DOC21/1142757-14

Chris Ritchie
Director Industry Assessments
Department of Planning and Environment

Via email Sheelagh.laguna@planning.nsw.gov.au

Attention: Sheelagh Laguna

EPA Advice on Revised Submissions Report – Air Quality Impact Assessment
Additional Information Still Required

Dear Mr Ritchie

Thank you for the request for advice on 23 December 2021 from Public Authority Consultation (PAE-34237526), requesting the review by the NSW Environment Protection Authority (EPA) of the Revised Submissions Report for the Sell & Parker Pty Ltd (the Proponent) proposed Kings Park Metal Recovery and Recycling Facility Expansion (SSD-10396) (the Proposal) at 23-43 and 45 Tattersall Road, Kings Park (the Premises).

On 31 August 2021, the EPA provided the Department of Planning, Industry and Environment, now the Department of Planning and Environment (DPE), with comment (DOC21/666127-17) on the Proponent's previous response to Submissions Report:

- *Kings Park Metal Recovery and Recycling Facility Expansion Response to Submissions* – Arcadis – 2 August 2021 (the *RTS Main Body*); and
- *Appendix D Supplementary Air Quality Assessment Information – Northstar Air Quality and Ektimo reports of varied dates.*

The Proponent has responded to the EPA's comments of 31 August 2021 in the *Kings Park Metal Resource Facility Revised Air Quality Impact Assessment,* Northstar Air Quality, 17 December 2021 (the Revised AQIA).

The Revised AQIA has satisfactorily addressed some of the issues raised by the EPA on 31 August 2021. However, the EPA recommends DPE ask the Proponent to revise the Revised AQIA to consider the comments made in Attachment A – *EPA Review of the Revised AQIA*.

If you have any questions about this request, please contact Damien Rose on (02) 9995 5586 or via email at damien.rose@epa.nsw.gov.au.

Yours sincerely

MITCHELL BENNETT
Unit Head, Statutory Planning
Phone 131 555 **TTY** 133 677 Locked Bag 5022 4 Parramatta Square **info@epa.nsw.gov.au**
Phone +61 2 9995 5555 **ABN** 43 692 285 758 Parramatta 12 Darcy St, Parramatta **www.epa.nsw.gov.au**
(from outside NSW) NSW 2124 Australia NSW 2150 Australia

Attachment A – EPA review of the Revised AQIA

The EPA recommends the following matters be addressed prior to determination.

1. Impacts on industrial receptors need to be assessed

On 31 August 2021 the EPA recommended that the AQIA include industrial receptors in the complete assessment of air quality impacts. The EPA also recommended that any predicted exceedances of the impact assessment criteria (IAC) be addressed, and all existing and any proposed mitigation measures be benchmarked against industry best practice.

The revised AQIA does not predict any additional exceedances of the IAC at the residential receptors considered in the assessment. However, impacts at receptors R10-R19 identified as industrial are presented in Appendix D. Exceedances at receptors identified as industrial are predicted for annual PM10 and deposited dust. Incremental 24-hour average PM10 concentrations indicate that additional exceedances are likely.

The revised AQIA presents a *Best Management Practice Dust Control* assessment which identifies a range of additional controls to help mitigate those impacts. This includes a thorough review of the application of the on-site air quality monitoring stations for reactive and proactive dust control, to be implemented through the *Air Quality Management Plan*.

The revised AQIA argues that the industrial receptors (R10-R19) are not representative of locations where there is potential for longer-term exposure, as individuals are at these locations for only 8 hours a day. The EPA does not consider this approach to be appropriate, as the *Approved Methods for the Modelling and Assessment of Air Pollutants in NSW* identifies a sensitive receptor as a location where people are likely to work or reside.

In the absence of appropriately assessed particulate impacts, the EPA does not have sufficient information to evaluate the potential impacts and recommend conditions. The revised AQIA includes summary results tables that indicates multiple receptors are predicted to exceed annual PM10 criteria and are likely to exceed, based on significant incremental concentrations, the EPA's 24-hour average PM10 criterion. An exceedance of the annual incremental deposited dust criteria is predicted at a receptor.

The EPA recommends that the proponent present cumulative impacts at all identified receptors. The proponent should provide contour plots of particulate impacts for transparent evaluation of impacts.

2. Impacts of all control and mitigation measures need to be modelled

On 31 August 2021 the EPA recommended that the proponent clarify existing and proposed controls for the site, including time frames for implementation of those proposed controls. The EPA recommended that the proponent consider additional control and mitigation measures aimed at ensuring particulate impacts do not exceed the EPA's air quality criteria at receptors. The EPA recommended that the AQIA assess the impacts from each activity to determine where additional controls may be most effective and consider those controls which may be implemented.

The revised AQIA presents the mitigation measures and clarifies a tabulated summary of how these measures have been implemented. Appendix E of the revised AQIA presents a detailed *Best Management Practice Dust Control* for the activities and concludes with recommendations for the adoption of additional control measures (Table 72). These additional control measures include sweeping of haulage routes (HR1), enclosure of conveying transfer points (C1), water sprays on appropriate handling and transfer points (HT1) and minimisation of drop height (HT2).

The revised AQIA has evaluated the semi-encapsulation of the oxy-cutter and states the site has limited capacity to locate a suitably sized structure for semi-encapsulation. The revised AQIA also provides a summary of the daily air quality management and provides details of the current air quality monitoring station and pro-active and reactive use of those measurement data through the *Air Quality Management Plan*.

The revised AQIA has recommended additional controls to be implemented onsite and calculated the resulting reduced emissions (Table 68). However, it does not appear that the additional controls have been included in the model to evaluate the reduced impacts and whether the additional controls will achieve compliance with the criteria. The *Approved Methods for the Modelling and Assessment of Air Pollutants in NSW* states that if impact assessment criteria are exceeded the dispersion modelling must be revised to include pollution control strategies until compliance is achieved. As the EPA consider industrial and commercial receptors to be appropriate receptors to be considered (see issue 1), the assessment should model all proposed control measures and assess compliance with the impact assessment criteria.

The EPA recommends that the proponent provide confirmation that all recommended control measures will be installed and implemented and the timeframes by which they will be installed/implemented.

The EPA recommends that if additional control measures are required to minimise impacts, the proponent include these in the modelling to allow for evaluation of their effectiveness.

The EPA recommends that if proactive and reactive mitigation measures are required to manage offsite impacts, the proponent must:

a) provide more specific information on the proposed triggers, actions and responses,
b) provide information and data from the existing real time monitoring program that demonstrates its effectiveness in managing off site particulate impacts,
c) describe how, if any, the proactive and reactive mitigation measures for the proposal are different from the existing program, and
d) using the information in a) – c) estimate the effectiveness of the proposed proactive and reactive mitigation measures

3. Modelled meteorology needs validation

On 31 August 2021 the EPA recommended the proponent undertake quality assurance of the collected onsite meteorological data to evaluate the suitability of assimilating the onsite meteorological data in the model. The EPA recommended that should the onsite data be suitable, it be incorporated into TAPM/CALMET to generate the meteorological data or alternatively used to validate the model generated data. Alternately, the EPA recommended extracting CALMET data at Prospect to evaluate the validity of the model generated data.

This recommendation has not been addressed in the revised AQIA. The EPA recommends the proponent use the onsite meteorological data to validate the modelled meteorology.