

## **Rape, Burn Scour and Pillage of the Towrang Valley**

I oppose Gunlake's latest submission to expand its production from 0.75 million tons of quarry product per year to 2 million tons per year for the next 30 years due to the increase in noise, dust, transport and EIS submission errors as detailed below. The physical problems exist now and will only be exasperated by the increase in production without Government restraints. The EIS submission has mocked the compulsory community consulting process and simply falsified its part in consulting with the local community at large. See Chapter 5, page 67 of the Main Report for the "sanitised program": one general meeting with 70 locals doesn't constitute a proper consultative process!

The EIS does not address any of these issues in any depth. The minimal contact with the local community has led to the growing opinion that this project will be approved without proper community consultation and that Gunlake will not undertake well-established quarry practices by Holcim at Lynwood.

### **Noise**

We live 5.8 km from the existing Gunlake site and can measure existing daytime noise levels of  $L_{eq,15}$  from 45 to 54 dB. These readings have been taken with the SPLnFFT and logSPL apps on an iPhone 6 which are acceptable for initial data collection. The noise source was actually confirmed by Ed O'Neil in August 2015 with a visit to our house. Initial conversation by Ed for immediate dampening of the primary crusher never materialised into action: this point is important for later consideration of so-called community consultations. I offered to have our site used to substantiate these findings but there was no follow-up from our face to face meeting with Gunlake. Indeed extensive modelling by Gunlake's noise consultants is meaningless without experimental verification, a scientific practice that the consultants have completely ignored. There are many people affected by low frequency noise emanating from the plant at distances well beyond the often-quoted 3 km of Factsheet 1. In Factsheet 2, "The EIS predicts that noise levels at residences will satisfy the relevant noise criteria" is scientifically flawed and unjustified. Without proper sound proofing of the plant equipment, including the primary crusher, this extension of the quarry is troublesome.

### **Dust**

With wind speeds in excess of 20 km/h, significant quarry dust has scattered into the atmosphere, especially the smaller and lighter particles from dried out quarry stacks. We can only assume that sub 2.5 micron particles are present, potentially causing harm for local residents and workers, both non-protected at present. The amount of watering to restrict these dust storms at present is wanting and not being addressed for future stockpiles of product.

### **Transport**

It can be shown that the lower limit of 440 trucks on Brayton road per day, rising to 692 on occasions, will cause unexpected and undesirable road damage to that

road. Even the Goulburn Mulwarree Council expected life time for a 2 million Equivalent Single Axles count over a 20 year period under-estimates that figure by at least 4 years if not 9 years for higher increases in the annual production rates. This physical deterioration on the road surface can be controlled but the incidence of serious accidents cannot be measured on that 7 km stretch of road. A far more responsible approach has been given by Holcim's Lynwood quarry, nearly adjacent to Gunlake's quarry: dust and road transport problems are minimized with proper stock piling and rail transport along with suitable noise and light modifications to equipment as recommended by the community at large.

### **Consultation**

The contrast in the detail of Factsheet 1 and 2 as per Gunlake exemplified the deficiencies in the Gunlake discussion with the community at large.

1. Increases in truck numbers suddenly are not reported in the Factsheet 2. Why not?
2. Summaries of noise modification of equipment and transport options are not reported but left to be read in the large EIS, or its appendices.
3. Factsheet 2 is only available on the Gunlake website, whereas the earlier quantitative data of Factsheet 1 was delivered to residents on the area. Why so?
4. On page 67 of the Main Report of the Gunlake Quarry Extension Project it is reported here has only been one single meeting with the local community groups. Why has there not been another meeting organised after the release of the EIS so Gunlake can explain its plans and choice of options?
5. The face to face meetings that are ongoing are farcical: our face to face meeting in August 2015 lead nowhere with empty promises of noise reduction for the primary crusher. There are no plans to systematically reduce noise of the crushers or truck noise at the quarry as promised in Factsheet 1.
6. Consultation with the community at large is non-existent. Section 5 of the Main Report is not a reflection of the real community consultation process at all. It has not taken place except for the single meeting on 30 July 2015. Face to face meetings don't generate any positive results and are merely stalling tactics.
7. The Statement of Commitments in Chapter 17 should be contrasted with the positive statements of Holcim. If the Gunlake's EIS is so positive about the impacts of noise, dust, transport, ground and surface water and community liaisons on that local community and its life style, why doesn't it give any guarantee that our lifestyles won't be effected by its massive extension. No mention of compensation for any physical or physiological damage stemming from Gunlake's plan to rape, scour (better than the Viking action, to burn) and pillage our environment and lifestyle, just wonderful gratuitous throw-aways. See Table 17.1 for details. Why not guarantee our land and house values won't be effected by Gunlake's significant intrusion into our environment?