

## Location

- relocating the plant to Tomago or in the Hunter Valley were not investigated enough as possible options. Can a comparison of the pro's and con's be completed for Tomago and the Hunter Valley?

## Risk

- A risk assessment of plant operations needs to be detailed further for the effect of unlikely incidents, for both air quality and water discharge impacts on the environment and sensitive receivers. As pollution events occurred in 2007-2009, further pollution events are expected regardless of the control measures put in place due to the cumulative act effect.

## Community

- The sample size is not tailored to the most affected residence, as minor day to day implications do not affect the Newcastle LGA.
- The report does not conclude their findings, Does the community want this development?
- I believe the attitude statements are biased.
- 58% of community respondents had concerns with the plant being installed, surely this is justification to reassess possible locations for the plant, perhaps closer to their customers, in a less densely populated location.

## Traffic

- why not transport the materials, rather than transporting the product to the consumers?

## Air Quality

- Report is still in draft form.
- the report does not detail worst case emergency scenarios nor the pollutants emitted during emergency events, what are the worse case impacts?
- The report does not focus on mean NOx impact to sensitive receiver's, rather than focusing on the maximum. I would like a clarification on the average discharge of NOx into the atmosphere as compared to the average background of NOx in the Stockton community, rather than the OEH criteria.
- provide justification for monitoring the scrubber and boiler yearly, and not monthly or fortnightly?

## Water quality

- provide details of the water quality discharged compared to ANZECC criteria.
- will there be further accumulative effect of additional shipping movements caused by the increase in coal loaders in the future?

- struggling to find a suitable discharge point for the effluent is a strong indication of the pollution that the plant will be discharging is excessive, is it possible a failure in the modelling will result in the pollution floating and causing further impacts to recreational water activities, is it possible these will exceed ANZECC criteria?
- has the possibility of have nitrogen remove processes onsite been evaluated to be used onsite?
- what would be a typical response for a water pollution event through the proposed discharge points?