

Issues with Environmental Impact Statement.

1. Moving the bulk liquids berth 750 metres nearer to where planes take off, and placing it at the end of the parallel north south runway, seems a pretty bad idea. Even worse is the idea of putting ships carrying dangerous LPG gas and petrol at this new location. Planes go over this spot all the time. These ships aren't just passing through, they are going to be like sitting ducks. We will certainly know about it if they take a hit from a plane. Would like to see the reasoning behind this one.
2. Worried about the dredging of Brotherson Dock. Contaminating industries have operated around Port Botany for decades. Seems pretty obvious Brotherson Dock will be full of contamination. Very surprised that the investigations didn't find much contamination. Kind of concerning that perhaps the testing hasn't been done right.
3. I see the 2024 sampling studies only tested 7 locations and only a couple seem to be in Brotherson Dock. Why more tests weren't done in Brotherson Dock seems very odd. Seems like the emphasis for these investigations is skewed or wrong.
4. Not sure why tests were done for maintenance dredging in 2024. The depth of the dock is being increased by over 4m, so that means taking out a lot of sediment and that would seem to be a pretty big operation. By any stretch of the imagination this is not maintenance dredging. Again seems like this study is very much off point.
5. I see the assessors comments on the 2024 reports was "no further investigations or remediation of sediments was required," seems a pretty strange conclusion following just a couple of tests for contaminants in Brotherson Dock. Can't really see how this conclusion could be reached, would be nice to know.
6. Also the assessors comment "little to no risk to human health or the environment," I can't see how the assessor reaches this conclusion, that it is 'not a problem' when it has already been said that contaminants are present and there is likely to be a sediment plume so clearly stuff from Brotherson dock is not going to be contained. Seems to be wishful thinking to me.
7. PFAS is in the papers everywhere. We have heard Sydney Airport fire training ground was a huge site of PFAS contamination and it is just a stones throw away across the water, yet there doesn't seem to have been much PFAS testing. I'm told that PFAS isn't covered by the dredging guidelines NAGD as the dangers of PFAS were not known in 2009 when these guidelines were written. Here's hoping it has been properly assessed although it is not mentioned in the really thorough contamination assessments done in 2020. Hopefully, it isn't just based on the 2 samplings done in 2024 as that would clearly not be enough.
8. Yarra Bay & La Perouse beaches are not included in the map where all other beaches around the bay have been listed. They are the closest beaches to Brotherson Dock. Almost seems deliberate. If the beaches don't exist, I guess the people using them can be treated as if they don't exist. It sort of makes me worried that there may be reasons that the investigators don't want to recognize the closest beaches to Brotherson Dock, or the people using them. What do they know that we don't? Again it doesn't give much confidence in what is going on.
9. Placement of Little Bay, Phillip Bay and Little Bay is wrong on many maps. Doesn't give public much faith in the accuracy of reports if basic things like maps throughout the report are wrong.
10. Issues of operating noise from ships and BLB, and poorer air quality and odours will all be increased for people at La Perouse now that the bulk liquids berth has been moved away from Brotherson Dock 750 metres closer to La Perouse. This doesn't seem to be the conclusions of the reports, but it is not clear why they don't come to these conclusions. Again it doesn't give much faith in what they are doing if they conclude there will be no increase in noise etc. Sort of defies the laws of science.
11. Trying to get my head around Areas of Environmental Interest. Surely, if they exist around a project then they are important. Can't understand why "Only sources or activities adjacent, or topographically up-gradient and within 500m of the project area have been considered as Areas of Environmental Interest (AEIs)" Seems to have suddenly become very specific. Almost like something is being avoided.