

**Martins Creek Quarry (SSD-6612)
Submission on Additional Material**

**Umwelt, Martins Creek Quarry Project: Independent Planning Commission – Additional
Information: Final, Report R34, December 2022**

This submission is made on the additional material provided by Umwelt in line with the reopening of submissions by the independent Planning Commission on 23 December 2022.

As requested, comments specifically address sections of the Umwelt document as indicated at the start of each comment. Relevant quotations from the Umwelt report are shown in italics.

Umwelt page 5, para 2: *For the Martins Creek Quarry, road haulage is further constrained by proposed commitments to minimise amenity impacts in Paterson Village, including:*

- *no road haulage of quarry product on Saturday*
- *no road haulage between 24 December and 1 January, inclusive*
- *no trucks through Paterson Village before 6.45 am*
- *reducing truck movements in Paterson Village between 3 - 6 pm*
- *restricted haulage during significant community events which may occur on the primary haulage route including Total Field Days and funerals in Paterson Village.*

(Underlining is my emphasis)

Umwelt and Daracon appear to have completely missed the point made in numerous community submissions that the adverse impacts of truck traffic are not confined to Paterson. There are significant adverse amenity and traffic impacts on Maitland residential suburbs of Bolwarra and Bolwarra Heights but these areas still get no mention, and more importantly, no specific attention.

“no trucks through Paterson Village before 6.45 am” means there are trucks through Bolwarra and Bolwarra Heights at 6.15 am or earlier.

Further, several community submissions pointed out that *“no road haulage between 24 December and 1 January, inclusive”* and *“reducing truck movements in Paterson Village between 3 - 6 pm”* are hollow concessions.

The construction industry is largely shut down between Christmas (24 December) and New Year (1 January) with some activities and businesses closed until mid-January. Consequently, offering no haulage during this period is not a genuine concession. Similarly, reduced truck movements after 3 pm on weekdays would likely occur anyway because there are fewer delivery destinations that would still be operating for trucks departing the quarry after 3 pm.

Umwelt page 5, para 7: *Daracon now proposes to further limit road transportation to ... no more than 80 laden trucks per day (160 movements), Monday to Friday. In addition, Daracon propose to further limit the hourly truck movements to:*

- *12 laden trucks per hour (24 movements), Monday to Friday between 7.00 am and 3.00 pm*
- *9 laden trucks per hour (18 movements), Monday to Friday between 3.00 pm and 6.00 pm.*

Umwelt page 6, para 2 ... *there will likely be many hours and days when truck movements are less than these peak numbers. Based on these considerations, Daracon estimate that this will result in an average daily rate of 56 laden trucks (112 truck movements).*

The claim presented above that there will be “*many hours and days when truck numbers are less than these peak numbers*” is inconsistent with the statement quoted below from page 5, para 4 highlighting the tight demand for quarry products and, indeed, is inconsistent with all the information presented in section 3.1, pages 12 to 14 under the heading “High Demand for Quarry Products”. Given the lengths the Umwelt report goes to highlight the “high demand” and “tight market”, it is difficult to see how Daracon will not take every opportunity to meet this high demand and, as a result, truck movements are likely to be close to peak approval numbers most of the time, not the reduced average quoted above from page 6.

Umwelt page 5, para 4 ... *there is a significant shortfall of available construction material in the Hunter region and more broadly in NSW. Daracon advise that construction industry customers are seeking to book quarry materials for projects well into 2023, in order to secure supply in a very tight market.*

Umwelt page 6, para 2: *The reduction to a maximum of 9 laden trucks (18 movements per hour) between 3.00 pm and 6.00 pm aims to further ameliorate traffic impacts during higher activity in Paterson Village and interaction with school finishing time. Also mentioned as dot point 6 on page 35.*

As pointed out earlier, the claim that this “*aims to further ameliorate traffic impacts during higher activity in Paterson Village and interaction with school finishing time*” is a hollow concession because there would be less truck movement in this period at the end of the working day because trucks would not be able to reach some delivery destinations before close of business for the day. It is almost insulting to the community to window-dress this as a concession to school finishing times.

If Daracon has a genuine concern about interaction with school transport activity on the haul route, it would make a similar concession in the morning school bus pick-up period from 7.30 am to 8.30 am. The fact that Daracon is unwilling to do so highlights that claiming the afternoon reduction in truck traffic is a concession to school finishing time is simply window dressing the normal truck dispatch from the quarry at this time of the day.

Umwelt page 5, para 7: *Daracon now proposes to further limit road transportation to ... no more than 80 laden trucks per day (160 movements), Monday to Friday. In addition, Daracon propose to further limit the hourly truck movements to:*

- *12 laden trucks per hour (24 movements), Monday to Friday between 7.00 am and 3.00 pm*
- *9 laden trucks per hour (18 movements), Monday to Friday between 3.00 pm and 6.00 pm.*

Umwelt page 6, Table 2.1 column 3 *proposed further reduced haulage rates*

One of the fundamental principles every undergraduate planner learns early in their studies is the importance of taking account of the cumulative impact of new proposals on existing social and environmental conditions, when considered alongside the impact of existing development and other potential developments.

Daracon’s reduced rates of 160 trucks per day and 24 movements per hour between 7.00 am and 3.00 pm may appear, in isolation, to be an acceptable number to trucks passing through the village of Paterson.

However, it is important to note that, from day one, they will **more than double** the current number of trucks passing through the village on an hourly basis – 7.00 am to 3.00 pm.

There is already a core number of heavy trucks moving through Paterson every day serving the needs of the growing residential and farming communities of the Paterson, Allyn and Williams Valleys. There are also a number of trucks supplying goods to businesses in the town of Dungog and the village of Gresford.

In my submission to the IPC dated 14 November 2022, I described what makes up this core traffic in more detail and gave an indication of truck numbers.¹ Currently, on average, there are around 14 heavy truck movements per hour through Paterson during weekday business hours and occasionally greater numbers – for example, truck movements on Mondays are generally greater because Monday is the weekly cattle sale in Maitland, so there are number of additional local trucks transporting cattle on that day.

So, in addition to the existing level of non-quarry truck movements through Paterson, the cumulative impact of Daracon’s 24 truck movements per hour will mean, from the start, there will be around 38 truck movements per hour or one truck every 1.6 minutes on average. Using the DPE’s assessment report conservative assumption of 2% per annum growth in broader local traffic, the table below looks at the cumulative impact over the 25-year project life.

Year	Non -quarry (local) truck traffic (Trucks per hour)	Daracon maximum truck traffic (Trucks per hour)	Total truck traffic (Trucks per hour)	Rate
0	14	24	38	1 every 95 secs
10	17	24	41	1 every 87 secs
20	20	24	44	1 every 81 secs
25	23	24	47	1 every 76 secs

¹ Andrew Amos submission to IPC, 14 November 2022, page 9

By year 25, it is reasonable to expect a total of around 47 truck movements per hour. That is more than one heavy vehicle movement through Paterson in little more than every minute (every 76 seconds) during weekday business hours. No rational person can possibly consider that is conducive to maintaining the rural and social amenity value that this village enjoys today. Without the quarry traffic, there would still only be around 23 trucks per hour in total in year 25.

In summary, Daracon's proposed reduced truck numbers still impose a considerable impact on the amenity of the Paterson village when considered in the context of the cumulative numbers of local truck traffic and quarry traffic.

Simply considering the reduced truck numbers proposed by Daracon and ignoring the cumulative impact these truck numbers have in addition to the underlying local traffic is not sound planning.

Umwelt page 8, last para: ... *the road haulage limits now proposed are within the range that have been considered acceptable by residents on the haul route under previous operations.*

Throughout the assessment process, the community indicated that haulage rates prior to Daracon securing the licence to the quarry had been acceptable.

(Underlining is my emphasis)

Daracon and Umwelt continue to wrongly assert that the level of road haulage between 2001 and 2012 under the operations of RailCorp and Metromix was acceptable to the community.

This is not true and there is ample evidence to support the fact that these operations **were not acceptable** to the community. This evidence includes:

- A public meeting in Paterson on 16 August 2007 attended by 80 concerned residents and focusing on the expanded operations of the quarry, exceeding the approval of 459,000 tonnes. The meeting identified trucks as the major problem.
- The formation of a Community Reference Group by RailCorp in November 2007 to enable community feedback on quarry operations and trucking. As with the earlier public meeting, the volume of truck movements was identified as a major issue.
- Decision by Dungog Council to take action in the Land and Environment Court in 2008.

The fact that 80 residents were sufficiently concerned in 2007 to attend a public meeting in Paterson should be more than sufficient evidence that the level of quarry operations and truck movements over the preceding few years was not acceptable to the community. Similarly, the fact that RailCorp was moved to form a community reference group following the public meeting is ample evidence of the level of concern in the local community.

Documentation exists to support this evidence. The records of the August 2007 public meeting and the initial RailCorp Community Reference Group were included with my November 2022 submission to the IPC as appendixes. I have again included them as attachments to the email with this submission for the IPC's convenience.

As I pointed out in my November 2022 submission, this history was omitted from the discussion of “Historical operations and court proceedings” in the DPE assessment report.² It was particularly disappointing to see that the DPE omitted any discussion of Metromix’s involvement in the quarry operations in the period leading up to the 2007 public meeting and any discussion of the 2007 community objections and Dungog Council’s 2008 decision to take action in the Land and Environment Court.

In my view, this omission was significant failure on the part of the DPE to properly research and assess the community position on the quarry operations and trucking during the years immediately prior to Daracon’s involvement. This failure has meant that, in the assessment process, there was little visibility of relevant information that counters the applicant’s erroneous claim that previous haulage rates were acceptable to the community.

Umwelt page 21, last para: *Given the constant nature of the quarry in the region for over 100 years, its operation including road haulage is part of the region’s context. The proposed road transportation of 450,000 tpa returns road haulage to a level not inconsistent with road haulage volumes occurring prior to Daracon securing its licence in 2012 (refer to figure 3.1)*

By making reference to the 100 years of quarry operation, it appears that Umwelt is trying to imply that road haulage of around 450,000 tonnes per annum has been occurring for a very long time and, therefore, is “*part of the region’s context*”.

However, close examination of Umwelt’s Figure 3.1 on page 22 **clearly shows that this is not the case.**

Figure 3.1 shows road haulage tonnages from 1993 to 2019. Looking at the period from 1993-94 to 2001-02, the average annual road haulage is approximately 261,000 tonnes – 42 per cent lower than the 450,000 tonnes quoted by Umwelt.

Further, it is reasonable to presume that pre-1993 levels of road haulage were even less because the quarry then mainly operated as a rail ballast quarry directly loading dedicated ballast trains at the quarry rail siding. Also, road haulage that did take place was most likely with smaller trucks without dog trailers and mainly servicing local demand.

In this context, it is reasonable to conclude for most of the quarry’s 100-year operation up to 2001-02, road haulage had a much lower impact on the community and generated little concern.

While it is likely that quarry operations and truck movements up to 2001-02 were acceptable to the community, it cannot be construed from this observation that operations in the period from 2001-02 to 2011-12 were acceptable. In my previous comment above, I have provided evidence of a significant level of community concern during this later period.

The context Umwelt appears to be painting here is misleading.

² Andrew Amos submission to IPC, 14 November 2022, page 6 and DPE Assessment Report, section 2.1, page 5

Umwelt page 26, second last para, Drivers' Code of Conduct

The three dot points here contain nothing that the community isn't entitled to expect under the law and under the normal operating procedures of any responsible trucking company. *"Adhere to posted speed limits"* – news flash, that's the law!

Having these aspects – that should be normal operating conditions - codified for the drivers may help but, really, the code of conduct is little more than window-dressing for the assurance of the community.

Umwelt page 30, last 2 paras: *... further reductions in road haulage are now proposed which will bring rates of haulage to be less than those under the most recent IEMP ...*

Mr Neil Ritchie noted in his submission delivered to the IPC Public Meeting on 7 November 2022 that: "... under the current interim orders, new owners took them [businesses in Paterson] over and have kept those businesses going."

This is another example of Umwelt cherry-picking information that does not stack up under close scrutiny. Here, Umwelt appears to be implying that the new owners of Paterson businesses have kept them going under the conditions of the most recent IEMP, which allowed higher rates of haulage than Daracon now proposes.

However, this is inconsistent with earlier information in the Umwelt document, notably

- In the last paragraph on page 6, Umwelt states *"During the period 1 February 2019 to 24 September 2019, the quarry operated in accordance with the most recent IEMP ..."* and
- Second last paragraph on page 12, *"Since September 2019, the quarry has not supplied any significant material volumes of construction materials into the greater Hunter regional market."*

Given that the quarry has not operated under the most recent IEMP since September 2019 and has not provided any significant quantities of construction materials since that time, it is not surprising that the new owners have *"kept those businesses going"*.

The businesses have operated since late 2019 with virtually no truck traffic from the quarry and not trucks operating to the maximum haulage rates permitted by the 2019 IEMP as Umwelt appears to be implying.

For further context, it is also informative to note the next sentence of Mr Ritchie's submission.

"They [the new owners] were either oblivious to what had transpired or expected this SSD would be rejected."

Umwelt page 32, para 2 dot point 4 Gostwyck Bridge approach upgrade: - *the upgrade will allow for the realignment of Dungog Road by incorporating a series of curves to raise driver awareness and associated new line marking.*

I questioned the merits of introducing the curved approach in my November 2022 submission to the IPC.³ I have spoken to other local residents who agree that the justification for the curved alignment of “increasing driver awareness” seems dubious.

There is already a blind left-hand bend at the top of the steep incline from the bridge deck for vehicles travelling east (i.e. towards Martins Creek). The photo shows the warning sign for this bend on the western approach to the bridge.



As I pointed out in my November 2022 submission, the proposed curve will result in a sharper left-hand bend at this point. In terms of forward vision, this is not helpful for drivers of light vehicles and motorcycles that have lower driving positions, resulting in shorter sight distances.

Also, for part of the year, this section of the road faces directly into the early morning sun, which further interferes with forward vision and reflection on the road surface can make line marking difficult to see for vehicles travelling east. Adding a curve to what is now a straight section of road after the left-hand bend may further complicate this situation.

While I cannot claim any expertise in road design, sometimes the opinions of everyday motorists can be worthy of consideration. A few years ago, a new law was introduced requiring motorists to slow to 40 kph when passing a stationary emergency vehicle. Many members of the public were quick to point out that this was impractical, and potentially dangerous, on roads with speed limits of 100 kph or greater. After a number of accidents and near misses, this opinion proved correct and the law was revised.

If the SSD application is approved, I believe the Gostwyck Bridge proposal needs peer review by experts in road design, preferably from within the Roads and Maritime group of Transport for NSW.

Umwelt page 27, para 2 and following dot points: *Further, recommended Condition requires a Social Impact Management Plan (SIMP) for the development*

This paragraph lists affected stakeholders as “Martins Creek, Vacy and Paterson residents”. Clearly, the Umwelt and Daracon representatives at the December public meetings missed the point made by numerous speakers about affected Maitland residents – no SIMP for them! This is reinforced in the second dot point regarding a “Stakeholder Engagement Strategy” to be “particularly focussed on the Paterson and Martins Creek communities”

³ Andrew Amos submission to IPC, 14 November 2022, page 15

Essentially, the dot points under paragraph 2 on page 27 are little more than vague waffle that is meaningless to the community and lacks anything by way of detail on potential useful deliverables for the community. A couple of examples:

- What is a “*Near Neighbours Impact Framework*” and “*a local provision framework*”? What will they deliver for the community? Page 31 says the latter will require mechanisms to mitigate impacts on hospitality and tourism businesses without any suggestion as to what sort of mechanisms have potential to result in meaningful mitigation measures in practice.
- “*three-yearly independent surveys of current community attitudes concerning the development*” There is no information about how the results of these surveys will be used or how they will drive changes. What happens if the community attitudes deteriorate? What ensures there are practical, on-the-ground outcomes from these surveys?
- “*adaptive strategies throughout the life of the development*” What will this mean in practice and how will it work? Who will determine these strategies, who will monitor, regulate and enforce the adoption of such strategies? As it stands, it is meaningless to the community.

Umwelt page 28, para 5 and dot points: *... the recommended conditions in Part D of the draft development consent provide stringent requirements for management, monitoring and reporting of performance against compliance requirements.”*

Some of the specifics of the monitoring and reporting requirements listed in the dot points under paragraph 5 are quite broad and open to wide interpretation when it comes to defining the monitoring processes, the level of monitoring and the detail to be provided in reports. This is particularly so for reporting on the impacts and environmental performance of the development, the program to investigate ways to improve the environmental performance, the effectiveness of management measures and the contingency plan for unpredicted impacts and their consequences.

Other reporting listed is fairly clear cut – such as those related to reporting non compliances with impact assessment criteria and statutory requirements as well as complaint reporting.

Umwelt pages 24 – 29, Response to IPC question 5

As briefly indicated in the last two points, the five-page response to this question is very wordy and, in places vague, with a lot of bureaucratic terminology.

I am not confident that it adequately answers the question posed by the IPC or provides any assurance to the community of material and worthwhile mitigation measures for the full spectrum of affected residents (of both the Paterson area and Maitland suburbs) over the life of the project.

The reality is that the mitigation proposals offer virtually no potential for providing positive, practical social outcomes for the impacted communities. Most of the measures do not mitigate the physical adverse impacts, particularly the impacts of truck movements, because they are really offsets, not physical mitigation measures. No amount of community benefit programs, social impact surveys, engagement strategies etc provide tangible mitigation for the effect of having heavy trucks

constantly rumbling through a small rural village with its totally unsuitable road configurations or past Maitland's suburban homes and growing residential areas. The information on the proposed Social Impact Management Plan outlined on pages 27 and 28 really does look very much like the proverbial "lipstick on a pig".

Attachments

- Appendix A** Summary of notes from Public Meeting held in Paterson 16 August 2007, re Martins Creek Quarry
- Appendix B** Martins Creek Quarry Community Reference Group, Meeting 1, 30 November 2007

Appendix A

Summary of notes from Public Meeting held in Paterson 16 August 2007, re Martins Creek Quarry.

- Meeting was attended by approximately 80 people
- 90% of attendees did not receive RailCorp(RC) survey on the quarry
- Flora and fauna issues in surrounding properties and within quarry boundaries
 - Have RailCorp(RC) listed the endangered species in the area
 - How will they minimise the impact
 - What steps are in place to rehabilitate the site now and in the future
 - Is a list of species from the January study available? – 2nd study planned for October '07 should complete the study and lists should become available.
- Community representation on the Community reference group (CRG) needs to be discussed as the affected area is much wider than Paterson and Martins Creek local communities
- Communication to the community is obviously lacking, Paterson PSST was suggested as a definite means of distribution
- Question regarding how the meeting was going to measure feedback from the floor.
- How will RC measure the effects of blasting on the surrounding properties?
 - What compensation is available?
- Complaints re the truck drivers must be reported as the transport companies are on notice to improve performance and perceptions.
- Question re dust measurement on nearby properties. Process was explained in relation to the 6 day sampling procedure.
- When will these figures be available for comparison?
- Who will really police the dust levels and other dust related issues?
- Community updates and surveys should be distributed in which way?
 - By postcode
 - Local newsletter
 - Publications such as Chronicle
- Is there a simple way to communicate to the community?
- Previous information sheets are to be distributed.
- Trucks / Dust / Blasting – something needs to be done
- Tonnages, 1 train per week vs. 400 outward truck movements per week
- Blasting concerns – are controlled and monitored; only Tuesday to Friday, records are kept for all events.
- 2 Distinct stakeholders in this process; 1) nearby properties to the quarry, and 2) the trucks and their harm to a 1920's Heritage Village
- Solutions are being sought through this process
- Issues re trucks driving in convoy, especially early in the morning, this should be included in a code of conduct for drivers.
- Road repair issues are along the entire route and should not have to be worn by the local councils.

- Comments re the use of rail vs. road transport. Response was that transport economics is a major issue (there should be a full cost/benefit analysis presented to the community). Unloading point in the Newcastle area is also an extra problem for RC.
- When will a map of the full proposal be available for the community? Response – in a future newsletter with an explanation of the details.
- What are the operating hours of the operation? Response – Mon-Fri 6.00am – 5.30pm, Sat 6.00am – noon.
- There could be a curfew on operating hours to reduce truck movements, especially early mornings.
- Enforcement of speed limits through the village (and elsewhere) is an issue. Should be covered in Code of Conduct.
- What is RC going to do for the citizens of Paterson? There has been a reduction in rail movements from 70% to 7%.
- There is a fear for the Heritage Buildings being destroyed by the vibrations of the traffic.
- Who polices the correct covering of loads, large rocks constantly in Martins Creek properties? Danger for residents! Who covers the cost of damage caused by this problem? Response – guidelines are in place and should be adhered to. Ring the quarry with complaints immediately.
- Who is taking actions on complaints? Who is going to care? Response – there is a commitment to answer these concerns.
- Community Reference Group (CRG) should include local emergency services. Response – would it be better to ensure that emergency services are prepared and trained on the quarry operations?
- Motion moved: The meeting opposes any expansion of the quarry. CARRIED
- CRG – should include reps from Upper Allyn Valley and Vacy. Response – can be done.
- Cash contribution for road works? 3A process will tackle this issue. \$'s per truck movement.
- Please don't assume that everyone has mail delivered to home or has internet access.
- What is the maximum tonnage in the proposal for the quarry? Response – related to spare capacity, limited expenditure for improvements, transport issues, community contributions, movement in the Sydney and Central coast markets. RC needs more information to determine its application.
- Quarry affects the entire Shire and therefore s94 contributions for the development should be significant. "Dungog's pain is NSW gain"
- What's in it for Dungog Shire? Jobs – 3, financial gain – undecided (in dispute)
- Dungog District Chamber of Commerce should be involved in CRG.
- Why did the production in the quarry in 05/06 of 570,000 tonnes exceed the approval of 459,000? This approval level is being disputed and the new process will sort this issue out once and for all.

- Truck movements were an average over several years, how many in the peak year of 05/06? Response – cannot be sure, would have been higher than 20,000.
- Did RC realise that 1 truck movement is equivalent to 10,000 car movements in terms of road damage and wear. Therefore the reported truck movements represent and equivalent 400 million car movements on roads that receive no direct state government funding.
- Is there a proposal for a dedicated road to be built to by pass Paterson?
- Who is going to correct the loss of property values in the main street?
- Who will check dust & grime levels associated with trucks? Only quarry levels are currently checked.
- How many completed surveys were there? Response 65(?)
- When did trucks start to include “dogs” as this represents much more significant road damage and much higher volumes being moved on the roads?
- Parking of trucks in no parking zones or in the small strip in front of shops should be included in the Code of Conduct, and should be enforced by the local police.
- Speed control in the village should in Code of Conduct as well.
- How many representations has DSC made to State government on the issue of a dedicated road, especially given the announcement of a tunnel in Sydney to take trucks off the road?

Main Summary Points

- **COMMUNICATION IS LACKING**
- **COMPLAINTS SYSTEM NEEDS ATTENTION**
- **DUST MONITORING AROUND THE ENTIRE AREA NEEDS MORE WORK**
- **TRUCKS ARE THE BIG PROBLEM**
 - **NOISE**
 - **VIBRATION**
 - **SAFETY**
 - **EMISSIONS**
 - **THE DRIVERS**
 - **OVERLOADING**
- **BLASTING TIMETABLES AND MONITORING**
- **ROADS ISSUES WITH INADEQUATE FUNDING AND SUPPORT**
- **NOT ENOUGH JOBS**

- RAILWAY ALTERNATIVES
- HERITAGE OF THE VILLAGE
- REAL ESTATE VALUATIONS
- SURROUNDING COMMUNITIES ARE ALSO SUFFERING
- CURFEWS
- WILDLIFE ISSUES
- GEOLOGY OF THE SITE
- \$ PER TRUCK
- SUPPLY ROUTES, DESTINATION OF PRODUCT

Phone numbers for complaints

Quarry – 49385261, for quarry and truck issues

Department of Environment and Climate Change (Formally EPA) – 131555.

Main Summary Points

- COMMUNICATION IS LACKING
- COMPLAINTS SYSTEM NEEDS ATTENTION
- DUST MONITORING AROUND THE ENTIRE AREA NEEDS MORE WORK
- TRUCKS ARE THE BIG PROBLEM
 - NOISE
 - VIBRATION
 - SAFETY
 - EMISSIONS
 - THE DRIVERS
 - OVERLOADING
- SLABBING TIMETABLED AND MONITORING
- ROADS ISSUES WITH INADEQUATE FUNDING AND SUPPORT
- NOT ENOUGH JOBS

Appendix B

Martins Creek Quarry Community Reference Group

Meeting 1, 30th November, 2007 at 4.30pm

Venue: Martins Creek Community Hall

Chair: Ellen Davis Meehan, Director of Key Insights

Present:

Ellen Davis-Meehan, Key Insights, Chair

Josh Flack, Key Insights

Peter Watts, RailCorp

Brad Hartley, RailCorp

Cr. Joe Thomson, Dungog Council

Zoltan Lyall, Paterson Progress Association

Kate Murphy, Dungog and District Chamber of Commerce

Apologies:

Mark Bridges, Paterson P&C.

<i>Agenda Item</i>	<i>Discussion</i>	<i>Actions</i>
1. Welcome	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Outline of Key Insights role in the CRG	
2. Background and purpose of group	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Background and purpose of the CRG outlined: It has been set up to capture feedback from the community, including complaints. It gives people an avenue to be heard.▪ The CRG is a 2 way mechanism. RailCorp is able to distribute their information, while receiving feedback from the community.▪ Clarification of the RailCorp staff roles. Brad is the Quarry Engineer. Peter is the Quarry Manager.▪ Newspaper ad could have been more specific in terms of Martins Creek. Could easily have been confused with the Tilligera Dam CRG.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ (K.I)Future Media releases will specifically identify Martins Creek Quarry
3. Finalisation of Terms of Reference for the CRG	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Initial consultation mentioned "increased efficiency" of the quarry as part of the proposal. Under the draft ToR, only "expansion of" the	

RailCorp



KEY INSIGHTS
PTY LTD

	<p>quarry is mentioned. Is there a difference between quarry efficiency and expanded output?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Efficiency gains will be realised through the more intense use of capital that will result from increased output. ▪ Q: Where does the CRG fit in within the 3A Approval process? Concern that the CRG may simply been a "box-tick" as part of the process. ▪ A: The existence of the CRG is not yet a requirement for RailCorp. In the future, the activities of the CRG may form part of the SIA report and decision making process. Issues raised in the CRG will potentially guide State Gov't requirements during the preparation of the extensive Environmental Assessment report. ▪ Q: With regard to getting a "community expert"; when will members of the group get to see the <i>background studies prepared in order to assess whether "community expert" input may be appropriate</i>. Members would like to get a hold of that info because there is probably quite a deal of expertise in the wider community that could be drawn upon for comment and suggestions. ▪ A more open forum to disseminate information would be desirable, once reports become available, rather than just the standard "public exhibition" which is not very user-friendly. ▪ Members were happy to confirm the Terms of Reference with changes as discussed. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The first sentence in the Terms of Reference will make reference to efficiency increases as well as expansion. ▪ Agreed that the ToR include a provision for "timely access to reports" for members of the CRG. ▪ Add Dungog and District Chamber of Commerce to the membership (immediate) ▪ A dot-point summary on the progress of each of the reports will be made available to CRG members on the Key Insights Website. (RailCorp, ASAP)
<p>4. RailCorp Project outline and update</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The Department of Planning identified the 3A legislation as an appropriate avenue in 2005. RailCorp are nearing the 1st draft of their preliminary paper. They are trying to do most of the "groundwork" before bringing the proposal 	

	<p>to the public eye. "State significant" status is a given, due to the large size of the quarry's reserves.</p>	
<p>5. Questions on the project</p>	<p>Q: When will the draft EA be submitted to the DoP?</p> <p>A: Hopefully before Christmas.</p> <p>Q: What is the nature of the relationship between the quarry and Metromix, etc?</p> <p>A: It is a sales arrangement and a capital arrangement. The private sector found a commercial market for some of our output and invested in capital to enable the production of new products. They need to show a return on that investment, and this is achieved through sales agreements.</p> <p>Q: As the trucks from these private firms have the company name on them, is it possible that it is these companies that are receiving any public complaints? Accordingly, should one of these companies have a seat on the CRG?</p> <p>A: It would be good to keep a "community" focus to the composition of the group.</p> <p>Comments on truck issues:</p> <p>The road impacts are the most wide-ranging. People's perceptions on road issues tend to be strong. Don't know how much RailCorp can do to influence the truck issues.</p> <p>The volume of truck movements tends to be the issue, more than any bad behaviour by individual drivers.</p> <p>The impacts for Paterson as a result of trucks are mixed. Some of the businesses rely for their custom on passing trucks.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ RailCorp will check with trucking companies about complaints and report to the next CRG meeting.

Q: What is the lifespan of the proposed expansion?

A: The capacity of quarries is generally talked about in tonnage terms, rather than expected timelines. The life of the quarry then depends on the speed of extraction.

In the case of the Martins Creek Quarry, it is estimated that reserves are approximately 26 Million tonnes, although approximately 4 million tonnes may be unable to be extracted due to constraints on the site.

Q: Will there likely be any review of different transport ideas for quarry products, for example, a rail interchange in Sydney?

A: A bottom loader in Sydney is being considered. For the local market (e.g. Newcastle, Maitland, Dungog) it is not commercially viable to service the area with rail transport. RailCorp aims to truck less material than was trucked in 2005 (during the big Kooragang Island project). Material in excess of the Hunter market is targeted to go to Sydney.

Comment:

Perhaps it would help to let the community know about some of these aims. For example "truck movements are expected to fall to x after y years."

Q: What is the timeline for approval of the project?

A: Hopefully by Christmas next year we'll be awaiting a determination from the DoP.

Q: What does a yes/no determination from the DoP mean?

A: A "no" won't mean that the quarry will stop. It will just keep operating under the existing consents, which are not well drafted.

RailCorp



KEY INSIGHTS

PTY LTD

www.keyinsights.com.au josh@keyinsights.com.au

	<p>Comment: Would like to see some maps of the existing vs. proposed quarry activity.</p> <p>A: There is very little difference in the footprint of where the quarry will be, maybe in the order of 1.5-2Ha extra.</p> <p>Q: Are there any other issues identified in the studies?</p> <p>A: Transport is the main issue. Local dust concerns have mainly been addressed. There have been blasting complaints from Paterson Valley Estate. For example in Broken Hill there has been documentation of interesting meteorological phenomenon where blasting noise is heard large distances away, with sound bouncing off inversions in the atmosphere.</p> <p>Comment: Vibrations may be felt toward Paterson.</p> <p>Comment: Another issue associated with the commercial arrangements is the perception within the community that Martins Creek is no longer the "people's quarry". The "small guy" can't go to the quarry with a trailer and get a load of gravel.</p> <p>Response: Actually, people can still turn up and get a trailer-load of gravel.</p> <p>Response: Perhaps that is a good opportunity to make that fact more widely known.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ RailCorp will provide an aerial map of existing vs. proposed quarry activities on the Key Insights website.
<p>6. Community consultation methods and results to date</p>	<p>Overview of Key Insights community consultation research to date:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ MC Doorknock survey 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Focus groups ○ Meetings with Dungog and Maitland Councils ○ Stakeholder meetings and discussions 	
7. Scoping of issues / concerns/ methods for ongoing consultation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Print media can be a bit hit-n-miss. ▪ Public meetings can be potentially confrontational. ▪ There is a need to be proactive in engaging the community. 	
8. Summing up - where to from here? Next meeting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Discussion of time for next CRG meeting. It should be in response to measurable progress, although it would be good to schedule a tentative date. ▪ End of February 2008 discussed. 4.30pm on Wednesdays is the most suitable time for members. ▪ Venues were discussed for the next meeting. Zoltan may be able to arrange the Tennis Club in Martins Creek. ▪ Meeting Concluded 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Dungog and District Chamber of Commerce was officially invited to join the CRG.
Close/Next Meeting	<p>Meeting closed: 6.30pm</p> <p>Next meeting: (Tentative) Wednesday 4.30pm 27th February.</p>	

RailCorp



KEY INSIGHTS

PTY LTD

www.keyinsights.com.au josh@keyinsights.com.au