



MS D. LEESON: Good morning and welcome. Before we begin, I would like to acknowledge the traditional owners of the land from which we virtually meet today, and pay my respects to their elders, past, present, and emerging. Welcome to the meeting today to discuss the Kariong Sand and Soil Supplies Facility Project SSD-  
5 8660 currently before the Commission for determination. Davis Earthmoving & Quarrying Proprietary Limited, the applicant, proposes the construction and operation of a resource recovery facility and a building products and landscape supplies facility at 90 Gindurra Road, Somersby, located in the Central Coast local government area. The site is approximately four kilometres west of Gosford within  
10 the Somersby Industrial Park and covers 10.8 hectares of land zoned IN1 General Industrial under the Gosford LEP 2014.

My name is Dianne Leeson. I'm the Chair of this Commission panel. I am joined by my fellow Commissioner, Peter Cochrane. We're also joined by Brad James and  
15 Phoebe Jarvis from the Office of the Independent Planning Commission. The representatives of the applicant today are: Eric Davis, Chief Executive of Davis Earthmoving & Quarrying; Dr Mark Jackson, Director, Jackson Environment and Planning; Mark Liebman, Director, Sustainability Workshop; Dr Martin Doyle, Director, Northstar Air Quality; Tom Cockings, Director, Waves Consulting; and  
20 Mr Kurtis Lindsay, Principal, Land Eco Consulting.

In the interests of openness and transparency, and to ensure the full capture of information, today's meeting is being recorded, and a complete transcript will be produced and made available on the Commission's website. This meeting is one part  
25 of the Commission's consideration of this matter and will form one of several sources of information upon which the Commission will base its determination. It is important for the Commissioners to ask questions of attendees and to clarify issues whenever it is considered appropriate. If you're asked a question and are not in a position to answer, please free to take the question on notice and provide any  
30 additional information in writing, which we will then put up on our website. I request that all members here today introduce themselves before speaking for the first time, and for all members to ensure that they do not speak over the top of each other to ensure accuracy of the transcript. We will now begin.

35 So thank you and good morning again, and thank you for the meeting you afforded us last week which was the virtual site inspection. That has given us a good background to the site. We do intend to still, as you know, conduct a physical site inspection which is being organised for next week. Brad has set out an agenda which I think he has spoken to you about, Mark, and in covering the various things that we  
40 would like to explore a little more. Last week was quite comprehensive so we will see how we go today. There might not be quite as much to get through, but we will see how we go.

45 The first issue that I think is exercising – sorry – were you planning a presentation today or we were just - - -

DR M. JACKSON: We certainly are, Commissioner Leeson. I can share that if you like.

MS LEESON: Okay.

5

DR JACKSON: And basically we've prepared a response, and thank you for sending through the questions, Brad. So the team has prepared a response, Commissioner, so we're happy to run through that and take any additional questions from yourself and Commissioner Cochrane when they come up.

10

MS LEESON: Look, that would be fine, and we have an hour set aside for this.

DR JACKSON: Okay.

15

MS LEESON: So, you know, we will take as much of that hour as we need.

DR JACKSON: Fantastic.

20

MS LEESON: And perhaps a little more if we have to. One of the things I would like you to try and cover in your presentation if you can, or keep as a question to answer later on, is this whole question about the volume and the theoretical capacity of material coming to the site. So you've sought approval for up to 200,000 tonnes per annum in a staged arrangement. On our back of the envelope theoretical numbering we think there's a capacity there of probably four or five times that if the facility operated at full tilt and all the trucks coming and going were fully laden, based on your traffic analysis. So we would like to understand the premise on which you've struck 200,000 as what you're seeking approval for, and how that sits in the context of this site, and perhaps the industry generally. But we will hand across to you for the presentation, but we would like you to try and deal with that question at some point today if you can.

25

30

35

DR JACKSON: Yes, yes. Absolutely. Thank you, Commissioner Leeson. I think we've touched on it quite a bit in the presentation, but thank you for introducing our team. Before any of our particular team actually speak, if everyone can just introduce themselves just briefly that would be great. So without a further ado, we've basically put together some more detailed responses in relation to these questions that are being sort of asked today, and, as I mentioned before, if there's any follow-on questions, Commissioners, as we go through the material, feel free to just jump in, and either myself or our team will certainly try and sort of flesh out a response for you.

40

45

So in terms of volume management, thank you for raising this question. So in relation to the proposed development, the applicant is only seeking up to 200,000 tonnes per annum at maximum capacity for the site. Look, it does have a higher potential capacity, but obviously this is the proposal which has been put forward in the development application. So in terms of the throughput through the facility, as the Commission is aware, the proponent has volunteered three separate stages to

provide an opportunity to validate environmental performance of the facility, and, as you're aware, these three stages have been adopted as conditions within the draft consent. And we have done that to provide not only agencies but the community as well with confidence in relation to the environmental performance of the site, and it  
5 does actually line up with the predictions in the EIS, and it's also an opportunity update those controls or increase them should it be required.

In terms of how the materials will be tracked into the facility to make sure the site does not go over 200,000 tonnes per annum, there are a series of requirements the  
10 site will need to comply with. So as part of the Protection of the Environment Operations Act, all waste materials need to be weighed over the weighbridge, and all waste material and products going off the site need to be weighed as well. So there's a real-time management system in place where Eric's staff can generate a report  
15 site. Because this will be potentially adopted as an EPA licence condition, it is very strictly enforced by EPA as well, so it's in the proponent's best interest to make sure they're tracking waste very carefully into the site and they're not exceeding that maximum capacity of 200,000 tonnes per annum as well.

20 So just in terms of some additional points in relation to how waste tracking and volume management will occur on the site, as a condition of EPA licence the site will need to report on a monthly basis. It's a bit like a tax return to the EPA, but this is like a stock management report which need to go into EPA each month as part of their waste and resource reporting portal. So it's a way the EPA can monitor  
25 compliance of the site's volume limits if you like. And also it provides an opportunity for the EPA to track compliance with what is called the authorised amount or the maximum amount of waste materials, and also products held on site. So, as I mentioned, there will be a weighbridge system in place with software to provide that instantaneous reporting in relation to waste received. If the site is  
30 reaching 200,000 tonnes well before the 12-month annual sort of maximum quantity which it can receive, the site will have to stop. It's – basically, it will be in breach of its licence condition and potentially its consent condition, and it will need to cease receiving waste. This does happen from time to time across the industry, and it's a matter that the EPA take quite seriously in regulating the performance of these sites.  
35 All these procedures and systems will need to be documented in a waste monitoring program, which is a proposed condition, E63, within the draft consent.

So that is basically a summary of the volume management and how that will be basically managed within the site. As I mentioned before, basically, the site cannot  
40 exceed those limits – 200,000 tonnes per annum plus another 10,000 tonnes of landscape materials which are to be sold at the front of the site. I think I've mentioned most of these points already, but the site can – is proposed to store up to 40,000 tonnes of materials at any one point in time, and it's also important to note, based on the market conditions and the expected sort of scale up of operations, the  
45 waste management plan as part of the proposal has indicated this will occur over approximately a six-year period. Look, that is a market forecast, but certainly it's not going to be receiving 200,000 tonnes per annum equivalent on day 1. So that's

probably an important point to know. And, as I mentioned before, all these waste tracking provisions will be documented in the waste monitoring program, which is a proposed consent condition as well.

5 Commissioners, was there any further questions you had in relation to this matter? Have we sort of touched on the main points?

MS LEESON: It's clearly and industry where you take materials as they're available and as you can, you know, procure them. Given the 200,000 tonne per  
10 annum limit, I mean, I imagine you would try and balance that over the course of the year. You need to be somewhat opportunistic in terms of getting materials for your business, but would you – I guess I'm trying to understand a little more how it would work. Would you be trying to average that out more consistently over the year with a few peaks and troughs as circumstances change? You know, would you be looking  
15 at sort of a routine or a more normalised weekly or monthly volume which might sort of pop up and down depending on some of those opportunistic issues?

DR JACKSON: Yes. Maybe Eric, is that something that you might just want to talk to briefly?  
20

MR E. DAVIS: Yes. Yes, that's fine. Yes. We would like a steady flow of rubbish so we could be processing and removing at the same time. It's no good having big lots of material coming in all at once because then it doesn't allow you to process properly and have – you need a steady flow to be able to produce landscape products  
25 to supply customers. It's no good having a big glut of material then not material then material then no material because you're supplying to people and they need a steady flow of material as well, the landscapes and building market, because you will lose your customers if you run out of material, and if you have too much material at once, well, then, you can't process efficiently because you get overwhelmed with too much material. So that's correct. We would like a steady supply all year, and we would do that by arrangements like putting caps on certain customers. They would have a cap  
30 of so much a week, and that would give us consistency of input material. And even with sales, we tend to have to share the different materials around with different landscape yards. We can only supply them so much of one material, so they will be on caps for supply as well. So, yes, that's how we will manage it. Being more commercial customers, you have a lot of control over your sales and your input because you can talk to them, and you have regular clients that you work with. We're pretty experienced with that.

40 MS LEESON: Thanks, Eric. I mean, I think we were looking at it initially from the lens of the community, if you like, about, you know, what the traffic volumes might be like. They could be really heavy at one point and then next to nothing at another, so it was the impact on the community. But understanding the commercial perspective, I think, gives us the other side of that and a good explanation as to how  
45 you would try and operate your business on a sound commercial footing. Thank you.

MR DAVIS: Okay.

DR JACKSON: Great. We will just move onto the noise question if that's okay, Commissioners. So we've prepared some additional content to answer these questions. So the first question was really a summary of the changes made to the project to address community concerns. So I've got a bit of a dot point list there of the mitigation measures which have been adopted, and I know we went into these a bit last week, but, just in summary, the proponent proposes to install a three-metre high concrete noise barrier around the particularly noisy components of the operation, being the mulcher and also the crusher building, and that will be enclosed, and those buildings will be further noise insulated with sound insulation lining within those enclosures for enhanced noise control. Similar to the mulcher building, the concrete crusher will be placed behind a noise wall, behind the mulching operation. That will be enclosed in a heavy duty building as well, with that additional noise insulation for enhanced sound control. So these are all additional measures, taking into consideration some of the community's, you know, comments in relation to potential noise issues.

Some other changes include secondary sorting to be done in the fully enclosed warehouse at the front of the building – sorry – the front of the site that we went into last week, and that will be provided with 35-decibel sound insulation too. The tip and spread area is now being provided within a three-sided building to minimise noise transmission too. As we mentioned last week, there's a five-metre-high noise wall along the eastern boundary to protect the amenity of the sort of rural dwellings to the east. Operating hours will be restricted to 8 am to 5 pm Monday to Friday for waste processing, which is potentially the noisy aspects of the operation. In terms of noise impacts and the modelling done, we've assumed very sort of conservative noise power levels associated with the plant and equipment, and this was at the direction of the Department too, which they've no doubt sort of briefed you on, and we've also looked at worst case scenario where all the plant and equipment and vehicles will be operating at the same time, which is highly unlikely, but that's what we've modelled. And in addition to that, the proponent has made a commitment to instal continuous noise monitoring equipment at the boundaries of the site too. So it's part of the proponent's sort of proactive approach in monitoring performance and getting on top of these issues before they become a problem, so we would just like to emphasise that.

Some of the other changes in relation to operational noise, as I mentioned before, we've modelled worst case scenario with all plant and equipment operating. In addition, the noise study has undergone both a peer review from a community commissioned study, as well as a peer review that the Department of Planning, Industry and Environment commissioned themselves through an internal expert, as well as, obviously, EPA experts. In relation to noise in the draft consent conditions, there is a requirement for noise monitoring post commissioning which the proponent is pleased to accept as a condition, and, you know, to demonstrate to the community that noise emissions are being managed and in accordance with the predictions of the proposal. How will they work in practice? So, in summary, all these noise mitigation measures will be built and installed prior to operations commencing. All these noise mitigation measures are fixed, built measures, and they all need to be in

place before waste materials are received and processing occurs. Eric, is there anything you want to add to that?

5 MR DAVIS: No. Only the fact – well, yes, I suppose – the fact that with the noise monitoring we will have another setting in there that will be reached before it meets the EPA threshold, so we will be nipping it in the bud, you could say, before it's a problem. So we will know if the noise is getting up a bit before it becomes an environmental issue, and we will be fixing it before the alarms are going off. And the noise monitoring is 24/7, and it's a live feed to the EPA, and, yes, it's a live feed through the internet. There's no turning it off. It's always there, on the boundary there working. Okay.

MS LEESON: Thank you.

15 DR JACKSON: Commissioners, was there any further questions you had in relation to noise?

MS LEESON: Peter?

20 DR JACKSON: No? That's all good?

MS LEESON: No. I'm not sure whether Peter's on mute. I can't see him.

25 MR P. COCHRANE: Sorry. I was just shaking my head. No. No more questions. Thank you, very much. Peter Cochrane.

DR JACKSON: Okay. Thank you. Okay. Just in the spirit of sort of managing time, we will just move onto air quality, if that's okay. So the first question posed was the summary changes made to the project to address community concerns. So, once again, I know we went through some of these matters last week, but we've summarised them here clearly to outline them. So just going through them, sealed surfaces across the site will be provided in terms of hard stands and operational areas to minimise dust generation. Processing activities which have the potential for generating dust will be in closed buildings across the site and – we will go into water in a minute, but a membrane filtration plant is being proposed for the western corner of the site to supply water for dust control very comprehensively across the whole site. So there will be some additional mobile water sort of tank provisions for keeping roads moist, particularly in dry and sort of hot and potentially windy days to further suppress dust from roads. The whole site will be provided with a comprehensive network of water sprays on storage bunkers to keep the surface of materials moist, particularly during that sort of dry and hot and windy weather, which is, you know, can occur in summer. And there's further dust suppression systems proposed for the tip and spread building, as well as the mulcher and the crusher building as well, and the mulcher and crusher buildings are obviously being fully enclosed to minimise any impacts on air quality.

It's also important to note the site will not accept any odorous waste materials; it's all inert, building related materials which don't smell as well. The proponent has also committed to ceasing operations during very unfavourable conditions that can occur, you know, at certain times of the year, and that's not an uncommon operational control that these facilities commit to as well, particularly - - -

MS LEESON: Are those unfavourable conditions already defined, or would they be defined in an operational management plan?

10 DR JACKSON: I suspect in an operational management plan, Commissioner Leeson. Maybe that's a question for Martin – Martin Doyle from Northstar. Martin, did you want to make a comment in relation to that?

15 DR M. DOYLE: Yes. So there are standard wind speeds that might be a trigger for modifying conditions across the site. That would be defined in the air quality management plan. I think it's important to note as well that we haven't modified the modelling to take account of those changes, so the modelling provides a worst-case assessment of the potential impacts without that modification occurring. So - - -

20 MS LEESON: Yes. But if I understand correctly, then, you haven't yet identified what those unfavourable conditions would be. They would be defined in the operational management plan that you would submit to the Department post approval.

25 DR DOYLE: Yes. That's right.

MS LEESON: Okay. Thanks. And the other question I had is, in the early stages, if that water quality pond is still in establishment, not yet full, you haven't got the membrane filtration systems in place, etcetera, would you be importing water in tankers for dust suppression across the site in that site establishment period before your water quality pond was properly up and running?

MR DAVIS: In – yes. In the construction phase, we will import water, yes, to keep dust suppression - - -

35

MS LEESON: Okay. And until such time – sorry, I interrupted. Sorry, Eric.

MR DAVIS: Yes. Until such time as we build the dam, we will have to import water. That's correct. And that's normal practice for construction. We've got two water trucks currently, and we've got permits with Sydney Water, and we pay for the water out of a standpipe from the street, and you probably would use, you know, a couple of water truck loads a day, maybe two a day, just in the construction phase for moisture content to get compaction and to keep the dust down on the site.

45 MS LEESON: Thank you.

DR JACKSON: Okay. Great. Thank you, Commissioner Leeson. So just finishing this slide, all loads will be covered to minimise dust generation during transport of materials, and, once again, a commitment to an onsite weather station and continuous air monitoring has been proposed within the proposal as well, and that little graphic or photo on the left-hand side is an example of an air quality monitoring station that will be installed as a part of the project for effectively real-time air quality monitoring of the facility, and that provides a mechanism whereby the facility can adaptively manage its impacts and control the operations, particularly during those unfavourable weather conditions when they do occur.

10 In terms of the second question, is the applicant's assessment or the findings from our impact assessment, and the proposed mitigation measures, and how they will actually work in practice. So the air quality impact assessment done by Martin and his team used the AERMOD dispersion modelling tool in accordance with air quality requirements, and the air quality impact assessment has also conducted a cumulative assessment of air quality. That is, not only just assessing the impact of the proposal, but it has been obviously considered in addition to the background levels in the area. And the modelling has also considered a worst-case scenario when the site is operating at maximum capacity, and all vehicles, plant, and equipment are operating at maximum capacity and simultaneously, which is, once again, quite an unlikely scenario, but the modelling has considered that absolute worst case. So, in accordance with EPA requirements, the key pollutants model included total suspended particles, or TSP, deposited dust, particular matter – that's PM10 and PM2.5 – and an additional one we were asked to model was silica as well, which we will touch on in just a moment. So the impact - - -

MR DAVIS: Mark – sorry Mark, can I butt in there for minute?

DR JACKSON: Yes, certainly.

MR DAVIS: The modelling – and I may be wrong – but the modelling has been done to the point where we don't actually have to shut down on bad days; is that correct? Like, I put my hand up that we will shut down in unfavourable weather, but we can run in unfavourable weather due to this modelling.

DR JACKSON: Martin, is that something you want to touch on briefly?

DR DOYLE: Yes. Sure. So the whole idea of the real-time monitoring system is that Eric will be able to understand the contribution of the site to the wider air quality impact off site and in the general community, so there will be a range of triggers that will be triggered, and that will allow Eric, similar to as he was describing with the noise, to identify when those concentrations are increasing, and whether there are activities on site that could be modified or ceased to ensure that that concentration criterion is not exceeded. So that's generally a multi-level approach as well, so it's not just that everything has to be turned off at once to enable that to occur, so that could be stop crushing for an hour or two and see if that affects it, apply more water.

So it's a multi-tiered approach to the management. It's best practice in the mining industry generally.

5 DR JACKSON: Thanks Martin. Eric, was there anything you wanted to add in addition?

MR DAVIS: No, no. That's fine. I just wanted to give everyone, you know, the – be happy that we've got enough things in place – I'm happy to stop in bad weather, of course, but it's not panic stations. We've got enough monitoring in there that we  
10 know exactly what's going on with the dust in the air and the noise that we can really keep on top of it before it becomes an environmental issue. You know, like I said before with the noise monitoring, we will be pulling things up before they become a problem, you know? So, yes. That's all.

15 MS LEESON: Okay. Thank you.

DR JACKSON: Thank you. Sorry, Commissioner, did you want to say anything there?

20 MS LEESON: No. No. I mean, these are the things that, you know, subject to approval, one would expect to see in operating operational management plans and the triggers and the various procedures that would be pulled into place there, so I'm comfortable with that answer. Thank you.

25 DR JACKSON: Okay. Thank you. Okay. So just finishing this slide, so the modeling of 24-hour maximum concentrations for PM10 and 2.5 are well below EPA criteria under their policy, and annual cumulative PM10 and 2.5 and also total suspended particles were well below the criteria at all receivers as well, and that has been fully documented in the assessment. One of the matters that came up in the  
30 community consultation and feedback was management of silica, particularly from concrete-based products which are received and recycled at the site. So this is a matter that Martin's team looked into in quite some detail in an addendum to the air quality impact assessment. So as everyone's aware, silica is common name for sand, or silica dioxide, which is a common ingredient in concrete. Depending on the type  
35 of concrete made, sand can comprise up to about 25 per cent by weight of concrete, and, obviously, sand is a natural component of sandstone. So Martin's team looked at modeling the potential emission rates of respirable crystalline silica, or RCS, at when the site's operating at maximum capacity, and what levels would be present at receiver locations around the site. So the study found that incremental average  
40 annual concentrations were very, very low between .1 and .3 micrograms per cubic metre, and .1 micrograms per cubic metre at industrial receivers. Cumulative concentrations were also low, between .8 to 1 microgram cubic metre at residential and .8 at industrial receivers.

45 So Martin's team also looked at benchmarking these emission rates at receivers, and those benchmarks which were reviewed include Victorian EPA criteria of 3 micrograms per cubic metre, and this same level has been adopted by the California

EPA, in the absence of a New South Wales criterion that we could actually compare to. So the assessment was actually very conservative, and I think that's an important note to make, is that Martin's study actually assumed that the silica content of the materials being processed was 67 per cent by weight, which is a lot higher typically than the sand content in concrete. So, once again, this was a worst-case scenario by just assuming all the concrete processed was actually sandstone, which was quite high in silica. So the study concluded the project would not have an adverse impact on silica dust, and good management strategies for dust control at the site will also assist in minimising emissions of silica received at any sensitive locations around the site. Martin, was there any other additional comments you wanted to make in terms of those findings?

DR DOYLE: Yes. So one more point, I think, just to build on the discussion over the conservative assessment. So silica as an EPA – a Victorian EPA criterion assumes that's all PM2.5, so what we've done is we've taken the annual average PM2.5 concentrations and then multiplied those by 67 per cent to get the RCS concentration. So that basically assumes that all the material that is being processed at the site contains silica, which is, again, overly conservative, as only a portion of that would be concrete and contain silica, so I think that's very important to note.

DR JACKSON: Thanks, Martin. Commissioners, was there any further questions in relation to air quality?

MS LEESON: Peter? You're on mute.

MR COCHRANE: Thank you. Yes. One quick question. The excavated natural material that you're expecting as a substantial part of the inputs, is there a high silica – are you anticipating a high silica content in that?

DR JACKSON: I wouldn't imagine so, Commissioner. Look, excavated natural material is basically excavated soil from building sites, and that material will be basically received, stored, and blended with other material, subject to an EPA process called a resource recovery order and exemption process. But that material won't be crushed; it won't be handled in such a way that it would be generating, you know, dust or silica, for that matter. Martin, I'm not sure whether you would like to make a comment in terms of the silica content of soil? I mean, that would be substantially lower than sandstone, I would have expected.

DR DOYLE: It would be significantly lower. Yes. I'm not sure of the numbers, unfortunately.

MR COCHRANE: I wasn't thinking of soil per se, but if people are excavating foundations etcetera, that would be the sort of – some of that would be sandstone material if it came from the Sydney basin.

DR JACKSON: Eric, is that something you want to make a comment on?

MR DAVIS: I wouldn't expect people to bring sandstone, to be honest. They will bring us the topsoil and brick and concrete. We may get some sandstone, but really clean products like sandstone, they normally find a home for them before they bring to big facilities like ours, to be honest.

5

MR COCHRANE: Okay. Thank you.

DR JACKSON: Very good. Well, just moving on, just conscious of time, so in terms of operational traffic and access, we went into this in a fair bit of detail last week, so I've just provided a summary here, Commissioners, for the record, if you like. So, obviously, heavy vehicle management off Kangoo Road and Debenham Road South is a key consideration as part of the proposal. So the site will only be accessed via Gindurra Road through the Somersby Industrial Estate. The proponent does not want heavy vehicles using local roads, and there is mitigation measures to prevent that. There's inbound and outbound lanes, separated by a concrete median to prevent trucks turning right onto Gindurra Road, which we went through last week, to avoid any trucks going past rural dwellings to the east. The site is designed such that it has a recessed access to hold B-doubles within the site should they arrive before the site actually opens, and there's a right-turn lane from Gindurra Road into the site to enable smooth traffic flow on Gindurra Road to prevent any issues for any sort of eastbound residential traffic.

As I mentioned before, vehicles will only enter the site from eastbound direction on Gindurra Road and exit in a westbound direction, and that is a proposed condition of consent. The applicant has already obtained approval for B-double access into the site, which is only a small number of the overall sort of truck vehicles entering the site, and the proponent will need to prepare an operational traffic management plan and conduct driver training, which is being proposed by the Department as a condition of consent, and that is also proposed in the traffic study done as part of that proposal too. Once again, I've just summarised the traffic movements there which include both vehicles coming in and leaving the site on a daily basis at maximum capacity.

MS LEESON: Mark and Eric, we note there's that quarry to the east of the site. It must get truck movements in there. We're not sure whether they access the site from Gindurra Road or from Kangoo. How do you propose to differentiate your truck – because they must use, I think, those roads at some point – I'm assuming they do. How do you differentiate your truck movements from theirs? I mean, I understand what you're doing and the proposals that you've got in place, but I'm curious as to how the community might differentiate who's coming to your site versus who's going to the quarry.

MR DAVIS: I can answer that if you want.

45 MR COCHRANE: Thank you.

DR JACKSON: Thanks, Eric.

MR DAVIS: The majority – just from observation, I have nothing to do with the quarry. I .....

5 MS LEESON: Sorry, Eric, you might need to turn off your camera. Your audio has become a little unstable.

MR DAVIS: Hang on. I will see if I can do that. I'm actually not on my computer today; I'm on someone else's. Can you hear me there?

10 MS LEESON: That's better. Thank you.

DR JACKSON: That's better.

15 MR DAVIS: Okay. From my observation, the trucks leaving the quarry are generally flat-top trucks and they have blocks on – sandstone sawn blocks, because that's the main material that leaves that quarry – and they're strapped down – big sandstone blocks strapped down on flat tilt tray – flat back trucks – so it's quite obvious they're leaving the quarry. And even going to the quarry, they're empty flat tray trucks to cart the blocks.

20

MS LEESON: Right. Thank you. That's fine. Thanks.

25 DR JACKSON: Okay. So we've just got a sort of image here in relation to the entry design to ensure vehicles flow into the site from the west into a turning lane into the site. Just briefly, Commissioner, as we went into this last week, so I don't want to labour on it too much. There is a concrete median to prevent trucks turning right onto Debenham Road South and Kangoo Road further to the south as well.

30 MS LEESON: And your view is that this arrangement satisfies both the RMS and council?

DR JACKSON: That's correct.

35 MS LEESON: Yes. Thank you. Thanks.

40 DR JACKSON: And I can also add, Commissioner Leeson, the – Eric will actually need to do post-commissioning surveys of traffic to basically validate that the traffic management plan in place is actually working, you know, so that is a commitment that the proponent has agreed to as well. Okay, so I think that was it for operational traffic. Was there any further questions, Commissioners, in relation to that?

MS LEESON: No, not from me, thanks. Peter seems fine too.

45 DR JACKSON: Okay. Thank you. Okay. So we're getting to the back end of the presentation now and the questions. So in terms of stormwater management, the first question was touching on what are the onsite management and mitigation measures. I know we went into this in a bit of detail last week, which was really good, but, once

again, we've got a summary of the mitigation measures proposed. So, in summary, the site has very much a best-practice water management system, which is proposed to collect, treat, recycle, and reuse water within the site for a range of operational uses, and the strategy's based on maximising water reuse within the site, particularly  
5 for dust suppression, and to ensure only high-quality water leaves the site to support the growth and also the development of the bushland to the south. We also talked last week in relation to how water from the membrane filtration plant which will be installed at the site, which will take water from the water quality pond, and that high quality water will be then used to support the Melaleuca biconvexa community  
10 which is being conserved to the northwest of the site. So the proponent has really considered all feasible water-sensitive urban design practices, which is really good to see, as part of this project. The strategy is based on a risk-based approach in terms of water quality by separating out the water which has a higher potential for contaminants in it from basically high-quality water which has a lower probability of  
15 having contaminants.

So the treatment train is quite comprehensive and I've just provided a high-level summary here in relation to that treatment train, including filter socks, gross  
20 pollutant traps, bioswales which are pictured on the left-hand side of the slide there, a five-megalitre water quality pond which is actually a very, very large pond, an emergency spill pond of .5 megalitres for any contaminated water, particularly coming out of the waste storage bays, membrane filtration plant which we've mentioned, and a level rock spreader to gently enable the release of pond water to irrigate the bushland at the rear of the site. I've got a summary of additional  
25 mitigation measures there including tank storages for water and recycled water, and also additional measures which we haven't really touched on in relation to oil and water separator for the water coming out of the truck wash at the rear of the warehouse building. And the site will also be expected to sewer, so the water from the truck wash, following treatment, will be discharged subject to a trade waste  
30 agreement with Central Coast Council.

Once again, there's continuous water quality monitoring proposed, particularly around the emergency spill pond, and we will have a look at that plan in just a minute. So that water quality monitoring will determine whether any contaminated  
35 water needs to be isolated in that spill pond, or whether it can go into the main pond if it meets the water quality criteria. It's also important to note that water quality testing of water in the pond to meet ANZECC requirements – the quality criteria – will be done prior to discharge of any water that's used to irrigate the bushland to the south, and obviously that will be documented into the water management plan for the whole site. And, as I mentioned before, the high-quality water from the membrane  
40 filtration plant will be used for dust suppression across the site, as well as for watering of the Melaleuca community as well. Sorry, that was a little bit to get through, but I just wanted to make sure that that was highlighted.

45 We mentioned, Commissioners, just a moment ago, in terms of the different risk areas in terms of water quality, so these are the six catchment areas across the site. So L1 is roof water from the warehouse. That is a low-risk water source, of course.

That water will be partly stored in a 20-kilolitre rainwater tank at the back, and overflow will go into an OSD tank below ground and then piped underground and transferred directly into the water quality pond without coming into contact with any other water. The blue catchment areas, M1, M2, M3, and M4, is medium risk water quality. All of that water will be directed to the western side of the site through a series of spoon drains into gross pollutant traps to take out a lot of sediment. That water will then be filtered through a bioswale system, which is that green area along the western side of the site, prior to discharge into the water quality pond. The higher-risk water in terms of potential for contaminants is H1 here. So this is basically the water coming off the waste storage bays, as well as water from the timber shredding part of the operation too.

That water will be directed into a gross pollutant trap which is just highlighted here, and that water will be either directed into the emergency spill pond if it doesn't meet the water quality criteria, or it will be directed into the main pond if it does. And we've just got a photo of how that pond system works, and I know we went into a little bit of detail last week in relation to this, but basically there's continuous water quality monitoring at this point here where my cursor is after water comes out of the gross pollutant trap. If that water meets the relevant criteria, it is then directed via an electronic valve into the main pond here. If it doesn't meet the relevant criteria, that water will go into this pond. That water will be tested in the emergency spill pond. If it meets trade waste criteria requirements, that water will be discharged to sewer, subject to an approval from Central Coast Council. If it doesn't, that water will be pumped out and taken to a licenced treatment plant offsite. So that is a bit of a summary of all the mitigation measures onsite. Mark, was there anything you wanted to add? You're just on mute there, Mark.

MR M. LIEBMAN: Sorry, Mark. Yes. Look, Commissioners, I just wanted to probably add the most important thing which is the frequency of discharge predicted from the site. The receiving water, if you like, is not really a receiving water, it's receiving bushland, and the site has got such a significant demand for water for dust suppression and also for product moisturising that, you know, we're predicted to have very infrequent discharge from the site, and that is really the best of protecting that receiving bushland from any impacts.

MS LEESON: Peter, just while we're talking about that, you had a question earlier today around the spoon drains and the capacity of those, and I think it was related to sort of the type of rain event, that they might be – their capacity might be exceeded. Did you have a question around that this morning?

MR COCHRANE: Yes. Mark, if you go back to the previous slide.

DR JACKSON: Sure.

MR COCHRANE: Or the one before that, sorry. The spoon drains. Yes. So coming in from M4, you've got a perpendicular spoon drain there, and my question – or perpendicular join as it comes down that slight slope – and my question was, in

very high rainfall, is that going to be adequate to channel the water where you're aiming to have it ending up in that bioswale?

5 MR LIEBMAN: Yes, Commissioner. Thank you for your question. There are also – can you see the design contours in the background as well?

MR COCHRANE: Yes.

10 MR LIEBMAN: So the design contours also play a significant role in directing where that water would go, so this – and it's difficult to see in this kind of macro detail, but the micromodel, if you like, shows more contours on it, and, for example, that spoon drain which is heading in a southerly direction from M4, you know, basically sits in a valley. It has got no choice but to kind of follow those contours if you like. Elsewhere on the site, like further down at the southern end of catchment  
15 M3, you know, we will need to – and, again, it's micro and macro detail, so if had 100 mill contours there you would be able to see that there's actually – water would need to almost go uphill before it gets into H1. There's a small rise there that, I'm sorry, we just can't show it at this level.

20 MR COCHRANE: So I think the wettest day in Gosford – in the Gosford region – was something of the order of 130 millimetres in a day. That's a pretty heavy rainfall obviously. I guess you're not going to be able to cater for the most extreme events. It will be the more average conditions I suspect; is that correct?

25 MR LIEBMAN: Look, we will be able to cater for much more than just average conditions. So the five-megalitre pond has been designed for larger than the 95<sup>th</sup> percentile five-day rainfall event, so that's looking at the cumulative rainfall that falls across a five-day period, and then ranking all of those events, and then we've taken the 95<sup>th</sup> percentile. And, in fact, the 95<sup>th</sup> percentile requires a pond volume of 4300  
30 cubic metres, and we have a pond volume of 5000 cubic metres, and then we've got additional storage in the emergency spill pond as well. Look, having said all of that, the site is predicted to discharge two times a year – two to three times a year – so, you know, it certainly will discharge, and, again, I reiterate my point that it's the very low frequency of discharge which is the critical parameter or characteristic to  
35 consider in assessing the impact, you know, particularly on the bushland.

MR COCHRANE: Thank you.

40 MR LIEBMAN: Thank you.

DR JACKSON: Thank you, Commissioner Cochrane and Mark. I think we sort of touched on a few aspects of this slide already in terms of the discharge process, in terms of the operations of the water quality pond or the type D sedimentation basin. So just in summary, the pond has also been designed with an additional 2.5-megalitre  
45 freeboard for fire water containment should that be needed in the highly unlikely event of a fire occurring on the site. The pond has obviously been designed to be triggered for discharge when the water quality is tested and validated and be found to

made suitable for discharge. Obviously, the operation is seeking to contain as much water onsite for operational reasons rather than discharging when not necessary. Water will be discharged through a 50-metre level rock spreader to enable gentle infiltration of water into the bushland to the side. And what's also important as well,  
5 the water quality management system designed actually results in improved water quality compared to pre-developed conditions, and in doing so meets the most stringent NorBE, or Neutral or Beneficial Effect test, in New South Wales. So the Commission can have confidence that the system is certainly best practice. Once again, a water management system or a water quality management plan will need to  
10 be prepared post approval in the soil water management plan, and there will be post-commissioning monitoring done and water quality verification done prior to scale up of operations too, and as a part of the overall operations the site will have to or is proposed as a condition of consent to monitor groundwater quality as well. So that is a bit of a summary of the water discharge process, Commissioners. Was there any  
15 further questions you had?

MS LEESON: I'm fine. Thank you, Mark.

DR JACKSON: Okay. Thank you. And thank you, Mark. So just motoring  
20 through the last couple of matters in relation to the proposal, this one is contamination and how will existing onsite contamination be managed under the recommended conditions. So as you're aware, Commissioners, a site investigation has already been done on the site as part of the development proposal. The study  
25 found three areas of concern, which is not uncommon for these types of projects, particularly where there was industrial use in the past, and this site was operated as a previous recycling facility, so there is some fill of unknown origin, some asbestos near the old buildings to the northeast of the site and to the central section of the site,  
30 and there's some also hazardous building materials – e.g. lead paint – associated with the old buildings to the northeast of the site.

So the majority of area of concern 2 and 3 have already been resolved as part of the stage 1 approval from Central Coast Council for construction of the warehouse building. So this is a matter that Eric's team has already worked through, so an asbestos management plan has already been prepared and delivered in relation to the  
35 northeast corner of the site, and an occupational hygienist has actually validated the site has been cleared in accordance with the Central Coast Council approval. However, for the central part of the site, the asbestos management plan will be updated to include an unexpected finds protocol just in case any contaminants are found during the civil works process to ensure that those contaminants are isolated  
40 and managed in accordance with best practice, and in accordance with best practice an occupational hygienist will be engaged to certify the site is clear of any contaminants post construction as well. Eric, was there anything further you wanted to add on this slide?

45 MR DAVIS: No. Not unless there's – is there any questions, Commissioner, on contamination?

MS LEESON: No. I think there's a draft condition. The draft conditions there spell it out quite clearly and removal of contamination offsite and to a licenced facility. I'm comfortable with the explanation. Thank you.

5 DR JACKSON: Okay. Great. Commissioner Cochrane?

MR COCHRANE: No. I'm good. There's a condition B69 which requires contaminated materials to be directed to an appropriate site. I'm just wondering about the level of confidence about something being directed and actually arriving,  
10 which is not probably your problem, more a question for the Department.

DR JACKSON: Eric, is that something you wanted to comment on?

MR DAVIS: Well, generally – yes, that's fine – generally if we do find  
15 contaminants on a site and we do direct them to the correct place, we get a weighbridge receipt and the payment receipt that the material has arrived at the correct place, so we keep that on file so if it's ever questioned we have that on file that it did arrive there and it was paid for and how many tonne it was, and that correlates with the hygienist at the time. The hygienist will do an estimate of how  
20 much material's contaminated and that all marries up together, and it also gets removed by a qualified person and documented at the time. So all that's there and documented, with the weighbridge receipt, the payment, and the actual hygienist report.

25 MR COCHRANE: Okay. Great. Thanks, Eric.

MR DAVIS: Okay. No problem.

DR JACKSON: Okey doke. So just moving onto the second last matter, and I'm  
30 conscious of time, Commissioner, so we will go through this pretty quick. So visual impacts is another matter that the proposal has considered. So a visual impact assessment was done as part of the application to consider the impacts at 10 viewpoints around the site. Viewpoint 1 was notionally the most effective – sorry – affected by the proposal; that is, the corner of Gindurra Road and Debenham Road  
35 South, and we will have a look at that in just a moment. So some additional measures were adopted to make sure the visual impacts were minimised at that location, including reducing the size of the noise wall at the front of the site to two metres, which would gradually increase to five metres within the site. That wall would be coloured or painted to blend with vegetation, and that interface would be  
40 further softened with obviously additional landscaping to minimise the impact of that sort of built feature. And as part of the proposal, there's extensive landscaping proposed along Gindurra Road, a ..... open picket fence, in accordance with the character of the industrial estate, and to, you know, ensure the site blends in with the rural interface to the northeast.

45

So just looking at those viewpoints briefly, they're sort of shown here. So viewpoint 1, which is on the northeast corner of the site, this was the most affected, so you can

see there a sort of visual representation of how that sort of noise wall will appear from that corner of the site, so that will obviously be painted a fairly neutral colour and landscaped to minimise the visual impact. The front of the site at viewpoint 4 is shown graphically in this render here. Obviously, the vegetation's fairly immature there, but that will be enhanced over time. Viewpoint 5, which is along Debenham Road South, looking from some of the rural properties into the site, obviously there's a lot of screening from existing vegetation on the eastern side of the site, and just to enhance the representation of where the noise wall is it has been coloured orange there. Obviously, if that is painted sort of a neutral colour, it would be very difficult to actually see it from some of the rural properties. And, as we discussed last week, viewpoint 10 on the southern corner of the site, basically the existing bushland will be retained along that part of the site, and obviously that sort of bushland character will be maintained along Kangoo Road. The proposals considered a range of landscaping measures and utilising endemic sort of native species as much as possible. The site will be landscaped, obviously, extensively along the eastern boundary between the noise wall and the boundary with a range of shrubs and medium trees as well. Along the boundary - - -

MR DAVIS: Sorry, Mark, can I just add something there? Just to give you all an idea, we've actually put a five-metre offset around the whole site for landscaping, so there's five metres of landscaping around the whole site.

MS LEESON: Thanks, Eric. We picked that up on the plan. Yes.

MR DAVIS: Yes. We've offset – even the sound wall. The sound wall is offset five metres from the boundary, so there's five metres of plants between our boundary and the sound wall. Okay. Continue on Mark. Thanks.

DR JACKSON: Thanks, Eric. I was just making a point there, Commissioners, that, where possible, all the existing vegetation along the eastern boundary will be retained to provide screening during the development of the site, and a landscape management plan is obviously in the draft conditions of consent as well, and maintaining that landscaping is a commitment the proponent will need to make for the life of the development. Commissioners, was there any questions following on from that in terms of visual impacts?

MS LEESON: No. That's fine, thank you.

DR JACKSON: Okey doke. Lucky last slide. Recommended conditions of consent. Just in summary, Commissioners, the proponent has no comments or changes to make to the draft conditions. The proponent endorses all the conditions and is supportive of the consent of the Department as drafted for consideration by the Commission.

MS LEESON: Okay. And that's a fairly typical question that we would like to ask the applicants, you know, to make sure that, in the event we approve it, that there's

nothing that you consider unworkable in there or problematic. So that's handy to know. Thank you very much. Peter, do you have any final questions for the team?

5 MR COCHRANE: Just one, and it's one we asked the Department, which was around the current state of the roads and the likely impact of the additional traffic on it, and we note that the conditions require the preparation of a dilapidation report on the condition of all public infrastructure which really would be Gindurra Road. What's your sense, Eric, of the likely impact on that road? Is it a relatively recent one and in good nick, or is that something that may have to be addressed during the project?  
10

MR DAVIS: No, no. The road is in good condition. I'm happy with the condition of the road and I'm sure it will handle the traffic – the extra 80 cars – or not 80 cars but 80 vehicles a day. It won't affect the road at all.  
15

MR COCHRANE: Okay. Great. Thank you. Thank you.

MS LEESON: Thanks, Peter. Brad or Phoebe, are there any questions that the office would like to ask to help us in all our deliberations?  
20

MR B. JAMES: No questions from me, Di.

MS LEESON: Thanks, Brad. Phoebe?

25 MS P. JARVIS: No questions from me.

MS LEESON: Okay. Great.

MS JARVIS: Thank you.  
30

MS LEESON: All right. Well, look, thank you very much. That has been really helpful. We had a good session with you last week in that virtual site visit which put us in, I think, good stead for today. We are planning, as you know, to come up next week for a site visit, and Brad's working through the arrangements of that with you. I would just like to thank you and the team for all the effort you've put in for today. It has been very helpful. So on that note we will draw the meeting to a close and thanks very much. We will see you next week.  
35

DR JACKSON: Sounds great. Thank you, Commissioners. Thank you, team.  
40

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thank you everyone for your time.

45 UNIDENTIFIED MALE: All the best.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thanks. Bye bye.

MS LEESON: Okay. Bye.

**RECORDING CONCLUDED**

**[12.10 pm]**