

[REDACTED]

From: Martine Brieger <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, 31 January 2023 8:26 PM
To: IPCN Submissions Mailbox
Subject: Fwd: Martins Creek Quarry (SSD-6612) - Submissions on Additional Material
Attachments: 221223 Statement Regarding Re-Opening of Submissions.pdf

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Hi there

Thanks for the opportunity to respond to the new information published.

My comment relates to the Commission's question 2 - why shouldn't the Commission impose a condition requiring a greater portion of product to be transported by rail.

Rather than question DPE or Daracon response, my comment is just wondering why the relevant government department - Transport for NSW - has not been asked to formally respond and provide accurate, impartial and relevant information about the rail freight network. Why is information relied on from a consultant employed by the proponent?

I ask this as I am not only a resident but also an employee of Transport for NSW. I do not work in the freight area (I work in change management and have no expertise on this subject). However, I am aware that our organisation highly values freight customers and works very collaboratively with private stakeholders to enable access to the rail network to enable the distribution of materials and goods.

DPE's claim that Daracon has adequately demonstrated that rail transportation of quarry products is severely constrained seems to be one of taking their word for it rather than making any effort to independently verify this claim. Furthermore, this claim - that it's not feasible or possible to transport more of the quarry material by rail, is the first and fundamental piece of information upon which all the other information and decision-making around trucking arrangements and transport haul routes is based on. Surely it deserves the rigour of actually seeking to verify this statement from the NSW government department that oversees this?

If it turned out that this claim was false or even partially untrue, it would mean that the residents of Paterson, Martins Creek, Tocal, Bolwarra Heights, Lorn and East Maitland will be subjected to the negative safety and amenity impacts for at least the next 25 years.

Please - thoroughly check this claim about access to freight routes being unviable/unsuitable before allowing this proposal to progress any further. Currently you only have a rail consultant's word for it, paid for by the proponent. This isn't strong enough to make a decision on.

Kind regards
Martine Brieger
[REDACTED]
Paterson NSW 2421

[Redacted text block]

[Redacted text block]

[Redacted text block]

[Redacted text block]

[Redacted text block]

[Redacted text block]

[Redacted text block]

[Redacted text block]

[Redacted text block]

[Redacted text block]

[Redacted text block]



[Redacted text block]

[Redacted text block]

[Redacted text block]