

My submission has been based upon a reading of EIS supporting documents which no doubt have been created by independent authorities well paid for their professional opinions which whilst supporting this development do not really act a devil's advocate upon behalf of the millions of Sydney siders whose very existence and lifestyle will be affected by this quarry development? Particularly if one or two of these vital submissions filled with generalisations in favour of a 40 year process fail to deliver and that independent authority is no longer in existence or escapes massive class action as a result of their submissions many many years ago?

## Ground water

Their research work is based on bore holes and submission based upon limited budgets seeking a quick submission cut down to suit outcomes sought by the developers?

At stake is the actual flow of underground water through sandstone and even the average homeowner excavating a cellar in sandstone will tell you that this stone will leak despite the best intentions? So how do they think really that a 40 meter excavation opening up will not create a potential pollution and siltation of Sydney's water supply many kilometres away?

## Surface water

Their research is bereft of local water/rain records and the collection of precipitation into local sinks or vents into local streams and water holes. The area has no rainfall records in place and they rely upon nearest weather station records. Even in Sydney Basin we experience rain shadows and rain sinks within kilometres of each other. Because of the scale and length of this project 40 years it deserves a better long term collection of local data say over 5 years?

## Environmental Risk

We all understand that their reports are based on current expectations and controls that may or may not be acted upon immediately or require time wasting reports and reviews by these experts whose costs are not met out of government or approving Authorities Budgets the expectation being that should our Environment be challenged in any way we will be solely reliant of operations entity's goodwill and financial resources/

Not good enough when Sydney's water supply may be threatened through a minor fault not picked up or canvassed in the Environmental Risk assessment as perhaps not explored at the outset in the interests of developing an assessment with limited scope but expected supportive outcomes?

## Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment

Whilst we accord Aboriginal Cultural Heritage respect and inclusion it is interesting to contemplate this simple salient fact.

WE HAVE 'INHERITED' OUR PRISTINE BUSHLAND AND ENVIRONMENT FROM OUR ORIGINAL RESIDENTS IN THE SAME CONDITION THAT GENERATIONS OF ABORIGINES HAVE PASSED FAITHFULLY DOWN OVER CENTURIES!

It is incumbent upon us our generation to ensure that if this quarry project proceeds it does so in the spirit the Aborigines both as to its initial size and duration governed by a responsible body releasing a licence as to continuation, size and period of activity

In this regard and given the impact of huge volumes of sand expected to be supplied to Sydney and obviously a key ingredient supporting the current voracious infrastructure development by NSW Government in hand with an equally voracious private enterprise allegedly acting in response to our demand for such infrastructures creating massive profits and leaving behind structures which may or may not be in use in 40 years time as redundant

To protect their Heritage and ours this project should be limited in size from the beginning to 25% of its planned land size to be operated for a maximum of five years from the time the first load of sand is transported off site. The Quarry development would then be subject to further EIS survey developed at that time using more relevant on site data gleaned from its previous five years operation. In addition the operating company will be required to setup tracing seepages outside of its operating area to detect any waters that may be making its way towards Sydney's water supply using latest scientific methods the results of which have been verified independently and will be used to decide if their operation can continue for another five years with an increase in their land use from 25% to 50%. As you can now realise within 20 years half of the assessed life of this quarry we as a generation can and should be satisfied that our Water Supply is safe for our grandchildren?!

## Aquatic Ecology

Whilst the experts have supported this development with their submissions aquatic ecology will be destroyed by this very development and perhaps an alternative aquatic ecology could be developed by the operating company to replace the ones it is destroying along a selected corridor significantly similar to the one they are mining/

## Political

As previously mentioned above Sydney has a voracious appetite for building sand particularly after the closure of Penrith and it is really interesting that this development obviously requiring huge investments by its backers who of course stand to earn a forty year income stream including I presume NSW Government from royalties that not one politician of either side of politics has raised the real possibility of impregnating and threatening Sydney's Water Supply from this Quarry either now or over a period of 40 years when most of them have left the scene or just do not care any more as they no longer live in Sydney Basin?

Gov Budgets to support research and development of sand resources as and when required to achieve their voracious infrastructure politically motivated projects?!

Just imagine how much concrete/sand is going into Badgery's Creek airport and supporting developments and will **NSW Gov demand/mandate that construction companies use at least 50% recycled concrete products?**

## Impact on Sydney water supply

It is truly a sad reflection on this Quarry's application that despite a leading Scientist's pleading against it protecting Sydney's Water Supply a key element in not only Sydney's future but our very future survival? WE **cannot drink sand** whilst we might drive on and live in sand supported buildings

# Scale of and length of project

To preserve our futures it is incumbent that this development is subject to size and length of operation in stages to ensure that our Sydney Water Supply is secure and remains secure.

Of course my suggested 5 year spans and % sizes may be adapted to commercial realities however providing the spirit of absolute control and corporately financed security over development is maintained with adequate annual reporting to Gov and Sydney's population?!

It might also be mentioned here that future development should be mandated to include recycled concrete products to reduce our need for sand and perhaps an equal amount be set aside in NSW