

Conclusion

The Mara document has to be set aside,

Mara just don't get it, The community want to continue with the lifestyle type property that they acquired. This not a case of the people coming into the area with an existing large scale extractive industry operating. They are already there so it is quite the opposite. They chose to shift to a RU2 area for many reasons some are even health as this area was originally a pristine environment. And they felt they could further enhance by proper current management practices of the landscape. Some wanted to share with tourists this unique enclave.

The area is facing continuing pressure. The climatic extremes are impacting on the wildlife and flora, plus human. Lets not add to the situation.

The full now disclosed statutory documents must go to a proper true community meeting in the near future. This would not unduly delay the DPIE process. In fact it will enhance the determination decision. This would give the true feedback from the community unfiltered to DPIE.

Introduction

I have given a few comments below to inform DPIE from a point of view of a person who participated in this approval process as a member of the public.

I thank Mara for such a long tome. I have done some comments on the Mara document.

I have not covered all problems in the document as there is a pattern. They have completely missed the mood of the nearby community. Failed in the initial search of the appropriate participants. Continued to try and control the narrative.

I fail to see what extra clarity that Mara have added. This is a PR constructed document.

Comment

Community consultation

I am going to recoin these events as Maybe Community Engagement Process (MCEP). I have witnessed first hand the break down of true consultation and the emergence of tick the box and whew thats over. I first noticed the shift some 20 years ago with a large state government department. They ran an information session, they had media officers and some technical people present. They were able to give reply's to the few that had gathered. The notification of the meeting was to a limited number of the local community. The other issue was that reply's or responses given referred to that that is covered in such and such legislation/Act or policy. Well that does not measure up as the average person should not have to know the particular legislation, that is for the proponent to ensure is explained to the questioner and the whole audience in lay terms.

Briefing session 4/8/21 is what I would call it at best, I came into this meeting with no knowledge of Mara. The impression I got from the conduct of the meeting was that Mara were a public relations organisation (a representative of Mara was introduced with a title that had Communications in title, with no minutes being taken I can do no better than that). Check what Mara (facilitator) and applicant calls this meeting, community consultation. Did it meet the criteria set by DPIE under EIS/SEPP? Query Tim Mullaney (Ironstone representative) was there for? Tim did not speak on this occasion. Company developing quarry is? Entity operating the quarry? Owner of the 308 Ha property is? There is nothing I can see in the documentation provided where the operator of the quarry is disclosed.

If the process rolled out by the proponent does meet the DPIE consultation definition then it is time to amend the policy. The conduct of this video connection session 4/8/21 must be questioned. A production video of greater than 15Min was played in a time limited session. The person who said they were the facilitator read out question pre submitted or were they from the "survey" we do not know, as to my knowledge none of these actual questions have been made public. The "facilitator" admitted to let's say paraphrasing or rewriting the (or some) submitted questions. The "facilitator" proceeded to reply to some questions. This is not the role of a facilitator. Yes some were spoken to by the consulting project manager which was a great help. Mara successfully added to the confusion. The people want to hear directly from the representative of the proponent or qualified individuals. With this controlled approach and the playing of the video the time for live questions was severely limited. Everything about this "consultation" process seems rushed. People want to ask questions in person and get a person directly involved or qualified on extractive industries operations to answer. The video could have been distributed earlier to all in the surrounding area. This then would have allowed a true direct live Q&A within the time frame. The second session had no live questions. The first session had questions that at best I would describe as being treated with a dismissive attitude by the facilitator. (poor, with confusing instruction of links issued did not help people that wanted to participate.). The sessions were less than 60 min which did include the video, I for one was expecting a full 60 min of live Q&A interaction. Mara have admitted that they did not capture all people in the catchment area to enable them to participate. Locals who did participate said that they found out from family and word of mouth. Mara did not acknowledge existing tourist business in this capture of applicable community.

Mara staff are not locals if they live in the Hunter!

Ironstone Developments Pty Limited is a limited by shares Australian proprietary company. Inc 20/07/2001 Located at NSW 2322 (Black Hill) since 2020-03-02 the company is, as the updated on 2020-03-02 ABN database shows, registered. The company has been registered for Goods & Services Tax since 2001-07-20.

Known company numbers for Ironstone Developments Pty Limited are as follows: ACN - 097575669, Australian Business Number - 78097575669.

Deep Creek Quarry is an example of a business name Ironstone Developments Pty Limited used from 2 March 2020.

Holding Coy of Ironstone Developments Pty Ltd is

Woodbury Investments (NSW) Pty Ltd #144508261

Mara SIA

"A sawmill was located on the 343-hectare property and operated prior to Ironstone Developments purchasing the property in 2000. The land is currently used for grazing of beef cattle".

Not sure where the 35Ha of land went to. The interesting thing is that the claim is for the land to have been purchased by this entity prior to incorporation. During the information session it was stated that Ironstone Developments Pty Ltd was owned by a Mark Woodbury.

Extract letter 19/2/21 Planing Industry environment.

"The Department wishes to emphasise the importance of effective and genuine community consultation. A comprehensive open and transparent community consultation engagement process must be undertaken during the preparation of the EIS. This process must ensure that the community is provided with a good understanding of what is proposed, a description of any potential impacts, and an opportunity to actively engage in issues of concern to them."

The proponent has not met this criteria.

Clear

Clearing has commenced on some of the subject land. DPIE/MCC how can this occur?

Blast

More information needed or the qualified person explain direct to the community in lay terms. Too late when they do the management plan and "local" are not satisfied. If approved there must be a baseline conducted on residences in the catchment area.

Crusher 4000 tonnes a day mobile crusher. If mobile is it very hard to build soundproofing around?! cannot find answer to this potential problem.

Collect and load

500,000 tonnes PA operation is clear,blast,crush,transport.

Trucks Loads

55 per day what heavy veh configuration as is approx 32/33tonnes. This should have been stated in the number of all vehicle movements per day. The heavy vehicle alone will be at least 110 plus light vehicle and deliveries. It has been intimated that the trucks will all go towards the Pacific Hwy. This would be some 11Km+ stretch of road that MCC would have to ensure they were able to receive a fee to enable extra upkeep of Buckets Way (both sides). I understand that TNSW and MCC are in discussions with already existing issues with the Buckets Way and Pacific Hwy intersection. This extra burden (if approved) would need to be on the agenda. The initial documents circulated by Mara indicate that 120 loaded trucks would leave the site daily. What is the correct figure that DPIE/MCC/TNSW have used in calculations or will be considering approving on the roads? Do you see why the community was concerned? How can we trust any documents issued by the proponent?

On site controls
noise

dust

safety

Mentioned in other main document. I have no comfort that the quarry operator will be totally compliant with the intention of any directive.

Contact for site issues from external parties.

Have been stated but not who would be supplied with these contact details. See Mara catchment area issues.

Remedies to be undertaken
triggers to halt

Ongoing community meetings (if approved)

frequency set

trigger to call ad hoc

structured,

This should have been clearly spelled out at time of opening up the MCEP and certainly have been provided in detail by the proponent before the opening up of comment by DPIE.

I have no confidence in the proponent and the chosen organisation who conducted the MCEP. There must be a complete rethink going forward on this involvement. A true open and transparent meeting will be necessary. Comments elsewhere in document.

Economic benefit.

During the MCEP it was stated that the economic benefit was approx \$7.8M PA. The Mara documents now discloses a figure of approx \$5.8M PA. No explanation or highlighting of this change has been supplied. How can we trust any figures supplied by the proponent?

Rehabilitation

Approach

I will leave to the MCC Senior Ecologist

Mara at one point says that rehabilitation is progressive but the final Mara reports says rehabilitation will not commence until 2050-51. This needs to be clarified. Good Q&A for the new community consultation.

A agricultural dam is no match for a complete wetlands area. I fail to understand this claim by Mara.

Bonds

It appears that Mara think a 3 year quarry bond is sufficient. (see below as to the real issue

the live question was seeking). The bond must be for the life of the extractive industry operation plus a short time after for community and expert feedback to DPIE. The ongoing bond is higher than just the rehab after 3 years. It should be substantial as the quarry owner can walk away at the end of the current period of 30 years.

Financial

Question was asked about how sure that the proponent has the financial backing to continue over life of project. This question was really about the ability of the quarry operator/developer to have funds to rectify any damage to the surrounding residences.

A Cost-benefit analysis was promised, Can you please point me to this analysis amongst the proponents documents?

Compensation

Has any financial amount or any other compensation or commercial arrangement been made with any persons or entities within the catchment area as defined by Mara? This is other than the property to be acquired due to noise travel along Deep Creek.

Nb A reply or response does not mean an answer has been given.

Rusty

0406644249

Appendix A

Mara 4 Aug 2021 2 sessions 10am 18:00

Online information session outline

- Welcome and overview of session
- Video presentation by Jonathan Berry – *Wedgetail Project Consulting* and *Project Director for the quarry's Environmental Impact Assessment*
- A facilitated Q&A session
- Information on how you can give feedback
- Session closes

Ongoing information and feedback opportunities

For those who have poor internet connection, or will be unable to make one of the time slots, the video presentation and a list of questions and answers, will be uploaded onto the Deep Creek Quarry website: deepcreekquarry.com.au

You can also send your feedback to the project team via the website until **13 August 2021**.

About the proposal

Ironstone Developments is seeking to develop a new hard rock quarry called Deep Creek Quarry, located off The Bucketts Way north of Limeburners Creek in New South Wales. Since 2020, consultation has been underway to gather ideas, issues and concerns about the proposed development. An online community information session is scheduled as the next step in the consultation process to seek community feedback on the proposal, which includes:

The **facility**, if approved, will produce a range of quarry materials, including road base and high grip aggregate materials used in road construction and decorative landscaping products.

Currently an environmental impact statement (EIS) is being developed for assessment by the NSW Department of Planning, Industry and Environment (DPIE). The EIS must consider and investigate potential issues and impacts, as well as opportunities that may result from the proposal.

This includes potential impacts to flora, fauna and water, and from noise, dust, and traffic. It also considers economic opportunities, jobs, the use of local suppliers and investment in infrastructure.

Location

The proposed quarry is located off Deep Creek Road, Limeburners Creek. The site is approximately 10km northeast of Clarence Town and 11km northwest of Karuah, within the Mid-Coast Local Government Area (LGA). Access to the site would be from The Bucketts Way via a new private haul road with a new intersection on The Bucketts Way.

Deep Creek Quarry project location map

Timeline

Learn more about the project and Environmental Impact Statement

About the project

Documents

Project fact sheet

Download

Frequently Asked Questions

Download

Ways to get involved

Interested stakeholders are invited to provide feedback on the proposed Deep Creek Quarry Project.

Given current COVID-19 restrictions, most of our community consultation will be conducted online, over the phone and via email.

Find out more about our community engagement program
Have your say

Survey closed

This survey is now closed.

Get Involved

Mara Consulting has been engaged by Ironstone Developments to conduct community consultation.

Feedback will be used in a report as part of the environmental impact statement for the proposed project and submitted to the Department of Planning, Industry and Environment for assessment.

We're empowering democracy with

About the project

Ironstone Developments is seeking to develop a new hard rock quarry called Deep Creek Quarry, located off The Bucketts Way north of Limeburners Creek in New South Wales. If approved, the quarry will produce up to 500,000 tonnes per annum of hard rock products and will be a source of quarry materials such as road base, high grip aggregates and decorative products. The quarry will service local construction and landscape industries, predominantly across the Hunter, Mid-Coast and Central Coast regions, and further afield for high grip and decorative materials.

The proposed project will include:

- Construction of a site access road off The Bucketts Way
- Site preparation and development of the quarry area
- Construction of infrastructure such as a weighbridge and workshop
- Stockpile and water management facilities
- Extraction and crushing of quarry material
- Transportation of the extracted material from the site
- Ongoing site maintenance and site rehabilitation at the end of the project life

Location

The proposed quarry is located off Deep Creek Road, Limeburners Creek. The site is approximately 10km northeast of Clarence Town and 11km northwest of Karuah, within the Mid-Coast Local Government Area (LGA). Access to the site would be from The Bucketts Way via a new private haul road with a new intersection on The Bucketts Way.

Deep Creek Quarry project location map

Timeline

Environmental Impact Statement

The proposal is considered a State Significant Development (SSD) due to the amount of resource to be extracted over the life of the quarry. As a result, an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) is being prepared to support the Deep Creek Quarry development application.

The EIS must assess the potential environmental and community impacts of the proposal, as well as the opportunities. To inform the EIS, expert consultants have been engaged to complete a full range of studies, including:

- Groundwater and surface water
- Aboriginal heritage
- Ecology (threatened flora, fauna and vegetation surveys)
- Air quality
- Soils and rehabilitation
- Noise
- Traffic
- Social impact
- Visual impact.

The social impact assessment will identify and define potential social impacts (positive and negative) of the proposal and make recommendations to help reduce and manage those impacts.

More information will be available on this website once the results of the EIS studies are known.

We're empowering democracy with

Mara Consulting has been engaged by Ironstone Developments to conduct community consultation.

Feedback will be used in a report as part of the environmental impact statement for the proposed project and submitted to the Department of Planning, Industry and Environment for assessment.