

DPEMP SUPPLEMENT

UPPER DERWENT VALLEY HARD-ROCK QUARRY, MAYDENA



CONTENTS

FOREWORD 3

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION 15

 PCAB COMMENTS15

 Information sought15

 Response15

 Information sought16

 Response16

 ON-SITE OPERATIONAL NOISE17

 Information sought17

 Response18

 TRAFFIC NOISE18

 Information sought18

 Response18

 AIR EMISSIONS19

 Information sought19

 Response19

FOREWORD

A Development Proposal and Environmental Management Plan (DPEMP) was prepared to support a Development Application by Jenkins Hire Pty Ltd and Stroud Pty Limited (the ‘proponent’) for a Planning Permit to establish a hard-rock quarry at Roberts Hill, Maydena.

The application sought approval for production levels of up to 30,000 cubic metres per annum, of which all this volume may be crushed and/or screened.

The proposed quarry operation includes two activities defined within Schedule 2 of the *Environmental Management and Pollution Control Act 1994 (Tas)* (EMPCA) –

- ‘5. Extractive Industries. (a) Quarries: the extraction of any rock or gravel and producing 5 000 cubic metres or more of rock or gravel per year’; and
- ‘6. Materials Handling. (a) Crushing, Grinding or Milling: processing (by crushing, grinding, milling or separating into different sizes by sieving, air elutriation or in any other manner) of ... (ii) rock, ores or minerals at a rate in excess of 1 000 cubic metres per year’.

Level 2 Activities must be referred by the planning authority (in this case, Derwent Valley Council) and to the Environment Protection Authority (the EPA), for assessment under EMPCA.

This DPEMP provided information on -

1. the present environment of the proposed hard-rock quarry, including such matters as zoning (planning scheme), land use, flora, soils and climate. It also describes the hard-rock quarry operation in detail, the emissions sources, and the development timetable; and
2. each of the potential environmental issues associated with the hard-rock quarry, and provides detail regarding the mitigation measures that will be undertaken to address each issue. Infrastructure matters of the expanded operation are also discussed.

Council advertised the application for a 28-day period within which anyone could make a representation about the project. When the representation period closed, the Council forwarded all representations to the EPA.

The Environment Protection Authority (EPA) received representations (provided by the planning authority) and comments from referral agencies in relation to planning application DA 012/216 and its supporting documentation.

A supplementary report to the DPEMP has been requested of the proponent by the EPA.

Information *required* by the EPA is listed in Table 1. In addition, the EPA has encouraged the proponent to the public and agency comments listed in Table 2.

Information has been provided where requested by the EPA.

TABLE 1: ADDITIONAL INFORMATION REQUIRED BY THE EPA BOARD

Nil.

TABLE 2: OTHER MATTERS RAISED DURING THE PUBLIC CONSULTATION PERIOD

Representa tion No./ Agency	Issue	Comment	Further Info requested [yes/no]	EPA Comments
Department of State Growth	Access Road	State Growth will require sealing of access road for 25 metres to be undertaken prior to operation, to prevent transfer of clay and gravel onto the through road. A permit for this sealing will be required under Section 16 of the Roads and Jetties Act.	No	
Department of State Growth MRT	Karst	MRT supports the conclusion in the karst survey report that the risk of encountering significant subsurface karst development is significantly lower in the northern part of the proposed mining lease area.	No	
PCAB	Fauna	PCAB supports the intent stated in the DPEMP to lower the speed limit between dusk and dawn to reduce the impact to Tasmanian Devils in the area that may be impacted upon by increased traffic overnight. It is recommended that additional mitigation measures are implemented in accordance with 'the Devil Guidelines'. The Guidelines can be found at: http://dpiwwe.tas.gov.au/Documents/Devil%20Survey%20Guidelines%20and%20Advice.pdf	Yes	Clarify what additional mitigation measures will be undertaken to mitigate for roadkill impacts associated with night-time traffic.
PCAB	Karst	<i>Procedure to follow in the event of discovery of a significant karst feature:</i> PCAB supports the 'Karst Feature Identification and Management Procedure' outlined in the DPEMP but recommends that it be created as a standalone document for use on site by all staff. It is also recommended that the procedure should also be more comprehensive, including greater detail on how to identify significant karst features. PCAB would appreciate the opportunity to comment on this document once it has been further developed.	Yes	Clarify whether a standalone 'Karst Feature Identification and Management Procedure' document will be developed for approval prior to commencement of operations.

		<p><i>Set-back distance from significant karst formations:</i></p> <p>PCAB notes that the new set-back distances are included only in the DPEMP maps and not in the text. The set-back distances should be reviewed after Stage 1.</p> <p><i>Review of environmental conditions between quarry stages:</i></p> <p>PCAB notes that it is proposed that blasting data collected during stage 1 will only be kept for 5 yrs. It is recommended that all data is kept for the duration of the project to ensure that any review undertaken is completed with a strong foundation of data.</p>		Clarify whether all blast data will be kept for the duration of the project.
3, 4, 5, 6, 11, 13		The development will be a boost for the local community with increased employment, local investment and economic activity.	No	Comment in support of proposal
3, 6, 8, 10, 11, 13, 14, 15, 16, 18, 22		<p>A local (southern) supply of lime will benefit agricultural producers.</p> <p>Ag. lime comes from Northern Tasmania, representing a significant cost to the producer. One representor indicated that they could save between \$15,000 to \$20,000 per year in freight if they were able to purchase lime from Southern Tasmania.</p>	No	Comment in support of proposal
7, 9, 12, 17, 19, 20, 21	On-site operational noise	<p>The following comments and issues were raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The nearest residence is located at the old ANM site, approximately half the distance as that stated in the VIPAC report. Noise levels at this location are between 45 dBA and 50 dBA according to the report. Representor considers that they will be subject to unacceptable noise levels. Noise will be clearly audible in Maydena and will create a significant burden for the community, and undermine its potential as a tourism base. Noise levels from the quarry operations should below minimum background levels and not be audible day or night at the nearest residence or in Maydena. 	Yes	<p>Describe measures that will be implemented to ensure noise levels do not exceed 45 dBA at the old ANM site buildings.</p> <p>Measures may include for example, drill shrouds and strategically positioned earthen bunds around the crusher, in place for the entire time the crusher is located in that particular location.</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noises emission from the crushing plant would be continuous. It will be a noisy, with one representor questioning what mitigation will be put in place. Questioned what happens if the developer wants to use louder or additional equipment than that assumed in the VIPAC modelling report. The quarry does not comply with Quarry Code of Practice guidelines with respect to noise. Drilling between the hours of 0700 and 1900 hrs and clearing, ripping, stockpiling etc 24hrs/day are unacceptable, especially if, such operations will be audible at the nearest sensitive site or Maydena, particularly at night. Site operations should be restricted to 9am to 5 pm (with no operations on Sunday), with noise levels no greater than 5dBA higher than ambient daytime noise for a sensitive use site. A daytime limit of 40 dBA and night-time limit of 24 dBA at the nearest sensitive site should be applied. It was further suggested that the daytime limit should be 35 dBA (5 dBA above LA90 ambient level) at the nearest sensitive site, contending that Maydena is a sensitive area given the importance of tourism). The developer should provide, commission and maintain an approved noise measuring station on the western edge of Maydena, with data available to the public and State government. One representor suggested would be useful to have information on low frequency (5-30hz) emissions from extraction and drilling operations. 		
9, 12, 17, 19	Noise assessment methodology	<p>The following comments and issues were raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Longer measurement time frame should have been used to determine true minimum ambient noise level, e.g. at least 1 month. 	No	The noise assessment is considered adequate.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The method used to measure noise appears dubious, with no control measures, not clear what the weather conditions were during monitoring, influence of extraneous noise sources and proximity of sound level meter to the residence. • Considers it is essential to know what the true ambient noise level is without the limitation of the measuring equipment. • One representor Quoted Tasmanian Noise Measurement Procedures Manual 2008, and queried the claim by the consultants that all noise measurements made in general accordance with the stated procedures. • VIPAC report needs to be checked for accuracy. • VIPAC should have obtained actual real noise data generated from the proposed site, rather than rely on modelling, with one representor questioning whether trails at the site have been undertaken. • Representor questioned the accuracy of sound power data used in VIPAC report, DBA levels, and whether the crushing plant noise emissions had been modelled. • No figure is given in Table 4 of VIPAC report for predicted SPL at the nearest sensitive site for extraction and drilling under worst case weather conditions. • Activities stated in Table 3 of the DPEMP (operating hours) should correlate with those presented in the VIPAC report (e.g. pg. 18). 		
9,12,17, 19	Traffic noise	<p>Noise pollution from the trucks passing through towns 24hours/day is unacceptable, and a large concern. Engine brake noise a particular concern at night. Residents are entitled to peace and quiet in residential areas, especially at night.</p> <p>Representor noted that, unlike forestry practices, disturbance from quarry trucks is expected to will continue for a long time. While log trucks operate at all hours, there are very few, often none, each day, however</p>	Yes	Clarify what mitigation measures will be undertaken to ensure noise from night-time cartage operations does not result in a noise nuisance to residences on Gordon River Road.

		<p>when logging operations do occur, there is significant noise disturbance from trucks on Gordon River Road throughout the day and night.</p> <p>Truck movements should be restricted to daylight hours during non-daylight savings time, and 9am to 5 pm rest of year, or 8 am to 6 pm in the least.</p> <p>Representor ‘strenuously’ opposes the proposed site access, as it is directly opposite their entrance and are concerned about air brake and associated truck noise.</p> <p>Representor questioned the conditions under which ‘backlog’ would occur, and the time periods.</p>		
7, 12, 17, 21	Karst	<p>One representor was concerned about effects of blast vibrations on their spring water source, although acknowledged that the blast vibration analysis was extensive.</p> <p>Karst systems and considered rare and will be damaged by proposal.</p> <p>Karst formations in all 3 areas should be verified by systematic drilling prior to commencement of operations.</p> <p>With regard to sinkholes in Block 2, one representor questioned what precautions will be undertaken to ensure a massive collapse does not occur.</p>	No	The DPEMP contains sufficient information for the purposes of assessment.
2, 9, 19, 21	Road Kill / Threatened species	<p>The development will significantly increase the amount of roadkill.</p> <p>The proposal does not consider the impact of a large number of truck movements on threatened species. The section of road west of Westerway already has a high incidence of roadkill.</p> <p>The study on threatened species is limited: the fauna survey is inadequate, Wedge tailed eagles reside in the area, they can be easily disturbed at a distance of kilometres, they and other threatened species are likely to use the tall forest that covers part of the proposed site.</p>	No	<p>The study on threatened species is considered sufficient for the purposes of assessment.</p> <p>See comment above on road kill.</p>

<p>7, 2, 9, 17, 19, 20, 21</p>	<p>Land use / planning</p>	<p>Maydena has seen accommodation and tourism business grow rapidly over the last 10 years, with a number of attractions in the local area, and new tourist ventures.</p> <p>The quarry would destroy the serenity of the local pristine environment, significantly impact the local tourism industry and the future tourism potential for Maydena and surrounds, with heavy vehicle traffic and noise cited as major concerns.</p> <p>One representor, owner of cottage accommodation and tourist business, noted that guest’s reasons for returning are because of the pristine area. Another noted that a quarry would greatly impact tourism and their future plans for a health retreat.</p> <p>Several representors noted a potential conflict between the proposed quarry and Dirt Art’s mountain bike venture at Eagle’s Eerie, with concerns regarding heavy vehicle access along Robarts road, and damage to the amenity and reputation of the valley, with impact on the mountain bike venture.</p> <p>A representor stated that they were a tourist to Tasmania who would change their regular travels to Mt Field National Park due to the quarry development.</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Not a matter for the EPA Board</p>
<p>7, 2, 1, 9, 12, 19, 21</p>	<p>Traffic safety</p>	<p>Traffic movements are a major concern from a safety point of view, for tourists and local traffic and towns people, especially along Gordon River Rd with its narrow nature and bends.</p> <p>The road between Maydena and Westerway is not designed for large trucks, does not have any passing points and only limited roadside, and</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Not a matter for the EPA Board</p>

		<p>contains zones such as the Possum Shed Café where tourists and children are in close proximity.</p> <p>The roads are already under significant pressure from existing heavy traffic, i.e. log trucks already significant safety concern.</p> <p>Damage to roads also a concern with regard to road safety.</p> <p>Safety concerns in the local towns should be addressed.</p> <p>A representor considered that an alternative transport system such as rail should be used and or assessed.</p> <p>A representor considers the local Council has a degree of obligation to ensure public safety on roads within its municipality, acknowledging that some roads fall under state Government management.</p>		
9	Quality of life	A resident and bussiness operator in Maydena, has significant concerns regarding the impact that the proposed development will have on the quality of life in Maydena.	No	Not a matter for the Board (Note, issues relating to noise, air and water quality are addressed elsewhere).
9, 19, 21	DPEMP bias	<p>Questions whether the DPEMP makes a sincere attempt to address impacts of the proposed quarry.</p> <p>Data for the sound power levels used in the VIPAC report should have been sourced from an independent acoustic specialist.</p>	No	
9, 17	Land values	Concerned that the quarry will affect real estate values.	No	Not a matter for the Board
9, 19, 21	Road maintenance	The road currently requires continuous upgrading, repairs and maintenance. Damage to roads will significantly increase due to heavy vehicle traffic associated with the quarry.	No	Not a matter for the Board

		<p>Representor questioned the level of State Government funding for damage caused by the trucks. It was also questioned whether the developer will contribute to road maintenance.</p>		
7, 9, 12, 17, 19, 21	Air emissions	<p>Impact of diesel emissions on Maydena residents from machinery was not addressed. Noted that the quarry is downwind from Maydena where children and elderly reside. This was regarded as not acceptable.</p> <p>Developer should provide and maintain an air monitoring station, with information freely available to the public and State Government. Equipment powered by other sources such as LPG or electricity could be used.</p> <p>Noted that limestone is to be refined on site for direct agricultural application. A representor queried how this level of production may impact dust emissions.</p> <p>Noted that dust will be kept to a minimum by being wet down and retaining vegetation. Representor questioned what dust mitigation would apply for truck movements.</p> <p>A representor was unconvinced the mitigation measures outlined in section G-1-1 of the DPEMP will be effective. Suggested dust monitoring be undertaken.</p>	Yes	Describe measures that will be undertaken to prevent the escape of material that may blow or spill from the vehicle during cartage.
9, 19	Water quality	<p>The quarry development may result in the silting of Pillinger’s Creek and Tyenna River. Silt levels and water quality should be monitored prior to commencement of the proposal.</p>	No	The DPEMP contains sufficient information for the purposes of assessment.
9, 17, 19	Rehabilitation	<p>Recognised issues such as weed and soil disease and water quality and questioned the obligations of the developer to rehabilitate the site, and</p>	No	The DPEMP contains sufficient information for the purposes of assessment.

		adequacy and amount of bond to ensure costs recovered in the event of proponent bankruptcy (for example).		
12	Proponent experience	Questioned experience of the proponent in managing a quarry in an environmentally significant area, with reference to the sites proximity to the South West World Heritage Area.	No	Not a matter for the Board
12	Planning	Noted that the consultants in their report made reference to development of an extractive industry in the planning scheme, but did not specify the Derwent Valley Planning Scheme.	No	Not a matter for the Board
12	Blasting	Suggested that it would be beneficial to have a siren sounded so Maydena residents are not caught unaware when blasting is conducted.	No	The DPEMP contains sufficient information for the purposes of assessment.
12	Infrastructure / equipment (Environmentally hazardous materials)	Noted that no amenities for staff will be on site unless during a busy period. Questioned where equipment will be serviced.	No	The DPEMP contains sufficient information for the purposes of assessment.
12	Risk assessment	Suggested risk assessments will need to be undertaken, and questioned frequency of assessment.	No	The DPEMP contains sufficient information for the purposes of assessment.
7, 17, 19, 20, 21	Socio-economic aspects (Note also comments above in support of the proposal).	The economic future of the local area will be predominately based on tourism (with example of Dirt Art's mountain bike venture), with the benefits from tourism greater than those from a local limestone quarry. Representor considered advantages and disadvantages of the quarry and whether the proposal should be evaluated by an accredited economic agency. Also considered whether future resource requirements can be better met by expansion of existing supply. Another considered that the value placed on the limestone is nothing compared to the disturbance that will be generated by the quarry, which will continue for the life of the ore body.	No	Not a matter for the Board.

7, 17	Transport route	An alternative route to Gordon River Rd is via the Styx Rd to the Lyell Highway at Karanja, as commonly used by log trucks. Recommends that this be specified as the route for trucks.	No	See comment above in relation to traffic noise.
19	Assessment process	Letter advising of proposed development was not issued to ratepayers who were new to the area. Asking for submissions over the Christmas break, when people are largely on holiday, is a known strategy by Council and the EPA to minimize the potential negative feedback. The submission period should be extended.	No	The assessment process has been undertaken in accordance with relevant policy and legislation.
19	Auditing	Developer should provide an independent suitably qualified person to monitor and document all environmental aspects and report to the EPA.	No	The DPEMP contains sufficient information for the purposes of assessment.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION

The following information is provided for those items where the EPA has stated 'yes' in the 'Further Info requested [yes/no]' column of Table 2.

PCAB COMMENTS

- PCAB supports the intent stated in the DPEMP to lower the speed limit between dusk and dawn to reduce the impact to Tasmanian Devils in the area that may be impacted upon by increased traffic overnight. It is recommended that additional mitigation measures are implemented in accordance with 'the Devil Guidelines'. The Guidelines can be found at: <http://dpiwwe.tas.gov.au/Documents/Devil%20Survey%20Guidelines%20and%20Advice.pdf>

Information sought

- Clarify what additional mitigation measures will be undertaken to mitigate for roadkill impacts associated with night-time traffic.

Response

Night time traffic is unavoidable for the project; however, it will be limited in its volume. The volume of truck movements from the quarry at night-time will be a fraction of what occurs from the forestry industry in the region.

The guidelines referred to by PCAB provide on page 19 of that document the following mitigation measures for road construction or upgrade and increased night time road use -

- Avoid night time use of the road where practicable.
- Reduce speed limit on private roads (particularly at night).
- Reduce speed limit on roads (particularly at night) where practicable.
- Deploy facilities such as ripple strips that alert drivers to hazards.
- Map high risk road sections and install advisory signage.
- Undertake education and awareness training for drivers associated with the development.
- Increase the visibility of wildlife on roads by the use of a lightly-coloured aggregate seal.
- Reduce the volume of traffic at night (e.g. provide buses for workers) where practicable.
- Where practicable, and noting relevant controls, clear vegetation on roadsides in high risk areas to enhance view field for drivers.
- Inspect road regularly and remove dead wildlife if safe to do so.

The proponent has committed to the following for the Tasmanian devil (and spotted-tailed quoll, which is a threatened species known in the Maydena region) –

'Commitment 5 - Tasmanian devil (*Sarcophilus harrisii*) and Spotted-tailed quoll (*Dasyurus maculatus maculatus*). The following management measures are proposed for these species –

- Piles of slash/logs created through vegetation removal will be arranged such that it can be used in site rehabilitation works to create quoll habitat;
- Any potential Tasmanian devil dens located during construction works will be left undisturbed until they are checked by a suitably qualified person and advice given as to their management; and

- A speed limit on Roberts Road of 40 km/hr will be imposed from dusk to dawn.'

The ecological assessments done for the project indicate that there are no high-risk road sections near or within the vicinity of the project site as no Tasmanian devil roadkill was observed.

The limitation of truck numbers during night-time hours via Table 3 of the DPEMP is consistent with 'reducing the volume of traffic' in the guidelines.

The proponent has no issues with a reduction in the speed limit for all road users from the junction of the Gordon River and Florentine Roads through to the eastern side of Fitzgerald if this would assist with reducing roadkill events for native wildlife. Road speed limits is a matter however for the Department of State Growth.

Staff will be trained in the behavioural expectations of the proponent, as is the case for their other projects, and this would of course include discussion about driving to the conditions (and within the speed limits as is required by law), avoiding the use of engine breaks in residential-zoned areas, and the 40km/hr speed limit on Roberts Road.

No additional measures are considered necessary.

- Procedure to follow in the event of discovery of a significant karst feature: PCAB supports the 'Karst Feature Identification and Management Procedure' outlined in the DPEMP but recommends that it be created as a standalone document for use on site by all staff. It is also recommended that the procedure should also be more comprehensive, including greater detail on how to identify significant karst features. PCAB would appreciate the opportunity to comment on this document once it has been further developed.
- Set-back distance from significant karst formations: PCAB notes that the new set-back distances are included only in the DPEMP maps and not in the text. The set-back distances should be reviewed after Stage 1.
- Review of environmental conditions between quarry stages: PCAB notes that it is proposed that blasting data collected during stage 1 will only be kept for 5 yrs. It is recommended that all data is kept for the duration of the project to ensure that any review undertaken is completed with a strong foundation of data.

Information sought

- Clarify whether a standalone 'Karst Feature Identification and Management Procedure' document will be developed for approval prior to commencement of operations.
- Clarify whether all blast data will be kept for the duration of the project.

Response

The proponent has no objection to the 'Karst Feature Identification and Management Procedure' as written in the DPEMP being a standalone document.

If PCAB and/or the EPA want the document to 'be more comprehensive, including greater detail on how to identify significant karst features' then it [PCAB] would need to be an active contributor to such an expanded document.

While we appreciate that PCAB would appreciate the opportunity to comment on this document once it has been further developed, the proponent expects PCAB to be an active contributor to the document, including the provision of expertise and advice (text, images etc) which may be in the form of materials/information from the geomorphological specialists in DPIPW.

We see no plausible reason of why the current procedure in the DPEMP could not be successfully applied until such time a new version is prepared by the proponent with direct and active contribution by PCAB (ie not merely a review of drafts). There should not need to be a *secondary approval* required of the procedure

before works start at the site – Block 1 has no evidence of karstic features so the likelihood of finding anything there is extremely low to nil. The permit, if conditioned to be as PCAB suggests, may result in months passing before works could commence on the site.

A minimum 5 years' storage of blast data has been nominated by the proponent. Longer term storage may be conducted by the proponent however it would be at their discretion as the data may be voluminous – we are talking about a 90+ year project, so that is a lot of data to keep for its duration.

The proponent has no issues with providing the blast data to DPI/PWE/EPA for their longer-term storage.

ON-SITE OPERATIONAL NOISE

The following comments and issues were raised:

- The nearest residence is located at the old ANM site, approximately half the distance as that stated in the VIPAC report. Noise levels at this location are between 45 dBA and 50 dBA according to the report. Representor considers that they will be subject to unacceptable noise levels.
- Noise will be clearly audible in Maydena and will create a significant burden for the community, and undermine its potential as a tourism base.
- Noise levels from the quarry operations should be below minimum background levels and not be audible day or night at the nearest residence or in Maydena.
- Noises emission from the crushing plant would be continuous. It will be a noisy, with one representor questioning what mitigation will be put in place.
- Questioned what happens if the developer wants to use louder or additional equipment than that assumed in the VIPAC modelling report.
- The quarry does not comply with Quarry Code of Practice guidelines with respect to noise.
- Drilling between the hours of 0700 and 1900 hrs and clearing, ripping, stockpiling etc 24hrs/day are unacceptable, especially if, such operations will be audible at the nearest sensitive site or Maydena, particularly at night. Site operations should be restricted to 9am to 5 pm (with no operations on Sunday), with noise levels no greater than 5dBA higher than ambient daytime noise for a sensitive use site.
- A daytime limit of 40 dBA and night-time limit of 24 dBA at the nearest sensitive site should be applied. It was further suggested that the daytime limit should be 35 dBA (5 dBA above LA90 ambient level) at the nearest sensitive site, contending that Maydena is a sensitive area given the importance of tourism).
- The developer should provide, commission and maintain an approved noise measuring station on the western edge of Maydena, with data available to the public and State government.
- One representor suggested would be useful to have information on low frequency (5-30hz) emissions from extraction and drilling operations.

Information sought

- Describe measures that will be implemented to ensure noise levels do not exceed 45 dBA at the old ANM site buildings. Measures may include for example, drill shrouds and strategically positioned earthen bunds around the crusher, in place for the entire time the crusher is located in that particular location.

Response

The proponent will seek to minimise to a reasonable level the emission of noise from their activity into the landscape generally via the application of industry standard practices, such as -

- Earthen bunding, which may include long-term storage piles of overburden;
- Using well maintained machinery;
- Using trained operators whom know how to effectively and efficiently operate machinery;
- Strict operating hours for drilling and blasting activities;
- The use of appropriate reversing alarms on machinery;
- Limiting the number of trucks during night-time hours;
- Avoiding the use of engine breaks in residential-zoned areas; and
- Additional machinery specific measures, such as shrouds to the drill rig etc.

TRAFFIC NOISE

Comment -

- Noise pollution from the trucks passing through towns 24hours/day is unacceptable, and a large concern. Engine brake noise a particular concern at night. Residents are entitled to peace and quiet in residential areas, especially at night.
- Representor noted that, unlike forestry practices, disturbance from quarry trucks is expected to will continue for a long time. While log trucks operate at all hours, there are very few, often none, each day, however when logging operations do occur, there is significant noise disturbance from trucks on Gordon River Road throughout the day and night.
- Truck movements should be restricted to daylight hours during non-daylight savings time, and 9am to 5 pm rest of year, or 8 am to 6 pm in the least.
- Representor 'strenuously' opposes the proposed site access, as it is directly opposite their entrance and are concerned about air brake and associated truck noise.
- Representor questioned the conditions under which 'backlog' would occur, and the time periods.

Information sought

- Clarify what mitigation measures will be undertaken to ensure noise from night-time cartage operations does not result in a noise nuisance to residences on Gordon River Road.

Response

The number of trucks has been capped at 6 per night-time period (12 movements). This limits the number of times truck noise from quarry activities (mainly engine as the vehicle speed will be low) will occur in the town.

The Maydena township has a posted speed of 50 km/hr for the main residential area. Slow vehicle speed reduces the noise emitted. Truck drivers must comply with the posted speed limit – this is a legislated road rule for all road users – or face potential penalties.

Truck drivers will be advised to avoid using engine breaks in residential-zoned areas, which is consistent with signage around many towns and residential areas where truck haulage occurs. Engine breaks are a safety feature of trucks and can be deployed legally if the driver needs to utilise them.

AIR EMISSIONS

Comment –

- Impact of diesel emissions on Maydena residents from machinery was not addressed. Noted that the quarry is downwind from Maydena where children and elderly reside. This was regarded as not acceptable.
- Developer should provide and maintain an air monitoring station, with information freely available to the public and State Government. Equipment powered by other sources such as LPG or electricity could be used.
- Noted that limestone is to be refined on site for direct agricultural application. A representor queried how this level of production may impact dust emissions.
- Noted that dust will be kept to a minimum by being wet down and retaining vegetation. Representor questioned what dust mitigation would apply for truck movements.
- A representor was unconvinced the mitigation measures outlined in section G-1-1 of the DPEMP will be effective. Suggested dust monitoring be undertaken.

Information sought

- Describe measures that will be undertaken to prevent the escape of material that may blow or spill from the vehicle during cartage.

Response

Trucks will utilise tarps to prevent the escape of material. Some trucks that would be used have tarps permanently fitted, which is the case for most modern haulage trucks carting gravels, sands etc.

Furthermore, the road rules require that a driver secure their load whilst travelling on a public road.

Van Diemen Consulting Pty Ltd

PO Box 1

New Town, Tasmania

T: 0438 588 695 E: rwbarnes73@gmail.com

This document has been prepared in accordance with the scope of services agreed upon between Van Diemen Consulting (VDC) and the Client.

To the best of VDC's knowledge, the report presented herein represents the Client's intentions at the time of completing the document. However, the passage of time, manifestation of latent conditions or impacts of future events may result in changes to matters that are otherwise described in this document. In preparing this document VDC has relied upon data, surveys, analysis, designs, plans and other information provided by the client, and other individuals and organisations referenced herein. Except as otherwise stated in this document, VDC has not verified the accuracy or completeness of such data, surveys, analysis, designs, plans and other information.

No responsibility is accepted for use of any part of this document in any other context or for any other purpose by third parties.

This document does not purport to provide legal advice. Readers should engage professional legal advisers for this purpose.

Document Status

Revision	Author	Reviewer and Organisation	Date
1	R Barnes C McCoull	RW Barnes, VDC Pty Ltd	15-02-2017
Final	R Barnes C McCoull	RW Barnes, VDC Pty Ltd	15-02-2017