Their repeated statement is to engage/ consult with local residents/ community members.
THIS HAS NOT HAPPENED.

WHEN WILL G.Q. ENGAGE / CONSULT?

The “newsletters also state that GQ will hold a 2nd meeting for the community shortly after the SEARs is released. This was first mentioned in the May edition. The SEARs were released on 13-5-2019.
THIS HAS NOT HAPPENED.

WHEN WILL G.Q. HOLD THIS MEETING? (over 12 months since this was first indicated)

3. Following the formation of the Community Consultative Committee, **Neighbours of Winfarthing Inc.** have raised some 235 questions/ broad general concerns (minimal specific information has been supplied by GQ). These are all documented in the minutes of the CCC. The questions/ concerns were either asked at the meetings or tabled in written form for a response at the next meeting.

There have only been some 75 responses by GQ.

- 39 answers have indicated that the responses to these will be included in their Environmental Impact Statement which we will have access to when the EIS is released for public submissions.
- 18 were only partly answered as the GQ representative didn't have the all of the information required to give a complete answer. The final response will be in their EIS.
- 7 were answered in full.
- 6 were not answered at all.
- 5 were not answered as the GQ was unaware of the content. e.g. amended application to the Department re change of road entry to the quarry site.

WHEN WILL GQ RESPOND TO OUR QUESTIONS AND CONCERNS, AS OUTLINED IN THE CCC GUIDLINES?

4. **At the community drop-in session on 25th May 2019**, a document with 61 questions/ concerns were handed to Ann-Marie Kirkman of GHD Pty Ltd by the President of NoW Inc, Graeme Dally.

THERE HAS STILL BEEN NO ANSWERS GIVEN TO ANY OF THESE.

WHEN WILL G.Q. RESPOND?

At this drop-in session, NoW Inc members and others arrived together turning the session into a “meeting”.

There were many questions asked by the community members. Many of these were along similar lines. 30 questions/ concerns/ statements and their responses were compiled from the notes taken at the meeting.

The responses given by GQ or GHD to these were CONTADICTORY IN NATURE (as documented in the notes taken) leaving the “locals” confused and upset.

WHEN WILL G.Q. CLEAR UP THESE CONTRADICTIONS?

5. Information Flyer, February 2019.

After receiving the flyer, Wendy and Graeme Dally sent A-M Kirkman at GHD Pty Ltd a

list of 35 questions.

**NO ANSWERS TO THESE QUESTIONS HAVE BEEN RECEIVED.
WHEN WILL THE ANSWERS BE PROVIDED, AS INDICATED BY G.H.D.?**

6. DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING -SEARs REPORT 13-5-2019

The Department emphasised the importance of continued and effective and genuine community consultation during the preparation of the EIS. This process should provide the community with a clear understanding of the proposal and its potential impacts and include active engagement with the community regarding the key issues of concern.

7. INTERNAL REVIEW OF SIA SCOPING REPORT

This review is limited to desktop study only and has not independently sought the views of potentially affected people and groups.

Stress and mental health impacts have not been considered.

There is little focus on nearby residents, rural – residential communities and other stakeholder groups which would be most affected by the project, and there is little discussion regarding the views, values and concerns of these residents and stakeholders (as they relate to the project) and how they might be impacted.

8. AMMENDED SEARs 10th March 2020

Consultation – in particular you must consult with

- Affected landowners
- Community groups

The EIS must describe the consultation process and demonstrate its effectiveness.

As mentioned earlier, all of our questions/ concerns were broad in nature and based upon our research, as GQ / GHD have only given us minimal concrete information.

There is a total of some 326 questions / concerns raised by NoW Inc. Many of these required detailed responses.

We have been trying to work within the CCC guidelines and the Community Participation Plan – (Department of Planning, Industry and Environment, November 2019.)

Unfortunately, to us, it appears as though Global Quarries Pty Ltd / Global Quarries Australia Pty Ltd (which company?) isn't following the recommendations of the 2019 SEARs, Internal review of SIA and SEARs 2020.

As indicated the responses that we have received, have been few and mostly unsatisfactory.

As of Wednesday 10th June 2020, the chairman of the CCC Mr Ian Colley has stated in an email to me that the meeting on the 18th will probably only be short as GQ has nothing to present. This has been typical of their behaviour to us.

WHEN WILL G.Q. RESPOND TO OUR QUESTIONS AND CONCERNS AS INDICATED IN THE VARIOUS DOCUMENTS LISTED?

Graeme Dally
President

Neighbours of Winfarthing Inc.
10th June 2020

BILL KENCHINGTON – MARULAN QUARRY PROJECT - CONCERNS PRESENTED AT CCC MEETING NUMBER 4 ON THURSDAY 18 JUNE 2020

1) RESTRICTION OF VEHICULAR ACCESS TO WINFARTHING ROAD

It is understood that the proposed quarry access to the Hume Motorway is now planned to be at a new location closer to Narambulla Creek.

What arrangements are proposed to install a physical barrier to stop all manner of vehicles accessing the quarry site at the existing gated entrance off Winfarthing Road?

If this existing access is not physically blocked any quarry employees' vehicles, service vehicles, visitors' vehicles and even the haulage trucks may want to use it, for convenience sake, to gain access to and from the quarry. This would be especially so for those vehicles coming from Goulburn, as otherwise it would mean having to travel all the way to the South Marulan Interchange to gain entry to the quarry site from the northbound carriageway.

Any vehicles to and from the quarry via Winfarthing Road will have a detrimental effect on our safety (e.g. school children and resident motorists from being exposed to increased turning traffic at the Hume Motorway intersection) and the natural environmental (e.g. dust in the atmosphere in dry weather and mud on the road pavement in wet weather from traffic travelling on the gravel access road).

It is noted that the April CCC Minutes reported – Follow up action from previous minutes (1st Meeting)

“Action 2 - A clearer map of the traffic options will be made available”. *Still awaited*

2) QUARRY DEVELOPMENT PLAN

We are told via GHD's PEA Report (April 2019) that the proposal is to quarry 500,000 tonnes of rock annually for 18 years totally 9 million tonnes to produce 5million (or 6 million tonnes?) of tuffaceous aggregate for the construction industry.

It is assumed that a feasibility study would have been undertaken to determine the quality and quantity of the above quarry material and based on a quarry development plan albeit in draft form to arrive at these figures. This quarry development plan (in plan and elevation showing the extent of the quarry workings) should be made available to show to the community what is proposed.

At our last CCC Meeting in April 2020 Consultant Graeme Edwards advised “until plan is fully developed/accepted and agreed it is only in draft form and it can only be progressed at a high level at this stage”.

So, there is a “draft plan” for the quarry extraction work, why can't we be provided with a copy of this plan?

What is meant by “it can only be progressed at a high level at this stage”?

We were told at that meeting that the quarry extraction work will be on the western side of the hill and won't be seen from Winfarthing Road, except the operations will be seen in the early stages until the excavation work deepens.

Does that mean that there will be created a vertical/inclined excavation face of the quarry that will not be seen from Winfarthing Road but will be seen from the Hume Motorway?

In addition, we were told that the extent of the quarry excavation could not be advised at this stage. However, a

figure of 100 metres depth was initially given and later corrected to 10-20 metres. That is a huge disparity. Where is this depth measured from – the top of the hill, the ground level of Winfarthing Road or what? This matter needs further clarification with a diagram/plan, otherwise it is way too vague.

Based on the above PEA Report, someone has determined the size of the proposed quarry (i.e. area and depth of excavation needed to produce the 9 million tonnes of rock).

Again, I ask can we be given a copy of that quarry development plan? If not, why not?

As the above PEA Report was published some 14 months ago, surely you will have a more up to date plan (albeit a revised “draft plan”) following the further investigation that you would have done in that time.

You want the community to be on side with you (or do you?), so why all the secrecy with this project?

It is noted that the April CCC Minutes reported – Follow up action from previous minutes (1st Meeting)

“Action 3 – A map of the actual quarry will be provided to all members at the next meeting”. *Still awaited*

3) COMMUNITY WATER AND AIR QUALITY

Believe it or not there are residents within a few hundred metres of the quarry site. These residents are not connected to a town water supply and rely heavily on rain falling on their roofs and flowing into their rainwater tanks. Also, these residents currently breathe clean fresh air from the atmosphere.

How will the quarrying operations be controlled to avoid any dust from being spread over and on the neighbouring residents’ properties including their homes, so as not to contaminate the water they drink and the air they breathe?

“It will be monitored” is NOT an acceptable answer.

Again, some residents also rely on bore water, can you categorically guarantee that this water will not be affected by the proposed quarry operations?

If not, why not?

4) MAINTENANCE OF THE WILDLIFE CORRIDOR

Native animals (kangaroos, wallabies etc.) regularly travel from our next door neighbour’s property and through our property and across Winfarthing Road and into the property upon which the quarry is proposed.

This wildlife corridor would appear to be adversely affected by the quarry proposal. What measures are proposed to address any adverse impact to ensure that this corridor will continue to be effectively maintained?

It is noted that the April CCC Minutes reported – Follow up action from previous minutes (1st Meeting)

“Action 7 – Is the area in the middle of a wildlife corridor? - GQ will get back to the Committee on this”. *Still awaited*

5) THE “SHELLY” TRIG STATION

The “Shelly” Trig Station No. TS 4803 is located on Trigonometrical Reserve No.TR18607. This land is owned by the NSW State Government.

This reserve would appear to be in the middle of the area proposed for the quarry.

The Trig Station is quite old having been established in 1882 by the NSW Department of Lands and despite its age the structure is in good condition.

This structure consists of a mast and vanes mounted on a rock cairn.

The Trig Station was initially used as a reference point for terrestrial observations which were conducted across the State.

Recent advice from the NSW Surveyor-General states that this Trig Station is in low use today and they do not want this survey infrastructure disturbed or damaged in any way (Reference Section 24(1) of the Surveying and Spatial Information Act 2002).

Whilst the "Shelly" Trig Station may not be heritage listed it is of special historical significance to the local community on account of its age and what it stood for and as such should be preserved.

The question is how will the quarrying operations be undertaken without disturbance or damage to this Trig Station?

6) THE NAME OF THE QUARRY PROPONENT

Finally, the simplest of all the questions still remains to be answered.

Various documents show different companies as the quarry proponent, namely Global Quarries Pty Ltd and Global Quarries Australia Pty Ltd.

Was Global Quarries Pty Ltd deregistered in June 2020? If that is the case is Global Quarries Australia Pty Ltd the proponent? Or is it some other company?

BILL KENCHINGTON Marulan CCC Member 18 June 2020