

ICAG Inc. response to Volume 1 and 2

Volume 1 (page 17 and 19) and Volume 2 (Page 1 to 16) - final version

Please add this document to the ICAG Inc. (2 emails sent) re: Karuah South Quarry

Volume 2 – Parts 5 to 8 – SURFACE WATER

Karuah South Quarry SSD 17_8795

Page Number	ICAG Inc. – Comments and Concerns of EIS Volume 2
5-8 last paragraph of page	Buzz words “capture, re-use and recycling” regarding “efficient use of water resources whilst simultaneously reducing the likelihood of the discharge of potentially sediment-laden water from the Site”. <i>How do they intend to stop the water going off site?</i> ICAG Inc. believe this is misleading and misguided by the Consultants who must truly believe that their dams will not over flow (sediment-laden dirty water holding dams” at all ever, and must believe therefore that these dams will not discharge off site by rainfall events or discharge via diesel pumps. Yet the documentation clearly shows if you read it that they are seeking “off site creek/river discharge of both their “clean water” and “sediment-laden water”. Therefore No creek/river discharge off site” must be a Condition of Consent under a Controlled Action to protect down- stream aquatic wildlife and the Oyster Industry, Tourism Industry. It is not the Government Departments property and therefore ICAG Inc. on behalf of our Members, Our Associates and the Community DO NOT give permission for our natural environment to continue to be polluted by Government approvals to mining companies, quarries, housing developments, other entities to discharge into our natural water source anywhere or out to Port Stephens.
5-9	Surface Water Impact Assessment (SWIA). The site covers 21 hectares approximately that is 50+ acres of bushland to be destroyed and more. The community is not privy to actually how big the property is. ICAG Inc. states that the Stage 1 and Stage 2 and 3 rd section of property and 4 th section that is to be the discharge area have not been written how many acres is each section to be destroyed. Therefore we believe this has been done to be unclear and misleading just how much of this bushland is to be removed which is all but the entire property.
1.2.1 (.4)	Construction of sediment basins and associated drainage infrastructure. Yet there is nothing read to tell us how big, how deep these dirty water holding dams will actually be. Where does the water go when the dams overflow will be and what they intend to do with water running out of these dirty water holding dams/sediment-laden dams. <i>Why was this information not contained in the EIS.</i>
	Should quarry be approved ICAG Inc. request that these dirty water holding dams/sediment-Laden dams are not given any approval from Planning Department and/or PAC for discharge Approval off site. It is unsatisfactory for the natural environment to be used as mining and Or quarry discharge waste services. It is no longer acceptable to keep handing over public Natural environments to be wrecked.
1.2.1.(.5)	Vegetation removal – soil removal & storage. Just like Duralie Coal their top soil got lost with the overburden dumps of mountains and valleys they were removing and filling up. this quarry ICAG Inc. sees that the written word in the EIS and what will actually take place are two different things. It is sadly obvious that this amount of bushland removal and causing this much destruction on the natural environment. The top soil will be lost forever along with everything currently living on this property, plants, animals and natural creek systems.
1.2.1 (.13)	<i>Where does the wheel wash sediment water go?</i>
1.2.2	Staged development x 2 stages x 3 stages in each stage. What about the part of the land that has the overburden dumps and the other area with the sediment dam and discharge to creeks on the property, dirty water holding dam/sediment-laden dam is in this area as well.

Extraction area Stage 2.	It is misleading the way the EIS has been written of the area of Stage 1 and Stage 2 and the ‘approximately’ which is not accurate or ‘concrete’ in actually how big each area really is & what this equates to is how much bushland is to be removed and wildlife will die. It was not Until ICAG Inc. saw Volume 2 the map on page 5-12, we were shocked. Considering that the maps the Consultants gave us & the general public & showed us on slide show presentation December meeting 2018, now realising this map was within the EIS Volume 2, confirmed to us sadly how secretive the EIS has actually being done. If the Government Departments had actually read this, they would have seen this and stated as we do that this is being misrepresented to the general public of the full weight of this development over the entire property.
Extraction area Stage 2. Cont’d	
<p>ALERT!</p> <p>Please see map provided to general public after ICAG Inc. requested an aerial photo of properties vegetation in tact.</p> <p>Then the map of the boundary line between Hunter Quarries and Michael Kielys property, that clearly backs up our claims as fraud.</p> <p>See map of creeks that actually exist on Michael Kiely’s property in a hand drawn map.</p>	<p>Miss-representation of boundary map. ICAG Inc. refutes where the boundary red line is situated between Hunter Quarries. The ICAG Inc. Secretary can see this ridge from her property and states that Consultants maps are in the wrong place. She believes as do other people that know Michael Kiely’s property that Hunter Quarries boundary should be shown to the ridge which is still there and not down the other side of the mountain. We believe that this has been misrepresented in most maps provided so that people think and the Consultants are hoping that people will see that as the property has this impact (only on paper) that this should be approved without any hold ups. People in the community who know this property have also stated that this is untrue and that the ridge is still there. We have attached a map that depicts the boundary line accurately as it is currently. The fact that these misleading and false maps have been able to be put out on public submission period is more than alarming.</p> <p>If Michael Kiely has allowed Hunter Quarries to operate on his level of property down the slopes then again we believe this has been done to degrade his property. Or they are trespassing. Though ICAG Inc. and the community members that know this property state that the Government should investigate our claims of fraudulently supplying a map to the general public (that for now) does not exist.</p> <p>We had wanted to attend a site tour. This was another area that we wanted to see how much of the property was still intact as we all know it to be as the boundary line in the wrong place was so very obvious to us and we wanted to know why.</p> <p>Michael Kiely C/- Consultants refused our site tour with Michael. We would expect as this progresses that a site tour is actually given to us. The old rule of thumb. If you have nothing to hide and we and our associates have a right to check the documentation details as being accurate, which we do not believe it is.</p> <p>Also the creeks that are not written up within the EIS for their benefit, does not mean that the creeks as we and people in the community know actually exist.</p> <p>The submission period MUST be stopped until Government Departments investigate Fully for full disclosure of documentation that does not accurately show the landform Currently and a property of Michael Kiely that while Hunter Quarries is not operating On this bushland area.</p>
Page 5-11	14-20 jobs for people and yet over 50 acres of destroyed land, impacts to properties around them across the highway and at Limeburners Creek and homes along the Branch will be everyones reality if this quarry is approved with discharge of sediment-laden water off site. Is it 14 people or up to 20 this is such a big variance for little jobs for 25 years with all this destruction on the natural environment and death to wildlife.
Page 5-11	Water will be used from the existing property dam. No details of size of this dam in its current capacity? What wildlife live in this dam, fish, frogs, tortoise etc. Is this where the Giant Barred Frog exists in this dam that they intend to “eventually remove the existing

	<p>dam”. <i>What wildlife organisations will be present to collect all aquatic wildlife as the dam is drained and dug up? How many wildlife species will die as this dam is destroyed?</i></p> <p><i>ICAG Inc Requests that should this quarry be approved that the dam is saved and that ‘proposed quarry’ footprint is altered to have this natural dam that wildlife have lived for sometime be retained and not used as a dirty water holding dam or water levels removed Where water for aquatic life in this dam is compromised. No amount of bio-banking, credits, offset, mitigation or replace can restore a fresh water dam system on a ‘proposed quarry’ site.</i></p>
5-11 2 nd last paragraph from bottom	<p>“both the extraction etc. whilst satisfying environmental and site constraints”. ICAG Inc Refutes that no amount of EIS jargon, justification, will ever satisfy the impacts ‘should this Project be approved’ will actually do, to cause harm, injury and death to wildlife. To cause harm, destroy living bushland, trees of 400+ years old. <i>What are the site Constraints the EIS on page 5-11 Volume 2 talks about?</i></p>
5-13 Sediment Basins South & West	<p>“Sediment basins x 2 West and South” each with a pre-treatment pond “to collect sediment laden run off from the disturbed sections of the quarry”, <i>What are these pre-treatment ponds? Where are these pre-treatment ponds located? What map in EIS shows this in detail? Where do these pre-treatment ponds run into? What are they made out of? What is going to happen to the thick sludge left over (in time)? Where or how are you going to dispose of this brine/sludge? What measures are to be taken to stop this being discharged off site during a rainfall event or a ‘on purpose’ scheduled discharge event, should the project be given full approval with no Conditions of Consent preventing off site discharge?</i></p>
5-13 Diversion Drains	<p>2 clean water diversion drains East and West to direct water from undisturbed areas of the mountain behind Michael Kiely’s place which is part of his property (they have called “up-slope” to remove the fact this is the incline up to one of the biggest trees ICAG Inc Committee had ever seen.</p>
Last paragraph of page 5-13	<p>ICAG Inc. Committee on reading this gasped. The overall footprint of the ‘proposed quarry’ would remove almost all of the bushland, rainforest, ferns, swamp, creeks, trees not documented in the EIS conveniently we can presume! Disturbances “kept small as possible during all stages of operation” though then say in the same sentence “with vegetation and soil removed immediately prior to the progressive extension of operations. R W Corkery did not answer ICAG Inc Question when we asked how much in metres will they clear at a time? considering that Rivercare, Landcare projects and the Departments involved in this only allow a maximum of 10 metres clearance of privot before that area is planted and then you have to leave an area with privot and then remove another 10 metres. This is obvious that this is being done for the wildlife so they have places to fly in the 3-4 metre high story, where our little birds nest. So our frogs, lizards and small animals can run into the area that is not cleared. It is of no assurance for wildlife safety. It is of no assurance and how can rehabilitation commence until the material has been finished being retrieved.</p>
5-14 to 5-18 Is the tabled documentation required from the NSW Dept. of Planning & Env.	<p>How alarming that relevant government departments have been consulted. We will list them for a public record of what we believe are Government Departments that continue to hand over our environment, our bushland, forests, wildlife, natural water sources to be written off and turned into mining/quarry wasteland. Climate change is very real and the wilful Government approvals handing over bushland/mountains to be removed - shameful in 2019.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Planning Dept. 2) NSW Dept. of Industry 3) Crown Lands & Water 4) EPA – Environmental Protection Authority 5) OEH – Office of Environment & Heritage
5-18 to 5-25	<p>We have further comments to make though are time poor from an unfair submission period of unrealistic timeframe to NOT have the time to read all documentation. Unfair submission,</p>

5-26	<p>assisting the quarry/mine to proceed without ample time allotted for people/general public to cross check information contained in these oversized and ridiculously though cleverly spun across the 3 volumes for very difficult reading and an unrealistic time frame set by the Planning Department of Environment (Planning Dept.). If there was no data of creeks on the 'proposed project' site then were these all done as a base line of 'pre quarry damage'? because if they were not, why not? Drainage lines C/o Consultants documentation are actual creeks and Creek systems of Yalimbah Creek, regardless of whether they are 1, 2 or 3. considering Rob Corkery tried his hardest to wrongly convince people there were no creeks on the property, when in fact and reality there are creeks on the property. ICAG Inc. does not trust any documentation in the 3 volumes of the EIS covering any water component on the 'said property'.</p>
5-27	<p>Regardless of whether the highway is built, which should not have been built in the way it has been across swamp and headwaters of Yalimbah Creek, though done on the cheaper alternative sadly to the environmental loss. There are however pipes that will carry any running water, particles and/or contaminants to the south side of the Pacific Highway.</p>
	<p>The above in no way should give this company and the 'proposed project' the ability to falsely justify that any discharge off the property via sediment-laden water dams/dirty water holding dams would not make any difference to water quality is "the fox guarding the hen house". When the flood rains come over this mountain area and should the project go ahead to approval, the rain regardless of people running around in the rain testing water will not be able to stop and cannot stop rapidly running water off site as Blue Rock Close is the lowest point at the front of the property from this road. Words in EIS are therefore baseless to keep contained dirty water dams from overflowing.</p>
	<p>Regardless of an un-environmentally designed Pacific Highway that did not preserve upper Yalimbah Creek, the "flow channel" is the alive creek systems on this property where Wildlife are currently living. That is until should this project be approved.</p>
5-29	<p>It is obvious by the photos on both Blue Rock Close drain pipes and drain pipes of the Pacific Highway the water quality and colour is concerning. As stated what has caused this water to turn yellow? To put the photos in black and white in the EIS, ICAG Inc. believe was a deliberate and misleading approach reducing the visual awareness that there is something very wrong in both of these areas. Is it discharge from another source? Or is the iron oxide coming from the rocks dumped as part of the pipework construction? Either way Government Departments Must investigate, as this discoloured water is on the Port Stephens side South Pacific Highway.</p>
5-31	<p>Explain undisturbed catchment if the water on the south side of the Pacific Highway is yellow?</p>
5-31 last para.	<p>"If no sampling was taken downstream of the pacific highway", How can the R W Corkery draw conclusion "it is likely that this would represent a potential source of suspended solids, hydrocarbons and heavy metals in runoff quoting (Yannopoulos et al, 2012). Where would these be coming from to draw a conclusion of data not of real time water monitoring?</p>
5-32	<p>Site water management:- "prevents uncontrolled discharge to receiving environments", yet they are still seeking creek to river discharge throughout the 3 volumes of the EIS. And "effective water quality management strategies that prevent discharge of impacted water to receiving environments", which white washes they are infact seeking Creek to River discharge is irrelevant to ICAG Inc. regardless of amount, means and method of discharge.</p>
5-32 clean water	<p>It is disturbing that Clean Water will be diverted around the disturbed areas of the site without mixing with other classes of water and discharged to the downstream environment (off site). Yet they blatantly have in brackets "(regardless of water quality)". So just because the quarry says its "clean water", how clean is it really? What contaminants are in the water? So if the water quality of this "clean water" is not being tested/checked before discharging off site, it could therefore have elements that are actually harmful to aquatic life and downstream oyster farmers. Despite the EIS up talking their septic system for the workers,</p>

5-32 Cont'd	should this 'proposed project' be approved, stating that sewerage would be more harmful for the oysters. Yet reality check. Suspended particles coming from a quarry or further up river from Duralie Coal are no reason why this quarry or coal mine for that matter should be able to continue or in the case of Karuah South Quarry seek to discharge off site and in doing so will sadly change the structure of the on site water quality and down stream water quality.
5-32 Sediment Laden water	"priority given for its use in quarrying related activities, dust suppression, crushing plant, wheel wash. However ICAG Inc. and the Community can see very clearly that throughout their documentation they ARE seeking Planning Department or PAC approval to discharge sediment-laden water/dirty waste water off the property. Rob Corkery eventually said YES.
5-32	Raw water used for drinking, ablutions, dust, wheel washing if rainfall is not sufficient to supply enough water. If they were forced to retain their natural property dam, this would be a source of water while not bleeding it dry and leave the wildlife intact in this dam, bushland area.
5-36	ICAG Inc. contacted both the Department of Planning to enquire why a "blue book" was being referenced throughout the EIS and 2 Volumes without any corresponding documents copied from the blue book for reference and clarification of just what they were meaning. Planning advised our Secretary that the Landcom Blue Book was a book written with information on sediment and discharge figures. Our Secretary asked Landcome is that the housing development that clears all bushland to the ground ahead of subdividing? The reply was Landcom is a company that does sub-divisions. So mining/quarries & Government Departments of many hang onto every word written in the Blue Book, written by a company that clears bushland to the ground. And yet can write a book of discharge and sediment dams and management/mitigation practices and all is well in the world. We dispute the use of such practices for and on behalf of other companies seeking to do the same thing. total bushland clearance and wildlife deaths.
5-37	Once again they revoke the above and again talk about discharging off site. "Whilst type F Sediment basins are designed to capture runoff from disturbed catchments and store the runoff for a sufficient period of time to allow the sediment to settle out of suspension prior to discharging water of suitable quality to receiving environments, the design of the proposed sediment basins for the project provides for double the sediment storage zone via the inclusion of inlet basins. In addition while being equipped with discharge points, the intent of the two sediment basins will be to prevent the uncontrolled discharge of sediment-laden runoff from the site and to supply water for operation activities for dust suppression, wheel wash, crushing
5-37	ICAG Inc. continues to say that the above is creek/river discharge using off site practices and Gravity and rainfall.
5-37 West Sediment basin	Sediment basin West has two "open channels" one entering from the north of the sediment basin and the other from the west. Each open channel would discharge into an inlet basin to allow for initial settling of suspended sediment, each inlet basin would gravity discharge into the main sediment basin via a spillway. This is creek/river discharge via this method a time based reality for the natural environment. What are the drains made out of? ICAG Inc. requests that if rocks are to be used in the man-made drains that angulated rock is not used like Duralie Coal as it stopped wildlife from being able to jump across. A Wallaby was seen Going back and forwards along the edge, trying each time to find a place. It was the angulated rock that was not sympathetic to caught wildlife, that this wallaby turned back towards The open cut pit, machinery. These drains need to be constructed in such a way that people or animals can walk across without thinking about navigating crevices and angulated rock. There is no mention we have found of what these drains will be constructed from or how deep or how wide they will be. <i>How wide and deep will these open channels/drains be?</i>
5-38 Eastern Sediment basin	ICAG Inc. does not believe that suspended particles becoming sludge in the bottom of these Sediment dams will not cause a problem for onsite creek systems and off site down stream. Wheel wash water is being reticulated to the 'inlet basin' which would gravity discharge into

5-38 Eastern Sediment basin Cont'd	main sediment basin via a spillway. REALLY... any accumulated sediment in the inlet basin would be regularly removed, allowed to dry on the stockpiling area and either sold as fill or blended with other quarry products prior to sale. If the sediment dams and wheel wash are producing this much suspended particles, that they can be harvested, dried and then sold or added to other products. Is as stupid to read as it is written. Yet they continue to justify that by adding flocculants and discharging when it is below 50NTU is right to discharge is Creek and River discharge off site. When in reality if water is so solid massed it needs a product to separate out the particles. This water should NOT be discharged under any circumstances regardless of the adopted' blue book readings, ANZACC discharge smoke screen. We do not feel confident with this explanation.
Extraction area 4.1.4.2.2	Pit area, where a sump will be situated in the southwestern corner and progressively developed over the life of the quarry all water would be used for dust suppression and crushing operations. We do not feel confident this would happen.
Discharge Management 4.1.5 Flocculent used If nephelometric Turbidity units Are above 50 NTU prior to Discharging off Site to natural Environment downstream	“volumes of sediment-laden water held in the sediment basins are key sources of water for operations at the quarry, it is recognised that there is potential for discharge from the sediment basins to the receiving environment to occur and if above 50NTU flocculants (bio-polymer) would be added to reduce the volume of sediment in the water such that turbidity is reduced Below 50NTU prior to discharging. NO we do not condone or agree that ANY discharge events should happen if this “proposed project/quarry” is approved. This must remain “A Controlled Action with Conditions of Consent”. No offsite discharge with sediment-Laden waste water. This EIS is full of justifications and explanations using the blue book or flocculants products. Yet in reality this is seeking full creek/river discharge off the premises of sediment-laden Water. Why would anyone want to allow this to happen, let alone have the to seek Government approval to do such a crime against the natural water sources and down Stream oyster farmers, tourism operators, Port Stephens, Marine Park?
5-39	Septic should be closed tank and made to hire a pump out, no transpiration pit.
5-39 4.1.7.1.2 Surface water Flow monitoring	During discharge and assessment of the flow conditions downstream of the discharge would be undertaken. Whereabouts? Why are they modified? Are you people for real? You are going to have someone record the flow: a) high rapid movement flowing over channel b) medium moderate movement of water covering 50% of defined channel low slow movement of water 50% of channel d) none no movement of water. A photo will be taken on each occasion for comparison to previous flows. Why and for what purpose are the photos to be taken?
5-40	Water colour of each sediment basin and sump e.g. highly turbid brown, clear. Yet they have forgotten about salmon pink, green, yellow/orange, presence of black oily film in water. And as if erosion would be considered alarming considering you are all wanting to open cut this area of land, bushland in the Yalimbah Creek Catchment/Karuah River, Port Stephens.
	There will be pipes and pumps going everywhere as the words on paper try to become the running of this project should it be approved.
	There would be springs on this property and the creeks are fed with ground water. Yet we don't believe this has been covered adequately if at all. It may not be considered in the water balance, yet it should be written about of its existence?
	With so much written words of dust suppression using all this sediment-laden water, the entire place will be a sticky mess of runoff.
	It is also alarming that they intend to buy in so much water to use on the site including potable water to use as dust suppressant. No quarry/mine should be using precious drinking water for people first above any companies such as these seeking approvals. Climate change is happening, is real and the consequences of sea level rising, higher temperatures are felt In areas of Port Stephens and heat at 2017 from 42 to 50 degrees each day for weeks. adding further removal of trees/bushland areas reduces cloud formations and produces less oxygen and removal of carbon dioxide. The bushland areas are the lungs for the world and they are being destroyed each day. Let's not add further destruction in this area of Karuah.

Page 5-45 6.1.1	How much potable water will they use e.g. how many swimming pools of water each year?
	It should be seen as criminal to use societies drinking water for dust suppression on a quarry Face/mine site.
	If this project is approved. Miss leading information on page 5-45 “ no loss of water available to downstream users of water beyond those permissible under the water Management Act. 2000
	So kind to discharge clean water into receiving environment to help maintain flow. Gosh how nice
Pg 5-45 6.1.2 Flow and water Course function Off site discharge Once again roads Used as excuse That discharge Would not impact	“not impact on stream function or riparian environment in the receiving system directly downstream of the site as these have already been removed or overprinted by the construction Blue Rock Close, The Pacific Highway and ancillary drainage infrastructure. Furthermore the flow condition of Yalimbah Creek approx. 700 me downstream of the site becomes tidally influenced. Gosh what a load of rubbish. Creek to River discharge whether it is in the tidal fresh to salt area of Yalimbah Creek and the bigger volume of water will dilute any suspended naturally occurring particles. Really what a fog-off.
Pg 5.45 6.1.3 water quality	And after all the above so far. They state that the sediment laden discharge from the site is considered to be low. Actually ICAG Inc. dispute this and say any discharge event can/will alter the water quality considering it has not come from a natural creek environment if the project is approved. This is sense in looking at this logically not through rose coloured glasses and done for a purpose to continue the shereade that all this quarry is intending to does to the natural environment will be a low impact’. What rubbish! Utilising the blue book that was made up by a company that also justifies their existence on run off and sediment control.
5-46	ICAG Inc. refutes their claims on page 5-46 that the “probability rainfall event whereby discharge could be expected to occur once a year”. Really?
	All water naturally makes its way off the property and in time under the roads through the pipes to Port Stephens South side of Pacific Highway. people have advised ICAG Inc. Committee that they have seen Yalimbah Creek run salmon pink and wondered what it was. Yes what is it? Where is this coming from? Obvious suspended particles in the water? Where is the source Hunter Quarries? Or someone else?
5-47	Final acknowledgement that the project would result in “minor” we say major reduction in discharge to downstream environments as a result of capturing and storing sediment laden run from those catchments. The creeks on the property in most of the property will be dug up destroyed. <i>The creeks in the right hand corner of the property will be impacted through Discharge events of both “clean water” how clean? Or sediment-laden water?</i>
5-53	Fox guarding the hen house on reporting what is actually on the property like all the creeks which the EIS has not gone into detail enough or in some places on the property at all.
BLUE BOOK Calculation sheet Pg 5-57-5-58	5-58 onwards we are alarmed, we have no time to write against it in an unfair and ridiculous timeframe where the Planning Dept. expects people to read this documentation in 28 days is beyond wrong.
7b-31 (5.1) Assessment Criteria	“Heritage significance of this property “aesthetic, historic, scientific or social values for past, present or future generations”. ICAG states the obvious. The property is aesthetically bushland in tact and wildlife in abundance living on this property. Pushed into this area are any wildlife that got displaced and found their way into this extremely significant bushland property now as Hunter Quarries continues to destroy bushland to the side and behind this property. The historic part of this property is the 400+ year old gum trees around 60 that must be listed as Regional, State, Australia and World significant trees. You can’t get these trees back with their hollows for wildlife through any disgusting “bio-bank/credit systems to falsely claim that this in some way makes up for bushland/wildlife death, which obviously it does not. These trees are not even written up in their EIS. Shameful to say the least.

Page No.	ICAG Inc. Comments or Concerns
7b-31 5. 5.1 Assessment Criteria Cont'd	<p>Scientific knowledge of these trees and plants around them. 400+ year old gum trees to be removed by a person who believes he can “do what he likes on his property”. He has Significant tree species on his property. He has significant wildlife species on his property Including the Giant Barred Frog No. 32 on the World list.</p> <p>This is where Government Departments Planning and/or PAC MUST refuse to authorise this quarry to proceed in any part. The Conservation value of Flora and Fauna on this property is more than unique and its value goes up the more Hunter Quarries is allowed to destroy bushland around this property. <u>Social values for the past:-</u> These trees were the seed trees for the old logging industry hundreds and hundreds of years ago. These giant trees were saved then and MUST be saved now in 2019 onwards to celebrate the past, to Protect these trees and wildlife in the Present and in doing so will secure the life of these plants and animals for future generations</p>
Heritage Significance 7-b - 32	Significance natural history - “nature of significance and comparative significance. Using the Burra Charter adopted by State, Commonwealth heritage agencies as the recognised document for guiding best practice for heritage practioners in Australia”.
Criterion7b-32 a-b	ICAG Inc. believe that this bushland and tree species of gum 400 years old plus the fig trees Hundreds of years old are natural history of the local area and must be preserved intact. And is an important for NSW, Australia and the world in cultural and natural history of this area of Karuah.
Criterion c to g 7b-32	These tree species of 400+ year old gum trees around 60 must be protected and preserved and the wildlife on this property. No off setting will ever be able to cover what will be lost to the natural environment, the local area of Karuah that has a tourist opportunity for people to come and see these trees and appreciate 400+ years of the age of these trees. These trees are a cultural significance for local, regional, state, Australia and World heritage significant trees that must be protected and preserved along with the entire bushland area for wildlife. Therefore this bushland property must be preserved and kept intact entirely.
Local heritage Items 7b-32 to 7b-33	These trees are significant. They contribute individually and collectively as 60 trees of this Size, their hollows for habitat for our wildlife cannot be mitigated if they are removed. They have a greater value to members of the community who know they exist and the wider Community starting to realise they exist. These trees reflects the socio-economic & Natural History of the area and this property and of State significance in the natural environment. These trees “form an irreplaceable part of the environmental heritage of NSW and must have some connection or association with the State in its widest sense. The age of these trees MUST be preserved and protected for past, present and future generations who saved these trees as seed trees? Present generations MUST not destroy these amazing Giants of the bush on this property on Lot 11 at Blue Rock Close Karuah NSW Australia.
7b-33 they say No artifacts Were found	ICAG Inc. Committee remember Michael Kiely having a glass case of artifacts that he has found on his property. Though sadly we did not have photos to produce. Though Michael Kiely would know the answer to this one.
7b-34	Confusing documentation on this page. Did you find any items?
Not enough time To comment Against 7b-44 To 8-27	Not enough time to respond to this section in detail in a 28 day period.

The Social Impact of the ‘proposed project’

The justification and white was of the actual impacts people are already suffering from Hunter Quarries. The actual concerns that people have for the ‘proposed project’ that will destroy the bushland including 400+ year old trees, fig trees, wildlife injury to death of any wildlife that can’t jump or fly away quickly and big distances, seeking approval to discharge off site & been represented as we would expect to ‘speak up the quarry’ that it would have little to no impact. ICAG Inc. notices that Wildlife species were kept off documents/maps.

Page No.	ICAG Inc. Comments or Concerns
8-7	They left out ALL wildlife concerns that we and others mentioned in their summary. And significant 400+ year old tree species gums & figs.
8-8	It is irrelevant their documentation says they will do things differently, when they are determined not to enclose their crushers in a sound proof building
8-8	How disgusting:- Consultants have concluded via predictions in desk top analysis & computer generated data that the impacts would be acceptable . This is false conclusion. none of it is acceptable from anyone being impacted by Hunter Quarries.
8-8	No amount of white-washing community impacts in documentation contained in the EIS or Volume 1 and 2 will ever mean it is not happening.
8-8 False desk top Predictions & False conclusion That cumulative Impacts would be “acceptable”.	False and misleading information contained on page 8-8 drawing false conclusion of “conservative predictions of potential impacts. The results indicate that cumulative residual amenity impacts would be acceptable. ICAG Inc. refutes this false and misleading conclusion as absolute rubbish! People will be impacted in this area alone by 2 different Companies and by 2 different operations operating independently with their own crushers . Both of which are determined NOT to house their crushers in sound proof building to then reduce the dust and noise on the environment, community properties including Limeburners Creek, The Branch Lane properties and further afield with dust and noise impacts that will be very real and not perceived or false readings of actual impacts not “perceived impacts from desk top analysis in the office.
8-8 to 8-12 maps	“Presenting information to the community on an ongoing basis and gathering feedback” stating “a range of mechanisms have been proposed to mitigate residual social impacts. Yet they will NOT enclose their crushers in a sound proof building reducing noise and dust impacts are pathetic on this issue of impact to the community alone. “assuming that this project is successful in alleviating community concerns” No meetings won’t fix the actual impacts people are suffering. “the project would operate with only minor additional social impacts and with acceptable cumulative social impacts. No this is untrue. In this area there will be 2 quarry companies destroying the natural environment, producing, noise, dust and discharge run off into local creek areas etc. This project is NOT acceptable operating on its own or joint cumulative impacts with Hunter Quarries. Again “mechanisms would be established to incorporate this feedback into adaptive management of the operation” when they can’t even have on their documentation or in their verbal that they will cover the crushers, stating “we don’t have too, we don’t have too, we don’t have too etc. If this project is approved why would they NOT want to cover their crushers in a sound proof building reducing noise and dust is confined before it goes up to our air and atmosphere causing climate change impacts.

Therefore this company is “breaching their own written word” within the EIS as they are Determined not to cover their crushers. Also Hunter Quarries Must be made to comply with Their operating Conditions of Consent and cover their crushers as they have done with their Other operations after being fined in 2018 \$15,000.00 for exceeding noise and dust levels. Therefore Karuah South Quarry should be an upstanding (new) quarry and do the right thing By the people they are going to impact. Should this proposal be approved from Planning or PAC and he is given approval to remove the cliff. Properties in Limeburners Creek will look down into this area, as they currently do with Hunter Quarries. This quarry proposal must not be approved or any further Hunter Quarries new proposed pits off the Branch Lane or anywhere else removing the bushland area on the North side of the Pacific Highway Entirely through approvals in the end life extinguished!

Page 8-13 that because people can see Hunter Quarries from highway or private properties their impact will be different and/or no difference is horrific. No amount of “staging of the quarry” will hide the mountain being removed and bushland destroyed, wildlife killed.

Page No.	ICAG Inc. Comments or Concerns
8-13	
Truck movements	There is a massive difference between 12 trucks or 72 trucks per day stage 1 and 20 truck movements or 120 truck movements a day in stage 2. This is blurring the truth. How many truck movements per day will pull out onto the local Branch Lane under the Highway and then travel south on the Pacific Highway. The variance is just too stupid for words in Vol 2.
8-13	We read 11.6 ha of native veg would be removed in the project area. ICAG Inc. say and the Rest of the native vegetation will go as well. So what is the combined impact? It is the full Size of the property not including the middle bit that Hunter Quarries is busily digging up And destroying.
Biodiversity Offset scheme	The amount of native veg on this property would trigger the NSW biodiversity offsetting Scheme
8-13 False and Misleading That this area Is adjoining Hunter Quarries There is a cliff Still there so this Is wrong and False documents.	This area in question is intact bushland and is protected by the mountain cliff/pit on Hunter Quarries side and bushland overburden rock slide on Michael Kiely’s property still with bush The ICAG Inc. committee representatives attended this property and the cliff is still there And current seen from properties in Limeburners Creek. REFER TO MAP SUPPLIED SHOWING THE ACTUAL BOUNDARY LINE, NOT THE WRONG BOUNDARY LINE BEING PRESENTED BY R.W.CORKERY TO PUBLIC AND GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS. THIS SHOULD BE SEEN TO BE FRAUD?
8-13	It is therefore NOT a cumulative impact consideration. Other than to protect this bushland a Area completely and intact from any further impact for tree species and wildlife species

FALSE & MISLEADING DOCUMENTATION 8-13 2nd last paragraph

Alert! ICAG Inc and people within the general public that know this property dispute the false claims made within this documentation as above 8-13. Government Departments should investigate this thoroughly as We believe this is misleading and misrepresentation of the truth on this property.

Both of these properties (Hunter quarries) and the Karuah South Quarry are not on the same land level as there is a ridge line and Hunter Quarries has not come down onto Michael’s land because the cliff edge is still present and can be seen from many locations in Karuah, Limeburners Creek, and Girvan.

Michael Kiely has either allowed Hunter Quarries to impact his land by his permission, through trespass. Or Michael Kiely has cleared his own land, regardless of either. The ridge is still current and their mapping as Stated on numerous occasions is wrong, false and misleading to what is currently still there on these properties.

In previous pages he says 14-20 jobs, now on page 8-13 he says 20 jobs. Which is it?

Page 8-14 states that there are no specific legislation requirements in NSW for the assessment of social impacts of development. Yet Environmental planning and Assessment Act 1979 refers to the evaluation of development section 4.15 (1b) “the likely impacts of that development, including environmental impacts on both the natural and built environments and social and economic impacts in the locality”

Page No.	ICAG Inc. Comments or Concerns
8-14 (1.5)	There is and will be continued impact to people. There is and will be a change to the environment, experience of the community. There is a change to people's space and seeing The natural environment being destroyed. More truck movements on the road 75 trucks give Or take/more or less per day travelling to Sydney. Changes to land knowing that 400+ year Old trees and wildlife will be destroyed and killed if this project is approved by Planning Dept. or PAC. There is and will be changes to health and wellbeing as people are Interfered with living in a beautiful area of bushland seeing it destroyed being impacted by d- Dust, noise polluted water down stream.
8-14	Highly offensive that R W Corkery & Co and Michael Kiely have concluded that "visual Outlook or other perceived hazards". When in reality people are and will continue to be Impacted by quarries in this area separately and together accelerates the impact by another New company, more new pits, more modifications etc. etc. Not perceived impact, a time Based fact of reality.
8-14	Properties are being devalued by Hunter Quarries including Limeburners Creek, Karuah The Branch Girvan. This is not a perceived impact of noise and/or dust and seeing removal Of mountain range, causing climate change impacts and removing bushland on the north Side of the pacific highway separately and collectively in a cumulative impact of bushland And wildlife extinction in this area if these quarries are approved to operate.
8-15	Government does not STOP impacting people through their approvals. They are not Sad or embarrassed or ashamed of their approvals impacting people's health, devalue of Property which does impact people in this situation on their properties in their homes every Day of the week.
8-15	"Whether the development creates fears or impacts the aspirations of impacted people" This is as ugly as the words on paper!
	There are those in society that if their nose is not bleeding, or they are not breathing the dust In, or they are not impacted by noise, they don't care, show indifference or are unempathetic To those people that are impacted. The Government approvals force these types of mining/quarry ventures onto people. Without their permission, without compensation, without assistance to move at the value of Property before it was destroyed in value by the mine/quarry.

Negative social impacts, "extend, duration, serenity, sensitivity of impacts. ICAG Inc. is most alarmed at the false justification of R W Corkery though we have been given an unfair and biased time frame from the planning Department, the Minister and the departments that set up unrealistic time frames of submission period to the general public to read and write against such large and complex documents, assists the mine/quarry at the expense of community groups/individuals that would make a comment if the time allowed. 8-15 to 8-18 as mining/quarries take down complaints "it is the fox guarding the hen house". ICAG Inc. knows that there are many more noise and dust complaints than what has been documented in Volume 2 of the EIS page 8-18.

In 2005. No one knew what this mine was intending to do. Properties in Limeburners Creek were not notified. If Government and mining are proud about what they are approving or intending to-do to the natural environment. Then advertise a brochure in everyone's letterbox in a 5-10 km radius.

Page 8-19 it took ICAG Inc. Secretary to contact community. Yet R W Corkery bounced her for at least 4 months not giving her information she requested as a property that is being impacted by Hunter Quarries/dust/visual destruction of the bushland/rainforested areas and death to all wildlife. This was both unnecessary and exhaustive. Though continued to show us how consultants use this flawed process to annoy, torment people such as our Secretary collecting information for her husband and her and the wider community,

and was denied the decency of information in the beginning which left us all frustrated. Properties in Limeburners Creek, The Branch Lane should also be included in the “principal amenity impact area”. The map on page 8-20 shows how unfair their modelling desk top analysis is. By the blue line it should be a full circle of 360 degrees to be accurately representing all in that circle of impact. “Principal amenity impact”, ICAG Inc believes that this is a false and misleading representation and needs to be redone in a 360 degrees circle from the furthest extremity North.

At our expense at North arm cove, Limeburners Creek, Tahlee Carrington and tea Gardens, Hawks Nest these people have wrongly been left out as the map does not show accurately in a 360 degrees circle from dust, noise and visual to the above areas like the ones shown on the consultant’s maps.

We would have liked to make comments against alarming and wrongful conclusions, though we do not have enough time under this false, unfair time frame set on public by Planning Dept. submission period.

8-27 - selective logging hundreds and hundreds of years ago, leaving 400+ year old gum trees, they left as seed trees for this old logging industry. Don’t try to in documents say that the bushland is insignificant, this is a false and misleading comment to make considering the vast array of plant and animal species including these massive majestic gum trees with hollows. The site has been drilled, there is weed lantana in areas, and the property has been degraded trying to confirm falsely the property is of no significance. When in reality the property is of WORLD significance from these giant tree species alone.

While our website is about mining impacts. We believe we have been misrepresented on page 8-27. We also speak out about impacts in the area of Karuah and surrounding areas are Mid North Coast. We also speak out and network with groups/individuals in the Upper Hunter towns and villages being wiped off the planet. Our Website reports about the Gloucester-Stroud Valley mining impacts, yet they have made no mention of this area in their documentation. Yet our website clearly shows this area is being removed by coal mining companies etc. And they have we feel blurred why ICAG Inc. first formed was because of a “proposed magnetite mine 2005 Group formed 2006 which then introduced me to a community group run out of Goloucester and we realised the impacts further north up the valley and the creek/river impacts to Karuah River Port Stephens.

This project **MUST** also be assessed under the Commonwealth Government and be a Controlled action with Conditions of Consent. The document signed in 2012 and has been carried across to this proposed quarry in 2019 is not right at all.

The documentation is wrong, with wrong assumptions, though not surprising. Government Departments **MUST** look at this project from 2019 and the impacts to downstream users through seeking creek/river discharge. Significant species of flora and fauna exist on this property and are being removed by Hunter Quarries around Lot 11 of this area in question to save and not approve the quarry or to destroy everything and kill wildlife in numbers undocumented through approval by either planning or PAC. ICAG Inc. request that **NO** approval to operate is given and the property is retained for history, heritage purposes for present and future generations. IAG disputes they don’t need to go to the Commonwealth Department of the Environment and Energy under the Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999.

There MUST be federal governance requirements for the project.

Next Council notes and comments. Misrepresenting Council (see email).

We are unable to respond to pages to 8-63 as there is not time.

8-64 silica dust 5.2.7 the natural environment. ICAG Inc. concerned for regional impacts caused by development, mining and quarrying. They falsely state that the project has been designed to minimise impacts upon habitat features flora and fauna. What a load of rubbish. Bio diversity credits are you people for real?

The ecologists working for the quarry, paid by Michael or R W Corkery decided that they “project have determined that impacts associated with the development did not require referral to the commonwealth department of the environment and energy. Koala impacts, potential changes to water resources in Yalimbah creek, has concluded that there would be only minor changes to these environments” ARE YOU People for real? **Fox guarding the hen house again**

The mitigated assessment outcomes for the natural environment are medium as it acknowledges that this would change but would only require temporary (for the life of the project) management community risk expectations for the natural environment remain high. Meanwhile the wildlife habitat is destroyed along with any wildlife that can't fly or jump great distances and quickly from falling trees their homes in hollows of these 400 year old trees or nests in bushes/trees. Cut the Koalas tree down with the Koala there or in another tree. No Koala no trees.

Don't approve the quarry then all wildlife remains in their habitat and people are not impacted in any way real or “perceived from the quarry consultants”.

The community is real and their understanding is right. The white-wash documentation from consultants is done so that this project that is horrendous in bushland areas comes out being “temporary” Are they for real?

8-65 “by avoiding or mitigating impacts”. Yet they will not enclose their crushers is they are approved to operate. No one can trust a mining/quarry company that they will do the right thing by the community to remove impacts dust and noise being two of many impacts that if they did what was needed would be more helpful to people that did not ask this industry to be thrust upon them and their area.

And in the limited time frame, we can't comment on every single page of the 3 volumes if we actually wanted too. So ICAG Inc. once again can't complete full reading and response to these documents.

ICAG Inc. looking at consultative committee meetings very rarely has people on that committee that are there for the community at the expense of the mine/quarry providing the 'tea and biscuits at the end of the night'. They are usually full of 'pro mining people' and do NOT represent the full community. You just have to look at Duralie/Stratford Coal and even AGL gas (formerly project) to see how flawed this process actually is.

ICAG Inc. Committee recommend our Secretary Amanda Albury to be involved on the CCC should this project be approved.

Wedgerock is joking, 28 days to read all the documentation that he feels “community has been offered substantial opportunity to review the project and has incorporated concerns and comments received to date in the design of the project”. No actually you have not.

This project has VERY HIGH risks to the community and will cause HARM.

Page No.	ICAG Inc. Comments or Concerns
8-67 Cumulative Social impacts	There are other quarries in this area pulling out the same gravel seams. Therefore this Quarry proposal does not actually need to happen. There are also other quarries in the area Of Midcoast Council, Port Stephens and Dungog areas that are not Michael Kiely though. He advised us all in 2014 that he receives royalties, the fighting between himself and Hilton Grugeon meant that an entire new area of bushland was destroyed that will only get worse

	As Hunter quarries scars up the landscape, destroying bushland and killing wildlife North
	Hunter quarries does produce noise and dust
	People's homes ARE being impacted by dust, noise and polluted water in tanks and will Continue under any of the projects particularly if they refuse to cover their crushers.
	The local bushland environment is being destroyed right before everyone's eyes. Removing Mountains of old growth forests are not something to be proud about.
	The existing Hunter Quarries is impacting people's health and this will accelerate if Michael Kiely's Karuah South Quarry is approved.
	The gravel is under the bushland so YES the bushland/wildlife will be removed.
	The public does not believe that Government and mining/quarry operators operate for the People that are or will be impacted by this pending mine or quarry and this is more than Disgraceful by Planning Dept./Ministers/PAC/Land & Environment Court approvals. Though Sometimes these departments say NO e.g. Gloucester Resources/Rocky Hill mine. We Request that the same principles of NO are given to Karuah South Quarry.
8-67 on the Community has No confidence In Gov. approvals Or operating.	Mining companies/quarries/government do NOT operate recognising that their approvals, Decisions and operating do impact people. They see these people as not registering at all. They keep these people off their records. They don't report accurately if at all noise and Dust complaints. The fox is guarding the hen house. And it's a sick ugly process that Continues to allow this type of impact on people living on their own properties/homes.

Consultants have miss quoted property owners impacted. They have justified wrongly that the impacts people are suffering can be coped with.

They have stated that Hunter quarries are operating within the level prescribed by the NSW guidelines and legislation. No one comes from Government with complaints re: noise and dust, or very rarely.

The actual impact is people telling consultants and ICAG Inc. their real-time impacts.

Consultants and Government can continue to down play these peoples impacts written in 3 volumes of the EIS that the impact of one or the cumulative impact of 2 or more remains the same impact is as stupid as the words written on the page.

The documentation down plays the actual impacts people suffer even inside their homes from dust and noise from Hunter Quarries. How or why would Michael Kiely be any different or any other company that may take up residence on that property if this project is approved?

The conclusion is baseless. Written by the Consultants for the purpose of justifying down the actual impacts that people are suffering.

Miss representing the actual truth of the impacts. Consultants have falsely written that the impacts are not experienced constantly by the community. Again we believe this misleads the reader, the government departments and actually hides the truth of impacts by dust and noise coming from Hunter Quarries across the highway or to Limeburners Creek is the reality of those people being impacted by Government and/or local council approval to operate, with NO regard for the actual impacts one quarry let alone 2 quarries is going to have on people. The only time noise impacts stop is if they are NOT operating at all.

The only time dust impacts stop is not operating at all. Or the day has no wind to pull dirt off the uncovered overburden dumps of Hunter Quarries built higher than the tree line. Government compliance Departments MUST stop these impacts on the community and force them to cover their crushers.

Page No.	ICAG Inc. Comments or Concerns
8-68 5.5	Watching bushland mountains being destroyed and wildlife dying in numbers going In documents is a drastic change and negative social impact for everyone in the community.
8-68	They acknowledge dust and noise will be generated and has falsely written that the Cumulative dust impacts between Hunter Quarries and them would remain within assessment criterial. Yet there is nothing for ICAG Inc to read on this issue. This should be in the EIS As we have no idea what this is other than to say the justification is wrong. Cumulative Impact of 2 different companies operating together is $1 + 1 = 2$ impacts not one.
“	Long term impacts are bushland is removed. Wildlife dead. Mountains removed. Holes In ground filling up with sediment laden water, discharging off property. The long term Impacts are forever. This is a false statement on page 8-68 from R W Corkery.
“	Again false comment and summary. People impacted are actually impacted. No justification that as the project commence there will be a temporary change and residents understand And a likely to adapt to the change. Bull Crap!
“	The natural environment being destroyed would result in social impact not “may result in the Documentation”.
Office of Environment and Heritage is respon	Office of Environment and Heritage is responsible for handing over VAST areas of bushland Old growth forests to be cleared. Wildlife and flora on their protection lists they keep handin ‘over and the entire bushland on the north pacific highway is being removed through Ruthless quarrying over the entire areas all at once at the expense of the wildlife.
FRAUD? 8-68	No bio-diversity off set could ever replace the 400+ year old gum trees and it is criminal We believe that these species and the hundreds of year old fig trees have also not been Shown at all in the EIS.
	No amount of feel good community meetings will replace what will be lost in flora and in Fauna if this project is approved in any part thereof and therefore must be rejected entirely.
	Impacts will be immediate to bushland and wildlife. Impacts downstream as they discharge Off property if approved to do this by Planning and/or PAC will alter the downstream Ecology of natural water sources. Any mitigation measures are just words on paper.
	Sense of place, property values, health and wellbeing, local heritage and 400 year old trees And wildlife will be impacted.
8-68	It is not residual fear this is dreadful justification. The impacts are real, happen each day Hunter quarries are open impacting the wider community. No amount of public meetings Will ever reduce the impact this ‘proposed quarry’ is seeking to do to the bushland area.
8-68	“Proposed mitigation, they won’t cover their crushers. So anything else you try to do is Baseless garbage.
LIARS! (last paragraph)	And “while these residual impacts are possible, the community is not vulnerable to impact an given the predicted impacts are not significant, has the capacity to adapt.
8-69	Concern that they want to hold CCC meetings with Hunter Quarries. This is wrong And removes two independent CCC Committee. The fox are playing together justifying their In existence. Alert! To the Government Departments this is a VERY bad idea to combine Both CCC.
	Who manages the complaints records?
	Limeburners Creek properties, the Branch properties are discriminated against as they have Not put these areas into being directly impacted. Yet this is not true and must be rectified. Properties anywhere should be able to register for blasting notification. Limeburners Creek Property wants to be notified as the dust comes to them on an easterly breeze from Hunter Quarries and to date, this mining boss is inconsiderate for what his mine is doing to surround Areas.
	Paying money into groups we see as a paid silence. Though this should have been made Clearer just how much money he was putting out to the community each year?

	They plan to have open days on the property really. Book ICAG Inc. Committee and Our Associates in for this site tour. Considering we have been refused a Site Tour of one of Their main groups assisting them in their ‘meet and greet’ community.
--	---

We have run out of time to discuss anything further as we would have liked pages 8-70 onwards due to unfair time constraints.

Falsely stating again that Karuah east Quarry operation is satisfying all relevant assessment criteria. No they have NOT covered their crushers. They do NOT use water to stop dust leaving the property like bush fire smoke across the entire 6 lanes of highway. They impact people with their dust, noise and blasting/machinery and crusher noise during the times of operating and dust comes off their property in wind events.

ICAG Inc. rejects that “CUMULATIVE IMPACTS WOULD BE “ACCEPTABLE”. This is an ugly ploy of all mining companies/quarries that they will not impact the environment or people. Yet reality tells us all the complete opposite.

If you are approved COVER YOUR CRUSHER IN A SOUND PROOF BUILDING to reduce noise and dust in a 360 degree area around you.

Anything we read in Volume 2 convinced us this project must be rejected entirely.

Yours faithfully
ICAG Inc. Committee
c/- Secretary
Amanda Albury

(Volume 1 from Page 17 and 19 below)

Volume 1 – Parts 1 to 4 – AIR QUALITY, NOISE,

TRAFFIC, BIO-DIVERSITY REPORT

Karuah South Quarry SSD 17_8795

The unfair time constraints put on the general public has been done so that individuals and groups cannot read the documentation in the unfair timeframe given by Planning Dept/Minister legislation which has been done to stop people being able to read these documents, organise independent flora, fauna, ecologist experts to look at the property and look at the documentation.

Complaint:- We have not had time to read each word on every page due to the unfair time constraints put on the community during a submission period of 28 days with extension period after this time to add to submissions sent in by end of submission period 24th April to 21st May 2019.

Page Number	ICAG Inc. - Comments and Concerns of EIS Volume 1
1-13	We dispute that modelling exercises are actually accurate to show the impacts of dust and Noise produced from Hunter Quarries already and that Karuah South Quarry Michael Kiely Would add to this noise with his 'proposed project' should it be approved. 1 + 1 company = 2 companies producing noise, dust, bushland and wildlife death, discharge downstream. Though each company does or will have many pits.
	Did they actually do real time modelling to see the dust from Hunter Quarries? Or Did they keep their crushers turned down low during this process that we see from Duralie Coal and Stratford Coal more than co-incidence ICAG Inc believe.
	The fox guarding the hen house on the actual impacts VS desk top analysis and we thinks'. The conclusions are wrong though typical of Consultants working for mining/quarries
	Hunter Quarries should have been made to turn their crushers up full speed, with dust flying everywhere and on a windy day picking up the dust and looking like smoke from a fire. This then would give you the real time impacts the consultant need to do 'real time dust and noise monitoring.
	Will they go into a paid impact of noise and dust with property owners to compensate these people impacted?

We believe their modelling is missing representing the actual truth of impact, as they have drawn the wrong conclusion that their operating would be of no more impact. Is as false as their documentation combined.

This gravel mine is not in the best interest of the community, majority of people and surrounding areas that will be impacted.

The gravel is for the Sydney market he states, providing 14 to 20 jobs for 25 years worth of destruction on the environment. Oyster industry and Tourism does not destroy the natural environment, provides many more thousands of jobs than 14-20 and the oysters go to the Sydney market bringing in billions (?) of dollars per year.

Where are these landowners prepared to accept higher impacts on their land by entering into suitable negotiated agreements with the operators? Now if this was done with Michael. And then a new company took it over. Where would these people stand then?

Page 1-39 - The noise and dust will travel more than 2km as shown on the map with the 360 degrees radius. Their diagrammes/desk top analysis, having dust and noise stopping at right angles is misrepresenting what will actually happen.

Air quality done at Wallsend is a bit too far away don't you think for a comparison? Need further explanation for this one.

They have refused to put in PM 2.5 dust monitors and actually don't go into detail if they are planning to have a fixed monitoring system or not? Annexure 3 of what volume? Done we believe to be as confusing as possible within their documentation.

Page numbers are missing; page numbers are out of order. All done we believe to be confusing.

Wind direction map 1-42 we don't believe is accurate as wind would blow in all directions not just west as their diagramme is showing falsely we believe. Which means it would carry noise and dust to other areas outside of their map system graph. ICAG Inc. believes their mapping and diagrammes have been done to misrepresent the truth of noise and dust impacts. If this quarry is approved more of what Hunter Quarries does will continue by two companies.

Koalas found on this property. To falsely say that the "project is "unlikely" to "significantly" impact the Koala and referral is not required. Actually we dispute all that they falsely claim and believe that this should have been looked at very closely the entire project from Commonwealth/Federal Government.

Grey headed Flying Fox:- if you continue to hand over bushland areas it IS impacting wildlife. This property has 200+ year old fig trees that these flying foxes feed off along with other animals and live in their hollows. Then there is the 400 year old Eucalyptus trees that also feed Flying foxes and other wildlife on this property that if this quarry is approved loose these food source trees. If they lose their bushland areas, they move into parks like they have done in Singleton.

This bushland area North Pacific Highway must be left for the wildlife that are dependent on these bushland areas. If approval happens under PAC then it is wildlife extinguished in numbers going undocumented.

If bats and animals lose their homes and food trees ICAG Inc. rejects the lame excuse on page 4-26 that "the proposed action would not directly or indirectly cause mortality to individuals.

ICAG Inc. attaches page 4-9, 4-24, 4-25, 4-27, 4-28, 4-29, 4-30, Flora and Fauna

Yalimbah Creek map figure 5. Boundary of Hunter Quarries is in the wrong location and has misrepresented the truth we believe. Attached Page 4-21, 4-23.

Attached page 4-15 map showing clearly how much bushland has been destroyed by Hunter Quarries, how much more they intend to take and how much bushland Karuah South Quarry will remove if they are approved.

Attached noise Acoustical table. Page 2-17

Dust – page 2-31 we felt that the dust impacts compared to noise impacts in a diagrammatical way lacks the same area of impact. **Wind brings Hunter Quarries dust further than 3Kms away, how are you planning to stop dust from doing this off property if approved?**

Blasting together or a different times Pg -201 Hunter Quarries does not notify people as they should and does NOT change their sign out the front on The Branch Lane Corner and Blue Rock Close.

Anything ICAG Inc. Committee read in Volume 1, we are convinced this project must be rejected entirely.

Yours faithfully
ICAG Inc. Committee
c/- Secretary
Amanda Albury