

## **Volume 2 – Parts 5 to 8 – SURFACE WATER**

### **Karuah South Quarry SSD 17\_8795**

ICAG Inc. regrets not being able to read the entire Volume 2. This unfair and unrealistic timeframe put on people in the community to read and respond to such large documents. These concerns raised are only a representation of what is so alarming within this document; to environment, wildlife (Koalas, Quolls, Phascagales, micro bats, bush turkeys, possums, wallabies, birds, Giant Barred Frogs) etc, people, creeks/river systems, aquatic wildlife, Oyster Farmers, Tourism industry. No amount of mitigation, offsetting 200 year old Fig trees & 400 year old Eucalyptus trees can be “offset, bio-banked, bio-credits purchased for Flora and Fauna”. No one can ever justify the continued removal of natural bushland areas, death to our wildlife, through approval process, regardless of what ‘resource’ is being sought or being put under a “State Significant Development” terminology that accelerates approval.

<b>Page Number</b>	<b>ICAG Inc. - Comments and Concerns of EIS Volume 2</b>
5-7	In the Executive Summary they talk about 2 stages and each stage with have three Sub-stages. Talking about landholder rights to take water harvestable rights etc. <b>Not sure if our assumption is right that this is talking about surface water to Dams “clean water” or “sediment laden water”?</b>
	Talks about upper catchment of Yalimbah Creek system on property of Lot 11 and talks about historically would have been a second order watercourse. “Yalimbah Creek with the construction of Blue Rock Close & Pacific Highway, removing former flow of Yalimbah Creek with all discharge from catchment directed to a bank of culverts which convey discharge under Blue Rock Close, Pacific Highway via “overland flow approximately 600 east-northeast of the Yalimbah Creek coastal wetland”. <b>Note: ICAG would have used a capital C and capital W.</b>
	While the property may not flood as their documentation states. <b>ICAG Inc. says that any water “clean water” and how clean is this clean water on a quarry site?</b> and discharge water from their sediment-laden dam water (dirty water dams) will flow off site and run into these pipe systems to the South side of the Pacific Highway is Creek to River Discharge into Yalimbah Creek to Karuah River Port Stephens, past mangroves, past oyster leases. <b>Why would ANY company seek off site creek river discharge and try to justify their actions by using flocculants must NOT be given approval to do off site discharge from their sediment-laden water if this quarry is given approval to operate</b> (as per their EIS that is more than alarming).
<b>Comment:</b> Photo coloured water in Volume 2 Page 5-29. On EIS USB stick the water is yellow with no explanation of why water is this colour?	1) seek to pump clean water off to an area on property and one off property (see maps) to maintain flow of creek, yet one pipe is at the front of the road side? “thus helping to maintain flows to the receiving environment downstream off the site”. Yet they constantly say throughout their 3 Volumes of EIS that this area of Lot 11 and the entire side of this highway is not part of Yalimbah Creek anymore. They state that Yalimbah Creek Catchment is good. <b>What about the yellow water on South side of Pacific Highway in pipe area?</b> In their EIS it shows in a black and white photo that the water has a problem, suspended particles you can see this even though black and white photo. <b>In the EIS on the USB stick you can see in colour that water (portrayed in a black and white photo In EIS) is YELLOW. What is the source of this iron-oxide yellow water?</b>
	<b>Comment:</b> As this area is a high rainfall area. The clouds of storms move up this mountain range north parallel to The Bucketts Way and go north and sometimes these same storm clouds come West along property at Limeburners Creek other areas.

While R W Corkery states throughout their documentation this property is over 21 ha in the site “site covers 21 ha approximately”. **How big is the property in total of bushland/wildlife to be removed? How big is the remaining right hand corner of property where maps show creeks exist, to be actually left in some capacity of natural bushland/swamp area of those creeks in that area which is Upper Yalimbah Creek? This is not clearly shown in the EIS or at all.**

-2-

The pit will constantly fill up with water from rain & surface water, which will not be stopped from running down the sides of the open cut (if this is approved). They would have to pump this water from the bottom of the pit if the level off puddles made their operations unusable. This will happen all the time during and after rainfall events. The EIS wants us (the public objecting to the EIS including, Volume 1 and 2) outlining this “proposed project” that there will be someone running around in the rain testing the waters “turbidity, “suspended particles” in the water before discharging this ‘dirty water’ off the property to Yalimbah Creek piping under Blue Rock Close, Pacific Highway, Yalimbah Creek holding ponds to Yalimbah Creek Catchment, Karuah River Port Stephens. ***Are you all for real? The ICAG Committee Members laughed when we read this (a person running around testing water in the rain before the water is discharged off site) is just so stupid. How would one stop the water running out of the sediment-laden dam and running off site in a rainfall event?***

***Where will this water in the pit go as we have found nothing in the EIS/volumes to clarify what happens to the pit water?*** Or advise us of the sections of the EIS this is written in detail please.

***What happens to the final void area that will fill up with dirty water/suspended particles?*** Or like Hunter Quarries left to change colour from pink/brown to green and discharge of its own ability when the level exceeds the dam wall capacity and overflows this water into the environment without treatment from Hunter Quarries currently remains unknown to ICAG Inc. and community.

It is obvious by the dust produced by Hunter Quarries (South) former Karuah Red Quarry does not use water to suppress dust at all. Planning Dept. Compliance MUST rectify this situation as dust comes across the six (6) lanes of the Pacific Highway looking like smoke from a bush fire. The Planning Department/Compliance Office MUST ENFORCE their ‘Conditions of Consent’ and force them to enclose their crushers into a sound proof building that will reduce impacts of dust and noise on the community as per their “Conditions of Consent”. Should Karuah South Quarry be approved their crushers must be enclosed to reduce dust & noise.

As Hunter Quarries (2) North was fined \$15,000.00 for non-compliance of Conditions of Consent exceeding levels of dust and noise. Hunter Quarries had to stop production until they housed their crushers in a building. During this time they operated the pit on this site and took by truck to Hunter Quarries South to crush. People in this area were being impacted twice as much. **See news article attached.** This has set a precedent for Hunter Quarries to operate all their crushers in a sound proof building to reduce noise and dust on the environment and impacts to property owners. ICAG Inc. also believe that as a precedent has been set on Blue Rock Close that any “proposed quarries” should they be approved MUST also cover their crushers in a sound proof building regardless of whether their crushers are mobile or not!

<b>Page Number</b>	<b>ICAG Inc. - Comments and Concerns of EIS Volume 2</b>
5-7 2 <sup>nd</sup> last paragraph	Water samples taken by/on behalf of R W Corkery & Col showed that water quality in the Yalimbah Creek Catchment was “good quality”, while the broader Karuah River Catchment Continued to show signs of impaired health (Mid Coast Council 2018). <b><i>They want to add discharge suspended particles to the mangroves of Port Stephens.</i></b>

***The Conditions must be very clear of “no off site discharge in any capacity from these Dirty water holding dams/sediment-laden water” regardless of whether they intend to use a flocculant or not and regardless of being told it is “natural product” or “citrus based”. As this is not naturally occurring in the natural environment then it should not be used to sink particles in water or discharges off site and downstream.***

ICAG Inc. state this is not a solution of sinking particles to the bottom of the sediment laden water dam before discharging off site and is a bad idea and we object to this being used whether from Michael Kiely’s proposal or should another quarry owner take this land over, this solution should NOT happen at all. What happens to the solids? ***Who in Government monitors discharge levels? No one! Who in Government measures the amount of flocculants required to sink the heavy dust particles and other contaminants to the bottom of the “dirty water***

***holding dam/s”, before discharging out of these dams to the environment off the property? The mine/quarry does!***

Page Number	ICAG Inc. – Comments and Concerns of EIS Volume 2
Last paragraph On page 5-7	ICAG Inc. is not confident that the EIS words of “water management strategy for the site would ensure that water is managed in a manner that maximises opportunities for reuse via the capture of sediment-laden runoff, whilst diverting clean runoff from undisturbed catchments away from disturbed areas of the site, this helping to maintain flows to the receiving environment downstream off the site”. <b>ICAG Inc. States the obvious that this is seeking approval to Creek to River discharge off site and into the environment off the property, under the highway and downstream to Port Stephens. ICAG Inc. refuses to accept that discharge off the property would be of benefit from the “dirty water holding dams”/”sediment-laden water” to the natural environment. This is seeking Creek to River Discharge via assistance to gutter, road gullies and pipework. <u>Should this company be given full approval to operate, they MUST not be given off site “discharge of dirty water/sediment laden water at all.</u></b>

**NOTE:** “Receiving Environment” ICAG Inc. states the obvious that this (offsite discharge via clean or sediment laden water) MUST be separate. They MUST not be given approval to discharge sediment-laden “dirty water” discharge off site at all in any method, amount or means. Duralie Coal has turned Creeks/River/s orange/black.

***Also Alert! If the clean water drain is taking water from behind the pit on Hunter Quarries land, then how much of their waste water diverts through Michael Kielys property? It would not be clean ground water as it is running in man-made drains and how much of this drain is being impacted by Hunter Quarries discharge water?***

**It has come to ICAG Inc’ attention that local people walking in Blue Rock Close heard running water gushing**, wondering what it was they investigated and were shocked to see that water was rushing through Michael Kiely’s property. ***Where was this water coming from?*** The Colour is a pink/salmon colour like the rock in this area. The water was gushing fast and there had been no rain that week or on the day it was discovered. Yes ICAG Inc. Committee have seen these photos to the above discharge event.

***Is this water coming from Michael Kiely’s property? OR is the discharge water coming from Hunter Quarry/pit behind Michael Kiely’s property (Lot 5?)***

***Are Hunter Quarries discharging their sediment-laden water through Michael’s property before going under the road pipes of Blue Rock Close and then the pipe under the Pacific Highway?***

Page Number	ICAG Inc. – Comments and Concerns of EIS Volume 2
5-8  If approved this quarry MUST have “Conditions of Consent” and be a Controlled Action”.	In the EIS Volume 2 page 5-8 they again state that “there is potential for discharge from the sediment basins to the receiving environment to occur. Should discharge from the sediment basins be required, the water quality of the discharge would be assessed and measures taken to achieve a desired water quality prior to discharge occurring”. <b>ICAG Inc states that NO discharge of sediment laden water should occur at all. No Creek to River discharge approval should be granted from any Government Department. If this company is approved to proceed through their EIS words they MUST be a “Controlled Action with Conditions of Consent” from Federal/Commonwealth Government and the same goes for the State Gov. Departments of many, Planning Department and/or PAC.</b>
<b>ICAG Inc. Comment.</b>	No amount of flocculants should be put on any water to sink particles to the bottom to then Justify, creek/river discharge. If there is a need to tamper with particles in the water, then The “Precautionary Principal” should apply. If there is any chance of harm then don’t do it.

Page Number	ICAG Inc. – Comments and Concerns of EIS Volume 2
5-8 3 <sup>rd</sup> paragraph from bottom of page.	“measures taken to achieve a desired water quality prior to discharge occurring”. <b><i>Who are the ones deciding that water quality is alright before discharging?</i></b> The quarry people! Really the ones discharging sediment-laden water into the natural environment to cause problems down stream are the ones working out if the water is suitable or not to discharge? ICAG Inc states No Creek to River Discharge must be a “Controlled Action” with “Conditions of Consent”. Also “No dirty water/sediment laden water to leave the site”.
5-8 “In Summary” 2 <sup>nd</sup> last paragraph from bottom of page	This entire paragraph is rubbish! <b>“minor reduction in discharge to downstream environments” by “capture and storage of sediment-laden runoff”</b> . ICAG Inc. state that is <u>misleading and is trying to reduce the impact of such a development in intact bushland property. In a high rain fall area of mountains. The entire property has creeks and gullies. Yet the Consultants maps do not show these creeks at all.</u> Only after rebuking in public meeting in December, they showed a creek system in the right hand side of property from Blue Rock Close. The additional demand would be removing bushland, altering, removing these creeks, killing wildlife. The additional demand would be that this company is blatantly requesting Government Departments to approve off site discharge clean water or dirty water/sediment laden water. If Government gives approval for the dirty water off site discharge, we have enough destroyed swamps, creeks & river systems without adding more. Throughout the EIS and 2 Volumes the Consultants continue to downgrade their actual impacts they will have by misrepresenting the truth ICAG Inc. believes.
7a – 24	Two aerial maps one photo in 1954 bushland in tact. One photo in 1993 roads shown with Karuah Red (1) getting bigger with other infrastructure showing in other bushland areas. These photos show the slow progressive decline of the bushland. Which should show everyone that is part of approval Planning/PAC this project must not proceed. Council’s support to object this proposal with their communities/rate payers of Midcoast & Port Stephens areas is requested.
7a-164 Figure 8 (see attached)	This map shows clearly in Volume 2 that the boundary between Hunter Quarries and Michael Kiely is in the right place showing on this map. Once again this shows how all their other maps are wrong, misleading, incorrect and needs to be sorted immediately before this ‘submission processes and pushing this to PAC for objection/approval is started. Once again ICAG Inc. and those in the community do not believe this was done by error.
7b – 31	Michael had a cabinet with things he had found on the property. Sadly ICAG Inc. does not have photos of these contents. Michael would know what we mean.
	Assessment Criteria – This property has significant heritage value due to the 200+ year old Fig Trees and 400+ year old Eucalyptus Trees and all the extroindnary wildlife Koalas, Quolls Phascagales etc. Two categories “nature of significance” and “comparative significance”. <b><i>These trees are significant for this property and must remain intact.</i></b>
7b-31	Should this quarry be approved, it will breach the values listed on this page Historical Significance (these trees), Aesthetic significance will be destroyed if this quarry proceeds.
8-11 map	Hunter Quarries proposed NEW mine/quarry Karuah Red Quarry (proposed) which must not be given any approval to start at all protecting this bushland area forever. This map shows the destruction of the environment, separately and cumulatively. They must be stopped from being given approval.

Rob Corkery said there are no creeks on the property. This is untrue. Project will impact creeks on property and off site. Anything this quarry does will impact the natural environment. The natural creek systems across this property all making their way to the lowest points of the property in some capacity to then run off the property and under the roads pipe system to Yalimbah Creek, Karuah River to Port Stephens. *Once the flocculants and the sediment-laden particles have mixed with the bigger volume of water it will be alright then?*



-5-

ICAG Inc. state the obvious that their “dirty water holding dam/sediment laden water dams” and including the “sump” is inadequate from the size scale shown on the map compared to the property as a whole and their project sites 1 and 2 with 3<sup>rd</sup> area impacted by infrastructure/overburden dump, 4<sup>th</sup> area impacted by a sediment laden dam and discharge points for “clean water” and “sediment laden water”.

*Yet we could not find the discharge points on the property for the “sediment-laden dirty water” off site?*

*All dams have an overflow area, where is this water then going to make its way off site? We could also not find how big these dams will be, what construction method either, will they be holes in the ground or built up with earth walls?*

ICAG Inc. believe that these two ONLY dams and one “sump” are inadequate to keep water contained on the property to stop discharge off the property in either a “controlled and approved discharge” or an “unscheduled discharge event through rainfall topping the dams over to overflow into the environment and off the property. Either Way ICAG Inc. requests that should this quarry be approved it must be a “Controlled Action with Conditions of Consent” and “no discharging off site”, Commonwealth, Federal, State Governments must be involved.

Page 8-27 Karuah Quarry commenced operations 3<sup>rd</sup> December 1997 and then as Hunter Quarries expanded around 2012 on middle section of Lot 11. Karuah South Quarry would take out the remaining property below the mountain that Hunter Quarries is currently removing (on middle section of Lot 11). The areas are on different levels of the land and this part of Michael Kiely’s property (Karuah South Quarry) is NOT impacted by Hunter Quarries at all and the boundary line is wrongly shown on many maps within the EIS and documents handed out to the general public last year. Wrong, misleading and we believe done on purpose.

We acknowledge that state significant developments assist mining companies/quarries/extractive industries and large developments to be handed our natural environment easily. Though this does not make it right for the environment, our wildlife and impacts to our creeks, river systems or forced impacts on people that are left to suffer noise/dust impacts, property devalues, health issues, heartache watching bushland cleared/wildlife killed under these companies.

**We dispute that this development does not warrant a full investigation by the Commonwealth Government as we believe they will cause Ecological Impacts. Giving them approval to NOT be a Controlled Action in November 2012 for this project in 2019 is wrong and needs to be stopped from proceeding through the Government hoops and fully investigated before The Planning Department ‘fast tracks this to the PAC Panel’.**

(Page 8-28) We would encourage Midcoast Council and Port Stephens Council to object to this ‘proposed quarry’ entirely. This bushland is unique 200+ year old Fig Trees and 400+ year old Eucalyptus Trees. And would expect Council to protect and enhance the natural environment through wise management of these natural resources (our wildlife, our bushland, these amazing trees, our creeks & river systems). **They belong to us all.**

Due to time constraints and an unfair and unrealistic time frame where we could NOT read the 3 volumes in this time of 28 days and we regret that we have been stopped and prevented from writing against almost every page in the EIS and 2 Volumes. Every page needs to be rebuked for something they have written. We will attempt to do this for the PAC hearing, so that at least a record has been recorded for history if PAC approves this quarry.

**(Page 8-44) We had comments to make of the meetings that were held.** Yet due to time constraints are not able too. The summaries throughout the documentation, which gives the reader the wrong idea that Council is fully supporting this proposed project. When this is actually not correct by email received from Council. (see attached). ICAG Inc. see this as misleading anyone who reads this including Government Departments and PAC. We see this as a deliberate ploy to advance their approval chances along. In reality this project should be stopped. The EIS and Volumes 1 and 2 have wrong information of information that is missing.

-6-

contained in these documents. And we question again the rush to push this through to PAC from Planning now we are over the (25) objection letters needed to send it to PAC.

**There are many more animals and plant species on this property that we could not find within the documentation.** An expert did look briefly at the documentation at our meeting in May and said that in all of their map charts, the wildlife have not been found in this area (to be quarried). We think this is more than strange and once again we believe has been done to mislead the approval process.

4.3 page 8-45 – No surprise that those people that could benefit would be supportive of industries. Some people would not be aware of the impacts people are suffering under Hunter Quarries already. Others would not care. Other people see a new company as an extension of Hunter Quarries providing jobs and nothing else matters to them. In reality though people are impacted, our wildlife dies, bushland cleared, this will continue to happen if this ‘proposed quarry’ Karuah South Quarry is approved.

(page 8-45) The tick box for the School is alarming. One person interviewed about what exactly. This person would not know that children who attend that School each day have nose bleeds each day attributed to the dust from Hunter Quarries. Yet through Government approvals and Council these people and others are left to suffer. If many children at the School were sick then they would be “adversely impacted by the project”.

We did not feel that the questions we raised in the Environmental Assessment were answered and some not at all. The justification of R W Corkery in their documentation that this quarry would not impact anyone or they would get used to it because they are resilient having been already impacted by Hunter Quarries is MOST dreadful.

8-46 – community meetings were not attended by the public in good numbers. ICAG Inc Committee went to visit Oyster Farmers and people in town to discover that they had letterboxes, though knew nothing about this NEW pending quarry.

8-47 While not surprising the justification that Hunter Quarries is causing dust and noise, yet this project will not is extremely silly! The project is going to destroy more bushland, kill more wildlife, produce more dust and noise in a beautiful area being destroyed by quarries. The false justification that because Hunter Quarries is operating already and these R W Corkery conclusions are offensive “the predicted impacts are known and well understood by the local community” (page 8-48).

8-48 Impacts to the natural environment can NEVER be addressed by Consultants employed by mining companies/quarries/developments or sadly Government Departments. If the person is being paid to write a report for that company or for that Department to falsely show there is ‘little to no impacts’, this is the report that is written.

***What about the ‘anti-social behaviours’ of quarries/mines?***

***What about safety for environment, people, wildlife first before giving approval to mining/quarries/developments?***

8-49 People living on the side of the Aboriginal settlement can hear the crushers and would get their dust, though may not realise this.

ICAG Inc. tried for years to contact the Karuah Land Council Representatives who we have NEVER been able to contact or speak to properly about Duralie Coal’s discharge, the proposed magnetite mine and advised by local people in Karuah when we held meetings back in 2010 onwards that it was suggested to ‘stay away from

these meetings'. This leaves us disappointed that under Karuah Land Council's watch, it is sadly obvious to us their assistance to Government/Consultants including sitting in their car in Duralie Road, much of the natural land environments have been destroyed along The Bucketts Way and else-where including this new bushland area of this "proposed project" area, should it be approved. People, organisations, clubs etc. we believe have a paid silence. We were stunned to read in the EIS/Volumes that the Aboriginal people interviewed would like to collect fire wood on the property once the trees are felled. ***Do they know about these trees hundreds of years old or 400+ years old currently living on this property?***

8-49 – Our 1 + 1 = 2 is about the companies that would be operating in this area. Not how many pits each company does already have (Hunter Quarries) or "proposed project" Karuah South Quarry/Michael Kiely if approved will have. This was also only relating in this particular area Lot 11 there will be two separate companies operating if this 'proposed quarry' is approved.

8-50 – "current perceptions" ugly words, as people ARE impacted by Hunter Quarries and WILL be impacted by Michael Kiely's proposal if approved. No amount of "mitigation measures" would "reduce and manage potential amenity and environmental impacts". Unless of course the quarry is rejected and must preserve this bushland area as Offset in Perpetuity. More to write no timeframe to do this.

8-64 When you are talking about silica dust being "minor incremental change would occur as a result of the project and that from a cumulative perspective dust generation would remain acceptable". ICAG Inc refutes these claims of R W Corkery. We will go into further detail in our PAC objection. Any silica dust present coming off the property to workers, to neighbours, to community is a health risk. Special dust studies should be done regarding Hunter Quarries before letting another company cause even more dust and noise on surrounding areas. More to write no timeframe to do this.

***"Cannot be determined" re the dust impacts/silica impacts, because no one in Government has actually done base line studies before and during Hunter Quarries operations. It is about time this is done now from May 2019.***

8-64 - ***We also note that the mitigated risk is always reading as low/very low, medium.*** In reality people will continue to be impacted by noise, dust, removal of bushland, death to wildlife, discharge off property into everyones creek/river systems of Port Stephens. This is the sad reality. More to write no timeframe to do this.

8-64 – **HOW** can a quarry project that will remove almost 50+ acres of bushland or impact the remaining right hand corner with discharge/dust etc. write a statement such as this and not be STOPPED from every Government Department for writing such untruths? **"the project has been designed to minimise impacts upon habitat features, flora and fauna"**. Really... ***Where is this area? What happens to the bushland you are clearing written down in other sections of your documentation? What happens to the wildlife? What happens to the 200+ year old fig trees and the 400+ year old gum trees? How do you justify removing all of this by turning it into a quarry pit and justify that you will minimise impacts upon habitat features, flora and fauna?"*** This sentence is misleading, deceitful about what your entire project is actually going to do to everything living on this property, should this project be approved. More to write no time frame to do this.

**5.2.6 - There is no such thing as impacts from mining or quarries as being "low" in noise or dust. Again this is misrepresenting the truth.** There is more to write though no timeframe to do this.

We believe that this EIS on these issues of dirty water dams/sediment-laden dams off site discharge is NOT clear or represented at all. ICAG Inc. Secretary has been reprimanded from people in the general public that claimed they are not seeking discharge approval. However should anyone choose to read the documentation as

-8-

ICAG Inc Committee Members in sections have had to do. The documentation speaks for itself. Therefore there is no protection for our down-stream users if this project using this EIS is approved in anyway.

5-27 We dispute that the project has been determined in 2012 November by the Commonwealth Department did not require a referral. We request that actually it does. That it MUST be “A Controlled Action with Conditions of Consent” from both the Commonwealth/Federal Government and Controlled Action with Conditions of Consent from the State Government Minister and his Departments of Planning and PAC.

8-68 – it is MOST dreadful that documentation states “comprehensive predictive assessments and reporting for the existing quarries that predict and demonstrate impacts consistently within approved levels and in accordance with the relevant guidelines and legislation. Hunter Quarries was breached in 2018 for exceeding levels of dust and noise from Halloran Road quarry. The same should apply to Hunter Quarries that exceeds dust and noise levels most times they operate from Corner The Branch Lane/Blue Rock Close.

8-68 - And the cumulative impact will be 2 companies operating many pits all at the one time, over the top of each other at the expense of the environment, wildlife, people and our natural water sources. Misleading and fragmenting truth. The only time that people are not impacted by the noise is when Hunter Quarries is not operating. Dust from crushers if not operating is stopped. However dust from overburden dumps being built up higher than the trees with wind brings dust over everyone and over the Pacific Highway’s 6 lanes. Wind also takes dust from exposed cliffs in wind gusts or during explosions. Hunter Quarries MUST be made to enclose ALL crushers. Must be made to dust suppress at all times. Must not discharge off property.

Social impacts Section 5.5 needs extensive objections from ICAG Inc. to PAC.

Due to time constraints we have not been able to supply any further documentation that we would have liked to have been given the opportunity to object to Volume 2 closely for a History and Record sake.

ICAG Inc. therefore states again that this ‘proposed project’ of Michael Kiely’s Karuah South Quarry is rejected entirely.

Yours faithfully  
Ironstone Community Action Group Inc./  
ICAG Inc. Committee  
C/- Secretary Amanda Albury