

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Monday, 23 January 2023 1:20 PM  
**To:** IPCN Submissions Mailbox  
**Subject:** Martins Creek Quarry Project (SDD-6612)

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

Dear sir/madam,

The proposed reduction of truck movement is marginal and does not address the concerns of residents in Paterson and along the proposed a road. If anything it seems like a gimmick to appease rightly concerned residents and the concerned authorities.

The argument that the Martins Creek Quarry has operated over 100 years and has not caused any concerns is invalid. The quarry has been used to extract small amounts of gravel and has never been used to extract anything near the amounts proposed by Darracon. When, in history, the amounts extracted grew, a dedicated rail track was installed to haul product to where it was needed. This alleviated the impact on residents.

The explanation that Darracon can not use the rail track for all its products because of missing license to operate more trains and the non-existence of a bottom dump facility is not valid. Darracon has seen fit to pursue the project over many years now, which must have cost them an enormous amount of money. If this quarry is potentially so important for the economy in the area and the product is so vitally important for building of infrastructure as Darracon states, and the main traffic road is the New England Highway (also stated by Darracon), surely it would be possible to apply for a license to operate more rail trains and invest in the building of a designated bottom dump facility at the end of the rail track to be able to then haul the product by means of designated high traffic routes (the New England Highway). It seems to me that this would be a compromise that could work for all.

Finally I would like to object to the granting of the project on the grounds that Darracon has not taken the concerns of all impacted parties seriously at all.