



Our reference: EF14/9902: DOC14/489989
Contact: Michael Heinze 02 6229 7002

Department of Planning & Environment
Mining Projects
GPO Box 39
SYDNEY NSW 2001

Attention: Margaret Kirton

6 October 2016

Dear Ms Kirton

Re: Gunlake Quarry Extension Project (SSD_7090)

I refer to an email from Megan Dawson of the Department of Planning & Environment (DPE) dated 26 September 2016 regarding the Response to Submissions Report (RTS) for the proposed Gunlake Quarry Extension Project (SSD_7090). The email requested the Environment Protection Authority (EPA) review the RTS report and provide comment.

The EPA has reviewed the RTS and acknowledges that the proponent has incorporated a number of the issues raised by the EPA in its submission on the Environmental Impact Statement dated 25 May 2016, into an updated Statement of Commitments for the project.

Noise

The EPA welcomes the commitment by the proponent to enclose the primary crusher within 4 months of an approval of the project. While some discussion has been presented in the RTS with regard to remodelling of the predicted noise impact by enclosing the primary crusher, the EPA suggests that, as a condition of approval, the proponent be required to validate the noise reduction achieved by the enclosure of the primary crusher within three months of its installation. If the noise reduction is measured to be above predicted noise levels, additional mitigation measures should be required of the proponent to comply with the predictions in the RTS.

Air

The proponent disagrees with the EPA's suggestion of the installation of additional High Volume Air Samplers (HVAS) at Receptors R4 and R6. The EPA requests DPE consider requiring the placement of an additional HVAS at Receptor 4 (now owned by Gunlake Quarries) which is located generally to the west of the Gunlake Quarry and (in the prevailing westerly winds) would generally provide a good indication of ambient air quality upwind of the Quarry. This would allow the contribution of the quarry to dust generation to be more accurately estimated.

In the past, when the EPA has received dust complaints about the quarry, it has been difficult to establish the contribution of the quarry to ambient dust levels with the only HVAS located downwind of the quarry, at Receptor R1 (in the prevailing westerly winds).

In addition, the EPA recommends the placement of an additional HVAS at Receptor R6, which is located generally to the south-east of the Quarry and is not associated with the quarry operations, unlike R1 and R4. This would provide a good indication of quarry operational impacts on private lands. It would also

provide a more reliable indicator of dust impacts as the quarry pit moves southwards over the coming years and receptor R1 becomes located progressively more northerly of the quarry pit.

The EPA has no further comments to make on the RTS, but would appreciate the opportunity to review any draft conditions of consent which the Department of Planning & Environment might propose for the modification, should it consider approval of the proposal.

Should you have any queries or wish to discuss this matter, please contact Michael Heinze on Ph: 6229 7002.

Yours sincerely



JULIAN THOMPSON
Unit Head – South East Region
NSW Environment Protection Authority