

Alastair Jewell

From: Craig Welsh [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, 2 May 2023 12:22 pm
To: Alastair Jewell
Subject: CJ Industries - RM200488 etc - Gary Clark Reply

Good afternoon Alastair

I do not need to hear reply evidence from Mr Clark. I have read his reply and responses to the minutes and have no questions for him.

Regards

RMA Commissioner Services Ltd

Craig Welsh (MSc) (BComm)

RMA Commissioner

[REDACTED], Nelson 7011

Mobile: +64 [REDACTED] 7 | [REDACTED].co.nz

Alastair Jewell

From: Craig Welsh [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, 2 May 2023 9:45 am
To: Alastair Jewell
Subject: CJ Industries - RM200488 etc - Elizabeth Gavin Reply

Good morning Alastair

I do not need to hear reply evidence from Ms Gavin, subject to her confirming that her findings also relate to clean fill activities not just quarrying as stated in paragraph 4.4 and 4.5 of her reply evidence. Ms Gepp could relay the response to me at the hearing.

Regards

RMA Commissioner Services Ltd

Craig Welsh (MSc) (BComm)

RMA Commissioner

[REDACTED] 7011

Mobile: +64 [REDACTED] | [REDACTED]

Alastair Jewell

From: Craig Welsh [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, 1 May 2023 11:09 am
To: Alastair Jewell
Subject: CJ Industries - Questions for Mr Aiken

Good morning Alastair

I have prepared the following questions for Mr Aiken to answer for the hearing. They focus on Figure 1 of his reply (page 4).

1. Please explain the orientation of the figure. At the moment, it appears (based on the dark gray rectangle vaguely imitating the outline of stage 1) as though the tranches cut through stage 1 from east to west – and therefore the 20m x 80m pit is at right angles to the flood flow path, making the headwall (the cut face at right angles to the flood path) 80m.
2. Will the dark gray buffer between the tranches be left alone – thereby providing a buffer between tranches – if so how big is that buffer?
3. You can roughly fit four pits in a trench – if the conditions require a grass cover on the rehabilitated pit (80x20m pit as initially proposed) – and the rehabilitation is ongoing (i.e. as the pit face advances the rehabilitation follows) then 3 pits worth of grass cover would be already established (or planted) whilst working on the 4th (80x20m) pit in the trench. This means that about 80% of the trench area would be grass covered anyway – so my question is what real advantage does the trench system have over the initial mining process that I heard? This question stems from the fact that section 3.3(a) explains that the rationale for the tranches stems from establishing grass cover.

Regards

RMA Commissioner Services Ltd

Craig Welsh (MSc) (BComm)
RMA Commissioner

Mobile: [REDACTED] | [REDACTED]

Alastair Jewell

From: Craig Welsh [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, 28 April 2023 9:50 am
To: Alastair Jewell
Subject: CJ Industries - Applicant Witnesses

Hi Alastair

Could you please pass on to Ms Gepp that I have no questions for the following witnesses:

- Mr Hegley – noise;
- Dr Kaye-Blake – economics (subject to somebody at CJ Industries confirming that the price of aggregate doubles for every 30km that it is hauled (as per paragraph 3.8)). This is not a question for Dr Kaye-Blake to answer;
- Dr MacNeil – subject to Ms Gepp confirming that this evidence also applies to land fill activities not just quarry activities.

At the Applicant's discretion, these witnesses do not need to appear.

Regards

RMA Commissioner Services Ltd

Craig Welsh (MSc) (BComm)
RMA Commissioner

Mobile: [REDACTED] | [REDACTED].co.nz