Blacktown
City Council

Your ref: SSD-11606719
File no: MC-20-00011

10 August 2022

NSW Department of Planning, Industry and Environment
GPO Box 39
SYDNEY NSW 2001

Recipient Delivery giles.bloxham@dpie.nsw.gov.au

Attention: Mr Bloxham

Dear Sir

SSD-11606719 – Eastern Creek Recycling Ecology Park Throughput Increase

Thank you for your correspondence dated 12 July 2022 requesting our advice on the abovementioned State Significant Development proposal at 1 Kangaroo Avenue, Eastern Creek.

The Applicant's reports have been reviewed by our officers and our comments and issues to be addressed are listed in the attachment to this letter.

We object to this proposal until all our concerns detailed in the attachment to this letter have all been comprehensively addressed.

Council also reserves the right to add to our submission following Council's consideration of our officer's comments at its Ordinary meeting.

We request the information responding to these issues to be referred back to us for consideration and the nomination of conditions, before any final determination of this application is made by the Department.

If you would like to discuss this matter further, please contact Judith Portelli, our Manager Development Assessment, on 9839 6228.

Yours faithfully

Peter Conroy
Director City Planning and Development

Blacktown Council's submission to SSD-11606719 – Eastern Creek Recycling Ecology Park Throughput Increase

1. Planning comments

a. Council has not sighted evidence that satisfactory arrangements have been made to contribute to the provision of regional transport infrastructure and services, to comply with Clause 2.28 of State Environmental Planning Policy (Industry and Employment) 2021.

b. Insufficient details of the proposed signage have been provided. Signage locations and elevation plans are to be submitted.

c. A private open space area for employees, a minimum 7m x 7m, is to be provided in accordance with the Eastern Creek Precinct Plan Stage 3.

d. The proposal represents a significant shortfall in car parking, as required by the Eastern Creek Precinct Plan Stage 3, which total 503 spaces. Details are to be provided as to where the shortfall of 227 car spaces could be provided on site if required in the future, should staff numbers grow or future uses be proposed.

e. Setbacks of the proposed maintenance and manufacturing workshop and site workshop to Kangaroo Avenue, and the setback of the car park to Honeycomb Drive extension are to be shown on plans.

f. The car park extension area impedes access to the site to the west which is occupied by Fulton Hogan. Therefore, the Honeycomb Drive extension must be brought forward and completed as a part of this proposal to ensure proper access to the car park is provided from a public road.

g. Additional design and access information on the Honeycomb Drive extension fronting this site are to be provided for Council's assessment as part of this proposal.

h. The landscaping plan is to be updated, including landscaping to screen the car parking area from Honeycomb Drive.

i. The landscaping and tree planting along the Kangaroo Avenue frontage of the site is to be extended in front of proposed Basin B to screen the retaining wall and basin from the street. An upwards climbing plant is also to be included for the retaining walls located adjacent to proposed Basin B.

j. The retaining wall details for the proposed 10.5m high retaining wall 3 that runs parallel to Kangaroo Avenue, is be amended to show terracing of the retaining wall to allow for a ratio of 3m in height to 1.5m in width for the stepping. The amended plan is to show how the 1.5m terraced stepped area will be suitably landscaped to provide a green wall and to screen the height of the retaining walls from Kangaroo Avenue.

k. Proposed or existing landscaping directly to the south of the proposed maintenance and manufacturing workshop is also to be shown on the landscape plans to show how the bulk and the appearance of this building can be softened by landscaping.

l. Details demonstrating that trucks can enter and exit in a forward direction, of truck movement paths and swept paths throughout the site, including any truck parking areas within the site are required to be shown on the site plan in accordance with Roads and Maritime Services standards that trucks can enter and exit in a forward direction.

m. Detailed layout of proposed hardstand area adjacent to the Maintenance and Manufacturing Workshop including how may trucks would be parked, and where bin storage is proposed and any screening. More information is required as we hold concern at the risk of contaminated waste residue left in bins being washed into stormwater drains.

n. The access and the gate of the site onto Kangaroo Ave is not a dedicated public road and is still owned by the adjoining property. Owner's consent is required to provide access for this proposal onto their land out to the public road.

2. Environment, Noise and Waste comments

Council has reviewed the proposal in relation to issues including waste, noise and air quality impacts. A summary of these matters are listed at Attachment 1.

3. Asset Design engineering comments

a. Defer approval of proposed Stage 2 until the surrounding public roads (Kangaroo Avenue and Honeycomb Drive extension) are constructed and dedicated.

b. Maintain access to public roads for the Fulton Hogan operation west of the site.

c. Defer the approval of proposal Stage 2 until terms have been agreed with Council for works within Contribution Plan 18 trunk drainage channel UA2.1. These works are to be at no cost to Council including maintenance of the driveway and associated culverts and drainage structures in perpetuity.

d. Undertake a flood impact assessment for Contribution Plan 18 Channel UA2.1 to demonstrate that there will be no adverse impact on flooding and drainage conditions in the channel as a result of the proposed driveway crossing.

e. The application should clearly show how it is consistent with the original development consent from Land and Environment Court (case 10994 of 2009) in relation to stormwater quantity management and provide details of these calculations.

f. Provide amended plans and details for the proposed stormwater basins and associated drainage outlets

4. Drainage comments

1. Revised architectural plans are required for the Maintenance Workshop to detail the number of toilets required for the amenities so as to ascertain the water reuse requirements for this proposal.

2. Revised modelling from at&l is required for assessment of water quantity to address the following:

   a. The use of DRAINS to model the basins is incorrect. It contradicts condition 26 of the court order of 11 November 2010 that specifically requires RAFT modelling for these catchments.
   b. The RAFT model is to use the specific parameters outlined in the court judgement noting higher pre-development losses than considered in the DRAINS model.
   c. For Basin B, set the base of the On-Site Detention at the Extended Detention Depth for the bioretention basin.
   d. For the Northern and Southern Basins, set the base of the On-Site Detention at the permanent water level.
   e. The RAFT models are to be provided digitally for review by Council.
   f. The DRAINS models where used for the pipe system are to be provided digitally for review by Council.

3. Revised modelling from at&l is required for assessment of water quality to address the following:

   a. The Model for Urban Stormwater Improvement Conceptualisation (MUSIC) was not provided. It was not possible for Council to make a proper assessment

   b. The Model for Urban Stormwater Improvement Conceptualisation (MUSIC) layout as shown on Figure 4 of the Surface Water Impact Assessment by at&l dated December 2021 is unsatisfactory. This is due to the inconsistencies with Council's modelling requirements, these issues include:

      i. Detail all bypass. The Model for Urban Stormwater Improvement Conceptualisation (MUSIC) schematic currently shows no bypass across the site. Check catchments as this is rarely achieved.
      ii. There should be a catchment downstream of Basin K draining directly to the northern basin bio.
      iii. The total surface flow into Basin B bioretention is 2.578 Ha excluding roof area. To protect the bio a Gross Pollutant Trap should be provided upstream, treating the surface flow and protecting the basin from sediment loading to ensure ongoing effective operation.
      iv. A detention node for Basin B is shown downstream of the Bioretention B. For detention nodes the K values are all set to 0 and there is no treatment possible in the detention component so it is unclear why it is there.
      v. Similarly, a detention node for Basin K is shown. For detention nodes the K values are all set to 0 and there is no treatment possible in the detention component, however the basin can be used to regulate discharge downstream. Review the K values in Basin K.
      vi. In On-Site Detention North it is shown as a wetland when it is understood that it is a bioretention basin.

vii. At Appendix B of the Surface Water Impact Assessment by at&l for AT&L Works As Executed drawings C01(2) and C03(3) a permanent water volume of 500 m3 is noted as available in the northern basin. A simple calculation based on the volume available below the permanent water level suggests that this would need to be drained completely to provide the non-potable volume require for reuse. Based on the nominated non-potable usage (cart) of 178 kL/day in Section 3.3 of the Surface Water Impact Assessment, this storage will be depleted in less than 3 days. Consequently, the northern basin cannot operate as a wetland and the wetland node should be deleted and modelled more as a pond.

viii. At Appendix B of the Surface Water Impact Assessment by at&l for AT&L Works As Executed drawings C02(2) and C04(2) a permanent water volume of 500 m3 is noted as available in the southern basin as a specific additional storage with a non-planting zone. The Works As Executed does not make clear what the finished base level of the basin is however it is likely to be some additional storage over the basin extents in addition to the additional 500 m3 storage. Section 3.3 of the Surface Water Impact Assessment refers to 746 m3 for southern basin and this may account for this extra storage. Draining the 746 m3 to the northern basin via a transfer pipe to provide the non-potable volume required for reuse would suggest that the wetland would dry out, possibly for an extended period. Based on the nominated non-potable usage (cart) of 178 kL/day in Section 3.3 of the Surface Water Impact Assessment, this storage will drain in about 4 days. Consequently, the southern basin cannot operate as a wetland and the wetland node should be deleted and modelled more as a pond.

ix. It is unclear how the flows from the permanent storages in basins South and North (shown with red dashed lines) operate in Model for Urban Stormwater Improvement Conceptualisation (MUSIC) and how/when they get water to the recycled water tanks.

x. The rainwater tank internal usage (toilets) are too low. There are 4 toilets in the Site Workshop and additional information is sought to determine the number of toilets in the Maintenance workshop. The proposed usage at 0.1 kL/day/toilet or urinal applies for a standard 8 hour day. Where there are two shifts this figure should be 0.17 kL/day/toilet and where there is 24 hour operation the figure should be 0.23 kL/day/toilet. Review the usage.

xi. In the Model for Urban Stormwater Improvement Conceptualisation (MUSIC) model reduce the Rain Water Tank node volume by 10 % compared to the size of tank on the plans.

xii. Basin B bioretention filter level is set 11.44 m below road No. 7. This will create a significant shadow that reduces the efficient growth of the plants. Determine the ineffective filter area based on section 11.8.4 of the Water Sensitive Urban Design developer handbook. Consider raising the level of the filter media and/or lowering road no. 7. Consider also the thermal

impacts from the masonry retaining wall on the southern side of the basin as per section 11.8.4 as well.

xiii. Provide the amended Model for Urban Stormwater Improvement Conceptualisation (MUSIC) digitally to Council.

4. Provide amended drainage plans from at&l Project No. 19-692 to address the following:

   a. There is insufficient information shown on drawing C313(F) to understand how Basin K will operate. It is understood to be only a detention basin. On a dedicated separate plan provide detailed plans and sections through Basin K. Provide details of the control pits and weirs and pipe(s) out. Provide a vehicular access ramp down to the base of the basin.
   b. There is insufficient information shown on drawing C315(I) to understand how Basin B will operate. It is understood to be a combined bioretention and detention basin. On a dedicated separate plan provide detailed plans and sections through Basin B. Provide details of the control pits and weirs and pipe(s) out. Provide a sealed subsoil collection pit and discharge the subsoil flows downstream of the control pits. Bioretention generally to comply with the details outlined in Council's Water Sensitive Urban Design standard drawings with a saturated zone. Provide a vehicular maintenance access ramp down to the base of the basin with a track down one side of the bio.
   c. It is unclear whether basins B and K are to be designed now with sufficient area/volume to allow for the ultimate filling of the site and contribution of additional catchment from the filled hole as depicted on at&l drawing SKC007 (P6) dated 26-10-15 as shown in Appendix C of the Surface Water Impact Assessment by at&l dated December 2021.
   d. On drawing C320(B) and C321(A) provide more variations in colours for fill and cut. The current gradations are too similar to assess.
   e. Provide details/sections of the retaining walls.

5. Natural Areas comments

a. The Biodiversity Development Assessment Report (BDAR) by Arcadis dated December 2021 is unacceptable in its current form. It needs to be amended to make clear the areas of Cumberland Plain Woodland (PCT 849) within the proposal area that will be cleared and those that won't.

   Currently 0.4 ha of PCT 849 (comprising remnant and planted woodland) are identified within the subject land and only 0.28 ha of this is used in the BAM-C for offset calculation.

   Areas to be protected should be shown on a map and methods to protect these areas e.g. type and location of bushland protection fencing, clearly outlined under Mitigation Measures.

   Alternatively, offset calculation should be made for the whole 0.4 ha of Cumberland Plain Woodland resulting in a higher biodiversity credit offset obligation for this proposal.

b. The Landscape Plan:

- must include planting densities or numbers of plants proposed. As it is, the planting diagram looks too thin to meet the stated aims from the Environmental Impact Statement of "screen planting and perimeter fencing to be used along the eastern perimeter of the Proposal Site, between the Maintenance and Manufacturing Workshop and along Kangaroo Avenue to provide a natural visual barrier to soften proposed built elements";
- must reconsider carpark species to include trees for shade in addition to groundcovers and instead of broad, spiny shrubs like Bursaria spinosa or thin low trees like *Acacia decurrens*.
- must propose planting trees at a higher pot size than 45L (minimum 200 L to ensure establishment success).

Attachment 1

10 August 2022

Air quality, noise and waste management issues

The following comments on the Bingo REP Expanded Throughput SSD Application (SSD11606719) were prepared in relation to air quality, noise and waste management:

Issue	Comments
Air quality	
Quantitative assessment of potential air quality, dust and odour impacts	The Secretary's Environmental Assessment Requirements for the REP DA (**SEARs**) require that the quantitative assessment must include: - identification of existing and potential future sensitive receivers; and - consideration of cumulative local and regional impacts. Despite this, potential future sensitive receptors have not been identified. A review of whether sensitive receptors will or are likely to exist near the development in the future would be expected. **Otherwise, it cannot be said that all potential future impacts have been considered.** In addition, it appears that the assessment has not considered the potential cumulative impacts of the REP proposal with other developments which are currently proposed but not yet approved, for example, Eastern Creek Energy from Waste Facility. A review of nearby projects with the potential to contribute to cumulative air quality impacts would be expected. **In the absence of this information, it cannot be said that all potential impacts have been considered.**
Details of proposed mitigation, management and monitoring measures during both the construction and operation stages of the proposal	The SEARs require that the details of proposed mitigation, management and monitoring measures must provide: - strong justification for continued implementation of existing measures; and - strong justification for any additional measures proposed as part of the development. Despite this, management of odour impacts is not addressed. **This is a significant issue for the neighbouring communities, especially given the ongoing odour management issues of the existing facility and the fact that the EPA has had to take regulatory action several times at this facility.**

Issue	Comments
Background levels and approach to cumulative impacts	The assumed background total suspended particles (**TSP**) and deposited dust levels should be explicitly described but it is not. The reviewer is left to infer these from the model results. Concerns about insufficient cumulative impact assessment have already been identified in comments above. **The incomplete description of background TSP and deposited dust levels exacerbates the inadequacy of the cumulative impact assessment.**
Emission inventories, calculations, and source representation in the model	Peak-to-mean factors are not discussed in the context of the odour assessment. **The absence of peak-to-mean factors in the modelling means that the modelling will underestimate potential odour impacts.** It is stated that site-specific odour sampling was carried out in June 2022 and that the results from the sampling were used to develop the odour emission inventory. That date passed before public exhibition of the REP DA started. However, the odour sampling reports were not provided. Consequently, it is not possible to verify the conditions under which samples were taken or to verify that the samples were representative of reasonable, worst case odour emissions. Results from the odour sampling should be provided to verify that the assumed emissions were representative of reasonable, worst case odour emissions. **Without this information, it is not possible to evaluate the reliability of predicted odour emissions (eg. whether they have been underestimated), and this undermines the adequacy and reliability of the odour impact assessment.**

Issue	Comments
Noise and vibration	
Background noise levels	The 2014 background noise monitoring data was undertaken between 18 March 2014 and 27 March 2014 at BG1 and BG2. Due to an equipment error, the survey was repeated at BG1 from 8 April 2014 to 16 April 2014. The second monitoring event at BG1 in April 2014 included the school holiday period from 11 April 2014 to 16 April 2014, which only yielded three (3) valid days of data for the day time and evening assessment periods and six (6) valid days data for the night time assessment period. Section 2.3 of the Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment (**NVIA**) presents the background noise monitoring data and the Rating Background Levels (**RBLs**) used to determine noise impact assessment criteria. They are referred to as Project Noise Trigger Levels (**PNTLs**). The NVIA methodology (Section 2.3) adopts the lowest RBLs from the 2014 and 2019 background noise monitoring data to derive PNTLs. The methodology adopted in the NVIA is not in accordance with the NSW EPA's *Noise Policy for Industry* 2017 (**NPI**) method for determining background noise levels (Fact Sheet B). The 2014 monitoring data at BG1 is not valid, as it was completed during the school holiday period. The selection of adopted RBLs, which relies on the lowest of the 2014 and 2019 monitoring data, may result in an incorrect derivation of PNTLs, which in turn may lead to an incorrect assessment of impacts. **As a result, the current background noise levels used for the assessment in the REP DA are not adequate to inform the extent of potential future noise impacts stemming from the proposal.** In addition, the NVIA states "as can be seen from Table 2-3, no significant changes have occurred in the area that have impacted on the ambient noise environment between 2014 and 2019". However, on review of Table 2-3 of the NVIA, there are significant changes in background noise levels, particularly in the evening at BG2 where the RBL decreased by 7dB; and at BG1 where the daytime RBL increased by 3dB. **Accordingly, the NVIA has failed to correctly identify significant changes in the environment, and therefore may have failed to accurately identify all potential future noise impacts stemming from the proposal.**

Issue	Comments
Compliance noise monitoring	NVIA Section 3.4 states that compliance noise monitoring for the existing REP facility has been conducted by Consulting Earth Scientists since 2016. Typically, noise compliance monitoring for development consents and environment protection licences should be undertaken by a suitably qualified and experienced person(s), consistent with the technical eligibility criteria for membership to the Association of Australian Acoustical Consultants or the Australian Acoustical Society. Despite this, the proponent has not provided evidence that the noise compliance measurements have been undertaken by suitably qualified and experienced person, or that it has been done in accordance with appropriate Australian Standards and Noise Policy. The absence of such evidence may mean that the existing environment and the performance of the existing REP facility have not been reliably established, and so the forecast noise impacts for the RPE DA have not been established reliably. **This may, in turn, mean that the noise monitoring assessment fails to adequately demonstrate compliance with relevant noise criteria.**
Attended noise monitoring	NVIA Table 3-6 outlines observations made during operator-attended noise monitoring conducted by RWDI and makes a comment that "background environment made up of traffic and industrial noise". A review of the Pacific Environment report (October 2016) Table 3-2, which summarises operator-attended noise monitoring results completed in March 2014, notes that industrial noise was not present. The proponent is required to provide additional information regarding "industrial noise", clarifying what other industrial noise sources are present and at what relative contribution. **In the absence of such information, the potential future noise impacts of the Project are uncertain, due to conflicting observations as to whether industrial noise is present.** To this end, it is understood that the community has raised concerns around potential future noise emissions from the proposal, meaning that it is of even greater importance to identify the source(s) of industrial noise and ensure that compliance with relevant noise criteria can be clearly demonstrated. Further information about the emergence of industrial noise since the 2014 surveys should be provided. The industrial noise present in the 2014 surveys may be attributable to the operation of the existing REP, and that noise may have not been accurately quantified. **Therefore, it cannot be said that compliance with relevant noise criteria has been clearly demonstrated, nor can it be said that all potential future noise impacts have been considered or accounted for.**
Modelling vehicle noise emissions	NVIA Section 4.4 describes heavy vehicle movements associated with the proposal, as summarised in Table 4-3. Heavy vehicles in this type of setting typically do not exhibit noise propagation properties similar to a line source as would normally be done for road traffic noise and are more analogous to a "moving point source" as they are in transitory in nature. CadnaA software was used to predict noise emissions from the proposal, which does accommodate a moving point source input.

Issue	Comments
	The proponent is required to provide additional information as to what corrections were applied to the line source to represent a moving source in the model. **In the absence of such information, the use of CadnaA software may result in an inaccurate prediction of noise emissions and impacts that fails to account for moving point sources.**
Timber stockpile area	NVIA Table 4-2 presents the plant and equipment quantities and sound power levels. The assumptions following the table do not, however, describe the operating hours for the Timber Stockpile Area. In addition, the proponent has not provided information regarding the operating hours of the Timber Stockpile Area. **The failure to accurately reflect the operation of the Timber Stockpile Area in the assessment of potential future noise impacts may result in an inaccurate prediction of noise emissions and impacts. Consequently, the assessment is unreliable.**
Construction noise	NVIA Section 3.2 the states that construction will occur from 7am – 6pm Monday to Friday and 8am – 4pm Saturday. NVIA Section 4.5.4 states that construction would be undertaken during standard construction hours (ie. 7am – 6pm Monday to Friday and 8am – 1pm Saturday). The EIS for the proposal, dated June 2022, refers to "standard construction hours" as being 7am – 6pm Monday to Friday and 8am – 1pm Saturday. The uncertainty in the statement of proposed construction hours casts doubt on the reliability of the construction noise and vibration assessment and also makes it unclear how the proposal will operate, and how it will comply with the Interim Construction Noise Guideline (**ICNG**). **For this reason, the EIS fails to adequately account for all potential future noise impacts stemming from the proposal, and the assessment is unreliable.**
Low frequency noise	The assessment of potential Low Frequency Noise (**LFN**) has been calculated by comparing the C weighted and A weighted noise levels from the proposal in NVIA Section 6.2. The *Noise Policy for Industry* 2017 Fact Sheet C (Table C1) outlines how to apply the corrections for modifying factors. To determine whether LFN is a feature of the proposal, C-weighted and A-weighted noise levels must be measured simultaneously. The proponent has not provided justification as to why existing LFN noise emissions at the receiver locations was not conducted, considering that the receivers are potentially subject to noise from numerous industrial noise sources and the potential for LFN is prevalent. The NVIA concludes that LFN will not occur. **In the absence of data stemming from simultaneous measurement, the conclusion in the NVIA concerning LFN cannot be supported. For this reason, it cannot be said that the EIS for the proposal adequately deals with potential future impacts stemming from LFN associated with the proposal.**

Issue	Comments
Waste management	
Classification of waste	The waste received by the REP facility (both currently and as proposed) is stated to be predominantly construction and demolition (**C&D**) and commercial and industrial (**C&I**) waste, such as mixed or co-mingled C&D and C&I waste consisting of metals, brick, concrete, plasterboard, soil, aggregates, plastics, ferrous and non-ferrous metals and a range of building and demolition wastes. The EIS for the proposal does not explain if the waste received will be classified by the generator and the classification verification process that will be carried out by Bingo to confirm any such classification, including spot sampling and analysis frequency rates. **Absent this information, it remains a possibility that material could be received by the proposal which should be rejected. If incorrect material is received and processed, it could contaminate large quantities of other, suitable materials.**
Additional Waste Generation in Construction and Operational Phases	The EIS for the proposal states that "The waste impacts of the construction and operation of the Proposal were found to be minor and any impacts would be readily managed and reduced through the implementation of mitigation measures". (page xivii of main EIS document) However, no volume estimates of expected waste generation for the construction works, nor any classification information on any test pits or bores, have been carried out for the proposed development or provided in the EIS. **Accordingly, this statement in the EIS is not supported by the assessment provided in the EIS, which is inadequate to satisfactorily identify all potential future impacts related to additional waste generation in the construction and operational phases of the proposal.**
Re-Processing of Residual Materials	Figure 2.4 (Attachment 1 below) on page 26 of the main EIS document shows the material flow paths. This Figure indicates that any residual material from the MPC 1 or 2 is tested and, if it fails the contamination criteria for acceptance to landfill, it is reprocessed until it meets the landfill classification criteria. However, there are no data available in the EIS which deal with this aspect of residual waste. There is no description of the type of reprocessing that may be required nor any indication of the amount or percentage of the residual that needs reprocessing to meet an acceptable classification for landfilling. **In the absence of this data, the EIS fails to adequately identify all potential future impacts stemming from the re-processing of residual materials.**
Waste Inspection	The waste receival inspection procedure for wastes received at the MPCs involves spreading the waste on the floor and carrying out a visual inspection. Industry experience indicates that this process is likely to miss hazardous materials as it is difficult to inspect all the waste. Even with the use of picking stations, it is likely that operators will miss hazardous items. The increase in throughput proposed for the MPC facilities also requests and increase in storage of material on site from 667,000 tonnes to 950,000 tonnes. There is no indication in the EIS on how the stockpiles will be managed and quarantined until they are analysed and approved for reuse off site.

Issue	Comments
	If hazardous items are missed, those items could contaminate acceptable waste and/or stockpiled waste, resulting in that contaminated waste being either unnecessarily landfilled (if contamination is detected) or inappropriately distributed for re-use (if contamination is not detected).
Construction waste	The EIS indicates that Stage 1 of the proposal will not require any additional infrastructure, but Stages 2 and 3 will generate some construction waste. However, the EIS does not address any management plan requirements for construction waste generated by the proposal. **In the absence of information concerning construction waste management plans, the EIS fails to adequately account for potential future waste impacts stemming from the construction phase of the proposal.**
Contingency for hazardous residual waste	No contingency planning is provided for circumstances where a substantial amount of the residual waste from the MPC facilities is hazardous. This is unacceptable, given the very large daily throughput proposed for the MPC facilities. **In the absence of plans and documentation dealing with the management of hazardous residual waste, the EIS fails to adequately account for potential future waste impacts stemming from the hazardous residual waste that may be associated with the proposal.**