

26 February 2021

By email.

Dr Mark Jackson

Director

Jackson Environmental Planning

Head Office
4 Park Avenue
Blackheath, NSW, 2785
Australia
E: mark@sustainabilityworkshop.com
T +61 (2) 4787 8428
www.sustainabilityworkshop.com

Dear Mark,

RE: NSW EPA's review of the RtS and supplementary issues pertaining to the water impact assessment of SSD 866o - a proposed resource recovery facility – 9o Gindurra Road.

Thank you for forwarding me NSW EPA's review of the RtS document regarding the proposed state significant development (866o) by Kariong Sand and Soil Supplies. This letter addresses NSW EPA point C) Water Impact Assessment.

We have:

- 1) Reviewed the EPA correspondence
- 2) Provided a response below.

EPA Correspondence

The EPA raises three key points as follows:

- 1) The stormwater treatment design has been modified, with removal of the floating treatment wetland, and changes to the operation of the OSD to include a 5 day trigger for controlled discharges once water quality criteria have been achieved. The EPA notes that these criteria are to be developed in consultation with the EPA based on ANZECC Guidelines for slightly to moderately disturbed ecosystems.
- 2) The EPA has requested that "the applicant confirms that the removal of the wetlands from the OSD basin, and the addition of controlled discharges does not change the total volume of water discharged to the environment."
- 3) The EPA recommended that a condition of consent be revised to ensure that if the land use or hydrology of the southern portion of the site change during the life of the operation that a

revised impact assessment should be prepared to ensure residual risks to the environment remain unchanged.

Applicant Responses to the NSW EPA

Responses to each point raised are noted below:

- 1) The Applicant agrees that the discharge criteria should be based on slightly to moderately disturbed ecosystem ANZECC Guideline values and welcomes the opportunity to develop criteria jointly with the EPA.
- 2) The Applicant confirms that the removal of the floating wetland will have a negligible effect on the total volume of water discharged from the site.

Operating the proposed basin with controlled discharges does marginally increase the total volume of water discharged from the site however total site discharges remain close to the pre European (undisturbed land-use) level of site discharge. As such the proposed water management system will not have an adverse impact on the downstream environment.

Table 1 Total Site Discharge in Various Development States

	Pre-European discharge	Stage 1 Approved Development (existing scenario)	Stage 2 EIS prior to addition of controlled discharges including irrigation of Melaleuca Biconvexa area	Stage 2 EIS after addition of controlled discharges including irrigation of Melaleuca Biconvexa area
Total site discharge (ML/year)	9.76	31.6	7.3	8.56

- 3) The Applicant agrees to the recommended amendment to the proposed condition of consent relating to the undeveloped part of the site and assessment of residual risk. We also note that the day to day application of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act to any future development on the site should also ensure this outcome without any need for a specific condition of consent.

Conclusions

The Applicant welcomes the opportunity to consult with the EPA to refine the proposal during the commissioning stage of the water cycle management system. The addition of controlled discharges does marginally increase the total site discharge however it remains below the pre-European level of discharge.

Yours sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Mark Liebman". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Mark Liebman, CPEng, MIEAust, MIPWEA

Director, Principal Engineer