Stephen O'Donoghue - RE: Noise and blast queries

From: Phil Towler <ptowler@emgamm.com>
To: Stephen O'Donoghue <Stephen.O'Donoghue@planning.nsw.gov.au>
Date: Wednesday, 4 September 2013 12:43
Subject: RE: Noise and blast queries
CC: Oliver Muller <omuller@emgamm.com>, Trish McDonald <Trish.McDonald@cobbo...
Attachments: MIA.JPG; P0037_LandOwnership_20130830_01.pdf

Steve

Noise and blasting answers:

> Phil - in Oliver's response to blast questions at Lahey's cemetery, dated 15 August, it states that maximum MIC for overburden blasts on site is 500kg - however should this be 3,500 kg MIC for overburden as discussed in revised PPR page 33? Suggests that to meet criteria that overburden blast sizes will need to be significantly reduced from 3,500 down to ? as get closer to the cemetery. Please clarify further.

The maximum overburden blast MIC will be 3,500 kg as stated in the EA (Section 16.5.9) and PAC Responses (Section 2.2.4). Overburden blasts sizes will be reduced close to the cemetery.

As stated in the EA (Section 16.5.9ii), vibration criteria will be met for heritage items for 3,500 kg MIC blasts more than 700 m from the item. Where blasting is to occur closer than 700 m of Laheys Creek cemetery, the MIC and blast pattern will be designed to meet the vibration criteria for heritage items. For example, the limiting distance for heritage receptors using an MIC of 500 kg is 260 m. The closest edge of the pits s currently 370 m from the cemetery.

> Phil - can you ask Oliver whether that with the relocation of the MIA as per the revised PPR to a shielded position whether construction noise from the CHPP & MIA will meet 35dBA at private receptors to the west and sth west - namely 3224, 1215, 1198, 1199 and 1178.

The CHPP construction activities have not changed since the Noise and Vibration Assessment for Out of Hours Construction (Appendix I of the PPR&RTS) was prepared. However, the MIA has moved to the east and the construction fleet has been re-assessed based on the location of the star in the image attached (MIA.jpg). Two meteorological conditions were assessed, calm (day) and inversion (night).

The predicted noise levels for MIA construction (ie updating the values provided in Table 3.9 of the Out of Hours assessment) are as follows:

Receptor	Criteria (dB(A)), Leq, 15 min		Stripping, Leq		Cut to fill, Leq		Pavement, Leq	
	Standard hours	Out of hours	Day	Night	Day	Night	Day	Night
1178	40 dB(A)	35 dB(A)	22	24	27	29	27	30
1198	40 dB(A)	35 dB(A)	24	**36**	28	**40**	30	**42**
1199	40 dB(A)	35 dB(A)	23	35	28	**40**	30	**43**
1215	40 dB(A)	35 dB(A)	22	33	26	**37**	28	**40**
3224	40 dB(A)	35 dB(A)	26	32	30	**36**	31	**36**

The residences and activities where the out of hours noise levels are greater than 35 dB(A) are the same as predicted in Table 3.9 of the Out of Hours assessment.

> Phil - I just need some clarification on issue of 25% land affected by noise. From Figure 4 from Revised PPR Noise Appendix the 40dBA line extends well into a property as indicated in extract below. From Figure A1 from EA Land owner ship within PA area (see extract below), can you confirm that this land is owned by landowner 33 (Leslie Deutscher), who also owns residence ID 1122. From Appendix A Schedule of Land in EA, 5 lots make up the landholding.
>
> Is this total landholding 2 separate properties owned by the Deutschers?
>
> What is the %landholding affected within 40dB(A) contour across the 2 separate landholding parcels?

The western Deutschers property extends further to the south than shown in the EIS schedule of lands. The lots shown were generally truncated to show only land in or intersecting the PAA. The full extent of the property (33) is shown in the updated schedule of lands map. (We are currently checking the map and will send through a final version and accompanying table shortly).

Based on the worst-case noise scenario (Inversion, Year 20), the 40 dB(A) Leq(15 min) contour covers 22.3% of the western Deutschers property and 13.2% of the total Deutschers land-holdings (see table).

Deutschers property	Area (ha)	Noise Affected	Percent
West	609	135.8	22.3%

East	419	0	0%
Total	1028	135.8	13.2%

_____

I trust that these assist.

Best regards

Phil

Philip Towler
Associate Director

Sydney, Newcastle and Brisbane.

EMM
EMGA Mitchell McLennan

Ground Floor, Suite 01
20 Chandos Street
St Leonards NSW 2065

PO Box 21
St Leonards NSW 1590

T 02 9493 9500 | D 02 9493 9518 | M 0409 702 050 | F 02 9493 9599

www.emgamm.com

From: Stephen O'Donoghue [mailto:Stephen.O'Donoghue@planning.nsw.gov.au]
Sent: Monday, 2 September 2013 6:07 AM
To: Phil Towler
Subject: Blast query

Phil - in Oliver's response to blast questions at Lahey's cemetery, dated 15 August, it states that maximum MIC for overburden blasts on site is 500kg - however should this be 3,500 kg MIC for overburden as discussed in revised PPR page 33? Suggests that to meet criteria that overburden blast sizes will need to be significantly reduced from 3,500 down to ? as get closer to the cemetery. Please clarify further.

Thanks

Steve

Stephen O'Donoghue
Senior Planner
Mining and Industry Projects
NSW Department of Planning & Infrastructure
Phone 0477 345 626
stephen.o'donoghue@planning.nsw.gov.au

NSW GOVERNMENT Planning & Infrastructure